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“All critics of Jews should not be tagged as anti-Semites. We are not a nation of Christ, Spinoza, and Einstein; that the Nazis are brutes does not make us angels … Criticism is not the same as hatred, and critics are not our enemies. The greatest friends of a people are not those who praise but those who honestly find fault. A people without criticism is either a dictatorship or a community so deeply embedded in smug self-satisfaction as to be on the road to decadence.”

William Zuckerman, Jewish author [written before World War II, in Goldstein, D., p. 119]

“The far-reaching consequences of the [Jewish] martyr complex go beyond any effect of the individual Jew … and do not leave unmarked even the most sympathetically inclined Gentiles. Since the Jew is hypersensitive on the subject of his Judaism, Gentiles fear to offer constructive criticism lest they be accused of prejudices. Thus the Jew is denied the benefit of honest evaluation of the very real differences and prejudices existing … I believe we Jews will never be normal individuals so long as we foster our martyr complex, so long as we remain evasive of self-appraisal and self-improvement, and so long as it is easier to blame the other fellow for our own faults.”


“By accusing western democracies of anti-Semitism, the Jews put them on the defensive. As long as guilt feelings can be profitably mined, advantages can be gained. But the lode is not likely to last forever.”

Moshe Leshem, former Israeli diplomat, p. 253-254]

“A popular government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy; or perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance and a people who mean to be their own government must arm themselves with the power which knowledge brings.”

James Madison
It is a daunting task to write a book, knowing full well that it swims counter to one of the strongest contemporary currents, and that it will automatically and categorically be rejected without investigation by the cultural, educational, and political machinations of modern western society, not for failings in its intellectual, scholarly, or moral rigor, but because its subject matter is publicly configured (by militantly enforced convention tended to by a powerful “special interest” group) to be beyond the pale of criticism. The subject matter in this volume is individuals, by virtue of their identity within an extremely politically active group, who are rendered completely free from the responsibility of such group association. It is further daunting, and disturbing, that such a volume is – by blanket dictate – condemned, even in its mere conception, to be an immoral, innately prejudicial, and even evil, enterprise.

We are all socialized in Western society to resist judging any individual by his or her ethnic/group association. It’s a noble ideal: Why prejudge anyone about anything? Let any individual be completely evaluated upon his or her respective merits. America is educationally, and legally, configured as a “tolerant” society, champion of a variety of multicultural perspectives. As reasonable as this may seem, however, there can be a profound double standard subliminally at work here. What about when the “individual we must not prejudge” is part of a subcommunity that itself prejudges all who are not part of that group’s boundaries of identity, a group that consistently acts by its self-protective, self-expansive biases? Is it “prejudicial” to criticize individuals who maintain – actively or passively – such group allegiance, within, and transcending, the American matrix? And is it not morally reasonable, and in fact morally necessary, to criticize any collectivity, to the degree it deviates, at core, from the inter-ethnic tolerant, and universalistic, ethic of the American sociopolitical framework? And what about when such a group can, alternately or collectively, self-configure as a racial, ethnic, religious, nationalist, and political organization? Does such a community merit categorical immunity from criticism?

Herbert Spencer’s well-known quote about prejudicial intolerance seems especially written for this volume:

“There is a principal which is a bar against all information, which is proof against all arguments, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance – that principal is contempt prior to investigation.”

Jewish scholar Samuel Dresnev, speaking about academia’s failings on another subject, wrote something which also has application here:

“The hesitancy to speak out is understandable, but it is not pardonable. Safety is no substitute for honesty. History will ultimately judge those who failed their responsibilities as scholars and human beings.” [DRESNEV, p. 221]

What you are about to read may be shaped by some to be another Satanic Verses, another forbidden topic, this one American-style – guaranteed magnet to those manning the censorial posts of free speech American democracy. But, unlike Salmon Rushdie’s work, this is not a fictionalized attack on Islam that is assailed by narrow-minded Ayatollahs; it is a real-life investigation of those of
great strength, and thereby guaranteed to incur emphatic condemnation – not by dictatorial regimes across the world, but here at home.

This book aims to methodically present a virtual encyclopedic collection of facts towards deconstructing the many myths about Jewish history and identity, and to investigate the ways in which these myths are used towards enormous economic, cultural and political advantage, extremely detrimental to non-Jews. The book also deconstructs the artifice behind incessant Jewish accusations of the generic “anti-Semite,” accusations that are ceaselessly wielded as a political tool towards further Jewish empowerment. It also addresses Jewish pre-eminence in American (and, hence, world) popular culture, including the mass media (TV, film, radio, newspapers, book publishing, music, et al), academia, the international art world, and the profoundly disturbing hold of pro-Israel Zionism within the American government. It explores the reasons why who is identifiable as Jewish in the upper echelons of power is important, why it is necessary to have open public discussion about this subject, and why such an investigation is not an immoral and prejudicial enterprise, but rather its antithesis: an enterprise of solid moral and rational worth. Knowing full well that such assertions will be relentlessly assailed as recycled “anti-Semitic canards,” this work is meticulously footnoted every inch of the way, overwhelmingly citing Jewish scholarship itself as authoritative sources, as well as the popular mass media (of whom most authors on Jewish subjects are also Jewish). This book, representing over 2,000 book-form pages, gleans evidence using approximately 10,000 citations from about 4,000 bibliographic sources (books, magazines, newspapers, government documents, and scholarly journals), relying heavily upon what is commonly known in academic jargon as “secondary sources” (i.e., not “first source” archival documents and so forth). This is purposeful, for a crucial concern of this volume is what the Jewish community understands and says about itself, and how so much of these beliefs are spread as popular opinion for all others.

The chapter about anti-Semitism in this volume was the original section which led me to dig yet deeper and deeper into all realms of Jewish identity, history, economics, politics, and power. The more I dug at a range of university libraries, the more disturbed, stunned, I became at what I was finding. And why was this not part of common public discourse? Again and again I shook my head at what I found: the systematic historical revisionism and successful Jewish lobbying efforts to canonize Jewish religious myth (rooted in its cosmology of consummate victimhood) in secular form, reshaping the complexion of everything from the history of the world to the very premises of American democracy itself.

While Jewish censorial dictate decrees that no one should even begin to read such a volume as this, let alone expose the issues herein to public forum, this author suggests (however bizarre it may seem) an open, democratic approach to the issue. Choose any ten currently popular books about the Jewish community. Read them. And then read this one. Think for yourself. Look deeper into the differences between this volume and the others. What do these differences
mean? Is this a work of irrational bigotry? Have Jews always been history’s preeminent, and saintly, victims? Is noting who is Jewish in the President Clinton administration a manifestation of “prejudice”? There are few books that can completely change a reader’s opinion about its subject. As I have been well advised, this is one of them.

The immunity from questioning and debate that is afforded the modern Jewish community reflects a stupendously lofty position of influence and privilege; one might notice it holds a rank generally reserved for the likes of despotic potentates and censorial political regimes. And, of course, God. Who else is beyond criticism? Volumes weigh the shelves in the world’s libraries that impugn and defame beliefs that were formerly beyond questioning. In “free societies,” anyone who wants may write, and publish, works that attack Christianity; assail the “historical revisionism” of Afro-centrism; deconstruct the myths of Hinduism; defame the Pope; disdain Republican, Democratic, communist, or any other ideology; emblazon the whole of Islam as a hotbed for irrational mania and terrorism; write entire volumes about the alleged worldwide economic “conspiracy”; and vilify the entirety of the nebulous entity known as the “white establishment” and anyone dictated by skin color to be within it. But, curiously, in the vast expanse of deconstructive engines of all and everything, one cannot criticize the sacrosanct domain of Jewish history, politics, and identity, unless the critic is willing to be systematically marginalized in all walks of life, prepared to be tarnished and branded as a contemptible hate-filled “anti-Semite,” risk losing her or her job, and be categorically lumped into mainstream society’s moral and intellectual garbage dump reserved for the likes of the Nazis and Ku Klux Klan.

“True opinion,” wrote prominent Jewish American journalist Walter Lippman (1889-1974), “can prevail only if the facts to which they refer are known; if they are not known, false ideas are just effective as true ones, if not a little more effective.” LIPPMAN, W., LIBERTY AND THE NEWS, 1920. Enforced ignorance of the full Jewish story, mass censorship, and fear of reprisals for its telling, are among the reasons why no substantial scholarly volume critical of Jewry of this sort has ever been published in America. Never could it be published by an American mainstream publisher. Among many other things, this volume illustrates why. (Professors Albert Lindemann of the University of California and Kevin MacDonald of California State University, both publicly charged by Jewish reviewers as anti-Semites for recent scholarly volumes about Jewish history, have begun, however cautiously, in roundabout ways, to knock on the Iron Door).

We live in a land where to state in summary overview, in public forum, the parameters of America’s “Jewish issue,” is to invite categorical dismissal as a prejudiced bigot. Without evidence and information, few have enter into the reasoned discussion that should be happening about this in a truly “free” society. Hence, anyone open to exploring the issue of Jewish-Zionist pre-eminence, even domination, in popular culture, must be prepared to expend enormous effort in examining the huge dimensions of the issue, breaking past knee-jerk...
platitudes. The acquisition of knowledge is no easy task. Nor is the search for truth. This giant book was created for free-thinkers who are so inclined, to honestly examine the facts of Jewish history, identity, and socio-political control. To understand, too, the continuous turmoil in modern Israel, one must start here, with the BIG picture.

It is also the conviction of this author that there is a very small number of individuals in the Jewish community who, critical of their own community, recognize clearly the dimensions of the issues herein. These people are heroes in this story – the ones who know that, sooner or later, the injustices perpetrated in the collective name of the Jewish community must be frankly addressed. And changed. These injustices, in the long term, are good for no one. The author of this work argues that the issues in this work are better raised here, in an academic context, towards public discussion and debate, than any other. The increased Balkanization of American society, certainly the divisions in Israel, and the world at-large, are a danger to everybody. And Jewish ethnocentrism – coupled with an unusual transnational power to assert it – has few parallels.

The author of this work is against stereotypes, prejudices, irrational biases, discrimination, racism, and all the other buzzwords that signify ignorance, intolerance, injustice and evil in our day. Yet when such buzzwords are used so loosely as political ramrods and shields to ward off legitimate criticism everywhere in the power struggles of “cultural pluralism,” they lose their moral and intellectual moorings. Such systematic screening from criticism grossly rewards – and institutionalizes – pure propaganda. The world’s Jews do not talk and act with one head. There are many expressions of international Jewry. Yet such diversity does not mean that their self-defining commonalities that impact non-Jewish others are beyond reproach, immune from critical commentary. Of course not all Blacks are stereotypically “the same,” but they are different, as a group – in character, history, and collective world view – from Hispanics. Of course not all Americans are equal, but they are certainly different as a people (in all their diversity) than, say, Indonesians. Likewise, there are many kinds of Muslims, but they definitely have more in common with each other than they do with Methodists. Not all Germans were Nazis, but few question the enforcement of a collective German responsibility for their Aryan fascist movement. (If more Germans had stood up and taken active stands against those that claimed to speak for them, history would have been different).

As Rabbi Joseph Telushkin has observed about “political correctness” in the “Jewish joke” context:

“People who oppose telling ethnic jokes would have us believe that the whole genre is nonsense, that alcoholics, neurotics, oversensitive people and shady characters are evenly distributed among all groups. However, tolerant as it sounds, this assumption makes no sense, for it implies that history and culture have no impact on human beings. But of course, they do. What makes Jews Jewish is a specific religious culture and his-
historical experience that have shaped their values and strongly influenced how they view the world.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 10]

Amitai Etzioni, a Jewish scholar and an escapee from Nazi Germany, in discussing the German peoples’ collective responsibility for Hitler’s fascism, has thoughts that also have important relevance here. In the following quote he is talking about Germans, but his argument can just as well be applied to Jews (or any other people):

“Communal responsibility is based on the fact that each of us is born into a community and shares its history, memories, identities, achievements, and failures. We are not simply human beings who can retreat behind a Rawlsian ‘veil of ignorance,’ secure in our universal rights and historical innocence. We are also members of specific families and communities … We are all coresponsible for that which our community has perpetrated or condoned, for both sins of commission and omission.” [ETZIONI, p. 13-14]

Fair enough. In this respect, the subject of this volume is not Germans, but Jews. They will be held here, of course, accountable to the same “communal responsibility” as any other people. This simple premise, however, (daring to hold Jews responsible for their collective actions and inactions now and across history) is, of course, in today’s world, an extremely radical – and even dangerous – position. Why this is so, and how it came to be that simply to ask questions (and even to state unpleasant facts) about the Jewish community – a special interest group in America of unparalleled power and influence – is considered a virtual crime today, is part of the forthcoming story.

Let us proceed then.
THE CAUSES OF HOSTILITY TOWARDS JEWS:
A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

“Reason and documentation … attest to the fact that anti-Jewish hostility has not been (and is not) constant and ubiquitous. If it had been, the conclusion is obvious: Jews could not have survived individually or collectively, religiously or ethnically.”

Alan Edelstein

“Medieval Jewry, much as it suffered from disabilities and contempt, still was a privileged minority in every country in which it was tolerated at all.”

Salo Baron, p. 259, 1972

“If Judaism is fundamentally altruistic in an evolutionarily meaningful sense, it would be expected that Jews [through history] would characteristically engage in self-sacrificing behavior on behalf of gentiles – a thesis for which there is absolutely no evidence.”

Kevin MacDonald, p. 64

“Indeed, the more religiously conservative a Jew is today, the less likely he or she is to identify with universalistic ideologies or with the non-Jewish ‘poor and downtrodden.’”

Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, 1982,


Daniel Fuchs, fiction, “Homage to Blenholt” [in BERSHTEL, p.113]

In order to understand the present and prospects for the future, something must be understood about the past. Jews claim their origins to a seminal patriarch, Abraham, in the land of Ur (today part of Iraq) 4,000 years ago. Abraham was not a farmer or village member of a settled community. He was likely one of the “wandering” tribes of his time, a citizenship less, “outsider” social class known as the “Apiru,” or “Habiru” (Hebrews) who were scattered across a wide area of the Middle East, from Syria to Egypt. [ANDERSON, p. 33] According to traditional Jewish religious belief, God is reputed to have singled out 75-year
old Abraham among all people on earth and struck an arrangement with him, providing his progeny the consummate family inheritance: “If Abraham will follow the commandments of God, then He, in His turn, will make the descendants of Abraham His Chosen People and place them under His protection … God at this time stipulates only one commandment, and makes only one promise.” [DIMONT, p. 29] The initial agreement, by modern standards, seems extraordinarily peculiar. God’s commandment was that all males by the eighth day of birth must have the foreskin of their penises cut off, a painfully literal branding of Jewish distinction around the male procreative organ:

“God … said to Abraham … You shall circumcise the flesh of the foreskin and that shall be the Covenant between Me and you.”
[GENESIS: 17:9-13]

With this physical marking, notes Barnet Litvinoff, “no male child born of Jewish parentage is ever allowed to forget he is a Jew … it reminds him of the doctrine of the chosen people.” [LITVINOFF, p. 5] “As a sign of this sacred bond, of being special seed, Chosen,” note Herbert Russcol and Margarit Banai, “The Lord of the Universe commands Abraham” to circumcise “every man child among you.” And as the Torah states it: “I will establish my covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant.” [RUSSCOL/BANAI, 1970, p. 173] Is this alleged commandment by God to the Abrahamic “seed” in Jewish tradition not racial?

“Circumcision,” says Lawrence Hoffman, “has thus remained the sine qua non of Jewish identity throughout time. Jews came to believe that it warded off danger, and even saved Jews from damnation, that the sign of circumcision was tantamount to carrying God’s ineffable name carved in the flesh, that it was a means of attaining mystical unity with the creator, and that it brought about visionary experience.” [HOFFMAN, p. 11] It also symbolized, on the male genitals, special attention to the genetic continuance of the progeny of Abraham, that – if they obeyed the laws and demands of God – they would someday be as numerous as the stars.”

“By the very sexual act itself,” says Philip Sigal, in explaining traditional thinking, “the circumcised mystically transmits the covenant to the foetus.” [SIGAL, p. 20] Until the 20th century, it was normal that during the mezizah phase of the circumcision ritual, the mohel (the expert who performed the circumcision) took the infant’s “circumcised member into his mouth and with two or three draughts sucks the blood out of the wounded part. He then takes a mouthful of wine from a goblet and spurts it, in two or three intervals, on the wound.” [ROMBERG, p. 45] Today, notes Rabbi Immanuel Jacobovits, “the original method of sucking by mouth tends to be increasingly confined to the most orthodox circles only.” [JACOBOVITS, p. 196]

In exchange for circumcision and following God’s orders, the Jews were promised the land of Canaan (the land mass of today’s Israel, more or less), a place that was already inhabited. [DIMONT, p. 29] This land for circumcision exchange is the root of Jewish tradition, from which centuries of rules, regulations, dictates, interpretations and other additions have followed. God’s spiri-
tual link to Jews is understood to have originated, of all things, around a piece of real estate commonly understood to be part of the “Covenant,” which, says Alfred Jospe, “is the agreement between God and Israel by which Israel accepts the Torah [Old Testament]…. The concept of covenant signifies the consciousness of what the truth is.” [JOSPE, p. 15] “The covenant,” adds Will Herberg, “is an objective supernatural fact; it is God’s act of creating and maintaining Israel for his purposes in history.” [EISENSTEIN, p. 274] “The covenant made for all time means that all future generations are included in the covenant,” notes Monford Harris,

“Being born into this covenental people make one a member of the covenant. Berith is election. This is very difficult for moderns to understand, let alone accept. It is our modern orientation that sees every human being as an ‘accidental collocation of atoms,’ the birth of every person as purely adventitious. From the classical Jewish perspective, being born to a Jewish mother is a divine act of election.” [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 90-91]

“For Israel,” notes Edward Greenstein, “God’s immanence found expression in the perception of God as a super person.” [GREENSTEIN, E., 1984, p. 89] The idea that God was some kind of tradesman, and that he was a distinctly dialectical Other to humanity, as a Lord, King, Patriarch, Commander, and even Warlord of a worldly provenance has – with the religious commentaries and meta-commentaries that evolved from His commands in Judaism – provided fuel for modern scholarly debate about Jewish (and linked strands of Christian) creations in the world of secular affairs, most particularly in their materialist, rationalist, and patriarchal flavors. The result, in today’s Orthodox Judaism, says Evelyn Kaye, is a “community [that] has developed an insular, single-minded approach which is completely intolerant of any views that differ from its own.” [KAYE, p. 23]

Whatever else they believed, Jews have traditionally understood themselves to be – by hereditary line – special, intrinsically better than other people: they were divinely esteemed. The Old Testament stated it plainly:

“For you are people consecrated to the Lord your God: of all the peoples on earth the Lord your God chose you to be His treasured people.” [DEUTERONOMY 7:6]

The notion that Jews – originally defined racially as the Israelite progeny of Abraham (and a special lineage through his son Isaac, then Jacob, and so on) – are the “Chosen People” of God is the bedrock of Jewish self-conception and it resonates deeply in some form to Jewish self-identity to this day. What exactly such a mantle of greatness confers has, for most, changed drastically over (particularly recent) centuries, and is still a delicate source for self-reflection and debate, ranging from traditional racist theories against non-Jews (still entertained by many Orthodox Jews, and most of Zionism) to more modern, liberalizing, and even secular notions that Jews are destined to lead humankind to some kind of redemptive glory.

The extraordinary self-perpetuating ethnocentric premises of traditional
Judaism have been remarked upon by many modern scholars. Likewise, they have often addressed the drastically different ethical and spiritual views of Judaism and Oriental religious faiths (such as Hinduism and Buddhism). Such a gap is poignantly illustrated in this story by the great popular folklorist, Joseph Campbell:

“A young Hindu gentleman came to see me, and a very pious man he proved to be: a worshipper of Vishnu, employed as a clerk or secretary of one of the Indian delegations at the UN. He had been reading the works of Heinrich Zimmer on Indian art, philosophy and religion, works that I had edited many years before, and which he wanted to discuss. But there was something else he wanted to talk about too.

“You know,” he said after we had begun to feel at home with each other, “when I visit a foreign country I like to acquaint myself with its religion; so I have bought myself a Bible and for some months now have been reading it from the beginning; but you know” … and here he paused, to regard me uncertainly, then said, “I can’t find any religion in it!” … Now I had of course been brought up on the Bible and I had also studied Hinduism, so I thought I might be of some help. “Well,” I said, “I can see how that might be, if you had not been given to know that a reading of the imagined history of the Jewish race is here regarded as a religious exercise. There would then, I can see, be very little for you of religion in the greater part of the Bible.”

I thought that later I should perhaps have referred him to the Psalms; but when I then turned to a fresh reading of these with Hinduism in mind, I was glad that I had not done so; for almost invariably the leading theme is either the virtue of the singer, protected by his God, who will “smite his enemies on the cheek” and “break the teeth of the wicked;” or, on the other hand, of complaint that God has not yet given due aid to his righteous servant: all of which is just about diametrically opposed to what an instructed Hindu would have been taught to regard as religious sentiment.

In the Orient the ultimate divine mystery is sought beyond all human categories of thought and feeling, beyond names and forms, and absolutely beyond any such concept as of a merciful or wrathful personality, choosers of one people over another, comforter of folk who pray, and destroyer of those who do not. Such anthropomorphic attributions of human sentiment is – from the point of view of Indian thought – a style of religion for children.” [CAMPBELL, Myths, pp. 93-94]

“If you will obey my voice,” God tells Jews in their seminal religious text, the Torah, “and keep my Covenant, you shall become my own possession among all people, for all the earth is mine.” [EXODUS 19:5] This anthropomorphized model of the Israelite God is someone profoundly concerned with ownership, allegiance, and control – key values in the self-promotive tenets of classical Judaism and their practical application in history. After all, the seminal Jewish religious text – the Torah (in Christian tradition the first five books of the Old Testament) – was created as a kind of Jewish family album, an ancient listing of
Israelite genealogies and pedigrees that codifies sacred recipes for group solidarity, self-aggrandizement (land conquest, et al), and self-preservation for those with direct ancestral linkage to Abraham.

“The biblical faith [of the Old Testament],” writes scholar Bernhard Anderson, “to the bewilderment of many philosophers, is fundamentally historical in character. It is concerned with events and historical relationships, not abstract values and ideas existing in a timeless realm.” [ANDERSON, p. 12] “The halakah [Jewish religious law] does not aspire to a heavenly transcendence,” notes influential modern Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, “nor does it aspire to soar upon the wings of some abstract, mysterious spirituality. It fixes its gaze on the concrete, empirical reality and does not let its attention be diverted from it.” [SOLOVEITCHIK, p. 92]

“There is no Valhalla [afterlife Paradise] in Judaism,” notes Chaim Bermant, “and no Garden of the Houris, and while there was paradise and hell, both were to be experienced mainly on earth … Neither heaven with all its joys, nor hell with all its torments (which, as described in the Talmud, are akin to those of Tantalus) have a central place in the Jewish faith, Judaism is of this world and in so far as it believes in the Kingdom of Heaven at all it is as something which will become manifest on earth.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 16]

Beyond Israelite genealogies, the Torah (the Old Testament) includes an ancient compilation of rules and regulations, elaborated upon in metacommendaries by later Judaic religious texts, especially the Talmud, which codifies correct behavior for all the minutia of daily living. In Jewish tradition, “the whole keynote of being,” says sociologist Talcott Parsons, “starting with the creation, was action, the accomplishment of things.” [PARSONS, p. 103] (And one of the “keys to Jewish success,” says Jewish business author Steven Silbiger, is to “be psychologically driven to prove something.”) [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 9]

“Judaism is not a revealed religion,” wrote the great German-Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn, “but revealed legislation. Its first precept is not ‘thou shalt believe’ or not believe, but thou shalt do or abstain from doing.” [GOLDSTEIN, D., p. 43, in Jerusalem] “A constant motif of post-Enlightenment ethics,” says Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, “is the rejection of religious authority as an external command to which one submits. For this reason [philosopher] Hegel is sharply critical of the Jewish structure of law. ‘Of spirit,’ he writes of Judaism, ‘nothing remained save pride in slavish obedience.’ Much of Nietzsche’s work is a deepening set of variations on this theme. Judaism, he says, introduced ‘a God who demands.’ The autonomous self, central to modern ethics, is radically incompatible with the structures of Jewish spirituality, built as they are on the concept of mitzvah, command.” [SACKS, J., p. 100-101]

The all-encompassing and dictatorial manner of Jewish Orthodoxy in the Talmudic (and other) interpretations of the Old Testament is reflected in this observation by Gerson Cohen:

“The Torah encompasses and seeks to regulate every moment of life … Nothing human is beyond the scope of judgment and its program of
prescription. It is for this reason that Torah is often called a way of life, for its purpose is to teach the Jew how to act, think, and even feel.” [COHEN, in KLEINE, p. 92]

The obsessive nature of even modern Jewish Orthodoxy within a tight web of restrictive daily dictates, and the surrender to what Israeli scholar Israel Shaha
k calls its innate “totalitarianism,” [SHAHAK, p. 15] is reflected in this com-
ment by Egon Mayer:

“What are the first words that one should utter upon awakening? There
is a rule. How many steps may one take from one’s bed before washing at
least the tips of one’s fingers. There is a rule.” [MAYER, Suburb]

Michael Govrin notes that

“A Jew is born into an already articulated biography. In the traditional
context of Halacha – the Jewish Law (which until two hundred years ago
was the only way a Jews could define him or herself) – a Jew’s life is cod-
ified to a unique extent. From rising in the morning to the moment of
falling asleep at night, from birth to death and burial, the myriad of ges-
tures, thoughts, and intentions is pre-articulated, forming a specific
mold into which the life is poured. The private life in a given historical
moment is a personal variation on that generic mold; always seemingly
only a re-enactment – not an ‘invention’ – of a preexisting role in an on-
going plot that started with the first Jews, and is still unfolding.”
[GOVRIN, M., 2001]

Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen note that the “halakaha [Jewish reli-
gious law] commands that before eating bread a Jew must recite a blessing, and
before this blessing the hands must be washed and a blessing recited over the
hand washing. Even the manner in which the hands are washed is prescribed:
the kind of utensil used, the order in which the hands are washed, the number
of times each hand is washed.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 125]

“It is a commonplace,” adds Eunice Lipton, “that an abiding and secularized
aspect of Jewish tradition is its valuing of sensual satisfaction. Jewish law
acknowledges appetite; one is even is told how often one should make love …
One might say that Jewish validation of the senses results from the emphasis on
human life in the present as opposed to any interest in any afterlife.” [LIPTON,
p. 289]
Evelyn Kaye, who grew up in an Orthodox community, notes that
“Orthodox Judaism plans to regulate every minute, every action and every
thought of life … [KAYE, p. 126] … The code of Jewish law dictates a range of
regulations for sexual intercourse, including when and where it may be experi-
enced, as well as what to think about during the act.” [KAYE, p. 125] “It is for-
bidden,” says the Code of Jewish Law, “to discharge semen in vain. This is a
graver sin than any other mentioned in the Torah … It is equivalent to killing a
person … A man should be extremely careful to avoid an erection. Therefore,
he should not sleep on his back with his face upward, or on his belly with his
face downward, but sleep on his side, in order to avoid it.” [GANZFRIED, p.17]
There are even rules,” says Kaye, “about what you may think about while you
sit on the toilet.” [KAYE, p. 17]
Israel Shahak underscores Orthodox Judaism’s complex honing of regulations to the point of hairsplitting for even purely theoretical concerns that appear to be extraordinarily esoteric in a modern context:

“During the existence of the Temple, the High Priest was only allowed to marry a virgin. Although during virtually the whole of the talmudic period there was no longer a Temple or High Priest, the Talmud devoted one of its more involved (and bizarre) discussions to the precise definition of the term ‘virgin’ fit to marry a High priest. What about a woman whose hymen had been broken by accident? Does it make any difference whether the accident occurred before or after the age of three? By the impact of metal or wood? Was she climbing a tree? And if so, was she climbing up or down?” [SHAHAK, p. 41]

One of the most profoundly important dimensions of traditional Judaism (one that has had enormous repercussions for Jewish relations throughout history with their non-Jewish neighbors) is its injunction to fellow members that Jews must – conceptually, and through most of history, physically – live “apart,” “separate,” distinct from other human beings. Jewish self-conception, from its early days, was antithetical and antagonistic to other peoples. “Separation of Israel from the nations [non-Jews],” says Moshe Greenberg, “in order to be consecrated by God took the extreme form of condemning to death any who worshipped or tempted others to worship alien gods.” [GREENBERG, p. 28].

In later years, throughout the Jewish diaspora, this developed into the Jewish self-conception as a “nation apart” – physically as well as conceptually distanced from all other peoples. “In their determined efforts to prevent assimilation and loss of identity as a small minority in the midst of a hostile majority,” notes the Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion, “the rabbis deliberately set up barriers for the explicit purpose of preventing social interaction with gentiles [non-Jews], and decrees were enacted to erect barriers against this danger. The partaking of meals with gentiles was forbidden … food cooked by gentiles was banned.” [WERBLOWSKY, p. 269] “The underside to this sense of chosenness [per the Chosen People idea],” says Rabbi Isar Schorsch, “is an inclination to dichotomize the world between ‘them’ and ‘us. Categories of people are set apart by the fact that God has assigned them far fewer mitzvot [commandments] to keep. Three of those 100 blessings [Orthodox Jews must recite each day] praise God for ‘not having made me a gentile,’ ‘for not having made me a woman,’ and ‘for not having made me a slave.’” [SCHORSCH, I., 4-30-99] Even in a 1988 survey, “more than a third of Reform rabbis – traditionally the most ‘integrated’ and ‘outreaching’ of the major Jewish denominations – endorsed the proposition that ‘ideally, one ought not to have any contact with non-Jews.’” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 181]

Such a “nation apart” admonition is part of classical Jewish religious (and related to secular Zionist) belief to the present day. Jewish author Alfred Jospe notes that

“when a male Jew is called to the Torah, he recites the traditional blessing, asher bahar banu mi’kol ha’amim, praising God ‘who has chosen us
from among all other nations.’ When Jews recite their daily morning prayer they say the benediction, she’lo assani goy, thanking God ‘that he has not made [us] gentiles.’ When they pronounce the benediction over the Sabbath [Saturday] wine, they declare that God has chosen and sanctified Jews from all other peoples in the same way which he has distinguished between Sabbath and weekday. When Jews make Havdalah on Saturday night, they recite the traditional ha-mavdil, glorifying God for setting Jews apart from all other peoples just as He set apart the sacred from the profane and light from darkness.” [JOSPE, p. 10-11]

“Unlike many religions,” notes Steven Silbiger,

“Judaism is more than simply a belief system that anyone can adopt. To become Jewish means enlisting in a tribe. The relationship or covenant is between God and the Jewish people, rather than between God and individual Jews. Judaism is a religion with a strong ancestral component.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 11]

In the ancient Greek and Roman worlds people were polytheists, and relatively tolerant of each other’s theology. Judaism, however, was expressed throughout their diaspora as an elitist, confrontational faith, engendering ill will everywhere. “It was not sensible,” says Jasper Griffin, “nor was it good manners [in the ancient world] to allege that other peoples’ gods did not exist. Only a madman makes fun of other peoples’ religious practices, says the historian Herodotus in the fifth century BCE … The response of the Jews [to other religions] was felt to be shocking and uncouth, as well as dangerous for everybody.” Jewish rejection of the religions and communities in which they lived “placed an inseparable barrier between them and full acceptance into the classical world; as later on, even more acutely, it did with Christians.” [GRIFFIN, p. 58]

The seminal source of Jewish history and sacred law is recorded in the Torah (the Old Testament of the Bible in Christian tradition, consisting of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy). Biblical scholars tend to believe that the Old Testament (which sometimes cites conflicting facts in various places) was essentially four different written narratives eventually combined together, each section originally written between 800 to 1600 years after the events described allegedly occurred. Within these texts we read that Abraham and the early Israelites settled tentatively in the land of the Canaanites, but that famine eventually drove them towards Egypt. The ancient Hebrews were reportedly enslaved in Egypt, (a period of momentous impact even in current Jewish collective memory), but were ultimately led back to Canaan – the Promised Land – by Moses in a 40-year trek across the desert in the thirteenth century BCE. Moses became instrumental in mediating God’s demands to the Hebrew people and instituting laws of behavior and belief for them, known today as the Mosaic code.

Eventually the Israelites forcibly reestablished themselves in the land of
Canaan and over the following centuries divided into sub-clans, fighting and warring among themselves, and against others. The most drastic intra-Jewish schism was the establishment of two conflicting monarchies – Israel, in the northern areas, and Judah, in the south. When ancient Israel joined a coalition of non-Jewish states in threatening the southern Jewish kingdom, Judah joined the powerful Assyrian kingdom which destroyed Israel in about 723 BCE. Judah was destroyed, in turn, in 586 BCE, by Babylonian invasion, concluding the first Jewish expulsion from their proclaimed homeland. Jews were allowed to return in 538 BCE under the sovereignty of the Persian monarch, Cyrus; the Romans were masters of the Palestine area by about 100 BCE. The Jews were ultimately expelled en masse again, this time by the Romans, when Israelites repeatedly revolted against Roman rule. By the third century CE most Jews were scattered all across the Roman Empire, from India to Spain. In Jewish lore, this is the solidification of the Jewish “galut” (a term meaning exile, with derogatory connotations) in non-Jewish lands, i.e., the Diaspora (dispersion).

It is necessary to again underscore, against the grain of modern popular (and largely secular) Jewish opinion, that the Old Testament is a compilation of stories, genealogies, and Godly dictates that were intended by its Jewish authors to be purely intra-Jewish in scope. The ten commandments of Moses – “Love your neighbor, “Thou shalt not kill,” and all the rest of it – did not represent in origin for Jews a universalistic creed. “Love your neighbor” meant love your fellow Israelite. “Thou shalt not kill” meant don’t kill those of your own people. “[Jewish] tradition,” says Charles Liebman, “argued that the essence of Torah is the obligation to love one’s neighbor as oneself, with the term ‘neighbor’ implying only ‘Jew.’” [LIEBMAN, Rel Tre, p. 313] John Hartung notes that careful inspection of the Torah/Old Testament “Love Thy Neighbor” commandment make this clear, for example, in Leviticus 19:18:

“Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” [Jewish Publication Society translation: other translations include the same qualifier; HARTUNG, 1995]

As Louis Jacobs observes:

“Among both Jews and Christians the injunction is read simply as ‘love thy neighbour as thyself’ … [but] in the original context the [Love Thy Neighbor] verse means: even when someone has behaved badly towards you, try to overcome your desires for revenge but rather behave lovingly towards him because, after all, he, too, is a human being and a member of the covenant people as you are and therefore entitled to be treated as you yourself wish to be treated … The golden rule to love the neighbour applies only to the neighbour who is a Jew.” [JACOBS, L., 1995, p. 323, 324]

As Menachem Gerlitz explains the “neighbor” passage:

“And you shall love your neighbor like your own self” – this is an important rule of the Torah. Every Jew must love his fellow Jew with all his heart. The Baal Shem Tov [founder of the ultra-Orthodox Hassidim]
used to explain this as follows: Our Torah teaches us to ‘love Hashem your G-d with all your heart.’ How can we prove to ourselves that we are really fulfilling this commandment? Only through the commandment of loving our fellow Jew like our own selves. Only by truly loving each and every Jew, every son of the Chosen People which Hashem selected from all other nations to love, just like a person loves the son of a dear friend.” [GERLITZ, M., 1983, p. 195]

Judeocentrism, not human universalism, is the core of traditional Jewish understanding of the Old Testament. The influential medieval Jewish theologian, Maimonides, advised that “It is incumbent on everyone to love each individual Israelite as himself as it is said, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.’” [MANKIN, p. 37] Although there were some Jewish apologetics with this notion as early as Philo, it was Christian and Enlightenment influences that universalized the Ten Commandments, and liberalizing Jews, mainly since the eighteenth century, began to follow suit, bending and broadening the tenets of Judaism (carefully selecting from contradictory religious references) to encompass a humanistic concern for non-Jews in step with modern universalist-oriented values.

Mosaic law or not, the only time– till the modern state of Israel – that Jews have had the opportunity to practice Moses’ commandments and the rest of their beliefs (towards themselves or anybody) from a position of complete empowerment was, even by their own ancient religious standards, a disaster. The pinnacle of ancient Jewish history was a series of monarchial regimes that represented a turbulent time of failures in living up to Covenantal laws, incessant quarreling, fratricide, genocide, wars of conquest with non-Jewish neighbors, repeated intra-Jewish civil wars, and other struggles for power and control, rife with continuous bloodletting, as violent as any in human history. Most of this is codified as part of the Jewish religious faith/history in the Torah.

The well-known historian, Will Durrant, describes the Israelites’ seizure (after the Mosaic moral code was accepted) of the Holy Land from the Canaanites who lived there, like this:

“The conquest of Canaan was but one more instance of a hungry nomad horde falling upon a settled community. The conquerors killed as many as they could find, and married the rest. Slaughter was unconfined, and (to follow the text) was divinely ordained and enjoyed. Gideon, in capturing two cities, slew 120,000 men; only in the annals of the Assyrians do we meet again with such hearty killing. [DURRANT, p. 302]

Even in the Book of Exodus, when Moses (deliverer of the admonition “Thou Shalt Not Kill” and all the rest of it) discovered his own people weakening, “out of control” with idolatrous dancing, naked, before a “Golden Calf,” he directed the Levites, the priest caste, to slay three thousand of them. [EXODUS 33:27-28]

Considerable portions of the Bible revolve around violent struggles amongst Israelites for power. Both King David and Solomon – among the most beloved of the Israelite ancients in the myths of modern Jewry – had half-brothers with rival claims to the Israelite monarchy murdered. Solomon, for exam-
ple, arranged for Adonijah to be slain as well as another threat to the throne, Joab, who was even murdered in the Holy Tabernacle. (Both David and Solomon even had forced labor gangs of their own Israelite people). Likewise, Ambimelich, the son of Gideon, (who like most powerful Israelite rulers had a harem of wives and concubines) murdered 70 of his brothers to guarantee the throne for himself. Jeru too, in a fit of ruthlessness, killed the King of Israel, Joram, and then murdered Ahaziah, of the Israelite kingdom of Judah, as well as his two brothers. Then he had all 70 sons of King Ahab decapitated, clearing the way for his own leadership.

In King David’s family, notes Joel Rosenberg,

“David’s adultery with Bathsheba and murder of Uriah is balanced by the sexual violation of David’s daughter Tamar by David’s son Amnon, the murder of Amnon by his half-brother Absalom, the appropriation of David’s concubines and kingdom by Absalom, and the slaying of Absalom by David’s own servant Joab.” [ROSENBERG, J., 1984, p. 47]

There is too the story of Gibeah (Judges 19:21). An Israelite, enraged by the rape-murder of his concubine by Jews of another tribe, hacked the corpse into pieces and sent a section to each of the twelve Israelite tribes to make an embittered point about solidarity. A confederation of tribes joined together to exact revenge on the perpetrators of the crime. The ensuing Israelite battle against each other took over 60,000 lives (Judges 20:21). The victorious confederation then marched on Jabesh-gilead, a group who had declined to join the coalition against the destroyed Benjaminites. 12,000 soldiers were sent to “smite the inhabitants of Jaged-gilead with the edge of the sword, with the women and children.” (Judges 21) Only female virgins were spared.

Going further along in Jewish religious history, there is the murder of Simon by his son-in-law, Hycanus, in another bid for the monarchy, and his son, Aristobulus I, who killed his mother and brother, and imprisoned the rest of his family. After him came his brother, Alexander Jannaeus, to the throne, a “despotic, violent ruler” who reigned during the civil war between warring pro-Greek Israelites (Sadducees) and anti-Greek Israelites (Pharisees). Jannaeus’ bloody revenge upon the Pharisees was “as bloody as any in history.” [DIMONT, p.89, 90] There was Antipater, “one of history’s most unsavory characters,” whose family had been “forcibly converted to Judaism” [GOLDBERG, M., 1976, p. 32] and his son, Herod, who murdered a few sons, one of his wives, and range of others including 45 Israelite religious leaders. [DIMONT, p. 95-96] The Torah tells us that the Israelite prophet Elijah slew 450 prophets of the rival deity Baal (I Kings 18) and military commander Jeru killed “all the prophets of Baal, all his worshippers and priests.” (I Kings 10:18-27) [LANG, B., 1989, p. 120]

Under the ruler Mannasseh there was the reintroduction of pagan cults, child sacrifices and “systematic murders” in the southern Israelite kingdom of Judah; this kingdom itself had a rivalry with the northern Israelite kingdom, Israel, and – as noted – it eventually aligned with Assyrian invaders against its Israelite brethren, ultimately to ancient Israel’s complete destruction.

The chaos, internecine warring and corruption, the straying from the “Cov-
enant,” the worship of idols and the fracturing of the moral codes of Israelite solidarity resulted in a central Jewish belief that took form in later centuries, that Jews had been scattered in a Diaspora (dispersion) throughout the earth in galut (exile) from the land God gave them, Israel. But 2,000 years of exile experience, notes Alfred Jospe, “could not shatter the image Jews had of themselves. Destruction and exile were a national disaster but not completely unforeseen. They were part of the divine plan … The Jew was persecuted not because God had abandoned or rejected him; [The Jew] suffered because he was not equal to his moral task. In the words of the prayer book, ‘because of our sins, we were exiled from our land’ … Suffering was defined as punishment and punishment in turn was a call to duty. Exile was God’s call to return to the faithfulness inherent in Israel’s role as the ‘chosen people.’ The acceptance of punishment opened the gate to redemption and return to the land.” [JOSPE, p. 17] Such a view of human suffering by Judaism, argues Richard Rubenstein, was “a colossal, megalomaniacal and grandiose misreading of a pathetic and defeated community’s historical predicament. To this day Jews can be found who delude themselves with the notion that somehow Jewish suffering and powerlessness have redemptive significance for mankind.” [KREFETZ, p. 182]

The key to the Israelite future of divine favoritism, and its special covenantal “mission,” was eventually linked to a Messiah who would triumphantly come to lead His people into a glorious future. Originally the Messiah was understood to be merely a nationalist savior, a great and literal king of the Israelite people; later He was reconfigured as an expression of the one God of the Universe who would lord – physically and spiritually – over the earth, not in an after-life, but in the here-and-now. [JOSPE, p. 22-23] “Judaism,” notes Stephen Whitfield, “in all its forms and manifestations, has always maintained a concept of redemption as an event which takes place on the stage of history and within the community. It is an occurrence which takes place in the visible world, unlike Christianity, which conceives of redemption as an event in the spiritual and unseen realm, an event which is reflected in the soul.” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 33]

Over the centuries the Messiah was not quick in coming, and not all new questions about changing times were clearly indicated in the seminal Torah, so a written tradition of commentary, argument, and interpretation by respected Jewish religious leaders evolved and became codified in a second religious text called the Talmud. Many argue that it is not the Torah but actually the Talmud – this later legalese and folklore about the seminal Torah – that is the crucial source for day-to-day Orthodox Jewish decision making about religious and secular issues. “The Talmud,” observes Jacob Neusner, “is the single most influential document in the history of Judaism.” [BORAZ, p. 5] “Historically speaking,” says Adin Steinsaltz, “the Talmud is the central pillar of Jewish culture.” [STEINSALTZ, 1976, p. 266] “The Talmud,” adds Robert Goldenberg, “provided the means of determining how God wants all Jews to live, in all places, at all times. Even if the details of the law had to be altered to suit newly arisen con-
ditions, the proper way to perform such adaptation could itself be learned from the Talmud and its commentaries.” [GOLDENBERG, R., 1984, p. 166]

This many volumed tome, consisting of Judaism’s “legal literature,” is really two distinct books merged together, the Mishna (the “oral law,” originally written in Hebrew – a language considerably different than modern Hebrew) and the Gemara (largely commentaries about the Mishna), written mostly in Aramaic three hundred years apart. The Talmud is so difficult to read and so unwieldy that only lifelong experts even think to tackle the original texts. Hence, the Talmud that explains and interprets the Torah has needed plenty of other vast textual explanations to deal with itself; such influential metacommentaries through history include those of Maimonides (including his Mishneh Torah), Joseph Caro (particularly his Shukan Arukh, which has never appeared unabridged in English), [GOLDENBERG, R, 1984, p. 174] and others. Many of such works, too, are so large that they are further distilled into more reasonably digestible abridgements. Rashi’s 39 volumes of explanation, for example, are much larger than the talmudic texts it addresses. (Rashi’s comments are usually printed as part of the text in Talmudic editions printed since the early Middle Ages). [GOLDENBERG, R., p. 139] It was not until 1920 that the Talmud was translated into another language (German) for the first time. In 1935 it first appeared in English.

Edwin Boraz notes that “the study of the Talmud may be so formidable, challenging, and complex … [that] one may ask, for what purpose? … [BORAZ, p. 1] … [Aside from the ‘mishnaic’ Hebrew and Aramaic of the original texts] the classic commentaries to the Talmud are written in ‘medieval rabbinic Hebrew,’ which is a blend of both Hebrew and Arabic. The language barrier alone is arduous.” [BORAZ, p. 13] The Talmud also lacks “an inner order … [it] shift[s] from one subject to another in ways that are not readily apparent. Often, the pronominal references are unclear … In short, a talmudic passage seems scattered and diffused, rather than a well-reasoned dialectic inquiry.” [BORAZ, p. 13-14]

To complicate matters even further, there are even two versions of the Talmud, of Babylonian and Palestinian origin. The latter (called the Yerushalmi), however, is rarely used, even in religious circles. Jacob Neusner notes that “it fills hundreds of pages with barely intelligible writing. [It is] famous for its incomprehensibility … The Yerushalmi has suffered an odious but deserved reputation for the difficulty in making sense of its discourse.” [NEUSNER, 1993, p. x]

A fundamental current of Talmudic discourse, however, is noted by Herman Wouk: “Talmudic political judgment often shows the bitterness of a people trodden by wave after wave of oppressors.” [WOUK, p. 201] And what of its legal and moral direction which shifted in emphases so much over the centuries as was politically expedient? This from Wouk again, a devout Jew: “Since the Talmud reports the sayings of hundreds of savants over many centuries, it abounds in contradictory maxims, in conflicting metaphysical guesses, in baffling switches from cynicism to poetry, from misanthropy to charity, from dis-
like of women to praise for them … In a word, one can say almost anything about this recording of the talk of wise men through seven centuries, and then find a passage to support it.” [WOUK, p. 201]

“For any maxim of the haggada,” says Leon Poliakov, “one can be found that states precisely the contrary.” The haggada are “non-legal teachings, speculations, stories, legends, and prayers” in the Talmud. (The halakah is its “legal” contents.) “The ancient rabbinic sage used two kinds of speech,” says Rabbi Samuel Karff, “halacha and agada [i.e., haggada]. Halacha is the language of Jewish law. It asks and answers the question: ‘What must a Jew do to fulfill the covenant?’ Agada was the language of the Jewish faith. It tells the story of God’s relation to man through his relation to the people of Israel … Agada remains not only the language of worship, but the language of preaching.” [KARFF, S., 1979, p. 8, 11-12]

“The Jewish tradition is so rich in the diversity of its sacred texts,” adds Alan Dershowitz, “that one can find an antidote to virtually any unacceptable statement.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 132] The “antidotes” to every troubling statement in the Talmud suggest a chameleon-like capacity, a religious faith that has the ability to change colors in different milieu, and readily adapt to pressures around it. This capacity is based upon “pilpul” (pepper), a “dialectical technique of reconciling apparently contradictory concepts in the Talmud’s texts, often by straining original meanings through the needle’s eye … [It later] degenerated into little more than sophistry.” [SACHAR, p. 65] “Talmudic dialectics,” notes the Jewish Encyclopedia, “became developed and endowed the Jews who stood beneath the spell of the Talmud with peculiar characteristics, especially imbuing them with a love of hair-splitting which afterwards deteriorated into sophistic subtlety.” [GOLDSTEIN, D, p. 133, v. 5, p. 726] The Talmud, notes Robert Goldenberg, has a reputation for “overcomplicated, ‘hairsplitting’ dialectic.” [GOLDENBERG, R., 1984, p. 139] “One of the thirteen rules for interpreting the Torah,” says influential modern Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, “is the contradiction between two verses and their harmonization by a third verse.” [SOLOVEITCHIK, p. 143] In interpreting the seminal Torah, notes Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Hertog, “each word in the Torah has, according to esoteric tradition, four kinds of meanings: the direct, the interpretive, the allusive, the secret.” [ZBOROWSKI/HERTOG, p. 119].

Canadian Jewish theatre mogul Garth Drabinsky once noted this tradition’s influence upon his own personality:

“Jewish scholars have their own version of the Socratic method: they dissect, analyse, interpret, and argue over everything. Today, partly as a result of this training, I refuse to take anything at face value, which makes me hard to please. No wonder I’ve been called one of Canada’s toughest bosses. What people don’t realize is that I have a problem pleasing myself. It wasn’t until I went to Jerusalem for the first time – and that wasn’t until I was thirty-seven – that I really understood my own background. Jerusalem was a buzz-saw of argument. You can’t survive in Is-
rael unless you’re willing to argue – about everything. I felt absolutely at home.” [DRABINSKY, G., 1995, p. 26]

Leon Poliakov uses the following story to explain the nature of Talmudic reasoning:

“A goy [non-Jew] insisted that a Talmudist explain to him what the Talmud was. The sage finally consented and asked the goy the following question: ‘Two men climb down a chimney. When they come to the bottom, one has his face covered with soot, the other is spotless. Which of the two will wash himself?’ ‘The one who is dirty,’ answered the goy. ‘No, for the one who’s dirty sees the others’ clean face and believes he is clean too. The one who’s clean sees a dirty face and believes his is dirty too.’ ‘I understand!’ the goy exclaimed. ‘I’m beginning to understand what the Talmud is.’ ‘No, you have understood nothing at all, the rabbi interrupted, for how could two men have come down the same chimney, one dirty and the other clean?’ [POLIAKOV, p. 253]

Although Talmudic reasoning considers a variety of argument, Israeli lawyer Uri Huppert explains the fundamental underlining of its “intolerant” discourse:

“It is beyond any doubt that the halachic-Talmudic reasoning is reached by considering a variety of opinions, hence the sophisticated rabbinical ‘responsa’ – questions and answers – are regarded as the very essence of halachic Judaism. But by the same token, this Judaism cruelly rejects, prohibits, and excommunicates any step or expression that collides with the legalistic-dogmatic concept of Orthodox Judaism, which is xenophobic and intolerant by definition, as expressed by the [modern] Orthodox rabbinical establishment.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 197]

The Talmud is full of anecdotes, advice, folk wisdom, and material that, by modern standards, affects the non-Jew with feelings of incredulity (but sometimes insult and indignation as we will see later). It is not hard to imagine why so many Jews flocked from the rabbinically controlled ghettos in the European Enlightenment era. Many modern, secularized Jews have looked with dismay upon the wisdom of their ancient sages. We learn in the Talmud, for example, that:

“One who eats an ant is flogged five times forty stripes save one.” [HARRIS, p. 71]

“Demons … have wings like angels … [and] they know the future.” [HARRIS, p. 76]

“A dog in a strange place does not bark for seven years.” [HARRIS, p. 84]

“For night-blindedness, let a man take a hair-rope and bind one end of it to his own leg and the other to a dog’s, then let the children clatter a potsherd after him, and call out, ‘Old man! dog! fool! cock! …’” [HARRIS, p. 191]
“The bald-headed, and dwarfed, and the blear-eyed are ineligible for the priesthood.” [HARRIS, p. 88]

“Only kings … eat roast meat with mustard.” [HARRIS, p. 88]

“The Rabbis have taught that a man should not drink water on Wednesdays and Saturdays after night fall … An evil spirit … on these evenings prowls around…” [HARRIS, p. 92]

“These things cause hemorrhoids: – eating cane leaves, the foliage and tendrils of a vine, the palate of cattle, the backbones of fish, half-cooked salt fish, wine, lees, etc.” [HARRIS, p. 106]

“These things are detrimental to study [including] walking between two camels…; to pass under a bridge beneath which no water has flowed forty days; to drink water that runs through a cemetery…” [HARRIS, p. 116]

“It is not right for a man to sleep in the daytime any longer than a horse sleeps. And how long is the sleep of a horse? Sixty respirations.” [HARRIS, p. 157]

“The daughters of Israel burn incense for [purposes of] sorcery.” [HARRIS, p. 188]

Jewish apologists like Alan Dershowitz exclaim immediate indignation at anyone who dares to excerpt such material, despite the fact that they very much represent – in page after page – the “folk” flavor of the ancient Talmud. Cloaking himself as protective defender of both Judaism and Christianity, and going back one generation from the interpretive Talmud to the Torah itself, he argues that

“A classic technique of both anti-Semitism and anti-Christianity has been to cull from Old and New Testament biblical prescriptions that when taken out of context seem bizarrely out of place in contemporary life.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 332]

What, one wonders, do Dershowitz-like commentators have in mind for the correct “context” for understanding Talmudic admonitions, from which anti-Semites have always found a treasure trove of disturbing material? They are just as bizarre when left in their original context, probably more so since hundreds, if not thousands, of the same sorts of archaic perspectives reinforce each other, and those who are doing the “culling” are usually the religiously pious. Such “bizarre cullings” as above are not Talmudic aberrations but are part of a common tone of an interwoven multi-rabbinical catalogue, from the very particular perspective of “being Jewish” hundreds of years ago. Such expressions of “folk wisdom” are not just that, they are explication of a distinct religion, and are argued about over and over, debated to this very day in Orthodox circles not towards discard, but towards (in their essential meanings, however they are conjured) use.

When confronted with the details of Talmudic guidance and logic, some liberal-minded Jews can’t actually stomach what they find. Jane Rachel Litman notes that, when faced with the teachings of the ancient rabbis, some Jews respond with abject denial: i.e., arguing, on modern terms, that the old rabbinical sages couldn’t have possibly meant what they wrote:
“The background sound in the small library is muted but intense. Pairs of scholars lean over their talmudic texts whispering energetically, trying to puzzle out the meaning of the particular sugya, passage. The teacher directs them back toward the group and asks for questions.

One student raises a hand: ‘I don’t understand verse 5:4 of the tractate Niddah. What does the phrase ‘it is like a finger in eye’ mean? The teacher responds, ‘This refers to the hymen of a girl younger than three years old. The Sages believed that in the case of toddler rape, the hymen would fully grow back by the time the girl reached adulthood and married. Therefore, though violated, she would still technically be counted as a virgin and could marry a priest. It’s an analogy: poling your finger in the eye is uncomfortable, but causes no lasting harm.

There is a collective gasp of breath among students. Their dismay is palpable. They do not like this particular talmudic text or the men behind it. But its authors, the talmudic rabbis, hardly wrote it with this particular group of students in mind – mostly thirty- and forty-year old women in suburban Philadelphia taking a four-week class titled ‘Women in Jewish Law’ at their Reform synagogue.

The questioner persists. ‘I don’t understand. Are you saying this refers to the rape of a three year-old girl?’

‘Or younger,’ the teacher responds dryly.

‘I don’t see how it says anything about rape and hymens. You must be mistaken. I don’t believe the rabbis are talking about rape at all. I think this statement has nothing to do with the rest of the passage.’

The teacher (I’ll admit now that it was me, a second-year rabbinic student) responds, ‘Well, that’s the common understanding. What do you think it means?’

The woman is clearly agitated, ‘I don’t know, but I do know that it couldn’t be about child rape.’ This is week three of the class. The woman does not return for week four. Denial. “ [LITMAN, R., SEPT 2000]

Litman, the rabbinic student, then confesses that “I find [Elizabeth Kubler] Ross’s model helpful when addressing sacred Jewish texts that are violent or xenophobic, that speak of child abuse, human slavery, or homophobia with gross insensitivity. Like so many of my colleagues and students, I often drift confusedly through denial, anger, grief, rationalization (a form of bargaining); sometimes reaching acceptance, sometimes not.” [LITMAN, R., SEPT 2000]

Another Jewish religion teacher, Deena Copeland Klepper, notes that “there are many passages in the Bible that make us squirm.” She cites Psalm 137 from the Torah, where Israelites are enjoined to dash innocent Babylonian babies against the rocks. “I have read Psalm 137 with adults in Jewish history classes many times,” Klepper says, “it is the best way I know to communicate the anguish of the Israelites in exile from their homeland. And yet reading the text also elicits a horrified reaction in my students. Against the familiarity of the first part of the psalm, that final vengeful outburst against innocent children shocks; it violates my students’ modern sensibilities.” [KLEPPER, D., APRIL 2001]
Despite such moral problems with ancient texts, says Edward Boaz, “To be sure, the Talmud was written in a historical context vastly different from the world we live in. Its solutions may not be entirely appropriate to ours. But to its credit, the Talmud is not an abstract religious work. It grows out of the needs of people in all walks of life. The authors have created for us a valuable paradigm that may be utilized for meeting the challenges that confront our children.” [BORAZ, p. 3]

For all such Talmudic injunctions, the enduring capacity for the Talmud (and other Jewish religious metacommentaries) to be entirely malleable as an authoritative work to fit the occasion at hand is noted by Jacob Katz; of seven Talmudic commentators expressing an opinion about a seminal religious dictate concerning apostasy, “three succeeded in twisting the meaning of the sentence into the opposite of its obvious intention.” [KATZ, Ex, p. 81]

To hold the Jewish community tightly together against other peoples, rabbinical arguments can even be consciously used to subvert the original meanings of the seminal Torah itself. Rabbi Jonathan Sacks notes that

“One of the most famous passages in the entire rabbinical literature [is] the argument between Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus and [other rabbinical] sages [of his era] on the ritual cleanliness of a broken and reconstituted oven. Rabbi Eliezer declared it clean; the sages ruled against him. He ‘brought all the proofs in the world’ for his view but none was accepted. After invoking several miracles, he finally appealed to Heaven itself, ‘whereupon a Heavenly voice was heard saying: Why do you dispute with Rabbi Eliezer, seeing that in all matters the halakhah agrees with him?’ This proof too was rejected, on the grounds that ‘It [the Torah] is not in heaven.’” [SACKS, J., p. 164]

Here, even though Rabbi Eliezer was, according to Jewish law, clearly correct in his opinion about the broken oven, “the assertion of [communal rabbinical] authority [over God] is necessary ‘so that disputes should not multiply in Israel.’” [SACKS, J., p. 165]

Lothar Kahn notes prominent secular Jewish author Arthur Koestler’s views about such Talmudic reasoning:

“The survival of a brand of scholasticism in today’s Talmudic schools was an intellectual shock [to Koestler]. The acrobatics in logic in which it indulged appeared to aim at the same intellectual and moral evasions as the practices relating to Sabbath and Pesach. Interpretations of Mosaic Law, specifically devised to evade the original law, struck him as a form of mental corruption.” [KAHN, L., 1961, p. 151]

The Talmud has always functioned as a flexible apparatus to shift and adapt the Jewish faith over the centuries to current needs and political expediencies. There is enough conflicting argument in the Talmud to prove or disprove virtually anything, resolve from the shelf any theological – or practical – emergency, depending on which way contemporary winds blow. In the Talmud, for example, (Sanhedrin 59a) one old sage, Johanan, opines that “A Gentile who takes up the Torah [Old Testament] is deserving of death.” This, to say the least,
can be rather disconcerting to find, especially for all the millions of non-Jews who have dared to read the Old Testament, but the admonition to kill is there in seminal Jewish religious literature. Of course, on the same page another rabbi, Meir, takes an opposite stance and claims it is meritorious for anyone to absorb the Bible. (UNIV JEW EN, v. 3, p. 4) Both opinions are there, both are legitimate, both religiously sanctioning what a devout Jew essentially chooses to believe, based upon his or her evaluation – generally within current convention of a maze of interpretations and emphases – of conflicting rabbinical arguments.

Despite the extremely malleable capacities intrinsic to the Talmud, one of its historical standards to our own day – in the Orthodox context (which is what all Jews were till the Enlightenment) – is religiously sanctioned racism, rooted in the Chosen People ethos and the notion that Jews were superior to all others and destined to remain “apart” from them. “The Talmudic mind,” says Norman Cantor, “is hostile to ethnic equality and to universalism. It is very anxious to enforce an ideal of communal purity. All possible contacts with Gentiles are to be avoided.” [CANTOR, p. 206] “It is the Talmudic mentality and customs,” wrote David Goldstein, a Jewish apostate, in 1940, “that are largely responsible for the enmity of non-Jews towards Jews. This enmity also exists among Jews themselves, for revolt is the keynote of modern Jews, revolt against Rabbinism, Orthodox Judaism, which is Talmudism.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 130] “Learning the classic Jewish texts in the yeshivot (religious schools) of both western and eastern Europe,” notes Edwin Boraz, “involved generations of traditions. The Talmud became part of the genetic code of our people.” [BORAZ, p. 3]

And what is included in this “genetic code?” “Sadly,” says Rabbi Isar Schorsch,

“a low estimate of non-Jews pervades much of Talmudic literature. The Mishna admonishes Jews not to leave their animals unattended at the inn of a gentile, because gentiles are suspected of engaging in bestiality. Gentiles are described also as liable to rape and murder, so that a lonely Jew should avoid their company … [T]reatment of the 'other' remains a problem for Judaism. In a divided world, we are entitled to take whatever measures will advance our narrow interests. And it is such a world, in which holiness and hatred are intertwined, that [jailed American fraudster] Rabbi Frankel inhabits.” [SCHORSCH, I., 4-30-99]

Flagrant religious directives, in classical Judaism, for racist positions (and worse) against all non-Jews, however, are difficult for the non-Jew to research for many reasons. Relatively few Jews, for instance, are inclined to address such a subject in detail (for fear of fueling “anti-Semitism”) in English publications. (Non-Jews who address the Talmud critically are routinely dismissed as anti-Semitic). It is usually addressed more safely, “privately,” in Hebrew. An example of this may be gleaned from an English summary in Religious and Theological Abstracts of a 1994 article in Hebrew by Elliot Horowitz. His subject is Purim – the annual Jewish festival that celebrates the destruction of the Jews’ arch-enemy, Haman – usually by hanging him in effigy. Horowitz’s article
“deals with the character of Purim over the centuries as a day combining ritual reversal, joys and hostility – especially towards Christians and its symbols, as well as with 19th and 20th century historiographical attempts to come to grips with the troubling evidence concerning the activities of the Jews as part of the holiday’s carnivalesque character. The problematic character of much historiography concerning Purim can be seen in the case of H. Graetz who wrote that it had been the custom to burn Haman upon a gallows which had the form of a cross. It was difficult for Jewish historians to speak their minds honestly about what Purim had been like in the past, for fear it would reflect upon European Jewry in the present. [The article] stresses the tenacity of anti-Christian Purim practices, especially among European Jewry, in medieval and modern times.” [REL&THEO, 1995, 38, p. 851]

Meanwhile, for popular, public Gentile consumption in English, Hayyim Schauss’s book about Jewish festivals is typical in its reframing of historical fact into merely the fantasies of Christian anti-Semitic fanatics, i.e., the reconstruction of Jewish culpability into Jewish innocence, an attitude systematically manifest throughout Jewish polemic. Schauss writes that:

“As far back as the fifth century the charge was made against Jews that they burned a cross and a figure of Jesus on Purim. This slander often led to attacks upon Jews by their Christian neighbors. In time, under pressure of the Christians, the custom [of burning an effigy of Haman] disappeared in Christian lands.” [SCHAUSS, p. 268]

The Israeli social critic, Israel Shahak, addresses another example of this systematic deceit and dissimulation about Jewish history by noting the 1968 English-language volume, The Joys of Yiddish, by Leon Rosten. Shahak notes that the book

“is a kind of glossary of Yiddish [the Jewish traditional language of central and eastern Europe] [with]…. an etymology stating … the language from which the word came into Yiddish and its meaning in that language … The entry shaygetz - whose main meaning is ‘a Gentile boy or young man’ – is an exception: there the etymology cryptically states, ‘Hebrew origin,’ without giving the form or meaning of the original Hebrew word. However, under the entry shiksa – the feminine form of shaygetz – the author does give the original Hebrew word, shegetz (or, in his transliteration, shegues) and defines its Hebrew meaning as ‘blemish.’ This is a bold-faced lie as every speaker of Hebrew knows. The Megiddo Modern Hebrew-English Dictionary, published in Israel, correctly defines shegetz as follows: ‘unclean animal’: loathsome creature, abomination … wretch, unruly youngster; Gentile youngster.” [SHAHAK, p. 26]

Edwin Freedland notes that:

“The etymological history of the word shiksa itself is instructive … The Hebrew word shakayatz means to abominate, to utterly detest. In the Bible there are constant admonitions not to eat or take the shikutz (mas-
culine noun form), literally, the abominated thing, into one’s house.” [FREEDLAND, E., 1982, p. 508]

For popular consumption in English, however, the word *shiksa* is usually carefully censored. In *A Dictionary of Yiddish Slang and Idioms*, for example, “*shiksei*” is simply defined as “Non-Jewish girl (also used to imply an impious or wild Jewish girl).” [KOGOS, p. 70]

But most Jews know better. Yossi Klein Halevi, who grew up in an American Orthodox community, notes that the word “*shiksa*” means “a gentile woman, that nasty Yiddish word implying ‘slut.’” [HALEVI, MEMOIRS, p. 224] When Israeli Ze’ev Chafets married a non-Jewish woman in 1997, he had to face more firmly the institutionalized Jewish racism (and moral double standards) against his new wife:

> “Jews who would rather cut off their tongue than say ‘nigger’ or ‘spic’ and consider ‘kike’ and ‘Hymie’ fighting words talk about ‘goyim’ and ‘shiksas’ with blithe indifference. They assume that we can’t be guilty of prejudice because we are all victims … But terms like ‘shiksa’ … no longer sound like charming Yiddishisms to me; they seem like slurs.” [BROWNFELD, p. 85]

A minority of non-Orthodox Jews who haven’t studied their own traditional literature, or Yiddish and Hebrew, in detail, may not even be aware of the range of such objectionable (by modern moral standards) material in seminal Jewish religious texts. Nor do informed Jews invite an examination of the full context of Jewish-Gentile relations through history. In the last few decades whenever such material is brought to public attention, however rarely, its exposure is attacked by Jewish organizations as “anti-Semitic canards,” distorted and misrepresented excerpts from their original contexts. Throughout history it has usually taken apostate Jews to reveal them to the non-Jewish community.

> “Among the first generation or two of Dominican friars [in the Middle Ages],” says Norman Cantor, “… were a remarkable number of Jewish converts. The reason that the friars … could engage in a lengthy debate with the rabbis in their public disputations in France and Spain was that these debating friars were almost invariably former rabbis or rabbinical students, or sons of rabbis.” [CANTOR, p. 179] “Most often,” notes Leon Poliakov, “by making the conversion of the Jews and the denunciation of Jews their chief vocation [Jewish apostates] constituted a true scourge for the Jewish communities…. [POLIAKOV, p. 167] … The role of the renegade Jew … has always been of prime importance during the persecutions of the Jews.” [POLIAKOV, p. 69]

In the year 1236, for example, Nicholas Donin, a Jewish convert to Christianity, “approached Pope Gregory IX with a list of charges against rabbinic Judaism.” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 60] According to Donin, notes Jeremy Cohen, “the rabbis [of the Talmud] allegedly instructed the Jews to kill Christians and ruled that the Jew may blamelessly cheat and deceive Christians in any way possible … The Talmud, claimed Donin, licensed murder, theft, and religious intolerance, and it included strictures against trusting Gentiles, honoring them, or even returning a lost piece of property to them. The worst outrage for Donin
was the prayers in the Jews’ daily liturgy uttered against Christians and apostates.” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 68, 71] A compilation was also made, “probably in large part by converts from Judaism,” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 65] which resulted in “a collection of objectionable excerpts from the Talmud and Jewish liturgy according to topic, over one hundred folios listing the passages in the order of their appearance in the Talmud.” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 65] The result of a Papal investigation of the Talmud resulted in its public burning.

Another such disputation in Barcelona, Spain, occurred in 1262 between Rabbi Moses ben Nahman and Friar Pablo Christiani. Christiani was born Jewish and “he had studied Jewish literature under the direction of Rabbi Eliezer ben Emmanuel of Tarascon and Jacob ben Elijah Lattes of Venice.” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 108] Elsewhere, “Juan Perez de Montalvian, a Marrano [secret Jew],” notes M. H. Goldberg, “was a priest and notary of the Inquisition. The Society of Jesus founded by Saint Ignatius had numerous monks of Jewish descent. When Saint Ignatius chose a successor to lead the order, he appointed Diego Lainez, who had been born a Jew.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 109-110]

In the 15th century, notes Bernard Lazare, “Peter Schwartz and Hans Boyd, both converted Jews, instigated the inhabitants to sack the [Jewish] Ghetto; in Spain, Paul de Santa-Maria [formerly Solomon Levi] instigated Henry III of Castille to take measures against the Jews … [Santa-Maria] is generally found the instigator in all the persecutions which befell the Jews of his time, and he hunted the synagogue with a ferocious hatred … The Talmud was the great antagonist of the converts, and one that had to withstand most of their wrath. They constantly denounced it before the inquisitors, the king, the emperor, and the Pope … The theologians followed the example of the converts, most frequently they had about the Talmud no other notions beyond those given them by the converts.” [LAZARE, p. 88]

“In the sixteenth century,” adds M. Hirsch Goldberg, “a butcher named Pfefferkorn tried to have the German emperor destroy all rabbinic writings and Hebrew books except the Bible.” [GOLDBERG, M., 1976, p. 214] Pfefferkorn too was a Jewish convert to Christianity, as was, in the eighteenth century, Jacob Frank (1726-1791). “Frank and his closest followers adopted Catholicism,” notes Jewish apologist Milton Aron, “and, in vengeful activities against their opponents within Jewry, heaped various false accusations against the Jews and their teachings, leading to the burning of the Talmud.” [ARON, M., 1969, p. 30]

Then there is the case of “Michael the Neophyte, an eighteenth century Jewish convert to Christianity, who not only swore that Judaism commanded the ritual killing of Gentile children, but provided gory details of his own participation in those murders.” [PIPES, D., 1997, p. 32]

In Germany, notes Nachum Gidal, “one of the most influential opponents of political equality for the Jews was the baptised Jew Freidrich Julius Stahl (1802-1861) who was the founder of Prussian conservatism, leader of the Con-
servative Party, House of Lords, and member of the Upper House of Prussian Parliament.” [GIDAL, p. 17] In Russia, in 1869, “the infamous Book of the Kahal, … written by the Jewish apostate Jacob Brafman, made its appearance and seemed to document the already well-known accusation that the Jews constituted a ‘state within a state’ whose main aim was to subjugate and exploit the non-Jewish population.” [ARONSON, p. 42] (Louis Rapoport even argues that Jewish oppression of Jews was even pre-eminent in the Russian communist revolution: “The Jewish Bolsheviks were the most fanatical advocates of suppressing Jewish parties.”) [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 29] Even recently, in Croatia, “in July 1997, Mladen Schwartz, an individual of Jewish origin and an ultra-nationalist agitator, promoted his book ‘Protocols, Jews and Adolf Hitler’ in Zagreb’s main square. In the book Schwartz poses such questions as ‘Why should the Croatian state be in the service of Judeo-lobbyists?’” [INSTITUTE OF JEWISH POLICY RESEARCH, 2001]

Over the centuries, inflammatory Talmudic passages were “exposed” to the Christian public more and more by non-Jewish authors; in 1700, for example, the German, Johann Eisenmenger, wrote Judaism Uncovered and August Rohling, a professor of Semitic languages in Prague, penned Talmud Jew in 1871. These two works were among the most sensational charges against Jewish tradition and belief; modern Jewish scholarship (and even more so, Jewish popular opinion) generally portrays such texts as fabrication or misinterpretation – in either case, “anti-Semitic.” “The Talmud,” says George Mosse, “was said to be full of exhortations to cheat, lustfulness, usury, and hatred of Christians … The Talmud had come to symbolize the secret of the ‘perverted’ religion of the Jews.” Rohling decided that it was a “program for domination of the world by the chosen people.” [MOSSE, p. 139]

In Eisenmenger’s case, his “anti-Jewish sallies,” writes Jacob Katz, “were on the whole not his own inventions. He collected anti-Jewish ornaments from the Christian tradition, systematized them, and attempted to prove their truth by reading them into the Talmudic literature with which he was well acquainted.” [KATZ, Jew Dig, p. 6] Nazis and others have, of course, recognized such materials’ value in enflaming anti-Jewish hostility and appropriated them for presentation for their own purposes.

Eisenmenger’s anti-Jewish work, the argumentative basis for many books critical of Jews that were written later, is particularly noteworthy and bears greater scrutiny. As a dedicated Christian, Eisenmenger’s writings were framed as a polemic that impugned Jewish belief and tradition. His opus, Judaism Uncovered (Endecktes Judenthum), was a two-volume set of over 2,100 pages, quoting from 200 mostly Jewish sources and was the result of twenty years of research. The author was a respected scholar and well read in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. “In short,” says Jacob Katz (a well-known Jewish scholar who Israeli critic Israel Shahak singles out as being particularly apologetic when it comes to Jewish religious texts), [SHAHAK, p. 114] “Eisenmenger was acquainted with all the literature a Jewish scholar of standing would have known … [He] surpassed his [non-Jewish] predecessors in his mastery of the sources and his
Katz refers here to the likes of Bernard Lewis, another Jewish scholar, whose reaction to Eisenmenger’s work is much more typical:

“Eisenmenger was a professor of Oriental languages … By careful selection, occasional invention, and sweeping misinterpretation, due sometimes to ignorance and sometimes to malice, he presents the Talmud as a corpus of anti-Christian and indeed anti-human doctrine… Eisenmenger’s book, though disproved again and again by both Christian and Jewish scholars, became a classic of anti-Semitic literature, and has remained a source book for anti-Semitic accusations to the present day.” [LEWIS, B., 1986, p. 105]

Influential Jews of the Royal Court in Eisenmenger’s locale and era (Samson Wertheimer and Samuel Oppenheimer, among them) managed to have the book banned by the Habsburg Emperor; Eisenmenger appealed, and “litigation continued for decades.” The author never lived to see the censorship of his book about Jews lifted. [KATZ, p. 14] “The powerful supplier of the Austrian armies, Samuel Oppenheimer,” notes Leon Poliakov, “actually succeeded, for a consideration, in having the work banned. Its 2,000 copies were confiscated as soon as they were printed, and the author died, apparently of grief.” [POLIAKOV, p. 243]

Conceding that Eisenmenger’s voluminously footnoted citations from Jewish law and religious literature do indeed exist as he says, Jacob Katz argues (as do many Jewish apologists) that just because these citations are undeniably part of Judaism’s religious tradition doesn’t mean the rules and laws were actually practiced (or, at least, practiced any longer). Katz asserts that such odious directives from Jewish sages must be understood in terms of the climate of their creation. “Eisenmenger,” says Katz, “consciously ignored whatever later [Jewish] generations read into earlier sources … [he was] seeking only the original meaning intended by the writers.” [KATZ, p. 17]

Katz proclaims what he calls the “historical approach” (i.e., trying to understand “the original meanings intended by the writers”) to be fallacious. The correct way to view Jewish seminal thinking, he argues, is by the “exegetical-homiletical method” (i.e., what Jews were supposed to believe and what they practiced were eventually two different things – they adjusted to changes around them). This, for Katz, negates the “original meanings.”

One of Eisenmenger’s principal attacks was upon codified Jewish opinion for treatment of non-Jews and their religions. Eisenmenger cited textual evidence that Jewish religious tradition forbids robbery, deceit, and even murder only within their own community, non-Jews were categorically exempt from moral protection. If Jews were raised with such beliefs, argued Eisenmenger, it is not hard to believe that they would be inclined to defame Christianity at every chance, as well as rob, swindle, and even murder those not of their own community.

“The nature of the Jewish tradition,” writes Katz of such Eisenmenger
charges, “its earliest strata reflecting the conditions of the ancient world, enabled Eisenmenger to prove such theses. The legal and ethical systems of the ancient world were dualistic ... In the period of the Mishnah and Talmud, the question of whether the property of non-Jews was protected by law was still under dispute. Certain individuals who were considered subversive – idol worshippers and the like – remained outside the absolute protection of the [Jewish] law even in matters of life and death.” [KATZ, From, p. 18]

Katz goes on to argue that those rabbinical opinions that asserted, for instance, “that one should actively work towards [“sectarians’ and ‘infidels’”] deaths became merely “theoretical material.” [KATZ, p. 18] Or as another apologetic Jewish scholar, Louis Jacobs, puts the Eisenmenger issue:

“There is no doubt that the Talmudic Rabbis, living among pagans, had a poor opinion of the Gentile world around them even while admiring some of its features. At times some of the Rabbis gave vent to the harshest feelings, as in the notorious statement ‘Kill the best of the goyyim.’ Johann Andreas Eisenmenger (1654-1704) in his Endecktes Judenthum (Judaism Unmasked) collected such adverse passages in order to prove to his satisfaction that the Jews hate all Gentiles. It became an important aspect of Jewish apologetic to demonstrate that Eisenmenger had either misunderstood many of the passages he quotes or had taken them out of context.” [JACOBS, L., 1995, p. 184-185]

Ultimately, Eisenmenger aligned evidence from Jewish religious law to exhibit an alleged foundation which suggests that, when the Messiah comes, non-Jews would be destroyed. But not only that. Based on the citational evidence he could piece together, Eisenmenger thought “it stood to reason that [Jews] would carry out the commandment of destruction even in the present on those whom it was within their reach to injure and harm.” [KATZ, p. 19] In fact, this theme of vengeful Jewish destruction of non-Jews was addressed in a volume by professor Abraham Grossman in Hebrew, in 1994, specifically investigating Ashkenazi (European Jewish) religious society. A summary of his conclusions in Religious and Theological Abstracts states that

[The] Ashkenazi believed in the conversion of the Gentiles as part of the redemptive era, following the stage of vengeance ... The idea that a link exists between vengeance to be carried out against the enemies of Israel and the redemption, and that vengeance is a forerunner to redemption, can be found in the Bible, the Talmud, and in apocalyptic literature, and should not be viewed as uniquely Ashkenazi.” [REL&THEO, 38:1, 859]

As renowned sociologist Max Weber once noted:

“In the mind of the pious Jew the moralism of the law was inevitably combined with the aforementioned hope for revenge, which suffused practically all the exile and post-exilic sacred scriptures. Moreover, through two and a half millennium this hope appeared in virtually every divine service of the Jewish people, characterized by a firm grip upon two indestructible claims – religiously sanctified segregation from the
other peoples of the world, and divine promises relating to this world … When one compares Judaism with other salvation religions, one finds that in Judaism the doctrine of religious resentment has an idiosyncratic quality and plays a unique role not found among the disprivileged classes of any other religion.” [NEWMAN, A., 1998, p. 163])

Yet, concludes professor Katz, “To anyone who is knowledgeable of Jewish literature, Eisenmenger’s interpretations [of central Jewish religious texts] read like a parody of both the legal and homiletic literature … It is otherwise, of course, for the reader who is unfamiliar with the literature: he may fall for Eisenmenger’s conclusions, not knowing that they are no more than the very assumptions that preceded the writer’s examination of the material [i.e., anti-Jewish Christian prejudice].” [KATZ, J, From, p. 20]

Unfortunately, this “parody” reading of seminal Jewish religious literature, and its “theoretical theses,” as we will soon see, has many Jewish adherents even today, as it always has, and – with renewed interest in it in the Jewish world today – is causing moral consternation for the more universalistic, enlightened members of the Jewish politic.

“Eisenmenger neither forged his sources nor pulled his accusations out of thin air,” says Katz, “There was a nucleus of truth in all of his claims: the Jews lived in a world of legendary or mythical concepts, of ethical duality – following different standards of morality in their internal and external relationships – and they dreamed with imaginative speculation of their future in the time of the Messiah.” [KATZ, p. 21] That admitted, Katz turns to debunk Eisenmenger’s volumes of evidence by claiming that the German scholar found only what he wished to find. In other words, the most relevant facts of Eisenmenger’s argument, to Katz, are not to be found in the evidence of Jewish religious law and literature, but, rather, in Eisenmenger’s underlying paradigm of anti-Semitism.

Is Katz’s view true? Is all this anti-Gentile animosity irrefutably found in Jewish religious literature “obsolete,” and did Eisenmenger just piece various facts together to form a false whole? Or, rather, is it just that pious believers in talmudic Judaism have really never had the political empowerment – until the creation of modern Israel – to surface the most disturbing elements of the faith?

Let’s turn to Moshe Greenberg for the beginning of an answer to all this, a scholar described by the periodical Conservative Judaism as “one of the leading scholars of Hebrew scripture in the world,” formerly the Chair of the Department of Bible Studies at Hebrew University in Israel. As a young man, Greenberg’s first introduction to the racist foundation of Jewish religious literature was in Sefer Hatanya, the central works of Habad hasidim [one of today’s ultra-Orthodox groups, also spelled “Chabad”]. Greenberg noted in 1996 that

“What emerged for me, from the study of the first chapters of the book and their antecedents was the discovery that the main stream of Jewish thought is permeated by the genetic spiritual superiority of Jews over Gentiles, disconcertingly reminiscent of racist notions of our time. Living in Israel for the past twenty years in a Jewish majority that is no more sensitive to the feelings of minorities within it than Gentile majorities
are…. [with] Jews in their midst, I have come to realize the vitality of Jewish racist notions, and I am more than ever convinced that the hold Judaism will have on this and future generations will be gravely impaired unless these notions are neutralized by an internal reordering of traditional values.” [GREENBERG, p. 33]

Such traditional values may be found in the memoirs of Yossi Klein Halevi (an American Jew who eventually moved to Israel) and what he was taught as a youth at Brooklyn’s Talmudic Academy:

“Jews and goyim [non-Jews] were locked in eternal struggle. For now the goyim prevailed. But when the Messiah came, we would triumph. Twenty goyim would cling to each thread of our prayer shawls, pleading to serve us as protection against divine judgment.” [HALEVI, p. 68]

One Talmudic Academy teacher taught that “Jews were the center of the world … Anything extraneous to Jews was of no real interest to us, or, by implication, God himself.” [HALEVI, p. 68]

Today’s Orthodox Lubavitcher movement (famous for its yearly Chabad telethon to raise money for its projects) also reflects the principles of Jewish racial uniqueness, for example, in its Sefer Hama’Amarim, by Rabbi Yosef Yitzchok Schneersohn:

“The Jewish people were granted the unique ability to draw down all Divine effluences through their performance of Torah and mitzvos [the fulfillment of religious commandments] … [Jews] become vessels for G-dliness … The reason why only Jews possess this unique quality is because of their power of mesirus nefesh, total self-sacrifice... [SCHNEERSOHN, Y., 1986, p. 2] … The Talmud comments that Jews possess three innate character traits: they are bashful, merciful and benevolent. These traits are not only meritorious in and of themselves, but also reveal the greatness of the Jewish people. Every Jew inherently possesses these beautiful traits. [SCHNEERSOHN, Y., 1986, p. 11] … G-d’s conduct with the Jewish people transcends the bounds of nature. When a Jew submits all his natural matters to G-d’s service, the Almighty then helps him in a supranatural manner.” [SCHNEERSOHN, Y., 1986, p. 199]

[See http://jewishtribalreview.org/micsam.htm for the courageous comments about Chabad by a concerned former professor of Jewish studies in Montreal, Michael Samuel, in a 1999 email to the Moslem Student Association]

[See http://jewishtribalreview.org/bush.htm to note the public double standards applied to this group]

Some in today’s Jewish community recognize a growing problem with what Jacob Katz disregarded as the “original meanings” of Jewish religious tenets, particularly when reinvigorated by Jewish Orthodoxy and fused to modern Zionism, wherein “theoretical” status is revived as practical actions in the real world. In a 1994 issue of Tradition magazine, published by the Rabbinical Council of America, four questions were posed to a panel of scholars, including this one:
“Has Religious Zionism been guilty of cultivating a negative stance towards Gentiles? How can Israel’s chosenness (behavior Yisrael) be so formulated as to avoid its being misinterpreted as either another form of secular nationalism, or an endorsement of negative attitudes towards Gentiles? [FELDMAN, p. 5]

The simple fact that such questions need to be asked, in-house, in a Jewish rabbinical magazine, is revealing. Of the various responses, Gerald Blidstein, Professor of Jewish Law at Ben Gurion University in Israel, had the most disturbing one:

“Unfortunately – from my point of view and, it would seem, from the perspective from which this symposium is mounted – the number of followers of Meir Kahane [the profoundly racist and, some say, even fascist, American-Israeli leader] within the Orthodox movement is not tiny, nor has his militant doctrine found a positive response among small sections of our community. On the contrary: central aspects of his worldview, or at least his basic attitudes, are shared by large segments of observant Jewry in both Israel and America … Meir Kahane is merely an unmasked version of what Zionism always was – racist, brutal, rapacious … The modern Orthodox community … exploits… democratic, humanistic modes of behavior … for its own benefit. Exploiting values cynically, benefiting from them but not committing oneself to them or internalizing them, ought to be unacceptable.” [BLIDSTEIN, p. 11, 14]

(“A confidential [1970] survey by the American Jewish Congress, the most liberal of the leading Jewish organizations, revealed that more than a third of its members said they approved the tactics of the JDL” [the Jewish Defense League – the party Meir Kahane founded.]) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 174]

The 1995 assassination of Israeli prime minister Yitzak Rabin by a zealous Orthodox student, Yigal Amir (whose yeshiva had military training as part of its curriculum), was an event of tragically profound importance to Jews; it brought into ominous focus a very real and very lethal expression of traditional talmudism, underscoring a widening gap between areligious Jews and growing numbers who have revived religious fundamentalism based upon ancient talmudic intolerance, and who now celebrate – thanks to the creation of the modern state of Israel – the power to express the angry dreams of their ancestors. Amir publicly professed his act of murder to be a religious deed (Rabin’s willingness to surrender occupied land in peace talks with Arabs was understood to be traitorous to Jewish messianism). Even in America, four months before Rabin was assassinated, a Brooklyn rabbi, Abraham Hecht, publicly called for the death of any Israeli public official who ceded land to Arabs in peace agreements with them. [JEWISH WEEK, 3-27-98, p. 20]

A year before Rabin’s murder, the prime minister spoke to a Jewish audience about (American-born) Israeli doctor Baruch Goldstein, the man who had recently burst into a Hebron mosque with an automatic weapon and slaughtered nearly 30 Muslims at prayer until he himself was beaten to death:
“The level of support for a murderous lunatic and the identification with [Goldstein] among some sectors of the public have been greater than I’d estimated at first. I see in this the danger of an Israeli racism, or to be more precise, a Jewish racism.” [DERFNER, L., 4-1-94, p. 2]

As the Jewish Bulletin noted in 1994, “since the Hebron murders, Israeli teachers have devoted lessons to explaining why Goldstein’s deed was an abomination. But at one highly rated Jerusalem school, the Hebrew Gymnasium, about half the students of an 11th grade class gathered off campus after one of the anti-Goldstein lessons, and chanted ‘Death to the Arabs,’ and ‘Goldstein tzaddik,’ or righteous man … Probably the most disturbing finding came from one of the largest high school in Beersheva. A teacher there polled the class and found that 60 percent of the students supported the massacre.” [DERFNER, L., 4-1-94, p. 2]

Based upon literal interpretations of some parts of the Talmud, even Jewish religious opponents understood how religious texts could be interpreted to sanction Rabin’s murder. As a troubled Israeli rabbi, David Hartmann, observed:

“The rabbis under radically different conditions prevailing during the third century AD … encouraged … hate and destruction. [Rabin’s assassin] was no aberration. He was wholly within the normative tradition that has survived frozen through the ages to our own time … There are sufficient other resources in the tradition – humane and pacifist ones – to counteract the dogmatism. The tragedy is that a group of fanatical and political rabbis has become dominant over all other voices in Israel.” [ELON, p. 42]

Gershom Scholem, a professor at Hebrew University and an author on Jewish mysticism, was outraged when a dozen kabbalists (Jewish mystics) camped outside Prime Minister Rabin’s house a few weeks before his murder publicly calling upon “angels of destruction,” and prayed for Rabin to die. This occurred, notes Scholem, “in the heart of Jerusalem, in fairly normal times. No one in the religious world cried out to protest. Nobody said it’s all nonsense. In other words, they believe (these invocations to black magic) actually work.” [ELON, p. 46]

In 1988 another Israeli rabbi, David Ben-Haim, this one a member of the “radical right” messianic religious movement in Israel, dipped into Talmudic texts and other seminal Judaic literature to evidence profoundly disturbing material. “In a thirty page study that examined all Halakhic authorities on the subject,” says professor Ehud Sprinzak of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, “Ben-Haim proves that according to the vast majority, the Torah, when speaking about Adam (a human being), never includes Gentiles in this category. He points out that ten recognized Halakhic authorities repeatedly proposed that Gentiles are more beast than human and that they should be treated accordingly; only two authorities recognize non-Jews as full human beings created in the image of God.” [SPRINZAK, p. 273]

“What comes of all this,” wrote Rabbi Ben-Haim, “is that according to the
prophets, and also according to our sages, the Gentiles are seen as beasts … It is possible that one may see these injunctions as racism; another may call it hatred of Gentiles, whoever he is; but as far as the Jew who adheres to the statement of the Torah of Israel is concerned, this is reality and a way of life which were set for the people of Israel by G-d.” [SPRINZAK, p. 274]

“Hardly anyone speaks of Jewish fundamentalism,” worries Israel Shahak, “which is growing in Israel and the United States even more.” [SHAHAK, Ideology, p. 80]

Evelyn Kaye, a woman raised in an Orthodox Jewish community in New York, wrote in 1987 an indicting volume about her life within it and the religiously enforced racism of the ancient sages that still holds firm in Jewish communities to our present day. The foundation of “being Jewish” against the rest of humanity is manifest in the fundamentally hostile attitudes towards non-Jews. Kaye writes that

“The mark of a truly devout Hasidic or Orthodox Jew, as well as many other Jews, is an unquestioned hatred of non-Jews. This is the foundation of ultra-Orthodox and Hasidic philosophy. It is as tenacious, unreasonable, and impossible as anti-Semitism, racism, and sexism. And as intractable… There is a complete litany of all the terrible things about non-Jews which apply to every single one and which are believed implicitly by the Orthodox. These include:

– all Goyim drink alcohol and are always drunk;
– all Goyim are on drugs;
– all Goyim hate Jews even when they seem friendly;
– all Goyim are anti-semite, no matter what they say and do;
– all Goyim have a terrible family life and mistreat their wives and children;
– all Goyim eat pork all the time;
– Goyim are never as clever, as kind, as wise or as honest as Jews;
– you can never ever trust Goyim.

There’s much more. But the essence of anti-Goyimism is passed to Jewish children with their mother’s milk, and then nurtured, fed and watered carefully into a full-blown phobia throughout their lives. In order to avoid being contaminated by these terrible creatures, the Ultra-Orthodox go out of their way to avoid them … Children … manage to grow up without seeing one of these dangerous people close up. Their attitudes are then perfectly formed. They know whom to hate.” [KAYE, p. 113]

In the 1980s, Samuel Heilman watched an ultra-Orthodox teacher lecture his young students, and noted that

“Already at this age, these children knew that goyim represented the absolute other of Yidn [Jews] – the counterworld. The relation between the two was clear: ‘No ideas or institutions that held in the one were valid in the other.”’ [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 192]

Yossi Klein Halevi (whose grandfather was a millionaire in Europe) also grew up in a New York Hasidic neighborhood, in Borough Park. In 1995 he wrote that:
“Aside from watching them on TV, goyim were alien to me as they were to the Hasidic children. Naturally, I had no non-Jewish friends. An Italian family lived on our block. If I saw one of the Italians at a distance, I’d cross the street to avoid the awkwardness of saying hello … I did master [my father’s] crucial lesson: to see myself as a stranger in a hostile world, a member of a people only formally to humanity – in effect, a separate species.” [HALEVI, p. 15]

“Sadly,” noted Orthodox Rabbi Mayer Schiller in 1996, “it is … the granting of humanity to the Gentile either as an individual or as a people … that is so often lacking in Orthodox circles. Suffering from a kind of moral blindness, we find it difficult to see the non-Jew as anything more than a bit player in our own drama.” [MACDONALD, p. 5]

The origin for such beliefs are largely to be found in traditional Jewish religious literature, then secularly reinforced by a litany of Jewish complaints about alleged Gentile persecution throughout history. The ambivalent nature of some of today’s translated Jewish religious texts themselves (per their traditional intent) often reflects the fact that various offending words and passages attracted censorship throughout past centuries by offended Christian authorities (who were initially appraised of the remarks by Jewish apostates) and Jewish publishers (who feared dangerous consequences from Christian hostility). As Adin Steinsaltz notes, “When the Christian church adopted a more severe attitude toward enemies within its own ranks, it also began to examine Jewish literature and, to a large extent, the Talmud. Much of the responsibility for this attitude rests with various Jewish converts to Christianity … Several European rulers and Church dignitaries were convinced that the Talmud contained anti-Christian material and, on the basis of informers’ charges, they ordered that all anti-Christian statements and libel against Christ be erased from the books.” [STEINSALTZ, 1976, p. 81-82]

Jewish publishers eventually became self-censors; offending passages were excised or spaces were left blank on pages for Jewish readers to fill in by oral tradition and memory. The word “Gentile,” or the pejorative “goy” (both meaning any non-Jew), for example, was often replaced with the word “other,” “Egyptian,” “Kushite,” “stranger,” or other dissimulatives for non-Jewish consumption. In one case, for example, a Jewish scribe’s definition of “goyim” as “followers of Jesus Christ” became “those who do not believe in the law of Moses.” [POPPER, p. 28] As Rabbi Adin Steinsaltz notes, “most present day editions [of the Talmud] still contain a considerable number of changes and omissions introduced by censorship. Indeed, almost every passage dealing with non-Jews must be suspected of having undergone some change.” [STEINSALTZ, p. 50] “Much Talmudic discussion of early Christianity,” notes Robert Goldenberg, “was censored out in the course of the Middle Ages and must now be recovered from scattered manuscripts.” [GOLDENBERG, R., 1984, p. 170] Jewish religious leaders, scholars and general readers usually knew and understood the subterfuge through history, however, many knowing well the original meanings.
The Encyclopedia Judaica notes that

“In rabbinical literature the distinction between gentile (goy, akkum) and Christian (Nazeri) has frequently been obscured by textual alterations necessitated by the vigilance of censors. Thus ‘Egyptian,’ ‘Amalekite,’ ‘Zadokite (Sadducee),’ and ‘Kuti’ (Samaritan) often stands in place of the original Nazeri, as well as goy, akkum, etc. Probably when Resh Lakish stated that a gentile (akkum, etc. in existing texts) who observed the Sabbath [Saturday rites] is punishable by death (Sanhedrin, 58b), he had in mind Christians … Numerous anti-Christian polemic passages only make real sense after Nazeri has been restored in place of the spurious Kuti or Zedokite.” [ENCY JUD, v. 7, p. 411]

“Whole paragraphs have been deleted,” says Morris Goldstein, “words have been expunged or substituted, spellings have been changed, thoughts mutilated, and manuscripts seized and burned.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 3]

M. Herbert Danzger writes that “Jewish modernists” (seeking to reframe and redirect morally objectionable passages against non-Jews in Jewish religious literature), argue “that these laws referred not to Gentiles generally but to ‘star worshippers,’ a precise legal category meaning those who deny the existence of deity, who practice no law and no justice, whose ways are cruel and murderous.” [DANZGER, p. 295] Even if the ‘star worshippers’ interpretation had credence, who exactly in history ever believed in ‘no deity, no law, no justice,’ and wallowed in cruelty and murder? Certainly any society anywhere conceives of itself as framed within concepts of some kind of deity, law, and justice, and attributes their lack to its enemies, as does the rabbinical literature. According to the Encyclopedia Judaica, after the fall of the second Temple in 70 CE, the

“world was regarded as divided, by rabbinical opinion … into the Jewish people and the ‘nations of the world,’ and insofar as individuals were concerned, into the ‘Jew’ and the ‘idolater,’ with the Hebrew equivalent of ‘idolater’ usually abbreviated to ‘akkum,’ literally a ‘worshipper of the stars and planets.” [EN JUD, p. 410]

Michael Asheri, a Jewish American immigrant to Israel, notes modern Jewish apologetics and dissimulation about the subject of idolaters:

“Once we get out of the area of friendship and business [with non-Jews], … it is obvious that to the Jewish way of thinking, many of today’s Gentiles are still worshippers of idols. The use of devotionals in Christian churches is ingeniously explained away by orthodox Jewish thinkers, but Jews are stillstringently prohibited from entering churches in which such images are displayed. (Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh Deah 142:14) Certainly the practices of present day Hindus and Buddhists must be considered idol worship or the term has no meaning at all. In addition, the prohibition of yayin nesech, wine made by Gentiles, is based entirely on avoidance of avoda zara [worship of strange Gods]. If some of the Gentiles are not idol worshippers, why does this prohibition continue to be obligatory for all observant Jews?” [ASHERI, M., 1983, p. 332-333]

Asheri next addresses the reason for Jewish secrecy about this delicate sub-
ject: the fear of anti-Jewish hostility as a response to the Jewish anti-Gentile tra-

duction. There is, says Asheri,

“an important reason for not making apparent our attitude in this re-
pect and that is darchet shalom, keeping the peace, between the Jews
and the peoples of the world, among whom they live.” [ASHERI, M.,
1983, p. 333]

There are other things about Jewish identity that are best not discussed too
publicly. One of the principles of traditional Jewish law, notes the Israeli social
critic Israel Shahak, is that a Gentile’s life must not be saved. He cites a line in
the Talmud (Tractate Avodah Zarah, 26b): “Gentiles are neither to be lifted (out
of a well) nor hauled down (into it),” i.e., if a non-Jew falls into a well a Jew is
religiously forbidden from saving his/her life. The highly respected Jewish
theologian Maimonides takes this example to comment that “it is forbidden to
save [non-Jews] if they are at the point of death; if, for example, one of them is
seen falling into the sea, he should not be rescued.” [SHAHAK, p. 80] (In this
context of Jewish religious tradition, Shahak sardonically notes the extremely
uncompromising position many outraged Jews can find themselves in when
they so vociferously complain that so many countries “stood by and did noth-
ing” to help Jews during the Jewish Holocaust.)

As far as Maimonides is concerned, we will refer to him heavily here. His
opinions are highly relevant in our own day. Maimonides is neither obscure to
modern Orthodox Judaism, nor obsolete. He is an integral part of modern
Orthodox discourse; according to the New Encyclopedia Brittanica (1993), Mai-
monides is recognized “as a pillar of Orthodox faith – his creed became part of
the Orthodox liturgy [and he is known] as the greatest of Jewish philosophers.”
[NEW ENCY BRIT, 7, p. 708]

Israeli professor Michael Harsegor explains another angle to Jewish self-
absorption, in the tale of the “Good Samaritan” from the Christian New Testa-
ment tradition (Luke 10:33-34.) Two Jews, a Cohen and a Levite, pass a non-
Jewish man who had been physically attacked and left behind for dead by rob-
bers. Per traditional Jewish religious conviction, the passing Jews do not stop to
aid the injured man. Eventually a Samaritan passes and stops to help the fellow
in distress. As Harsegor notes, in explaining this parable of pan-human Chris-
tian teachings,

“It is wrong to cling to the Torah, like the Cohen and Levite, and do
nothing more. You have to be humane, like the Samaritan, who is not a
religious Jew.” [COUSSIN, 1999]

Conversely, Rabbi Yitzhak Ginsburgh, an immigrant from the United States
to Israel, has commented that

“If you saw two people drowning, a Jew and a non-Jew, the Torah says
you save the Jewish life first. If every simple cell in a Jewish body entails
divinity, is a part of God, then every strand of DNA is part of God. Therefore,
something is special about Jewish DNA … If a Jew needs a
liver, can you take the liver of an innocent non-Jew passing by to save
him? The Torah would probably permit that. Jewish life has infinite value.” [BROWNFIELD, A., MARCH 2000, p. 105-106]

It is critically important today, of course, for Jewish apologists to find more humane perspectives on the subject of non-Jews in traditional literature. “Moses Rivkes, a seventeenth century [Jewish] Lithuanian authority, “notes Jacob Katz, “drew the conclusion that, regarding the obligation to save life, no discrimination should be made between Jews and Christians; the same degree was attached to saving either.” Rivkes, of course, represents only one man’s view and reflects the views he sought to counter. His opinion, note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “only demonstrates the depth of historic Jewish hostility toward the non-Jew and the legitimization that this hostility received within the religious tradition.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 38]

Other disturbing views from Jewish religious literature and tradition include:

“When we withhold mercy from others [it] is equal to that for doing (merciful deeds) to members of our own people.” [SHAHAK, p. 96] “If the ox of a Jew gores the ox of Gentile, the Jew is not required to pay damages, but if the ox of a Gentile … gores the ox of a Jew, the Gentile is required to pay full damages.” [MISHNAH, BABA KAMA 4:3]

If after taking a purification bath, a Jewish woman sees a dog, pig, donkey, horse, leper, or a non-Jew (“heathen”) before she “meets a friend,” she has to take the bath over again. [GANZFRIED, p. 42] “One should not be alone with a heathen belonging to one of the seven peoples [the Biblical tribes of Canaan from which non-Jews are traditionally understood to have descended], because they are apt to commit homicide.” [GANZFIELD, p. 52] Likewise, “cattle should not be kept in the barns of heathen-owned inns, out of suspicion that they may practice sodomy with them.” [LIPMAN, E., 1974, p. 235]

“The Talmud is in disagreement over whether Jews may rob Gentiles,” says Jewish scholar Gordon Lafar, “but even the liberal authority Rabbi Menachem HaMeiri agrees that a Jew who finds something that was inadvertently lost by a Gentile is not obliged to return it.” [LAFAR, p. 189-190] In this regard, for example, in 1980 Brooklyn rabbi David Katz wrote a book about the 613 mitzvot (i.e., commandments; singular: mitzvah) that a good Orthodox Jew is expected to fulfill. (Katz notes them as “divine decrees”). [KATZ, D., 1980, untitled preface page] Among those is Mitzvah 69: “It is a positive commandment to return a lost object to a Jew, as the posuk says (Vayikra 22), ‘You should return to your brother.’” Of interesting note here are some of the detailed explanations of this: Katz highlights the Jewish religious “law” as stated by an old – and obviously still influential – Talmudic expert, Rambam:

“3. One is allowed to keep a lost object of a gentile and he who returns it commits a sin because he is supporting the wicked people of the world. But if he returns it to sanctify G-d’s name, by their saying that the Jews are honest people, it is allowed an praiseworthy to return it. Where there will be a profaning of G-d’s name one is forbidden to keep the lost object and must return it …
4. In a city that has Jews and gentiles living together and half are Jews and half are gentiles, if one found a lost object he should take the lost object and announce it. If a Jew comes and gives a sign, that the object is his, he is obligated to return it to him.

5. If the majority of the city are gentiles, and one finds it in a place where most people there are Jews, he must make an announcement. But if it is in a place that is mostly gentile, the lost article belongs to the finder and even if a Jews gives a sign we do not give it to him. We say he gave up since there are mostly gentiles and they would take it for themselves. Still the right way is to return it even then to the Jew who gave the sign.” [KATZ, D., 1980, p. 211-212]

In traditional law, Jewish physicians may break the Sabbath (i.e., the rest day) and work in order to help seriously sick Jewish patients. But there are conflicting opinions in religious texts about helping non-Jews, and the allowance to aid ill Gentiles on the Sabbath is not as clear. Apologetic Rabbi Immanuel Jacobovitz notes that

“the special sanction to disregard religious laws in the face of danger to life originally operated only in regard to Jewish lives, an attitude still upheld, in theory at least, by the Shulkan ‘Arukh … Evidently the problem [of what to do about helping non-Jews] was not very acute until the 17th century, when many responsa [opinions] began to be devoted to it. In principle the more rigorous view of the Talmud and the codes was generally maintained, but in practice it was admitted that Jewish doctors and midwives – even the most religious among them – often violated the Sabbath in their attendance of non-Jews, however legally indefensible their action might be.” [JACOBOVITS, p. 63]

An Israeli commentator, Uri Hupperet, is more blunt about the traditional reasons why Orthodox Jewish doctors might help Gentiles on the Sabbath:

“Saving a Gentile’s life is also subject to pragmatic reasoning. A Gentile who is in immediate danger of losing his or her life can be saved even on the Sabbath; not based on the philosophy of ‘loving thy neighbor,’ but motivated by netivey shalom (preserving peace with neighboring Gentiles), or by darkey eivah (avoiding atrocities of Gentiles against Jews). It is not the human dimension that motivates the command to save a life in this respect, but a dimension beneficial to the ethnocentric community that will remove ammunition from antagonists of Orthodox Judaism.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 95]

Peter Novick notes the “psychological and rhetorical” tensions, as he calls them, which traditional Jewish law provided for Jewish American soldiers in World War II:

“Jewish American GIs were expected – always in principle and sometimes in practice – to crawl out under enemy fire to bring in wounded Irish Americans or Italian Americans, as the later were expected to do for them. Members of the older [Jewish] immigrant generation surely tested much higher for feelings of international Jewish peoplehood. At
the same time, and not unconnected with this, they were closer to a tradi-
tion that made it in principle impermissible to violate the laws of Sab-
bath observance to save the life of a gentile, let alone risk one’s own life.”
[NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 34]

In the Middle Ages it became customary to spit (usually three times) at a
Christian cross (one European king had the word “God” in Hebrew etched on
the cross to alleviate the insult). Pious Jews are also traditionally enjoined to
curse when passing a non-Jewish cemetery or building inhabited by Gentiles.
[SHAHAK, p. 93] To this day, in some traditionally religious communities good
Jew ritually curses if he passes a crowd of non-Jews, but utters a blessing when
a group is Jewish. [SHAHAK, p. 93] “According to the Talmud,” confirms
Reuven Kitelman, “a blessing is to be offered upon seeing a multitude of Jews.”
[KITELMAN, p. 147]

In 1996, Yossi Klein Halevi wrote that during his youth in an Orthodox
Jewish neighborhood in Brooklyn, “some Borough Park children said it was a
mitzvah, a religious commandment, to spit when you passed a church. An alter-
native opinion held that it was forbidden to even walk within spitting distance
of a church.” [HALEVI, p. 17] “An Orthodox Jew learns from his earliest youth,
as part of his sacred studies,” says Israel Shahak, “that Gentiles are compared to
dogs, that it is a sin to praise them.” [SHAHAK, p. 96] Institutionally, says Sha-
hak, The Book of Education, written in the 14th century, is currently a popular
book for Israeli schoolchildren, its publication subsidized by the government.
Its texts includes material such as ‘The Jewish people are the best of the human
species … and worthy to have slaves to serve them. We are commanded to pos-
sess them for our service.’” [SHAHAK, p. 95]

In our own time the occasional exhuming of such anti-Gentile passages
from seminal Orthodox Jewish literature for public discourse has garnered
storms of Jewish wrath and protest; apologists vehemently argue that such texts
are obsolete, misunderstood, ambiguous, or representative of a minority rab-
binical opinion among others who took opposing views.

Those Jews who are familiar with such passages (particularly – but not only
– the Orthodox) realize that such texts are guaranteed fuel for anti-Jewish hos-
tility; hence, apologetic Jewish scholars inevitably step forward at the first
inkling of these texts gaining any kind of non-Jewish audience, seeking – at all
costs – damage control. The fact is that such material was, and is, often very
much, part of Jewish Orthodoxy and is seminal to traditional Jewish thought
about “others.” Such material is not what the apologetic Jewish community
wants known and circulated about them beyond Jewish circles. Nor does it fit
modern secular Jewry’s universalistic myths about themselves, that liberal uni-
versalism originated in the Jewish religion. “Jews would be pretty embarrassed if
some of our own triumphalist literature were better known,” Leah Orlowick, a
Conservative rabbi told a Jewish interviewer inquiring about Christianity, “I can
show you texts where Jews declare themselves inherently on a higher spiritual
level than all non-Jews. And if you’re willing to wade through all the apologetics,
the hemming and hawing, I can bring you to Jews who still believe in natural
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superiority, so let’s not be hypocrites.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 221] One of the best ways of dissimulation by Jewish apologists is to turn the tables of complaint by indignantely arguing that the public examination of such racist Jewish doctrines is, in fact, unreasonable expressions of the investigators’ anti-Semitism.

Morris Adler’s post-Holocaust (1958) comments, sponsored by the B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundation, are typical:

“A distinguished group of Christian scholars have studied the Talmud and refuted the vile allegations about it. They have treated it as an important phase of historic Judaism and interpreted its true character. The most patent absurdities are no longer repeated except perhaps by some ranting bigot whose very extremism discredits him in the eyes of reasonable people.” [ADLER, M., 1958, 1963, 1974, p. 12]

One of the ways Jewish dissimulation works is also like this:

“The Talmud is full of remarks against idolatry and idolaters; but the prevailing opinion of the rabbis is that by idolaters are meant only those in Palestine.” [UNIVERSAL JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA, v. 3, p. 4]

“Idolaters” is traditionally known by Orthodox Jews to be one of the words that can signify, generically, non-Jews anywhere. “The term idolatry,” says E. E. Urbach, “was coined by our sages and included everything connected with a god other than the God of Israel … in practice the laws dealing with idolatry cover all relations between Jews and non-Jews.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 157]

“The assumption that all Gentiles are by definition idolaters,” says David Novak, “led to a number of important halakhic norms. And although the concept of Noahide, that is, the non-idolatrous Gentile changed this assumption, many of the norms based upon it remained, albeit in modified form in most cases.” [NOVAK, Image, p. 115]

“As far as Christians being idolaters,” says Ronald Modras, “the state of Jewish law on the matter was confused. Medieval Jews generally regarded Christianity as an idolatrous religion. But laws prohibiting interaction with idolaters were not applied to Christians with any uniformity … [Jews] often regarded themselves as a civilized people living among barbarians.” [MODRAS, p. 193]

Jacob Minkin notes that “Maimonides classed the Christian in the category of idol worshippers.” [MINKIN, p. 318] And “an Israelite who worships an idol,” says Maimonides, “is regarded as an idolator in all respects … the penalty for which is death by stoning.” [MINKIN, p. 318] Maimonides also had this to say about “idolaters”: “It is forbidden to show them mercy, as it was said, ‘nor show no mercy unto them (Deut. 7:2) … You also learn that it is forbidden to heal idolaters even for a fee. But if one is afraid of them or apprehends that refusal might cause ill will, medical treatment may be given for a fee but not gratuitously.” [HARKABI, p. 157] “Maimonides exempts the Muslims from the category of idolators,” says former Israeli army official Yehoshafat Harkabi, “but the Christians, by contrast, were explicitly included …” [HARKABI, p. 157] … The classification of Christians as idolators has apparently become widespread and accepted in religious literature [today]. This is not merely a theoretical matter, since practical conclusions flow from it.” [HARKABI, p. 159]
With the increasing rise of a “back to the roots” Jewish nationalist Orthodoxy in Israel (and in considerable degree in the United States), and irretrievably tainted by the influence of modern western pan-human moralities, some Jews are stirring with serious moral qualms about bygone eras’ interpretation of seminal Jewish religious literature returning to credibility. An Israeli rabbi, Tzvi Marx, for example, has lamented the dangers of traditionalist understanding of some talmudic, and even Torah, texts. These includes the likening of Arabs to dogs and the notion that Jews are human beings but “idolaters” are not. [from the Talmud, BT Yebamot 61a, also BT Baba Metzia 114b, MARX, p. 44] Elsewhere, Rabbi Marx bemoans talmudic Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai’s “infamous teaching” and “dehumanizing depiction” of non-Jews, stemming from the Torah line that states: “And you [only you Jews] my sheep, the sheep of my pasture, are men.” [EZEK. 34:21]

“The difference between a Jewish soul and souls of non-Jews,” said influential Rabbi Yitzhak Hacohen Kook (spiritual leader of today’s Gush Emunim messianic movement) in the early 20th century, “– all of them in all different levels – is greater and deeper than the difference between a human soul and the souls of cattle.” [BROWNFELD, A., MARCH 2000, p. 105-106]

How popularly widespread are such brutal dehumanizations of non-Jews in traditional – even secular – Jewish culture? In a 1961 study of Jewish-Americans (not focusing solely on the Orthodox), Judith Kramer and Seymour Leventman noted that

“Even in the Yiddish language [the common language of immigrant Jews from central and eastern Europe, where more Jews lived, till Hitler, than any other place in the world] … popular usage distinguished between Jews and non-Jews by employing different verbs to describe the behavior. Reserved for gentiles are words otherwise used in reference to animals: e.g., Jews eat (essen), but goyim eat like pigs (fressen); Jews die (starben), but goyim die like dogs (pageren); Jews take a drink (trinken), but goyim drink like sots (soifen).” [KRAMER, p. 107]

(For the people and their language that is ever innocent, Jewish author Leo Wiener reflected a common Jewish perception in 1899: “There is probably no other language in existence on which so much opprobrium has been heaped as on Yiddish. Such a bias can be explained only as a manifestation of a general prejudice against everything Jewish.” [HERZ, J., 1954, p. 82] In 1999, as part of widespread Jewish public relations efforts to veil the essences of traditional Jewish identity, unsuspecting non-Jews in Poland were invited to sit in on a brief “course” for them at the 9th Jewish Culture Festival in Krakow. It was entitled, however incongruously, Jezyk jidisz dla kazdego (“Yiddish for Everyone”). A Polish monthly tourist magazine noted that the festival “plays a not significant role in breaking down bad stereotypes in Polish-Jewish relations.” [MIESAC w KRAKOWIE, p. 3])

“Every Jew is familiar with the works of Hillel,” says Chaim Bermant,
“and the precept of ‘love they neighbor as thyself’ is at the heart of Judaism, yet every student brought up on the Babylonian Talmud – and it must be remembered that for many centuries, especially in Poland, the Jews studied little else – is inculcated with a disdain for the gentile which has entered into Jewish lore and into the very expressions of the Yiddish language.” [BERMAN, C., 1977, p. 35]

This human/non-human kind of Yiddish linguistic distinction between Jews and non-Jews has been transposed to Hebrew and Jewish culture in modern day Israel. “The immediate referent of the Israelis is a Jew,” says Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “Indeed the very term Jew is used colloquially as a synonym for person.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 166] This kind of degradation of the Gentile world is also reflected in the Hebrew words for Jewish immigrants who come to live in Israel from around the world, and, conversely, those who leave the Jewish state. Those who **come** to Israel are **olim**, which means to ascend. Those who **leave** Israel for non-Jewish lands are **yordim**, “from the root meaning to ‘descend,’ but also to ‘decline’ and to ‘deteriorate.’” [AVRUCH, K., 1981, p. 56]

In a discussion concerning Jewish perspectives on slavery (about which there is “no negative attitude” in Biblical or rabbinical literature) Judah Rosenthal, Professor of Biblical Exegesis at the College of Jewish Studies in Chicago, also notes Rabbi Yohai’s weighty opinion on the biblical sheep reference and that, indeed, the old rabbi believed the “concept of man refers only to Israel.” A more tolerant opinion, in Rosenthal’s view, was that of another Talmudic contributor, Rabbi Akiba, who wrote that “Beloved is the man that he was created in the image of God.” However, adds Rosenthal, Rabbi Akiba also believed that a citation from Leviticus 25:46 (“You should keep them [non-Jews] in slavery forever”) was an “obligation.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 70-71] This echoes Maimonide’s belief that keeping a Gentile slave “forever” was a “normative commandment.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 71]

Maimonides also said this:

“A Gentile slave has to be enslaved forever … one of the main reasons being that since the Jewish nation is the elite of the human race … they deserve to have slaves serve them.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 71]

and:

“A man may give his bondswoman [female slave] to his [male] slave or to his neighbor’s slave … since they are regarded as cattle.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 71]

(“The Torah hardly abolishes slavery,” notes Edward Greenstein, “The Bible assumed slavery as a given and gave it a role. A slave was an indentured servant who could repay his debts through labor.”) [GREENSTEIN, E., 1984, p. 96]

Along the same lines, Isaac Abravenel (1437-1508), a prominent Jewish scholar of the Middle Ages, “considered Israel to be superior to other nations and therefore, he [Israel] is entitled to be their masters.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 73] There are also Jews who believe such things, quite literally, today. In a 1980 speech by Israeli rabbi Moshe Halevi Segal, he proclaimed that
“All nations should surrender to us, to the King of Israel, to the Messiah of G-d of Jacob, and should be taught exclusively by us. They must desert their false beliefs and cultures, and the social system dangerous to us, to leave this treacherous democracy … Democracy … confuses the truth and justice.” [SPRINZAK, p. 273]

The Orthodox “Chabad” movement is a very popular, and activist, movement in America and Israel today, seeking to pull wayward secular Jews back to the religious fold. For decades this organization was headed by Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, who died in the 1990s. “The difference between a Jewish and a non-Jewish person,” said Schneerson,

“stems from the common expression: ‘Let us differentiate.’ Thus, we do not have a case of profound change in which a person is merely on a superior level. Rather, we have a case of ‘let us differentiate’ between totally different species. This is what needs to be said about the body: the body of a Jewish person is of a totally different quality from the body of [members] of all nations of the world … A non-Jew’s entire reality is only vanity. It is written, ‘And the strangers shall guard and feed your flocks’ (Isaiah 61:5). The entire creation [of a non-Jew] exists only for the sake of the Jews.” [BROWNFIELD, A., MARCH 2000, p. 105-106]

Some talmudic – and other – citations also dictate that only non-Jewish corpses are “unclean.” This, says Rabbi Tsvi Marx, has an “attitudinal impact [that] is far reaching … and ethically devastating when taken literally.” The idea, for instance, that only Jews can have ritually “unclean” corpses can be, and is, interpreted by many Orthodox Jews to mean that non-Jews are not technically of the same essential material as Jews, and, thus less – or not at all – human. “In the Talmudic tradition Jews are often depicted as reflecting “the image of God,” says Moshe Greenberg, “but not the non-Jews. Rabbi Yohanan, for instance, says Jews were purged of their pollution; the Gentiles … were not. Rabbi Shmuel Edel is among those who collaborated this view.” [GREENBERG, p. 31-32]

Rabbi Marx adds that in the English Soncino Talmud translation concerning tractate Yebamot (p. 405, footnote 2), readers are informed that Rabbi Simeon B. Yohait says that “only an Israelite … can be said to have been like Adam, created in the image of God. Idol worshippers [i.e., non-Jews] hav[e] marred the Divine image and forfeit all claim to this appellation.” [MARX, p. 44] Marx brings up the influential Maimonides again too, in another context. According to Maimonides’ interpretation of earlier rabbinical arguments, Marx worries that in Jewish religious law the “murder of a gentile seems not to be a punishable offense.” [MARX, p. 45]

Again, Maimonides is no rabbinical slouch, and is not obscure. His opinion on all matters is respected by Orthodox Jews to this day. “Ignoring the weighty legal opinion of Maimonides,” says Eugene Korn, “is always a risky strategy.” [KORN, p. 271] Of the Jewish sages, Maimonides was also “the most consistent advocate of …. suzerainty over Gentiles.” [NOVAK, The Image, p. 114] In fact, Maimonides also wrote the following, referring to the biblical figure Noah, who was not Jewish:
“Moses [commanded] on the authority of God to compel all human beings to accept the commandments that were commanded to Noah, and he who does not accept [them] is killed.” [KORN, p. 266]

“The context of [this],” says Eugene Korn, “is [Maimonide's] description of an ideal polity under Jewish sovereignty.” [KORN, p. 266] Such a world view in traditional Jewish thinking is usually swept under the rug in modern popular discourse. A case in point is the complete lack of historical context in which popular Jewish commentary condemns those non-Jews who readily accepted (and still accept) the infamous Protocols of the Elders of Zion, the best known anti-Jewish text in modern history. (Originating in Eastern Europe, the Protocols claimed to be an actual document from a secret Jewish cabal). “The Protocols of the Elders of Zion,” notes Richard Levy,

“one of the most important forgeries of modern times, presents a Jewish plot to take over the world and to reduce non-Jews to slavery … The Protocols found a huge audience, especially following the turbulent times following World War I … Why has the Protocols of Elders of Zion, a shameless fraud, seized the imagination and informed the political judgment of [anti-Semitic] men and women throughout the twentieth century?” [SEGEL, p. 3]

Like virtually all Jews who pose such a question, they do not actively seek an answer from within their own community – i.e., they are really not interested in an honest answer. Why would anyone fall for the idea of a Jewish plot to dominate the world aimed at holding all others in subjugation? Maimonides, above, in classical religious thinking, points to the beginning of an answer. Orthodox conviction that God will favor Jews at the “end of days” to, in some form, rule the world is yet another marker. The Torah/Old Testament states expected Jewish domination clearly in a number of places – for example:

“The Gentile shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising … the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee … Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.” [ISAIAH 60, 1-12]

“Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” [PSALMS 2: 8-9]

“Thus saith the Lord, ‘The labor of Egypt, and merchandise of Ethiopia and of the Sabaeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine: they shall come after thee, in chains they shall come over, and they shall fall down unto thee, they shall make supplication unto thee, saying, ‘Surely God is in thee; and there is none else, there is no [other] God.”’ [ISAIAH 46: 14]

[See John Hartung’s article about the roots of the Israelites’ war-based ethnocentrism and how it has been popularly transformed in much of Christian
tradition (and some reforming strands of Judaism) into a benevolent “light of nations” scenario; HARTUNG, 1995]

As Old Testament scholar John Allegro has noted:

“The history of the Jews as revealed in the Torah was thus in a sense coextensive with the story of mankind, and in Adam’s supremacy of the beasts of the field [GEN. 1:26] could be seen figured from the Creation the eventual dominion of the Jew of the whole world … [ALLEGRO, I., 1971, p. 61] … Yahweh [the Israelite God] is not just a tribal deity, but the God of the Universe. His Chosen People are not just another ethnos: they are the Sons of God, destined to rule the world.” [ALLEGRO, p. 162]

“One of the basic tenets of the Lurianic Cabbala [a strain of Jewish mysticism],” note Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky, “is the absolute superiority of the Jewish soul and body over the non-Jewish soul and body. According to the Lurianic Cabbala, the world was created solely for the sake of the Jews; the existence of non-Jews was subsidiary.” [BROWNFIELD, A., MARCH 2000, p. 105-106]

A(n ultra-Orthodox) Chabad-sponsored Internet website, geared for non-Jews, frames this world view discretely:

“What is the key to salvation? Those who return to the Law (the Seven Commandments for the Children of Noah, according to the eternal covenant made with Noah in Genesis 9) and who assist the Jewish people (Isaiah 60. 61, 66) will be saved and will participate in the miracles and revelations, including worshipping in the Third Temple, under the kingship of the Messiah. As described in many places, including Jeremiah 16:19-21 and Zechariah 8:20-23, all the old gentile religions of the world will disappear, and their followers will turn to Jews for spiritual leadership.” [see http://www.noahide.com/]

As prominent anti-Jewish critic Henry Ford once said about his own publishing of an edition of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion:

“You will find we at no time guaranteed their authenticity. We have merely stated what they contain and have paralleled this with what actually took place and are leaving it to the mind of the public to judge.” [WARREN, D., 1996, p. 150-151]

In 1920, the London Times reviewed the Protocols, not with condemnation, but with the uneasy sense that much of what the Protocols proclaimed, forgery or not, was coming to pass on the world scene:

“What are these ‘Protocols?’ … Are they a forgery? If so, whence comes the uncanny note of prophecy, prophecy in parts fulfilled, in parts far gone in the way of fulfillment? Have we been struggling these tragic years to blow up and extirpate the secret organisation of German world dominion only to find beneath it another, more dangerous because more secret? Have we been straining every fibre of our national body, escaped of a ‘Pax Germanica’ only to fall into a ‘Pax Judaica?’ The ‘Elders
of Zion’ as represented in their ‘Protocols’ are by no means kinder task- 
masters than William II and his henchmen would have been.” [BER-
MANT, C., 1977, p. 33]

We may seek further clues to Gentile receptivity to the fictitious Protocols 
due to Jewish identity itself and the inevitable expressions, in day-to-day life 
with the goyim through history, of Jewish supremacy and domination.

“Throughout their history,” says Israeli Jay Gonen, “the Jews … entertained 
feelings of superiority over Gentiles … It therefore became a prevalent notion 
among Jews that they are supposed to use their heads while the Gentiles do the 
dirty work.” [GONEN, p. 137] “A Jewish servant or labourer is almost unknown 
in Egypt,” noted one “Mr. Samuel” in his late 19th century Jewish Life in the 
East, “our people here as elsewhere being infected with that dislike for manual 
labor and that preference for earning our living with our heads which is at 
once the strength of our upper and the destruction of our lower classes.” 
[SMITH, G., 1881/1959, p. 18]

Israeli-born David Grossman notes the expression of this elitist Jewish atti-
tude in modern Israel. Much of his 1988 volume, The Yellow Wind, explores 
Jewish exploitation of its Arab underclass for menial labor. The following is an 
interchange Grossman had with a small Arab child in a West Bank refugee 
camp. It is, as Grossman consistently notes, far from an isolated example of how 
young Palestinian experiences and world views about Jews are being shaped by 
their overseers.

“[Grossman]: Do you know who the Jews are?
[Boy:] The army.
Are there other Jews?
No.
What does your father do?
Sick.
And your mother?
She works in Jerusalem for the Jews. Cleans their houses.”
[GROSSMAN, D., 1988, p. 24]

In the same book, Grossman expands upon this theme of socialized Jewish 
racism and exploitation of a menial underclass, illustrated by an incident with 
one of his neighbors in Jerusalem:

“An Arab woman cleans the stairwell at the [Jewish] housing project 
in which I live. Her name is Amuna, and she lives in Ramallah [an Arab 
town]. I talk to her from time to time. A three-year-old [Jewish] boy, the 
son of one of our neighbors, used to seeing her bent over a pail of water, 
heard us talking and was surprised – I saw it on his face. He asked her 
name and I told him. Afterwards, he asked what we had talked about in 
Arabic, and I explained. He thought a minute and said: ‘Amuna is a little 
bit a person and a little bit a dog, right?’ I asked him why he said that. 
He explained: ‘She is a little bit dog, because she always walks on all 
fours. And she is also a little bit of a person, because she knows how to 
In 1911 the prominent Zionist A. D. Gordon (an early pioneer to Palestine/Israel) surveyed his Jewish people and culture – Orthodox or not – with concern, writing:

“We [Jews] have developed an attitude of looking down on manual labor. We must not deceive ourselves in this regard, nor shut our eyes to our grave deficiencies, not merely as individuals but as a people. The well-known Talmudic saying, that when the Jews do God’s will their labor is done for them by others is characteristic of our attitudes. This saying is significant. It demonstrates how far this attitude has become an instinctive feeling within us, a second nature.” [GORDON, p. 679]

The “Labor Zionism” political movement sought to readjust urban Jews to farm labor in the early years of Zionism in Palestine/Israel. But Rosemary Reuther even notes the same old Jewish propensity to function as overseers has come to the fore in modern Israel:

“The sabra [native-born Jewish Israeli], redeemed from Diaspora weakness, with a gun in one hand and a plow in the other, has become a military-political-industrial ruling elite. Many Jews no longer work the land with their own hands or do any kind of manual labor. For many, such labor is now seen as ‘Arab work.’” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 150]

Israeli Nimrod Tevlin recalled his youth in Russia:

“After [the first year of college], we [members of a Zionist organization] decided to quit and spend full time preparing to emigrate to Palestine. Hardly any of us, however, had backgrounds as workers – heavy physical work like farming was considered work for the goyim.” [GORKIN, M., 1971, p. 56]

The 1989 Russian census clearly evidences this traditional Jewish proclivity to avoid manual labor. And why have so few Jews ever worked in Russian factories? Jewish scholar Michael Paul Sacks, in a common Jewish apologetic theme to be elaborated upon in depth in this book later, has the stock answer: anti-Semitism among the working class. “There was little to attract Jews to work in the factory,” says Sacks, “Surveys have shown greater levels of anti-Semitism among blue-collar workers and those with lower levels of education … There can be no doubt that in comparison with professional or semi-professional employment, Jews in blue-collar jobs were an especially small minority.” [SACKS, M., 1998. p. 265]

Chone Shmeruk notes the practical implications of such feeling in pre-war World War II Warsaw: “As far as my district goes [where I lived in Warsaw] … it was exclusively Jewish. The only non-Jews there were the janitors, who usually had small apartments near the entrance.” [SHMERUK, p. 326] [See also p. 701, p. 848, p. 868, p. 902, p. 1573 later discussions of American Jewry’s propensity towards employing maids, especially African-Americans, for menial labor [in the POPULAR CULTURE chapter], as well as the traditional non-Jewish Saturday servant known as the shabbes goy].

What are we to make of the disturbing implications of these words, in 2001, from Michael Finkel, in a New York Times article? :
“Moshe lives in Israel, which happens to be one of the more active nations in the international organ-trafficking market. The market, which is completely illegal, is so complex and well organized that a single transaction often crosses three continents … Israel also does not contribute much to the supply side of the equation. Organ donation is extremely low; an estimated 3 percent of Israelis have signed donor cards … Paying for an organ has become so routine in Israel that there have been instances in which a patient has elected not to accept the offer of a kidney donation from a well-matched relative. ‘Why risk harm to a family member?’ one patient told me.” [FINKEL, M., 5-27-01]

Early Zionist Arthur Ruppin notes an incident in which he found a Gentile cutting wood for a Jew in Eastern Europe. Ruppin suggested that there were Jews would might be able to use the work, but the employer noted that “a Jew does not undertake such work, even when he’s starving; it is not suitable for a Jew.” [MACDONALD, p. 23]

During the California Gold Rush in the mid-19th century, many Jews hurried to the mining areas, but not to labor for gold. Their demeanor was noted by Hinton Rowan Helper, “whose tract, The Impending Crisis of the South, would soon crystallize opinions concerning slavery … [Helper] was as vociferous in his claims of Jewish laziness in the gold rush as he was in condemnation of the southern slaveholder. With regards to the Jews he wrote: ‘Mining, the cultivation of the soil, in a word, any occupation that requires exposure to weather, is too fatiguing and intolerable for them. The law requiring man to get bread by the sweat of his brow is an injunction with which they refuse to comply.’” [LEVINSON, R., 1978, p. 13]

Another contemporary of the Gold Rush, J. D. Bothwick observed that

“In traveling through the mines from one end to the other, I never saw a Jew lift a pick or shovel to do a single stroke of work, or, in fact, occupy himself in any other way than in selling slops. while men of other classes and of every nation showed such versatility in betaking themselves to whatever business or occupation appeared at the time to be most advisable without reference to their antecedents, and, in a country where no man, to whatever class of society he belonged, was in the least degree ashamed to roll up his sleeves and dig in the mines for gold, or to engage in any other kind of manual labour, it was a remarkable fact that the Jews were the only people whom this was not observable.” [LEVINSON, R., 1978, p. 13]

In his autobiography, well-known Yiddish author Sholem Aleichem watched a ferryman in Eastern Europe absorbed in the difficult physical task of pulling a boat across a river. “Only a Goy could do work like that, not a Jew,” he wrote, “The Bible says of Esau [non-Jews], ‘And thou shalt serve they brother.’ It is good that I am a descendant of Jacob [Jacob: Jews] and not of Esau.” [LINDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 5] Albert Lindemann also notes the case of “the eminent Jewish-American intellectual Sidney Hook [who] remembered how, as a boy, he had asked his religion teacher about the injustice of what Jacob did to Esau.
The teacher responded, ‘What kind of question is that? Esau was an animal.’” [LINDEMANN, p. 5]

This Jacob-Esau division is another deep source of enduring Jewish racism and elitism per their supposed genius in outwitting others. The story of Jacob and Esau is from the biblical Genesis. They were the two sons (twins) of Isaac (son of the seminal Jewish patriarch Abraham) and Rebecca. Jacob, however, is understood in Jewish lore as an early patriarch of the Jewish ancestral lineage, Esau is not. Esau is an ancestor of Gentiles. And as the Torah (Genesis 25.21-23) states it, God told the pregnant Rebecca that “two nations are in thy womb, two nationalities will emerge from inside of thee. And one people will be stronger than the other – the elder will serve the younger.” The “younger” of course was Jacob, ancestor of the Jews. “If you fail Jacob,” notes traditional Yiddish folklore, “you aid Esau.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 81]

Albert Lindemann notes the later development of this brother tale:

“In the biblical account, Jacob conspires with his mother, Rebecca, to trick Esau out of receiving the blessing of their aged and blind father, Isaac. Esau, the first-born, had already foolishly given over his birthright to Jacob in exchange for a bowl of lentils. But Esau remained Isaac’s favorite … Esau was outraged when he discovered that he and his father had been duped, that Jacob had posed as his older brother [to his blind father] and had gained Isaac’s blessing … Anti-Semites of various shapes have drawn upon the Jacob-Esau tale as proof of the incorrigible cunning and moral corruption of the Jews throughout history … Even in the 1990s, the notion of a somehow unbridgeable gap between Esau and Jacob, Gentile and Jew, remains central to traditional Jewish perspectives (‘Esau always hates Jacob, ‘The Messiah will not come until the tears of Esau have been exhausted.’)” [LINDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 4-5]

“[Jacob’s] deception,” says Shlomo Riskin, “was orchestrated by his mother, perhaps even ordained by God, but his feeling of guilt never leaves him.” [RISKIN, S., 1994, p. 5B] Esau, notes Nathan Ausubel, “surnamed ‘the wicked’ in Jewish folklore, is portrayed as a fierce warrior and hunter, preoccupied with fighting and the chase. Jacob, on the other hand, is depicted as a gentle scholar, always found in the House of Study in pursuit of divine instruction.” [AUSUBEL, p. 28] Jacob, however, in the original story, was the treacherous brother. One Jewish observer, Hugh Blumenfeld, has noted with consternation that the brother who was morally righteous, Esau, is so much condemned in Jewish lore. “It floors me,” Blumenfeld told a Jewish newspaper, “because he is the one who forgives his brother, who tries to do right by the end of the story.” [KATZ-STONE, 1999, p. 47]

Rabbi Yisroel Yaakov Klapholz notes the traditional Talmudic views of the Esau (Gentiles) - Jacob (Jews) dialectic:

“Rebekah became pregnant with twins … Esau said to Jacob: ‘If you do not let me come out first, I will kill my mother as I leave her stomach.’ Jacob said: ‘That evildoer is a murderer even before his birth’ … One [son] will adorn himself with Torah, the other will boast of his sins. Both
will be hated by other nations and both will rule the world. But in the end, the descendants of your righteous son shall reign supreme. After Esau’s rule, no other nation shall reign but Israel. G-d [God] also revealed to Rebekah that He loves Jacob and despises Esau … Rebekah called one son Jacob, the other Esau. Esau was born ruddy all over, like a hairy mantle, his redness indicating that he was of a murderous nature … Esau … refused to be circumcised for the rest of his life. Jacob, on the other hand, was born circumcised.” [KLAPHOLZ, p. 14-16]

One of Rabbi Klapholz’s chapters in a book he authored is called “Jacob’s Innocence and Esau’s Cunning.” “People saw the deeds of the two youths,” says Klapholz, “and said: ‘Esau is a thorn-bush and Jacob a fragrant flower.’ The cunning Esau was always plotting to do evil.” [KLAPHOLZ, p. 17]

Samuel Heilman, an anthropologist and an Orthodox Jew, notes, from the usual Jewish martyrrological view, the Jacob-Esau subject in the Hasidic community:

“Jacob and Esau are two opposites,’ as Rabbi Shlomo Halberstam (1848-1906) of Bobov, Poland, put it in commonly heard terms that saw Jews and Gentiles symbolized by the two Biblical brothers, ‘and it is unthinkable that there should be any connection between them in any way.’ If much of the two thousand years of the diaspora had led to Jewish persecution and degradation, these Jews responded by categorizing everyone who was not a Jew as some inferior being.” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 19]

Throughout Jewish tradition, the origin of hatred of Jewish arch-enemies is the most primitive sort: animosities are rooted in clan-based feuds. The despised are actually blood-related with common, not so terribly distant, ancestors. As noted, the Israelite patriarch Abraham had two sons: Isaac and Ishmael. Isaac is considered by modern day Jews to represent the Jewish lineage; Ishmael, even according to Islamic tradition, fathered the Arab line. In the Jewish family tree, Isaac’s sons were Jacob and Esau: Esau is a kind of symbolic patriarch of all Gentiles. Only the children of Jacob are considered to continue the Jewish line. Esau fathered Eliphaz, who in turn fathered Amalek, the most-hated enemy in Jewish tradition. [More, at length, about Amalek later. For purposes here, suffice it to note – as startling as it may sound – that the Old Testament commands Jews to “blot out the memory” of him by exterminating all his descendants. To read about Amalek now, see http://jewishtribalreview.org/amalek.htm. Amalek is, hence, actually not that terribly remote from the Jewish bloodline: he was the great-great grandson of Abraham.

Joshua Cohen notes traditional Jewish perspective of the Amalek story:

“The Talmudic sages tell us that the Jewish fathers – Abraham, Isaac and Jacob – rejected [Amalek’s mother’s] offer to convert and that her rejection resulted in Amalek’s hatred of Israel … In a way then, this [Talmudic] midrash tells the origin of the prejudice that western tradition would later call anti-Semitism … The Amalekites … were the first enemies of the Jews after their emergence from Egypt as a full-fledged nation … Not only do Jews and Amalekites share a common ancestry;
Jewish humanity and Amalekite bigotry were encoded in the same seed.”
[COHEN, J., p. 296-297]

The Israelites/Jews continued on their separatist course thus conceptually armed, victims of senseless bigotry, as they saw it, through history.

Before we move on, however, we must yet mention again the influential sage Maimonides, whose pronouncements still find widespread credibility in Jewish culture (particularly amidst the Orthodox in our own day). According to Maimonides, notes Eugene Korn:

“Only with the commission of grievous sins do a small minority of Jews lose their share in the world to come. The reverse proposition appears to be true for Gentiles: Immortality for non-Jews would be the exception, open to a small minority. Thus we arrive at arbitrary inequality, the essence of injustice.” [KORN, p. 270]

Some modern, and influential, rabbis like Rav Velvel Soloveitchik interpret such Maimonides opinions to their most ominous degree. “Not only is the rational and autonomous moral [non-Jewish] person denied wisdom and a share in the world to come,” says Eugene Korn, “… it robs all non-believers and their cultures of any intellectual, religious, or even human value.” [KORN, p. 281] “By modern standards,” observes Lenni Brenner, “Judaism is jarring in its ethnic and religious chauvinism, and extreme and contradictory in its social ethics, real and ideal.” [BRENNER, p. 41]

Israel Shahak, both an Israeli citizen and Holocaust survivor, underscores that racism, stemming from the Jewish Chosen People concept, is intrinsic to the Orthodox Jewish faith. “The rabbis,” he writes, “and, even worse, the apologetic ‘scholars of Judaism’ know this very well and for this reason they do not try to argue against such views inside the Jewish community; and of course they never mention them outside it. Inside, they vilify any Jew who raises such matters within earshot of Gentiles, and they issue deceitful denials in which the art of equivocation reaches its summit. For example, they state, using general terms, the importance which Judaism attaches to mercy; but what they forget to point out is that according to the Halakhah [Jewish religious law] ‘mercy’ means mercy towards Jews.” [SHAHAK, p. 96]

Note, for example, the apologetics of professor Robert Pois, who, like many, turns the usual dissimulatives about a “selective interpretation” of the Talmud into the implication that only Nazis and their kindred would, in overview, entertain negative opinion about this important Jewish religious work:

“The selective mining of Talmudic sources … has been a traditional approach of anti-Semites for some time. Yes, there are nasty anti-heathen (read anti-Christian) comments in the Talmud. But … the 63 sections of this compendium of Jewish oral law and folklore … was not informed by a systematic theology. Rather, it was, literally, commentary. In a word, it was a panoply of opinions of one or the other religious and social issues … Obviously, if one wants to depict the Talmud as being consistently anti-Goy, great selectivity is necessary. Such was revealed in
that tradition which informed the writings of Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Alfred Rosenberg.” [ROIS, R., 1998]

Chamberlain and Rosenberg, of course, were prominent Nazi ideologues. Pois here infers that to investigate assertions of Jewish racism in its sacred works can only be the interest of a Nazi.

The origin of the chauvinist Jewish worldview, which will surface many times in this volume, is, again, the traditional Jewish notion of themselves as the “Chosen People” of God. This idea, wrote J. O. Hertzler, is “literally and vividly maintained … in a very decided Judeocentric view of history and the world.” [HERTZLER, p. 70] It is often referred to as “choseness,” or “election,” as if there had been a divine vote cast somewhere to confirm their self-perceived specialness. “The Jews may stand astride time and eternity,” wrote Arthur A. Cohen, “… This is unavoidably an aristocratic mission.” [EISENSTEIN, I. p. 275] “Alas,” says Ze’ev Levy, “the concept of choseness entails ethnocentrism, for the better (in the past) or the worse (today). Choseness does not go with otherness, that is, with unconditional respect of others.” [LEVY, p. 104] This is an understatement. “The concept of an eternal selection,” says Moshe Greenberg, “eventually merges with a doctrine of spiritual-racial superiority, rooted, it seems, in the biblical term ‘holy seed’ … [According to the Old Testament/Torah, Ezra 9:2] holiness inheres in the seed and is hereditary.” [GREENBERG, p. 31]

“The word ‘chosen’ [per ‘Chosen People’],” notes Arnold Eisen, “is used sparingly in the Bible, to convey the passion of choosing. Its antonym is not ‘considered impartially’ or ‘ignored,’ but ‘despised.’” [EISEN, p. RHETORIC, p. 66] “The Jewish religion,” wrote Arthur Koestler, “unlike any other, is racially discriminating, nationally segregative, and socially tension-creating.” [LINDEMANN, p. 20]

The continuing debate about this within the Jewish community by liberal and secular thinkers is generally framed euphemistically in the contrasting terms of “particularism and universalism.” While most Jews tend to be apologetic for this term, particularism actually refers to the purely self-concern, self-aggrandizement, racism, and ethnocentrism of traditional Jewish thinking (to the systemic detriment of non-Jews) throughout the centuries. This was consistently manifest by a Jewish segregated life-style, tight knit community, different Jewish moral standards for behavior towards Jews and non-Jews, racial and hereditary obsessions, and condescending views of all non-Jews around them. Universalism, on the other hand, refers to a shift in Jewish moral thinking (like everyone else) beginning with the Enlightenment, exemplified in a liberalizing Germany with the universalizing ideas of philosophers like Immanuel Kant. Universalism embodies the notion that Jewish particularism (or any other) is morally incorrect and obsolete and that spiritual and secular laws should be the same for everyone, all-inclusive. (As Israel Shahak notes, the Jews of Europe did not fight for freedom and liberation from their own stagnant ghetto ideology of particularism; emancipation was a gift of universalistic benevolence from the surrounding non-Jewish community which opened the doors for Jews to leave their distinctive ideological ghetto.) [SHAHAK, p. 17]
Monford Harris calls tradition Jewish conception of its collective self in our modern, post-Emancipation universalistic age “the scandal of particularity.” “The current definitions of Jewishness derive from emancipation-era experiences,” he noted in 1965,

“Until that time Jews knew very well what Jewishness was. Emancipation-era Jewishness was involved with understanding itself through universally valid categories, and in the process authentic Jewish understanding of Jewishness is rejected. The Jewish understanding of Jewishness had become too particular and parochial for modern premises.” [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 85]

Eventually recognizing that complete acceptance of a universalistic ethic towards their fellow human beings could only mean serious endangerment of the “particularist” Jewish identity, liberalizing elements of world Jewry over past decades have moved to proclaim two antithetical ideas as essential parts of Jewish identity: both an allegiance to “Chosen People” Judeo-centrism and pan-human universalism. This is managed by the enduring Judeo-centric notion that distinctly Jewish hands must cling to the steering wheel of humanity itself as some form of a Jewish leadership “mission”: in the pseudo-religious sphere, this is generally expressed as some version of “We Jews are fated to lead all of humanity to its destiny.” In this new Chosen People construct, Jews can thereby still take satisfaction in their presumed exceptionality, but it is now (supposedly) morally adjusted to do some good for others in their wake.

“In the very emphasis upon the particular,” says Rabbi Hayim Halevy Donin, “this singular family [Jews] reflected the noblest form of universalism.” [DONIN, p. 8] “We Jews are a narrow, nationalist, self-centered people,” observes Samuel Dresner, “There is no point in denying it … [Yet] in all of Judaism … particularism and universalism go hand in hand … Particularism and universalism, both are essentials of Judaism.” [DRESNER, p. 50-51] “Jewish pride, Jewish chauvinism, Jewish particularism,” says Roger Kamenetz, “– the idea that we are a special chosen people – seems to contradict the very universalistic prophetic messages Judaism also teaches.” [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 150]

Knowing the foundation of Judeo-centric religious history, such Jewish proclamation is peculiar:

“We [Jews] are under no obligation to forcefully convert non-Jews,” says Reuven Bulka, “On the contrary, we must carefully avoid any coercive conversion practices. However, it is another matter when the issue is enlightening the world with Judaic values.” [BULKA, p. 18]

“Why did God choose Israel?” asks Alfred Jospe, “Because all other nations refused to accept Torah. Originally, God had offered it to all nations of the world. But the children of Esau [non-Jews] rejected it because they could not reconcile themselves to the commandment ‘Thou shalt not kill.’ The Moabites declined the offer because they felt they could not accept the commandment ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery.’ The Ishmaelites [traditional ancestors of today’s Arabs] refused it because they could not square their habits with the commandment, ‘Thou shalt not steal.’” [JOSPE, p. 14]
This is of course yet another manifestation of classical Jewish ethnocentrism, often arrogance, and even today sometimes racism, false-fronted by an illusionary claim of Jewish service to humanity, a service conceived to be more special than any other. Jewish scholar Norman Cantor states the true essence of traditional Jewish identity succinctly:

“The covenant idea is the polar opposite of democracy, multiculturalism, and ethnic equality.” [CANTOR, p. 21]

“Jewish values,” adds Charles Liebman,

“... are folk-oriented rather than universalist, ethnocentric rather than cosmopolitan, and at least one major strand in Jewish tradition expresses indifference, fear, and even hostility to the non-Jew.” [LIEBMAN, C., p. 10]

“In Borough Park’s language,” says Yossi Klein Halevi, referring to the Orthodox community where he was raised, “‘universalist’ was a synonym for traitor … Other people might take their humanity for granted; but Jews, at least in Borough Park, felt certain only of their Jewishness.” [HALEVI, p. 75] “Maintaining the bonds one Jew must feel with another Jew,” notes Susan Schneider, “is part of Judaism, along with the idea that being Jewish may require maintaining the purity and/or unity of the Jewish people.” [SCHNEIDER, p. 323]

In an American context, Arnold Eisen notes the modern Jewish liberals’ resultant quandary in reframing the Jewish worldview for Gentile consumption:

“The notion of the Jewish [special] mission to [other peoples] was problematic, because it presumed that one people had the truth, and all others could but wait patienty to receive it. Such hierarchical ideas did not seem to fit in a society which espoused egalitarianism; if all men were created equal, why did other people need the Jews in order to attain true knowledge of God? The search for ways of reconciling pluralism and election became a pressing task of Jewish apologetic.” [EISEN, p. 21]

One of the ways convoluted apologetic seeks to distance itself from racism and inevitable Gentile hostility is to rhapsodize about special Jewish destiny, as does Reuven Bulka, who in this case also obfuscates it:

“The notion of chosenness is … misleading and fraught with danger, as if to imply some inherent genetic or biological virtue that is merely an accident of fate. Being chosen is the end result of chosingness, much the same way that the bride’s choice to agree to the request of a groom to marry her is predicated on the presumption that she has already been chosen, an assumption inherent in the groom’s question-request entreaty.” [BULKA, p. 17]

But as Jewish author Monford Harris notes about such notions of Jewry as a “choosing” people:

“The idea of the Jews as ‘chosen people’ has been eclipsed. Yet it is so central to classical Jewish thought it could not be wholly surrendered. It was, consequently, reinterpreted … [One] way of reinterpreting the idea
of the chosen people is to say that the Jews are the ‘choosing people.’ Since the day of the Nazi idea of the master race it has been said that the idea of the ‘chosen’ people is ethically untenable, and that it is better to understand the Jews as the choosing people; i.e., the Jews were the only people in antiquity to recognize the true God. Precisely that which it tries to avoid is what this notion falls prey to. To say the Jews are the choosing people is to assert a position of such arrogance as to violate the canons of good manners, let alone ethical considerations. To assert that only our ancestors were wise enough, good enough, to make the right choice and that all other nations lacked either the wisdom or the sincerity to do so is on a par with Nazi racism.” [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 89]

In the apologetic realm, it is interesting to note the noble moral currency afforded modern Judaism in popular American culture by the presentation of the pan-human, universalistic excerpt from Jewish religious sources that supposedly says: “Whoever saves a single life, saves the world entire.” (This is the stated theme, for example, during a candle-lighting scene to begin the fabulously popular Stephen Spielberg movie about Jews under Nazi occupation, Schindler’s List). Even taking this “life-saving” statement at face value, however, it is subject to interpretive manipulation. Some Jewish observers have noted that “this Talmudic saying, taken literally, is the ideological basis for an amoral survivalism,” i.e., saving “a” life is merely self-survival. [CHEYETTE, p. 233]

Yet this supposedly noble refrain is clouded even further. In the talmudic Mishna, Sanhedrin 4:5, the original really says this: “Whoever destroys a single Jewish life, Scripture accounts it to him as though he had destroyed a whole world.” It is quite particularist in its scope, i.e., it only cares about Jews, self-survival or not. Nonetheless, this literal fact does not hinder many Jewish non-Orthodox apologists from universalizing this chauvinist quote anyway. “Most Jews whose study of the Mishna,” says Jacob Petuchowski, “is confined to the standard edition continue to invest this statement with a particularist limitation, while the few scholars who deal with textual criticism are aware of the greater universalistic breath of the original statement.” [PETUCHOWKI, p. 8] When dropping the adverb “Jewish” from the seminal source, insists the likes of Petuchowski, one arrives at the “correct reading.”

“The Talmudic epigraph of Stephen Spielberg’s Schindler’s List,” adds Jewish scholar Peter Novick, “‘Whoever saves one life saves the world entire,’ surely reflected the universalist values of liberal Judaism as it had evolved in recent centuries. The observant knew that the traditional version, the one taught in all Orthodox yeshivot [religious schools], speaks of ‘whoever saves the life of Israel.’” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 182-183] Apologetic Rabbi Isar Schorsch does a little verbal gymnastics to rearrange the timeline sequence of this “regretful” Jewish racism:

“[Jewish] xenophobia contaminates one of the finest expressions of universalism in the *Mishna*. Prior to testifying in a capital case, witnesses are warned of the consequences of their words. ‘Anyone who saves a single person is credited with having saved the entire human race.’ (Mishna...
Sanhedrin 4:4) Regrettably, in some manuscripts and printed texts the word ‘person’ is replaced by the word ‘Jew.” [SCORSCH, I., 4-30-99]

This kind of modern revisionism has set the stage for a bitter – and intensifying – struggle in international Jewry for the heart, and meaning, of Judaism between Orthodox followers of traditional belief and liberalizing revisionists, who largely suppress the historical facts of their own religious history. In recent years a number of Orthodox groups have even declared that their ideological rivals – those Jews who at least pay lip service to universalistic ideals – are not even Jewish. “In debates within the Jewish community,” says Gordon Lafar, “both universalists and chauvinists claim to be speaking in the name of traditional Jewish values.” [LAFAR, p. 180]

“In my youth,” noted Meir Tamari in 1987, “Judaism was synonymous with socialism. There were religious Orthodox trade unions and religious Orthodox socialist parties. In Reform Judaism, this was a major issue. And we literally distorted Jewish sources – and I was guilty of that, misguiding many young people in explaining to them that the Torah and socialism were synonymous.” [JEWISH WEEK, 5-15-87, p. 28] “After fifty some years of conscious exploration,” wrote professor Paul Laute, a 1960s-era Civil Rights activist, “it has finally occurred to me that my identification of Jewishness with progressive social action is as much a historical construction as the messianic intolerance of [the racist Jewish messianic movement] Gush Emunim.” [LAUTER, p. 45]

Amnon Rubenstein, an Israeli scholar, in noting the folly of claiming Judaism as a “universal” religion, cites the following crucial Torah (Old Testament) passages about God’s favoritism towards the Jews:

“If ye will hearken unto My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be Mine own treasure from among all peoples.”

“Ye shall be holy unto Me, for I the Lord am holy and have severed you from other people that ye shall me mine.”

“These well known passages,” he observes, “explain why it is impossible from the traditional viewpoint, to separate the idea of choserness, of a ‘treasure nation,’ from the concept of the covenant and the observance of Jewish religious law and how false it is to relate these religious paradigms to secular values. It is futile to transplant the biblical injunctions into a secular context and support this by referring to the prophets’ ‘universal’ visions of social justice and peace among nations.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 34-35]

Rubenstein attributes the values of “human equality” to “Christian monotheism” and the French revolution. [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 36]

Another Israeli, Bernard Avishai, notes that left-wing Israelis “cringe when they hear the same people [“Jewish American intellectuals”] talk about ‘Jewish ethical vocation’ or, worse, lecture Israelis about how Judaism mandates a peculiarly open-spirited morality, a sense of history.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 350] As Stuart Svonkin notes:

“The work of Jewish historians clearly demonstrates that there are few discernible connections between the premodern Jewish tradition and modern ideals of social justice. The liberal universal precepts that [the
likes of former Anti-Defamation League head Benjamin Epstein enumerated bear little relation to historical Judaism; their provenance is much more recent … These renovated, if mythic, ‘Jewish precepts’ – clearly dehistoricized and largely secularized – closely corresponded with the basic tenets of postwar American liberalism. The ADL’s inter-group relations program was thus predicated on the assertion – historically inaccurate but rhetorically powerful – that the same ‘concepts of democracy’ informed both Judaism and the ‘American creed’ of liberty and equality.” [SVONKIN, S., 1997, p. 20]

In Israel, a society for Jews and controlled by Jews, there is no need for universalizing apologetics over the essence of traditional Judaism. Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen note that

“Many leftist secularists see Judaism as so inimical to liberal values that they have severed their own ties with it. Whereas their predecessors held that one could be a humanist socialist and be Jewishly committed at the same time, intellectuals in this new circle are in effect walking away from the battle over the political meaning of Judaism. They view Judaism as so thoroughly conservative, nationalistic and particularistic that it cannot be reformed. In this view the only hope for the Israeli liberal is the disestablishment of Judaism.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 118]

In 1996 American-born Israeli Ze’ev Chafets noted how troubled he was at what he discovered to be powerful expressions of traditional Judaism in the Jewish state:

“Rabbi Meir Kahane began preaching that Arabs are dogs and the penalty for a Muslim man marrying a Jewish woman should be death,”
Rabbi Yitzhak Peretz “said a schoolbus full of kids was hit by a train because God was angry that the movie theatre in their town was open on Friday nights,”
the Lubavitcher Rebbe [rabb] “allowed his followers to declare him the Messiah,”
Rabbi Yitzhak Kadouri, “the world’s greatest kabbalist … put a hex on a Jerusalem office building that blocked his view,”
Rabbi Dov Lior “declared it kosher to kill gentile women and children in wartime,”
Rabbi Nahum Rabinovich “advocated scattering land mines to prevent Israeli soldiers from carrying out orders in the West Bank,” “20,000 yeshivah boys gathered to stone and threaten Israeli archeologists,”
Rabbi Moshe Maya “arose in the Knesset and said that the halakhic penalty for homosexuality is death,”
Rabbi Ovadia Yosef, “universally considered one of the great Torah sages of the age, was quoted as ruling that the faithful should refuse transfusions from gentiles and nonobservant Jews because they have dangerously treif blood which might cause all manner of un-Jewish behavior,”
Rabbi Mordechai Eliyahu believes that “Jewish blood is inherently pure and therefore incapable of defiling Jewish recipients.” [CHAFETS, Z., 1996, p. 18]

“Real Torah Judaism,” concludes Chafets, with sarcasm for the Orthodox, “is a scientifically based doctrine of racial purity. Jews have one, superior, kind of blood, the rest of humanity has another … [My rabbi in Michigan] was probably ashamed to tell the truth.” [CHAFETS, Z., 1996, p. 18]

The origin of this divide between “particularist” and “universalist” Jews is to be found in the 19th century, in the wake of the Enlightenment and the emergence of European Jews from their isolationist ghettos. “Rationalism, modernism, and emancipation,” notes R. J. Zwi Wroblowsky, “made the notion of a chosen people increasingly problematical.” [WERBLOWSKY, p. 158] Religious reformers in Germany sought to “redefine Judaism to fit Protestant categories.” This new Reform Judaism, says Charles Silberman, “expurgated … aspects of Judaism … to make worship in the synagogue resemble Protestant services as much as possible.” [SILBERMAN, p. 38] “In general, [Reform Judaism] gave Jewish religion a distinctly gentile tinge.” [PATAI, R., 1971, p. 304] “Orthodox Jews naturally expressed their horror at the progressive Christianization of the synagogue,” says Walter Laqueur, “for this, not to mince words, is what it amounted to.” [LAQUEUR, p. 17] In 1884, Orthodox Jews even sued a Reform temple in Charleston, South Carolina, for introducing an organ into the synagogue, “a desecration of the Jewish ritual.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 6] Theology shifted in “Reform Judaism” too. In 1869, for example, a Philadelphia conference of Reform-minded rabbis formally de-emphasized the more literal aspects of the old chosen people concept, refocusing on “the unity of all rational creatures.” [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 59]

Even a strand of Orthodox Judaism in America – commonly termed “Modern Judaism” – in earlier years did play down some of its segregationist and anti-universalistic tenets. But, as Jack Wertheimer noted in 1993,

“Few Orthodox spokesmen any longer articulate the undergirding assumptions of Modern Orthodoxy, namely, that a synthesis of traditional Judaism and modern Western culture is not only feasible but desirable. The thought of the leading ideologue of modern Orthodoxy in the nineteenth century, Rabbi Samson Hirsch, is now reinterpreted by his disciples as having urged Torah im Derekh Eretz, a synthesis of traditional Judaism and Western culture, as merely a temporary solution to the pressing needs of the day; now, it is argued, such a goal is no longer desirable …”[WERTHEIMER, J., 1993, p. 127]

Virtually all contemporary gedolim (recognized rabbinical authorities within the Orthodox world) identify with right-wing Orthodoxy, and their views are rarely challenged.” [WERTHEIMER, J., 1993, p. 128]

Jewish thinkers, particularly in the Reform world, says Richard L. Rubenstein, sought “to assert the priority of those elements of the Torah which seemed to remain relevant and defensible in their own times. [T]hey tended to distinguish between the spirit of the Torah and its frequently embarrassing let-
ter by emphasizing the abiding relevance of the moral elements of the Torah.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 236] “The idea,” says Michael Meyer, “that pure religious faith is essentially moral rapidly became the theoretical basis and practical operative principle of the Reform movement.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 337]

With the Reform movement came Jewish efforts to distance enlightened, modern Jewry from their rabbinically archaic and cloistered pasts. Also came the appropriation of the universalistic themes of Christian-based culture to make them “Jewish.” “Attempts have been made to link the Jewish propensity to identify with political activism and social justice to Judaism,” note David Desser and Lester Friedman, “with specific exhortations in the Old Testament. Such attempts try to isolate precepts and commandments favoring social egalitarianism and universalism. This thesis … has at best a tenuous explanatory capacity. In fact, Christianity would more likely have greater ties to secular liberalism … Jewish cries for social justice did not arise until the 19th century, and there were precious few major political thinkers until this period.” [DESSER, p.] “Some commentators,” worry particularist Jewish scholars Seymour Lipset and Earl Raab, “want to believe that an intrinsic aspect of Jewish life consists of such universally benevolent ‘Jewish social values’ as equality, social justice, and world peace’ … By taking on a public orientation similar to Christian denominations, Judaism runs the danger of appearing more Americanized and less particularistic.” [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 54]

One of the most influential propagators of the notion of a universalistic Judaism (the basis for the popular western strain of Judaism called Reform) was Abraham Geiger. Geiger, an early nineteenth century theologian, claimed that “Judaism has proved itself a force outliving its peculiar nationality, and therefore may lay claim to special consideration.” This “special consideration” is ultimately understood to be Jewish exceptionality in pan-human affairs, especially in – but not limited to – matters of morality and spirituality. But as modern scholar Joseph Blau observes about Geiger’s above proclamation, “let us reflect for a moment on the paradoxical quality of this assertion. Geiger was saying that because Judaism had eliminated its own claim to a special character, it was entitled to a special character. Because particularism had been excised from Jewish religion, Judaism had a right to special status. He seems to be on the verge of replacing particularist Jewish nationalism by particularist Jewish religion.” [BLAU, p. 49] In other words, Geiger, Reformed Judaism, and many of today’s Jews (especially in America where Reform is so popular) have been shamed by the democratic, egalitarian, and universalistic impact of the Enlightenment and pan-human ideals of Christianity to exchange Jewish chauvinism for *>(Linux)* … Jewish chauvinism! Modern Jewry simply lifts Christian universalistic tenets and incongruously tacks them onto Jewish particularism, the particularism that early Christians (rebelling Jews) left in the first place. “It is curious to sit in a Reform or so-called Conservative American [Jewish] congregation,” says Norman Cantor, “and listen to the rabbi sermonize about the equality between Jew and Christian, black and white. This is actually the universalizing message not of the talmudic rabbi, but of Rabbi Saul [St. Paul of New Testament fame] who was beaten up and driven from the diaspora synagogues when he preached this leveling message.” [CANTOR, p. 106]
George L. Mosse notes the way particularist Judaism was contorted to be somehow universalized in turn-of-the-century Germany:

“In 1910, Rabbi Cossman Werner of Munich castigated Jews who had been baptized into Christianity for committing a crime not merely against Judaism but above all against humanity itself. Such Jews opposed equal rights and hindered others in fighting for justice, for ‘to be a Jew means to be human,’ a statement which was greeted with thunderous applause. The argument against baptism was based not on Judaism as a revealed religion but on the religion of humanity.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 19]

This curious universalistic message, heralded today in some form by so many modern Jews, is rendered transparently hollow and fundamentally incongruous in a Jewish context. As Eric Kahler phrases it, in Orwellian double-think: “The substance of [Judaism’s] particularism is universality.” [KAHLER, E., 1967, p. 11] “True universalism, according to [one Jewish] school of thought,” wrote Lothar Kahn, “can’t occur without each human family contributing its individuality to the whole race of men. The Jew can best become a Frenchman or German – a citizen of the world – by perfecting the Jewishness in him.” [KAHN, L., 1961, p. 30] Or take Will Herberg’s typical Jewish view of it all:

“Jewish particularism, because it transcends every national and cultural boundary, becomes, strangely enough a vehicle and witness to universalism. [HERBERG, p. 276]

In other words, at root here, Herberg simply asserts that because Jews extend their allegiance to each other wherever they are in the world, this is “universalism.” E. L. Goldstein notes the Jewish reluctance to relinquish the racial foundation of Jewish identity, even in the invention of a “universalistic” Reform Judaism in the 19th century:

“It was not uncommon for a rabbi to make bold pronouncements about his desire for a universalistic society and then, in moments of frustration or doubt, revert to a racial understanding of the Jews … While willing to stretch the definition of Judaism to its limits, it was clear that most Reformers were not willing to break the historical continuity of the Jewish ‘race.’ Even Solomon Schindler … one of the most radical of Reform rabbis, felt compelled to acknowledge the racial aspect of Jewish identity. Despite the high universal task of Judaism, wrote Schindler, ‘it remains a fact that we spring from a different branch of humanity, that different blood flows in our veins, that our temperament, our tastes, our humor is different from yours; that, in a word, we differ in our views and in our modes of thinking in many cases as much as we differ in our features.” [MACDONALD, 1998, p. 157]

“The tension between the universal and particular in Jewish life,” observes Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen about much Jewish commentary today, “is a favorite theme of Jewish commentators, both scholarly and popular … They in effect lead their audiences in cheering the uniqueness of American Jewry,
portraying it as the one American religious or ethnic group that combines a passionate concern for itself with an almost equally passionate concern for others.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 28] Louis Jacobs, in an apologetic, notes the endemic Jewish universalist/particularist identity incompatibility:

“The question of universalism in Judaism is, and is bound to be, an extremely complicated one. The God Jews worship is the Creator of the whole world and of all peoples yet Jews believe that they are the Chosen People, however the latter concept is understood. The balance between universalism and particularism has always been difficult for Jews to achieve … It is all really a matter of where the emphasis is to be placed and there have been varying emphases in this matter throughout the history of Judaism. Some Jews have spoken as if God’s chief, if not total, interest, so to speak, is with ‘His’ people. Others, especially in modern times, have gone to the opposite extreme, preferring to stress universalism to the extent of watering down the doctrine of particularism to render it a vague notion of loyalty to a tradition in which the universalism had first emerged. Few Jews will fail to admit that there are tensions between the two doctrines.” [JACOBS, L., 1995, p. 576-577]

Popular Jewish author Cynthia Ozick can, on one hand, claim that “Jewish universalism emphasizes that the God of Israel is also the God of mankind-in-general” and yet conclude the same article with an appeal to fellow Jews to be more self-absorbed as Jews: “If we blow into the narrow end of the shofar [a ram horn, used as an instrument to herald traditional religious practice] we will be heard far. But if we choose to be Mankind rather than Jewish and blow into the wider part, we will not be heard at all; for us America will have been in vain.” [OZICK, C., p. 34]

This implicit contradiction in a “universalist”-“particularist” Judaism is not lost to some young Jews who see through such illusory thinking. In a book about Jewish identity, one Jewish interviewee notes that “Judaism is very insular, it doesn’t happily bring people in, so if you’re supposed to be setting an example yet you keep everyone out, that’s contradictory.” [KLEIN, E. p. 191]

And this thinly disguised attitude of enduring Jewish superiority always leaves the ideological door ajar for Jews to easily turn back to Jewish Orthodoxy and its seminal “particularism” of religious antiquity, or simply convert it in secular terms to modern Zionism. By the end of the twentieth century, with the modern state of Israel, we are seeing this happening. Most of those who call themselves Jews have a significant degree of loyalty to Israel. And Jewish Orthodoxy is in fact growing in America and often entwining with its secular Chosen People offshoot, Zionism. The idea of being divinely endowed is a powerful attraction. One study notes that about a quarter of all Orthodox Jews in America today were new (i.e., “returned”) to Orthodoxy. The current growth in Orthodox adherents is the first since the eighteenth century Enlightenment. “The Haredim [ultra-orthodox],” says Robert Wistrich, “are the fastest growing segment in contemporary Jewry.” [WISTRICH, TERMS, p. 5] “Institutionally and demographically,” noted Jonathan Sacks in 1993, “the strongest and most
rapidly growing group in the contemporary Jewish world is Orthodox Jewry.” [SACKS, J., p. 138]

How profoundly this paradoxical “particularism” (i.e., chauvinism) is ingrained in the Jewish consciousness is evidenced even in leftist political organizations that are supposed to be founded upon notions of universality, egalitarianism, and pan-human solidarity. In the years leading up to the Russian communist revolution in the early twentieth century, the undying obsession by most Russian Jews for themselves – distinct from many Russian leftists around them – often manifest itself in ethnocentric political expressions. Many Jews of Russia and Poland congregated towards their own socialist movement called the Bund. Much to the aggravation of communist party leader V. I. Lenin and his universalistic Bolshevik movement, the Bund’s version of leftism insisted upon – even within the context of the existing nation state of Russia – special Jewish national rights beyond those civil. [AGUS, p. 164]

“It was not enough for the Bund,” says Heinz-Dietrich Lowe, “to shift … from Russian to Yiddish in its agitational programme, it had to develop a fully fledged national programme which demanded cultural autonomy for the Jews of the Russian empire.” [LOWE, p. 171] When non-Jews began rioting in Russia against Jewish exclusionism and commercial exploitation in the late 1800s, “the Bund … used these pogroms as an opportunity to intensify its economic activities and further its political aims.” [LOWE, p. 171] “[The Bund’s] leaders,” says Joseph Marcus, “consistently conducted a class-conscious policy, ostensibly in the interests of the whole working class, but actually confined to its Jewish members.” [MARCUS, p. 211]

While the Bund had a large following in Eastern Europe, notes Shmuel Ettinger,

“at the same time, the Zionist Federation, which was also being formed by Russian Jews, stimulated the [Jewish] nationalist trends … Among Jewish political subgroups the Socialist Zionist Party demanded that a Jewish society, socialist in principle, be established in a special territory to be set aside for the Jews; the Jewish Socialist Party, the ‘Seymists,’ demanded a superior leadership institution, ‘Sejm,’ for every one of the nations which belonged to the Federation of Russia; the ‘Peoples’ Party’ (Folkspartey), led by historian Simon Dubnov, demanded a large measure of autonomy for the Jews within the framework of the Russian state … Many Jews also played a part in organizing the general Russian political parties.” [ETTINGER, 1984, p. 9]

Across time and culture, even in the context of the supposed multiculturalist and egalitarian American New Left movement of the 1960’s, Jews collectively tended to perceive themselves with special distinction. As Arthur Liebman noted:

“[Gentile intellectuals] really are not totally accepted into even the secularist humanist liberal company of their quondam Jewish friends. Jews continue to insist in indirect and often inexplicable ways on their own uniqueness. Jewish universalism in relations between Jews and non-Jews has an empty ring … Still, we have the anomaly of Jewish sec-
ularists and atheists writing their own prayer books. We find Jewish political reformers … ostensibly pressing for universalist political goals – while organizing their own political clubs which are so Jewish in style and manner that non-Jews often feel unwelcome.” [LIEBMAN, in MACDONALD, p. 158]

Jews have a long history of leftist political advocacy, agitation against any status quo of Christian empowerment, and profoundly disproportionate percentages of leadership roles in groups that ostensibly espouse pan-human, universalist themes. With massive Jewish escape from the working class in America, Nathan Glazer and Patrick Moynihan noted in 1963 that “the unions are increasingly less Jewish [but] Jewish labor leaders continue to dominate, even though they deal for the most part with non-Jewish workers.” [GLAZER/MOYNIHAN, p. 144-145] “In America and Europe,” says Barry Rubin, “the left was so heavily Jewish as to be virtually a communal activity in itself, especially in the 1930’s … Marxist intellectuals in those years were heavily Jewish in composition and profoundly Jewish in their thinking … [Its pre-eminent leaders] were all born into highly assimilated, wealthy families…” [RUBIN, B., p. 147] Reflecting on the collapse of the leftist movement in America, Harold Cruse, an African-American intellectual and former communist, complained that

“The Jews could not [Americanize Marxism] with the nationalist-aggressiveness emerging out of East Side ghettos to demonstrate through Marxism their intellectual superiority over the Anglo-Saxon goyim. The Jews failed to make Marxism applicable to anything in America but their own national-group ambition or individual self-election.” [LIEBMAN, A., p. 529]

In 1982 a Jewish author noted a similar quote by a Gentile communist activist from Wisconsin:

“It became increasingly apparent to most participants [at a communist youth conference] that virtually all the speakers were Jewish New Yorkers. Speakers with thick New York accents would identify themselves as ‘the delegate from the Lower East Side’ or ‘the comrade from Brownsville.’ Finally the national leadership called a recess to discuss what was becoming an embarrassment. How could a supposedly national student organization be so totally dominated by New York Jews? … The convention was held in Wisconsin.” [in MACDONALD, 1998, p. 72]

“The problem arose,” says Arthur Liebman,

“to the means to accomplish the objective of Americanizing what was an essentially Jewish and European socialist movement … [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 340] … The disproportionate presence of Jews and the foreign born generally in the socialist movement coupled with the relative absence of non-Jews and native Americans troubled many of its leaders, Jews and non-Jews alike. The Communist party, for example, in the 1920s was made up almost entirely of Jews and foreign born, most of whom were in foreign language federations. The Jews alone in the 1930s
and 1940s accounted for approximately 40 to 50 percent of the membership of the Communist party.” [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 339]

Nathaniel Weyl notes that:

“Although Communist leaders were normally taciturn about the extent to which Party membership was Jewish, Jack Stachel complained in The Communist for April 1929 that in Los Angeles ‘practically 90 per cent of the membership is Jewish.’ In 1945, John Williamson, another national leader of the American Communist Party, observed that, while a seventh of Party membership was concentrated in Brooklyn, it was not the working-class districts, but in Brownsville, Williamsburg, Coney Island and Bensonhurst, which he characterized ‘as primarily Jewish American communities.’ In 1951, the same complaint about Brooklyn was reiterated. A 1938 breakdown of Communist educational directors on a district level reported that 17 out of 34 were Jewish and only nine ‘American’… Based on scrutiny of surnames, Glazer concluded that all of the ‘Rank and File’ (Communist) teachers placed on trial by the Teachers Union in 1932 were Jewish.” [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 118-119]


Peter Pulzer once noted that, in the German socialist ranks of the early 20th century, “Their [Jews’] disproportionately bourgeois origins and their tendency to derive their views from first principles rather than empirical experience, led them into a dominating position [in] the party’s debates.” [WEISBERGER, A., 1997, p. 93] Arthur Liebman notes the background to the Morris Hillquit’s election to the American Socialist party chairmanship in 1932:

“Hilquit, in turn, brought the unmentionable to the center stage in an emotional speech, declaring, ‘I apologize for having been born abroad, for being a Jew, and living in New York City.’ Hilquit’s oblique reference to anti-Semitism assured him of victory. As Thomas [Hilquit’s opponent for the chairmanship] later commented, ‘Once the anti-Semitic issue was raised, even though unjustly, I was inclined to think it best that Hillquit won.’ The Socialist party did not want to risk being labeled anti-Semitic.” [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 341]

Some estimates suggest that 60% of the leadership for the 60s-era radical SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) were Jews (well-known radicals included Kathy Boudin, Bettina Aptheker, among many others). [PRAGER, p. 61] From 1960 to 1970, five of the nine changing presidents of the organiza-
tion were Jewish males (Al Haber, Todd Gitlin, and the last three for the decade: Mike Spiegel, Mike Klonsky, and Mark Rudd). [SALE, K., 1973, p. 663] “Perhaps fully 50 percent of the revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society,” says Milton Plesur, “and as many as 50 to 75 percent of those in campus radical activities in the late 1960s were Jewish.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 137] As Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note:

“The early SDS was heavily Jewish in both its leadership and its activist cadres. Key SDS leaders included Richard Flacks, who played an important role in its formation and growth, as well as Al Haber, Robb Ross, Steve Max, Mike Spiegel, Mike Klonsky, Todd Gitlin, Mark Rudd, and others. Indeed, for the first few years, SDS was largely funded by the League for Industrial Democracy, a heavily Jewish socialist (but anti-communist) organization. SDS’s early successes were at elite universities containing substantial numbers of Jewish students and sympathetic Jewish faculty, including the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Brandeis, Oberlin, and the University of California. At Berkeley SDS leaders were not unaware of their roots. As Robb Ross put it, describing the situation at the University of Wisconsin in the early 1960s, ‘… my impression is that the left at Madison is not just a new left, but a revival of the old … with all the problems that entails. I am struck by the lack of Wisconsin-born people [in the Madison-area left] and the massive preponderance of New York Jews. The situation at the University of Minnesota is similar’ … [Researcher] Berns and his associates found that 83 percent of a small radical activist sample studied at the University of California in the early 1970s were of Jewish background.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 61]

Susan Stern was among those to turn to the violent Weatherman underground organization. Ted Gold, another Weatherman member, died when a bomb he was making exploded in his hands. [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 61] In an iconic 1970 incident, three of the four students shot and killed by National Guardsmen at a famous Kent State University demonstration were Jewish. [BYARD, K., 5-5-00]

A study by Joseph Adelson at the University of Michigan, one of the American hotbeds of 1960s-era activism, suggested that 90% of those defined as politically “radical students” at that school were Jews. [PRAGER, p. 61, 66] And, “when, for instance, the Queens College SDS held a sit-in at an induction center several years ago,” wrote Gabriel Ende, “they chose to sing Christmas carols to dramatize their activity, although the chairman and almost all of the members were Jewish.” [ENDE, G., 1971, p. 61]

Ronald Radosh notes that

“In elite institutions like the University of Chicago, a large 63 percent of student radicals were Jewish; Tom Hayden may have been the most famous name in the University of Michigan SDS, but ‘90 percent of the student left [in that school] came from Jewish backgrounds;' and nationally, 60 percent of SDS members were Jewish. As my once-friend Paul Breines wrote about my own alma mater the University of Wiscon-
Decades earlier, note Rothman and Lichter:

“The American Student Union, the most prominent radical student group during the 1930s, was heavily concentrated in New York colleges and universities with large Jewish enrollments. And on other campuses, such as the University of Illinois, substantial portions of its limited membership were students of Jewish background from New York City.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 101]

In communist organizations that supposedly idealized a classless society for all people, it inevitably grated with enduring Jewish self-perception: Jews often tended to configure as a special caste of controllers of – not a religious, but now – a secular messianism. As Jeff Schatz notes about pre-World War II Poland: “Despite the fact that [communist] party authorities consciously strove to promote classically proletarian and ethnically Polish members to the cadres of leaders and functionaries, Jewish communists formed 54 percent of the field leadership of the KPP [Polish Communist Party] in 1935. Moreover, Jews constituted a total of 75 percent of the party’s technica, the apparatus for production and distribution of propaganda material. Finally, communists of Jewish origin occupied most of the seats of the Central Committee of the of the KPPP [Communists Workers Party of Poland] and the KPP.” [SCHATZ, p. 97] Jews were at this time 10% of the Polish population.

In Russia, notes Shmuel Ettinger,

“when the Russian Social Democratic Party split into two factions – Bolsheviks and Mensheviks – both factions had many Jews in their leaderships (such as Boris Axelrod, Yuly Martov, Lev Trotsky, Grigory Zinoviev, and Lev Kamenev) and among their most active party members. Many Jews also played a part in the foundations and leadership of the party … For example, Mikhail Gots was one of the party’s main theoreticians and Grigory Gershuni was the leader of its fighting organization, which carried out terrorist acts against the Tsarist regime.” [ETTINGER, p. 9]

Earlier in Russia, notes Leon Schapiro, “a particularly important part was played by [Jewish revolutionary Aaron] Zundelovich, who in 1872 had formed a revolutionary circle mainly among students at the state-sponsored rabbinical school, at Vilna.” [SCHAPIRO, L., 1961, p. 153]

Also, notes Albert Lindemann, “it seems beyond serious debate that in the first twenty years of the Bolshevik Party the top ten to twenty leaders included close to a majority of Jews. Of the seven ‘major figures’ listed in The Makers of the Russian Revolution, four are of Jewish origin.” [LINDEMANN, p. 429-430]

Among the most important Jewish communists were the aforementioned Trotsky (originally Lev Davidovich Bronstein) and Grigori Yevseyevich Zinoviev (“Lenin’s closest associate in the war years”). Lev Borisovich Kamenev (Rosenfeld) headed the party newspaper, Pravda. Adolf Yoffe was head of the
Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Bolshevik Party in 1917-18. Moisei Solomonovich, head of the secret police in Petrograd, was known by some as the epitome of “Jewish terror against the Russian people.” [LINDEMANN, p. 431]

In Hungary, notes Jewish scholar Howard Sachar, “for 135 days [in 1919], Hungary was ruled by a Communist dictatorship. Its party boss, Bela Kun, was a Jew. So were 31 of the 49 commissars in Kun’s regime.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 339]

During that time, note Jewish scholars Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, Jews also represented

“most managers of the forty-eight People’s Commissars in his revolutionary government. Most managers of the new state farms were Jewish, as were the bureau chiefs of the Central Administration and the leading police officers. Overall, of 202 high officials in the Kun government, 161 were Jewish. Jews remained active in the Communist party during the Horthy regime of 1920-44, dominating its leadership. Again, most were from established, middle-class (or, at worst, lower-middle-class) backgrounds. Hardly any were proletarians or peasants. Most of the Hungarian Jewish community was massacred during World War II … Nonetheless, the leading cadres of the Communist party in the postwar period were Jews, who completely dominated the regime until 1952-53 … The wags of Budapest explained the presence of a lone gentile in the party leadership on the grounds that a ‘goy’ was needed to turn on the lights on Saturday.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 89]

“In Lithuania,” add Rothman and Lichter,

“about 54 percent of the [Communist] party cadres were Jewish. Salonika Jewry played a major role in the foundation of Greek Communist party and remained prominent until the early 1940s. Similar patterns prevailed in Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Jews played quite prominent roles in the top and second echelon leadership of the communist regimes in all of these countries in the immediate postwar period. They were often associated with Stalinist policies and were strongly represented in the secret police. In Poland, for example, three of the five members of the original Politburo were Jewish. A fourth, Wladyslaw Gomulka, was married to a woman of Jewish background. In both Rumania and Czechoslovakia, at least two of the four key figures in the Communist party were of Jewish background.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 90]

In Canada, in the 1940s, the Jewish head of the Communist Party in Montreal, Harry Binder, estimated that 70% of the Communist Party membership in his city were Jewish. In Toronto, from a Jewish population of 50,000, about 30% of the formal members of the local Communist community were believed to be Jews, not including those who had looser ties to the organization. [PARIS, E., 1980, p. 145]

David Biale notes Jewish pre-eminence among the communists of South Africa:
“The fact that they were outsiders to the main elements of white South African society – British and Afrikaner – undoubtedly made them more likely to rebel against the existing order. It was the explosive combination of Communist ideology as a kind of substitute for religion and the Jews’ marginal status that probably turned these Jews into such a prevalent presence on the South African left.” [BIALE, D., MARCH/APRIL 2000, p. 63-64]

“Jews of Polish background played an important role in the founding of the Cuban communist party,” note Rothman and Lichter, “and there are scattered indications of their significance in left-wing parties and groups in other Latin American countries. Jews were also prominent in the formation of Communist parties in various North African countries.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 90-91]

Even in 1930’s pre-Nazi Germany, the Communist Party’s top two leaders – Rosa Luxemburg and Paul Levi – were Jewish. (Hannah Arendt notes that Luxemburg was a member of a “Polish-Jewish ‘peer group,’” which was a “carefully hidden attachment to the Polish party which sprang from it.”) [ARENDT, 1968, p. 40] Earlier, in the wake of World War I, another Jewish radical, Kurt Eisner, proclaimed a socialist republic in Bavaria. Upon his assassination, Eisner’s government was replaced by another socialist one – that of president Ernst Toller (also Jewish). Erich Muehsam and Gustav Landauer were other Jews in high positions in the government. [PAYNE, p. 124-125] Next came a Communist coup to oust the socialist regime. As John Cornwell describes it, “After a week or two of outlandish misrule, on April 12 [1919] a reign of terror ensued under the red revolutionary trio of Max Levien, Eugen Levine, and Tonja Axelrod [also all Jewish] to hasten the dictatorship of the proletariat. The new regime kidnapped ‘middle-class’ hostages, throwing them into Stadeheim Prison. They shut down schools, imposed censorship, and requisitioned peoples’ homes and possessions.” [CORNWELL, p. 74] In Austria, in 1920, repeating the theme, “the socialist government was led by Friedrich Adler, Otto Bauer, Karl Seitz, Julius Deutsch and Hugo Breitner.” [GROLLMAN, E., 1965, p. 117] “The Austrian Social Democrat party was founded by Victor Adler, a deracinated Jew from a well-known Prague Jewish family, and the party paper was edited by Friedrich Austerlitz, a Moravian Jew. Other prominent Jews in the party leadership included Wilhelm Ellenbogen, Otto Bauer, Robert Dannenberg, and Max Adler.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 88]

“The list of leading socialists [in Germany] of Jewish origin is long and illustrious,” adds Adam Weisberger, “– Eduard Bernstein, Rosa Luxemburg, Gustav Landauer, Kurt Eisner, Paul Singer, Hugo Haase – to mention some of the most prominent among them.” [WEISBERG, A., 1997, p. 2]

As George Mosse notes:

“Jews were highly visible in many of the postwar [World War I] revolutions, not only in Bolshevik Russia but also in Budapest, Munich, and Berlin. During the postwar crisis, belief in Jewish conspiracies and subversive activity was not just a curious notion held by professed haters of
Jews; in 1918, even Winston Churchill associated Jews with the Bolshevist conspiracy.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 68-69]

[Other chapters will deal with the important role of Jews in the communist movement more extensively. If interested now, here are three links to excerpts about Jewish pre-eminence:

– in Russian and other Eastern European communism:
http://jewishtribalreview.org/russicom.htm,

– Jews in the Polish communist system:
http://jewishtribalreview.org/commlink.htm

– and Jewish communist spies in America:
http://jewishtribalreview.org/spieslink.htm

For those who even know about such a past, Jewish historiography these days tends to assert that communist and socialist Jews, in Russia and everywhere else, did not have any interest in a Jewish identity. This position asserts that such Jewish communist involvement was an investment in a secular universalism that leaves behind the traditional Jewish collectivist identity. In explaining away why so many Jews were secret police terrorists under the communist regime in Eastern Europe [see above links], Jewish author Michael Checinski writes that

“They were, for better or worse, considered less susceptible to the lures of ‘Polish nationalism,’ to which even impeccable Polish Communists were not thought immune. It should be remembered that these Jews were of a particular type: there were few veteran Communists among them, as their victims would be former KPP members and other left-wingers, and Moscow was taking no chances with sentimental ties of comradeship cramping their style as guardians of political ‘purity.’ Many of them had not only sadistic inclinations but also various grudges against their future victims, both Polish and Jewish. Indeed, it is significant that there were no traces of ‘Jewish solidarity’ among the staff of the Tenth Department. On the contrary, they represented a distorted conception of ‘internationalism,’ which could be described as ‘Jewish anti-Semitism.’” [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 71-72]

This is a common Jewish apologetic tact today, to explain away the Jewish identities of so many communist terrorists by proclaiming that they had no connective identity with others in their work circles. Even here, Jewish consensus proclaims, even as Jews murdered others, Jews remain victims of anti-Semitism. [Much more about this in future chapters]

But as Kevin MacDonald suggests, “surface declarations of a lack of Jewish identity may be highly misleading … There is good evidence for widespread self-deception about Jewish identity among Jewish radicals … [Bolshevism] was a government that aggressively attempted to destroy all vestiges of Christianity as a socially unifying force within the Soviet Union while at the same time it established a secular Jewish subculture.” [MACDONALD, 1998, p. 60]

Arthur Liebman notes this phenomenon in “the flood of Yiddish-speaking Jews” to America in the early years of the twentieth century:
“These new Jews were too large a constituency to be kept separate from the Socialist party for the length of time necessary to accept the arguments of the sophisticated Marxist cosmopolitan Jews. If these masses of Jews who valued their Jewish identity and language would come to socialism through a special Jewish organization, then the Socialists decided they would have it. The Jewish Socialist Federation was officially recognized by the Socialist party in 1912.” [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 339]

As Jewish author John Sack notes about the many officials of Jewish origin in Poland after World War II who headed the repressive communist secret police system:

“I’d interviewed twenty-three Jews who’d been in the Office [of State Security], and one, just one, had considered himself a communist in 1945. He and the others had gone to Jewish schools, studied the Torah, had been bar-mitzvahed, sometimes wore payes … By whose definition weren’t they Jews? Not by the Talmud’s, certainly not by the government of Israel’s or the government of Nazi Germany’s.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 63]

Melanie Kaye-Kantrowitz puts her Jewish identity in a socialist context this way:

“Out of nowhere pops a question, ‘If you don’t care about being Jewish, how come all your friends are Jews?’ Vivian … thinks about being Jewish on the toilet and in her sleep, as well as every other moment of the day or night. ‘I live in New York,’ I snap, and we both burst out laughing. Mentally I flip through my friends for a non-Jew. Nothing. She shakes her head. ‘You’re such a Jew. How come you don’t know this about yourself?’ … My parents never thought about it either, it was who they were. In Vilna they were Jews and socialists, and when they came here they were still Jews and socialists. They lived among other Jews. Everyone spoke Jewish. What was there to think? It was like air, they breathed it. There was Jewish everything. My parents would argue who you could trust less, communists or Democrats, anarchists they never worried about. All Jewish. Orthodox, secular. Owners, bosses, workers. Doctors, teachers, salesclerks, writers, dancers, peddlers, you name it. All Jewish. Movies. Gossip columns. Like I said, you breathed it.” [KAYE-KANTROWITZ, 1990, p. 188]

Jewish author Anne Roiphe, today an ardent supporter of Israel, addresses the same theme:

“I can say I was a Marxist before I was old enough to know history, and afterward a liberal, a Leftist, a woman of the people with the people, but finally I must own to the hypocrisy. I see certain unwelcome contradictions.” [ROLPHE, 1981, p. 113]

Rolph’s first hypocrisy was that she was born to wealth: “I am the product of the [economic] wits of my grandfather.” [ROLPHE, 1981, p. 113] And despite an identity as a Marxist, Leftist, liberal, or whatever else she thought she was, Rolphe inevitably was drawn back to “this odd mystical connection to the Jewish peoplehood,” [ROLPHE, 1981, p. 182] writing an entire volume about it (subtitled A Jewish Journey in Christian America). “I thought,” she wrote, “that
... I had asserted my ego as separate from the forced march of Jewish history ... I had thought I had cut out the roots of the tree that was causing too much shade in my garden ... [but] the tree without roots had surprised me with its staying power.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 180]

Jewish communist Sam Carr was released from a Canadian prison in 1951 for spying for Russia. “Ironically,” notes Erna Paris, “given the fact that he ‘wasn’t much of a Jew,’ he did become the leader of the Unified Jewish People’s Order after 1960.” [PARIS, E., p. 176] In Argentina, Jewish publisher Jacobo Timerman was imprisoned by the ruling military junta in 1977. It was pointed out to him by his right-wing interrogators that he was a member of a “registered affiliate organization of the Communist Party” in his youth. Timerman denied that he joined it because of any interest in communism, but, rather, for how it could serve his other ideological interests: “I belonged to it as an anti-Fascist, a Jew, and a Zionist.” [TIMERMAN, J., 1981, p. 116]

“A number of Jewish socialists, particularly in the later stages of the [German] Wilhelmine period,” notes Adam Weisberger, “exhibited the phenomenon of returning to Judaism ... although admittedly often in secular or accentuated form. Joseph Bloch, for example, originally an ardent assimilationist and German nationalist, became perhaps the chief proponent of Zionism in the German socialist movement.” [WEISBERGER, A., 1997, p. 98]

In 1961, Jewish author Daniel Aaron criticized the shallow attachment many in radical movements really had to their left-wing postures: “Some writers joined or broke from the [Communist] Movement because of their wives, or for careerist reasons, or because they read their own inner disturbances into the realities of social dislocation. To put it another way, the subject matter of politics ... was often the vehicle for non-political emotions and compulsions.” [WALD, p. 14]

Sigmund Freud (although not a Marxist, his a-religious work is often joined to Marxist theory) insisted that his psychological speculations applied to all people and tried to dismiss any evidence of his own special Jewish particularism. But he was always conflicted about it. As he once wrote about his connection to Jewish identity, “When I felt an inclination to [Jewish] national enthusiasm I strove to suppress it as being harmful and wrong, alarmed by the warning examples of the people among whom we Jews live. But plenty of other things remained to make the attraction of Jewry and Jews irresistible – many obscure emotional forces, which were the more powerful the less they could be expressed in words, as well as a clear consciousness of inner identity, the safe privacy of a common mental connection.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 180] (The clique that runs, and enforces, the psychoanalytic world, as we shall see later, remains overwhelmingly Jewish).

Jewish messianic elitism in leftist “universalist” circles endures to this day. In 1992, Michael Lerner, prominent editor of the left-wing Jewish journal *Tikkun*, suggested remedies for curing anti-Semitism in leftist organizations. The cure? “Put[ting] self-affirming Jews in positions of leadership in your organizations” [LERNER, Socialism, p. 115] and indoctrination sessions to sensitize non-Jews to Jewish needs (Lerner’s term is: “internal education programs.”)
Erna Paris notes the history of Jewish communism in Canada:

“Although the Jewish left claimed to be dedicated to perfect equality, it also gave full-blown expression to the strong velvet-gloved, ancient, patriarchal traditions of Judaism. If the ancestral prophets like Amos were the Fathers of Israel, so the men of UJPO [United Jewish People’s Order: a ‘Jewish’ branch of communism] and the school of the Jewish labour movement were the ‘Fathers’ of the women and children in the movement. Without question, they were the new Hebrew prophets of a better world.” [PARIS, E., p. 152]

As Adam Weisberger notes this Jewish identity root in the profound historical influence of Jews in revolutionary communist and socialist movements that aimed to destroy the existing social order:

“A messianic idea, derived from traditional Judaism, persisted through the process of secularization and entered into the groundwork of socialism … Jewish socialists, even when they were estranged from Judaism and possessed little or no formal Jewish education, remained an essential part of the mission of those Jews who believed they had broken with tradition.” [WEISBERGER, A., 1997, p. 112]

“After being nurtured by a culture that saw itself superior by virtue of its special relationship with God,” note Jewish authors Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter,

“many Jews must have experienced their contact with modern Europe [with the birth of the Enlightenment] as traumatic. It was difficult to think Jewish life superior to the achievements of European civilization once the protective mantle of the shtetl was no longer present. What better way to reestablish claims to superiority than by adopting the most ‘advanced’ social position of the larger society and viewing this adoption as a reflection of Jewish heritage? Thus many radical Jewish intellectuals were able to continue to assert Jewish superiority, even as they denied their Jewishness.” [ROTHMAN/ LICHTER, 1982, p. 121]

Arnold Eisen, in a discussion of Leslie Fiedler (who started out as a socialist) and other well-known Jewish American “intellectuals,” notes the transformative essence of Jewish identity from traditional Judaism to modern political movements: “Here the entire language of chosenness – suffering, witness, mission, reciprocity, exclusivity, covenant, and even repudiation of Christianity and idol worship! – has been appropriated and hollowed out in order to endow the Jewish intellectual with the role of prophet to his own community and the world.” [EISEN, p. 136] Salo Baron goes back further in time, but underscores the same Jewish identity foundation, which can, however incongruously, simultaneously straddle both “universalistic” communist movements and “particularist” Zionism:

“Under one guise or another, even the antireligious movements in 19th century Judaism were unable to cast off their messianic yearnings for an ultimate redemption of their people, or of mankind at large. The growing secularization of modern Jewry made the transition from reli-
gious messianism to political Zionism appear as but another link in that long chain of evolution.” [BARON, 1964, p. 172]

David Horowitz recalls what it was like growing up in a New York City household with his communist parents, an environment still founded upon the Jewish religious myths of redemption:

“In the radical romance of our political lives, the world was said to have begun in innocence, but to have fallen afterwards under an evil spell, afflicting the lives of all with great suffering and injustice. According to our myth, a happy ending beckoned, however. Through the efforts of progressives like us, the spell would one day be lifted, and mankind would be freed from its trials.” [HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 284]

Even the founder of Hadassah (the women’s Zionist organization), Henrietta Szold, once wrote that “the world has not progressed beyond the need of Jewish instruction, but the Jew can be witness and a missionary only if he is permitted to interpret the lessons of Judaism as his peculiar nature and his peculiar discipline enable him to interpret them.” [GAL, A., 1986, p. 371] How Zionism, the modern secular expression of traditional Jewish ethnocentrism, is supposed to “instruct the world that has not progressed beyond the need of Jewish instruction” is never explained. [Note Zionism’s implicit racism and oppressive policies against non-Jews in the later chapter about Israel].

With the erosion of the New Left in America in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and Israel’s 1967 victory in its war with surrounding Arab states, distinctly Judeo-centric political configurations arose out of the Jewish universalistic left-wing community that, as Mordecai Chertoff notes, “affirm[ed] Zionism … and Judaism … as socialists and radicals.” [CHERTOFF, p. 192] Such organizations included the Jewish Student Movement, the Jewish Action Committee, Kadimah, the Jewish Student Union, the Maccabees, American Students for Israel, the World Union of Jewish Students, Na’aseh, Jews for Urban Justice, the New Jewish Committee, the Jewish Liberation Project, the Youth Committee for Peace and Democracy in the Middle East, and the Committee for Social Justice in the Middle East. Such organizations produced between 20 and 40 periodicals with a combined circulation of over 300,000. [GLAZER, NEW p. 192-193]

“The extreme radical groups of the New Left came out officially in favor of the Arabs,” notes James Yaffe, “but it generally conceded that there was much opposition from Jews in those groups. ‘Jewish kids in the Movement,’ one of them told me, ‘have a double standard on Israel. A non-Jewish leftist is much more likely to condemn Israel than a Jewish leftist.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 193]

“There are still those [Jews] who are impressed,” wrote Nathan Glazer in 1971, “by what seems to be the New Left concern for all of mankind, but more and more … are discovering … that there is a limit to the number of trumpets one can respond. [Jews] are responding, in greater numbers to their own.” [GLAZER, p. 196] “How many times,” complained anti-Vietnam War activist Gabriel Ende in the same year, “have committed Jews joined with others in Vietnam and student power rallies, only to have their erstwhile companions
stabil them in the back with boorish anti-Israel remarks on the morrow?” [ENDE, G., 1971, p. 59]

Traditional Jewish tendency to cluster and control is likewise evidenced in the opposite political field – American conservatism. Pat Buchanan – the outspoken conservative newspaper columnist and former candidate for the President of the United States (widely despised in Jewish circles as an “anti-Semite”) – has attacked the ‘neo-conservative’ movement of Irving Kristol and others (many Jewish), who Buchanan likens to “fleas who conclude they are steering the dog, their relationship to the [conservative] movement has always been parasitical.” [SHAPIRO, Pat, p. 226]

In more recent history, reflecting another popular angle of Jewish chauvinism under the guise of universalism (in a theme to be discussed at length later), Eli Weisel, the well-known semi-official spokesman for Jewish suffering in the Holocaust, wrote a formal report to the President of the United States about what the proposed $168 million United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC would be. While up to six million Jews were killed in the Nazi extermination programs (and over three times that number of non-Jews may have been killed, [MILLER, p. 253] depending upon how one defines “Holocaust,” Weisel, true to Jewish particularist/universalist form, noted that the museum would focus mainly on Jewish victims:

“The Holocaust was the systematic bureaucratic extermination of six million Jews by the Nazis and their collaborators as a central act of state during the Second World War; as night descended, millions of other peoples were swept into this net of death … The event is essentially Jewish, yet its interpretation is universal. The universality of the Holocaust lies in its [Jewish] uniqueness.” [MILLER, p. 255]

A poignant – and current – example of this worldview is the aforementioned Michael Lerner, a man who has been provided precious moments in the national spotlight by an influential admirer, Hilary Clinton. Incredibly, Lerner frames American universalistic ideals themselves as oppressors of American Jewry. “Jews have been forced,” complains Lerner, “to choose between a loyalty to their own people and a loyalty to universal ideals.” [LERNER, p. 5] What moral person of any faith or ethnicity is not “forced to choose” – by his or her own conscience – between what Lerner cannot openly state: selfish, exclusionist self-interest club interests versus sacrifice for the common good? That Lerner imagines only Jews have faced such a dilemma in the American – or any – context is but evidence of the blind depth of Judeo-centrism. Lerner is enraptured, overwhelmed, by his own sense of Jewishness. True to form, “it is [a] hidden vulnerability,” insists Lerner, “that constitutes the uniqueness of Jewish oppression.” [LERNER, p. 65]

Leftist, rightist, Orthodox, atheist, or anything else, the origins of Jewish incessant, undying obsession with their “uniqueness,” “exceptionality,” “difference,” “messianism,” et al is to be found in the Judaic religious record. As Adam Garfinkle sees it:

“The mission of Israel, as the Prophets defined it, is to spread monotheism and the moral code that flows from it around the world, but not
to make everyone part of a great Israelite tribe. .... The Jews do not merge with the nations or convert them. They are, said Balaam, in Numbers 23:9, a people destined to live alone. Although Jewish ideas are universalistic, traditional Jews see themselves in exclusionist terms, a self-perception that has caused endless confusion and resentment among non-Jews. Jewish apologists like to emphasize the special burdens of this role and point to the costs it has extracted on the Jewish people in history – no doubt all true. But that does not change the basic fact, as even a casual reading of central Jewish texts show, that Jews have believed themselves special, closer to the Divine than other people.” [GARFINKLE, p. 10]
JEWS AND CHRISTIANITY

During the turbulent times of the Middle Ages and leading to our own era, there have been a number of wars with particularly religious emphasis. From 1208 to 1228, for instance, the Catholic Church led crusades against the Albigenses (a Christian “heretic” movement in Western Europe), which totally destroyed them. The Inquisition burned thousands of Christians at the stake and eliminated religious dissent in Southern Europe. For over a century, from 1559, much of Europe echoed a series of religious wars between Catholics and Protestants. One of the most famous atrocities of this period was the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre, in which thousands of Huguenots were massacred in Paris, and thousands more in the countryside. In the seventeenth century, Protestant churches in Poland were destroyed by Catholics in anti-Protestant riots in towns like Poznan, Cracow, and Lublin. [HAGEN, p. 198]

Within this context of intra-religious warring, in conjunction with famines, pestilence, and other wide-spread catastrophes, “what is astonishing,” writes Alan Edelstein, “given the situation of medieval European Jewry, and what bears examination, is not that many were attacked, expelled, or forcibly converted, but that more were not.” [EDELSTEIN]

“Any judgment on the Christian treatment of Jews [across history],” agrees Nicholas de Lange, another Jewish scholar, “should also take account of the treatment of other religions, and indeed of dissident movements within Christianity. Against this background, the treatment of Jews can actually seem astonishingly humane and generous.” [DE LANGE, p. 35] “Christianity mercilessly persecuted paganism and heresies,” says Abram Leon, [but] it tolerated the Jewish religion.” [LEON, p. 73] “We shall have to admit,” wrote famed Jewish historian Salo Baron, “that church censorship has rarely interfered with the autonomous development of Jewish culture.” [BARON, Ancient, p. 266]

Yet modern Jewry’s deep animosity towards Christianity stems from the accusation that institutional Christianity (as distinct from riotous mobs and individuals) was seminal to anti-Semitism in the Middle Ages, and even earlier, laying a religious foundation for the hostility towards Jews in the Western world to our own time. It can easily be argued, however, (as did Benjamin Disraeli, and others) that official Christian protection of Jewry is as much responsible for Judaism’s survival as anything else. “It may be asserted,” wrote Salo Baron, that had it not been for the Catholic Church, the Jews would have not survived the Middle Ages in Christian Europe.” [SCHORSCH, p. 38] Yet an important part of the Jewish victim tradition is the perceived monolithic oppression of Christianity, presumably emanating from the traditional Christian notion that “Jews killed Jesus,” and epitomized in attacks by medieval mobs and thugs
against Jews, especially during the fervor of the Crusades in 1068. “Anyone who reads the Talmudic tractate *Avodah Zara,*” says Michael Lerner, “cannot escape the impression that Jews have come to believe that all non-Jews are so dangerous that they should be avoided.” [LERNER, *Goyim*, p. 434]

Cecil Roth, a prominent Jewish historian in the first half of this century, argues that the Jewish persecution by Christianity throughout the ages – a staple of popular Jewish folklore – has been greatly exaggerated:

“Jewish historiography towards Christianity, and especially Catholicism, is typical of the errors which a too slavish following of the German tradition has inspired … The same lack of understanding and the same violence of contrast have been carried into other aspects of Jewish history. No attempt whatsoever has been made to understand the psychology of persecution. Any Jew-baiter is necessarily represented as a bloodthirsty desperado … Any [Jewish] apostate as a mere self-seeking humbug. All persons who have favored the Jews inevitably figure as saints and heroes, while whoever opposes or oppressed them automatically become ruffians and hypocrites … Almost every Jew is made to figure as a peaceful, unoffending saint, with no blemish whatsoever to mar his character or to explain his mistreatment … [But] blood ran as quickly in the ghetto as outside … [Jewish] violence was not unknown in the synagogue itself. [Jewish] sordidness was present in plenty to enhance by contrast the glories of martyrdom.” [ROTH, p. 421-423]

Based upon the ancient Judaic mythos of eternal victimization, Jewish animosity – and often hatred – towards Christianity runs deep to this day. Yet, says Salo Baron, “It would be a mistake … to believe that hatred was the constant keynote of Judeo-Christian relations, even in [medieval] Germany or Italy. It is the nature of historical records to transmit to posterity the memory of extraordinary events, rather than of the ordinary flow of life.” [LIBERLES, p. 347]

Judaism had, of course, antipathy for Christianity from the latter’s very inception. Christianity evolved out of Judaism; it was founded and propagated by Jews dissatisfied with the direction of the seminal faith as guided by its leaders. “Popular hatred of the Temple priest and the rich,” says Lenni Brenner, “became the basis of Christianity, and the New Testament must be seen as the last major production of the Jewish religious genre.” [BRENNER, p. 42] The new faith branched out of Judaism as a distinctly different – and to Jewish minds heretical – religious view. At this point in history, Judaism was the dominant religious force (vis-à-vis Christianity) in Jerusalem; Christianity was embryonic and Jews were the persecutors. Christians hoped that Jews would join their new, universalistic faith.

Edward Flannery writes that

“The synagogue resented Christianity’s claims and in the emerging conflict struck the first blow. Hellenist Jewish converts to the Church were driven from Jerusalem. [Saint] Stephen was killed, as were the two Jameses, though James the Less was killed through the action of the high priest, not the majority of Jews. Peter was forced out of Palestine by the
persecution of Herod Agrippa I, and Paul endured flagellations, imprisonment, and complaints by Jews to Roman authorities, and threats of death at Jewish hands. Barnabas’ death (60 AD) at the hands of Jews in Cyprus is unanimously reported by early hagiographers.” [FLANNERY, p. 27]

By 80 AD Jewish ritual had incorporated a daily curse against Christians: “May the minim [heretics] perish in an instant; may they be effaced from the book of life and not be counted among the Just.” [FLANNERY, p. 28] In 117 CE Jews were involved in the death of St. Simeon, the bishop of Jerusalem, and unrepenting Christians were massacred by Jews in the Bar Kocha revolt (132-135 AD) against the Romans.

Christians were severely persecuted under Roman rule, while Jews – after initial revolts against Rome – largely prospered. “Christians were subject to mounting and systematic persecution from the time of Emperor Trajan (98-117 CE) onwards,” notes Robin Spiro, “The Jews, by and large, fared better than the Christians at the hands of the Romans, and retained the majority of their special privileges.” [SPIRO, p. 17] As Christianity grew in later centuries, attacks, riots, pogroms, rebellions – or whatever else one chooses to polemically label them – were instigated by Jews against Christians in Palestine and other parts of the Old World. Simon Dubnov notes that “in 556, during bouts in the circus in Caesarea, the Samaritans, assisted by Jewish youths, attacked the Christians. The Christians were beaten soundly. Several churches were razed and Stephanus, the governor of Palestine, was killed … In Antiocha … in 608, the local Jews rebelled; since they predominated in numbers they killed many Christians, including the patriarch Anastasias, whose body they dragged through the city streets … In other localities (Scytopolis, for instance) the Jews were hostile toward the Christians. During commercial transactions, they would not even accept money directly from the hands of a Christian; they had to throw their coins into water, where the Jews would then retrieve them.” [DUBNOV, p. 24-25 v. 2]

When the Persians invaded Palestine in 614, Jews joined as “auxiliaries” in slaughtering Christian neighbors. “Jewish warriors,” says Simon Dubnov, “along with Persians, now assaulted numerous Christian churches (a church legend exaggerates the number of dead to 90,000). Many churches, including the one of Christ’s grave, were razed to the ground … In hostile acts towards Christians the Jew did not lag behind the Persians. Bitter resentment … found an outlet in atrocities.” [DUBNOV, p. 216, v. 2] According to a Christian monk of the times, Strategius of Mar Saba, Jews bought “a large number” of Christian prisoners from the Persians, “who they then slaughtered just as one might buy cattle to slaughter.” [SCHAFFER, p. 192] “Even as the Persians were approaching Palestine,” notes Peter Schafer, “the Jews appear to have risked an open revolt against the Christians and allied themselves with the Persians.” [SCHAFFER, p. 140] The Persians were soon driven out, however, by Heraclius of Christian Byzantium. When a Jewish leader, Benjamin of Tiberias, was asked why he had previously justified the cruelties against Christians, the Jewish patriot is
reported to have answered, “Because they were the enemies of my religion.” [DUBNOV, p. 218, v.2]

For centuries a range of ridiculing and hostile defamatory material about Christ was popularly circulated in the Jewish communities, eventually written as Sefar Toledoth Yeshu. “It enjoyed wide circulation among the general Jewish population.” [JACOB, W., 1974, p. 11] The earliest known copy found in modern times was discovered in a synagogue built in the seventh century. Christ, it was said, practiced witchcraft and was the illegitimate son of a Roman soldier or, by other accounts, a “disreputable man of the tribe of Judah.” [SHAHAK, p. 98, FLANNERY, p. 34, GOLDSTEIN, p. 148] The book, “in Hebrew and Yiddish was, but is not now, in common circulation,” wrote Jewish scholar Joseph Klausner in 1926, “yet the book may still be found in (manuscript) and in print among many educated Jews. Our mothers knew its contents by hearsay – of course with all manner of corruptions, charges, omissions, and imaginative additions – and handed them on to their children.” [KLAUSNER, p. 48] In the early years of Christianity Rabbi Tarphon of Jerusalem declared that “Christians were worse than heathens and one Rabbi Meir proclaimed that the New Testament was “a revelation of sin.” [FLANNERY, p. 34]

The Talmud also accused Jesus of a variety of sexual indiscretions and that he had been condemned by God to boil for eternity in “boiling excrement.” Jewish religious texts also enjoined pious Jews to burn whatever New Testament volumes they came across. (Israel Shahak notes that this was publicly performed in Israel in 1980 by a Jewish religious organization, Yad Le’alchim). [SHAHAK, p. 21]

A Chabad-sponsored Internet web site notes that “The Talmud (Babylonian edition) records other sins of ‘Jesus of Nazarene’:

1) He and his disciples practiced sorcery and black magic, led Jews astray into idolatry, and were sponsored by foreign, gentile powers for the purpose of subverting Jewish worship (Sanhedrin 43a).

2) He was sexually immoral, worshipped statues of stone (a brick is mentioned), was cut off from the Jewish people for his wickedness, and refused to repent (Sanhedrin 107b, Sotah 47a).

3) He learned witchcraft in Egypt and, to perform miracles, used procedures that involved cutting his flesh – which is also explicitly banned in the Bible (Shabbos 104b). The false, rebellious message of Jesus has been thoroughly rejected by the vast majority of the Jewish people, as G-d commanded. Unfortunately, however, this same message has brought a terrible darkness upon the world; today, over 1.5 billion gentiles believe in Jesus. Those lost souls mistakingly think they have found salvation in Jesus; tragically, they are in for a rude awakening.” [NOAH’S COVENANT WEB SITE : http://www.noahide.com/yeshu.htm, 2001]

“The very name Jesus,” says Shahak, “was for Jews a symbol of all that is abominable, and this popular tradition still exists. The Gospels are equally detested, and they are not allowed to be quoted (let alone taught) even in modern Israel schools. … For theological reasons, mostly rooted in ignorance,
Christianity as a religion is classed by rabbinical teaching as idolatry. All Christian emblems and pictorial representations are regarded as idols …” [SHAHAK, p. 98]

Another Israeli, Israel Shamir, notes that the Toledoth is being rejuvenated today in Israel:

“Last year [2000], the biggest Israeli tabloid Yedioth Aharonoth reprinted in its library the Jewish anti-Gospel, Toledoth Yeshu, compiled in the Middle Ages. It is the third recent reprint, including one in a newspaper. If the Gospel is the book of love, Toledoth is the book of hate for Christ. The hero of the book is Judas. He captures Jesus by polluting his purity. According to Toledoth, the conception of Christ was in sin, the miracles of Christ were witchcraft, his resurrection but a trick.” [SHAMIR, I., 2001]

In 1997, notes Yossi Halevi, “a group of pro-Israel Pentecostals from Oklahoma were gathered outside the room on Jerusalem’s Mt. Zion traditionally associated with Jesus’ Last Supper, when several Ultra-Orthodox men passing by ostentatiously covered their noses with their prayer shawls, to protect them from the ‘stench,’ one of them spat on the ground.” [HALEVI, Y., p. 16] In Jewish tradition, notes Leon Poliakov, “Christians, significantly, were feared as wild animals much more than hated as men.” [WOLFSON, p. 6]

This age-old Jewish contempt is integral to the reciprocal Christian religious animosity towards Jews in the Middle Ages, especially after such material was revealed by Jewish apostates to the surrounding Christian populace. But it is not likely that most “Christian” hostility towards Jews through the ages was based solely upon religious beliefs, although their contesting world view certainly could inflame non-Jewish hostility. As even Mark Twain noted, “With most people, of a necessity, bread and meat take first rank, religion second. I am convinced that the persecution of the Jews is not due in any large degree to religious prejudice.” [TWAIN]

At Hebrew classes,” says Evelyn Kaye, who was raised in an Orthodox community, “we learned only about the role of the Jews in Greek and Roman times. The other aspects of the world were dismissed completely … At Hebrew classes, we understood that no one ever mentioned the name of Jesus under any circumstances … Any discussion of Jesus was taboo … We learned nothing about the spread of Christianity, or its development. We heard nothing of Christian suffering in defense of faith … I absorbed the idea that as soon as Jesus had arrived and started Christianity, Jews were persecuted ever after.” [KAYE, p. 79]

Secular Jewish author Earl Shorris recalled in 1982 the first time he bought a Christmas tree, and the emotions he had when he decided to throw the tree out after both he and his son cut their hands on Christmas ornaments (“one of the cruciform balls “):

“I resolved to save the lives of the Shorris family by getting the Christmas tree out of my house. Like David approaching the giant of Gath in the valley of Elah, I advanced upon the Goliath of Christmas trees. For a moment I was afraid, but I knew that righteousness was on my side
and I snatched the great tree from its moorings and bore it out to the trash bin. Disregarding the mystical signs that hung from its limbs, I broke it in half with my bare hands and cast it down into the dark barrel, the Sheol of Christmas trees. Then all the family – the mother, the wounded men, and even the babe – rejoiced.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 40]

“A number of years ago,” notes Maurice Friedman about common Jewish perspective on Christianity,

“one of my oldest friends, now a minister, told me of his hope of establishing a community church which would attract many of the Jews in New York City who no longer have any religious commitment. ‘Will you have a cross at the altar?’ I asked. ‘Of course,’ he replied. ‘It is a universal religious symbol.’ ‘That is where you are wrong,’ I said. ‘Even to the non-religious Jews the cross is a symbol of anti-Semitism from which the Jew has had to suffer.’” [FRIEDMAN, M., 1965, p. 211]

There are still excessive anti-Christian currents within much of Jewry today – even including among its educated leaders. Michael Wyschogrod, a Jewish philosophy professor, wrote in 1989:

“For many Jews, the cross is a source of contamination. From time to time, I have helped organize Jewish-Christian meetings at Catholic locations. There will almost always be some invited Jewish participants who inquire whether there are any crucifixes in the meeting rooms or in the room in which the participants sleep. If so, some participants will refuse to attend or inquire whether the crucifixes can be covered over or removed. What is going on here?” [WYSCHOGROD, p. 146]

Rabbi Daniel Lapin wrote an entire book in 1999 about Jewry’s defamation of Christianity. As he notes,

“A scenario I have seen several times took place during a Rotary luncheon I once attended. The invocation was given as it always is, but on this occasion, unbeknownst to me, the presenter violated an unwritten rule by invoking the name of Jesus. One of the prominent members who is also a leader of the local Jewish community exploded in a paroxysm of rage … Why do Jews think it acceptable to decree how Christians may pray? Why do so many Jews feel that they must take offense and react angrily at the invoking of the name of Jesus?” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 300]

[ See p. 741 for more discussion of traditional – and current – Jewish anti-Christian bigotry]
From the beginning of their tenure in Europe (and elsewhere), many Jews were merchants. This provided a base as they began expanding into money lending activities, including usury. Usury is defined most simply as money lending for profit. In medieval times it was universally condemned as a heinous and immoral act by the Christian church. The act of usury was deemed a mortal sin, and its practitioner’s path of greed was understood to end in eternal damnation in Hell. The idea of profiteering from someone else’s’ need – possibly desperate – for money was believed by medieval Christianity to be the antithesis of compassion, generosity, and charity. Christ was upheld as an example of poverty, non-materialism, and abstinence. Common wisdom asserted that those who had surplus money to lend in the first place were obsessed with greed and avarice and needed no more – certainly by usury – for their coffers. And making money for doing absolutely nothing (except having the money available) went against Christian medieval understandings of decency, justice, honest work, and morality. In essence, usury was perceived as a crass system of exponential exploitation by which the already wealthy could get increasingly wealthier for little more than the fact of their wealth in the first place. (In the nineteenth century, notes Abram Leon, Karl Marx argued that “usury centralized money wealth, where the means of production are disjointed. It does not alter the modes of production but attaches itself to it as a parasite, and makes it miserable. It sucks blood, kills its nerve and compels production to proceed under even more disheartening conditions.” [LEON, p. 150]

As George Eaton Simpson and J. Milton Yinger observed:

“The church’s condemnation of usury made sense in the relatively self-sufficient, largely barter economy in which a large proportion of the population lived, even down to the eighteenth century. Under those circumstances, a person borrows money only when he has suffered some unusual loss – long illness of the breadwinner, loss of crops, a destructive fire. To charge interest in such a situation is to kick a man when he is down. To the great majority of people, this continued to be the perspective on interest-taking: it was robbery; money was unproductive and yet one had to pay for its use.” [SIMPSON/YINGER, p. 295]

The vast gap between Christian and Jewish moral perspectives, per materialist self-aggrandizement, is evidenced everywhere in their respective traditions. In the Christian New Testament, for instance, Jesus enjoined values of humility and modesty to his followers, teaching that “It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than it is for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of heaven.” [LUKE 18-25] Jewish religious tradition stands in drastic opposition.
The [Talmudic] Mishnah, for instance, proclaims, “Who is rich? He who enjoys his wealth.” Likewise, there is no equivalent in Jewish mainstream tradition to Christian vows of poverty and material abstinence, [SHAPIRO, p. 12] as epitomized in recent times by Mother Teresa. As the Talmud says: “Poverty in the home is more painful than fifty lashes.” [KOTKIN, p. 46]

“Judaism is a this-world religion,” says Joshua Halberstam, “and making money is considered a natural human endeavor. Unlike Christianity, Judaism never considered poverty a virtue; the idea that the meek shall inherit the earth is a New Testament doctrine, not a Jewish one.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 25] “Judaism does not consider poverty noble,” says Maurice Lamm, “… The Jew prays for parnassah, a respectable income.” [LAMM, p. 108] As famed sociologist Max Weber wrote, “Pharisaic [i.e., rabbinic] Judaism was also far from rejecting wealth or from thinking that it be dangerous, or that its unqualified enjoyment endangers salvation. Wealth was, indeed, considered prerequisite to certain priestly functions.” [POLL, S., 1969, p. vii]

The Jews were not forbidden in medieval Europe to become usurers. Because they refused to convert en masse to the dominant religious faith and, to Christian belief, be spiritually saved, Jews were considered outsiders. Whatever its continuously decried immoral atmosphere, usury was an economic opportunity and the Jewish community gravitated to it. In historical perspective, this niche they were afforded was a great economic privilege and a springboard for Jewish economic expansion to our own day. (In the Islamic world too, where usury was religiously prohibited to Muslims, Jews again gravitated towards that generally regarded repugnant activity). Of course there were, religious and legal injunctions or not, small numbers of Christian usurers too. But Jews had a distinct advantage in that they could be completely open in their profit-making activities. “The picture of the Jew,” says Jacob Katz, “waiting at home for the Gentile to come to borrow money or pay a debt is a realistic one … [but] many Jews also had also to call at the house of the Gentile to offer their services as traders or money-lenders.” [KATZ, Ex, p. 38]

Christian usurers, who were despised at least as much by their co-religionists as Jews, usually had to be more discrete in their dealings. The gravity in which all usurers were violently hated by the general European population may be measured in the following passage by Jacques Le Goff:

“The persecution and slaughter of Italian usurers, in particular in France during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, were phenomena as frequent and widespread as pogroms against the Jews, with the one difference that the pogroms were prompted by religious motives as well as the hatred of wealthy moneylenders of a different faith.” [LEGOFF]

“Italians and Huguenots,” adds Alan Edelstein, “were expelled from France for economic reasons, and the same factors caused Germans in Novgorod to wall themselves for protection from Russian mobs.” [EDELSTEIN, p. 23]

The exploitive nature of Jewish usury invariably alienated the Christian populace. The Cortes of Portugal, for instance, complained in 1361 that Jewish usury was becoming “an unbearable yoke upon the population.” [LEON,
p. 165] Guido Kisch, in a probable understatement, notes that “the continual complaints against Jewish moneylenders, coming from all classes of the medieval population, particularly in the 14th and 15th centuries, necessarily made the Jew an unpopular figure.” [KISCH, p. 328] Usurious Jews who did no physical labor, who were segregated in their own communities, who did not serve in the local military, and who were agents of the hated aristocracy, were commonly accused of parasitism by local non-Jewish populaces. “Jewish money lending,” says Salo Baron, “[was a] lucrative business … For the most part, the accepted rate ranged between 33 and 43 per cent, although sometimes they went up to double and treble those percentages, or more … When the European economy entered a period of deceleration in the late thirteenth century, further aggravated by recurrent famine and pestilence, such exorbitant charges, though economically doubly justified because of the increased risks, created widespread hostility.” [BARON, EHoJ, p. 45] Money lending was not usually for a borrower’s business expenses or expansion, but for subsistence survival. [MACDONALD, p. 263] We are talking about desperate people who often enough stood to perish from their web of increasing debt.

“It was not luxury needs,” says Abram Leon, “but the direct distress which forced the peasant or the artisan to borrow from the Jewish usurer. They pawned their working tools which were often indispensable to assure their livelihood. It is easy to understand the hatred that the man of the people must have felt for the Jew in whom he saw the direct cause of his ruin … [LEON, p. 171] In this role as petty usurers exploiting the people, [Jews] were often victims of bloody uprisings…” [LEON, p. 83] [uprisings that were] “first and foremost efforts to destroy the letters of credit which were in [Jewish] possession.” [LEON, p. 171]

In 1431, for instance, armed peasants demanded that the city of Worms surrender its Jews to them, “in view of the fact that they had ruined [the peasants] and taken away their last shirt.” [LEON, p. 172]

Usury was in fact considered immoral by Jews too. The great Jewish theologian, Maimonides, wrote “why is [usury] called nesek [biting]? Because he who takes it bites his fellow, causes pain to him, and eats his flesh.” [MINKIN, p. 362] Usury was forbidden to Jews, as well as Christians, in the Old Testament. (The Islamic Quran also expressly states its prohibition of “interest.”) But there was a qualifier. Jews conjured a double moral standard; usury upon others in their own community was prohibited, but usury upon non-Jews was acceptable. The Torah states that one cannot practice usury upon a brother, but can to a stranger. [DEUTERONOMY, 23:20] Who is a brother and who is a stranger? “Brother,” in Jewish religious teachings means “Jew.” “Stranger” is anyone else.

St. Ambrose (339-397), the bishop of Milan and writer whose works influenced later medieval Christian thinking, “considered lending to a stranger a legitimate hostile act against an enemy.” [BARON, p. 53] St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), a well-known Christian theologian of his time, sounded an idealized, universalized Christian ethic about the Deuteronomic double standard:
“The Jews were forbidden to take usury from their brethren, i.e., from other Jews. By this we are given to understand that to take usury from another man is simply evil, because we ought to treat every man as our neighbor and brother…” [NELSON, p. 14]

“All Jewish converts [to Christianity] of early sixteenth century Germany,” says R. Po-Chia Hsia, “attacked the practice of Jewish money lending.” One convert, Johannes Pffeferkorn, argued that profits from usury was the main reason that Jews remained Jews, that they were reluctant to become Christians and do “honest work.” Another, Anton Margaritha, argued that such “honest work by Jews would humble them.” [HSIA, p. 172] (Conversely, in England, the Jewish “monopoly of usury brought them such wealth that some Christians undoubtedly went over to Judaism in order to participate in the Jewish monopoly in lending.”) [LEON, p. 140, quoting BRENTANO]

A double standard ethic was endemic to traditional Jewish teachings. The Old Testament laws were for the benefit of Jews, and it always aggravated relations with their non-Jewish neighbors. The medieval Christian world held open doors to Jewish converts to the purported universality of their own faith, but most Jews opted for their own perception of themselves as an elite group – God’s special Chosen People – despite the inevitable hazards that such a self-perception engendered from the surrounding non-Jewish communities. The old adage to avoid trouble, “When in Rome, do as the Romans do,” was studiously dismissed by Jews to the extreme. They were even permitted talmudic (religiously-founded) self-governance by Christian authorities and were only called to the greater laws of the state for extraordinary transgressions. This situation provided Jews the uninhibited capacity to act within favorable, double-standard, self-aggrandizing laws created for themselves against the wider society. As Jacob Katz notes:

“The belief that Jewish law was of divine origin, whereas Gentile law was purely a human invention, linked any evaluation with the most fundamental theological tenet of Judaism. The moral conduct of the Jew towards Gentiles, if it was not to be determined solely by expediency and prudence, could have been influenced only by principles derived exclusively from Jewish sources.” [KATZ, Ex, p. 59]

Israeli professor Ehud Sprinzak notes traditional Jewish perspective on the surrounding Gentile “law of the land” in Eastern Europe:

“Everyone knew everybody in the [Jewish community], and there was no need for official code or written law. The only formal law was the Torah and its halakhic interpretation as understood by the local rabbi … It was a basis communal conduct … (‘You help me, and I’ll you’) … The attitude towards the formal law of the land was suspicion … One has to survive it, not respect it. The art of Jewish survival within the ghetto included an elaborate system of using, avoiding, and sidestepping the [Gentile] law.” [SPRINZAK, Elite, p. 178]

Or, as James Yaffe puts it:

“The feeling of separation … leads to a special Orthodox morality. Ul-
timately because the moral value of every act is determined by halakhah, by Jewish law, they develop a rather cavalier attitude toward ‘gentile’ law. For example, a tiny minority of Hasidim [in America today] engage in jewelry smuggling. In the shtetl [Jewish Eastern European village] this was a traditional trade. Nobody looked upon it as a crime, because nobody recognized the existence of national borders; the only borders that mattered were those that divided the Jewish from the gentile world.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 120]

The combination of insular self-governance, their languages of Hebrew and/or Yiddish, and self-imposed isolation, also inferred (and was in fact understood by Jews to be) a Jewish “sub-nationality” within the broader Christian state. This too was much resented by the indigenous European populace. It was a politically volatile situation. Each faith, the majority Christian and minority Judaic, was entrenched in its respective belief system, each implicitly hostile to the other, with the only significant intercourse between them being the world of commerce, a field in which Jews were rapidly building, despite their small numbers – through trade and the hated usury – a profound advantage.

In this context of mutual hostility, Jacob Katz paraphrases the sociologist Max Weber with regards to the Jewish community’s “extreme” use of its moral double standard in its treatment of non-Jews, commercially or otherwise:

“[While it is a] universal phenomena… [that] members of any cohesive social unit observe … different moral standards among themselves from those observed by it in relation to strangers, [the sociologist Max Weber] was right in depicting the medieval Jewish community as an extreme case in point…” [KATZ p. 56]

Bearing in mind that the only interaction Jews really had with Christians in this era was in the realm of commerce, this double standard – ethically treating Jews one way, and Gentiles the other – is again highlighted by Katz:

“No moral teaching could change the realities of religious rivalry, social segregation, and the plurality of legal systems. All these must have encouraged a double standard of behavior. Those who were reluctant to be guided by the higher morality had the letter of the law on their side.” [KATZ, p. 61]

For the Jewish part, Katz’s referral to “the letter of the law” is their sacred Talmud, and other Jewish teachings which “are far from forming the elements of a universalistic ethic. They took social duality for granted,” [KATZ, Ex, p. 63] which is a delicate way of saying that Jewish religious teachings were commonly interpreted to sanction the exploitation of non-Jews.

It is hard to miss the intention of the Talmud, or misinterpret its noble meaning, or “pilpul” it into something other than what it is, when it says:

“Rabbi Shemeul says advantage may be taken of the mistakes of a Gentile. He once bought a gold plate as a copper one of a Gentile for four zouzim, and then cheated him out of one zouzim in the bargain. Rav Cahana purchased a hundred and twenty vessels of wine from a Gentile for a hun-
dred zouzim, and swindled him in the payment out of one of the hundred, and that while the Gentile assured him that he confidently trusted his honesty. Rava once went shares with a Gentile and bought a tree, which was cut up into logs. This done, he bade, his servants to go pick out the largest logs, but to be sure to take no more than the proper number, because the Gentile knew how many there were. As Rav Ashi was walking abroad one day he saw some grapes growing in a roadside vineyard, and sent his servant to see whom they belonged to. ‘If they belong to a Gentile,’ he said, ‘bring some here to me, but if they belong to an Israelite, do not meddle with them.’ The owner, who happened to be in the vineyard, overheard the Rabbi’s order and called out, ‘What? Is it lawful to rob a Gentile?’ ‘Oh, no,’ said the Rabbi evasively, ‘a Gentile might sell, but an Israelite would not.’” [HARRIS, p. 182, BAVA KAMA, Fol. 113, col. 2]

This is to be found in Jewish religious texts. Likewise, this:

“When an Israelite and a Gentile have a lawsuit before them, if they canst, acquit the former according to the laws of Israel, and tell the latter such is our laws; if they cannot get him off in accordance with Gentile law, do so, and say to the plaintiff such is your law; but if he cannot be acquitted according to either law, then bring forward adroit pretext and secure his acquittal. These are the words of Rabbi Ishmael. Rabbi Akiva says, ‘No false pretext should be brought forward, because if found out, the name of God would be blasphemed, but if there be no fear of that, then it may be adduced.’” [HARRIS, p. 31, BAVA KAMA, Fol. 113 col. 1]

“The economic behavior of the Jew,” wrote the great sociologist Max Weber, “simply moved in the direction of the least resistance which was permitted them by [their] legalistic ethical norms. This means in practice that the acquisitive drive, which is found in varying degrees in all groups and nations, was here directed primarily to trade with strangers [i.e., non-Jews], who were usually regarded as enemies.” [WEBER, p. 254]

In medieval Poland, “the limitations upon non-Jews [by Jewish law and culture] were … stringent,” notes Bernard Weinryb,

“Being outsiders in the Jewish community they were subject to all the prescriptions applying to foreigners. Thus Jewish middlemen and agents were forbidden to put one non-Jewish businessman in contact with another or to bring a non-Jewish consumer into a non-Jewish store. Many warnings were issued to such agents against showing non-Jews ‘how to do business’ or divulging Jewish business secrets to him … Jews were forbidden to rent a room to a non-Jew … Another area controlled by the Jewish community was rents and leaseholds. In time … monopolistic tendencies increased among the Jews … The fact remained that the monopolistic-exclusion principles were also an integral part of the Jewish way of life and could thus not be regarded as a constant anti-Semitic factor directly solely against themselves.” [WEINRYB, p. 159]

In an overview of Polish history, another Jewish scholar, Eva Hoffman, notes
“that the Jews had their views of the people among whom they lived we cannot doubt, but their ordinary opinions, ideas, and preconceptions are largely inaccessible to us, since almost no secular Jewish literature is extant for the early period. We do know, however, that Jews had their exclusionism and monopolistic practices, prohibiting rights of residence to outsiders in their quarters, and strictly guarded certain business practices and ‘secrets’ from non-Jews … We can take it for granted, moreover, that fierce religious disapproval traveled both ways [between Jews and Poles] … At the same time, unlike other minority groups, Jews had no wish to assimilate, to take on the coloring of the surrounding culture, to become like the other.” [HOFFMAN, E., 1997, p. 45]

Strict adherence to Jewish laws and values by even the most corrupt of Jewry was typical of the Jewish underclass of Europe’s Middle Ages who found in their religious beliefs sanction for their predations on Gentiles. “Despite all their depravity,” says Mordechai Breuer, “members of the Jewish robber bands lived as Jews and generally adhered to traditional Jewish life styles and customs. As a rule, they did not undertake any expedition on the Sabbath [Saturday] and kept the dietary laws.” [BREUER, in MAYER, p. 249]

“Jewish bandits stole almost exclusively from Christians,” notes Otto Ulbrichtl, “No breaking into houses of Court Jews or representatives of the Jewish community or synagogues (in contrast to the many burglarized churches) were reported.” [ULBRICHT, p. 62]

Florike Egmond’s historical work about organized crime in the Netherlands (1650-1800) notes the following:

“[There was] picking pockets, the theft of textiles and gold or silver, and church robbery with its concomitant violence against priests and clergy. None of these was the exclusive domain of Jews, who were involved in various other subcategories of theft and burglary as well, but in these particular offences Jews were especially prominent … [EGMOND, p. 108] … Some Jewish groups specialized in church robbery … From 1680 to 1795 the robbery of churches and priests and clergy was the nearly exclusive domain of Jews … [EGMOND, p. 109] … Jews robbed not only Roman Catholic priests but Protestant ones too. It looks rather as if most Christian thieves stayed away from all churches, while Jewish thieves selected churches for more reasons that just convenience.” [EGMOND, p. 110]

In pre-Holocaust Poland and Russia, notes Yiddish expert Abraham Brumberg, Jewish thieves, pimps, and prostitutes developed a rich folklore of hundreds of songs, mostly in this tenor:

“I go into the street
I open a door
I spot a fur coat
I invite it to go with me.” [LESTER, p. 36]

Such a world view that callously preys upon surrounding Gentile society was apparently not considered to be incongruous with the fundamental tenets
of Judaism. As Brumberg notes, ‘Many who subscribed to these [thieving] values considered themselves God-fearing and had their own synagogues.” [LESTER, p. 36] [This we shall run across again]

There is a tradition of Yiddish criminal songs in Eastern Europe:

“The two large cities of Warsaw and Odessa ‘boasted’ of a strong Jewish underworld which lived by its own laws, and the songs in this category are varied and vivid, revealing the sentiments of the criminal world in the Pale (area of Czarist Russia where Jews were permitted to live). In many ways, these songs are similar to those of the non-Jewish world on themes that dealt with the life and pursuits of housebreakers, pickpockets, hijackers, counterfeiters, extortionists, gangsters, pimps and even murderers. These are genuine folk songs, products of anonymous singers, actual persons who daily evaded the police, faced the hostility of the respectable community, quarreled and brawled among themselves, experienced the dangers and pleasures of their ‘chosen profession.’” [RUBIN, R., 1979]

In 1939 Chaim Kaplan, a German-born Jew, noted the Jewish émigrés at the Russian-Polish border where 2,000 Jews were given a monetary advance by the Soviet government for a work project in the Soviet hinterlands: “To our shame, only 800 returned to accept the work and take the journey – the rest disappeared without a trace. They simply expressed their gratitude to the Soviet government, which had extended its protection and opened its borders to them, with trickery. There were also incidents of stealing from private people. Polish-born Jews are rather high-handed in matters of ‘yours’ and ‘mine,’ and if they don’t actually steal, they ‘take’ … There can be no atonement for such shameful behavior. It reflects on the character of an entire people.” [KAPLAN, C., p. 90]

Jews were popularly perceived in medieval (and even up to modern Europe) as either ostentatiously wealthy parvenus or predatory small time thieves, with considerable moral overlap between them. Both groups were significant players in local economies with the Jewish upper-class and underclass often linked in economic exploitation of the non-Jewish communities around them. “From Court Jews to peddler,” says Jonathan Israel, “those divergent groupings penetrated and depended on each other economically, as well as in religion and commercial life. It would be idle to deny that there was exploitation as well as collaboration and interdependence, but such exploitation existed on all levels and operated in all ways.” [ULBRICHT, p. 59]

One of the privileges that Jews often sought and acquired from European aristocracies in the Middle Ages was the right to demand full payment from aggrieved owners when stolen objects found their way into Jewish hands for sale. This caused deep resentment amongst the Gentile population; it was often charged that this policy paved the way for lucrative Jewish “fencing” operations where stolen goods could regularly find their ways to Jewish shops and hiding spots in the their community. [BARON EHOJ, p. 42] These Jewish agents of receivership were called in Hebrew ba’al ha-davar, literally meaning ‘wire pullers,’ figuratively meaning “Masters of the Affair.” [BREUER, p. 249]
Florike Egmond notes the same kinds of Jewish fencing operations in the eighteenth century in the Netherlands:

“Two equally salient characteristics of Jewish organized crime [were] its near monopoly on the buying and selling of stolen goods and the central importance of towns to all its activities … [EGMOND, p. 115] … The near monopoly of Jews in the fencing business indirectly contributed to the prominence of other Jews in organized crime … [EGMOND, p. 116] … The period between about 1740 and 1765 can be regarded as the phase of expansion of Jewish crime. After that Jewish involvement in organized crime continued at a consistently high level.” [EGMOND, p. 119]

Although based in urban areas, Jewish bands were highly mobile and also preyed on those in the countryside. “Jews involved in organized crime in the Netherlands,” adds Egmond, “were often active in retail trade … Extensive travelling also meant numerous contacts with other Jewish peddler.” [EGMOND, p. 123] Eventually, common self-protective interests brought some Jewish, Gypsy and Christian criminals together. Egmond notes, however, that “most Christians who joined Jewish bands, whether they acted as occasional assistants or as experienced members” were always considered “outsiders.” [EGMOND, p. 145] In the case of one crime ring, the “Great Dutch Band,” a band of mixed ethnicity, it was formed by Moyse Jacob “who played a central role in bringing together the various criminal circuits of the Dutch Republic within a more permanent organizational structure.” [EGMOND, p. 148] In the Great Dutch Band’s first (Brabant) “branch,” two-thirds of its sixty members were Jews; in its second branch (the Meerssen Band), two-thirds of its sixty members were also Jewish; and 16 of 25 people were Jewish in the Band’s third expression. In the fourth, Jews were a quarter of the group. “The first [branch],” notes Egmond, “set the pattern with respect to criminal specialization, leadership, and forms of organization. All the principal commanders had been instructed (and probably selected) by Moyse Jacob himself.” They were also all Jewish. [EGMOND, p. 149]

In a volume about Polish peasant society, William Thomas and Florian Znaiecki note that

“The Jewish shopkeeper in a [Polish] peasant village is usually also a liquor dealer without license, a banker lending money at usury, often also a receiver of stolen goods and (near the border) a contrabandist. The peasant needs, and fears, him, but at the same time despises him always and hates him often. The activities of those country shopkeepers is the source of whatever anti-Semitism there is in the peasant masses. We have seen in the documents the methods by which the shopkeeper teaches the peasant boy smoking, drinking, and finally stealing; the connection established in youth lasts sometimes into maturity, almost every gang of peasant thieves or robbers centers around some Jewish receiver’s place, where the spoils are brought and new campaigns planned. Gangs composed exclusively of Jews are frequent in towns, rare in the
country; usually Jews manage only the commercial side of the questions, leaving robbing or transporting of contraband to peasants.” [THOMAS/ZNAIECKI, p. 1200-1201]

Jewish itinerants (perhaps 10% of the Jewish population in Germany in the Middle Ages), as well as Jewish thieves, and robbers were common in European life. Evidence of Christian criminals’ linkage to the Jewish economic underworld is reflected in the fact that “some 20%” of the vernacular for illicit activity in the jargon of non-Jewish criminals contained words and terms derived from Yiddish and Hebrew. [BREUER, p. 248]

Oklahoma professor Stan Nadel notes the reason for the spreading of Yiddish criminal terms into the English language across the world:

“It seems that [the Yiddish word] gonef (sometimes gonnoff, hence the false etymology) entered American and English slang via what is known as thieves’ cant. One of the traditional occupations for Jews in Europe and America was as pawnbrokers. That is an occupation which tends to bridge the border between the criminal and business worlds. At the margin, the line between pawnbroker and fence (handler of stolen goods) is often obscured and some Jews played and important part in the criminalized underground of large cities … I had assumed [the term gonef] moved into American English from German Jewish immigrants in New York (like [famous Jewish criminal] Mrs. Mandelbaum) until I learned it was also present in 18th century London thieves’ cant. Then I was told by a specialist on the 18th century London underworld that Jewish fences played a key role in linking the London underworld with markets in Amsterdam (he says they claimed they could fence anything, including the crown jewels), and that this is the source of Yiddish loan words in English thieves cant.” [NADEL, S., 6-18-98]

But, as we will increasingly find, it was not only the Jewish vagabonds, unscrupulous shopkeepers, or exploitive upper strata Court Jews who played the role of swindler with the Gentiles. No less an authority than Heinrich Graetz, one of the greatest Jewish historians whose History of the Jews was a pioneer work, had this to say, generally, about the Jews in Poland. It was a mainstream ethic

“to twist a phrase out of its meaning, to use all the tricks of the clever advocate, to play upon words, and to condemn what they did not know … Such were the characteristics of the Polish Jew. … Honesty and right thinking he lost as completely as simplicity and truthfulness. He made himself master of all the gymnastics of the Schools (of religious interpretations) and applied them to obtain advantage over any one less cunning than himself. He took a delight in cheating and overreaching which gave him a sort of joy of victory. But his own people he could not treat in this way: they were as knowing as he. It was the non-Jew, to his loss, that felt the consequences of the Talmudically trained mind of Polish Jew.” [GRAETZ, v.10, p. 62, 82]

Israeli professor Jay Goren recalls the Jacob-Esau tradition, where Jacob, the Jewish cheater/deceiver, is heroized in Jewish tradition, noting:
“As we may recall, Jacob the tent dweller, who used his head, outsmarted Esau, the skilled hunter, who uses his hands, and cheated Esau out of his inheritance, Isaac’s blessing. The blessing was the birthright of Esau by virtue of his being the firstborn child. In Jewish tradition, Jacob came to symbolize the Jews and Esau the Gentiles. Thus, an image of contrasting roles were formed whereby the Jews were supposed to use their heads and the Gentiles their muscles.” [GOREN, p. 135]

The Israeli author Israel Shahak in 1994 argued that Orthodox Judaism is, in its very construct, motivated by “a combination of hypocrisy and the profit motive.” Even in Israel today, secular Jews look with disdain upon the Orthodox religious community for its “duplicity and venality.” “It is actually true,” Shahak writes, “that the Jewish religious establishment does have a strong tendency to chicanery and graft due to the corrupting influence of the Orthodox Jewish religion.” [SHAHAK, p. 48] [See Jewish drug money laundering p. 1087]

The great German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, echoes Graetz and Shahak in his own observations of the Jewish community:

“[The Jews], living among us, or at least the greatest number of them, have through their usurious spirit … received the not unfounded reputation as deceivers … They do not seek civil honor, but rather wish to compensate their loss by profitably outwitting the very people among whom they find protection … We may suppose that their dispersion throughout the world, with their unity in religion and language, must not be attributed to a curse that had been afflicted upon this people. On the contrary, the dispersion must be considered a blessing, especially since the wealth of the Jews, if we think of them as individuals, apparently exceeds per capita that of any other nation at the present time. [KANT, p. 101-102]

A well-known French Jewish socialist (and later Zionist), Bernard Lazare, addressed this issue of Jewish morality in 1894:

“The moral charge of the anti-Semite [is that] the Jew is more dishonest than the Christian; he is entirely unscrupulous, a stranger to loyalty and candor. Is this charge well founded? It was true and is true in all those countries where the Jew is kept outside of society; where he receives only the traditional Talmudic education…. The Talmud and anti-Judaic legislation [in Gentile societies] united to corrupt the Jew to his very depths. Impelled by his teachers on the one hand, by hostile forces on the other, by many social causes besides, to the exclusive occupation of commerce and usury, the Jew became degraded. The pursuit of wealth ceaselessly prosecuted, debauched him, weakened the voice of conscience within him, taught him habits of fraud.” [LAZARE, p. 164]

This ethic was of course brought by Jews, particularly from Eastern Europe, to America. As Jewish commentator James Yaffe notes: “The Lower East Side [the turn-of-the-century Jewish section of Manhattan] pushcart peddler who prided himself on his honesty wouldn’t hesitate to sell damaged goods to the gentile housewife.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 68] Max Weber notes this quality in
Jewish identity through history, referring to it as “the dualistic nature of [Judaism’s] in-group and out-group moralities.” [POLL, S., 1969, p. v]

As Mary Antin, a Jewish immigrant to the United States from Russia, once observed in her autobiography, *The Promised Land*:

“[Jewish merchants and money lenders] preyed upon [Christians], and our shopkeepers gave false measure. People who want to defend the Jews ought never to deny this. Yes, I say, we cheated the Gentiles whenever we dared, because it was the only thing to do ... Is not that the code of war? Encamped in the midst of the enemy, we could practice no other. A Jew could hardly exist in business unless he developed a dual conscience, which allowed him to do to the Gentile what he would call a sin against a fellow Jew.” [TRAXEL, D., 1998, p. 29]

Many modern Jewish apologists refute such exposure and criticism of traditional Jewish double standard of morality. As we have seen, when caught in the act of deceit there are religious texts that recommend explaining it quickly somehow away. Jules Carlebach, for example, argues that a “dual morality” – if, in his view, it ever existed – was no big deal; he likens the Jewish medieval communities in Europe to “independent political states,” saying:

“If an independent political state adopted legislation which is intended to further the interests of its citizens, but which has no parallel provisions in neighboring states, then it is both logical and essential to create a dual system.” [CARLEBACH, p. 224]

Jews had always closed ranks as a completely “foreign” body in mainstream Christian society. While some Jewish religious teachings certainly supported the notion that they should live in obedience with the laws of the host country they lived in, this was largely expedient and prudent for their own survival. Less supportive Jewish texts included prayers that anticipated the downfall of surrounding non-Jewish society. During Arab-Christian hostilities, for instance, Jews appealed to God to drain them both in war. They had a prayer, notes Salo Baron, “composed in the geonic period which was unheard of in any other period of Jewish history in the dispersion: ‘Be it Thy will, O Lord, that the Kings should wage war on one another.’” [BARON, ASOC&REL, p. 186]

Jewish communities in Europe, as insular self-entities always searching for their own best interests, had been known to betray non-Jewish lands in which they lived. Both Hebrew and Yiddish were Jewish languages that were impenetrable to most non-Jews. (For centuries rabbinical dictate even forbade the teaching of Hebrew to Gentiles). These “secret” languages tended to heighten non-Jewish suspicions of them. The Muslim invasion of Christian Spain was aided by the Spanish Jewish community who expected better treatment under Islamic rule. The French city of Bordeaux was believed by some to have been betrayed by Jews in 848 to invading Normans; the same charge was made against Jews for the fall of the French town of (Visigothic) Arles to Catholics. Poles charged Jews with abetting invading Swedes in the 17th century. [HAGEN, p. 23] In the 12th century, Byzantine Jews aided invading Turks (Constantinople was breached with help from – and through – the Jewish quar-
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ter); in the 17th century Spanish and Portuguese Jews intrigued with the Dutch. [MACDONALD, p. 64-65] On the other hand, in the early 1800s, when Napoleon invaded the Pale of Russia, “the pattern of German-Jewish behavior during the Napoleonic invasion was largely repeated in Russia.” [SACHAR, p. 79] The Jews, in other words, did nothing, laid low, and waited to see who was victorious. “With the exception of the Jewish community of Lithuania,” says Howard Sachar, “the citizens of the Pale were not obliged to commit themselves until the war was won.” [SACHAR, p. 79]

The Italian ambassador to Poland, Eugenio Reale, in 1946 wrote an analysis of the “Jewish question” in Poland:

“In effect, Polish Jews together with German Jews held a monopoly over all exports and imports of goods between Germany and Russia. Certain branches of manufacture in Poland were also under their control, particularly the textile industry in Lodz. It is of little wonder, then, that the Jews often manifested their true, undeniably existing feelings of solidarity with the Prussians. In Pomerania, during the 1848 insurrections, groups of Jews greeted the insurgents with shouts such as: ‘We do not want Poland, we are Prussians.’ Almost a half century later, during the Warsaw manifestations in favor of Polish autonomy in the Russian sphere, the Jews took a similar position against the demonstrators, shouting, “Why should Poland exist? Down with Poland! Down with the white eagle [the symbol of Poland].” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 46]

In Morocco under French rule, notes Nahum Goldmann, “the Jews were on such poor terms with the Arabs that they were nearly all pro-French – which brought them the hatred of those who aspired to independence.” In Algeria, also bucking under French colonialism, Jews “even had automatic French citizenship, unlike the non-Jews.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 48] Even in 1996, notes the American Jewish Yearbook, “Between 800 and 900 Jews were known to be living in Bosnia-Herzegovnia … During the [civil] war, about 300 people who before the fighting had not declared themselves as Jewish joined the Jewish community, presenting written documentation such as marriage or birth certificates. Before the war, these people had declared themselves as ‘Yugoslavs. Some of them remained in Bosnia-Herzegovina while others went to Israel.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 378]

The Jewish Diaspora community in Europe has been formally called to task by Christian authorities a number of times in history, including two momentous occasions to find out exactly what the Jews in their midst believed and where they morally, politically, socially, and religiously stood with regards to Gentiles. One of the most important accounts of such an occasion was in France in the year 1240. A Jewish apostate named Donin, Christianized to Nicholas de Rupella, well versed in Hebrew as a Talmudic scholar, claimed to Church officials that there were many elements in the Jewish teachings that were threatening to non-Jews. A public disputation was held between Donin and Rabbi Yehiel ben Joseph of Paris and as Jeremy Cohen notes about Hebrew records of the event: “Some modern writers have labeled the Hebrew protocol
[of the disputation] a prime example of literary polemic, using well-known forensic motifs to reinforce popular Jewish belief rather than actually reporting what occurred.” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 66]

Jacob Katz notes the infamous line in the Talmud that came up for public examination, stating “The best among Gentiles should be slain.” One can imagine that such a directive in Jewish religious texts, whatever its complex historical context as a part of intra-Jewish argument, exposed to Church leaders in Medieval society by a Jewish apostate, was not an easy one for the rabbis to explain away. Even Katz passes on its essential content, simply alluding to “whatever its meaning may be…” [KATZ, p. 108] M. K. Harris, in his book on Talmudic literature, adds an addenda to this opinion to “kill the best of the Gentiles.” “Modern editions,” notes Harris, “qualify this by adding ‘in time of war.’” [HARRIS, p. 191]

The intention of the Church inquiry was, of course, to squeeze out of Jewish religious texts the most self-condemnatory sounding material. Hence, some of what Katz calls the Talmud’s apparent “picture of extreme hostility on the part of the Jews towards their Christian neighbors” seemed nothing less than indicting:

“You have permitted [Jews] to shed the blood of Gentiles. ‘It is permitted to steal and plunder the Gentile’s possessions and (it is allowed) to cheat him.’ ‘Concerning the lost property of a Gentile, you say that it is forbidden to return it to him.’ The Gentile is suspected by the Jew of practicing fornication, adultery, and sodomy. The Jew is not allowed to make the Gentile any gift, nor is he even permitted to say, “How handsome this Gentile is;’ it is permitted to you to curse and to despise idolatry; and we are as despised in your eyes as locusts and flies.”” [KATZ, p. 107]

The way the rabbis weaseled out of the grim possibility of extremely serious repercussions for the Jewish community was to argue that such lines – although they truly exist in Jewish sacred texts – applied to Gentiles of antiquity, yes, but that Christians were now an exception. This position, says Katz, was “no more than an ad hoc device to be used in the course of controversy. There is no indication in the Talmud or in the later halakhic sources that such a view was ever held, or even proposed, by an individual halakhist. In fact, evidence to the contrary exists.” [KATZ, p. 110] Rabbis even tried to convince Christian interrogators that insults and degradations in the Talmud directed towards Jesus of Nazareth referred to a different Jesus because it was a common name! [POPPER, p. 10] As Rabbi Yehiel ben Joseph said in defense of the Talmudic texts that defamed Christ, “Not every Louis born in France is the king of France. Has it not happened that two men were born in the same city, had the same name, and died in the same manner? There are many such cases.” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 70] “The Jesus of the Talmud,” notes scholar Jeremy Cohen, “… is mentioned as condemned to wallow eternally in boiling excrement … When forced to admit that one talmudic passage mentioning the crimes of Jesus and his execution did indeed apply to the Christian Jesus, Yehiel still emphasized that the Tal-
mud was not responsible for maintaining this opinion among Jews.” [COHEN, J., 1982, p. 71]

The Jewish representatives also took great pains to distance themselves from traditional prayers that asked, as the apostate noted, for the end of the “unrighteous kingdom.” Did this mean the surrounding society in which the Jews currently lived? It did. This has always meant to Jews “the whole secular world and its entire political edifice” [KATZ, p. 112], but the Jewish defenders managed to convince their inquirers that the prayers alluded to the ancient powers of Biblical eras.

This formal inquiry evinced a renewed suspicion by the Church towards Jews, as well as an outside steerage of the Judaic faith – for their own safety – towards liberalization. “The Paris disputation,” says Katz, “marks a transition, from the comparative tolerance of the Catholic Church towards the Jewish faith to the harassing practice of scrutinizing and censuring Jewish customs and tenets. The same event assisted, or even compelled, the Jews to take a further step towards the idea of religious tolerance.” [KATZ, p. 113]

In 1806 a second group of Jewish community leaders were forced to again face a formal inquiry into their belief system by the greater society in which they lived. This convening again occurred in France, but this time it was at Napoleon’s insistence. The Jewish “Assembly of Notables,” and later an even more influential assemblage of Jewish leaders, the Sanhedrin, was presented with twelve written questions, upon whose answers their fate – as a community – was understood to rest. With the rise of the European nation states, conflicts between them, and with continued Jewish self-conception as a kind of subnational entity, Napoleon sought to confront the affluent and powerful parts of the Jewish community as to their ultimate political loyalties and allegiances.

Questions included:

• In the eyes of the Jews, are Frenchmen considered as brethren? Or are they considered strangers?
• In either case, what line of conduct does their law prescribe towards Frenchmen not of their religion?
• Do Jews born in France, and treated by the laws as French citizens, consider France as their country? Are they bound to defend it? Are they bound to obey the laws and to conform to the dispositions of the civil courts?
• Can a Jewess marry a Christian, and a Jew a Christian woman? Or does the law allow the Jews to intermarry only among themselves?
• Does Jewish law encourage Jews to practice usury among their own community?

The Jewish notables replied, after extended consultations, with an affirmation of Jewish loyalty to France and the brotherhood of all French citizens, complete with careful, cautioned, diplomatic explanation for all such replies. Napoleon’s emissary, Count Mole, was struck by what appeared to him to be evasive references: now to Moses, now to the Talmud, now to practical Jewish
usage. He was particularly suspicious of the answer on usury ... [but] Napoleon ... declared himself satisfied.” [SACHAR, p. 48] The Jewish answers to Napoleon – the compromises of both orthodox and secularly assimilated Jewish leaders – are, in retrospect, considered also by historians to have been largely evasive. The gulf between those who represented traditional Jewish teachings and the growing numbers of secularized Jews was great, but both – traditional and assimilative – HAD to figure out ways to give Napoleon the answers he wanted. This gulf is reflected in Jacob Katz’s view that

“Even learned Jews sincerely maintained that Judaism had always taught universalistic ethics only. When the ‘scientific’ anti-Semites of the 1880’s discovered and published the extracts from ancient Jewish authorities on which earlier anti-Semitism had been based, the general Jewish public was not only outraged but genuinely astonished ... Jewish leaders and scholars reconciled the contemporary views with the ancient authorities by resorting to apologetics.” [KATZ, p. 196]

Robert Goldenberg notes the long tradition of Jewish evasiveness when it comes to explaining the Talmud to non-Jews:

“[In the Middle Ages] Christians too studied the Talmud – often with the help of apostate Jews – and would then quote rabbinic authority in support of their own claims. Jews thus had to develop a double attitude toward the nonlegal aspect of the Talmud: when it was useful to them they cited it to refute the Christians’ claims, but when it weakened their position they felt free to repudiate it.” [GOLDENBERG, R., 1984, p. 164-165]

In our day, Jewish apologists, propagandists, and populists continue to proliferate, reaching back into rabbinical law to recreate a romantic vision of the historical record of Jewish morality towards others. “The fact that the Jews in general,” proclaims Nachum Gidal, in a polemic against Christianity, “were very ethical in their religion, family, and daily life was of little significance for the Christian community.” [GIDAL, p. 12] “At all times and in all places,” claims Meir Tamari, both a Talmudic scholar and the chief economist of the Bank of Israel, “Jews were encouraged, especially in the economic field, to go beyond the letter of the law and to that which was more merciful than required, even though the rabbinical authorities could not naturally enforce such kindness.” [TAMARI, p.]

Or, as Jacob Neusner rhapsodizes:

“It is ethical for a Jew to guide the frail old lady across a busy street, it is also ethical for a Boy Scout to do so. And so being Jewish and being a Boy Scout functionally are pretty much the same thing.” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 75]
So great is the Jewish “commercial spirit,” so omnipresent, and so much part of Jewish religious teachings themselves, that, beginning in the 19th century, many Jews socializing into “civil” Christian society found themselves embarrassed by the crass behavior that resounded from the Orthodox synagogues. “There were many modern, acculturated Jews,” observes Howard Sachar, “who were increasingly repelled by the synagogue’s cacophony: the nasal singing, the selling of prayers, the gossiping of women in the gallery, the absence of decorum.” [SACHAR, p. 159]

“In Judaism,” says Martin Sklare, “there is no sharp division between the sacred and secular, and consequently little development of separate norms in each area. This system conflicts with the Christian – and American – one which distinguishes between the sacred and profane, defines which situations belong to each category, and provides for special behavior.” [SKLARE]

In other words, in Orthodox Judaism everything anywhere may be “profaned;” there is no physical sanctuary – including a synagogue – from the ubiquitous prowl of economic exploits (the Sabbath – the day of rest – is, for the religious, the exceptions). Jay Gonen notes an old joke about Jewish obsession with money even in religious contexts, circulated not by Gentile anti-Semites, but by Jews in Israel:

“Two Jews, by a miracle, find time to pause and reflect in front of a holy site, the Wailing Wall, or the western wall of the Second Temple. One of them notices that the other is weeping profusely over the destruction of the Second Temple. ‘Why are you crying so much?’ he says, ‘True, the Temple has been destroyed, but the lot is still worth something.’” [GONEN, p. 27]

Jewish comedian Joan Rivers explains materialist and ostentatious Jewish identity this way: “I’m Jewish. If God wanted me to exercise he would’ve put diamonds on the floor.” [SAPOSNIK, 1998]

One of Jewish comedian Milton Berle’s jokes went: “A Jewish youngster asked the boy next door to play with him. The boy answered, ‘My father says I can’t play with you because you’re Jewish.’ The Jewish lad answered, ‘Oh, that’s all right. We won’t play for money.’” [BERLE, M., 1996, p. 311] Or, “The Israelis have just developed a brand-new car. It not only stops on a dime, it picks it up.” [BERLE, M., 1996, p. 305] And: “Why did the Israelis win the Six-Day War?” “Because the equipment was rented.” [BERLE, M., 1996, p. 305]
“And then there was the Jewish Santa Claus. He came down the chimney and said: ‘Hi, kids. Want to buy some presents?’” [BLOOMFIELD, p. 29]

Another joke even addresses manipulation of anti-materialist notions of respect in the Gentile world towards Jewish economic advancement:

“A wealthy Boston Brahmin was on his deathbed. The end was near, and he asked his three business partners, a Catholic, a Protestant, and a Jew, to come to the hospital to discuss some matters pertaining to his estate. ‘You boys know I have no family,’ he began, ‘so I’m dividing my wealth among the three of you, in three equal shares. As a sign of your good friendship, however, I would like each of you to make a token gesture after I’m gone, by putting a thousand dollars into my coffin before it is lowered into the ground.’

Several days later, the funeral was conducted according to the wishes of the deceased. At the appropriate time, the Catholic friend walked up to the coffin and placed in it an envelope containing one thousand dollars. The Protestant friend came forward and did likewise. Finally, the Jew walked up to the coffin, took out the two envelopes, and replaced them with a check for three thousand dollars.” [NOVAK/WALDOKS, 1981, p. 95]

As always in Jewish folklore, Gentiles are – to the wily, down-to-earth Jew – stupid.

William Novak and Moshe Waldoks call the following joke “a favorite, found in most collections of Jewish humor”:

“A minister, a rabbi, and a priest were discussing how they made use of the funds in the collection plate. The minister said, ‘I draw a line on the floor, and I throw the money into the air. Everything that lands to the right of the line is for God; everything on the left is for me.’

‘That’s pretty much what I do,’ said the priest. ‘But instead of a line, I draw a circle. Everything in the circle is for God; everything outside the circle I keep for myself.’

‘I, too, have a system,’ said the rabbi, ‘I take the money and throw it up in the air, and whatever God catches He can keep.” [NOVAK/WALDOKS, 1981, p. 95]

Such observations about Jewish values are acceptable, and common, within the Jewish community itself but, as Jewish scholar Nancy Jo Silberman-Federman notes, such a joke told from a Gentile would flag him or her as an anti-Semite. She notes the self-deprecating (and/or exploitive) tone of many Hanukkah cards sent by Jews to each other:

“[In one case] the front of the card pictures a Jewish woman hugging Santa. The copy reads, ‘Merry Christmas! Thank goodness for Gentiles.’ The inside reads, ‘Somebody has to buy retail!’ If certain jokes are told by non-Jews, both the teller and the joke would be considered anti-Semitic … This [celebrating of such jokes in Jewish circles] may be seen socially as a mechanism for in-group solidarity.” [SILBERMAN-FEDERMAN, p. 220]
Whereas in most – if not all – other religious faiths, adherents seek physical refuge from the anchors of materialist concern while they pray, in Orthodox Judaism, overt pecuniary transactions – involving personal egos and status assertion – are an integral part of the traditional Jewish religious service itself. Jewish sociologist Martin Sklare calls it “commercialism in the synagogue.” This includes “shenodering, the pledging of money for the opportunity of participating in the Torah service…, the holding of auctions during holidays and festival services for the purpose of ‘selling’ certain particularly honorific privileges; by stimulating competitive instincts, large amounts may be pledged; and the Yom Kippur appeal: fund raising which takes place during Kol Nidre, a particularly holy service.” [SKLARE, p. 363]

To traditional Christian – and other religious temperaments – such vulgarization in a “House of God” inevitably calls to mind the old Christian story of Jesus becoming outraged at the Israelite money changers on Temple grounds. [Matt. 21:12-13; Mark 11: 15-17; Luke 19: 45-46] What kind of religion, non-Jews have found themselves asking through history, is this?

In modern times, of course, to ask such a question is to attract assault as an “anti-Semite.” And, however bizarre, Jewish scholar Sara Horowitz’s comments, post Holocaust, in linking Jesus’ outrage at Jewish money-dealing in the sacred Temple to the Nazi persecution of Jewry is typical:

“The New Testament [has] multiple descriptions of Jews defiling the Temple and Jesus’ consequent need to purify the holy space by throwing out the Jewish money changers … Historically, the image of the Jewish money changer whose presence defiles sacred space conlates with Jews as money lender, with the typing of the Jew as materialist and avaricious. Jewish attachment to money over attachment to God, to nation, or to other people is repeatedly portrayed in Nazi propaganda newsreels and feature films.” [HOROWITZ, p. 125]

But even when the Zionist “father” of modern Israel, Theodore Herzl, visited (in the late 19th century) the famed Jerusalem Wailing Wall, the supposed last remaining edifice of the ancient Temple itself, so revered in Jewish religious tradition and a magnet to Jewish pilgrims, he could only write with disdain that “we have been to the Wailing Wall. A deeper emotion refused to come, because that place is pervaded by a hideous, wretched, speculative beggary.” [HERZL, in PATAI, p. 746-747]

Isaac Baer Levinsohn describes the Eastern European synagogue of the nineteenth century:

“Each … synagogue abides by … only general disorder … This [person] jumps while another shouts; this one moans his loss while another one complacently smokes … One has just begun his prayer as another has finished it … this one jokes and pulls another by the ear. Quarrels and fisticuffs often ensue about private as well as public matters … One aspires to be the sixth to come up to the Torah, another seeks the honor of taking the Torah out of the Ark and often they quarrel on that account.” [SACHAR, p. 217]
As many Jews, leaving their ghettos and Orthodox Judaism in the 19th century attuned themselves to surrounding Christian “civil” society, many became concerned about “embarrassing solicitations” in the synagogue. One American Conservative Judaism publication even chastised its community, saying:

“There is no charitable expression in the English language that can connote the desecration of a Torah honor and the degradation of a House of Worship into a market place of vulgar vanities and rude commercialism.” [SKLARE, p. 363]

Sklare describes Orthodox religious gatherings:

“The Orthodox shul with the accompanying multidinous prayers, jams of people and children, all joined together in a cacophonous symphony of loud and sometimes raucous appeals to the Almighty.” [SKLARE, p. 372]


“the Hasidim [ultra-Orthodox Jews] noticed the great tendency to imitate the non-Jews. Jewish weddings had bridal processions. The groom was led in by his own parents; the rabbi also participated in the bridal procession; ushers attended the ceremony; the rabbi made a speech during the ceremony; pictures were taken – many times, movies. All these appeared to the Hasidim as mockeries and imitation of the goyim to which they vehemently objected.” [POLL, 1969, p. 41]

Martin Sklare notes that one of the major affectations in the creation of the modern Conservative Judaism movement was a change toward “decorum.” In Orthodox Judaism, he notes, “should a worshipper consistently adopt what would generally be considered a reverent demeanor … his deportment might well be the subject of intense criticism … The form of Orthodox worship does seem to be almost unique in its lack of solemnity.” [SKLARE, p. 361]

The novelist Herman Wouk wrote with fondness about his memories of Orthodox synagogue culture brought to America with Jews from Eastern Europe:

“Calls to the Torah, opening of the Ark, and so forth, all went for a price. The auctions were colorful and exciting enough, but the mood of prayer naturally vanished while they went on. They were often pretty long. During the reading of the Torah, moreover, it became the practice of each man, as he was called to his aliya, or reading turn, to announced his contribution to the synagogue’s many charities. For each announcement he or his family received a public blessing by the shamas. Again this was a process of high economic value, but not attuned to the thoughts of the higher world … They enabled many tiny congregations to survive and grow into majestic congregations and fashionable temples. With the prospering of the Jewish community, these devices of desperation have gradually given way to conventional fund raising.
‘Five dollars for the third reading!’ Nor do I want to forget the historic auction one Yom Kippur afternoon nearly forty years ago, in a synagogue in a Bronx cellar, when my father outbid men with far more money (though they were all poor struggling immigrants) for the reading of the Book of Jonah ... These auctions are a thing of the past and it is better so, but they served a purpose. Children in such synagogues learned unmistakably what a precious thing a call to the Torah was.” [WOUK, p. 123-125]

The value of the Torah would seem to suggest a price tag. Auctioning off the rights to recite prayers and announcing in public, each in turn, individuals’ charitable contributions reveals a lot more about Jewish merchant culture – and its pressures, struggles for community status, and symbiotic religious dogma – than it does anything remotely spiritual. Wouk’s fond memories for all the big bills flying around the Torah in his synagogue (albeit for religious intention) reflect a nakedly material concern. Such activity reaffirms what the Torah was largely intended as: recipes, rules, and regulations for Jewish self-advancement in a hostile political world, or – as apologists like to frame it – communal survival through the centuries. Wouk’s childhood memories of high auction recitation prices confirming the Torah’s value are obviously rooted in pride for his father and his status as an economic victor, as well as a general fascination with the wheeling and dealing of a street bazaar. Even the synagogue could function as a forum to celebrate human vanity in one’s ability to pay for something, in this case the right to recite sacred texts. (Synagogue members have even been sued in recent years for not paying membership dues. In Rockaway, New York, for example, in 2001 David Slossberg and three others were sued for back payment by the White Meadow Temple.) [GOLDWERT, M., 1-5-01] “Conspicuous charity,” wrote Judith Kramer and Seymour Levantman about the Jewish American community in 1961, “is less a matter of religious or ideological commitment than a conventional social obligation serving as a source of status.” [KRAMER, p. 101]

Anthony Polonsky notes the Jewish tradition of “ostentatious generosity” in seventeenth century Poland:

“Was this piety on the part of a few rich individuals shared by all Jews? To answer this question clearly, one must study the religious attitudes of the time. It seems that participation in services was motivated more by a desire to shine in public than by profound faith. If previously a synagogue seat was a sign of respectability in the community, now unfortunately they were being sold. Indeed, the practice of buying seats, backed by a deed of sale became common.” [POLONSKY, p. 59]

For an Eastern European Jewish community ever fixated upon worldly accomplishment and the hierarchical status of respective members, even in their most holy religious center “the prosteh yidh [common Jews] sat at the back of the synagogue.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 74]

In the late 1950s the American Jewish poet, D. A. Levy, wrote:

My father and i
went to a temple to hear
the services
sat down in time
to hear the haunting
language for just a moment
when someone told us we had to stand in the
back - we had chosen ‘reserved seats’
seats that had been paid for
we left and it was there i completed
my external jewish education [PORTER, p. 126]

As James Yaffe observed in 1968:

“The synagogue charges no admissions fee to services, except on High Holy Day, Yom Kippur and Rosh Hoshanah, when everybody comes to worship. Then most synagogues require worshipers to buy tickets, and many sell reserved seats; the closer to the altar, the higher the price … ‘Passing the plate’ is not a custom in the synagogue. Sometimes a plain white envelope is left on the worshiper’s seat. Inside he finds a slip of paper with his name on it, and a list of suggested contributions, from twenty dollars up; he will put a check next to the amount her prefers, and slip the piece of paper back into the envelope. In old-fashioned Orthodox synagogues the method is often less decorous; the rabbi reads out the member’s names, and each man is expected to call out how much he intends to give.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 154]

Jewish student Silja Talvi complains about this Jewish tradition of charging steep admission to the most sacred of Jewish holy days (she blames “capitalism” for this custom, however, and rationalizes that the high prices are somehow useful in keeping “psychopathic anti-Semites” out of synagogues):

“It is not a stretch to surmise that many more established synagogues have taken their cues from the capitalist economy that surrounds them, having arrived at the point of valuing finances about kehilla [community]. For all this kvetching about all the lost, unaffiliated Jews, how many among the country’s mainstream Jewish religious leadership have stopped to think about dropping cost-prohibitive barriers to getting in through the front door? … In this regard, Jewish religious institutions would do well to take inspiration from the Lubavitchers and Christian churches alike: Free admission, fund-raising drives and donation baskets have a certain logical and friendly appeal, especially for those unaffiliated, lower-income Jews who have reason to feel uneasy about spending close to $100 to be allowed a seat at a temple to spend the day or evening in prayer. Non-Jews who have overheard me in conversation about the fees involved in obtaining tickets for Jewish holiday services have expressed confusion at the very existence of fee schedules and entrance tickets. The tickets, I explain, are a necessary and common-sense precaution for Jewish institutions that hope to make it more difficult for psychopathic anti-Semites to walk through their doors. But why the high cost, they ask? For once, I don’t have a good answer.” [TALVI, S., 2001]
Convert to Judaism Lydia Kukoffmnn explains the Jewish idea of “paying to pray” like this:

“I remember how put off I was at the thought of tickets for religious services. It was so foreign to my way of thinking. Over the years, however, I have come to realize that, although I may still resist the idea of paying to pray, it is the onetime of the year when the temple is able to assure its continuity, and thereby its potential for service to its members.” [KUKOFF, L., 1981, p. 84-65]

There are even Jewish jokes about such materialism in the synagogue:

“It is Yom Kippur. A man comes to the synagogue in a state of obvious excitement. The usher is at the door looking at admission tickets. As the man tries to walk in, the usher stops him: ‘Let’s see your ticket.’ ‘I don’t have a ticket. I just want to see my brother, Abe Teitelbaum. I have an important message for him.’ ‘A likely story. There’s always someone like you, trying to sneak in for the High Holy Day services. Forget it, friend. Try somewhere else.’ ‘Honest. I swear to you, I have to tell my brother something. You’ll see. I’ll only be a minute.’ The usher gave him a long look. ‘All right,’ he says, ‘I’ll give you the benefit of the doubt. You can go in. But don’t let me catch you praying!’” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 44]

Paul Cowan recalls the synagogue memories of his father (former CBS-TV president Lew Cowan):

“Once, when I was a boy, my father told me that he recalled the Yom Kippur she went to synagogue and watched Jake Cohen [Lew’s father] weep and beat his breast to atone for his sins. Then, after services, Lou would walk home with his parents and the rest of the huge Cohen clan and listen, appalled, as they fought over status and money; as they gossiped cruelly about siblings who weren’t there. That wasn’t religion, my father would tell me angrily. That was hypocrisy.” [COWAN, P., 1982, p. 6]

In 1982, Earl Shorris recalled his childhood memories of the kinds of men who headed his synagogue:

“We arrived at the synagogue as a family, three generations led by my grandfather ... My grandfather spoke to his friend Eddie – Big Eddie, he called him. They spoke as members of the board of directors of the synagogue, important men, big donors. My grandfather earned his money from the labor of Italian and Polish women who sewed clothing in his factories. Big Eddie sold cheap wine and whiskey to the poor of the town. We did not approve of Big Eddie. His diamond ring and his fat cigar offended us ... [H]is business offended us. There were fights in front of his store, stabbings, more than one killing. There were rumors about him. Some people said he dealt with criminals. It as said that he gave so much to the synagogue to atone for the way he made his money ... He traded donations for a position as a director of the synagogue. My grandfather said Eddie wanted to be president, that he was willing to donate a community
center if the directors would elect him president .... [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 3-4] [When Big Eddie finally strode up at the synagogue to be so honored, “the man our community commended to God” (p.7)] the color of his flesh was as rich and vulgar as his suit. [Grandfather,] you were so small, so pale beside him. Jerusalem was conquered, the Temple was destroyed, and there was no prophet in all of Israel.

After the service I asked my father why it had happened. Money, was all he said. Sometimes you have to do these things, my grandfather added. A building doesn’t come cheap.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p.7]

Jewish pride and concern for status and material affluence has a long history. There is a Yiddish word for it: yicchus, which connotes the traditional Jewish importance of personal and familial prestige, status, and a respected reputation in the community. This yicchus could be obtained for parents by their children’s marriage to a spouse of higher standing. But yicchus could be lost too, for instance, by stooping to manual labor. [ZBOROWSKI, p. 78]

“In his ghetto community [the Jew] strove for yicchus,” wrote Harry Golden, “a word which has remained to this day the most important word in Jewish culture … [It] is more than a thousand years old … Yiddish and Hebrew are filled with words denoting the nuances of community standing.” [CUDDIHY, p. xi]

Originally supposedly rooted in family genealogies and scholarship, it also grew to reflect upper class occupations, material affluence, and – for many – ostentatious display of ownership. As Zborowski and Herzog put it:

“Historically, traditionally, ideally, learning has been and is regarded as the primary value and wealth as subsidiary or complementary. Economic pressures and outside influence have made of wealth a constant contender for first place in the value hierarchy.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 74]

David Koskoff even suggests that the idea of the marriage bond expressed as expensive jewelry has roots in ancient Jewish history, where the wedding ring had to be

“large, heavy, and gold. It was expected to be of a specified value and fully paid for! Indeed, in the Hebrew stipulation that the ring must have a stipulated value, we see, perhaps, the origins of later customs which laid down that a wedding ring must be durable and of some worth – not a mere trifle … The basic principle survives today. It is not the thought that counts, it is the money.” [KOSKOFF, p. 273]

In non-religious Jewish circles, the principles of economic status (and embarrassment) are the same. “Community pressure can be exerted in many other ways,” says Yaffe,

“Some [Jewish] federations publish a book at the end of each [fundraising] campaign, in which the names of all contributors and the amounts of their contributions are listed. In Cleveland this book is mailed free of charge to every affiliated member of the Jewish community … [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 172] … [At fund-raising dinners] the same
thing goes on … After the food and the speeches, the name of each guest is read out from a stack of cards, and he is required to stand up and announce how much he intends to give – and to hand in his signed pledge then and there.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 173]

Zalman Schachter was asked why many young Jews in the post-1960s era left Judaism for other faiths like Buddhism. “First,” he replied, “it doesn’t feel real if it comes from their own thing. If you come to shul on Yom Kippur – this is the gross level, yah? – and you know you’re going to be hit for the United Jewish Appeal and the building fund, you can’t take your own tradition seriously.” [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 150]

The above kinds of expression of Jewish competitive pride, material self-worth, ostentation, and economic centeredness even at the heart of their religion – often aggravating anti-Jewish sentiment in surrounding Gentile populations – have been widely criticized.

The wealthy Jewish gravitation to ostentation in Amsterdam (in the 1500s and 1600s) is noted by Jewish scholar Herbert Bloom:

“If we compare [in Amsterdam] the Sephardic Jews’ luxurious and extravagant life-style with the simpler and more restrained ways of the average wealthy Dutchman, the contrast is striking and served to accentuate the traditional association between the Jew and money.” [BLOOM, H., p. xvi]

“In Germany,” notes Joachim Prinz, “forty Marrano [‘secret’ Jewish] families participated in founding the Bank of Hamburg in 1619, and by the middle of that century they were accused of having too luxurious a life style, as evidenced by their palatial homes and their ostentatious funerals and weddings … Some of the finest homes in Amsterdam belonged to newly arrived Marranos.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 127]

Oscar Rank (formerly Rosenfeld), an earlier Jewish psychoanalyst and follower of Sigmund Freud in the early 1900’s, complained that Jews in Vienna go “out of boredom to the synagogue and reduce it to a place of business, as if it were a branch of the stock exchange. The women show off their dresses, or what is beneath them; the men discuss petty affairs, but not what is beneath them.” [KLEIN] Walter Rathenau, the first Jewish foreign minister of Germany, noted (in 1897) Jewish ostentatious display in Germany, where he spotted “the curious vision of a completely alien tribe of people, conspicuously overdressed, of mobile and hot-blooded gesture. An Asiatic horde here on the sands of Brandenburg!” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 203]

Another Jew, Mordechai Breuer, took a harsher look at the European synagogue tradition as Jewry looked at itself during the Enlightenment: “What will the goyim say? was the question many an Ashkenazi Jew asked himself in view of the uncouth behavior, noisy commotion, and lack of formal structure that had established themselves in numerous synagogues.” [BREUER, p. 244]
Walter Lippman, a prominent American journalist of German-Jewish descent, complained about excessive expressions of ostentation in the Jewish community of New York City in the early decades of the twentieth century:

“The rich and vulgar and pretentious Jews of our big cities are perhaps the greatest misfortune that has ever befallen the Jewish people. They are the real fountain of anti-Semitism. They are everywhere in sight, and though their vices may be no greater than those of other jazzy elements in the population, they are a thousand times more conspicuous… When they rush about in super-automobiles, bejeweled and be-furred and painted and overbarbered, when they build themselves French chateaus and Italian palazzi, they stir up the latent hatred against crude wealth in the hands of shallow people: and that hatred diffuses itself. They undermine the natural liberalism of the American people… The Jew is conspicuous, and unless in his own conduct of life he manages to demonstrate the art of moderate, clean and generous living, every failure will magnify itself in woe upon the heads of the helpless and unfortunate.” [LIPPMAN, Quoted in Cuddihy, p. 143]

Harold Hochschild, Jewish chairman of a mining conglomerate, noted in a private memo in 1940 that

“Anyone who visits restaurants, theatre or other places of entertainment in New York especially on Saturday or holiday nights, who has traveled on large pleasure-cruise ships, or who has seen certain types of Jewish summer hotels or camps near similar Gentile resorts must admit that differences in behavior play a strong part in anti-Semitism … It may not be morally wrong for Jewish women to overdress and overload themselves with jewelry and makeup, but these habits are certainly repugnant to many Gentiles.” [HOCHSCHILD, A., 1986, p. 184]

Even Chaim Weitzmann, a pioneer Zionist and first President of modern Israel, had deep concern about many American Jews and their self-created magnetism for anti-Jewish hostility. “He believed,” says Peter Grose, “that the [American] anti-Semitism of the 1930s and 1940s was partly the Jews own fault.” Weitzmann worried that

“Along with a new generation of modest and honest workers, there is a certain part of Jewish bourgeoisie – rich, quasi-powerful, loud, vulgar, pulling a weight far in excess of their numbers, ostentatious, in the eyes of the Gentiles they and they alone represent Jewry, and this is a grave danger.” [GROSE, p. 167]

A compilation of non-Jewish observers were featured in an article about anti-Semitism in the American Hebrew of 1890, says Marie-Jane Rochelson:

“Possible reasons cited for the dislike of Jews included their commercial ‘sharpness,’ their ‘clannishness,’ and their ‘vulgar’ ostentation in dress and manners. It is hardly surprising that [prominent Jewish author Israel] Zangwill’s portrait of wealthy, materialistic, and family-oriented Jews in ‘Grandchildren’ [a chapter in one of his books] evoked discomfort [among Jewish readers].” [ZANGWILL, 1998, p. 26]
The respected Danish-American social crusader, Jacob Riis, and Lewis Hine, were the foremost photographic chroniclers of immigrant life in New York City in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, bringing to public attention the harsh urban conditions of the new poor and dispossessed from all over the world. Observing the Jewish community, Riis wrote:

“Money is their God. Life is of so little value compared with even the leanest bank account. In no other spot does life wear so intensely BALD and materialist an aspect in Ludlow Street … Proprieties do not count on the East Side; nothing counts that cannot be converted into hard cash.” [RIIS, quoted in CUDDIHY, p. 140]

“The great mass of American Jews,” wrote Jewish author Ralph Boas in 1917, “have sunk into a comfortable materialism … The sad result is that in prosperity the Jewish self-consciousness ceases to be religious and becomes merely racial.” [BOAS, p. 150]

Jews in early 20th century America, notes sociologist John Higham, were popularly seen as

“the quintessential parvenu – glittering with conspicuous and vulgar jewelry … attracting attention by clamorous behavior, and always forcing his way into society that was above him. To treat this stereotype entirely as a scapegoat for somebody else’s psychological frustrations is to overemphasize the irrational sources of ‘prejudice’ and to clothe the Jews in defensive innocence.” [MACDONALD, p. 49]

In mid-twentieth century, Judith Kramer and Seymour Levantman noted that

“Lacking occupational variety and economic yichus (the prestige of old and respected family businesses), [second generation Jewish Americans] substituted money as the measure of success. Money, and what it can buy, has remained the major source of status stratifying the [Jewish American] gilded ghetto and justifying its popular appellation.” [KRAMER, p. 13]

In 1998, apologist Jewish professor Judith Elkin sought to explain parallel kinds of Jewish ostentation away in Latin America, explaining that “for tourists unfamiliar with the prevailing ostentatious life-style of the wealthy, the expectation of Jewish wealth may appear to be borne out on first contact with mercantile and industrial entrepreneurs, especially in the Caribbean basin … Actually, a princely life-style can be sustained in Peru, Colombia, Mexico, or Brazil quite cheaply, and a household with five or six servants may be only middle class in terms of the net financial worth of the head of household.” [ELKIN, p. 156]

Jewish historian Howard Sachar also notes Jewish communal ostentation in the public sphere throughout Latin America:

“In Sao Paolo [Brazil], as in Mexico City or Buenos Aires [Argentina], a major focus of Jewish identity is a luxurious sports facility-country club-community center … Like its model in Buenos Aires, it is called
Hebraica … Not to be outdone, the Jews of Rio have constructed their own modern Hebraica building on the prestigious Rua des Laranjeiras. A seven-story building, it is equipped with comparable facilities.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 262]

The sister of Jewish comedian Roseanne Barr remembers growing up in Salt Lake City and her feelings when she her family went to the local synagogue: “In a synagogue parking lot filled with Mercedeses, Lincolns, and Cadillacs, our old Chevy stood out like a sore thumb.” [BARR, p. 3] Barr eventually made it big in Hollywood where many famous moguls go home at the end of the work day to nearby Beverly Hills, a famed and wealthy enclave that is largely Jewish. (According to the local Jewish Federation Council, the 1990s population of Beverly Hills was 62% Jewish). [HASSE, 1998] Beverly Hills, notes Jewish journalist Connie Bruck, is “one of the most ostentatious displays of wealth that exists in this country, a town that spawns every excess that money can by.” [BRUCK, p. 80] This city, adds Janet Steinberg, “is the quintessential symbol of opulent California life.” [STEINBERG, J., 7-15-99, p. 37] As Jewish professor Barry Shain notes about this life-style: “I understand [President Bill Clinton’s sex playmate] Monica Lewinsky [who was raised in Beverly Hills, and is Jewish] very well. I never knew her personally, but I went to Beverly Hills High School. I understand her moral life from my experiences growing up with those wealthy Jewish women. They look upon the world as an opportunity to amuse themselves.” [LUCIER, J., 3-2, 98, p. 12]

There are those who think that Palm Beach, Florida, is more “decadent” than Beverly Hills. One Washington DC newspaper declared, for instance, that Palm Beach is “the wealthiest and most decadent, glamorous and self-indulgent place on earth.” Not surprisingly, the population of metropolitan Palm Beach, too, is over 50 percent Jewish. [CHAFFEE, K., 12-3-1999, p. C12] “In 1962,” noted the Palm Beach Post in 1999, “only about 3,000 Jewish people lived in the greater West Palm Beach area. Today, estimates put that number at 100,000.” [HAYES, R., 1-26-99, p. 2B] The results of this invasion into a once predominantly WASP enclave is noted by Jewish author Ronald Kessler who has written an entire book about Palm Beach, highlighting what he describes as “anti-Semitism”: “I tried to lean over backwards not to probe too deeply into anti-Semitism on the island. But I soon learned that I would be missing a big chunk of the story [of Palm Beach] if I skirted a subject that made me uncomfortable professionally and that was personally painful.” [KESSLER, R., 1999, p. 68] Symbolic perhaps of the changing elite guard, is the fact that The Social Index Directory, an elitist listing of Palm Beach society people, “is now owned by the family of Robert Gordon, who is Jewish.” [KESSLER, R., 1999, p. 9] Although Jews have their own exclusive country club in Palm Beach (the Palm Beach Country Club), with 350 members, Kessler assails the non-Jewish community, complaining that “the [WASP] aristocrats are still in charge [of Palm Beach], the upper crust intact, the future of WASPdom secure.” [KESSLER, R., 1999, p. 52]

Melvin Urofsky notes the 1940s visit of eventual Israeli prime minister Golda Meir to Palm Beach:

“At Palm Beach, Florida, she was stunned at the elegance of the dinner
crowd, their jewels and furs, and she mentally contrasted the scene of wealthy men and women vacationing in their posh resorts and that of Haganah [the early Israeli army] soldiers freezing in the Judean hills. ‘These people don’t want to hear about fighting and death in Palestine,’ she thought, but she was wrong, and before the evening had ended, they had pledged her $1.5 million, enough to buy a winter coat for every soldier in the Haganah.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 162]

How about the posh Hamptons enclave for the super-rich on Long Island, New York? “The placement of the Jewish Community Center so prominently at the entrance to the town,” notes Steven Gaines,

“gave [Jewish real estate baron Evan] Frankel great satisfaction over the years and had its desired effect, particularly during the Jewish High Holidays, when Woods Lane was line end to end with the luxury cars of those attending services. One year, a local man was provoked to count the number of German-made cars parked in front of the synagogue and remark in an indignant letter to the East Hampton Star that the Jews must have forgotten Germans’ war crimes.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 216]

In 1998 Jewish mogul Ira Rennert made national news and came under widespread public attack for his plans to build the largest – and most ostentatious – home in America on New York’s Long Island. His 63-acre compound would include three separate buildings, 29 bedrooms, 39 bathrooms, two bowling alleys, a 164-seat cinema, 17 acres of manicured garden, and parking for 200 cars. The Washington Post likened it all to the “architecture of egoism.” [HARDEN, p. A1] Rennert, also noted the [London) Daily Telegraph, “is an enthusiastic Zionist and financial backer of Israel’s prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu, which has led to [neighbor] fears [that Rennert’s new home is really] a school or a conference center.” [SAPSTED, p. B2]

Another Jewish home builder on Long Island, Barry Trupin also engendered local wrath for his reconstruction of the Chestertown House. “What irked everyone,” notes Steven Gaines,” was the arrogance of it all – not just to tamper with a famous old house, but to tamper with it so badly … The house was indeed a grotesque creation, part faux-Normandy castle, part Disneyland on LSD. It was the largest private renovation project ever undertaken in New York State.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 220-221] Plans for the home included a personal zoo, a helicopter landing pad, and “an indoor barrier reef … a vast sunken aquarium … with a twenty-foot waterfall cascading down chunks of rock imported from Vermont, into a pool in which guests could not only swim but skin-dive, with hidden underwater air nozzles. The reef was stocked with 500 species, including lobster, parrot fish, sea anemones, grouper, and octopus.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 232]

Another such Jewish mogul is David Saperstein, the largest stockholder in America’s largest radio network, Westwood One. “He’s building a much-touted mansion in an exclusive neighborhood near Beverly Hills,” noted Mother Jones magazine in 2001, “the 45,000-square-foot extravagance, dubbed the ‘Fleur de Lys,’ will include a ballroom to host dinner parties of 250, according to the Los
Angles Times.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] [Note also, elsewhere in this work, immigrant Jewish Iranian tendencies to mansionize existing homes, Norman Lear’s unique mansion, and Hollywood producer Aaron Spelling’s comparably spectacular, and newsworthy, home ostentation in Los Angeles].

Chaim Bermant notes the style of Hollywood’s old guard Jewish movie moguls:

“If there was little intrinsically Jewish in the output of the Hollywood tycoons, there was something particularly Jewish in their style. The elder Selznick once told his son David (producer of Gone With the Wind): ‘Live expensively! Throw it around! Give it away! Always remember to live beyond your means. It gives a man confidence.’ This was not, in fact, far from the principles on which Hollywood operated, where the very cost of a film – ‘this multi-million dollar epic’ – was often used by the publicity department as a commendation.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 98]

In 1959, apologetic Rabbi Albert Goldman observed that

“often unable to distinguish between the real and the apparent, the substance of worth and the tawdry yet glittering imitation, their ersatz values attest to their basic superficialities. Lacking the understanding and support of their Hebraic traditions and group life, some suburban Jews fall prey to the current cultural ‘success system’ and, in their own insecurity, scramble madly after prestige and power. They believe that the undiscriminating expenditure of money alone will assure the attainment of their life goals.” [GOLDMAN, A., p. 203]

In modern times, suggested Roger Kahn in 1968, “it is only slightly hyperbolic to suggest that when a Jewish businessman feels threatened he reaches not for a gun or a club, but for a checkbook.” [KAHN, R., p. 181] And Jonathan and Judith Pearl note the common nature of the modern Jewish bar mitzvah ceremony: “While scholars debate whether this centrality is part of a historical continuum or aberration, the fact is that for many American Jews, the focus of bar mitzvah has shifted from scholarly achievement to lavish partying … This focus on extravagance is all too well known.” [PEARL/PEARL p. 16]

“Many people feel that the supreme Jewish crime is materialism,” noted Jewish author James Yaffe in 1968,

“Jews, under the impact of the American experience, are said to have become money grubbers and turned away from the Almighty in order to worship the Almighty Dollar. It certainly isn’t hard to find instances which seem to bear this out … Spending money to make a splash to achieve status with friends and relations, has become a common game among American Jews. Everyone makes jokes about the women at Miami Beach with their mink coats and their jewelry, the women on Park Avenue with their wall-to-wall carpeting and their expensive furnishings in the style sometimes known as Brooklyn Renaissance, the men in their long black Cadillacs. (’Can your little boy walk yet, Mrs. Cohen?’ ‘God forbid he should ever have to!’) The popularity of these jokes itself is proof that they correspond to a reality – though the people who make
them always insist they refer to ‘those other Jews.’ If you want to see that reality with your own eyes, spend a day or two at the Concord Hotel in the Catskills … Even more horrible examples of lavishness and vulgarity are provided by many wedding and bar mitzvah parties. Extraordinary things occur.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 270-271]

In 1984 Dov Fisch complained about bar mitzvahs “with scantily clad go-go girls” and the president of the Monticello Raceway who defrauded it of nearly $5,000 for his son’s bar mitzvah. “Tragically,” he wrote, “the bar mitzvah syndrome has become a symbol of so much of what is wrong with American Jewish life today. The one-upmanship knows no bounds.” Hence, a Long Island boy was zoomed to his bar mitzvah by a motorcycle racer, another arrived home to parade beneath, literally, a “fiddler on the roof,” and a Jewish couple spent $2,000 for a “Car Mitzva” which commemorated “the thirteenth year of their Rolls Royce.” Harvey Cohen’s bar mitzvah was at the rented Orange Bowl football stadium in Miami, where

“the parents shamelessly invited two hundred guests to the spectacle, featuring a sixty-four piece band, bartenders dressed as referees, waitresses dressed as cheerleaders, and pom-pom girls wearing sweaters with the letter ‘H’ for Harvey … [The] electric scoreboard lit up with the words: ‘Happy Birthday Harvey.’” [FISCH, D., 1984, p. 224-225]

Famous Jewish prostitute Xaviera Hollander notes one of her most memorable Jewish lovers:

“Take the case of the obscenely rich young investment banker with whom I had formed what is politely termed a relationship. I had arranged romantic music, shimmering candlelight, an exquisite meal and I was wearing the most seductive perfume. Casanova Cohen, the ardent lover, rushed into bed. He gave me a perfunctory kiss and then got down to business. Literally. He treated me to a resume of his day’s dealings and then demonstrated his refinement by cataloguing his cherished possessions from Rolex to Rolls Royce. I think that he expected me to be overawed and could not comprehend that I found him boring, intellectually, not physically.” [HOLLANDER, X., 2000, p. 39]

Stephen Bloom notes what happened when a group of ultra-Orthodox Jews bought a slaughterhouse in Postville, Iowa, in 1987, and soon began to make their influence felt in the town:

“Generally, newcomers are eager to assimilate to a new culture. That’s why they came in the first place. But instead of arriving at the lowest rung of the economic ladder, these Jews had arrived already on top. The Jews who settled in Postville came from cities, and many brought with them large sums of money … Sholom Rubashkin built an enormous house on Wilson Street in an area of Postville that the locals quickly labeled ‘Kosher Hill.’ Iowans were loathe to show such material wealth. ‘That Rubashkin home is a palace,’ Alicia [one of the non-Jewish local people] said, and no one denied it.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 50]

“In recent years,” wrote Gerald Krefetz in 1982, “some Jews have succumbed
to that all-American tendency to compound braggadocio and vulgarity in touting their ability to make it. Leaving discretion and taste aside, they boast of their abilities, vanities, and riches. One observer noted that after generations of oppression, ‘it is not simply that living well is the best revenge but rather that living well is an obligation.’ And telling about it is a compulsion. Jewish leaders, particularly those of the old school, feel called upon to ask ‘followers to avoid ostentatious display, fearing it might create antagonism.’” [KREFETZ, p. 5]

Such requests generally fall on deaf ears: materialist “this world” consumption is championed by the Jewish religious faith itself, after all. Take the 1996 case of Jewish scholar, Jeffrey Rubin-Dorsky, who laments the fact that his ex-wife expects him to economically support her enrollment in a religious school to become a rabbi, and continue payments on her BMW. (The woman eventually became Orthodox, where she was forbidden to become a rabbi by sexist Orthodox standards). [RUBIN-DORSKY, p. 456]

Samuel Heilman notes the concern an Israeli ultra-Orthodox rabbi had for the materialism of another ultra-Orthodox rabbi in America:

“‘I visited someone in the United States a few years ago, a ben Torah,’” [said the rabbi]. Stern nodded as he spoke, as if to imply that I had caught the drift of his message. ‘We got into his car, a beautiful car.’ He said ‘beautiful’ as if it were two words: ‘beauty full.’ ‘The car had everything. Beautiful thick velvet seats, beautiful radio, lots of room, even a telephone – this was before so many people had telephones in their cars. So I said to him – we’ll call him ‘Reb [Rabbi] Shmuel – ‘Reb Shmuel, this is a beautiful car.’ ‘And you know what he said to me? He said to me: ‘Reb Moshe, bist a na’ar [you’re naive]. This is last year’s model; I’ve already ordered next year’s model.’

‘Why?’ I asked him. ‘This is a wonderful car; you could keep it still for years.’ You know, it was one of those big Lincolns, a really gorgeous car. ‘And he said to me: ‘Reb Moshe, my neighbor already has a new model and it’s eating me up.’” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 250]

Still, some embarrassed Jews seek to blame non-Jewish origins for the ancient Jewish propensity towards materialism and ostentation. “We [Jews],” says Hillel Levine, “woke up from the American dream and tried to discover who we really were. For many of us this now means turning our concerns inward into the Jewish community, because we are disenchanted with the crass materialism of the larger society. Yet where can we find inspiration in the multimillion dollar presences of suburbia?” [LEVINE, p. 185]

Norman Podhoretz recalls taking a fellow secular Jewish author, Norman Mailer, to an Orthodox synagogue in New York City:

“He asked me to take him to a synagogue on Yom Kippur because he wanted to see the Hassid in the flesh … There were wooden benches, and as common in this kind of setup, these were young men, students smoking and dropping cigarettes on the floor. Orthodox Jews, especially Hassidic Jews, don’t treat synagogues like a church … After a short while Norman announced he’d had enough.” [MANSO, p. 367]
Stephen Bloom notes the ultra-Orthodox community of Postville, Iowa, and its raucous religious effect on the tranquil town:

“An hour must have passed, and then, as though on cue, a great roar of voices erupted from within the shul. The worship had ended and the men broke into raucous song. These liturgical melodies were booming and boisterous, each lasting twenty to thirty minutes. Soon, the singing was accompanied by banging. The men were pounding the metal tables with fists. They were stamping the shul’s wooden floor with the heels of their shoes and boots. The collective sound signaled to me that they must have been drunk. I was eavesdropping on some sort of loud, inebriated religious reverie … The sounds shooting out from the shul’s windows and front door were deafening on this otherwise serene Iowa night.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 36]

He also notes, once he is actually among these worshipers, that they “seemed drowned in showmanship – who could wail loudest, bow farthest without falling over, read the longest Hebrew passage fastest and without taking a breath.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 203] They also get drunk as part of their religious activity: This was an old fashioned chugging contest. Toast after toast followed … [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 206] “Rapturous song, powerful drink, and overwhelming body heat was the Holy Communion of these believers. Everything about the day was intense and bodily: the dirty mikveh [communal bath], drinking, singing, the body odor, the pounding of fists and feet.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 207]

Secular Jew Howard Jacobson wrote in 1993 about his experiences while waiting to see the famous Orthodox Lubavitcher rabbi, Menachem Schneerson, in New York City. For a decade, the rabbi gave out a dollar (symbolic charity) to each of those who came to wait in lines to see him. As Jacobson notes:

“I am taken down – and I stress the preposition: down, down, down – and into the shul of the Lubavitcher headquarters, where the dollar-queue will form, and here I behold a sight which beats even Areyonga in the Central Australian Desert for uncouthness, for outlandishness, for other-worldliness beyond any imaginings of other worlds. The shul teems and shudders with men and boys in every attitude of Hebraic, and to my eyes pre-Hebraic, worship … And here’s the most startling thing of all – men and boys begging, begging in the synagogue, banging for your money, pulling at your sleeves for charity – tsodekeh, tsodekeh – offering to pray for you for money, to pray for your parents for money, selling you raffle tickets, shoving them into your pockets, into your breast pockets – a mitzva, a mitzva – except that that’s not the most startling thing of all, because the most startling thing of all is that they’re selling gold watches down here.

I try to hold on to my nerve. Jesus lost his sense of humor and proportion in the temple, and I am determined not to lose mine.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 144-145]

“We [Jews],” Jacobson consoles himself, “believe there’s no distinction
between the world’s business and the business of the spirit.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 145]

Leaving his momentary personal audience with the rabbi, “no sooner do you beat back the first wave of beggars [in the synagogue],” recounts Jacobson,

“than you find yourself waylaid by tradesmen wanting to sell you polythene sleeves to store your dollar in. For two dollars you can protect the one dollar. Or you can have it sealed and plasticated, turned into a place-mat with a date and a picture of the Rebbe [rabbi].” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 150]
“The extraordinary story of Jewish-American success contains lessons for us all.”

Steven Silbiger, 2000, p. 1

“The Torah lights, the Torah shines, but only money warms.”

Old Yiddish folk saying, [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 238]

“Maybe we don’t know your [Christian] history. But you still have a lot to learn about ours.”

Jewish “banker who had been born into a left-wing family” at a Christian-Jewish group discussion, [COWAN, P., 1987, p. 185]

“During my dialogues with [famous Jewish Nazi-hunter Simon] Wiesenthal, I wondered what the Hebrew interpreter Luis de Torres, who was the first member of the expedition to set foot in the New World, might have said to the ‘Indians’ when the Pinta, Nina, and Santa Maria landed in the Bahamas on 12 October 1492: ‘Did he address them in Hebrew?’ ‘That I don’t know,’ Simon said, adding deadpan, ‘But I can tell you what the Indians said back to the white man: ‘Now begins the tsuris [Yiddish for “troubles “].’

Alan Levy, 1993, p. 22

In the early 1900s, Werner Sombart, a German professor of economics, became intrigued with a new book by the German sociologist Max Weber entitled: The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. In it Weber speculated about the Protestant faith and its ideals of rationality, frugality, hard work, efficiency, goal orientation, and other such attitudes in the creation of capitalism. Sombart – and many others since him – was attracted to the controversial notion that a religious world view had in some way shaped (and perhaps initiated) the western economic system. But Sombart thought that Weber’s focus on Protestantism was not the right place to look for the roots of capitalism. After all, Christianity had evolved out of a much older religious tradition: Judaism. So Sombart wrote his own book, eventually even more controversial than Weber’s, entitled The Jews and Modern Capitalism; it was based on the argument that a preceding Jewish value system informed the Protestant one. As Sombart saw it, “Puritanism is Judaism.” [NEWMAN, A., 1998, p. 165] “There is almost certainly a strong element of truth in Sombart’s contentions,” notes W. D. Rubinstein, “which may well account for the unique success enjoyed by
the Jews in the English-speaking world in modern times, and the rarity of anti-Semitic tendencies.” [RUBINSTEIN, WD, 2000, p. 21] When the book first came out, in 1911, Sombart’s “fundamental assertions were not challenged,” in fact he spoke to many audiences “recruited mainly from the Jewish intelligentsia.” [MENDES-FLOHR, WERNER, p. 93] Both of these scholars – Sombart and Weber – have been pioneers in the scholarly debate about Jews and their role in economic history, each noting some of most enduring and self-preserving traits of Jewry over the centuries wherever they lived:

- They were foreigners with no formal citizenship everywhere in their diaspora.
- They were scattered throughout the world, never concentrated in a single area.
- Their physical and social separateness from non-Jews was voluntary and part of their religious worldview.
- They were not peasants and were not linked to the land in their diaspora; wherever they were found, they were an urban class.
- They lived a double standard of morality: one for themselves and another for non-Jews, which functioned to position them as intermediaries between other peoples, and ultimately protected their group solidarity and identity.
- They had strong injunctions to marry only within the Jewish community. [TRAVERSIO, p. 44]
- They also accumulated “liquid wealth,” per merchantry and money lending enterprises.

Among Weber’s and Sombart’s other arguments was the idea that mainstream Judaism has largely been rationalist and legalistic in scope, eschewing magic and the realm of the supernatural, “this life” oriented and not towards the hereafter, and that the natural world is viewed by traditional Judaism only in the way by which it can be profitably exploited for the benefit of the Jewish people. As Harry Kemmelman notes in one of his popular novels featuring lead character “Rabbi Small”: “The virtuous Muslim, when he dies, goes to Paradise; the Buddhist assumes he will be reincarnated at a higher level; the Christian goes to heaven. When the virtuous Jew dies, he just dies.” [KEMMELMAN, H., 1981, p. 171]

Talcott Parsons notes that Jewish emphasis upon “rationality … was mainly legalistic in character.” [PARSONS, p. 106] This rationality, argues Sombart, was integral to capitalism. And all these aforementioned factors contribute to a decidedly materialist world view. As R. Joseph Hoffman observes:

“The Old Testament has a great deal to say about wealth as a sign of divine favor and source of human happiness. It is arguable that no single aspect of ancient Israelite religion stands in such obvious contrast to ancient Greek speculation concerning the immaterial nature of the good as the insistence of the Hebrew writers that the things of this world, being ‘God’s possession and man’s ward,’ are a source of delight, content-
ment, and blessing. The theme is recurrent... [The story of Genesis] is the mythological embodiment of a fundamentally this-worldly, economic theology.” [HOFFMAN, R. J., 1989, p. 172]

“So closely has Jewish economic activity been intertwined with the history of capitalism,” concurs prominent Jewish scholar Howard Sachar, “that many historians have forgotten that the Jews were its putty as well as its molders. Jews helped shaped the destiny of capitalism, but capitalism also shaped the destiny of the Jews.” [SACHAR, p. 39] “According to this distinguished economic historian [Sombart],” says Paul Mendes-Flohr, “Jewish values and ingrained sensibilities – arid intellectualism, a calculating intelligence, insatiable desire, a double ethic – display a particular affinity to the ethical code and attitudes required by ... the major economic developments and instruments of capitalism.” [MENDES-FLOHR, p. 134]

Sombart was terribly off the mark with some of his speculations, especially a chapter devoted to innately racial “characteristics” of Jews (although, ironically, some Jewish scholars like Norman Cantor and Raphael Patai accept this kind of commentary today, so long as it is flattering to them), and Jews have had nearly a century to pick Sombart’s ideas apart. But not all of them can be easily discarded. In particular, his essential queries still stand, re-examined and reconsidered by scholars in our own day. Why have Jews had such enormous economic influence wherever they were – and are – in history, and whenever capitalism developed, why were Jews always significantly located as beneficiaries? To what degree have they been responsible for, or at least instrumental in, the development of capitalism? What is it about Jews and money? “One need not accept Sombart’s exaggerations,” wrote Salo Baron, “to see that the Jew had an extraordinarily large share of the development of early capitalism and received corresponding benefit.” [LIBERLES, p. 44]

Sombart argued that, while Christian opinion in the medieval era disdained the pursuit of monetary gain and preoccupation with self-enrichment, Jewish religious principles actively encouraged a materially accumulative path. “Sombart notes will ill-concealed distaste,” says Werner Mosse, “that the most learned Talmudists [rabbis and other Jewish religious scholars] were also the most skilled financiers, doctors, jewelers, and merchants.” [MOSSE, p. 5] A year before the Jewish expulsion from Spain in 1492, for instance, Abraham Seneor, the Chief Rabbi of Castillian Jewry, was also a “tax farmer” (tax collector), [BARON, Econ Hist, p. 47] a position purchased from the Spanish aristocracy that was rendered in the public mind as a particularly despised form of exploitive entrepreneurism. Such colossal economic Jewish religious figures can be found yet today. By 1995, for example, Joseph Gutnik, an ultra-Orthodox Hassidic rabbi, had an economic empire worth $1.5 billion and was recognized as one of the richest men in Australia. His company, Centaur, notes the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz, “had two main assets in western Australia – a nickel mine and a gold mine ... Gutnik apparently has a fondness for diamonds. At one time he was even nicknamed Diamond Joe.” [HANDWERKER, H., 5-15-01]

Sombart proposed “on one hand, [that] Christianity was the religion of pov-
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erty, and condemnation of material wealth was part of its creed. On the other hand, Judaism was the rational basis for wealth, the home of the modern economic spirit – free enterprise.” [KREFETZ, p. 44] “Orthodox Jews have never despised business,” notes the Jewish scholar Irving Kristol, “Christians have. The art of commerce, the existence of a commercial society, has always been a problem for Christians. Commerce has never been much of a problem for Jews … Getting rich has never been regarded as being in any way sinful, degrading, or morally dubious within the Jewish religion.” [KRISTOL, p. 317] “For the Jews, poverty was no virtue, wealth no evil. The Talmudic monetary laws, the dinei memonot, formed what was regarded by many as the most rewarding of Talmudic inquiry and creativity … It’s not the afterlife that’s important but life itself for rich and poor alike.” [GETTLER, L., 2000, p. 27]

According to the New Testament,” notes Jewish business author Steven Silbiger,

“the Christian world has, at best, an ambivalent attitude toward money and wealth … For Jews, on the other hand, wealth is a good thing, a worthy and respectable goal to strive toward. What’s more, once you earn it, it is tragic to lose it. Judaism has never considered poverty a virtue. The first Jews were not poor, and that was good. The Jewish founding fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, were blessed with cattle and land in abundance. Asceticism and self-denial are not Jewish ideals.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 1415]

Silbiger compares the very different Christian and Jewish religious traditions about money. For the Christian:

“Easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the Kingdom of God.” – Matthew 19:24; Luke 18:25; Mark 10:25


“For the love of money is the root of all kinds of evil.” – Timothy 6:10

For the Jew: “Where there is no flour, there is no Bible.” — The Mishna

“Poverty causes transgression.” — Hasidic folk saying

“Poverty in a man’s house is worse than fifty plagues.” — The Talmud

“The account of Yahweh’s [God’s] covenant with Abraham (Gen. 15),” notes R. Joseph Hoffman,

“is … told in terms of this-worldly reward and material blessing (Gen. 22:17) … [In Judaism there is a] doctrine of conspicuous reward for obedience [to God] … [Apostle] Luke in particular presents the poverty ethic as a central Christian requirement … Paradigmatically, to be a ‘true’ follower [of Jesus by his Apostles] is to be poor.” [HOFFMAN, R. J., 1989, p. 173, 183, 185]

As Sombart put it:

“It is well known that the religion of the Christian stood in the way of economic activities. It is equally well known that the Jews were never faced
with this hindrance. The more pious a Jew was and the more acquainted with his religious literature, the more he was spurred by the teachings of that literature to extend his economic activities.” [SOMBART, p. 222]

Sombart even out-Freuds Freudian theory by suggesting that Jewish religious dictates encouraged sexual sublimation which, in turn, improved energies in money matters. (“We see that a good deal of capitalistic capacity which the Jews possessed was due in large measure to sexual restraint put upon them by their religious teachers.”) [SOMBART, p. 237]

Exploring Jewish moral tenets towards non-Jews, particularly in the economic sphere, Sombart highlights excerpts from Jewish religious teachings like these:

“If a non-Jew makes an error in a statement of accounts, the Jew may use it to his own advantage; it is not incumbent upon him to point it out.”

“It is permissible to take advantage of a non-Jew, for it is written, thou shalt not take advantage of thy brother [i.e., other Jews].” [SOMBART, p. 245]

As modern Jewish defenders point out, there are indeed other Jewish religious citations that can be produced that infer different attitudes towards non-Jews. But as Sombart underscores, for the Jews who seek religious assurances that a Jew can cheat and deceive Gentiles with moral impunity, there are clearly many citations to be found in the Jewish religious record that support, and even encourage, such an attitude. Such attitudes were unquestionably used by Jews in history, often as a mainstay. Hence, as part of Gentile folklore throughout the world, Jews are consistently and universally depicted as misers, penny-pinchers, and cheats who are completely obsessed with making money, views that are bitterly decried by Jews today as being totally unfounded, completely unwarranted, and anti-Semitic: in all cases, “stereotypes.”

Wherever Jews lived in their diaspora, there were similar perspectives about them in the traditions of surrounding peoples:

- “A real Jew will never pause to eat till he has cheated you. (Serbian)
- “The Jew cheats even when praying.” (Czech)
- “A real Jew will get gold out of straw.” (Spanish)
- “So many Jews, so many thieves.” (German)
- “A bankrupt Jew searches his own accounts.” (Greek)
- “Bargain like a Jew but pay like a Christian.” (Polish)
- “A Jewish miser will reject nothing more than having to part with his foreskin.” (Russian)
- “A Jewish oath, a clear night, and women’s tears are not worth a mite. (Venetian)
- “A Jew, if he cheats a Moslem, is happy that day.” (Moroccan)
- “Mammon [money] is the God of the Jews.” (Hungarian)

[ROBACK, p. 186-204]
Jewish scholar Leonard Dinnerstein notes the similar folk beliefs about Jews in the African-American community:

“There are several humorous tales about a ‘Colored Man, a Jew and a White Man’ in which the Jew is distinguished from other caucasians. The main thrust of almost all of these jokes is the compulsive Jewish concern for wealth.” [DINNERSTEIN, L., 1998, p. 117 (of double pagination)]

Like virtually all Jewish observers these days, however, Dinnerstein regards such folk tradition to be based on no facts whatsoever. As he decides, despite the fact that such folk traditions are part of every folk history wherever there have been Jews in any number,

“[Blacks] have imbibed the European-American folklore about the cunning and exploitive Jew whose ruthlessly amassed fortune is used to political and economic control of society. There is more mythology than substance in these beliefs, but that does not lessen their impact. These stereotypes have existed among Blacks since their socialization into American culture.” [DINNERSTEIN, L., 1998, p. 873 (pages are doubly paginated)]

What Dinnerstein neglects to mention, of course, as do virtually all Jewish polemicists on this subject, is that these “stereotypes” have also been very much part of even Jewish folklore, hence Jewish self-identity. What did the Jewish community think, and celebrate, about itself in its own traditions?

• “A Jew at a fair is like a fish in water.” (Yiddish)
• “The Jew loves commerce.” (Yiddish)
• “A Jew and a wolf are never idle.” (Yiddish)
• “The Jew likes to poke his nose everywhere.” (Yiddish)
• “Better in the hands of a Gentile than the mouth of a Jew.” (Yiddish)
• “When the Pole thinks, he seizes his moustache, when the Russian thinks, he takes hold of his forelocks, and when the Jew thinks, he holds his hands behind.” (Yiddish) [ROBACK, p. 186-204]

As Irving Howe and Eliezer Greenberg note about Yiddish folklore: “This folk humor provides a means of indirect social aggression and at other times, it releases a mordant self-criticism.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. xx] The following are more examples of traditional Jewish self-identity from a collection of Yiddish folk sayings, [KUMOVE, S., 1985] further confirming certain troubling aspects of collective Jewish identity:

• “One need never suspect a Jew – he surely is a thief.” [p. 139]
• “It’s good to do business with a thief.” [p. 233]
• “If you steal – you’ll have.” [p. 233]
• “What is smaller than a mouse may be carried from a house.” [p. 233]
• “Petty thieves are hanged, major thieves are pardoned.” [p. 233]
• “A thief gives handsome presents.” [p. 230]
“Before a thief goes stealing, he also prays to God.” [p. 231]
“Better with a hometown thief than a strange rabbi.” [p. 231]
“Thieve and rob if you must but be honorable.” [p. 232]
“God protect us from Gentile hands and Jewish tongues.” [p. 196]
“Live among Jews, do business among the Goyim.” [p. 143]
“If you steal enough eggs, you can also become rich.” [p. 249]
“A fool gives and a clever person takes.” [p. 106]
“Always take – if you give me, I’ll go away, if not, I’ll stay.” [p. 106]
“Always take!” [p. 106]
“The goy is treyf [forbidden] but his money is kosher [acceptable].” [p. 126]
“Offer a Jew a ride and he throws you out of your own wagon.” [p. 45]
“A sense of justice we want others to have.” [p. 127]
“Money rules the world.” [p. 179]
“Money is the best soap – it removes the greatest stain. (p. 179)
“Gold shines out of the mud.” [p. 179]
“Gold has a dirty origin but is nevertheless treated with honor. [p. 180]
“The world stands on three things: on money, on money, and on money.” [p. 180] [All from KUMOVE, 1985]

Jewish psychoanalyst Theodore Reik, in Jewish Wit (his volume about the subliminal psychological meanings of Jewish humor) notes:

“All kinds of deception and cunning, of fraud and trickery, devised and committed by Jews, either to get money or to avoid paying money, are exposed and candidly revealed by Jewish jokes.” [REIK, T., 1962, p. 67]

There is even an entire tradition of Yiddish folk songs like this:

“Stealing has made its home in my heart,
It doesn’t let me alone for a moment.
It tells me that it was made just for me,
That it can’t live without me for a moment.” [RUBIN, R., 2001 – Song 8]

Jewish author Stephen Bloom was troubled when, during studies of an ultra-Orthodox group in America with deep roots in Jewish tradition, “anti-Semitic” stereotypes about Jews and money seemed confirmed:

“To Lazar, bargaining was a thoroughly Jewish endeavor. Negotiating the lowest price wasn’t chutzpah, it was tradition. ‘I don’t feel like a Jew unless I bargain!’ Lazar bellowed. ‘I feel bad when I don’t make a deal. That’s part of being a Jew! A Jew has to know he got something for the absolute lowest price – or he feels rotten.’ If Lazar hadn’t been telling me this, I’d have thought it was one of the [non-Jewish] regulars at Ginger’s [diner]. Lazar meant what he said, and his remarks were totally anti-
Semitic. If anyone else were saying this, Lazar would have him by the throat.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 209]

“Perhaps money is to Jews,” suggested Gerald Krefetz in his 1982 book, Jews and Money, “what aggression and territoriality is to other national, religious, and ethnic groups, “… In the American context … it continues to exert a magnetic attraction, for Jews seem to make much of it and hold it in high regard.” [KREFETZ, p. 30] Rabbi Jonathan Sacks notes the Jewish religious perspective on making money, that “the Torah treats protectively the money of Israel.” [SACKS, J., p. 107] “The Bible [Torah] is all about business,” adds Rabbi Burton Visotzky, a professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary, “In Exodus, people step out of the family, forming a corporate entity. A lot of negotiation goes on. Abraham negotiates with God, with Pharaoh; Moses negotiates with God, with the people.” [ELLIN]

Forbes business magazine even featured a story in 1999 about this same Rabbi Visotzky, who teaches a monthly religious session to 20 powerful Jewish Manhattan businessmen. The article is intriguing for its insights on Jewish morality. On the day the reporter attended, the subject of discussion was Genesis 12:10-20. In this part of the Torah, the reader finds the disturbing story of the seminal Jewish patriarch Abraham, who pretends that his pretty wife, Sarah, is his sister so that he may both protect himself and sell her to the Egyptian Pharaoh. (She was, in fact, however incestuous, his half-sister.) [SMITH, M., 1989, p. 138] “This ploy,” notes the Forbes reporter, “will not only save his life but also allow him to turn a profit on her sale. Less delicately put, Abraham becomes Sarah’s pimp.” [LEE, S., 11-10-99] After Abraham reaps payment, God punishes Pharaoh by cursing his land with the plague. The Egyptian leader returns Sarah to Abraham and bans them from his land. “Payoff time again for Abraham,” notes the reporter, “Pharaoh pays him hush money.” [LEE, S., 11-10-99] Rabbi Visotzky then explained for Forbes the essence, as he saw it, to the biblical tale, quoting a lawyer in his study group who suggested that, “Morality aside, you may not like it, but by the end of the chapter – let’s face it – Abraham is talking one-on-one with the head of state and he’s earned start up costs.” Visotzky then adds: “This is what it means to be a small and embattled people who are going to survive at any cost. The only thing that matters is the bottom line.” [LEE, S., 11-10-99]

(In this genre, a turn-of-the-century Jewish scholar, Cesare Lombroso, even argued that “among the Jews, before the definitive version of the Tablets of Law, the father had the right to sell the daughter to a man who would make of her his concubine for a period of time established by the sales contract … The Jews thus trafficked in the prostitution of their own daughters.” [HARROWITZ, p. 117] In 2001, African-American reverend Jesse Jackson, mired in a scandal when it was discovered he had fathered a new child out of his marriage, turned to study the Torah with New York Rabbi Marc Schneier, for solace. The rabbi “and Jackson,” noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “studied the portion of Genesis in which Judah sleeps with his daughter-in-law, mistaking her for a prostitute. Despite his transgression, Judah is chosen from among his brothers
to become heir to Jacob’s dynasty, which later produces King David and, Jewish tradition holds, will one day produce the Messiah.”] [WIENER, J., 1-26-01]

Such Abrahamic ethics of survival and self-promotion aside, the Jewish historian Werner Mosse, in a review of Sombart’s theses, notes that

“What Jews brought with them from their past into the industrial age was, as has often been noted, their particular appreciation of the value of money.” [MOSSE, p. 8]

Mosse argues that this “appreciation of the value of money” was the Jewish means to security as a minority people in hostile Europe. “Significant also,” Mosse writes, “is the sense of Jewish solidarity overriding even the economic competition. What gives this solidarity a special economic significance is the dispersal of Jews across national boundaries.” [MOSSE, p. 11]

This transnational allegiance to other Jews, and their lack of patriotic and defensive obligation to even the land in which they lived (until, for the assimilated, the 1800s), afforded Jews a uniquely favorable position of self-preservation and prosperity at the expense of non-Jews around them. Hannah Arendt notes that

“The Jews had been the purveyors in wars and the servants of Kings, but they did not and were not expected to engage in conflicts themselves. When these conflicts enlarged into national wars, they still remained an international element whose importance and usefulness lay precisely in their not being bound to any national cause.” [ARENDT, p. 21]

This Jewish inter-connectedness across many lands, their own transnational languages of Hebrew and/or Yiddish, and a materialist ethic (antithetical to the Middle Age Christian morals around them) accentuated – often in monopolistic form – further Jewish development in money-lending, merchantry, and other trades. (As early as the 4th century the Archbishop of Constantinople, St. John Chrysotome, noted that the Jews in the declining Roman Empire “possessed large sums of money and that their patriarchs assembled immense treasures.” Jews occupied “the highest commercial position in (Antioch), causing a cessation of all business when they celebrated their holidays.” [LEON, p. 123]

Jewish cross national links and associated expertise in money-making matters gave rise, in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, to the phenomenon of “Court Jews,” specious pseudo-princes eventually ubiquitous throughout Europe. Most of the hundreds of European nobles had Court Jews, who were usually afforded formal titles of aristocracy. By the 18th century, notes prominent Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz, “every state in Germany had its Court Jew or Jews, upon whose support the finances of the land depended.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 55] These confidantes of the nobility were influential in effecting requests and concessions on behalf of the Jewish communities. “What was characteristic of the Court Jew … was his close association with [the Jewish] community whose interests he championed.” [MEYER, p. 105] “The Jewish heritage,” says Selma Stern, “… which was the
innermost core of their existence, made [Court Jews] remain ... more Jews than court factors.” [STERN, p. 241]

At various times and various places, such Jews were afforded trade monopolies by the European aristocrats, including the dealing of jewels, silver, tobacco, velvet, and other luxuries and commodities. All classes, and especially the poor, could be critically and negatively effected by such Jewish manipulations. In the seventeenth century, for instance, Moses Jacobson “almost monopolized the highly important salt trade [to Poland and Lithuania] limiting the quantities he imported from Holland so the prices remained high. He bought so many goods that he could load up whole ships and deprived local merchants of their livelihoods.” [CARSTEN, p. 145]

“[The Court Jews] became,” says Lewis Coser, “the rulers’ instrument for destroying feudal forces, estates, and guilds restricting his power. They were his financiers and bankers and collaborators....” [COSER, p 575] “In their capacity as bankers and money lenders,” says Selma Stern, “[Court Jews] often participated in political councils, in secret diplomatic missions, in the negotiation of peace treaties, and in military conferences.” [STERN, p. 115] Eva Hoffman calls similar Jews in the Polish empire “court servitors.” “One such servitor,” she observes, “a man known as Becal, paid a large sum to the king in return for a license to collect royal tolls in Ruthenia and Volhynia – in defiance of a law prohibiting Jews to lease royal customs. Over time, some of the more successful Jews began to identify with the szlachta [the aristocracy], adopting its dress, comportment and sometimes its arrogance.” [HOFFMAN, E., 1997, p. 50]

Such Jews also functioned as the official gold and silver suppliers, as well as the money minters, for the nobles of various lands. Usually (but not always) under sanction of the Lords, these Jews, lessees of the royal mints, often withdrew millions of pieces of common coinage, particularly during wars, to reduce their silver content towards skimming profit for themselves and the ruling aristocracies. The resultant “devaluation of the currency and staggering inflation” was a “despised but very lucrative business” provoking “the ire and hatred of the impoverishing population” against the Jewish community. [BREUER, p. 109-110] During the Seven Years War in the mid-1700, 20-25 percent of Prussia’s war costs were raised in this way. “Whatever the ethical questions surrounding the operation of the mint entrepreneurs,” notes Steven Lowenstein, “there can be little question that [the Seven Years War] created a new type of Jewish elite.” [LOWENSTEIN]

“[Court Jews],” says Stern, “were charged with counterfeiting and with violating money regulation; they were accused of money-clipping... they were blamed for the disorder in the currency system, for the fluctuations in the value of money, and for the resultant impoverishment of the subjects of the realm.” [STERN, p. 162]

Another Jewish proclivity, war profiteering, has a long history. Jews were “prominent as military suppliers to Christians against Muslims in 13th century Spain, and against a rebellion of Catalanian nobility against King Pedro III of Aragon (1276-1285).” Jews, in this era, “also played a prominent role in the pro-
duction of military equipment, metal casting, and armament manufacture.” [ENCY JUD, p. 934] In the 16th century, some Jews were experts in gunpowder and cannon manufacture and co-religionists “probably served as military suppliers during this period in Central Europe also.” [ENCY JUD, p. 934] In the 17th and 18th centuries Jews in Amsterdam supplied the armies of Holland, Morocco, and England. Various internal 17th century wars in Morocco provided Dutch Jews the opportunity to “act as military suppliers to all sides involved in the conflict.” [ENCY JUD, p. 934]

Jewish war profiteering was so widespread by the sixteenth and seventeenth century that “no war was waged in Germany” without Jewish financing, [MEYER, p. 106] and Court Jews across Europe were loaning rival aristocracies funds for supplying Christian armies to war against each other. Jews were hence positioned for centuries as prime war profiteers and beneficiaries of Gentile political turmoil. Jews risked not their lives in these conflicts as combatants (some Jews began to serve in armies after Emancipation), but their investments (and increased popular Gentile hostility) during risky times. During the many wars of Europe, “this situation,” says I. L. Carsten,

“proved the great opportunity for those Jews who provided the armies with food and fodder, bought the soldiers’ booty at advantageous prices and traded in the wake of the armies. Because there were so many princes and because they all needed loans so badly, this was the opportunity not only for a few Jews attached to one court, but for dozens, even hundreds, working for many different princes, to supply them with what they needed, or rather more often what they did not need.” [CARSTEN, p. 143]

“Although the Court Jews themselves constituted only a minute proportion of the Jewish population,” says the Encyclopedia Judaica, “they required a widespread network of subcontractors, petty merchants, etc., who were also Jewish, in order to fulfill their functions as major contractor-suppliers, especially in war time. Large scale providing was achieved through contacts with Jewish dealers in Eastern Europe.” Anti-Jewish critics contended that in Germany at this time “all the military suppliers were Jews and all the Jews were military suppliers.” [ENCY JUD, v. 5, p. 934] Prominent Jewish war contractors included the Model family, Joseph Oppenheimer, the Gomperz family, Israel Avaron, and the Wertheimer, Mayer, and Herschel families. In England Abraham Israel “was the most prominent contractor during the rule of Cromwell.” Jews supplied William of Orange’s military needs in the 1700’s and Solomon de Medina supplied the troops of the Duke of Marlborough. Jews supplied the Duke of Schoenber’s armies in Ireland and Peterborough’s campaigns against the Spanish. Robert Harley “was accused of ruining the economy of England in order to enrich Jewish military suppliers.” [ENCY JUD, v. 5, p. 935]

“European history in the Baroque Age,” notes Howard Sachar, “is studded with the names of these resourceful Jewish agents: men such as Israel Aaron, the first Jew to be admitted to East Prussia, who served as army supplier to Frederick William, the Great Elector, during all of Frederick William’s European wars; the banker Elias Gumperts of Cleves, who was also of use to the Great Elector
in furnishing stone, wood, palisades, uniforms, munitions, food, and money for fortresses along the Rhine … During the war of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War in the eighteenth century, we find Jewish purveyors aligned with a Bavarian army that at one moment fought with, and the next moment against, the Prussians.” [SACHAR, p. 24]

Jews also provided the French military supplies beginning in the 16th century, especially during the reign of **Louis XIV**. Abraham Gradis also supplied the French troops in Canada during the Seven Years War in the 18th century. “Among their other activities [“the Jewish banking firm of Mendes”] is reputed to have financed the French war in Canada, and to have dealt in bullion imports from America. Such operations as these naturally led to employment of these [Jewish Sephardic] Marrano bankers as loan agents by various European monarchs and for a couple of centuries or so practically all wars were more or less financed from these sources.” [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 15]

Jews also “played a prominent role in supplying weapons and provisions to the English army in the colonies.” Mathias Bush provided the troops in Pennsylvania against the French, the Frank family contracted for the English army in America, and the Shaftall family supplied the American army in Georgia. [ENCY JUD, v. 5, p. 935] Even in a small town like Talbotton, near Atlanta, Georgia, “a local grand jury called to investigate war profiteering [in the Civil War] issued a report that blamed all the town’s problems on unnamed Jewish businessmen.” [TRACHTENBERG, 1996, p. 18] “Joseph Seligman, founder of the investment firm J. & W. Seligman, was the person [Abraham] Lincoln trusted to convince European investors to buy Union bonds to finance the cost of the Civil War. Emmanuel Lehman, one of the founders of the Southern-based investment banking house Lehman Brothers, went to Europe and raised a great deal of money for the Confederacy.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 45-46]

In 1618-1648 a series of wars – known as the Thirty Years Wars – spread across Europe. Largely a Catholic-Protestant conflict, it also echoed economic and territorial animosities. Germany was particularly devastated. The largely mercenary armies traversing Europe were often unpaid and ended up looting and ravaging the general populace. Starvation was rampant. “The agony of the Thirty Years War,” says Jewish historian **Howard Sachar**, with a flair for descriptive deprecation, “had literally pulverized the German peasantry into a race of hysterical grass-eating mystics.” [SACHAR, p. 65] Grass-eating mystics or not, another Jewish scholar notes that “while the Christian populace was decimated – in a number of regions reduced by 60 to 70 per cent – the Jewish population as a whole experienced only a minimal overall decline … Many Jews were able to provide services useful for the conduct of the war in their capacity as middle men, suppliers of goods, and credit agents.” [MEYER, Ed., p. 95] “Many Jewish businessmen in the 17th century,” says Sachar, “laid the foundation for his modest fortune by his purchase and disposal of the debris left on the battlefield of the Thirty Years War. Of course, foraging for one’s own duke behind enemy lines, or even within one’s own lines, was dangerous work, and not infrequently Jews were caught and executed as spies.” [SACHAR, p. 23] “
“In Vienna,” notes Joachim Prinz, “after the Thirty Years’ War, for example, the wealth of many of the Jewish families intoxicated the whole Jewish community … In Russia, some Jews seemed to prosper during the Thirty Years’ War because they were the tax collectors for the state.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 52] “The Thirty Years’ War,” adds J. O. Hertzler, “… brought destruction, starvation, and pestilence. Again the spleen of dispossessed princes and impoverished and outraged peasants was vented upon the Jews who had achieved prosperity through their purchases and trade.” [HERTZLER, p. 95] During such periods, being Jewish was a distinct advantage towards survival. One rabbi of the era noted that “the soldiers, for years now on the march through the towns and villages, have often treated us more kindly than the non-Jews, so that Gentiles have sometimes brought their belongings to Jews for safe-keeping.” [MEYER, Ed., p. 97] Historian Mack Holt notes the situation of the people of France during times of warring:

“[The civilians] overcome the dual threat of death and destruction from the soldiers themselves, as well as the pressure and hardship of royal taxation which the king needed to pay for the military destruction … [There was also] the threat of financial ruin meted out by the crown’s tax collectors … [HOLT, p. 195] Whenever marauding troops billeted themselves on the civilian population, they invariably seized all livestock and grain stores as a matter of practice.” [HOLT, p. 197]

Wealthy Jews were involved in the financing of World War I (Jews “played a prominent part in organizing the German war economy”) [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 257] as well as earlier German wars of unification. Geran Bleichroeder’s money, for instance, was notable in 1866, during fighting between Prussia and Austria. The Philipp Speyer firm in Germany was involved in arranging credit for the United States during its Civil War and was involved in financing the building of railroads across America. [GROSS, N., p. 219] Earlier, Daniel Franks “was instrumental in raising money for the British army during the French and Indian War with the aid of his brother, Moses, a London financier.” [GROSS, N., p. 223] Mayer Amschel Rothschild’s “great fortune was acquired by hiring [William IX’s] troops, as mercenaries to the British in the American Revolutionary War.” [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 15] Conversely, Haym Solomon, an immigrant from Poland, helped secure credit for the American Revolution from France and the Netherlands. In Germany, “through [Ludwig] Loewe’s brother Isidor (1848-1910) and jointly with the firm of Mauser, an order of unprecedented magnitude was obtained for equipping the Turkish army.” [GIDAL, p. 266] After a merger with the Mauser company, this company “was supplying half the armies of the world with rifles.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 74] The London Rothschilds “found the 20,000,000 pounds to compensate slave owners after the abolition of slavery in the British Empire in 1833. In 1854 a 16,000,000 pound loan to finance the Crimean War was launched through the House of Rothschild, and in 1871 they raise 100,000,000 pounds to help France pay her war indemnity to Prussia.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 40]

“Among the branches of trade in which Jews achieved special prominence,”
underscores Jewish scholar W.E. Mosse, “the outstanding one in the early nineteenth century was, undoubtedly, war contracting. It was this activity which may be said to have laid the foundations of the fortunes of the German-Jewish economic elite. This was, unquestionably, the major source of early Jewish capital accumulation.” [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 386] Mosse suggest that some of the reasons why war profiteering became such an important source of Jewish economic activity was rooted in “the quasi-monopoly” they held in the European agricultural produce trade and “corruption in business dealings” with “those responsible for awarding military contracts.” [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 388] Eventually Jews rose to become “prominent” even in the armaments industry itself, including weapons and ammunition. (Even Chaim Weizmann, a chemist and eventually the first president of modern Israel, was instrumental in providing acetone as an explosive ingredient for British heavy artillery at a crucial time during the first World War. Weizmann’s efforts helped secure formal British government support for the principle of a Jewish state in the land then known as Palestine). [RHODES, R., 1988, p. 88-91]

With the rise of European political movements against the Jews in the late nineteenth century, Albert Lindemann notes that “a European-wide body of opinion, cutting across class lines, focused on what was perceived as Jewish ruthlessness and immorality in search of profit. It was often asserted, and much discussed in the press, that the brutal Boer War (in South Africa, 1899-1902) was manipulated to benefit wealthy Jews. The repression of an uprising in 1907, in the course of which thousands of starving and desperate Romanian peasants were slaughtered, was widely described as protecting Jewish interests…. Involvement of Jews in these matters was not only plausible but real enough.” [LINDEMANN, p. 32-33] “[Jews] were a crucial element in the development of South Africa during the final quarter of the nineteenth century and a considerable proportion of the ‘Uitlanders,’ whose restiveness under Boer rule was to lead to the South African war, were Jews. Among them was … Barney Barnato … [who] built up one of the largest fortunes in South Africa and controlled a labour force of one hundred and twenty thousand men.” [BERMNANT, C., 1977, p. 54]

In Germany, says Sarah Gordon, there was “the popular belief that Jews had been highly active as war profiteers between 1914 and 1918 [World War I], and that they had promoted or gained from postwar inflation by questionable activities as financiers and middlemen. Anti-Semites eagerly compiled statistics on Jewish criminal activity, both real and bogus, to buttress their arguments.” [GORDON, p. 53] “The most repulsive of men,” remarked the well-known German Jewish philosopher (and Zionist) Martin Buber, “is the oily war profiteer, who does not cheat any God, for he knows none. And the Jewish profiteer is more repugnant than the non-Jewish for he has fallen lower.” [MENDESFLOHR, BUBER, p. 141]

Jewish international economic power toward expressly Jewish political ends in a war could even be asserted in Asia. At the turn of the twentieth century, American Jews who were concerned about a perceived Russian mistreatment of
its Jewish citizens included Jacob Schiff, a senior partner in the American banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb, and Co. He believed that “the only hope for Russian Jews seemed to lay in the possibility that the Russo-Japanese War would lead to upheaval in Russia and constitutional government there.” [BEST, G., 1972, p. 315] Toward this end, Schiff helped Japan raise $180 million, nearly one-fourth of the total Japanese expenditure in its war with Russia. Schiff, the wealthy capitalist, even funded socialist indoctrination programs for Russian prisoners of war by the Japanese, in the hope that this might aid in the Tsar’s downfall. [LINDEMANN, p. 170] The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia claims that “in his later years [Schiff] recognized that he had innocently aided in the creation of a menace in the shape of Japanese imperialism.” [UJE, v. 9, p. 400]

At the same time, since 1890, Jewish-American financiers – led by Jacob Schiff, Isaac Seligman, and Adolph Lewisohn – had vigorously lobbied the powerful international Jewish banking community as a collective entity to reject Russia’s own searches for loans. Ultimately defeated by Japan and suffering great indemnity demands, Tsarist Russia faced a largely successful international economic lockout by Jewish money lenders (the Russian government ultimately collapsed to the communist revolution, a situation international Jewry hoped to be better for Russian Jews). “A great nation,” reported the Jewish Chronicle with satisfaction about the teetering Tsarist state, “was now going from one Jewish banker to the other, vainly appealing for financial help.” [ARONSFELD, p. 103]

Simon Wolf, Chairman of the Board of Delegates of the United American Hebrew Congregation, wrote that

“Russia at this juncture needs two important elements to inspire its future prosperity and happiness: money and friends … The Jews of the world control much of the first … There is no disguising the fact that in the United States especially the Jews form an important factor in the formation of public opinion and in the control of the finances…” [ARONSFELD, p. 100]

The following ultimatum to the huge country of Russia, and a threat to those who broke Jewish ranks to do business with it, was announced by a group of Jewish American businessmen wielding their own foreign policy, self-described as the “Hebrew alliance:”

“First, until equal civil and religious rights are given the Jews of Russia, no money will be loaned the Russian government by any American Jews. Second, the Rothschilds [the worlds greatest and far-reaching banking firm, based in Europe] are united with the American Jewish bankers in this agreement and will use all their enormous prestige and power to assist in carrying out the threat. Third, no financial concern will be allowed to loan Russia money, under pain of the displeasure and financial punishment that such a combination of resources of the Hebrew alliance could so readily dispense.” [ARONSFELD, p. 100]

Jewish economic collusion against Russia, notes Edwin Black, “was widely
criticized for the stubborn continuation of their boycott even as it threatened the Allies’ [World War I] war effort. But the boycott remained in effect until the monarchy was toppled in 1917.” [BLACK, p. 31] Even within Russia itself, a Jewish “adventurous millionaire,” Parvs (aka Israel Lazarevitch Gelfand), was a sponsor of V. I. Lenin. [SINGER, N., p. 2] In this historical context – the “conspiracy” of international Jewish financiers unifying to bring Tsarist Russia to collapse – the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia notes that “the canard of the Jewish conspiracy to attain political world domination originated at the time when the Tsarist regime was threatened with revolution.” [UJE, v. 3, p. 1] The most famous anti-Semitic volume of all time, The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which claimed to evidence a Jewish conspiracy to dominate the world, was created – and published – in Russia at this time.

Stemming to great extent from profits garnered from the mostly Christian misery of Europe’s Thirty Years War, the phenomena of “Court Jews” rose to power and prominence in the 17th century, forging grandiose and pompous life-styles that stirred ill will from the common peasantry. “The wealth and luxury displayed by many Court Jews,” says F.L. Carsten, “indeed made them an easy target for popular wrath. Many maintained great houses and loved ostentatious, grand displays, as so many princes and nobles did.” [CARSTEN, p. 151] “Court Jews,” says Selma Stern, “built and bought stately homes in which they reigned in patriarchal fashion in the midst of their numerous employees, clerks, servants, business friends, Talmudic scholars, and Yeshiva students.” [STERN, p. 228] (A Jewish author even wrote an entire book about an earlier European period, 768-900 BCE, when there existed “a Jewish princedom in feudal France.” Arthur Zuckerman noted that there is “unimpeachable evidence that the Carolingian Kings granted Septimanian Jewry a domain of considerable extent along the Mediterranean seacoast and on the borders of Spain.”) [ZUCKERMAN, A., 1972, p. 13]

Court Jew Behrend Lehman, for example, was so wealthy that he owned a castle and thirteen villages. Israel Jacobson owned fifteen estates and other property throughout Germany. [CARSTEN, p. 151] Suss Oppenheimer, one of the most famous Court Jews (who was hanged when his aristocratic benefactor died and political winds changed) “with an extended network of Jewish financiers throughout Germany and the Netherlands” financed wars for the Habsburg Empire against Louis XIV in 1688. His economic support helped save Vienna from the Turks in 1683 and his money “played a decisive role” in the siege and capture of Budapest in 1686 and Belgrade in 1688. [MEYER, p. 106] Oppenheimer reflected common Jewish practice by doing “all his business with other Jews; [he] gave contracts for military and court supplies only to them.” [CARSTEN, p. 155]

In gleaning from the wars of the non-Jews around them, Court Jews not only kept their lucrative business networking within the local and transnational Jewish community, they even took the self-protective, self-promotive clan ethic to the next extreme. Although Court Jews were scattered in nations throughout Europe,
“virtually all of the many hundreds of Court Jews were related by marriage. This was of considerable advantage for their financial, diplomatic, and dynastic services.” [BREUER, p. 112]

Not surprisingly, on the other end of the economic spectrum, Jewish street thieves and robbers followed the same clannish pattern as their wealthy counterparts. “I believe I can prove,” said a commentator in the nineteenth century, “by means of a genealogical table that at least several hundred of the most notorious Jewish bandits alive form one single family.” [BREUER, p. 249]

This notion of a “single family” has much broader implications. The collective incestuous economic character of both rich and lower class Jews, unified as members of an ethno-religious clan and functioning as a self-contained network within and against the non-Jewish communities in which they lived, even transnationally, is noted by Deborah Hertz in a commentary about the wealthy Jews of Berlin who rose to prominence in the eighteenth century:

“None of the loaning, purveying, selling, or investing feats performed by the wealthy Jews in Berlin could have been executed without the aid of poor Jews who lived in small villages to the east. Both economic historians and anti-Semites alike have pointed out that cooperation between Jewish financiers in various European capitals was indispensable for Jewish financial interests in this era. It has less frequently been noted that the international ties linking Jews in different cities were also ties across the Jewish social hierarchy.” [HERTZ, p. 44]

This Jewish emphasis towards ethnocentric unity and monopolistic economic control is a foundation of Jewish Diaspora history and surfaces and resurfaces over the centuries all over Europe. Jews were often expelled (“due as a rule to economic causes”) [HERTZLER, p. 88] en masse from towns, provinces, and even entire countries many times in their history.

These include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location 1</th>
<th>Location 2</th>
<th>Location 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>1446 - Brandenburg</td>
<td>1541 - Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1462 - Mainz</td>
<td>1550 - Genoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276</td>
<td>Upper Bavaria</td>
<td>1483 - Mainz</td>
<td>1551 - Bavaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1483 - Warsaw</td>
<td>1557 - Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1492 - Spain</td>
<td>1569 - Papal states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1496 - Portugal</td>
<td>1649 - Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1496 - Naples</td>
<td>1669 - Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>1498 - Nuremberg</td>
<td>1744 - Bohemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1510 - Brandenberg</td>
<td>Moravia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>1515 - Genoa</td>
<td>Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>1533 - Naples</td>
<td>1891 - Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1439</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
<td>1541 - Naples</td>
<td>[SIEGEL, p. 127-129]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a more local scene, in England alone, for example, resulting from complaints and animosities against Jews leading up to their expulsion from the
country in 1296, Jews were expelled from a number of cities, including

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1190</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>Wycombe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>Berkhamsted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244</td>
<td>Newbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Derby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[BARON, Ancient, p. 243]

From the 15th century to the late 19th century Jews were also banned from most of Russia as an inassimilable “alien people,” limited to living in an area (with large numbers of other ethnic peoples) commonly referred to as the Pale of Settlement. Jews consisted of about 12% of the total population of this area.

**Joachim Prinz** notes the difficulties faced by the French attempt to ban Jews from all of France:

“In 1683, the French government insisted upon a general expulsion of the Jews from France. Special instructions were sent to the authorities of Bordeaux, which had a considerable community of Marranos [secret Jews], warning them “not to expel more than a dozen Conversos [Marranos] every year because if they are forced to leave Bordeaux, it would ruin the city’s economy as the commerce is almost entirely in the hands of that sort of persons.”” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 129]

Although modern Jewish apologists tend to stress Christian religious persecution of Jewry, the much more vital reason for non-Jewish animosity, wherever Jews were, was that Jews often formed strangleholds on important parts of local economies, thanks to their centuries-old domination in commerce and often “unsavory” business practices, as well as their clannishness and transnational loyalties and allegiances to each other, always at the expense of non-Jews. As Deborah Hertz writes, concerning Germany,

“Across the German-speaking territories, city councils, princes, and emperors were besieged by complaints from gentile craftsmen and merchants that Jewish business practices already had or would soon undermine their livelihood.” [HERTZ, p. 37]

In Strasbourg, notes Howard Sachar, in 1806, Napoleon “was inundated with anti-Jewish grievances, with accounts of the ‘ruination’ of the peasantry by Jewish moneylenders. The petitioners begged the emperor to take special measures against Jewish foreclosures.” [SACHAR, p. 44] Jews are often portrayed in history as having been “forced into” their usurious paths. “It is self-evident,” counters Abram Leon, “that the claim, as do most historians, that the Jews began to engage in lending only after their elimination from trades is a vulgar error. Usurious capital is the brother of commercial capital … The eviction of Jews from commerce had as a consequence their entrenchment in one of the professions which they had already practiced previously.” [LEON, p. 138]

The periodic consequences for Jewish exploitation of the impoverished could be violent. The Jewish Polish scholar Yitzak Schipper believed that “by the thirteenth century … the Jewish moneylender became the creditor of the poor classes of feudal society. He came face to face with those who could least
afford to pay interest and carry the burden of medieval usury … The religious motive propagated and stimulated by the Crusaders was hardly a decisive factor in the hatred and persecution of the Jews. Jewish pogroms in the Middle Ages were of a strictly socio-economic character. The main purpose [of the violent attacks against Jews] was the destruction of promissory notes…” [LITMAN, p. 65, 67]

In later centuries, “in Austria,” says Albert Lindemann, “the capitalist financiers, the stockjobbers, the builders of the railroads, those responsible for the bankruptcies of [non-Jewish] artisans and small investors were undeniably to large extent of Jewish background.” [LINDEMANN, p. 25]

The rise of powerful Jewish banking institutions began – especially in Germany and the Netherlands – in the seventeenth century. Wealthy Jews became influential in Dutch imperialist activities overseas, many as shareholders in both the Dutch East and West India Companies. About a quarter of both the Dutch East and West India companies were Jews; they also represented 37 of 41 members of the Amsterdam Stock Exchange in this era. [SACHAR, p. 28] When the Dutch Governor, Peter Stuyvesant, of New Amsterdam (now known as New York City), wrote a letter in 1655 to his superiors at the Dutch West India Company to seek permission to ban Jews from his colony, he was rebuffed. “He did not reckon,” notes Lewis Wirth, “with the fact that the Jews of Amsterdam were financially interested in the company that employed him and were represented in the Board of Directors.” [WIRTH, p. 133]

“In Germany,” notes Joachim Prinz,

“forty Marrano ['secret' Jewish] families participated in founding the Bank of Hamburg in 1619, and by the middle of that century they were accused of having too luxurious a life style, as evidenced by their palatial homes and their ostentatious funerals and weddings … Some of the finest homes in Amsterdam belonged to newly arrived Marranos.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 127]

By the late seventeenth century important Jewish banking firms were founded in London. Sir David Salomons, “one of the founders of the Westminster Bank, is also recognized as one of the creators of the joint stock system. Furthermore, London owes its position as the world’s money centre largely due to the activities of three Jewish banking houses, namely the Goldschmid family, the house of Rothschild, and the banker Lord Swaythling.” [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 16] “Several Jews,” says Howard Sachar,

“were … directors of the East India Company and of Lloyd’s of London… [SACHAR, p. 28] … In the early modern age, the courts of Europe were almost completely dependent upon private bankers for short term loans … most of the money in those days … was in the hands of the Jewish dealers in gems and precious metals. The identical circumstances that produced the merchant and purveyor produced the Jewish banker: his connection with the Netherlands, the banking center of Europe, through his Sephardic brethren, his international connections in all the mercantile
centers of Europe; above all, his long experience in dealing with precious metals and the currencies of the continent.” [SACHAR, p. 24]

The most famous banking house in history and the enduring symbol of international finance, investment banking, and trans-Jewish intrigue, the House of **Rothschild** (HR) of Frankfurt, Germany, rose to economic power in the nineteenth century, with branches throughout Europe. “The key aspect of the HR operational strategy,” notes Sam Lehman-Wilzig, “was secrecy … The extent to which [the Rothschilds] followed this strategy [of secrecy] bordered on the incredible. To this day their records have not been made public.” [LEHMAN-WILZIG, p. 254] “By the mid- [nineteenth] century,” writes Benjamin Ginsberg, “the entire European state system was dependent upon the international financial networks dominated by the Rothschilds.” [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 18] “Instances occurred,” notes Howard Sachar, “in which the Rothschilds demonstrably altered the course of international politics.” [SACHAR, p. 137] Its quick reversal of political allegiance, national loyalties, and attendant financing is noted by Hannah Arendt:

“It took the French Rothschilds in 1848 hardly twenty-four hours to transfer their services from the government of Louis Philippe to the new short-lived French Republic and again to Napoleon III.” [ARENDT, p. 24]

The vast empire of the Rothschilds alone evoked growing non-Jewish resentment. Arendt rhetorically wonders, “Where, indeed, was there better proof of the fantastic concept of a world Jewish government than in this one family, the Rothschilds, nationals of five different countries, prominent everywhere, in close cooperation with at least three different governments (French, Austrian, British), whose frequent conflicts never for a moment shook the solidarity at interest of their state bankers? No propaganda could have created a symbol more effective for political purposes than reality itself.” [SACHAR, p. 136]

For many historians, the House of Rothschild is seminal in the examination of the rise of international capitalism. The Rothschilds may be even understood as the very prototype for the modern multinational corporation. “Considering HR’s dual policy of economic expansion and aid to their Jewish brethren,” notes Sam Lehman-Wilzig, “comparison to modern TNOs [transnational organizations] are especially intriguing … [LEHMAN-WILZIG, p. 260] … In those territories where the firm was already established, the [Rothschild] brothers used their presence with its concomitant financial importance for the area as an umbrella under which other Jews could be harmed only at risk of HR retribution.” [LEHMAN-WILZIG, p. 255] “Along with love of business,” added Joel Kotkin in 1993, “the Rothschilds [still] remain united by another, larger vocation, one extending beyond business, family, and even nation – the vocation of being Jews.” [KOTKIN, p. 16]

The Rothschild banking concerns, however, were far from the only ones. Major Jewish investment banking organizations across Europe included those of the Seligmans, Oppenheimer, Habers, Speyers, Warburgs, Mendelssohns,
Bleichroders, Eskeles, Arnsteins, Montagus, Goldsmids, Hambros, Sassoons, and others. The Jewish international banking network that floated state loans to finance European industry and railroads was wide: the five Rothschild brothers were in London, Paris, Vienna, Frankfort, and Naples. The Bleichroders were based in Berlin, the Warburgs in Hamburg, the Oppenheims in Cologne, the Sassoons in Bombay, the Guenzburgs in St. Petersburg. Jews were also influential in the creation of influential joint stock and commercial banks including two of Germany’s largest – the Deutsche Bank and the Dresdner Bank, as well as Crédit Mobilier, Banque de Paris, Banca Commerciale Italiana, Credito Italiano, Creditanstalt-Bankverein, Banque de Bruxelles, among others. [KREFETZ, p. 46]

“There was, by the end of the nineteenth century,” notes Chaim Bermant, “hardly a financial centre where Jewish bankers did not enjoy a position of considerable prominence. In Brussels there was the house of Bischoffsheim, and also Errers, Oppenheim and Stern who combined with Sulzbach and May of Frankfurt to form the Banque de Bruxelles, in 1821. In Switzerland Isaac Dreyfus and Sons participated in the formation of the Basler Handelsbank and the Basler Bankverein. In Holland there was Wertheimer and Gompertz and the house of Lissa and Kann. The Hungarian General Credit Bank of Budapest was of Jewish creation as were the Hungarian Commercial Bank and the Hungarian Hypothecary Credit Bank. In St. Petersburg the Guenzburg families established the Discount and Credit Bank as well as the Bank of St. Petersburg. The Warsaw Discount Bank was founded in 1871 by Mieczystaw Epstein, and Leopold Kronenberg took part in the formation of the Warsaw Credit Union as well as the Bank Hadlowy; but it was London, until World War I the banking capital of the world, which saw the largest concentration of Jewish financial talent [Rothschilds, Hambros, Speyers, Erlangers, Cassels, Sassoons, Hirschs, etc.].” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 40]

Louis Frankel was “one of the most important financiers in Sweden;” Isaac Gluckstadt was “one of the most famous financiers in Denmark.” Maurice Blank founded what became the “second largest bank in Romania and the largest privately owned bank in the country.” Ernest Cassel “established the National Bank of Egypt.” [GREENBERG, M., p. 68-70] Maurice de Hirsch “helped place the first Turkish loan in Paris in 1854 and had, jointly, with the Ottoman bank, helped to establish the Crédit Général Ottoman in Constanti-nople, both of which gave him invaluable Turkish contacts.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 43] “The first international bank [that] opened in Germany was founded by a Marrano, Diego Teixera de Mattos in Hamburg … [By] the middle of the eighteenth century … the Pintos, Delmontes, Bueno de Mesquita and Francis Mels of Amsterdam were the leading financiers of northern Europe.” [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 15]

In the United State, between 1840 and 1880, important Jewish banking firms that developed included those of August Belmont, Goldman Sachs, J.W. Seligman, Kuhn Loeb, Ladenburg Thalmann, Lazard Frères, Lehman Brothers, Speyer, and Wertheim. “Jewish bankers,” notes Gerald Krefetz, “pro-
jected an image of concentrated power because they often acted in concert, collaborating on financial deals.” [KREFETZ, p. 47]

Wherever Jews have lived (and live) in their diaspora, following their collectivist strategies and aggressive opportunism that have served them well throughout history, they have often risen to extraordinary economic and social power. This was true in the Muslim world where Jews in the eleventh century “attained the highest level of political power in Muslim Spain,” in North Africa in the tenth and eleventh centuries when Jews “were important bankers, financiers, and advisors to the caliphates,” and in the Turkish Ottoman Empire where, by the fifteenth century, Jews “were particularly useful to the Ottomans because they lacked any tie to any of the subject populations of the multi-ethnic empire and, thus, could be entrusted with unpopular tasks such as tax collection.” [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 14-15] In the Ottoman empire, Jews “mainly worked in trade, and their role was particularly important to farming taxes, the collection of customs dues, and in the mint. They controlled all major tax farming in the Istanbul region in 1470-80 … Jews continued to play an important role in this sector in the sixteenth century … The Jews relatively high economic profile in Istanbul and other Ottoman towns in the Balkans naturally inclined the sultans to favor Jewish immigration into the Empire … In the first half of the seventeenth century, they monopolized the collection of customs, acting as intermediaries between the Ottoman officials and the European traders. By 1620, most customs officials in the port [of Izmir].” [BENBASSA/RODRIGUE, 1995, p. 6, 47]

Joachim Prinz notes the condition of Jews in Islamic Spain:

“During the reign of the Moors, with but few interruptions, the Spanish Jews enjoyed not merely an equality of rights not accorded to Jews in other European countries until the French revolution; they held positions of great honor and distinction. There was hardly a Cabinet during the period between the eighth century and the Christian Reconquest which did not have a Jew serving as minister of finance.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 19-20]

In Christian Spain, faced with animosity and hostility, and threats, from the local Christian populace, in the late fourteenth century the Jewish community set upon an elaborate deceit towards both survival as Jews and power. Known as “conversos,” or derisively by Christians as “Marranos” (swine), Spanish Jews converted en masse to Christianity, falsely professing the new faith for public consumption, but remaining Jews in virtually all respects in their private lives. The Jewish historian Cecil Roth notes that once the community embarked upon the ruse of conversion:

“The social and economic progress of the recent converts and their descendants became phenomenally rapid. However dubious their sin-
cerity [as Christians], it was now out of the question to exclude them from any walk of life on the ground of their creed. The Law, the administration, the army, the universities, the Church itself, were all overrun by recent converts of more or less questionable sincerity, or by their immediate descendants. They thronged to financial administration; for which they had a natural aptitude; protest being now impossible. They pushed their way into the municipal councils, into the legislature, into the judiciary. They all but dominated Spanish life … Within a couple of generations … almost every office of importance at [Royal] Court was occupied by Conversos and their children.” [ROTH, p. 20-21]

“Outwardly,” notes Abba Eban, “these Marranos were … Christians; inwardly, they were Jews. Their disbelief in the dogmas of the Church was notorious … in time, they all but dominated Spanish life … These doubtful Christians were rightly regarded as a greater menace than avowed Jews. The population too had become enraged by the hypocrites who had gained a monopoly in important financial positions.” [EBBAN, p. 189-190]

In a theme common to Jewish history, the Conversos “throughout the country … farmed the taxes [i.e., were lessees to collect taxes]. Thus, they inevitably became identified in the popular mind with the royal oppression. The occupation was as remunerative as it was unpopular; and the vast fortunes which were rapidly accumulated added jealousy to the other grounds for dislike.” [ROTH, p. 31] The Jewish fraud of conversion to Christianity was well known by the native Christian populace, and Jewish domination and exploitation eventually engendered such hostility towards them that they were expelled from Spain in 1492; ironically, in that same year the Christopher Columbus expedition to the New World “was largely a Jewish, or Marrano, [economic] enterprise.” [ROTH, p. 270] Prominent Jews involved in the Columbus journey included Luis de Santangel who was chancellor of the Spanish king’s “royal household,” Gabriel Sanchez, “the chief treasurer of Aragon,” and Juan Cabrero, “the king’s chamberlain.” Columbus’ cartographer was Jewish (Abraham Zacuto) as was the head of Spain’s naval academy (Yehuda Crescas). [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 57] “The only high official who wasn’t Jewish [in the planning of the Columbus expedition],” notes M. H. Goldberg,

“was the royal secretary – and his wife was Jewish … Of course, the involvement of Jews in Columbus’s voyage does not mean that Columbus himself was a Jew. But it does underscore the tendency of Jews somehow to be present, even if only behind the scenes, in history’s most important events.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 111-112]

At the time of the Columbus voyage and parallel Jewish expulsion, even King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella’s Finance Minister, Don Isaac Abarbanel, was Jewish. [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 52] “On board Columbus’ ship,” adds Joachim Prinz,

“were many Marranos. The list that has come down to us includes Rodrigo Sanchez, superintendent; Dr. Marco, ship’s surgeon; and Mesta Bernal, the physician. Luis de Torres, a Jew who had been converted [to
Christianity just a day before the ship sailed, served as official interpreter, and a Marrano, Rodrigo de Triana, was the seaman who sighted the first land.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 57]

Famous Jewish Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal explains his perceptions of the Jewish dimensions to the Christopher Columbus expedition like this:

“Why did [Christopher] Columbus personally supervise the roll-call? So I began to look at the roll he called. One tenth of his crew was Jews; some of them, I learned later, may have been rabbis. But, even though nine-tenths of the crew wasn’t Jewish, there was no priest aboard. Very unusual at sea! Then I am looking into the financing of his voyage. This business of Queen Isabella hocking her jewels to pay for it is all legend. With the help of Marrano [secret Jewish] ministers of hers, the mission was entirely financed by Jewish money ... I began to ask myself, ’ Simon went on, ‘why the Jews financed Columbus when all others had refused for years. Who was he and what did the Jews want from him? ... Not only are there a number of Jewish names, but later I learn that several in Columbus’ crew spoke Hebrew and a couple of them may have been rabbis. And who was the interpreter on board? Luis de Torres, who had been interpreter for the Governor of Murcia, which had a large Jewish population. It took me two weeks to confirm that Luis de Torres had been the governor’s interpreter of Hebrew. Now the only possible explanation of this is that Columbus expected to reach countries in which Jews lived and governed.’ From research on Columbus that began around 1965, Wisenthal was convinced ‘that the Jews, concerned about their deteriorating situation in Spain, were looking for a homeland, a place to flee to, where they could find a protector. And so, in the belief that the ten lost tribes had found refuge in ‘India,’ they financed the expedition of Columbus: a man they could trust.’ Simon says Columbus was surely a Converso [convert from Judaism to Christianity] and quite likely a Marrano [a convert to Christianity who secretly remained Jewish].” [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 20, 21]

Upon their expulsion from Spain, many Jews emigrated to the country next door, Portugal. Within the next hundred years, despite restrictions and persecutions in the new country, “there was no stratum to which the New Christians [Conversos] did not penetrate. This was the case even more in Portugal than in Spain … Their wealth was enormous … They almost monopolized commerce.” [ROTH, p. 76] “Some of the richest of the Portuguese Marranos were able to establish branches of their enterprises in England and on the Continent, and many ventured into the New World to take advantage of the extraordinary opportunities for their diversified commercial undertakings … The wealth of these Portuguese immigrants, according to figures which have come down to us, was staggering.” [OPRINZ, J., 1973, p. 127]

One such Jew, Joao Miquez, son of the physician of the King of Portugal and nephew of famous bankers, eventually emigrated to Turkey, publicly renounced Christianity (choosing back the Jewish name Joseph Nasi), and rose to a lofty position in the Turkish Royal Court “so that for a time he was virtually the ruler
of the Turkish Empire, then the most powerful in Europe.” [ROTH, p. 203] Miquez was influential in the election of a new king in Poland, he encouraged a revolt in the Netherlands, and was influential in the Turkish seizure of Cyprus from Italy. “No Jew of his time,” notes Joachim Prinz,

“or probably of any time before the emancipation of the eighteenth century, played such an important role in world affairs … His most ingenious political dealings concerned the Marranos [secret Jews] of the world. From his strong position in the powerful [Jewish] Mendes family, Joseph Nasi devised what can be called a specific Marrano strategy, a plan for economic and political revenge against those who had mistreated Marranos. The Mendes family determined that if a country or a town discriminated against Marranos, they would have to pay for it … the ruin of those who hated them.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 140, 141]

Racial purity and obsessive endogamy was still an issue for the Jews (Marranos) of Belmonte, Spain, even in the 1940s. The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia noted that “these [people] pride themselves on being descended directly, and with no admixture of foreign blood, from the old Portuguese Jews.” [UN. JEW, p. 367]

As early as 1512 Marranos began to settle in Antwerp, the most important port in northern Europe. With the rise of Amsterdam, “the Dutch Jerusalem,” more Jews moved there; and Jewish entrepreneurs extended throughout the Dutch colonial world. By the eighteenth century, the immigrant Marranos in Amsterdam – an international trading center and enemy of Spain – economically peaked, long since openly renewing their Jewish identities. In Amsterdam “developed the largest and most important [Jewish] community in Europe, with connections in many another Jewish settlement, and with the far flung influence in the Dutch colonies.” [BLOOM, p. xiv-xv]

Jews in Amsterdam were deeply involved in a variety of economic activities, including Dutch colonialism (one quarter of the Dutch East India company’s stockholders were Jewish, for instance) and the diamond and jewelry trade as a virtual Jewish monopoly. [BLOOM, p. xvii] A common theme of non-Jewish peoples throughout Jewish history surfaced when “there was constant complaining, both at home and in the colonies, that these [Jewish] strangers were undermining the rights of native-born Dutchmen.” [BLOOM, p. xvi]

In the eventual colonialist battle between the Dutch and Spain over the control of Brazil, “the war resolved itself almost into a struggle between the Spanish and Portuguese on the one hand and an alliance between the Marranos and the Dutch on the other,” including a Jewish espionage network in parts of the South American country. [ROTH, p. 285] As one traveler noted in the 17th century: “Among the free inhabitants of Brazil who were not in the Dutch West India Company service, the Jews were the most considerable in number. They had come there from Holland and built stately houses in Recife. They were all traders which were of great consequence to Dutch Brazil.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 128]

Despite their formal expulsion from Spain, small numbers of Marranos continued to live in Spain for centuries later. In 1835 a Marrano said that

“The great part [of my wealth] is buried underground; indeed, I have
never examined the tenth part of it. I have coins of silver and gold older than the times of Ferdinand and the Accursed and Jezebel; I have also large sums employed in usury. We keep ourselves close, however, and pretend to be poor, miserably so; but, on certain occasions, at our festivals, when our gates are barred, and our savage dogs are let loose in the court, we eat food off services such as the Queen of Spain cannot boast of …” [ROTH, p. 360]

Pre-Nazi Germany is yet another of the dramatic examples of the rise of Jewish economic influence and control in European countries, in this case violently ended by the Nazi destruction of German Jewry. Jews numbered at most about one per cent of the German population between 1871 and 1933, and this percentage had been steadily declining [GORDON, p. 8] but by the end of the eighteenth century, “a high proportion of the landed and liquid wealth in Prussia was in the hands of either nobles or Jews.” [HERTZ, p. 36] By 1908, 12 of the 20 richest Berliners were of Jewish ancestry, as were 11 of the 25 richest people in Prussia. [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 208] Of the top 200 Prussian millionaires, 55 were Jewish. Of the top 800, 190 were of Jewish extraction. [MOSSE, p. 30] 41% of Prussian iron and scrap iron firms, and 57% of other metal businesses were owned by Jews. [GORDON, p. 11] Although Jews in 1903 were only 0.74% of the labor force in Prussia, 27% of all Prussian lawyers were Jews, as were 10% of apprenticed lawyers, 47% of magistrates, and 30% of all higher ranks of the judiciary. [GORDON, p. 13]

By the 1930s, 46% of German Jews were self-employed. [KOTKIN, p. 43] In 1932, six million Germans were unemployed. [RUBENSTEIN, R.L., p. 117] In the town of Sonderburg, in the Rhineland area of Germany, “of the five largest employers, two were Jewish firms; in one case, the Jewish-owned mill employed hundreds of Gentile workers – as many as 20 percent of the working adult labor force. In a very real sense, the Gentile community depended on Jews for employment and for retail goods.” [HENRY, F., p. 52]

Gentile fortunes in Germany and its environs were based in landownership and agriculture; Jewish fortunes were founded upon banking and finance. [MOSSE p. 206] In Berlin, by the eighteenth century, “the income of Jews in the middle of the Jewish tax scale would be about three times higher than the average Berliner. The middle of the Jewish tax scale would thus be approximately equal to the top ten per cent of Berlin households.” [LOWENSTEIN] The average income of Jews in pre-Nazi Germany was 3.2 times higher than the rest of the population. [NIEWYK, p. 16] “At the end of the eighteenth century 400 Jewish families formed one of the wealthiest groups in Berlin … In Bavaria, in 1808, 80% of government loans were endorsed and negotiated by Jews.” [ARENDT, p. 17] By 1914 the Jews of Berlin – 5 per cent of that city’s population – paid over a third of its taxes [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 13] and there were “a large number of domestic servants in the two most important Jewish areas of Berlin during the 1920’s.” [GORDON, p. 15]

In 1923, 150 of the 161 privately-owned banks in Berlin were Jewish; [GORDON, p. 11] “In Berlin alone,” notes Jewish author Edwin Black, “about 75% of
the attorneys, and nearly as many doctors, were Jewish.” [BLACK, p. 58] “All the major Berlin department stores – Wertheim, Herman Tietz, N. Israel, KaDeWe,” says Jewish author Peter Wyden, “were the properties of Jews. All the principal newspaper publishers and thirteen of the drama critics were Jews. Garment manufacturing, a major industry, was generally known to be in Jewish hands.” [WYDEN, p. 21] “In Germany,” says Nachum Gidal, “Jews above all developed the setting up of department stores, the manufacture and ready-made ladies and gentlemen’s clothing, the tobacco, leather, and fur industries and the new film industry.” [GIDAL, p. 17]

By 1823, the Bavarian government owed 23% of its public debt to Jews; as early as 1818, there was growing complaint about excessive Jewish influence in Germany. One German writer, Garlieb Merkel, noted that while the “German peoples had, in many years of political disaster lost their precious political rights and had diminished in stature, [Jews] had increased their wealth at a terrifying rate. They knew how gain equality with Christians everywhere and they zealously set about developing this equality into further privileges.” “This statement of Merkel has some truth in it,” says scholar Jacob Katz, “Jews had exploited, economically and socially, the new status they had achieved in the past generation.” [KATZ, From, p. 94] With formal emancipation, the Jews of Berlin, complained Merkel, “now bought up every house afforded for sale in the main streets and filled the cities with their shops. The Jews had long dominated in financial deals and trade in bills. Now they led in occupations such as the book trade … Almost all the country homes on both sides of the Tiergarten, the Berliners only place of recreation, had passed into Jewish hands … The Jews has made their gains at the expense of other citizens.” [KATZ, From, p. 94-95]

The Jewish-French intellectual, Bernard Lazare, noted in 1894 that:

“In Germany [Jewish] activity was exceedingly great. They were at the bottom of legislation favorable to the carrying on of banking and exchange, the practice of usury and speculation. It was they who profited by the abolition, in 1867, of the ancient laws limiting the rate of interest. They were active in bringing about the enactment of the law of June 1870, which exempted stock companies from government supervision. After the Franco-German War, they were among the boldest speculators, and at a time when German capitalists were carried away by a passion for the creation of industrial combinations, they acted a no less important part than had the Jews of France, from 1830 to 1848. Their activity persisted until the financial panic of 1873, when the country squires and the small traders who had been ruined by the excesses of this Grunder Periode in which the Jew had played the most important part, gave themselves up to the most violent anti-Semitism, such, indeed, as proceeds only from injured interests.” [LAZARE, p. 166]

With the rise of consolidated corporations in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s, says W. E. Mosse, a Jewish scholar, “a picture emerges of a number of [German] companies with significant Jewish representation in the top positions, which constitutes something of a network with certain common features
and common interests.” [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 219] For those men with “multiple board memberships” in a variety of major companies, 18 men had more than 21 board positions each. Of these 18, 10 were Jewish. [MOSSE, p. 257] “The distribution of these Jewish board members among major companies shows a distinctive interlocking pattern.” [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 253]

This typical business formulation had been evidenced in the German elite some years earlier when Jews tried to gain acceptance into Masonic lodges. Jacob Katz notes that

“Members of the lodge were expected to communicate with each other on equal footing. Jews, so the complaint ran, tended to cluster together whenever they appeared in the lodge, creating a subgroup, a clique. Similar observances were made in other quarters as well. I do not think this accusation was a figment of their imagination with no basis in fact. Jewish historical experience, as well as Jewish concepts and practices, created a mentality functioning as a factor of cohesion among Jews and thereby as a barrier between them and non-Jews.” [KATZ, RoGH, p. 5]

Many German Jews were known to have, at least officially, converted to Christianity. Like the Spanish Marranos, this was often merely expeditious. As the German Jewish poet Heinrich Heine observed, baptism was “the ticket of admission into German culture.” [VARON, p. 10] Heine himself, notes Nahum Goldmann, “was a very good Jew at the end of his life and [his] conversion to Christianity was only a formality.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 66] Popular German Jewish author Emil (born Cohen) Ludwig’s “conversion to Christianity had been merely an effort to buy the respect of Germans.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 26] “Often one submitted [to baptism],” notes Adam Weisberger, “as an opportunistic matter of convenience … A Jewish origin was a handicap but one which baptism could remedy.” [WEISBERGER, A., 1997, p. 48] (Even in America, noted James Yaffe, reflecting a theme, “Serge Koussevitzky, Eugene Ormandy, and Pierre Monteux, all Jews, had to convert to Christianity in order to reach the top of the symphony world.”) [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 52]

Even among the wealthy assimilationists to German society in the Jewish communities “mixed marriages were the exception rather than the rule and the Jews continued to live a life apart. They interacted with non-Jews in their professional lives, but very seldom in private.” [TRAVERSO, p. 15] This model even parallels the wealthy German-Jewish situation in the United States in the same era: “The social solidarity [in America] was no way better exemplified and furthered than by the tendency – common to all unified elite – to intermarry … [SUPPLE, p. 80] … German-Jewish investment banking [in the U. S.] in the late 19th century … was … based upon the proliferation of kinship groups … it seems possible to say that the German-Jewish groups had a strategic role to play in the providing of capital from Germany for American industrial development.” [SUPPLE, p. 84-85] By 1937 nine of America’s richest 60 families were Jewish, including the Guggenheims, Lehmans, Warburgs, Kahns, Schiffs, Blumenthals, Friedsams, Rosenwalds, and Baruchs. [GOLDSTEIN, D. p. 101] Stephen Birmingham notes that the insularity of the wealthy Jewish strata in
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America: “For forty-five years after its founding in 1867, Kuhn, Loeb, and Company had no partners who were not related by blood or marriage to the Loeb-Kuhn-Wolff family complex. For nearly fifty years after Goldman, Sachs was founded, all partners were members of the intermarried Goldman and Sachs family. The Lehmans hardly seemed to need intermarriage at all: until 1924, nearly 75 years after the firm was founded, all the partners were named Lehman.” [BIRMINGHAM, p. 9-10]

By 1907-08 Jews had a conspicuous presence in the corporate sector of the German economy. Despite representing only one per cent of the German population, 20 per cent of the largest companies had a “substantial” Jewish involvement. A further 16 per cent had “significant’ Jewish management. [MOSSE, W., 1987, p. 273] Examining the very largest companies, W. E. Mosse notes that over two-thirds of such firms had a “significant Jewish component.” Of the most powerful corporate organizations in Germany, only 7.7 per cent were “without some degree of Jewish participation.” [MOSSE, p. 273, 274] In 1913, fifteen Jews held 211 seats on boards of German banks; by 1928 this number was 718. In that same year Jews represented 80% of the leading members of the Berlin stock exchange. Five years later the Nazis expelled 85% of all stockbrokers because of “race.” [GORDON, p. 12]

In the pre-World War II Weimar Republic of Germany that fell to the Nazis, 11% of Germany’s doctors were Jews, and 16% of its lawyers. [MOSSE, p. 26] By 1909-10, about one-fourth of the teachers at German universities were of Jewish descent. [GORDON, p. 13] As elsewhere, an expediential prerequisite for advancement was at least superficial conversion to Christianity. “Those who were baptized,” says Nachum Gidal, “were then eligible to be appointed to professional chairs.” [GIDAL, p. 17] “In the spring of 1933,” notes Anthony Heilbut, “Hitler shocked the world by dismissing from their jobs the titans of German scholarship, the vast majority of whom were Jewish.” [HEILBUT, p. 23] (Adolf Hitler’s family doctor had been Jewish. Hitler’s sister was even once employed by the Mensa Academica Judaica in Vienna. Hitler was awarded a medal of honor for his deeds in World War I; the award was reportedly expedited by a Jewish army officer, Hugo Gutmann.) [GOLDBERG, M., 1976, p. 38-39]

Almost 80% of department and chain store business in pre-war Germany were Jewish, 40% of wholesale textile firms, and 60% of the wholesale and retail clothing business. By 1895, 56% of German Jews were involved in commerce; correspondingly, only 10% of non-Jewish Germans were in this field. [TRAVERSO, p.15] By the 1930s, Jews controlled 90% of the world’s fur trade, reflected in an important yearly auction in Leipzig. [BLACK, p. 131] “Jews were also important in the wholesale metal business and retail grocery business.” In Upper Silesia more than half of the local industry – coal, iron, steel, petroleum, et al – was owned or directed by Jews before 1933. [NIEWYK, p. 13-14] “The coal and iron industry of Upper Silesia,” says Sidney Osborne, “– the second largest in Germany – was almost the exclusive creation of a handful of Jews.” [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 18]
This area included the Jewish-owned iron company owned by Mortiz Friedlander, Sinai Levy and David Lowenfeld; the “well-known iron and steel works, Bismarkshutte” which was founded by two Jewish merchants; an “extensive iron pipe and tube works” owned by Mortiz Hahn and Simon Huldschinsky; the Upper Silesian Iron Industry (with branches Tubenhutte and Baildonhutte); “one of the largest enamel works” in Germany; Ferrum, and iron and steel firm; the Upper Silesian Zinc Foundries company; the “coke-oven industry Gluckauf; the Upper Silesian Coke and Chemical Works; and coal mining (Otto Friedlander). [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 18] “Other important industries in Jewish hands,” adds Sidney Osborne,

“were leather, textiles, and cigarette factories, the Portland cement and lime industry, and important iron and lumber interests. This account of Jewish enterprise in Upper Silesia is given with some particularity because it was more or less typical of what was going on in other industrial regions of Germany.” [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 19]

“The Hirsch copper works in Halberstadt…”, notes Nachum Gidal, “[became] the most important copper and brass works in Europe. The works was still owned by the Orthodox family until 1933. In the basic materials industry, Fritz von Friedlander-Fuld (1858-1917) was outstanding with his Silesian enterprises … [comprising] a group of major firms. Friedlander-Fuld was responsible for building up the coke industry in Germany … Closely linked with the coke industry was the petroleum industry, led by general director M. Melamid … The founder of the Silesian iron industry (Caro-Hegenschedt) was George von Caro … His brother Oskar Caro … is regarded as the founder of the German enamel industry. Mortiz von der Porten … spearheaded the aluminum sector in Germany.” [GIDAL, p. 266] Wilhelm Von Gutmann’s Gebruder Gutmann Industries “was the largest single factor in the coal industry of the Austro-Hungarian empire.” [GREENBERG, M., p. 70] Philip Rosenthal founded “the most famous porcelain factory in Selb in Bavaria.” [GIDAL, p. 267] Albert Balin “played an outstanding part in the building up of the German merchant fleet … Under his guidance [the Hamburg-America line] developed into Europe’s leading shipping company.” Walter Rathenau was president of the “Siemens works, the largest electricity company in Germany.” [GIDAL, p. 266-268]

In the 1930s, notes Ian Kershaw, during Nazi efforts to politicize the German peasants against Jews in the Alzenau district,

“Jewish-owned cigar factories dominated local industry … Jews in fact owned most of the twenty-nine factories, with a combined work force of 2,206 women and 280 men … In the countryside … the main issue was the remaining dominance in many areas of the Jewish cattle dealer, the traditional middle-man and purveyor of credit for untold numbers of German peasants … [As late as 1935,] the wholesale cattle trade in Ebermannstadt was … still ‘to a good ninety percent’ in Jewish hands.” [KERSHAW, p. 241-242]

Jews were likewise dramatically over represented in every sphere of aca-
demic enterprise, from philosophy to science. “Jews were also the most influential critics of drama, art, music, and books as well as the owners of the most important art galleries and theatres.” [GOLDBERG, p. 26] In the Berlin of 1930, 80% of the theatre directors were Jewish and they authored 75% of the produced plays. [MACDONALD, p. 125] Many prominent actors, actresses, and moviemakers were Jewish. Some Jewish scholars, like Walter Laquer, have even went so far as to claim that without Jewish influence the culture of the pre-Nazi Weimar Republic “would not have existed.” [TRAVERSO, p. 12] “Jews,” says Laquer, “were prominent among Expressionist poets, among the novelists of the 1920’s, among the theatrical producers and, for a while, among the leading figures of cinema.” [LAQUER, p. 73] “Jewish names,” notes Nachum Gidal, “were numerous among the pioneers of film and the film industry,” [GIDAL, p. 370] including Paul Davidson and Herman Fellner who founded “the first German film company.” [GIDAL, p. 370]

Frederick Grunfeld romanticizes the Jewish road from an economic base to enormous influence upon German popular culture:

“The shoe-factory generation regularly produced and nurtured a brood of scribes, artists, intellectuals. Else Lasker-Schuler was the daughter of an investment banker, Carl Sternheim the son of a banker and newspaper publisher, Walter Benjamin of an antique dealer, Alfred Neumann of a lumber merchant, Stefan Zweig of a textile manufacturer, Franz Kafka of a haberdashery wholesaler, Herman Bloch of a cotton-mill owner; Theodore Lessing and Walter Hasenclever were sons of doctors and grandsons of manufacturers, and so on, in an orderly and predictable procession from the department store into the library, the theatre and the concert hall.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 28-29]

Most of the members of the famously influential “Frankfurt School” of politics, philosophy, and culture were also Jewish – Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Friedrich Pollock, and many others. Frederick Grunfeld argues that these people did not really experience anti-Semitism in pre-Nazi Germany. Why? “All of these privileged witnesses … came from well-to-do families of the upper middle class, for whom money had always been a talisman against the cruder forms of prejudice.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 17]

Although such people were from affluent families, socialism and communism were often the world views they championed. “What today we are apt to call Weimar culture,” notes Jewish scholar Werner Mosse, “was largely the creation of left-wing intellectuals, among whom there was such a disproportionate number of Jews that Weimar culture has been called, somewhat snidely, an internal Jewish dialogue.” [MOSSE, W., 1985, p. 22] “In twentieth century Germany where the Jews formed less than one percent of the nation’s population,” observes Istvan Deak,

“Jews were responsible for a great part of German culture. The owners of three of Germany’s greatest newspaper houses; the editors of the Vossische Zeitung and Berliner Tageblatt; most book publishers; the owners and editors of the Neue Rundschau and other distinguished literary mag-
azines; the owners of Germany’s greatest art galleries were all Jews. Jews played a major part in theatre and in the film industry as producers, directors, and actors. Many of Germany’s best composers, musicians, artists, sculptors, and architects were Jews. Their participation in literary criticism and in literature were enormous: practically all the great critics and many novelists, poets, dramatists, and essayists of the Weimar Republic were Jews … If cultural contributions by Jews were far out of proportion to their numerical strength, their participation in left-wing intellectual activities were even more disproportionate.” [DEAK, p. 28]

By the 1920s German critics like Theodore Fritsch, Hans Blucher, and Adolf Bartel were influential in the growing German complaint that German culture was dominated by Jews. [TRAVERSO] A German Jew, Moritz Goldstein, had poured fuel on the issue of Jewish dominance by writing a much-discussed article in 1913 in which he wrote that Jews essentially ran German culture, from an almost complete monopoly of Berlin newspapers and dominance of German theatre, music, and literature. [LAQUER, p. 74] “German cultural life seems to be passing increasingly into Jewish hands,” Goldstein wrote, “… We Jews are administering the spiritual property of a nation which denies us our right and our ability to do so.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 21] Even in the nineteenth century the German composer, and nationalist, Richard Wagner, was horrified to realize the large number of Jews in his audiences, as well as in the receptions for him afterward. [TRAVERSO, p. 12]

Although Jews, as 1% of the German population, represented a negligible electoral power, by the early twentieth century their economic and social impact was considerable in the political sphere. Jewish-funded lawyers, for instance, were instrumental in securing fines against, or jail terms, for right wing politicians, often for disorderly conduct charges or libel. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 27] Even “the police commissioner of Berlin during part of the period of Nazi agitation for power was a Jew, Dr. Bernhard Weiss.” [GOLDBERG, M. H. 1979, p. 121] “In 1933,” says Anthony Heilbut, “[Jews] were only five hundred thousand of Germany’s sixty-four million people, and one-third of these lived in Berlin. Jews had infiltrated many areas of German life, particularly the media, through the newspapers they owned and edited, as well as the movies they wrote and produced.” [HEILBUT, p. 25] Before World War I, two of the most important German newspapers – the National-Zeitung of Berlin and the Frankfurter Zeitung – were owned and edited by Jews. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 25] 13 of 21 daily newspapers in Berlin in the 1870’s were Jewish-owned, among them the only three that focused on political satire. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 25] In the pre-Nazi era of the Weimar Republic, three of Germany’s important newspapers were Jewish-owned – the Vossische Zeitung, the Berliner Tageblatt (founded in 1872 by Rudolf Mosse and Georg Davidsohn) and the Frankfurter Zeitung (Heinrich Simon/Leopold Sonnemann). (The eventual president of the World Zionist Organization, Nahum Goldmann, began writing for the Frankfurt paper when he was 15 years old). [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 16] The newspapers Grenzboten and Ostdeutsche Post were also owned by a Jewish media mogul, Ignaz Kuranda. [ROTH, C., 1940, p. 142] The two largest publishing houses in Germany – the Ullstein, and Mosse
companies – were also owned by Jews, as were a number of smaller ones. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 26] Rudolf Mosse, the founder of the Mosse company, and a colleague also began “building up an advertising bureau which soon overtook the former leaders, the English advertising agencies, and had 275 branches worldwide.” [GIDAL, p. 272] In the late 1800s Leopold Ullstein “launched the Berliner Morgenpost, which built up a circulation of six hundred thousand, the largest in Germany, but perhaps his most dramatic breakthrough came with the Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung which by 1894 had a circulation of two million … Ullstein had five sons, all of whom developed different branches of his enterprise. By the ‘thirties they were not only the biggest newspaper group in Germany, but they also published books, magazines, dress patterns and music. They also had their own news agency, picture service, film studio and even a zoo to serve their children’s papers.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 70]

The Jewish-owned Landhoffs book publishing firm was also a “book trade dynasty,” [LOTTMAN, p. 51] as was the Springers company. “Not just the principals of the [Springers] firm,” notes Business History, “but many of the distinguished scientists among their authors and editors were Jewish.” [SHAW, C., p. 214] Leading “avant-garde” publishing firms included the Jewish houses of S. Fischer, Kurt Wolff, Georg Bondi, Erich Reiss, and the Malik Verlag. [LAQUER, p. 73] “Bote and Bote was Germany’s largest music publisher and ran a concert agency as well … Both Rutter and Loening in Frankfurt am Main and the Deutsche Verlegsantalt in Stuttgart were founded by Jews, as were the later publishing houses of Erich, Reiss, Brandus, and a number of specialist presses.” [GIDAL, p. 35]

With the rise of German fascism, in 1933 a retired United States Department official, Edward House, told a new ambassador to Berlin: “You should try to ameliorate Jewish suffering. [The Nazis] are clearly wrong and even terrible, but the Jews should not be allowed to dominate economic or intellectual life in Berlin as they have for a long time.” [GROSE, p. 97-98] Anthony Heilbut notes a joke that was a favorite of Albert Einstein’s, “in which an émigré asks a friend if he is homesick for Berlin, and the other replies: ‘What for? I’m not Jewish.’” [HEILBUT, p. 46]

Jews were also vastly over represented as editors and reporters in German journalism. “Unfortunately,” says Sarah Gordon, “many of them tended to use their works as vehicles to oppose or criticize prevalent German values.” [GORDON, p. 14] Among these critics of German society was Kurt Tucholsky, “whose biting satire made him a hero of the more cosmopolitan segments of the German middle class. The son of a successful Jewish businessman-lawyer, Tucholsky flayed Germans and German values mercilessly. By the late 1920s, he had decided that Germany was hopeless and that middle-class Germans were either idiots or positively evil.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 85] Germans, assessed prominent Jewish pianist Arthur Rubinstein in the 1930s, “are not a musical people. They accept the heavy, pedantic music of Pfitzner, Reger and Bruckner with their long-winded ‘developments,’ just as they enjoy a stodgy meal of sauerkraut and sausages.” [SACHS, D., 1992, p. 21]
On one hand, Jews were increasingly perceived to have strangleholds on the German social, cultural and economic system. On the other, in the political field, Richard Rubenstein notes that

“Marxism was seen by conservative Europe as Jewish in origin and leadership, a view that was reinforced in Germany by the three successive left wing regimes that succeeded the Bavarian royal house of Wittelsbach from November 7, 1918 to May 1, 1919, at the end of World War I. In Munich, the city that did more than any other to give birth to [Hitler’s] National Socialism, and in the era in which Hitler first joined the miniscule party, a series of politically naive, left-wing Jewish leaders attempted ineffectually to bring about an enduring socialist revolution in Catholic, conservative Bavaria.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 113]

“As Robert Michel pointed out in his classic Political Parties,” note Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter,

“Jews at that time [late 1800s] were playing a key role in socialist parties in almost every European country in which they had settled in any numbers.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 84]

In Germany, these included Daniel deLeon, a Sephardic Jew who headed the Socialist Labor Party. DeLeon “attempted to conceal his Jewish background, pretending that he was descended from an aristocratic family of Catholic background.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 95]

At the influential Die Weltbuhne left-wing intellectual journal in pre-Hitler Germany, 42 of 68 writers “whose identity could be established” were found to be of Jewish descent. Two more were “half-Jews” and three others were married to Jewish women. But, notes Isak Deak, “only a few of the Weltbuhne circle openly acknowledged that they were Jews … Die Weltbuhne was in this respect not unique; Jews published, edited, and to a great part wrote the other left-wing intellectual magazines … Jews created the left-wing intellectual movement in Germany.” [DEAK, p. 24-25, 29]

In increasing political turmoil between World Wars I and II, and amidst the rise of Nazism and a growing perception that the communist movement would destroy tradition German culture and values, left-leaning Jewish politicians who were assassinated included Bavarian premiere Kurt Eisner, Eugen Levin (the chairman of the Executive Assembly of the Second Munich Soviet Republic), and German Foreign Minister Walter Rathenau.

The actual origin of the term “anti-Semitism” is credited to German author Wilhelm Marr who wrote, in 1879, a book entitled The Victory of Judaism Over Germany. Here is a brief excerpt, as he agitated about so much Jewish dominance in the life of German society:

“There is no stopping them ... Are there no clear signs that the twilight of the Jews is setting in? No. Jewry’s control of society and politics, as well as its practical domination of the religious and ecclesiastical thought, is still in the prime of its development, heading toward the realization of Jehovah’s promise, ‘I will hand all peoples over to thee.’ By now, a sudden reversal of this process is fundamentally impossible, for if it were, the entire
social structure, which has been so thoroughly Judaized, would collapse. And there is no viable alternative to this social structure which could take its place. Further, we cannot count on the help of the ‘Christian’ state. The Jews are the ‘best citizens’ of this modern, Christian state, as it is in perfect harmony with their interests ... It is not a pretentious prophecy but the deepest inner conviction which I here utter. Your generation will not pass before there will be absolutely no public office, even the highest one, which the Jews will not have usurped. Yes, through the Jewish nation, Germany will become a world power, a western New Palestine. And this will happen, not through violent revolutions, but through the compliance of the people ...

German culture has proved itself ineffective and powerless against this foreign power. This is a fact; a brute inexorable fact. State, Church, Catholicism, Protestantism, Creed and Dogma, all are brought low before the Jewish tribunal, that is, the [irreverent] daily press [which the Jews control]. [Text in brackets inserted by Mendes-Flohr and Reinharz, presumably from the context of the rest of the original Marr work] The Jews were late in their assault on Germany, but once they started there was no stopping them.” [MENDES-FOHR/REINHARZ, 1980, p. 271-273]

In nearby Austria, major newspapers like Neue Freie Presse (“the most prestigious newspaper in Central Europe”) and Wiener Tagblatt were likewise Jewish-owned. “In German-speaking Europe,” says Jacques Kornberg, “the term ‘journalism’ and ‘Jews’ went together in people’s minds.” And, adds Kornberg, since Jews had a reputation for “shady business practices” and “journalistic corruption,” notions of “anti-Semitism and anti-journalism always went hand in hand.” [KORNBERG; ROTH, C., 1940, p. 142]

In Vienna, Austria, by 1910, 62% of the lawyers were Jewish, 51% of the doctors and dentists, and 70% of those in scientific occupations. [TRAVERSO, p. 15] A large proportion of the rest of Viennese Jews, 40%, were merchants. A Jewish writer from Berlin, Jakob Wasserman, in visiting Vienna in 1898, remarked that

“I soon realized that the whole of public life was dominated by Jews… I was amazed to see such a crowd of Jewish physicians, lawyers, clubs men, snobs, dandies, proletarians, actors, journalists, and poets.” [TRAVERSO, p. 28]

Jewish author Stephan Zweig claimed that nine-tenths of Viennese culture was “promoted, nourished, or even created by Viennese Jewry.” [TRAVERSO, p. 28] “The crowding of Jewish sons of well-to-do parents into the cultural occupations was especially marked in Germany and Austria,” notes Hannah Arendt, “where a great proportion of cultural institutions, like newspapers, publishing, music, and theatre, became Jewish institutions.” [ARENDT, Origins, p. 52] In the late nineteenth century, says Albert Lindemann, “that the non-Jews [of Vienna] had a sense of being overwhelmed by a Jewish invasion is … easy to understand, particularly because Jews tended to choose certain occupations from which non-Jews were often consequently thrown out … Nearly all
the banks in the capital, and indeed in the Dual Monarchy as a whole, were owned by Jews as were many of the most important newspapers, especially those of mass circulation.” [LINDEMANN, p. 25] “Antisemitism,” once observed Arthur Schnitzler, “became popular in Vienna only when the Jews themselves took it up.” [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 346]

This pattern existed not only in Germany and Austria, but in Western Europe and other parts of the world as well. “Between the Franco-Prussian War and the First World War, Paris was a major international banking and financial center, and Jews were among the dominant figures in French finance. In the late nineteenth century, roughly one-third of all Paris bankers were Jews.” [p. 20] Although Jews only numbered 60,000-80,000 people in France in 1880, they had joined the “inner circle of banking elite in the mid-nineteenth century … many observers… viewed the French bankers and the financial sector of the middle class as … running the country.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 33] “The Jews [in France],” says Michael Marrus, “had, in less than a century, worked their way into all layers of French society. The rapidity of this advance is particularly striking.” [MARRUS, p. 35] “In France,” wrote Bernard Lazare, “under the Restoration and the July Monarchy, [Jews] stood at the head of the financial and industrial enterprise, and were among the founders of the great canals, railways, and insurance companies.” [LAZARE, p. 166] “There is no denying,” says Arnold Mayer, “that [by 1940] in France Jews occupied pivotal and exposed positions in government as well as in mass movements of the left.” [MAYER, p. 49] Such “pivotal positions” included the Jewish prime minister of France, Leon Blum. “Blum,” notes Mayer, “quite artlessly chose two Jews, Andre Blumel and Jules Moch, to be close assistants. His two cabinets also included not a few ministers and under secretaries of Jewish origin.” [MAYER, p. 48] (Even in the cultural sphere, “perhaps the most celebrated art salon in French society was owned by Madame Armand de Caillavet, daughter of a wealthy Jewish banker from Austria.” [MARRUS, p. 39])

Much earlier, prior to their mass expulsion from France, the historian Rigord (1150-1207) claimed that by the twelfth century Jews “had acquired half of Paris” and that “a great number of Christians had even been expropriated by the [usurious] Jews because of debts.” [LEON, p. 146] Even Pope Innocent II complained to the King of France in this era that Jews were gaining possession of Church properties, lands, and vineyards. [LEON, p. 147]

By the late nineteenth century, there was talk amongst prominent Jews in France about themselves as a superior people with a “right to rule” others. “There were certain magistrates,” wrote a well-known French Jewish intellectual, Julien Benda, “financiers rather than literary men, with whom the belief of superiority of their race and the natural subjugation of those who did not belong to it, were visibly sovereign.” [LINDEMANN, p. 69]

In the same era, even the novelist Emile Zola, hero of French Jews for his activism in their support in the so-called Dreyfus Affair (where a Jew was framed for espionage), was concerned in his writings about the conspiratorial implications of Jewish economic endeavors. “That such a man,” says Albert Lindemann, “shared the widespread apprehensions of the period about the rise of Jewish
power, particularly in the form of money, suggests how much that sort of anti-
Jewish hostility cut across the political spectrum.” [LINDEMANN, p. 70]

Even the famed leftist, Friedrich Engels, who had praised Jewish activism in
the socialist movement, said, “I begin to understand French anti-Semitism
when I see how many Jews of Polish origin and German names intrude them-
selves everywhere.” [LINDEMANN, p. 70]

The pattern of spectacular Jewish economic influence and prominence
throughout their Diaspora is not uncommon. On the contrary. According to
Australia’s Business Review Weekly’s 1986 ‘Rich List,’ 25% of the 200 wealthiest
people in Australia were Jews. [RUTLAND, p. 260] This is phenomenal since
Jews consist of half a per cent of that country’s population. As usual, the com-
community was sticking together. 1961, 1966, and 1971 censuses found that 85-
88% of Australian Jewish men and 90-94% of Jewish women were married to
fellow Jews. In a more recent survey, a “large percentage” of mixed marriage
partners (i.e., non-Jews) convert to Judaism and often the children are raised as
Jews. [RUTLAND, p. 293] Taking advantage of the increased ethnic pluraliza-
tion of Australian society, by the late 1980’s, says Suzanne Rutland, there has
been a “re-Judaization” of Australian Jewry. [RUTLAND, p. 294]

In New Zealand, Jewish entrepreneur “Sir Wolf Fisher and several Jewish
colleagues pioneered the national steel mills, its brewing and hotel industries.”
[SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 171]

In South Africa, “nowhere in the world have Jews slipped so quickly into a
life of economic ease as here.” [LITVINOFF, p. 192] “The marketing of dia-
monds,” says Mendel Kaplan, “at the outset through individual dealers and later
through the big diamond syndicates, was largely handled by Jews … the best of
them … afterwards made their mark in the gold industry.” [KAPLAN, p. 356]
Edmond de Rothschild had a significant investment in his predecessor in the
South African diamond trade, Cecil Rhodes. By 1770 Jews controlled four-
fifths of all diamonds imported from India and “over the years Jews have taken
leading positions at De Beers, which today controls roughly four-fifths of the
world’s output of unpolished diamonds.” [KOTKIN, p. 53] (The modern pol-
ished diamond trade is largely located in the Jewish state). Beneficiaries of
apartheid, “South African Jews,” says African-American professor Tony Martin,
“were the world’s richest community and have become the world’s highest per
capita contributors to Israel.” [MARTIN, p. 74] Ernest Oppenheimer, who
became one of the richest men in the world, is called by Louis Hotz “one of the
chief architects of modern South Africa’s economy,” [FELDBERG, p. 57] Re-
presenting about 4% of the “white population,” “there is hardly a branch of
South African industry in which Jewish men of enterprise and initiative have
not had some part.” [FELDBERG, p. 63] “The white status of the Jew [in apart-
heid South Africa],” says Milton Shain, “was never seriously questioned or
threatened … The Anglo-German Jewish establishment enjoyed privilege,
power, authority, and even acclaim from earliest times, and the upward mobi-
ity of the Eastern European Jew was patently obvious. The pariah was indeed
transformed into the parvenu.”
“In *South Africa,*” diplomatically noted South African civil rights activists *Desmond Tutu* to a Jewish interviewer, “Jews in their success, especially as industrialists and business people and as traders would be seen as people who have benefited from the exploitation of Blacks, because the South African system is a capitalist system which has tended to favor the strong and successful … [HOFFMAN, p. 14] think there is a perception [among many South African Blacks] that Jews are not entirely innocent. Most of us oppose capitalism, because what we have experienced of capitalism tends to favor the privileged and the strong and [it] seems to be exploitive.” [HOFFMAN, p. 14]

In *Belgium,* Jews dominate an estimated 80% of the Antwerp diamond trade. [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 47] Most of these are ultra-Orthodox Hassids. “If [Antwerp’s] Jews maintain little contact with Antwerp’s Gentile majority,” notes Howard Sachar,

“their segregation is self-imposed, particularly by the Orthodox establishment. What contact would they wish, anyway, with the non-Jewish world? Their business activities are confirmed almost exclusively to an industry they themselves monopolize.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 48]

In *Canada,* while comprising under 1% of the national population, by 1981 “both Jewish men and Jewish women tend to be concentrated at the top of the occupational hierarchy. Thus, Jewish men are about 4.5 times more likely than all men in Canada to be in a medical profession; 4.1 times more likely to have a social science job … Jews were 5.3 times more likely than all Canadians to earn very high incomes ($50,000 plus per year) and had “the highest average incomes of any ethnic group in Canada.” [p. 26-28] In a 1986 Toronto *Life* list of the most influential people in Toronto, “almost one in four was Jewish.” [TROPER, p. 40]

In today’s *Russia,* with the fall of communism, a Jewish capitalist “oligarchy” is known to control between 50-80 percent of Russia’s wealth. As Jewish scholar *Betsy Gidwitz* noted in 1999:

“That Jews control a disproportionately large share of the Russian economy and Russian media certainly has some basis in fact. Between 50 and 80 percent of the Russian economy is said to be in Jewish hands, with the influence of the five Jews among the eight individuals commonly referred to as “oligarchs” particularly conspicuous. (An oligarch is understood to be a member of a small group that exercises control in a government. The five oligarchs of Jewish descent are Boris Berezovsky, Mikhail Friedman, Vladimir Gusinsky, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, and Alexander Smolensky. The other oligarchs are Vagit Alekperov, Vladimir Potanin, and Rem Vyakhirev.) Perhaps the most famous (and simultaneously the most infamous) of the oligarchs is Boris Berezovsky. In common with most of the other Jewish oligarchs, Berezovsky controls industries in three critical areas: the extraction and sale of a major natural resource, such as oil, as a source of great wealth; a large bank (useful in influencing industry and transferring assets abroad); and several major media outlets (useful for exerting influence
and attacking rivals). He also controls a significant share of the **Aeroflot** airline and the Moscow automobile industry.” [GIDWITZ, B., 9-15-99]

A 1999 **Wall Street Journal** editorial notes that disturbing situation in today’s **Russia**:

> “Russia’s oligarchs – many of them apparatchiks from the communist days – have stripped the country’s best assets and transferred their winnings to off-shore companies they control … For every dollar a Russian has laundered abroad there had to be a counterparty at the other end. London, Geneva, and New York are preferred destinations, as well as off-shore havens such as Cyprus and New Jersey. Estimates of $10 billion capital flight from Russia each year are probably conservative.” [WS J, 8-30-99, p. 8]

[For a fuller story of Jewish Russian dominance in today’s Russia, including its “Russian mafia” dimensions, see the Mass Media 2 section p. 1213].

 Across the world, in **Panama**, by the 1980s, under the dictatorship of **Manuel Noriega**, “the Jewish community as a whole, many of whose ancestors had arrived as Syrian traders at the turn of the century, was exceedingly rich. A spiritual leader of the community, **Rabbi Zion Levy**, warned them on more than one occasion at the Jewish Club in Panama City that their excesses could endanger their interests. The six-thousand-strong Jewish community owned the largest businesses in the Avanida Center, Via Espana, and Sona Libre. They lived in the expensive neighborhoods of Punta Paitia and San Francisco.” [COCKBURN, p. 251] “Maybe it’s not nice to say,” a Jewish merchant told a reporter for the Israeli newspaper **Yediot Aharanot**, “but our situation with Noriega was wonderful.” [COCKBURN, p. 251] In fact, noted **Joel Kotkin** in 1993, “in virtually every society where Jews are represented in any significant numbers – from the Americas to South Africa to Europe – [Jewish] levels of educational achievement and occupational and economic status remain far above the national averages.” [KOTKIN, p. 20]

**Nicaragua**? In 1986 the **Associated Press** noted that “Rabbi Balfour Brickner of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue in New York, who went to Nicaragua on a fact-finding mission in 1984, said most of Nicaragua’s handful of pre-[Sandinista] revolution Jews had close ties to the [former] dictator, Anastasio Somoza, and left of their own accord.” From a peak of about 150 families, fleeing the country with the fall of the dictator, there was then probably remaining “not more than five.” [NOKES, R., 3-20-86]

**Honduras**? “Sam the Banana Man” Zemurray, a Bessarabian Jewish immigrant, made millions of dollars in his Cuyamel Fruit company, and by the 1930s was “the major shareholder in the largest banana company in Central America” (United Fruit – later called United Brands). Zemurray owned “300,000 shares of UFCO stock, valued at $30 million, a fortune placing him among the nation’s monied elite” and he was “the man who would run tropical America’s most powerful and far-flung transnational company for the next twenty-five years.” “Some may argue…,” wrote scholars **Lester Langley** and **Thomas Schoonover** in 1995,
“that Zemurray had shaped United Fruit in the twenty years after his dramatic takeover and, further, that his ‘style’ in establishing his own company earlier in the century involved bribery and the subsidizing of revolution to overthrow a legitimate government in order to place someone more favorable to his interests in the executive office. Unarguably, he stands guilty of this charge – as does the U.S. government in its dealings with the isthmian governments in this century.” [LANGLEY/SCHOONOVER, p. 171]

“As a foreign corporation of conspicuous size,” notes the New Encyclopedia Brittanica, “United Fruit sometimes became the target of popular attacks. The Latin-American press often referred to it as el pulpo (“the octopus”) in the first decades of the twentieth century.” [NEW ENCY BRITT, 1993, 12, p. 140]

In 1975, Eli Black, by then another Jewish head of the same corporate conglomerate, committed suicide when it was revealed that he was bribing Honduran officials to get lower banana export taxes. “Bananagate,” noted Langley and Schoonover, “was yet another episode in the sordid record of the United States and, particularly, of United Fruit of Central America.” [LANGLEY/SCHOONOVER, p. 171]

In Costa Rica, the Jewish community built their economic power in clothing manufacture and sales. By 1978, as 0.8% of that country’s population, “Jews were 1.6% of its medical doctors, 2% of its architects, 1.2% of its civil engineers … Jewish men and women of letters have occupied leading positions [in universities] since the early 1970s.” [GUDMUNDSON, p. 229] “To be sure,” noted Lowell Gudmundson in 1987, “wealth in general – and Jewish wealth in particular – invites criticism in Costa Rica,” [GUDMUNDSON, p. 230] as it did in 1951-52 when there were demonstrations against Jewish commercial activities. An eventual Costa Rican president complained in 1946:

“You [the Jews] should not be irritated by the complaints of Costa Ricans; you have left them without homes to live in; you are taking from them one of the few prosperous activities of the present day; you do not invest, nor produce; you try to create monopolies in some areas of commerce.” [GUDMUNDSON, p. 226-227]

In Colombia, Ernesto Corescos, a Jewish entrepreneur, founded the Colombian airline (totally called Avianca). [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 267] In Venezuela, Jewish “Marrano” refugees from Portugal “intermarried and were numbered eventually among Venezuela’s most aristocratic families.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 266] By the mid-1980s, among the 17,000 Venezuelan Jews (living mostly in Caracas) were 350 factory-owners. Also, notes Howard Sachar, about recent Jewish immigrants there since World War II, “by now, their children occupy important positions in the professions, and notably as faculty members of the National University of Caracas.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 266]

In Mexico, notes Judith Elkin,

“In a 1994 study of the Jewish community of Mexico, 52.6 percent of employed Jews identified themselves as ‘directors, managers or administrators,’ while another 26.7 percent identified themselves as ‘profes-
The rate of upward social mobility was astonishing, considering that the community was barely 70 years old … Professionalization demarcates the occupational pattern of male and female Jewish workers from that of the majority population.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 154]

Robert Levine adds that

“Affluent Mexican Jews, conscious of not ‘feeling’ Mexican and of being considered foreigners, now travel to Houston and Los Angeles to buy their clothes and to seek medical treatment. As a result, they contribute to the persistence of the stereotype of themselves as outsiders. Poorer Mexican Jews mixed more with non-Jews, but economic improvement is generally accompanied by a narrowing of extra group contacts until, at the top of the economic pyramid, virtually all contacts are with other Jews.” [LEVINE, Adoptive, p. 77]

“The relatively small Jewish community [of Mexico],” notes Judith Elkin, “with its accumulated experiences, skills and enterprises, can be said to have served as a catalytic agent in the economic life of Mexico.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 145] In 2000, the Jerusalem Report also noted:

“The Jewish community [in Mexico] keeps a low profile partly because several of its members have been kidnapped. ‘Jews have been targeted perhaps because they are viewed as wealthy,’ says one member of the Jewish community who would not give a name for publication.” [DE LOPEZ, R., 11-29-00, p. 5]

In Argentina, according to a national census, as early as 1960, “most Argentine Jewish males were employers or self-employed … 37 percent were in commerce, 22 percent in industry, and 10 percent were executives and managers … Jews are concentrated in white-collar occupations.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 150] By 1970, half of the 242 credit unions in the country were owned or partly owned by Jews. The credit union system collapsed, however, noted Judith Elkin, because of

“inflation and high interest rates [which] enriched the credit unions beyond the capability of some directors to manage their funds prudently. Swollen coffers attracted speculators, who operated on both sides of the law and invested too heavily in construction … Fraud in the management of the credit unions led to their widespread bankruptcy. Their collapse took down with them hundreds of thousands of small depositors … Perhaps the worse damage was the revival of ancient antipathies to Jewish ‘money changers.’” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 165]

Although “over the decades” the Jews of Argentina “established themselves as one of the nation’s most affluent communities,” with the controversial collapse of two Jewish-owned banks under charges of corruption, $28 million in Jewish “communal assets were lost overnight.” [JORDAN, M., 6-28-01]

Among the prominent Jews of Argentina is the Wertheim family, owners of Banco Mercantil Argentino, ISA Fabrica (“the largest woolen mill in Latin America”), Argentina’s “biggest television manufacturer,” as well as companies involved in fruit, fashion and cattle. A Zionist activist, Julio Wertheim has also invested in Israeli companies. [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 286-288]
In Brazil, “highly literate and well-versed in business affairs, [Jews] were in the forefront of Brazil’s remarkable [post-World War II] economic take-off.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 256] The Klabin and Lafer company, for example, became “the largest newsprint producer in Latin America.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 146] Then there is Leon Feffer. “By 1950 [Feffer’s] company,” notes Jewish historian Howard Sachar,

“was the largest manufacturer of quality paper in Brazil. At this point, he might have followed the example of the Klabins, East European Jews whose firm was the largest manufacturer of paper products in Latin America … [By 1985] not less than 70 million trees are growing in Feffer-owned forests, and 10,000 men are working there. Another 3,000 employees labor in Feffer’s huge integrated pulp-and-paper factory and 1,3000 in three smaller factories … [He is] the largest integrated pulp, paper and board operator in Latin America … [His company has a] domination of the Brazilian market.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 257-258]

Henrique Rattner notes that

“Jews have situated themselves in the upper ranks of society in terms of income per capita, educational achievement, life-style, and political identification … [RATTNER, p. 187] … Based upon available data, we may conclude that about two-thirds of the Jewish community of Brazil belong (in terms of income, occupation, educational level, and consumptive patterns) to the upper strata of Brazil’s stratification system. Studies of income distribution in Brazil show a clear trend toward the concentration of income in the hands of the upper 5% of the population … [RATTNER, p. 193] … It can be assumed that two-thirds of Brazilian Jews belong to the elite who control nearly half of the total personal income and of the country’s wealth where nearly half of the population at-large live at a subsistence level.” [RATTNER, p. 195] By 1968, only 0.3 percent of Jews in Brazil had manual labor jobs. “By comparison … the vast majority [of non-Jews worked] in agriculture and manual labor.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 152]

And what of the common Jewish Brazilian perception of their place in the social pyramid? “A felling of uneasiness and insecurity,” suggests Rattner, “leads to possible ambivalence in the attitudes and behavior of Jews and of their community toward progressive democratization of Brazilian society.” [RATTNER, p. 200]

In Cuba, before Castro, says Robert Levine, “that Cuban Jews experienced significant post-war prosperity was demonstrated by the luxurious community center, the Patronato de la Casa de la Commidad Hebrea de Cuba,” built in 1953. “Several members of [dictator Fulgencio] Batista’s government from 1952 to 1958 were close to local Jews.” [LEVINE, p. 211] Among those was Jewish mobster Meyer Lansky, who built his own resort hotel, the Rivera, in Cuba, “the largest casino hotel in the world outside Las Vegas.” [LEVINE, p. 203]

Among American Jewish industrialists, developers, financiers, and department store owners in the area, Jacob Branden was knighted by Batista, the Habif family owned the largest perfume factory, and Philip Rosenberg was head of one of the largest Cuban sugar plantations, the General Sugar Corporation. Hardy
Spatz owned the Avis Rental car franchise; Albert Hartman was president of Chrysler of Cuba. [LEVINE, p. 229] “Several Jewish businessmen, especially the Americans, ran finance companies investing in commercial and residential real estate.” [LEVINE, p. 197] Adolph Kates was founder of the Miramar Yacht Club and was a member of the American Chamber of Commerce, Cuban Chamber of Commerce, and the honorary president of the Pro-Israel Committee in Cuba. [LEVINE, p. 225] Between 1930-45, 344 Jewish-owned companies made half of all shoes in Cuba. Twenty-four Jewish-owned diamond companies employed 1,200 people. [ELKIN, 1998, p. 145-146]

With Castro’s communist revolution in 1959, about 70% of the Jewish residents of Cuba fled the country, “part of the general exodus of the middle and upper classes to the United States mainland.” [LEVINE, p. 243]

There has even been an entire volume written about the tiny Jewish community in Jamaica. Why? “Although Jamaican Jews number no more than 350 individuals,” wrote Carol Holzberg in 1987, “they are still reputed to be among the island’s most prominent, wealthy, and influential national entrepreneurs.” [HOLZBERG, MINORITIES, p. xiv] By 1974-75 Jamaican Jews amounted to only 0.25% of that country’s population, but accounted for 24% of the national entrepreneurial elite “as measured by the number of Stock Exchange company boards they served on as directors and chairmen … By 1978 … six of the 14 most active national entrepreneurs were Jewish.” [HOLZBERG, p. 118] “By the eighteenth century,” notes Joachim Prinz, “the Jews were paying most of the taxes on the island of Jamaica, and both industry and international trade were in their hands.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 128]

How about Curacao, an island north of Venezuela, once a significant African slave site in the Americas? “In fact,” notes the Jewish ethnic magazine *Moment,*

> “after 350 years on the island – the community refers to itself as the oldest continuous Jewish community in the Americas – the Jews are quick to point out that on Curacao, they are the locals … [There is] now fewer than 350 Jews on an island of about 125,000 … As one rabbi told me, Curacaaoan Jews have long been the ‘Brahmins’ of their little island. There is no ‘community outside Israel where Jews [have] occupied that status in society,’ the rabbi said … The Jews are deeply entrenched in the island’s business elite. Jews own the island’s main bank, Maduro & Cu-riel’s. They own most of the car dealerships, the largest electrical appliance store, and many of the jewelry and clothing shops. Rabbi Michael Tayvah, a 39-year-old from Great Neck, N.Y., and spiritual leader at the Sephardic shul, says the Jews remain prominent in shipping—operating container freight companies.” [Roinick, J., AUG-SEP 2001]

Peru? “In 1864,” notes Howard Sachar, “the abandoned mercury and silver mines of Peru were revived by the [Jewish] Salcedo family. [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 268] “The vast majority of the founder of Lima’s Jewish community,” says Ariel Segal,
“were mercachifles, peddlers, small traders, and owners of stores, immigrants who after years of hard labor and poverty prospered and became rich. The children who graduated from the Colegio Leon Pinelo in its first years inherited the already prosperous properties of their parents and became professionals. Today they are leaders of Lima’s population, the inheritors of a community with solid institutions.” [SEGAL, A., 1999, p. 47]

Segal has written an entire book about “the Jews of the Amazon” in the remote city of Iquitos. As one Jewish visitor to the region noted in 1910, “Upon arrival, you would think that you were in a Jewish city … It is typical of [a Moroccan Jewish immigrant from Tangiers] to make his fortune in Iquitos.” [SEGAL, A., p. 51]

In Bolivia, in 1987 the Jewish community numbered only 480 people, and “most are in commerce and trade, but some have entered the cultural life of the nation as musicians, artists, and promoters of athletic teams.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 127] The few Jews in Paraguay have centered upon a mercantile life, mostly in Asuncion. “Although far from wealthy, in a nation of limited resources, they are moderately well off.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 269]

In Chile, notes Howard Sachar,


By the 1970s, Jews numbered about 30,000 in Chile, mostly living in Santiago. Immigrant Jews “rapidly achieved their characteristic eminence in commerce and played a major role in the establishment of Chilean light industry.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 275] Chilean Jews were the first to build

“factories for the manufacture of wagons, mirrors, leather clothing, and gramophone records … Chile’s first plastic factory was opened in 1924 by Jewish immigrants … By the fifties, there were Jewish entrepreneurs in sugar refining, tobacco plantations, lumber, chemicals, patent medicines, olive oil, perfume, thermoelectric plants, packing plants, eyeglasses, zippers, air conditioning and heating, Bakelite, and glass utensils for laboratories. Jewish managers and engineers were employed in foundries, construction firms, and public works, carrying on a long tradition of Jewish technicians involved with Chile’s development.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 143]

As a 1981 World Jewish Congress report noted in overview about the Jews of Latin America (expressly noting Jews in Mexico, “Central America and the West Indies,” Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Venezuela and Colombia):

“For the most part, Jews living in these well-organized communities are relatively well-to-do … Most of the people who live in these countries are poor.” [WALINSKY, L., 1981, p. 77, 78]
Hong Kong? The *Wall Street Journal* noted in 1997 that a Jewish family originally from Baghdad, the Kadoories, “are the foundation of Hong Kong commerce.” [KAHN, J., p. A1] Hong Kong, said the *Jerusalem Post* in 1998, is the place where the Jewish community (the relatively few who live there) is “arguably the wealthiest per capita in the world.” [ARNOLD, p. 16]

Even in Iran things were excellent for Jews. Before the fall of the Shah in 1979, the 80,000 Jews of Iran “on per capita terms may well have been the richest Jewish community in the world.” [MISRAHI, p. 358] 80% of Iran’s Jews were regarded as ‘well off,’” says David Misrahi, “another 10% ‘very rich.”’ [MISRAHI, p. 358] (In the wake of the Khomeini revolution, notes Robert Spero, when Iranian Jews began arriving en masse to the largely Jewish city in New York – Great Neck on Long Island, they began “to buy hundreds of homes … In a suburb not noted for modesty about its wealth, practically every American Jew in Great Neck has a story to tell about Iranian ostentation.” [SPERO, p. 20, 22]

What about the Jews of Northern Ireland, who peaked at about 400 families in the capital city of Belfast in the 1950s? (Most have since left the area, going to England or Israel). As Patrick Rucker notes:

“The cornerstone of the [Belfast Jewish] community had been set in the 19th century by a group of well-to-do Germans and Austrians. Gustav Wilhelm Wolff, in 1861, co-founded the shipbuilding factory Harland and Wolff, makers of the SS Titanic, and the Jaffe family thrived in Northern Ireland’s linen industry. Wealthy and influential, many such families became prominent in civic society … The Jews that remained in Northern Ireland, like their forefathers, are generally affluent and esteemed. Ronnie Appleton, president of the Belfast Hebrew Congregation, is a good example. A prominent attorney, Appleton was Belfast’s longest serving barriester when he retired last year [1999] … The Appletons probably have stronger ties to Israel than any other local family.” [RUCKER, P., 6-30-2000, p. 52]

What about today’s post-communist Poland, where only about 10,000-25,000 “active, affiliated, and ‘border-line’ Jews” are estimated to exist? “They are,” says Laurence Weinbaum, a senior researcher for the World Jewish Congress, “extremely well-educated, often … (at least relatively) well off” [WEINBAUM, p. 32]

In Italy, after emancipation in the 18th century, says Cecil Roth, “Jewish genius became apparent in every aspect of Italian life … [ROTH, ITALY, p. 479] … The proportion of distinction in the Jewish community outnumbered those in the country as a whole by sixteen to one, holding a clear lead in every field except the hereditary nobility and the Church.” [ROTH, p. 480] Although Jews only represented 0.1% of the Italian population in 1930, nearly 7% of the names of a handbook of notable contemporary biographies were Jews. [ROTH, p. 480] That same year Jews represented 8% of the country’s university professors. [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 53] Adapting to political conditions, Jews were even well represented as prominent members of the fascist regime of Benito Musso-
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lini. “Several Jews,” notes Edwin Black, “were among Mussolini’s closest advisers.” [BLACK, p. 62] Guido Jung was also Mussolini’s Minister of Finance, Albert Liuzzi was a commander in the fascist militia, and Giorgio Del Vecchi was the fascist rector of the University of Rome. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 37] Other prominent Jewish Italian fascists included Aldo Finzi, an undersecretary of the Ministry of Interior and member of the first Fascist Grand Council, Dante Almani, a vice chief of police, Maurizio Rava, a general in the fascist militia, and Renzo Ravenna, the mayor of Ferrara. Even Mussolini’s mistress, Margherita Sarfatti, was Jewish. She was also co-editor of the Fascist party’s monthly magazine. [ZUCOTTI, p. 25-26]

Over 200 Jews marched with Mussolini into Rome in 1922 and there were three Jews among the Fascist “martyrs” who died in bloody fights with socialists. “Jewish involvement with Italian fascism is not surprising,” says Susan Zucotti, “With the exception of many in Rome, Italian Jews were solidly middle class, and by late 1921 fascism had become basically a middle-class, anti-worker movement. Early revolutionary aspects had declined, leaving as primary goals anti-socialism, union-busting, strike-breaking, and the restoration of law and order at workers’ expense.” [ZUCOTTI, p. 24 ] “There can hardly have been a Jewish family [in Italy],” wrote Hannah Arendt, “without at least one member in the Fascist Party, for … Jews, like other Italians, had been flocking for almost twenty years into the fascist movement, since positions in the civil service were open only to members.” [ARENDT, EICHMAN, p. 178] (Even in Hollywood, in the 1930s the Jewish mogul of Columbia studios, Harry Cohn, had an autographed photo of Mussolini in his office). [CHRISTOPHER, p. 202]

Meir Michaelis writes that

“It has been suggested that jealousy of intellectually superior rivals, like [Jews] Treves and Modigliani, turned Mussolini into a latent anti-Semite during his socialist phase … Various Jews took part in the conversion of the future Duce to intervention and nationalism (G. Pantremoli, E. Jarach, E. Jona, C. Sarafatti). There were five Jews among the founders of the Fighting Fasci … According to Giuseppe Antonio Borgese, Mussolini was also strongly influenced by two Jewish women, one Russian and one Italian [Angelica Balabanoff and Margharita Sarfatti].” [MICHAELIS, M., 1978, p. 10-11]

Both women were Mussolini mistresses. Even Mussolini’s dentist, Piperno, was an Orthodox Jew. [GOLDBERG, M. 1976, p. 35-36]

In 1927 reporter Guido Bedarida reported on an interview he had with Rome’s Chief Rabbi, Angelo Sacerdoti:

“Professor Sacerdoti is persuaded that many of the fundamental principles of the Fascist Doctrine such as: the observance of the laws of the state, respect of traditions, the principle of authority, exaltation of religious values, a desire for the moral and physical cleanliness of family and the individual, the struggle for an increase of production, and therefore a struggle against Malthusianism, are no more or less than Jewish principles.” [BRENNER, Zionism, p. 41]
In the European northeast, “by 1900,” notes Ewa Morawska, “Jews constituted 75% of the entire commercial class in Russia and Congress Poland, 80% in Galicia, and 65% in Hungary.” [MORAWSKA] In Hungary profoundly disproportionate Jewish influence was also readily observable in social and economic life. “By 1920,” says Norman Cantor, “half of the lawyers of Budapest were Jews, and Jews were also prominent in science, literature, and the arts.” [CANTOR, p. 247] By the late 1930s, Jews, as 5% of the Hungarian population, also owned over 36% of the retail stores, warehouses, and offices.” [KOTKIN, p. 43] In Budapest, in 1914, “Jews constituted 42 percent of the journalists, 45 percent of the lawyers, 49 percent of the doctors. Many had important positions in the government, and hundreds bore the patent of nobility. In no other country was the share of Jewish authors in the national literature as extensive. Ferenc Molnár was the nation’s most popular playwright … In 1913, Jeno Heltai, a cousin of Theodore Herzl [the founder of Zionism], was elected chairman of the Hungarian Writers’ Association.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 339]

“By 1904 Jewish families owned 37.5 percent of Hungary’s arable land; by 1910, although Jews comprised only 0.1 percent of agricultural laborers and 7.3 percent of industrial workers, they counted 50.6 percent of Hungary’s lawyers, 53 percent of its commercial businessmen, 59.9 percent of its doctors and 80 percent of its financiers.” [RHODES, R. 1988, p. 105] “In countries like Hungary and Romania,” notes Richard L. Rubenstein, “commercial activity was largely in the hands of Jews, many of whom had emigrated from Galicia and the Pale of Settlement. They were regarded as permanently alien and unassimilable.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 45]

“The financial elite [after World War I],” says George Schopflin, “was separate from the political elite, though not wholly so. In Hungary this elite was overwhelmingly Jewish … In Romania, the financial elite was small and weak and tended to be dependent on external, Western patrons; it too was heavily Jewish and was far less assimilated than in Hungary … In Poland, the situation was similar, except that a native entrepreneurial class, based primarily on the population of former Prussian Poland, had begun to emerge and to compete with a Jewish entrepreneurial class that it regarded as alien.” [SCHOPFLIN, G., 1990, p. 70-71]”

As W. D. Rubinstein notes:

“In Hungary, there are reliable statistics about the highest class of taxpayers (known as ‘virilists’) in 1887. At that time, no fewer than 62.3 percent of businessmen in this category (362 of 588) were Jewish, according to the research of Andrew C. Janos. Moreover, 12.5 percent of the ‘viriliist’ landowners in Hungary in 1857 were Jewish – 305 of 2,450. By the 1920s it was apparently the case that 54.0 percent of the owners of commercial establishment in Hungary (66.2 percent in Budapest) were Jews, as well as 85.0 percent of the directors and owners of financial institutions (90.3 percent in Budapest), and 62.1 percent of all employees in commerce. But only 12.5 percent of all industrialists (31.6 percent in Budapest) were Jews, by the familiar Jewish/Gentile divide between
commerce and industry. It was also claimed by Janos that ‘the members of twenty or so ‘grand [Jewish] families – the interlocking clans of Kohner, Ullman, Herzog, Deutsch, Mauthner, Goldberger, [and] Wodianer … controlled among themselves some 90 per cent of Hungary’s modern banking system and industrial plants.” [RUBINSTEIN, WD, 2000, p. 6-7]

Czechoslovakia? “On the whole,” notes Ruth Kestenberg-Gladstein,

“the Jews of Bohemia and Moravia were doing well. At the threshold of the twentieth century, the Jews of these two lands belonged to the ‘comfortable, well-off’ strata of the population … [KESTENBERG-GLADSTEIN, p. 37] …[T]ime-honored Jewish business practices in the so-called ‘small trade’ [peddling] was … especially in the Czech areas … a Jewish monopoly [p. 38] … Jewish peddlers who became wealthy by exploiting the local peasants, who trusted them and availed themselves of their services as moneylenders, created resentment among Jews and gentiles alike. These peddlers charged exorbitant rates of interest, thus forcing the peasants, and sometimes even a gentleman farmer, to sell their property at auction, and then often purchased the property themselves at a cheap price. These abuses continued until the Austrian Usury Laws of 1882 put an end to them … [p. 38-39] … By 1861 the Jews had been granted Besitzfähigkeit (the right to own landed property), and with the extravagance of the aristocratic landlords on the one hand and the thrift of the Jews on the other, it frequently happened that Jewish leaseholders became landowners.” [p. 39]

Although there was a strata of poor, Jews “played an important role in the growth and development” of the Czech textile and beer industries, coal mining, and glass. “Quite aside from the fact that [these businesses] afforded employment to non-Jewish workers in their factories and generally boosted industry, the Jewish industrialists of these cities were responsible to a considerable extent for the economic advancement of their brethren, since they employed Jews in their offices and hired Jewish agents and commercial travelers to bring their goods to market … It seems that the Jews preferred to use their brethren in the organization of their businesses.” [KESTENBERG-GLADSTEIN, p. 40]

Jewish economic or managerial influence in turn-of-the century Czechoslovakia was significant in the following categories: banking, journalism, insurance, coal, iron, lignite, graphite, magnesite, asbestos, health resorts (Jews were “operators of most of the first class hotels”) [PICK, J., p. 378], water power, agriculture (“The origin of much of the agricultural industry in Czechoslovakia could be traced to Jewish farmers”) [PICK, J., p. 379], breweries, malt (“Most malt factories producing for export were in Jewish hands”) [PICK, p. 381], hops (“The bulk of the hops output was exported and the majority of the exporters were Jewish”) [PICK, p. 382], sugar (“Many Jewish names were prominent among the sugar industrialists of the old Monarchy and, consequently, there were many Jewish members on the Boards of the nationalized enterprises in the Republic of Czechoslovakia”) [PICK, J., p. 382], candy/
serves/chocolate/cookies, alcohol (The “alcoholic liquors” industry was “primarily in Jewish hands”) [PICK, J., p. 389], yeast, starch, chicory/coffee substitutes, vegetable shortening, cucumbers/cheese/flour, forestry, pulp and paper (“Both [of the largest mills] were under Jewish management”) [PICK, J., p. 392], cardboard, plywood (“In this group, two Jewish-managed firms were of special importance”) [PICK, J., p. 394], furniture, the chemical industry, wood distillation/explosives/matches, pharmaceuticals (“Among the leaders of the pharmaceutical industry was Dr. Robert Heisler in Chrast, whose plants produced morphine and cocaine”) [PICK, J., p. 397], glass, glass jewelry, metal working/engineering/electrotechnical industries, metallurgy (“The famous Bohemia Copper Works in Prague were founded by Maximilian Bondy … The company was managed by Adolf Epler, who for many years had been associated with Sir Frederick Epstein”) [PICK, J., p. 402], automobiles, airplanes, aeronautical and scientific instruments, communications equipment and supplies, light metal products, textiles (“The textile industry [was] mostly in Jewish hands”) [PICK, J., p. 409], cotton, woolens (“The woolen industry had old and established traditions in Czechoslovakia. Its leaders were in the vast majority Jewish”) [PICK, J., p. 412], jute, flax, synthetics, hosiery, carpets, hats, clothing, leather, boots and shoes, gloves, rubber, cork, motion pictures (“The largest producer was the Elekta Film concern, with its imaginative chairman, Josef Auerbach”) [PICK, J., p. 422], cartels and syndicates, commerce, stock and commodities exchanges, patents, transportation, railways, inland waterways, and commercial aviation. [PICK, J., 1968, p. 359-447]

Liva Rothkirchen notes an eventual “violent anti-Semitic reaction” by non-Jews to the Jews of Northeastern Slovakia,

“where the Jewish population was especially numerous and least assimilated in appearance … The reason for this hostility lay mainly in the social disparity between the backward economic condition of the lower strata of the gentile population in this area on one hand, and the more favorable position many Jews had attained during the era of liberalism, on the other.” [ROTHKIRCHEN, L., p. 76]

More broadly across central Europe, “Jewish entrepreneurs [of the Austria-Hungarian power establishment] built the railroads, financed the coal mines, set up the Pilsner beer industry, pioneered sugar refining, developed the iron and steel industries, controlled the leading banks and newspapers, and were prominent in the leather goods, furniture, clothing, and food processing trades.” [TIMMS, p. 51] The French-based Jewish Pereires family financed the southern Russian railways in 1856. “Other railways were financed by the Pereires in northern France, the Bischoffsheims in Belgium, Baron de Hirsch in Turkey, and the Belichroeders in Germany and Austria.” [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 16]

In the major Polish city of Krakow, 60% of the local doctors and lawyers were Jews. “Like Jews in commerce,” says Ezra Mendelsohn, “Jews in the professions played a decisive role in Poland. One-third of all Polish lawyers and notaries were Jews, as were almost one-fourth of all those people engaged in
publishing and journalism. Over one-half of all private doctors in Poland were Jews … [All these people] were extremely important as leaders of the Jewish community, and especially as leaders of the various Jewish political movements, including Zionism.” [MENDELSOHN, E., 1981, p. 8]

“Following an 1862 waiver [by the Russian Tsar] on restrictions for Polish Jews,” notes Elizabeta Ettinger, “… by 1870 one-third of the factories in Warsaw were owned by Jews and by 1895 there was hardly a street left with no Jewish property (‘We own the streets, the Poles said half in jest, and the Jews own the houses.’)” [ETTINGER, E., 1986, p. 20] By 1929, Jews constituted 43% of all of Poland’s “entrepreneurs and capital owners” and the “bulk of private non-farm real assets were Jewish. In the top-income group the proportion was even higher. In manufacturing and commerce, Jews held 40-45% of large and medium-sized businesses, and a majority of smaller ones.” [MARCUS, J. p. 253]

“It was the Jewish commercial class whose impact was most strongly felt in [Poland] as a whole; thus in 1931, of all those active in industry, 20 percent were Jews, while of all those active in commerce, 52.7 percent were Jews. In the backward kresy the latter figure was much higher, reaching 88.3 percent in 1921! Such Jewish ‘domination’ of trade, which was certainly a fact in the more backward regions of the state where the native middle class was so weak, was also a typically East Europe phenomena.” [MENDELSOHN, E., 1981, p. 7] The Jewish bourgeoisie “dominat[ed] commerce and banking” in Poland in the 19th century and held a “strong position in industry.” [BADZIAK, p. 57] One of the best known Jewish industrialists in Poland, Izrael Poznanski of Lodz, “has long been a focus of interest for historians and writers. After the Second World War,” says Kazmierz Badziak, “the name Poznanski became a byword for the ruthless parvenu exploiting the working class.” [BADZIAK, p. 58]

In the small Polish town of Kolbuszowa (with a population half Jewish), for example, former Jewish resident (up to World War II) Norman Salsitz recalled that “Jews conducted practically all the business of the town, with little or no Polish competition … Most [Poles] purchased from Jewish shopkeepers, took their drinks in saloons with Jewish proprietors, and relied on Jewish lawyers, whom they acknowledged to be ‘clever.’ It was my father, for example, who supplied Catholic churches in our area with candles and other items used in various church ceremonies.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. xiv, 244] Four of the town’s five lawyers were also Jewish, as were two of the three doctors. Although Jews are religiously forbidden to eat pork, and Kolbuszowa was almost completely populated by Orthodox Jews, even the largest pig dealer in Kolbuszowa was a Jew, Abraham Rappaport. “How a Jew could prosper in such a business,” wonders Salsitz, “no one ever explained.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 99, 100, 97] Salsitz declares that there were poor Jews in town, but also notes the condition of the non-Jewish peasants who lived in surrounding areas: “Their small plots of land were barely able to sustain them. At certain times of the year, before the harvest was in, survival for them came to be measured a day at a time. Potatoes, cabbage, sour milk, beans, a piece of bread – only these basic foods kept them from
starvation. Pigs, chickens, eggs, butter, and milk they also produced, but could not themselves afford to eat.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 17]

An Italian ambassador to Poland, Eugenio Reale, noted, that, as less than ten percent of the Polish population:

“Already at the beginning of the twentieth century one-third of Poland’s industry and over one-half of its commerce was in Jewish hands. Before the Second World War, three-quarters of all Polish Jews were engaged in trade and industry whereas 80 percent of non-Jews were farmers. In trade, in banking, for every non-Jew there were 35 Jews; in industry and the crafts, for every 8 non-Jews there were 32 Jews; in the learned professions, for every non-Jew there were almost 4 Jews … As a result of the monopolistic and closed-shop nature of the Jewish enterprises, non-Jewish workers were naturally unable to advance in industries where they should have.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 48]

As Ezra Mendelsohn notes about Poland during the years 1915-1926, “To the extent that the Jews remained basically unacculturated and unassimilated they were regarded [by Poles] as aliens, speaking a foreign language and refusing to identify with Polish interests … Objective reasons for disliking Jews, who were so numerous, so influential, and so clearly non-Polish were not lacking.” [MENDELSOHN, E., 1981, p. 16, 12]

As just one percent of the population in England, by World War I Jews accounted for 23% of Britain’s non-landed millionaires, as financiers, merchants, bankers, stockbrokers, and other such entrepreneurs. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 22] “Of 31 millionaire British merchants who died between 1808 and 1838 … 24 were Jewish.” [BROOKS, J., 10-23-88, p. 42] More generally, “about 8.5 per cent of Britain’s top wealth-holders between 1809 and 1939 were Jews.” [RUBINSTEIN, WD, 2000, p. 11] Disproportionate influence in the mass media, as usual, was extraordinary. The Reuters news agency (“the chief purveyor of information on world events to the entire British press and, at times, the government”) was founded and owned by Jews (originally by Paul Julius Reuter whose original name was Israel Beer Josaphat), as was the Sunday Times, the Financial Times, the English Review, the Daily Telegraph, and the Westminster Gazette. A Jewish businessman, Harry Oppenheim, also had a major interest in the London Daily News. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 22] “In England,” notes Cecil Roth,

“the most notable Jewish figure in the newspaper world in the nineteenth century was J. M. Levy, who founded not merely the Daily Telegraph, but, as a result, popular journalism as a whole in England … All three of the pioneers in the establishment of the European news agencies were Jews – Reuter, Wolff, and Havas.” [ROTH, C., 1940, p. 143, 145]

As Chaim Bermant notes:

“In the last century both the London Sunday Times and the Observer were at one time owned and edited (with no conspicuous success) by Rachel Beer, a member of the Sassoon banking clan, and the Daily Telegraph was owned until 1928 by the Levy-Lawson family. The Telegraph
was originally picked up as a bad debt by Moses Levy, a printer (who for a while also owned the *Sunday Times*), but it was his son, Edward, who put new life and zest into it, and who, in 1871, joined with the *New York Herald* to sponsor Stanley’s successful search for Livingston … The *Daily Herald*, The People, and numerous other publications belonging to the Oldham group, were owned for a time by Julius Elias.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 70-71]

By 1969 Jews were over represented by seven times their ratio in the population as Members of the House of Commons. [LITVINOFF, p. 18] (Among the earliest Jewish members of British Parliament was Manasseh Lopes in 1802. However, notes Stanley Weintraub, “he was no role model as he became involved in a scandal and was imprisoned for bribery and corruption.”) [WEINTRAUB, S., 1993, p. 116]

As early as the twelfth century Jews exerted profound economic influence in England. The King of England, Henry II, owed a Jewish banker, Aaron of Lincoln, 100,000 pounds, a sum equal to that era’s annual budget for the entire English kingdom and numerous estates of nobles were taken over by Jewish usurers as payment for loans. [LEON, p. 145] By the late 17th century, the Carvajal family alone imported a twelfth of the country’s gold bullion into England. [SACHAR, p. 22])

Typical too, as everywhere, the Jewish elite in England were genetically insular in consolidating their wealth and control. “[Britain’s] leading [Jewish] families,” says W. D. Rubenstein, “among them the Rothschilds, Montefiores, Goldsmids, Samuels, Sterns, Beddingtons, and Sassoons – became immensely wealthy, a self-contained and inter-married caste which has come to be known as the ‘cousin-hood.’” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 13]

This ‘Cousinhood,’ says Chaim Bermant, “[was] not merely a cluster of relatives. In many ways they functioned as an organic unit and even while their own rights were not yet wholly assured, they threw their wealth and influence on behalf of persecuted co-religionists in other parts of the world.” [BERMANT, p. 3] There is, in Britain,” says a Jewish author, Stephen Brook, “as in most nations of the western world, a club known as the Jewish community … Membership, like an ancient title of nobility, is inherited.” [BROOK, p. 11]

Benjamin Disraeli, certainly the best known individual of Jewish descent in English history, rose to prominence as the British prime minister and was a chief architect of England’s world imperialist policy. World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann calls him “the true creator of the British Empire in the nineteenth century.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 9] Although an “assimilated” Jew into English society, he felt strongly about his Jewish heritage. “He felt very proud,” writes Hannah Arendt, “about the Rothschilds’ help in defeating Napoleon and did not see any reason why he should not be outspoken in his political opinions as a Jew.” [ARENDT, p. 71]

As prime minister of the greatest imperialist country of the nineteenth century, Disraeli had connections with international Jewry and its enormous economic means. “Disraeli’s purchase of the Suez Canal in 1878,” says Benjamin
Ginsberg, “was made possible by Henry Oppenheim’s extensive contacts in Egypt and a four million pound loan from Lionel Rothschild.” [GOLDBERG, B., 1993, p. 24] Chaim Bermant recounts the well-known story about this transaction:

“In 1875, when Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli heard that a large packet of shares, which would have given Britain control of the Suez Canal, were on offer, there was only one person to whom he could turn for ready cash: Baron Lionel de Rothschild. His secretary, Cory, was quickly sent round to the bank and ushered into the presence of the Baron. How much money was needed? he was asked. Four million pounds. When? Tomorrow. The Baron, fingering a muscatel grape, popped it into his mouth and spat out the skin. ‘What is your security?’ ‘The British government.’ ‘You shall have it.’” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 40]

The implications of such international Jewish dealings were not lost to critics of the time.

The British scholar Goldwin Smith, (“a respected historian and educational reformer”) [PILZER, J., 1981, p. 10] wrote against Britain’s imperialist policies, arguing that the Disraeli government’s foreign policy benefited Jewish, and not British, interests. [GOLDBERG, p. 24] Smith argued that “the Jew alone regards his race as superior to humanity, and looks forward not to it ultimate union with other races, but to its triumph over them all, and to its final ascendancy under the leadership of a tribal Messiah.” [SMITH, G., 1881/1981, p. 10] The British writer J. A. Hobson, in his classic work, Imperialism: A Study, declared that Jews formed “the central ganglion of international capitalism.” [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 24] “United by the strongest bonds of organization,” he wrote, “always in closest and quickest touch with one another, situated in the heart of the business capital of every state, controlled, so far as Europe is concerned, chiefly by men of a single and peculiar race, who have behind them many centuries of financial expertise, they are in a unique position to manipulate the policy of nations.” [HOBSON, p. 56-57] Hobson’s book, described by one author as “the single most influential tract ever written on imperialism” [SMITH, p. 395] even gained high praise from the leader of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, V.I. Lenin.

Nor were the implications of such criticisms lost to Disraeli himself. In fact, “[Disraeli] produced the entire set of theories about Jewish influence and organization that we usually find in the more vicious forms of anti-Semitism.” [ARENDT, p. 71] Such a “vicious form” is best epitomized in the infamous Protocols of the Elders of Zion, a document produced by the Russian tsarist government during their unsuccessful attempts to secure loans from international Jewish financiers at the turn of the century (most of them colluded against Russia). The Protocols proved to be false (it was essentially excerpted from an obscure novel) but has nonetheless become the most famous anti-Jewish document of all time, and is still afforded occasional currency by anti-Jewish groups and individuals today. The Protocols basically details an alleged Jewish plot to control the world and subjugate its non-Jewish populations.
Who knows if Disraeli would have dismissed *the Protocols*? His own fascination with the prospect of world domination by a wealthy transnational Jewish cabal was very real. This fascination was not that of an obscure London rag picker or street sweeper. It was from the perspective of a member of Parliament and the eventual Prime Minister of Great Britain, the most powerful imperialist nation on earth in his time; and it was dreamed by a man who spent his political life among people, including many Jewish financiers, of momentous influence. “To the very end of his life,” notes Howard Sachar, “Disraeli held fast to the credo of [Jewish] racial aristocracy. Whenever he engaged in conversation with the Rothschilds, he harped on the theme to the point of monotony.” [SACHAR, p. 157-158]

The idea of Jewish innate superiority and an economic interest in dominating earth were expressed in some of the novels Disraeli himself authored. His first novel was called *Alroy* (1833) and its title was taken from a historical figure, a messianic Jew in Iran in the twelfth century, David Alrui, who appealed to his fellow Jews to take up arms against the non-Jews around them. “In… *Alroy*,” notes Hannah Arendt,

“Disraeli evolved a plan for a Jewish Empire in which Jews would rule as a strictly separated class … In a new novel, *Coningsby*, he abandoned the dream of a Jewish Empire and unfolded a fantastic scheme according to which Jewish money dominates the rise and fall of courts and empires and rules supreme in diplomacy. Never in his life did he give up this second notion of a secret and mysterious influence of the chosen man of a chosen race, with which he replaced his earlier dream of an openly constituted mysterious ruler caste. It became the pivot of his political philosophy … [ARENDT, p. 75] …

To Disraeli, it was a matter of course that Jewish wealth was only a means for Jewish politics. The more he learned about Jewish bankers’ well-functioning organizations in business matters and their international exchange of news and information, the more convinced he was that he was dealing with something like a secret society which, without anybody knowing it, had the world’s destiny in its hands.” [ARENDT, p. 76]

Disraeli even believed that Jews everywhere were uniformly desirous of “revenge” against Christians, using absolutely contrasting ideologies – capitalism and communism – to the same end through parallel “internationalism.” “Men of Jewish race,” he wrote, “are found at the head of every one of [the communist and socialist groups]. The people of God cooperate with atheists; the most skilled accumulators of property ally themselves with communists, the peculiar and chosen people touch the hands of the scum and low castes of Europe! And all this because they wish to destroy the ungrateful Christendom which owes them even its name and whose tyranny they can no longer endure.” [ARENDT, p. 76]

“In this singular delusion,” says Arendt,

“even the most ingenious of Hitler’s publicity stunts, the cry of the alliance between the Jewish capitalist and the Jewish socialist was already
anticipated. Nor can it be denied that the whole scheme, imaginary as it was, had a logic of its own. If one started, as Disraeli did, from the assumption that Jewish millionaires were makers of Jewish politics, if one took into account the insults Jews had suffered for centuries (which were real enough, but still stupidly exaggerated by Jewish apologetic propaganda), if one had seen the not infrequent instances when the son of a Jewish millionaire became a leader of the workers’ movement and knew from experience how closely knit Jewish family ties were as a rule, Disraeli’s image of a calculated revenge upon Christian people was not far fetched.” [ARENDT, p. 72]

Disraeli, suggests Albert Lindemann, “may have been, both as a writer and even more as a personal symbol, the most influential propagator of the concept of race in the nineteenth century, particularly publicizing the Jews’ alleged taste for power, their sense of superiority, their mysteriousness, their clandestine international connections, and their arrogant pride in being a pure race.” [LINDEMANN, p. 77] As Stanley Weintraub notes, Disraeli “sees crypto-Jews managing affairs: professors, ambassadors, generals, councellors, and cabinet members.” In Coningsby, Disraeli wrote that the world is “governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes.” [WEINTRAUB, S., 1993, p. 216] In real life, “within days of publication” of this book, Disraeli was invited to dinner with a Rothschild. [WEINTRAUB, S., 1993, p. 219]

Turning elsewhere, to Eastern Europe, a nineteenth century consortium of wealthy Jewish contractors and financiers were instrumental in building railroads throughout the area. One of the “secrets” to Samuel Poliakov’s success in this field, says Aradius Kahan, “was his ability to obtain credits from Russian and foreign banks … and the speed, if not necessarily the quality, of construction and exploitation.” [KAHAN, p. 93] “Kinship ties,” adds Kahan, “between Jewish bankers in Berlin and Frankfort … facilitated transfers of loans across national boundaries.” [KAHAN, p. 99] Baron Moritz de Hirsch, “an enormously wealthy financier, [built] the Trans-Balkan Railroad.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 253] “It is estimated that Hirsch made between $32m and $34m from the entire Oriental Railway scheme, but he may have had to pay out more than half of that in bribes.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 45] Hirsch, notes Chaim Berman, “had one palace in Paris, another in Versailles, a third near the Rothschilds in Piccadilly, a castle in Moravia, a country house near Sandringham, a shooting lodge near Newmarket and a vast hunting estate at St. Johann in Hungary. It was there that, during a memorable fortnight in October 1891, he entertained a large party [which included various members of the British aristocracy] … In a five-day shoot the party slaughtered over eleven thousand head of game.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 45-46]

Other prominent Eastern European Jewish ‘railroad tycoons’, says Howard Sachar, “included the Poliakovs, the Kronenbergs, the Nathansons, the bankers Efrosi and Co., the Rafaloviches, and Gunzbers. They had the most available capital and the best international connections for securing additional funds
from their fellow Jews in Berlin, Paris, and Warsaw.” [SACHAR, p. 212] Because of this, “Jews were able to lay the basis for modern Russian banking.” Horace Gunzberg founded one of the largest investment banks in Russia; Meyer & Co., was the second largest bank in Moscow. In Warsaw, by the late 1800s the Wawelbergs, Kronenbergs, and Frankels were among its most preeminent bankers. In Odessa, the Efrosi Bank “played a crucial role in the grain export trade,” and the Poliakovs alone founded four banks in Moscow. [SACHAR, p. 212]

“By 1916,” notes Robert Brym, “the fourteen St. Petersburg banking houses operating in joint-stock capital had 70 managers, 28 of whom (or 40 percent) were Jews. One liberal Jewish commentator of the period was prompted to remark that there ‘is hardly a loan the Russian government seeks to negotiate but some Russo-Jewish agents are, directly or indirectly, connected therewith.” [BRYM, 1978, p. 25]

“A number of important industries were very disproportionately owned and organized by Jews,” notes W. D. Rubinstein,

“they included textiles, sugar refining, flour milling, saw mills, brewing and alcohol, tobacco, and the leather manufacturing industry; in commerce, the grain and timber trade; banking; shipping and transport; and mining – industries from which Jews were not barred by law. Such statistics as exist show that the Jews often far exceeded their percentage of the population in these fields. For instance, Jews owned about 182 of 518 join-stock sugar companies (35 per cent); 69 out of 106 sawmills in the northwestern areas (68 per cent); and so forth, based on very scattered statistics. By 1878, 60 per cent of the grain export from Odessa was in Jewish hands; according to the 1897 Census, 886 of every 1,000 persons engaged in commerce in Russia’s northwestern provinces were Jews.” [RUBINSTEIN, WD, 2000, p. 6-7]

For the Jewish community at-large, the overall nuances of Jewish influence in a more generally impoverished Eastern Europe was different than the West. In the late eighteenth century the Polish Commonwealth collapsed and was absorbed by Austria, Prussia, and Russia. The demise of serfdom in later years eroded Jewry’s aristocracy-serving pre-eminence; Jewish communities became more and more politically agitated. Aleksander Hertz notes that:

“All the positions of the nationalist Jews agreed with the idea that Jews were different than Poles, constituted a distinctly separate cultural and national community, and had their own specific interests. The Zionists laid full emphasis on alienness, the Bundists on differentness and separateness, but both ascribed to the fact of Jewish survival to their age-old isolation from the surrounding community. Unlike the Poles and assimilationists, they viewed isolation as an extremely positive phenomenon.” [HERTZ, p. 28]

In Russia, under Tsarist rule, Jews were only allowed to live in an area called the Pale of Settlement, twenty-five western districts (20% of European Russia – 362,000 square miles, reaching west of Warsaw) which they shared with a variety of other ethnic peoples – Poles, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, and Lithuanians,
among them. Jewish economic activity was varied, from merchantry to craft specialization. Still, a British traveler of the era wrote that “the entire petty trade in Poland and Lithuania is controlled by Jews” and a historian of Lithuanian Jewry noted that in 1792 “all the trade and industry of Lithuania was controlled by this population.” [MENDOLSOHN, p. 2] “Nearly all the merchants of the Pale [of which Jews were 12% of the population],” says Howard Sachar, “were Jews … [and] it was true that the Jews were exceptionally influential in the upper levels of commerce.” [SACHAR, p. 212] By the turn of the twentieth century, estimates another scholar, three-quarters of the merchants of the Pale were Jewish, 88-96% of those in provinces like Grodno and Minsk, 82% of those in Western Galicia, and 92% in Eastern Galicia. [HEINZE, p. 185]

“In the Pale of Settlement,” observes Michael Aronson, “most of the grain trade (measured in terms of actively employed individuals engaged in the trade) were heavily concentrated in the hands of the Jewish merchants … They also engaged extensively in the exploitation of the forests. Jews were thus very important intermediaries between the peasants and the market. They took part in almost all the peasants’ commercial dealings in the Pale and generally excluded non-Jewish competition from this field of activity.” [ARONSON, p. 37]

Such Jewish economic power derives from its medieval origin, notes Bernard Weinryb, “where in Poland a number of wealthy Jews … were engaged … (as money lenders, merchants) … managers of the prince’s mint, supervisors of collection of taxes and tolls, [and] management of estates acquired as the result of foreclosure.” Often these Jews became “creditors of the prince or King, occasionally even a city.” They also leased ore and salt mines and “paid a fixed sum annually and then usually took in a much higher amount.” [WEINRYB, p. 63] “There are also cases,” notes Weinryb, “in which failure to repay the loan punctually caused the amount of the loan to be raised to five times the original sum. In some cases tardy borrowers were jailed, and on many occasions their real estate and villages were foreclosed and taken over by the Jewish lenders. The debtors’ natural resentment of his creditors was increased when home-owner and property owners saw their properties foreclosed.” [WEINRYB, p. 60] In southern Poland, after the 15th century, Jews owned such estates, non-Jewish slaves, and “in later centuries … certain Jews were exercising … local justice over Christians.” [WEINRYB, p. 62]

Odessa, notes Chaim Bermant, “the largest industrial and commercial city of southern Russia, had a Jewish population of 165,000 (out of half a million) before World War I, and although part of the Pale, it was not quite of it, for its population was largely Western in outlook, with a sizeable industrial proletariat, many prosperous merchants and bankers, and a large Jewish professional class. About ninety per cent of the doctors in Odessa, and more than half of the lawyers, were Jews.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 149]

In western Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a “confrontation (between Jewish and non-Jewish workers) took place predomin-
nanty in Jewish-owned factories; the presence of the Jewish worker was consid-
ered [by non-Jews] to be part of a ‘Jewish plot’ which would ultimately replace
the non-Jewish worker.” [KAHAN, p. 39] Tensions sometimes rose between
Jewish social classes too; Kahan suggests that wealthy Jewish industrialists were
reluctant to exploit other Jews in their factories. Non-Jews were less likely to be
“class-conscious, less easily organized, and less radical in demanding higher
wages and more humane treatment.” [KAHAN, p. 40] “By 1880,” says Norman
Cantor, “Russia was going through the early stages of industrialization and the
emergence of factory production provided jobs in Warsaw and elsewhere. The
factories, usually owned by Jewish entrepreneurs, were highly exploitative and
insalubrious, as was characteristic of the early Industrial Revolution elsewhere.”
[CANTOR, p. 253]

A certain proper protocol of exploitation was also necessary. Exploiting fel-
low Jews had precarious religious and social repercussions. “It appears,” says
Ezra Mendelsohn, “that Jewish industrialists refused to hire Jews because they
felt that proper employee relationships were impossible when both were of the
Jewish faith.” [MENDELSOHN, p. 21]

By 1889 the Russian Ministry of Justice warned the Tsar that the legal pro-
fession was being “flooded with Jews.” [LINDEMANN, p. 145] Barnett Litvi-
noff noted in 1969 that, even under communism, “in the major cities of
European Russia the Jews take on the familiar characteristics of Jews in other
parts of the world … In terms of employment structure, they resemble almost
uncannily their fellows in the United States: their most often chosen occupa-
tions are medicine and law … [As 1% of the Russian population] one-seventh
of all Soviet doctors are Jews, and one-ninth of all the lawyers. Next in promi-
nence comes writers and journalists.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 99]

Michael Paul Sacks devoted an entire article to the subject of the 1989 Rus-
sian census and its revelations regarding Jewish occupational tiers in the Soviet
Union. While Jews in Russia are popularly conceived in the West to be a disad-
vantaged people oppressed by endemic Russian anti-Semitism, by the 1950s, he
notes, Jews

“continued to be widely represented in the Soviet academic, cultural,
and artistic elite … In the 1970s … Jews had specialized knowledge and
experience that remained in short supply and assured their entry into
filled the void left by the aftermath of the [Russian] revolution when the
traditional clerical, administrative, and intellectual classes boycotted the
Soviet regime or were kept out of these positions [SACKS, 1998, p. 248]
… [The 1989 census revealed that Jews had a great] concentration in ur-
ban areas …, higher levels of education, and relative seniority in key in-
dustries … Jewish educational achievement vastly exceeded that of
Russians [64% of Jews had a ‘higher education,’ 14% of non-Jewish
Russians] [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 252] … The difference between the two
groups [Jews and Russians] was evident across all age groups, but the
educational advantage of older Jews seems especially significant: older
workers were at a more advanced stage in their careers and those with high education were likely to occupy important positions within their professional fields …” [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 252]

Sacks notes that the largest employment category for Jews in Russia was/is as engineers (16% of all employed Jews). The most populous occupational category for non-Jews in Russia was/is metal workers (7.2%). [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 256] “Occupations that were largest only for Jews,” Sacks continues, “were primarily top-level positions, and all were white collar: physicians, scientists, chief managerial personnel, artists and producers, literary and press personnel. The categories that were largest only for Russians were entirely manual labor and often low-skill: tractor drivers, cleaners, weighers, nursemaids, lathe operators, tailors and seamstresses, carpenters, and dairy workers.” [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 257] Three-quarters of all employed Jews in 1989 were in non-manual labor positions; conversely, three-quarters of all Russian non-Jews had manual labor jobs. Among the Jewish “manual laborer” category were watchmakers, jewelers, bookbinders, shoe makers, tanners, furriers, barbers, cosmeticians, and photographers. [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 260, 263]

Sacks notes the troubling implications of the Russian Jewish occupational field:

“Jewish achievements may have left Jews in a vulnerable situation. They were concentrated in high-level positions and often very isolated from the bulk of the Russian labor force. Older and much more highly educated, most Jews were in a world far apart from typical Russian workers. A survey in Russia in 1992 showed that one of the strongest variables associated with anti-Semitism was ‘having no acquaintances or friends who are Jewish.’ Another study from the same period found that ‘the vast majority of Russians (between 75 and 78 percent) saw themselves as having nothing or very little in common with Jews.” [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 264]

With the eventual fall of Tsarist rule, the influence of Jews in the rise of Russian communism was profound. (After all, as Louis Rapoport notes, “[Karl] Marx, Ferdinand Lassalle, and Eduard Bernstein [were] men of Jewish origin who laid the foundations of communism and socialism.”) [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 15] During the 1917 revolution, two communist factions, the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks vied for power. Leading up to the revolution, eight of the seventeen Menshevik Party central committee members were Jewish. The “entire Menshevik Party which included many Jewish members … was politically linked with the Jewish Labor Bund [a party largely championing Jewish nationalism].” [LEVIN, N., 1988, p. 13] The head of the Menshevik Party was also Jewish, Raphael Abramovich. [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 31]

The rival Bolshevik revolutionary faction, however, prevailed in the overthrow of the tsarist government, replacing it with a communist government headed by V. I. Lenin. (A Jew, Boris Zbarsky, even was the one who embalmed Lenin’s corpse for permanent display in the Kremlin). [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 95] Lenin had a Jewish grandfather, Alexander Dmitrievich Blank, on his
mother’s side. Russian author Dmitri Volkogonov’s 1994 biography of Lenin notes that

“In [Lenin’s sister’s] letter to Stalin [after Lenin’s death], Anna wrote: ‘It’s probably no secret for you that the research on our grandfather shows that he came from a poor Jewish family, that he was, as his baptismal certificate says, the son of ‘Zhitomir meschanin Moishe Blank.’ She went on to suggest that ‘this fact could serve to help combat antisemitism.’ Paradoxically for a Marxist who believed in the primacy of environmental over inherited factors, she also asserted the dubious proposition that Lenin’s Jewish origins ‘are further confirmation of the exceptional abilities of the Semitic tribe, [confirmation] always shared by Ilyich [Lenin] .... Ilyich always valued Jews highly.’ Anna’s claim explains, for instance, why Lenin frequently recommended giving foreigners, especially Jews, intellectually demanding tasks, and leaving the elementary work to the ‘Russian fools.’” [VOLKOGONOV, D., 1994, p. 8-9]

Lenin also once told Maxim Gorky that “the clever Russian is almost always a Jew or has Jewish blood in him.” [VOLKOGONOV, D., 1994, p. 112]

At the time of the revolution, the chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Jacob Sverdlov, was Jewish. [WEYL, 1968, p. 197] As the new ruling Bolshevik clique took shape, three of the six members of the original ruling Politburo were also Jewish. Two of them, Lev Kamenev (Rosenfeld) and Grigori Zinoviev (Apfelbaum), joined with Stalin to form the threesome that ruled Russia at leader V. I. Lenin’s death. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 30] (Zinoviev once remarked that “We must carry along with us ninety million out of the one hundred million Soviet Russian population. As for the rest, we have nothing to say to them. They must be annihilated.”) [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 31] Zinoviev “and his wife Z. I. Lilina were close family friends of Lenin, and Zinoviev probably received more personal letters from Lenin than any other leader.” Similarly, Lev Kamenev “received the most correspondence [from Lenin] ... He was much trusted by Lenin, even on personal matters, for example on Lenin’s relationship with his mistress Inessa Armand at the time he and Lenin were sharing an apartment in Poland. Kamenev’s knowledge of Lenin is important because he was the first editor, with Lenin’s direct participation, of Lenin’s collected works.” [VOLKOGONOV, D., 1994, p. xxxv]

Another Jew, Angelica Balabanova, formerly an associate of Mussolini in Italy, headed the first Communist Comintern. Karl Radek (Sobelsohn) was “one of the leading agents of the Communist International … The short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic was led by Bela Kun (a variant of Cohen) and the organizer of the Workers’ and Soldiers’ Soviets of the even more ephemeral Bavarian Soviet Republic was Eugen Levine.” [WEYL, p. 197] “Eugen Levine and Max Levien, distinctly un-Bavarian names,” notes Alex de Jonge, “pro-claimed a Communist Soviet Republic.” [DE JONGE, A., 1978, p. 53]

Howard Sachar notes more deeply the case of Hungary where
“a free election took place in November 1945, and the communists won only 8 percent of the vote … With the intimidating force of the Red Army behind them, the Communists turned their efforts in the next year to infiltration … Their Soviet-trained leadership included a large majority of Jews. Although many of the commissars from the Bela Kun era in 1919 had been killed, a number of them survived in Soviet exile. These were the men who returned now in the wake of the Red Army. Their spokesman was Matyas Rakosis … He returned at the head of a quintet of fellow Jews that included Erno Gero, who would become the communist government’s economic overlord; Mihaly Farka, its military and defense chieftain; Jozeph Revai, its cultural ‘pope’; and most importantly, Gabor Peter, who would be named head of the dreaded security police.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 344]

Jewish pre-eminence in the new Russian regime was throughout the communist system. As Zvi Gitelman notes:

“The idea that the Bolshevik regime was a Jewish one gained popularity because of the relatively large numbers of Jews who in 1917 suddenly rushed into governmental posts from which they had been barred under the tsars. So striking was the prominence of Jews in high places that when it was proposed that a Jewish ticket be put forth in the elections to the Constituent Assembly, Maxim Vinaver commented, ‘Why do Jews need a separate ticket? Whichever party wins, we will still be the winners.’” [GITELMAN, Z., 1972, p. 114]

In the struggle for power in Russia, notes Nathaniel Weyl, “the prominence of Jews in the leadership of the Bolshevik Party was no greater than their prominence in the leadership of other, less totalitarian parties.” Prominent Jews in rival socialist factions included Julius Martov (Tsederbaum), Raphael Abramovich, and I. N. Steinberg. Boris Savinkov, also Jewish, was the “legendary head of the Terrorist Brigade of the Socialist Revolutionary Party.” Aaron Baron and Lev Chorny were well-known Anarchists. [WEYL, 1968, p. 199-200] Building to the Russian revolution era, prominent Jewish revolutionaries also included Grigory Abramovich Perets and Nikolay Utin. One of the founders (in 1876) of the “Land and Liberty” revolutionary party was Mark Natanson. “Another Jew,” notes Leon Schapiro, “Aaron Zundelewich, played an important part on its executive committee. There were Jewish propagandists, Jewish organizers, Jewish terrorists … It is impossible to doubt the importance of the Jewish contribution to the less spectacular business of organisation and staff-work. It was the Jews, with their long experience of exploiting conditions on Russia’s western frontier which adjoined the Pale for smuggling and the like, who organised the illegal transport of literature, planned escapes and illegal crossings, and generally kept the wheels of the whole organisation running.” [SCHAPIRO, L., 1961, p. 152] One of the Land and Liberty party’s later branches, the “Black Repartition” group, “soon became the cradle of the Marxist movement. Jewish revolutionaries participated in all stages and in all aspects of this movement.” [SCHAPIRO, L., 1961, p. 149-151]
“The abundance of Jewish names in the higher and middle levels of power (in the [Bolshevik] Party and state apparat, in the military, ministry, etc.) is indisputable,” says apologist Jewish author Arkady Vaksberg, “… For anti-Semites now, this is an odious and outrageous fact; from the point of view of normal people not blinded by chauvinist hatred, it is meaningless.” [VAKSBERG, p. 22] “Among the second-string leaders of the Soviet,” observed Nathaniel Weyl, “were Gregory Sokolnikov (Brilliant), Solomon Lozovsky, who would head the Red International of Labor Unions, and Moses Uritsky, chief of the Petrograd Cheka and number two man in the Soviet secret police.”[WEYL, 1968, p. 198]

In 1923, notes Isaac Deutscher, “a triumvirate, composed of Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev, formed itself within the Politburo … Between them, the three men virtually controlled the whole [Communist] party and, through it, the Government … Zinoviev was, in addition, the President of the Communist International.” [DEUTSCHER, p. 255] Amidst intrigue and power struggles within the communist movement, however, by 1927 Kamenev and Zinoviev “at last threw in their lot with Trotsky.” [DEUTSCHER, p. 307] Trotsky, an enemy of Stalin, was “the founder and builder of the Red Army,” [DEUTSCHER, p. 192] and once the “number two man next to Lenin.” [NEW ENCYC BRITTANICA, p. 945] He was also Jewish, born Lev Davidovich Bronstein. Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev, notes Arkady Vaksberg, “alone formed the ‘leadership nucleus’ and had every reason to expect to inherit the mantle of leadership from Lenin. The man closest to the ‘troika’ (Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev) after [Yakov] Sverdlov’s death was Grigori Sokolnikov.” [VAKSBERG, p. 19] All five of these men poised to rule Russia were Jewish. Kamenev once told Trotsky (his brother-in-law) [WALSH, p. 440] that “It will be enough for you and Zinoviev to appear together on the platform in order to reconquer the whole party.” [DEUTSCHER, p. 308] It didn’t work out that way. Stalin proved to be a more ruthless and/or shrewd leader in the struggle for power.

Nonetheless, Jews were very well represented in the Soviet system under Stalin. As Isaac Deutscher notes,

“Jews were quite prominent in [Stalin’s] entourage, though far less so than they had been in Lenin’s. [Max] Litvinov stood for over a decade at the head of the Soviet diplomatic service; Kagonovich was to the end Stalin’s factotum; Mekhlis was the chief political Commissar of the army; and Zaslavsky and Ehrenburg were the most popular of Stalin’s sycophants. Yet he was not averse from playing on anti-Jewish emotions when this suited his convenience. During the struggle of against the inner-party oppositions his agents made the most of the circumstance that Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Radek were of Jewish origin.” [DEUTSCHER, p. 605]

“Lev Mekhlis,” notes Louis Rapoport,

“would become Stalin’s secretary and one of the most despised men in Soviet history … Immediately after the Revolution, many Jews were euphoric over their high representation in the new government. Lenin’s first Politburo was dominated by men of Jewish origins … Under Lenin, Jews
became involved in all aspects of the Revolution, including its dirtiest work. Despite the Communists’ vow to eradicate anti-Semitism, it spread rapidly after the Revolution – partly because of the prominence of so many Jews in the Soviet administration, as well as in the traumatic, inhuman Sovietization drives that followed.” [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 30]

The Soviet Union’s leading communist newspaper was Pravda. It’s “leading staff members,” Yakov Khavinson and David Zaslavsky, were Jewish, as were the Soviet Unions ambassadors to the U.S., Maxim Litvinov and Ivan Maisky, who were recalled in 1943. [VAKSBERG, p. 260, 139]

In 1994, Russian-born (and raised) Jewish author Arkady Vaksberg wrote a book entitled Stalin Against the Jews. Its fundamental thesis is that Stalin was a fanatical anti-Semite. (Louis Rapoport’s Stalin’s War Against the Jews reflects the same theme). The fact that many Jews (including millions of others) died under his direction is beyond question. And Stalin’s actions in later life reflect his suspicions of the loyalty of many in the Jewish community. But the fact that Stalin was nonetheless surrounded by Jews everywhere in positions of high power (Lazar Kaganovich, Pyatnitsky, Fillip Goloschekin “and many others who were made part of the ruling circle”) [VAKSBERG, p. 20] is described by Vaksberg as “camouflage” for the Soviet leader’s hatred of Jews. [VAKSBERG, p. 27] Yet Vaksberg’s own evidence to portray the Russian Jewish community as solely victims consistently deflates the premise of Stalin’s enduring anti-Semitism. Vaksberg assails Stalin as a singularly rabid, irrational Jew-hater even while stating that “the people who surrounded Stalin and who had rendered him service in the twenties and thirties were mostly Jews” [VAKSBERG, p. 35] and conceding that Jews especially close to Stalin like Emelyan Yaroslavky (Mines Gubelman), Moisey Gubelman, Lev Mekhlis (“Stalin’s right hand man”), [VAKSBERG, p. 23] Lazar Kaganovich and Isaac Mintz all survived Stalin’s declared “anti-Zionist” purges.

“Why did Stalin, as an anti-Semite, “ wonders Vaksberg, “have two Jewish secretaries – Lev Mekhlis and Grigori Kanner?” [VAKSBERG, p. 27] Why too, we might add in turning Vaksberg’s facts to different theses, whenever Stalin went on a vacation, did Lazar Kaganovich, a Jew, take over running the government? [VAKSBERG, p. 51] And why, we might add, if Stalin was so all-encompassingly hateful of Jews, did he entrust his life to a Jewish bodyguard, Matyas Rakoszy? [VAKSBERG, p. 40] (Another Jewish Stalin bodyguard, son of a rabbi, and “protege of Nikita Khruschev,” was Alexander Contract, who started out in the NKVD – later the KGB. Contract even saved the life of future Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin). [O’DWYER, T., 7-6-98] And if Stalin was singularly focused in his alleged hatred of Jews, why did his “personal corps of physicians” include “Drs. Weisbrod, Moshenberg, and Lev Gigorievich Levin?” [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 37] Even prominent non-Jewish Communist Party officials (and close associates of Stalin’s social circle), President Mikhail Kalinin, Bukharin, Molotov, Voroshilov, Andreyev, Poskrebyshev, and Rykov, all had Jewish wives. Stalin’s own daughter Svetlana Allilueva had an affair with Jewish screenwriter Alexei Kappler; she later married Grigory Morozov (Moroz),
also Jewish. [VAKSBERG, p. 138; RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 208] The fact that Stalin reportedly did not approve of these men is routinely explained by Jewish scholars as anti-Semitism. Stalin's sister-in-law (eventually imprisoned) by his first wife was also Jewish. So was one of his daughters-in-law. And there is controversial testimony that Stalin even had a Jewish mistress, Rosa Kaganovich. [RAPOPORT, L., p. 46, 241] [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 94]

Over a hundred Jewish generals also served in Stalin's Soviet army, including the chief of the Soviet Air Force at the start of World War II, General Jacob Smushkevich. [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 78]

“It seemed,” says Louis Rapoport,

“there were Jews wherever [Stalin] looked. His loyal tin soldier, Marshal Voroshilov, was devoted to his Jewish wife, Catherine. Marshal Bulganin was also happily married to a Jew, Nadezhda. Politburo member Andrei Andreyev, who fell from grace in 1950, was married to Dora Khazan, and Kaganovich the Jew was married to Maria, also one of the tribe. Malenkov, who was suspected of being a bit of a philo-Semite, had a Jewish son-in-law, as, it was said, did Khrushchev. The up-and-coming Leonid Brezhnev was said to have a Jewish wife.” [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 208]

Stalin’s alleged fanatical anti-Semitism had further curious twists. “Another non-Jew not only helped create Israel,” notes M. Hersch Goldberg, “but saved it. Incredible as it may seem, that man was Joseph Stalin. The tale of Stalin’s role in helping create and then insure the early survival of Israel has been little told; and on those occasions when it has been mentioned, there has been no satisfactory explanation for it.” This includes the fact that in 1947 the Soviet Union publicly supported the creation of a Jewish state, and was the second country (after the U.S.) to recognize its establishment. Stalin also initially supported Israel in its war of independence against the Arabs and supported Israel with shipments of arms through Czechoslovakia. Even the Soviet delegate to the United Nations, also President of the Security Council, was of Jewish heritage – Jacob Malik. [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 220-224] It would seem that if Stalin was truly overwhelmed with feelings of irrational anti-Semitism, Jewish power within his own government had overwhelmed him.

From the start of his argument about Stalin's single-minded hatred of Jews, Arkady Vaksberg marks the early struggle for power between Stalin and Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev-Sikolnikov: “All four men whom Stalin perceived as his rivals in the struggle for power were Jewish. Each of them, especially Trotsky, naturally had a large number of allies in higher echelons of power who could influence the distribution of posts and positions and the political clout and popularity of candidates. There was a certain ethnic ‘imbalance’ here too.” [VAKSBERG, p. 19]

As normal in Jewish scholarship (framing Jews as victims even as they act as oppressors), Vaksberg even makes the preposterous claim that the reason Jewish commanders ran 11 of the 12 major Gulag Archipelago concentration camps (including the director of them all, Matvei Berman, who also headed the
slave labor project that built the Belomar-Baltic Canal) was that Stalin wanted to make Jews look bad, and foment anti-Semitism. “It could not,” he insists, “have been sheer coincidence.” [VAKSBERG, p. 98] Maybe not. But other possible reasons are too profoundly troubling for Vaksberg to consider.

Jews were also everywhere prominent in Soviet secret police organizations. “From the beginning,” writes Benjamin Ginsberg, “the Soviet state relied upon military, police, and security services to sustain itself, and Jews were active in these agencies. … Jews … staff[ed] and direct[ed] the coercive instruments upon which the state relied to control its citizens.” [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 30] Genrikh Yagoda, for instance, was the Soviet Chief of the Secret Police in the 1930s. A pharmacist, he specialized “in preparing poisons for his agents to use in liquidating Stalin’s opponents.” [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 31] “Yagoda was the man Stalin trusted most within the repressive apparatus without which no totalitarian regime can exist,” says Arkady Vaksberg, “The Soviet version of dictatorship and Stalin personally would not have survived without the ‘faithful watchdogs of the revolution’ and their ‘punishing swords.’” [VAKSBERG, p. 36] Yagoda’s brother-in-law, Leopold Averebakh was the “chief supervisor of Party purity in Soviet literature.” [VAKSBERG, p. 35]

(America has even had its own Jewish secret police kind of poisoner. Journalist Alexander Cockburn noted Sidney Gottlieb as the “US Official Poisoner … For more than two decades [he] managed the CIA’s Technical Services Division … With Gottlieb’s death, America has lost its prime poisoner. For many years, most notably in the 1950s and 1960s, Gottlieb presided over the CIA’s technical services division and supervised preparation of lethal poisons, experiments in mind control and administration of LSD and other psycho-active drugs to unwitting subjects.”) [COCKBURN, A., GOTTLIEB]

“Working side by side with Yagoda,” notes Arkady Vaksberg about a kindred Jewish government deputy, “was another professional checkist (a euphemism for professional executioner), Meer Trilissen … The many actions undertaken by Trilissen’s agents included blowing up the cathedral in Sofia with the Bulgarian tsar and his government inside.” [VAKSBERG, p. 38]

Other Jews, Matvei Berman and Naftali Frenkel of the secret police, were instrumental in the creation of the slave labor system in which 200,000 workers died during one project alone, the White Sea-Baltic Canal. [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 31] “It was Frenkel,” notes Louis Rapoport, “who refined Berman’s use of prisoners as slave labors … Most of the chief overseers of the Canal were Jews. Solzhenitsyn described them as ‘six hired murderers each of whom accounted for thirty thousand lives: Firin - Berman - Frenkel - Kogan - Rappoport - Zhuk … Thousands of Jewish revolutionaries helped to spearhead the Terror machine with a messianic fervor. One of them, Matvei Berman, had helped to institutionalize slave labor as early as 1922.’” [RAPAPORT, L., 1990, p. 30, 44]

Likewise, Yakov Agranov, Karl Danker “and other representatives of the Jewish proletariat … distinguished themselves with a talent for execution.” [VAKSBERG, p. 39] Other prominent Jewish officials in the Soviet government
included K.V. Pauler, Chief Operations Officer of the secret police in the 1930’s, Lev Inzhir (Chief Accountant for the Gulag: Inzhir “the all-powerful clerk, was kept busy with figures on transit points, rail depots and harbors, human and other freight transfers, length of terms, morality rates.”), “top” Chekist Aron Soltz, [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 44, 45] M. I. Gay who headed a secret police organization that conducted mass arrests and executions during “The Great Terror” of the 1930s, and A.A. Slutsky and Boris Berman who were in charge of terrorist and espionage activities abroad in the 1930s.

Noting that “many of the prosecution witnesses and agent provocateurs against” Jewish enemies of the communist state were also Jewish, Louis Rapoport adds that

“Some of the main instruments of the Terror [against everyone] were also of Jewish origin: M. I. Gay, who headed a special secret police department; A. A. Slutsky and his deputies Boris Berman and Shpiegelglas, who were in charge of terror and espionage abroad; and NKVD operations chief Pauker. None of these mass executioners survived [later purges against them] [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 49-50]

The man who headed the firing squad that executed the Russian royal family, Yakov Yurovsky, was also Jewish, as was the Bolshevik official who reported the deaths to Lenin, Yakov Sverdlov. [KRICHEVSKY, Behind, 1997, p. 8] Or, as Arkady Vaksberg puts it: “There is no getting around the fact that the first violins in the orchestra of death of the tsar and his family were four Jews – Yakov Yurovsky, Shaia Goloshchekin, Lev Sosnovsky, and Pinkus Vainer (Pert Voikov). The concert master and conductor was Yakov Sverdlov.” [VAKSBERG, p. 37]

As Zvi Gitelman notes about the Cheka, the early Soviet terrorist police organization:

“The high visibility of Jews in the Bolshevik regime was dramatized by the large numbers of Jews in the Cheka … From the Jewish point of view it was no doubt the lure of immediate physical power which attracted many Jewish youths … Whatever the reasons, Jews were heavily represented in the secret police … Since the Cheka was the most hated and feared organ of the Bolshevik government, anti- Jewish feelings increased in direct proportion to Cheka terror.” [GITELMAN, 1972, p. 117] http://jewishtribalreview.org/commlink.htm

[Parallel Jewish representation in the Polish communist secret police is addressed in the Holocaust chapter. See http://jewishtribalreview.org/commlink.htm to view this excerpt]

Leon Schapiro remarks that “it is difficult to suggest a satisfactory reason for the prevalence of Jews in the Cheka … Anyone who had the misfortune to fall into the hands of Cheka stood a very good chance of finding himself confronted with, and very possibly shot by, a Jewish investigator.” [SCHAPIRO, L., 1961, p. 165]

“I doubt that there was another poet (or novelist or playwright or artist),” says Arkady Vaksberg, “who was surrounded by as many Chekists as [Vladimir]
Mayakovsky. [Mayakowsky was the leading poet of the Russian revolution era.] And sadly, they were almost all Jewish.” These included at least three Jewish generals in the secret terrorist organization: Yakov Agranov, Moisey Gorb, and Lev Elbert. [VAKSBERG, p. 45]

Another Jewish author, Richard Pipes, adds that

“The worst bestialities were committed by some of the provincial Chekas – which operated at a distance from the eyes of the central organs and had no fear of being reported on by foreign diplomats or journalists. There exists a detailed description of the operations of the Kiev Cheka in 1919 by one of its staff, I. Belerosov, a former law student and tsarist officer, which he gave to general Denikin’s investigators.

According to Belerosov, at first (fall and winter of 1918-1919) the Kiev Cheka went on a ‘continuous spree’ of looting, extortion, and rape. Three-quarters of the staff were Jews, many of them riffraff incapable of any other work, cut off from the Jewish community although careful to spare fellow Jews.” [PIPES, R., 1990, p. 823-824]

In later years, another Jew, Zakhar Ilyich Volovich, “was involved in many of the dirty circles of the NKVD [precursor to the KGB], crimes even today enveloped in dark secrecy.” [VAKSBERG, p. 45-46] Among the many Jewish executives in the Main Directorate of State Security of the NKVD were Mosiey Boguslavsky, Yakov Veinshtok, Zakhlar Volovich, Mark Gai, Matvei Gerzon, Moisey Gorb, Ilya Grach, Yakov Deich, Grigory Rapoport, Abram Ratner, Abram Slutsky, David Sokolinsky, Solomon Stoibelman, Meer Trilesser, Semyon Firin, Vladimir Tsesarsky, Leonid Chertok, Isaak Shapiro, Grigory Yakubovsky, “and many other NKVD workers of the same level and same origins.” [VAKSBERG, p. 98] The non-Jewish head of the NKVD, Lavrenti Beria, had “many Jews in his close entourage … [who were in] major positions in the NKVD.” These included Generals Arkady Gertsovsky, Veniamin Gulst, Ilya Ilyushin-Edleman, Matvei Potashnik, Solomon Milshstein, Lev Novobratsky, Leonid Raikhman, and Naum Eitigen. Heads of NKVD “investigative groups” included Colonels Boris Rodos, Lev Shvartsman, Isaia Babich, Iosif Babich, Iosif Lorkish, and Mark Spekter. [VAKSBERG, p. 102]

Among these, Colonel Lev Shvartsman stands out for Arkady Vaksberg as “one of the most vicious KGB executioners … He personally tortured Mikhail Koltsov, diplomats, major scientists, and cultural figures.” [VAKSBERG, p. 223] Likewise, another Jew, Colonel Boris Rodos was a “sadist [who] … at the Academy of Internal Affairs taught … the methods of working over prisoners in their cells.” [VAKSBERG, p. 211] “As a Jew,” notes Yevgenia Albas in his book about the history of the KGB, “I’m interested in another question entirely: Why were there so many Jews among the NKVD-MGB investigators – including many of the most terrible? It’s a painful question for me, but I cannot evade it.” [ALBATS, Y., 1994, p. 147]

“Such Bolshevik Jewish luminaries as Lev Kamenev, Grigori Zinoviev, and Yakov Sverdlov,” says Ukrainian-American author Myron Kuropas, “helped Lenin come to power; and it was Jews like Maxim Litvinov, Lazar Kaganovich,
and hundreds of lesser lights who were in the forefront of Stalin’s rise to power. It was they who later helped Stalin engineer Ukraine’s genocidal famine and the brutal Soviet takeover of Western Ukraine. When the USSR began to decline, writes [a former KGB officer married to a Jewish officer in the same force], ‘the flower of this educated leadership and their children emigrated to Israel and the West.’ I can’t help but wonder how many of these criminals now reside in the United States.” [KUROPAS, M., 8-14-94, p. 77]

Some estimates suggest that between a fourth and a fifth of the rural Ukrainian population perished by enforced starvation. [MOYNAHAN, p. 120] One of the dedicated Jewish communists was Lev Kopolev. “We were realizing historical necessity,” he wrote,

“We were performing our revolutionary duty. We were obtaining grain for the socialist fatherland … I saw women and children with distended bellies, turning blue, with vacant, lifeless eyes. And corpses – corpses in ragged sheepskin coats and cheap felt boots; corpses in peasant huts, in the melting snow of old Vologda, under the bridges of Kharkov … I saw all this and did not get out of my mind or commit suicide … I believed [in the new Soviet order] because I wanted to believe.” [MOYNAHAN, p. 119]

In 1987, Stuart Kahan, an American relative of Russian communist strong man Lazar Kaganovich (originally named Moiseyevich; he is described by Kahan as the Soviet “Apparatus of Terror”), wrote a book about him. The author interviewed the elderly Kaganovich in Yiddish via his father, and concluded that his relative

“was, to put it mildly, a devil. That relative exuded evil, an evil that put millions of people to death … [KAHAN, S., p. 5] … Although the Church was left intact, its lands were seized [by the communist movement]. Even prior religious teaching was forbidden in the schools. Of course, word came down that it was the Jews who did this. After all, wasn’t the revolution prepared and fashioned by Jews? Both of Karl Marx’s grandfathers were rabbis, and Lenin’s grandfather was also Jewish. And wasn’t Yakov Sverdlov, the first chief of state, a Jew, as was Trotsky himself? … That Trotsky, unquestionably the most outstanding man among the Bolsheviks, was a Jew did not seem an insuperable obstacle in a party in which the percentage of Jews, 52 percent, was rather high compared to the percentage of Jews (1.8 percent) in the total population.” [KAHAN, p. 80-81]

Kaganovich “eventually held more key posts in the power structure than anyone except Stalin … He demolished the huge Church of Christ the Savior and replaced it with the Palace of the Soviets. As commissar of heavy industry during the war years, he chose his brother Mikhail as his deputy and controlled everything from the vast fuel and steel industries to chemicals and building materials.” [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, -. 43]

Jewish author Arkady Vaksberg even calls yet another Jewish Soviet leader, Rozalia Zemlyachka (Zalkind), “a sadist and monster who would play a major
role in the slaughter in the Crimea after the destruction of the last strongholds of the White Movement [anti-communists] there.” [VAKSBERG, p. 23] Another Jew, Bela Hun, “spread bloody terror” with Semlyachka. [VAKSBERG, p. 41] Another government (and Jewish) terrorist, “the lawyer Moisey Uritsky … was the scourge of Petrograd in 1918, terrorizing the citizenry as the local Cheka. He was killed by another Jew, Leonid Kanegisser.” [VAKSBERG, p. 23] Another Jewish Soviet leader, Filipp Goloschchekin, “was one of the main organizers of the murder of the tsar’s family in 1918 … [He also] displayed boundless cruelty in the genocide of the Kazakhs when he became Party leader of Kazakhstan.” [VAKSBERG, p. 17]

As even Winston Churchill once wrote about Jewish influence in the communist world:

“This [communist] movement among Jews is not new. From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt [Adam Weishaupt, the Bavarian founder in 1776 of one of the most famous conspiratorial groups, the Illuminati, in history], to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxemburg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development and envious malevolence, an impossible equality has been steadily growing. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century.” [PIPES, D., 1997, p. 139]

Jews were also “particularly visible in the Soviet cultural and propaganda apparatus” and they “dominated the Soviet film industry.” [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 31] Half of the June 1930 membership of the Communist Academy – a philosophy organization – were also Jewish. “It is obvious that from the very first moves to revive academic and scholarly work in the philosophical field [in Russia],” notes Yehoshua Yakhot, “the part played by Jews was considerable and, in a certain sense, predominant.” [YAHOT, p. 244] By 1984, as one percent of the Soviet populace, one author even found that even 33 per cent of Soviet musicologists were Jews. [BRAUN, J., p. 85]

More than once in Soviet history, Jews have fallen under government suspicion for a collective foreign intrigue – many charged as agents of “American imperialism” or Israel. Sometimes portrayed in the Soviet press during Stalin era as men of “uncertain allegiance,” notes Isaac Deutscher, the newspapers

“revealed systematically the Jewish names of writers who had been know to the public under Russian pseudonyms … The Jews were to some extent protected by their prominence in vital spheres of the national life, in the management of industry, in nuclear research, in the [communist] party machine, in the academic world, and in the armed forces. (Nearly twenty thousand Jews held teaching posts in the Universities).” [DEUTSCHER, p. 608]

Among those many purged by Stalin in 1953 was the Jewish head (Palgunov) of Tass, the government news agency. [HYDE, H.M., 1971, p. 590] In 1937, in a purge of the Commander of the Red Army, seven of his top generals
Opponents of indigenous European nationalist movements, Jews also rose to power in enforcing communist rule over post-World War II Soviet satellite countries, including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. In Hungary, for example, Mathiou Rakosi was the Communist Party leader and Peter Gabor headed the secret police. Eduard Oklag, Yokub Berman and Gilyari Minz were prominent in the Polish government, Anna Pauker in Romania. “It was she,” notes Howard Sachar, “not the [Communist] party’s chairman, Gheorghe Gheorghin-Dej, who made the key policy decisions in her triple capacity as deputy premier, foreign minister, and deputy secretary of the central committee … Simeon Bughichi, Mrs. Pauker’s successor as foreign minister, was also Jewish … There were several Jews [after World War II] … who played leading roles in the [Yugoslavian communist] government. The most eminent of these was Moshe Pijade [president of the Yugoslav National Assembly].” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 363, 365, 315]

A number of these Jewish leaders throughout the communist system met their end in government power purges. In Czechoslovakia, for example, Rudolph Slansky and ten other Jewish elites of the party were tried; eight were executed. “The Slansky trial,” note Ronald Radosh and Joyce Milton, “was in part a move to purge the Czech communist party of its Jewish leadership.” [RADOSH/MILTON, p. 349] Jewish scholar Barnet Litvinoff adds that

“When Stalin’s tyranny was at its height, and his grasp upon his satellites complete, powerful Jewish personalities were conspicuous in the Communist hierarchies of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Romania … Hilary Minc and Jacob Berman who returned to Warsaw … stood very close to the master in the Kremlin … Erno Gero, Matyas Rakosi, and Mihaly Farkas occupied similar positions in Hungary, while Anna Pauker was the unquestioned mistress of Romania, with authority comparable to Rudolf Slansky’s in Czechoslovakia. The list was an extensive one, and included government and Party officials alike, ambassadors abroad, and some military figures trained by the Soviet secret police, not to mention university professors, film producers and broadcasting personalities.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 104-105]

[Also, see http://jewishtribalreview.org/spieslink.htm that examines the phenomenon of Jewish communist spies for the Soviet Union in America]

Philip Mendes notes Jewish prominence in a wide variety of communist and left wing movements throughout the world:

“As early as the French Revolution of 1830, Jews played an active role in radical movements [including Michel Goudchaux, Philippe Anspach, Michel Alcan, Olinde Rodrigues, Adolphe Crémiieux, and Josue Leon] … In the 1860s and ‘70s Jewish activists occupied some of the highest positions in the fledgling Russian revolutionary movement. The ‘pioneer of Russian-Jewish revolutionary action’ was Nicholas Utin [Others included Mark Natanson, Paul Axelrod, George Plekahnov, Vera Zasulitch, Rosalie Bograd, Meir Molodetsky, Gregory Goldenberg, Lew Deutch, Vladimir
Jochelson, Aaron Sundelievitch, and Hsya Helfmann] … Jewish individuals also played a prominent role in all the Russian radical movements, from the Socialist Revolutionaries to the Mensheviks to the Bolsheviks … In Hungary … for almost four decades in fact, the top leaders of the Communist Party were Jews … In France, many Jews have figured prominently in the leadership of the Communist Party, including Charles Rappoport, Jean Kanapa, Jean Ellenstein, Haim Cukierman, Charles Fiterman and Henri Krasucki.” [MENDES, P., 1993, p. 9-13]

Other countries of prominent Jewish radicalism cited by Mendes included Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Holland, Austria, Germany, Spain, Great Britain, Chile, and the Middle East.

Ultimately, Benjamin Ginsberg [GINSBERG, B., 1993] alludes to the recurring paradigm to all this, that Jews throughout European history have sought benefit from allegiance to ruling powers – from absolute monarchists to communist dictatorships – which oppressed, suffocated, and even massacred non-Jewish masses. As a people who historically distanced themselves from the indigenous peoples of every land they lived and as centuries-old nemeses of the Christian order, Jews were ideally suited to function as dispassionate legislators – and exploiters and oppressors – over those of whom they had no real bond or interest. “The Gentile population in general,” says Ewa Morawska about Eastern Europe, “and the inhabitants of villages surrounding the [Jewish community] in particular, were seen by Jews primarily in instrumental terms as suppliers of … material livelihood.” [MORAWSKA, p. 15] For those many Jews who had a religious basis in their lives, traditional Judaism often served the interests of devaluing others. As consequence, Jewish communities periodically engendered the wrath – and sometimes violence – of the common populace.

Jewish scholar George Mosse frames the common bond between the polar politics of the Jewish European capitalist and communist this way:

“There was an affinity between the Jewish bourgeoisie which supported the newest in the arts, placing themselves squarely on the side of the modernists, and their wayward socialist children, who wanted to overthrow the existing social and economic order. This affinity was based on shared ideals that the sons wanted to realize more completely than the fathers had.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 57]

“Empirical data,” adds Jewish scholar Norman Cantor, “support the contention of French and German anti-Semites in the 1920s and 1930s that the Jews were both capitalists and communists, and thus doubly anathema to the reactionary racist movements that funneled into Judeo-phobic fascism. The German cartoons of the 1920s who depicted Jews as both bloated capitalists swallowing European civilization and nefarious red terrorists plotting to blow up western civilization were not engaging in absolute fantasy, even though Jewish apologists then and historians now like to make that accusation and try to forget the whole thing.” [CANTOR, p. 275]

Also note chapter 21, p. 935, another chapter about Jewish economic influence
“Probably 90% of medieval people [in Europe] were peasants. But astonishingly little is known about them. Universally illiterate, like prehistoric people, they left no documents of their own. Literate members of medieval society, mainly churchmen, either ignored the peasants or, in most cases, mentioned them with contempt. To reconstruct the life of peasants, not only their economic condition but also their customs, attitudes, and inner experiences presents an impossible challenge.” [JUDD]

“[Medieval] satire [about peasants],” says Jacques Le Goff, “often emphasizes the peasant’s filth, poor clothing, and minimal diet, but also a sort of bestiality that placed him … between beasts and humans … [This reflects] the undeniable and widespread conditioning brought on by harsh living conditions, alimentary shortages, monotonous work, a daily struggle for existence, the great scourge of famines, recurrent epidemics, and the dangers of war …” [LE GOFF] (As recently as pre-World War II Poland, Jewish author Norman Salsitz, who was raised in that country, notes that “all across Poland the peasant was held in almost universal contempt.”) [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 88]

These peasants are that stock from whom most Euro-Americans have descended. And these impoverished and often desperate people who harbored the greatest day to day grievances against the Jews, and who perpetrated most of the violence against them – are rendered entirely mute in the twentieth century. We know well the Jewish martyrrology myths of the Middle Ages story, told and retold by their Hebrew and Yiddish chroniclers that are popular Jewish canon today. But we don’t know the peasants’ version of things; there is only scant reference to them by the Christian clergy or local aristocracy, neither of whom were even remotely sympathetic to their plight.

A Jewish author, Max Dimont, lays the barest outline of the peasant torment:

“[Christian feudal life was like] a vast prison. The bars were the all-encompassing restrictions placed upon the daily life of the people. Inside the bars were the peasants, the so-called Third Estate, who comprised about 95 per cent of the total population. Outside the bars but tied to them by invisible chains were the other two estates, the priests and the nobles. Neither inside the prison nor tied to the bars outside it were the Jews, the unofficial “Fourth Estate.”
The restrictions placed on the feudal serfs, as the peasants were called, pursued them from “womb to tomb.” There could be no movement from one estate to another except through the ranks of the clergy, and then only for the exceptionally gifted child. Restrictions on travel kept the serf tied to the soil. He usually saw nothing of the world except that within walking distance. Though he was technically a free man, he could own no property. He could be sold with the land by his lord … The peasant had to grind his flour in the lord’s granary, bake his bread in the lord’s bakery – all for a fee, paid either in goods or in labor. He could only own wooden dishes, and one spoon was all he was allowed for his entire family, no matter what its size. The kind of cloth he could buy, sell, or wear, was regulated. The lord was allowed to sample everything his serfs had, including their brides …” [DIMONT, p. 247]

“In this [feudal] system,” notes Eva Hoffman, “the Jews who were growing more numerous and visible could be thought of as another estate, with its own place in the ordained social order.” [HOFFMAN, E., 1997, p. 47] “All Eastern European Jewry,” notes a Yiddish folk saying, “is one town.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 47]

“No travelers’ account of Poland,” says Jerzy Lukowski, “was complete without almost ritual reference to the degradation of the serfs … In Poland, peasants were forbidden to leave their villages without seigneurial [manor lord] permission in 1496 … Until 1768, the noble seigneur enjoyed the power of life and death over his serfs. He could buy and sell them like chattel, independently of landed transactions.” [LUKOWSKI, p. 38] As late as the 1800s, says Jewish scholar Howard Sachar, “the typical Russian peasant was bound in serfdom to his soil. Diseased, ignorant, hopelessly superstitious, he lived in a rude hut, slept in his clothes, and fed his fire with animal dung.” [SACHAR, p. 80] And as Sula Benet notes about Poland:

“For three hundred years, until 1784, the peasants were serfs, bound to their land and to their lords. After that, although the Constitution of 1791 nominally changed their status, there was little real change in their position or condition until Poland was reconstituted in 1919, after the first World War.” [BENET, S., p. 31]

And what of the Jewish merchants and money lenders, and the Jews at-large, the people that kept to themselves and refused to interact with others except towards commercial profit, these people from whom many impoverished Gentiles sought out to borrow money, not to expand their fortunes, but merely to survive the current season?

Dimont continues:

“None of these restrictions applied to the Jews. They were free to come and go, marry and divorce, sell and buy as they pleased…. The priests were excluded from work, the nobles did not want to work, and the serfs were not allowed to enter the bourgeoisie or middle-class professions. There was no one left to do this work except the Jews, who
therefore became indispensable. The Jews were the oil that lubricated the creaky machinery of the feudal state.” [DIMONT, p. 247]

Jews were visibly distinct from the rest of the population, especially by dress. They usually wore black and the men were distinguished by side locks over their ears. They also “stood out by specific mannerisms,” says Janusz Tazbir, “their nervous gestures, continually emphasizing the spoken word, and their characteristic feverish haste.” The Jew was to a Christian “an economic rival, an onerous creditor, accused of arrogance and impudence … and willing to suffer any humiliation for even a small gain.” They were widely perceived as cowards and swindlers who held “occupations that did not deserve to be called ‘work.’” [TAZBIR, p. 27-31]

Bernard Weinryb suggests as typical the area of Breslau in the mid-14th century: perhaps 10% of the Jewish community was “poor and about 7% ‘very rich,’ thus placing about four-fifths of the Jewish population in the middle-income range, whatever this may have meant to them.” [WEINRYB, p. 70] Even as late as the twentieth century, there can be no comparison between the strata of “poor” in the Jewish community and the impoverished Gentile peasant society at-large around them. Ewa Morawska notes that

“At the end of the last century in Galicia [a province that is today divided between Poland and the Ukraine, including the city of Krakow], a region generally poorer than other provinces of Eastern Europe, about 50,000 peasants annually died of starvation; such catastrophes did not occur in Jewish society, even among the most deprived, partly because of the well-organized in-group assistance, but also because of a somewhat higher general standard of living.” [MORAWSKA, p. 12]

A good example of chronic Jewish myopia concerning their own history, completely devoid of the wider context of European history around it, is Poland. This country – until Hitler’s campaign to exterminate Jews, and Poles, and others – was the home for more Jews than any other place in the world. After being expelled from other areas of Europe in the mid-1300’s, Jews were allowed by the ruling nobles to immigrate to feudal Poland. There, despite modern Jewish itemization of alleged Polish persecutions over the centuries, the Jewish community flourished. (Just before World War II, “84% of all the Jews in the world either lived in historically Polish territory, or came from families that had lived there.” [SHERWIN, p. 157] To this day Jewish popular opinion still condemns Poles and their culture, with accusations of all sorts leading up to alleged Polish indifference to – and betrayal of – the Jews under the Nazis. More about that later.

Let’s go back a few centuries. What kind of country, we might wonder, had the Jews moved to? Beyond the sacred island of Jewry, what was the indigenous populations’ miserable situation? What were the social and political forces that were boiling all around them? In war after war after war, Poland has been a country continuously ripped apart, partitioned, divided, and subdivided by invaders for centuries. If anyone has a legitimate claim to historic victimization, Poles can stake a claim as deeply valid as anybody. Here is a rudimentary chronological
overview of the social upheaval, religious tension, and terrors that ripped through all or part of Polish society (which has changed and reformed in expanse) for hundreds of years, beginning with the century before the Jews’ arrival:

1241-1242. Mongols invade Poland.
1246-1307. Lithuanians raid parts of Poland.
1248-1287. Jatvingians raid parts of Poland.
1328-1322. Teutonic (Germanic) knights and Bohemians crush Poland in a series of wars.

1350’s. **Jews began immigrating en masse to Poland.**
1399. Mongols defeat Poland in war.
1410. Poland defeat Teutonic knights in war.
1419. Protestant Hussite rebellion.
1454-1467. Polish uprising against the Teutonic knights.
1475, 1484. Ottoman Empire attacks parts of Poland.
1486-94. Russian Tsar Ivan II the Great attacks Lithuania.
1492. Tatars raid parts of Poland.
1497. Moldavians militarily defeat Poles.
1498-99. Tatar invasion reaches Krakov, one of Poland’s greatest cities.
1500-1503. Tsar Ivan II attacks Lithuania again.
1507-1508. Polish war with Russia over Lithuania.
1512-22. Polish war with Russia over Lithuania.
1524. Ottoman troops cut through parts of Poland and conquer sections of Hungary.
1558-82. Russian Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible fights 24 year long war against Teutonic kingdom.
1563-70. Russia invades Poland in First Nordic War.
1578-81. Poland defeats Russia in three campaigns.
1600-1635. Swedish-Poland war.
1618-1648. Thirty Years War, of which Poland has peripheral involvement.
1620. Poles defeat Prince of Transylvania.
1621-1631. Poles defeat Turks in battle, but Turkish attacks continue for ten more years.
1633-34. Poles attack Turks, Russians, and Swedes.
1635. Poland seizes Swedish ports on Baltic Sea.
1648, 1651. Rebellion of Cossacks against Polish nobles. With armed aid from Tatars and Turks, hundreds of thousands of people are massacred.
1654-1655. Russia attacks Poland and conquers eastern part.
1655, 1657. Poles defeat Swedish and Brandenburg armies.
1660-62. Polish union with Ukraine and defeat of Russia. Polish rebellion against King of Poland.
1672-1673. Turks attack Poland; Poland loses two-thirds of Ukraine.
1673. Turks defeated.
1683. Turks driven from Vienna, a crucial event for Europe.
1704-1710. Swedish troops destroy one-third of all Polish cities.
1756-63. Seven Years War. Russian armies used Polish bases in their war against Prussia.
1768-72. Polish Catholic uprisings, known as the Confederation of Bar.
1794. Polish popular insurrection against Russia and Prussia.
1797-1801. Polish legions, formed from former Austrian prisoners of war, fight Austria.
1806. France attacks Prussia, Russia aids France, and Poles rebel against Prussia.
1809. Napoleonic Wars of 1809.
1830-31. Polish insurrection and war against Russia.
1833-1846. Rebellious Polish revolutionary cells captured and imprisoned.
1846. Polish rebellion put down by Austrian troops.
1853-56. Russia’s Crimean War leads to reforms in Poland.
1863. Polish insurrection, put down. Executions and exile. Russian governor makes “every effort to stamp out Polish culture altogether.”
1905. Polish patriots take part in abortive revolution against Russian government.
1914. World War I. 800,000 Poles killed and destruction of the country.
1917. Russian Revolution.
1918. Polish uprising against Germans in city of Poznan.
1920. Polish-Soviet war.
1929. Polish unemployment hits 33%, not including those employed in agriculture.
1939. Fall of Poland to the Nazis in World War II.

[ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, 1993]

This is the kind of country Poland’s Jews lived in since the fourteenth century. “The established order (of the Polish state) has been overturned on at least five occasions – in 1138, in 1795, in 1813, in 1864, and in 1939, on each occasion all concrete manifestations of a unified political community were lost.” [DAVIES, p. x] In just the 1600’s, for instance, “war, the bubonic plague, slave raids, and mass murders had reduced the total [Polish population] … [to] 45% of the former total population.” [E. Britt., 25, p. 946] Jews were, as elsewhere in Europe, for centuries not obliged to serve in the military and distanced themselves from warring factions as much as possible, unless, of course, it was clearly opportune to make an allegiance. Jews principally functioned – at least till the
Enlightenment – with the intertwined aims of insular self-survival, weathering others’ socio-political catastrophes, and advancing wherever and whenever possible towards the objectives of Jewish individual and communal opportunism.

The failed Polish insurrection against Russian rule in 1863, notes Theodore Weeks, had the following effect on the populace in Poland:

“The Jews of Russian Poland were also affected by the post-1863 repressions. On the whole, however, the Russian administration did not single them out – unlike the Poles – for specific restrictive measures … Thus as Polish rights were further restricted, on the whole, the Jewish legal situation in Russian Poland remained relatively untouched.” [WEEKS, T., p. 64]

“Only a very small percentage of the population in Poland,” notes Bernard Weinryb, “in about 1600 estimated at less than 10 per cent of the country’s total population, had any aspiration to “rights.” Less than half of this small group (the magnates and the wealthy landed gentry) had standing and influence in the country.” [WEINBRYB, p. 160]

Discriminated against on one hand (as everyone, short of nobility and clergy, was throughout medieval Europe in some form), the Jewish community in Poland was also afforded special privileges by the ruling aristocracy. While Jews were sometimes prohibited from owning land (as were most other people), they could pay the owning nobles a flat fee to lease it; profits beyond this fee were theirs to keep. “The belief that Jews could not own land,” notes Albert Lindemann, “ranks as one of the most often overheard simplifications about their status, both in Russia and elsewhere in Europe … The real issue was not whether Jews could own land, if they would work it with their own hands, but whether they could own land that allowed them to exploit the labor of the peasants.” [LANDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 63]

Jewish author Norman Salsitz notes another version of the land issue, in his book about growing up in pre-World War II Poland:

“My father’s father was born and spent his life on an estate not far from Kolbuszowa. The estate belonged to Jacob Eckstein, certainly the most estimable Jew in our town. Naftali Saleschutz, my grandfather, served as manager, which brought him into close relations with many peasants who worked in the fields belonging to Eckstein and gave him a sense of connection with the soil. (The Jews had lived in the area since the sixteenth century; they were originally farmers but had in time moved off to the towns and villages and lost direct contact with the land).” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 28]

For the non-Jewish part, notes Michael Aronson, “Russian peasants endured a hunger not only for food. They suffered from land hunger as well.” [ARONSON, p. 25]

Jews in Poland were formally protected and served as tax-collectors, bankers, and administrators of the money mints, breweries and salt mines. (In later centuries Jews eventually owned many of such important industries). Even the
Polish King Casimir the Great fell into debt to Jewish lenders, as did King Lewis of Hungary. [LEON, p. 156] “In the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries,” says Abram Leon, “Jewish usurers succeeded in taking possession of the lands belonging to the nobles.” [LEON, p. 185] Until the union of Poland and Lithuania, Jews perhaps had it even better in Lithuania. “Lithuanian Jews,” says Leon, “enjoyed the same rights of the free population. In their hands lay big business, banking, the customhouses, etc. The farming of taxes and customs brought them great wealth. Their clothes glittered with gold and they wore swords just like the gentry.” [LEON, p. 189]

“Jews in southeastern Poland …”, notes Jewish scholar Bernard Weinryb, “were legally on par with the nobles with regard to the amounts paid as indemnification for being wounded or killed. If we go beyond formality and consider the prevailing practice the position of the Jew appears in a more favorable light. If he could not be nobleman, he could be like one – or in the place of one. Jewish lessees of the king’s or nobles’ villages and towns, or of various taxes and other sources of revenue, were accorded broad powers and status-bearing functions, often over large expanses populated by many people, not all of them peasants. To these Jews were transformed almost Lord’s power, mostly including the perquisites of local justice. A number of Jews actually did behave like nobles – conducting themselves haughtily, arrogantly, arbitrarily, dictatorially, and sometimes even recklessly … A number of cases are known in which a non-Jewish tax collector, or nobleman, or a court usher, was simply afraid to enter the houses of prominent Jews on business, not wanting to risk being thrown out or beaten up … Many … instances are known in which Polish Jewish communities or other groups refused to follow Polish court summonses or orders from other offices.” [WEINRYB, p. 162-163]

In later centuries, however, “increasingly,” says Leon, “the Jews came in contact only with the poor, the artisans, and the peasants. And often the anger of the people, despoiled by the Kings and Lords and compelled to pledge their last belongings to the Jews, turning against the walls of the [Jewish] ghetto.” [LEON, p. 155]

The Jewish role of hated tax collector was common not only in Poland, but throughout Europe. Salo Baron writes that:

“Most widespread was the Jewish contribution to tax farming. The medieval regimes, as a rule, aided by only small, inefficient, and unreliable bureaucracies, often preferred to delegate tax collection to private entrepreneurs who, for a specific lump sum they paid the treasury, were prepared to exact the payments due from the taxpayers. Of course, the risks of under collection were, as a rule, more than made up by considerable surpluses obtained, if need be, by ruthless methods. [BARON, EH of J, p. 46]

“Wealthy Jews,” notes Bernard Weinryb, “with good connections among those in power, and on one hand, underworld elements, believed in their own
ability to take care of themselves, or to invoke the protection of the powerful. They frequently resorted to hard and brutal measures to achieve their ends…” [WEINRYB, p. 164] Typically, Jewish apologists like Leon Poliakov – following traditional martyrological models – blame Jewish economic “aggression” against non-Jews as a response to Gentile hostility to them:

“The Jews replied to Christian animosity by a hatred just as intense but necessarily restrained or repressed. Whereas the aggressive potential of the Christians could be expressed at will and discharged directly, Jewish aggression was obliged to seek other channels and to become in some way transmuted. The psychic energy thus accumulated had ample opportunity to function in the realm of the struggle for existence – in the pursuit of negotiable currency.” [POLIAKOV, p. 87]

Along with Jewish leases on tax collecting, inns, dairies, flour mills, tolls, and other essentials of commerce, says Simon Dubnow, “the Jews inherited from the landed gentry some of the rights over the serfs. The lessees endeavored to extract as much revenue as possible from the nobleman’s estates, and to do that it was necessary to exploit the peasantry.” [DUBNOV, v. 4, p. 26]

“Jews,” writes Witold Rymankowki, “in contrast to the millions of serfs and the impoverished townspeople who were oppressed by the nobility, constituted a privileged group which … effectively represented the only class in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to concentrate finance and liquid assets in its hands.” [POLONSKY, p. 156] An old Latin proverb proclaimed that the Polish Commonwealth was “heaven for the nobles, purgatory for the townsfolk, hell for the peasants, and paradise for the Jews.” [HAGEN, p. 13]

“The Council of Four Lands,” says David Biale, “which was the supracommunal governing body of the Polish Jews, maintained a virtual ‘Jewish lobby’ at the Polish parliament. In the eyes of enemies of the Jews, the power of this lobby was such that, according to a statement from 1669, ‘in practice Jews do not let any law materialize which is unfavorable to them.”’ [BIALE, POWER, p. 72]

Jews prospered so well that, when the Polish and Lithuanian nobility merged forces in the mid-sixteenth century, Jews followed up with their “services.” With Polish expansion into the Ukrainian frontiers, Jews leased land there too from the aristocracy, and dictated over the population of serf-slaves. Wealthy Jews established themselves securely throughout the Polish economy and farmed out work and management opportunities to relatives and co-religionists. “During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,” says Salo Baron, “domestic commerce (in Poland and Lithuania) as well as export (timber, grain, furs) and import (cloth, wine, luxuries) were for the most part in Jewish hands.” [BARON, EHOJ, p. 227] In fact, Heinrich Graetz states that “circumstances were such at the time that the Jews of Poland could form a state within a state.” [GRAETZ, Pop Hist, p. 10, v. 5; in LEON, p. 190]

The Jews of Poland were exploited by the Polish nobility (in the sense that they were heavily taxed as a communal entity). But Jews in turn ruthlessly exploited the masses of impoverished peasants beneath them, most of the non-Jews of the land, and even the burghers, townsfolk, and sometimes nobles.
“[Jews] enjoyed religious and communal autonomy and enriched themselves, becoming the most numerous group of capitalists in the country. They were sufficiently protected by law, and living in wealth they turned to Talmudic studies.” [OXFORD POLAND, p. 567]

In Germany, the Jewish opportunity to collect money for no work (per usury) was noted by an ancient rabbi, Shalom ben Isaac Sekel:

“The reason why the Torah holds a higher place [for Jews] in Germany than in other places is that the Jews here charge interest to Gentiles and need not engage in an [time-consuming] occupation. On this score they have time to study the Torah.” [BARON, EHoJ, p. 55]

The upper strata of Jewish wealth attracted malevolent attention. In sixteenth century Poland there were formal complaints that “Jews in the royal towns have synagogues and houses, which are finer and more numerous than the churches and the houses of Christians. There is a need for the King to act fast to rectify this.” [POLONSKY, p. 58]

In seventeenth century Poland, Hirsz Kiejdanower, identified as a Jewish “mystic,” wrote:

“I have seen Jewish women out on the street, dressed not as Jews but as nobles. They question their husbands’ opinions and bring Christian hatred and jealousy upon us.” [POLONSKY, p. 50]

For their part, the peasants were in a despicable state. In Poland the aristocracy’s complete control over commoner lives was legalized with statutes in 1496, 1518, 1532, and 1543, whereby the poor were formally rendered as human chattel living “under conditions of virtual slavery as cheap laborers for the noble’s farmstead economy.” [ENCY BR, 25, p. 949]

“The Jewish arendator [leasee of land, mills, inns, breweries, tax farming, etc.],” writes Norman Davies, “became the master of life and death over the population of entire districts and, having nothing but a short-term and purely financial interest in the relationship, was faced with the irresistible temptation to pare his temporary subjects to the bone. On the noble estates, he tended to put all his relatives and co-religionists in charge of the flour mill, the brewery, and in particular the Lords’ tavern, where by custom the peasants were obliged to drink. On the church estates, he became the collector of all ecclesiastical dues, standing by the church door for his payment from tithe-payers … the baptized infant, newly-weds, and mourners … The Jewish community became the symbol of social and economic exploitation.” [DAVIES, p. 444]

“The Jewish steward,” adds seminal Jewish historian, Heinrich Graetz, “strove to draw as much as possible from the manors and to exploit the peasants as much as possible.” [GRAETZ, in LEON, p. 192] Likewise, “the toll farmer,” remarks Bernard Weinryb, “had many opportunities to practice abuse. Rates were not clearly fixed. The toll farmer and his employees had the right to search traveler’s wagons to confiscate the wares of anyone trying to avoid payment of tolls … Those who thought they had been overcharged tended to regard this as Jewish oppression.” [WEINRYB, p. 64]
“Jews,” notes Hillel Levine, “sometimes even managed whole villages and oversaw the economic development and exploitation of forests, mines, mints, custom houses, toll roads, and breweries on the gentry’s estates, using serf labor … Jews were motivated … to squeeze profits out of the margins. These included more rigorous supervision of the serfs and more efficient collection of rents and taxes, adding to the harshness of the serfs’ lives and by no means making the Jewish arendator [lessee of a business enterprise from the lords] beloved.” [LEVINE, p. 63]

Chaim Bermant notes:

“In Poland, the Jews became so numerous, prosperous and entrenched, that they began to lose something of their caution. Their whole economy was based mainly on the arenda system under which they became tax farmers and collectors for the crown, or lessees of the forests, estates, mills and salt mines of the nobility. Some operated on a large scale, many on a small scale, leasing a few acres of land, or operating a small distillery or tavern, but their utility to theirsuperiors rested in their powers of extraction. The peasantry, the work force, the cattle, the land, were all regarded in much the same light and were pressed for their maximum yield, and if the nobility were thus the ultimate exploiters, the Jews were the visible ones and aroused the most immediate hostility. Rabbis warned that Jews were sowing a terrible harvest of hatred, but while the revenues rolled in the warnings were ignored. Moreover, the rabbis themselves were beneficiaries of the system.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 26]

The Cambridge History of Poland notes that:

“Jesuit preachers … used to complain that peasants were mere slaves. Their field service had been steadily increased and all kinds of abuses had been practiced. The squires wanted to sell their badly-brewed ale and so peasants were simply forced to drink it. The Jewish innkeeper had to distribute set quantities among the peasants, who could throw it away, but pay for it they must. [The peasants’] right to buy and sell became limited; their children were taken away from them in order to serve at the manor; they were not allowed to go to the town in order to earn money or acquire some learning. The worst condition existed on the large domains of the nobility in Ruthenia. The noblemen usually farmed out their immense domains to the so-called commissaries, and these would extort money from the peasants, with the active help of the Jews.” [CAMBRIDGE, p. 566]

The reference to ale is important here. Jewish merchants were eventually afforded a monopoly on alcohol distribution throughout most of Poland, including the Ukraine. This meant that the person who regularly demanded tax payments from such peasant “slaves,” the person who managed the land and made decisions upon which the impoverished peasants were exploited, the person who dragged the peasant’s child away, the man who drove the peasant into deeper debt, and the man who sold the peasants booze to drink away their misery, all had a Jewish face.
In the mid-eighteenth century, in rural areas of parts of Eastern Europe, up to 85% of the Jewish population “was involved in some aspect of manufacturing, wholesaling, or retailing of beer, mead, wine, and grain-based intoxicants, like vodka.” [LEVINE, p. 9]

“Anti-Semites,” says H. H. Ben-Sasson, “ascribed the drunkenness prevalent among the peasants and their permanent state of indebtedness to the wily Jewish taverner, who also extended credit to them.” [BARON, ECHJ, p. 136] (Gentile accusations that Jewish saloon owners were poisoning the non-Jewish populace with alcohol and contributing to moral decay even had a direct parallel to Jewish commercial activities in the American South at the turn of the twentieth century. Jews, who “overwhelmingly opposed prohibition,” yet were known themselves as “unusually sober,” were singled out for attack by Christian temperance leaders for their great role in the liquor trade, for what was described as Jewish greed and pursuit of profit at the expense of public health and morality. [LINDEMANN, p. 232] During the prohibition years, the Seagram’s alcohol fortune was built by the Bronfman family, who ran illegal liquor into the United States from Canada; one of the heirs of this fortune, Edgar Bronfman, is the current head of the Jewish World Congress).

Eastern European Jews had a popular Yiddish song for this aspect of their prosperity: “Slicher is a goy … trinker muss er. (The Gentile is a drunkard; he has to drink.)” [CANTOR, SC, p. 183] Jews themselves had a marked tendency towards sobriety. George Mosse suggests that “the reasons for their moderation in the consumption of alcohol may have … been … economic…. Avoidance of drunkenness helped to avoid expenses and thus assisted in the primary accumulation of capital.” Staying sober, needless to say, is also a distinct advantage, economically or otherwise, over the intoxicated. And alcoholism is a steady, reliable source for profit. “The Jews,” says Hillel Levine, “… could avert facing his contribution to the plight of the serf – ‘A goy,’ he might mutter with self-righteousness, ‘drunken sloth is the essence of the Gentile.’” [LEVINE, p. 10]

It is disturbing to note how deeply ingrained the disdain for non-Jews is in Jewish folk tradition (as well as the lengths they go to hide it from Gentiles). In a 1955 study of Jewish American stereotypes equating non-Jews with drunkenness, 38 of 73 Jewish respondents denied they had ever heard about an association of Gentiles and alcoholics as children, but “when asked specifically about a childhood ditty called ‘Drunken is the Gentile,’ only 17 denied familiarity with it. This turnabout, wrote the researcher, Charles Snyder, was because Jewish respondents recognized that “the interviewer knew the prevailing folk beliefs and that it was no longer necessary to conceal ethnocentric ideas behind a universalistic front.” [SKLARE, p. 576]

Under the veil of objective scholarship, a pair of modern (1952) scholars even echoed classical Jewish stereotypes and contempt for non-Jewish peasantry with this defaming vignette from their book about their beloved Eastern European Jewish community:

“It is no rare occurrence for the market day to end in violence. The peasant, having sold his wares, will celebrate his profits – and perhaps
drink them away – at a Jewish inn. When he can no longer pay for liquor and still insists on more, he will be thrown out, whereupon if he is already inflamed by drinking he sets up a cry, “The Jew has cheated me!” If a group of comrades who have shared the activities of the day should join him, a token riot may follow.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 67]

Anthropologist Frances Pine notes traditional peasant perceptions of local lawyers and innkeepers (code words for Jews, especially the latter) in the Polish mountain area known as the Podhale:

“Lawyers and innkeepers were portrayed as encouraging village men to drink and then, when they were unable to pay their debts, taking their lands as forfeit. Many of these stories probably contain substantial truths; for instance, land records from the 19th until the mid-20th century show frequent mortgaging of lands and transfers of land title to pay off debt to non-villagers who are listed as innkeepers and advocates.” [Pine, F., 1999, p. 52]

Jews continued to invest in and propagate alcohol, a product they recognized was harmful and were disinclined to use themselves (short of ritual wine uses). By the late nineteenth century perhaps the largest brewery in Europe, Schultheiss-Patzenhofer, “was a ‘Jewish firm’ (in terms of management, Board membership, and financial links).” [MOSSE, p. 12-13] In the Ukraine, by 1872, after the feudal system had passed into history, wealthy Jews owned about 90% of Ukraine’s distilleries, as well as 56% of its sawmills, 48% of its tobacco production, and 33% of the sugar refineries. [SUBTLENY, p. 277] In the Russian province of Zhitomir, 73.7% of the Jews living there made their living by leasing distilleries and selling alcohol at taverns. [LINDEMANN, p. 152] Even in the Polish town of Oswiecim (renamed and known infamously as the Nazi site for the concentration camp Auschwitz) Jakob Haberfeld, a Jewish “liquor magnate” owned (up to the World War II era) the most beautiful building in the area – a 40-room mansion. [GOLDMAN, A., 1998, p. A1] (On the subject of Jewish reclamation, in 2001 heirs to the Jewish Wertheim department store dynasty were even taking ownership to land in Berlin [once owned by the Wertheim family] that was the site of Adolf Hitler’s personal bunker. [BOYES, R., 6-26-01]

Hayim Zhitlowsky was from the Jewish village of Uschah in what later became part of the Soviet Union. He was, as one Jewish historian puts it, “the outstanding thinker of the Jewish cultural renaissance in the Yiddish language in the twentieth century.” He was no vicious, prejudicial, peasant anti-Semite; he was a lover of his own Jewish people, and influential in preserving their culture. But Zhitlowsky was deeply troubled by the omnipresent Jewish exploitation of their surrounding non-Jewish peasant neighbors. In 1883 he wrote:

“[The Jewish businessman] Samuel Solomovich Poljakov built railroads for Russia. Those railroads were, according to Nekrasov’s famous poem, built on the skeletons of the Russian peasantry. My uncle Michael in the [Jewish town of] Uschach distilled vodka for the Russian people and made a fortune on the liquor tax. My cousin sold vodka to the peasants. The whole town hired them to cut down Russian woods which he
bought from the greatest exploiter of the Russian peasants, the Russian landowner…. Wherever I turned my eyes to ordinary, day-to-day Jewish life, I saw only one thing, that which anti-Semites were agitating about; the injurious effect of Jewish merchantry on Russian peasantry.” [In CUDDIHY, p. 138]

Other Jews, especially among socialists, were moved by the Eastern European peasants’ plight at the hands of Jewish communities. “We were convinced,” wrote one, “that all the Jews were swindlers.” Another, Pavel Akselrod, said that “however great the poverty and deprivation … of the Jewish masses … the fact remains that, taken overall, some half of them function as a non-productive element, sitting astride the neck of the lower classes in Russia.” [LINDEMANN, p. 141] Isaac Deutscher notes the case of prominent Jewish communist leader Leo Trotsky: “Trotsky saw poverty and exploitation from the window of the home of an upstart Jewish landowner, whose son he was.” [DEUTSCHER, p. 24]

Ber Borochov, a Jew, a socialist, and a Zionist, explained Jewish exploitation of non-Jews this way: “The vast majority of non-Jews gain their livelihood from nature … whereas the majority of Jews earn their living directly from other men. In Russia and Galicia 70-80% of non-Jews earn their livelihood from nature; a similar percentage of the Jews earn theirs from men.” [BOROCHOV, p. 68] By 1918, notes Richard Rubenstein, “in addition to the miserable condition of the peasants … between seven and eight million Poles were unemployed or woefully underemployed in a country of 32,500,000.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 117] And as Sula Benet observes:

“Before [1946], about sixty per cent of all farms were too small to support a family, while at the same time almost half of the arable land was owned by a landed nobility representing less than six-tenths of one per cent of the agricultural population … The great majority of peasants – almost ten million – owned farms too small to furnish a family subsistence.” [BENET, S., p. 32-33]

Richard Watt is one of many scholars to have written a book about some aspect of Polish history. And Watt, like virtually all modern historians, feels obligated to, with broad strokes, make reference to the Jewish poor to tone down what must be said about the economic dominance Jews enjoyed in the country. So, on one hand, Watt remarks that “as a group [the Jews] were very poor – but Poland itself was a poor country.” [WATT, p. 360] But he also observes, however incongruously, that “in every village a Jew owned the store, a Jew was the horse-and-cattle trader, and a Jew was the moneylender … Some Jews dominated the professions of law and medicine. They played major roles in banking and the insurance industry. In fact, Jews handled practically all of preindependence Poland’s commerce … [WATT, p. 359] … Although Poland’s Jews comprised 10 percent of the population, they paid between 35 and 40 percent of Poland’s taxes. And because they owned a substantial amount of Poland’s wealth, their mass emigration would have seriously drained the nation of capital.” [WATT, p. 365]
As W. D. Rubinstein notes, in citing the studies of fellow Jewish scholar Joseph Marcus, “Jew received about 40 per cent of all income earned by Poland’s Group I earners [i.e., the wealthiest people in Poland], including incomes earned in the agricultural sector.” [RUBINSTEIN, WD, 2000, p. 8] [The implication here, of course, is that the Jewish percentage of the top incomes in Poland was far higher in the commercial and financial sectors].

In 1975 a Jewish American, Leona Schecter (living earlier in Moscow with her husband, Time magazine bureau correspondent Jerrold) recalled a conversation she had with her Ukrainian maid who said “Yes, it’s always the same with the Jews. They’ve always pushed their children to do well. It was always that way here and it’s the same with you. At least you don’t push food into your children to make them fat, like the Russian Jews do. In Odessa every Jewish child knew two or three languages and could play on at least two musical instruments. It paid off – they have the easy jobs, they are the intelligentsia with all the privileges. You never see a Jew in a factory of a on a collective farm.” “I was stunned,” writes Schecter, “but there was nothing I could contradict in what she said.” [SCHECTER, 1975, p. 121]

By 1905, notes Theodore Weeks in the journal Eastern European Jewish Affairs,

“the former landowning elites of noble background were in many cases overshadowed or even eclipsed by ‘new men,’ many of whom were Jewish or of Jewish origin … Poles could, and did, argue that Jews had profited from equal rights to enrich themselves with no thought to the general good of the Polish land. Furthermore, following this argument, nationalist Poles accused Jews of continuing their own selfish, anti-Polish interests, of forming Jewish nationalist groups which specifically demanded nationalistic rights for non-Polish languages and culture, and, worst of all, acting (actively or passively) as agents of russification in the Polish provinces.” [WEEKS, T., p. 66]

In the early 1800s, in the wake of the Enlightenment, Russian laws were devised to pry Jews out of their tight ethnocentric ring and pull them into the broader non-Jewish community. Jewish communal autonomy was legally deconstructed, limits were put on Jewish trade, Jewish schools were forced to teach the language of the people in whose midst they lived, and some Jews were conscripted into the military for the first time (they had earlier bought their way out). Jews were forced to choose family surnames and some were relocated to work in agricultural establishments, but “agriculture held little if any attraction to them.” [SACHAR, p. 78] The Russian government’s intention, says Lionel Kochan, was to “decrease the Jewish identity.” [KOCHAN, p. 114]

It didn’t work. Russian Jewry could not be convinced, cajoled, coerced, or torn away from their traditions of “separateness” and “uniqueness.” In spite of every conceivable repressive measure, notes Howard Sachar, “the Jews remained a cohesive mass, devoutly traditional in religion and occupation, a separate nation sticking like a bone in Russia’s throat.” [SACHAR, p. 84] (Despite later being forcibly assimilated in the next century under Soviet communism, 69% of the Jews of Vilnius (17,000 people; 7 percent of that city’s pop-
A CLOSER LOOK AT POLAND AND EASTERN EUROPE

population) declared in the census of 1959 that Yiddish was their “mother tongue.” In Riga, where 30,000 Jews were 5% of the city population, 48% declared Yiddish to be their mother tongue. For the Soviet Union at-large in that same year, nearly 20% of all Jews formally declared Yiddish to be their principle language.) [KOREY, W., 1973, p. 173] “As late as 1897, 96.9 percent of Russian Jewry declared [Yiddish] to be their mother tongue.” [ASCHHEIM, S., 1982, p. 11]

With the emancipation of the peasant serfs in the 1860s and 1870s, Jewish socio-economic life was changing; aristocratic-linked privileges including complete self-autonomy were eroding. “The commercial monopoly of the Jews declined,” notes Abram Leon, “in the degree that the peoples whose exploitation had fed it, developed.” [LEON, p. 136] By the turn of the twentieth century a large Jewish proletariat had grown and their principal agitation tended to be about “being Jewish.” “By far the most significant Jewish Marxist party was the Bund,” notes Kochan, “It far exceeded other Russian social democratic parties in size and influence.” [KOCHAN, p. 122] The Bund expressly demanded distinctly Jewish nationalist rights in Russia. A second Jewish political movement of nationalist separation was Zionism, which sought to transplant the Russian Jewish population to some other country to establish Jewish nationalism. In the context of Jewish traditional economic exploitation of the non-Jewish people, its long – and continuing – tradition of insularity, and rising Jewish agitation for its own separatist demands even within Russia, some Russian Gentiles responded violently.

Riots against Jews began in 1881 after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II; the fact that there was a Jewish member (Gussia Gelfman) in the assassin’s group enflamed already existing negative public opinion against Jews. [LOWE, p. 59] In the further context of collapsed grain prices, Russian crop failure, an industrial slump, and gathering groups of peasants looking for seasonal work where there was none, 45% of all Jews who were attacked were engaged in trade. [LOWE, p. 58] “Jews operated independently of, and outside, the corporatist framework,” says Lowe, “which had the … advantage that they could avoid special taxes and other obligations in kind owed to the guilds. This situation gave rise to the frequent complaint that Jews tried to avoid their obligations.” [LOWE, p. 60] In this vein, the official government newspaper aggravated hostility against Jews by writing that “90% of Jews avoided military conscription.” [LOWE, p. 61] During the Russian-Japanese War, notes Stuart Kahan, “many Jews tried various tactics to stay out of the army. Some submitted to baptism, converting to the Church in order to delay military duty. Or, if not that, at least be assigned to a non dangerous position. Others bribed officers with anything they could get their hands on in order to get out of military service.” [KAHAN, S., p. 43]

In Lithuania, notes World Zionist organization president Nahum Goldmann, “There was a law exempting only sons [i.e., one son in a family] from military service, and in Jewish communities it was the rabbi who kept the birth register. So when a father had three sons they were each entered under a different name; in my own family my grandfather was called Leibmann, my father Goldmann, and my uncle Szalkowitz!” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 16]
Even relatively liberal newspapers continually published accusations against the Jewish community. “In article after article,” notes Michael Aronson, “[Russian] newspapers accused the Jews within the Pale of Settlement of being merciless exploiters of the Russian laboring classes and the major source of their impoverishment and suffering.” [ARONSON, p. 68] The Russian Ministry of Interior published a statement in reaction to growing attacks upon Jews:

“In the last 20 years the Jews, little by little, have taken over not only trade and production, but through rent or purchase, significant amounts of landed property. Because of their clannishness and solidarity, all but a few of them have bent every rule not to increase the productive forces of the country, but to exploit the native inhabitants, primarily the poorer classes. This provoked the protest of the latter, finding such deplorable expression in acts of violence.” [LOWE, p. 64]

In the midst of riots against Jews in Russia in 1881 a socialist organization called People’s Will proclaimed that

“The people in the Ukraine suffer most of all from the Jews. Who takes the land, the woods, and the taverns from out of your hands? The Jews. From whom does the peasant, often with tears in his eyes, have to beg permission to get to his own field? The Jews. Wherever you go – the Jews are everywhere.” [LINDEMAN, p. 141]

During the Russian pogroms against the Jews in the late 1800s, “Jewish liquor stores,” notes Heinz-Dietrich Lowe, “and inns were often a major, or even first, target of attack.” [LOEWE, p. 56] But, says Israeli scholar Boas Evron, “the Russian pogroms were aimed against traditionalist Jews [those who resisted assimilation into Russian society], and only rarely did they touch the more affluent neighborhoods where the assimilated [Jews] lived.” [EVRON, p. 49] Let us recall briefly again, the nonassimilative Talmudic Jewish world view of the non-Jew around him. As a German Jewish observer, I. Horowitz, noted:

“The Polish Jews of the ghetto were filled with contempt for everything outside their world. Their servile, craven exterior simply masked their real sense of the Talmudic superiority. Beneath the helpless aspect lay a cynical, arrogant view of the non-Jew: Jews had shut themselves off and created states within states. The ghetto, originally born of compulsion, had become a second nature, an inner necessity.” [in ASCHHEIM, S., 1982, p. 23]

The British vice-consul to Russia, L. Wagstaff, noted the circumstances leading up to the 1880s rioting against Jews in Eastern Europe:

“It is chiefly as brokers or middlemen that the Jews are so prominent. Seldom a business transaction of any kind takes place without their intervention, and from both sides they receive compensation. To enumerate some of their other occupations, constantly denounced by the public: they are the principal dealers in spirits; keepers of ‘vodka’ (drinking) shops and houses of ill-fame; receivers of stolen goods; illegal pawnbrokers and usurers. A branch they also succeed in is as government contractors. With their knowledge of handling money, they collude with
unscrupulous officials in defrauding the State to vast amounts annually … It must, however, be said that there are many well educated, highly respectable Jews in Russia, but they form a small minority … In the leasing by action of government and provincial lands, it is invariably a Jew who outbids the others and afterwards re-lets plots to the peasantry at exorbitant prices… From first to last, the Jew has had his hand in everything … In their relation to Russia [Jews] are compared to parasites that have settled on a plant not vigorous enough to throw them off, and which is being sapped of its vitality.” [MACDONALD, 1998. [p. 79-80]

In 1919, a three-man committee was appointed by U.S. President Woodrow Wilson to study the situation in Poland. “The three Americans, Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, Sr., Brigadier General Edgar Jadwin, and Homer H. Johnson,” notes Sonja Wentling,

“agreed that excesses had occurred, but they differed over the causes and extent of the violence [against Jews]. Morgenthau, an assimilated Jew who opposed Jewish separatism and nationalism, submitted a report that was very different in character from the one submitted by his colleagues.While Morgenthau emphasized the deliberate murder of Jews based solely on the fact that they were Jews, Jadwin and Johnson concluded that the problem in Poland was due in large part to Jewish separatism and commercial competition … In their [Jadwin’s and Johnson’s] opinion, it was not religious differences that had kept Poles and Jews apart, but the history and attitude of the Jews.” [WENTLING, S., 2000, p. 388]

In a statement which can be applied virtually anywhere, historian Mack Holt notes that “civil war, popular revolt, and social violence were endemic to pre-modern society.” [HOLT, p. 3] Whatever the context of the riots/pogroms beginning in the late nineteenth century in Russia against Jews, they must be weighed (as they never are) within the growing socio-political turmoil in that country – a society wrestling free from its foundation in (non-Jewish) indentured servitude. Violent peasants outbursts in their struggles for justice, freedom, and dignity were many: between 1826 and 1861 there were 1,186 “peasant uprisings” in Russia [WOLF, E., p. 52] struggling against feudal oppressors, whoever they were. The culmination of a century’s turmoil was ultimately expressed in the Russian civil war of 1919-20 in which nine million people perished. [KAHAN, S., p. 99] Other estimates cite Russian deaths at sixteen million between 1914 and 1921, the result of war and revolution. [CLEMENTS, B., p. 172] Bryan Moynahan notes further, a decade later, that “the terror-famine inflicted as a matter of Socialist policy from the beginning of 1930 probably killed fourteen million peasants … Whole villages were depopulated … The Soviet Union was still massively a peasant country; more than 80 per cent of the population lived in its 600,000 hamlets and villages. The Communist attitude to country people, however, was murderous. The Party never enjoyed any rural affection.” [MOYNAHAN, p. 107-108] Those thousands of peasants deported to other areas of Russia “sometimes spent weeks in the [train] cars as they rolled
slowly toward their place of deportation, stacked into cattle wagons or ‘Stolypin cars,’ windowless prisons. The legs of some did not touch the floor for days, because they were so tightly packed that they hung suspended between each other.” [MOYNAHAN, p. 113] As noted earlier, many Bolshevik Jews were at the helms of these mass oppressions and mass murders.

Judeo-centric history, however, is only interested in the martyrological legends of its tribe and largely focuses on the seminal 1881 rioting/pogroms against Jews which spread into 8 provinces and 240 communities in parts of Russia. As Jewish scholar Michael Aronson notes, however, “The number of cases of rape and murder (one of the highest estimates refers to 40 dead and 225 rapes in 1881) seems relatively low by twentieth-century standards. But this did not prevent the stormy events of 1881-84 from having a deeply shocking and long-lasting impact on [largely Jewish] contemporaries.” [ARONSON, p. 61] For Jews, especially in the West, the attacks upon Jewish communities merely informed, and confirmed, convictions of Jewish innocence and the specialness of their unique suffering within their religiously-based martyrological tradition.

As Chaim Bermant notes, Jewish innocence and passivity to Polish attack is not accurate:

“After the 1881 pogroms Jews began to organize self-defence units. In the late ‘eighties, for example, a large gang which set upon the Jews of Odessa found themselves confronted by Jewish bands, armed with clubs and iron-bars (and according to the police, fire-arms), and quickly drew back. The same happened in Berdichev and several other centers. Jews often gave as good as they got, even better on occasion, but their efforts were restricted by the police and the army, nominally there to keep the peace, but usually siding with the attackers. In August 1903, there was a pitched battle in the streets of Gomel between Jews, peasants and railway workers in which twelve Jews and eight Christians were killed and many hundreds were injured: much property was looted and destroyed. In a pogrom at Zhitomir which extended over three days in April 1905, ten Christians and sixteen Jews were killed – mainly through police action. On the third day of the fighting a crowd of about a thousand Jews made their way to the governor and warned that if their attackers were not called off they would embark upon a general slaughter. ‘Rivers of blood will flow. We will kill all Christians irrespective of their age, sex, class …’” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 211]

The Polish side of the story in anti-Jewish “pogroms” in that country is never mentioned in mainstream Jewish history. As Tadeusz Piotrowski notes about violence against Jews, for example, in the towns of Kielce and Czestochowa, “the first was sparked by a massive demonstration involving 300 young Jews who marched up and down the town streets chanting: ‘Long live Lenin! Long live Trotsky! To hell with Poland!’ The second was precipitated by the shooting of a Polish soldier by a Jew.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 43] Likewise too, much of the violence against Jews in the early years of the twentieth century, in the context of a World War, the Polish-Soviet War, and the Polish-Ukrainian
War, means – **in context** – something quite different than an exclusive Polish expression of single-minded hatred of Jews: i.e., irrational anti-Semitism. As Norman Davies notes in the case of the years 1918-1920, “the scale of Jewish casualties was minimal considering the conditions in which they occurred … That fewer than one thousand Jewish civilians perished, when the Polish army during the same period suffered over 250,000 casualties, is a fair indication of the scale of the [Polish] disaster.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 43]

Meticulous Jewish documentation of “anti-Semitism,” pogroms, and other acts of violence against Jews in Europe is a central part of Jewish history and identity. Yet, far less examined as context to anti-Jewish animosity are the likes of Norman Salsitz’s depiction of his Jewish boyhood in small-town Poland:

“We stole fruit off the trees and out of the orchards of the townpeople and peasants. Why we did it no one seemed to know. The Poles, of course, knew of this practice and tried their best to protect their property. Dogs were set upon us, and if Poles caught up with us we could expect a beating. But year after year it was the same all over again. Instead of actually taking fruit, too often we just managed to break off the tree limbs and ruin what was on them… In the summer peasants also stood [in the town market area] selling wild strawberries, blackberries, and raspberries that they brought along in heavy, thick baskets … My friends and I missed few chances to sneak up to the baskets and run off with a handful of berries. Why did we do it? The berries we enjoyed, of course, but there can be no denying the thrill that stealing the berries brought us, especially when peasants gave chase for a short distance in a vain effort to retrieve what was rightfully theirs … Snatching berries didn’t bother me as much as the large number we crushed when we made our grab.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 64-65, 126]

And the terrible context for this maliciousness? As Salsitz notes elsewhere:

“Peasants rarely had it well off. The overwhelming majority barely scraped by. Either they worked the fields for others and received a portion of the harvest, or they cultivated their own plots (a large majority owned their land), few of which were large enough for subsistence, let alone surplus. Most led a hand-to-mouth existence, and worse than that in the early summer months, when reserve provisions were nearly exhausted and the desperately needed new crop was still not ripe … They survived in part because they made do with so little and because of Kolbuszowa, where they might find an occasional job.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 88]

In the Ukraine, Jews positioned themselves throughout history into especially volatile situations. Orest Subtleny, a scholar of the Ukraine, writes:

“Forbidden to own land, but allowed to lease it, Jews often became leaseholders. Thus, on the vast lands of the Ostrorog family, for example, there were about 4000 Jewish leaseholders, in 1616, over half the crown lands in Ukraine were leased to Jewish entrepreneurs. Because they had to make good their investments in a relatively short period of two or three years, they exploited the properties and peasants merciless-
ly, without regard for future consequences. It was not uncommon for a leaseholder to demand six or seven days of labor from the peasants and, with the help of the magnate’s minions, to drive them into the fields.” [SUBTLENY]

“In 1768,” notes Jerzy Lukowski, “there occurred … one of the bloodiest peasant uprisings in European history, the so-called Koliscyzna … [in the area of Hunan] one modern study suggests (the massacre) of 5,000 nobles and 7,000 Jews. The Jews were particularly hated in the Ukraine, where they dominated the peasant economy as millers, inn keepers, usurers and middlemen – in short, as the alien instrument of an alien authority.” [LUKOWSKI, p. 60]

“In exchange for their services,” notes Subtleny, “Jewish merchants attempted to extract the highest possible profits. To many non-Jews it appeared that they were not only excessive, but ill-gotten. For example, after studying the economic relationship between Jews and Ukrainians in Transcarpathia, a Hungarian economist of Irish descent, Edmund Egan, reported to the government that while the administration, magistrates, and estate owners contributed to the woeful plight of the peasantry, the main fault lay with the Jews, who as money-lenders, merchants, and tavern-keepers, were ‘disposing the Ruthenians of their money and their property.’” [SUBTLENY, p. 311]

An 1890 Hapsburg police report noted that “except for their daily bread, the peasants are dependent on the Jew at every state in their lives. He serves as their customer, counselor, agent, and factotum, in the full sense of the word.” [SUBTLENY, p. 312-313]

Jewish economic dominance of Eastern Europe commoners goes back many centuries. Abram Leon notes that “Polish money has been discovered bearing Hebraic characters and dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This fact in itself proves that Polish trade was in the hands of the Jews.” [LEON, p. 184-185]

In 1810 a Russian military officer, V. Bronewsky, wrote that “Poland should in all justice be called a Jewish kingdom … Jewish taverns mark out all the main roads … Apart from some rare manors which are administered by the Lords themselves, all the others are farmed out or pledged to the Jews. They possess enormous capitals and no one can get along without their help. Only some few very rich Lords are not plunged to the neck in debt with the Jews.” [LEON, p. 196] Another Eastern European traveler, one Von Furtenbach, wrote that “Everything is in [Jewish] hands. They lend money to the Lords and peasants.” [LEON, p. 196]

“The success of the Polish Jews in the [later arendar] period,” notes Hillel Levine, “in squeezing profits from unprofitable enterprises and returning unrealistically high yields from mandatory loans has something to do with their capacity to take advantage of their international connections. Indeed, the rise of the arendars must be compared with, and even linked to, the rise of the better known Court Jews in central and western Europe.” [LEVINE, p. 64]

The Polish and Ukrainian Jews first felt large scale retribution for their self-aggrandizing policies on the backs of the non-Jewish poor in 1648. It is a par-
particularly accursed year in both Jewish and Polish history, but is considered a heroic one of rebellion in today’s Ukraine. It is also the date of the beginning of an event sometimes referred to in Jewish history as their “Third Great Catastrophe.” Tens of thousands of Ukrainian Cossacks, led by Bogdan Chmielnicki, rose up against Polish noble domination and engaged in a vindictive orgy of vengeance and murder throughout the Ukraine and Poland. The catalyst was when Chmielnicki came home one day to find his home confiscated by a Polish noble, one of his sons killed, and his fiancée kidnapped. From his personal rage Chmielnicki forged a unified revolt amongst his people against the suffocating aristocracy. And Jews, omnipresently exploitive appendages of aristocratic oppression as land managers, tax collectors, financial advisors, tavern owners and merchants were soon to bear the wrath and fury, full force, of Cossack revenge. “[The Cossacks] first attacked the soldiers of the Polish nobles and the Jewish communities settled on their estates, and which frequently served as their estate managers.” [REVOLT AND THE PEASANT, p. 161] The nobles’ Polish armies were routed and thousands of Jews were massacred. (One scholar believes that the Jewish community’s “rejection of their own poor” during the Cossack attacks contributed to some Jews’ conversion to Christianity.) [POLONSKY, p. 59] The Polish people at-large, however, may have borne up to ten times the Jewish number of casualties. [DIMONT, p. 240]

Some Jewish sources have claimed 2.4 to 3.3 million deaths during the Cossack rebellions even though there may have been as few as 50,000 Jews in the area in which the insurrection occurred. “The fragmentary information of the period, and to a great extent information from subsequent years including reports of recovery – clearly indicate that the catastrophe may not have been as great as had been assumed.” [WEINRYB, p. 193-194]

“Contemporaries of the Cossack revolt,” says Bernard Weinryb, “attribute it also to the extortionist practices of the Jews. Some memoir writers (the memoirs having been written and published later) mention also that the people hated the Jews because the latter were leaseholders of the Greek Orthodox churches. They allegedly held the keys to these church buildings and controlled their use. It is said that the Jews demanded a fee for permitting the christening of a child, a wedding, and other church affairs. This theme appears again and again in Ukrainian folk songs and other material.” [WEINBRYB, p. 186]

As Israel Shahak notes

“This typical peasant uprising against extreme oppression, an uprising accompanied not only by massacres committed by the rebels but also by even more horrible atrocities and ‘counter-terror’ of the Polish-magnates’ private armies, has remained emblazoned in the consciousness of East-European Jews to this very day – not, however, as a peasant uprising, a revolt of the oppressed, of the wretched of the earth, nor even as a vengeance visited upon all the servants of the Polish nobility, but as an act of gratuitous anti-Semitism directed against Jews as such.” [SHAHAK, p. 66]

In this regard, two Jewish authors, Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin,
expressing common Judeo-centrism, parallel the Chmielicki attacks to the Holocaust:

“In both instances, all Jews, including infants, were targeted for murder; the general populace nearly always joined in the attacks. [PRAGER, p.19]

A well-known historian of Eastern Europe, scholar Norman Davies, notes the typical Jewish myopia and distortion on the subject as evidenced in Martin Gilbert’s *Jewish History Atlas*. Gilbert claims that over 100,000 Jews were massacred in attacks by Cossacks beginning in 1648. Martin even writes that “[the Cossacks] joined with the Polish peasants in attacking the Jews.” “[Gilbert’s readers],” notes Davies, “might easily get the impression that the Chmielnicki massacres were directed mainly, if not exclusively, at Jews. In fact, there were virtually no Polish peasants at that period in the areas marked on Gilbert’s map, and the attacks on the Jews were but one part of a terrible vengeance wracked by the Cossacks and their associates on everyone who they regarded as agents of feudal oppression.” Gilbert also noted an area where 5,000 Jews a year died of starvation in 1880-1914. “Again,” says Davies, “the unsuspecting reader might be led to assume that the Jews of Galicia were the main or even only victims of starvation. There is nothing in the text to indicate that the Polish and Ukrainian peasants of Galicia were starving in even greater numbers.” [DAVIES, *Between*, p. 248]

[The following link is to a post by a Polish commentator at an online discussion group. We at JTR cannot verify the accuracy of this list, nor the Polish source book for this. But, from our own research, the names we recognize on the list (Bronislaw Geremek, Jerzy Kosinski, Stanislaw Krajewski, Adam Michnik, Jerzy Urban, Dawid Warshawski) are indeed Jewish. But Lech Walesa?!). ]

List of name changes for Poland’s most powerful/influential people in our modern era.

[http://jewishtribalreview.org/polishnames.htm]
THE JEWS AND SLAVERY

In our own time, as throughout history, Orthodox male Jews still must daily thank God for not being born Gentile, as well not being born a woman. Such ritual thanks branch out into other areas as well.

“One specific mitzvah [religious commandment] required of traditional Jews each day,” says Arthur Kurzweil, “is [a reminder] that we were slaves in Egypt. This mitzvah is not performed with a ritual object, nor is it an act that would cause some to think you looked religious. Merely reflecting in your mind and hearing that we were slaves is, in itself, considered a spiritual act of great significance.” [KURZWEIL, p. xxii] Jewish victimhood tradition ritually underscores their roles as slaves thousands of years ago. In Orthodox households, says Evelyn Kaye, “bitter herbs [are dipped] in salt water at Passover to remind [Jews] of the tears of the slaves in Egypt.” [KAYE, p. 45]

The traditional daily reminder of slavery and the supposed fact that thousands of years ago Jews were held in bondage is all the more peculiar when one tries to imagine what thoughts went through the minds of the many Jewish slave traders throughout history, merchants who were instrumental even in the slave trading of Europeans. These are the words of James Parkes, a respected philosemitic scholar, extremely sympathetic to Jews in his many volumes about their history:

“In the period from the fifth to eight centuries [Jews] gradually took the place previously occupied by the Syrians as ‘international’ traders; and they continued, and perhaps, developed, the trade in slaves.” [PARKES, p. 17] “While the Jews were… never… the only traders, it is possible that the slave trade through north-eastern Europe to the Slav countries and the land trades to the East were for practical purposes Jewish monopolies.” [PARKES, p. 25] “It would appear that Jews had little difficulty in obtaining slaves in the eastern provinces of the empire and Poland, in spite of the protection which acceptance of Christianity in those regions should have given the inhabitants. References to this traffic in Christian slaves are not infrequent. [PARKES, p. 45]

“The evidence is thus enough to show that the Church possessed a genuine grievance against the section of the Jewish population involved in the slave trade. But the misdeeds of slave traders did not cease at the purchase of Christians in eastern Europe. Agobard quotes cases – and there is no reason to refute his evidence – of the theft of children in France for sale to the Moors of Spain; and a chronicler of the middle of the tenth century brings an even more unpleasant story of the castration of boys in
eastern France for their sale as eunuchs to the Moorish harems, a trade which was, apparently, extremely profitable.” [PARKES, p. 46]

“In the tenth century,” notes Jewish (and Zionist) author Julius Brutzkus, “the Jews possessed salt mines near Nuremberg. They also traded in arms, and exploited the treasuries of the churches. But their great specialty … was their trade in slaves.” [LEON, p. 124] “The first Jews that Poles encountered,” states the Encyclopedia Judaica, “must certainly have been traders, probably slave traders, of the type called in the 12th century Jewish sources holekhei rusyah (travelers to Russia). [EN JUD, v. 13, p. 710] “In the tenth century,” notes Israel Abrahams, “the Spanish Jews often owed their wealth to their trade in slaves.” [ABRAHAMS, p. 98]

Jews, says Lewis Browne, “traveled everywhere from England to India, from Bohemia to Egypt. Their commonest merchandise in those days, beginning with the eighth century, was slaves. On every high road and on every great river and sea, these Jewish traders were to be found with their gangs of shackled prisoners in convoy.” Such disturbing facts that impugn the Jewish myths of perpetual victimhood must of course be apologized away. “Slave trading,” says Browne, a Jewish scholar, “seems irredeemably vile and hateful to us today, but we must remember here again the standards have changed … And in light of the customs of those times, the slave-traffickers were actually doing almost a moral act. They alone were keeping the conquering armies from slaughtering every one of their defeated foes after each battle.” [WILLIAMS, J., p. 230]

Jewish apologists of course further argue that Jews were involved in the trade of European slaves (the English word “slave” is reputed to come from “Slav”) because “they were forced into it” by others, they were only “doing the dirty work for Christians,” it was a norm of the era, or that extensive Jewish slave trading was a “Christian ecclesiastical myth.” Another Jewish apologist justifies the Jewish slave trade of Europeans during the era of Pope Gregory this way:

“Had the Jews been prevented from owning slaves it is likely that they would have given up the slave trade and had they done this the labor shortage that would have been created might have caused an inestimable loss of life through sheer starvation.” [ABEL, p. 197]

“Slave traders were proverbially dishonest.” [BARON, p. 193] And there were many legal hurdles that Jewish slave traders had to face, both from Christian authorities (who grew increasingly outraged by Jews owning Christian slaves), and their own rabbinical authorities when faced with the necessity of slaves’ castration, for instance, to be eunuchs. Jewish religious texts forbade mutilation. This problem was easily resolved by resorting to a technicality; prospective Jewish slave owners merely hired non-Jews to do the operation before they formally bought them. [BARON, p. 191] Jewish writers in Spain complained more frequently than other places about the ethics of having slave concubines in Jewish households. [BARON, p. 194]

Jewish mythology claims a long history of moral superiority over others, and innocence. The original Ku Klux Klan (1865-1876), however, was not hos-
tile to Jews and even had Jewish members, including Simon Baruch, the father of the Quarter-Master General of the Confederate Army. (The father of Bernard Baruch, the Chairman of the War Industries Board under President Woodrow Wilson in World War I, was a member of the Ku Klux Klan). [COIT, M., 1957, p. 12-13] The Secretary of State of the Confederacy (initially its Secretary of War) was also of Jewish birth, Judah P. Benjamin. [RUBINSTEIN, p. 20] After the war Benjamin fled to England. David de Leon was the first Surgeon General of the Confederacy. [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 172] Other prominent Confederate Jews included Edwin Moise, Speaker of the Louisiana House; Raphael Moses who “was influential in leading Georgia out of the Union;” Henry Hyans, the Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana leading up to the Civil War; and Edwin de Leon, “whom Benjamin sent to Paris to handle public relations and propaganda for the South.” “The prominent role of Jews in the Confederacy,” notes Nathaniel Weyl, “is generally either ignored or condensed into shamefaced footnotes by those historians of American Jewry whose opinions conform to the liberal-leftist stereotype.” [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 54]

“Not a single Jew,” notes Stephen Isaacs, “has been identified among the abolitionists in Charleston, South Carolina, which had been home to the largest Jewish community in the United States at one time.” [ISAACS, p. 180] “[The Jew] somehow feels that in the Great Democracy he is ‘the other’ Negro – a white-skinned one,” wrote Isaac Deutcher in 1968, “And how very often he gets his own back on the black Negro: in the Southern States more often than not it is the Jew who is one of the most fanatical upholders of white supremacy.” [DEUTCHER, 1968, p. 43]

Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, a champion of liberal Reform Judaism and “the most active and renowned rabbi in the United States” in the nineteenth century [SACHAR, p. 196], actively supported the enslavement of Blacks, called Abraham Lincoln an “imbecile,” and argued that Blacks were “beasts of burden.” [LINDEMANN, p. 210] Other of his words were later engraved on a memorial tablet in the Memorial Hall of Temple Emanu-El, the great Reform Judaism synagogue in New York City:

“American Judaism. A religion without mystics or miracles. Rational and self-evident, eminently human, universal, liberal and progressive. In perfect harmony with modern science, criticism, and philosophy and in full sympathy with universal liberty, justice and charity. There are no better American citizens than the Jews and no religion better befitting a free people than Judaism.” [GOLDSTEIN, D. p. 68]

Jonathan Kaufman notes the case of another very prominent New York Jewish rabbi in 1861:

“Rabbi Morris Jacob Raphall … brought the full force of Jewish learning to a defense of slavery, preaching a lengthy sermon that defended its biblical roots and noting that ‘Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job – the men with whom the Almighty conversed, with whose names he emphatically connects to his own most holy name … all these men were slaveholders.’ Raphall was no fringe figure. He was one of the most prominent rabbis
of his day; the year before he had been chosen to be the first Jew to open a session of the House of Representatives with a prayer.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 22]

Modern scholar Judah Rosenthal notes rabbi Raphall’s effect on the slavery debate in America:

“Rabbi [Morris] Raphall delivered a sermon entitled ‘The Bible View of Slavery.’ Raphall attempted to prove ‘that according to the Talmud there is no difference between a lost ox, donkey, or slave, and that the Talmud recommends turning over a fugitive slave to its master. The discourse of Rabbi Raphall which appeared in print caused a public stir. It was reprinted many times in the pro-slavery press. It produced a sensational effect coming from a popular rabbi who had the reputation of being a biblical scholar … Raphall was right in his Biblical exegesis.” [ROSENTHAL, J., 78]

In 1896 an editorial in the Jewish South of Richmond, Virginia, argued that “Negroes are intellectually, morally, and physically an inferior race – a fact none can deny,” [LINDEMANN, p. 225] and with the death of a particularly racist Jewish senator from Maryland, Isador Rayner, a Black journalist wrote that Rayner “invoked upon his colored neighbors the terrors of (a pogrom).” [LINDEMANN, p. 233]

In 1991 a book was published by Louis Farrakhan’s Nation of Islam, described by one Jewish author as “a masterful piece of propaganda.” [MAGIDA, p. 171] This work, and some of the issues surrounding it, merit some special attention here. Aside from a handful of obscure, rarely read volumes that challenged the commonly accepted facts of the Holocaust, the Nation of Islam’s new volume was the most controversial book about Jews published in decades and helped in securing a deeper rift between American Black and Jewish communities. Available from a 1-800 telephone number, the book received relatively wide circulation in the African-American community. The volume, The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews, seeks to document Jewish historical involvement in the African slave trade and severely taints, by association, Jewish luster in the later American civil rights record. In a word, the book – which is a direct assault upon the myths of Jewry’s self-perception of a higher moral ground than other people – must somehow be dismissed by the Jewish community to avoid considerable embarrassment.

In fact, dismissal is quite easy. The Nation of Islam and Louis Farrakhan are in such serious disrepute in the Jewish, and other non-Black, communities that few people, other than those in the African-American world, have actually read the NOI book. Though most Jews have heard of it, it is automatically understood to be “hate literature,” molded of entirely anti-Semitic nonsense and unworthy of anyone’s serious attention. No Jew in his or her right mind would ever dare to purchase such a thing and add to anti-Semitic coffers. (Reluctance to read the book, on principle, is deep. At the University of Judaism in Los Angeles, by late 1997 the 1994 edition on its library shelves – the sole copy – had never been checked out). This situation has allowed Harold Brackman, of the
Simon Wiesenthal Center (one of the various Jewish “defense” agencies), to write a few versions of his rebuttal to _Secret Relationship_ charges, counterclaims that serve completely as the relevant truths for Jews – and sympathizers – interested in the matter. Brackman and the Jewish community rely upon the fact that most (non-Black) people will probably only read his book about the controversial subject, if any.

“Among [the arguments in support of the _Secret Relationship_],” says Ralph Austen (who read the book) in the Jewish journal _Tikkun_, “there is one which Jewish intellectuals need to take seriously: that few of the Jewish leaders who have attacked the book have actually read it.” [AUSTEN, p. 66] And what is the essential impact one gets out of reading it? “There were not many Jews in America between 1492 and the 1860s,” says Austen, “and quite a few had been involved in the slave trade.” [AUSTEN, p. 68]

_The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews_ seeks to tell the story of Jewish involvement in the African slave trade, largely throughout the Americas. The book’s strategy is to use nearly 1,300 (mostly) scholarly citations to present its argument. Seeking maximum credibility, the overwhelming majority of the excerpts from historical sources are indeed “authoritative,” i.e., the quotes are not only from respected academic volumes, but most authors are Jewish scholars in various fields of expertise. As many African-Americans bitterly complain, a very large number of Jews are preeminent in the academic world, even in African-American studies, a situation that has for decades found Jews (and other non-Blacks) dictating to African-Americans the facts and parameters of their own history. Some citations in _The Secret Relationship_ are from less academically pedigreed commentators, but most of these are also Jewish which, as the Nation of Islam intended, confers a dimension of legitimacy to the quote, even if it is only opinion.

The quotes, facts, and figures by legitimate and well-respected Jewish academics (who usually address the subject of Jews and slaves peripherally in the course of their own other interests) do not depict, in any way, a morally superior people. They underscore the Jewish role in the African slave trade and they are collected in the Nation of Islam volume by the hundreds. Take, for example, the following excerpts:

“The female slave was a sex tool beneath the level of moral considerations. She was an economic good, useful, in addition to her menial labor, for breeding more slaves. To attain that purpose, the master mated her promiscuously according to his breeding plans. The master himself and his sons and other members of his household took turns with her for the increase of the family wealth, as well as for satisfaction of their extramarital sex desires. Guests and neighbors too were invited to that luxury. [LOUIS EPSTEIN, _Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism_, in SEC.LIFE, p. 196]

“They came with ships carrying African blacks to be sold as slaves. The traffic in slaves was a royal monopoly, and the Jews were often appointed
“They came with ships carrying African blacks to be sold as slaves. The traffic in slaves was a royal monopoly, and the Jews were often appointed as agents for the Crown in their sale …” [Seymour Liebman, New World Jewry, SEC LIFE, p. 55] … [The Jews] were the largest ship chandlers in the entire Caribbean region, where the shipping business was mainly a Jewish enterprise … The ships were not only owned by Jews, but were manned by Jewish crews and sailed under the command of Jewish captains.” [Seymour Liebman, New World Jewry, 1493-1825, in Martin, p. 113]

“The West India Company, which monopolized imports of slaves from Africa, sold slaves at public auctions against cash payments. It happens that cash was mostly in the hands of Jews. The buyers who appeared at the auctions were almost always Jews, and because of this lack of competitors, they could buy slaves at low prices. On the other hand, there was also no competition in the selling of the slaves to the plantation owners and other buyers … Profits up to 300 per cent of the purchase value were often realized with high interest rates … If it happened that the date of such an auction fell on a Jewish holiday the auction had to be postponed.” [Arnold Wiznitzer, Jews in Colonial Brazil, in SEC. LIFE, p. 29]

“Just as a disproportionately large number of Jews were slave owners, a disproportionately large number of Jewish merchants sold slaves as they would any other goods. Several of these merchants were prominent in their communities: an acting rabbi, the president of a congregation.” [Roberta Feuerlicht, in SEC LIFE, p. 179]

The Nation of Islam’s own racist reputation, Jewish lobbying power (and the fear of it), and the obvious fact that few – if any – pedigreed historians have bothered to read the Secret Relationship can only explain the following resolution by the American Historical Association about the controversial book:

“The AHA deplores any misuse of history that distorts the historical record to demonize a particular racial, ethnic, or cultural group. The Association therefore condemns as false any statement alleging that Jews played a disproportionate role in the exploitation of slave labor in the Atlantic slave trade.” [RESPONSE, p. 9, SPRING, 1995]

But Jews did, it would seem irrefutably, have (at the very least) a “disproportionate role” in the slave trade even in the southern United States, where they were not – as the NOI book shows – as involved as in other places in the Americas. According to one survey noted by Jewish scholars Lee Soltow and Ira Rosenwaike, 75% of Jewish households surveyed in the American South owned slaves, more than double the average 36% for all southern households. [ROSENWAIKE, in SEC. LIFE, p. 180] And Jews, as we will continue to witness, have always been “disproportionately” represented in virtually any field where there is serious money to be made. (In Port Royal, Jamaica, in 1680, about 16% of Jewish households had no slaves; in the non-Jewish community, this figure was over 47%. Likewise 73.7% of Jewish households had between one and four
slaves; in the non-Jewish community the figure was 41.8 %.) [SCHORSCH, J., 2000]

Ultimately, the much-maligned NOI volume does not assert that Jews ran the whole slave trade from a back street in Amsterdam, but rather that they held indeed a disproportionately significant role, a factor that should be considered in modern Jewish-Black relations, the way it is an important factor in Black-White relations. The book’s fundamental charge is so stated: “The most prominent of Jewish pilgrim fathers used kidnapped Black Africans disproportionately more than any other ethnic or religious group in New World history and participated in every aspect of the international slave trade.” [SEC. LIFE, p. vii] Behind Jewish resistance to take responsibility (whatever its dimensions) for the more distasteful parts of Jewish history is the fact that such concessions imperil the mythos of modern Jewish identity itself: i.e., that Jews are morally superior to all others, for which they are humanity’s consummate (and innocent) Victims.

Albert Lindemann notes the typical case of prominent Jewish historian Oscar Handlin’s volume Three Hundred Years of Jewish Life in America: “[Handlin] ignored the issue [of slavery in his volume] … even while mentioning by name the ‘great Jewish merchants’ who made their fortunes in the slave trade.” [LINDEMANN, p. xx]

It is clear that the issue of Jewish influence in the African-slave trade in many parts of the world was significant. And this is the value of the NOI book (along with, perhaps, the idea that Jews are not, as so often depicted in the popular media, necessarily the “best friend” of the Black man). How much significant the slave trade was Jewish-inspired can only be a matter of endless disputation. Considerably less than one percent of North America’s population were Jews and it’s hard to imagine that, by numbers alone, 18th and early 19th century Jewry could have possibly controlled the huge slave market in this area. (As late as 1817, there were only 3,000 Jews in all of America. [ROSENWAIKE, p. 13]) Nonetheless, in considering the evidence – Jewish and otherwise, it is clear that Jews were very much disproportionately involved in, and important to, the trade in human chattel. In some colonial posts they were no doubt pre-eminent in the business. The largest Jewish exploitation of slaves seems to have been in Barbados, Brazil “In the first half of the seventeenth century,” notes Abram Leon, “all the great sugar plantations in Brazil were in the hands of Jews.” [LEON, p. 176], Curacao, Jamaica, and Surinam (Dutch Guinea). Jewish historian Arnold Wiznitzer adds that “Jews dominated the slave trade” in Dutch Brazil. [SCHORSCH, J., 2000]

Historian David Brion Davis notes that in the Jewish-founded town of Joden Savanne in Surinam, they “extracted labor from African slaves in one of the most deadly and oppressive environments in the New World.” [MAGIDA, p. 184]

Jewish scholar Harold Bloom also noted that, in the early 1700s,

“Colonists [in Surinam] were troubled by attacks of ‘Bush Negroes,’ former slaves who had escaped inland and refused to return to their
owners. They declared themselves independent and set fire to many plantations … [BLOOM, H., p. 121] … Slave trade was one of the most important Jewish activities here as elsewhere in the colonies.” [BLOOM, H., p. 123]

And as scholar Jacob Marcus, also Jewish, observes:

“Some writers of the eighteenth century, in attempting to account for repeated flights by Negro slaves, accused Jewish owners of mistreating their charges, and indictment the [Jewish] authors of the Historical Essay [on the Colony of Surinam (1788)] ascribed to anti-Jewish prejudices and vigorously denied. It is a fact, however, that the wars against the French and the Bush Negroes called into being among the Jewish planter class a specific type of individual: the aggressive, brutal fighter, politically ambitious and resentful of every limitation and infringement of their personal liberty.” [SCHORSCH, J., 2000]

Whatever its faults, the Secret Relationship is legitimate in laying out the historical role between Blacks and Jews in the New World on the table for scrutiny. While this relationship has not really been “secret” in the literal sense (the information is freely available to anyone who cares to tediously find it) it certainly has never before been fore grounded nor popularly addressed; rather, it has been buried from public discourse in the obscure pages of esoteric academe. It has taken the growth of African-American scholarship (whether others like its accentuations or not) to frame discourse about the slave trade to their own – not Jewish – perspective. As one can see in this book, existing Jewish scholarship on Black history – originally framed to Jewish interests and concerns – is voluminous.

The Nation of Islam’s intention in their volume was to quote from expressly Jewish sources as much as possible and overlooked those many non-Jewish sources that would instantly fall prey to discredit by the omnipresent charge of anti-Semitism. Citations from Jews would presumably render the NOI’s arguments all more authoritative, resistant to the inevitable charge that the book was unfairly biased against Jews.

What the NOI apparently didn’t recognize, of course, is that Jewish convention asserts that many Jews themselves are tainted by the dreaded virus of anti-Semitism. Thus, at the bottom line, it only slightly matters whether the NOI had quoted Adolf Hitler’s view about the Jews (which they did not) or critical Jewish authors of Israel and Jewish life like Roberta Feuerlicht and Lenni Brenner (which they did). Jews or not, such people are not – to the standards of the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s Harold Brackman, “respected authorities.” “The truth of the matter,” writes Brackman, “is that The Secret Relationship validates Feurlicht and Brenner as ‘authoritative’ for precisely the same reasons that the Nazis exploited the writings of selected Jews in that earlier era.” [BRACKMAN, p. 57]

This, then, is the tone of debate – not uncommon in the Jewish community – over the book: the inevitable dragging of even Brenner’s and Feuerlicht’s criticism of Jewry into an association with Hitler and the very thought of an investigation into the facts of Jewish influence in the slave trade as opening doors to another Holocaust.
As *The Secret Relationship* was disseminated among segments of the African-American community, the Jewish community ignored it as much as possible, sometimes attacking it generally, categorically, as merely an anti-Semitic tome. “The book is a remarkable work of hate,” says Jewish author Richard Bernstein in his own volume about the “multiculturalist” political wars of today’s society …. I myself saw copies of it for sale at an Afrocentric conference I attended in Atlanta.” [BERNSTEIN, p. 117] But silence by the Jewish community was perceived by many in the Black community as an admission of guilt, and Brackman eventually came forward to “point-by-point” discard the allegations posed in the controversial volume.

Harold Brackman’s credentials include the facts that he has taught – like so many Jewish scholars – African-American history at three major American universities. One of his book rebuttals to the *Secret Relationship* outshines even the NOI’s reputed capacity for hyperbole, entitled: *Ministry of Lies, The Truth Behind the Nation of Islam’s The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*. The Nation’s 1300 citations cannot be reasonably addressed in a digestible volume, so Brackman goes for what he considers to be the “anti-Semitic” volume’s weakest links.

Unfortunately, for the Jewish argument, upon close examination, the very foundation of Brackman’s scholarship is shaky from the start, as evidenced in the very methodology of his attack to deconstruct the *Secret Relationship* as “lies.” Brackman begins a chapter entitled “Methods ( … of Deceit and Distortions to Falsify History)” by stating that

“the *Secret Relationship* is an anonymous production. ‘The Historical Research Department’ [the formal author of the NOI book] identifies no individual members, nor does it indicate their academic credentials. In other words, those responsible themselves remain secret – choosing to hide rather than stand behind their scholarship.” [BRACKMAN, p. 45]

Curiously, such impugning based on anonymity can likewise be made about the magazine *Response*, the journal of Simon Wiesenthal Center, the Los Angeles Holocaust-oriented “education center” that sponsored Brackman’s own work. While a *Response* “staff” is noted at the end of the magazine – an Editor in Chief, and Editor/Supervisor, Senior Researcher, et al, the text of the magazine itself is never credited with an attributable author (except a brief editor’s column). Even the Wiesenthal Center’s educational resources kit for teachers, *The Holocaust, 1933-1945*, does not provide authorship for most of its pages of factual assertions.

Brackman continues:

“The reader is asked to proceed on blind faith supported only by the assurance that: ‘The facts, we believe, speak for themselves.’”

The purported facts, of course, are excerpts from mostly Jewish authors, most of them credible scholars. Brackman pushes foreword, now on a rhetorical soapbox:

“No thoughtful person should accept this statement at face value. Historical facts and historical truth are not identical. The indispensable link
between them is the historian’s commitment to the honest evaluation and presentation of evidence. Two thousand years ago, the Roman orator Cicero enunciated what might be called ‘The Historian’s code of Ethics’:

“The first law for the historian is that he shall never utter an untruth. The second is that he shall suppress nothing that is true. Moreover, there shall be no suspicion of partiality, or malice.” [BRACKMAN, p. 45]

Brackman’s championing of Cicero as a paragon of moral virtue and truth-finding is a bizarrely unsupportive selection for the foundation of his own arguments. Certainly Cicero was a virtuous figure, committed to telling the truth with no malice, et al. But as Brackman should have known, in the common Jewish rush to condemn nearly every important thinker in history as somehow anti-Jewish, Cicero is often cited in books about anti-Semitism as a seminal “anti-Semite” himself; he is to be found in such titles as *History and Hate*, *Twenty-Three Centuries of Antisemitism*, *A Short History of Antisemitism*, and others.

Jewish professor Peter Schafer in his *Judeophobia. Attitudes Towards the Jews in the Ancient World*, even writes that, in Rome, “the first voice to be heard, and one regarded as the first evidence of Roman ‘anti-Semitism’ is that of the great orator of the late Republic, Cicero (106-43 B.C.E.) in his famous speech *Pro Flacco* … It is the Jews as a pressure group, influential in public assemblies, who are attacked by Cicero.” [SCHAFER, 1997, p. 180]

Taking careful account of Cicero’s aforementioned reluctance to “utter and untruth,” the ancient sage says this about Jews:

“How numerous they are, their clannishness, their influence in the assemblies.” [FLANNERY, p. 15]

These are charges that are among the foundations of “anti-Semitic” arguments to our own day. And of course they remain, after all these centuries, “true,” as we shall soon see. Cicero also called Judaism *barbara superstisios* (a barbarous superstition) [MORAIS, p. 40] and his teacher, Apollonius Molon of Rhodes (presumably one of Cicero’s seminal inspirations for the truthful approach to history) “was the first to compose an entire work against the Jews, thus launching the endless chain of *adversus Judaeos* [criticism of Jews] that reaches us to the present day.” [FLANNERY, p. 12]

So begins Professor Brackman’s defense of Jewry against the anti-Semitic “lies” of the *Secret Relationship*.

Obviously, anyone interested in the relationship between Jews and the slave trade should read both books, the NOI’s and Brackman’s. Rather than go through a tedious point by point refutation of a range of Brackman’s own refutations of the *Secret Relationship*, suffice it to note that in his little 100 page book, Brackman often manages to stray considerably off the subject of Jews and the slave trade, rhapsodizing about Jewish altruism in the Civil Rights movement, chronicling the deteriorating Black-Jewish relations since 1991, arguing that calling the Black slavery experience a “Holocaust” (as the NOI book does) is inappropriate, and that African slavery deaths are often exaggerated. Most significantly, Brackman renders the Nation of Islam book to be merely “a hateful fantasy … originally
concocted by white anti-Semites … who throughout history have demonstrated that they have no more true regard for Blacks than Jews.” [BRACKMAN, p. 91] This standard Jewish tactic of shirking responsibility and passing it all along elsewhere upon someone else’s head is a historically Jewish as the Talmud. And drawing a connection, as Brackman does, between automobile baron Henry Ford’s belief in a world Jewish conspiracy and the NOI’s examination of Jewish involvement in slavery is to find, in Jewish minds, the very equivalent obsession with “conspiracy” theories as those they condemn in “anti-Semites.”

In 1993 a tenured Black professor, Tony Martin, of Wellesley College (the alma mater of Hilary Clinton) made national attention by committing the crime of using the Secret Relationship (as one of seven other course books) as a reading assignment in an African-American studies class. Martin found himself in a struggle for academic freedom against a massive – and unified – campaign by national Jewish agencies to censor and defame him, attempting to get him fired as an academically incompetent anti-Semite. The Anti-Defamation League, the Jewish Community Relations Council and others joined to charge Martin with “clear-cut anti-Semitic prejudice in his classroom and on the Wellesley campus and demanded his firing.” [MARTIN, p. 8-9] Martin and the book were soon attacked in four articles in the Boston Globe, on National Public Radio, the New York Times, the Associated Press, ABC’s This Week With David Brinkley, the Today Show, and others. [MARTIN, p. 13-14]

In an attack on professor Martin, a Jewish fellow faculty member at Wellesley College, Jerold Auerbach, wrote that “Anti-Semitism … is quietly diverted into the channel of academic freedom … Professor Martin and his ilk are free to emulate [Nazi ideologue] Joseph Goebbels … It is sufficient, perhaps, to note that anyone who teaches The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews as serious history has entered the realm of academic charlatanism.” [AUERBACH, p. 1]

One wonders how an ideologue like Auerbach musters the gall to smear Martin as a veritable Nazi when Auerbach’s own ideological allegiance and attention to “serious history” is so morally questionable. In 1984 professor Auerbach sported an article in the Zionist journal, Midstream, in defense of twenty-two members of the messianic fascist Gush Emumim organization who faced court trials for a variety of crimes in Israel. “Accused of murdering Arabs at the Islamic College in Hebron, and of attempts to assassinate Arab mayors, bomb Arab buses, and destroy the Dome of the Rock,” Auerbach sees such charges as “inflamed rhetoric [that] obscures principles of Jewish religious nationalism …. To describe these defendants as ‘West Bank terrorists’ prejudices their guilt and distorts their identity … A lunatic fringe can easily be dismissed, but Gush Emunim draws too heavily upon Judaism and Zionism for such cavalier treatment. The credo of Gush Emunim … may … be enchantingly simple. But it can also be urgently compelling for in Judea and Samaria [these are the right-wing land expansion terms Auerbach chooses in reference to what is more commonly known as the “occupied territories”] Jews are struggling to explore and express intimate relationships – between a people, its God, and its promised land – that have defined Judaism since the ‘Exodus.’” [AUERBACH, 10-84]
The group Auerbach fawns over – Gush Emunim, its messianic world view, and its hostility to all non-Jews, we have run across before and will visit again in this volume. Its credo is messianic land expansion and Nazi-like attitudes towards non-Jews based on the worst tradition of talmudic interpretation. “Gush Emunim leaders,” says Israel Shahak, “have quoted religious precepts which enjoin Jews to oppress Gentiles.” [SHAHAK, p. 96] Israeli Uri Huppert notes that Miriam Levinger, wife of prominent Gush Emunim leader Rabbi Moshe Levinger, “expressed the extremist attitude now prevalent in the Orthodox, religious-nationalist camp in her well-known remark that ‘democracy’ is not a Jewish value.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 18] Ideologues of Gush Emunim-style teachings who have risen to fame in recent years include Yigal Amir, the assassin of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, and Baruch Goldstein, mass murderer of 29 Arabs in a Hebron mosque as they prayed. More about Gush Emunim later.

Among the most prominent (of the few) African-Americans attacking Martin’s “anti-Semitism” was Henry Louis Gates, Jr., a Harvard professor, who was afforded space on the subject in the Op Ed section of the New York Times. (Gates, notes the African-American Los Angeles Sentinel, is seen by “many African-Americans … as a pawn of Jewish leadership who never misses an opportunity to attack Black scholars and Afro-centrism, while ignoring rampant Jewish racism.” [LEWIS, p. A7] Gates wrote that:

“The Bible of the new anti-Semitism is the Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews, an official publication of the Nation of Islam that boasts 1,275 footnotes in the course of 334 pages. Sober and scholarly looking, it may well be one of the most influential books published in the Black community in the last twelve months … To be sure, the book massively represents the historical record, largely through a process of cunningly selected quotations from often reputable sources. [GATES, p. 219] … The authors of the Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews boast that they’re hanging the Jews by their own words!” [GATES, p. 225; original emphasis]

And what of Gates’ authoritative reference to categorically refute the 1,275 “misrepresenting” citations in the Secret Relationship? Harold Brackman. Gates’ rebuttal to the Secret Relationship, proudly proclaimed in the Simon Wiesenthal Center’s magazine, Response, “drew of Brackman’s scholarship.” Hence, Gates’ foundation as an African-American scholar attacking the NOI book is not largely – if at all – his own research, but that from a polemical Jewish scholar working for the Wiesenthal Center [See later chapter (for a discussion about its role as a pro-Israel, Judeo-centric propaganda center). In a thank you letter to Brackman (published in the Wiesenthal’s journal), Gates wrote:

“I want to say how appreciative I am for the ground-clearing work you performed in your paper on ‘The Secret Relationship.’ It’s a subject I had been addressing for a while, addressing the book’s insidiousness in fairly general terms but I think anyone interested in truly thrashing through the issues has to be immediately grateful, as I am, for your splendidly detailed and meticulous work of reason and analysis.” [RESPONSE, p. 11, FALL 1992, v. 12, no. 6]
“Of all the areas of Jewish enterprise,” notes Gerald Krafetz, “none has been so overlooked as the field of crime. And it isn’t because of a lack of Jewish criminality. For an introspective people, this oversight is significant. It is as if Jewish crime did not exist, an unsavory skeleton is best left in the family closet … The sociopathy of Jews is not an acceptable notion since it runs counter to both religious precepts and preconceived ideas that Jews have of themselves.” [KREFETZ, p. 112] “Jews were … involved in many of the most visible and spectacular frauds of the post-Civil War period,” notes Benjamin Ginsberg, “as well as in economic dislocations and financial manipulations that characterize the era.” [GINSBERG, p. 75] In one much publicized scandal for instance, the Jewish governor of South Carolina, Franklin Moses, oversaw the issue and selling of $6 million in fraudulent state securities, as well as funneling hundreds of thousands of dollars in public funds into his own pocket. [GINSBERG, p. 75]

In a broader financial sphere, very visibly at the top of the socio-economic pyramid, Jewish businessman Joseph Seligman’s nefarious activities in the late 1800s helped to create the infamous “Black Friday” stock market crash. Benjamin Ginsberg notes that the crash “ruined thousands of investors, implicated President Grant, and led to a Congressional investigation of [Jay] Gould and Seligman … Similarly, in the early 1890s, Jacob Schiff collaborated with E. H. Harriman in the latter’s attempts to wrest control of the Northern Pacific Railroad from J. P. Morgan and James Hill … When the price of the Northern Pacific Stock collapsed, the entire market crashed in the notorious ‘Black Thursday’ panic that led to a nationwide economic depression.” [GINZBURG, p. 73]

In 1885 the French-based project to build the Panama Canal collapsed, resulting in financial scandal that led, in part, to Seligman again. “Both the United States Congress and the French Parliament had inquiries,” says Ginsberg, “In both countries major Jewish financiers were implicated: Baron Jacques de Reinach in Paris and Joseph Seligman in the United States. Many shareholders lost everything, but Seligman lost nothing. In contemporary parlance, the Seligmans engaged in influence peddling, insider trading, and corporate asset stripping and looting – all at the expense of credulous investors.” [GINZBURG, p. 74] The French end of the Panama Canal scandals, notes Albert Lindemann, “involved large amounts of French capital and threatened national prestige – and Jewish agents were deeply involved. The intermediaries between the Panama company and parliament were almost exclusively Jews with German names and backgrounds, some of whom tried to blackmail one another.” [LINDEMMANN, p. 87]
The Jewish component of (Gentile) Huey Long’s corrupt political machine in early 20th century Louisiana included Leon Weiss, an architect, who “was implicated in the financial scandals surrounding the administration and served prison time.” [KIRKUS, 10-1-97] Herbert Stempel was willing participant in the 1950s television quiz show scandals until a Gentile, Charles Van Doren, usurped him in deceit. Jewish TV producer Lew Cowan, denying guilt, was one of the most prominent executives who lost his job in the wake of the scandals. Even at the heart of the World Zionist Organization, after founder Theodore Herzl’s death, his wife Julie (“an extravagant and unstable woman”) “threatened the Zionist leaders with scandals and lawsuits if they didn’t meet her extravagant financial needs.” [STERNEBERGER, I., 8-15, 1995]

At the other end of the socio-economic world, “the scant attention [popular author Irving Howe] paid to Jewish crime in World of Our Fathers, his magisterial study of the [Manhattan Jewish] Lower East side,” notes Charles Silberman, “is a good example of the amnesia American Jews show about this part of their history.” [SILBERMAN, p. 128] In researching the level of Jewish crime during the early decades of this century in the Lower East Side, Albert Fried notes that “I discovered that an enormously complex, richly endowed culture of vice and criminality, made up mainly of young people, thrived on the Lower East Side, that most outsiders regarded it as Tammany’s bastion of power [Tammany Hall, the corrupt New York city government of the era] that the Jews themselves eventually came to look upon it as an insufferable burden of shame and embarrassment.” [FRIED, p. XIV] Such embarrassment included Jewish “fagins” (bands of pickpockets), thieves, pimps, prostitutes, opium dealers, gamblers, brothel-owners, racketeers, murderers, robbers, and others of virtually any persuasion. Arson for building insurance and horse-poisoning in extortion rackets were “two offenses associated almost exclusively with Jews.” [JOSELIT, p. 36] “In the area of only one square mile [in the Jewish Lower East Side],” notes Jenna Weissman Joselit, “authorities estimated there were approximately two hundred disorderly [prostitution] houses, three hundred and thirty-six gang ‘hang-outs,’ and over two hundred pool halls-cum-betting establishments; dance halls, a rendezvous of pimps and procurers, were found every two and one-half blocks.” [JOSELIT, p. 24]

Abe “the General” Greenthal, “was one of America’s premier pickpockets … Abe’s home and base of operation was in New York City, but his gang traveled all over the United States picking pockets.” Michael Kurtz (born in 1850) “was one of America’s most celebrated burglars.” Joseph ‘Yoski Nigger’ Toblinsky “led a gang that specialized in stealing and poisoning horses.” Benjamin (Dopey) Fein “was the first gangster to make labor racketeering a full-time and profitable business. He institutionalized the practice of furnishing gangs of hoodlums to unions in their wars against employers.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 88, 91, 94, 95]

“In 1908,” notes the Jerusalem Post, “Jews were 25 percent of the four million residents in New York City but 50% of the prison population.” [HENRY, M., 10-4-01] That same year, the police commissioner of New York City, Theodore A. Bingham, publicly noted that half of all the criminals in his city were Jewish.

The murder of a well-known Jewish gambler, Herman Rosenthal, was particularly horrifying for the Jewish community in that it opened up a Pandora’s Box of trials and testimonies profoundly unflattering to local Jewry. Goren notes that

“The appalling fact was that the underworld segment which the trials and the indefatigable press had so thoroughly laid bare consisted almost entirely of Jewish gangsters and gamblers. No longer could Jewish apologists find comfort in viewing the phenomena as a rare deviation from the norm. In the accounts, the criminals appeared as commonplace East Side figures. Sons of hard-working parents, most had been exposed as children to religious training and had led average family lives. Even considering the hired gangsters apart, one could point to exceptional and touching instances of family loyalty, pride in one’s ethnic group, and knowledge of an affection for Jewish religious tradition.” [GOREN, p. 154]

“Jewish criminals,” wrote Moses Rischin, “regularly made newspaper headlines. The appearance of an ungovernable youth after the turn of the century was undeniable and excited apprehension.” [FRIED, p. xvi] In April 1911, for instance, 400 Jewish shopkeepers flooded a criminal court building to complain and testify before a grand jury about robberies and gangs in their neighborhoods. [FRIED, p. 26] In 1909 alone, 3,000 Jewish “youngsters” appeared before an area juvenile court. [FRIED, p. 41] Gangster Monk Eastman alone “bossed a Jewish street gang that could field as many as 1,200 men on short notice.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 97] While many criminals were rooted in poverty, some prominent Jewish gangsters – like Arnold Rothstein and Big Jack Zelig – came from comfortable backgrounds. [FRIED, p. 40] The king of Jewish crime in the era, Arthur Rothstein, “was a rich man’s son.” [COHEN, R., p. 46] Monk Eastman’s father “was solidly middle class, a restaurant owner.” [COHEN, R., p. 45] Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway discounts the usual apologetics for Jewish gangsters, saying:

“More likely, these men selected careers in crime because they wanted money, power, recognition and status; and they wanted it fast. Crime offered them a quick way to realize their dreams.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 52]

“It was the Jews, by and large,” says Norman Cantor, “not the Italians, who created what was later called the Mafia. In the 1920s the Italians began to
replace the Jews in the New York organized crime industry, but as late as 1940 if you wanted a spectacular hit you were looking for a representative of the Lepke Buchalter Gang, also known as Murder Inc. Jews were also prominent in the gambling trade and developed Las Vegas in the 1940s. It was a Jewish gambler who fixed the 1919 baseball World Series – what became known as the Black Sox scandal.” [CANTOR, p. 389] The perpetrator of the scandal was Arnold Rothstein, notes Charles Silberman, “the inventor of organized crime.” [SILBERMAN, p. 128]

“It was with some astonishment,” notes Jewish critic Marvin Kitman, “that I discovered what an integral part of American Jewish life crime was. Our forefathers made names for themselves, such as they are, as gangsters, murderers, musclemen, hit men, acid throwers, arm breakers, bombers and all the other professions open to nice Jewish boys. Prostitution, vice, alcohol, gambling, racketeering, extortion, and all the other things that fill the newspaper today and that I gladly have been attributing as character flaws in other groups of founding fathers: Those were our things … I was shocked at how deep our roots are in all the sinks of depravity and corruption … The Jews were the first ones to realize the link between organized crime and organized politics. They led the way in corrupting the police and city hall. They first realized the value of gang/syndicate cartels in business to reduce the killing of each other. They were monopolists of the highest order … We wrote the book, so to speak, on crime, but it’s all forgotten.” [KITMAN, p. 9]

“Some disgruntled Jewish immigrants,” says Jonathan Sarna, “chose crime as their vehicle of upward mobility. Through robbery and fencing operations, they created a parasitic counter-industry that lived off the garment trade, skimming its profits for personal benefit. Others made their living by exploiting Jewish religious practices (the standard history of the kosher-meat industry in New York is aptly entitled Fraud, Corruption, and Holiness).” [SARNA, Jewish, p. 53]

Kosher meat is food that is prepared according to traditional Orthodox religious standards; it presumably entails extra time and energy to prepare which escalates prices to be higher than non-kosher food. An investigation in New York City sponsored by a Jewish community organization in 1915 discovered that 60% of the meat sold as kosher was fraudulent: most rabbis who supervised kosher sanctions were under slaughterhouse employ and abandoned strict religious adherence. [GOREN, p. 79] Among 6,000 New York area butchers who allegedly only sold kosher meat to fellow Jews, there were “few who did not, at some point, deal in unkosher meat.”[GASTWIRT, p. 113] The Jewish slaughterhouse system was also involved in price-fixing, extortion, racketeering, fist fights in the synagogue, and even murder. “The intense rivalry and competition in the kosher poultry business,” notes Harold Gastwirt, “made it prey to racketeering and violence.” [GASTWIRT, p. 46]

Jewish gangsters were also violently active in support of Jewish unions or employers, depending upon who paid them. “Some of the so-called Jewish
unions,” remarked a veteran of Jewish labor activities, “... fell early in their careers upon evil days: underworld characters, gangsters, got a foothold in the organization ... Unfortunately, the element engaged to help would refuse to clear out when their services were no longer wanted.” [GOREN, p. 304] Rita Simon notes another of the political dimensions of underworld [and New York City governmental] corruption:

“In exchange for police protection of his gang, [gang leader] Monk [Easton] employed ‘repeaters’ (repeat voters) at the polls in favor of Tammany Hall, the local Democratic machine.” [SIMON, p. 139]

Jewish crime was widespread in a number of the largest urban areas of America, some of it eventually “syndicated” throughout the country, at times even in cooperation with the Italian mafia. In Chicago the Westside Jewish underworld ward was known as the “Bloody Twentieth.” A 1906 description of the area claimed that “murderers, robbers, and thieves of the worst kind are born, reared, and grow to maturity in numbers that far exceed the record of any similar district on the face of the globe.” [FRIED, p. 90] (Even Al Capone’s accountant, who later rose to further notoriety, was Jewish, Jake “Greasy Thumb” Guzik.) [LACEY, p. 18] In Cleveland, the Jewish community had its “noisome and brutal Woodland section”; in Detroit it was the eastside, most prominently ruled by the Purple Gang; in Boston it was the Chelsea quarter; Newark had its “fierce third ward”; and in Philadelphia Jewish crime, featuring boss Harry Stromberg, was largely located in the southeast area. These cities, with New York, says Albert Fried, “held the worst, that is the most criminalized, of the Jewish neighborhoods in America.” [FRIED, p. 90] In London, England, notes Daniel Levy, “the Jews were involved in assorted criminal activities. They committed petty thievery, forgery, and illegal distilling of booze. Some sailed to eastern Europe and convinced young girls that jobs and bachelors awaited them in England, only to ship them off to Indian or Argentinean white slave markets.” [LEVY, D, p. 20] Earlier forms of blackmail by non-Jewish British gangs were “developed by Jewish gangs (formed after the great immigration of the 1880s) into extortion from legitimate shopkeepers. Much as Jewish gangsters liked to portray themselves as honourable knights defending their co-religionists against anti-Semitic thugs, they were just as likely to live as predators upon their fellow Jews. A gang of extortionists known as the ‘Bessarabians’ were headed by a professional boxer who called himself Max Moses in private life and ‘Kid McCoy’ in the ring.” [FIDO, M., 2000, p. 17]

Poland? In the early twentieth century, future Israeli prime minister David Ben-Gurion was jailed in Warsaw, Poland, for suspected radical political activism. “That was the first time,” he said later,

“that I ever came into contact with the dregs of society. I was shaken to the core at the language and behavior. I never had the slightest notion that such people ever existed ... The thing that shook me most was that these criminals were Jews.” [Daniel Kurzon suggests that these included members of a rival Jewish political group which Ben-Gurion considered
“more dangerous criminals” than the “brothel keepers.” [KURZMAN, D., 1983, p. 67]

Prominent Jews in Chicago’s criminal underworld included Louis ‘Diamond Louie’ Cowan, Hymie ‘the Loud Mouth’ Levine, Sam ‘Sammy the Greener’ Jacobson, Maxie Eisen, Murray ‘the Camel’ Humphreys, and (non-Jewish) Al Capone’s money man, Jake Guzik. [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 43] In 1924, “Chicago Jewish leader” S. M. Melamed warned about the “great number of Jews in the underworld.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 49]

“Bootlegging in Boston,” notes Robert Rockaway,

“was controlled by Charles ‘King’ Solomon … He headed one of the largest liquor, vice, and narcotics smuggling syndicates in New England … In the 1920s, Solomon ran the Boston underworld.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 34]

But even smaller cities, like Minneapolis and adjacent St. Paul, had serious problems with Jewish crime. In November 1927 the Minneapolis Saturday Press ran an article that enflamed local public opinion, quoting the remarks of a non-Jewish gangster:

“90% of the crimes committed against society in this city are committed by Jew gangsters … It is Jew, Jew, Jew, as long as one cares to comb over the records. I am launching no attack against the Jewish people as a RACE. I am merely calling attention to a FACT.” [FRIED, p. 113]

Originally from Sioux Falls, Iowa, prominent Jewish gangsters in Minneapolis included “Kid” Cann (Isador Blumenfeld), Yiddie Bloom, and the Berman brothers (Davie and Chickie). [LACEY, p. 66] Cann is believed to have been responsible for the murder of Walter Ligget, publisher of Midwest America, for a series of articles the paper printed about the Minneapolis criminal underworld. Ligget was gunned down in front of his family while Christmas shopping. “Much of [Minneapolis’] illicit business,” notes Robert Rockaway,

“was managed by Isadore ‘Kid Cann’ … Blumenfeld and his all-Jewish syndicate … In 1942, the FBI identified Kid Cann as ‘the overlord of the Minneapolis, Minnesota underworld.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 48]

Cleveland mob leaders included Moe Dalitz, Morris Kleinman, Sam Tucker, and Lou Rothkopf. After prohibition, “the Cleveland mob joined with Lansky and his confederates … and formed the core of the most sophisticated national crime syndicate in America.” [BLOCK, A., p. 165] Shondor Birns (Szandor Birnstein) was another prominent Cleveland mobster, lasting in the criminal underworld for decades til 1975, when he was assassinated by a car bomb. In early years, he was part of the Maxie Diamond (also Jewish) gang. Among Birns’ crime partners was Mervin Gold who “was accused of defrauding banks and the Small Business Administration by using stolen Canadian bonds as collateral for loans. He fled to Israel,” but eventually returned. Birns, noted by the Cleveland Plain Dealer for his reputation as a “charming killer,” was suspected of Gold’s eventual murder. [MCGUANGLE, F., 7-11-99, p. 5H]
Reading, Pennsylvania? As non-Jewish mobster Patsy Lepera recounted in his autobiography:

“Reading at that time, in the thirties and forties, was run by the Minkers – Abe and his brother Izzy. They had a nephew named Alex Fudenman who fronted for them … Even though my father was connected right to Sicily, he had to do what the Jews wanted done in Reading, because that was their town. They eliminated the Italians. At one time it was a two-mob town … One thing I learn as I go through life is if you come up against a Jew or an Italian, you check him out. You don’t do nothing against him – you check him out careful. Jews don’t belong to the [Italian] mob, but they’re connected strong. An awful lot of Jews are connected strong.” [LEPERA, P., 1974, p. 7-8]

Missouri? Charlie Birger (born Sachna Itzik Berger), prominent bootlegger, was hung in 1928 for the murder of the mayor of West City, Missouri. He is believed to have been “responsible directly or indirectly for the murders of at least a dozen people, many of whom had been his loyal followers.” One of the killed who was not a follower was a local Ku Klux Klan leader. [DE NEAL, G., 1998, p. xviii]

To what lengths Jewish fraud and crime could go might be measured in the chutzpah of Bernie Barton (originally Blaustein) who even set up a fake church with a junkie as preacher as a “front for fencing stolen goods.” [DEUTSCH, G., p. 7]

A number of modern respectable Jewish fortunes were founded on links to the underworld in the Prohibition era. Most noteworthy, the Seagram’s alcohol fortune (the Canadian Bronfman family) grew to power by getting their alcohol into criminal hands who smuggled it into the United States. Bronfman, who bristled when anyone called him a bootlegger, had a distribution deal for his booze with Jewish mobster Meyer Lansky. [BIRMINGHAM, p. 159] Detroit’s largely Jewish Purple Gang was also extremely active in running illegal booze from Windsor across the river border. The Purple Gang’s activities also included “gambling, prostitution, extortion, loan sharking, and rackets of every kind.” [FRIED, p. 102] So much smuggling was going on between Canada and the United States across Lake Erie that it was known as “the Jewish Lake.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 37] During prohibition too, “[Federal] officials labeled sacramental wine [for religious purposes] one of the chief sources of illegal liquor in the nation,” notes Jenna Weissman Joselit, “Furthermore, calling the record level of usage a ‘national scandal,’ they saw the problem as largely a Jewish one.” [JOSELIT]

Here’s what Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway says about Detroit’s Purple Gang, and Jewish gangs generally:

“During Prohibition (1920-1933), Jewish gangsters became major operatives in the American underworld and played prominent roles in the creation of organized crime in the United States. At the time, Jewish gangs dominated illicit activities in a number of America’s largest cities, including Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis, Newark, New York, and Philadelphia. The gang dealt in bootlegging, gambling, extortion, drugs, and
murder, and developed a reputation for being more ruthless than Al Capone’s mob in Chicago. The Purple’s decade-long reign of terror ended when most of the gang’s members either went to prison or were murdered by rivals … During the Prohibition era (1919-1933) 50 percent of the country’s leading bootleggers were Jews, and Jewish criminals financed and directed much of the nation’s narcotics traffic … While Jews predominated in their quarter [in Purple Gang-era Detroit], other immigrants and ethnic groups lived there as well. One former resident of the old neighborhood joked that it was of the old neighborhood joked that i was easy to distinguish the Jewish dwelling from those occupied by non-Jews. ‘The non-Jews grew flowers in front of their houses,’ he said. ‘The Jews grew dirt.’” [ROCKAWAY, R., 2001, p. 113-]

Elsewhere, “bootlegging in Prohibition-era Philadelphia was directed by Max ‘Boo Boo’ Huff … Huff’s successor as Philadelphia’s dominant Jewish mobster was Harry Stromberg, alias Nig Rosen … He also led what was called the ‘69th Street Gang’ that dealt in prostitution, extortion and labor racketeering. His influence extended as far as Washington, Baltimore, and Atlantic City … When Stromberg left Philadelphia, he was superceded by his driver and bodyguard, Willie Weisberg, a long-time member of the city’s Jewish underworld.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 32, 34]

Another modern Jewish fortune similarly constructed is that of the Annenberg’s, which was founded upon Moses Annenberg’s horse racing news monopoly that he arranged with the criminal underworld. “That Annenberg and the Prohibition and gambling mobs had interests in common is indisputable,” says Albert Fried, “An information monopoly, nominally independent, gave the mobs the wherewithal to police the complex, sprawling kingdom of the Book [i.e., gambling and bookies]; it was an instrument of their sovereignty. In return Annenberg was allowed to reap inordinate profits and become one of the richest men in the land, the founder of one of its singular dynasties.” [FRIED, p. 118]

Another of the most prominent Jewish American family fortunes, the “fabulously rich Pritzker family from Chicago,” had links, however indirectly, to organized crime even in more recent history. They were involved, as “clients of the [Bruce] Kanter firm,” who ran a variety of shady Caribbean companies. Kanter, who “had direct ties to organized crime,” [BLOCK, A., p. 162] served on the Hyatt hotel company’s Board of Directors (Hyatt is one of many companies owned by the Pritzkers). [BLOCK, A., p. 191] Also, notes Allen Block,

“…A little digging into their background produced troubling questions. It was discovered that the source of some Pritzker money comes from the racket-ridden Teamsters Pension Fund … Investigators probing the Pritzker empire were intrigued by its connection to the Pension Fund. This was especially so when it discovered that both [mob-linked] Jimmy Hoffa and Allen Dorfman personally worked on Pritzker loans.” [BLOCK, A., p. 192]

In 1997, major publishers afforded two legendary Jewish conmen of international (dis)repute respective biographies. Adam Worth started out re-join-
ing and re-deserting various Civil War regiments (both Union and Confederate) for enlistment bonuses and later expanded his exploits into forgery, larceny, robbery, burglary, and other criminal mainstays. In England, Sir Robert Anderson, head of Criminal Investigations at Scotland Yard, observed in 1907 that “Adam Worth was the Napoleon of crime. None other could hold a candle to him.” The Pinkerton security agency noted that “in the death of Adam Worth there probably departed the most inventive and daring criminal in modern times … Among all the men Pinkertons have known in a life time, this man was the most remarkable criminal of them all.” [MCINTYRE, p. 287] Novelist Sir Arthur Conan Doyle used Worth as his model for Professor Moriarty, Sherlock Holmes’ arch-nemesis. An important associate in Worth’s earlier years was “Mother” Mandelbaum, described in her era as “the great crime promoter of modern times,” the “most successful fence in the history of New York” and the woman who “first put crime in America on a syndicated basis.” Starting in 1862, over the next two decades she was reputed to have “handled between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000 worth of stolen property.” [MCINTYRE, B., 1997, p. 29, 30]

A few years later another real-life rogue (and Jewish) notable, Morris Cohen (the subject of the second biography), rose from a life as a western Canadian circus barker and pickpocket to an adventurous life as an arms dealer, bodyguard, and general to Chinese leader Sun Yat-Sen. [LEVY, D.] Later he served under Chiang Kai-Shek. He also functioned as a liaison for Zionist influences to Chinese leadership. [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 99]

A similar Jewish con-man was Elias Abraham Rosenberg, a “rascal” who arrived in Hawaii in 1887. There, he “ingratiated himself with King David Kalakaua by his chanting and so-called occult powers. He soon became the King’s soothsayer and astrologer, acquiring such power over the monarch that the Hawaiian press bitterly denounced him as a ‘Holy Moses.’ Rosenberg taught the King some Hebrew and was persuaded to appoint him appraiser of customs. He was given quarters in the Iolani Palace, where he practiced magic, read the stars, and chanted Bible stories in Hebrew.” [KOPP-MAN/POSTAL, 1978, p. 229-230]

In 1998, Jewish fraudster Trebitsch Lincoln was also afforded a biography. Lincoln, noted a reviewer, was “the king of dupers” and “a thwarted megalomaniac who was also a champion con man.” Born in Hungary in 1879, he immigrated to England and converted to Christianity. He became a member of Parliament, and later tried to become a British, and then a German, spy. He turned up as a supporter of the right-wing Kapp Putsch in Berlin in 1920, became an abbot of a Buddhist temple in Shanghai, fleeced his devotees, welcomed invading Japanese, became a Nazi apologist/propagandist and on and on in the life of a human chameleon. [BERRY, N., 5-8-98, p. 28]

In 1999, the (London) Daily Mail highlighted the Kray twins, Ronnie and Reggie, “of Jewish and Romany stock.” Both were imprisoned in the 1960s. Only Reggie survives, “the best-known gangster in Britain … By 1963, through their
networks of thugs and thieves, Ronnie and Reggie were lording it over London’s underworld and became figures in London society.”

Decades after the likes of Worth and Cohen, famous Jewish underworld figures like Bugsy Siegel and Meyer Lansky made the American scene. Siegel was instrumental in creating the legalized crime-laden playground of Las Vegas, starting things off at the Flamingo Hotel. Joseph Sacher headed the nearby Sands Hotel; Sacher “was second only to Lansky in the [crime] Syndicate. Years … [later] he fled the U.S. and went into exile in Israel.” [KELLEY, K., p. 219] Allen Friedman notes another early Jewish criminal influence in Sin City: “The real potential of Las Vegas was not understood until Moe Sedway arrival in 1941.” [FRIEDMAN, A., p. 82]

Meyer Lansky eventually “retired” from a successful life of crime with some $150-300 million after corrupt escapades that included Florida’s “Gold Coast,” the Bahamas, and a gambling resort in pre-Castro Cuba. “At the height of his notoriety,” says Robert Lacey, “Meyer Lansky was reckoned to be, and was targeted by the U.S. Justice Department as, the biggest gangster in the United States – a dangerous lawbreaker of extraordinary power. He was identified as the Mafia’s banker, the boss of the National Crime Syndicate, the head of the Combination – the Chairman of the Board.” [LACEY, R., p. 10-11]

Las Vegas has long been a hotbed of underworld influence and a worldwide attraction for gambling and prostitution. The Italian Mafia has also, from the conception of Las Vegas as a leisure Mecca, held great sway in the city, but its most famous underworld personages have always been Jewish mobsters Bugsy Siegel and Meyer Lansky. The great scope of Jewish contribution to the creation, and dubious ethics, of Las Vegas may be measured by the words of professor Allen Balboni. Here he discusses the development of the desert city as a gambling resort area:

“Most of the [Las Vegas] hotel builders were Jewish Americans. Jay Sar-no and Nate Jacobson were associated with Caesar’s Palace [Sarno later created Circus Circus]; Moe Dalitz, Morris Kleinman, and Sam Tucker with the Desert Inn (and, along with Jake Factor, with the Stardust after [Italian-American Tony] Corneo’s death); Sidney Wyman, Al Gottes-man, and Jake Gottlieb with the early years of the Dunes; Gus Greenbaum, Moe Sedway, and Charlie Resnick with managing the Flamingo after Bugsy Siegel’s death; Ben Goffstein, Willie Alderman, and David Berman with the booking and running of the Riviera; Milton Prell with the establishment of the Sahara and then with the transformation of the Tally-Ho into the Aladdin; Hyman Abrams, Carl Cohen, and Jack Entratter with the ownership and operation of the Sands; and Ben Jaffe, Phil Kastel, and Jell Houssels (of Anglo-Saxon background) with the construction and operation of the Tropicana … A few Italian-Amerians hold minor ownership shares in casinos.” [BALBONI, p. 27]

Jewish singer Eddie Fisher recalls a Las Vegas offer he had at the peak of his career that he now regrets turning down:
“When I was working at the Desert Inn I met with a man named Billy Weinberger, who told me, ‘We’re building a new hotel and we want to give you fifty percent of it.’ In return I would perform there permanently and would use my influence to attract other major stars. That sounded interesting. ‘What’s it going to be called?’ I asked. ‘Caesar’s Palace.’” [FISHER, E., 1999, p. 292]

Bernie Rothkopf also owned the **MGM Hotel**. Allen Glick was, between 1974-79, “the mob’s front man at the **Stardust, Fremont, Hacienda,** and **Marina** hotels.” [MORRISON, J.A., p. 1A] “In July, 1979 Allen Glick was stripped of his Nevada gambling license and fined over $500,000 for a variety of improprieties.” Glick sold his interests in casinos to Allan Sachs, who was, with a partner, “figureheads for the Chicago mob responsible for providing skim monies” from Las Vegas gambling operations. [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 336] Jerome Mack, past president of the **Dunes and Riviera**, was a former national chairman of the Israel Bonds Campaign. Jewish entrepreneur Hank Greenspon owned the **Las Vegas Sun** newspaper and a local TV station. [See his efforts for Israel in the mass media section, p. 1214, p. 1425 and p. 1707]

In more recently years, Arthur Goldberg is the CEO of **Park Place Entertainment**, a conglomeration of 29 hotel-casinos [JENKINS, P., 5-30-99] worldwide (**Caesar’s Palace, Bally’s**, etc.) that is twice the size of its nearest competitor. Its **Stardust** division is the world’s largest hotel company. Elsewhere, Sheldon Adelson, chairman of the Sands, is also the owner of **Venetian**, a new Las Vegas complex built in 1999 at a cost of $1.6 billion. Adelson is “one of richest men in America,” in 1998 worth about $600 million. [STOLL, I., 1-7-00, p. 1] Adelson, noted the **Las Vegas Review-Journal**, “is one of the country’s largest donors to Jewish groups and he has influence in the national Jewish community.” [RALSTON] Adelson, notes the (Jewish) **Forward**, “has paid for 75 congressmen to visit Israel with the American Israel Public Affairs Committee [the pro-Israel lobbying organization].” [STOLL, I., p. 1] As **Joe Gelman** noted in 1999, “A number of these sin-palace operators are Jewish and strong supporters of Israel.” [GELMAN, p. 15B] B] [Author Gelman complains about the use of this citation here : http://jewishtribalreview.org/gelman2.htm]

The chairman of the **Mirage**, Steve Wynn, is also Jewish. (The funds for Wynn’s first casino, the **Golden Nugget**, was in large part raised by convicted Jewish financier Michael Milken). [JOHNSTON, D., p. 74] The Las Vegas mayor, Oscar Goodman, elected in 1999, is the former president of Temple Beth Sholom. He also has a reputation as a “mob lawyer,” defending, among others, Jewish mobster **Meyer Lansky** and **Frank Rosenthal**. Rosenthal, notes the **Las Vegas Review-Journal**, “is credited by some with founding the modern day Las Vegas sports book but was repeatedly denied a gambling license because of association with organized crime members.” [ZAPLER, p. 1A]

All of this, in more recent years, has its mirror image in Atlantic City and, increasingly, other American gambling Meccas. Kenny Shapiro, for instance, was “the Atlantic investment banker for [Italian American mafioso] Nicky
Scarfo, the vicious killer who ruled the Philadelphia Mafia, the most murderous mob family in America.” [JOHNSTON, D., 1992, p. 82]

Another influential Jewish gambling mogul today is Sol Kerzner, founder and principal owner of **Sun City** (also known as “Sin City”), a resort playground created in 1979 in a poverty-stricken area of apartheid South Africa. Kerzner’s modern empire has expanded with extravagant casinos in Atlantic City, New Jersey, the Bahamas, Mauritius, France, and a Native American site in Connecticut. An alleged bribery scheme involving the Jewish mayor of Cape-town, David Bloomberg, in 1986 held up – for a while – his United States investments.

“Sun City,” notes reporter **Jay Clarke**, “started out as a ‘Sin City,’ a place where South Africans could let their hair down because it was located then in the so-called ‘independent homeland’ of Bophuthatswana. Gambling, showgirl revenues, and prostitution were the lures.” [CLARKE, p. TR1] “If ever there was an appropriate setting for corruption it is Sun City,” noted the (London) **Guardian**, “situated as it is in one of nine homelands which represent the cornerstones of that most corrupt of social systems, apartheid.” [BERESFORD, p. 18] One of the Israelis who made millions off the immoral socio-political system surrounding **Sun City** is Shabtai Kalmanovitch; he worked as an “economic advisor” to Bophuthatswana’s dictator. [BERESFORD, p. 18] )

In recent years Sun City has attempted to diversify by creating a family-oriented “Lost City” adventure park adjoining the casino. “The patent reason why the Lost City has been designed as a family playground and entertainment centre,” says the (London) **Guardian,**

“is that it entices the public into gaming. The corridors leading to the main casino even feature children’s versions of slot machines – game machines – which could with some justification be described as nursery slopes inculcating the joys (or otherwise) of adult addiction to the one-armed bandits packing the main ‘treasure hall.’” [BERESFORD, p. 18]

Many Jewish (and other) mob figures were also involved in the gambling industry in Cuba until the communist revolution destroyed their operations. “After the loss of Cuba and the clampdown on the Mafia by the Kennedy Justice Department,” notes Dan Moldea, “**Meyer Lansky** and the organized crime syndicate had targeted the Bahamas as its new off-shore gambling and narcotics empire.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 128]

In the casino/resort/hotel world of the Bahamas, and its criminal underworld, Jews have also been prominent. Among those who find a place in Alan Block’s book about organized crime on these islands are

- **Louis Arthur Chesler** who “served as [mobster] Lansky’s point man … Among Chesler’s criminal specialties was the handling of stolen securities.” [p. 34-35]
- **Morris Mac Schwabel**, a Manhattan attorney, formerly convicted of securities fraud. [p. 36]
– **Joseph Jacob Frankel**, who in the early 1960s “teamed up with Charles ‘Ruby’ Stein and [Italian mafioso] Nicholas ‘Jiggs’ Farlano who were major organized crime figures.” [p. 89]

– **Arthur Millgram**, president of Automated Ticket Systems (it had contracts with the New York lottery system), who was murdered in 1977. [p. 91]

– **Joel Mallin**, a lawyer who had “ties to the mob.” [p. 91]

– **Irving Kahn**, partner with “mob attorney Morris Shenker.” [p. 95]

– **C. Gerald Goldsmith**, who “was the Board Chairman of the [Nassau] Port Authority, DEVCO, and several related firms. This put him in the middle of one of the largest political payoff scams in the Bahamas. … One of his duties was the illegal siphoning of company funds into the hidden bank accounts for political payoffs.” [p. 95, 98]

– **Ben Novack**, owner of Miami’s Fontainebleau hotel, who was an “associate of prominent gangsters Lansky, Coppola, and others including Max Eder, a loanshark and suspected labor racketeer with a history of gambling, robbery, narcotics, and homicide arrests.” [p. 115]

– “Cleveland racketeers **Morris Kleinman** and **Moe Dalitz.**” [p. 116]

– **Burt Kanter**, a lawyer who had “direct ties to organized crime. [p. 162] He was a senior member of the law firm Kanter, (Milton) Levenfeld, (Charles) Lippitz and (Roger) Baskes.

– **Allen Dorfman**, who was “murdered in 1985 to prevent him from talking about mob investments … [He] was in the same league as Glick, Shenker, and Malnik.” [p. 164]

Even among many of the most vicious Jewish thugs, worldwide collectivist Jewish loyalty usually finds expression. “During Israel’s war of independence,” says Gerald Krefetz, “[Meyer Lansky] killed an arms exporter who was selling to Arab countries. Lansky has contributed substantial funds from his gambling fortunes to Jewish causes, particularly to the United Jewish Appeal.” [KREFETZ, p. 116] “A Jew should lead a normal life and a proud life,” Lansky once remarked, “… I’ve been ready at any time in my life to defend myself against insults to Jews or to me as a Jew.” [SARNA, Jewish, p. 55] In Russia, in warring leading to the Communist revolution, “real life gangster [Jewish] Misha Yaponchik … helped to defend Odessa’s Jews from the Whites [loyal to the Tsar] but was afterwards killed by the [Communist] Reds.” [SICHER, p. 172] In England, Jewish criminal Jacob Comacho (aka Jack Spot) started “to establish the reputation for violence that would cause his rise. He called himself the “King of Aldgate.”“When Oswald Mosley’s Fascists started to infest the East End [of London] chanting, ‘We gotta get rid of the Yids,’ Spot became a local hero, taking a lead-weighted chair leg to inflict a savage beating on one of Mosely’s roughnecks at the battle of Cable Street. Spot’s exultant recollection of the incident from his placid law-abiding retirement in the ‘80s was still capable of startling a young journalist by the revelation of relished brutality … He liked to think of himself as the strong man who could be sent for by any Jewish businessman in trouble anywhere, from Glasgow to London. He would then bash the businessmen’s enemies, and in return help himself to clothing, food and
drink, and spare cash as he needed it. Rabbis recommended him to their con-
gregations, as Spot tells it.” [FIDO, M., 2000, p. 32-33]

“During Prohibition,” notes Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway, “fifty per cent
of the leading bootleggers were Jewish, and Jewish criminals financed and
directed much of the nation’s narcotics traffic … At the same time, a number of
these mobsters, quietly and without publicity, defended and assisted the Jewish
community. Despite their aversion to ‘these black sheep of Israel,’ many ordi-
nary Jews appreciated the gangster’s protection, whereas communal leaders
accepted and sometimes solicited their aid.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 215] Jewish
mobster Mickey Cohen, for instance, was particularly active in raising money
for the Jewish terrorist group IRGUN in its attacks against the British (and
Stephen Birmingham, “American Jews were aware of the role of organized
crime in the fight for an independent Israel is unclear. Probably most were not
aware. Those who were, numbed by reports of the Holocaust that were at last
appearing in the American media, preferred to look the other way or to take the
attitude that the end justifies the means.” [BIRMINGHAM, p. 284]

The Jewish criminal underworld was also helpful to Israel in getting weap-
ons to Israel in its early years. Yehuda Arazi, an arms purchaser for the Haganah
organization, even made contacts with the Jewish-based Murder, Inc. gang,
looking for help. “In my business,” said Arazi’s, “We can’t be too fussy who we
do business with. Sometimes they’re not nice people.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 230]
Other underworld contacts arranged for Israeli agents to conceal arms smug-
gling out of New York City. Jewish criminals even had links to the President of
Panama who allowed illegal Israeli arms shipments to sail under the Panama
flag. [ROCKAWAY, p. 231] In 1947 gangster Mickey Cohen helped fund-raising
efforts for the terrorist Irgun gang fighting the British in Palestine. Jewish crim-
inals pooled about $120,000 for the Irgun cause.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 232-233]
Jewish gangsters like Allie Tennebaum, says Rich Cohen, “did live to see the
emergence of a strong Israel, and they must have seen it as something to rejoice
over, proof that not everything the gangsters believed in was wrong.” [KAUF-
MAN, G., p. 2]

Susan Berman, daughter of gangster David Berman, wrote that her father
was, as Jonathan Sarna sardonically notes, “a Jewish role model.” He was
“extremely proud of being Jewish,” notes Ms. Berman, “… He felt that for a
Jewish child to be properly brought up, there must be a synagogue, a rabbi, and
a cantor in evidence.” [SARNA, JEWISH, p. 55] Another Jewish author, Rich
Cohen, romanticizes gangster murder as some kind of affirmative act of
redemption, delighting in Jewish violence so strongly that he can write:

“When [Abe] Reles took a mark [murdered someone], he was not just
ending a life: he was expressing the essential freedom of the Jew in
America.” [KAUFMAN, p. 2]

“America,” wrote another Jewish author, Albert Fried, about Jewish gang-
sters,” is embracing Bugsy Siegel’s vision; his martyrdom [he was murdered by
other mobsters] was not in vain.” [SARNA, JEWISH, p. 55] “Bombast of this
sort,” complains Jonathan Sarna in a review of Fried’s volume, “is obviously meant, in part, to pander to a potential Jewish audience, trying to fashion for it folk heroes of the same ‘gentleman-bandit’ type as non-Jews enjoy. Jewish criminals are thus portrayed as being proud of their heritage, big givers to charity, and strong supporters of the state of Israel.” [SARNA, JEWISH, p. 55]

Is this an artificial portrayal that Jewish gangsters were integral to, and respected by, many in Jewish neighborhoods, and loyal to the burgeoning state of Israel? After the assassination of gangster Big Jack Zelig in 1912, during his New York City funeral procession “the streets of all around Broome Street were jammed,” said Jewish detective Abe Schoenfeld, “A choir consisting of twelve singers conducted by Cantor Goldberg of Newark, New Jersey, sang their Jewish hymns as the procession proceeded down Delaney Street to the bridge. There was an unbroken line of people covering the sidewalk watching the funeral. Only the funeral of Rabbi Joseph (a revered spiritual leader) surpassed this—the funeral of Jack Zelig.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 217]

In Chicago, the death of criminal Samuel “Nails” Morton attracted “five thousand Jewish mourners, including rabbis [who] accompanied Morton’s hearse to the cemetery. Local reporters wanted to know why so many Jews would attend the funeral of a notorious gangster.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 218] The reason, argues Robert Rockaway, is an old one: Jewish unity against non-Jewish enemies.

Between both the Jewish criminal underworld and respectable Jewry, there were especially strong feelings of solidarity against anti-Jewish right-wing political movements. In the 1930s, for example, prominent gangster Meyer Lansky was solicited by a New York City judge and former Congressman, Nathan Perlman, and New York’s most famous rabbi, Stephen Wise, to arrange violent attacks against pro-German groups in America. [ROCKAWAY, p. 220, COHEN, R., p. 190] As late as 1992 the Synagogue of the Suburban Torah in Livingston, New Jersey, sponsored a tribute occasion in honor of a Jewish gangster, Max “Puddy” Hinkes, who had decades earlier organized violent Jewish mobster attacks upon pro-Nazi sympathizers in the area. [ROCKAWAY, p. 223] In Minneapolis, “gambling czar” David Berman led Jewish underworld assaults upon pro-Nazi conferences in the 1930s [ROCKAWAY, p. 224]; likewise, Mickey Cohen instigated similar violence in Los Angeles. [ROCKAWAY, p. 227] For some Jews, Cohen’s claim that he single-handedly beat up two Nazi-types locked in a jail cell with him is welcome legend. [COHEN, R., 1999, p. 191] Even Jack Ruby, assassin of JFK assassin Lee Harvey Oswald,

“with several friends, frequently attempted to disrupt rallies of the German-American Bund. One acquaintance reported that Ruby was responsible for ‘cracking a few heads’ of Bund members. Apparently he joined in this activity for ethnic rather than political reasons. The young men in the group were not organized adherents of any particular political creed, but were pool hall and tavern companions from Ruby’s Jewish neighborhood who gathered on the spur of the moment to present opposition when they learned that pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic
Bund movement was planning a meeting.” [WARREN COMMISSION, 1964, p. 696]

“From Arthur Rothstein and Meyer Lansky to their modern day successors in the Americas, Israel or the Soviet Union,” says Joel Kotkin, “Jewish criminals have succeeded in everything from murder for hire to smuggling. Yet, even in crime, both emphasis and cultural preference lay with the successful use of sechel (smarts) rather than brute force.” [KOTKIN]

It is curious that Kotkin concedes a Jewish criminal tradition but accepts another mythology about modern Jewry - that Jews were/are smart, but never violent. One of the many Jewish mobsters recruited to help Israel was Bugsy Siegel. “Siegel,” says Robert Rockaway, “remained enthusiastic about violence. Even after he became a major crime boss, he wanted to do the killing himself rather than simply arrange matters. This may explain his willingness to help Israel once he learned that Jews were willing to kill to achieve their state.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 231] Other exceptionally prominent Jewish murderers in America’s criminal underworld included Louis “Lepke” Buchalter, head of Murder, Inc., and “one of the most vicious gangsters in the annals of American crime … Between sixty and eighty men died on Lepke’s orders. They were burned in gasoline, buried in quicklime, shot, stabbed with ice picks, or garroted.” [ROCKAWAY, 1993, p. 17] Lewis “Pretty” Amberg “was one of New York’s best known killers, having ‘rubbed out’ from eighteen to a hundred men, no one knew for sure.” [ROCKAWAY, 1993, p. 22] Charley Workman “was said to have killed twenty men … he was so expert at assassination.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 193] Harry “Pittsburg Phil” Strauss was “perhaps the most famous professional killer in American gangster history … [He] killed over 100 (some say over 400) men from the late 1920s to 1940s, making him the most prolific killer in New York.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 149]

Rich Cohen, who wrote a book about Jewish crime, noted his own family’s reaction to what he discovered in his research:

“They really had no idea just how bad [Jewish criminals] were. I didn’t really know how violent they were, or how many people they killed or how many times they were arrested. You come to see them as people. Even within that world, some of them were worse than others. With some, it was just the situation. And some of them were just killers.” [KERNICKY, p. 1E]

Cohen also noted that some of New York’s Jewish gangsters gathered at his grandmother’s restaurant:

“When I told [my grandmother] of my interest in writing about the restaurant and also about the gangsters and their table in back, her face clouded over, ‘They’ll kill you,’ she said, ‘These men, they’re not like you. They’ll kill a boy like you.’ When I pointed out that these men – Reles, Strauss, Goldstein, Maione, Abbandando – were long dead, she shook her head and said, ‘They’ll kill you.’” [COHEN, R., 1999, p. 35]

Yet, adds Cohen, “When [Abe] Reles and the boys were hanging out at my grandparents’ diner and the cops came by, my great-grandmother would hide
their guns in the onions. She hated gangsters, but she hated people she thought hated Jews more.” The endemic anti-Semites Cohen refers to here are generic policemen. [COHEN, R., p. 156]

Jewish author Gloria Deutsch also notes today’s Jewish blinders to their inglorious turn-of-the-century American past:

“We were always conditioned to believe Jews didn’t do these things, but here is Sandy Sadowsky [author of My Life in the Jewish Mafia] with her hair-raising stories of gangland murders, prostitution, rackets, strong-arm men – the shtarkers who exacted revenge and protected their bosses – and one wonders if believing in the myth of Jewish crimelessness (other than a spot of fraud here and there) wasn’t anything more than a huge collective ostrich act.” [DEUTSCH, p. 7]

Jewish violent criminality today also goes against the popular myths of an absolute non-violence in the Jewish community. “The concept of Jewish convicts serving serious jail time,” noted the Los Angeles Times in 1995, “runs counter to a popular stereotype that Jewish felons tend to be nonviolent types who serve their sentences in minimum security cells … Jews outside of prison often find this [fact of Jewish murderers] hard to deal with.” “The people who know about it are kind of amazed,” Howard Cohn, a part-time rabbi at the Pennsylvania State Corrections Institute told the Times. “They can’t believe there are really Jews in a prison like this.” [BEALE, p. A5]

In the most sensational genre, New York serial killer David Berkowitz (“Son of Sam”) was Jewish (he was adopted by a Jewish family as an infant), as was Joel Rifkind [EFTMIADES, p. 75] of Long Island, who into the early 1990s strangled to death at least 17 women, mostly New York prostitutes. “He went, picked up a prostitute, had sex with her, killed her, and dumped her.” [EFTMIADES, p. 90-91] In the 1920s, one of America’s most sensational crimes, splashed all over the country’s newspapers, was that of the Leopold and Loeb boys: “A pair of wealthy young members of Chicago’s Jewish bourgeoisie in the early 20s, they kidnapped a young man, Bobby Franks, and murdered him as a kind of Nietzchean experiment; after their arrest, it was revealed that they had a sexual relationship too.” [BARBOUR, D., 1998] At the time, it was popularized as “the crime of the century.” [ABRAHAMSEN, D., 1983, p. 41] Amy Fisher, who received a great deal of press in New York tabloids as the “Long Island Lolita,” was jailed in 1992 for shooting the wife of her lover. [PORTER, B., 5-11-99, p. A6]

Even in an Orthodox religious community, in 1990, the Jewish Week ran an article about today’s New York Satmar Chasidic community, “notorious for its violent actions against other Jewish groups [which] has imploded into a war against itself. Pitting supporters of the deceased Satmar Rabbi against supporters of his successor … In the Brooklyn area of Williamsburg, home to more than 30,000 Satmars, four cars belonging to one faction were set on fire last week, while as many as 500 Satmars watched and cheered. Three Satmars, in one of the burning cars, needed to be rescued by police, who were also trying to control the Satmar onlookers.” [MARK, J, Satmar]
Satmar violence against others has increasingly spread against non-Jewish neighbors. “Recent years,” wrote Jonathan Mark in 1990, “have seen an explosion of tension between all chasidim and their Black and Hispanic neighbors. Most recently, Hispanic groups have complained that the Satmars act like they have the right of eminent domain over Brooklyn’s Williamsburg neighborhood, where many Satmars reside. They have charged that chasidic men have sexually harassed non-Jewish women, that chasidic security patrols are actually racially motivated vigilantes.” [MARK, SATMAR, p. 4]

In the more overtly political context (and not Orthodox), in an entire book about assassinations (limited only to those deemed “political”) carried out by Jews in Palestine/Israel from 1882 to 1988, Israeli scholar Nachum Ben David itemizes 91 cases of “assassination events” committed by Jews. (An assassination is defined by this author in his title as “a rhetorical device for justice”). Most murder victims were other Jews who were considered “traitors/collaborators/squealers/informers.” [BEN DAVID, p. 418] “We are not dealing with a lone fanatic killer [in these cases],” stresses Ben David, “but with a premeditated planned act, committed by a group or by a representative of a group.” [BEN YEHUDA, p. xxi]

Aside from a possible volume about Jewish gangster murders, no doubt a similar volume could be created about Jewish assassinations under the auspices of Russian communism. Just before, and after, the creation of the Soviet state, assassinations by Jews, in one form or another, sometimes as secret police agents, are many. Mark Zborowsky, for instance, (a later immigrant to America where he became a university professor), in league with fellow Jews Naum Eitingon and Grigory Rabinovich, was instrumental in the operation to murder Trotsky’s son, Lev Sedov. [VAKSBERG, p. 96] Arkady Vaksberg notes another case of Jews murdering Jews:

“The murder of two Jews whom Stalin hated [Efraim Sklyansky and Isiah Khurgin] had been organized by two other Jews, Kanner and Ya- goda. Let us add that Kanner’s assistant, Bombin, and Mekhil’s assistants, Makhovev and Yuzhak, were all Jewish.” [VAKSBERG, p. 28]

In 1904, the Russian Minister of Interior, Vlacheslav Plehve, also fell to a Jewish assassin. [LINDEMANN, A., 1997, p. 296] In 1906, in the Russian town of Grodno, “Jewish partisans assassinated the Russian district commander of police.” In 1908, the chief of police from another town, Bialystok, came to Grodno. This time, “the Jew who tried to shoot him died in prison.” [LACEY, p. 18] In September of 1911 another Jewish assassin, Dmitry Bogrov, shot and killed Pyotr Stolypin, a prominent Russian official, at the Kiev Opera Theatre. [SINGER, N, p. 2] Another Jewish would-be killer, Fanya Kaplan, also shot V. I. Lenin through the neck in a failed assassination attempt in early communist Russia, saying that he had “betrayed the Revolution.” [LEVYTSKY, p. 29] On the same day, “the Cheka leader Uritsky was shot to death in August 1918 by a distinguished Jewish poet and army officer named Kannegiesser who ‘was revolted by the fact that so many of the Bolsheviks were Jewish.’” [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 198]

In 1926, another Jewish assassin, Shalom Schwartzbard, murdered Ukrai-
nian nationalist Symon Petlura, in Paris. (Petlura was in exile from his homeland; he formerly led the Ukrainian army against Bolshevik attack). As noted earlier, a Jewish woman was also a member of the team that assassinated Tsar Alexander II. And, as noted before also, those who directed (and participated in) the murder of the royal family during the Russian Revolution were also largely Jewish. Even in Argentina, “on May Day 1909, during a workers’ demonstration in Buenos Aires, a Jewish anarchist murdered a local police chief,” thereby igniting anti-Jewish rioting. [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 281]

Elsewhere, during the rise of Nazi fascism in Germany, notes Franklin Ford, “paradoxically, during their movement’s first years in power, Nazis were the victims, not the perpetrators of two sensational murders of German’s residing in foreign parts.” [FORD] In 1936 a Nazi official in Switzerland, Wilhelm Gustloff, was assassinated by a Jewish student, David Frankfurter. In 1938 Ernst von Rath, a German embassy official in Paris was killed by Herschel Grynszpan. The Nazis used this act as an excuse to respond with intensified savagery to the German Jewish population. Years earlier, in 1918, long before the Nazis came to power, a Russian Jew, Yakov Blumkin, assassinated the German ambassador to Moscow, Count Mirbach. [SUDOPLATOV, p. 189] Kurt Eisner, the Jewish prime minister of Bavaria, was also assassinated in 1918 by Count Arco Valley, “a young man who felt stigmatized by the fact that his mother was Jewish.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 123]’

As Leon Schapiro notes about late 19th century Russia and the formation of a communist base there:

“When Jews thronged into the party after 1881 the number of Jewish terrorists was very high. There were important Jewish terrorists, like Gershuni, for example, in the socialist revolutionary party which evolved during the present century as the heir of the ‘People’s Will’ … In more recent times one could cite the extensive Jewish participation in the savageries of the Red Terror of the Cheka [the secret police] – or even events in Palestine.” [SCHAPIRO, L., 1961, p. 152]


Also in America, in 1974 Samuel Byck, another Jewish would-be assassin, embarked on a sensationallly bizarre suicidal scheme to kill President Richard Nixon. He murdered a security guard at the Baltimore/Washington airport, stormed into a jet and demanded to the pilots that it take off and follow his orders. His plan was to crash the plane into the White House. Technically unable to accommodate him, Byck murdered the two pilots before he was, in turn, shot and killed by authorities. [CLARKE, J., p. 128-142]

More famous, of course, in Texas, was Jack Ruby (born Jacob Rubinstein), the (Jewish) murderer of Lee Harvey Oswald, the man who is believed to have
killed **John F. Kennedy**. Ruby had interests in six Dallas-area strip-tease clubs. As **Gerald Posner** notes:

“Ruby often resorted to violence with his employees, and lost the tip of his left index fingers when one bit it off during a scuffle. He beat one of his musicians with brass knuckles, cracked another’s head with a blackjack, knocked another’s teeth out, and put the club’s handyman in the hospital with a severe beating. To avoid paying the club’s cigarette girl $50 in back wages, he threatened to throw he down the stairs until she relented her claim … He was not above attacking people from behind, kicking men in the groin or face once he had them to the floor, or even striking women … He was often malicious, forcing beaten victims to crawl out of the club on hands and knees.” [POSNER, p. 357]

Ruby’s killing of Oswald erased his looming testimony, as well as any other person’s or organization’s involvement in the most famous political assassination in American history. “In Dallas, Texas,” noted Jewish scholar **Barnet Litvinoff**, “a man born with the name Rubinstein who subsequently eliminated its Jewish-sounding suffix took it upon himself to avenge the martyrdom of a President. He gave his Jewishness as one of the reasons for doing so.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 18] At Ruby’s trial, Patrick Dean (the police sergeant in charge of security where Oswald was killed) testified that shortly after the shooting he talked to Ruby about what he had just done. One of the reasons Ruby killed Oswald, the killer told him, was “because he wanted the world to know that Jews do have guts.” [BELLI, p. 167] When Kennedy was shot, Ruby was in the advertising offices of the **Dallas Morning News**, troubled by a full page advertisement in that morning’s newspaper. As **Gerald Posner** notes,

“The entire page was a black-bordered advertisement, headed in large block letters, ‘Welcome Mister Kennedy,’ and the text accused the President of being a Communist tool. It was signed by ‘The American Fact-Finding Committee, Bernard Weissman, Chairman. Ruby was very disturbed that the News should have run such a demeaning advertisement and was dismayed that it was signed by someone with a Jewish name.” [POSNER, 1993, p. 371]

Ruby mingled with a variety of underworld figures, and was involved in gun smuggling to Cuba, facts that has fueled in later years a variety of conspiracy theories about who really killed Kennedy. And for what reason. **Jim Marris** notes that

“The smuggling of arms to Cuba was overseen by Norman ‘Roughhouse’ Rothman, a burly associate of Miami’s mob boss Santos Trafficante who managed Trafficante’s Sans Souci in Havana. At the same time Rothman reportedly was splitting Havana slot machines with [Cuban dictator] Batista’s brother-in-law.” [MARRIS, p. 391]

In his 1989 investigation of the Kennedy assassination, Marris also devotes an entire chapter entitled, “Did Ruby and Oswald Know Each Other?,” itemizing the testimony of those who claimed that the two were not strangers to each other. [MARRIS, p. 402-414]
“There were many signs that Ruby wasn’t just a harmless scoundrel,” noted Newsweek in 1993, “and the investigation into his background was remarkably – almost willfully – shallow. FBI agents interviewed hundreds of his acquaintances, but they barely followed up on obvious leads about his underworld friends and his trips to Cuba.” [BECK, p. 94]

While Ruby was locked in prison and sentenced to death for the murder of Oswald, the London Guardian notes that Ruby

“was raving by the end – there was no bigger conspiracy theorist than Jack Ruby. He became convinced America had begun a pogrom against the Jews because of what he, or Oswald, or both of them, had done.” [BYGRAVE] 10
JEWS AND “WHITE SLAVERY”

“[Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion] could hard imagine that Jewish women would stoop to crime or prostitution. When an associate, Meyer Weisgal, who resembled David Ben-Gurion, once told him humorously that a girl had walked up to him on a London street and offered her services, overwhelmed by the idea of sleeping with the ‘Israeli prime minister.’ Ben-Gurion, clearly troubled, was interested in only one thing: ‘Was she Jewish?’”

Dan Kurzman, 1983, p. 39

“I also take a kind of perverse pleasure in the thought that the most important and influential book ever written is the product of Jewish thought ... I call it ‘perverse’ because it is an instance of national pride which I don’t want to feel and which I fight against constantly ... “I remember once a fellow Jew remarking with satisfaction on the high percentage of Nobel Prize winners who were Jewish. I said, ‘Does that make you feel superior?’ ‘Of course,’ he said. ‘What if I told you that sixty percent of the pornographers and eighty percent of the crooked Wall Street manipulators were Jewish? He was startled. ‘Is that true?’ ‘I don’t know. I made up the figures. But what if it were true? Would it make you feel inferior?’ He had to think about that. It’s much easier to find reasons to consider oneself superior than inferior. But one is just the mirror image of the other.’”

Isaac Asimov, 1994, p. 322

‘But where do Jews enter the picture?’ I asked him. ‘Ah!’ said Simon Wiesenthal, slapping his knee. ‘I haven’t told you something else. A few years ago, I have a talk with a man who went to school with Hitler. I ask him what Hitler was like in school and he says, ‘Normal. But maybe this hatred began after he got this infection from a Jewish whore.’ ‘Are you saying that Hitler caught syphilis from a Jewish prostitute?’ I asked incredulously. Wiesenthal laughed and said: ‘What’s the matter? You think only Jews can catch diseases from prostitutes?’ ‘No, but were Jewish prostitutes common in Austria?’ ‘Why not? Is there a Gentile monopoly on prostitution?’ ‘I just don’t see it as a vocation for a nice Jewish girl.’ ‘A nice Jewish girl,’ Simon mimicked. ‘You have those ‘nice Jewish girls’ in Israel, too, these days and they had them in Vienna years ago – when there were more Jews.’

At the end of the 19th and beginning of the twentieth century, Jews were deeply involved in what was popularly called “white slavery”: international prostitution rings. “White slavery,” notes scholar Albert Lindemann, “was a concern of Jewish leaders throughout the world, who recognized it as a special problem.” [LINDEMANN, p. 33] [Jews have also dominated the pornography and commercial sexploitation business, a trend which continues to this day – see Mass Media section (p. 1141)]

“Between 1880 and 1939,” notes scholar Edward Bristow, “the Jews played a conspicuous role in ‘white slavery,’ as the commercial prostitution of that era was dramatically called. Not only was this Jewish participation conspicuous, it was historically unprecedented, geographically widespread, and fraught with collective political dangers.” [BRISTOW, p. 1] “Jewish trafficking,” says Bristow, “was anchored in brothel keeping, women freelanced or kept houses while their husbands procured … Jewish traffickers also supplied Gentile-run houses.” [BRISTOW, p. 56-57]

Rooted largely in Eastern and Central Europe where they “dominated the international traffic out of the area,” [BRISTOW, p. 2] Jews were involved in prostitution rings that networked, wrote Arthur Mora (of London’s Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women) in 1903, to “almost all parts of North and South Africa, to India, China, Japan, Philippine Island, North and South America, and also to many of the countries of Europe.” [BRISTOW, p. 1] Jewish criminals trafficked women under their control virtually anywhere, also including the major cities of Bulgaria, Bosnia, Greece, Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, Ceylon, Manchuria, South Africa, Rhodesia, and Mozambique. [BRISTOW, p. 181]

“By 1900,” says Bristow, “Jewish commercial vice was largely incorporated in underworld elements and many of it participants were predators of the poor.” [BRISTOW, p. 89] Jewish pimps, procurers, and traffickers preyed mostly on non-Jewish women, but even large numbers of Jewish women were part of their stables.

In 1872, for example, Jewish prostitutes in Warsaw numbered 17% of the known prostitution population, in Krakow 27%, and in Vilna 47%. [BRISTOW, p. 23] Within the Jewish community itself, it was not uncommon for recruiters to marry innocent Jewish young women and “deposit them in foreign brothels.” [BRISTOW, p. 25] Many of the Jewish criminal underworld figures apparently saw no gap between their day-to-day activities and their religious lives, often maintaining their religious obligations. A Warsaw thug, Shilem Letzski, organized a small synagogue for Jewish “prostitutes, madams, pimps, and thieves.” This criminal community even had a rabbinical court “to settle disputes between pimps.” [BRISTOW, p. 60] In Constantinople, prostitutes contributed money to “have their pimps called to Torah on holidays.” [SCHNEIDER, p. 225]

In Buenos Aires, Argentina, notes Donna Guy, the Jewish pimp organization called the Varsovia Society
“ostensibly functioned as a mutual aid society … In fact, the Varsovia consisted of pimps who wanted to maintain their business and still lead a religious life … Varsovia associates established their own synagogue on Guemes Street in the midst of the traditional bordello district.” [GUY, p. 22]

Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway notes also, for example, that prominent Jewish American mobster Longy Zwillman “always remained sensitive to his Jewish upbringings.” When a close friend died, and the funeral was conducted in a church, Zwillman refused to attend. As he explained it, he was an ancestral member of the Jewish priest caste (the Cohens) and it was religiously forbidden to him to be with a dead body in a room. [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 30]

Dr. Louis Maretsky, the head of the B’nai B’rith in Germany, forlornly noted in 1912 that at least 271 of 402 prostitution traffickers on a Hamburg police list were Jewish; in reviewing similar lists for Eastern Europe and South Africa at least 374 of 644 were from the Jewish community. [BRISTOW, p. 56] (No mention here is made of even higher possible percentages: as explored later, it has long been a tradition for many Jews in their diaspora to formally change their identifiable Jewish names). Concerning Galicia, Maretsky wrote that “the prominence of Jewish traffickers and brothel operators there is no doubt. From the files of the Austrian and German police there were 111 Jewish traffickers active in Galicia and the neighboring province of Bukovina for 1904-08 alone.” [BRISTOW, p. 56]

By 1889 Jewish women ran 203 of 289 (70%) of the licensed brothels in the “Pale of Settlement” (encompassing over 20 provinces in eastern Poland and western Russia – an area where Jews were about 12% of the population). 1122 of 5127 (22%) licensed prostitutes in this area were Jewish. [BRISTOW, p. 63] The grievous political dangers for local Jewry in the context of enduring inter-ethnic hostilities, when 78% of the rest of the women were Gentile, many indentured in Jewish houses, is obvious.

Further in the West, 16 of 19 licensed brothels in Warsaw were run by Jewish women, prostitutes in the low-class establishments were expected to service 40-50 customers a day, up to 60-70 on Holy Days. (In 1905 the respectable part of the Jewish Warsaw community rioted against the brothels; 40 whorehouses – legal and illegal – were reported destroyed, 8 persons killed, and 100 injured). [BRISTOW, p. 61]

In Mińsk, Jews ran all four legitimate houses of ill repute. In the Russian province of Kherson (which includes the city of Odessa) 30 of 36 licensed brothels were Jewish-owned. The American Consul in Odessa wrote in 1908 that the “whole ‘business’ of prostitution is almost exclusively in the hands of the Jews.” [BRISTOW, p. 56]

Martin Fido notes another genre of Jewish Eastern European profiteer in the prostitution world, in England:

“Latvian ponces accompanied [prostitutes] to help them cross borders and find accommodation and working premises. These men were despised by police and by some of the criminal fraternity for ‘living off immoral
earnings.’ But they were not pimps … They were effectively travel agents, couriers and managers in strange and unfriendly places. Their arrival in London ensured that a major strand of prostitution would be controlled by organized crime. One of these Latvians, Max Kassell, was still running a small stable of hookers in the 1930s, when he was murdered in Soho … Jewish dominance of the East End [of London] and its crime was reflected in their Yiddish name, ‘spielers’ (places for games). In the Brick Lane neighborhood, Isaac Bogard, a Jewish villain whose swarthy complexion and tightly curled black hair earned him the nickname ‘Darky the Coon,’ extended his interests. He began in the early years of the 20th century by supplying muscle for street traders who wanted to prevent newcomers from moving in, but he moved on to managing prostitutes and drinking clubs.” [FIDO, M., 2000, p. 19-20]

Then in London there was Harry ‘Little Hubby’ Distleman, “a Jewish club manager, gambler and possibly part-sharer (with his brother) in a chain of brothels.” [FIDO, M., 2000, p. 31] Jewish author Chaim Bermant noted in the Jewish Chronicle in 1993 that “In the same period (1903-1909), 151 aliens [in Great Britain], most of them Jewish, were convicted for keeping brothels, and 521 for soliciting … Rabbi Avigdor Schonfeld … protested that to draw attention to the existence of Jewish prostitutes harmed the good name of the Jewish people.” [JEWISH CHRONICLE, 1-15-93]

More recently, Jewish singer Eddie Fisher recalls that “while performing in England in the late 1950s I had become friendly with a Jewish song plugger, a man who eventually left the music business to open a very exclusive whorehouse.” [FISHER, E., 1999, p. 293] A little later, there was the infamous Colin Levy:

“In 1973, one of the better-known and more appreciated solo practitioners of that tony [London prostitution] underworld was Norma Levy (nee Mary Russell), an Irish-born prostitute in her mid-twenties whose career ‘on the game’ was being managed by her husband Colin Levy, a petty crook …In 1973, Colin Levy found himself short of money. Aware that one of Norma’s patrons was the celebrated Lord Lambton, he decided to solve his problem with a bit of blackmail. Camera in hand, he lay in wait outside Norma’s bedroom during Lambton’s next visit to her flat. At the appropriate time, at a signal from Norma, he burst into the room. With flashlights popping in his face, the stunned Lambton was frozen on film, in flagrante delicto, for posterity.” [Levy’s blackmail failed, but there was a resultant scandal, including the ethics of newspaper (where Levy tried to sell his photos] that published accounts of the story] [KIERNAN, T., 1986, p. 162]

In Vienna, authorities knew of about 50 Jewish prostitution traffickers based in Czernowitz, “and they were a very inbred lot extending over two generations.” [BRISTOW, p. 74] The most publicized ‘white slavery’ trial occurred in 1892, in Lemberg (once also called Lvov, then a Polish provincial capital, today called Lviv in Ukraine), where 27 traffickers – all Jews – were prosecuted
for ensnaring women to go to Constantinople, Egypt, and India. Some of the women recruits understood their tasks, but others “were maids, others field workers, one a butcher’s helper, all apparently promised honest jobs.” [BRISTOW, p. 74] (Lemberg, “a cradle of Zionism from the 1880s onward,” also had anti-Jewish riots in 1918. [KRAJEWSKI, S., p. 340])

There was a tradition of Yiddish folk songs about Jewish criminal behavior, like this:

“I am Salve, the thief,
Four brothers are we;
One is hungry, the other well fed,
But thieves all four are we.
One is a pickpocket,
The second a pimp, a handsome fellow;
One is a hijacker on the lookout for packages,
And I am a house thief.
A pimp is common,
As all agree:
From his own wife,
He gets the disease
To be a hijacker is bitter:
You can rupture your lung,
It’s hard to earn something with some of the packages,
The best thing is to be a house thief.”[RUBIN, R., 1979]

“In an age of pandemic anti-Semitism,” says Bristow, “a Jewish pimp was a political as well as a social force,” [BRISTOW, p. 4] very emotionally reinforcing anti-Jewish sentiments of the day. Jews were already blamed in central Europe for a financial crash in 1873 and economic competition between Jews and non-Jews was heightening.

A young and enraged Adolf Hitler paid particular attention to the highly visible phenomenon of Jewish street hustling and prostitution rings in Vienna, and was incensed that many non-Jewish women were coerced into the largely Jewish-run trade. “In no other city of Western Europe,” he wrote in *Mein Kampf*, “could the relationship between Jewry and prostitution, and even now the white slave traffic, be studied better than in Vienna … an icy shudder ran down my spine when seeing for the first time the Jew as an evil, shameless, and calculating manager of this shocking vice, the outcome of the scum of the big city.” [BRISTOW, p. 84]

The Jewish prostitution business extended from Europe across the world, where it sometimes overlapped with French, Italian, Chinese, and other rings. In the Punjabi (Indian) capital of Lahore, “Jewish pimps were in the habit of leaving their women penniless only to reappear after workers had accumulated some money.” [BRISTOW, p. 195] In Rio de Janeiro Jewish immigrants from Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Romania were so much identified with prostitution in the late 1800’s that “the kaftan, a Jew’s traditional long gown, became synonymous with pimp.” [BRISTOW, p. 113]
Thirty-nine Jews were expelled from Brazil in 1879 for soliciting women for prostitution and running illegal whorehouses. [BRISTOW, p. 114] Of 199 licensed whorehouses in Buenos Aires in 1909, 102 were run by Jews and more than half the prostitutes were Jewish. [FRIED, p. 71] 4,248 Jewish women were registered for licensed brothels in Buenos Aires between 1880-1913, and those represented only the licensed ones. Edward Bristow estimates that 9,000 Jewish women immigrants came to Brazil in a 25-year span in that era as prostitutes (many were no doubt highly transient), when the total Jewish population of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay combined amounted to less than 60,000 people in 1910. [BRISTOW, p. 119]

In 1889, the Buenos Aires Bulletin Continental reported that 200 German/Austrian women were held against their will by Jewish pimps from Poland. [GUY, p. 5] “Jewish procurers,” says Donna Guy,

“… became an organized ring in major cities all over the world. They were particularly powerful in the Argentine port cities of Buenos Aires and Rosario … [GUY, p. 10] … Turn-of-the-century reports by the Hamburg B’nai B’rith [a Jewish fraternal organization] concluded that most prostitutes in Buenos Aires were Jewish and that traffickers ‘dress with ostentatious elegance, wear large diamonds, go to the theatre or opera daily; they have their own clubs and organizations where wares are sorted, auctioned, and sold … They have their own secret wireless code, are well organized, and– heavens! – in South America everything is possible.” [GUY, p. 19]

“Pooling their financial resources in a kind of guild,” notes another Jewish scholar, Howard Sachar,

“the [Polish Jewish] newcomers [to Argentina] in 1909 controlled slightly more than half the nearly two hundred licensed brothels in Buenos Aires. Jewish women served as their madams, and Jewish immigrant girls often were recruited and lured into their hands as prostitutes.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 283]

In Cuba, Jews “became engaged in the ‘White Slave Trade,’” says Robert Levine, “importing prostitutes – some Jewish – from Poland … Many women recruited to the business had been trapped in the Russian and Polish Pale and throughout the Hapsburg Empire by force or fraud, and the human dilemma was great.” [LEVINE, p. 66]

Incredibly, even in Germany, where Jews have such a horrible history, such Jewish-related problems still bubble beneath the surface. In 1994 a US News and World Report reporter noted the observations of a Frankfort policeman patrolling Precinct 4:

“‘It’s all owned by Jews,’ [Bernd] Gayk says of the train station’s red light district. ‘Practically everything in this area is owned by German Jews. There is a single cabaret here owned by a German, but the rest belongs to the Jews.’” [MARKS, J., p. 42, 44]

Shockingly, even shortly after the Holocaust when there were only a few thousand Jews left in Germany, they remained prominent in the prostitution
business there. In 1961 Rabbi Richard L. Rubenstein interviewed Dean Heinrich Gruber of the Evangelical Church of East and West Berlin. Rubenstein notes that Gruber nearly himself perished in a Nazi concentration camp, and he “had a long and heroic record of opposition to the Nazis on Christian grounds as well as friendship and succor for Nazism’s chief victims [Jews].” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 5] “The problem in Germany is that the Jews haven’t learned anything from what happened to them,” the Dean told a startled Rubenstein, “I always tell my Jewish friends that they shouldn’t put a hindrance in the way our fight against anti-Semitism.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 7] Gruber then complained that “many of the brothels and risqué night clubs, for example, were in Jewish hands, especially those in close proximity to army camps.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 7] And Rubenstein’s response to the clergyman? “Look,” the rabbi said,

“I don’t understand why you are so troubled about a pitifully small number of Jews in shady positions or interested in making money rather than following more edifying pursuits. It seems to me that every person pays a price for the kind of life he or she leads. Why should Germany be upset about a few such Jews unless they are overly involved in other peoples’ lives? Must every Jew make himself so pale, so inconspicuous, even invisible, that he will give no offense to Germans? … After what happened [the Holocaust], why should any Jew remain and worry about German approval?” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 7-8]

Marvin Wolf, a Jewish captain in the U.S. army serving in Germany, recalls that in 1971

“Rabbi David, the Jewish chaplain in Frankfort am Main – and the husband of my mother’s second cousin – told me that he knew several Jewish millionaires at whose homes I would be welcome – but, ‘I’m not crazy about any of them,’ he said. ‘What do you mean?’ I asked. ‘After the war, ‘45, ‘46, Germany was in ruins,’ he explained. ‘Terrible times. Nobody had money except the Occupation forces and a handful of Jews who had survived the camps and got a monthly pension – government reparations. In Frankfort, a few of these Jews recruited starving, desperate German girls and opened brothels. Got their revenge, and got rich, too. They’re in other businesses now, but do you really want to spend Pesach [Passover] with such people?’” [WOLF, M. J., 1998]

In 1909 one Jewish observer, Marcus Braun, estimated there to be 50,000 Jewish immigrant prostitutes in America and 10,000 pimps. (Edward Bristow considers these figures grossly inflated, but notes that one of Braun’s colleagues, echoing at least public feelings about the problem, thought there were up to 100,000 American Jewish women of ill repute.) In any case, the Jewish pimps of New York City (who owned many of the “so-called French” bordellos in the Tenderloin district and “sought to fill them with French prostitutes from abroad”) [BRISTOL, p. 165] had their own official organization: “The New York Independent Benevolent Association.” Frances Kellar, a respected social worker, wrote in 1907 that “the two nationalities who may be said to be central to the disorderly house business in New York [are] French and Jewish … French
houses … are not … to be so much feared as the Jewish … [which are] thoroughly vicious and bad.” [BRISTOL, p. 165] By the turn of the century, “hundreds and hundreds” of Jewish women walked the Lower East Side of New York City as prostitutes. [FRIED, p. 8] Benjamin Altman described the whores he saw on Allen Street: “A hundred women on every … corner. Tall women, short women. Fair women. Ugly women.” [FRIEND, p. 12]

Between November 15, 1908 and March 15, 1909, almost three-quarters of 2,093 prostitute cases before the New York City courts were “native-born” women, “a preponderance,” noted Albert Fried, “who were presumably Jewish.” (Ethnic categories included “Russian” and “Polish,” but not Jewish). [FRIED, p. 8] Of “foreign-born” prostitutes in court, 225 were Jewish, 154 French, 64 German, 31 Italian, 29 Irish, and 10 Polish. [FRIED, p. 8]

“The Jewish pimp,” says Albert Fried, “freely used marriage brokers and unemployment agencies to snare his victims – the young, the lonely, the innocent, the weak, the alienated, the oppressed.” [FRIED, p. 14] Starting out with one whore in 1890, for example, by 1912 Motche Greenberg had a “controlling interest in eight whorehouses and 114 women and was earning $4,000 a month, an incalculable amount by today's standards.” [FRIED, p. 18]

In Chicago, by 1907 Rabbi Emil Hirsch declared that 75% of the “white slavery” in his city was controlled by Jews. [BRISTOW, p. 177] The Jewish periodical the Forward forlornly reported that “the facts that were uncovered at the trial [for corruption] of [police] inspector McCann are horrifying. 75% of the white slave trade in Chicago is in Jewish hands. The owners of most of the immoral resorts on the West Side are Jews. Even in Gentile neighborhoods Jews stand out prominently in the nefarious business.” [FRIED, p. 70]

(Even in 2001, as a result of an undercover police investigation, Joel Gordon (a cantor, i.e., the man who sings liturgical songs and leads prayer in a synagogue) and his wife Alison Greenberg were tried in Chicago for running a brothel. Ginsberg was also charged with acts of prostitution. “We now realize,” said Howard Peritz, a member of Gordon’s synagogue, “that in starting a congregation around a man [Gordon], we were canonizing him.” [JEWISH TELEGRAPHIC AGENCY, 1-5-01] The same year, a synagogue room (Finchley Synagogue’s Kinloss Suite) in Great Britain made the news when it hosted a “stag party with three strippers performing ‘sexually explicit acts.’” Some of the money raised was supposed to go to a Jewish charity.) [ZERDIN, J., 29-01]

In 1987, a Jewish ultra-Orthodox group bought a slaughterhouse in Postville, Iowa, and began hiring illegal non-Jewish aliens from Eastern Europe to do the menial jobs at their company. Despite the fact that only Jews dominated the upper eschelons of the firm, and Jewish author Stephen Bloom’s underscores Jewish exploitation and condemnation of the entire non-Jewish community in his book called Postville, he frames the following in cautiously distancing, apologetic form:

“A woman in her mid-twenties said:] ‘The managers are incredibly rude. One manager fired me because I wouldn’t go to bed with him.’ The translator used the word ‘manager,’ but the woman was most likely speaking of
one of her supervisors, who would have been a Christian. ‘If the manager wants to sleep with you and you do, you get a raise. If you don’t, he makes your life miserable. Girls have no choice.’ No one [of a group of fellow workers] disputed what the woman said.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 138]

In 1932, a few Polish-American officials of the city of Hamtramck (within Detroit) were charged by a grand jury with the “familiar charge of collusion with vice interests for gratuities.” The central player among those convicted was Jewish, Jacob Kaplan, “head of a vice syndicate” who collected $2,000 a month from disorderly houses in the Syndicate.” [WOOD, 1955, p. 53-54] In 1941, the Detroit Free Press listed the names of those involved in another exposed vice ring in the area of Hamtramck, a ring that drew city officials and administrators into its web with bribes and payoffs. The racketeers included “Sam (the Jap) Gross, Hamtramck area brothel operator;” Charles Berman, “charged with operating a vice resort;” Irene Kaplan, “defendant in accusations as brothel keeper;” Ike (Forty Grand) Levy, “vice resort operator;” Kitty (Big Nose) Silverman, “reputed vice resort keeper;” and Jack (alias Jack Jesus) Silverman, “husband of Kitty.” [WOOD, A., 1955, p. 84, 86]

Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway notes the dimensions of Detroit’s all-Jewish Prohibition-era Purple Gang:

“Detroit’s Canadian border and existence of Jewish-owned Canadian distilleries, such as those of Sam and Harry Bronfman [Jewish founders of Seagram], offered opportunities to Detroit’s Jewish gangsters that rivaled bootlegging operations in Chicago and New York. Instead of transporting the liquor themselves, the Purples arranged for the Jewish-dominated ‘Little Jewish Navy’ to bring it across the river for them ... The Gang’s dealings also extended to the sale of stolen diamonds, narcotics and prostitution in Canada.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 2001, p. 113-]

Green Bay, Wisconsin? George Tane, also Jewish, “was a bootlegger who controlled Green Bay, Wisconsin. After Prohibition, he owned all the houses of prostitution in the city.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 214] Atlanta, Georgia? In 2001, Steven Kaplan, owner of the nude “Gold Club,” faced a Federal indictment on counts of “loan sharking, money laundering and bribing police officers.” He was also accused “of building a $50 million fortune in part by providing prostitutes for celebrities ... Atlanta’s Gold Club is one of the most profitable nude clubs in the country.” [COURT TV, 4-30-2001] [See also evidence in this volume – Mass Media 2 Chapter (p. 1213) – about prostitution rackets controlled by today’s “Russian” mafia, which is largely Jewish in organization; Heidi Fleiss (the much-publicized, high-priced Jewish prostitution “madam” to Hollywood stars), famed Jewish prostitute Xaviera Hollander (“The Happy Hooker”), and details of enormous Jewish influence in the worlds of “smut” and pornography]

With the American public beginning to note the high Jewish representation in the prostitution trade; some journalists implied wider corruption. In the June 1909 issue of McClure’s magazine, for instance, George Kibbe Turner wrote:
“Out of the Bowery and Red Light districts have come the new development in New York politics – the great voting power of the organized criminals. It was a notable development not only for New York, but for the country at large. And no part of it was more noteworthy than the appearance of the Jewish dealer in women, a product of New York politics, who has vitiated more than any other single agency the moral life of the great cities of America in the past ten years.” [BELL, p. 187]

“It is an absolute fact,” wrote Ernest Bell in his 1911 book about white slavery, “that corrupt Jews are now the backbone of the loathsome traffic in New York and Chicago. The good Jews know this and feel keenly the unspeakable shame of it.” [BELL, p. 188] “The criminal instincts that are so often found naturally in the Russian and Polish Jew,” wrote Frank Moss in a popular volume called American Metropolis (1897), “come to the surface in such ways as to warrant the opinion that these people are the worst element in the entire make-up of New York City … A large proportion of the people of New Israel are addicted to vice.” [FRIED, p. 55-56]

“Vice and crime did pervade the Lower East Side,” remarks Albert Fried, “and no one knew it more keenly than its residents. The better part of wisdom, so far as they were concerned, was to keep the disgrace quiet, to avoid publicizing it.” [FRIED, p. 59] Meanwhile, in the early 1900’s the National Council of Jewish Women even had Yiddish-speaking volunteers working to keep new female immigrants at Ellis Island “out of the clutches of men (often Jewish) who would try to entice them into prostitution.” [SCHNEIDER, p. 224]

By the early years of the twentieth century, large urban department stores had reputations “as breeding grounds for prostitution.” In New York City, for example, Macy’s fell under suspicion to some, in part for its proximity to a former red light district. In 1913, Percy Strauss, the Vice President of Macy’s, hosted a “vice vigilante” group to investigate his store. “Strauss,” notes William Leach, “no dour Puritan, had a personal interest in leading a campaign against vice. For one thing, as a German Jew and spokesman for the Jewish community, he had to disprove the charge – widely made – that immigrant Jewish women (and many of his own employees, therefore) were more likely than other women to be prostitutes.” [LEACH, p. 117] By 1915 the Committee Against Vice (of which Strauss had conveniently become chairman) published a report that affirmed that Macy’s was “normal.” “On the other hand,” says William Leach, “testimony in the ‘secret reports’ told a different tale. Saleswomen, it was revealed, passed around pornographic cards and poems about themselves, talked openly about ‘sex’ and ‘sex desire,’ and ‘gossiped about fairies,’ as one investigator put it. Private accounts by other investigative reformers echoed this view, that things at Macy’s and in other department stores were hardly ‘normal’ or ‘decent.’ ‘The strongest temptation of girls in department stores,’ warned one reformer, ‘is not poverty but luxury and money.’” [LEACH, p. 118]

Although Jewish poverty was – and is – often argued as a major reason for their high international representation in such a vice, a 1914 League of Nations survey of 25 Jewish prostitutes in Buenos Aires showed that only 4 of them
claimed to be poor before their new trade. Nine, however, stated that their family lives had been “immoral or abusive in some way.” [BRISTOW, p. 95] (As Robert Rockaway notes about the dozens of members in Detroit’s all-Jewish criminal Purple Gang, which was involved in everything from murder to prostitution: “[Purple Gang members] were not products of crushing poverty, broken homes, or widespread economic despair. Most of them had been raised in lower middle class households where the father had a steady, if not well-paying, job.”) [ROCKAWAY, R., 2001, p. 113-]

And what, in complete dismissal of the facts of history, is the common Jewish perspective about the unabashed prominence of Jews in the “white slave trade?” This, in 1998, from Jewish scholar Gary Tobin in a popular Jewish newspaper:

“For those with a knowledge of history of 19th century anti-Semitic propaganda, the idea that Jews are running “the white slave trade” is nothing new. Cartoon like stereotypes of loathsome Jewish villains trading on the lost virtue of non-Jewish maidens was standard material for the Nazis and their precursors … It took a sick mind to imagine that Jews were running the world’s oldest profession.” [TOBIN, Distinguished, p. 51]

Tobin was responding to a very disturbing article in the New York Times (January 11, 1998) which described the horrible situation that Slavic Gentile prostitutes face today, trapped in Israel. As the Times notes, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and a resulting economic chaos, literally hundreds of thousands of Russian and Ukrainian women have been dispersed throughout the world, most entrapped in an international prostitution trade run by the “Russian mafia.” (Although it is certainly inferred, what the Times article does not overtly mention is that a significant part of the Russian mafia is Jewish. See later chapter p. 1087). Glenn Frankel, however, a Washington Post correspondent in Jerusalem, took the perspective in 1994 that “there was much talk about the Russian mafia muscling in [to Israel], although the police and most crime experts agreed that the brothels were almost entirely under the control of the Israeli mafia and that the Russians worked mostly as low-level managers or hookers.” [FRANKEL, p. 175]

“Israel has become a routine destination for the global trafficking of women,” noted Leonard Fein in a 1998 Jewish Bulletin,

“women coerced into prostitution. The thousand such women brought into Israel annually derive principally from the countries of the former Soviet Union, and the way they get to Israel is that they are ‘purchased,’ each one costing between $10,000 and $20,000. And they are, of course, expected to repay the cost to their masters through what amounts to indentured servitude – or, if you prefer the simpler and more straightforward, slavery … Some [are] as young as 15, and even 12 … Each woman earns between $50,000 and $100,000 for her pimp. The turnover of the prostitution trade in Israel comes to some $450 million a year.” [FEIN, 1998, p. 21]
In a country of six million people, this averages about $75 a year paid to a pimp for every man, woman, and child in Israel. There are today 150 brothels and sex shops in Tel Aviv alone. [SILVER, E., 8-25-2000, p. 32]

In an interview with Marina, a Russian prostitute, the (Jewish) *Forward* noted in 1995 that there were nine or ten “Russian” prostitution rings in Israel. “Girls are regularly beaten to keep them obedient,” Marina told the *Forward*, “… [The Israeli police are] regularly paid off with free visits to our girls. A reporter like you thinks you’re picking up a stone from the road, but you might find you’re digging into a mountain.” [SHILLING, p. 5] As a report by *Israel’s Women’s Network* noted in 1997:

“Every year, hundreds of women from the former Soviet Union are lured to Israel, gaining entry by posing as immigrants, on the promise of finding lucrative jobs, and then are lured into prostitution by abusive pimps.” [GROSS, N., 1997, p. 16]

In 1998, Hungary’s Consul in Tel Aviv, Andrea Horvath complained that four Hungarian women “had allegedly met their Israeli employer in a Budapest discotheque. They were hired as dancers but were later forced to provide sexual services as well.” [MTI, 3-20-98] In 2000, Robert Friedman, in talking about his book about the “Russian Mafia,” noted Semion Mogilevich, head of a major Jewish mobster network, noting him as “one of the world’s biggest traffickers in women, Eurasian women.” [PENKLAVA, M., 5-3-2000]

“Women are sold into the sex business in Israel for between $5,000 and $15,000,” reported the *Jerusalem Post* in 1998, “while the pimps who buy them can earn between $10,000 and $50,000 a year per woman … 2,000 women are brought to Israel from the CIS and forced by pimps to work as prostitutes. Many are brought here on false pretenses and held against their will.” As Ira Omait, head of the Haifa Emergency Shelter for Women told the *Post*, “We are fast heading in the direction of trade in minors for prostitution and slavery.” [COLLINS, L., 12-15-98, p. 5] Incredibly, as noted in a *Jerusalem Post* editorial in 1998, “According to the Women’s Lobby [a women’s group in Israel], part of the [prostitution] problem is that there is no law against slavery in Israel.” [JERUSALEM POST, 1-13-98, p. 10]

“Poor Women of Ex-Soviet Union Lured Into Sex Slavery” headlined a 1998 *Associated Press* story. Women forced into prostitution in Israel, noted the article, were locked in rooms and provided only food and condoms. And Israeli law on the subject? In 1996 150 men were arrested for pimping or running brothels. Merely 21 cases went to trial, and no one was ever convicted of a crime. [LINZER, D., 6-13-98] In 1998 an Israeli judge even ordered an insurance company to pay for a client’s prostitution addiction:

“An Israeli insurance company has been ordered to pay 300,000 shekels ($80,000) to fund the prostitution habit of a man injured in a car accident.” [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 4-22-98]

The man claimed that since a 1993 car crash he couldn’t form relationships with women and relied on the prostitution world.

The 1998 *New York Times* article noted that more than 1,500 Slavic prosti-
tutes – mostly from the Ukraine – have been deported from Israel for residence infractions in the past three years. (Israeli oppression knows no end: “Unlike many countries, Israel does not pay airfare for deportees.” [LINZER, D., 6-13-98]) Prostitution is not illegal in Israel and clients include foreign workers, “Israeli soldiers with rifles on their shoulders,” business executives, and tourists. The Times noted that

“The networks trafficking women run east to Japan and Thailand, where thousands of young Slavic women now work against their will as prostitutes, and west to the Adriatic Coast and beyond … The routes are controlled by Russian gangs based in Moscow … In Ukraine alone … as many as 400,000 women under 30 have gone in the past decade … Israel is a fairly typical destination … Police officials [in Israel] estimate that there are 25,000 paid sexual transactions every day. [This in a country with a population of 6 million]. Brothels are ubiquitous … Once they cross the border [into Israel] their passports will be confiscated [by pimps], their freedoms curtailed and what little money they have taken from them at once … The Tropicana, in Tel Aviv’s bustling business district, is one of the busiest bordellos. The women who work there, like nearly all prostitutes in Israel today, are Russian. Their bosses, however, are not. ‘Israelis love Russian girls,’ said Jacob Golan, who owns this and two other clubs, ‘…. They are blonde and good looking and different than us … And they are desperate. They are ready to do anything for money.” [SPECTER, p. 1]

“The situation,” wrote Jewish author David Weinberg in an 1998 article about prostitution in Israel entitled Not So Holy Land, “is enough to make you cry in despair, or vomit from shame.” [WEINBERG, D., 1-18-98, p. 8]
THE JEWISH COSMOLOGY OF VICTIMHOOD (PART 1)

“I have frequently had hotheaded romantics assume that our family fled Russia to escape persecution. They seem to think that the only way we got out was by jumping from ice flow to ice floe across the Dnieper River, with bloodhounds and the entire Red Army in hot pursuit. No such thing. We were not persecuted and we left in a quite legal manner with no more trouble than one would expect from any bureaucracy, including our own. If that’s disappointing, so be it.”


Ask any non-Jewish American what his or her personal link is to the Roman era, the Dark Ages, the Middle Ages, and other epics of human history and he will tell you: nothing. He knows nothing about it. And he doesn’t care. For such a late twentieth century American to reflect on his own roots back to, say, medievalism, is to look with the naked eye for Mars: it is a vague dot, reputed by others to exist, in the remotest distance. Indistinct. Unfathomable. Something eternally elusive, lost forever.

Few Americans can trace their family history more than a few generations, if that. Throughout anyone’s own ancestral lineage, however, going back deeply into time, there obviously exists their own share of participants – as both perpetrators and victims – in great and minor wars, massacres, invasions, famines, epidemics, and other disasters of every kind. Presuming five procreative generations per century, exponentially, any human being alive today can theoretically claim direct genetic lineage to over a thousand ancestors back to 1800, over 37,000 people to 1700, over a million back to the year 1600, and over a staggering billion human beings back to 1400 (thirty generations). Whatever the mathematically realistic number, (and Jewish history claims 4,000 years) the deeper we go back into history, the more we must consider the veritable Milky Way of humanity that preceded us in direct ancestral lineage; people of every imaginable sort, and they all knew well the melancholic chords of human suffering, sometimes subtly, sometimes brutally. Every single one of them.

Today’s Americans of French, British, Italian or other European descent find themselves today lumped together in the generic “white” American community. Their respective ancestries are stirred together, gone. Their European origins mean little to them; they are homogenized in the New World, their identities now expressed – for better or worse – in the icons of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Billy the Kid, Babe Ruth, the hallowed Constitution,
even McDonald’s hamburgers, or other superficial national icons that ancestrally have nothing directly to do with them.

The typical American’s alienation, disinterest, and lack of connection to distant history is not characteristic of modern Jews. On the contrary. A stone thrown in spite through a Jewish window in Italy in the fourteenth century is a stone thrown into Jewish hearts today. The actions against Jews by desperate thugs in Poland in the eighteenth century are dumped on Gentile doorsteps in our time by Jews who are still grieving, still embittered, still seeking redress. And when we turn, in more recent history, to the bestial deeds of Adolf Hitler to conquer the world, we find that Jews have pulled tightly in a circle to proclaim that everything sinister in the whole world malevolently labors against them, and them only.

Ultimately, it is a central article of modern Jewish faith – reflecting both secular and religious attitudes, formed and hardened over the ages – that to be Jewish is to be always maltreated for innocence by others. Or, perhaps more correctly to Jewish eyes, as part of this innocence, being Jewish is to be a victim for the crime of being superior to their persecutors. This claim to superiority was originally religiously based, as God’s “Chosen People” of Old Testament tradition. And this Jewish preoccupation – as being victims of their self- presumed superiority – has been passed down, religiously, over the ages (traditionally epitomized in Jewish pilgrimage to Jerusalem’s Wailing Wall to bemoan their communal fate, manifest also in the likes of the volume Sefer Yosifon, anonymously compiled in the tenth century as a litany of Jewish complaints and miseries). In the aftermath of Hitler’s atrocities against Jews during World War II, this world-view has come to define, more tightly than any other aspect of Jewish tradition – and now highly politicized – modern Jewish self-identity.

But is this true? From the evidence we have already seen, are Jews correctly depicted as history’s consummate, incomparable, and innocent victims? Have Jews preeminently and collectively suffered more than all other human beings, “victims of centuries of persecution and bigotry?” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 378] And for no reason?

In the American context, “one commonly finds a sentence like this in many [Jewish] books or articles,” says Joshua Rothenberg, “… ‘Jews came to the shores of this country from the ghettos of the shtetlekh [Eastern European Jewish villages] as a result of the pogroms.’ Each phrase in this sentence is untrue or oversimplified to the point of untruth. There were no ghettos in 19th century Eastern Europe (except in the metaphysical sense) … And the pogroms were not the principal reason for emigration: proportionately more Jews came to the United States from Austrian-ruled Galicia – where there were no pogroms – than from Tsarist Russia.” [ROTHENBERG, p. 3]

“It has been discovered,” says Henry Feingold, “that religious persecution, even its physical manifestations of pogroms, rarely furnishes sufficient impetus for Jews to uproot themselves. Moreover, it cannot account for the thousands of Jews who chose to leave areas relatively free of religious persecution … [FEINGOLD, p. 60] … Historians have taken a closer look at the early accultur-
nation process and have discovered that the highly touted ability of the Jewish family to withstand the stresses of transplantation have been overstated. New studies on Jewish vice and crime and criminality and the discovery of a relatively high divorce and desertion rate among immigrant Jews present a picture of a community paying a dear price for establishing itself.” [FEINGOLD, p. 61]

“The lachrymorose recollection of the shtetl, which are still with us,” says Daniel Bell, “fail to recall its narrowness of mind, its cruelty, especially to schoolchildren (to whom a whole series of memoirs, such as Solomon Ben Maimon’s, testify), and its invidious stratification.” [BELL, Reflections, p. 318] Little remembered is this oppression of Jews by Jews. “Prior to World War I,” adds Rothenburg, “the Kehilah [Jewish governing bodies] were ruled, in most cases, by an oligarchy of the rich and the [Jewish] clergy. Their excesses, especially in the area of indirect taxation (kosher meat, etc.) and the silencing of the protesting voices of the poor, are well-known and documented. The Kehilahs remained a source of bitter complaint for the majority of the Jewish population, which had no say in the conduct of their own community affairs.” [ROTHENBURG, p. 5]

American Jews today hold dear many nostalgic “Fiddler on the Roof”-type myths about their Eastern European ancestors. As, however, Jewish author Ivan Kalmar notes

“A stalwart Jewish peasant, with a native wit and a naive religiosity, ever sturdy in the face of unending adversity, he is the epitome of Jewish nostalgia … The Fiddler is so much part of the way we think of our Jewish background … The Fiddler image has some basis in reality, but it is also very much part of a nostalgic reconstruction of our past, an example of what anthropologists call ‘invention of tradition’ … Jewish authors [like Sholem Aleichem, creator of Fiddler on the Roof] tried to create stereotypes of the Jews that would identity them with less wealthy groups who were looked at more favourably by the greater society. Sholom Aleichem’s Tevye [hero of Fiddler on the Roof] is very much a Ukrainian peasant. To counter the idea of the Jew as a ‘parasite,’ Sholom Aleichem presents Tevye as a dairy farmer, who sells not the Gentile peasant’s products but his own. North American Jews have enthusiastically accepted the validity of Sholom Aleichem’s Tevye as a metaphor for the Eastern European Jew of old … Where finally Tevye finally shows unique character, he turns out to be a modern Jew. Where he is being a ‘typical,’ folksy, traditional East European Jew, he resembles the romanticized Ukrainian peasant … Of course, there were in reality Jewish peasants like Tevye, but compared to the Slavs, the percentage of Jews who farmed was miniscule.” [KALMER, I., quoted by PRYTULAK, L., UKRAINIAN ARCHIVES]

“Having … turned their backs on Poland,” notes Jewish scholar Victor Seidler about modern Jewish perceptions of Eastern European heritage, “it can be difficult for the second generation [of Jews in America] to recognize just how Polish their parents were. Things we learned to think of as ‘Jewish’ turn out to
be Polish.” [SEIDLER, V.J., 2000, p. 74] “Indeed,” notes George Mosse, “when the first German-Jewish painter, Mortiz Oppenheim, painted scenes from the ghetto shortly after emancipation, it was transformed, as we have seen, into a community permeated with German middle-class values.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 80]

Jewish author Howard Jacobson notes Jewish historic myth-making at an exhibition of photographs of Eastern European Jews at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. Particularly troubling to him was the depiction of the stereotypically “studious Jew”:

“Something is wrong with this exhibition. Something is wrong with the way we modern Jews idealize a past we wouldn’t touch with a bargepole if it were offered us again … Why is Jewish study always made to look so soulful in these sorts of photographs, so unrelieved, so unvaried, so fucking miserable and desolating? What is it about Jewish books that make absorption in them such an invariably heart-rendering business? What a sell! How have the Jews done it, how have we persuaded ourselves, but gentiles as well, that anguish and lamentation and self-abnegation and bodilessness and pathos attach inalterably and exclusively to our studies? You don’t see [St. Thomas] Aquinas looking into a book like that.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 192-193]

The distinguished Jewish historian, Salo Baron, of Columbia University, whose twelve-volume Social and Religious History of the Jews is the most extensive Jewish history by a single author in existence, argued a view that, post-Holocaust, has been swept to the wayside by modern Jewish discourse. His view was that Jewish suffering in the European Middle Ages, and throughout history, has been exaggerated. That is, that the Jews of Europe, as a group, in comparison to their Christian neighbors, actually had a better life in the Middle Ages, to the 20th century. For all the claims of massacres and pogroms, according to surviving documents, the Jewish population actually grew more rapidly than the Gentiles around them. [LIBERLES, p. 42] This accelerated in later centuries. “The two and a half centuries from 1660 to 1914,” says Baron, “the Jewish population grew numerically some fifteen times … while mankind at-large increased by only 250 per cent, Europe by 350 per cent …” [BARON, H and J.H., p. 50] This thesis, addressing later years, is supported by a non-Jewish scholar of the Ukraine, Orest Subtleny:

“Throughout the nineteenth century, especially in its latter part, the Jews experienced a tremendous population rise. Between 1820 and 1880, while the general population of the [Russian] empire rose by 87%, the number of Jews increased by 150%. On the Right Bank, this rise was even more dramatic: between 1844 and 1913 the number of its inhabitants rose by 265% while the Jewish population increased by 844%! Religious sanctions of large families, less exposure to famines, war, and epidemics, and a low mortality rate because of communal self-help and the availability of doctors largely accounted for this extraordinary increase.” [SUBTLENY, p. 276]
Salo Baron argued that his people, the Jews, were so privileged, relative to non-Jews throughout the European Middle Ages, that with the coming of the Enlightenment era “emancipation” and “equality” amounted to “a net loss [to Jews] in status and life-style.” [SCHORSCH, p. 383] Elsewhere, he wrote that “it is likely … that even the average medieval Jew, compared to his average Christian contemporary … was the less unhappy and destitute creature – less unhappy and destitute not only by his own consciousness, but even if measured by such objective criteria as standards of living, cultural amenities, and protection against individual starvation and disease.” [LINDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 11]

“Throughout the Middle Ages,” notes David Biale, “the Jews enjoyed considerable influence in many of the lands in which they lived … In addition to their interest Court politics, these Jews participated in political life in defense of Jewish interests.” [BIALE, POWER p. 69] “The situation of the Jews in the first half of the Middle Ages,” says Abram Leon, “was … extremely favorable. The Jews were considered as being a part of the upper classes in society and their juridical position was not perceptibly different from that of the nobility.” [LEON, p. 128] “At least some of the Jewish dress of the Middle Ages,” adds Biale, “such as the Jewish hat, originated out of choice rather than compulsion … The yellow patch [worn by Jews] … was not originally intended as an instrument for segregating and humiliating the Jews … but to proclaim publicly that its wearer enjoyed official protection.” [BIALE, POWER, p. 67]

One of the privileges Jews enjoyed throughout Europe until relatively modern history was that they didn’t have to serve in the local military organizations. “During the continuous wars of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries,” wrote Baron, “… the Jews were neutral and suffered few losses. If they had been combatants they might have lost more than in all the pogroms.” [LIBERLES, p. 42] Yet Medieval Jews were allowed the extremely significant privilege of carrying weapons, a privilege equal to knights and one to which all commoners (the overwhelming majority of the population) were forbidden. [GOLDBERG, p. 123] Baron also noted that, while there were certainly Jews who suffered poverty, the surrounding Christian population was worse off. And if the Jewish ghettos were, as widely claimed, abject holes of enforced degradation, “is it not remarkable that the most typical Ghetto in the world, the Frankfurt Judengasse, produced in the pre-Emancipation period the greatest banking house in history?” [LIBERLES p. 45]

“The Jews,” says Israel Shahak,

“in spite of all the persecution to which they were subjected, formed an integral part of the privileged classes … Jewish historiography, especially in English, is misleading on this point inasmuch as it tends to focus on Jewish poverty and anti-Jewish discrimination … The poorest Jewish craftsman, peddler, landlord’s steward, or petty cleric was immeasurably better off than a serf [most of the non-Jewish population]. This was especially true in those European countries where serfdom persisted until the nineteenth century, whether in a partial or extreme form: Prussia, Austria (including Hungary), Poland, and the Polan
lands taken by Russia. And it is not without significance that, prior to
the beginning of the great Jewish migration of modern times (around
1889), a large majority of all Jews were living in those areas and that their
most important social function there was to mediate the oppression of
peasants on behalf of the nobility and the Crown.” [SHAHAK, p. 52-53]

Jews in Eastern Europe understood the people around them as, categorically,
persecutors. And “the Jews saw their persecutors as an inferior race,” noted World
Zionist Organization President Nahum Goldmann, “Most of my [physician]
grandfather’s patients [in Lithuania] were peasants. Every Jew felt ten or a hun-
dred times the superior of these lowly tillers of the soil; he was cultured, learned
Hebrew, knew the Bible, studied the Talmud – in other words he knew that he
stood head and shoulders above these illiterates.” [GOLDMANN, 1978, p. 13]

“It would never have occurred to us,” said one Jewish immigrant to the
United States, “that the Gentile world [in Eastern Europe] was happier … On
the contrary, we considered our world happier and finer.” “We thought they
were unfortunate,” says another, “We were above them, this was the feeling
[towards peasants].” [MORAWSKA, p. 17] In the face of the commonly cher-
ished belief among modern Jews that their brethren of Eastern Europe were ter-
rribly and uniformly impoverished, it is a fact that Jews were doing so well
(relative to the non-Jews around them) that non-Jewish servants in Jewish
households were common.

Apart from racist folk tales, Zborowski and Herzog note that most Jewish
children in Eastern Europe learned fragments of the surrounding non-Jewish
culture via the Gentile servants in their homes. “These impressions [of non-
Jewish life],” the scholars write, “[were] available not only to the children of the
rich, for [Jewish] women of modest circumstances who worked in a store or at
the market often had the help of a [non-Jewish] peasant girl in the house.”
[ZBOROWSKI, p. 155] “[Jewish life] was certainly better than the life of the
Russian peasant,” remarks Howard Sachar. [SACHAR, p. 215]

“Even when the Jewish common people were known to be desperately
poor,” adds Albert Lindemann, “as in Austrian Galicia or parts of the Jewish
Pale of Settlement in tsarist Russia, their overall per capita wealth still seems to
have been greater than that of non-Jews, mostly peasants, among whom they
lived.” [LINDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 21] “On the whole,” says sociologist Stephen
Steinberg, “Eastern European Jews [prior to immigration to America in the late
nineteenth century] were unquestionably poor, though decidedly better off
than the surrounding peasant population.” [STEINBERG, p. 97]

What, one wonders, is to be read between this relativity of being “poor?”
How poor could Jews have really been if they were “decidedly better off” than
the non-Jewish peasants (who were most of the Eastern European population),
even hiring Polish servants for their homes?

Another part of Jewish popular mythology is that the Jews were forced
against their will into ghettos in Europe. The widely-believed accusation that
Jews were forcibly segregated, particularly into ghettos, is a distortion of his-
torical fact. In the Middle Ages most Christian towns themselves had walls, gates,
and locks for protection from outsiders. The enclosed Jewish ghetto was, in origin, a Jewish construction, conceived for both protection and self-segregation from the taint of non-Jewish ways.

“In the thirteenth century,” writes Max Weinrich, “segregated living quarters for Jews were made compulsory. The fact of the matter is that separate Jewish streets had existed all along … If the Jews lived together long before segregated living quarters were imposed upon them, then their segregation must have been voluntary. It was. Living apart, no matter how bizarre it may appear in the light of present day concepts and attitudes, was part of the ‘privileges’ accorded to the Jews in conforming with their own wishes.” [WEINRICH, p. 105]

As president Nachum Goldmann of the World Zionist Organization notes:

“It is wrong to say that the goyim forced the Jews to separate themselves from other societies. When the Christians defined the ghetto limits, Jews lived there already.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 66]

For centuries Jews isolated themselves from their surrounding non-Jewish neighbors except, of course, for the necessities of commerce. “Had the Jews not possessed a deep-rooted conviction of the truth of their religion,” says Jacob Katz, “and had they not actively sought to maintain their separate identity, the tendencies inherent in medieval conditions would inevitably have ended by breaking down the social barrier erected by Jewish ritual.” [KATZ, Ex, p. 40] “In Orthodox Judaism,” wrote anthropologist Maurice Fishberg in 1911, “a Jew must not eat at the same table with a Gentile, nor any food prepared by the latter; must not eat or drink from dishes, with spoons, forks, knives, etc. which have been used by a Gentile; must not drink wine with the container of which has been touched by a Christian, Mohammedan, or heathen … I know Jews to feel nauseated and even vomit when told that the food they have consumed was not kosher. … It was the intense tribal spirit engendered by his religion which kept the Jew from intimate contact with the Gentiles, more than the laws promulgated by Christian states for the purpose.” [FISHBERG, p. 536]

“We [Jews] formed the ghetto ourselves,” wrote the Zionist leader Vladamir Zabotinsky, “… voluntarily, for the same reason for which Europeans in Shanghai established their separate quarter, to be able to live their own way.” [KORBANSKI, p. 8] “The Ghetto was rather a privilege than a disability,” notes J. O. Hertzler, “and sometimes was claimed by the Jews as a right when its demolition was threatened.” [HERTZLER, p. 73] Boas Evron cites the work of fellow Israeli scholar, Yehezkel Kaufmann, in noting that

“the popular assumption that external anti-Jewish pressures forced group identity and exclusivity on the Jews is unconvincing, since historical evidence shows that Jewish exclusivity and aloofness preceded outside hostility and were thus its cause, not its result … Jewish communities were always borne by host societies … They never shared in political, military, administrative, or technological responsibilities.” [EVRON, p. 53]

In articles in 1928 and 1932, Cecil Roth, one of the foremost Jewish scholars of his day, set out to debunk the Jewish myths of incessant persecution by non-
Jews through the ages. “In the first place,” wrote Roth, “…. the Jew has always tended to regard as a martyr all persons who died at Gentile hands … even if he died in a drunken brawl … All those [Jews] who met a violent end, no matter under what circumstances, were included under the head of martyrs in the Jewish popular consciousness and recollection.” [ROTH, Most, p. 136-137]

This martyr tradition and schema has even been outrageously used, quite the same, with the identical religious base, in Orthodox Jewish messianic political quarters in our own day. Baruch Goldberg, the American-born Orthodox Israeli doctor who murdered 29 Arabs with an automatic weapon this decade as they prayed in a Hebron mosque, and who was subsequently beaten to death, was proclaimed by some Jews to be kadosh. (This word is commonly translated as meaning “holy;” it also has connotations meaning “separate” or “apart.”) “A Jew who is killed because he is a Jew,” wrote Dov Leor (a rabbi for the messianic Gush Emunim organization) about Goldberg’s violent death, “must certainly be called … a holy martyr … without investigating their previous conduct.” [LEOR, p. 61] “Baruch Goldstein was the greatest Jew alive,” declared a Jerusalem teacher, Samuel Hacohen, “not in one way, but in every way … There are no innocent Arabs here, and thank God that one Jewish hero reminded us that it had become almost legal to kill Jews in the street. He is the only one who could do it, the only one who was 100 percent perfect. He was no crazy … Killing isn’t nice, but sometimes it is very necessary.” Rabbi Yaacov Perin also announced at Goldberg’s funeral that “One million Arabs are not worth a Jewish fingernail.” [BROWNFELD, A., 3-99, p. 85]

A 1908 pamphlet, notes Cecil Roth, was widely circulated in the Jewish community under the title, Jews Hanged or Burned Alive in Rome…. Because They Refused to Change Their Faith. Of the hanged Jews listed, all but one were in fact executed for specific crimes, a harshness rendered no differently to any other people of past eras. “This instance,” says Roth, “…. is symptomatic of the attitude which Jewish historiography has consistently adopted. Any popular attack or any governmental persecution in which Jews were victims is set down outright as an expression of anti-Semitic sentiment.”

In another example, in 1278, on charges of money clipping [skimming gold or silver content from coinage], 267 Jews were hanged in London. This punishment was not merited out to Jews as Jews, but to those who were disproportionately “in possession of the greater amount of ready money.” Those who accumulated money in the Jewish money-lending and usury era happened to be overwhelmingly Jews, but also included a lesser number of Christian goldsmiths and such who were similarly arrested and executed. “What seems at first blush,” says Roth, “[to be] an act of sheer persecution appears in a closer examination one of primitively sharp justice.” [ROTH, p. 137]

In the early years of Christianity, in Alexandria (of today’s Egypt), attacks upon Jews rendered in Jewish historical consciousness as acts of anti-Semitism were really what Roth says today would be called “an interracial riot.” [ROTH, p. 138]
Roth underscored the precarious existence of all peoples’ lives in the Middle Ages:

“The modern reader frequently fails to realize that, generally speaking, life in the Middle Ages was not secure. For every section of the population the probabilities of meeting a violent death were high, even in times of comparative peace. Country people were continually subject to the onslaught of bandits or of lawless barons, as well as the marchings and counter marchings of armed forces. [Even] city dwellers … [ran] the risk of sack and wholesale murder. The whole of medieval, and a great part of modern, history is studded with instance of the sort: the devastation of Attila, the Scourge of God; the ravaging of the Vexin by William the Conqueror; the sack of a score of German cities during the Thirty Years War. There were frequently cases when only a minority of the population survived, the vast majority being piteously massacred. These events and their like should be borne in mind when one considers the vicissitudes of any particular racial or religious minority. The scarlet of Jewish persecution does not stand out on a ground of virginal white. [ROTH, p. 138]

In medieval Poland, says Bernard Weinryb, “In an epoch and a country where most of the time people were in danger of attacks by Tatars and Turks, of wars, soldiers, and robber gangs on the roads, insecurity became the normal way of life for people who had never known anything different.” [WEINRYB, p. 159]

The miseries caused by the sack of Rome in 1527, Christian crusades against Muslim-controlled Jerusalem in 1096, Leon in 1197, Malaga in 1487, Naples in 1494, Padua in 1509, Tunis in 1535, or “a hundred other occasions” were at least equivalent tragedies to Jewish descriptions of “Jewish martyrdom.” [ROTH, p. 138]

“It is probably the fact,” says Roth, “that in the course of the medieval wars and disorders, the Jews normally suffered more than any other section of the population. This was not necessarily, however, because they were Jews, but simply because they belonged to the more opulent class … on the capture of a town (by an army), the first objective of the assailants would naturally be the streets of the goldsmiths and the street of the Jews.” [ROTH, p. 139]

Likewise, Jews – perceived as affluent and exploitive outsiders to native populations – suffered the same way at the hands of mobs as did Italian traders in London in 1439 and 1455, and at the “Hansa Steelyard” in 1494. Jews were also subject to random “acts of rapine,” like any Christian – or other community – of the Middle Ages, as happened in the Jewish part of Asolo, in northern Italy, in 1547. Perpetrators in that case were punished by the central government.

While Jews were sometimes required to wear special badges of identification in the European Middle Ages, it was a norm of discrimination for the era. Muslims also had to wear such marks of “outsider” distinction in Christian societies. Conversely, in the Muslim world, Christian communities were also faced with such laws and legislation of discrimination, sometimes even in clothing. And of
course Jewish law itself has various nomenclature and attendant rules for treatment of various categories of non-Jews as second-class, or worse, people. (Even in modern Israel, Arabs are discriminatorily noted as such on national identity cards).

“Some current histories,” said Roth in 1932, “appear to assume the Jews were sole victims of the Spanish Inquisition … Strictly, this is so far from the truth that a precise might retort that [the Jews] never came under the [Inquisition’s] scope, save in exceptional cases, since the activities were essentially confined to [Christian] apostates and renegades.” [ROTH, p. 141] Those “Jews” who risked trouble were those among the Marranos/Conversos, who disingenuously represented themselves as Christians and were thereby subject to the same scrutinization for religious conformance as that directed upon any other Christian. Widely targeted were Christian heretics, not the Judaic faith. As M. Hirsh Goldberg notes,

“Contrary to popular belief, Jews who openly remained Jews were not tortured or killed as part of the inquisition proceedings. The Inquisition was specifically authorized by the Church to root out heresy among Catholics, so only heretical Christians and Jewish converts to Christianity accused of secretly reverting to Judaism were prosecuted.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1979, p. 16]

“The Inquisition,” notes Joachim Prinz,

“is considered one of the many traumatic experiences of Jewish history, and as such, it is always spoken of with dread. But, of course, the Inquisition had no power over Jews at all. It was established for the purpose of dealing with Christians who had deviated from their faith. The Marranos who were called into account for their secret practices appeared not as Jews but as allegedly heretical Christians … No unconverted Jews were ever called to the tribunals.”[PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 44]

“Living under the Inquisition,” adds Goldberg in another volume,

“caused Jews to make some curious adjustments, as can be seen in the family of Manoel Pereira Coutinho, who had five daughters – all nuns in a convent in Lisbon – while in Hamburg his sons were living openly as Jews.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 109]

“All Jews know about the Inquisition,” wrote David Goldstein, a Jewish apostate, “but of Jewish [-perpetrated] injustices they know hardly anything.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 117] “The name of Torquemada,” wrote Jewish author John Cournos in 1937, “the loathsome Grand Inquisitor, was a byword among us children, as it was in other Jewish households.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 117] This view that the Inquisition somehow centered on Jews still remains widespread in the community today, as proclaimed in a 1990 issue of the American Jewish Congress magazine devoted to the subject of Jewish identity. Ignoring the Christian target groups of the heresy trials, Zvi Bekarman remarked that “The Inquisition is brought to us as one more proof of the suffering of the Jews.” [BEKERMAN, p. 14]

Despite all the Jewish lamenting of pogroms and massacres upon their
ancestors, the Catholic-Protestant massacre of St. Bartholomew’s Day in the 1500’s was as spectacularly horrible as any Jewish medieval misfortune to that time. Nor, adds Roth, “was persecution of the Jews in its acutest form [ever] systematic.” (The later World War II Holocaust scenario, which of course was systematic, will be addressed later at length in its own chapter).

Jews were often blamed for the epidemic of the Plague and the Black Death that swept Europe in the Middle Ages (while Jewish communities were relatively free from the disease, [HERTZLER, p. 95] but such causal connection to medieval minds was not to the detriment of Jews only. Non-Jews were also accused of, and murdered for, causing the Plague in Palermo in 1526, in Germany in 1530, 1545, and 1574, at Casale Monferrat in 1536, and other places throughout Europe. In Breslau, in 1349 sixty Jews were executed for having caused a town fire, “but,” says Roth, “when one recalls that 300 years afterwards the Great Fire of London was [blamed upon] the Papists, one realizes that the Jews had no monopoly on unjust accusations.” [ROTH, p. 144]

Jewish communities themselves had irrational superstitions to scapegoat others and to explain disease and other misfortunes. Says Zborowski and Herzog:

“If an epidemic strikes the shtetl, prayers are, of course, offered up. Other steps consist chiefly in marrying off two orphans or cripples, so that God will be mollified by the good deeds of the worshippers… Whenever there was an epidemic in the shtetl they used to blame it on peoples’ sins. They tried to find the guilty ones and expose them to the public … Another method for getting rid of an epidemic was to get two orphans if possible and to marry them off on the cemetery …” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 224]

Throughout Europe, “it was…. dangerous to be an old woman in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries” when witch hunts put 100,000 unfortunates on trial for sorcery in Germany alone. [ROTH, p. 145] Some 30,000 such victims are reputed to have been burned alive or torn to pieces in England, and over a two hundred year period in Scotland, an average of two hundred “witches” were burned at the stake each year. Throughout Europe gypsies were sporadically singled out for persecution and blame, and various Christians and other non-Jews from time to time were executed for the charge of cannibalism.

Lest modern Jews feel too smug in the brutal superstitions of the ancient Gentiles, the Talmud itself notes an instance when eighty Jewish women were hung at one time at the instigation of a fellow Jew, “Simeon the Son of Shetach,” in Ashkelon for the crime of being witches. [HARRIS, p. 174] When coming across a witch, the Talmud recommends that the passerby “should mutter thus, ‘May a potsherd of boiling dung be stuffed in your mouths, you ugly witches!’” [HARRIS, p.189] Some rabbis even opined that a witch may be either male or female, but “most women are witches.” [HARRIS, p. 190] Even “the best among women,” said Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai, “is a witch.” [HARRIS, p. 191]

The Talmud also details the various manners of stoning, strangling or beheading Jewish “blasphemers and idolaters.” Such criminals were also buried
up to their knees in manure, and their mouths forced open by strangling. Molten lead could then be poured “into his bowels.” [HARRIS, p. 170]

The persistence of the Jewish mythology of unique persecution, says Roth, has much to do with their longevity and communal dispersal throughout Europe and the world. The persecution of the Albigensians of France, for instance, is known by hardly anyone today because their destruction was singularly localized, they were completely wiped out, and there is no one interested in heralding their suffering. Likewise the Waldenses of France, and various others. “The Jews,” notes Roth, “are an inseparable element in the history of every country in Europe … and thus have an advantage, as it were, of a superior publicity service; and no historian, even a Gentile, could fail to be impressed by this insistent, pathetic, unique record.” [ROTH, p. 147]

Roth goes to the essence of the Jewish mythos of communal agony:

“In the classical period … with its holocausts and heroes, the lot of the Jewish people was much the same as that of the ancient Britons, the Iberians, and the Gauls; and the leaders of those peoples’ struggles for freedom deserve to be remembered as much as the Jewish martyrs who are commemorated each year on the ninth of Ab. But this is far from the case. Generally, they are forgotten, save by a few industrious antiquarians; and they have no place today in the proud memories of any people. The reason is very plain. The races for which they fought are long since dead. The Jews are still alive.” [ROTH, p. 147]

These insightful observations were written by Roth in 1932. The rise of German fascism and its institutionalized inhumanity was still only rising. Yet we can see here in Roth’s unusually honest overview of Jewish history the broader, foundational context for current Jewish thinking about themselves to this day. Of course the so-called Holocaust of World War II has completely solidified the traditional view of the persecution of Jewry and obliterated Roth’s broadly realistic brand of Jewish historiography.

To a now militant Jewish polemic, their community’s European experience in World War II merely confirms the Jewish mythos of unique and eternal victimization and martyrdom. It is monolithic, irrefutable, immutable, and immovable: Jews argue they were uniquely “singled out.” There will be a great deal more about the Holocaust and its part in Jewish identity in its own chapter. For immediate purposes, it is enough here to recognize the historical context for modern Jewry’s fundamental self-conception: that of humankind’s foremost – and superlative – victims, passed along as part of religious faith century after century, reified in Jewish cosmology at every turn.

Roth’s early 1930’s view, in the context of rising Nazi fascism and worry about anti-Semitism spreading in America, has been completely muted in our own day, and Jewish apologetics about Jewish identity and history began rising in direct proportion to the gravity of the growing German threat. By 1941, a Jewish author, Oscar Janowsky, reviewed – in the same Jewish journal that earlier published Roth’s critiques of the Jewish victimization cosmology – two new books that championed Jewish history. Each book was authored by well-respected Jewish
scholars. One of them was Cecil Roth. Janowsky’s title for his article was “Apologie
tics for Our Time.” In the context of German Nazism, even Roth was swallowed
by the demands for Jewish positive image-making against all and any self-critical
Jewish commentary. “Both authors,” wrote Janowsky, “would readily concede
that the purpose [of these books] was not to write ‘history’ of the accepted variety.
Our age requires apologetics, and this sad need has been filled by the authors.”
[JANOWSKY, p. 225] This “sad need” was so great that a 1951 volume entitled
The Hebrew Impact on Western Civilization even stated bluntly in its very first

In 1947, Milton Steinberg wrote a volume, Basic Judaism, explaining the
faith for both Jews and “those many non-Jews who happen to be curious about
Judaism.” [STEINBERG, p. viii] Here Steinberg’s apologetic, in doing his part
to engender a positive Jewish public image (like so many others to our own
day), was grossly untrue: “Judaism is totally unaware of race. Though the Tra-
dition loves to trace the House of Israel to the Patriarchs, blood descent is no
factor in its calculations.” [STEINBERG, M., p. 99]

With World War II and the disaster that befell humanity – and the Jews
within it – looming soon over Europe, this apologetic methodology (as well as
a resultant Jewish militancy) about Jewish history has continued in a rarely
interrupted straight line to the present day. (Examine, for example, the gush-
ingly laudatory content of the popular 1999 best-seller by a non-Jewish author:
The Gifts of the Jews). In fact, the mythology of perpetual Jewish victimhood
was well along as an exploitable tool by American Jews and Zionists as a poli-
tical devise at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, where Jewish woe cen-
tered upon anti-Jewish riots and attacks in Eastern Europe, particularly in
Russia. “Some of the atrocities [against Jews] initially reported,” writes Albert
Lindemann, “were exaggerated or simply did not occur, and some Jews made
false claims in the hope of getting relief money from Western Europe and
America.” [LINDEMAN, p. 154]

Many of the exaggerations were also created to enhance Zionist propaganda
to garner sympathy and support for a Jewish state in Israel. An important target
of Zionist propaganda and historical exaggeration was American Jews. “You
have to speak to American Jews in superlatives,” remarked Nachum Goldmann,
for many years the president of both the World Zionist Organization and World
Jewish Congress, “Cool, balanced, analysis makes no impression on them, and
exaggeration is almost indispensable.” [GROSE, p. 162] Elsewhere, in 1978 he
noted that his Zionist group alone had spent “millions of dollars on propa-
ganda.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 63]

A pioneer strategist in the use of the accusation of anti-Semitism as a pro-
paganda device was Theodore Herzl, a Viennese journalist and playwright, the
man most credited for the successful promotion of the Jewish “return to Israel”
Zionist ideology. Herzl “understood the true nature of propaganda,” notes
former Israeli diplomat, Moshe Leshem, “of the emotional appeal.” “In truth …
o noise amounts to a great deal,” Herzl noted in his diary, “A sustained noise is in
itself a noteworthy fact, world history is nothing but noise.” [LESHEM, p. 85]
Among the most reported Russian anti-Jewish pogrom sites at the turn of the century was Kishinev. (This incident led to the creation of the Jewish lobbying agency, the American Jewish Committee in 1903). [HALKIN, p. 54] Chaim Weitzmann, another Zionist activist and the first President of the state of Israel, wrote to a member of the wealthy Jewish Rothschild family (instrumental in funding early Jewish settlements in pre-Israel Palestine):

“Eleven years ago … I happened to be in the cursed town of Kishinev … In a group of about 100 Jews we defended the Jewish quarter with revolvers in our hand, defended women and girls … We slept in the cemetery – the only safe place and we saw 80 corpses brought in, mutilated dead…”

“Thus Weizmann,” says Albert Lindemann, “reports that he personally saw eighty mutilated corpses in a single place, when the death toll for the entire city was later generally recognized to be forty-five. But there is another problem with the account he provides. It is pure fantasy. Weizmann was in Warsaw at the time.” [LINDEMANN, p. 164]

The long – and continuing – Jewish defamation of Poles and Poland, as part of a broad Zionist propaganda policy and secular Jewish victimization theology, has been going on for a long time. For all western Jewry’s complaints about massive Polish violence against Polish Jewry, in 1919 Hugh Gibson, the United states minister to Warsaw, wrote that, “It is ridiculous as we are told about every incident where the Jew gets the worst of it and a great many incidents that never happened at all. These yarns are exclusively of foreign manufacture for anti-Polish purposes.” Two prominent and powerful American Zionists – Louis Brandeis and Felix Frankfurter (both United States Supreme Court justices) – confronted Gibson to complain about his dispatches to Washington. “They complained that my reports on the Jewish question had gone round the world and undone their work [in proclaiming enormous violent Polish anti-Semitism],” said Gibson,

“… They finally said that I had stated that the stories of excesses against the Jews were exaggerated, to which I replied that they certainly were and I should think any Jew would be glad to know it … [They] seemed to be interested in agitation for its own sake rather than in learning the situation … Their efforts were concentrated on an attempt to bully me into accepting the mixture of information and misinformation which they have adopted as the basis of their propaganda … Felix handed me a scarcely veiled threat that the Jews would try to prevent my confirmation by the Senate [then pending] … They made it clear to me that they do not care to have any diagnosis made that is not based entirely on Jewish statements as to conditions and events and doesn’t accept them at face value. If they are not ready to go into the question honestly I don’t see how they can hope to accomplish anything for their people… [American Jews have embarked upon] a conscienceless and cold-blooded plan to make the condition of the Jews in Poland so bad they must turn to Zionism for relief.” [GROSE, p. 94-95]
In 1923 the United States Vice Consul to Warsaw, Monroe Kline, added that “It is true that the Pole hates the Jew … The Jew in business oppresses the Pole to a far greater extent than does the Pole oppress the Jew in a political way.” [GROSE, p. 95]

More recently, Leonard Fein notes Jewish fears of assimilation that could erase them as a people, and the emotional cloud that informs Jewish perception of the facts of history:

“Deep down – and sometimes not so very deep – we [Jews] still believe that we depended on the pogroms and persecutions to keep us a people, and that we have not the fibre to withstand the lures of a genuine open society. It is seduction, not rape, that we fear the most, and nowhere is the seducer more blatant, less devious, than here in America.” [in SILBERMAN, p. 165]

The Jewish limited historical memory (and corresponding embracement of legend) and its singular focus on its martyrrological tradition has also been systematically exploited to buttress Zionist reasoning for the necessity of the modern state of Israel: a home for Jews from worldwide anti-Semitic persecution. The lengths some Jews will go to enforce – and create – the martyrrological/persecution tradition for political purposes was noted by Wilbur Crane Eveland, a former CIA agent stationed in Iraq in the early years after the foundation (1948) of today’s Israel. A few months before his arrival to that country in 1950, a bomb went off “outside a Passover gathering,” underscoring Arab hostility to Jews and encouraging 10,000 to move to the new Israeli state. Eveland wrote that

“Just after I arrived in Baghdad, an Israeli citizen had been recognized in the city’s largest department store: his interrogation led to the discovery of fifteen arms caches brought into Iraq by an underground Zionist movement. In attempts to portray the Iraqis as anti-American and to terrorize the Jews, the Zionists planted bombs in the United States Information Service Library and in synagogues. Soon leaflets began to appear urging Jews to flee to Israel … Although the Iraqi police later provided our embassy with evidence to show that the synagogue and library bombings, as well as the anti-Jewish and anti-American leaflet campaigns, had been the work of an underground Zionist organization, most of the world believed reports that Arab terrorism had motivated the flight of the Iraqi Jews whom the Zionists had ‘rescued’ really just in order to increase Israel’s Jewish population.” [FEURLICHT, p. 231]

Aware from personal experience about the facts in such matters, in 1998, an Iraqi-born Jew and former Zionist activist, Naeim Giladi, wrote that he wanted “to tell the American people, and especially American Jews, that Jews from Islamic lands did not emigrate willingly to Israel; that to force them to leave, Jews killed Jews.” [GILADI, p. 1]

In 1975 Jewish CBS reporter Mike Wallace journeyed to another Arab nation, Syria, to do a 60 Minutes program on the country. Years later, he noted his own biases (about alleged Syrian anti-Semitism) that were destroyed when he actually went to Damascus:
“[Before I went to Syria] I had a strong impression of what life was like for [Jews] there. From Jewish friends in America, I had heard the same stories over and over again: The Jews in Syria were confined to ghettos and were constant victims of persecution. A tight curfew was imposed on them and they were not allowed to have telephones or drives automobiles. Nor were they permitted to worship in synagogues of study in their traditional language, Hebrew. In short, the Syrian Jews were forced to live as prisoners within their own country.” [WALLACE/ GATES, 1984, p. 282]

All this, as Wallace soon learned upon visiting Syria, was complete nonsense. Jews owned cars; Jews had classes in Hebrew. Although the Jewish community was under close surveillance by the Assad regime, Wallace is careful to note that so was everyone in that police state. The CBS reporter interviewed a variety of Jews in the Arab country. Speaking to a Jewish teacher, Wallace notes his surprise to her response about the myths he had heard about Syrian anti-Semitism:

“Then I mentioned all the stories I had heard about how badly the Jews were treated in Syria, and when I asked her where she thought they came from, she replied in an almost malevolent tone: ‘I think that it’s Zionist propaganda.’” [WALLACE, M., 1984, p. 285]

Cecil Roth, in his overviews of Jewish history with its attendant polemics and apologetics (let alone some of the fraudulent escapades of modern Zionism), argued that the continued suppression of an honest evaluation of the Jewish past could come back to haunt them:

“By suppression we play into the hand of the anti-Semite, who may one day make capital out of the innocent humanity we have chosen to ignore. But, above all, by repression we are faithless to the most sacred charge of history, which is the pursuit of truth.” [ROTH, p. 423]
I also tried to avoid becoming uncomfortably hooked on anti-Semitism as the main problem in the world. Many Jews I knew divided the world into Jews and anti-Semites, nothing else. Many Jews I knew recognized no problem anywhere, at any time, but that of anti-Semitism... Such is the blindness of people that I have known Jews who, having deplored anti-Semitism in unmeasured tones, would, with scarcely a breath in between, get on the subject of African-Americans and promptly begin to sound like a group of petty Hitlers. And when I pointed this out and objected to it strenuously, they turned on me in anger. They simply could not see what they were doing. I once listened to a woman grow eloquent over the terrible way in which Gentiles did nothing to save the Jews of Europe. ‘You can’t trust Gentiles,’ she said. I let some time elapse and then asked suddenly, ‘What are you doing to help the blacks in their fight for civil rights?’ ‘Listen,’ she said, ‘I have my own troubles.’ And I said, ‘So did the Gentiles.’ But she only stared at me blankly. She didn’t get the point at all."


For nearly fifteen centuries in their diaspora, after the Jewish/Roman historian Josephus, the Jewish community taught and re-taught only its religious dogma and martyrological mythos to define its past, present, and future. Until the Enlightenment in the late 18th century, the Jewish ghettos were filled with people cloistered away under rabbinical blinders. Jewish “history” was all history, and it was entirely framed in the religiously-based conventional framework for understanding the world: Jewish exceptionality, Jewish martyrrology, and an apocalyptic vision entwined in Jewish suffering in search of atonement. [LOPATE, p. 306] As Jacob Neusner notes:

“What strikingly characterizes the imagination of the archaic Jew is the centrality of Israel, the Jewish people in human history, the certainty that being Jewish is the most important thing about oneself, and that Jewishness, meaning Judaism, was the dominant aspect of one’s consciousness.” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 62]

Simon Dubnov, a prominent and well-respected Jewish historian, notes that Jews were so self-isolated from the non-Jews around them that for centu-
ries their own history was merely the recycled metacommentaries about their seminal myths of Chosen People victimhood:

“Talmudic literature (including the Midrashim) … hardly contained any material concerning social dynamics which is necessary for history in the true sense. The leaders of the nation that was deprived of its kingdom seemed to have lost interest in the events of the world around them … The historian is greatly distressed when, in the scores of volumes of talmudical literature, he finds merely vague hints at events of the first five centuries of the Christian era, and searches in vain for chronological data. He has a sense of shame for the nation … which… lost its ability to perpetuate its experiences, even in simple chronicles… The one-sidedness of the Jewish sources, which illuminated only the spiritual side of life, created a false historical perspective.” [DUBNOV, p. 436-438]

Robert Goldenberg notes that, in Jewish tradition,

“great rabbinic leaders … became both disembodied bearers of a an elaborate legal tradition and also heroes of a marvelously rich tradition of legend … From the historian’s point of view, the Talmud thus becomes a terribly frustrating book. It is rich with stories that may – or may not – reflect the way certain events happened, and it is full of legal discussions that may – or may not – report the actual content of early rabbinic scholarly activity. Everything is fascinating, everything is potentially an open window on the past, but nothing can be trusted.” [GOLDENBERG, R., 1984, p. 157]

“Jews have suffered and Christians have suffered [throughout history],” wrote Rabbi Richard Singer, “Mankind has suffered. There is no group with a monopoly on suffering and no human beings which have experienced hate and hostility more than any other. I must say, however, that it is my impression that Jewish history has been taught with a whine and a whimper rather than a straightforward acknowledgment that man practices his inhumanity on his fellow human beings.” [ZUKERMAN, p. 66]

“[A] disability for the Jews in modern times,” says Barnet Litvinoff, “has been their own obscurantism. If all the questions of how to live were to be answered only in the wisdom of the Talmud, there could be no intellectual explorations, and therefore no progress.” [LITVINOFF, p. 10] “[Rabbis] had cut off [the Jewish community] from the community of nations,” wrote Bernard Lazare in 1894 about the Jewish ghetto mentality, “They had made of it a sullen recluse, a rebel against all laws, foreign to all feeling fraternity [with others], closed to all beautiful, noble, and generous ideas; they had made of it a small and miserable nation, soured by isolation, brutalized by a narrower education, demoralized and corrupted by an unjustifiable pride.” [LAZARE, p. 14]

“The Eastern European Jews,” notes Raphael Patai, “(with a few very notable exceptions) considered interest in all realms of non-Jewish intellectual endeavor as un-Jewish and therefore prohibited. Even the readings of books other than the Bible, the Talmud, the codes, and the Midrashim was strictly for-
bidden, and has remained so to this day in those circles in which the Eastern European Yeshiva tradition survives.” [PATIA, R., 1971, p. 294]

“Jews lived with memory, so that redemption might be hastened,” adds Stephen Whitfield, “but they did not live with history. The rabbis … made little effort to record the history of their own post-Biblical era … The first post-medieval attempt at a history of the Jews was written by a gentile, Jacques Basnage … Only … under the impact of modernization … could Jews … wrest meaning from Jewish life and identity. [WHITFIELD, p. 29-30]

Basnage’s 17-volume work, published between 1706 and 1711, has been called by one twentieth-century Jewish reviewer “the basis for the science of Jewish history; and though his work was far from perfect, it remained the best for a century to come.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 212]

Although Jewish history usually highlights Christian intolerance and the periodic burnings of the Talmud, the earliest printings of even this religious tract were accomplished with substantial Christian support. As M. Hersch Goldberg notes:

“Pope Leo X, who reigned from 1513 to 1521, encouraged the printing of the first complete edition of the Talmud. Under his patronage, fifteen volumes of the Babylonian Talmud were printed in Venice beginning in 1519 … Another Christian played an important part in preparing that historic edition of the Talmud. The printer Daniel Bomberg (whose name may sound Jewish, but who was a Christian) had set up his press in Venice in 1516. He devoted great care and attention in printing the Talmud … Seemingly fascinated with Jewish literature, Bomberg is said to have done more to spread Jewish learning than any other printer of his time … Over the years, Bomberg printed approximately two hundred books of Jewish interest.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 210-211]

The Talmud itself, of course, is not history, but religious polemic. “Memory of the past,” says Yosef Yerushalmi, “was always a central component of Jewish experience; the historian was not its primary custodian.” [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN, p. 30] “The [Israelite] prophet,” notes Old Testament scholar John Allegro, “saw Yahweh [the Israelite God] as a cosmic deity, lord of the heavenly hosts and forces of nature, but at the same time still the special god of Israel, a tribal deity whose main interest was the welfare of his Chosen People. Thus it followed that whatever the grand strategy in the Creator’s mind, it involved the destiny of the Jews, and all history was directed to their glorification.” [ALLEGRO, J., 1971, p. 58]

“Most Jews have a slight knowledge of Jewish history,” says Chaim Bermant, “This is true even of those in Yeshiva (college of higher learning), for the Yeshiva is devoted largely to the study of the Talmud, and the Talmud, though encyclopedic in scope, was completed by the sixth century and events beyond that date are largely terra incognita, except where they are echoed by liturgy and lore.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 18]

The above observations, and one of the theses of this volume, point to a
Jewish identity that is at its conceptual roots – even for the secular today – religious in complexion and fundamentally ahistorical.

Firmly going against the grain of popular Jewish proclamation that they, and their old religion, Judaism, are the root of everything wise and wonderful on earth, a Jewish author and social activist, Maurice Hindus, wryly observed in 1927 that

“The force that first pried the Jewish mind open to radical doctrines of a modern nature had its origin not in Jewish but in distinctly non-Jewish intellectual associations … [Political philosophers] Marx and Lassalle were steeped in Western, that is, modern Gentile culture, Gentile philosophy, Gentile science … It is only after the Jew began to ram down the gates of the ghetto and to make excursions into the intellectual temples of his Christian neighbors, only after he had laid aside the Talmud and the Shulcan Aruch for modern, western, that is Gentile, history, biology, psychology, science, that he embarked on a career of achievement in modern arts and science … The old Jewish civilization, with its rigid orthodoxy and its emphasis on Jewish superiority, compelled aloofness from worldly intellectual intercourse even as it compelled social isolation. It frowned on the perusal of modern literature, philosophy, social theory, even on the study of foreign, that is Gentile, languages.” [HINDUS, p. 369-370]

“Guided by the dictum that ‘all that is new is forbidden by the Torah,’” says Charles Silberman, “the rabbis spoke as though the slightest deviation from tradition was a lapse into heresy.” [SILBERMAN, p. 171]

“The Jewish nature does not produce its rarest fruits in a Jewish environment,” noted Israel Abrahams, “… It was ancient Alexandria that produced Philo, medieval Spain Maimonides, modern Amsterdam Spinoza.” [FEUERLICH, p. 38] “One can be ignorant of all the sayings of the wise old rabbis,” notes Ann Roiphe, “and still acknowledge the Magna Carte, the Declaration of Independence, the words of Rousseau, Hobbes, Emerson, the art of Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo and Dante, the science of Darwin, Newton and Galileo. These were not Jewish, and the great Jewish thinkers, Freud, Marx and Einstein, Claude Levi-Strauss, studied at Christian universities and learned form Christian scholars … The great universities of the West were founded without Jews … The Christian world created Oxford, Cambridge, the Sorbonne, Harvard, and Yale.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 209]

These perspectives do not reflect the mainstream current of modern Jewish history, however. For most, the self-repeating myths of the wonders of Jewish Talmudic scholarship and its attendant Jewish martyrology were – and are – central to Jewry’s understanding of its past. In the late nineteenth century, for example, Heinrich Graetz, the seminal “modern” Jewish historian, was only following a long line of self-portrayal when he introduced one of his volumes of Jewish history with what he felt to be the essence of their story:

“The long era of the dispersion, lasting nearly seventeen centuries, is characterized by unprecedented sufferings, an uninterrupted martyr-
dom, and a constantly aggravated degradation and humiliation unparalleled in history … ” [GRAETZ, v. 4 Intro, in LIBERLES p. 104]

In 1911 a Jewish anthropologist, Maurice Fishberg, blamed common Jewish “nervous disposition” largely on historic persecutions:

“Considering that in medieval times massacres of Jews were quite frequent … it may be said that many of the survivors have remained with unstable nerves, and that a fair proportion of neurotics and psychopathics have inherited their nervous disposition from their maltreated grandparents … Any people, no matter what race, could not remain with healthy nerves under the ban of abuse and persecutions to which the Jews were subjected.” [FISHBERG, p. 532]

In 1917, H. G. Enelow framed the same world view this way:

“There is no history as full of hardship and suffering as the history of Israel. But there is none so heroic, either. That is just what has made it the most heroic history in the world. That because the Jews were chosen for a divine work, they have to suffer a great deal.” [ENELOW, p. 45]

Likewise, another nineteenth century Jewish scholar, Leopold Zunz, made the convergence of Jewish superiority and “aristocracy” through suffering explicit in a quote that eventually became “perhaps the best known in modern Jewish literature” [ROTH, Most, p. 136]:

“If there be an ascending scale of sufferings, Israel reached its highest degree. If the duration of affliction, and the patience with which they are borne, confer nobility upon man, the Jews vie with the aristocracy of any country.” [SCHULMAN, p. 34]

A 1954 “High Holy Days Prayer Book” for Jewish congregations even devoted two pages to quotes (including the one immediately above) by secular Jewish commentators, a legendary Jewish martyrological history framed here as the expression of religious faith. Other lamentations in the prayer book included:

• “Combine all the woes that temporal and ecclesiastical tyrannies have ever inflicted on men or nations, and you will not have reached the full measure of suffering which this martyr people was called upon to endure.” [Leopold Zunz]

• “The thousand years’ martyrdom of the Jewish people, its unbroken pilgrimage, its tragic fate, its teachers of religion, its martyrs, its philosophy, champions – this whole epic will, in days to come, sink into the memory of men.” [Simon Dubnov] [SILVERMAN, M., p. 386-387]

Fredda Herz and Elliot Rosen understand such self-definitions as “aristocratic” victims to be essential to modern Jewish temperament: “Jews anticipate attack from non-Jews, while privately reassuring themselves that they are ‘God’s chosen people.’ The assumption is that suffering is a basic part of life. This suffering may even reinforce the notion that they are superior to others by virtue of their burden of oppression.” [HERZ/ROSEN, p. 367]

In 1993, one of England’s chief rabbis, Jonathan Sacks, framed Jewish resis-
tance to assimilation in the land they lived as a noble sacrifice, the willingness to stand loyal with a relentlessly subjugated, oppressed people: “For the most part, Jews [through history] did not say, ‘What advantage is it to remain part of the people of Israel, seeing that they are humiliated and persecuted? It is better for me to join my destiny to those who have power.’ They declared their willingness liheyet miyisrael, to be counted among Israel.” [SACKS, J., p. 131]

“[The] self-image of Judaism,” says Philip Sigal, “as originating in bondage and redemption indelibly engraves itself upon the group memory and it became the permanent mythos of its origin. Beside that, documentable history is irrelevant. All that has transpired since antiquity is wedded to that theology.” [SIGAL, p. 1] Israeli scholar Boas Evron notes that

“Long historical memory, delving into centuries-old, even millennia-old, disasters, massacres and wrongs (accompanied by the convenient forgetting of wrongs and atrocities perpetrated by ones’ own people against others), lachrymorose self-righteousness, are all characteristics of groups whose experience is basically passive, as the Jews have been politically for thousands of years. In such groups, the consciousness of being victims accumulates and poisons the very being of its members. At times these characteristics become the primary content of their self-awareness as a group, a perverted focus of their self-identity. Finally, this suffering becomes a source of pride. (‘I am persecuted and hated, a sign that I am valuable and unique, for which I am envied and hated’), rather than engendering a desire to be rid of it.” [EVRON, p. 109]

The cloaking of Jewish martyrological legend over an authentic Jewish history in the real world is noted by another Israeli, Meron Benvenisti:

“It is an ahistoric philosophy of an ahistoric people. It sustained us for two thousand years and is so imbued in our psyche that it was not altered even when we made the profound leap from an ahistoric, dispensed, and powerless people to an historic, independent, and powerful nation [Israel].” [BENVENISTI, p. 73]

“The belief that the Jewish people had always been the passive sufferer of Christian persecution,” says Hannah Arendt, “actually amounted to a prolongation and modernization of the old myth of chosenness.” [FEUERLICHT, p. 35] “The more desperate the oppression,” writes Raphael Jospe, “the more oppressors reinforced the Jewish view that they, the victims, were the Chosen People, and that the oppressor religions were all the more morally spiritually bankrupt.” [JOSPE, R. p. 130]

Michael Aronson notes the way that riots against Jews in Russia in the late nineteenth century were simply plugged into traditional interpretive Jewish martyrological frameworks focusing on categorical Jewish innocence:

“In Jewish consciousness, three biblical images are deeply ingrained as archetypes of Jewish oppression. First is that of the Pharaohs, who enslaved the Children of Israel in Europe. Next, are the treacherous and murderous Amalekites, who attacked the Children of Israel in Sinai after their exodus from Egypt and became the symbol of causeless hatred.
And third is the archetypical murderer Haman (by tradition a descendant of Amalek), who tried to destroy all the Jews in the Persian Empire. From the very beginning of anti-Jewish outbreaks in 1881, the biblical images must have sprang to people’s minds and influenced their interpretation of events. Indeed, these images were invoked repeatedly in both journalistic and historical literature on the pogroms written by Russian Jews, and others.” [ARONSON, p. 9]

Like many Jewish or Gentile historians tainted by martyrological contagion, Bryan Moynahan’s index to the Jews’ role in his book about the last 100 years of Russian history reflects almost solely the Jewish victimology theme:

“Jews:
– accusations against
– anti-Semitism
– behavior toward
– emigration
– in Great War
– massacre
– pogroms against” [MOYNAHAN, p. 266]

Prominent Jewish psychoanalyst and child psychologist Bruno Bettelheim once wrote an article about the popular social psychology surrounding (famous Nazi victim) Ann Frank, noting the special state of “innocence” the Jewish people decree about themselves, a blanket character afforded no one else:

“Some time ago I questioned in print why there is such vast admiration for The Diary of Ann Frank. I received many reactions, positive and negative, but whether those who let me know their reactions agreed or disagreed, they all shared one feature: a deep compassion for what they called the ‘innocent’ victims of Nazi aggression … I was further startled to find that in the many communications I received, the adjective ‘innocent’ was applied only by Jews to Jewish victims. Nobody referred to the innocent Gypsies or the innocent Jehovah’s Witnesses, though they, like the Jews were internal minorities, one of which, the Gypsies, was exterminated in toto. Maybe I overlooked it, but despite search I can recall no popular reference to the innocent Norwegians, for example, who the Nazis also killed in numbers.” [BETTELHEIM, 1991, p. 257]

“Jewish consciousness is cultivated consistently from the moment they are capable of understanding the spoken word,” observed Maurice Feurlich in 1937,

“… I had the theme, Children of a Martyr Race, dinned into my consciousness so deeply that it became the basic element of my emotional life. Almost the first words I understood were “oppressed people,” “martyrs,” “prejudice,” “persecution.” Like all other Jewish children, I emerged with a ‘Persecution Complex’ which grew stronger as I grew older … [This] more than anything else constitutes the Jewish consciousness we have today … Our persecution complex makes us abnormal in dealing with our neighbors … For few of us have the courage to
admit that the fault might rest in our personal makeup. It is true of human nature generally that men seek to blame for failure everywhere but their own doorstep, but we Jews divulge from the normal when this becomes a mental habit with which we constantly salve the wounds of our failures.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 116]

“It became customary [in the Middle Ages] to record the names of the victims of persecutions,” says Leon Poliakov, “many lists are preceded by the evocation of the ‘cities of blood’ … Thus the memory of the first martyrs was perpetuated and a tradition was created and strengthened, inspiring succeeding generations to follow the lead and example of their ancestors.” [POLIAKOV, p. 84] The ancestors have followed the lead well. In a 1984 survey, 94% of American Jews were found to believe that “Jews have a uniquely long and tragic history of persecution.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 31] “One critical element in this statement,” note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “is the word unique. The image of Jewish victimization has its political and psychological uses, and as a result Jews often have a deep emotional investment in preserving their image as a uniquely long-suffering minority. Leading Jewish spokesmen have resisted efforts to deny Jews their history of extraordinary persecution and to diminish the singularity, the distinctiveness, of Jewish victimization.” [LIEBMAN, COHEN, p. 31] “All the Jews must internalize past events as if they happened to them only yesterday,” explains Meron Benvenisti about traditional Jewish victim identity, “My father still feels the agony of the expulsion from Spain as if it happened to him personally and not five hundred years ago.” [BENVENISTI, 1989, p. 73]

Jewish religious history – and Jewish identity itself – has always been founded upon the idea that non-Jews are out to destroy them. “For Thy [God’s] sake are we killed all the day long,” proclaims the Torah/Old Testament. “We are counted as sheep for the slaughter.” [PSALMS 44:22] “Eysor soyneh l’yaakov,” wrote Joshau Halberstam in 1997, “[is] a phrase well known to Jews brought up in traditional homes. The literal translation of the phrase is ‘Esau hates Jacob,’ but the names are always understood as referring to the gentile hatred of Jews, an enmity that is presumed to be perpetual.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 215] Rabbi Moshe Zvi Neriyah, director of a network of religious Zionist high schools in Israel, and a former member of the Knesset, publicly declared that there were two kinds of Gentiles, “those that simply hate us and those who attempt with all their power to destroy us.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 59] “The Holocaust is not a national insanity that happened once and passed,” remarked a former Israeli Minister of Education in 1984, “but an ideology that has not passed from the world and even today the world may condone crimes against us.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 61]

A number of Jewish religious fast days, including the traditional ninth of Av, the tenth of Tereth, the seventeenth of Tammuz, and the third of Tishri, commemorate “national and communal catastrophes.” Most are linked to the destruction of the First Temple (physically memorialized today in Jerusalem at what is widely known as the “Wailing Wall”) by non-Jewish enemies. At one
time in Jewish history thirty-six such fast days of mourning were observed each year. [YOUNG, p. 263] “Three times a day,” notes Howard Sachar, “and oftener on special occasions, pious Jews prayed for the Restoration [of the destroyed Temple].” [SACHAR, p. 309] Even at Jewish marriages, wrote Alfred Siegel, “you know how it is to be a Jew. In the hour of pleasure he remembers his pains, and even in the ecstatic instant of a wedding he breaks a glass under his foot to remind himself of the crash of the Temple in Jerusalem. A Jew is never entirely happy.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 115]

Samuel Heilman notes the way the story of the biblical Samson is treated in an ultra-Orthodox religious school he visited:

“This Samson was not the Jewish Hercules as much as the weakened and tormented Jew who begs God to allow him to avenge the injustices he has suffered.” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 247]

Heilman also notes that the traditional Queen Esther story (in which she saves the Jewish people in Persia from destruction from an arch-enemy), and the yearly Jewish celebration of the story at Purim, may be simply a borrowed tradition from another people, plugged into the Jewish martyrological base. As Heilman notes,

“Purim in Israel comes at the end of winter and commemorates the deliverance of the Jews of ancient Persia from the genocidal decree of Vizier Haman … There are some scholars who argue that in fact the [Purim] holiday precedes the scroll [about Esther] and simply enshrines the principle of Jewish salvation from all those who have tried to destroy the [Jewish] nation. And indeed, Jewish tradition is filled with many local ‘Purims,’ each with its own ‘megillah’ commemorating the deliverance of the Jews in question from disaster. Some of those scholars who see Purim in such relative terms argue that it arose in Persia as a Jewish counter holiday to many of the pagan winter festivals. Others cite the absence of any evidence of a king named Ahasueras in Persian records as well as the similarity of the names Esther and Mordechai to the ancient Babylonian gods Ishtar and Marduk as evidence of a linkage with precursor non-Jewish traditions.” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 109]

A tradition of reciting the names of local “martyrs” to the faith was a widespread tradition among Jews in Europe for centuries; modern Israel has its own remembrance “Day of Holocaust and Heroism.” The mass suicide of 900 Jews at the fortress of Massada rather than surrender to Roman attackers is a major icon in modern Israeli mythology. In the Biblical Exodus tradition, the Egyptian Pharaoh also chases Jews to annihilate them; in the Book of Esther, as noted above, Jews are saved from an evil Persian court minister, Haman, who sought their destruction. Still recited today as part of the yearly Jewish Passover rituals, Jews say, “In every generation they [non-Jews] rise against us to annihilate us: Bekhol dore omdm alaynu l’khalotaynu.” Other aspects of the Passover seder, notes Stephen Whitfield, include the identification “with the fate of [Jewish] ancestors so fully that the distinction between past and present has in effect been obliterated.” One way to attain this collapsing of time is “to raise a piece of
matzah and announce (in the present tense): ‘This is the bread of affliction which our forefathers ate in the land of Egypt.’” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 29]

Other forms of Jewish martyrrology reportedly evidenced in the Middle Ages were occasions of mass suicide (including the slaying of fellow family members) if threatened with forced conversion to Christianity. “Medieval Christians … tended to perceive it not as the extraordinary behavior of individual Jews but as behavioral practices sanctioned by the Jewish community and law. In the minds of some it encouraged and confirmed the perceptions of the Mosaic law as harsh and Jews as murderous.” [REL.&THEO. 38, 863, 1995] The rabbinical tradition itself, notes Nahum Glazer, is rooted in a martyrrological world view: “Talmudic tradition preserves the memory of the chief scholars who suffered martyrdom rather than bow to the imperial [Roman] decree that forbade the study of the Torah … The story of the Ten [rabbi] martyrs became one of the motifs of medieval Jewish liturgy.” [GLATZER, p. 175-176] One talmudic tradition even notes 400 Jewish children who were reputedly “captured for shameful purposes”. “They all leaped to their deaths into the sea.” [GLATZER, p. 183]

The Jewish cosmology of eternal victimization is virtually celebrated in our own day. In a 1985 “fact-filled, fun-filled” book for children, for instance, The Jewish Kids’ Catalogue, there is a section on the Jewish experience in World War II, including a full-page photograph of children walking towards Nazi box cars. The caption reads: “Orphan children from the ghetto of Lodz boarding a train that will take them to death camps.” [BURSTEIN, p. 67] In 1987 a Jewish psychologist, Ruth Bers Shapiro, took public exception to another children’s’ book entirely about the Holocaust entitled The Children Remember; it was created for 4-8 year-olds. Such early socialization to the Jewish Cult of the Persecuted worried Shapiro; she suggested that the Jewish community “needs to anticipate how this information will be absorbed and shaped by the child’s inner life.” [GALLOB, B., p. 15]

(Emblazoning perceived martyrdom in communal memory is central to Jewish tradition. “The Hebrew Bible,” notes Peter Novick, “contains the verb ‘to remember,’ in its various declensions, 169 times (along with numerous injunctions not to forget). Yet what Jews are enjoined to remember is almost always God’s handiwork; secular history, insofar as such a category is even admitted by tradition, gets short shrift. Mourning and remembering the dead are, of course, traditional Jewish obligations.”) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 10]

Jewish author Paul Cowan notes the socialization of his half-Jewish son into Jewish tradition:

“One night in March 1973, we were invited to a puppet show dramatizing the story of Purim. At the dramatic high point, when the evil Persian vizier Haman threatened to murder all the Jews, Matt ran across the room and threw himself into Rachel’s arms, pleading for comfort. ‘Mom, he won’t get me, will he? I’m only half-Jewish.’” [COWAN, P., 1987, p. 24]

In 1986, Ze’ev Chafets, a Jewish American immigrant to Israel, and eventual head of the Israeli Government Press Office, noted something wrong with his six-year old daughter Michal:
“I noticed a change coming over her. Suddenly she became afraid to go to bed in the dark; often she had a hard time falling asleep. A few times she cried out in the middle of the night and woke up with a headache. Obviously, something was bothering her.”

Eventually Chafets managed to get his daughter to tell him what was wrong. As he tells it:

“Abba [Father],” she sobbed, “Why does anyone want to kill us?”

“Michali, what do you mean? Who wants to kill us?”

“Us, the Jews. Everyone wants to kill the Jews. But why, Abba? What have we done wrong?”

I was stunned by the question, and by Michali’s fear. One of the reasons I had decided to live in Israel was to bring up children free of tics and neuroses of diaspora life. And now here was my sabra [Israeli-born] daughter shaking with insecurity. “Who told you that everyone wants to kill Jews?” I almost shouted.

“Our teacher. She told us about Haman and Pharaoh the King of Egypt. And Hitler. Abba, he puts Jews in the oven and burns them up. And the Christians too.” Michali burst into tears. “Abba, is John one of those Christians?” John was a friend of mine who worked for the international Red Cross.

“Yes, baby, John is a Christian, but he doesn’t want to hurt you.”

Similarly, in 1993 an Israeli scholar noted with concern the comments of a colleague’s kindergarten-age daughter:

“Daddy, I know that on Passover we celebrate our freedom from the horrid Egyptian Pharaoh who wanted to keep us as slaves. On Purim we are happy because brave Queen Esther convinced the King to hang the wicked Persian Haman who wanted to destroy all the Jews. On Hanukkah we celebrate our freedom from our Greek enemies. Daddy, tell me – who were our enemies on Tu Bi-Shevat [Israel’s national tree- planting day]?”

Myron Aronoff calls such a story a manifestation of Israel’s “national paranoia.” [ARONOFF, p. 57] This paranoia, of course, is not just Israeli; it is a foundation of Jewish identity. And for the little girl who wondered about the Jews’ enemies against trees, they are there to be conjured. In a 1987 appeal by the Jewish National Fund to Americans for money to plant trees in Israel, a recent forest fire was highlighted as a “suspected arson” by Arabs, and fund-raising for trees is often requested to honor children Holocaust victims. [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 32]

Steven Cohen notes four main themes in the Jewish victimization mythology (Cohen frames them in the past tense, but they are, for most Jews, as viable as ever):

1) premodern Jews viewed life among Gentiles as galut, exile.

2) Jews believed that Gentiles hate Jews.
3) They believed that Christian culture and civilization are inferior to Jewish civilization.
4) They believed that individual Gentiles have personality characteristics which are inferior to those of Jews.” [COHEN, Uses, p. 26]

In our own time “Pulitzer prize-winning” Jewish historian and former president of the American Academy, Barbara Tuchman, is typical. (In 1967 Tuchman argued in the New York Times that the United States should intervene militarily for Israel in its war with Arabs. [FEUERLICHT, p. 196] Tuchman, daughter of wealthy financier Maurice Wertheim and niece of a former secretary of the treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., obviously can’t – with a straight face – claim victim status herself without some serious help from the Jewish martyrology tradition). [CHRISTOPHER, p. 219] In her 650-page volume on “calamitous” European society in the fourteenth century, originating in her interest in the Bubonic plague, Jews are represented solely in relation to her own sense of their socio-political victimization. Of all the possibilities of a group of human beings over a century, (including the story of their own experience with the epidemic) Tuchman frames virtually the entirety of Jewish experience as merely a sponge for abuse from Gentiles. This is the book’s complete index for the heading “Jews”:

- money lenders
- resented by Pastoureux
- persecution of
- blamed for plague
- rights of
- accused of ritual murder
- Talmud tried for heresy
- badges worn by
- sexual relations with Christians forbidden
- ransom of Jean II
- attacked in working class revolts
- in Spain
- pogrom in Prague

If fourteenth century Jews spent every moment of their lives fielding insults and running away from vigilante mobs, when did they have a moment of freedom to record the chain of misery that always wrapped so tightly around them, so that their progeny might still agitate with authority about their lack of relief, 600 years later? Jews did find time, however, in the Middle Ages to regularly memorialize lists of martyrs during synagogue services, emphasizing “Jewish suffering and its exaggeration.” [MACDONALD, p. 219]

Tuchman’s conviction of non-Jews’ unrelieved hatred of Jews through the centuries as one of the foundations for her perspective of history is evidenced in her following quote about the Holocaust:
“What lurks in the shadows of ancient memory [was] a bitter recognition that a Gentile world … would fundamentally have felt relieved by the Final Solution.” [BAER, p. 64]

Jewish historian Arnold Wiznitzer reflects the Jewish martyrological base to understand history in his books about Brazil. As Jonathan Schorsch notes:

“Much of the American Jewish historiography from the 1960s continued the monumentalist, nationalist orientation of its predecessors, and Arnold Witznitzer’s work could easily be included here. A historian of Brazilian history whose work to this day practically constitutes the field in the English language, Wiznitzer summed up his findings in his now classic book, Jews in Colonial Brazil. There he takes great concern to memorialize every ‘Jewish’ victim of the various Inquisitions.” [SCHORSCH, J., 2000]

In the Jewish cosmology, Jews can only be victims, even when they are preeminent in the society in which they live. In 1987, David Schers, for example, explored “the oppression of those [Jews] who are ‘well off’ in Latin America.” “Is it possible,” he asked, “to speak of those who eat well, have attractive lives, and live in relative prosperity? The case of the Jews of Latin America demonstrates that it is indeed possible. [They have] alienation, self-hate, and family conflict … The very invisibility of Jewish suffering … makes it more painful than might otherwise appear.” [SCHERS, CULTURE, p. 285-286] Jews, insists Sarah Horowitz, bizarrely, are also

“victimized by their own positive stereotypes, which mask the gender, class, ideological and ethnic differences that distinguish them from one another … The invisibility of Jewish studies as an academic field […] moreover, is hidden behind the presence of Jews as scholars in all fields.” [HOROWITZ, p. 123]

Jews, who are collectively the wealthiest, most comfortable ethnic/racial group of people in modern America, [see later chapter] nonetheless remain insistent in clinging to the identity core as themselves being victims and never oppressors, economic or otherwise. “If Jews are, by definition, victims,” notes Edward Shapiro, explaining the common Jewish world view, “then those Jews who do not sympathize with this cult of victimization are inauthentic Jews who betray the essence of Jewishness.” [SHAPIRO, E., 1998] Even Jewish multi-millionaires like financier Harry Solomon, (whose 1989 estimated worth was $50 million) apparently fail to see the irony in claiming that “We [Jews] are all the victims of our backgrounds.” [KOTKIN, p. 45] When Celia Heller wrote her book about the Jews of Poland, she completely ignored historic Jewish commercial dominance of Eastern Europe [see earlier chapters] and traditional Jewish self-segregation to preposterously link the Jewish situation there to that of oppressed African-Americans, evolving from the shackles of slavery: “The concept of caste is extremely useful in understanding the situation of Jews in interwar Poland just as it was in understanding the situation of the Negroes in the United States before the Civil Rights struggle.” [HELLER, C., 1977, p. 59]
Robert Greene wrote an entire volume about professional “hustler and swindler” Mel Weinberg [GREENE, *preface*] and his role in “Abscam,” an FBI sting operation to investigate white collar crime in America. Even as a six-year old, however, the future master scam artist was already primed to his identity as a Jewish victim:

“His mother answered his knock on the door.
‘You’re late. How did it go in school today?’ she asked.
‘Not so good,’ answered the boy.
‘What happened?’
‘I got left back,’ he replied.
His mother stared at him. The message short-circuited her ability to comprehend, much less believe.
‘You must be mistaken,’ she said, clearly aware that something was amiss. ‘Nobody gets left back in the first grade. Besides, you bring home all those gold stars every day. That means you are doing wonderful work in school. Why would they leave you back?’ ‘Because I’m Jewish,’ he sighed, fixing his mother with his most earnest look.
‘Because you’re Jewish,’ she replied in a voice that took on a slightly hysterical edge. ‘How can that be? This is the Bronx, in New York, not Poland. Your teacher is Jewish. Why were you left back?’”

[GREENE, 1981, p. 17-18]

“When I was a little kid,” says controversial talk show host Howard Stern,

“I was a victim. Many times I would turn the other cheek when I should have stood tall. I was overly polite when I needed to be firm. There was something in my personality that avoided confrontation because I always felt I would lose in a two-way struggle. I never excelled at anything ... I had ‘victim’ written all over my freakish face. I was a gawky lamb available for slaughter. I had lived my entire young life as a sniveling coward. I was the half-Jew who bowed his head and walked into the gas chamber without putting up a fight.” [STERN, H., 1995, p. 255]

The *Cleveland Jewish News* notes this about famous feminist Gloria Steinem:

“Steinem was born to a ‘gentle, nurturing’ Jewish father and a Protestant mother who believed in theosophy, a set of beliefs based on mystical insight. Largely home-schooled until the age 12 while her ‘itinerant’ father packed up the family and traveled around the country, Steinem does not identify with any organized religion, except when there’s antisemitism.
‘Then I identify with the Jewish person.”’ [KARFELD, M., 10-22-1999, p. 20-]

“As Jews,” a “leader in the Jewish community” of Brooklyn, New York, told researcher Jonathan Reider, regarding the Iranian hostage crisis of 1979, “we know what it means to be hostages. We have been hostages since day one.”

[REIDER, J., 1985, p. 256]

A. M. Rosenthal (eventually Executive Editor of the *New York Times*) and *Times* reporter Arthur Gelb even titled their 1967 book about a Jewish Nazi
“One More Victim.” The subject of the volume is Daniel Burros, the King Kleagle of the New York Ku Klux Klan and former official in the American Nazi Party, who was a vehement hater of Jews. How, one wonders, is Burros a victim? Is he a victim of his own choices in life? Is he a victim of his own racism? Is he a victim of his own strange psychological dilemmas? Is he perhaps a victim of A. M. Rosenthal and the New York Times, who published an expose about Burros, noting that he was secretly Jewish? (Burros committed suicide immediately after publication of the article). No, insist the Jewish authors, Burros is a victim of anti-Semitism – his hatred of Jews is something internalized from an ugly, exterior, non-Jewish world. The authors put it this way (and they are blaming Gentile society for the creation of the Burros Nazi identity):

“The fact that there is a Jewish condition disturbs many Jews and they rail against it, but it is a fact nonetheless, because it cannot be otherwise. It is a condition not inborn but created, created not so much by Jews but by Gentiles, and arising from the one simple fact that, being apart, Jews have no privacy [i.e., if a Jewish mother calls out in public to her son “Irving,” everyone knows they are Jewish. Rosenthal and Gelb go on to argue that Jewish “separateness” and “distinctiveness” is an attribute branded upon Jews by the non-Jewish world, completely ignoring this as an absolute pillar of historical, and current, Jewish identity] … No number of laws, no strength of others’ traditions, and no faith in morals or even religion, can protect the Jew – German Jew, Russian Jew, Brazilian Jew, and American Jew – from knowing that he was born into a tribe of victims … From the moment he is aware of his Jewishness and of the history of Jews he is aware that this history is the biography of the scapegoat, the martyr, the dispossessed, the wanderer, the outcast, the tortured, the despised or the pitied, the beaten, the murdered – the victim. What is a Jew? ‘A misfortune!’ There is not a Jew who has not said that to himself, sometimes in a whisper he can hardly hear … Every Jew now alive has lived in the memory of the ghetto’s stench, remembers Torquemada [of the Spanish Inquisition], and every Jew now alive has an Auschwitz number on his soul … What is a Jew? A Jew, among other things, is a prisoner caged in the ugliest of ages, the mind of his own enemy.”[ROSENTHAL/GELB, 1967, p. 57-60]

Hence, we are lead to believe – somehow in all this – the Jewish Ku Klux Klan leader, is born, “victim” of an anti-Semitic society.

How weird does the Jewish persecution thing get? Jewish publisher Lyle Stuart even recalls an incident he had with William Gaines, also Jewish and the publisher of Mad magazine: “One day Bill and I were riding in his Cadillac and he said, ‘You know, sometimes when I pass a bus stop I see those people standing there. I think they hate me. And I said, ‘Bill, you have to get some self-esteem.’ And I suggested he see a psychiatrist, which he promptly did.” [TEBBEL, R., 1999]

Jewish author Ben Stein once noted the mood among the wealthy producer/writer elite of Jewish-dominated Hollywood [See later chapter about this subject: p. 741]
“There was a distinct feeling that, despite the high pay and the access to powerful media that TV writers and producers enjoy, they are still part of a despised underclass, oppressed psychologically, and (potentially) physically by an Aryan ruling class of businessmen and others. This feeling was by no means confined to Jews. [?] The belief in a ruling class of white, East Coast Protestants meeting occasionally in corporate board rooms to give its orders to whoever happens to be elected to office is so strong that no amount of argument to the contrary makes a dent. And hostility to that real or imagined class is just as strong.” [in ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 107]

Despite the fact that the exploitation, oppression and sovereignty over non-Jews, as we have seen, is a very foundation of talmudic Judaism, Jews commonly portray themselves as victims even in their exploitation of others. In a relentless apologetic and Zionist-inspired volume (see the later chapter on Zionism p. 1725), *The Jews of Germany*, Nachum Gidal asserts that “the Jews were forced into the role of pawnbrokers, money changers, and usurers, very public offices and therefore often hated … Thus ‘the Jew’ became the tool and the scapegoat of the rising capitalist economic system.” [GIDAL, p. 40]

Even if this apologetic myth – often cited in the Jewish community – was true, that they were somehow “forced into” their historic roles as oppressors of the non-Jewish populace, such self-preserving actions still represent a self-centered, self-protective amoralism where self-preservation (“self” being either the individual or ethnocentric community) is considered the paramount concern. If we may this way dismiss collective Jewish responsibility for negative actions against others over centuries, we may likewise conveniently excuse all Germans who were also “forced” to join the Nazi movement (or any other collective expression of evil) because there were no alternative options (short of personal trouble, hardship, and, of course, danger and self-impairment).

In modern America, even Jews responsible for a huge share of communist-instigated terror in post-war Poland, are reconceived as “victims” through a lens that can see nothing else. As Stefan Korbonski says,

“The ten years of Jewish rule in Poland [in the Stalinist era] could not easily be forgotten. It was an era of the midnight knock on the door, arbitrary arrests, torture, and sometimes secret execution. Most of those responsible for that reign of terror left Poland and upon arrival in the West represented themselves as victims of Communism and anti-Semitism – a claim which was readily believed in the West and earned them the full support of their hosts.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 63]

“In other words,” notes Tadeusz Piotrowski, “these [Jewish] executioners were transformed into victims.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 63] [More information about these people in the Holocaust chapter]

Jewish celebration of communal victimology is the cornerstone of Jewish identity. Simon Wiesenthal, the famed hunter of Nazi fugitives and namesake of Holocaust remembrance organizations, has even written the ultimate coffee table book for Jews (*Every Day Remembrance Day: A Chronicle of Jewish Mar-
tyrdom) who wish more specific attachment to their self-perception of historic victimization; the book is a kind of calendar, listing selected atrocities against Jews throughout history, at least one for every day of the year.

“That collective Jewish consciousness (of suffering and martyrdom),” writes Lucy Dawidowicz, “has been and remains – with justice, I think – one of the central myths of Jewish history, being an essence distilled from real events and reinforced in nearly every Jewish generation until our own time by brute reality.” [DAWIDOWICZ] “Every Jew,” declares Milton Steinberg, “at some time or other has reason to conclude that he has been penalized for his Jewish-ness.” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 77] “The Jews,” observed Sir Lewis Namier, both a Jew and Zionist, “do not have a history, they have a martyrology.” [RAPHAEL, p. 30] “Being a Jew and sufferer go together,” a Jewish senior citizen told anthropologist Barbara Myerhoff, “When we stop suffering, we get rich and secure, we stop being Jews. We become like everyone else, living for enjoyment only. Without it we don’t know what our purpose is.” [MYERHOFF, p. 198] “Moral decency, sympathy for the victim, sympathy for those who suffer,” claims Ann Roiphe, reciting the myth she deeply believes, “these are the building blocks of the mystical connection Judaism. It seems not so much to be a matter of indulging in masochism as to be a matter of aligning oneself with innocence.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 187]

Molly Katz, in a book of humor, *Jewish as a Second Language*, highlights a number of Jewish cultural traits. Finding humor in the enduring truths of what the Jewish community recognizes in itself, she notes that a Jew must “always agonize, resent, be disappointed, gloat, get even, suffer, [and] be positive something terrible is going to happen.” Conversely, Jews can “never be satisfied, think everything is fair, be a good sport, feel undeserving, let go of a grudge, ease up, [or] acknowledge the possibility of any light at the end of a tunnel.” [KATZ, M., p. 72]

“I share … an identification with the tribal suffering,” wrote senior editor Jack Newfield in the *Village Voice*, “I don’t know why, but if I read of Russian Jews waiting outside a visa office, if I read that a synagogue was blown up in Brussels, or I read [Jacobo] Timerman’s book, it affects me more on a certain level than when I read about a massacre in El Salvador or if I read about some atrocity in South Africa. There is a sense that those are my brothers and sisters.” [BRENNER, p. 55] “Although American Jews seem rooted, comfortably integrated in Christian America,” wrote Jewish art critic Donald Kuspit in 1997, “their long history has taught them, with paranoid precision, that one never knows what persecution and ostracization the future may bring.” [KUSPIT]

“It isn’t easy to find a Jew whose personality hasn’t been warped by his feelings toward gentiles,” wrote Jewish commentator James Yaffe in 1968, “Sometimes the damage is great, sometimes slight; many individuals succeed in overcoming it, or in learning to live with it, or even in making something valuable out of it. But the damage, in one form or another, is almost always there.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 57]

“How can a Jew not be bitter,” wondered Ann Roiphe in 1995, “how can a
Jew not be bent by the stories we know, stories that have come to us through the generations, so many stories of communal disaster, of individual pain, of lies and exclusions, of expulsions and blood libels, of Cossacks riding down on our villages, inquisitions and their instruments of torture, of cold shoulders and cold murders, of blame placed on our children’s heads for plagues, for draught, for flood, despaired for our enforced poverty and envied and loathed for our assumed wealth? … [ROIPHE, p. 443] … It is hard for a Jew not to feel that the plot of the world, its most central story, is about his or her destruction, exclusion, failed attempts to find a safe spot.” [ROIPHE, p. 446] “According to the Hebrew Bible (and its Christian analogue, the Old Testament),” notes Jewish feminist Andrea Dworkin, “Jews are God’s chosen people. It is not easy to see the benefits, if any, of this divine chooseness, since the history of the Jews is one of persecution and oppression … In the often-joined race for having suffered most, Jews are the group to beat.” [DWORKIN, A., 2000, p. 109]

The Jewish novelist, Bernard Malamud, took chauvinist Jewish martyrology so far as to subsume all human suffering under the Jewish umbrella, claiming that “suffering makes all men Jews.” [WHITFIELD, Mult, p. 10] Jewish philosopher Jacques Derrida “says we are all Jews, insofar as people in the contemporary world are nomads and displaced.” [STEYN, J., 1999, p. 11] The ridiculousness of such notions may be quickly dismissed in many ways, most poignantly with a comparison of Jewish consummate “suffering” to an almost unfathomable kind known by so many, even today, in the Third World. As Pascal Bruckner describes his experience with overwhelming poverty in a Third World train station:

“Here, the suffering are not just little groups scattered in a crowd; they are laid out, row upon row, on the bare cement. There are far more of them than there are travelers. Creatures are lined up in rags made of bags and cloth, with arms that are eaten away by gangrene and repulsive pustules sticking out.

You walk uneasily past these prostrate figures, as if you were walking in a swamp, and make your way to the ticket window. Bodies are strewn about like damaged goods, as if waiting along with their emaciation, eczema, and lumpus for street cleaners to sweep them up. It is impossible to tell if they are living or dead. Nobody pays them any attention ... It is an entire race of crushed, reviled, beaten down remnants, and this tide of flotsam begs you, calls to you, pulls at you, but so weakly that you push them aside with a simple movement of your foot.” [BRUCKNER, P., 1986, p. 53]

This is no episodic “holocaust” against a people who are declared by Evil Ones to have too much power and influence in surrounding society. Bruckner’s description here is a norm of survival for entire defined castes in places like India for centuries. Do these people, an underclass that is an unchanging fixture in Indian history, merit status as honorary Jews, history’s declared foremost sufferers?

Further along on the Jewish martyrological bandwagon, a Marxist and athe-
ist, Isaac Deutscher, rejected all cultural, religious, and Zionist definitions of his Jewishness, but said

“I am, however, a Jew by force of my unconditional solidarity with the persecuted and exterminated. I am a Jew because I feel the Jewish tragedy as my own tragedy.” [SHAPIRO, p. 8]

“Deutscher’s Jewish identity,” explains Edward Shapiro, “was dependent on Jews remaining among the persecuted.” [SHAPIRO, p. 8] “With the invention of nuclear weapons the world has become Jewish,” decides Eli Wiesel. [ROSENBERG, D., p. xiv]

The emotions of the Jewish Persecution Complex are deep, powerful and often vengeful, as evinced by left-wing publisher Michael Lerner:

“There are moments when I become so overwhelmed by the feelings of anger at what was done to my family and my people that I become sympathetic to the most extreme fantasies of the Israeli right wingers.” [LERNER, Goyim, p. 430]

On another front, in an article in the feminist MS magazine, one of its founders and editors, Letty Pogrebin, solicits “Christian sisters … to try to understand the immediacy of our [Jewish] mourning and the 5,000 years of terror that echo in our souls.” [POGREBIN, Antisem, p. 46] Another “liberal feminist,” and regular contributor to the Village Voice, Ellen Willis, echoed this view in her own public utterance:

“It is what all Jews, religious and secular, Zionist and non-Zionist, have in common – our status as outsiders, of being persecuted.” [COHEN, Uses, p. 26]

There are even intra-Jewish concentric circles of this ideology of incessant victimhood. In Israel, Orthodox Jews have taken the tool of self-perceived oppression to understand themselves systematically discriminated against and persecuted by secular Jewry around them. “This Orthodox self-perception as victims,” says Meir Lockshin, “in its most extreme forms, involves seeing the discrimination against Orthodoxy as systemic. A number of Orthodox Jews are now saying that the basic structures of Israeli democracy – the Knesset, the police, the army, and the courts – all discriminate against observant Jews.” [LOCKSHIN]

Meanwhile, not to be outflanked in the hierarchy of fellow Jews’ feelings of persecution, Shlomo Cohen wields his own Jewish essence by counter-claiming that

“I am a secular Jew, a member of a group that is probably the most oppressed in Jewish life today, certainly in Israel.” [COHEN, S. p. 23]

Also in Israel, with the influx of Jews from Russia to the new Jewish state, “Russian mafia” head Grigori Lerner (who was imprisoned in Israel) “in Israel’s Russian language press … is being portrayed as a [victim] of ethnic persecution.” [GROSS, N., 1997, p. 22] And what about the hyper-religious, far-right Messianic Gush Emunim movement in the Israeli-Occupied Territories? Israeli psychologist (and apologist) Tzvi Moses sees something familiar in their self-obsessions:
“The [Gush Emunim] settlers developed a feeling of persecution as a defense mechanism, similar to what was essential in its time to the Jewish nation in exile for its defense and adjustment in an inimical environment. The existence of such a mechanism in the psyche of the Jewish nation creates a problematic system in which change is difficult … Obstinacy and inflexible thinking typify the thinking of the Gush today.” [GROSSMAN, D., 1988, p. 42-43]

Even within the elemental unit of the household, Jewish women have traditionally cultivated complaint of personal suffering and victimhood abuse to practical ends. Zborowski and Herzog note that “vulnerability becomes a weapon, especially for the mother. Her suffering serves not only as a rebuke for the past but also as control of the future.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 297]

Oppression of Jews is commonly understood by Jews to have always existed, in varying but usually harsh degrees, everywhere they went in their exile from the Holy Land. Most of the world’s Jewry, by the Middle Ages, ended up as a minority people in Christian Europe. Their experiences there, particularly in relation to the Christian faith throughout medieval times, are widely believed by Jews today to have lain a foundation for the Nazis’ savage treatment of their people in the twentieth century.

Ann Roiphe goes out to do some calisthenics and lose some calories and, apparently, this is what runs through her mind:

“Even here in America stepping up and down in the aerobics classes of our local Jewish community centers we remember the trains of the Christians, those nation builders who called us ‘Christ killers’ as they killed us.” [ROIPHE, p. 444]

Psycho-socially and religiously then, since ancient history, to be Jewish has always meant exilic misery – exile from one’s country (driven out of the Holy Land in ancient history by the Babylonians and Romans), from one’s God (who has been traditionally understood to be angry with too much Jewish disregard for His dictates), and –increasingly for some, with the rise of rationalism a couple hundred years ago and estrangement from Jewish tradition in a sea of non-Jews – from one’s own people. But always, to be Jewish over the past millenium there has been an anchoring in the belief that Jews – the Biblical “chosen people” – are exceptional, and bound, at least, for some glorious leadership destiny. Many Jews today – secular or religious – still quite literally believe that they are God’s gift to mankind (often self-described as “the light unto the world.”) It is also a widely believed article of Jewish dogma, however, that, even in today’s comfortable Western Diaspora, a Jew’s non-Jewish neighbor might at any time turn on him – the Jewish Other, the ultimate scapegoat – with animosity. For essentially no reason. (Traditional Orthodoxy’s reason for Gentile hostility, however, is Gentile jealousy because God selected Jewry as His Chosen People). The successful creation of the modern state of Israel in recent times (as a direct consequence of Nazi Germany) – and its overwhelming support by worldwide Jewry – is a communal defense of such perspectives.

By the end of the 20th century “being Jewish” had reaffirmed its ultimate
expression as both religious and supra-religious collective complaint, codified as a militantly arrogant politic against the rest of humanity.

There is, of course, considerable evidence across history – over seventeen hundred years of it – of destructive acts by others against Jews in their Diaspora ("dispersion"): restrictive laws, harassment, and sometimes large scale violence. We are not, however, talking about a weekend time span. Nor are we speaking of anti-Jewish actions that were systematically reasonless. We are talking about nearly two thousand years of exile and, quite literally, the life experiences of many millions of people. Lost to Jewish ideology is the fact that their mistreatment at times by others has always had a context and that perils, misery, and misfortunes have also been the common lot of all peoples everywhere – of all faiths, politics, and social persuasions. Whenever and wherever Jews suffered, non-Jews suffered too. Human history is a long and torturous catalogue of social, economic, and political upheavals; everywhere the struggle for power, everywhere the struggle for survival. Other peoples have always suffered too, sometimes catastrophically, in sequence across history, with their own dilemmas, strife and tragedies, and much of Jewish misfortune has resonated, inevitably, from others' painful struggles. Often enough – and this is hotly and routinely denied, or reductively qualified, by common Jewish discourse these days – Jews caused other people suffering too. Whatever the case, few peoples have had the good fortune to survive as an ideological unit as long as the Jews who culminate a trans-historical diary of troubles and grievances across thousands of years as a unified expression of their modern selves. Most other peoples quietly assimilated into surrounding communities, woefully perished, or began anew.

Many Jews see the presence of a divine hand to account for the fact of their longevity, that – after 4,000 years and innumerable historical obstacles – they are still here. Such commentators – and they are legion – always fail to recognize, however, that untold billions of other human beings are “still around” too who are NOT Jews, by divine hand or otherwise. And while not all non-Jews exactly mirror the same habits, ethnicity, and self-image of their own direct ancestors thousands of years ago, neither do Jews. Things have changed. Always and everywhere. The Talmud itself (a sacred compilation of Jewish religious opinions over centuries) is a map of such changes. No Western Jew today – who represents the cumulative absorption of Hellenism, the Enlightenment, and a myriad of other extra-Jewish historical influences, as well as a long line of interbreeding with other racial types – would be recognized as brethren by illiterate Jewish goat-herders living in tents 4,000 years ago. And meanwhile, untold billions are not descendants of Abraham. Who cares? Somewhere back up the ancestral line we all merge souls to our common human ancestors, of whom no greater covenant in this world has ever been made. For Jews who take too much pride in (however drastically changed) a 4,000-year-old identity linked to a particular individual (the early Abraham-Isaac-Jacob lineage), one need only scan the jungles of New Guinea, Africa, and the Amazon to find remote tribes whose modern religious and ethnic identity still very closely echoes their unfathomably ancient origins. So what? Does their longevity confirm – as so many Jews would have it for themselves – the Divine hand of favoritism? A hand that in some cases far outdistances the Jews?
THE JEWISH DICTATES OF HISTORY

“The rewriting of the past is usually undertaken to achieve specific political aims.”

– Bernard Lewis, Jewish author, 1986, p. 48

“Pseudohistory [is] the rewriting of the past for personal or political purposes… If we want to be taken seriously, we must obey the rules of reason and apply the tools of science and scholarship.”

– Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, 2000, p. 2, 5, in their book about Holocaust deniers

“It may be true that German romanticism furnishes the sources for much in Zionism, but to know only this is to know half of the story. The other half is what Jewish existence makes of facts, how Jewish stubbornness uses history for its own purposes.”

– Monford Harris, 1965, p. 97-98

To write acceptable history of Jews in America, it is necessary to respect their performance, to know and to love the performers. He who writes history performs an act of faith. The historian selects a fact here, a person there – seeking to recreate a vanished scene, to capture a mood, to clothe a skeleton in flesh and blood. He breathes upon dead bones of the past – and, lo! – they come to life! The history of the Jews is unlike that of any other people. It is distilled anguish. It is crystallized grief. It is the dirge of a displaced people. It is the story of an exiled band of pilgrims seeking sanctuary.”

Anita Libman Lebeson, 1950, p. 308

“After Christ, the history of the Jew is in large part the history of anti-Semitism.”

– A. M. Rosental/Arthur Gelb, 1967, p. 69

When digging back into written records, researchers always retrieve selected fragments of an immense historical continuum and carefully shape and edit them, intent upon lending credibility to their respective theses of the past. This is the nature of “history”– it is always being reviewed, revised, changed, adjusted, and selectively reedited. Decades pass. Centuries. Emphases change: certain facts are accentuated, others are left out. Relevant historical information
is overlooked, or discovered. Whoever has the luxury and/or determination to review and reconstruct history colors it entirely as they wish. Christopher Columbus (his journeys funded in large part by Jewish investors and claimed by some to be himself of at least partial Jewish descent) is a good example. Revered in American folklore for two centuries, he has become, in the last decade or so, widely regarded by many as an exploitive, colonialist villain.

Modern popular belief and convention is validated by selected evidence from the past. While the time-rooted “facts” of events can sometimes be documented, the hows and whys of history have no such absolute mooring. What was written in the past is always biased, and that considered credible today in no lesser manner reflects the biases of writers and researchers today.

“Sometimes the past is remembered selectively,” notes Alan Wald, “in accord with the needs of the ideological outlook one has at a given moment or had at some significant moment in the past.” [WALD, p. 15] “[Historical] data and interpretation of data often becomes inseparable through consensus,” writes Alan Edelstein, one of the few Jewish scholars who have sought to reexamine the popular conventions of complete Jewish victimization. “This is particularly evident when many scholars share the same perspective, such as that of Jews as victims, and Christians as persecutors … The direction of inquiry is controlled by the questions that are posed. Because scholars are concerned with anti-Semitism, questions about Jewish-Christian relations are posed from this perspective.” [EDELSTEIN, p. xviii]

In researching Jewish history, the investigator discovers a wide variance of written material. Work by authors expressly critical of Jews (and they include a surprisingly number of Jewish commentators, mostly “apostates” of one kind or another, from the Middle Ages, through the Enlightenment era and up to World War II and the Holocaust) is invariably labeled by today’s political conventions to be “anti-Semitic” in nature. There is a large body of such material extending throughout history, written by critics wherever Jews were to be found, ranging from legitimate scholarship to Nazi fantasy material. Some of the criticism is ridiculous; the accusations of Hitler are absurdly exaggerated. But other observations about Jewish life by non-Jews is startlingly consistent over two thousand years. Consistently credible Gentile themes in attacks against Jews include Jewish elitism, their insularity and clannishness, their disdain for non-Jews, their exploitive and deceptive behavior towards those not their own, the suspicion of Jewish national loyalties and allegiance to the lands they lived in, excessive Jewish proclivity to money and economic control, and an economic “parasitism” (the concentration of Jews in lucrative ‘non-productive’ fields of finance – usury, money lending, etc. – at the expense of non-Jewish communities).

“Anti-Semitism,” remarks Oliver Cox, “is an ancient social attitude probably coeval with the rise of Jewish tribalism. It is thus an immemorial trait identified with Jewish culture … Jewish communities, historical or current, must expect to incur such responses as ethnocentrism, nationalism, and group discrimination. Anti-Semitism has been identified with Jewish behavior in the sense that it is a reaction of other groups to the Jews’ determination to assert
and perpetuate their identity ... Unlike race prejudice ... anti-Semitism or intolerance is essentially an inherent social response – a retaliation from a normal Jewish determination to resist merger of their civilization with that of a host peoples.” [COX, p. 183-184]

“The Jews,” said J. O. Hertzler, “… have been a supernation rather than members of a nation. More than any other people, certainly up to the time of the emancipation, they were innocent and irresponsible toward the national traditions and aspirations of the people among whom they lived.” [HERTZLER, p. 76] “The vast majority of Jews [in Russia],” notes Michael Aronson, “… maintained a traditional way of life, tenaciously holding on to age-old Jewish practices … Partly by choice and partly because of the circumstances created by anti-Jewish legislation, the Jews tended to keep aloof from the surrounding population.” [ARONSON, p. 34]

In 1927 Jewish commentator Maurice Hindus noted the gigantic gulf traditionally set between Jews and Gentiles: “For the old Jewish civilization, with its rigid orthodoxy and its emphasis on Jewish superiority, compelled aloofness from worldly intellectual intercourse even as it compelled social isolation … There are thousands of Jewish immigrants in [America] who remember only too vividly how horrified their parents were when they first discovered their children in possession of Gentile books and interested in Gentile studies.” [HINDUS, p. 370] Meri-Jane Rochelson notes that even secular Jewish literature in Eastern Europe rarely addressed the Jews around them: “The absence of non-Jews in [Israel Zangwill’s] Children of the Ghetto may be related to what Dan Miron has shown to be an even more severe omission of Christian neighbors in East European shtetl [Jewish village] fiction of the early twentieth century. According to Miron, the impression of insularity that results is part of a larger visionary shtetl myth.” [ZANGWILL, I., 1998, p. 28] Likewise, notes Ivan Kalmar, Sholem Asch’s Fiddler on the Roof story [and its later Broadway and Hollywood adaptations] “largely ignores even the Gentile environment.” [KALMER, I., in PRYTULAK]

As for non-Jewish perceptions of their Jewish neighbors, “hatred for the Jews,” says Abram Leon, “does not date solely from the birth of Christianity. Seneca treated the Jews as a criminal race. Juvenal believed that the Jews only existed to cause evil for other peoples. Quintilian said that Jews were a curse for other people.” [LEON, p. 71]

In 59 BCE the Roman statesman Cicero noted Jewish “clannishness” and “influence in the assemblies.” In the second century AD Celsus, one of Rome’s great medical writers, wrote that Jews “pride themselves in possessing superior wisdom and disdain for the company of other men.” Philostratus, an ancient Greek author, believed that Jews “have long since risen against humanity itself. They are men who have devised a misanthropic life, who share neither food nor drink with others.” Tacitus (56-120 A.D.) a Roman public official, declared that “the Jews are extremely loyal toward one another, and are always ready to show compassion, but toward other people they feel only hate and enmity.” [MORAIS, p. 46]
A brief sampling of the critical commentary and animosity towards Jews from a variety of sources through history includes the following:

“The Jewish nation dares to display an irreconcilable hatred toward all nations, and revolts against all masters; always superstitious, always greedy for the well-being enjoyed by others, always barbarous – cringing in misfortune and insolent in prosperity.”

Voltaire, (1694-1778), one of the greatest French eighteenth century writers, from *Essai sur les Moeurs*

Ironically, notes Jacob Katz, “Voltaire did more than any other single man to shape the rationalist trend that moved European society toward improving the status of the Jew.” [KATZ, *From*, p. 34] Still historically remembered (according to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1994) “as a crusader against tyranny and bigotry,” Voltaire turned repeatedly and angrily against Jews who he believed to epitomize such “tyranny and bigotry.” Jews, he complained, “are … the greatest scoundrels who have ever sullied the face of the globe … They are, all of them, born with raging fanaticism in their hearts, just as the Bretons and Germans are born with blond hair. I would not in the least be surprised if these people would not some day become deadly to the human race … You [Jews] have surpassed all nations in impertinent fables, in bad conduct, and in barbarism. You deserve to be punished, for this is your destiny.” [GOULD, p. 91] On another occasion Voltaire charged that “the Jew does not belong to any place except that place which he makes money; would he not just as easily betray the King on behalf of the Emperor as he would the Emperor for the King?” [KATZ, J, Fro, p. 44]

Thirty of 118 of Voltaire’s essays in his *Dictionary of Philosophy* address Jews, usually disparagingly. Voltaire calls Jews “our masters and our enemies … whom we detest … the most abominable people in the world.” [PRAGER, p. 128]

With the coming of the Enlightenment, notes David Sorkin, “Jews were roundly condemned for “their ritualistic religion, national character or economic situation which, separately or together, prevented them from being moral. Enlightenment thinkers almost without exception subscribed to this image of Jewish inferiority.” [SORKIN, p. 85] “The [Jewish] ghetto, Enlighteners argued,” says Steven Aschheim,

“had produced an essentially unacceptable culture. Jews were utter strangers to Europe. Social isolation had created traits in need of drastic transformation: Jews harbored within them hatred of the Christian nurtured by centuries of Talmudic and rabbinic indoctrination, they were religious fanatics, parasitic in their economics and dishonest in their dealings.” [ASCHHEIM, S., 1982, p. 6]

Even “enlightened” Jews disdained their Eastern European “ghetto” brethren: “The German Jews’ attack upon his own and later upon the East European ghetto was made easier by the fact that the attack was in the mainstream of Enlightenment humanism. Jewish reformers agreed that integration required emphatic rejection of ghetto traits, traits which Goethe in his discussion of the
The traditional rabbi had summed up as ‘fanatic zeal … repulsive enthusiasm … confused murmurings … piercing outcries … effeminate movements … the queerness of an ancient nonsense.’ [ASCHHEIM, S., 1982, p. 6]

“Know that wherever there is money,” said Montesquieu in his Persian Letters, “there is the Jew.” [KREFETZ, p. 45]

“The Semites … must declare all religious differences from their own to be bad. In this sense, intolerance is really a factor of the Semitic race, and a portion of the good and bad legacy it has left the world.”

Ernest Renan, (1823-1892) [RENAN, E., p. 63] French philosopher, historian and “one of the pioneers of Semitic philology” [LEWIS, B., 1986, p. 44]

“Jews chose voluntarily and with a profound talent for self-preservation the side of all those instincts that makes for decadence, not as if mastered by them, but as if detecting in them a power by which the world could be defied. The Jews are the very opposite of decadents … they have put themselves at the head of all decadent movements.”

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) [AGUS, p. 295]

“The case against the Jews is long and damning; it would justify ten thousand times as many pogroms as now go on in the world.”


“The Jews remain what they have been at all times: an elite people, self-confident and domineering.”

Charles De Gaulle, former President of the Republic of France (1890-1970); (Facing heat, DeGaulle tried later to reframe this as compliment) [GOULD, p. 494]

In apartheid South Africa, in a study of the representation of the Jews of that society in the fiction of Black writers, “coloreds,” and Indians, Jews were perceived to be “exploitive and powerful.” [SHAIN, p. 153] Another study, by Melville Edelstein, suggested that the only English-speaking group further than Jews in “social distance” from Blacks were the dominant Afrikaners and that it was common parlance in Black culture to use the term “stingy like a Jew.” [SHAIN, p. 153]

Even prominent and widely respected Jewish commentators echoed the same themes about their own people. Benjamin Disraeli, of Jewish heritage, and the most famous British prime minister of the nineteenth century wrote that

“The native tendency of the Jewish race is against the doctrine of the equality of man. They have also another characteristic – the faculty of acquisition … Their bias is to religion, property, and natural aristocracy.” [FELDMAN, p. 638]

Another Jew, the great philosopher Baruch Spinoza, was a bridge between Jewish medievalism and the Enlightenment. Spinoza noted that:
“At the present time there is absolutely nothing which the Jews can arrogate to themselves beyond other people … As to their continuance so long after dispersion, there is nothing marvelous in it, for they separated themselves from every nation as to draw upon themselves universal hate.” [LEVY, p. 93]

Similar complaints reflecting consistently reoccurring charges against Jews have been echoed continuously throughout history, in many languages and in many lands, including – even in the ancient past – “Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Syrians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, and many others.” [HERTZL, p. 62] But this disdain for Jews by critics (some of the most learned men of their times, including Jews and Jewish apostates, across the spectrum of humanity) is not accepted as historical evidence for anything in our own day, except for the strange tenacity of irrational “anti-Semites” and “self-hating Jews” to badmouth Jews. Because this century’s Nazi hate machine incorporated anything negative at all about Jews for their own evil aims, modern Jewry defensively, and manipulatively, equates any criticism about Jews in history (and there is a ton of it) to prejudicial lies or oversimplifications that led – and can lead – to Nazi fascism. So what was the real situation in bygone eras? What were Jews like, in relation to Gentiles? Popular Jewish dictate has one answer: look only to the Hebrew texts, ancient rabbis, and other Jewish chroniclers. They know what Jews were like. Their texts are reliable. The rest are all lies and exaggerations.

“How does one understand – not even forgive, simply understand!” exhorts Harvard law professor and well-known Jewish polemicist Alan Dershowitz,

“the virulently anti-Jewish statements of intellectuals throughout history? Their numbers included H. L. Mencken (‘The Jews could be put down very plausibly as the most unpleasant race ever heard of’); George Bernard Shaw (‘Stop being Jews and start being human beings’); Henry Adams (‘The whole rotten carcass is rotten with Jew worms’); H.G. Wells (‘A careful study of anti-Semitism, prejudice and accusations might be of great value to many Jews, who do not adequately realize the irritation they inflict’); Edgar Degas (characterized as a ‘wild anti-Semite’); Denis Diderot (‘Brutish people, vile and vulgar men’); Theodore Dreiser (New York is a ‘kike’s dream of a ghetto,’ and Jews are not ‘pure Americans’ and ‘lack integrity’); T. S. Eliot (a social as well as literary anti-Semite, even after the Holocaust); Immanuel Kant (‘The Jews still cannot claim any true genius, any truly great man. All their talents and skills revolve around stratagems and low cunning … They are a nation of swindlers.’) Other famous anti-Semites include Tacitus, Cicero, Aleksander Pushkin, Pierre Renoir, Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, and, of course, Richard Wagner. This honor roll of anti-Jewish bigotry goes on, and included people of every race, religion, and geographic area, political leaning, gender, and age. The answer to the question why? probably lies more in the realm of abnormal psychology than in any rational attempts to find understandable cause in history, or economics. Anti-
Semitism is a disease of the soul, and diseases are best diagnosed by examining those infected with them.” [DERSHOWITZ, A., p. 113]

Nicholas de Lange, a Jewish scholar, joins Dershowitz in reflecting a virtually generic Jewish response about the constant complaint about their people throughout history and culture, saying:

“Much of the ancient literature on the Jews … is devoted to explaining why the Jews have incurred the justifiable anger or hatred of ordinary peace-loving, law-abiding people … But no critical historian would consider taking their arguments at face value, and in fact they are likely to tell us more about their authors than their victims.” [De Lange, p. 28]

A Jewish-Polish professor in Warsaw, Pawel Spiewak, adds this about the same theme:

“We find the representatives of almost every ideological orientation [who were anti-Semites] … Enlightenment thinkers (Voltaire), arch-conservatives (de Maistre, de Bonald), socialists and communists (Fourier, Proudhon, Marx, Sobel), and the great Romantics (Goethe). These writers seem to differ in everything – their relation to religion, the idea of progress, authority, feudalism, and capitalism, the concept of knowledge and human nature – but they are united in a spirit of dislike and hostility towards that strange tribe, the Jews.” [SPIEWAK, P., p. 51]

While fascists on the political right like Hitler decried the Jews, polar political 18th and 19th century leftists like socialists Charles Fourier, Alphonse Tousenel, Pierre Le Roux, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Johann Gottlieb Fichte were, to today’s Jewish analysis, also vehemently irrational anti-Semites. These men wrote tracts like this, by Proudhon:

“The Jew is by temperament an anti-producer, neither a farmer nor an industrialist nor even a true merchant. He is an intermediary, always fraudulent and parasitic, who operates, in trade as in philosophy, by means of falsification, counterfeiting, and horse-trading.” [LEWIS, B., 1986, p. 111]

“I see no other means of protecting ourselves against them,” wrote Fichte, “than by conquering their Promised Land and sending them all there.” [LEWIS, B., 1986, p. 111-112] Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin declared that Jews were

“One exploiting sect, one people of leeches, one single devouring parasite closely and intimately bound together not only across national boundaries, but also across all divergences of political opinion … [Jews have] that mercantile passion which constitutes one of the principle traits of their national character.” [LEWIS, B., 1986, p. 113]

“For one [reason] or another,” notes Daniel Pipes, “virtually every major figure in the early history of socialism – including Friedrich Engels, Charles Fourier, Ferdinand Lasalle, Marx, and Joseph Proudhon – showed a marked antipathy to Jews.” [PIPES, D., 1997, p. 88]
Jewish author William Korey notes the same mystifying anti-Jewish omnipresence among disparate peoples in interviews (at a Harvard archive) with 329 refugees from the Soviet Union in the early 1950s: “A detailed examination of the background information of those who registered hostile attitudes to Jews reveals that they were of various age, national, educational, and status groups, and that they left the USSR at different periods.” [KOREY, W., 1973, p. 11] The top six “anti-Semitic” assertions by this diverse group of people included assertions that

1) Jews occupy a privileged and favored position in Soviet society.
2) Jews are business- and money-minded.
3) Jews are clannish and help each other.
4) Jews are aggressive and ‘pushy.’
5) Jews are sly, calculating, and manipulative, and know how to ‘use a situation.’
6) Jews are deceitful, dishonest, unprincipled, insolent, and impudent.

[KOREY, W., 1973, p. 5]

When investigating the history of Jewish relations with Gentiles across history, there are obviously only two possible sources for information: Jews and non-Jews. There were no unbiased Martian observers watching with telescopes, none – in any case – that left us records. So why, one might wonder per the aforementioned professor De Lange and millions like him, must a “critical historian” consider Jewish accounts categorically more reliable than historical accounts by non-Jews, when all varieties of critical commentators about Jews across history, class, language, and culture basically said the same thing? “However uncomfortable it is to recognize,” says Albert Lindemann, “not all those whom historians have classified as anti-Semites were narrow bigots, irrational, or otherwise incapable of acts of altruism and moral courage. They represented a bewildering range of opinion and personality types.” [LINDEMANN, p. 13] And why is this “uncomfortable [for Jews] to recognize?” Because, by even a child’s exercise of logic and common sense, the perceptual common denominator of all such disparate people can only be the enduring truths about Jews as each observer experienced them in varying historical and cultural circumstances.

The French Jewish intellectual (and eventual Zionist), Bernard Lazare, among many others in history, noted this obvious fact in 1894, long before the Nazi persecutions of Jews and resultant institutionalized Jewish efforts to deny, or obfuscate, crucial – and central – aspects of their history:

“Wherever the Jews settled [in their Diaspora] one observes the development of anti-Semitism, or rather anti-Judaism … If this hostility, this repugnance had been shown towards the Jews at one time or in one country only, it would be easy to account for the local cause of this sentiment. But this race has been the object of hatred with all nations amidst whom it settled. Inasmuch as the enemies of Jews belonged to diverse races, as they dwelled far apart from one another, were ruled by different laws and governed by opposite principles; as they had not the
same customs and differed in spirit from one another, so that they could not possibly judge alike of any subject, it must needs be that the general causes of anti-Semitism have always resided in [the people of] Israel itself, and not in those who antagonized it.” [LAZARE, p. 8]

Since the institutionalized persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany, leading up to, and during, World War II, there has been a militantly enforced moratorium on critical commentary by Gentiles about Jewry. (Exceptions to this include a relatively small amount of material produced by major publishing houses that is critical in some aspect of the modern state of Israel and rare, obscure, usually self-published books with little circulation by individuals highlighting “world Jewish conspiracy” or “the Holocaust never existed” themes. Such works are automatically considered by popular culture to be part of an unreadable, fiction-oriented “lunatic fringe.”)

While most literature about Jews by non-Jews throughout history is considered to be “anti-Semitic,” there is also a historical perspective about Jews that is “philo-Semitic” in nature. This term refers to a friendly, generous, or sympathetic depiction of Jewish history by non-Jewish writers. It is a pro-Jewish bias. This has often taken the form of Christian writers feeling some kind of link to Judaism, as Christianity’s own origin. There are also those who benefit by allegiance to Jewish powers. With the rise of the Nazis and their vicious treatment of European Jews, a corresponding increase in philo-Semitic literature and apologetics also made the scene. The Nazi epoch, in this view, emphatically confirms as horrific fulfillment Jewish perceptions of their own prior history as perpetual victims.

Almost all scholarship and other commentary in modern times about Jewish history, however, (and considerable amounts of non-Jewish history) is provided by Jewish academics and popularists, most of whom are, in varying degrees, entranced and enthralled by legends of their own heritage. In fact, most of the massive amount of material being published these days about Jews is written by Jews for Jews; it is then popularized in elemental forms throughout the mass media for unquestioned digestion by the general public.

“Jewish studies [on North American campuses],” notes Jacob Neusner, “[are not] treated in accord with academic disciplines but as an arena for Jews to explore their roots, Jews teaching (self-evidently valid) facts to other Jews.” [NEUSNER, p. 9] “All modern studies on Judaism, particularly by Jews,” notes Israel Shahak, … “to this day … bear the unmistakable marks of their origin: deception, apologetics, or hostile polemics, indifference or even active hostility to the pursuit of truth. Jewish studies in Judaism … to this very day, are polemics against an external enemy [non-Jews] rather than an internal debate.” [SHAHAK, p. 22]

“In popular [Jewish] history,” notes non-Jewish scholar Albert Lindemann, “a strange tendency exists to favor an emotionally laden description and narrative, especially of colorful, dramatic, or violent episodes over explanation that employs calm analysis or a searching attention to historical context. Pogroms, famous anti-Semitic affairs and descriptions
of the ideas of anti-Semitic authors and agitators are described with a moral fervor, rhetorical flair, and considerable attention to the details of murder, arson, and rape. Background, context, and motives are often slighted or dealt with in a remarkably thin and tendentious fashion. In such histories the antagonists of the Jews emerge as stick figures … Violent episodes against Jews burst forth like natural calamities or acts of God, incomprehensible disasters having nothing to do with Jewish action or developments within the Jewish world but only with the corrupt characters of the enemies of the Jew.” [LINDEMANN, A., *Esau’s*, p. 12]

In 1990 Michael Aronson, a Jewish scholar, wrote an entire volume debunking the conventional Jewish view that the Russian government sponsored pogroms in a national anti-Semitic “conspiracy,” organizing attacks against Jews in 1881 throughout that country. “The interested student,” he wrote, “may choose at random any recent text, whether devoted to Russian Jews in particular, or modern Jewish history more broadly, or late imperial Russia in general, and it is almost certain that, if the pogroms of 1881 are mentioned, they are interpreted according to a conspiracy theory. This study rejects the conspiracy explanation … [The] scholarly literature devoted to Russian Jewish history dates to the pre-Revolutionary period and is largely the creation of Russian Jewish historians.” [ARONSON, p. 7-8] Seminal among these historians were Emmanuel B. Levin and Simon M. Dubnov. Levin’s bias was explicit. “Levin’s patron,” says Aronson, “was Baron H.O. Guenzburg, who commissioned him to write a number of works on Russian discriminatory and restrictive Jewish legislation.” [ARONSON, p. 11]

In 1998, Elliott Horowitz wrote an unusually honest article (http://iupjournals.org/jss/jss4-2.html) in *Jewish Social Studies* about the way Jewish history is reframed by modern Jewish apologetics and polemics. His particular subject in the piece was the Persian invasion of Jerusalem in 614 and the attendant Jewish massacres of tens of thousands of local Christians (low estimate 30,000 people; high estimate 90,000). Horowitz quotes, for example, the 1840s work of Reverend George Williams who wrote that the Jews “had followed the Persians from Galilee, to gratify their vengeance by the massacre of the [Christian] believers, and the demolition of the of their most sacred churches. They were amply guted with blood. In a few days 90,000 Christians of both sexes, and of all ages and conditions, fell victims to their indiscriminating hatred.” [HOROWITZ, 1998]

“As we shall see,” notes Horowitz about the preceding quote,

“Jewish contemporaries of Williams described the events of 614 rather similarly. A century later, however, in the years following the Holocaust, memories of Jews gratifying their vengeance and giving vent to their ‘indiscriminating hatred’ began to fade, being displaced increasingly by the Sartrean [Jean-Paul Sartre] Jew, ‘passionately hostile to violence’ … Although the Jews of Palestine undoubtedly participated in the wide-scale violence against Christians and their houses of worship in 614, their precise role has been open to keen debate. Difference of opinion however,
have often revolved less around what actually happened than around how much should be told and how.’’ [HOROWITZ, 1998]

Crucial in historical records about the 614 massacres was an eyewitness, Antiochus Strategos, a Christian monk. Strategos claimed that over 66,000 Christians were slaughtered, and that Jews playing a major role in the killings. Many later chroniclers, including Eutychius of Alexandria and the Greek Theophanes, discussed the Jewish-inspired massacres. In the nineteenth century, Jewish historians like Salomon Munk and Heinrich Graetz wrote about the slaughters. Although formulating some apologetics for Jewish behavior in the era, Graetz, notes Horowitz, was “unwilling to sweep Jewish religious violence under the rug, or to dismiss, as would many later Jewish historians, all Christian accounts thereof as tainted by bias.” [HOROWITZ, 1998]

Twentieth century Jewish historians who were part of a “historiographical stonewalling” include Samuel Klein (whose history of the Jews in Palestine made no mention of the 614 massacre), Michael Avi-Yonah (whose original work did not mention who perpetrated the massacres and whose later work solely blamed the Persians), and Salo Baron (who does not mention the reason Jews were driven out of Antioch in the fifth century: a Jew was caught urinating on an image of the venerated Virgin Mary). Readers of both Avi-Yonah and Baron, notes Horowitz, “could come away with the impression that during the massacre of 614 not a single Jew had shed a drop of Christian blood.” [HOROWITZ, p. 7] Horowitz also notes that virtually all Jewish historians overlook the horrific details in their telling of another set of Jewish massacres of Christians in Antioch, and the murder of its patriarch, in 610. According to translations of Theophanes, for example, “the Jews of Anitoch … disembowed the great Patriarch Anastasisu, and forced him to eat his own intestines … They hurled his genitals into his face.” [HOROWITZ, 1998, p. 6]

In Israel, especially since 1967, notes Horowitz, “the tendency in Israeli historiography, both academic and popular, [is] to ignore the slaughter of Jerusalem’s Christians in 614.” [HOROWITZ, 1998, p. 7] A former Minister of Education, Benzion Dinur, for example, never mentioned the 614 massacres in a review of the period. Nor does professor Naftali Arbel mention Jewish responsibility in his own volume that addresses the era. Likewise Teddy Kollek and Moshe Pearlman’s book about Jerusalem, and the Israeli Encyclopedia Entsiklopedyah ha-ivrit. In the Hebrew University-sponsored History of the Jewish People by H. H. Ben-Sasson, “not a word was said concerning Christian casualties in the volume from which thousands of Israeli high school and university students have learned about their nation’s past.” [HOROWITZ, p. 8]

Peter Novick notes how the history of Jewish-Palestinian relations has been distorted by Jewish scholarship to accommodate Israeli propaganda purposes: to connect “Arabs in general, and Palestinians in particular, with Nazism”:

“The claims of Palestinian complicity in the murder of European Jews were to some extent a defensive strategy, a preemptive response to the Palestinian complaint that if Israel was recompense for the Holocaust, it was unjust that Palestinian Muslims should pick up the bill for the
crimes of European Christians. The assertion that Palestinians were complicit in the Holocaust was mostly based on the case of the Mufti of Jerusalem, a pre-World War II Palestinian nationalist leader who, to escape imprisonment by the British, sought refuge during the war in Germany. The Mufti was in many ways a disreputable character, but postwar claims that he played any significant part in the Holocaust have never been sustained. This did not prevent the [Jewish] editors of The Encyclopedia of the Holocaust from giving him a starring role. The article on the Mufti is more than twice as long as the articles on [prominent Nazi leaders] Goebbels and Goring, longer than the articles on Himmler and Heydrich combined, longer than the article on Eichmann – of all the biographical articles, it is exceeded in length, but only slightly, by the entry for Hitler.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 158]

Another very rare Jewish commentator, Jonathan Schorsch, published an intriguing article in 2000, reviewing Jewish historians’ reluctance to investigate, and honestly comment upon, Jewish involvement in the African-American slave trade. The core of the article is to note Jewish historical efforts to bend unsightly unpleasantness from the Jewish past into cautious apologetics, and to categorically scapegoat Christian society for all Jewish-inspired oppression of others. Schorsch notes the norm for Jewish scholars in the work of influential historian Salo Baron: “When forced to talk about Jews as slave traders, such as in the British West Indies, Baron feels the need to insert an apology, though that is not always the case when he discusses non-Jewish slave trading.” Thus, for example, while Cortes, the famed conquistador of Central America, is condemned for heinous crimes against indigenous people, partner conquistadors of Jewish descent, like Bartolome de las Casas and Hernando Alonso, are not faced squarely, and are morally pardoned.

Schorsch also takes influential Jewish historian (about Brazil) Jacob Rader Marcus to task for the same theme: condemning Christian involvement in the slave trade, but disguising, or muffling, Jewish guilt and culpability. “The silence [about Jews and their African slaves] of even so sensitive and progressive a historian as Marcus,” declares Schorsch, “can be astounding. Discussing the Jews of Saint-Domingue, where he has just informed the reader of one wealthy Jewish clan that owned a plantation employed 280 slaves, Marcus cites the discovery that ‘anti-Jewish prejudices was not absent on Saint-Domingue even among the Negroes.’”

Here Marcus falls upon the usual Jewish “anti-Semitic” and “innocence” model for understanding Jewish history: that African slaves who disdained their Jewish masters that oppressed them were, for this, themselves moral criminals. As Schorsch frames this issue: “[Marcus] seems to be saying, that white Christian Europeans would hate Jews, but Negroes! What reason could they possibly have for hating Jews?”

Another Jewish scholar of the subject of Jews and their African-American slaves, Arnold Wiznitzer, “refrains from looking into the attitudes of Jews
towards blacks or Indians.” And, during a 1982 conference in Brazil, “featuring lectures by some of the most distinguished Jewish historians working on the Sephardic Diaspora [in Brazil] [they] nearly without exception failed to analyze black-Jewish contacts on Curacao, though one mentioned in passing some of the Jewish slave traders on the island.” [SCHORSCH, J., 2000]

Likewise, notes Jonathan Schorsch, fellow Jewish scholar Robert Cohen has “buried” the facts of Jewish slaveholding in the Caribbean in a table of statistics, and correspondingly “minimizes Jewish slaveholding” in his prose. [SCHORSCH, J., 2000] Ultimately, says Schorsch, “there is something dissatisfying about this kind of apologetic argument; indeed, something is unsettling … That [such tactics], intentional or unconscious, recurs so consistently in twentieth-century American Jewish historiography suggests the depths of the topic’s unpalatability.” [SCHORSCH, J., 2000] (The “topic” Schorsch refers to here is Jewish-Black relations, but it may well be virtually anything whatsoever that strikes Jewry in an unflattering light).

In 1999, Jewish scholar Jay Gertzner leaned back on the usual kinds of conventional Jewish excuses to explain non-Jewish hostility towards Jews, per the subject of one of his books: the Jewish creation –and dominance – of the smut trade in New York City (and, hence, America). Here he assails those who criticized the many immigrant Jews who were busy undermining the morality of American WASP culture:

“This irrespressible insistence, seen as characteristic of Jewish merchants in particular, and of ethnic middlemen minorities in general, helped confer pariah status on the erotic book dealers. Here, the one-hundred percent moralist warned, was a tightly knit group of workers single-mindedly driven to material success, an apparently autonomous minority that had chosen to pursue its own ‘godless, un-American’ goals with a strange and foreign intensity. When added to the disreputable nature of the business, as attested to by the denunciation of various authority figures, and by police action against the ‘promoters,’ as postal inspectors termed them, the identity of the erotica distributor as clannish – employing their own kind’ – and aloof – with their own, ethnic, allegiances – became fixed. Here was a kind of ‘parasite’ with whom one would, on occasion, itch to deal, but would remain chary of trusting, especially because the dealer was so good at what he did.” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 41]

In other words, in Gertzman’s subtext here, it is not really the Jewish pornographers who merit critical examination for failings in their morality, but those non-Jews who dared to criticize them as Jews (and Gertzman notes elsewhere indeed that the smut world was very much a Jewish in-house activity), [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 28-29] per the tenets of “anti-Semitism.” Gertzman even goes on to paraphrase another Jewish commentator, adding that – pornographers or not – the smut peddlers are heroes. After all, in the Jewish world view the destruction of the WASP’s moral world was intrinsically noble, i.e., the non-Jewish world is, by definition, repression. Here the Jewish pornographer is a noble protagonist for righteousness:
“Moses Kligsberg asserts that the eastern European Jewish people’s sense of how and where to fulfill takhlis [fate] was a chief motive for the immigration to America, and so explains the perseverance, enthusiasm, respect for education, community and family solidarity, and malleability that other sociological analysts attribute to traits of middleman minorities. The prosecuted erotica dealers could only submit to fate and promise themselves that, even if they went to jail, their sons and daughters would recognize that they had been fighting puritanical taboos, not selling smut, and were accepting the setbacks that presented themselves as they endeavored to accomplish legitimate goals.” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 42]

While such unpleasant parts of Jewish history are systematically overlooked, explained away, or, as above, championed, since the 1960s numerous wealthy Jews have been funding Jewish studies programs at colleges and universities throughout America, and well-budgeted Jewish researchers have been falling over each other in writing about everything imaginably Jewish (even including meta-histories of the lives of modern Jewish historians like Salo Baron, Raul Hilberg, Simon Dubnov, Cecil Roth, and others). “Jewish studies have become a growth industry,” said Bernard Cooperman in 1990, “and the signs of prosperity are everywhere. There is at least one, and usually more than one, full-time instructor in Jewish studies at almost every university in this country. The Association for Jewish Studies, the basic professional organization in this area, counts well over 700 full members, that is, individuals who are employed in a recognized academic institution. Every major academic press in the country has an active list of Jewish Studies books … International conferences abound, new journals appear with alarming frequency.” [COOPERMAN, p. 195]

“The growing number of scholars who are today writing the best history thus far produced for American Jewry,” wrote Henry Feingold in 1996, “[are creating] an information explosion of such magnitude that merely screening the amount of data available and separating them from pseudo-data poses extraordinary difficulties … It directly effects not only how the future history of American Jewry will be written but what will be written about.” [FEINGOLD, p. 31] “Too many histories of the Jews,” adds David Biale, “unconsciously fall back on the theology of Jewish uniqueness and assume that the Jewish tradition evolves in some splendid isolation from the rest of the world.” [BIALE, Conf, p. 45] And a core of Jewish Studies interest? “Jewish studies,” notes Susannah Heschel, “emerged not as a politically neutral field concerned with describing the history of the Jews but as a politically charged effort to reconceive Christian history as well.” [HESCHEL, 1998, p. 107]

In 2000, the Cleveland Jewish News noted that Peter Haas [is]

“the new Abba Hillel Silver professor of Jewish Studies at Case Western Reserve University and director of the Samuel Rosenthal Center for Judaic Studies … To begin, Haas said, one should be struck with the oddity of having Jewish studies at a modern, secular scientific university … In 1940 there were about 10 Jewish studies programs in the United
States. By the 1970s, there were up to 400. And there are even more today ... Jewish studies and religious studies in general have also diversified, with academicians specializing in areas such as Jewish women, Hebrew linguistics, Jewish musicology and antisemitism.” [OSTER, M., 2/18/2000]

Indeed, among the mountains of material Jews write about themselves is a vast subfield: modern Jewish obsession with “anti-Semitism.” In one Jewish analysis of ancient Latin and Greek writers, we are informed that 18% were “substantially favorable” towards Jews, 59% were “neutral,” and 23% “substantially unfavorable.” [GRIFFIN, p. 58] “It is … striking,” says Jasper Griffin, in a subtle poke at Jewish narcissism, “that references to the classical authors to Jews are in the modern world collected, analyzed, and discussed so much more intensively than their references to other peoples. It would not be easy to produce comparable statistics collected by modern scholars for ancient judgments on other groups or nations.” [GRIFFIN, p. 58] Indeed, Jews – who insist that non-Jews keeping tabs on who’s Jewish is itself an act of anti-Semitism – can somehow tell us that exactly three Jews died in the Battle of the Alamo, exactly seventeen died when the U.S.S. Maine was sunk off Cuba in 1898 to start the Spanish-American War, and that Wyatt Earp lived with a Jewish woman and was buried in a Jewish cemetery. [DAVIS, p. 29] [Note the curious controversy over an image alleged to be Earp’s wife, Sarah Marcus Earp. Hollis Cook, the historical park ranger at Tombstone, Arizona, alleges that a popular photographic reproduction of Ms. Earp, is not her, but probably, for whatever reason, a New York City prostitute.] [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 270-273]

“So much has been written about modern Jewish experience,” notes Stephen Whitfield, “that, even if confined to its American locale, the acquisitions librarians can barely keep up with the pace. So crammed are the shelves of books about Jews – including their American branch – that perhaps the sin of adding ever so slightly to that literature cannot be palliated.” [WHITFIELD, p. 1, American] Over the past six decades leading up to 1988, one scholar found – in French, German, or English – 86 books about “Jewish humor” alone. [WHITFIELD, American, p. 66] Professor Laurence Baron, director of the Lipinsky Center for Judaic Studies at San Diego State University, passes out a list of books in English under the heading “Why Righteous Gentiles Rescued Jews During the Holocaust.” The list is 46 volumes long.

Thousands of publications appear about some aspect of Jewry every year, but with all the money flying around, however, there is more than the usual kinds of pressure in academe to “publish or perish.” “The desire to present Jews and Judaism in a good light,” says William Cutter, “still influences many donors [to Jewish studies] and may even be their primary motive.” [CUTTER, p. 163]

“By making Jewish Studies available at the university level,” remarks Bernard Cooperman, “we have given … young people another chance to appreciate the positive and sophisticated aspects of Jewish culture … We have legitimized these subjects and made them attractive by neutralizing the [rest of the university] environment in which they are taught.” [COOPERMAN, p. 196-
“In ways that are often quite expected,” noted Gary Morson in 1996, “many Jewish scholars have found themselves listening to a Jewish voice within them they have long neglected.” [MORSON, p. 78]

The necessity, then, to parrot and disseminate traditional Jewish mythology in an academic context apparently doesn’t bother many Jewish scholars. “A discipline [Jewish studies] which exploded in this country in the late sixties,” says David Biale, “has become, all too often, careerist and conformist. With the inflation of endowed chairs, a product of the Jewish community’s desire to buy ethnic respectability in the academy, the field has become fertile ground for academic entrepreneurs.” [BIALE, Conf, p. 140]

“The [Jewish] obsession with Holocaust memorials,” says Jay Berkovitz, “… is paralleled by an equally dangerous obsession, the establishment of Jewish Studies in out-of-the-way places that have neither student support nor community support. They are, in effect, monuments to power, real and imagined, of Jewish wealth. Both of these phenomena point to an unseemly sensationalism and superficiality.” [BERKOVITZ, Disc, p. 29]

Despite the ethical and intellectual poverty in many Jewish studies programs, tightening budgets in the university world at-large, and tinkling Jewish money for Jewish apologetics and cosmetics has attracted academic hustlers of all sorts “seeking,” according to William Cutter, “entre into the Jewish community.” [CUTTER, p. 164]

But it’s not easy for non-Jews to get in. In fact, non-Jewish perspectives on “being Jewish” are not really welcome. While Jews herald Gentile discrimination against them as virtually the very foundation of Jewish studies, the Jewish community’s typical double standard reeks with hypocrisy. In 1987 Jacob Neusner wrote that:

“Just now a non-Jewish graduate student applying for a job [in Jewish studies] at a state university in the Middle West, was told that he was by far the best-qualified candidate. In face, he was the only truly qualified candidate who wanted the job. But he would not even be interviewed. The reason? He isn’t Jewish. The local Jewish federation was paying part of the salary, and the local Jewish federation wanted some teaching done under its auspices. Only a Jew could do it. So the state university enforced the rule that for Jewish Studies only Jews need apply.” [NEUSNER, Judaism, p. 10]

Neusner was indignant that Jewish Studies programs across America have developed into isolated ghettos in academe. “I cannot imagine,” he complained, “a more complete surrender to contempt for the Jews than that which Jews themselves have made in their profound misunderstanding of the nature of the academy.” [NEUSNER, p. 10]

Meanwhile, the Chronicle of Higher Education reported that in the same year (1987) that Neusner noted American academe’s caving in to Jewish money and its institutionalized discrimination, “Jewish organizations” were successfully lobbying for national legislation that would enforce public disclosure of “large gifts” to colleges “from foreign sources,” a law which explicitly targeted Arab
donations and perspectives. The usual Jewish double standard was in evidence, the *Chronicle* noting that:

“The [Jewish] organizations and their Congressional backers say the legislation would discourage colleges from accepting money on the condition that people of certain ethnic groups or political views be excluded from endowed chairs or academic programs created with the gifts … Jewish organizations charge that Arab donors were using gifts to influence academic research improperly.” [JASCHIK, p. A19]

Also in 1987, two Jewish professors at Cornell University fought a philanthropic donation from a Jewish anti-Zionist, and alumnus of the college, Alfred Lilienthal, for an Islamic lecture series. David Owen, a professor of Near Eastern Studies, argued that Lilienthal’s views of Israel were not ‘balanced.” The chairman of that department (Jewish too), Stewart Katz, also was hostile to the grant. Yet another Jewish academic, Isaac Kramnick, the Associate Dean, directed both Islamic and Jewish Studies at Cornell. “On the Cornell campus,” Lilienthal told the *Jewish Week*, “only one religion and its political goals are really taught. More of the other side has got to be given.” [JW, 5-15-87, p. 19]

(In this chauvinist context, African-American professor Tony Martin wrote that “even now, in 1993, it is still possible to find a large African-American Studies department in a large eastern university proposing to establish a Ph.D program in Black Studies where more than half of the compulsory reading in the bedrock ‘great Black books’ are by Jews. The reverse situation of a Judaic studies Ph.D program taught by white Jews and based on the writings of Black experts, would be so unthinkable as to be the stuff of comedy.”) [MARTIN, p. 42]

Alfred Lilienthal’s gift and Jacob Neusner’s outrage is extremely unusual. The more typical Jewish perspective is that of Bernard Cooperman, who expresses outrage for an even more subtly insidious threat to Jewish mythology than that of a non-Jew teaching Jewish issues:

“Here is the danger [in a secular university context] … Some [Jewish teachers] are not even practicing Jews. I remember well a recent case in which Jewish money funded a new Jewish Studies chair and the university offered the position to a man who been, at least one time in his life, an apostate!” [COOPERMAN, p. 196-197]

Jewish censorship and information control in academe takes many forms, often instilled by academics themselves. Joseph Amato notes the disturbing case of a British professor at the University of London who does not submit to the Jewish dictates of history:

“British scholar Norman Davies – one of Europe’s foremost scholars of Poland – was denied by fellow faculty a chair at Stanford University by a twelve to eleven vote because his book, *God’s Playground: A History of Poland*, 2 vol. (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1984) was found to be unacceptably defensive of Polish relations to Jews [see later chapter p. 195] during the Second World War. Stanford University, taking the side of the majority, argued in its defense of the faculty’s politically motivated judgment that, indeed, in the case of subjects like history, polit-
ical persuasions could validly be scrutinized in assigning appointment. Leaving aside the bitter accusations that marked the debate, several profound historical-moral questions come into play regarding not only Polish collective responsibility for the fate of the Jews, but the right of the Poles to write a history of their own suffering as an immense tragedy.” [AMATO, p. 204]

The faculty members who were activists against Davies were primarily Jewish. Davies filed a $9 million lawsuit against Stanford, charging “a conspiracy … because of political views plaintiff had expressed in his written publications with regard to Poland, the Soviet Union, and the teaching of Polish and Soviet history which such defendants believed, among other things, to be insensitive of the Jewish faith and unacceptably defensive of the behavior of the Polish people, particularly during the German occupation of Poland in World War II.” [LINDSEY, R., 3-13-87, p. A14]

“People are frightened to speak about this,” Stanford emeritus professor of humanities Ronald Hilton told the New York Times, “Davies is not anti-Semitic; his reputation for fairness is recognized internationally.” [LINDSEY, R., 3-13-87, p. A14] An appellate court eventually ruled in 1991 that Stanford was within its rights to reject Davies. “In effect,” said Paul Robinson, the chairman of Stanford’s history department during the time of the controversy, “the entire system of American education would be undone if [Davies’] complaint had been accepted.” [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 9-6-91, p. A48]

And as one Jewish author, Jon Wiener, concluded in even the liberal Nation magazine:

“The historians who voted against [Davies] were fulfilling their responsibilities as intellectuals.” [WIENER, J., 1991, p. 84]

Typically, the Jewish professor’s commitment – atheists, agnostics, et al of whatever political persuasion, all inevitably attackers of the status quo – to Jewish history, its religious roots and tenets, Jewish separatism, and Jewish “peoplehood” is that of the college where Steven Zipperstein teaches:

“My department hired two feminist historians this past year, one of them a Marxist theoretician. Among the first things both did upon moving to Los Angeles was to join a synagogue; one also registered her son in a Conservative [Judaism] day school.” [ZIPPERSTEIN, p. 213]

The celebratory cavalcade of “Jewish greatness” and demanding victimology smothers all before it. It’s usual content reflects Hannah Arendt’s perception that “out of the belief in chosenness by God grew that fantastic delusion, shared by unbelieving Jews and non-Jews alike, that Jews are by nature more intelligent, better, healthier, more fit for survival – the motor of history and the salt of the earth…. Secularization [and] assimilation … engendered a very real Jewish chauvinism … From now on, the old religious concept of chosenness was no longer the essence of Judaism; it became instead the essence of Jewishness.” [ARENDT, p. 74]
In our day, other than purely Biblical and archaeological concerns, few non-Jews have an interest in exploring the minutia of Jewish history and esoteric Jewish controversies other than those that have a Christian link in the Biblical eras; most of the non-Jewish public know nothing whatsoever of the broader Jewish story per se, and do not care to know anything about it. (“Certainly we are failing to attract Gentiles to our courses,” says Cooperman, “… at Harvard even the four or five non-Jews who used to take my Hebrew or modern Jewish history courses have disappeared in recent years.” [COOPERMAN p. 197] This situation, in conjunction with the emphatically enforced prohibition against non-Jewish critical commentary on the subjects of Jews, provides the opportunity in popular culture for a one-way avalanche of Jewish popular discourse about their past and present, and to recreate history, as current (pro-Israel, post-Holocaust) political winds dictate, entirely unchallenged. The overwhelming majority of passive non-Jews, however, who haven’t the slightest interest in the Jewish subject, nonetheless absorb – by public osmosis – the most superficial explications of issues that involve Jews in our day, particularly Israel. This usually occurs through the omnipresent fairy dust and sound bites of the mass media. There are a few important exceptions, but most writing and teaching about Jews these days is mythological and self-congratulatory in scope.

“Despite the scientific Jewish historiography that began … in the nineteenth century,” says Avner Falk, an Israeli professor, “Jewish historians still treat Jewish history from the idealized viewpoint that dominated my study of it as a schoolboy.” [FALK, p. 16] “Jewish scholarship,” says the President of the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Arthur Green, “[has been] the handmaiden of Jewish apologetics.” [GREEN, p. 85] “There is no interest in self-criticism within the Jewish community,” notes Leon Wieseltier, “There certainly isn’t … This is the death of the mind in some way.” [BERSHTEL, p. 118] The intensity of Jewish collective activism and enforcement of historical illusions (in this case, about the ever-angelic “Jewish family”) is also noted by Paula Hyman: “Myth-making about the Jewish family, and particularly about the role of women in that family, has become a virtual preoccupation of contemporary Jewish community.” [HYMAN, 1983, p. 18] “Jews living in the Diaspora,” adds another Jewish feminist author, Mimi Scharf, “have frequently spread much propaganda about themselves, in order to maintain a low profile, and as a consequence, have downplayed social problems of their own.” [SCARF, 9783, p. 51]

In 1989 Jacob Neusner complained in the Washington Post that rich donors to Jewish educational organizations were getting in the way of free speech. Robert O. Freedman, Dean of Graduate Studies at Baltimore Hebrew University had been running into precarious times for his outspoken criticism, and activism, against Israel. Likewise, Arthur Waskow, a teacher for seven years at the presumably liberal Reconstructionist Rabbinical College near Philadelphia was fired by superiors after pressure from college donors who vehemently objected to Waskow’s published criticisms of Israel in the Los Angeles Times and The Nation. [NEUSNER, Censorship, p. C5]

“Every community-endowed program in Jewish Studies,” remarks David
Biale, “has its own story about communal pressure to ‘represent’ the assumed interests of Jews on campus, to defend Israel against attack, and to bolster the self-image of Jewish students.” [BIALE, Between, p. 176] “The temptation to use the academic setting to further commitment to Jewish life,” notes S. Daniel Breslauer, “tempts some teachers into an apologetic stance. They seek to communicate the depth of Jewish religious experience, but fail to utilize critical scholarly techniques of analysis.” [BRESLAUER, p. 4]

Richard L. Rubenstein, a Jewish theologian, noted the problems he faced in finding a job after writing two volumes deemed too critical for the Jewish Establishment: “I became virtually unemployable within the Jewish community, or in any community where the Jewish community had substantial influence … Because [Florida State University at] Tallahassee was far removed from any large center of Jewish life, it was possible for the university to hire me.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., After, p. xv]

The Yiddish novelist Isaac Bashevis Singer put American Jewish historical myth making this way:

“The scribblers here [in the United States] try to persuade the reader that the shtetl [Eastern European Jewish community] was a paradise full of saints. So comes along someone from the very place and says, ‘Stuff and nonsense!’ They’ll excommunicate you.” [LINDEMANN, p. 129]

In 1974, Jewish sociologist Martin Sklare noted how drastically academic views of Jewish life in turn-of-the-century New York had changed:

“It is characteristic of the critical academic that he tends to idealize the immigrant Jew of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Instead of viewing the Lower East Side of the nation as retrogressive, as had an earlier generation, the critical academic generally admires them for their embodiment of a sense of ‘community’ and human warmth, for their ‘authenticity.’” [SKLARE, 1974, p. 19]

This is, at core, the description of the reconstruction of history at the university level, the replacing of a critical view of the past with something closer to legend: on a wide scale, a romantic Jewish American infatuation with its immigrant roots.

“[There] is the tension,” says Harold Wechsler and Paul Ritterband, “often exhibited between academy and the [Jewish] community … Take Jewish crime. A sociologist may very well find a rich vein to explore, while the concerned community might fear that the investigation’s results might provide materials for the enemies of the Jews. The sociologist may experience subtle, or not so subtle pressure to choose another topic.” [WECHSLER, p. 256] Likewise, note Jewish scholars Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, “Good studies of ‘Jewish personality traits’ are few in number for a variety of reasons, including a tendency by scholars to avoid the subject.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 126]

The pressure to censor the less pleasant parts of Jewish history is usually behind the scenes, but surfaces publicly from time to time. In June 1995, for example, Jewish organizations and individuals in Michigan sought to obscure
the historical fact that the notorious Detroit Purple Gang of the 1920s was Jewish. An exhibition by the Michigan Historical Center in the state’s capital city was “under fire” from Jewish critics because of a label posted beneath an exhibition photograph which said:

“The huge profits made on illegal alcohol encouraged crime on a greater scale. Detroit’s Purple Gang ran speakeasies, smuggled alcohol, supplied Al Capone with Canadian liquor and engaged in violent activities during the 1920s. Many of the Purple Gang members were from Detroit’s Jewish community and had attended the same east-side high school.”

Cindy Hughey, the Executive Director of the Michigan Jewish Conference was one of those lobbying for censorship of the reference to Jews. Likewise, a Jewish state politician, David Gubow, told the Detroit News, “I’m never one to get into censorship, and I can’t argue with the accuracy of the label, but other groups are not represented in the same manner.” “The primary purpose for the exhibits,” responded Darlene Clark Hine, a historian at nearby Michigan State University (and who was not involved in the show), “is to educate the public, and the truth is what the document reveals.” [FREEDMAN, D3]

As Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway has observed about the Purple Gang:

“Detroit’s toughest, most ruthless mob was the all-Jewish Purple Gang. Led by a transplanted New York hoodlum, Ray Bernstein, the gang dominated the city’s bootlegging and narcotics traffic throughout the prohibition era … Detroit police credited the Purple Gang with over 500 killings.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 41, 77]

Another scholar of crime has even called the Purple Gang “the most efficiently organized gang of killers in the United States.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 77]

In another case, Jewish author Joe Kraus was called by a fellow Jew a being “‘worse than an anti-Semite’ for an article I had written in which I discussed the underworld connections of one of his relatives; he claimed that I posed as a Jew and a friend but actually gave ammunition to contemporary skinheads, Nazis, and other Jew-haters … [KRAUS, p. 55-56] … Turn-of-the-century Jews actively worked against having [Jewish criminal] history told … [p. 62] … There are still enough people among the Jews who do not want Jewish gangster history to be told at all.” [KRAUS, p. 63]

Jewish reluctance to explore other prominent areas of their history was noted by Gerald Krefetz in 1982. He noted a long list of Jewish economists including Edward Bernstein, Arthur Burns, Otto Eckstein, Solomon Fabricant, Milton Friedman, Alan Greenspan, William Haber, Robert Heilbroner, Lawrence Klein, Simon Kuznets, Leon Kyserling, Robert Lekachman, Wassily Leontif, Allan Meltzer, Oscar Morgenstern, Paul Samuelson, Anna Schwartz, Robert Solomon, and Murray Weidenbaum. What do they have in common, other than being Jewish and economists? “The economic role of Jews in America,” suggests Krefetz, “is just about the only topic with which these economists have not concerned themselves.” [KREFETZ, p. 4]
Anyone who dares to pursue scholarship about the so-called “Holocaust” that does not follow Jewish demands about the subject is in serious political trouble. [This huge subject will be explored in a later chapter] As a non-Jewish teacher of the Holocaust in Great Britain, John Fox, noted in 2000,

“There is a mystique about the term holocaust which only those who wish to be known as infidels dare raise their voices against. This unfortunately means that virtually any aspect of Nazi anti-Jewish policy from the date of the Nazi takeover on January 30, 1933, may be classified as belonging to the Holocaust ‘and don’t you dare argue with that or else.’” [FOX, J., 3-19-2000, p. 2]

Coupled sometimes with popular Jewish efforts to deny (or avoid) historical facts, is an ignorance of them. Hillel Halkin notes typical American Jewish identity like this:

“A smattering of Yiddish or Hebrew remembered from childhood, a nostalgia for a parental home where Jewish customs were kept, the occasional observance of an isolated Jewish ritual, the exclusion of some non-kosher foods from an otherwise non-kosher kitchen, a genuine identification with the Jewish people combined with a genuine ignorance of its past history and present condition.” [AVISHAI, B.]

By the 1960’s many of the Jewish Studies programs being instituted in American universities were not objectively research-oriented, but functioned largely as propaganda outposts for Jewish-Israeli polemics. In such a context, says Weschsler and Ritterband

“The research function of a Judaica post [at a university] … serves a subordinate role to teaching. As long as nearly all young American Jews were exposed to the secular university’s many attractions, academic Judaica posts would serve perhaps a more important communal function than even rabbinical offices.” [WECHSLER, p. 275]

Take, for example, the disturbing case of prestigious Oxford University in Great Britain. In 1999, important philanthropist Stanley Kalms withheld his normal funding to (successfully) drive Dr. Bernard Wasserstein out of the directorship of the Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies at Oxford University. “I withdrew from funding,” said Kalms, “because I believe that the principal of the organization promoting traditional Jewish beliefs must conform to the general ethos of that organization. For instance, [Wasserstein] was in favor of intermarriage.” [Evening Standard (London), 3-31-99, p. 12]

In the late 1990s, Sanford Ziff, millionaire founder of Sunglass Hut in Florida, reneged on a $2 million pledge to the University of Miami “because the university allowed the student newspaper to publish an ad that denied the veracity of the Holocaust. The conflict resulted in a compromise, with Ziff releasing his donation after the university set up a committee to revive and expand its courses and programs on Jewish and Holocaust studies.” “What they did agree to do,” says Ziff,

“was to set up a special committee, and I, being on the board of the Holocaust Documentation and Education Center, was able to get the
center to confer with the University of Miami … Today, after a couple of years of meetings and all, the university, which at the time had three courses on Holocaust studies in the Judaic department, today has over 25 courses in Jewish history, Holocaust studies, anti-Semitism, Jewish life and not only in the Department of Judaism but throughout the whole university.” [BROWARD DAILY, 4-16-99, p. A6]

In 1998, Harvard University abandoned a three-year search for someone to head a proposed Holocaust studies program ($3.2 million was provided by wealthy Jewish financier and screenwriter Kenneth Lipper) because of incessant political and academic fighting over who the new director should be. “Members of the search committee, “noted the Boston Globe, “… were seen divided by philosophical disagreements and internal politics. There were debates, for example, over how the Holocaust should be taught.” [CHACON, R., 3-25-98, p. A1] Lipper was alleged to be pushing the university to hire controversial Jewish author Daniel Goldhagen for the position, which would lead to his tenure. (In total, Lipper had given nearly $8 million over the years to Harvard). “By the standards of higher education,” said a non-Jewish candidate for the job, Christopher Browning, “a donor should have no role in the selection of an individual. The fact that the donor continues to play a role is a scandal.” [SMITH, D., 7-19-97, p. 11]

Elsewhere, for example, unchallenged Jewish polemic finds its way to the University of Southern California, where “for the past thirty years, Hebrew Union College has provided faculty and has essentially been the de facto Jewish Studies department for USC.” Morton Schapiro, as the Dean of USC’s College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, oversees the department. [WESTPHAL, S., 2000, p. B1]

In 1995, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst even set up a pro-Jewish propaganda department, hiring

“a full-time staff person to promote acceptance of Jews and help advance Jewish learning and culture. The ‘Office of Jewish Affairs’ has two purposes: to combat anti-Semitism on campus and to build a positive Jewish experience among students who are not Jewish.” [SCOTT, F., 5-25-95, p. 1]

(The same day the announcement for the new Jewish promotional department was run in the campus newspaper, a former professor, Helen Cullen, had a letter (of protest) to the editor. She declared that “traditional Judaism and Jewish identity are offensive to most human beings and will always cause trouble between the Jews and the rest of the human race.” [SCOTT, F., 5-25-95, p. 1]

British Jewish visitor Howard Jacobson notes the first time he visited the University of Judaism in (a wealthy area of) Los Angeles:

“I go in through the main entrance and find myself immediately in a gift-shop. I don’t know enough about universities in America to be certain, but I have a hunch that it is not normal for a gift shop to the first thing you encounter on campus, before reception, before notice-
boards, before directions, even, were it not for the succah pioneers, before students.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 191]

**Martin Sklare**, influential sociologist of the Jewish community at Brandeis University, hoped to see the growth of a Jewish “survivalist” academe in America, “risen from” Zionist and nationalist “concerns,” and addressing the “identity problem and by extension … the welfare of the Jewish community.” [WECHSLER, p. 276] “Forthrightly extolling particularism,” say Wechsler and Ritterband, “over and against universalistic social scientific norms, [Sklare] insists that [universalism] in reality dampened efforts at the systematic study of contemporary Jewry.” [WECHSLER, p. 276]

A key subfield to Jewish studies (but, in reality, its backbone) is the study of anti-Semitism. And researchers and writers who choose to investigate such a subject (rooted in relations between Jews and non-Jews throughout history) have strong expectations about what they might find. They have, then, a tentative thesis. There are many possible roads to follow and no one enters historical research blindly. The Jewish theses usually reflect a communal arrogance of historical accomplishment, some aspect of a deeply felt bitterness towards all non-Jews (but particularly Christians), a belief that Jews have struggled and suffered through history like no other people, and that it is important now to itemize their sufferings and assess appropriate blame for their perceived misfortunes.

Jewish victimization is, of course, the predominant thesis in Jewish studies. “Study of the suffering of Jews,” notes **Albert Lindemann**, “is now advocated mostly as a way of preventing suffering in the future, largely by exposing the sinful or corrupt nature of Gentile society and its responsibilities for Jewish suffering and almost never as a means by which Jews could become aware of their own sins.” [LINDEMANN, A., p. 21] This Jewish propensity to dump communal responsibility off in some hinterland has an ancient religio-psychological history. “As is well known,” wrote Jewish psychoanalyst **Otto Fenichel**, “the Jews used to load all their sins on a goat and drive it out into the desert to purify themselves.” [FENICHEL, p. 14]

Stated or unstated, modern Jewish writers and researchers generally seek (at least) moral redress and even wider latitude to codify victimological myths of Jewishness as part of popular American (and even world) culture, unhindered. A few even openly express thoughts of revenge, originally a religious theme of traditional Judaism. ([Michael Cuddihy], for example, devotes an entire book to argue that **Sigmund Freud, Karl Marx,** and **Claude Levi-Strauss** were vengefully fueled by a desire to assault the dominant non-Jewish culture around them and to deconstruct its illusory civility).

In the most overt and extreme fashion, there is the case of the right wing ideologue (and others like him), **Meir Kahane**. Kahane’s hostility to Gentiles,” says **Ehud Sprinzak**, “is certainly the strongest emotional and psychological theme of his political theology. There is not a single essay or book in which this enmity and thirst for revenge does not surface … The very definition of Jewish freedom implies [for Kahane] the ability to humiliate the Gentile.” [SPRINZAK, p. 218, 220] In any case, with the birth of the modern Jewish state of Israel
in 1948 in the wake of Nazi terrors against the Jews during World War II, Jewish research has often taken on a sense of communal urgency in fortifying a range of Jewish historical, polemical and political arguments, myths, accentuations and justifications.

Expressions of Jewish victimhood takes many forms. From left wing political circles, for instance, Michael Lerner even argues that Jewish affluence – current and historical – is a “uniquely” Jewish form of victimhood, a “vulnerability” where Jews are blameless pawns in the designs of evil non-Jews. Jews are recurrently vulnerable to class hatred, says Lerner, “because Jews are placed in positions where they can serve as focus for anger that otherwise might be directed at ruling elites.” [Lerner, Socialist, p. 64: added emphasis] [See later chapter for a few dozen Jewish “ruling elites”]

There are some dissenting Jewish voices – a very small number – that challenge the traditional Jewish “chronic victim” scenario (what Salo Baron calls the “lachrymorose theory” of Jewish history). Such critics don’t endear the notion of the Jewish past represented as a kind of will-less, spineless, perpetual boun- eing to others’ initiations in the historical pinball machine. There isn’t really much room for communal pride – when you honestly get right down to it – in being pushed around all the time. And perpetual whining, even to a few Jewish ears, can begin to wear painfully thin.

So a few (very few) Jewish historical revisionists seek to drastically reconsider, reinvent, and reconstruct the Jewish past. In this view, Jews did have initiative in their Diaspora throughout history. Jews were empowered in their own lives. Jews did act decisively, not like drifting fluff in the historical winds, but like men. (And women.) One example of modern Jewish insistence upon complete victimization is the assertion that their ancestors were forbidden from owning land in most of Europe throughout the Middle Ages. This is an important argument, for it conveniently sets blame for the usurious and exploitive course of Jewish history into Gentile hands. The fact that Jewish tradition has deplored agricultural work since time immemorial (like the modern Bedouin to which Jews have, historically, cultural links) is completely overlooked as a relevant factor to the question of landlessness. Likewise, there are those who argue that even the “forcing” of Jews into their last Diaspora (dispersion) is largely myth. As Jewish author Abram Leon points out, when Jerusalem last fell in antiquity, 70 CE, three-quarters of the Jewish people already lived in other countries by choice, gravitating towards the most lucrative possibilities: mer- chantry. [Leon, p. 68]

“The depiction of all Jewish history,” writes Michael Goldberg, “as one long episode of victimization is false. Although Jews certainly have suffered many savage episodes of persecution – for a people over three and one-half millennia old, it would be truly astonishing not to find such episodes.” [Goldberg, p. 123] “The Jews were not merely passive objects,” insists David Biale, “at times protected by powerful rulers and at others slaughtered by mobs. In widely scattered times and places, they took up arms in self-defense and to pursue political objectives.” [Biale, Power, p. 72]
“Recent writers …,” observed Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “have challenged the assumption of earlier Jewish historians that the condition of Polish Jewry from the 16th century to the 18th was one of continual oppression, poverty, and humiliation, and have demonstrated that in fact Polish Jews enjoyed relative security and prosperity.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 37] Even excess sympathy for the “wandering Jew” folklore needs contextualization. “The Jews were not always the victims of events that created wanderers and refugees,” notes J. Bruce Nichols, “Occasionally they were perpetrators. Abraham sent the sons he had fathered by concubines ‘unto the east country’ so that they could not challenge the power of his son Isaac [traditionally understood to have furthered today’s Jewish racial line].” [NICHOLS, p. 159]

The most notoriously disturbing image of Jewish victims, of course, is that of “Jews led like sheep” to slaughter in Nazi Germany. These Jews, formerly “victims,” are now reconsidered by Jewish institutions to be “martyrs” for the cause of Jewishness. Whereas once their lives were thought to be piteously and inhumanely wasted, they are – in the new view (attached to both Jewish martyr tradition and the state of Israel) – nobly sacrificed towards the renewal of their surviving brethren. Vad Yashem, modern Israel’s memorial park and museum of the Holocaust in Jerusalem, is formulated along this martyrdom thesis. [More about this in the Holocaust chapter]

Such a changing historical perspective, however, that Jews were not always victims, but, like any people, exerted their own wills sometimes too, has serious political risks. For if one asserts that Jews throughout history were not always victims and were free – in European feudal society, for instance, freer than most non-Jews – to act upon their own ideas about themselves, it becomes harder to defend the traditional argument that Jews were always “forced into” their historical exploitive roles in the Diaspora. In particular, if we accept the premise of Jewish empowerment, we must also reconsider, and ultimately underscore, Jewish economic roles in history. This role is, in itself, a far cry from claims of victimization. And, at least in the powerful economic sphere and the ruthlessly competitive and self-aggrandizing nature of that enterprise, Jews victimized others too – on a massive scale. Especially, for example, during the many wars and famines in European history, Jews played integral and important roles in legislating, manipulating, and causing other peoples’ catastrophic suffering.

This kind of statement, however, in the late twentieth century, with the worldwide Jewish community still fomenting continuously fresh outrage about Hitler’s atrocities against Jews, represents a taboo subject. Given the profound gravity of the Nazi savagery against Jews, five decades later Jewry is still completely disinclined to take the slightest historical responsibility for anything negative in their long history. To suggest responsibility anywhere for anything is considered, and punished as, a heinous act of anti-Semitism.

Even the seed of dissenting Jewish scholarship doesn’t go so far as to suggest a re-examination of the social and economic causes of historical hostility against Jews. Few dare to touch the notion that Jews might take at least some responsibility for history in those times when it tumbled down upon them. Not
yet. And probably not for a long time, if ever. In fact, it’s hard enough to break widespread fossilized Jewish myths and conventions that have completely frozen in a defensive circle around the modern state of Israel. As even Norman Cantor recently (1994) noted:

“The proliferation of recent publication on Jewish history from American campuses may already be running up against a glass wall of informal censorship [where] … challenges to the overall received victimization/celebratory model of Jewish history … [are not welcome].”

[CANTOR, p. xviii]
WHO/WHAT IS A JEW?

“The feature of Jewish exceptionality is unassimilability … In modernity the Jews again slip through the grasp of Gentile attempts to comprehend them. Are the Jews a race, a nation, or a religion, modern Gentiles and Jews asked. The answer depended upon the interest of who was asking.”

– Adam Weisberger, discussing the works of Moses Hess, 1997, p. 128

At this point, before we go any further, it is necessary to pose what one would think to be a relatively simple query: What, dare we ask, is a Jew anyway? Who are they? Who qualifies for admission? What are the criteria for inclusion as a bonafide member of the Chosen People, secularly, religiously, or any other way? And for the Jewish masses that endlessly wail, rage, and breast-beat about enemies who have allegedly assailed them relentlessly throughout history, and for all the heralded Jewish oppressors who thought they could clearly identify and persecute the people who they hatefully despised, it is bizarrely enigmatic that by the end of the twentieth century even Jews cannot – in consensus – decide exactly who and what they are. It is, strangely enough – as growth pains of modern Israel have borne witness – an in-house controversy of the most profound dimensions. For if the state of Israel was founded as refuge for world Jewry, and if any Jew in the world has the innate right to be admitted there as an Israeli citizen, who, then, EXACTLY are they? “Jews live in a world,” says Michael Selzer, “in which, seemingly, no two Jews can agree on what a Jew really is … [but] every Jew has his own reasons for knowing that he is a Jew.” [SELZER, p. 11] “It is a tragic irony,” notes Barnet Litvinoff, “that the only people who could decide with certainty who were Jews were the followers of the Nazi ideologist Alfred Rosenberg.” [LITVINOFF, p. 6]

Michael Selzer notes the bizarrely nebulous aspects of modern Jewish identity, making the issue sound like an excerpt from Alice in Wonderland:

“Ironically, one may discover the characteristics of one’s own Jewishness in non-Jews, and all that one regards as most antithetical to it forming the essence of other Jews’ Jewishness … The only description of Jewishness which would apply to both, is that they are not non-Jews.” [SELZER, his emphasis, p. 12-13]

Or what on earth is one to make of this observation by another Jewish commentator, Robert Kamenetz:

“I began to suspect that Jewish identity, as it has evolved in the West today, could be a real barrier to encountering the depths of Judaism. In
WHO/WHAT IS A JEW?

other words, being Jewish could keep you from being a Jew.” [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 156]]

A 1964 textbook for Jewish high school students published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations frames the answer to the “Who is a Jew?” query in as vague terms as possible, yet likewise lobbies for the activist continuance of this indeterminate “Jewish” entity:

“Hard to Answer. By now you have discovered that it’s not easy to answer what first seemed like a simple question: What is a Jew? As a matter of fact, there are some intelligent Jews who do not think the question can be answered all. They say that we Jews are unique; that is to say, we are different from any other group of people on earth ... [Some people feel] that, to some extent, ... we are a religious group, in some ways a nation, in some ways a race, and in some ways a nationality. And yet we are more than any one of these by itself. We are a religious group plus, a race plus, a nation plus, and a nationality plus. But it is not easy to define what that ‘plus’ is in each case.” [GITTELSON, R., 1964, p. 20]

The essence of Jewish identity is, hence (in echoing the Chosen People conviction), an indefinable uniqueness – a term of distinction we will hear more about later in other contexts.

“Many ... attempts have been made,” wrote Alfred Jospe, “to define the meaning of Jewish existence, yet not all point to the same tact: the Jewish people has usually been an enigma to its own adherents no less than to outsiders.” [MILLGRAM, p. 7] “If you get rid of the theology and the biological mysticism,” wrote prominent Jewish journalist Walter Lippman, who distanced himself from the Jewish community, “and treat the literature as secular, and refuse to regard the Jews as a ... Chosen People, just what elements of a living culture are left?” [TOLL, p. 160]

Some observers, like the hostile (non-Jew) Hilaire Belloc, have suggested that throughout history Jews, chameleon-like, amoebae-like, “adjusted their notions of themselves to suit the varying circumstances with which they were confronted. They were a race when it suited them, a nationality when necessity demanded it, a religious group, and, finally, a cultural unit when the situation made such a status desirable.” [BELLOC, in WIRTH, p. 64]

Rabbi Jacob Neusner seems to affirm this, saying:

“For nearly a century American Jews have persuaded themselves that they fall into the religious – and therefore acceptable – category of being ‘different,’ and not into the ethnic – and therefore crippling and unwanted – category of being ‘different.’ Now that they have no Jewish accents they are willing to be ethnic.” [NEUSNER, Holo, p. 978]

“In the European diaspora,” noted Harry Golden in 1973, “Jews were called a nation and in the English-speaking diaspora a community. Now we are called an ethnic group, although in my travels I met few Jews who thought they were ethnics ... If we are ethnics, then Jews are the only ethnic group with their own religion.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 4]
Jewish author David Biale also addressed a nebulous Jewish identity in 1998: “To be a Jew, especially at this historical juncture, means to lack a single essence, to live with multiple identities.” [BIALE, D., 1998, p. 9]

The idea of “being Jewish,” says Nathan Glazer, can even go away for generations and sprout back to life from a patient seed that refuses extinction. “Even if [Judaism] finds no expression in one generation or another,” he says, “the commitment to remain related to it still exists. Dead in one, two, or three generations, it may come back to life in the fourth.” [SILBERMAN, p. 240] This incessant seed is the case, says Jewish commentator Stanislaw Krajewski, in Poland, where relatively assimilated Jews under communist rule are now finding their way back to a “particularist,” Jewish identity based on racial lineage:

“One can always return [to a Jewish identity]. Jewish descent is the foundation. Sometimes, however, it remains pure potential and never finds expression. That, too, can change. The experience of my generation and people younger than us is that many people start from zero, and then begin to be involved in their Jewishness.” [Dlomaslowska-Szuk, p. 323]

Raphael Patai, a Jewish scholar, claims that, for all the knottiness surrounding the modern day issue, being Jewish can best be described as nothing more than “a state of mind.” [PATAI, p. 23] (This kind of “state,” of course, won’t afford you citizenship in today’s state of Israel, nor acceptance into any Jewish community anywhere).

On occasion, Martin Buber, the well-known Jewish religious philosopher, has obfuscated the matter entirely. He believed (in the words of Michael Meyer) that “Jews elude all classification … [this] uniqueness was discernible only by the inner eye of faith and could be borne only as the yoke of the Kingdom of God.” [MEYER, p. 3-4] In other comments, Buber inferred a racial, “blood” connection among Jews. Either way, each informs a general Jewish sense of being a “community of fate,” covenant of fate, or collective destiny, “that unites all Jews, willingly or against their will.” [SACKS, J., One, p. 6] “Whatever befalls the People of Israel,” declares Yiddish folklore, “will befall Mr. Israel.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 143]

Abram Leon reflects a Marxist socio-economic view in declaring Jews to be “historically a social group with a specific economic function. They are a class, or more precisely, a people class.” [LEON, p. 74] A kind of economic caste. “According to Marxists,” notes Richard L. Rubenstein, “the Jews were not a distinctive religiocultural entity, but a petit bourgeois stratum of the larger society whose religion was the ideological superstructure mirroring the group’s concrete social and economic relations.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 121]

Once upon a time, in bygone eras, the definition of a Jew was simple enough. Jews were practicing members of Judaism, the seminal religious faith of both Christianity and Islam. They had a specific religion and belief system, distinct sacred texts, their own language, special customs, and the further back into history one goes (with a few conversionary aberrations), the more they were racially/linguistically homogeneous to their Semitic origins. In our day, this simplistic scenario has long since completely fallen apart.
By the end of the twentieth century, while there are many Jews who still adhere to various forms of Jewish religious expression – Orthodox, Reformed, Conservative, and Reconstructionist Judaism among them – others who still insist upon calling themselves Jews are irreligious, completely secular, or even atheistic. They wouldn’t pick up the Torah over a comic book.

“Jewishness is obviously not just a religion,” says Ellen Willis, an editor at the Village Voice Literary Supplement, “Secular Jews can feel every bit as passionately, viscerally involved in the question of being Jewish … It’s not a nation … So what is it? In a certain way it’s like a big extended family.” [BRENNER, p. 341]

What about a cultural definition? Jews in the world Diaspora have, over hundreds of years, inevitably absorbed some aspects of the cultural accouterments of their host countries. While religious traditions are often a common denominator in world Jewry, the Jews of Iran, Iraq, Brazil, South Africa, Austria, and all others have developed local religious nuances. Expressions of more secular Jewish aspects of culture are even more entwined with local non-Jewish traditions. The controversial African Jews of Ethiopia (the Falasha) have for centuries practiced a Judaism which is, to orthodox European-oriented rabbis, extremely problematical. For some, particularly amongst the most stubbornly orthodox of European (Ashkenazi) ancestry, and Jewish racists, the Falasha are simply not Jews. “What seems Jewish in one context,” says Samuel Heilman, “may turn out to be quite something else in another. That is the lesson of contemporary pluralism to which few of us can remain blind.” [HEILMAN, p. 11]

In fact, the legal assertion in Israel that recent Ethiopian and Russian immigrants to that land are brother/sister Jews (linked to some ancient genetic seed) has a curious sense of absurdity to it. New Ethiopian and Russian arrivals to the Jewish state are neither racially the same, linguistically the same, nor culturally the same. They are certainly not religiously linked either – under decades of communism, most Russians are atheists/agnostics, and the Ethiopians have their own distinct brand of religious practice. As Third World people, practically speaking, they have more in common with the local Muslim Arab Bedouin than they do with Russians – Jewish or otherwise.

Indeed, in the historical sense, even a Jewish “cultural” continuum across time itself has no basis in fact. “When we talk,” says Hillel Halkin, “about Jewish history, Jewish tradition, Jewish values, we are in fact talking about a highly complex configuration of diverse periods, places, and societies, which … differ enormously from each other.” [HALKIN, p. 6]

Is being Jewish then a racial essence? The traditional dictate of Orthodox Jewry and Jewish tradition, that a Jew is someone who’s mother was Jewish, supports a racial pedigree. (The real reason for this matrilineal definition, suggests Norman Cantor, was because “ancient Israelites produced children by relations with Gentile slaves and concubines” and “purity of Jewish blood could [only] be scrutinized … by the rabbinical ruling that Jewish descent had to go through the legitimate Jewish wife.” [CANTOR, p. 48] Orthodox thinking also dictates that if an individual is born Jewish, he or she will always remain Jewish,
even if they apostate. This seminal Jewish idea – that if one is born a Jew, he or
she can’t shake it – was the track Hitler followed in his attempt to exterminate
European Jewry. “What defines a Jew,” says South-African born Rabbi Shlomo
Levin, “is one single factor, the fact that they have a soul which is connected to
God in a particular kind of way through the mother’s line.” [KLEIN, E, p. 202]

Arthur Koestler calls this the “myth of a Biblical passing [of] racial purity
throughout the ages.” [KOESTLER, p. 236] “Born a Jew,” says Roger Kahn,
“Halachists insist, always a Jew. One cannot stop being Jewish by choice; per-
sonal choice is irrelevant to Jewishness.” [KAHN, R., p. 43] “The classical view
of Covenental existence as the basic meaning of Jewishness,” adds Monford
Harris, “has always been that the Jew who rejects the Covenant is still a Jew. The
atheistic Jew of our time (and perhaps this is the dominant type of of time) who
may reject the covenant on the grounds that there was (or is) no God with
whom a covenant was made, is still claimed by the covenant as a member of that
covenant. The covenant by God with the ancestors stands for all time, with all
Jews.” [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 91]

“It’s not a question of religious belief or observance or ‘having to be
[Jewish]’ or not ‘having to be [Jewish],’ I said, patiently, trying to explain to this
Catholic who only went to Mass on Easter,” wrote famed Jewish novelist Juditiz
Krantz in her autobiography,

“We were born of Jewish parents who were born of Jewish parents
going back, I assume, for thousands of years, barring the occasional po-
grom and rape. My ancestors were Jews as far back as you can possibly
imagine. That alone is more than enough to make us Jews.” [KRANTZ,
J., 2000, p. 325]

Jewish psychoanalyst Theodore Reik put it this way:

“Once a Jew, always a Jew. The story is told in New York of the banker
Otto Kahn and the humorist Marshall P. Wilder who was a hunchback. Strolling along Fifth Avenue, Kahn pointed to a church and said: ‘Mar-
shall, that’s the church I belong to. Did you know that I was once a Jew?’
Wilder answered: ‘Yes, Otto, and I was once a hunchback.’ The convic-
tion that there is an unalterability about being Jewish is expressed better
in this dry sentence than in many treatises. It seems that it is as difficult
for the Jew to get rid of his Jewishness as it is for the ancient mariner to
lose the albatross.” [REIK, T., 1962, p. 90]

Or, as Jewish sociologist Marshall Sklare has put it:

“One assumption of the Jewish family system is that all Jews share a
common ancestry. The Jew is thought to be connected with all other
Jews and the Jewish community is often viewed as a kind of extended
family.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 21-22]

On the other hand, those self-defining Jews with only a Jewish father are in for
a rude surprise if they go to Israel, where the tenets of Orthodox Judaism legally
hold sway in much of the secular culture. Judith Hertog was stunned when she
moved from Holland to Israel, only to find that the coveted “Jew” notation on her
national identity card was not granted; rather, it was stamped “Dutch” because
her mother was a Gentile. “Sometimes I catch myself trying to avoid talking about my mother’s Jewishness or lack of it,” she laments, “as if I should be ashamed to have a feeling of belonging to the Jewish people without a Jewish mother. If only my mother’s maternal grandmother had been Jewish, it would have been all right. Alas, my mother has only a Jewish grandfather … Is it even possible to define Jewishness in a non-religious way? If it is not religion, what is it? Maybe just a crazy obsession, carried on through generations?” [HERTOG, J., 54]

Similarly, Meryl Hyman, who thought herself Jewish made plans to emigrate to Israel. But, alas,

“Late in 1996, I called the Israeli consulate in New York to inquire about making aliyah, about exercising a right to return to the homeland as an Israeli citizen and a Jew. I asked the young woman who answered the phone to define a Jew. She said, ‘If you have a Jewish mother.’ I said, ‘My mother isn’t Jewish, but my father is. I am a Jew.’ She said, ‘No, you are not a Jew,’ and hung up the phone. I was dismissed by the first person I called.” [HYMAN, M., 1998, p. 20]

Emil Fackenheim compares the religious faiths of Christianity and Judaism, noting that Judaism is traditionally more than just a faith; it is a kind of obligatory, racial entwinement:

“A Christian child is born pagan, becomes Christian through baptism and itself is provisional until at confirmation the confirmant makes a conscious commitment to the Christian faith. A Jewish child, in contrast, is born Jewish … If a Christian boy or girl cannot in good conscience make the Christian commitment, confirmation can be postponed, if necessary indefinitely … The event of [the Jewish] bar mitzvah cannot be postponed or cancelled: In Judaism a Jewish boy becomes a ‘son of duty’ – obliged to keep the commandments – quite regardless of his wishes, beliefs, or twinges of conscience.” [FACKENHEIM, p. 29]

The roots of such thinking go back centuries. “There is a line of thought,” says Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, “that runs through the Middle Ages which seeks to include even the Jewish apostate within the rule that ‘though he sins, he remains a Jew’ … [Jewish] tradition … embraced all Jews and denied the possibility of any alternative basis of identity [SACKS, J., One, p. 90] … The terms of the Covenant were reaffirmed by those who survived and remained Jews. For it bound not only those who ‘stand here with us today’ but also those who are ‘not here with us today.’ The Covenant was involuntary and spans all generations. There is, in Isaiah’s phrase, ‘no bill of divorce.”’ [SACKS, J., p. 130]

This originally religious view of the absolute inescapability of Jewishness if born one is even reflected in the secular feminist world of 1998. In Jewish Women in America: An Historical Encyclopedia, the authors declare their thinking about who qualifies as a Jew to be considered for the volume. Among the decisions is this one: “When both parents were Jewish, we included some women who rejected their Jewish identity or considered it irrelevant to their lives.” [BRAWARSKY, S., Feminine, 1998, p. 49]
Complicating all this, however, the modern state of Israel – which celebrates a Jewish nationalism, patriotism, and loyalty to Jewish “peoplehood” above all else – expressly discarded Jewish religious law in a famous Israeli Supreme Court case in 1962. A born-Jew who had been sheltered from the Nazis in a Catholic monastery, “Brother Daniel” eventually converted to Catholicism and became a priest. But he was rebuffed in his legal attempt to proclaim his Jewishness and live as a citizen in Israel (per Israel’s law that allows any Jew who wishes to immigrate to that country.) In this unusual case, Israeli secular law overruled Jewish religious law to underscore Jewishness as an allegiance.

“Surely,” says Hillel Halkin, “in an age when most Jews the world over hold no firm religious beliefs and have no firm commitment to religious practice of any kind, there is something intellectually perverse, if emotionally understandable, in the contention that the son of Polish Jews [Brother Daniel] who has made great efforts to live in Israel is not a Jew because he believes in the New Testament, while the son of Polish Jews who live in Los Angeles is a Jew though he believes in astrology or in transcendental meditation, or in nothing more than his own personal welfare.” [HALKIN, p. 5] Halkin leaves unspoken what the essence of such identity irrationality is all about. A fundamental basis of “being Jewish” is its historical “otherness,” resistance, and animosity to Christianity. While a Jew can even be legally accepted as an atheist, an important part of “being Jewish” is ultimately defined in emphatic antithesis – to the Christian faith. “In the western world,” observes Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “a significant characteristic of being Jewish is not being Christian.” [LIEBMAN, p. 46] This is also exemplified in the 1990 case of two married Jews by birth from South Africa, Gary and Shirley Beresford, who, by Israeli Supreme Court ruling, did not qualify for the Jewish “Law of Return” to settle in Israel because they were members of the organization “Jews for Jesus.” [SEDAN, p. 53]

And what of the case of Ilana Stern? Her father was Jewish. Her non-Jewish mother died at her birth, in a Russian labor camp. Her father was reunited with her after the war, and they moved to Israel in 1956. Believing herself to be Jewish, when she registered for the Israeli army at age 16 she was classified to be Christian. As Uri Huppert notes:

“The Ministry of Interior had a simple explanation, Jewish religious law holds that anyone who is not born of a Jewish mother, and has not converted to Judaism, is not a Jew. But then Ilana raised the thorny question of just where her supposed Christianity came from. From Jewish law, was the prompt response – her Christianity had been inherited from her mother.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 122]

After a string of futile legal convolutions to be declared a Jew, Ms. Stern eventually left Israel. [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 123]

There are always exceptions, however, to any definition of Jewry. How nebulous and erratic any answer to “Who is a Jew?” becomes (contingent also upon socio-political winds of the era) can be seen in the compilation Who's Who in American Jewry, 1938-39, which included fifteen Protestant ministers and two
Catholic priests. [GOLDSTEIN, D. p. 31] (The historical context here, of course, was the rise of Aryan fascism in Europe and Jewish American efforts to publicly identify with mainstream American society). A former senator from Maine (and eventually Secretary of Defense under President Bill Clinton), Bill Cohen, always thought he was Jewish because his father was a Jew. Upon being made aware that traditional rabbinical law didn’t consider him Jewish, he refused to convert to something he thought he already was and eventually became a Unitarian. [BRENNER, p. 12]

In the religious and genetic contexts, faced with increased Jewish intermarriage with non-Jews in western societies, the liberalizing Reform movement of Judaism has accepted children of Jewish fathers as being Jewish; this is a concession bitterly opposed by Orthodox Jews who do not accept this recent innovation. Although most liberalizing western Jews today publicly play down racial aspects of Jewish identity, for many it is often still, privately, an issue of concern.

Amy Sheldon, for instance, a feminist Jewish professor at the University of Minnesota, and part of a liberal Jewish community, married a non-Jew. “I was not ready,” she laments, “for the messages I got from my own people … It is hard to live with the idea that a whole community is capable of automatically turning against me and my family.” [SHELDON, p. 79] This included racist comments about one of her child’s blonde hair and the fact that he didn’t “look” Jewish. In an Orthodox context, a Jew who had the misfortune to have red hair in a Haradim community spoke of his difficulty in finding a wife: “[Other Jews] thought I looked too much like a goy [non-Jew].” [MACDONALD, p. 214]

In 1970, two atheists, Benjamin Shalit and his non-Jewish wife from Scotland, fought the Israeli government in a legal struggle to accept their children as official Jewish citizens of the state. At stake was a realm of national privileges only accorded to Jews. In a 5-4 Israeli Supreme Court decision, their two children were accepted as Jews. This decision nearly brought down the Israeli government, and by the time the Shalit’s third child was born, Israeli law was firm in declaring this one not to be Jewish. Shalit (once the chief psychologist of the Israeli army) and his family eventually moved to Sweden. [HAZELTON, p. 38-39]

Scattered all over the world for a millennium, Jewish communities – theoretically dictating continuous Jewish matrilineal lineage for thousands of years – have obviously not been as insulated from their host peoples as some would have hoped. (And, too, during some brief periods in ancient history Jews actually proselytized converts into their community). Jews from Iran, for instance, by face alone, are not today distinguishable from Iranian Muslims. Jews from Arab countries generally look like Arabs. Although some have Semitic traces, many Jews from Europe appear to be physically European. The Ethiopian Jews are, of course, all Black.

So if being Jewish is not entirely religious, cultural, or racial, what is it? If none of these as a single force – or the three in unison – necessarily holds all those who call themselves Jews together, what remains? What binds this community so tightly, so forcefully, together? How does one liken oneself so insistently to this particular group? Why haven’t most Jewish-Americans diluted completely into
the American melting pot like so many Irish-Americans, Polish-Americans, and others?

Part of the reason is the continuous social psychology of an insular clan ethic, enforced by both the traditional isolation and folk history of Jews in the European ghettos and the separatist religious teachings of the Talmud. Even when pride in being Jewish was at its lowest ebb, in 1942, J. O. Hertzler still noted that “through most of history, the Jew has been loath to lose his distinctive identity. Today, whether he be Orthodox, Reform, ‘liberal,’ rationalist, or atheist, he usually does not want to cease being a Jew.” [HERTZLER, p. 73] For many who call themselves Jews, there is simply the enduring connection to a romanticized notion of the mythology of “the Chosen People.” If they are not active in the notion of a superior Judaic religiosity, then it may be association to an elite communal self that expresses itself in some other way – often, as many do, to a Jewish claim of superior intellect and insight, or economic and historic achievement, the last two which are certainly related. “Far more Jews,” says theologian Richard Rubenstein, “accept the unity of Jewish destiny than the unity of Jewish belief.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 4]

With the demystifying of all religious principles in our secular age, “being Jewish” is largely reduced to a definition that simply rests upon an abstract historical essence that has as its main self-conception an emphatic contradistinction to those who are not Jewish. “Being Jewish” is then rendered as an allegiance to a self-conceived privileged caste, part of whose privilege is wearing the mantle of “History’s Greatest Victims.” The conceptual separation by Jews from all other people – and their perceived innate anti-thesis in relation to them – is at the core of traditional Jewish thinking. “Judaism,” writes David Biale, “…. defines itself … in contradistinction to the Other, the goy [non-Jew]: the holy nation that ‘dwell alone’ … against the ‘nations of the world.’ Without the Other, the Jew of ‘Judaism’ lacks definition.” [BIALE, Confessions, p. 43] In other words, for many Jews, the clearest definition for the “What is a Jew?” riddle relies upon what “being Jewish” is not. Even large numbers of secular Jews who have abandoned Judaism as a religious faith still define themselves in an alien relation to the non-Jewish Other. For such Jews, the threatening idea of an enduring pseudo-mystical, transhistorical “anti-Semitism” becomes the very foundation upon which they understand their communal identity, always in relation to the hostile “Other.” This hostility becomes part of a continuous loop, expressed over and over again through history, elicited by Jewish arrogance and exploitation of those who inevitably become hostile towards Jews, thus reaffirming Jewish self-identity.

“The Chosen People had already been chosen by circumstance,” insists Jewish author Earl Shorris in addressing the essences of Jewish identity, “They were defined from outside, for no man chooses to be a slave – the condition that is thrust upon him. The genesis of the people whom God chose was from outside. They were a nation made by their enemies.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 44]

Certainly, these days, such a definition of Jewry is of far greater importance and more encompassing than any other. After the Holocaust, Jewish self-iden-
tification accelerated the already existing self-notion of themselves as consummate (even transcendent) human victims. This allegiance is a peculiar one for it affords American Diaspora Jewry – from their current positions of undeniable affluence, comfort, prosperity, and freedom – to still lay a claim (at least abstractly, historically, mythically) to being oppressed. This claim to oppression, of course, does not emanate from persecution by Americans around them. It is a claim to conditions of the past – both real and imagined, in other lands, in other eras; the claim is also rooted in a complete denial of their part in creating the conditions for their suffering. This country today is too multicultural and pluralistic; it is a land where the dominant majority is fast becoming today an aggregate of ethnic minorities, all unified in respective claims – both historical and current – to injustice wrought upon them. In such a pluralistic environment, it is difficult for Jews to be singled out for undeserved – or even deserved – hostility; in this sense, there is an extraordinary security in the solidarity of a wide field of co-complainants.

Paul Breines, a Jewish scholar, even goes so far as to suggest that the lack of any truly substantive anti-Semitism in mainstream America today is actually a “threat” to American Jews in that it removes one of the most important parts of their communal identity: the understanding of themselves as victims. And with the loss of victimhood goes the attendant “special claim to what is called the moral higher ground.” [BREINES, p. 43-44]

No matter what individual Jews do in their lives – as saints or sinners – they still make claim to this “higher moral ground” of communal victimhood. Today’s Jewish professor, entrepreneur, and lawyer (and even criminal) can relax in their comfortable armchairs and plan their next accomplishment, their next victory, assured that they always have the advantage as history’s blessed underdog, certain that they are members of a group that is intrinsically better than others, not the least by virtue of their peoples’ accumulative historic suffering. In this myth, the eternally oppressed Jew continues to succeed, over and over again throughout the world, in the face of another set of non-Jewish limitations and obstacles.

Meanwhile, the American Jew can play the riskless role of philanthropist, paying the fares and possibly housing costs of other Jews in the world, who are less fortunate than them, to make aliyah (ascension) to Israel and join the international Jewish protective army, human fodder for Jewish mythology. As Michael Goldberg notes, “Civil Judaism’s idea of Jews’ moral responsibility for one another extends no further than an arm’s length to reach into a wallet.” [GOLDBERG, M.] Or as Jonathan Woocher puts it:

“Civil Judaism’s emphasis on countering anti-Semitism (of which there is relatively little in the United States) and supporting Israel (which is done primarily through financial and political activism) … enables the American Jew to feel that (s)he is contributing to Jewish survival, without materially affecting his/her lifestyle or position in American society.” [WOOCHER, p. 99]
Alain Finkielkraut, a French Jew, looks cynically at his Jewish heritage and the peculiar status that he is afforded for his genealogy only:

“… the Judaism I had received was the most beautiful present a post-genocidal child could imagine. I inherited a suffering to which I had not been subjected, for without having to endure oppression, the identity of the victim was mine. I could savor an exceptional destiny while remaining completely at ease. Without exposure to real danger, I had heroic stature…” [FINKIELKRAUT, p. 7]

This Jewish proclamation of “heroic stature” has its strongest modern foundations in their communal connections to victimhood under the Nazis in World War II. Yet there has always been nurtured the religious claims to “chosenness” by God, specialness, and a superiority over other peoples, elitist claims which have broadened into secular dimensions as well. Eliot Cohen, former editor of *Commentary*, sees Jewish “specialness,” as many do, this way:

“I refer to that extra dimension given to Jewish personality and life by the fact that each Jew moves, consciously or not, in the context of a long and special history and religious ethical tradition that lays upon him, whether as a burden or a badge of pride, the sense of being “chosen,” and so created in him the tendency, even the obligation, to carry himself ‘with a difference.’” [COHEN, in KOSTELANETZ, p. 17]

“Let the Jew,” says Will Herberg, “who rejects the doctrine of ‘chosenness’ examine his conscience and see whether these words [by Cohen] do not ring the inmost reality of his being.” [HERBERG, p. 274] “A very large number of young Jewish people throughout the world have only tenuous ties to their Jewishness,” wrote Joachim Prinz in 1972, “But – and this is the problem which reminds us so much of the Marranos [Jews who hide their identity] – can Jewishness be forgotten?” [original author’s emphasis: PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 195]
ASSIMILATION, INTERMARRIAGE AND CONVERSION TO JUDAISM

“Marrying a Gentile is totally forbidden [in traditional Jewish law].”

– Michael Asheri, 1983, p. 332

While Adolf Hitler failed to destroy the Jews, many these days fear that they are in danger of accomplishing their own destruction via a younger generation’s choice of extinction. Jews have always resisted surrendering their identity chauvinism to go the way of French-Americans, Italian-Americans, Greek-Americans and so many others have already done in completely assimilating into American society decades earlier. The American Jewish community – more intensely than any other people – has always resisted that dreaded curse: assimilation. “The hydra-headed monster of assimilation takes many forms,” says Richard Gordis, “the ‘most menacing’ of which is intermarriage.” [SILBERMAN, p. 285] “What centuries of persecution have been powerless to do,” wrote Lewis S. Benjamin in 1907, “has been efficient in a score of years by friendly intercourse.” [SILBERMAN, p. 286] “We have survived,” says Alan Dershowitz, “– sometimes by the skin of our teeth – millennia of rape attempts against the Jewish body and soul by villains and monsters of every description. Efforts to convert us, assimilate us, and exterminate us by the sword have taken an enormous toll, but in the end they have failed. Now the dangers are more subtle: willing seduction, voluntary assimilation, deliberate abdication.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 354] “On the one end of spectrum,” remarks Henry Feingold, “is the danger of absorption into a benevolent society; on the other is the possibility of physical destruction … It seems like both dangers require a conscious will to overcome. That may be the secret of Jewish survival.” [FEINGOLD, p. 67]

Intermarriage (marrying non-Jews), notes Egon Mayer, has always been “the cardinal social offense that an individual Jew can commit against his family and community.” [SCHNEIDER, p. 334] “There are two main taboos laid upon the Jewish people,” wrote Ann Roiphe in 1981, “The first and most important taboo is not to leave the tribe … The taboo against intermarriage is really only an extension in practical matters of the first taboo. If you marry a stranger it will lead to your eventually leaving the tribe, and if you yourself do not, then your children and grandchildren will and so the body of Jewry will be depleted. Each loss is grieved and each time someone breaks the taboo the ranks close tighter behind him. They don’t say (not relatives, friends or friends of relatives) good luck, Godspeed, they vilify and despise.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 197]
Kitty Dukakis, the wife of Massachusetts governor Michael Dukakis, remembered being taken to the synagogue as a child by her grandmother:

“I remember, too, being the subject of discussion among the mezzanine denizens. The ladies looked me over and mumbled, under their breath, ‘shiksa.’ I was about four and a half when I heard that term for the first time: It is Yiddish and means a non-Jewish girl. At the very word, my grandmother would turn excitedly and shush her friends. She’d purse her lips, look over to the side, and pretend to spit, saying something like ‘p-tui, p-tui!’ I learned, later, she was spitting to ward off the ‘keenahori,’ the evil eye. ‘It’s not true,’ my grandmother cried vehemently. ‘She’s not a shiksa. She’s Jewish on both sides!’ My grandmother never knew my mother was only half-Jewish and that my sister and I had gentile blood. I think it would have killed her.” [DUKAKIS, K., 1990, p. 55]

Vickie Bane notes the case of famous radio talk show host “Dr. Laura” Schlessinger (whose father was Jewish, but mother not):

“Laura told Ethnic Newswatch that their Jewish neighbors on Long Island were very ‘unaccepting’ of her mother because ‘she was a shiksa [a non-Jewish woman] and because she was gorgeous … A lot of problems came from the Jewish women. I got into fistfights because they called my mother a dirty refugee.” [BANE, V., 1999, p. 25]

In Peru, Israeli Elaine Karp is married to a popular 2001 presidential candidate, Alejandro Toledo. But her relations with the local Jewish community was strained, noted the Jewish Chronicle, “partly because of her high profile marriage to a non-Jew … Her mixed marriage and her leftist views have caused some rejection.” [PERELMAN, M., 4-20-01]

In 1982, Earl Shorris noted the perspective of his Uncle Phillip about his son dating non-Jews:

“When [my Uncle Phillip’s] son, then a medical student, brought home a Gentile girl to meet his parents, Phillip is said to have addressed the boy as Tom, a subtle pun on a Hebrew word for wrong thinking. The young woman, confused at hearing her beau called by an unfamiliar name, asked my uncle, Do you always call him Tom? Only when he’s with you.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 53]

Jews, writes Inge Lederer Gibel, “are desperately concerned with the ever-rising rate of intermarriage … Even Jewish secularists … often resist or withhold their approval when a child announces the intention to ‘marry out.’” [GIBEL, p. 53-54] This situation inevitably leads to the standard Jewish ‘universalist/particularist’ contradiction and the hypocrisy of preaching one world view while practicing another. Gibel notes that

“The bulk of Jewry [worries about] the high rate of intermarriage, and the dichotomy of teaching ones’ children about universal values and the kinship of the human family while in the next breath saying, ‘But you mustn’t marry [a non-Jew].’” [GIBEL, p. 54]
Even Gibel, who decries Jewish racism and married a Black man, told her son, as she “told his sister: I don’t care who you marry, what color, what nationality, as long as she is a good human being and willing to make a commitment to a Jewish home.” [GIBEL, p. 65]

A 1990 survey of the American Jewish community set off a blaze of Jewish worry and hysteria. 52% of all marriages by Jews in America today, the study revealed, were to non-Jews. (Some scholars have argued a more realistic figure is 40%, which is still – for most Jews – intolerably high). “This (52%) number,” says J. J. Goldberg, “electrified Jewry from coast to coast. Within weeks it would spread by word of mouth and through newspaper headlines, impassioned sermons, and anguish editorial.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 66]

Many talk about Jews marrying non-Jews as if it was the reincarnation of the Nazi gas chambers. “The intermarriage process will take everything Jewish in its wake,” declared Rabbi Pincher Stolper, the Executive Vice President of the Orthodox Union, “it will grow until it engulfs the entire community. It is another Holocaust.” [GOLDBERG, p. 66] “Interruption,” says Rabbi Sol Roth, “is a holocaust of our own making.” [SILBERMAN, p. 286] “We will destroy ourselves,” worried Rabbi Morris Shapiro, “not through the gas chambers but the love chambers.” [RITTENBERG, p. 8] “There are no barking dogs and no Zyklon-B gas,” declared Rabbi Ephraim Buchwald, founder of the National Jewish Outreach Program, “…but make no mistake: this is a spiritual Holocaust.” [TOBIN, G., 1999, p. 1] In England, where Jews fight their own intermarriage battle, the United Synagogue Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks “reportedly said that intermarriage could complete the work of annihilation attempted by Hitler.” [BAADEN, p. 7] Paul Cowan recalls what his non-Jewish wife faced when they visited Israel: “Israelis and Jewish-American tourists accused her completing Hitler’s work by marrying a Jew.” [COWAN, P., 1987, p. 7] (“When I see those direct-mail envelopes screaming ‘Another Holocaust … here in America,’” says Zev Schwebel, “and then find inside an appeal for money to fight the ‘holocaust’ of intermarriage, it makes my blood boil. This is an obscenity … How dare they equate the horror of a Nazi with a couple that intermarry? This sort of talk is morally reprehensible.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 130])

Roberta Farber called the large number of young Jews desiring to marry out of the Jewish community “devastating,” suggested proposals be enacted to “thwart” it, and wondered how best to “retard” intermarriage.” [FARBER, p. 14, 20] Stephen Whitfield notes that the rise in Jewish intermarriage “has been so dramatic that panic buttons have been pressed.” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 19] Emma Klein suggests “communal” outreach programs to pull wayfaring Jews by birth back into the fold to “weather the threat of intermarriage.” [KLEIN, p. 3] Norman Cantor bemoans “the racial suicide of a runaway rate of intermarriage.” [CANTOR, p. 434] Michael Wechsler says that it has reached “alarming proportions.” [WECHSLER, p. 275]

“The current intermarriage scare,” wrote J. J. Goldberg in 1996, “is having a subtle effect on the balance of power in Jewish life. It is putting liberals on the defensive, by raising doubts about the very idea of Jewish integration in an open
society. Jewish institutions are devoting a growing share of their resources to shore up the Jewish community from within, and are backing away from their traditional role of trying to better American society ... Simply to say aloud that Jews should fight for the rights of all people – once a universal view – now invites public attack.” [GOLDBERG, p. 64] “The Jewish community is hysterical about Jews marrying non-Jews,” noted Gary Tobin in 1999, “The language of tragedy and despair pervades analysis and discussion of what is called the ‘intermarriage crisis’ in America today. Denominations within Judaism have passed bellicose resolutions calling for prevention of intermarriage; and respected scholars, rabbinic leaders, and popular culture figures in Jewish life consistently liken intermarriage to disease, war, and genocide.” [TOBIN, G., 1999, p. 1]

“Part of me,” says scholar Steven M. Cohen, the chief harbinger of the 52% intermarriage figure, “[sees] my friends who are intermarried and celebrating Christmas as renegades, as heretics, as a traitor of sorts, as missing a very important part of Judaism – and I pity them.” [COHEN, Discussion, p. 19] “Interrmarriage is a violation of Jewish law,” argued Blu Greenberg in a (1997 issue of the left-wing) Tikun magazine roundtable discussion about the subject, “It’s an abrogation of the covenantal concept of how one enters the Jewish community and peoplehood.” [FIRESTONE, TIKKUN, p. 37]

What other ethnic group in America could continuously, very publicly herald itself in such a way, with no fears of vehement criticism of its motivational core: naked racism? Any “white” group with a similar agenda is categorically deemed as ideological descendents of Nazi fascism. African-American groups with out-group marriage prohibitions are seen as Black versions of the Ku Klux Klan. But Jewry consistently resists confronting its own intrinsic racism in this matter. The Jewish Chosen People concept, by religious Jews or atheist Jews, is blurred, vaguely alluded to, as in this observation by Jewish author Gary Tobin:

“Many Jews may not know much about Judaism, but we do know that we are somehow different because we are Jews – whatever that means. And we know that other Jews are somehow connected to us.” [TOBIN, G., 1999, p. 3]

In the face of all the myths about the Jewish community’s interethnic tolerance for other communities, Maurice Lamm’s 1980 volume, The Jewish Way in Love and Marriage (Harper and Row, publishers) is based on Jewish religious law and advises the following:

“Permit no interdating – not once, not even in a group ... Make your child positively and absolutely aware of your horror at the prospect ... Do not attend wedding receptions or receptions of intermarried friends ... You must not accept a mixed marriage at all ... Pull out every stop ... Of course it is heartbreaking to be severe with your own child, but not melt ... Interfaith-marriage is treason against the Jewish people, its Bible, its history, and its laws.” [LAMM, p. 63-64]

In a section entitled “The Rights of the Intermarried,” Lamm notes that a non-Jewish marriage partner may not be buried in a Jewish cemetery, nor may
an unconverted child of a non-Jewish woman. [LAMM, p. 54] In the case of homosexuality, “the Halakhah decrees that the lesbian is not punished with death as the male homosexual would be, and is permitted to marry a priest. However, the transgression does warrant a disciplinary punishment – flagellation.” [LAMM, p. 67]

(Despite these traditional perspectives about same sex love, Jewish homosexual Lev Raphael’s views about marriage, in his youth, to non-Jews were kosher. “Beverly and I did not get married,” he writes, “I knew more and more clearly that I could not marry a non-Jew, no matter how much I loved her. What pushed me over the edge? Imagining Christmas, so profoundly a part of Beverly’s life, in ‘our’ house. I couldn’t do it, nor could I ask her to give it up. I couldn’t confuse myself or any children we might have. I wanted a Jewish home. No – it wasn’t that affirmative. I realized I couldn’t have a non-Jewish home; that was as far as I got, and it meant much more to me than my subterranean attraction to men … I wished my brother hadn’t taken something away from the family by marrying a non-Jew.” [RAPHAEL, L., 1996, p. 1213]

Paul Cowan recalls a non-Jewish girlfriend he once had (he did marry a woman who converted to Judaism):

“A few weeks after I got back from Israel, I invited my girlfriend, Beth, a Smith undergraduate, an Episcopalian-born poet from suburban Connecticut, whose literary ideas had influenced me, to spend time at my family’s house on Martha’s Vineyard. Ever since I had returned to America, I’d been toying with the idea of retaining the name Saul Cohen, since I thought that act would allow me to feel the same clear sense of my own identity as I had in Israel. It was a whimsical notion, of course, since it would plainly wound my father [who changed his name from Cohen] far more deeply than it would satisfy me. In fact, Beth was the only person to whom I ever mentioned the fantasy. Was I testing her? Probing for her innermost feeling about Jews? Probably. They came, in a rush, when she rubbed her hands in a Shylock-like gesture and said, ‘Saul Cohen. That’s not you. You don’t want to go back to the ghetto.’ It seemed like a flash of bigotry, and it bothered me so much that I never dated her again. When we discussed the episode, years later, she remembered it as vividly as I did. She had been sure that I was abandoning my identity as an American for a romantic illusion. The illusion might not have been so threatening if it had included her. But that night at supper my sister Holly had glanced toward Beth, then turned toward me and said, ‘I feel proud to be a Jew. Don’t you?’ I nodded, Beth recalls. Then, later, when I told Beth I was thinking of changing my name, she began to feel so excluded from my family’s – and my – inner core that she went outside and wept. For years I remembered her as a latent anti-Semite. She remembered me as one of the chosen people, who secretly believed that everyone else was inferior.” [COWAN, P., 1982, p. 113]

“I’m horrified by the attitude of so many Jews toward intermarriage,” complained John-Paul Flintoff from Great Britain in 1998, “It’s not just
in Israel. You come across the same thing in Israel. Yes, my wife is Jewish.” [FLINTOFF, J., 1–14-98]

“Among the most vehemently opposed to the prospect of intermarriage,” says Lena Romanoff, who surveyed over 500 members of a ‘Jewish Converts Network,’ “some [Jewish] parents are initially inclined to go to any lengths to end the relationship. Through outbursts, threats, and pleadings, the first stage in the sabotage plan is directed at the son or daughter. When that fails, and it usually does, discouragement is aimed at the non-Jewish partner through displays of indifference, coldness, or downright hostility.” [ROMANOFF, p.81]

Social worker Edwin Freedland noted in 1982 that:

“When some Jewish parents realize that they might have a non-Jewish in-law the reactions can be severe. I have seen Jewish mothers threaten suicide and Jewish fathers go into severe states of depression. I have seen threats to cut children off emotionally and financially and to get the child kicked out of medical school! I have witnessed harassment in the form of daily letters or phone calls. I have seen parents resort to arguing the Jewish partner out of the potential marriage, and I have seen the effort made with the non-Jewish partner. Whatever form the reaction takes, however, the rationale is usually phrased in terms of, or accompanied by comments on, the survival of the Jewish people. ‘How can you do this to us?’ is usually mixed with ‘Remember the Holocaust.’” [FREEDLAND, p. 509]

Alan Adelson’s book about the radical left-wing Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) notes that “one Jewish SDSer’s parents took their son’s emergence as a communist fairly placidly, but when he told them he was dating a Catholic girl, his mother gravely informed him: ‘Son, you’re killing us slowly.’” [ADELSON, p. 135]

A 1985 survey of American Jewry revealed that 43% of Jewish fathers and 50% of Jewish mothers were opposed to Jews dating non-Jews. Comparatively, only 16% of Christian fathers and 19% of Christian mothers opposed interdating. 59% of Jewish fathers and 62% of Jewish mothers opposed Jewish marriage to non-Jews, while only 29% of Christian fathers and 33% of Christian mothers opposed Christian marriages to non-Christians. [FORSTER, p. 69] Another study found that while 80% of the parents of non-Jewish spouses of Jews had positive attitudes about Jewish people, only a quarter of the Jewish parents of a child married to a non-Jew had positive attitudes towards Gentiles. [FORSTER, p. 110] What group of people seem to be narrow-minded bigots here? Why is this aspect of the “champions of liberalism” and “fighters against intolerance” never highlighted?

Jewish isolationism of course has deep and ancient roots, and even in America Jewish fears of, and hostility to, intermarriage are not new. In 1912, one survey noted that only seven of 100 rabbis surveyed in America had ever performed a mixed marriage. A 1909 resolution of the Central Council of American Rabbis declared that “mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should be discouraged by the American rabbinate.”
As late as the 1970s, even among Reform (generally considered to be a very liberal branch of Judaism) rabbis, “virtually all” of them opposed mixed marriages on principle and a majority refused to officiate such weddings. [MACDONALD, p. 98] “Most Jewish parents want their children to maintain Jewish contacts,” wrote Albert Gordon in 1959, “They do not favor the idea of intermarriage, primarily because it is their desire to perpetuate the Jewish people and the ‘religion of their father,’ however they may define that religion … Intensification of efforts to counter this situation, which Jews must regard as critical, must therefore occupy the most prominent place among the concerns of American Jews.” [GORDON, A., p. 245]

While for decades in American popular society a parent’s resistance to his or her child marrying someone of another race or religious faith has been the bottom line gauge of a bigot, “the battle against intermarriage,” said Arthur Hertzberg in 1964, “… is conducted among Jews more bitterly and with relatively more success than any other group in America. It makes no difference whether Jews believe or do not believe in any version of the Jewish tradition; they battle with equal fervor against the threat of intermarriage of their children. Certainly one would be shocked to discover non-believers of Catholic or Protestant extraction fighting comparably with their own children.” [HERTZBERG, p. 291]

In 1972, Rabbi Louis Bernstein noted the “frightening increase in intermarriage” and the Rabbinical Council of America set up a National Commission on Jewish Survival to fight it. [COX, p. 185] In 1977 Elihu Bergman, the Assistant Director of the Harvard Center for Population Studies, started seeing the dam leaking and worried that “a disaster is in the making.” [SILBERMAN, p. 275] In 1987 a New York-area Conservative Judaism Rabbi Association passed a resolution banning rabbis who perform intermarriages. “Any rabbi who officiates [at an intermarriage] is approving it. It will destroy the character, the uniqueness of the Jewish people, which we are obligated to perpetuate.” [RITTBERG, p. 8] Still in June of 1997, Rabbi Eric Yoffie, described as “a, if not the, leading spokesperson for Reform Judaism” (the most liberal strand of formal Jewish faith) and head of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, said: “I do not perform interfaith marriages. I personally do not believe that rabbis should marry Jews and non-Jews.” [SHANKS, p. 47] (Yoffie, by the way, rose to power in the ranks of the Association of Reform Zionists of America). “No Judaism, halihkic or otherwise,” said Rabbi Jonathan Sacks in 1993, “sanctions marriage between Jews and non Jews without threatening Jewish continuity at its foundations. Such, however, is the rate of intermarriage in highly acculturated
Jewish communities that exclusion of the outmarried can equally be perceived as a demographic disaster.” [SACKS, J., p. 160-161]

This opinion is an ancient one. Centuries before Christ, “the principle of the Jewish master race, founded upon the myth of racial purity,” notes Old Testament scholar John Allegro, “was being jeopardized by intermarriage on an increasing scale.” [Allegro, p. 52] In the Torah/Old Testament, Nehemiah even declared that

“I saw the Jews who had married women of Ashdod, Ammon, and Moab; and half of their children spoke the language of Ashdod, and they could not speak their own language. And I contended with them and cursed them and beat some of them and pulled out their hair… Shall we then listen to you and do all this great evil and act treacherously against our God by marrying foreign women?” [NEHEMIAH 13:23-27; in Allegro, p. 52]

In Jewish tradition, notes Dan Rottenberg, even among Jews, “there were complex rules regarding who could marry whom, for the groups constituted a distinct social pecking order, as follows, starting at the top:

1. **Kohanim** (priests) – male descendants of Aaron, who was a brother of Moses and a descendant of Levi.
2. **Levites** – other male descendants of Levi, who served as assistants to the Kohanim.
3. **Israelites** – all other Jews of unblemished heritage (that is, descendants of Jacob who had not intermarried with non-Jews).
4. **Halalim** – offspring of some forbidden marriages entered into by priests.
5. **Gerim** – converts to Judaism.
6. **Harurim** – freed slaves.
7. **Mamzerim** – bastards.
8. **Netinim** – descendants of the Gibeonites, who were circumcised at the time of Joshua (1200 BC?) and were not regarded as full Jews because their conversion was effected by trickery.
9. **Shetukim** – persons unable to identify their father.
10. Persons unable to identify either their father or their mother.

Not included in this list were gentiles and slaves, who had no legal status at all in Jewish law at the time, since Jewish law applied only to Jews.” [ROTTENBERG, D., 1977, p. 60]

“Being Jewish,” as we have so often seen, has always been packed with a range of contradictions and paradoxes; the subject of intermarriage – so deeply entwined in the strange genetic, ethnic, and nationalist maze of “Jewish identity” – is no different. While Jewish mythology traditionally makes implicit claims of a direct genetic lineage to the Israelite patriarch Abraham, and various rabbis throughout the centuries have legislated against marrying non-Jews, a quick scan of ancient Jewish history reveals that a number of preeminent Israelite historical characters had married out of the community.

The original patriarch himself, Abraham, cohabitated with Hagar, an Egyp-
tian; Joseph married Asenath, an Egyptian; Moses married Zipporah, a Midianite; King David’s mother was a Moabite as was his great grandmother, Ruth; and, as far as King Solomon goes (whose mother was a Hittite), “he loved many strange women, including the daughter of Pharaoh, women of Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites.” [KOESTLER, p. 235] (King Solomon was reputed to have hundreds, if not thousands of wives).

Even such seminal modern Zionist heroes like Theodore Herzl, Chaim Weizmann, and Ben Gurion all had children who married non-Jews. [SCHNEIDER, p. 339] Max Nordeau, one of the foremost Zionist pioneers, was married to a Christian. Even Israeli right wing prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s first marriage was to a woman whose mother was not Jewish.

Yet Moses himself cautioned against exogamy (DEUTERONOMY 7: 34) and “the promises of Isiah and the injunctions of Ezra in matters of separation,” noted J. O. Hertzler in 1942, “are as valid today among the Orthodox as at the hour of their supposed utterance … A generation or two ago, among many Jews, a father would say kaddish (a prayer for the dead) over the child who was intermarried, as if he had died. Intermarriage was an unforgivable sin, more sinister and dangerous than religious apostates.” [HERTZLER, p. 79]

Such injunctions still hold firm in Jewish Orthodox communities today in America (6% of the United States Jewish population, 14% of the New York Jewish population). The rate of intermarriage in the Orthodox community, according to two Jewish researchers on the subject, is “virtually nil.” [FARBER, p. 17] (In 1991 a study even showed that 85% of all Jews in New York married other Jews.) [FARBER, p. 16]

By 1990, however, with so many young Jews (or divorcees taking on second or third marriages) marrying out of the Jewish community across America, “religious and communal leaders,” says Edward Shapiro, “could no longer hurl jeremiads against exogamy or berate the intermarried, particularly when often their children and closest acquaintances had intermarried.” [SHAPIRO, p. 5] “The non-Orthodox … walk a tightrope,” says Lena Romanoff, “Although they do not want to encourage intermarriage, they also do not want to alienate young Jews who, with or without approval from their rabbis or parents are increasingly likely to become involved in intermarriage.” [ROMANOFF, p. 6] Hence, since about the 1960s, Jewish communities (except the Orthodox who ban it) have had no choice but to slowly shift from an intolerance of intermarriage to damage control: it was time to swallow their convictions and make strong efforts to keep the children of mixed marriages Jewish.

Outreach programs or not, there is a strong tendency to keep the children of mixed marriages Jewish anyway. Given traditional Jewish identity (with its obsessive root and intolerant view of Christians), it should be no surprise that Jews in mixed marriages are far less willing to give up links to their heritage than Gentile spouses. In a 1980s New York area demographic study, for example, the results suggested that three-quarters of Jewish women who marry Gentiles planned to raise their children as Jews. [SILBERMAN, p. 303] Calvin Goldscheider notes that “usually the Jewish partner remains attached to the Jewish
community and in many cases the partner not born Jewish becomes attached to the Jewish community through friends, family, neighbors, organizations, secular and religious. Most of the friends of the intermarried are Jewish; most support the state of Israel; most identify themselves as Jews.” [GOLDSCHNEIDER, p. 139] “In my experience,” says social worker Edwin Freedland, “it is far more likely that when Jews and non-Jews marry it will generally be the non-Jewish partner who is influenced away from his or her origins. When the focus is confined to those marriages in which the Jewish partner is female, then I have to add that I have almost never seen such a union where the non-Jewish male will be the less adaptive partner in family matters.” [FREEDLAND, E., 1982, p. 503] “If half the children [of mixed marriages] are raised as Jews,” notes a hopeful Charles Silberman, “there will be no net reduction in the number of Jews, no matter how high the intermarriage is.” [Silberman’s emphasis] [SILBERMAN, p. 303]

Faced with a younger Jewish generation that is more inclined to exogamy, some liberal community leaders, rather than lose Jews en masse, have faced the “disaster” with controversial, nontraditional, emergency remedies. While not proselytizing, some Jewish leaders are exploring conversion to Judaism by non-Jewish spouses as an option to keep a dedicated Jewish lineage and identity. (By 1990 there were about 190,000 formal converts to Judaism in America, the overwhelming majority married to born Jews). [EPSTEIN, p. 38] If, for instance, the non-Jewish marriage partner converts to Judaism, the chances of the union’s children being raised as Jews is much higher. While 75% of mixed married children remained Jewish when the non-Jewish partner converted to Judaism, likewise 75% of the children were not raised Jewish in non-converted households. [EPSTEIN, p. 40]

For many converts, their new Jewish identity has some unexpected aspects. “Virtually every Jew by choice to whom I spoke,” says researcher Charles, Charles Silberman, “told me that conversion involves a transformation in identity … ‘All of a sudden you feel labeled and vulnerable,’ a Denver convert told me … A New Yorker put it more graphically: ‘I feel much more of that ‘when will those goyim get me?’ syndrome than I expected.” [SILBERMAN, p. 317] More demanding than any religious allegiance, one study found that 71% of converts to Judaism felt that support for Israel was important; 70% even felt it important to visit the Jewish nation. (Two-thirds of the converts married to Jews earned $75,000 a year or more). [FORSTER, p. 97]

“As a new Jew,” counsels Laurence Epstein in his book for converts, “the convert needs to identify with the Jewish community so deeply that the community’s concerns are absorbed by the convert. The Jewish community cares about the survival and security of Israel. So must the convert. The Jewish community cares about preserving the memory of the Holocaust so as to firm its resolve to fight anti-Semitism. So must the convert.” [EPSTEIN, p. 198]

In 1973 the Reform and Conservative rabbis decided to deal with the unpleasant situation of increasing intermarriage by creating a formal course for converts to Judaism (i.e., mostly non-Jews who sought to marry Jews) “in order
to preserve a Jewish identity in the home to retain the next generation (as Jews).” [FORSTER, p. 55] It was agreed not to publicize the course, however, for fear of encouraging intermarriage (as well as the program’s inevitably controversial nature in Orthodox circles); “students” were selected by rabbis. The course addressed a wide range of “Jewishness” – “highlights of Jewish history included the Holocaust and the establishment of the state of Israel.” [FORSTER, p. 56]

The overwhelming majority of conversions in America are performed under the auspices of Reform or Conservative rabbinates. In Israel, which is deeply, and increasingly, influenced by Orthodox dictate, these conversions are not recognized as being legitimate. Jewish Orthodoxy formally dominates the Israeli religious (and, to some degree, secular) system. “It has long been known,” wrote Uri Huppert in 1988, “that Reform and Conservative rabbis are not authorized to officiate at ceremonies for their own congregants. They can neither marry, nor divorce, nor bury them.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 51]

Many converts to Judaism in America have a rude and unexpected awakening when they visit Israel and find that there they are not Jews after all. “More than one convert,” says Laurence Epstein, “has told me they wished they had known of these disputes [between Reform and Conservative Judaism and Orthodoxy] before they converted.” [EPSTEIN, p. 44] Rabbi Jonathan Sacks notes that “some hundreds of thousands of individuals who have received Reform conversions or patrilineal Jewish identity [i.e., only the father is Jewish], or are the children of women who have [converted to Judaism], consider themselves Jewish and halakhically are not.” [SACKS, J., p. 186]

In 1998 this experience befell Andrea Kinkel, the daughter of Germany’s foreign minister, who married an Israeli citizen and converted to Orthodox Judaism in the United States. The Israeli Foreign Ministry rejected her conversion when she and her husband moved to Israel. [DEUTSCH-PRESS] Similar is the case of Abraham Elhiany, born and raised in Louisiana. His father was Jewish, his mother was not. Upon moving to Israel, his various papers testifying to his “Jewishness” were decided to be forgeries by the Israeli rabbinate (although he was told by one clerk that the matter could be settled for $1,000). [ARNOLD, p. A1] Even if a Gentile jumps through all the hoops of rigorous year-long study (and, for males, a circumcision rite) to be an Orthodox Jew in Israel, the conversion is only valid in that country.

By traditional Jewish law, not only are non-Orthodox conversions to Judaism unacceptable. Any Jew who divorced and remarries without getting a specially Orthodox “bill of divorce” will thereby have children who are automatically considered by the Orthodox to be mamzerim, illegitimate, no matter who the Jewish parent remarries. Mamzerim are children born of incestuous or adulterous unions. “They carry a stigma with tragic consequences,” notes Rabbi Jonathan Sacks. “[By Orthodox decree] they may not marry a legitimate Jew. The Reform abandonment of halihic divorce thus creates a halakhic fact of illegitimacy … The potential for human grief is enormous.” [SACKS, J., p. 183-184]
For those who do successfully become converts under strict Orthodox observance in Israel, in 1985 the Israeli Interior Ministry afforded them still another slap in the face, highlighting their status as “second-class Jews.” All converts to Judaism were henceforth to have their Israeli identity cards stamped with “convert” next to the word Jew. [JEWISH WEEK, 7-4-86, p. 3]

This issue of “conversion to Judaism” and its attendant paradoxes and incongruities demands scrutiny. The Encyclopedia Judaica uses this alleged Jewish openness to conversion as evidence against the worst racist implications of the “Chosen People” mythology:

“[The Chosen People] concept has been the object of criticism, misinterpretation, and attack from within and without. The anti-Semite has seized upon it as an unveiled claim to Jewish superiority, and caricatures it by maintaining that it is the basis of a program of world domination … Judaism has always been open to the proselyte who – by accepting it – becomes part of the Chosen People. This fact is often cited to refute charges of ‘racial’ exclusiveness.” [ENCYCLOPEDIA JUDAICA, p. 502]

What about the opportunity for anyone to convert to Judaism, which “refutes” the charges of an intolerant “racial exclusiveness” as bedrock to the faith?

The main reason some liberalizing strands of Judaism have begrudgingly warmed to the idea of conversion is not because of any intrinsic openness in the faith, but because younger, secularized, and assimilating Jews are increasingly marrying non-Jews. If Jewish parents have to swallow poison, they would – as the lesser of evils – at least get the poison to convert to Judaism.

Because most people who convert to Judaism have a romantic involvement with a Jewish partner (over 90%) [FORSTER, p. xi], conversion to Judaism and intermarriage is highly related. Many conversions of course are merely expedient. According to a 1979 study, 47% of the converts become Jews because of pressure from the spouses-in-law, or for the sake of their children. In a 1987 study 40.6 per cent of Jews married to non-Jews were unhappy that their spouses were not Jewish; only 14.4% of the corresponding Gentile partners were unhappy their spouses were not Christian. Gentile spouses were found to be likely to convert to Judaism if requested to do so by Jewish in-laws. [FORSTER, p. 76] Likewise, Jewish spouses “preferred that their partners take on Judaism rather than become involved in Christianity themselves, because they wanted to retain their Jewish connection and identity, and they felt uncomfortable affirming Christian beliefs. They tended to actively encourage their partner’s conversion.” [FORSTER, p. 118]

One such study found that 98% of Jewish parents and their children married to non-Jews favored conversion (of the Gentile spouses); 58% of Jews married to Gentiles “actively encouraged conversion of their mate.” [FORSTER, p. 135]

“When Yehuda insisted I have an Orthodox conversion,” says Margaret Morrison, a Gentile married to an Israeli Jew, “so that we and our children would be fully accepted in Israel, I was shocked.”
“Eric [Goldberg] and I dated for two years,” says another Gentile woman who married him, “and the only thing Jewish I ever knew about him was his name … There was not one Jewish book or article in his apartment, and we never discussed Jewish issues. Was I shocked during our first real discussion about marriage when he practically demanded that I convert to Judaism and insisted we be married in a synagogue by his rabbi.” [ROMANOFF, p. 63]

Jacob Kramer simply told his non-Jewish girlfriend: “I’m not a particularly knowledgeable or a religious Jew, but deep down I feel Jewish, and I want you to consider sharing that feeling with me. Let’s explore together.” [ROMANOFF, p. 64] Ronald Maislin’s “major, and not uncommon, dilemma, was whether he should first ask Debbie to marry him, then to convert, or vice versa. “I didn’t want her to think I was blackmailing her into an answer,” he says, “But the fact was I probably would not have married her without conversion.” [ROMANOFF, p. 66] Madeline Plotnick told her would-be husband: “Al, I want our children to be Jewish, not just because I’m Jewish but because they would share a common religion with us. I want you to become a Jew so we can share everything together.” Michael Hart wrote a letter to his girlfriend: “I asked her to consider my proposal seriously but ended by saying that if she could not convert or at least consider it as a future option then I did not want her to respond to my letter. [ROMANOFF, p. 67]

“After only a few months of being together,” says Yossi Klein Halevi,

“I couldn’t imagine life without [non-Jewish] Lynn. And though I tried to forget the future, I dreaded a choice between Lynn and Jewish loyalty. I wanted her to covert to Judaism, to share with me the quest of how to be a Jew in this time. But I knew that could work only she fell in love with the Jewish people.” [HALEVI, MEMOIRS, p. 210]

Insisting that Lynn move with him to Israel, she eventually complained that “It’s all on me. I’m the one who has to make the big changes. Fall in love with Judaism, fall in love with Israel. I feel like an appendage to you. It’s a setup.” “You’re right,” replied Halevi, “but what’s the alternative?” [HALEVI, MEMOIRS, p. 228]

Paul Cowan explains common obsessions with Jewish identity in an intermarriage:

“Usually even the most disaffected Jews want to raise their children as Jews. Many are aware that, according to sociologists and demographers, increasing numbers of Jews who marry in the 1980s are choosing gentiles as their spouses. Even though they themselves are intermarrying, they often are afraid that their children will be assimilated into Christian culture. They fear that if they don’t insist on maintaining Judaism in their homes they will betray more than four thousand years of proud history and deprive their children of a valued legacy. It is often impossible for their gentle partners to understand the intensity of these feelings. They wonder why so many Jews who marry Christians insist on celebrating Jewish holidays and ignoring Christmas; on sending children to Hebrew school and keeping them out of churches. Why are they
insensitive to some of the deepest feelings of the gentiles that they love? Why, the Christians wonder, are Jews so stubborn? Why, some Jews respond, are the gentiles unable to understand the depth of their loyalty to their heritage and their people?” [COWAN, P. 1987, p. x]

“Many Jews in modern America believe it is enough to feel Jewish,” says Lena Romanoff, “to be a gastronomic or cultural Jew, perhaps with the notion that, as inexplicable as it is, they have little “J” cells in their blood…. When it comes time to encouraging conversion [in their Gentile partners] these Jews understandably find it difficult to explain this seemingly inexplicable commitment to their partners.” [ROMANOFF, p. 64]

And how are converts to Judaism accepted in the Jewish community?

“The Jewish community as a whole,” says Brenda Forster and Joseph Tabachnik, “still evidences great suspicion towards converts … Since Jews know of their own Marranos who faked being Christians for centuries, they have historical grounds for being suspicious.” [FORSTER, p. 74] “The Jewish community’s is a shamefully ambivalent attitude,” complained Rabbi Laurence Kushner in 1997, “even down right hostile toward people who want to join us. It is based on a narrow, ethnic definition of what it means to be a Jew, and has no basis in present social reality.” [FIRESTONE, TIKKUN, p. 37]

Even those few Gentiles who convert to Judaism with no attendant romantic interest in a Jew find their sincerity demeaned in the Jewish community. “It is assumed by those of a negative bent,” says Brenda Forster, “even when the facts are known to be otherwise, that … converts … have convert[ed] for utilitarian reasons.” [FORSTER, p. 76] Jewish identity, Laurence Epstein warns would-be converts, “… is something of an ethnocentric nature, such as the view that converts are not really Jewish, that only someone born Jewish could truly understand how a Jew feels.” [EPSTEIN, p. 52]

“Rejection,” says convert Lena Romanoff, “from all corners of Jewish society, is nothing new for a convert … It points to one of the most serious problems facing all converts: lack of acceptance by other Jews … Despite my obvious commitment, the consensus in my [Jewish in-law] family was that it would be better if my “past” was not made public knowledge … I began to think I was walking around with a disease of some sort.” [ROMANOFF, p. 128-129]

“Unlike Christians,” says Brenda Forster, “who open their arms and doors in great warmth, concern, and support for converts, Jews are generally suspicious … Jews by choice [converts] are surprised and hurt by evidence of non-acceptance from Jews that continues for years … Recent figures (1985) put the Jewish-Gentile divorce rate at 55%, with the Jewish-Jewish rate at 10% … Negative reactions [to Gentile spouses] by Jewish in-laws, by Jewish leaders, and by the Jewish community may eventually take their toll.” [FORSTER, p. 133-134]

“Sadly enough,” says Lena Romanoff, “some born Jews disregard the level of commitment and sincerity of the convert. In their eyes a convert is a convert and will always be a convert … I especially found it ironic when I hear Jewish parents say that they would rather their child marry a secular, assimilated Jew than a convert. In these cases, the convert is greeted with hostility or suspicion,
whereas those same parents would never pass such judgment on the uncommitted Jew.” [ROMANOFF, p. ] As Nahum Goldmann notes, “the Talmud says that a ger, a convert, is as hard to bear as a sore.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 65]

“Jews are born, not made,” insisted Marty Ross, the father-in-law of a convert, “The Jewish people fought long and hard to survive the ravages of history. Why should an outsider, after a few months of study, be entitled to claim our inheritance?” [ROMANOFF, p. 130] “To be a Jew,” says Jewish scholar Nicholas de Lange, “is thus to acknowledge an attachment to this historic experience. Conversion to Judaism is often conceived in religious terms, but religion is only one aspect of Jewish identity. One cannot become a Jew through subscribing to a set of religious beliefs, any more than one ceases to be a Jew by losing one’s religion. (We do not speak of a ‘lapsed Jew.’) Hence converts are normally spoken of not as converts but as proselytes, a Greek term which originally meant ‘immigrants.’ To become a Jew is essentially to join a people.” [DE LANGE, N., 1987, p. 20]

“Four thousand years of Jewish history,” observes Lena Romanoff, “have cast a unique perspective of the world on many Jews – a perspective that above all emphasizes the uniqueness of a people who have triumphed over repeated periods of persecution, alienation, aloneness. For some the sense of uniqueness is threatened by one who tries to ‘join the club.’ This belonging is seen as a birthright, not something that can be learned or transferred.” [ROMANOFF, p. 131]

Elected as “sisterhood president” at her local synagogue, when it was revealed that Romanoff was only a convert, and not a born Jew, she was informed that she “was no longer sisterhood president because one of the members does not think that a convert is a real Jew.” [ROMANOFF, p. 129, 1990] Anita Gray also converted to Judaism, married a Jew, and eventually became a “national vice chair of the United Jewish Appeal, a board member of the Council of Jewish Federations, a leader in the Cleveland Jewish community, and an active participant in the North American Jewish Forum.” She recounts her horrible experience at a conference about Jewish identity in Israel when she admitted that she wasn’t born Jewish:

“They had not met people like me – converts. It was as if I had two heads. An Israeli Lubavitcher [Hasidic] rebbe [rabbi] jumps up yelling, ‘A Jew knows a Jew through the eye.’ Then an aide to [prime minister Menachem] Begin stands up, points a finger at me, and declares, ‘You’re a tainted woman. Your children will not be able to play with my children.’ I was devastated.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 208]

In 1991, a newly appointed executive director of a Jewish education program drew strong criticism, particularly from the Orthodox and Conservative communities because she was married to a non-Jew. Jewish defenders of Judith Greenberg called the attacks “shocking” and her critics “bigots.” About twenty letters of protest had come to the Jewish Education Service of North America, not including others directed to Greenberg personally, “from people trying to force her out.” Rabbi Marc Angel, President of the Rabbinical Council of America, objected to Greenberg, calling her a “bad role model … [for] Jewish values.”
ASSIMILATION, INTERMARRIAGE AND CONVERSION TO JUDAISM


When Nan Fink (who “as a girl felt inexplicably connected to the victims of the Holocaust”) tried to convert to Judaism, “vicious letters and middle of the night telephone calls threatened the Conservative rabbi with whom Fink initially studied for conversion. At her local Orthodox shul no one would even speak to her. When referred to an Orthodox rabbi in Jerusalem, he informed her that conversion would cost ‘only $8,000, a real bargain.’” [PFEFFERMAN, Do We, p. 8] Fink, the former wife of Tikkun editor Michael Lerner (left-wing harbinger of “Jewish values”) notes that:

“I was … having a difficult time in the Orthodox shul, where I have been going to services with Michael and his teenage son for the last few months. I had hoped to find friends in this community, hardly anyone would speak to me. It was not my imagination. One day an anonymous letter arrived, scrawled on light blue note paper, telling me that I didn’t belong at the shul. Shocked, I quickly tore the letter to shreds. This was only a preview of what would come. A few weeks later one of the women congregants beckoned me to the side of the room after the service. I had seen her before, but we hadn’t spoken. ‘Nobody wants you here,’ she said in a stern voice. ‘People are too polite to tell you directly, but that’s how they feel. You’re not welcome. Do you understand?’ I left the shul weeping.” [PFEFFERMAN, Do We, p. 10]

In Fink’s conversion case, noted the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles, “sometimes Fink even ‘caught herself buying into the implicit racism,’ musing that a particularly non-Jewish friend was ‘goyishly’ bland or restrained.” [PFEFFERMAN, Do We, p. 8]

Louisa Gibson, also married to a Jew, notes her own hellious road towards conversion to Orthodox Judaism:

“This was a Blakeian period for me. A transition from innocence to experience. I was coming from a strong Catholic family, convent educated, sheltered. My parents did not teach us to judge people on the basis of their race or religion. I knew that bigotry and racism existed but had never felt it. It shocked me, and, like a person in shock, it took a while to understand that I was victim of these attitudes. I was an outsider … Everyone knows the convert has to be rejected. Little else about conversion is generally spoken about … Why do so many Jews believe their personal response to a convert must also be one of rejection?” [GIBSON, L., 2000, p. 24]

A convert to Judaism in 1958 told Jewish sociologist Herbert Gans “of becoming disturbed over a discussion at an informal party, the subject being how to inculcate Judaism into their children ‘keep them away from the goyim – the non-Jews.’ This resident was very active in the Jewish community and feared the consequences of revealing his origin. Nevertheless, he felt the time had
come to announce that he had been born and raised a Christian. The declaration broke up the party, and shocked some people. He said afterwards: ‘From now on, they’ll be on their guard about me in their presence. They’ve lost their liberty of expression, they don’t express themselves without restriction now. At party if anybody says

A convert to Judaism in 1958 told Jewish sociologist Herbert Gans “of becoming disturbed over a discussion at an informal party, the subject being how to inculcate Judaism into their children ‘keep them away from the goyim – the non-Jews.’ This resident was very active in the Jewish community and feared the consequences of revealing his origin. Nevertheless, he felt the time had come to announce that he had been born and raised a Christian. The declaration broke up the party, and shocked some people. He said afterwards: ‘From now on, they’ll be on their guard about me in their presence. They’ve lost their liberty of expression, they don’t express themselves without restriction now. At party if anybody says something, everybody looks to see if I’ve been offended and people are taken into a corner and explained about me.’” [GANS, p. 229]

That same year scholars George Eaton Simpson and J. Milton Yinger noted that

“Intermarriage is opposed by some Jews even when the non-Jew joins the Jewish group because ‘an alien element is introduced.’ According to [S.E.] Goldstein, the feeling that this element is ‘a source of weakness and danger’ has become stronger in recent years owing to the spread of a nationalist spirit among Jewish people.” [SIMPSON/YINGER, p. 569]

“If the notion of [a giant extended Jewish] family is taken seriously,” note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “it affirms a biological affinity. No amount of religious mystification can make biological Jews of converts.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 24] Even if a non-Jew converts to Judaism, explained Nathan, a Jewish senior citizen, to researcher Barbara Myerhoff, “that won’t make him a Jew. You could say a broche [blessing] over a chicken, but that won’t make him a fish.” [MYERHOFF, p. 79]

“The most insidious and persuasive barrier to a convert’s full integration into the Jewish community,” noted Gary Tobin in 1999,

“derives from the passionate and often heated who-is-a-Jew debate. Underlying many of the arguments swirling around in this discussion is the (secret) conviction that true membership in the Jewish community can only be achieved by birth. All other comers can never be like us, not really, not in their hearts. But we cannot say this out loud.” [original author’s parenthesis: TOBIN, G., 1999, p. 99]

“There is a debilitating hesitancy,” wrote Raphael Baaden, a Jew by birth, in 1996,

“around the question of conversion [to Judaism]. It cannot be positively encouraged [by Jews] … because, well, it can’t. Instead, it seems we should concentrate on exhorting Jews to marry Jews – that is (although it’s usually not stated in these terms) born Jews … A halakhic ruling about the inclusion of certain Jews – namely those with Jewish
mothers and non-Jewish fathers [i.e., the classical religious ruling of who is a Jew] seems to have been fashioned within a discourse of racial purity into a threatening statement of exclusion. This discourse of racial purity clouds our thoughts continuously, in particular when the question of conversion arises.” [BAADEN, p. 11]
THE JEWISH SELF-CONCEPTION OF INTELLECTUAL, MORAL, AND SPIRITUAL SUPERIORITY

“Jewish intelligence, integrity and intellect, as a matter of record, predominates in all branches of scientific discoveries, modern advancements and commercial enterprises, in all parts of the world, swaying destinies of various people and conducting the affairs of numerous nations, guiding opinions, and sentiments in the press, pulpit, rostrum, cathedra, reducing or increasing the instrumentality of exchanges, bourses, money markets and financial operations…”

Nachman Heller, 1928, p. 23

While Orthodox Jews still bluntly claim God’s unabashed favoritism, more secular Jews’ self-congratulation repeatedly highlights a disproportionate number of Jewish Nobel prize winners, as well as other ambitious and famous scientists, philosophers, writers, and their attendant legion of achievers, not as an expression of a self-promotive ethic, culturally-cultivated ambition, tradition of scholarship, nepotistic networks, or strong communal and personal economic base in support of self-advancement, but of a smug Jewish intellectual “essence.” “Nearly a fourth of the Nobel prizes in physiology and medicine,” writes Jewish author Miles Storfer, “have been awarded to people of Jewish faith or heritage … and more than a fifth of the prizes in physics have been awarded to people of Jewish descent.” [STORFER, p. 322] “Pointing to the high proportion of Jewish Nobel Laureates,” says Joshua Halberstam, “… is a custom practiced around Jewish tables everywhere.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 55]

“Now American Jewish culture basically comes down to ‘anything produced by a Jew is Jewish,’” complains Leon Wieseltier, “This is an insult to the intelligence. It is also not far from the Nazi idea.” [BERSHTEL, p. 118] In Russia, in the late 1970s, a Jew from Odessa told the American Jewish Congress that “it was kind of a hobby [among Jews] to collect the names of famous Jews who hide their identity [in the Soviet Union].” [ROTHCHILD, 1985, p. 38]

Albert Einstein, for instance (whose virtuous image was sourly damaged with the revelation of some particularly degrading and dictatorial letters to his non-Jewish wife) is always trotted out as the quintessential genius Jew. No doubt such people are talented, among a world of talent. Such parading of Jewish brain scions, however, avoids the behind-the-scenes fact that the formal recognition of Nobel, Pulitzer, and other “prized” individuals as the current
“best” in any given field inevitably has at least as much to do with competitive networking, connections, hustling, power, self-promotion, visibility, class, status, and/or academic cliques as they do with talent.

The Nobel Prize system – whatever else it is – is an elitist enterprise: a network, a self-referential club that favors those with particular socio-economic advantages. It parallels in structure the incestuous traditional self-promotive Jewish model. In a 1977 study of American Nobel Prize winners (laureates) in science, Harriet Zuckerman determined that:

- 82% of Nobel winners had fathers who were professionals, managers, or proprietors. [p. 65]
- Nobel winners were twice as likely as losers to have come from a “professional” families, and a bit more likely than others to “have fathers in business.” [p. 65]
- Only 15% of the winners came from “blue-collar or white collar” families. [p. 65]
- More than half of the 92 Nobel laureates surveyed “had worked as students, post doctorates, or junior collaborators under older laureates.” [p. 116]
- There was a “fair amount of intermarriage between laureates and the kin of laureates.” [p. 97]
- Six laureates shared the prize with their mentors. [p. 116]
- Laureates tend to come from elite universities. [p. 116]
- “Elite masters [Nobel laureates] can mobilize resources for their apprentices [future laureates],” including fellowships, grants, jobs, and publication possibilities in influential journals. [p. 132]
- The prestige of the Nobel Prize has been used to “confer legitimacy” upon “ideological, political, commercial, and military” ventures. [p. 23]

Zuckerman even devotes sections of her book to “Self-confidence” and “Upward Mobility in Academe” to help explain Nobel victories. For Albert Einstein’s part, notes Robert Schulman (Director of the Einstein Papers Project, some 43,000 letters, notes, papers, and other documents the scientist left behind): “In these pages we can closely observe Einstein and his solitary path to the [theory of] general relativity, and which personal relations are sometimes callously sacrificed in the name of scientific ambition.” [OVERBYE, p. 11] Einstein also left Germany during World War I “to dodge military service,” had an illegitimate daughter, and “considered breaking off his engagement to his cousin Elisa Einstein and marrying her 20-year-old daughter, Ilse, instead.” Einstein’s executor, Otto Nathan, “protective on Einstein’s public image,” delayed for years the public release of the papers by filing a lawsuit to control their handling. [OVERBYE, p. 11]

An embittered African critic dismisses entirely the Nobel prize system, and its “peace prize,” as nothing but a status and political game for the powerful:
“One does not win the Nobel; it is bestowed upon one. All we hear is an announcement that some Scandinavian cabal, in its mysterious wisdom, has decided thus and thus. All that the public is admitted to is the ceremony held for the alleged winners in a contest whose rules and venues and officials are shadowy.” [BLACK WORLD, p. 8]

Edward Epstein’s 1996 expose of the fraudulent life of Armand Hammer, in an entire chapter notes the Jewish billionaire’s heavy lobbying in the last year of his life to win the top Nobel award, finally getting Israel’s prime minister, Menachem Begin, “to be Hammer’s sponsor for the peace prize.” [EPSTEIN, 1996, p. 332-343] That year’s try was unsuccessful, and he died before he could attempt it again.

The traditional Jewish fixation upon intellectual activities as the foremost expression of superiority (as distinct from the “earthy” and “physical”) is reflected in this description of East European Jewry by Zborowski and Herzog:

“Because the head is the container of brains, it is treated with tender care … The symbolism is pervasive. The head of the table, the head of the bed, the head of the fish which the approving husband presents to his wife, each carries its honorific connotations … One part of the body that comes close to disgust is the feet, especially the toes. They are furthest from the head, lowest, and nearest to the ground.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 359]

Traditional Yiddish folklore often reflects on the Jewish self-conception of marked intelligence:

“Jews never have enough of anything except brains.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 140]

“God protect us from Jewish chutzpah [pushiness], Jewish mouths, and Jewish brains.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 44]

“Better the little Jewish brain than the big Govish head.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 104]

Two Jewish co-authors created a term to describe Jewry through the ages: “intellectual gladiators.” “We [Americans],” write Stephen Slavin and Mary Pradt, “define any job demanding considerable intelligence as ‘Jewish work.’” [SLAVIN, p. 60] With so many brilliant Jews in Europe before the Holocaust, Joshua Halberstam thinks that “it is likely that were it not for Auschwitz we would now have a cure for cancer.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 48] Myths of Jewish superiority are also noted by Susan Schneider from a feminist perspective:

“Jewish women have always assured themselves that they were different; yet even with the tenderness and emotional expression many Jewish men permit themselves there is another kind of male feeling of superiority at work – this time a superiority based on precisely the spiritual and intellectual capacity that Jewish men declared as their specialty … Intellectual rather than physical prowess is the determinant value of the Jewish male’s value on his place in the pecking order.” [SCHNEIDER, p. 294]

In a search for charitable aid from the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies
to help Jewish mentally handicapped children at an institution called Willowbrook that was being phased out, two researchers were perturbed by the Jewish organization's formal response. David and Sheila Rothman wrote that

“Troubled by the plight of Willowbrook’s Jewish residents, the Federation did appoint a committee to explore why Jews who were generally in the foreground in providing services [were]…. in this area …. behind other faiths. (The answer came back that ‘the emphasis in Judaism on intellectual achievement tends to set off Jewish retardates more sharply from other Jews.’”) [original author’s parenthesis: ROTHMAN, p. 159]

“It is extraordinarily difficult for American Jews,” says American Jewish scholar Charles Silberman, “to expunge [their] sense of superiority … however much they may try to suppress it.” [SILBERMAN, p. 80] “Jews still possess a feeling of superiority,” wrote Marshall Sklare, “although more in the moral and intellectual realms now than in the area of spiritual affairs … Leaving the (Jewish identity) group becomes a psychological threat: such a move is viewed not as an advancement but as cutting oneself off from a claim of superiority.” [SILBERMAN, p. 81]

“The Jew who has cut off his traditional religion,” wrote J. O. Hertzler, “… and has become an agnostic or atheist, is still considered to be a Jew and probably still, unconsciously, holds to the tribal spirit of superiority even though he no longer observes the ceremonial minutiae.” [HERTZLER, p. 68] In a study of native-born Jews in modern Israel, Herbert Russcol and Margarit Banai note traditional Jewish self-identity in the widespread haughty arrogance among those of the Jewish state:

“But there is a deeper reason, perhaps for his chauvinism: the inbred, self-congratulatory Jewish sense of superiority. Real or imagined, this superiority always infuriates the gentile. Denied a homeland, vilified, the Jew turned his vision inward and fed on his spiritual arrogance. He huddled in ghettos and rejoiced in his four thousand years of apartness, of uniqueness.” [RUSSCOL/BANAI, 1970, p. 173]

In 1984, Mordechai Nisan, a lecturer at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, published an article in Kivvunim, the journal of the World Zionist Congress. Nisan proclaimed that

“While it is true that the Jews are a particular people, they nonetheless are designated as a ‘light unto the nations.’ This function is imposed on the Jews who strive to be a living aristocracy among the nations, a nation that has deeper historical roots, greater spiritual obligation, higher moral standards, and more powerful intellectual capacities than others. This vision which diverges from the widely accepted egalitarianism approach, is not at all based on an arbitrary hostility towards non-Jews, but rather on a fundamental existential understanding of the quality of Jewish peoplehood.” [HARKABI, p. 153]

“Thus,” says Yehoshafat Harkabi, “the concept of the ‘Chosen People’ as an aristocracy provides sanction for the unequal and discriminatory treatment of non-Jews.” [HARKABI, p. 153]
Alan Dershowitz notes his feelings about his Jewish identity when he was a Yale law student:

“When I went home for the Jewish holidays, I told my parents about the brilliant teachers at Yale: Goldstein, Pollack, Bickel, Skolnick, Schwartz. Then I told them about the most brilliant of my teachers: Calabresi. Without missing a beat, my mother asked, ‘Is he an Italian Jew?’ Angrily I said, ‘Don’t be so parochial. He’s an Italian Catholic. Not all smart people have to have Jewish blood.’ Several months later, I learned that Guido Calabresi was in fact descended from Italian Jews.” [DER-SHOWTIZ, p. 50]

Ronald Brauner, also Jewish, notes his feelings after reading a book by Dr. Oliver Sacks: “Truth be told, as I read, my chauvinism also kicked in, as it always does. This guy is terrific! His book is one of the best I have ever read! The insights and sensitivities are remarkable! How could any one person be so brilliant, so on-target, so profound? … he must be Jewish! (that happens to you, too, sometimes, doesn’t it?) … [But] ultimately, sublime talent, insight and ability notwithstanding, a person doesn’t ‘have it all together’ until his Jewish component is also integrated into his work. Somehow, some way, each of us is bound to reflect our Jewishness in what we do.” [BRAUNER, R., p. 35]

Virginia Dominguez, an American visiting professor in Israel, wrote in 1989 that

“Who is Jewish matters. I doubt very much that I am the only non-Jew who discovered only while visiting or living in Israel that many internationally known figures like movie stars, artists, writers, scientists, and athletes whose religious and ethnic identity I had never thought about are Jewish. The Israeli media points to their Jewish identity with few exceptions, in interviews with them or stories about them. This tendency to point out the Jewishness of such figures jars with the sense outside Israel that a similar reference in a non-Jewish newspaper invites the charge of anti-Semitism.” [DOMINGUEZ, p. 127]

Norman Cantor, a New York University professor, claims – with breathtaking arrogance – on his dedication page for The Jewish Experience (1996) that a “world without Jews is a world devoid of humanity.” This insult to anyone not Jewish – ascribing to all non-Jews a lack of “humanity” – is reiterated in his later insistence in the same book that Jews are “a uniquely superior group with an indomitable drive for creativity and accomplishment,” (CANTOR, p. 311) and that “the time may be coming when the genetic superiority of Jews can be calmly discussed …” (p. 312)

In his other recent volume, The Sacred Chain (1994), a history of Jews, Cantor continually reiterates his narcissistic thesis for understanding his own people, and certainly himself: their genetic superiority over others.

“Once the Jews were emancipated, too many younger Jews of superior capability could not find places in society and the economy that were adequate for the exercise of their talents.” [p. 277]
“The Jews, once emancipated and given opportunity for mobility, were genetically so superior that market capitalism could not accommodate some of this superior species . . .” [p. 277]

“The Jews are a superior people intellectually and as long as Jewish genes exist, the extraordinary impact Jews have had in the twentieth century will continue indefinitely.” [p. 423]

“Although millions of Jews had carried their Eastern European impoverishment with them to the West, their literary, native intelligence, religion-controlled moral disciples and super genetic quality made them excellent prospects for upward mobility in Western society.” [p. 232]

“The genetic superiority of the Jews will be extended and as long as its carriers are individually free and privileged to pursue their interests in science, philosophy, literature and the arts, highly advantageous consequences for humanity will follow.”

These are not the self-obsessed ravings of a lunatic fringe element a hundred years ago, but those of a prominent Jewish professor today who gives current voice to an old strand of Jewish ideology in a book by a major publisher, HarperCollins.

Other old Jewish racist narcissists Cantor drags out in The Jewish Experience include, again, the ancient Talmudic scholar, Maimonides, who says that “God has distinguished us from the rest of mankind” (p. 314), and another, Judah Halevi, who, according to Cantor, “was a kind of Jewish nationalist [who] believed not only in the superiority of Judaism but in the intrinsic superior quality of Jews over other people.” (p. 316) (Halevi believed, adds Arnold Eisen, in “a hereditary capacity inhering in the Jewish people which uniquely prepared it for the reception of divine revelation.”) [EISEN, p. 18]

Yet Cantor seems ambiguously torn between the polar values of human universalism and Jewish racism. While championing racism himself, elsewhere he seemingly condemns it:

“Racism is itself a central doctrine in traditional Judaism and Jewish cultural history. The Hebrew Bible is blatantly racist, with all the talk about the seed of Abraham, the chosen people, and Israel as the light to other nations. Orthodox Jews in their many prayers still thank God daily that he did not make Jews ‘like the other people of the earth.’ If this isn’t racism, what is?”

Yet Cantor states in the same book what he apparently sees as objective science, and not a manifestation of the very racism he decries:

“Why did Jews as an immigrant group [in America] do better than the Irish or Italians? Perhaps it was innately superior genes, better selective breeding.” [CANTOR, p. 389]

The contemporary Jewish scholar, Raphael Patai devotes over fifty pages in his The Jewish Mind to claim evidence for “Jewish pre-eminence” and intellectual superiority over non-Jews. Not surprisingly, when Patai suggests that Jews are genetically superior in intelligence to others, he stoops so low as to quote from
whom he inevitably must, the race theory of a German Nazi, Hans Gunther, to embellish a Jewish “survival of the fittest” argument. In this Darwinian and Jewish martyrological view, over the centuries natural selection favored only the smartest Jews in a hostile Gentile environment. [PATAI, p. 304-305]

In one racist “scientific” theory to prove Jewish superiority, Patai lists scholars Norbert Weiner, J.B.S. Haldane, and Lewis S. Feuer as those who suggest that, because the Christian Church offered literate advancement only to those who chose a religious career that included celibacy, the real brains of the Gentile pack died out. As another Jewish author, Nathaniel Weyl, explains this theory:

“The intellectual eminence of the Jews is the result of a two-thousand-year process of selective breeding for intelligence … If the abolition of priestly celibacy gave Protestant countries a genetic advantage over Catholic ones in respect to brain power, similar institutional factors gave Jews a genetic advantage over Christians.” [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 10-12]

The insistent championing of Jewish genetic intellectual superiority over non-Jews surfaces from time to time in Jewish scholarship. Psychologist Benjamin Goodnick, for instance, was even taken aback by a fellow Jew, Peter Gay (one of Sigmund Freud’s biographers) and his resistance to Jewish genetic superiority claims. Goodnick says that:

“One tends to wonder why Gay belabors the issue of Jewishness. He seems deeply disturbed that Jews might be different from others and resists forcefully ‘… the untenable notion that Jews are by endowment more intelligent than other people.’ His view is strange, especially since he recognized that ‘history is a Darwinian battle.’ A brief survey of Jewish history would have suggested that the persecutions and decimations of the Jewish people over the millennia inevitably led to a survival of the fittest. It would appear that Gay did not take the opportunity to note, for example, the disproportionate number of Jewish Nobel prize winners…” [GOODNICK, p. 108]

This insistent Jewish notion of their superiority over others – however secularized – has deep roots in the old Chosen People mythology of the Judaic religion. As Eva (Etzioni) and Zvi Halevy see it:

“This element of Judaism [the Chosen People idea] may be unattractive for those who boast of modern universalistic values; and if viewed from an unfavourable angle, it can be argued that it is quasi-racist dogma. It is probably no longer acceptable in its original version to most non-Orthodox modern Jews. In a modified, less obvious, and less explicit form, however, it probably continues to exert a discernible influence on the Jewish self-image, and the Jews’ conception of their place in the modern world.” [HALEVY, p. 60-61]

These Jewish authors further argue that modern Jews continue to exhibit a “compulsion” to prove themselves superior to others, fulfilling in at least practical – if not religious – daily form the Chosen People dogma. This intrinsic Jewish arrogance as part of their communal identity has often been noted and commented upon by irritated non-Jews across history, and occasionally by Jews
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themselves. It is sometimes admitted (rarely in public) by Jewish thinkers to be a major factor in a veritable solicitation of animosity and hostility from others. There is a marked tendency, writes C. G. Schoenfeld, “of certain Jews to display what might be described as a kind of intellectual conceit or arrogance. As Ernest Jones [another biographer of Freud] has phrased it, ‘some Jews exhibit a curious ‘superiority complex’ in respect to brain power. And so readily does this seeming conceit or arrogance appear to provoke hostile reactions that some psychoanalysts believe such to be its prime [albeit unconscious] purpose – that, in short, the basic psychic function served by this seeming arrogance is to help fulfill unconscious masochistic needs.’” [SCHOENFELD, p. 28]

Masochism or not, consciously attracting anti-Semitism or not, the animosity engendered towards Jews who think they’re better than anyone else has always served the purpose of further alienating Jews throughout history from the mainstream societies in which they lived, which was what Orthodox rabbinical literature has consistently dictated to be desirable.

Even without religious, genetic, or even secularly messianic rationales for Jewish superiority, it endures of its own self-propulsion. The Jewish novelist Philip Roth, says Arnold Eisen, “could have been speaking for many American Jews when he noted in 1963 that, while the Jewish culture transmitted to him by his parents was at best fragmentary, he had ‘received whole a psychology which could be expressed in three words: Jews are better.’” [EISEN, p. 135] “I was always aware that I was Jewish,” recalls singer Eddie Fisher, “every minute of my life I was aware that I was Jewish … I felt like I belonged to a very special club and I was proud of that.” [FISHER, E., 1999, p. 9]

Jewish author Eric Kahler, with no apparent intent of self-reflective sarcasm, recalls that

“One day when I was discussing the problem of anti-Semitism with Austrian-Jewish poet Richard Beer-Hofmann, he said to me: ‘I am not at all astonished at the fact that they hate us and persecute us. But what I cannot understand is why do they not marvel at us more than they do?’” [KAHLER, E., 1967, p. 1]

The notion that Jews are intellectually superior to non-Jews has a long history of racist development in the Jewish community. For hundreds of years, for example, in Eastern Europe Jewish children were socialized to the idea. Jewish scholars Zborowski and Herzog note that

“A series of contrasts is set up in the [Jewish] child, who grew up to regard certain behavior as characteristic of Gentiles. Among Jews he expected to find emphasis on intellect, a sense of moderation, cherishing of spiritual values, cultivation of rational, goal-directed activities, a ‘beautiful’ family life. Among Gentiles he looks for the opposite of each item: emphasis on the body, excess, blind instinct, sexual license and ruthless force.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 152]

Are these not the quintessential stereotypes of any racist toward out-group Others, rendering them as veritable beasts?

There are of course other angles to Jewish arrogance, one by which Jewish
tradition conveniently blames Gentiles even for uncivil excesses in their own (Jewish) psychological selves. Rudolph Lowenstein writes that

“The ostentatious, patronizing, arrogant behavior of some Jews is another source of irritation to Gentiles, since it contains disguised elements of hostility which are recognized as such by both Jews and Gentiles. These successful Jews are trying to compensate for all the humiliations they suffered in the past not because they were poor but because they were Jews. It is in some ways an attempt to rehabilitate the whole Jewish people through their own success.” [LOWENSTEIN, p. 130]

A common term for Jewish arrogant “pushiness” comes from their own culture: there is a Yiddish word for it – *chutzpah*. Alan Dershowitz romanticizes the term:

“To the perpetrator of *chutzpah*, it means boldness, assertiveness, a willingness to demand what is due, to defy tradition, to challenge authority, to raise eyebrows. To the victim of *chutzpah*, it means unmitigated gall, nerve, uppityness, arrogance, hypocritical demanding. It is truly in the eye of the beholder.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 18]

Jacob Neusner sees the root of the Jewish self-compulsion with the concept of their collective superiority to be rooted in its psychoanalytic opposite:

“Being Jewish is being different. Being Jewish is not as good as being gentile. The father, toward whom guilt is already present, is Jewish and [has a] child. The normal guilt of the earliest school years may thus turn into hatred of the father – or it may produce hatred of the self as a surrogate for hatred of the father.” [NEUSNER, p. 56]

Jewish hatred is more familiarly redirected by Michael Lerner:

“Hostility towards non-Jews has evolved into a distinct culture of anti- *goyism*. [and] it may be as prevalent among American Jewish liberals as among Israeli right-wingers … It’s no secret that Jews disparage non-Jews behind their backs. Some Jews brag about tricking them in business, others shun them socially.” [LERNER, *Goyim*, p. 430]

“Chauvinism, or rabid nationalism,” wrote Clement Greenberg, in an article entitled *Self-Hatred and Jewish Chauvinism*, “history tells us, is a means usually of compensating for a sense of collective failure … It is with its first taste of success that a people musters up the nerve to begin actively compensating for its sense of inferiority – usually by arrogance and self-praise.” [GREENBERG, p. 427-428] “All the big talk current now too of ‘Jewish pride’ and ‘proud Jews,’” argued Israeli scholar Boas Evron in 1995, “… is the pathetic expression of a desperate feeling that there is nothing to be proud of.” [EVRON, p. 114]

In addressing Jewish elitism, Kenneth Clark notes in a Jewish periodical that

“Hypersensitivity about Jewishness among Jews may take many forms, including the constant concern with racial and religious problem, a seemingly compulsive need to discuss the problems and hard-
ships of the Jewish people even in situations in which these are not relevant; and the tendency to relate almost any social problem or event to the problems of Jews. Another manifestation of protective hypersensitivity seems to be a tendency among some Jews to perpetuate the assumption of the superiority of the Jewish people and to explain the persecutions of Jews throughout history as proof of resentment and envy which Gentiles have of Jewish superiority … “[CLARK, p. 123]

In the 1920s, a Jewish Polish poet, Antoni Slominski, remarked that “I know very few Jews who are not convinced of the superiority of the Jewish race. For that reason this nation … does not even neglect even the smallest of reproaches … Those Jews who complain about the lack of tolerance of others are the least tolerant.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 39]

“The rise of Jewish nationalism since the turn of the century,” wrote William Zuckerman of the Jewish Newsletter in 1960, “[has swung the pendulum] violently from self-criticism to self-pride, self-righteousness, and a feeling of superiority. The Jewish press, pulpit, and Defense agencies are constantly engaged in telling the Jews how clever, talented and generous they are, how many famous doctors, scientists, authors, and musicians they produce, and how many hundreds of millions of dollars they contribute to help their brethren in Israel. This constant emphasis on Jewish accomplishment is reflected in a morbid chauvinism which is as unpleasant to others as it is harmful to Jews.” [ZUKERMAN, p. 68]

In 1993, Jewish psychologist and author Judith Sills complained that Jews carry with them psychological “excess baggage,” defined as preoccupations with “materialism and superiority.” The Jewish Exponent noted that

“Materialism, she says, causes Jewish men to carry a tremendous amount of anger toward each other, and that makes it very hard for the single adults in our community to marry. Superiority, the flip side of inferiority, creates ill will among the Christian majority, Sills said, because it is expressed in an insulting way: ‘I am special. I am valuable. I am better than you. I am a Jew and you are a goy. I am the ‘Chosen People.’ I am in this special tribe. You are a shiksa.”’ [TEITELBAUM, L, p. 1x]

“The Jewish superiority complex,” notes Jewish author James Yaffe, “may have an element of belligerence in it. It isn’t enough for the Jew to feel superior to the gentile; he must let the gentile know it … [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 67] … Sooner or later most Jews will confess – diffidently, apologetically, defensively – that they do think Jews are smarter than other people … This pride has deep roots in Jewish tradition.” [YAFFE, J. 1968, p. 221] Ever strong in 1994, Benjamin Ginsberg notes that “Jews often, secretly or not so secretly, conceive themselves to be morally and intellectually superior to their neighbors … a Yiddish synonym for dullard or dope is “goyischer kopf,” that is, someone who thinks like a non-Jew.” [GINSBERG, p. 8]

ous Jews in very public lights fit this genre. New York Democratic Congress-
man, and well-known feminist, Bella Abzug, for example, had a reputation for being “rude and obnoxious.” Barry Gray (born Bernard Yaroslav) at radio sta-
tion WMCA in New York City, was “brash, abrasive [and] opinionated. [He] was the talk-show titan listeners love to hate, [and] is still going [in 1973] after more than a quarter of a century at the mike.” [BLACKWELL, E., 1973, p. 2, 208]

“A Jew,” declares old Yiddish folklore,

“is composed of twenty-eight per cent fear, two per cent sugar, and seventy per cent nerve.” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 44]

“Offer a Jew a ride and he throws you out of your own wagon.” [KU-
MOVE, S., 1985, p. 45]

“Regardless of what Jews do for a living,” says Gerald Krefetz, “and they seem to do everything from running the largest chemical company in the United States to operating three out of four retail establishments in New York City, they seem to think that their activities are prestigious. This pride is perhaps deceptive but it … serves Jews well. By thinking highly of themselves, they stretch their abilities and embellish their conceits. Humility is not a Jewish trait.” [KREFETZ, p. 18]

Jewish scholar Stephen Whitfield uses the following joke from Jewish circles to, as he says, “demonstrate the meaning of Jewish identity in America”:

“Three converts to Episcopalianism are drinking together in their ritzy country club, when they begin explaining the reasons for their switch from Judaism. ‘I converted out of love,’ the first one said. Seeing the dubious looks on his friends’ faces, he added, ‘Not for Christianity but for a Christian girl. As you know, my wife insisted that I convert.’ ‘And I converted in order to succeed in law,’ the second one said. ‘I would never have been appointed a federal judge if I hadn’t become an Episcopalian.’ ‘I converted because I think the teachings of Christianity are superior to those of Judaism,’ the third one added. ‘Whom are you trying to kid?’ the first man answered with considerable heat, ‘What do you take us for – a couple of goyim?’” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 73]

Ultimately, it is really not difficult to understand where the normative Jewish sense (even secularly) of a collective elite self comes from. As the Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion notes:

“The frequent biblical emphasis on the election of Israel led to the idea, also found in later rabbinical literature, that there was a moral or even racial excellence inherent in the Jewish people as such, and refer-
ces to the superiority of those what are ‘of the seed of Abraham our Father’ abound. Inevitably the doctrine of election also led to an ethno-
centric view of world history.” [WERBLOWSKY, p. 158]
OTHER JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO MODERN RACIST CURRENTS

Racial theories of intelligence were especially popular in the late 1800’s and early twentieth century, ending – we would have hoped – with the Nazis’ Master Race abominations in the 1940’s. Born of colonialist and imperialist world-views, respected academics in the western world – Jews among them – spent a lot of time in those decades measuring brain sizes and skull capacities of different peoples, usually towards putting themselves on top of the human pyramid.

“Race,” notes Michael Marrus, “… provides Jews with the means to express their sense of a distinct Jewish identity, a sense which was difficult to achieve in other terms, and which they themselves were not always ready to admit.” [MARRUS, p. 10] “The Jewish race,” wrote, Ben Mosche, a contributor to an 1893 Jewish Yearbook in France, “is not an ordinary race, let us admit it. It is endowed with a certain number of diverse characteristics … which make it the most noticed and most envied of human families.” [MARRUS, p. 18] Hannah Arendt noted the opinion of Benjamin Disraeli, the Jewish prime minister of Great Britain in the late 19th century, about his racial heritage:

“[Disraeli] was ready to assert that the Semitic principle ‘represented all that is spiritual in our nature,’ that the vicissitudes of history find their main solution – all in race,’ which is ‘the key to history’ regardless of ‘language and religion,’ for ‘there is only one thing that makes a race and that is blood’ and that there is only one aristocracy, the aristocracy of nature’ which consists of ‘an unmixed race of a first-rate organization.’” [ARENDT, p. 73]

One of the most influential thinkers in the theory of a criminal typology in physical appearance was an Italian Jew, Cesare Lombroso (1836-1909). The founder of the “science of criminal law,” Lombroso argued that “degenerate criminality” was expressed in physical traits (i.e., criminals looked like criminals). For example, in Lombroso’s view, the same kind of ears were to be found in “criminals, savages, and apes.” [MOSSE, G., 1978, p. 83-84] Lombroso wrote that criminals tend to be irrecoverably “born for evil;” their “atavism shows us the inefficacy of punishment for born criminals” and society should “eliminate them completely, even by death.” He also labeled entire groups of handicapped people as criminals and that “almost every ‘born criminal’ suffers from epilepsy to some degree.” Gypsies as a group were identified by Lombroso as inherently criminal: “They have the improvidence of the savage and that of the criminal as well.” “The Nazi killers,” says Henry Friedlander, “used the language of Lombroso to target the same victim groups, including Gypsies and the handicapped.
Thus members of the judiciary considered the killing of convicted criminals if their ‘physical shape no longer deserved to be called human.’” [FRIDELANDER, p. 3]

Another Jew, Max Nordeau (1849-1923), a friend of both Lombroso and right hand man for the Zionist leader Theodore Herzl, was the “real popularizer of the concept of degeneration,” defined by George Mosse as “those who stood against scientific methods and middle class morality.” [MOSSE, p. 84-85] (Nordeau’s volume, Degeneration, was dedicated to Lombroso. Jewish scholar Mosse argues that Lombroso and Nordeau were not racists, (?) “but their ideas became a staple of racist thought.” [MOSSE, G., 1978, p. 86] Both men’s works were appropriated by Nazi ideology and institutionalized against Jews.

A turn-of-the-century Jewish doctor (and Zionist), Felix Theilhaber, published arguments that Jewish racial preservation was rooted in Jewish sexual law and ethics, limitations that maintained procreation within the expressly Jewish community: “the categorical imperative of Judaism.” [EFRON, p. 147]

In 1907, Eliot Auerbach, a German-Jewish doctor, argued that a Jewish racial purity orientation was rooted in Jewish law and that “in the course of their entire racial history it has been the Jews themselves and not other peoples who have promoted the strongest resistance to racial mixing.” [EFRON, p. 131] “Auerbach’s hypothesis,” says John Efron, “built on the mystical premise that there existed a Jewish racial instinct whose effectiveness had ensured racial exclusiveness and therefore Jewish racial purity, was reminiscent of much of the German Volkisch literature being disseminated by nationalist (and other anti-Semitic) groups.” [EFRON, p. 136] Auerbach even used buzzwords of warlike defiance. In the contest between German and Jewish nationalism, he said, “it will be will against will. And the will to live will be more powerful than the will to go under.” [EFRON, p. 136]

Also influenced by the racist ideas in the air at the time, in 1910 an Austrian Jewish doctor, Ignaz Zollschan, published a “sensational” volume arguing that “Judaity was based strictly upon biological criteria.” Without the separatist possibilities of future Zionist nationalism, he argued, Jewry would either dissolve away or, in intermarriages with non-Jews, face “physical degeneration.” [TRAVERSO, p. 30]

The well-known German socialist, Karl Kautsky, attacked the growing interest of some Jews in racial theories, sarcastically wondering:

“If this [racist] theory permits Christian-Teutonic patriots to declare themselves demi-gods, why should Zionist patriots not use it in order to stamp the people chosen by God as a chosen race of nature, a noble race that must be carefully guarded from any deterioration and contamination by foreign elements?” [EFRON, p. 124]

In England, another Jewish “racial scientist,” Joseph Jacobs, argued that “brain activity” could increase brain size and this had evidenced itself in Jews who had to live by their wits and intelligence amidst persecution by non-Jews during former centuries. Jacobs therefore argued that the cubic capacity of Jewish skulls were “larger than that of their neighbors.” One of his studies, for
instance, purported to prove that, on the average, Jews have 4% more “brain ability” than Bretons and 2% more than Scots. [EFRON, p. 86-88]

Third World Hottentots and the like were routinely dismissed by Gentile racial theorists as brainless bumpkins, but Jews – with so much economic and cultural impact in western countries – were less easily dismissed as brain dead. Even hostile Gentile observers had little choice but to accord them some degree of respect. A variety of theses were invented to explain Jewish achievement (by both non-Jews and Jews) in hereditary terms, often focusing upon presumed “traits” for their remarkable “parasitic” assimilation in host lands, social Darwinism where only the smartest Jews survived Gentile hostility to them over the ages, or a genetic hybridization of centuries-old interbreeding of scholarly elite within the Jewish community.

Sander Gilman, a Jewish scholar, argued in 1996 that “the myth of Jewish superior intelligence has its origins in the age of biological racism. It is part of the discussion of Jews as a racial category.” As Gilman copiously notes, there certainly was a deluge of academic speculation about the subject, by both Gentile and Jews, for a number of years, but Gilman – following the standard “Jews as consummate victims” scenario – places the origin of such myth entirely into Gentile hands in the late 1800’s. It is true that both Nazi-oriented writers and prideful (or worried) Jews wildly speculated about the relationship between Jewish intelligence and their social, economic, and cultural achievements, but obsessions with innate “superiority” and “racial” distinction go back further to seminal Jewish religio-nationalism, and its tribal founding as the Chosen People.

Mordechai Kaplan, founder of the Reconstructionist movement in Judaism, suggests that modern Jewish preoccupation with their self-perceived communal superiority over others really reflects a malaise of insecurity. He writes that

“To the modern Jew who boasts of the Jews being the Chosen People, this belief expresses itself, for the most part, in scanning every bit of news from the sport sheets to the financial columns for success stories of Jews that might serve to better bolster up his pride in the sense of inferiority that his position as a Jew imposes.” [KAPLAN, p. 94]

A Jewish researcher, Miles Storfer, as recently as 1990 (in his book published by a respected academic publisher, Jossey-Bass) harkens back to the Chosen People root for Jewish intellectual (and moral) superiority. His thesis is that “even though human intelligence is primarily a function of heredity,” (STORFER, p. xiv) and that an “exceptionally large percentage of Jewish people ... score at or near the genius level” on intelligence tests, [Storfer’s emphasis, p. 320] others can get their IQ scores up a few degrees if they follow the Jewish model for child rearing:

“What an optimistic scenario this Jewish model offers the human race! If the child development principles employed by the Jewish family can generate such a multifold increase in the rate of productive genius, [Storfer’s emphasis] then understanding and utilizing this knowledge
for the betterment of all mankind could and should be viewed as a golden opportunity – not just an opportunity to develop a future population of highly intelligent people but, most importantly, an opportunity to use these heightened gifts of intellect to promote the kinds of achievements exemplified by the Jewish mission.” [STORFER, p. 330]

Storfer’s parochial, chauvinistic, selfish, messianic, and sometimes racist world view finds common expression in all realms of Jewish discourse, from the religious to the political. Shalom Carmy, for instance, noted to his 1992 Jewish scholarly audience an apparent in-house truism:

“Honesty, fidelity, modesty, conscience, courage, altruism, love are not unknown in the gentile world past and present. That these qualities have survived and sometimes even prospered is largely due to the insertion of the Jewish people into history.” [CARMY, p. 45]

After indirect Israeli army culpability was established in the 1982 massacre of hundreds of Palestinian refugees in Lebanese refugee camps, Rabbi Walter Wurzberger, former President of the Rabbinical Council of America, expressed shock, publicly noting that “we [Jews] are the people who established the standards of morals.” [JEWISH WEEK, 10-11-82]

Completely ignoring the self-obsessed and self-absorbed essences of Jewish tradition and religious law, even a left wing ideologue like Michael Lerner cannot resist but to gush elitist Jewish messianism:

“The universalistic dream of a transformation and healing of the world, that belief that peace and justice are not meant for heaven but are this-worldly necessities that must be fought for, is the particularistic cultural and religious tradition of the Jews.” [TIKKUN, v.1, no. 1]

Meanwhile, one of Lerner’s (politically) ideological opposites, Israeli right-winger Yehuda Etzion, one of the masterminds behind a 1984 plot to blow up Jerusalem’s Dome of the Rock (the third holiest Muslim shrine in the world) to usher in a planned world war, international chaos, and Jewish redemption, also subscribes to the Jewish self-conception of a ‘community of fate’:

“For Gentiles, life is mainly a life of existence while ours is a life of destiny, the life of a kingdom of priests and a holy people. We exist in the world in order to actualize destiny.” [SPRINZAK, p. 258]

For far too many Jews, all valuable qualities in their human capacities revolve in their minds around the fact that they are Jewish. Will Herberg proudly proclaims that

“The Jewish socialist, too, reveals the Messianic origins of the impulse that animates him, and, indeed, often relates his ‘idealism’ to ‘Jewish ethics,’ just as the Jewish scholar or scientist will find his intellectual concern quite natural in view of the ‘Jewish tradition of learning’ and the ‘Jewish zeal for the truth.’ I have myself heard Jewish labor leaders, men remote indeed from the faith and practice of Judaism, explain confidentially that their ‘progressivism’ was somehow the consequence of their being Jewish. These things are matters of common experience, and
I have yet to find a Jew who does not in some manner or form exhibit this profound sense of ‘difference’ and special vocation.” [HERBERG, p. 275]

Versions of messianic arrogance are expounded by Jews of all political persuasions, everywhere, internationally, addressing even their victimization mythology in Russia and Eastern Europe. In this context, Israel Shahak writes that

“The whole racist propaganda on the theme of the supposed superiority of Jewish morality and intellect (in which many Jewish socialists were prominent) is bound up with a lack of sensitivity for the suffering of that major part of humanity who were especially oppressed during the last thousand years – the peasants.” [SHAHAK, p. 53]

Even Michael Goldberg, a scholar who incisively argues for a reevaluation of the myths of Jewish victimization, cannot himself shake the millennia-old chauvinism. Goldberg critically points out that Jews who complain about non-Jews holding the modern state of Israel to a higher moral standard than other nations are on shaky ground, since current Jewish views of themselves supposedly affirms such a higher moral standard anyway. But after this ironic insight, Goldberg swallows the whole arrogant myth of Jewish superiority and separateness as his own – even fattening it to its obnoxious maximum, claiming:

“In the last analysis, to be a member of the House of Israel [i.e., Jews] is to bear a family resemblance to its most venerated and beloved relation, God. To be a member of the community of Israel means being a resemblance to no other community on earth.” [GOLDBERG, p. 149]

The curious expression of all proclamations of Jewish superiority over others, (even when it is cloaked in its most supposed benevolent form that they have bestowed to mankind the possibility of righteousness, justice, and universalism) is an absolute guarantee to invoke anti-Jewish sentiment in non-Jews. Gentiles are not – and never will be – fond of being systematically slighted, degraded, and insulted by Jews, who position themselves as a special caste at every turn, currently and historically. An added curiosity is that the foundation for an endemic Jewish self-celebration has an intra-Jewish chauvinism as well. In the intelligence realm, all such claims for innate Jewish intellectual superiority rest upon the visible status-laden achievement of successful Jews in various fields in the Western world, or in “scientific tests” that measure the exceptional skills of, specifically, Ashkenazis (Jews of European descent). Jews who lived for centuries in the Mediterranean, North Africa, and Middle East (the Sephardim, technically meaning Spanish Jews, but colloquially encompassing Jews from the “Orient”), and other countries, in recent decades reunited with their historic brethren in modern Israel, are never part of the “God’s intellectual gift to mankind” scenario. In fact, Sephardic Jews (who are second-class citizens, economically and otherwise, in Israel) measure poorly against Ashkenazis on intelligence tests and other measures of achievement. It should be no surprise that those in Israel who dictate the parameters of “intelligence” measurement in the first place, and who legislate the whole country for that matter, are Ashkenazi.
In 1994 Richard Herrnstein, a Jew, and his non-Jewish co-author, Charles Murray, came out with a controversial book, *The Bell Curve*, hell-bent on again resurrecting in new form the old racist and classist argument that intelligence is hereditary in that some “races” are inherently smarter – and some, conversely, stupider – than others. But the authors are especially particular about Jewish superiority. “Ashkenazic Jews of European origins,” they say, “test higher (for intelligence) than any other ethnic group.” Such Jews “constantly show their disproportionate level of success, usually by orders of magnitude, in various inventories of scientific and artistic achievement.”

So what might the obvious explanation for this discrepancy, per “intelligence,” between Ashkenazi and Sephardim, (let alone non-Jews) be? Both groups are, supposedly, of ancient common origin as Jews, the Sephardim of the Middle East are usually even closer to their racially “Semitic” origins than the Ashkenazi. So what is different about them? Europe, of course. Setting aside the possibilities that purely cultural motivators expressed as ambition, aggressiveness, opportunity, encouragement, and other such traits may play a major role in the displaying of “intelligence” as it relates to, and is evidenced by, accomplishment, if an argument for innate “Jewish (Ashkenazi) superiority” is to be taken seriously at all the explanation must focus on the fact that A) Ashkenazi Jews interbred over hundreds of years with Europeans and acquired European genes, or B) that Ashkenazi Jews developed the way they did – intellectually or otherwise – due to conditions in relation to – and/or the influence upon them by– the surrounding European culture. Neither one of these obvious explanations for Jewish “genius” is an expression of Jewish superiority; rather, European “blood” and/or culture are afforded major shares of responsibility. It’s not difficult to discern that the whole argument explicating some kind of innate Jewish superiority is unsupportable. If simply being Jewish meant one was genetically “smart,” what happened to the Sephardim (the most purely Semitic of Jews), who apparently are “innately” disposed to be, intellectually, “like normal people?”

Whoever they originally are, there are, in fact, some very negative consequences of, and evidence for, Jewish genetic separateness from the non-Jewish European gene pool over many centuries. Ashkenazi Jews have high incidences of about a dozen hereditary diseases. Referring to Tay-Sachs disease, Eve Glickman notes that the “inbreeding of Jews in Eastern Europe over generations explains the disease’s bloodline.” [GLICKMAN, 1997, p. 45] Citing a research article in the medical journal *Nature Genetics*, the *Baltimore Jewish Times* suggested that the insular, and fast-growing, Jewish community of Eastern Europe “reinforced genetic mutations in the originally small – and homogenous – population, accumulating defective genes that ‘inter-breeding’ might have diluted.” [MARCUS, A., 1996, p. 62]

Ashkenazi Jews have a 1 in 7 chance that they carry the gene for the diseases Tay-Sachs, Canavan, Gaucher (the most common Jewish genetic disease), Niemann-Pick, or cystic fibrosis. Other genetic diseases found in the Ashkenazi population are Dystonia, Mucolipidosis 4, and Familial Dysautonomia. If both
male and female partners carry the same disease gene, there is a 1 in 4 chance their child will develop the disease, and a fifty percent chance he or she will carry the gene. [GLICKMAN, 1996, p. 45] As noted in a study by the journal *Nature Genetics*, Jewish women of Ashkenazi descent also “have a much greater risk of developing early onset hereditary breast cancer.” [PR NEWswire, 4-29-96] In the early 1980s Rabbi Joseph Ekstein founded the Dor Yeshorim Committee for the Prevention of Jewish Genetic Diseases, which features testing programs for marriageable men and women in the Orthodox Chasidic community. [OSTRER, H., 1996, p. 9]

Jewish author Dan Rottenberg notes Jewish interwoven consanguinity in the late 19th century:

“In the past, Jews have married their near relatives more often than the rest of the world has done. A study in England in 1875, for example, indicated that 7.5 percent of all English Jewish marriages were among first cousins – a proportion that was about three times as great as that among gentiles. Marriages of first cousins and even of uncles to nieces are common among Jews and quite legal according to Jewish law.” [ROTTENBERG, D., 1977, p. 47]

Complicating Jewish genealogy debates even further, there are even some Jewish authors – Alfred Lilienthal, A. N. Poliak (a former professor of medieval Jewish history at Tel Aviv University), and Arthur Koestler among them – who have published arguments that most Ashkenazis are probably not even truly racially Jewish, or at least have little Jewish genes in them, and that they are largely descended from Turkish and Slavic converts to Judaism: mostly the so-called Khazars of the eighth century. “A substantial part,” suggests Koestler, “and perhaps the majority of eastern [European] Jews – and hence of world Jewry – might be of Khazar, and not, Semitic origin.” [KOESTLER, p.17] Another Jewish scholar, Paul Wexler, has written two volumes even arguing that – based on largely linguistic analysis – most Ashkenazis and Sephardim are not of authentic Jewish “stock.” In Wexler’s view, even the Sephardim are “primarily descendants from Arabs, Berbers, and Europeans.” [WEXLER, p. 1-12] In such research, Wexler follows the terrain of other Jewish scholars obsessively searching for authentic– usually racial Jewish pedigrees by following linguistic clues.

“It is very probable,” notes French Jewish scholar Maxime Rodinson, “– and physical anthropology tends to show that this is true – that the so-called Arab inhabitants of Palestine (a majority of whom, moreover, are people who have ‘become Arabs’), have much more of the ancient ‘Hebrews’ blood than most of the Jews of the Diaspora.” [RODINSON, p. 79]

A little known African tribe, the Lemba, can even make stronger genetic claims to being Jewish than can many European Jews. In scientific testing of DNA samples, the Lemba have been discovered to have markers on their Y chromosome that are comparable to Jews of the kohanim (the traditional Jewish priest caste, a degree of Jewishness attainable, by Orthodox rules, only by birth. Common kohanim surnames in the Western world include Cohen, Kahn, Kaplan, Rapaport, Katz, Azoulay, and Harunoff). The Lemba, who are today mostly
Christian, nonetheless believe themselves to be racially Jewish. Lemba tradition asserts that their forefathers emigrated to Yemen 2,500 years ago, later forging to Zimbabwe and South Africa. [HIRSCHBERG, P., 1999, p. 30-32]

In the medical realm, other genetic evidence about Jews in general, particularly the Ashkenazim, is contradictory. While some argue that fingerprints, enzyme markers, and other genetically-based evidence points to a common gene pool, there is also evidence that questions Jewish Ashkenazi racial lineage to Abraham. “A genetically controlled enzyme deficiency, G6PD,” notes Joshua Halberstam, “is rare among both Ashkenazis and Eastern European non-Jews but common among both Mediterranean Jews and Mediterranean non-Jews. Nor do Jews appear related by blood. Blood types are variably distributed around the world, and here again Jews most closely represent their host population.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 76]

If such evidence – linguistic and genetic – is what it obviously seems, for many people in the world who call themselves “Jews” their important hereditary connection to Abraham as members of the Chosen Race is illusory, just another in the many paradoxes of Jewish identity. Nonetheless, personal and communal conviction are powerful things. Whatever it is, the incessant obsession with the mythic, pan-Jewish self, distinct from others, endures and is well reflected in this impassioned appeal from a prominent Jewish fund-raiser, Jacob Loeb, in 1925 Chicago:

“From [a Jew’s] obligation as a Jew, to Jews, there is no escape. There is no escape from his ancestry, there is no refuge from himself. His kinship with his people is deeper than he knows, deeper far than he dares acknowledge. He is shackled forever from the past from which he comes… This is a drive for Jews to carry the burden of Jews. It matters terribly that we should know – that we should ask, one of the other, “Are you a Jew?” [LOEB, in WIRTH, p. 277]

“There is no way to stop being Jewish,” says Charles Silberman, “…because] Judaism defines itself not as a voluntary faith but an involuntary community of fate.” [SILBERMAN, p. 70] Eugene Borowitz even argued in the 1970s that Jews were deluding themselves with their assimilation into American culture. Borowitz argued that Jews were wearing non-Jewish masks, deceiving themselves and others. “We are not,” he wrote, “…who we say we are. The truth about us … is that we are more fundamentally Jewish than we are willing to admit … We have repressed an inner identity. The time has come to end this inauthenticity … We are Jews.” [BOROWITZ, p. 10]

Not all those born of Jewish descent, however, rush to the call of the Clan. Robert Moses, for example, a prominent urban planner in New York City threatened to sue the editors of the Jewish Encyclopedia if they claimed him in its pages. [SILBERMAN, p. 65] In 1930 a German refugee scientist, Karl Landsteiner, filed an injunction against inclusion in Who’s Who in American Jewry. [WHITFIELD, p. 12] Clifton Fadiman, the quintessential “Jewish intellectual” of the 1930s and 1940s, “for years refused to let Who’s Who list him as Jewish.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 57]
“Few cultures,” writes Amos Funkenstein, “are as preoccupied with their own identity and distinction as the Jewish. It asserted and reasserted its uniqueness in every mode of creative expression, not the least in the liturgy, which includes a daily Thanksgiving to the Creator ‘that he did not make us like all the nations of the land, and did not set us up like other families of the earth.’” [FUNKENSTEIN, p. 1]

In this context then (the endless avalanche of Jewish self-obsession and superiority claims at every turn through history), it is amusing to find in the pages of the journal Judaism the dredging up of a Gentile hack to do some of the difficult apologetic work of the Jewish traditional worldview for its Jewish editors. “There is,” says the non-Jewish professor, Bernard Harrison, (with presumably a straight face), “built in the very structure of Judaism, what I can only call a certain epistemic modesty which I have always found both charming and admirable.” [HARRISON, p. 8]
“Instead of learning about the Holocaust through the large lens of Jewish history, many Jews and non-Jews in America now learn the whole of Jewish history through the lens of the Holocaust.”

James Young, p. 304

“The myth of the Holocaust teaches that throughout their history of persecution the Jews have been blameless, their oppressors irrational.”

Liebman and Cohen p. 33

“It isn’t the truth [about Jews in the Holocaust era] that frightens me but the suppression of free speech in order to protect communal myths that are not lies but truths rendered so sacrosanct and undiscussed that they start to smell fishy.”

Carol Oppenheim, Jewish author, p. 39

“Many Jews use, shamelessly, the slaughter of the six million by the Third Reich as proof that they cannot be bigots – or in the hope of not being held responsible for their bigotry. It is galling to be told by a Jew whom you know to be exploiting you that he cannot be doing what you know he is doing because he is a Jew.”

James Baldwin, Black novelist, p. 34

“Related to the film’s box-office success is the fact that precisely because Schindler’s List has been watched by large numbers of people who had very little previous knowledge of the Holocaust, and cannot be expected to gain much more knowledge in the future. This specific version of the event may remain the only source of information about it for many of its viewers.”

Omer Bartov, p. 46

“It is doubtful that history is the genre for writers who are so overwhelmed by the Holocaust and yet want to describe it. It seems that some fictional form of expression may be more suitable than history for those who want to respond emotionally rather than historically to that great tragedy.”

Richard Lucas, p. 222
“[Jewish] manufactured claims of uniqueness for their own people are, after all, synonymous with dismissal and denial of the experience of others … Narcissistic false claims of uniqueness are joined with brutal, racist denials of the sufferings of others, becoming two sides of the same coin.”

David Stannard, p. 198

“I would be the last to minimize the atrocity of Auschwitz, where my father and mother perished. But don’t the tears of others count?”

Maxime Rodinson, p. 9

“[The Holocaust had been] hardly talked about for the first twenty years or so after World War II; then, from the 1970s on, [it became] ever more central in American public discourse – particularly, of course, among Jews, but also in the culture at large. What accounts for this unusual chronology?”

Peter Novick, 1999, p. 2

“The actual historical subject [of the Holocaust] itself has become almost unimportant compared with its contemporary political function in the hands of some Jews.”

John Fox, non-Jewish faculty member in Jewish history and Holocaust studies at both University College and Jews College, London, [3-19-2000, p. 47-48]

It is the profoundest of ironies that Adolf Hitler and the Nazis may have saved worldwide Jewry from extinction. (In the case of Jewish Hassids, Menachem Friedman notes that “paradoxically, it was the destruction of Eastern European Jewry in the twentieth century that created the conditions which enabled the spread of ultra-orthodoxy.”) [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 31] At the very least, judging by common Jewish commentary about their fate in Europe over fifty years ago, Hitler is responsible for a dramatic Jewish revival. Before World War II many Jews were on a slow but steady path of assimilation wherever they resided in their diaspora, particularly in Western Europe, each generation inched further away from the separatist myths of the Jewish past. Religion of all kinds continued in retreat and the rationale for being Jewish was – at least in some parts of the Jewish community – steadily weakening. As the Nazi regime came to power, however, many German Jews (if we take what they say at face value) had strayed from a specifically Jewish connection in their lives and were forced to re-examine their identities. In 1935, for instance, the German literary critic Jean Amery (Hans Mayer) supposedly discovered himself a Jew in a Viennese cafe when reading a newspaper about new Nazi laws on the subject. Likewise, in 1938, the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein connected to his long lost Jewish identity as a consequence of Nazi dictates. They were both suddenly Jews because Hitler said so. [TRAVERSIO, p. 39] Even Albert Einstein found his identity as a Jew in the context of rising political anti-Semitism in Germany in 1914. There had been nothing in Switzerland, he said, “that called forth any
Jewish sentiments in me. When I moved to Berlin all that changed.” [CLARK, p. 377] (He was helping to raise “funds for the Zionist cause of a Hebrew university” by 1921.) [RHODES, R., 1988, p. 173] “The composer Arnold Schoenberg and many other baptized Jews,” notes Nachum Gidal, “now publicly declared their return to Judaism.” [GIDAL, p. 425]

Sigmund Freud reflected, at least publicly, the same experience:

“My language is German. My culture, my attainments, are German. I could identify myself German intellectually, until I noticed the growth of anti-Semitic prejudice in Germany and German Austria. Since that time, I prefer to call myself a Jew.” [GAY, MOMENT, p. 50]

In 1937, an American Jew, Alfred Siegel, wrote in the American Israelite that

“Hitler has been a life-giving stimulant for me. In times when there is no Jewish flame left in me and I am feeling very cold, I get warm again on account of Hitler … I know I shouldn’t say this, but … Hitler [is] helping me to fulfill my status as an immortal man … What will become of me when there is no more Hitler and there is no one to set flames under me to keep me warm? What if we come at last to a world in which no anti-Semite is left and everybody loves me? What of my poor Jewish bones which set so quickly cold without stimulation? Who and what will keep me warm then? – May 27, 1937 [in GOLDSTEIN, p. 115]

For today’s many Jewish “ideologists,” wrote Jacob Neusner, decades after Hitler, “there is no real choice about ‘being Jewish’ if born one. The Holocaust dictates that there is no escape from it. Hitler knew you were one.” [NEUSNER, Holo, p. 978] “The gas chambers at Auschwitz,” notes Jonathan Sacks, “made no distinction between [Jewish] assimilators and traditionalists, believers and heretics, atheists and Jews of faith.” [SACKS, J., p.6] Such comments are terribly true, but always left unstated is the disturbing fact that the same all-encompassing view that “born Jews” (whatever they choose to believe) are inescapably Jewish is a concept intrinsic to classic Jewish identity itself. Hitler did not invent the idea that being Jewish is a racial pedigree, often these days euphemistically referred to as a “community of fate.” Was not Hitler following the same path as this 1970s observation by a Jewish theologian, Eugene Borowitz? “To be a Jew means to have a bond with every other Jew – and somehow know how to find him.” [in SILBERMAN, C., p. 76]

Whatever the case, in attempting to racially define and annihilate the Jewish people, Hitler rejuvenated them. This is exemplified in the famous plea by the Jewish theologian, Emil Fackenheim, who implored his fellow Jews to renew with vigor their sense of Jewishness. To allow it to wane – post-Holocaust – was now equated to be a posthumous victory for Hitler. (Even for Jews married to non-Jews, distinctive Jewish progeny is often a burning issue. A liberal feminist professor, Amy Sheldon, notes that “although I had many mixed feelings towards traditional Judaism, there was never any doubt in my mind that our children would be raised as Jews. ‘I can’t finish what Hitler started,’ I told my [non-Jewish] husband before we were married.” [SHELDON, p. 82])

We see in Hitler’s last breath in 1945 the birth of Israel in 1948, and the con-
joining of the Holocaust and the modern state of Israel as the sacred pillars of a renewed Jewish identity rooted in guilt, fear, resentment, hostility, and rage. It was, however, not an identity that took immediate shape after Hitler’s persecution of Jewry. The martyr status of concentration camp victims, the heroizing of survivors no matter what they had to do to live, the stress upon exaggerated Jewish resistance to the Nazis, a deeper embracement of Jewish tribalism, and the political exploitation of the Holocaust for Jewish and Israeli myths and manipulations came later. What came to be known as “the Holocaust,” says Edward Lilenthal, “was often indistinguishable, in the immediate postwar years, from the millions of noncombatant casualties due to terror bombings of civilian populations, epidemic illness, or starvation. It was considered by most as simply part of the horror of war.” [LILENTHAL, p. 5]

In Israel, in the early years after the Holocaust, Jewish survivors were even scorned with contempt by Israeli Jews as “soap” (i.e., feebly passive Jews who were passively turned into bars of soap by Nazi tormentors, [GOREN, p. 159] the fulfillment of demeaning stereotypes about fellow Jews. “With what scorn,” noted Georges Tamarkin in 1973, “Israeli youth reacts to the alleged faint-heartedness of the six million victims of Nazis!” [TAMARIN, p. 115] The Holocaust was an emblem of shame to Jewry, little discussed, more often avoided. “Even in their extraordinary death agony,” notes Haim Breseeth, “the millions of European Jews had not attracted sympathy [in Israel] – a minimum expectation from an important Jewish community.” [BRESEETH, p. 196] “In retrospect,” says Arye Carmon, “it appears that a disturbing conjunction evolved between the incomprehensible magnitude of evil of the Nazis and the victims who conscientiously were presented as an ideological object to be disassociated from. This conjunction may explain the duality of guilt and shame that has portrayed mourning in Israel.” [CARMON, p. 76] A daughter of Holocaust survivors who was raised in Israel remarked at a conference there that

“What I hated and dreaded most when I was a child was summertime. It was a time when the [tattooed concentration camp] numbers on my mother’s arm would be there for all to see and people would know that she was a survivor and was one of the despised people. People like my parents were despised in Israel, and I was ashamed of them.” [EMMETT, p. 147]

“In 1947 a Jewish concentration camp survivor, Primo Levy, could only interest a small, obscure press to publish an account of his experiences and the volume was little noticed. [TRAVERSO, p. 104] Even Eli Wiesel’s ultimately influential work about the Holocaust, Night, did not appear in English until 1960, after twenty publishers had rejected it. [WHITFIELD p. 74] “We would look in vain in the 1950s,” says Jacob Neusner, “for what some call ‘Holocaustomania.”’ [NEUSNER, STRANGER, p. 84]

“Many Jews raised in the United States in the wake of the Holocaust,” notes Melanie Kaye-Kantrowitz, “experienced it like a family secret – hovering, controlling, but barely mentioned except in code or casual reference.” [BRODKIN, K., p. 141]
In 1961 only two of 31 discussants in a major Jewish magazine’s symposium on “Jewishness and Younger Intellectuals” put any emphasis on the Holocaust effecting their lives. In that same year, another important Jewish magazine’s theme of “My Jewish Affirmation” overlooked the Holocaust almost completely. [LINENTHAL, p. 8] Even as late as 1966, when Commentary published a forum on “Jewish belief” in its pages, “the Holocaust,” notes Nathan Glazer, “did not figure in any of the questions, nor, it must be said, did it figure in the answers.” [GLAZER, American, p. 172] In a collection of 1960s-era interviews with Israeli prime minister David Ben Gurion “the word Holocaust never appears.” [STERNBERGER, I., 8-15-95]

The book that first attracted, and furthered, widespread interest in the particularly Jewish experiences of World War II was the diary of Ann Frank (The Diary of a Young Girl), a volume that a Jewish novelist, Meyer Levin, almost single-handedly pushed to fame. Levin urged the diary’s publication in the American Jewish Congress Weekly; it was serialized in the Jewish magazine, Commentary. Doubleday eventually published it and Levin himself heralded its importance on the front page of the New York Times Book Review, his editors not informed about his own “vested interest” – commercially and politically – in the story. [BLAIR, p. 3] The volume has since sold over sixty million copies in fifty-one languages. [WHITFIELD, p. 72] (There appeared with such revelations a corresponding shame and guilt among diaspora Jews and a rising need to atone for their own sin of doing so little to help European Jewry during the Hitler era. [RUBENSTEIN, p. 24]) The diary of Ann Frank is so well publicized internationally that, note David Goodman and Masanori Miyazawa,

“Ann Frank’s Diary of a Young Girl has sold over a four million copies in Japan, more than any other country except the United States. So beloved is Ann Frank in Japan that the first Japanese company to market sanitary napkins designed especially for Japanese women called itself Anne Co., Ltd., and sold its product under the brand name ‘Anne’s Day’ (Anne no hi), which quickly became a euphemism for menstruation in Japan.” [GOODMAN, p. 6]

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted continued popular promotion of Anne Frank in 2001, half a century after her death:

“A four hour miniseries, following Anne’s life from her happy school days through her two years in hiding in Amsterdam and to her final days in the concentration camp, air nationally over ABC TV on May 20 and May 21.

The 20th Century Fox studio is developing a feature move based on The Diary of Anne Frank.

A new edition of the diary, including five previously unpublished pages describing her parents’ difficult marriage, was released in March.

The Helos Dance Theatre premiered ‘About Anne: A Diary in Dance’ in Los Angeles last month.
An interactive CDROM titled ‘Anne Frank House: A House with a Story’ was released earlier this year, offering a virtual tour of the building and the ‘secret annex’ where the Frank family hid.

In Boise, Idaho, ground has been broken on a $1.6 million Anne Frank Human Rights Memorial Park.” [TUGEND, T., 5-13-01]

In formal literature, “apart from the notable exception of [Saul] Bellow’s The Dangling Man,” says Theodore Ziolkowski, “it was not until the 60s with Edward Wallant’s The Pawnbroker, Norma Rosen’s Touching Evil, Susan Schaeffer’s Anya, Arthur Cohen’s In the Days of Simon Stern, and later works by Cynthia Ozick and Saul Bellow – that the Holocaust became a genuine theme.” [ZIOLKOWSKI, p. 599] By 1998, however, Sheila Schimpf noted that

“For 10 years Barry Gross has asked Michigan State University students in his English classes how many have read or seen The Diary of Anne Frank. Almost every hand goes up. ‘It has become almost the common text for this generation of students,’ Gross says.” [SCHIMPF, p. E1]

In 1967, with the multiple-nation Arab war against Israel, worldwide Jewry snapped to a new kind of attention and consciousness, one that has since accelerated to our own day into deeply politicized Jewish obsessions with anti-Semitism, the hallowed specialness of the Holocaust, and the absolute sanctity of Israel. During the 1967 Arab war, Jews everywhere (as it is told and retold in Jewish scholarship) imagined the prospect for another Holocaust. “It would be impossible to understand the present Israeli stance toward the Arabs without taking full account of the Holocaust,” says Jay Gonen. [GONEN, p. 151] In the Arab armies Jews saw Nazi storm troopers. In the PLO leadership of Yassar Arafat, they stamped the face of Hitler. “Israel,” says Melvin Urofsky, “made it possible [for Jews worldwide] to endure the memory of Auschwitz. Were Israel to be destroyed [by Arabs], then Hitler would be alive again, the final victory would be his.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 351]

The old Jewish self-identity of weakness and victimization – based on the Jewish martyrological tradition of death, destruction, and terror – became now a conviction of armor, militantly wielded, shaped with the very shame and horror of the Holocaust. The resultant Israeli victory over the Arabs meant a symbolic return to physical power, along biblical lines even, for many Jews, redemption. It also meant the springboard for a new Holocaust-centeredness, aggressive in its character, hostile and embittered to non-Jews everywhere around them. And it was adept in milking communal guilt from comfortable Jews in America who experienced nothing of the risks of 1967 Israel nor the European Holocaust years. A victorious Israel rising up out of ashes of the Holocaust became the cornerstone of Jewish self-conception. The Holocaust was no longer shamefully harmful to the Jewish self-image. It was now a much-heralded building block for the state of Israel and impassioned Jewish vigor, everywhere discussed, everywhere publicized.

Jews who paid little attention to the Jewish annihilation during World War II, and in the early years after, two decades later were increasingly consumed with it. “A profound sense of their status as survivors seized world Jewry,” notes Jacob

“To some extent,” says Jacob Petuchowski, “this preoccupation [with the Holocaust] represents a repercussion of the guilt-complex of the survivors (and perhaps more so of those who survived at a safe trans-Atlantic distance than of the actual survivors of the camp.)” [PETUCHOWSKI, p. 6] The Jews, says James Yaffe, “feels guilty over the six million Jews who were killed by Hitler. What more could he have done to help them? Perhaps nothing, but his guilt stems from his sense that he might so easily have died instead of them.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 59]

“The notion of survivor guilt and of resurrecting the dead to greater power than they had in life,” suggests Samuel Heilman, “is of course an old one, most dramatically elaborated in Freud’s famous essay Totem and Taboo.” [HEILMAN, S, 1992, p. 370] It is important for many Jews to diffuse their own guilt by dumping much of it into the laps of others: “I am burdened with collective guilt,” said Hans Meyer, “I say; not they. The world, which forgives and forgets, has sentenced me, not those who murdered or allowed the murder to occur.” Meyer, Ruth Wisse informs us, “committed suicide, driven ‘to the mind’s limits’ and beyond by the dishonest postwar reimposition of normalcy.” [WISSE, p. 48]

“Ironically, “ says Leon Wieseltier, “for many Jews what remains [of Jewish identity] most vivid and ‘ethnically’ alive is the Holocaust.” [BECHSTEL, p. 118] Rabbi David Novak even argues that today’s Holocaust-based Jewish identity (i.e., the peculiar notion that modern Jewish identity is fundamentally defined by its contradistinction from real, and imagined, enemies) ironically owes much of its conception – in the modern post-Holocaust context – to the existentialist non-Jew, Jean-Paul Sartre, and his own book about anti-Semitism. [NOVAK, p. El of Is, p. 20]

With the growing emphasis upon a Jewish identity largely defined by the Holocaust, vacation tours were created for American and other diaspora Jews to visit death camps in Europe as part of an immersion in “the Jewish experience.” “At bar and bat mitzvahs, in a growing number of communities,” notes Peter Novick,

“the child is ‘twinned’ with a young victim of the Holocaust who never lived to have the ceremony, and by all reports the kids like it a lot. Adolescent Jews who go on organized tours to Auschwitz and Treblinka have reported that they were ‘never so proud to be a Jew’ as when, at these sites, they vicariously experienced the Holocaust. Jewish college students oversubscribe courses on the Holocaust, and rush to pin yellow stars to their lapels on Yom Hashoah (Holocaust Remembrance Day). And it’s not just the young. Adult Jews flock to Holocaust events as to no others and give millions unstintingly to build yet another Holocaust memorial.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 8]
The Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, one of the greatest Holocaust centers, built a multi-million dollar high-tech environment to “recreate the Holocaust experience” for Jews who missed it. The director of a Jewish education committee even proposed a high school course about the Holocaust so that all students could be able to understand “what it means to be Jewish.” [LIPSTADT, p. 356] By 1986, a quarter of all new books reviewed in *Judaica Book News* had a Holocaust subject and more college students were taking courses about the Holocaust than any other Jewish concern. [SILVER, p. 460] In 1985, 86% of American Jewry, as evidenced in one survey, believed that “there’s no doubt that the Holocaust has deeply affected the way I think and feel about being Jewish.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 33] “For American Jews,” notes David Schnall, “Israel has become vitally important not as a living alternative [as a place to live] but more so as a refuge, a final port in the storm of humanity, should the unthinkable occur once more.” [SCHNALL, p. 124]

The horror of the Nazi’s mass murder of Jews was not just that so many millions of people were sadistically violated, tortured, and murdered. The human capacity for mass atrocity is as old as humanity itself. History is full of Tamerlans, Genghis Khans, and Crusaders of every type riding into pillaged villages by ruthless exterminators, entire vistas laid waste in carnage. Tribe, clan, kingdom, and nation have, over the millennia, taken turns in being victim and victimizer. Strangely, they were people quite like us, like anybody, wrapped in nationalist institutions. That is what is most frightening about it. All the Nazis needed was a national narcissism about themselves, their past, and their destiny which was the precondition necessary to entirely dehumanize, enslave, and exterminate others. Where have we seen these preconditions before?

To the everlasting shame of our sad species, none of this is new. The rudimentary foundation of the Nazi’s “Master Race” self-perception and glorification finds a fanatic precursor, among others, in the most ironic of places: the origins of the Judaic faith itself in the Jewish self-conception as the “Chosen People.” What is the essential ideological difference, really, between those who envision themselves to have partnership in a superior racial lineage (in the Nazi case, pure Aryans) and those who traditionally understand themselves to be a likewise hereditary lineage of human beings, in the Jewish case supposedly descended from a single man, Abraham, especially graced and privileged by God (Jews)? Both rely, traditionally and fundamentally – in origin – upon racist criteria in their respective belief systems. For the Nazis, it is essential to prove pure Germanic lineage to qualify in the Aryan membership. By Nazi standards, if a grandparent was a Jew, a person was considered racially tainted, and Jewish. For Jews, as legally established in today’s secular state of Israel, the racial lineage is matrilineal: a Jew is defined as someone who has a Jewish natural mother. If
the father was Jewish and the mother not, the child is tainted and is not, by Orthodox standards, Jewish.

Dr. Joseph Mengele, the horrible Nazi medical experimenter and “Angel of Death” at Auschwitz, echoed this racial antithesis – at least as he saw it – when he reputedly remarked “that the [Nazi’s] Final Solution was the ultimate struggle for the control of the world between the only two peoples superior enough to vie for it, the Jews and the Germans.” [LESHEM, p. 63] Or, as Hannah Arendt saw it, “[The Nazi movements’] claim to choseness could clash seriously only with the Jewish claim … Leaders [of Nazism] knew quite well that the Jews had divided the world, exactly as they had, into two halves – themselves and all the others.” [ARENDT, p. 240]

In 1937, amidst the rise of German fascism, Charles Clayton Morrison at the liberal Protestant journal, The Christian Century, (which was a well-known crusader against Hitler and anti-Semitism) wrote that “[it is] this obsession with the doctrine of a covenant race that now menaces the whole world, and Jews themselves are the chief sufferers from it. [The Jewish idea] of an integral race, with its own exclusive culture, hallowed and kept unified by a racial religion, is itself the prototype of nazism.” [MORRISON, p. 736] “Nazi racism,” notes Richard L. Rubenstein, “was an attempt to reestablish a basis for community on shared archaic roots. The exclusion of the alien was intrinsic to its very nature.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 110] This exclusionism, as we have repeatedly seen, is also integral to traditional Judaism.

The Nazis were indeed conscious of themselves as a counter-Chosen People, based upon their racially Aryan-centered ideology which was antithetical and ultimately violent to the Jewish self-assertion of superiority. Adolf Hitler appropriated for his Aryan Master Race the Jewish notion of being a Chosen People, and then twisted it to his own megalomania, saying:

We [Aryans] are chosen … [and] whoever proclaims his allegiance to me is, by this very proclamation and by the manner in which it is made, one of the chosen. [Emphasis in original; KATZ, p. 9]

Feminist Merlin Stone even speculates, from a linguistic perspective, that Hitler and the Nazis may have known something about the ancient Hittites and Hebrews, arguing that if her theories about the “warlike Hebrews” are right,

“We must certainly view the … atrocities enacted upon the Hebrew people of the twentieth century by the self-styled Aryans of Nazi Germany not only as tragic but ironic. The researches and excavations of the Hittites culture have been carried on primarily by German archeologists throughout this century. It was sometimes before and directly after the First World War that nasili was slowly beginning to be accepted as the real name of the Hittite language and Nesa, or Nasa, their first capital … One cannot help but wonder how much Adolf Hitler was affected by reports of these finds … Strangely enough one more connection between the Hittites and Hebrews is the Hebrew use of the word nasi for prince.” [STONE, M., 1976, p. 127]
Hitler even had a pseudo religious view about Jews as a satanic kind of nemesis. As Steven Katz puts it:

“[In the Nazi view] the struggle between Aryan and Jew is not only necessary and inevitable but also a clash of world-historical… significance. Though actualized through blood and time, the depth of this homicidal encounter is rooted in eternity.”

Yoel Taitelbaum, former leader of the Ultra-Orthodox “Guardians of the City” movement, argued that a kind of cosmic struggle inevitably existed between Jews and non-Jews; the Nazis were one such – particularly brutal – Jewish nemesis. In this view, “hatred of Jews is inherent in the nations of the world because the choice of God fell upon Israel.” [Funkenstein, p. 308]

A more secular allusion to the Jewish Chosen People/German Master Race parallel is reflected in the work of the popular Israeli poet Uri Greenberg who wrote that Jews were “the race of Abraham, which had started on its way to become master.” [Funkenstein, p. 308] And what of Vladimir Jabotinsky, a seminal Zionist leader, who – imagining the modern Israeli nation – poeticized in 1920 that “with blood and sweat / a race will be born to us / proud, magnificent, and cruel.” [Funkenstein, p. 308]

The Nazi focus in scientifically proving their own racial superiority had respective precedents even in the European Jewish community who were receptive to such confirmation of their own superiority. In the late nineteenth century, Jules Caravallo, an official at the Alliance Israélite Universelle (one of the earliest Jewish lobbying organizations) reported the results of a French study that “Jews constituted a distinct racial type; [and] that the Jewish cranial dimensions were found ‘without exception to be superior to the dimensions of the corresponding Christian cranium; and that it seemed to be reasonable to accept a superiority of the Jewish heads over the Christian heads.’” The Jewish Alliance liked the study so much that they awarded a gold medal to its French author and widely distributed the results of the study. [Patai] (“Leaders of the Alliance Israélite Universelle,’ says Albert Lindemann, “warned its members against ‘arrogance’ yet still implicitly accepted, often in the social-Darwinian language current at the time, the notion of Jewish superiority.”) [Lindemann, p. 69]

Even in the late 1970’s a respected Jewish scholar saw fit to excerpt the following text of a German Nazi, Fritz Lenz, to support his own argument. The new context for this was a discussion by the Jewish author, Raphael Patai, of the possible reasons – as he saw it – for Jewish intellectual superiority over other people:

“Jews and Teutons [Germans] are alike distinguished by great powers of understanding and by remarkable strength of will. Jews and Teutons resemble each other in having a large measure of self-confidence, an enterprising spirit, and a strong desire to get their own way … [They each] are inclined to diffuse themselves as a ruling caste over foreign populations. They, too, prefer whenever they can to have the hard physical toil of life done for them by others…” [Patai, p. 328]
“Lenz’s attitude to the ‘Jewish race,’” declares Patai, “was unsympathetic but correct.” [PATAI, p. 327]

Incredibly, this kind of thinking continues to have currency for some influential Jews in our own day. In 1994 another Jewish American scholar, Norman Cantor, in one breath discarded the Nazi scientism that claimed Aryan superiority as a Master Race and replaced them with the innate, genetic superiority of Jews:

“… the further we travel from the monstrosity of Nazi misuses of the racial concept and the more genetic applications are investigated, the more does a scientific sanction for viewing the Jews as a distinct genetic group, and furthermore one exhibiting an extraordinary creative behavior pattern, come within the parameters of legitimate discourse.” [CANTOR, p.]

In the realms of Orthodox Judaism, (from which claims of Jewish superiority over others stems), there are Jews today who cite traditional Jewish religious texts to argue profoundly extremist, and shocking, ideas. In the last decade three Hebrew “radical right-wing” anthologies published in Israel, entitled *Tzifiya*, included recent Jewish writings that were, by any standards, echoes of Nazi ideologues. Charles Liebman remarks about a rabbi we have heard from earlier:

“In the last issue [1988] a rabbi from Merkaz Harav [David Bar Haim] writes on the differences between Jews and non-Jews … After bringing proof texts he concludes that … ‘non-Jews are considered as animals … The status of non-Jews in Jewish law resembles the status of animals and there is generally no distinction between them.’ A number of the articles in the anthology are overtly racist, some are written by rabbis of some distinction. The most depressing aspect is not that there are learned rabbis who hold such views but that the religious establishment finds no cause to condemn them.” [LIEBMAN, p. 318]

In 1988 Rabbi Binyamin Tzielli, the former Director of the Religious Department of Israel TV and Radio, attacked the principle of democracy:

“The democratic psychosis … has taken control of us for no substantial and visible reason … Democracy is part of the culture of the West and together with this culture it goes down and disappears before our eyes.” [SPRINZAK, p. 273]

In 1985, says Ehud Sprinzak, “Relying on Maimonides and other distinguished *Halakhic* sources [Rabbi Israel] Ariel maintained that the famous commandment [“Thou Shalt Not Kill”] was never meant to be universal, that only the killing of a Jew qualifies as murder and is punished accordingly. Killing of a non-Jew is not punishable by society.” [SPRINZAK, p. 270] Rabbi Ariel even wrote that the Jewish Promised Land extends from the Euphrates to the Nile and sooner or later a war would have to be undertaken against Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and Iraq, “with the expressed purpose of their elimination.” [SPRINZAK, p. 270] “Although [Ariel] writes in a scholarly manner and eschews policy recommendations,” notes Ehud Sprinzak, “any reader familiar
with his very dogmatic fundamentalism is left with no doubt: neither Muslims nor Christians qualify as alien residents [in Israel]; both should be expelled from the Holy Land.” [SPRINZAK, p. 22]

In 1994, Israeli Rabbi Yitzhak (Joseph) Ginsburgh produced a treatise “glorifying Baruch Goldstein’s murder of 29 Muslims in a Hebron mosque,” selling 1,000 copies in its first two days of publication. The author proclaimed that “the crowning glory of [Goldstein’s] act is the sanctification of God” and that “God looks more fondly on Jewish blood and therefore it is redder and its life has priority.” A second edition of Ginsburg’s publication was printed in 1995. Another volume, entitled Baruch Hagever: A Memorial Volume for the Holy Person Baruch Goldstein, was published by Michael Ben-Horin, Netanel Uzari, Yoel Lerner, and Yosef Dayan. Another rabbi, Ido Elba, faced Israeli charges of incitement to violence in his work entitled, “Clarification of Religious Precepts on Killing Gentiles.” [ALON, G., HA’ARETZ]

Rabbi Elba faced Israeli court action for his dangerous views but, as Orit Shochat noted in 1998 in the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz,

“Elba expounded on the halacha [Jewish religious law], as many others do. True, he did so at a rather inconvenient time shortly after the massacre of dozens of Palestinians by Jewish settler Baruch Goldstein but the halacha itself (which is, after all, immune to charges of incitement) contains some racist and sinister statements for which Rabbi Elba is not responsible. Why is there no ban on Sefer Hinuch, which is given as a bar mitzvah gift to Jewish boys throughout the country, although it also contains interpretations of these matters, in the very spirit of Rabbi Ido Elba?” [SHOCHAT]

It must be emphasized that all such commentators as those above are not just aberrant Jews who drag up racist and totalitarian dogma out of the blue: such people, often “learned rabbis,” are citing Jewish religious sources to today argue their theses. The crucial questions here, of course, involve how seminal Jewish religious texts can be used to sanction such monstrous material, to what degree it always has been used in this way, and how others – like the Nazis, reacting to Jewish fanaticism and racial claims – have built and expanded upon it for their own purposes. And lastly, of course: How widespread is Jewish interest in such religious sources now? Charles Liebman even notes another disturbing example in a more mainstream, and respectable, Orthodox Jewish journal in Israel:

An article in Tkhumin, the most distinguished annual [in Israel] dealing with matters of Jewish law and public issues from an orthodox perspective, published a learned essay on the status of Muslims, according to Jewish law. The author seems to phrase himself carefully and there is no trace of polemic in the tone of the article, a fact that makes the conclusions all the more striking. According to the writer, under the ideal conditions envisioned by Jewish law, non-Jews in the land of Israel ought to live in servitude to Jews. In fact, their very right to live in the
Land of Israel is problematic. It is permitted though not required to save their lives when they are endangered. [LIEBMAN, p. 311]

Overtly racist and fascist-like dogma from Jewish religious texts are finding new receptivity in modern Israel’s “religious Zionist” schools. Students are instructed that non-Jews have “inferior biological characteristics.” Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen note that students “learn that the first two [Jewish] patriarchs, Abraham and Isaac, each had two sons so that the Jewish son might inherit pure genes whereas the corrupt, impure genes that Abraham inherited from his idolatrous ancestors could be passed on to the non-Jewish son. Only Jacob’s son – those of the third generation – inherited pure genes and were worthy of being Jewish … That there is no outcry against [this] being made part of the religious Zionist high school curriculum suggests the level that Jewish ethnocentrism has reached in some quarters.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 60] Which is to say, a level it has been for many for most of Jewish history. (If such material is given credence in some Jewish circles in our own day, what, one imagines, was the Jewish community thinking in the medieval era?)

“There is a strain in Jewish thought,” laments London Rabbi Mark Solomon, “that says there is a special Godly something or other that is passed down in a certain genetic line which confers a special quality on people and Jewishness is a special quality. I call that metaphysical racism.” [KLEIN, E., p. 58]

It is not difficult to find instances where texts can be mined for religious justification of divinely-sanctioned Jewish chauvinism, racism, and dominance over others. Some Jewish religious texts centered on the Chosen People ethos underscore this attitude of Jewish preeminence and control over non-Jews:

“Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers; they shall bow down to thee with their face towards the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet.” ISAIAH, 49:22-23

“Kings shall come from you [Israelites] and shall rule wherever the foot of the sons of man has trodden. I [God] shall give to your seed all the earth which is under heaven, and they shall rule over all the nations according to their desire; and afterward they shall draw the whole earth to themselves, and shall inherit it forever.” – Book of Jubilees 32:18-19 [MACDONALD]

This kind of thinking even has credibility in some quarters of American Jewish academe. In 1993, in a book published by SUNY (State University of New York Press), David Novak examined various Jewish religious perspectives, including the idea of Jewish domination over others, and finds that such a notion is irrefutably part of Orthodox Judaism:

“If the Torah is only for the sake of Israel’s election, then it appears to be [in] the interest of her nationalist self-interest … The practical implications of assuming that the Torah is solely for the sake of affirming the
election of Israel [by God] is to see no transcendental standard governing Israel’s relationships with the nations [other people] of the world. The only relationship possible, then, is one where Gentiles accept Jewish sovereignty and dominance, be it political or only “religious” – in the usual western sense of that distinction … Such a theology can all too easily lend itself to such a practical program of dominance. Indeed, a consistent proponent of it would have no theological arguments with which to argue against such programs, however much he or she might be morally offended by them.” [NOVAK, Elec of Is, p. 25-26]

With the military empowerment of modern Israel and Jewish religious texts in mind, Shalom Carmy notes that

“A decade before the Balfour declaration [the 1917 British decree that helped to establish the modern state of Israel],” Isaac Breuer had warned that the power conferred by halaka on male Jews over women, slaves, and aliens, imposed an awesome responsibility, and that only the most rigorous discipline would prevent its abuse.” [CARMY, Rel Zio, p. 19]

With the assassination of Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin in 1996, most Jews were shocked that his killer, Yigal Amir, was Jewish – a man who felt that the myths of historic Israel and Jewish religious laws were being betrayed by Rabin’s peace accords with Arabs. Many were also disturbed to find out that Amir was so deeply and passionately trained in traditional Jewish religious doctrine. Earlier, Baruch Goldstein, another devout Orthodox Jew and a doctor, had machine-gunned to death 29 Arabs as they prayed in a Hebron mosque. Meir Lockshin, a Canadian professor and himself an Orthodox Jew, was so disturbed by the killings that he wrote

“One just can’t ignore the fact that Amir and the other famous Orthodox murderer of the nineties, Baruch Goldstein, attended the finest modern Orthodox schools and excelled in their studies. They were not sociopaths. They were well-integrated and respected members of their communities; it was impossible to tell them apart from their colleagues and friends. As Rabbi Lichenstein said on the day before the assassination, the nationalist Orthodox community in Israel would have gladly shown off Yigal Amir as one of the great successes of its educational system. It is absurd then for the Orthodox community to say that he and Goldstein are not representative.” [LOCKSHIN]

Within a year of Rabin’s death, his imprisoned assassin had “attracted marriage proposals from dozens of young women at home and abroad, including some from wealthy American families.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 8-18-97]

Baruch Goldstein’s terrorist act against random Arabs was not the first such attack in Israel. In 1982 a Jewish American in Jerusalem, Alan Harry Goodman, a veteran of the Israeli army, “shot his way into the Dome of the Rock [the third holiest shrine/mosque in worldwide Islam] with an M-16 rifle, killing one man and seriously wounding three others.” “Since Goodman’s trial in 1982,” noted Amos Elon nine years later, “more than twenty religious fanatics have been caught in the act of preparing one or another violent outrage on the Temple
Mount. Many more suspects were charged but released for lack of sufficient evidence.” [ELON, 1991, p. 100]

In 1984, 16 Jewish religiously-obsessed men were arrested for their plans to blow up the Dome of the Rock. A few months later, 28 “young yeshiva students from mainstream rabbinical colleges in Jerusalem were arrested one night at the foot of the Temple Mount with ladders and ropes in their hands. Some were armed. The presiding judge in their case allowed them all to go free.” Not long after this incident, yet another set of 28 religiously-driven criminals were apprehended “as they were plotting to blow up Moslem shrines on the Temple Mount. Some members were caught in the act of connecting explosives to Arab buses.” “Some of the plotters,” notes Amos Elon, “had distinguished service records in the army. A few were public figures … All were devoutly Orthodox. Most were graduates of prominent religious seminaries. They included ranking officers in the army and a veteran air-force pilot.” [ELON, 1991, p. 100-102]

Funds for their legal defense came from “hundreds of synagogues throughout the country,” “nearly a million” Israeli signed petitions requesting amnesty. “Given the gravity of the charges against them,” notes Amos Elon, “most of the defendants came away with relatively light sentences.” [ELON, 1991, p. 105] Some of the convicted eventually had their sentences dismissed by the president of Israel.

In view of such events, a troubled Israeli Rabbi, Tzvi Marx, worries that “the unwillingness of the yeshiva [Orthodox training] world to allow for moral criticism, on the simplistic religious assumption of the [Jewish Orthodox] tradition’s inherent perfection, has spawned an exaggerated, unholy triumphalism as well as racism which bore fruits in the violence of the Jewish Defense League, the [Meir Kahane’s] Kach movement, the [Jewish terrorist underground] Machteter, and finally in Hebron.” [MARX, p. 95] Such a dangerous Orthodox attitude has counterparts in the United States, as evidenced by Brooklyn’s Rabbi Abraham Hecht’s religious sanctioning of the Rabin assassination. [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 260] (Rabin was purportedly murdered for transgressions against Jewish religious law, particularly in his willingness to relinquish conquered land back to Arabs).

In the first half of the twentieth century, a prominent American Rabbi, Mordecai Kaplan, found the implications of traditional Jewish views of themselves as a Chosen People so ominous and out of sync with modern universalistic, egalitarian, and democratic values that he founded an entire movement, Reconstructionism, that rejected many of the tenets of Orthodox Judaism. (Members of Orthodox Judaism in turn of course rejected his views; some groups excommunicated him). Kaplan had this to say about the Jews as the Chosen People:

“We cannot fail to recognize in the claim of Jewish superiority a kinship and resemblance to the similar claims of other national and racial groups which have been used in defense of the imperialist exploitation of the yellow and black man by the whites on the grounds that they were the ‘white man’s burden.’ They are the grounds for the German perse-
cution of Jewry, in accord with the Aryan clause of the Third Reich’s fundamental law. They were in the past the grounds in which our own people rationalized their conquest and expropriation of the Canaanites… All such claims to superiority of one race, nation, or caste are detrimental to the interests of humanity, and are essentially vicious.” [KAPLAN, p. 94-95]

As Jacob Wasserman, a German-Jewish novelist wrote in 1929:

“It is clear to me that no people can continue being chosen, nor unceasingly designate itself as such, without upsetting in the eyes of other peoples the normal order of things. The whole idea is plainly absurd and immoral.” [in BARON, J., 1956, p. 209]

This “immoral” and racist “viciousness” is directed by traditional Jewish teachings at any non-Jew. In the particular case of the people of African descent, Jewish racism is well evidenced in the writings of the influential and revered medieval Jewish sage, Moses Maimonides, whose work is so well regarded by orthodox Jews that some of it has become part of Orthodox liturgy. Maimonides said this about Africans:

“The Negroes found in the remote South, and those who resemble them from among them that are with us in these climes … the status of those is like that of irrational animals. To my mind they have not the rank of men, but have among the beings a rank lower than the rank of man but higher than the rank of apes.” [GUIDE TO THE PERPLEXED]

(While pious Jews are supposed to follow 613 commandments in the Torah, Maimonides even “spoke about forcing” Gentiles to follow seven laws that the Talmud deems anyone must follow, if Jews have the power to enforce them.) [NOVAK, p. 48, E of I]

In recent years African-American scholars in particular have been speculating on the origins of racism as it affected their ancestors and the resultant moral climate that permitted the dehumanization of Africans for exploitation in the New World slave trade. Many believe that the seminal equation of Blacks and slavery is to be located in Jewish tradition, in the so-called “Hamitic” myth. In the Old Testament Noah (of “Ark” fame) had three sons, each brother the patriarch of different racial and social lines of humanity. One of them, Ham, had a son who was eventually cursed by Noah (Genesis 9:25) to be a “servant of servants” (i.e., slave). Jewish tradition links Africans as descendants of this grandson of Noah, Canaan:

“[Canaan’s] children shall be born ugly and black! … Your grandchildren’s hair shall be twisted into kinks … they shall go naked, and their male members shamefully elongated. Men of this race are called Negroes; their father Canaan commanded them to love theft and fornication, to be banded together in hatred of their masters and never tell the truth.” [GRAVES, p. 121]

“The association of Ham with the African race,” writes Tony Martin, an African-American professor at Wellesley College, “made this myth a major rationalization for the European enslavement of Africans … Christians have customarily
borne the brunt of blame for the Hamitic myth and they certainly are not without sin in this regard. Yet, the Hamitic myth (that is, the association of the African with the supposed curse of Noah) was invented by Jewish talmudic scholars over a thousand years before the transatlantic slave trade.” [MARTIN, p. 33]

“Since early times,” notes Judah Rosenthal, “Noah’s curse of Canaan was utilized by the defenders of slavery…. [Jewish] legend was that some Canaanite tribes left Canaan during Joshua’s conquest and settled in Africa … In the Talmud Africans are called Canaanites.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 74] Some Jewish religious literature (the Midrash) opines that all descendants of Ham were cursed to be slaves. [ROSENTHAL, p. 76]

This version of the Ham tradition is noted in the Jewish Encyclopedia:

“Ham is represented by the Talmudist as one of the three who had intercourse with their wives in the Ark, being punished therefore in that his descendants, the Ethiopians, are black … Ham was punished by having his descendants led into captivity with their buttocks uncovered.” [JEW ENCY, v. VI, p. 186]

The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion notes: “The Canaanites are believed to have been descended from Canaan, youngest son of Ham … Noah cursed Canaan for the depravity of Ham upon his father, destining him to be subjugated by Shem – thereby foretelling the eventual displacement of the Canaanites by the Israelites (descended from Shem), consistently justified by the Bible as the inevitable outcome of the sexual licentiousness practiced by the Canaanites.” [WERBLOWSKY, p. 149]

In modern history, few expressions of Jewish racism towards Blacks were as boldly proclaimed as Norman Podhoretz’s infamous article in the 1960’s in the American Jewish Congress’ magazine Commentary, of which he was editor. Podhoretz, once self-described as a liberal, readjusted Commentary down an increasingly neoconservative path:

“The hatred I feel for Negroes is the hardest of all the old feelings to face or admit, and it is the most hidden and most overloaded… It no longer … has any cause or justification … I know it from insane rage that can stir me at the thought of Negro anti-Semitism, I know it from the disgusting prurience that can stir in me at the sight of a mixed couple.” [LINCOLN, p. 179]

Traditional Jewish racism, based on religious principles, has taken new forms with newer secular Jewish ideologies. Boas Evron, an Israeli writer, traces traditional Chosen People attitudes into its newly secularized mode: Zionism, through the “Revisionist” Zionist pioneer Vladimir Jabotinsky. Jabotinsky, says Evron, “poeticized about ‘hidden glory,’ declaring that every Jew is a potential ‘prince’ – in other words, that Jews are noble by their very nature (just as the Germans imagined themselves to be innately superior) … Indeed, this belief in innate superiority is the basis of racism and of all the varieties of fascism, which is also a reason for classifying revisionist Zionism within the general category of fascist psychology.” [EVRON, p. 112]

Even in the years leading up to the Holocaust in Germany, Daniel Niewyk
recognizes some world-view parallels between German fascism and the growing Zionist movement among German Jewry:

“At the heart of the Zionist critique of liberal [Jewish] assimilation [into German society] lay the conviction that Jews constituted a unique race … That [Jewish marriage to non-Jews] might become a serious problem for the Jews prompted Zionist leaders in the Berlin Jewish community to authorize a report identifying intermarriage as a threat to the ‘racial purity of the stock.’” [NIEWYK, p. 129]

Niewyk overlooks what he calls “this [Jewish] racial arrogance” as having roots in the Chosen People ethos; he chooses to frame it as a mirror-like reaction to German fascism: “[it is] nothing other than the photographic negative of anti-Semitism.” [NIEWYK, p. 131]

But the former head of the Israel Civil Rights Association, Israel Shahak, does see the connection between traditional Orthodox Jewish racism and its capacity nowadays to violently implement such views in nationalist form, via the modern state of Israel. “Many people,” says Shahak, “do not realize where Zionism … is tending: to a combination of all the old hates of classical Judaism towards Gentiles.” [SHAHAK, p. 72] “It is true,” notes professor Georges Tamarin, an immigrant to Israel, “that the Bible is one of the greatest creations of human cultures. But it is equally true that it is full of inhuman motives and that, as [Jewish author Arthur] Koestler (who surely cannot be accused of being an anti-Semite) stated, all the bases of the [Nazi discriminatory] Nuremberg Laws can be found in it … If the segregatory laws of the Herrenrasse were barbarous, the segregatory laws of the Chosen People are equally barbarous.” [TAMARIN, p. 24]

Even the German-Jewish philosopher, Martin Buber, of “I-Thou” fame, beloved by many American Jews as a benevolent proponent of Jewish mysticism, called Jews “a community of blood [Gemeinschaft seines Blutes] … the deepest, most potent stratum of our being.” Many Jewish authors nowadays have busied themselves with diffusing the most troubling implications of Buber’s ideas. “This language,” remarks apologist Enzo Traverso, “so surprising today, signifies for him an essentially cultural strategy which … led inevitably to a reactionary or racist political standpoint.” [TRAVERSO, p. 30]

“Of all the doctrines that Buber ever enunciated,” notes Maurice Friedman, “this one of the ‘blood’ is perhaps the most problematic and the most difficult to comprehend … Buber would have seen no contradiction here, however, for his call to inner decision was a call to the realization of one’s uniqueness through the uniqueness of one’s people.” [FRIEDMAN, M., 1981, p. 132]

Jewish identity, wrote Buber, is not

“just the mere continuity with the past. [It] has deposited something in us that can never leave us in any hour of our life, that determines every tone and hue of our lives, whatever we do and whatever befalls us – namely blood, the deepest, [most] potent level of the soul.” [POPPEL, S., 1976, p. 129-130]

As Israel Shahak notes, during the rise of Nazism Buber was “actually teaching doctrines about non-Jews not unlike the Nazi doctrines about Jews.” [SHA-
Buber’s (Jewish) friend and influence, Gustav Landauer, had addressed the idea of the Jewish community of “blood” earlier:

“What man is by birth, what is his innermost and most secret, his inviolable uniqueness, that is the great community of the living in him, that is his blood and his community of blood. Blood is thicker than water; the community which the individual discovers himself to be is mightier and nobler and more ancient than the thin influences of state and society. What is most individual in us is what is most common in us.” [FRIEDMAN, M., 1981, p. 133]

A British Jew, Emma Klein, in a 1996 book about Jewish identity, led a section called What Is It to Be Jewish? with answers to the question by four young Jews who were grappling with the issue.

“It’s two things,” said Nichola, “It’s a family thing and a thing that has been imposed on me through blood. It’s a genetic thing, if you like.”

“It’s something that has been imposed on me,” said Claire, “It’s a blood thing. I can’t escape it.”

“I feel Jewish,” said Sophia, “out of history, my blood, and it’s just like a nationality.”

[A young man named Guy summed up the common theme more ominously]: “Entertaining any idea about racial purity just stinks of Hitler but it is an issue. I feel all sorts of people have some pride in their roots and they feel racial mixing dilutes your heritage. I think I might feel that. It frightens me.” [KLEIN, E., p. 191]

Even under Soviet communism and the emphatic destruction of religious roots, this familiar Jewish identity endured. Sylvia Rothchild notes the results of American Jewish Committee interviews (1978-80) with Russian Jews now living in America:

“Many émigrés spoke of their Jewishness as ‘a matter of blood,’ out of their control. They felt it as something ‘mysterious … unfathomable,’ a wellspring of feelings that inundated them from time to time. [Some] experience ‘inexplicable’ Jewish loyalty in spite of the fact that they were not religious, knew no Yiddish and had no Jewish education.” [ROTHCHILD, 1985, p. 34]

When Jewish author Ann Roiphe read some scientific evidence that suggested that “not much admixture has taken place between the Ashkenazi Jews and their gentile neighbors [in Europe] during the last 700 years,” she was pleased. “It is actually comforting,” she wrote, “to think of the scientist looking through a powerful lens and finding [Biblical heroines] Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel and the unfortunate, unwanted Leah sending their chemical matter into the future.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 37]

In 1973 Rabbi A. Avidan provided the following religious “guidance” for Israeli soldiers. It was published by the Central Regional Command of the Israeli Army. No other rabbi ever challenged its contents. It was eventually taken out of circulation, presumably because it could undermine military commanders’ own orders:
“When our forces come across civilians during a war or in hot pursuit or in a raid, so long as there is no certainty that these civilians are incapable of harming our forces, then according to the *Halakhah* [Jewish religious law] they may and even should be killed … In a war, when our forces storm the enemy, they are allowed and even enjoined by the *Halakhah* to kill even good civilians, that is, civilians who are ostensibly good.” [SHAHAK, p. 76]

For an outside observer to both groups, traditional Judaism and German Nazism, the original intention of the two belief systems seems similar: each seeks to maintain group privilege and exclusivity through racial lines of its own. (The likes of Patai, Cantor, Kahane and others extend racist self-glory, one way or the other, to our own day). Each anticipates in-group domination over others. And each ideology – in origin – aims to clear their respective land claims of foreign elements. By any means necessary. The Nazi’s idea of Aryan supermen stems from a secular, pre-Judeo-Christian pseudo-pagan revival, tinged with nihilism; the Jews special grace is religiously sanctioned from God, who was originally conceived as a brutal and vengeful Lord of a Kingdom. Each group envisions a special destiny, above all other people.

“The fact remains,” says Harold Cruse, “that the European experience shows that when it comes to playing the role of the Chosen People in history, the danger is that two can play this game as well as one. When that happens, woe be to the side that is short on numbers.” [CRUSE, p. 483]

For those who might decry with indignation a comparison of oppressed and oppressor as being ridiculously unwarranted, largely due to Jewish suffering in the Holocaust epoch, we need only turn to history to confirm where the atrocious deeds of the Nazis and Jews, in both action and attitude, merge:

*When the Lord your God gives them* [the Hittites, the Gergashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites – all contestant tribes against the Jews for parts of the ancient land of Israel] *to you and you defeat them; then you must utterly destroy them; you shall make no covenant with them and show them no mercy …* [Deuteronomy 7:1-6]

This, of course, is from the Jewish Torah, known in Christian tradition as the Old Testament. This is not just ancient history, or legend about ancient history, but part of the most sacred of Jewish religious texts. It is the origin of Judaic belief per their claims to the land of Israel. Many Jews to this day believe such material to be the infallibly dictatorial Word of God, as do many Christians who accept the Old Testament as part of their own religious foundation.

For anyone who takes the time to wade through the avalanche of esoteric minutia in the Old Testament, examples of religiously sanctioned cruelty and atrocity by the Israelites are found to be core to their dogma of “specialhood” and land conquest. The eminent and popular scholar Joseph Campbell (who, of course, is vilified by some indignant Jews as just another in the endless parade of anti-Semites; Jewish scholar Sander Gilman, for example, calls Campbell’s work “tainted with the rhetoric of anti-Semitism.” [GILMAN, *Psy-
cho and, p. 101] spent a lifetime studying world myths and belief systems and calls the Torah tradition “one of the most brutal war mythologies of all time.” [CAMPBELL, P. 181] Slave labor, rape, and genocide are, for example, encouraged in the following Old Testament passage:

> When you draw near to a city to fight against it, offer terms of peace to it. And if its answer to you is yes, then all the people who are found in it shall do forced labor for you and shall serve you. But if it makes no peace with you, but makes war against you, then you shall besiege it; and when the Lord your God gives it into your hand you shall put all its males to the sword, but the women and the little ones, the cattle, and everything else in the city, all its spoils, you shall take as booty for yourself. [Deuteronomy 20:10-14]

When God reputedly gave the land of Israel to the Jews, there were, of course, people already living there. And what, according to the most sacred of Jewish texts, was deemed necessary to clear the place of non-Jews? The text from the Torah quoted above continues:

> Thus you shall do to all the cities which are very far from you, which are not cities here. But in the cities of the people that the Lord your God gives you for an inheritance, you shall save nothing alive that breathes, but you shall utterly destroy them, the Hittites and Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, as the Lord has commanded. [Deuteronomy 20:14-18]

Could **Hitler** and his henchmen improve much on this?

The violent wresting of the Holy Land from others is led by Joshua and begins with carnage at the city of Jericho:

> “And they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both men and women, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword …” [JOSHUA, 6-21]

The genocide continued:

> “So Joshua smote all the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the vale, and of the springs, and all their kings; he left none remaining but utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the Lord God of Israel commanded.” [JOSHUA 10:40]

The parallel between the Israelites’ scapegoating of their archrivals, the Canaanites, as prelude to their extermination, and the Nazis’ contempt for, and mass murderer of, Jews is striking. “Canaan,” says **Eric Friedland**, “is transformed [by Jews] into a cipher for the worst elements of Israel’s social and religious life, a major contributing cause of its degeneration and downfall. A finishing touch is furnished by Isaiah (23:8) and Zechariah (14:21) when they debase the term ‘Canaanite’ into a synonym for a merchant or trafficker. Haven’t we heard this canard before?” [FRIEDLAND, p. 79]

Modern Jewish reflection upon, and moral reckoning for, their own genocide of the Canaanites, Friedland concludes, has not been forthcoming:
“The … difficult task is to come to terms from a religious perspective with that part of our past that, under a less developed moral standard, was for a long time condoned but in the present age raises serious ethical questions with profound repercussions.” [FRIEDLAND, p. 81]

As Robert Carroll notes:

“Total war can make sense from a strategic point of view, but it raises serious moral problems; and the genocidal war against the Canaanites in the Bible has bothered sensitive readers of a book often thought to express perfect, divinely ordained morality.” [CARROLL, R., 1989, p. 159]

“I remember,” notes Joshua Cohen, “[in fifth grade] asking my [Jewish religion] teacher how it was possible for Jews to have behaved like Nazis, and being told that the attempted genocide in [Torah chapter] 1 Samuel was different in that the Israelites were carrying out a holy command … [This] is itself an example of the appalling bigotry that can subsist in canonized texts. The biblical paradigm, moreover, confirms our fear that canonization of texts might confer a moral authority on bigotry. For many Jews, the text of the Bible and particularly of the Torah is sacred … My fifth-grade teacher is hardly alone in regarding the Command to exterminate Amalek as the word of God.” [COHEN, J. p. 293]

Although Aryan Nazism was an expressly stated anti-Christian creed, (restructuring German culture in terms of a pre-Christian and pre-Judaic neopagan revival, i.e., erasing Jewish and Christian world views), many Jews today ignore a myriad of other variables and stretch medieval Christian antipathy for the “Jews who killed Christ” into a psycho-social basis in the formation of the Third Reich. In this view, a key to understanding Hitler’s hatred of Jews was Christianity. Richard Libowitz, for example, states that “the fact that the vast majority of perpetrators of and bystanders to the Holocaust were baptized in good standing of traditional churches, none of whom has ever been formally rebuked by his or her particular denomination, suggests one of the primary non-Jewish challenges of Holocaust study demanding evaluation. Elie Wiesel has confronted the most disturbing facet of that realm with his reminder that ‘not every Christian was a killer, but every killer was a Christian.’” [LIBOWITZ, Asking, p. 65] “It [The Holocaust] was Christians who perpetrated it,” declares David Wyman, “– the Nazis who were the products of western Christian civilization.” [WILSON, M., p. 30]

Richard L. Rubenstein proclaims that German Nazi

“National Socialism was an anti-clerical movement. It was nevertheless dialectically related to Christianity. It was the negation of Christianity as negation was understood by Hegel and Freud. It could have as little existed without Christianity as the Black Mass of medieval Satanism could have existed without the mass of Roman Catholicism. The classic villains of Christianity, the Jews, became the primal object of extermination of the anti-Christian Christians, the Nazis. Studying the classical utterances on Jews and Judaism, and at the same time reviewing the terrible history of the Nazi period, prompts one to ask whether there is something in the logic of Christian theology that, when pushed to the
extreme, justifies, if it does not incite to, the murder of Jews.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 5]

Such a libel is profoundly short-sighted, preposterously convoluted, and loaded with Orwellian doublethink. It asserts that the Nazis’ emphatic break with Christianity was really an affirmation of fundamental Christian religious tenets and it ridiculously equates Satanism with the Catholic Church by virtue of the devil cult’s very rejection of the latter. (Was Godless communism, Aryan fascism’s opposite, an expression of Christianity too – at the same time! – because it also took hold in a Christian milieu?) Rubenstein’s logic, and so many others’ like him, insist that the very assertion of negation is really its opposite, an expression of affirmation. More profoundly, the insistence that Christianity presumed murderous antipathy towards Jews (fulfilled in German Nazism) and is somehow rooted in Christian universalistic teachings, completely overlooks the origins of such institutionalized hatred in western religious tradition. By Rubenstein’s own logic (or by any more reasoned analysis), even if we accept the scurrilous premise that the Christian world view is somehow murderous, it did not evolve out of thin air but was itself an outgrowth of Judaism. Even by Rubenstein’s own logic, it must be underscored that the initial Christians were themselves Jews who rejected (negated – by Hegel’s, Freud’s, or anybody’s definition) Judaism. Then, following Rubenstein’s own argument, Christianity’s negation of Judaism was really its affirmation, and the worst of “Chosen People” Judaism was passed down from its ideological parent from Jewry to Christianity to Nazism.

However one views this scenario, if we are going to seek out, in ancient origins, the presumed roots of Nazism, it is obviously more viable to locate examples of – and role models for – “nationalist” violent hate behavior even back further in the religious past, not in Christian universalism that invited others to join their fold, but in the “particularist,” exclusionist beliefs and brutally merciless actions of the ancient Jews themselves. Many today will steadfastly deny, and be outraged by, such disturbing Nazi/Israelite parallels. How can one compare the relatively “primitive” actions of a group of people thousands of years ago to those of a supposedly “civilized” group in the 1940’s: the Nazis, the consummate, scientific dehumanizers? After all, times have changed; the Jews of the late twentieth century understand their heritage to represent a “beacon of light to the rest of humanity.” “The origins of democracy are to be found in the Mosaic code,” so it is claimed by so many Jewish apologists and propagandists, and all the rest of it. But the bottom line is this: If Jewish-instigated genocide is routinely disregarded or trivialized from the ancient past, then why should any of the Jewish myths of that era be taken seriously? To deny the genocidal origins of the Jewish covenant with God as central to the faith is to deny the whole of the Old Testament, the origins of Jewish identity itself, and their link to the land of Israel. Ironically, for all the modern Jewish bitterness against Christianity for its alleged endemic anti-Semitism, the fact that Christianity also accepts the events of the Old Testament as the incontestable “will of God” spares Jews regular inquiries into the moral and ethical responsibility for the Nazi-like misdeeds of their ancient ancestors, a religious foundation that has led in more than one direction to the socio-political
dogmas today. Christianity is in fact largely protective of Jewish tradition. To both Jew and Christian alike (and Muslims, for that matter, who also accept the Old Testament) God sanctioned the Israelite’s massacres and they are, hence, acceptable and morally unchallenged. The Nazis never made claims that God was on their side. As such, they are everyone’s monsters.

(Christianity is responsible for the attempted extinction of the Jewish people? Some have argued the exactly opposite case. As Marcus Arkin notes about the writings of Jewish British prime minister Benjamin Disraeli, “[H]e reminds the Jews that Jesus Christ has done more for them than anybody else and that had the Church not flourished and Christianity had not become widespread, Judaism may have been forgotten completely.” [ARKIN, 1989] Because Jesus was a Jew, and based his teachings on the Old Testament, Christianity is not free in categorically dismissing the Jewish religion. Nor destroying it. As Jewish scholar Samuel Sandmel once even argued, Jesus “was … a Jewish loyalist … He was a martyr to his Jewish patriotism.”) [JACOB, W., 1974, p. 205]

In the case of yet another ancient Israelite genocide (this one more successful) against the Amalekites, even one of the foremost modern scholars on the Old Testament, Bernard Anderson, turns apologist – in apparent deference to the all-pervasiveness of Judeo-Christian thinking in Western culture – when he argues that the modern viewer should suspend moral judgment about Jewish-inspired genocide in their religio-historical origins:

“Through the [Israelite] prophet Samuel, [King] Saul was given a divine command to utterly destroy [the Amalekites] – man, woman, child, cattle, and goods … According to modern ethical standards, this act of total extermination was a barbarous thing (though it was scarcely less refined than modern warfare!) But instead of making a value judgement from our standpoint, let us try to understand the act within the religious perspective of ancient Israel.” [ANDERSON, p. 172]

As the Torah/Old Testament commands: “Now go and smite Amalek, and exterminate everything that is his. Don’t pity him, but kill man, woman, infant and nursling, ox, sheep, camel and ass.” [SAMUEL 15:2-3]

Saul in fact initially spared the King of the Amalekites, Agag, and confiscated some prime livestock. For Saul’s reluctance to blindly obey the word of the Israelite God and exterminate every living thing, he was considered to have “sinned” and was severely reprimanded by the prophet Samuel. Eventually Saul attempted to make amends by personally hacking Agag “in pieces.” [I SAMUEL 15. 1-33] “So decisively did [Saul] defeat [the Amalekites],” says scholar Bernard Anderson, “that they vanished from the historical scene shortly afterwards.” [ANDERSON, p. 172]

“Heretics, false prophets, witches, communities harboring apostates, and the six Amorite nations that occupied Canaan at the time of the Israelite conquest,” notes Joshua Cohen, “are all sentenced to extermination in the book of Deuteronomy. But the cherem [the sentence of “extermination”] on Amalek, is the most renowned ban in all of Jewish tradition. It is pronounced twice: in Exodus, Chapter 17, and again in Deuteronomy, Chapter 25.” [COHEN, J. p. 290]
Even more troubling, the Old Testament asserts that “the Lord will be at war with Amalek throughout the ages.” [EXODUS 17:16] “Amalekites,” notes the Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion, “were regarded as Israel’s inveterate foes, whose annihilation became a sacred obligation … Only after the final destruction of the Amalekites will God and his throne be complete.” [WERBLOWSKY, R., p. 41] The Old Testament commands Jews to literally “blot out the memory of Amalek,” an order that, as part of continuous religious review, ironically ensures that it can never be forgotten. On the contrary, such a religious sanction secures, notes Joshua Cohen, “the enduring presence of bigotry in [Jewish] sacred teachings.” [COHEN, p. 299]

A disturbing modern perspective on the Amalekites is their reinvention in some Orthodox and Zionist Jewish minds as Arabs (and any other non-Jews, or even Jews, that are understood to want to “destroy” Israel. Michael Asheri’s Amalek, for instance, is generic Germans.) [ASHERI, M., 1983, p. 340]

Rabbi Avraham Weiss (who we will meet again later in this chapter assaulting a convent in Poland) explains that:

“The affirmative Torah commandment is to destroy those who bear the seed of Amalek. Since the halakha has ruled that Amalek does not exist today, the commandment cannot be carried out. Rav [Rabbi] Haim Soloveitchik, however, maintained that there are two forms of Amalek. There is the genetic Amalek, and there is the figurative Amalek, which constitutes any nation willing to destroy Israel. Basing themselves on this position, Kahanists [the followers of Rabbi Meir Kahane] argue that Arabs are figurative Amalek. Thus, when Arabs were indiscriminately killed, the classic Kahanist response was, “We were not involved, but we applaud the action.” Thus, after Ami Popper murdered seven Arabs, Rabbi Kahane suggested that a street be named after him. Thus, the Hevron massacre [Baruch Goldstein’s murder of 29 Arabs at prayer in a mosque] has been defended in some circles not on rounds of national warfare, but on the grounds of fighting against Amalek. Rav Joseph B. Soloveitch [says that] every individual who bears the genes of Amalek must be wiped out. With regard to the figurative Amalek, on the other hand, one is mandated to engage in warfare against any nation that attempts to destroy the Jewish people.” [WEISS, p. 50]

Who then, one must inevitably be drawn to wonder, might be included as the (figurative) enemies of (figurative) Israel who seeks to (figuratively) destroy it? “The name Amalek,” observes Joshua Cohen, “has taken on a symbolic meaning in Jewish tradition … To most Jews, Amalek represents the malign genius of anti-Semitism.” [COHEN, J., p. 291] Amalek can hence be creatively interpreted to mean virtually anybody. “Anyone who acts to deliberately provoke hatred of God or Torah-fearing Jews,” decried an ultra-Orthodox newspaper in Israel, “can be considered ‘children of Amalek.’” [JERUSALEM POST, 3-15-92] “Amalek is also an ideology that denies Israel’s unique mission in perfecting the world,” wrote Shlomo Riskin in 1996, “The spiritual heirs of Amalek include the Nazis, the Soviet Communists and Moslem fundamentalists.” [RISKIN, S., 3-1-96]
The immediate modern Amalek nearest at hand in Israel was addressed by Rabbi Israel Hess in a 1980 issue of the campus magazine at one of Israel’s pre-eminent colleges, Bar-Ilan University (religiously Orthodox in orientation). **Hess was formerly its campus rabbi.** The title of his piece was *Genocide: A Commandment of the Torah.* “Hess,” says professor Ehud Sprinzak, “likened the Arabs to the biblical Amalekites, who were deservedly annihilated. The Amalekites, according to Hess, were born socially and militarily treacherous and cruel. Their relation to Jews was like the relation of darkness to light – one of total contradiction. The Arabs, who live today in the land of Israel and who are constantly waging a treacherous terrorist war against the Jews, are direct descendants of the Amalekites and the correct solution to the problem is extermination.” [SPRINZAK, p. 123]

Israeli Knesset member Amnon Rubenstein noted this articles, saying, “Rabbi Hess explains the commandment to blot out the memory of Amalek and says that there is no mercy in this commandment: the commandment is to kill and destroy even children and infants. Amalek is whoever declares war against the people of God.” [HARKABI, p. 150] “Hess implies that those who have a quarrel with the Jews instantly become Amalek and ought to be destroyed,” says Yehoshafat Harkabi, “children and all … Amalek is not an ancient extinct tribe but a generic enemy that each generation may identify for itself.” [HARKABI, p. 150] “It’s not just a lunatic fringe,” says Rabbi David Hartman, about this kind of thinking in the Jewish community, “It is a diseased element that is capable of infiltrating into the Jewish self-understanding.’” [DORFNER, p. 50]

In 1992 Moshe Kohn was mailed a pamphlet in Israel. It’s message was, he says,

“Now that we Jews are again enjoying national sovereignty in our homeland, we at long last again have the opportunity – and the duty – to fulfill the Biblical commandment to exterminate Amalek. Moreover, only after we have done so will God’s Kingdom prevail over all creation. And who exactly is today’s Amalek? According to our pamphleteer, it is ‘the Palestinians.’” [KOHN, M., 3-27-92]

Jewish religious injunctions to mass slaughter are even part of traditional yearly Purim commemorations, particularly on Shabbat Zachor (“the Saturday of Remembrance”) – “the Sabbath on which Jews are commanded to obliterate the enemy of Amalek, the arch enemy of the Jewish people.” [FEILER, p. 14] In the wake of the mass murder of Arabs at prayer by Baruch Goldstein, “some Jews,” noted the *Jewish Bulletin,* “say Goldstein was inspired by Purim passages that condone wanton killing.” [KATZ, p. 1] Such passages from the biblical Book of Esther celebrate how Jews rose up to kill thousands of Persians who plotted against them, recited twice by observant Jews during Purim. “The tone [of these passages] is not self-defense,” complains Rivkah Walton, “but of slaughter, slaughter, slaughter.” [KATZ, p. 1] “The concluding chapters of the Book of Esther,” adds Peter Novick, “tell of the [Jewish] queen’s soliciting permission to slaughter not just the Jews’ armed enemies but the enemies’ wives
and children – with a final death toll of seventy-five thousand. These ‘memORIES’ provided gratifying revenge fantasies to the Jews of medieval Europe.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 5] In the 1960s the Israelis kidnapped former Nazi official Adolph Eichmann from Argentina, and sentenced him to death in the Jewish state. One staff member at the American Jewish Committee worried that, because of the trial, “gentiles might learn that ‘for over 2,000 years Jews have cheered joyously in the synagogues when the Megillah readers annually told of the hanging of [Queen Esther’s arch-rival] Haman and his ten sons with him.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 1323]

“Objections to the Purim passages don’t stop there, however,” notes the Jewish Bulletin, “some people oppose the way biblical citations in Exodus (17:8-18) and Deuteronomy (25:17-19) are read on Shabbat Zachor before Purim. These call for the annihilation of the descendants of Amalek, the biblical enemy of the Israelites.” [KATZ, p. 1] Another Jewish commentator, Ismar Elbogen, noted the traditional emotional climate of such public Purim recitals:

“Often the reading of the scroll [of Esther], was accompanied by customs intended to release the overwhelming feelings of joy, and these not infrequently took on wild form … The noisy disturbances have been eliminated in every civilized country.” [ELBOGEN, p. 110]

In this Amalek context, what are we to make of the words of Philip Graubart in a 1996 issue of the Jewish Exponent?:

“Baruch Goldstein examined the story of Esther and the biblical passages regarding Amalek and discovered it was permissible to murder 40 Muslims at prayer. And we all know in Judaism’s vast corpus of sacred writings, there are a few other texts and ideas that, in the wrong hands, could lead to further atrocities…. Only Jews passionately committed to Jewish texts can fall victim to Judaism’s dark side. Only Jews who absolutely revere the Torah as God’s word could accept the biblical injunction to slaughter Amalek as a call to arms, or take God’s genocidal commandments to Joshua to be currently relevant … [but] I’m not afraid of passion, I’m terrified of the absence of passion in my own Jewish culture … On a day to day basis I feel a lot more threatened by apathy than by zealotry. And so do most rabbis.” [GRAUBART, p. 5]

Meir Kahane, the founder of the Jewish Defense League, an elected member of the Israeli Knesset, and a man even many Jews concede to have clearly fascist tendencies (Hebrew University professor Ehud Sprinzak calls Kahane’s political party, Kach, “quasi-fascist,” [SPRINZAK, p. 233] Lesley Hazleton calls Kahane himself “openly fascist”) [HAZELTON, L., 1987, p. 19] quotes the following two Old Testament citations to begin one of his books, Our Challenge:

“For thou art a holy people unto the L-rd they G-d: the L-rd thy G-d hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are on the face of the earth.” [DEUTERONOMY, 7:6]

“Every place wherever the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be. There shall be no man
able to stand before you: for the L-rd your G-d shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that ye shall tread upon, as he hath said unto you.” [DEUTERONOMY, 11:24:25]

Kahane then uses such religious ‘authentication’ to claim that “we [Jews] are not simply one more little superfluous nation but the heart and the reason for the world.” [KAHANE, p. 173] As an Israeli Knesset member, he even submitted a bill that sought to physically separate Israeli Jews from Gentiles; fellow Knesset member Michael Eitan compared his proposals to “the Nazi’s racist Nuremberg Laws.” [SPRINZAK, p. 239] In 1987, a Van Leer Institute survey of Israeli youth found that “42 percent said they supported Kahane. Among religious youth, the support shot up to 60 percent.” [HAZELETON, L., 1987, p. 132] (Kahane was assassinated by an Arab in New York City in 1990).

The problem of racism in Jewish tradition, says professor Moshe Greenberg, “has its roots in the policy of the Bible and the [Talmudic] sages to separate Israel from the [other] nations; it is full blown in the Kabbalistic denial that the Gentile is in the image of God and reaches horrific proportions in the genocidal biblical command to wipe out Amalek and the seven nations of Canaan.” [GREENBERG, p. 24] One (secular) Jewish apologetic strategy for this is to argue that the genocides recorded in the Old Testament never really happened. But, as Greenberg worries, “A historical critique of the biblical texts [about genocide] indicates … [that they] belong to the realm of theory rather than to historical reality. This may salve our conscience, but only aggravates the problem – that, under no pressure of facts, the biblical authors found compatible with their faith a divine command to commit genocide.” [GREENBERG, p. 30]

So how should Jews of moral conscience teach this key part of their religious tradition? They should, says Greenberg, tip-toe around it. “When we teach the [genocide] passages in school (and given the pivotal nature of the book of Joshua we cannot avoid teaching them) we must explicitly neutralize them (e.g., by stressing the ancient context, their obsolete motivation, and the annuling precedent set up by the sages) … It must be made clear to pupils that our general regard for the Bible as a treasure of enduring values does not extend to these passages. The urgency of such a repudiation corresponds to the evidence that the new empowerment of Israel stirs atavistic longings to act out what existed throughout all of Jewish history … only in the imagination.” [GREENBERG, p. 31]

Meanwhile, the truth about Jewish history and tradition is systematically ignored and distorted by popular Jewish folk mythology about an idealized past and morality. As parroted very typically by Mannie Sher, a Jew and former Chairman of the British Association of Psychotherapists, modern Jewish reification of their tradition of victimhood blames their alleged noble, peaceful morals for anti-Jewish hostility throughout history. Knowing the facts, this posturing reads like an insidious fairy tale:

“The world to which the Jews introduced God and their new ideals of universal morality, justice, peace, and individual responsibility has never been appreciative. Jewish ideals, like those of psychoanalysis, have
generally been alien and threatening to the prevailing order. Judaism gave a vision that ‘nation should not lift sword against nation’ to a world in which war and warriors rather than peace or prophets were glorified. Like psychoanalysis, Judaism sees every individual as both responsible for himself and answerable. It is little wonder then why hatred of the Jew developed and ultimately became the greatest hatred in human history.”

[SHER, p. 38]

There are others who admit a vast tradition of “hatred” in Jewish religious sources, but seek to dismiss its gravity. David Wolpe, for example, asks his readers in a popular Jewish newspaper:

“Is it good to hate? … Our tradition does not teach us that all hatred is bad. The Bible is unambiguous on this point: We are clearly intended to hate Amalek, whose memory we are instructed to wipe out … The subject is raised each year in the middle of the Passover seder … In fact there are few things that can be healthier than merited hatred … Sitting in a comfortable home today, it is easy to see barbarity in the words of the Haggadah. When we do, we betray our history.” [WOLPE, p. 8]

Of course all the above emphasis on ancient Israelite savagery is not to assert that Jews and Nazis hold a monopoly on atrocity or were locked in an inevitably trans-historical death embrace. Far from it. History is over-laden with atrocious crimes by one people against another throughout the centuries, exercising respective violent versions of what anthropologists today call ethnocentrism. The idea that “We are the People and everyone else is not” is endemic to world cultures and religions. But the extreme “Kill every thing that breathes” injunction as moral (and religious) policy is rare; after all, for even the most ruthless victor that which is taken alive has at least some economic, pleasure or productive value to the conqueror. The spiteful vanquishing of everything and everybody, repeatedly, in a holy book of all places, and one that is the foundation of Judeo-Christian heritage, cannot be completely overlooked – as it always is – in the development of future peoples, world views, and civilizations that stemmed from it.

Arnold Toynbee, the well-known British historian, in arguing that religious “fanaticism” in Judaism has been inevitably passed to Christianity (and its notorious Crusades) and Islam (like its Holy Wars), had the audacity to openly attribute the ultimate cause of discriminatory suffering experienced by Jews throughout history upon their own heads. “The first ‘bigots’ in history that I know of,” said Toynbee, “are … the Maccabees [a group of rebellious Jews who overthrew Greek rule], if ‘bigot’ means, as I believe it does, not just any persecutor, but one who persecutes people of another religion on account of his differences from them to religious practice and belief. The Maccabees forcibly converted Idumea and Galilee to Judaism and they brought it about that Herod and Jesus were Jews, not gentiles.” [SYRKIN, Toynbee]

Old Testament scholar John Allegro also notes the Maccabean era:

“In the conception of the New Israel, dreamt of by the Jews of the Exile, propounded by their prophets, and hammered out in Judea by ad-
ministrators from Babylon Jewry, there existed a fundamental conflict between the religious ideal of a world state governed by Jews and freely accepted by all men, and the practical reality that people are tenaciously conservative about their religions and take unkindly to having their gods chosen for them. When this removal of their freedom of worship is coupled with a particularly uncompromising racialist domination and tight political control, resistance to the alien regime stiffens even further, and will yield to naught but the severest military pressures. From the outset, then, the glorious New Israel was only likely to be achieved by force of arms, and maintained by brute force. The Macca-beans were at least realists, and played the military and political games as shrewdly and ruthlessly as any other tyrants of the ancient world. When it came to converting the gentile to the faith, to fulfill the spiritual promise of the kingdom of God, they simply offered the choice between circumcision and slavery.” [ALLEGRO, J., 1971, p. 116-117]

Arnold Toynbee takes such history further, leveling to modern Jewish eyes and ears the most profound of blasphemies: “The irony of Jewish history surely is that the Jews have been the chief sufferers from a spirit which they themselves originally kindled.” [SYRKIN, p. 177] Elsewhere he argues that, “[Hitler’s] main idea – the fanatical worship of a jealous tribal god, at the bidding of a prophetic leader – is the original (though not ultimate) Leitmotiv of the Old Testament.” [GOULD, p. 454]

“Toynbee,” says Jacob Agus,

“regards the biblical notion of a people, set apart from the rest of mankind, as the source of self-aggrandizement of Christian nations in the modern world. Ultimately, this narcissistic belief of the ancient Israelites took root in the minds of anti-Christian Germans, emerging as the Nazi madness of our own generation … [AGUS, p. 385] … Jews were accustomed to attacks from demagogues, chauvinists, purveyors of ‘mystiques’ of one kind or another. But, to be the target of criticism at the hands of a superintellectual [Toynbee] and a champion of humanism – this was a different matter all together … [AGUS, p. 373] … Largely because of a 1917 Toynbee article that was a major contribution to shaping and propagating the pro-Zionist policy in Britain … [AGUS, p. 382] … his views were resented all the more because he wrote as one who belonged to the traditional friends of Israel.” [AGUS, p. 373]

Needless to say, most Jewish readers – fixated on their communal identity as victims, and victims only – typically react with indignant outrage to Toynbee’s “anti-Semitic” suggestion. “At the bar of history,” complains Marie Syrkin, former editor at the Zionist-oriented magazine, Midstream, “[Toynbee accuses that] the Jewish sufferer is not innocent.” Her line of argument against him then notes Toynbee’s only historical evidence for this accusation against the Maccabees to be Flavius Josephus (a Jewish apostate to the Romans), who is a standard source for much information about Jews in the Roman-ruled era. Josephus is afforded a lot of credibility by Jews on other subjects; he is in fact a
major reference for some of today’s Jewish polemical argument. His detailed accounts of the desert fortress of Massada, for example, and the 900 Jews who committed suicide rather than surrender to a Roman siege is considered to be a factual account and has become a beacon of pride for many modern Jews. The Massada story has become an important symbol in Zionist nationalist folklore.

The Jewish historian, Hannah Arendt, sides with Toynbee and takes his thesis of Jewish fanaticism even further:

“There is some truth in ‘enlightened’ assertions from Voltaire to Re-
nan to Taine that the Jews concept of chooseness, their identification of religion and nationality, their claim to an absolute position in history and a singled-out relationship with God, brought into Western civiliza-
tion an otherwise unknown element of fanaticism (inherited by Chris-
tianity with its claim to exclusive possession of Truth) on one side, and on the other an element of pride that was ‘dangerously close to its racial perversion.’” [ARENDT, p. 242]

The Chosen People tradition “so close to” that of “racial perversion” in dehumanizing others has been consciously usurped by others in recent centuries. As David Stannard notes:

“[In South Africa] the Afrikaner’s self-identification with the ancient Hebrews – with their own Great Trek regarded by them as a second Ex-
odus, combines with their own explication of the biblical story of Ham as meaning that black Africans were divinely ordained to be their serv-
ants – formed the theologically legitimizing core of the reprehensible doctrine of apartheid. Thus, the covenantal belief of the Ulster-Scots in their self-defined status as one of God’s predestined ‘elect’ peoples has served to justify their occupation of the promised land of Northern Ire-
land along with their historical persecutions of that land’s native Irish people. And thus, on one occasion (among many) that the Puritan set-
tlers of New England laid waste an entire neighboring nation with barely a pretext of provocation –shooting and stabbing to death every man, woman, and child that they could find – they wrote in justification that ‘sometimes the Scripture declare that women and children must perish with their parents,’ and notes that as Chosen People (alluding to Deu-
teronomy 20:16) the Lord had given them the Indian’s “land for an in-
heritance.”” [STANNARD, p. 194]

“Oliver Cromwell’s Joshua-like campaign against the Catholics of Ireland in the seventeenth century,” adds Scottish scholar Robert Carroll, “which led to bloody massacres of civilians, was inspired by the Bible.” [CARROLL, R., 1989, p. 159]

“In the ancient world,” says Robert Pfeiffer, “the Jews alone claimed theirs was the only true religion and that eventually it would conquer the world … the Jewish claim to practice the only true religion, which would be inherited by both Christians and Muslims and then turned against the Jews themselves, was entirely opposed … to the current attitudes of Greeks, Romans, and Eastern
peoples. None of them would condemn the others for worshipping … false and deceitful gods.” [MORAIS, p. 46-47]

A typical Jewish reaction to the likes of Toynbee and his criticism of Judaism’s fanaticism and the modern state of Israel, and certainly the disturbing evidence cited herein, is reflected in Oskar Rabinowicz’s entire volume against the British scholar, entitled Arnold Toynbee on Judaism and Zionism: A Critique. The author’s defensive tirade begins, from his very first sentence, with a justification of Zionism, but the core of his argument originates in the ethnocentric and exclusionist notion that it is absolutely forbidden for non-Jews to speak critically about Jews:

“Judaism rejects racial discrimination, exclusiveness, personal superiority claims, or earthly uniqueness … No outsider [to Jewry] has the right to tell the Jews … what they do or do not … believe in.” [RABINOWICZ, p. 66]

Modern Jewish American discourse about the Holocaust typically remains myopic, self-obsessed, and one-sided. It is what Jewish scholar Peter Novick calls “collective memory” (i.e., a kind of legend). “Collective memory …,” writes Novick, “is not just historical knowledge shared by a group. Indeed, collective memory is in crucial senses ahistorical, even anti-historical. To understand something historically is to be aware of its complexity, to have sufficient detachment to see it from multiple perspectives, to accept the ambiguities, including moral ambiguities of protagonists’ motives and behaviors. Collective memory simplifies; sees events from a single, committed perspective; is impatient with ambiguities of any kind; reduces events to mythic archetypes.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 3-4]

Because so much of the Jewish disaster occurred in Poland, this country is especially singled out for attack in Jewish polemic. “Over the last thirty years,” notes Lawrence Weinbaum,

“much of world Jewry has displayed a keener sense of hostility to Poland than to Germany itself. Poland, not Germany, is often seen as the ultimate place of evil … Part of the hostility to Poland is based on the entirely false impression that Germans chose occupied Poland as the venue for the death camps because they could court Polish cooperation in carrying out the Final Solution. Although there is no historical evidence to support this contention, it has gained very wide currency and credence … Careless references to ‘Polish extermination camps,’ rather than German or Nazi camps, also played a part in fostering this perception … Popular literature, not always based on objective scholarship, has also played a leading role in shaping the popular image of Poland. Novels (and subsequent film adaptations) by popular writers such as Leon Uris (Exodus, Mila 18, QBVII), Gerald Green (Holocaust), and others have done much to influence the way we think about Poland, and the
impression gained from these books has generally been negative. In such works Poles are often portrayed in a worse light than the Germans and it sometimes seems that the burden of guilt for the Holocaust has been shifted to the shoulders of the Poles.” [WEINBAUM, p. 7]

In 1982, Jewish American author Laurence Weschler noted that “over and over, prior to my Polish trip, I encountered sheer hatred [by Jews] of the country and its people, cold fury in reminiscences of the anti-Semitism that, it was claimed, pervaded Polish society in the years before and during the war.” [WESCHLER, p. 28] Thus prepared, Weschler was stunned to find that the Jews who actually live in Poland do not share Jewish-American mythologies about the place. As Weschler says, after a series of interviews with Jews in Poland:

“Over and over, I hear the same assertion from this man and his young Jewish friends, and they all give me substantially the same reasons for making it. What follows is, in all fairness, a simplification, but the basic premise is consistent: that the Poles have never been anti-Semitic at heart. They have always been highly nationalistic, a proud, suffering people deprived of and longing for their state. In the past, they were faced with a large Jewish population – a population whose very size proves the prior openness of the Polish people, and particularly of Polish nobility, to Jewish immigration. The Jews tended to keep to themselves, in ghettos of their own choosing. It is easy to understand how during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the highly nationalistic Poles might have conceived of these self-possessed Jews as aliens in their midst… During the late nineteenth century, according to this view, capitalism, a foreign import, came to Poland by way of the Germans and native Jews. Many of the most visible and most brutal large-scale enterprises – especially textile plants – were owned by Jews. ‘Polish resentment is understandable,’ I am told. During the twenties, this explanation goes on, the Poles finally achieved their state, but ten percent of the population was Jewish, and the Jews were still largely concentrated in self-contained communities in urban centers. Many people – both Poles and Jews – felt this presence to be troubling, at once alien and too large. Zionists had their Polish supporters. Other Jews, meanwhile, were active in the Communist Party and were devoted to the Soviet example – this in a country and among a people who had only recently thrown off Russian imperialist yoke.” [WESCHLER, p. 31-32]

Richard L. Rubenstein also notes that the

“Post-Holocaust awareness of the genocidal potential of anti-Semitism has also effected historical investigations often with distorting effect. Because of the objective innocence of the victims, Holocaust studies have tended to emphasize what was done to the Jews rather than those elements of conflict and competition between Jews and non-Jews that could have contributed to the tragedy … There has been a persistent tendency to treat hatred of Jews and Judaism as a form of moral and psychological pathology … Regrettably, the interactions, economic, po-
litical and social between the two communities, as distinct from the actions against Jews by Christians, are seldom dealt with in retrospective inquiries into the evolution of anti-Jewish ideas and policies.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 87]

Many Jews, like prominent polemicist Alan Dershowitz, completely overlook the suffering of the Polish people, their own history, their own culture, and their own nationality to obnoxiously proclaim that Poland (the site of most of the Nazi concentration camps) “can only [my emphasis] be a Jewish cemetery with no tombstone.” [DERSHOWITZ] What was the wider story of the sufferings in Europe during World War II? What was the context of the Holocaust? We all know what happened to the Jews; it is heralded everywhere. But what was happening to other people?

In the first two years of the German invasion of Poland, the ill-treatment of Poles was worse than Jews, so much that Poles would sometimes don the Nazi-enforced “Yellow star” marker for Jews to blend in with them. [LUCAS, p. 34-35] On August 22, 1939, Hitler declared the necessary killing “without pity or mercy all men, women, and children of Polish descent or language. Only in this way can we obtain the living space we need.” [GUMBOWSKI, p. 59] Hitler also planned that “the destruction of Poland is our primary task. The aim is not the arrival at a certain line but the annihilation of living forces … Be merciless! Be brutal! … The war is to be a war of annihilation.” [LUCAS, p. 4]

William Shirer writes that:

“Hitler … wanted … a Nazi-ruled Europe whose resources would be exploited for the profit of Germany, whose people would be made slaves of the German master race and whose ‘undesirable’ elements’ – above all, the Jews, but also many Slavs in the East, especially the intelligentsia among them – would be exterminated… The Jews and the Slavic peoples were the Untermenschen – subhumans. To Hitler they had no right to live, except as some of them, among the Slavs, might be needed to toil in the fields and the mines as slaves of their German masters. Not only were the great cities of the East, Moscow, Leningrad, and Warsaw, to be permanently erased but the culture of the Russians and Poles and other Slavs was to be stamped out and formal education denied them … As early as September 18, 1941, Hitler had specifically ordered that Leningrad was to be ‘wiped off the face of the earth.’ After being surrounded it was to be ‘razed to the ground’ by bombardment and bombing. Its population (three million) was to be destroyed with it. [SHIRER, p. 937]

As Charles Sydnor notes about the Nazi invasion of Russia, beginning on June 22, 1941:

“A three mile-wide strip of territory stretching the length of Eastern Europe from the Baltic Sea to the Carpathian Mountains erupted in a torrent of fire and flying steel as German aircraft, artillery, and armor blasted across the Soviet frontier. In the violence of its initial collision, the immensity and ferocity of its subsequent development, and the profligacy of its destruction of human life and resources, the German-Rus-
sian conflict transcended anything then in the human experience. To the men of the SS Totenkopfdivision, who were to fight exclusively against the Russians until the end of the war, the campaign became a grim crusade of extermination.” [SYDNOR, C., 1977, p. 138-139]

“The Poles,” concedes a rare Jewish author, Eva Hoffman, in the Nazi hierarchy, were next only to Jews and Gypsies in the order of inferior races – slated for complete subjugation and, in the more visionary Nazi plans, for eventual extermination.” [HOFFMAN, E., 1997, p. 6] “The Nazi leaders,” noted Jewish author Raphael Lemkin (the inventor of the term genocide,”), “had stated very bluntly their intent to wipe out the Poles, the Russians; to destroy demographically and culturally the French element in Alsace-Lorraine, The Slavonians in Carniola and Carinthia. They almost achieved their goal in exterminating the Jews and gypsies in Europe.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 100]

And as Richard Lukas notes about conquered Poland: “The genocidal policies of the Nazis resulted in the deaths of about as many Polish Gentiles as Polish Jews…. this [Polish Gentile] holocaust has been largely ignored because historians who have written on the subject of the Holocaust have chosen to interpret the tragedy in exclusivist terms – namely, the as the most tragic period in the history of the Jewish Diaspora. To them, the Holocaust was unique to Jews, and they therefore have had little or nothing to say about the nine million Gentiles, including three million Poles, who also perished in the greatest tragedy the world has ever known.” [LUKAS, p. ix] (In nearby Ukraine, notes Myron Kuropas, an estimated 14.5 million Ukrainians, including 600,000 Jews were lost… through deaths, deportations and evacuations. The war also destroyed over 700 Ukrainian cities and towns and some 28,000 villages.”) [KUROPAS, M., 1995]

Twenty million tablets of cyanide for the gas chambers were discovered after the war in Nazi storehouses, many times the numbers necessary to exterminate Jews only. At one gas chamber site – Kulmhof (Chelmo) – a group of 5,000 gypsies were among the first to be murdered. Others exterminated there included convoys of non-Jewish children from Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Russia (“These children were killed just as the Jews were”) and even a busload of nuns. [GAS, p. 91-92] At Buchenwald, 250 Gypsy children were the first to be gassed. [HANCOCK, p.55] Throughout the territory of German occupation, people of all nationalities, and specifically invalids, the sick, and homosexuals, were subject to institutionalized murder, by gas or otherwise. The last gas chamber murders at the Mauthausen site were 181 Austrians who were against the Nazi regime.

Nazi Germany had clearly stated policies concerning surrounding European countries and their inhabitants of Slavic descent:

“By October 15, 1940, Hitler had decided on the future of the Czechs, the first Slavic people he had conquered. One half of them were to be ‘assimilated,’ mostly by shipping them as slave laborers to Germany. The other half, ‘particularly’ the intelligentsia, were simply to be, in the words of a secret report on the subject, ‘eliminated.”’ [SHIRER, p. 938]
Nazi mistreatment of prisoners of war, particularly Russian Slavs, was notorious:

“Dr. Otto Brautigam, deputy leader of the Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories wrote … It is no longer a secret from friend or foe that hundreds of thousands of prisoners of war have died of hunger or cold in our camps…”

The conceptual dehumanization of the Slavic people by the Nazis was not far behind the portrayal of Jews. Jews, however, were believed to pose a greater immediate threat, an innately alien and antagonistic element within German society, dimensionally international, conceived to be far more powerful in influence than Poles. Jews were to be exterminated first in a “Final Solution,” the Slavs later, except those to be used as slaves.

“Martin Boorman, Hitler’s party secretary … wrote a long letter to Rosenberg [another Nazi official] … “The Slavs are to work for us. In so far as we don’t need them, they may die … The fertility of the Slavs is undesirable…. Education is dangerous… [SHIRER, p. 939] Chaim Kaplan, eventually murdered by the Nazis, noted the conditions for his maid after the German invasion: “When the Nazis confiscated our apartment, they permitted our Christian maid to remain. She is exempt from the Nazi Nuremberg laws, they raped her. After that they beat her so that she would reveal where I hid my money.” [KAPLAN, C., p. 46]

The Nazi occupation of Poland was intended to de-Polonize the entire country and reconstruct it in a Germanic image. Polish names of towns and places were torn down and replaced by German ones (exactly as the Jews of Israel have done in replacing Arabic geographical names with Hebrew ones). “Property in Poland belonging not only to Jews but to Poles was subject to confiscation without compensation.” [SHIRER, p. 944] “The planned deportation [of Poles to the Auschwitz concentration] camp,” says Franciszek Piper, head of the Historical Research Department of the Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau, “of tens of thousands of men, women, and children from the Zamosc region – foreseen as one of the first bridgeheads for Germanization in eastern Poland – demonstrated the Nazis’ goal of exterminating the Poles, which they only achieved to a small degree.” [PIPER, F., Political, p. 15]

Hideously monstrous medical experiments on Jews by sadistic Nazis is well known. But “Jews were not the only victims. The Nazi doctors also used Russian prisoners of war, Polish concentration camp inmates, women as well as men, and even Germans… At the Ravensbrueck concentration camp for women hundreds of Polish inmates – the ‘rabbit girls’ they were called – were given gas gangrene wounds while others were subjected to ‘experiments’ in bone grafting. At Dachau and Buchenwald gypsies were selected to see how long, and in what manner, they could live on salt water.” [SHIRER, p. 979] Priests were also tortured and experimented upon at Dachau. [GOLDBERG, M., H., 1979, p. 223]

There were grandiose medical visions for others who were not Jews: “An S.S. physician, Dr. Adolf Pokorny, wrote Himmler … that … the three million Bolsheviks now in German captivity should be sterilized.” [SHIRER, p. 979]
The suffering of millions of non-Jewish Poles, Czechs, Russians, Gypsies and other nationals and ethnics during the Holocaust era has been completely forgotten and overlooked in our own time. (Between December 1939 and August 1941, the Nazis even murdered 50,000 Germans – defined as “mentally sick” – with carbon dioxide gas in chambers disguised, like other mass murder sites, as showers. [ARENDT, p. 108] Among the murdered were even Germans who protested against the Nazi treatment of Jews – people like clergyman like Bernard Lichtenberg and philosopher Kurt Huber. [RUBENSTEIN, p 188-189] Even Auschwitz, the notorious concentration camp of Jewish Holocaust symbology, was instituted by sending to the gas chambers 300 Poles and 700 Russian prisoners of war. [LUCAS, p. 38]

The numbers always cited for people murdered at Auschwitz (and the Holocaust in general) are only guesses and estimates – citing this fragmentary document or that, and then presuming from there – and they vary widely. While Franciszek Piper claims 90% of those who died at Auschwitz were Jews, the Simon Wiesenthal Center has ascribed 2.5 million Jewish and 1.5 million non-Jewish dead to the place. Scholar Norman Davies echoes whatever he read that one-quarter of the Auschwitz dead were non-Jews. Whatever the case, Auschwitz has become the consummate symbol of Jewish suffering in the Holocaust and Judeo-centric discourse has completely appropriated the human misery of Auschwitz, the Holocaust, concentration camps in general, and the neglected whole of World War II as an ethnocentric pillar of their own specialized victimization.

As Polish/Lithuanian poet Czeslaw Milosz notes, “the meaning of the word Holocaust [has undergone] gradual modifications, so that the word begins to belong to the history of the Jews exclusively, as if among the victims there were not also millions of Poles, Russians, Ukrainians, and prisoners of other nationalities.” [LUKAS, p. ix] Unlike other European nations, underscores Milosz, “there was no collaboration between Poles and Nazis. There was no collaboration. This should be said clearly, because there was no Polish pseudo-government under the Nazis. The Polish population was treated by the Nazis as the next to be destroyed and the Poles knew that.” [MILOCZ, p. 37]

Although far fewer in numbers, the people most directly parallel to the Jewish situation in World War II were the Gypsies (Sinti and Romani). By any criteria, their own catastrophe alone under German fascism ruins modern Jewish claims to “Holocaust uniqueness.” There are numerous surviving documents attesting to Nazi policy of complete annihilation of Gypsies, including a memo from the Office of Racial Hygiene stating that “all Gypsies should be treated as hereditarily sick; the only solution is elimination.” [HANCOCK, p. 43]

Ian Hancock, a University of Texas professor and himself of Romani heritage, has struggled for years to call attention to the disaster that befell his people. “It is abundantly clear,” he says, “that some historians see only what they want to see, that a very blind eye is being turned in the direction of Gypsy history, and that when the Romani genocide in Nazi Germany is acknowledged, it
is kept, with few exceptions, carefully separated from the Jewish experience.” [HANCOCK, p. 40]

Hancock has discovered Jewish resistance to the intrusion of the Gypsy story on Jewish sacred turf to be widespread. Sometimes the undercurrent of Jewish exclusionism is revealed to be nakedly racist:

“The director of one Holocaust center referred to me as a troublemaker; another writer on the Holocaust called my discussion of the Romani case in the Jewish context ‘loathsome.’ A representative of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, whom I have never met, told a researcher who called to find out how to reach me that I was a ‘wild man.’ People have walked out when it was my turn to speak at conferences about the Porrajmos [the Gypsy “Holocaust”], and one former professor at the university where I teach adamantly refused even to mention Roma and Sinti in his regular course on the Holocaust. There is an element of racism evident in the Jewish response; after all, Gypsies are a ‘third world people of color’ … At one presentation I gave at a Hillel center, I was interrupted by a woman who leaped to her feet and angrily demanded why I was even comparing the Gypsy case to the Jewish case when Jews had given so much to the world and Gypsies were merely parasites and thieves. On another occasion a gentleman in the audience stood up and declared that he would never buy a book on the Holocaust written by a Gypsy.” [HANCOCK, p. 55-57]

(Adamant Jewish conviction of intrinsic superiority – and elitist distinction – over Gypsies is reflected in famous Jewish novelist Judith Krantz’s autobiography:

“‘I admire old tribes,’ said [a German baron], ‘I once traveled for weeks with Gypsies, and I found them fascinating. You realize Gypsies have a tradition as old as the Jews, don’t you?’ I confessed ignorance of Gypsy tradition, but the next day, as the baron and I sat at the airport, I said thoughtfully, ‘I’ve been thinking about the Gypsies and the Jews, and it seems to me that for better or worse, the Jews have given the world Einstein, Freud, Marx, and for that matter, Jesus Christ himself – but I can’t think of many Gypsies who’ve changed the world, can you?’ Even that bloody awful baron had to laugh and say, ‘Touche.’” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 306])

Among those few Jews who publicly supported the Gypsy’s struggles for attention to their own “Holocaust” history was famed “Nazi-hunter” Simon Wiesenthal. Wiesenthal once described the run-around he experienced at the Washington DC Holocaust Museum in his efforts to get a Gypsy on the museum thirty-member governing board. “I felt the attitude of the Holocaust Memorial Council to be unjust,” he said, “… I received a number of copies of other letters in which all kinds of people had approached [Council head Elie] Wiesel with the request that he should support the claim of the gypsies.”[WIESENTHAL, p. 222-223] Only after Wiesel left as head of the group was a Gypsy allowed to sit on the Council.
“The Nazis selected the Jews as their first candidates for annihilation,” notes Israeli Boas Evron, “but the Gypsies were extirpated with equal thoroughness and much larger and more ambitious plans were afoot for the enslavement and piecemeal extermination of the Slavs (Soviet losses during World War II are estimated at twenty-five million people, only a minority of whom were soldiers).” [EVRON, p. 51]

In 1999, in Atlanta, Georgia, Jewish-dominated Holocaust politics explicitly censored the Nazis’ mass murder of homosexuals. As the Atlanta Jewish Times notes

“The Georgia Holocaust Commission caused a rift with the city’s gay community. The commission made repeated headlines in January with the deletion of two paragraphs from a Holocaust teacher’s guide about gay and lesbian persecution. The incident triggered a confrontation between the gay community and the commission … The drama peaked with the forcible removal of gay activist Harry Knox from a commission meeting at [Jewish commission director Sylvia] Wygoda’s order.” [ATLANTA JEWISH TIMES, 6-18-99]

Jews commonly claim that 6 million of their numbers were exterminated in the Holocaust. “The ‘Six Million figure,’” notes Zev Garber and Bruce Zucker-man, “often invoked in characterizations of ‘The Holocaust,’ points out the problem of stressing [Jewish] uniqueness over commonality. The truth is that eleven million people were killed in the concentration camps. Nearly half of these are excluded in most characterizations of ‘The Holocaust,’ and this seems to imply that Gentile deaths are not as significant as Jewish deaths.” [GARBER, p. 208]

Wladyslaw Krajewski, another Jewish commentator, today still lives in Poland. He notes his own problems in dealing with uninformed western Jewry who seek confirmation of Jewish myth, a conviction of blanket Polish anti-Semitism, and not the truths of World War II:

“When my wife and I were in the United States [for a visit], we also had to argue with those who ascribe anti-Semitism to the Poles en bloc, to the [Polish] Home Army, and so on … In general, there is a prevalent stereotype among [non-Polish Jews] according to which they are always victims (as indeed they usually are). Many people in Israel, and more so in the United States, think that the terror was directed exclusively against the Jews during the German occupation [of Poland] (as indeed it was primarily directed against them). They are unwilling to believe it when they are told that large numbers of Poles also fell victim to German terror. They say that such people may have fought in the resistance movement or aided Jews, but that only the Jews (and perhaps the Gypsies) were persecuted without reason. Such judgments result in large part from ignorance (although no one admits to being ignorant). Such things are not said by the few Jews living in Poland, who are better informed about the German occupation of our country.” [KRAJEWSKI, W., p. 103-104]
Some scholars have suggested between four and five million Jewish deaths in the World War II years. Jewish scholars Gerald Reitlinger and Raul Hilberg, among others, estimate the number of Jewish dead to be between five and six million. They are all guesses and estimates. No one knows anywhere near with certainty an exact figure. No matter, all these sums are unfathomably staggering and the suffering incomprehensible. But rarely heard is the fact that the Nazis also exterminated up to 7 million Christians in these same death camps. For every two Jews executed there, suggests Jewish author Max Dimont, three Christians were slain too. Slavs and gypsies, Russian prisoners, the Polish clergy, the Polish resistance movement and its intelligentsia were also decimated.

15 to 20 million people were killed in Europe. [ENCY BRITT, p. 716] Three million Polish Jews died as a consequence of Adolf Hitler, as did three million Polish Christians. Three and a half million Soviet prisoners of war alone perished in Nazi captivity. Throughout the world, the number of people who died because of World War II is estimated to be a numbing 50-64 million human beings! [ENCY BRITT, 18, p. 716] Where are the monuments to them – humanity at-large, devoid of clan and tribe allegiances – a museum that affirms that every single life in that grisly pile was precious, sacred, and unique in human history. There is no such museum. There is no such monument. We never hear about them. There are only monuments to Jewish suffering. Why?

However pained Jews are for their own horrible losses, by the end of the twentieth century Jewish mourning had become a politic that is deaf to the screams of others. To view the atrocities of the Third Reich in the larger view as crimes against humanity do not serve the Zionist and nationalist principles of the Jewish state of Israel nor even the general Jewish religiously-inspired sense that they are somehow “different” than others: “chosen.” The fact remains that the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews did not occur in a velvet box protecting others from hideous injury. Violence and atrocity was everywhere, in every direction. It was war, a World War, and profoundly maniacal people were struggling to annihilate anyone not part of their racial and ideological clan. But Zionists and other Jews remind us – relentlessly and incessantly – only that the Nazis violated Jews on a profound scale, and ignore the rest of the festering agony of it all.

The Holocaust gave modern Israel final legitimization to be born. For the Zionists, Hitler conclusively proved that life in the Diaspora was precarious and that gentiles could not, in the long term, be trusted. In times of social upheaval, it was believed that Jews might again be scapegoated. The Holocaust effectively united Jews throughout the world in a way that race or religion couldn’t. It remains important to Zionists that the extermination of Jews in Europe be viewed myopically, distinct from all other phenomena, distinct from the extermination of all other people. All that mattered to Germany was Aryans. And all that matters to Israel – and its many Diaspora supporters – is Jews.

In 1979 the head of a Jewish-American delegation to Warsaw, Eli Wiesel, objected to the fact that Poles speak of World War II “victims in general … We speak of Jews. They mention all of the victims of every nationality, of every religion, and they refer to them en masse. We object … The Jews were murdered
because they were Jews, not because they were Poles … And so we told our Polish hosts: ‘If you forget the Jews, you will eventually forget the others. One always starts with the Jews.’” [LINENTHAL, p. 31] “It wasn’t enough to give [Poland] our parents and grandparents, our brothers and sisters,” complained another Jewish delegate, Lily Edelman, “… We also had to leave them a billion dollar tourist industry.” [LINENTHAL, p. 31]

Not only does Judeo-centric myopia and self-obsession singularly recognize, memorialize, and even celebrate, Jewish victimization in World War II. Not only are non-Jewish co-sufferers ignored; they are, worse, subject to scorn and attack for not “saving the Jews.” Many Jews even bitterly complain that the United States should have “done something more” to save their brethren, as if Jewish lives were more important, more innocent, than any of the millions of others who died. It is hard to imagine what such critics have in mind, when America was already engaged in the utmost act of aggression and violence against Germany: war.

The people who are most subject by Jews to insult, complaint, abuse, prejudicial stereotyping, and hatred – sometimes seemingly even more than the German Nazis themselves – are the Poles. Polish Christians are commonly accused by Jewish writers to have “handed Polish Jews over to the Nazis” and/or turned their backs from saving them. “Poles were indifferent to, if not supportive of, the ensuing Nazi massacre of the Jews,” charges Barry Rubin, in a very, very common Jewish slander, routinely glossing over the mutually desperate situations of Poland, Jews, and enormity of World War II.

Jews, after all, had for centuries positioned themselves as exploiters of the Polish peasantry, in league with the oppressive aristocracy. There was little love for Jews by the Polish people and Jewish reputations were terrible. A pre-war Polish nationalist party, the National Democratic Party, for instance, objected to Jewish influence in the country, that the Jewish ten percent of the population “constituted an alien element detrimental to national unity. It feared that the very high proportion of Jews in the professions (estimated at thirty per cent of the lawyers, doctors, architects, and so forth), the Jewish monopoly in retail trade and finance, and the avoidance by the Jews of physical labor in mines, factories, and on the land amounted to barring the way of poor Poles to social advancement.” [KORBANSKI, p. 18-19] Polish feelings about Jews in Poland based upon their historical relationship may be ascertained by some old Polish proverbs about them:

– The peasant gleans, the Lord squanders, the Jew profits.
– The Lord plots the ruin of the peasant with the Jews.
– One mountain will not meet another, but the gentry will always meet the Jew. [CALA]

With some exceptions among individuals, and with the exception of self-aggrandizing commercial concerns, Jewish communities largely functioned as insular, self-absorbed, elitist, and self-positioned “strangers” in Polish society. The gulf between Polish Christians and Jews was enormous. (In pre-Holocaust Poland the intermarriage rate between Poles and Jews was one per cent).
It was self-imposed by Jews from the earliest times of their stay in Poland, and echoed by their Polish neighbors. “Ethnocentrism,” notes Tadeusz Piotrowski, “was a two way street.” [PIOTROSKI, p. 38] Most Jews chose not to assimilate into Polish society whatsoever (many could not even speak Polish) and had few links of good will to the surrounding non-Jewish people.

“In prewar [World War II] Poland,” notes Wladyslaw Krajewski, a Polish Jew, “Of course, the majority of Jews did not regard themselves as Poles. Growing up for the most part in Jewish environments, they observed only the Jewish customs and religion, spoke only Yiddish at home, and generally spoke Polish poorly.” [KRAJEWSKI, W., p. 96-97] Norman Salsitz notes growing up in a Jewish community in a Polish town and discovering that “many” Jews didn’t even know what the Polish flag exactly looked like. [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 73] In 1936, Jewish voting patterns in Poland (in their self-governing kehillah organizations) revealed a 38 percent vote for the Bund party (a group emphasizing a Jewish, as opposed to Polish, identity), 36 percent vote for Zionist lists (the return to Israel group), and religious Orthodox (religiously anti-Gentile) and “middle-class” groups at about 23 percent. [GITELMAN, Z., 1997]

Whatever Jewish politics, Norman Salsitz notes that, like many Jewish communities in Poland, the 2,000 Jews in his hometown were “95 per cent … observant, pious people.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 140] This, we may fairly presume, would include all the separatist and anti-Gentile ideology that Orthodox Judaism entails. As far as my district goes,” noted Israeli professor Chone Shmeruk, in reflecting upon the Warsaw neighborhood where he grew up,

“it was exclusively Jewish. The only non-Jews there were the janitors who usually had small apartments near the entrance. Most of the Jewish residents spoke Yiddish … As far as Warsaw goes, a street like Karmelick, for instance, was exclusively Jewish. There was a Bund elementary school there with all classes taught in Yiddish. There was no Polish element there and contacts with Poles were few or none. I did not visit Polish homes and they did not visit mine. I did not really have any Polish friends. My friends from school or the courtyard were Jewish … When a Jew left the northern district, it was perhaps not like going to another city, but rather going somewhere unknown … If you went to a park it was to be a ‘Jewish park’ … There was a chasm between the Jewish and Polish districts in Warsaw.” [SHMERUK, p. 326-328]

Jewish self-segregation was the norm for most Jews of Eastern Europe. Raphael Patai notes the vast gulf between his Jewish grandparents in the Hungarian village of Pata (from about 1880 to 1920) and the non-Jews around them:

“My attention was focused on the almost complete separation that existed between the life forms of that Hasidic Orthodox Jewish family and the other five equally religious Jewish families of Pata, on the one hand, and those of the hundreds of Christian Hungarian families of the village, on the other … I received the distinct impression [from documents and
interviews with relatives] that the life of my grandfather and that of the Hungarian peasants of Pata had practically nothing in common … The contact between my grandparents and the peasants of the village was confined to the occasions when the latter stopped by [my grandparents’] store to make their small purchases. To this might be added the twice-daily trips my grandmother had to take to the village well until about 1902 [until they had a well dug on their property] … Apart from this, my grandfather lived entirely in the world of Jewish tradition, primarily that of the Talmud. He knew nothing of the cultural traditions of the Pata peasants … One reaches the conclusion that this Hungarian Jew lived in practically complete cultural isolation from his purely Hungarian environment.” [PATAI, R., 1971, p. 136-137]

Alan Levy notes famed Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal’s attitude towards his non-Jewish neighbors in Poland:

“Having lived among Poles from birth, grown up with them, and attended their schools, Simon knew that ‘to them we were always foreigners. Mutual understanding was out of the question. And even now that the Poles, too, had been enslaved and were next on Hitler’s list for extermination, nothing had changed: there were still barriers between us.’ Sometimes, this estrangement grew so strong that Simon ‘no longer even wanted to look at Poles. In spite of the conditions and the risks inside the [concentration] camp, I would have preferred to stay there. But I didn’t always have the choice.’ [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 42]

“Jewish separatism,” notes Jewish author Eva Hoffman about Poland, “was also an active choice, and it also had its consequences. It means that Jewish individuals and communities cultivated their own alienness, and that although they were willing to engage in contractual relations with the Poles, they did not wish to enter into a shared world with them.” [HOFFMAN, E., 1997, p. 63] The firm root of this Jewish separatism from Poles endures today. As Jewish American Victor Seidler noted in 2000:

“I know that my father had come from Warsaw but in no sense did I think of myself as ‘Polish’. … When I gave my lecture at the Polish Academy of Sciences, I was introduced as someone with Polish ancestry and I had to clarify that my family was Jewish.” [SEIDLER, V.J., 2000, p. 47]

Jewish revulsion for Christians in Poland, their classical disdain –even hatred – for them, and the Jewish enforcement of the huge gulf between Jews and Poles, is reflected in this account by the best known Jewish polemicist about the Holocaust, Elie Wiesel, here describing his childhood in Poland:

“[Christian] rituals held no interest for me; quite the contrary. I turned away from them. Whenever I met a priest I would avert my gaze and think of something else. Rather than walk in front of a church with its pointed and threatening belfry, I would cross the street. To see was as frightening as to be seen; I worried that a visual, physical link might be created between us … All I knew of Christians was its hate for my people [Jews]. Christians were more present in my imagination than
in my life. What did a Christian do when he was alone? What were his dreams made of? How did he use his time when he was not engaged in plotting against us?” [WIESEL, A Jew, p. 4-5]

In a novel Wiesel wrote, called *Dawn*, Sylvia Barack-Fishman notes a disturbing undercurrent, common – as we have seen – in the traditional Jewish worldview:

“Wiesel’s protagonist comes to the startling conclusion that Jews must learn ‘the art of hate’ in order to guarantee their physical survival. ‘Otherwise,’ he argues, ‘our future will only be an extension of the past.’” [BARACK-FISHMAN, p. 281]

Jewish “hate,” as we have seen, casts a wide net. Even a Roman Catholic priest, Maximilian Kolbe, canonized by the church and heroized in Poland for voluntarily dying at Auschwitz that another man might live, is dismissed by one Jewish magazine these days as the former editor of “a mass-circulation anti-Semitic Franciscan weekly.” [TOMASZEWSKI, p. 47]

Reflecting the tone of Jewish disdain for Christians, one of Jewish novelist Max Shulman’s characters in *Potatoes are Cheaper* declared that

“If [my mother] happened to see [a nun] on the street, she made a circle three times, said Shma Yisrael and ran to kill a chicken.” [NOVAK/WALDOKS, 1981, p. 96]

That isn’t really fiction. Moshe Rozdial reflects the usual Jewish polemic and apologetic about Jewish racism and hatred of those around them:

“If I could be really honest, growing up around holocaust survivors, especially grandparents who had been part of village life in Poland, my clearest memory of anything that relates to churches was the way my grandmother would spit three times, you know, tu! tu! tu!, like in *Fiddler on the Roof*, to ward off evil spirits, every time she would walk past a church steeple. The cross has really been more a burden to Jews, than for Christians to bear. For my Bubbe, my grandmother, it represented the wrath of Satan, swooping down on a helpless people when they were not vigilant to warding off the evil eye. She saw Nazism as just another version of Christianity, hoardes of Aryan barbarians, swooping down with their broken cross, to do the work that the church had laid the foundation for, for a thousand years. I remember walking down the street with my hand in hers, feeling that tug and knowing, almost instinctively that if I look up I’d see a cross atop a roof, as she reflexively crossed the street to avoid walking directly in front of the church. Muttering, Nevelah! Nevelah! Do you know what that means? The impurity of the dead. Any dead thing. Any dead thing, that by Jewish law, could not be touched in any way, so as not to be defiled by spiritual purity. That’s what Bubbe thought of the crucifix and ultimately, the church … She’d spit three times, more if she was in a dark mood, and walk out of her way to avoid the site. The dead Jew on the cross was a Nevelah to her, a presence that has always defiled her life, Jewish life. A symbol of death and human corruptness, to my people. I know it’s not politically correct to say these
things to you. We Jews are always watching our tongues, when it comes to Christianity.” [RODZIAL, M., WINTER 1999]

A yeshiva student, Rachmiel Frydeland, notes how it was growing up Jewish in the pre-war town of Chelm:

“I had no contacts with Christianity at all. On the way to school we passed a Roman Catholic church and a Russian Orthodox church, and we spat, pronouncing the words found in Deuteronomy 7:26, ... though shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it; for it is a cursed thing ... Why should we say such horrible words? The [Christian] people looked so pious. They came from surrounding villages to worship, and they never bothered us.” [FRYDLAND, p. 55]

Abraham Sterzer grew up within a Jewish life in Eastern Galicia. “Our rabbi,” he says, “insisted that we Jewish children spit on the ground and utter curses while passing near a cross, or whenever we encountered a Christian priest or religious procession. Our shopkeepers used to say that it was a Mitzvah (blessed deed) to cheat a Goy (gentile).” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 39] Anna Lanota recalled that her Jewish community in Poland “had a somewhat unfavourable attitude toward other nations – maybe even contemptuous. There prevailed the feeling that we were the chosen people.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 39]

The first prime minister of modern Israel, David Ben-Gurion, once recalled his childhood among non-Jewish children in Poland:

“Somebody would perhaps throw a stone, or start an argument, and very often it was the Jews who started first. We used to get the upper hand.” [KURZMAN, D., 1983, p. 50]

Jewish commentator Elias Tcherikower notes the nature of Jewish shtetl (Jewish community) culture in Eastern Europe:

“Jews were not regarded, nor did they regard themselves, as Russians or Poles who differed in religion and occupational concentrations from the majority population ... Jews constituted an autonomous, isolated, self-enclosed, and collectively responsible social entity. The goings-on in the outside world certainly impinged upon the Jewish community, but were regarded as being as the same order as natural events; most often, as natural catastrophes. There was, relatively speaking, little social interaction that mattered between Jew and non-Jew. What was of significance was what went on in the Jewish world, in the world of the shtetl... Above all, the shtetl was a community of rigid religious orthodoxy... The shtetl frame of reference was the Jewish community. Outside was the world of the goy, the alien ... Loyalty to this hostile, alien world was nonexistent.” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 4-6]

As Jewish Holocaust survivor Nechama Tec notes about traditional Jewish separatism, self-imposed estrangement from non-Jews, and resistance to assimilate into Polish culture (which had virtually insurmountable consequences when any Christian Pole sought, at constant risk of his or her life, to hide Jews from the Nazis):
“In 1939, of all the European countries, Poland had the highest concentration of Jews. They made up 10 per cent of the country population. As the largest community of Jews in Europe, Polish Jews were also the least assimilated. They looked, dressed, and behaved differently from Polish Christians … In prewar Poland, more than half the Jewish children attended special Jewish schools. Enrollment in religious school, in turn, discouraged mastery of the Polish language. Thus, in answer to a 1931 census inquiry, the overwhelming majority of Jews mentioned Yiddish as their native tongue (79 per cent) and only 12 percent gave Polish as their first language. The rest chose Hebrew. Jews and Poles lived in separate and different worlds, and their diverse experiences made for easy identification. It has been estimated that more than 80 percent of the Polish Jews were easily recognizable, while less than 10 percent could be considered assimilated.” [TEC, N., 1986, p. 12]

Jewish anthropologist Samuel Heilman notes that the Hasidic ultra-Orthodox literalist movement, founded in the eighteenth century, became the dominant Jewish world view in Eastern Europe. “In several generations,” he observes, “[the Hasidic movement] absorbed huge numbers – perhaps a majority – of the region Jews.” [Heilman refers here to the “region” of Eastern Europe, including Podolia, Volhynia, Galicia, Poland, Russia, and the Ukraine] [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 21] In 1992 Heilman wrote a book about the Hasids in Israel (whose ancestors were from Eastern Europe) and, even there, the following is the profoundly separatist and ethnocentric world view he found still reflected by 11- and 12-year olds in the Hasidic school system. Showing a school class a map of Israel,

“I asked each boy if he could tell me what lay to the east, the south, the north, and the west [of Israel], each time pointing my pencil to the area in case they did not know the bearings of the compass. Again, no one knew … Next I asked each boy to tell me the names of the surrounding countries, without necessarily specifying where they were in relation to Israel. In response, one boy began to list cities in Israel … Perhaps the most revealing answer came from one youngster who, in reply to the question of what bordered on Israel, confidently answered that Israel was surrounded by chutz la aretz. Chutz la aretz is the Hebrew expression that most Israelis use to refer to the rest of the world. Literally, it means outside of the Land (of Israel), abroad. In this boy mind the world was neatly divided. Just as there were goyim and Jews, so similarly there was Israel and chutz la aretz … It struck me that in the world they inhabited, the information I had asked them was simply not important. They had a different map of the world … The large territories were not Russia, Germany, or Poland. They were named after cities of importance to the hasidim of Zvil: Apta, Lublin, Mezerich, Berdichev, Chernobyl. Cities had become countries.” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 233]

Stephen Bloom 2001 book about an ultra-Orthodox Jewish enclave (the Chabad Lubavitchers, founded in Lithuania) in Postville, Iowa, give a clear example of what relations must have been like between many Jews and Poles and Eastern
Europe before the rise of the Nazis. Jews in the Iowa town don’t want to touch Gentiles [BLOOM, S., p. 96], they resist eye contact with them as they walk down the street [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 86], they have no knowledge or interest in Gentile life around them [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 114], they appeared “obnoxious and imperial” to local people, [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 161], they cheat local merchants [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 323], and they use oil in their candelabras because oil, which doesn’t mix with other liquid, symbolizes Jewish separateness from all others. [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 182] “Wherever we go,” one Chabad leader said, “we don’t adapt to the place or the people. It has always been like that and always will be like that. It’s the place and the people who have to adapt to us.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 209] “Postville people, by and large, were tolerant,” says Bloom, “… [But the Hasidic Jews] were downright rude. They seemed to go out of their way to be obnoxious, especially when it came to business dealings … At first, the locals welcomed the Jews, but even the simplest offer – a handshake, an invitation to afternoon tea – was spurned. The locals quickly discovered that the Jews wouldn’t even look at them. They refused to acknowledge even the presence of anyone not Jewish.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 48, 51]

As Norman Salsitz notes about his Jewish youth in Poland:

“Most Poles were devout Catholics, and we Jews followed in the path of orthodox Judaism. Poles who were Catholics were automatically Poles; Poles who were Jewish were never referred to as anything but Jews. In look, in dress, in behavior, there was usually no mistaking the Pole and the Jew. Then, too, Poles all spoke Polish, Jews mostly Yiddish … Acquaintances among Poles and Jews were common, indeed nearly inevitable in a town the [small] size of Kolbuszowa; but close friendships were practically nonexistent.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 242]

Another Jew who a survived World War II as a child in Poland, Yehuda Nir, notes that when the Nazis came it was in the best interests of his affluent family to pretend that they were non-Jewish Poles but

“we kept delaying our move to the Aryan world. Our hesitation reflected a fear of the unknown, an inability to project ourselves into the role of Christian Poles, Catholics. Although we had known many Catholics quite well and have lived with the Nowickis for almost a year [Nir doesn’t explain this: they lived in the same apartment building? In the same house? Why?], they were always seen as strangers, goyim, the people on the other side of the fence. We felt we didn’t know enough to fully identify with them, that at best we could only mimic them.” [NIR, Y., 1989, p. 31]

“The Poles never thought of us as Poles,” says prominent Yiddish novelist Isaac Bashevis Singer, “and we didn’t either.” [RUBIN, p. 192] Nonetheless, before the war, when Poland was still able to assert its nationalist will, on April 12, 1933, the German Ambassador to Warsaw, Hans Moltke, reported to his superiors that “the Polish foreign minister warned him that any retaliation against Polish Jews or any others of Polish extraction living in Germany would be met with dangerous Polish countermeasures.” [BLACK, p. 112]
Poland was invaded by the Nazi war machine in 1939 and totally overcome and decimated in a matter of weeks. The Nazi blitzkrieg consisted of 1,800,000 soldiers, 2,500 tanks, over 2,000 aircraft and naval warships. Three million Polish Christians died during World War II, a figure equal to that of Polish Jews who perished. 40% of the national wealth was destroyed, 10% of the non-Jewish population was killed. [BART. p. 16] How were Poles to save Jews when they had first to struggle for their own lives and families?

In 1989 Stephan Korbanski, the “last surviving leader of the Polish Underground State during German occupation,” wrote a book complaining that “the charges leveled by the Jews against the Poles for allegedly sharing responsibility for the Holocaust by not preventing the slaughter of the Jews are groundless, unfair, and slanderous. An individual or nation can be blamed for denying help which could be given, but not for failing to do the impossible.” [KORBANSKI, p. vii]

Korbanski notes that German ordinances declared the death penalty for anyone (and often his or her family) caught helping Jews and that, nonetheless, the Jewish Historic Institute in Warsaw has documented by name 343 Polish Christians (and 101 others who cannot be identified) who were murdered for helping Jews escape the Nazis. The Association of Former Political Prisoners, mostly inmates from Auschwitz, estimates the number of Poles murdered for helping Jews at 2,500 (the Maximilian Kolbe Foundation has identified by name 2,300 Poles). [KORBANSKI, p. 67] Famed Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal notes that an “incomplete list of Poles executed for sheltering Jews numbers 521 families.” [WIESENTHAL, 1989, p. 216]

The Jewish-American author Jerzy Kosinski wrote:

“My parents and I were saved by Poles. I was hidden and transferred from one place to another and that with my looks! I look … like the stereotype of a Jew on a Nazi poster.” [KORBANSKI]

Korbanski underscores the fact that all Polish secondary schools and colleges were closed by Nazi invaders, the Polish language was forbidden, libraries and book shops were burned, the Polish language press was outlawed, Polish cemeteries were destroyed, and everything Polish was renamed in German. “Only one church was left in each county; all others were burned or closed.” [KORBANSKI, p. 23] In the early days of the Nazi invasion, Polish priests, political leaders, landowners, officials, teachers, lawyers, and doctors were routinely executed. Many of those who escaped were sent to Polish concentration camps to die. In the town of Bydogoszcz, over 20,000 inhabitants were liquidated for their defenders role against the initial Nazi onslaught. 9,000 Poles were shot in the streets of Warsaw in one year alone. During Nazi occupation Poles were killed for “not getting off the sidewalk to make way for a German approaching,” for “illicit fishing, for slaughtering a pig for their own use, for stealing fruit from orchards, for riding a train without a ticket.” [KORBANSKI, p. 24] Ethnic Germans, indigenous to parts of multi-ethnic Poland, served as spies.

Even the Pole Jan Mosdorf, head of “a right wing organization of a nationalist and anti-Semitic character,” who was imprisoned at Auschwitz risked his
life to help – and sometimes save the lives of – Jewish prisoners. [SWIEBOCKI, p. 206] Mosdorf, said one Jewish prisoner, Mojzesz Maslanko, “had a big heart and helped Jews. I personally received a large amount of help from him, which perhaps decided my survival.” [SWIEBOCKI, p. 206] Mosdorf was executed by the Nazis in 1943.

Meanwhile, while the Poles were invaded and occupied from the West by Germany, communist Russia attacked from the East. Soviet occupation of Eastern Poland resulted in the confiscation of everything from banks to sawmills. Churches and other religious centers were closed or destroyed. Over a million Poles were deported, mostly to Asiatic Russia. Among the deportees, some 500,000 ended up in labor camps where many died. [BART. p. 18] Members of Poland religious and political infrastructure were executed; Korbanski notes that up to 100,000 Polish political prisoners were murdered by the Soviets by mid-1941.

Korbanski, as a leader of the Polish underground, and others began to report to the outside world what was happening in Poland, including the situation of the Jews. They even had a Jewish liaison in the Warsaw ghetto. Members of the Polish “Home Army” even made a number of attempts to blow up the walls and open the Jewish Warsaw ghetto, but were repelled by German defenses. [KORBANSKI, p. 57]

In a review of Korbanski book by David Engel, a Jewish professor at New York University, Korbanski first-hand account and perspective (and the suffering of the Polish people) were summed up with these last sentences:

“Mr. Korbanski will never have to deal with the problems raised by the book; he passed away shortly after it was released. How sad that the final work of a man with so much to his credit is a splenetic diatribe, falling at times far below acceptable scholarly standards to the level of gutter literature.” [ENGEL, A New Jewry p.]

This kind of arrogantly insulting attitude is not unique to Mr. Engler, but reflects an important current in post-Holocaust Jewish thinking. The “problems raised in the book” are not with Korbanski defense of the Polish people against continuous and relentless Jewish impugnation; it is with the likes of modern Judeo-centric propagandists like Engler.

What especially grates Engler the wrong way is this kind of comment from Korbanski:

“The [Jewish] consensus which emerged (in the early periods of Nazi occupation) was the unanimous belief that only total submission to all the Nazi orders and industrious work for the Germans might offer chances of survival until the end of the war. The [Jewish] watchword was: ‘This is not our war; it the war of the Poles against the Germans.’ All the Jewish problems were to be dealt with by the Jewish Council (Judenrat), headed by former Polish senator Adam Czerniakow and formed by Germany themselves. That doctrine of submissiveness remained in force for two years, during which the Jews in the ghetto did not ask the Poles for any help or weapons.” [KORBANSKI, p. 44]
The well-known Jewish historian of the Holocaust, Raul Hilberg, supports such a notion that “the reaction of the Jews [to the Nazis] is characterized by almost complete lack of resistance … [Jews] had learned (over 2,000 years) that they could avert danger and survive destruction by placating and appeasing their enemies.” [HILBERG, p. 662, 666] Well-known Jewish psychologist Bruno Bettelheim concurred:

“A certain kind of ghetto thinking has as its purpose the avoidance of taking direct action. It is a type of deadening of the senses and emotions … One can … degrade oneself so that one will be permitted to survive.” [HOROWITZ, p. 143]

A Nazi lieutenant and head of an execution squad wrote that “the execution of the Jews is simpler than that of the Gypsies. One must admit that the Jews go to their deaths very composedly; they remain very calm. The Gypsies, however, scream and wail and move about incessantly as soon as they get to the place of execution.” Desperate Gypsies were known to even use stale bread as last resort weapons. [HANCOCK, p. 48]

A Polish-Jewish historian in the Warsaw Ghetto, and eventual victim of the Nazis, Emmanuel Ringelblum, expressed bewilderment that Jews did nothing to resist their fate. “Jews,” he wrote in 1942, “were evacuated under a guard of Jewish policemen. Not one of them escaped, although all of them knew where and towards what they were going … One gendarme is sufficient to slaughter a whole town.” [BART., p. 19]

While Jews en masse simply acceded to their horrible fate, engendering the contempt and disdain of Poles, about 350,000 Poles sustained a continuous fight against the Nazis in underground resistance groups throughout Poland. Another 100,000 were members of the Polish Armed Forces in the West and by the end of the war the Poles constituted the fourth largest Allied army. And, unlike other European countries under German rule, there was never organizational Polish collaboration with the Nazis. [BART, p. 16]

“The Jews did nothing [to resist the Nazis],” says Wladyslaw Bartoszewski, “until they had nothing left to lose, when they started an uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto on April 19, 1943 and in Bialystok shortly afterwards.” [BARTOSZEWSKI, p. 20] The Warsaw Uprising is the cornerstone of modern Jewish/Israeli mythology about Jewish “resistance” to the Nazis in World War II. The last surviving member of the uprising, a doctor who never left Poland, Marek Edelman, has been visited by many Jewish delegations over the years who sought insights and details of the last stand of Warsaw besieged Jewry. “On several occasions,” notes Norman Davies, “[Edelman has recounted] his sense of dismay at numerous meetings with people who only want him to confirm their preoccupations. … Edelman [however] had made his terrible gaffe, Do you really think it can be called an uprising”? [DAVIES, p. 22]

Dow Marmur noted a visit by Edelman to Canada to give a talk to the Polish-Jewish Heritage Foundation, and the clash between Diaspora mythologies and those of first-hand experience in Poland. Edelman, says Marmur, was
“the last surviving member of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and, in that capacity, he has earned an important place in twentieth century Jewish history … He said relatively little about anti-Semitism in Poland, although he answered all the questions put to him. The reaction from Jews was often hostile. We wanted him to say something else and when he did not, we were furious and let him know it … I am pleading for a general effort to understand him and people like him; they are our fellow Jews, and his personal contribution to Jewish history surpasses that of all his Canadian opponents put together.” [MARMUR, p. 49]

Stephan Korbanski was central to Polish underground resistance activity and his perceptions are highly credible. As critic Engler himself concedes from his professorial armchair:

“[Korbanski] transmitted a number of radio messages to the West concerning the systematic murder of Polish Jewry … including the operation of the gas chambers at Auschwitz. Korbanski was also responsible for arranging the trial and execution of collaborators, including some of those who blackmailed Jews in hiding … In recognition of these activities, in 1980 he was honored by Yad Vashem as a Righteous Gentile …” [ENGLER, p.]

But Engler just doesn’t like Korbanski centrally located view of Polish affairs and that Poles have their own perspective of history. Korbanski indictment of Jewish communists of the secret police agencies in the post-war destruction of Poland is especially galling. Korbanski writes that

“To realize his plan of seizing total control of Poland, Stalin formed two teams: one to satisfy appearances and the Western Allies, the other to actually rule Poland. The first was headed by the Polish communist Warda Wasilewska and the other by Jacob Berman, who knew Stalin well. The choice of Berman was connected with his Jewish origins, which exonerated him from suspicion of Polish patriotism and advocacy of Poland independence. Stalin regarded the Jews as cosmopolites, whose loyalties would be to Zionism rather than the country of their residence … [KORBANSKI, p. 73]

The principal instrument of Berman power was his total control of the Ministry of State Security, which began – under Stalin instructions – to liquidate all centers of Polish opposition, often by simply murdering persons suspected of advocating Poland independence. [KORBANSKI, p. 74]

Jewish historians Pawel Korzec and Jean-Charles Szurek also “admit [that] the Jewish youth and proletariat played an important (although not exclusive) role in the apparatus of oppression.” [BARTOSZEWSKI, p. 18] One Jewish veteran, Wladyslaw Krajewski, of the earlier pre-World War II Communist Party (KPP), estimated that half of its leadership was of Jewish origin. [KRAJEWSKI, W., p. 94] With Jews representing about 10% of the Polish population that was mostly Catholic with relatively little interest in communism,” in the large cities the percentage of Jews in the [Communist Party] often exceeded 50 per cent
and in the smaller cities, frequently over 60 per cent. Given this background, [the] statement that in small cities like ours, almost all communists were Jews does not appear to be a gross exaggeration. [SCHATZ, p. 96]

In Warsaw about 65 per cent of the Communist membership was Jewish. In 1930 “Jews constituted 51 percent of the [Communist Union of Polish Youth], while ethnic Poles were only 19 percent. (The rest were Bylerussians and Ukrainians).” [SCHATZ, p. 96] In 1932 Jews were 90 percent of the International Organization for Help to Revolutionaries. [SCHATZ, p. 97] They were also 54 percent of the communist field leadership, 75 percent of its propagandists, and “occupied most of the seats” of the Central Committee of the Communist Workers Party and Communist Party of Poland. In pre-World War II Poland, many communist activists were jailed. Polish researcher Andrzej Zwolinski fond that “in Polish court proceedings against communists between 1927 and 1936, 10 percent of those accused were Polish Christians and 90 percent were Jews.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 36] [SCHATZ, p. 97] Not surprisingly, the formal positions of the Polish Communist Party included a “firm stand against anti-Semitism.” [SCHATZ, p. 100]

Furthermore, the symbology of three very high level Jewish officers – Minc, Berman, and Zambrowski – in the post-war oppressive Communist institutions, “became a lasting part of anti-Semitic vocabulary.” [SCHATZ, p. 206] “All three communist leaders who dominated Poland between 1948 and 1956, [Jacob] Berman, Boleslaw Bierut, and Hilary Minc, were Jews.” [MACDONALD, 1998, p. 63] As the Catholic Primate of Poland, Cardinal Hlond, noted in 1976, ethnic Polish anti-Jewish sentiment was now “due to the Jews who occupy leading positions in Poland government and endeavor to introduce a governmental structure that the majority of Poles do not wish to have.” [SCHATZ, p. 207]

Chaim Kaplan even noted with sarcasm in 1939 the Russian representative to the Nazis in a pre-war German-Soviet treaty: “Representatives of [the Nazis] former arch-enemy, the Bolshevik-Jewish government, are now guests in this zone and have been received with royal honors. The head of the Soviet delegation is a Jew, the Nazi friend Litvinov. When it is time to engage in politics, nobody cares about race.” [KAPLAN, C., p. 84]

Stephan Korbanski also notes that the Soviet Communist secret police “team assembled by Berman [whose brother Adolf was chairman of the Jewish Committee in Poland till 1947, when he immigrated to Israel] [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 85] at the beginning of his rule were all Jewish – Vice Minister Natan Grunsapau-Kikiel (Roman Romkowski) [who once interrogated Korbanski], and other high officials like General Julius Hibner (David Schwartz), Anatol Fejgin, security police chief Joseph Swiatlo, Joseph Rozanski (Goldberg), Colonel Czaplicki, and Zygmunt Okret. These were not the only Jewish officials who oppressed Poles in the name of communism. Victor Klosiewicz, a member of the Communist Council of State, has stated that it was unfortunate that all
the department directors in the Ministry of State were Jews. ” [KORBAN-SKI, p. 78]

“Jacek Rozanski,” notes Polish author Jacek Borkowicz, was “director of the Investigative Department of the Polish State Security Ministry” and was “sentenced in 1955 to five years imprisonment [a later trial in 1957 sentenced him to fifteen years]” for “using inadmissible means of persuasion during interrogations … Son of a prominent Warsaw Yiddish-language journalist (on the pro-Zionist Hajnt), Rozanski was a dedicated communist who maintained his Jewish identity until the end.” [BORKOWICZ, p. 343-344] “All the detainees described [Rozanski] as an exceptionally cynical and sadistic psychopath who liked to torture prisoners needlessly,” notes Jewish author Michael Checinski, “… Rozanski Jewish origin was then common knowledge, in spite of his Polandized name.” [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 80]

The aforementioned Anatol Fejgin was head of the “Tenth Department of the Polish State Security Ministry – the special unit answerable to the Party First Secretary and concerned with spying on the communist leadership [and he] was sentenced at the same trial in 1957 to twelve years imprisonment.” [BORKOWICZ, p. 344]

Jewish author Michael Checinski notes the post-World War II case of Semyon Davidov who

“held the relatively modest post of head of Soviet advisers in Poland. But no serious operational decisions on any question pertaining to political provocations or police terror could ever be taken without Davidov consent. On the one hand, Davidov and his personal network supervised the activities of the Soviet advisers in all the mainstays of real power in Poland (the armed forces, security service, party apparatus, state administration, and industry). But he also was responsible for overseeing the entire Polish apparatus of terror.” [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 51]

Abel Kainer (a pseudonym of Stanislaw Krajewski, a Polish Jew) adds that

“The archetype of the Jew during the first ten years of the Polish People Republic was generally perceived as an agent of the secret political police. It is true that under Bierut and Gomulka (prior to 1948) the key positions in the Ministry of State Security were held by Jews or persons of Jewish background. It is a fact which cannot be overlooked, little known in the West and seldom mentioned by the Jews of Poland. Both prefer to talk about Stalin anti-Semitism …. The machinations of communist terror functioned in Poland in a matter [sic] similar to that used in other communist ruled countries in Europe. What requires explanation is why it is operated by Jews. The reason was the political police, the base of communist rule, required personnel of unquestionable loyalty to communism. These were people who had joined the Party before the war and in Poland they were predominately Jewish. ” [KORBANSKI, p. 79]

“The feeling that Jews are oppressors probably sounds absurd to many west-
erners,” wrote Stanislaw Krajewski, under his own name. “The only sense it has
derives from the Jewish participation in the oppressive rule in Poland, and in
particular the fact that a lot of Jews looked favorably at the Soviet occupation
of eastern Poland in 1939.” [KRAJEWSKI, p. 50] Most Poles did not look favorably
at such a scenario. World War II was a struggle for them on two fronts – in
the West against the Nazi fascists, and in the East against the Russian communists.

Even a Jewish scholar/polemist like Robert Wistrich, who expresses aston-
ishment that one-third of West Germany after World War II still felt that anti-
Semitism was primarily caused by “Jewish characteristics,” concedes that

“After the Polish communist seizure of power in 1948 there were in-
deed a number of Jews like Jakob Berman, Hilary Minc, and Roman
Zambrowski, who did play key roles in the party, the security services,
and economic planning. No doubt they were considered by Moscow as
being less susceptible than the Catholic majority to Polish nationalist
feelings, though in the eyes of many Poles they were little better than
agents of a foreign, semi-colonial power … the anti-communist under-
ground was convinced that Jews were deliberately betraying Poland.”
[WISTRICH, AIE, p. 271]

In another, related, example of the usual sharp double standard of Jewish
morality and responsibility, in an article entitled, “Lithuania May Charge Jews
for Crimes Against Humanity,” in December 1997 the Jewish Telegraphic Agency
reported the Lithuanian response to a Jewish-lobbied letter by thirty United
States Congressmen to the president of Lithuania, insisting that he “put sus-
pected [World War II] criminals on trial.” Kazys Pednycia, the prosecutor gen-
eral of Lithuania, “alarmed local Jewish leaders” by announcing that his office
“would not only study the massacres of Jews committed by both Germans and
Lithuanians during the war, but also crimes committed by Jews against Lithua-
nians when the country was under Soviet control.” “Of course there were Jews
who suffered from Lithuanians,” said Pednycia, “But there were also just the
opposite cases, and we all know that.” “The presence of Jews in the Soviet secret
policie,” noted JTA reporter Lev Krichevsky, “has prompted many Lithuanians
to share the sentiments expressed by the prosecutor general.” The chairman of
the Jewish community in Lithuania, Simonas Alperavicius, responded to the
prosecutor comments about Jews by declaring them “absolutely false,” “non-
ethical,” and “historically wrong.” [KRISCHEVSKY, Lith, p. 16] In 2000,
Lithuanian requests for the extradition of Nahman Dushanski and Simion
Borkov from Israel, for the mass murder of Lithuanians during World War II,
were denied by the Jewish state. [MELMAN, 2-10-2000]

Jewish pre-eminence in communist terrorist police organizations in the
Ukraine was the same. A Canadian of Ukrainian descent, Lubomyr Prytulak,
notes a 1997 volume published in his homeland entitled The Jewish Conquest of
the Slavs. It was produced by Security Service of the Ukraine, today state police
agency. In tabulating the nationalities of 183 biographies in the volume of leading
officials in the terrorist Soviet secret police agencies (the dreaded Cheka-GPU-
NKVD), Prytulak notes, on average, about six out of ten such people were Jewish.
This percentage doesn’t include, of course, those who successfully hid their Jewish identities, a practice common in Eastern Europe. As Prytulak concludes,

“One possible reason that Jews incessantly paint the false image of themselves as victims of Ukrainians is because of the reality that Ukrainians have been among the foremost victims of Jews … A more thoughtful examination of the phenomenon of anti-Semitism reveals many reasons for viewing it — at least in some of its manifestations — not as an irrational and unexplainable and gratuitous hatred, but as a natural and understandable antipathy from an acquaintance with Jewish misbehavior.” [PRYTULAK]

Richard Rhodes notes the prominence of Bela Kun and other Jewish communist elite in Hungary, and future (Jewish) nuclear bomb scientist Edward Teller family there:

“The leaders of the Commune and many among its officials were Jewish … Max Teller warned his son that anti-Semitism was coming. Teller mother expressed her fears more vividly. Shiver at what my people are doing, she told her son’s governess in the heyday of the Commune. When this is over there will be a terrible revenge.” [RHODES, R., 1986, p. 111-112]

Bela Kun, notes Louis Rapoport,

“a Jew, [was] the cruel tyrant of the 1919 Communist revolution in Hungary and later Stalin chief of terror in the Crimea.” [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 56]

In Russia, the “home” of communism, the preeminence of Jews in oppressive state departments, including the terrorist secret police, and the enforced starving of millions, was the same. [See details — Genrikh Yagoda, head of the secret police; Lazar Kaganovich, head of the “Apparatus of Terror,” Jewish dominance of the Soviet concentration camp system, et al – earlier] As Richard Pipes notes: “Unlike the mass murder of Jews by the Nazis, every aspect which is known in sickening detail, even the general course of the Communist holocaust of 1918-1920 remains concealed.” [PIPES, R., 1990, p. 823]

The following observation is written by a Jewish author, Shmuel Ettinger, with the normal Jewish framing of Russian perception about the subject as irrationally anti-Semitic:

“There is a tendency in Russian intellectual circles” to view the Bolshevik Revolution as an essentially non-Russian phenomenon, which took place under the influence of the minority nations in the Russian empire, chiefly the Jews. There are those who regard the political terror as a phenomenon connected mainly with the Jews (this element is to be found in, or inferred from [Nobel laureate] Aleksander Solzhenitsyn, the [communist] oppositionist, and Valentin Kataev, the official writer). Such an attitude is also behind militant anti-Semitism, born in publicistic writings and in belles-lettres, portraying the Jews as plotters who, since Peter the Great, have sought to harm Russia and are now corrupting Soviet society.
In this manner anti-Jewish pogroms and measures in the past are presented as protests against exploitations." [ETTINGER, p. 21]

In communist Poland, according to Piniek Maka (a Jew), the Secretary of Security for Silesia, the number of Jewish officers in the dreaded OSS (the secret police organization) was 150 to 225 (as much as 75% of the total) – merely in his own jurisdiction. [SACH, p. 175] Another Jewish OSS officer, Barek Edelstein, estimated that 90% of the Jews of Kattowitz disguised themselves with Polish names. Josef Musial, the Vice Minister for Justice in Poland in 1990, suggested that most officers in the OSS throughout Poland had been Jewish. [SACK, p. 183]

In 1992, when Shlomo Morel, a Jew still living in Poland, was interrogated by Polish authorities who were looking into his past as the commandant of a post-World War II communist concentration camp for Germans and nationalist Poles, “Shlomo went home, wrote a cousin in Israel, asked him for $490, and the next month, in January 1992, took the first plane that he could to Tel Aviv,” leaving his Catholic wife behind. [SACH, p. 166] In an interview with Jewish journalist John Sack, Morel advised him that he must not write about the story of Jewish dominance and brutality in the OSS “because it would increase anti-Semitism.” [SACH, p. 169]

Surviving prisoners under Morel rein had testified that:
- “The commandant was Morel, a Hun in human form."
- “The commandant was Morel, a Schweinehund without equal."
- “The commandant, Morel, appeared. The clubs and the dog whips rained down on us. My nose was broken, and my ten nails were beaten blue. They later fell off.”
- “The commandant, Morel, arrived. I saw him with my own eyes kill many of my fellow prisoners.” [SACK, p. 167]

After World War II, writes Richard Lucas, “Jews in [Polish] cities and towns displayed Red flags to welcome Soviet troops, helped to disarm Polish soldiers, and filled administrative positions in Soviet-occupied Poland. One report estimated that seventy-five per cent of all the top administrative posts in the cities of Lwow, Bialystok, and Luck were in Jewish hands during Soviet occupation … The entire character of the University of Lwow changed during the Soviet occupation. Prior to the war, the percentage of students broke down as follows: Poles, 70 per cent; Ukrainians 15 per cent; Jews 15 per cent. After the Soviets, the percentage changed to 3 per cent, 12 per cent, and 85 per cent, respectively.” [LUCAS, p. 128]

“The evidence,” observed Jewish commentator Aleksander Smolar, “is overwhelming: large numbers of Jews welcomed the Soviet invasion, imprinting in Polish memory the image of Jewish crowds greeting the invading Red Army as their liberator.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 50] “Thousands of Polish survivors testimonies, memoirs, and works of history,” notes Polish scholar Tadeusz Piotrowski, “tell of Jewish celebrations, of Jewish harassment of Poles, of Jewish collaboration (denunciations, manhunts, and roundups of Poles for deportation), of Jewish brutality and cold-blooded executions, of Jewish pro-Soviet citizens
committees and militias, and of the high rates of Jews in the Soviet organs of oppression after the Soviet invasion of 1939.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 51]

Testimony to the Jewish Polish response to the Soviet invasion of Poland includes the following Jewish accounts, from the archives of the Yad Vashem Holocaust organization in Israel:

“When the Bolsheviks entered the Polish territories they displayed a great distrust of the Polish people, but with complete faith in the Jews … they filled all the administrative offices with Jews and also entrusted them with top level positions.” [from the town of Grodno]

“I must note that, from the very first, the majority of positions in the Soviet agencies were taken by Jews.” [from the town of Lwow] “The Russians rely mainly on the Jewish element in filling positions, segregating, naturally, the bourgeois from the proletariat.” [from the town of Zolkwia]

“A Jewish doctor recalled how local Jewish youths, having formed themselves into a komsomol, toured the countryside, smashing Catholic shrines.” [near the town of Jaworow]

“Whenever a [pro-Soviet] political march, or protest meeting, or some other sort of joyful event took place, the visual effect was always the same – Jews.” [from the town of Lwow] [PIOTROWSKI, p. 49 - As Piotrowski notes, these comments have been edited out of an English translation of the source volume, originally published in Polish]

“The victims of the reign of terror imposed by Stalin and carried out by his Jewish subordinates,” says Stephan Korbanski,

“during the first ten years of the war numbered tens of thousands. Most of them were Poles who had fought against the Germans in the resistance movement. The communists judged, quite correctly, that such Poles were the people most likely to oppose the Soviet rule and were therefore to be exterminated. The task was assigned to the Jews because they were thought to be free of Polish patriotism, which was the real enemy.” [KORBANSKI, p. 79]

Korbanski then goes on to name and detail 29 more Jewish officials (beyond the ones earlier mentioned) of the communist elite that held positions in suppressing Polish nationalism. But political winds in the communist world shifted drastically. Between 1967 and 1968 over 900 Jewish communist officials were purged from Kremlin ranks; Korbanski sees a direct link to Israel 1967 military victory over the Arabs. Russia had backed the Arabs and Jewish Russian loyalties – per Israel – were put into question. [KORBANSKI, p. 85]

“In places like Gleibwitz,” writes John Sack, “the Poles stood against the prison walls as Implementation tied them to big iron rings, said, Ready! Aim! Fire!, shot them, and told the Polish guards, Don’t talk about this. The guards, being Poles, weren’t pleased, but the Jacobs, Josefs, and Pinteks, the office brass [of the Office of State Security] stayed loyal to Stalin, for they thought of themselves as Jews, not as Polish patriots … Stalin … had hired all the Jews on Christmas Eve, 1943, and packed them into his Office of State Security, his
instrument in the People Republic of Poland. And now, 1945, the Poles went to war with the Office, shooting at Jews in Intelligence, Interrogation, and Imprisonment.” [SACK, p. 139]

All this, of course, including the Poles own struggle for survival under Nazi rule, the role of Jews in the brutal communist oppression of Polish nationalism, traditional self-imposed Jewish estrangement from Polish society, and Jewish docile acquiescence to Nazi rule is part of the unscholarly “gutter literature” that the likes of David Engel and mainstream Jewry speak.

In 1984, a Polish journalist, Teresa Toranska, had this interchange with Jacob Berman, the despised Jewish former “Minister of State Security” in post-war communist Poland:

Berman: “I was against too large a concentration of Jews in certain institutions … it wasn't the right thing to do and it was a necessary evil that we'd been forced into when we [communists] took power when the Polish intelligentsia was boycotting us…

Q: In 1948-49 you arrested members of the [Polish] Home Army Council of Aid to Jews, the Zegata … Mr. Berman! The security services who were all or nearly all Jews arrested Poles because they had saved Jews during the [Nazi] occupation, and you say the Poles are anti-Semites. That's not nice.

Berman: … It was wrong that that happened. Certainly it was wrong … It was a small group, but very dedicated, and it took enormous risks to look after Jews during the war.” [TORANSKA, p. 321]

Toranska also talked to Roman Werbel, a prominent Jewish communist ideologue and editor of major Polish communist journals, who discussed the implications of the brutality wrought by Jewish security officers upon Poles in fomenting anti-Semitism:

“Beating causes degradation not only in the person who is beaten, but in the person doing the beating as well. So it better to shoot someone than to beat him … There are principals you have to stick to in beating, however Johnny has to be beaten by Johnny and not Moshe … I can see now that there were too many Jews in the security services.” [TORANSKA, p. 109]

Jewish apologist Michael Checinski (whose world view of Poland is fed by the omnipresent anti-Semitism model, whereby even in the act of oppression of Poles, Jews are themselves considered victims of an anti-Jewish plot concocted by an anti-Semitic communist regime) argues that

“while by coincidence or evil design, Jewish officials were often placed in the most conspicuous posts; hence they could easily be blamed for all the regime crimes …[CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 62] … Jews – and especially those with Jewish names or striking Semitic features – could be placed in the most controversial posts (for example, those dealing with Church affairs or the campaign against the political underground) and thus deflect antiregime feelings into anti-Semitism. This policy was implemented not only in Poland, but throughout Eastern Europe, where
the new [communist] governments, ruling only with the military support of the Soviet army, were seen by their own peoples as puppets.”

[CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 63]

In 1999, the government of Poland was still seeking to try a Jewish woman, Helena Brus (now living in England), who in the post-World War II communist regime was Poland chief military prosecutor. Polish investigators, noted the Jerusalem Report, say “that Brus … played a key role in the trial and execution of a hero of the Polish resistance, General Emil Fieldorf … The anti-Communist Fieldorf, hanged after a one-day trial in 1953 but posthumously pardoned in 1989, was an intelligence officer in the underground Polish Home Army in World War II.” [WINNER, D., p. 37]

In 1994, the New York Times discussed the case against Marcel Reich-Ranicki, a well-known German Jewish literary critic who had emigrated from Poland. “He was forced to admit his involvement with the Polish secret police from 1944 to 1950,” says Carol Oppenheim, “after his name turned up on the front page of a Warsaw newspaper publishing excerpts from a secret Polish intelligence archive.” [OPPENHEIM, p. 39]

“Hundreds of Jews,” writes Jewish author John Sack, “were operating in all of Poland and Poland-administered Germany … [SACK, p. 6] … Many [officers of the OSS] were Jewish boys but few used Jewish names … [SACK, p. 39] … The talk was in Yiddish, mostly … About three out of four of the officers – two hundred rowdy boys – in the Office of State Security in Kattowitz [Poland large industrial city] were Jews … They used names like Stanislaw Niegoslawski, a name that belonged to a [Polish prisoner].” [SACH, p. 40]

There is a profoundly disturbing – and continuously recurring – Jewish moral double standard behind Jewish efforts nowadays to impugn the Poles, in order to shirk their own responsibility for Polish “anti-Semitism” and the terrible Jewish situation under the Nazis. Jewish propagandists/scholars regularly charge that Poles were immorally complacent during the Nazi extermination of European Jewry (as Poles themselves were being slaughtered). They are still looking, a half century later, for scapegoats for the shame of their own people. Few can face the extremely sensitive issue of Jewish complacency – and even active participation – in their own liquidation.

Stanislaw Krajewski, Jewish and still living in Poland, notes that the traditional separatist tenets of Judaism even engendered a willing acceptance of their push by the Nazis into the doomed Jewish ghetto of Warsaw: “The self-separating orthodox circles have been criticized for their cultivation of a ghetto mentality. How strong this mentality was may be seen from the fact that when the ghetto was established in German-occupied Warsaw in 1940 some Jews expressed satisfaction: at least Jews would be separated from the goyim [non-Jews].” [KRAJEWSKI, p. 15, CJ REL, no. 3, 87, pp. 8–25]

Chaim Kaplan notes the many Jews who had the chance to flee to Russia immediately after the Nazi invasion of Poland: “The so-called leaders of Jewry fled for their lives early and three million Jews have been left orphaned, abandoned to the claws of a cruel beast that knows no pity. Unorganized emigration to Soviet
Russia has therefore increased … In tens of thousands our youths flee to this Russia from the inferno waiting them under the rule of Nazism … Finally the Soviet government noticed them. True Bolshevism cannot live side by side with financiers, middlemen, black marketeers, exploiters, and extortionists. Didn’t Communism come to uproot all such things from the world?” [KAPLAN, C., p. 77]

The Israeli social critic Israel Shahak – who spent his own childhood in a Nazi concentration camp – notes with cynical irony the fact that so many Jews today express outrage that, as they see it, “the whole world stood by” as the Jews sunk into the Holocaust. Shahak severely points out that according to the double standard moral dictates of Orthodox Judaism, Jews are, incredibly, themselves forbidden from saving non-Jewish lives. Citing talmudic references, current rabbinical writings in modern Israel, and the great Jewish religious philosopher Maimonides, Shahak writes that “the basic talmudic principle is that (non-Jewish) lives must not be saved.” [SHAHAK, p. 80] “As for Gentiles,” wrote Maimonides, “with whom we are not at war … their death must not be caused, but it is forbidden to save them if they are at the point of death; for example, one of them is seen falling into the sea, he should not be rescued.” [SHAHAK, p. 80]

The profoundly divisive nightmare of Jewish-Polish relations under Nazi rule – each people terrorized into the basest struggle for self-survival – might be epitomized in the testimony of Z. Maszudro, immediately upon his liberation from the Buchenwald concentration camp:

“Then the gaze of the [Nazi] construction officer fell upon two Jews whose strength had given out. He ordered a Pole named Strzaka to bury the two men, who could hardly stand on their feet. Strzaka froze with horror and refused. The construction officer took the shovel and beat him with it. He ordered him, Lie down in the trench immediately! Thereupon he forced the two Jews to cover with dirt the prisoner lying in the trench. The two men did it out of fear for their lives, hoping to escape the same gruesome fate themselves. When only Strzaka head still peered out, the construction officer called, Halt, and had him pulled out again. Now the two Jews had to lie in the trench, and the construction officer again gave Strzaka the order to cover the two with dirt. Slowly the trench filled with dirt; one shovelful after another was dumped in. The face of the Polish comrade was contorted with terror … But the construction officer stood next to him with the look of a wild animal that hypnotizes its victims.” [HACKETT, p. 195]

A few Jewish scholars have surfaced over the years to lay the unpleasant story of the Jewish role in their own European extermination on the table. The Jewish historians Raul Hilberg and Hannah Arendt – both widely maligned and vilified by the mainstream Jewish community – were among the first to explore Jewish leaders and organizations that were used by, and cooperated with, the Nazis to betray and exterminate their own people.

Arendt notes that

“The Jewish Council of Elders were informed by Eichmann [a high-level Nazi administrator] or his men of how many Jews were needed to fit each
train, and they made out the list of deportees. The Jews registered filled out the innumerable forms, answered pages and pages of questionnaires regarding their property so that it could be seized the more easily; they then assembled at the collection points and boarded the trains. The few who tried to hide or escape were rounded up by a special Jewish police force.” [ARENDT, p. 102]

“The final rounding up of Jews in Berlin was … done entirely by a Jewish police force…. To a Jew this role of the Jewish leaders in the destruction of their own people is undoubtedly the darkest chapter of the whole dark story …” [ARENDT, p. 104]

“In the matter of cooperation, there was no distinction between the highly assimilated Jewish communities of the Central and Western Europe and the Yiddish-speaking masses of the East … Jewish officials could be trusted to compile the lists of persons and their property, to secure money from the deported to defray the expenses of their deportation and extermination … They distributed the Yellow Star badges…. In the Nazi-inspired, but not Nazi-dictated, manifestos that (Jewish leaders) issued, we still can sense how they enjoyed their new power.” [ARENDT, p. 105]

“[Nazi official] Eichmann mentioned, “says Arendt, “and there is no reason to not believe him, that there were Jews even among the ordinary S.S. men, but the Jewish origin of [important Nazis like] Heydrich, Milch, and others was a highly confidential matter.” [ARENDT, p. 178] Such commentary elicited a firestorm of outrage from fellow Jews, including attacks from the Anti-Defamation League and the World Jewish Congress. “Arendt was accused of virtual treason against her people,” says Jeffrey Isaac, “for effacing the line between the gulf between the guilt of the Nazis and the innocence of the Jews.” [ISAAC, p. 23]

Yet even as severe a critic of Arendt views as Zionist author Marie Syrkin concedes that “in regard to the evil role of the Jewish police there can be no dispute.” [SYRKIN, p. 191] And the Jewish leadership (the so-called Judenrat, the administrative Jewish Council) at-large under the Nazis? “Whatever the heavy sins of the Jewish Councils,” continues Syrkin, “let those certain they would have first chosen death for themselves and their families judge them.” [SYRKIN, p. 192] Fair enough. So why not accord this judgmental leeway and same moral standard to the Poles too, whose complete family unit was subject to instant execution for any individual caught helping a Jew?

“One of the most important historians of the Warsaw ghetto,” says Haim Breseeth, “[was] Emmanuel Ringelbaum. Writing about the Warsaw ghetto Judenrat, he criticized the co-opted leadership with the seminal words: We are going like lambs to the slaughter.” [BRESEETH, p. 195] Most Jewish leaders kept the horrible truth of what was in store for their people hidden from them, either for “humanitarian” reasons or fear of resultant panic and chaos. Arendt notes that Leo Baeck, for instance, the head rabbi of Berlin, “believed Jewish policemen would be more gentle and helpful and would make the ordeal easier (whereas in fact they were, of course, more brutal and corruptible, since so much more was at stake for them.”) [ARENDT, p.]
Which is to say, **their own skins.** “Everywhere,” notes Anthony Heilbut, “Amsterdam, Warsaw, Berlin, Budapest – it was the same. Jewish leaders compiled lists of persons and property, ecured money from the deportees to defray the expenses of their deportation and extermination, and organized the efficient evacuation of whole communities. On occasion the leaders even selected a few people to be saved – and those tended to be prominent Jews and functionaries.” [HEILBUT, p. 421] Earlier, complained Chaim Kaplan in 1939, “the Joint [a Jewish help organization] official representatives have all left us. The leaders of Polish Jewry pushed themselves to the fore in peaceful days when a monthly salary of 1200 zloty, equivalent to that of a senator or a deputy, attracted them; but in time of danger to us – and to them as well, if the truth be told – they fled for their lives. Will their sin be remembered on the Day of Reckoning? I doubt it.” [KAPLAN, C. p. 96]

Kaplan later wrote about conditions under the Nazis in the Warsaw Jewish ghetto in 1942, as he knew and experienced them:

“To go from one matter to another on the same subject – from the **Judenrat**, to the Nazis; that is, from the actions of one degenerate to those of another degenerate; they are both on the same ethical plane … There are lists of ‘suspects,’ and for everyone on the list the sentence is death … Sometimes the greedy Nazis conspire with some worthless Jew. They share one pocket; both lie in wait for the loot of innocents and for their blood; both fill their houses with the wealth they have stolen and robbed … But robbing doesn’t last forever, and when the partnership breaks up it is not convenient for the thieves Nazi to have a Jew know his secrets. The remedy for this is to get rid of him … Thus Perlmutter, the president of the **Judenrat** of Mlawa, was killed by his German overseer, whose hand had never left his while both of them looted and robbed and grew rich. And so it was with the Thirteen. (“A group of Jewish Gestapo informers headed by Abraham Gancwajch”) … They thought that they could live in the shadow of the Gestapo, that it was a special privilege to be close to an iniquitous, wicked regime. And behold – they have gotten their just deserts. Thus may they be destroyed!” [KAPLAN, C., p. 339-340]

Among the most notorious so-called “elders” of the Jewish community, appointed by the Nazis, was Mordechai Chaim Rumkowski, who was a child molester at a Jewish orphanage before the war. [LEITER, R., 7-20-2000, p. 27] Despite his allegiance to Nazi directors, he too met his end in a concentration camp. Some Jewish Council members, notes Simon Wiesenthal, “did the only thing they could, under the circumstances, by following Nazi regulations to the letter. Others were corrupted. They accepted favours, juggled names, hoping against hope that they might save their own skins. Other Jews collaborated with the Nazis of bartered others’ lives for their own. Some Jews were concentration camp trustees. Sometimes they helped their fellow inmates; sometimes they didn’t.” [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 85]

As long as such people in the Jewish leadership, its sycophants, and Jewish prisoners were cooperative with the Nazis in helping to exploit and kill other
Jews, there was always hope – rarely realized – that the betrayers might come out of it all alive. But just on this count alone – that the Nazi might kill anyone for as little as a sidewise glance, why should Poles – who had been in competitive conflict with Jews for centuries (while Jews maintained themselves as essentially a separate country in Poland), and who were actively fighting the Nazis while the Jews did virtually nothing – be held to a higher moral standard than Jews about Jews, when some Jews themselves sold off their own people with little or no moral compulsion at all, and despised Poles?! And why on earth should Poles have been expected to rescue Jews at every corner when their own life situations were also in doubt, when Jews themselves were even turning in their own kind, in huge numbers, primally straining for personal survival?

Jewish author Norman Salsitz noted three well-known Jewish betrayers to the Nazis in his small hometown, Kolubuszowa (total population 4,000; half Jewish), in Poland:

“Enemies there were among our own ranks – not many, mind you, but with nearly everyone else against us betrayal by fellow Jews was all the more devastating … When we saw [one] speaking to German police and going in and out of military headquarters, we understood that he enjoyed a privileged position … When bribes had to be given to German officials he served willingly as an intermediary, taking a portion of the money as his hare. He warned of upcoming raids on our houses and seizures of property and persons, but suggested how, for a sum of money, all might be averted. We paid him, suspecting that most of the time no such raids were planned, that such talk was merely a device to line his own pockets. But who could be sure? … Regarding a second informer in town, Shmul Czolik, no one was likely to be surprised by his actions … Money put into Czolik hand hands usually meant an end to that [Nazi] threat … That he terrorized the town for a time is certainly no understatement … Then there was Pearlman, a thoroughly contemptible creature who also joined in the ranks of the informers in town … Though Jewish, he identified his fortunes with the Germans.” [SALSITZ, N., 1992, p. 261-264]

Upon liberation of the concentration camp at Buchenwald, prisoner Jacob Rudinger told Allied interviewers of an incident that shocked him deeply. Near the end of the war,

“Senior block inmates decided to destroy the documents of all Jews since the SS [the elite Nazi killing corps] had threatened to force all Jews out of the camp [to their extermination] the next morning. The next morning the SS carried out roll call … They ordered all Jews to move to the left wing of the block. I explained to the two SS men that I had no documents to show who was a Jew and who was not. About 200 of the 400 Jews moved to the left wing … My room attendant and I were able to bring approximately 100 of the 200 Jews into the block again. Then something happened I would not have believed possible. A Jew approached an SS man and declared that there were still many Jews in the
block. The two SS men went back into the block and brought out approximately twenty more Jews.” [HACKETT, p. 325]

Jews could even betray their own over petty arguments. As Dana I. Alvi noted:

“In November, 1944, one of the Jewish women we saved argued with a group of Jews and brought the Germans who then killed 18 people, including her nephew and her elderly sister. One man survived … For us, and the Jews who passed through our home, the greatest fear was that someone from the [Jewish] ghetto would betray [us]. The names of Jewish traitors are a record in the history books authored by Jews. The photos of Jews being pulled out of their hidings in the ruins of the Warsaw ghetto are testimonials to such betrayals. No other people but their own Jewish acquaintances knew of those hidings.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 67]


There were even predators like Stella Goldschlag, also Jewish, who worked undercover for the Nazis searching for hiding Jews. “Stella,” notes Peter Wyden, who knew her, “had stalked fellow Jews throughout Berlin and betrayed them to the Gestapo which deported them to die in concentration camps. She functioned much like an executioner on behalf of the Fuhrer final solution of the Jewish problem.” [WYDEN, p. 17] Goldschlag survived the Nazi era and has been living – unlike former Gentile Nazi collaborators hunted down by international Jewry all over the world – an undisturbed life in Europe.

Even in the art world, the Jewish Wildenstein family (prominent European art dealers) have come under fire in recent years for evidence that they had undercover dealings with the Nazis. As the Jewish Week noted in 1999,

“The Wildensteins aren’t the first Jews to be accused of profiteering off Nazi plunder … Such incidents weren’t uncommon in the chaos of post-war Europe. Countless more cases have surfaced of Jews who worked for the Nazis to save their own skins.” [GOLDBERG, J. J., 6-18-99 p. 14]

Tadeusz Piotrowski notes the dimensions of the Jewish Holocaust little heard about these days:

“There were Jewish szmalcownik (blackmailers). There was a Gestapo-sponsored Jewish militia (Zagiew-Zydowska Gwardia Wolnoschi, or Jewish Guard of Liberty, led by Abraham Gancwajch) and the Society of Free Jews (Towarzystwo Wolnych Zydow, under Captain Lontski), whose members spied on the Jewish underground. There were the Jewish Gestapo brigades and Jewish Sonderkommando units. There was Jewish police force (Jupo). There were camp trusties. (Kapos), retrievers (Abholder), raiders (Ordner), stool pigeons (Spitzel), scouts (Fahnder), and catcher (Greifer) of Jewish descent … At his trial [prominent Nazi official] Adolf Eichmann testified that the Nazis regarded Jewish collaboration as the very cornerstone of their anti-Semitic policy.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 66]
By the beginning of 1942, the Gestapo-directed Zagiew alone had about 15,000 Jewish agents. [PIOTROWSKI, p. 74] “Former inmates of the Nazi concentration camps,” adds Norman Finkelstein, “typically testify that the Kapos were, in the words of Auschwitz survivor Dr. Viktor E. Frankl, harder on the prisoners than were the guards, and beat them more cruelly than the SS men did.” [FINKELSTEIN, N., 1998, p. 63-64] (For what it’s worth, although of enormously less gravity, this harsh treatment in some ways echoes that afforded fellow Jews by Jewish overseers in an immigration barracks in America in 1882: “The Father, or manager and taskmaster over the immigrants, was an American Jew who looked down upon the earthly beings, as the immigrants were called and not in a friendly tone. His assistant, the Hungarian Jew, was a brazen scoundrel and treated the immigrants like cattle. The other Russian Jews, who through flattery managed to secure soft jobs, imitated them in behavior ... [Leading to a an eventual riot of Jewish immigrants that was quelled by 100 policemen], the Father’s assistant slapped a weak woman who had implored him [to give her] several drops of a certain medicine. He also threatened her lady friends with a revolver when they reprimanded him. After breakfast, a delegation went to see the Father with complaints agaisnt his assistant, but the latter gave them a rude reception. “) [SHPALL, L., 1957, p. 103, 107, 108]

Emmanuel Ringelbaum wrote with disdain about the Jewish police who suffocated his people under Nazi rule:

“Jewish policemen also distinguished themselves with their fearful corruption and immorality. But they reached the height of viciousness during the resettlement [transfer of Jews to concentration camps]. They said not a single word of protest against this revolting assignment to lead their own brothers to the slaughter. The police were psychologically prepared for the dirty work and executed it thoroughly. And now people are wracking their brains to understand how Jews, most of them men of culture, former lawyers (most of the police officers were lawyers before the war), could have done away with their brothers with their own hands ... Very often, the cruelty of the Jewish police exceeded that of the Germans, Ukrainians, and Letts... Victims who succeeded in escaping the German eye were picked up by the Jewish police ... Those who didn’t have the money to pay off the police were dragged to the wagons ... For the most part, the Jewish police showed an incomprehensible brutality ... Merciless and violent, they beat those who tried to resist ... Every Warsaw Jew, every woman and child, can cite thousands of cases of the inhuman cruelty and violence of the Jewish police. Those cases will never be forgotten by the survivors, and they must shall be paid for.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 68]

Israeli human rights activists, and Holocaust survivor, Israel Shahak, notes that

“My memories (and memories of all survivors who are honestly talking among themselves) tell me that at the time [of the war] we Jews hat-
ed the Jewish policemen, or the Jewish spies for the Nazis in the Ghetto, much more than we hated anybody else.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 75]

Holocaust survivor Marcus David Leuchter recalls that “the brutality of the Jewish police force was unexpected; in the number of people they caught, they even exceeded the demands of the Germans.” [LEUCHTER, M., 2000]

Of course, times have changed and things are recontextualized. Such stories are a grotesque embarrassment to the myths of the Holocaust, they are only rarely addressed in obscure academic corners, and few people today are aware of them. And while angry Jewish scholarship fingers Polish, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, and other Nazi collaborators as moral beasts to be hunted down still today throughout the world, parallel Jewish criminals are never even mentioned. Popular Jewish convention demands collective Jewish innocence and a correspondingly collective Gentile evil. Period. In this context, Wladyslaw Bartoszewski addresses today chronic double standard held for Jews and Poles in the World War II situation:

“While the Polish masses are criticized or condemned for their reluctance to help the Jews … a double standard is applied towards those members of the Jewish community who worked in Jewish Councils … [They] are excused, on the grounds that they had little choice, much more willingly than those Gentiles whose caution or fear prevented them from offering help to Jews … Most Poles particularly resent this application of a double standard to those Jewish individuals who were active in, and high-ranking members of the Communist Party, and especially the security police … No one … can claim that he or (very often) she had to be a member of the Stalinist political force or judiciary and, for one reason or another, had no choice but to torture and kill their innocent political opponents.” [BARTO, Conv, p. 29]

Still another Jewish enforced double standard of moral judgment is that going on today in today Czech Republic. As Carol Oppenheim notes, there is “the struggle in the Czech Republic by Jews and Sudenten Germans for legal restoration of homes that they were pushed out of almost fifty years ago. Germans are challenging the [Czech] government over a law that gives homes back to Jews making claims but refuses to consider the claims of Sudenten Germans for houses taken between 1945 and 1948, the very period when Jews figured prominently in the [then ruling] communist administration.” [OPPENHEIM, p. 39]

Despite all the historical conflicts between Poles and Jews, some Poles did rescue Jews from the Nazis. Some Poles did die for basic human principles. In fact, more than 2,500 Christian Poles were executed for aiding Jews. [CERAMI] Over 2,000 Polish Christian citizens are honored as Righteous Gentiles at Israel Vad Yashem. (This does not include the many that cannot be formally documented). “Every Polish Jew who survived in occupied Poland,” notes Eva Hoffman, “(rather than in the Soviet Union), did so with the help of individual Poles and of organizations set up for the purpose of aiding Jews. This was help offered at enormous risk, since sheltering Jews carried with it the penalty of death.”
But few Jews don’t want to hear about Christians who saved Jewish lives. Rabbi Harold Schulweiss, who has lectured on the subject to many Jewish audiences, notes that: “By and large, in most audiences, I found a resistance to my message. What was my obsession with them [Poles] they seemed to ask.” [CERAMI] (Even Liwa Gomulka, a Jew, and eventual wife of post-World War II Polish communist head Wladyslaw Gomulka, “refused to see an old Polish woman who had hidden her during the Nazi occupation and had come to her for some small favor.”) [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 143]

So where were the Jews, before things got worse for them, who saved a Polish life, in any way in those times? Where is just one? As Norman Davies notes, “to ask why the Poles did little to help the Jews is rather like asking why the Jews did nothing to assist the Poles.” [DAVIES, Playground, p. 264] And it was not the Poles who, in the end, were performing the absolutely unthinkable. If Poles and others are collectively held responsible for what they did, or did not do, under Nazi occupation and enforcement, what about the following? As Hannah Arendt observes:

“The actual work of killing in the extermination centers was usually in the hands of Jewish commandos … They … worked in the gas chambers and the crematories … they pulled the gold teeth and cut the hair of the corpses … they dug the graves and, later, dug them up again to extinguish the traces of mass murder … Jewish technicians had built the gas chambers at Theresienstadt, where the Jewish “autonomy” had been carried so far that even the hangman was a Jew.” [ARENDT, p. 109]

Wolfgang Sofsky observes that this was part of the Nazi process to dehumanize Jews:

“The SS deliberately had Jews burn Jews, as though it wished to prove that the members of the subrace accepted any degradation and even killed one another: as though it wished to shift the guilt onto the victims themselves … Those prisoners were left alive for a time in order to dispose of relatives, neighbors, and fellow Jews. Their behavior cannot be judged by the conventional moral conceptions of civil society. The institution of the sonderkommando shows to what point human beings can be brought by permanent threat of death … The Kommandos were subordinated to Jewish Kapos, who had unlimited power to mete out punishment.” [SOFSKY, W., 1993, p. 267-268]

Jews are automatically excused from the unspeakable horrors they were forced to do in their struggles for survival, and who can morally condemn them? Who among us today can swear with absolute certainty that we would not have done the same when trapped in Hell? But why the double standard? Why are only Jews, among all other people trapped in the Nazi net, afforded blanket forgiveness while everyone else stands relentlessly, to this very day, accused?

Germany, says Richard Rubenstein, “demonstrated that a modern state can successfully organize an entire people for its own extermination.” [ELLIS, M. 1990, p. 39] “Over the whole way to their deaths,” says Robert Pendorf, “the Pol-
ish Jews got to see hardly more than a handful of Germans.” [ARENDT, p. 117] “Prisoners from a special work detail, the so-called sonderkommando,” notes Franciszek Piper, “had to perform all the auxiliary work: removing bodies from gas chambers, cutting the hair, tearing out gold teeth, and burying corpses. The sonderkommando consisted mainly of Jewish prisoners originating from the countries from which the latest transports were arriving.” [PIPER, The Mass, p. 169] Literary agent Barbara Rogan recalls moving to Israel and reading a manuscript submitted by a former Jewish sonderkommando, who – among other things he did to survive – burned concentration camp bodies. “What fixes the book in my mind,” says Rogan, “… [was] his attempt to deal with overwhelming, abiding guilt … someone ought to have published it, but as far as I know, no one has.” [ROGAN, p. 320]

At the peak of the Auschwitz murder process, there were nearly 1,000 Jewish sonderkommandos – 450 from Hungary, 200 from Poland, and 180 from Greece. They were overseen in the hierarchy by 19 Russian prisoners of war, five Poles, and a German kapo. [SOFSKY, W., 1993, p. 268] Wherever they were in the hierarchy of death, all were subject to immediate execution if they refused to fulfill their assigned role in mass murder under the Nazis. At the Treblinka concentration camp, about a thousand Jewish sonderkommandos ran the daily routines. [De Beauvoir, S., 1967, p. 8] The Totenjuden (“Jews of Death”) were “those who handled the bodies, those who took them out of gas chambers, extracted their teeth, and carried them to the ditches.” The Platzjuden (“Jews of the Square”) were in charge of “herding the Jews out of the cars, collecting their baggage, and clearing the cars.” Another group of Platzjuden task was to aid “these convoys undress and to carry their clothing into the sorting square … The world of these two commandos obviously had an indelicate side, since they participated directly in the final process of liquidation.” The Goldjuden sorted out valuables and “subjected [new arrivals] to an intimate search.” Hofjuden (“Court Jews”) were involved in the “upkeep of the camp and the personal service of the Technicians [Nazi overseers].” [STEINER, J., 1967, p. 92-95]

At Auschwitz, Nazi doctor Carl Clauberg performed experiments on Jewish female prisoners. “His medical and nursing staff,” notes Irene Strzelecka, “consisted mainly of female Jewish prisoners.” Beginning in late 1943, his head doctor was “surgeon and gynecologist Alina Bialostocka,” a Polish Jew. [STRZELECKA, p. 90] Another Jewish doctor, Maximilian Samuels, was among those who performed castration experiments on male prisoners [STRZELECKA, p. 93] and “Jewish prisoners had to assist [Nazi doctor] Mengele in his scientific research on twins.” [STRZELECKA, p. 96] Another Jewish doctor, Miklos Nyiszli, was one of those “who would carry out autopsies [of those murdered in Nazi experiments] and give their scientific appraisals.” [STRZELECKA, p. 96]

“In the women camp at Birkenau,” notes Wolfgang Sofsky, “along with the German Asoziale [asocials], for the most part prostitutes, the ranks of the prominent prisoners included the small number of Jewish women from Slovakia who had … survived a series of selections. In Monowitz and the attached satellite
camps, several hundred Jews from the first transport were part of the [prisoner] aristocracy, along with German prisoners.” [SOFSKY, W., 1993, p. 147]

In 1987 a former Jewish kapo (a kind of foreman for the Nazis among prisoners), Jacob Tannenbaum, faced deportation from the United States for brutality in concentration camps. He was accused by fellow Jewish concentration camp survivors of ordering 300 Jews to their deaths in 1945, for raping women, and torturing and killing male prisoners, including a rabbi. “He was a nasty, nasty guy,” said a former head of the Office of Special Investigations, Martin Mendelsohn, “There were a lot of witnesses who remembered him and his bestiality.” [MAGIDA, p. 4] Yet, notes the Jewish Week, “most [Jews] agreed, in the words of Elie Wiesel, Auschwitz survivor and Nobel Peace Prize winner, that the kapos were victims. They were chosen by their enemies. It is true that some were very, very cruel, but even those were acting as instruments of the enemy.” [BOROSON, 5-22-87, p. 17] Tannenbaum was eventually stripped of U.S. citizenship, but not deported. “This is the best solution for all concerned,” said Tannenbaum lawyer, Elihu Massel, “It will also avoid a truly ghastly trial in which Jews would have had to testify against Jews, none of whom really want to remember.” [JW, 2-12-88, p. 34]

Famed Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal notes the case of an “ex-Gestapo agent named David Zimet – a Jew!” Zimet was “the right hand of a very known Gestapo sadist with the name of Grunov ... In one truck of Jewish women [deported by the Nazis] were the wife and the daughter of Zimet. And the hatred against him was so great that the Jewish women in that truck taking them all to die killed his wife and his daughter then and there’ ... Years later, Wiesenthal was looking over a confidential list of cases being investigated by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police when he read: ‘ZIMET, David. A policeman in ghetto in Tarnow. Witnesses have attested to his brutality.' ‘Zimet!’ Wiesenthal exclaimed. ‘This is my old case!’ He informed the Canadian authorities of his evidence against Zimet, but they proved unwilling to prosecute a Jew for Nazi crimes. The Canadian Jewish Committee intervened and Zimet agreed to submit to a council of arbitration established by the committee. ‘Nothing ever came of it,’ says Wisesenthal, ‘because the Jewish community was reluctant to publicize the case since Zimet was himself Jewish.” [LEVY, A., 1993, p, 83, 84]

(As Jewish scholar Peter Novak notes about Jewish collaborators with the Nazis: “With only one exception known to me – an article in Life in 1950 about a New York rabbinic court proceeding against a surviving Jewish camp official accused of beating another person to death – discussion of the phenomenon was confined to Jews. Much of [Jewish scholar Hannah] Arendt offense [to fellow Jews] was that she had written of these matters before a large gentile audience.” ) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 140-141]

“The true lords and masters of the kommandos were the kapos,” notes Wolfgang Slofsky, in his study of the Nazi death camps, “They were always on hand ... They kept the work sites under surveillance, distributed work tasks, and were responsible for their groups being complete ... They were to blame for a great deal of excessive
drudgery and a great many of the killings … [SOFSKY, p. 192] … Kapos shouted louder than the guards and were quicker to swing their clubs and strut around like petty potentates, reading on their masters lips their every wish. At times, a symbiotic relationship developed between masters and servants. The supervisors hardly needed to take action themselves: they were able to leave everything to their servile lackies … Often there was no real need for a gesture from the master – the servants took the initiative on their own … They imitated the master because the latter would never punish what the master did. They acted like their master in order to remain what they were – privileged prisoners. They followed this model in order to survive.” [SOFSKY, 1993, p. 137]

The authors of articles that dare to discuss the Jewish Councils that functioned as bureaucracies for Nazi overseers, notes Polish scholar Piotr Wrobel, “have been accused of slander, ignorance or even anti-Semitism …” [WROBEL, P., 1997, p. 225] Wrobel own article in 1997 addressed the profound double standard applied to Jews on the question of Jewish responsibility during the Holocaust epoch. In Holland, for example, two presidents of the Dutch Joodse Raad, Cohen and Asscher, “were arrested by Dutch authorities. The prosecuting attorney stated that Cohen and Asscher, as Jews, collaborated with the enemy, and shall not see the light of freedom. Eventually, the Dutch Miniser of Justice decided to drop the case, adding that this should not be construed as a rehabilitation of the party in question. “ [WROBEL, P., 1997, p. 227]

Under post-war Jewish “Courts of Honor,” which tried Jewish collaborators with the Nazis, notes Wrobel, “punishment tended to be lenient … Altogether, between 1946 and 1950, there were about 160 trials of former members of the Jewish Councils, their officers, Jewish policemen and kapos … According to its governing statute, the Court could pass only relatively mild sentences: exclusion from the Jewish community for a period of time from one to three years, withholding someone electoral rights in a Jewish community, and public reproach … It appears that major Jewish collaborators, who managed to survive, left Poland very soon after the war or changed their identities and the People Court tried only a small fraction of them.” [WROBEL, P., 1997, p. 228-230]

And Wrobel perspectives about all this, as a Pole, and the incessant Jewish condemnation of the Polish people for an alleged reluctance to save Jews? “How can non-Jewish bystanders,” concludes Wrobel, “be condemned for their passivity when Jewish Kapos, policemen, and former Judenrate leaders were rehabilitated? Many similar questions appear when we study the Holocaust and most of them have no satisfactory answer yet. This aspect of the Holocaust is still far from settled.” [WROBEL, P., 1997, 232]

There are even more profound Holocaust-era facts that the Jewish community vehemently strives to bury. While on the one hand the Jewish community wields the “We Shall Never Forget” injunction about their Holocaust, the facts
of Jewish-created mass murder are forcibly covered up. In 1993, for instance, Jewish journalist John Sack published the results of his interviews with 23 Jewish OSS (the communist secret police in post-war Poland) officers and 55 family members or friends of Jewish members of the dreaded OSS. The book, not surprisingly, has been subject to a concerted and massive censorial effort [see later chapter]. Sack was shocked with what he found in his seven years of research on the subject: 60,000-80,000 Germans and Poles were murdered in Jewish-run concentration camps, “more than the number of [Jews] who died at Belsen and Buchenwald.” [SACH, p. 14]

“Jews,” says Sack, “were sometimes as cruel as their [Nazi] exemplars at Auschwitz, and they even ran the organization that ran the prisons and … the concentration camps for German civilians in Poland and Poland-administered Germany … The Jews who committed [atrocities] covered them up … I learned that in 1945 they killed a great number of Germans: not Nazis, not Hitler trigger men, but German civilians, German men, women, children, babies, whose crime was just to be German … The Germans lost more civilians [this way than] … the Jews themselves lost in all of Poland pogroms. So I had learned, and I was aghast to learn it.” [SACK, p. x] Sack notes Jewish torturers sticking toads down peoples throats, whippings, and some buried alive in potato sacks. A hundred non-Jews at the Myslowitz concentration camp, for instance, were murdered each day. [SACK, p. 110] The death rate in some Jewish-controlled camps was 80%. [SACK, p. 206]

Simply the reporting of facts is, for many Jews, a manifestation of anti-Semitism. Note this letter by a Polish Jew to a Jewish magazine in 1998:

“Recently, [Polish] Panorama TV News showed a report about Jaworzno camp, where members or suspected members of independence fighters groups (many of them were Ukrainians), were imprisoned with the statement that it is difficult today to find traces of the camp, for the buildings which had housed the inmates had been converted into regular housing, the barracks have been dismantled and the former commander had left for Israel. My husband was outraged by this conclusion, and he said that such a blatantly anti-Semitic statement on a public new broadcast is sheer manipulation.” [MAKOWIECKA, A., p. 3]

Among other unpleasant Holocaust stories is that of a Jewish leader, Yisrael Kastner, a senior European Zionist official and eventual immigrant to Israel, who collaborated with the Nazi SS in its mass murder program. He did so, two Israeli researchers wrote, “in return for the freedom of a few hundred relatives and friends.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 154] “Kastner was eventually assassinated,” notes Noah Lucas, “as though proof of the intolerable tension which the probing of Holocaust history could engender.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 155]

After World War II too, bands of Jewish assassins calling themselves Nokmim (Avengers) “secretly sought out and summarily executed several hundred SS and Gestapo men and other Nazi officials in Italy, Austria, and Germany itself … They operated for about a year and a half, identifying and locating Nazi war criminals and summarily executing them.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 189] One
such band of Jewish killers was called **Din** (Judgment). Led by **Joseph Harmatz** and **Abba Kovner**, their “overall objective [was] the death of 6 million Germans as vengeance for Jews who died in the Holocaust.” [DAVIS, D., 1998, p. 9] Kovner visited Tel Aviv to garner support from Israeli officials to carry out a mass scale extermination action against post-war Germany. Reviewing at least part of the project, the President of Israel, Chaim Weizmann, noted Harmatz, “approved of our plans and recommended a scientist who would make poison for us.” [DAVIS, D. 1998] Initial Din plans were to poison German food supplies and the water supply of the entire city of Nuremberg. Returning with Israeli-supplied poison to carry out the plan, Kovner was arrested on a British ship by police who learned of the terrorist plot.

Nonetheless, members of Din managed to return to Germany and taint 3,000 loaves of bread with poison, intended for German prisoners. Harmatz estimates that the bread successfully killed 300-400 people. “The 300 or 400 we poisoned was nothing compared with what we really wanted to do,” he said in later years. [DAVIS, D., 1998, p. 9] For Kovner part, he moved to Israel, and “gave up dreams of vengeance, becoming one of the great poets of the new state.” [DAVIS, D. 1998, p. 9]

Reviewing the moral crimes of the Jewish leadership under Nazi rule, **Hannah Arendt** faces squarely the hideous, sordid mess of it all, points the finger to those who look to blame others beyond the Nazis for an answer (Ukrainians, Poles, Lithuanians, Russians, and others who were—to use Elie Wiesel phrase of pardon for Jewish Nazi collaborators – also “chosen by their enemies” ), and poses the gnawing rhetorical question to the European Jewish community itself: “Why did you cooperate in the destruction of your own people and, eventually, in your own ruin?” [ARENDT]

Such an accusation and such revelations in the 1960 engendered a storm of outrage from the worldwide Jewish community, anger that was less directed at the Jewish perpetrators of their own victimization under the Nazis, but, rather, at harbingers of bad news like Arendt (and a few others like Raul Hilberg) for daring to cite evidence that profoundly threatened sacrosanct Jewish myths about the Holocaust years and even earlier history, in most quarters myths that still hold popular currency. Vehement Jewish resistance to the writings of these two Jewish scholars exists to this day. In recent years Hilberg committed to text his bitterness to his community reaction to the facts:

“For thirty years … I was almost buried under an avalanche of condemnations. [HILBERG, p. 137] It has taken me some time to absorb what I should have always known, that in my whole approach to the story of the destruction of the Jews I was pitting myself against the main current of Jewish Thought, that I did not give in, that in my research and writing I was pursuing not merely another direction but one which was the exact opposite of a signal that pulsed endlessly through the Jewish community.” [HILBERG, p. 129]

Trying to get his seminal work, *The Destruction of the European Jews* published in 1958, Hilberg faced the “first negative reaction to my manuscript and
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these bullets were fired at me from Jerusalem.” [HILBERG, p. 111] Israel Vad Yashem, the memorial center created to mythologize Jewish victims of Hitler as “martyrs,” rejected the manuscript on the following grounds:

- 1. Your book rests almost entirely on the authority of German sources and does not utilize primary sources in the language of the occupied states, or in Yiddish or Hebrew.

- 2. The Jewish historians here make reservations concerning the historical conclusions you draw, both in respect of the comparison with former periods and in respect of your appraisal of the Jewish resistance (active and passive) during the Nazi occupation.” [HILBERG, p. 110]

Hilberg quickly understood that the results of his research into German archives went against the grain of Jewish institutionalized dictate concerning the Holocaust. “To discover the source of his [Dr. J. Melkman, General Manager of Yad Vashem] argument about resistance, “ says Raul Hilberg, “I merely had to glance at Yad Vahem letterhead which proclaimed the parity of the disaster and heroism.” [HILBERG, p. 111]

In the 1980s, John Sack paid a visit to Yad Vashem to search for information about the hundreds of Jews who ran the murderous post-war concentration camps under the auspices of the Office for State Security for Germans and anti-communist Poles. Virtually all former Jewish OSS members have successfully hidden their past and many had moved to America. One such person has become the “vice-president of the United Synagogues of America and a chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.” [SACK, p. 151]

Yad Vashem repository, writes Sack,

“had fifty million pages, five, on the average, per [Jewish] man, woman, and child, a mile-long tunnel of pages, all indexed, all catalogued, so I was surprised it had nothing at all on the Office of State Security [of Eastern Europe] or the Jews who had run it.” [SACK, p. 148]

The director of the Holocaust center told Sack the facts he had thus far uncovered were “imaginary”:

“Impossible! the Director said … [He glowered] at me as though he would choke me, a man who might someday write that the Jews sometimes killed the Germans [and Poles] when all the fifty million pages said it was the other way around.” [SACK, p. 148]

Sack investigation at Vad Yashem did turn up, however, the intriguing fact that the vice-chairman of this vast Holocaust propaganda post had himself served as an officer in the notorious OSS. He had even been a torturer, a “heavy-handed interrogator” at the Neisse concentration camp. “I was terrible,” he told Sack. “But better not to speak about this.” [SACK, p. 148-149]

(Note: famed Nazi-hunter Simon Wisenthal once noted that even many Jewish administrators for German Nazis ended up as officials in American Jewish organizations: “[I] in many cases, such people after the war found jobs with Jewish organizations. Maybe they were trying to atone; maybe they thought this was the best place to hide. Once, I was going special to Paris to see
the director for Europe of the [Jewish] Joint Distribution Committee, because working for him was a man – a Jew! – who had been in a concentration camp the head of the transports to the death camps. According to Wisenthal, the JDC director, an American, responded, ‘So what? This was a time when everyone had to serve.’” [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 85]
Few, if any, events in human history have attracted the amount of attention as the so-called Jewish “Holocaust,” capital H as opposed to all other lower case genocides. “Scholarship on the Holocaust,” wrote Theodore Ziolkowski, “whether accurate or not, is piling up at such a rate that some observers believe the end of the century will witness an accumulation of works exceeding the total number produced on any other subject in human history.” [ZIOLKOWSKI, p. 593] Moral arguments, factual contentions, survivor’s accounts, Nazi documents, Jewish polemics, and every other kind of angle about the Nazis’ attempts to eliminate Jews have been the base of careers for a huge number of mostly Jewish scholars. There are over ten thousand existent publications just about the Auschwitz concentration camp alone. [MILLER, p. 35] In 1982 a conference in Israel about the Holocaust drew 650 scholars from around the world, many with presentations about the subject. [LIBOW-ITZ, p. 272] And what has been a common core to the Jewish discourse on the subject? Wounded pride, often expressed in torrents of irrationality and emotionalism. “The blow to the national and human pride of the Jewish nation inflicted by the extermination of one-third of its people,” notes Israeli sociologist Chaim Schatzker, “hardened the remainder to any logical and rational argumentation on the subject of the Holocaust.” [SCHATZKER, p. 95] Jewish author Philip Lopate notes that Jewish emotionalism on the subject “forces the mind to withdraw.” And in the world of contesting ideas, “in its life as a rhetorical figure, the Holocaust is a bully.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 33]

Jewish obsession with the Holocaust knows few limits, and leaves no stone unturned in its quest for esoteric minutia. “Sometimes one is even tempted to ask whether historians working on the Holocaust are not stretching the bounds of common sense,” says Evyat Friesel, “One example is the debate that took place in 1991 in Frankfurt, where a Study and Documentation Center is being planned, in which well-known historians participated in a learned discussion on whether the Holocaust had been rational, irrational, or anti-rational.” [FRIESEL, p. 228-229] “In the Jewish community,” complains Gabriel Schoenfeld, “well-meaning organizations and individuals are mindlessly sponsoring Internet sites offering a ‘Holocaust cybrary’ or a ‘virtual tour’ of [concentration camp] Dachau! Already, an academic conference has been scheduled in Washington on the subject of ‘Deaf People in Hitler’s Europe,’ where for four days scholars in three separate victimological fields – ‘Holocaust Studies, Deaf Studies, and Deaf History’ – will have an opportunity to ‘interact.’ Do we need more of this?” [SCHOENFELD, p. 46]
By the end of the twentieth century the Holocaust is understood by Jews to be the tragically golden cap that proves the Jewish mythos of eternal victimization. “One lesson we [Jews] frequently derive from our history,” says Steven Cohen, “a very powerful one – is the lesson of victimization, whose paramount example is the Holocaust. Jews believe that we have been victimized over the years, that we have a unique history of persecution. The lesson gets pounded into us in a variety of ways. It starts with the central formative events in Jewish history, namely the enslavement in Egypt. It continues through to the Holocaust in Europe and is punctuated with invasions, expulsions, and pogroms in between. The Israeli writer Aharon Appelfeld has said that Jewish history is a series of Holocauats, with only some improvement in technology.” [COHEN, Uses, p. 26]

The popular formation of a modern Jewish identity that is completely Holocaust-centric is cause for some dissent in the Jewish community. “Some Jews actively search out anti-Semitism,” says Adam Garfinkle, “as a raison d’être to be Jewish, along with the modern cult of martyrology – the canonization of the Holocaust. This they do because positive motivation for Jewishness, flowing from their grasp of the value of the Jewish perspective, is all but absent in their lives.” [GARFINKLE, p. 21] By 1981 Jacob Neusner was disturbed by the “puzzling frame of mind of people whose everyday vision of ordinary things is reshaped into a heightened, indeed mythic, mode of perception and being by reference to awful events they never witnessed, let alone experienced, and by the existence of a place which they surely do not plan to dwell in or even to visit.” [NEUSNER, STRANGER, p. 2]

“I think there is absolutely no question, as I look at the American Jewish experience,” says Jonathan Woocher, “that we have appropriated both the Holocaust and the creation of the state of Israel in a mythic fashion. The myth has even been given a name, though not by me, ‘From Holocaust to redemption.’ Israel is a resurrection and all the world’s great religions have a resurrection myth.” [WOOCHER, Discussion, p. 28]

As always in the Jewish collective understanding of itself, and reflecting the traditional Jewish understanding of anti-Semitism, victims of the Holocaust were all categorically “innocent.” “Holocaust theology,” notes Marc Ellis, declares that “the Jewish sense of purpose [is] that of an innocent, suffering people in search of their destiny.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 6] The innocence of the European Jews is thereby transferred categorically to the intrinsic innocence of Israelis fighting Arabs. “For Holocaust theologians,” says Ellis,

“the victory in the [1967] Six Day War was a miracle, a sign that an innocent people so recently victimized might be on the verge of redemption. That is, a subtheme of Jewish suffering in the Holocaust is the total innocence of the Jewish people and thus the innocence of those who defend the lives of Jews in Israel. For Holocaust theologians, the victory of Israel in 1967 is a victory of the innocent trying to forestall another catastrophe, another holocaust, and the redemptive sign is that this time Jews will prevail.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 3]
Rooted in the mythology of relentless victimization of Jewish innocence across the centuries, one of the most curious obsessions for most Jews today is the militantly avowed “uniqueness” of the Holocaust in comparison to all other atrocities in the human record. The Jewish Holocaust’s declared outstanding “specialness,” grotesque and horrible, inevitably echoes – and is sometimes overtly theologically linked to – the traditional tenets of self-asserted Judaic claims to distinction, exclusiveness, and chosenness. Over the years, notes Edward Linenthal, the Holocaust became to be understood by Jews as even a pseudo-religious event itself, “not only a transcendent event, it was unique, not to be compared to any other genocidal situations, and its victims were Jews. Any comparison of event or linkage to any other victim group could be, and often was, perceived as, if not the murder of memory, at least its dilution. Moreover, the story ended with a kind of redemption, the creation of the state of Israel.” [LINENTHAL, p. 4] (This communal conviction has evolved over time, politically and socially, as it suited Jewish needs. As Peter Novick notes about earlier years: “After the war began, and after the main outlines of the Holocaust had become known, it was common for Jewish writers to interpret Nazi atrocities in a universalist fashion – stressing that Jews were far from the only victims.”) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 38]

Irving Greenberg, Chairman of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Commission, “regarded comparison of the Holocaust with any other form of genocide as ‘blasphemous, as well as dishonest.’” [LILENTHAL, p. 55] “The unique demands and inherent risks of teaching the Holocaust,” says Richard Libowitz, “point to rejection of an instructor who merely instructs, in favor of the professor who will profess.” [LIBOWITZ, p. 65] “The instrument of my return to [a Jewish identity] is not religion,” says Jane Delynn, “but the Holocaust. It is where my identity as a Jew lies – my chosen identification with an event in history that I have declared to be of significance as no other.” [DELYNNE, p. 64]

A public school study guide about the Holocaust, sponsored by the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit, begins with a question: “How is the Holocaust different from other mass murders or ‘genocides?’” The volume then champions to the student the “uniqueness” of Jewish suffering:

“Comparisons to determine which group suffered the worst tragedy serve neither the past nor the present. The uniqueness of the Holocaust, however, invites us to focus specific attention on it and its lessons for modern society.” [BOLKOSKY, 1987, p. 13]

The Holocaust gapes like a wound within the ongoing Jewish “particularist/universalist” tension: What’s more important, a larger community of human beings in general, or Jews in particular? The traditional answer, and the renewed answer for many Jews today, is the latter. “It makes no sense,” proclaims Alvin Rosenfeld, “to add up all the corpses [killed by the Nazis] without distinction and pile them on some abstract slaughter heap called ‘mankind.’ [ROSENFIELD, p. 160] Rosenfeld, like most Jews, wants to wade through the dead and sort them out: Jews in the rays of light, the rest in shadows. (When
Eric Yoffie observed the Muslim victims of Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic, he couldn’t acknowledge the Muslims’ own identity. He only saw Jews. “As Jews,” he says, “we look at these slaughtered victims and see Jewish corpses. We look at the more than a million refugees and see Jewish faces.” [YOFFIE, Military, p. 3]

“To cheaply universalize the Holocaust would be a distortion of history,” says Elie Wiesel, and then, in vintage Orwellian doublespeak, “The universality of the Holocaust lies in its [Jewish] uniqueness.” [RITTNER, Chap 8] Emil Fackenheim condemns those who “universalize the Holocaust,” those who “avoid precisely what ought to arrest philosophical thought. It is escapism into universalism.” [FACKENHEIM, Holo, p. 17] “The uniqueness of the Holocaust,” insists Gershon Mamlak, “was manifested in a dual form: the way the victims experienced it, and the way the Gentile world performed and/or witnessed it.” [MAMLAK, p. 12] “Of all he events in human history,” declares Ivan Avisar, “none is more compelling and disturbing than the Holocaust … The Holocaust was a unique or unprecedented historical experience … Hitler’s intent to exterminate an entire people is incomparable to any other episode of malice in the annals of human history.” [AVISAR, p. vii]

There is even a post-Holocaust Jewish rationale that encourages guilt in those Jews who still insist upon a universalist approach to other people. Deborah Lipstadt, for instance, claims that

“The Holocaust … poses … fundamental questions for those [Jews] who have shunned the particular in Judaism and have embraced the universal. Those who have pursued in Judaism’s name the causes of others and who have denied the legitimacy of specific Jewish concerns must recognize that the Holocaust calls many of the premises of their belief into question.” [LIPSTADT, p. 340]

Hence, for many Jews there is no space for reflection upon the commonality of human suffering in World War II. In popular Jewish opinion no other people are entitled, or allowed, to share Jewish center stage of Utmost Tragedy.

“Nothing annoys Jews so much as to be told that other people have suffered,” says Liebman and Cohen. “Not a few American Jewish spokesmen have bristled at the use of the words holocaust and even genocide to describe tragedies that have befallen other minorities and nationalities.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 31]

This Jewish offense was evidenced, for instance, against Archbishop Desmund Tutu, the Black leader of the Anglican Church of South Africa and internationally known activist against that country’s apartheid system. “There is a kind of Jewish arrogance,” says Tutu, “one can only call it that … I sometimes say that apartheid is as evil as Nazism and there have been Jews who say I am insulting them. Jews seem to think they have a corner on the market of suffering.” [HOFFMAN, p. 10]

Many Protestant and Catholic theologians, says Yaakov Ariel, “[have] tried to ascribe a universal significance – over and above nationality, or religion – to [Hitler’s] murder of millions of innocent people. Jewish spokesmen often
denounced such an outlook.” [ARIEL, p. 338] Jesse Jackson, during a visit to Israel’s Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum in 1979, created a wave of Jewish anger and indignation when he made the unpardonable sin of stating that the Jewish Holocaust “was one of the greatest tragedies of all times,” instead of saying it was “unique.” [CARSON, p. 135] Even the pope’s beatification of Edith Stein, a Jewish woman who became a Catholic nun and was murdered as a Jew at Auschwitz, has offended Jewish sensibilities as a symbolic Christian appropriation, and honing in, of Jewish special suffering. [VIVIANO, p. 354-355]

In 1982, an international conference in Israel on “The Holocaust and Genocide” drew attack from Jews “who feared the uniqueness of their tragedy would somehow be compromised by the conference’s inclusion of other victims, including Armenians, Tibetans, Gypsies, and Cambodians.” [LIBOWITZ, p. 272] A few years later, in giving a speech memorializing Holocaust victims, President Carter offended – among many others – a professor of Jewish History at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Yehuda Baer, for daring to mention victims other than Jews. Carter was trying to “de-Judaize” the Holocaust, wrote Baer, which was “an unconscious reflection of anti-Semitic attitudes” based on “a certain paradoxical envy on the part of non-Jewish groups directed at the Jewish experience of the Holocaust.” “To Baer,” notes David Stannard, “the simple acknowledgment of the suffering of others constituted Jew-hating.” [STANNARD, p. 168] Stannard, a professor of American Studies at the University of Hawaii, notes the preposterous position taken on the subject by Deborah Lipstadt, a professor of Jewish Studies at Emory University:

“Lipstadt regards as her enemy anyone who expressed doubts about the utter singularity in all of human history of Jewish suffering and death under Hitler … In short, if you disagree with Deborah Lipstadt that the Jewish suffering in the Holocaust was unique, you are, by definition – and like [former Ku Klux Klan member] David Duke – a crypto-Nazi.” [STANNARD, p. 168]

British scholar John Fox notes Lipstadt’s position on the Holocaust subject to be “nothing less than intellectual fascism.” [FOX, J., 3-19-2000, p. 47, 48]

Clinging tightly to the moral and political leverage afforded by the “uniqueness” of the Jewish experience in World War II, Christians are not welcome to search for parallel unity (in their own millions of dead) in the circle of suffering. “The Jewish community,” Michael Berenbaum smugly notes, “has become … deeply suspicious of Roman Catholic efforts to discover – some would say invent – a tradition of Roman Catholic martyrrology in the Holocaust.” [BERENBAUM, STRUGGLE, p. 85]

A chorus of Jewish critics led an attack upon a non-Jewish novelist, William Styron, for daring to write about the death camps in a novel from a non-Jewish perspective. Theodore Ziolkowski cites Alvin Rosenfeld as a typical complainant: “Rosenfeld’s attack on … Styron is based on two premises: an unwillingness to see the universal implications of the Holocaust and indignation at Styron’s assumption that a Polish Catholic woman could be viewed as a representative victim of the camps.” [ZIOLKOWSKI, p. 602]
“Some,” says Jeffrey Shandler, “have come to regard the Holocaust as specifically, even exclusively, Jewish cultural property (literary scholar Edward Alexander describes it as the Jews’ ‘moral capital’) that requires vigilant protection against misuse or misappropriation.” [SHANDLER, p. 162] Alexander, a Jewish professor at the University of Washington, claims that the Holocaust serves “a Jewish claim to a specific suffering that was of the ‘highest,’ the most distinguished grade available.” Those who dare to debunk such bizarrely elitist Jewish claims about their experience under Hitler, he says, are seeking “to plunder the moral capital which the Jewish people, through its unparalleled suffering in World War II, had unwittingly accumulated.” [STANNARD, p. 193]

(In 1998 even the DC Comics company came under Jewish attack for robbing them of their unique “moral capital.” In a new comic, Superman visits the concentration camps of World War II. The sin to Jews is that, although refugees wear yarmulkes and sport names like Moishe and Baruch in the comics, the word “Jew” (or, for that matter, Catholic or German) is never mentioned. Seeking to be politically correct and to avoid offence to anyone, the cartoon creators unwittingly exposed themselves to public attack by the Anti-Defamation League and others for “rob [bing] the [Jewish] victims of their identity.” [NEWSDAY, p. A22]

“The world owes Jews,” demands Alan Dershowitz, “and the Jewish state [of Israel], which was built on the ashes of the Holocaust, a special understanding.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 136] Eliezer Berkovits claims the Holocaust and the subsequent creation of modern Israel renders the Jews “as the point for the crystallization of moral direction in history. That is the ultimate significance of being the chosen people of God.” [BRESLAUER, p. 10] “[The] Holocaust stands alone in time,” decreed Menachem Rosensaft, “as an aberration within history.” [LOPATE, p. 290] “The uniqueness of Jewish destiny,” suggests Jacob Agus, “consists principally in the fact that the Jew is the litmus test of civilized humanity.” [AGUS, p. 363]

Lawrence Langer calls the Holocaust “an episode without parallel in history or eschatology.” [ZIOLKOWSKI, p. 683] Alvin Rosenfeld calls it “a major turning point in history and in the history of consciousness.” [ROSENFELD, p. 10] For Emil Fackenheim, the word “Holocaust” is so sacred that “it has seemed to me that this word should be used sparingly lest it be used in vain.” [FACKENHEIM, p. 16] George Kren and Leon Rappoport “hold that the Holocaust was unique because no other event of the modern era has so undercut the moral/humanitarian credibility of western civilization.” [KREN, Was, p. 22] Irving Greenberg and Rosenfeld declared that “the Holocaust is an event of such magnitude that it creates a historical force field of its own.’ [BRESLAUER, p. 6]

“This curious elitism,” argues Theodore Ziolkowski, “reduces a tragedy of humanity to an episode in Jewish mythology … [Such elitist commentators] unwittingly evade history by mythifying it.” [ZIOLKOWSKI, p. 683] And what’s worse, says Jewish author Philip Lopate, “is the degree to which such an apocalyptic religious-mythological rendering of historical events has come to be accepted by the culture at large.” [LOPATE, p. 290]
Sociologist John Murray Cuddihy is particularly insightful, and damning, in unearthing the latent – and classically Jewish – meaning behind the Jewish dictate of incomparable Jewish suffering in World War II:

“This [Jewish Holocaust] exemption from comparison is a heady privilege … Among the many items selected by culture to symbolize status, incomparability alone is inimitable.” [CUDDIHY, p. 77]

“In Jewish discourse on the Holocaust,” says Peter Novick, in an unusual Jewish perspective, “we have not just a competition [among other alleged “victims”] for recognition but a competition for primacy. This takes many forms. Among the most widespread and pervasive is an angry insistence on the uniqueness of the Holocaust … The assertion that the Holocaust is unique – like the claim that it is singularly incomprehensible or unrepresentable – is, in practice, deeply offensive. What else can all of this possibly mean except ‘your catastrophe, unlike ours, is ordinary; unlike ours is comprehensible; unlike ours is representable.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 9]

In other words, classical Judaism’s insistent self-heralding as a “nation apart” from others and its innate class-conscious self-image of all-encompassing uniqueness and exceptionality, is the conceptual master for Jewish understanding of their holy Holocaust, a latent religious-based encoding of their role in the World War II disaster, a perspective that is actually militantly enforced upon non-Jews from a position of Jewish “prestige as a control system.” [CUDDIHY, Holo, p. 72] Cuddihy underscores the racist undercurrent to the “Holocaust uniqueness” claim as a latent expression of the Chosen People paradigm, noting that Jewish philosopher Emil Fackenheim even calls the non-Jewish dead at the Nazi concentration camps “quasi-Jews,” [CUDDIHY, p. 67] marginalized stand-ins for those really worth counting. “The ‘Holocaust’ is the Jews’ special thing,” says Rabbi Jacob Neusner, “It is what sets them apart from others while giving them a claim upon others. That is why Jews insist on the ‘uniqueness’ of the Holocaust.” [NEUSNER, Holo, p. 978] “Let us be frank,” says Cuddihy, “National priority and national unicity (uniqueness) are both covert claims to superiority, parallel paths to the same summit, and that summit is what [Robert] Merton calls ‘ethnocentric glory.’” [CUDDIHY, Holo, p. 74] … Like social class symbols, cultural symbols serve ‘to influence in a desired direction other persons’ judgments’ of the group that is the symbol’s carrier.” [CUDDIHY, p. 75]

Uniqueness linked to incomparable suffering makes deep demands upon others. “Beyond moral privileges,” note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “the Jews feel that their suffering entitles them to a special consideration from the non-Jewish world. Groups (and individuals) often make much of their history of suffering as a way of strengthening their claims to certain rewards.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 44] “Out of this peculiar [Jewish] emphasis on suffering,” noted Rabbi Richard Singer in 1960 when the post-Holocaust political dimensions of this had hardly begun to take shape, “there has developed an attitude, a new attitude of vicarious suffering – a feeling among numbers of Jews today that because other Jews suffered and died they, the living, are somehow
entitled to special consideration.” [ZUKERMAN, p. 66] “One of the characteristics of nationalist Jews,” said William Zuckerman (noting, also in 1960, the commentary of Rabbi Singer), “is to look upon the Jewish group as isolated from the rest of humanity, particularly when it comes to suffering. They see only Jewish suffering and do not see the context of the entire world scene. The result is a distorted historical picture, showing Jews as the only sufferers, while the rest of the world presumably basks in happiness. As compensation for their suffering, it is assumed that Jews, as a group, are somehow entitled to special privileges which other people do not deserve (for instance, special immigration facilities, special fund raising, emigration from communist countries, etc.).” [ZUKERMAN, p. 66]

There are few Jewish voices like those of Singer and Zukerman today. On the contrary. The “unique” suffering of Jews affords the possibility to make even this preposterously manipulative declaration by Jewish journalist-novelist Ann Roiphe: “The scale and terror of the Holocaust makes it clear that Jews are innocent and a wronged people, murdered and abandoned to their fate. This makes Christians, even Christians who were not in Europe at the time, a guilty people.” [ROIPHE, CHANES, p. 461] Among those many who have succumbed to Jewish Holocaust mythology demands in the name of “interfaith dialogue” include the Catholic Church of France which in 1997 formally “asked for forgiveness” from Jews for Church “silence” when the Nazis were routinely slaughtering all who opened their mouths in protest of anything, and the Pope himself who entertained a historic first by hosting a menorah, symbolic candles of Jewish victims, and “7500 spectators” in the Vatican to “commemorate the Holocaust.” [LA TIMES, 4-8-94, p. A10]

Such Christian requests to Jews for “forgiveness” are the results of a long Jewish lobbying and pressure effort, heavily leaning on guilt-based non-Jewish associates who seek to bask in the Christian tenets of compassion and religious tolerance. In the late 1970s, for example, the largely Jewish “National Conference of Christians and Jews” (with branches in 77 major U. S. cities) published “A Holocaust Memorial Service for Christians.” The volume appeals to a grandiose universalistic morality, and suggests that Christians incorporate, on a yearly basis, “a special day” (April 22) in their religious services to pay homage to the Holocaust, [NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, p. 3] particularly underscoring that righteous Christians are morally bound to protect Jews from anti-Jewish hostility. [p.4] Likewise, “Christianity’s role in the Holocaust must not remain hidden or unstated. It must be faced, no matter how painful an undertaking it may be.” [p. 4] A section even tries to diffuse the obvious question, which is given a bold-type heading: “Are You Asking Us to Lay a ‘Guilt Trip’ on Our People?” [p. 5] For those who might wonder why the Holocaust is so suddenly relevant, “more than thirty years” after the fact, a small chapter explains that, through the prism of the Holocaust, we all “can better prepare ourselves to meet the challenges of the day,” [p. 6] (i.e., the consequences of Jewish particularism may be used to explore generalized principles of human universalism, even though the Holocaust must be held to be separate, distinct, from all other historic atrocities). In subsuming Christian identity
beneath that of Jewish martyrs, “Many Christians have wished to have a Christian symbol attached to the yellow Star of David when they wear it … If you choose to use the Yellow Star as a symbol, and wish to have some Christian identification on it, it is recommended that you use the Sign of the Fish, the oldest Christian symbol. This is preferable to using the Cross.” [p. 11] (And why can’t Christians wear the cross? Because Jews hate the cross, and from time immemorial have understood it – rival religion – as a sign of evil. Spitting at the Christian symbol is an old Jewish tradition, long before the Holocaust). [See citations elsewhere, p. 620] The National Conference of Christians and Jews have even provided a page-long prayer for Christian penance for the Holocaust, with the recurring refrain: “For the sin which we have committed before You” – 14 times. [p. 15]

Joel Epstein, a professor of history in Michigan, in an overview of “world civilization” textbooks, uses in-depth addressment of the Holocaust and its alleged “uniqueness” as his criteria for recommending them or not. “The uniqueness of the Holocaust in history needs to be explained,” he says. One textbook which “recognize[d] the fact that the extermination of the Jews was the most shocking aspect of the war, an attempt at genocide on an unprecedented scale,” falls short of Epstein’s standards. “If the centrality of the Holocaust to this process had been emphasized,” he advises, “this text would be noteworthy. As it is, however, such emphasis is lacking and the uniqueness of the event is not articulated clearly.” [EPSTEIN, p. 65, 70]

In discussing classroom methodologies to teach the Holocaust, Richard Libowitz observes that

“The Holocaust is a unique event in human history … Efforts to constrain knowledge within standard lines will conceal the uniqueness, effecting diminishing student perceptions … Students must be taken … to the edge of the abyss and made to look down … Traditional pedagogical norms caution educators against subjective involvement with their materials; the Holocaust, on the contrary, demands entry into the event.” [LIBOWITZ, Asking, p. 63]

A Jewish professor of twentieth century history at Miami University in Ohio, Allan Winkler, noted in 1996 that

“thanks to [and experience teaching about the Holocaust at a Jewish high school], to my more open acceptance of my own Jewish identity, the Holocaust is now a logical part of my university teaching … When I address the American role in World War II … I hope to show my students how American policy was made, and to help them understand its limitations. Examining our response to the Holocaust is one way of identifying shortcomings in the American approach.” [WINKLER, p. 330]

In the proliferation of college courses about the Holocaust, some Jewish overseers feel that there are not enough qualified teachers to teach the subject from the right ideological perspective. “It was argued,” says Richard Libowitz, “that the Holocaust was so unique an act within human history that to
approach it within the classrooms as one more historical occurrence, one more instance of ‘man’s inhumanity to man’ would be to miss its message and implications alike.” [LIBOWTIZ, p. 280] One way to enforce Holocaust uniqueness in academe is “Holocaust endowed chairs,” special faculty appointments funded by wealthy Jewish philanthropists interested in maintaining a special emphasis on the subject at American universities. So prevalent are these special teacher/researcher positions in the United States the *New York Times* devoted an entire article to them in 1995. “Advocates for the special chairs,” reported the *Times*, “argue that the Nazi genocide is of transcendent importance in modern history and demands the constant and focused attention that only a specialized chair can provide.” [NY TIMES] Saul Friedlander, holder of the Holocaust chair at UCLA, told the *Times* that “the chairs have made the Holocaust a special domain, but there is no choice because otherwise it is not taught in a significant way.” [NY TIMES] (In 1998, Jewish financier Kenneth Lippet pulled his $3 million Holocaust chair endowment from Harvard University after the position went unfilled for three years: the academic search committee couldn’t agree on who was best qualified for the job). [SCHOENFELD, G., p. 42]

This elitist view of supreme Jewish suffering, distinct from all others, has become profoundly politicized and attempts to systematically disenfranchise dissenters to the “uniqueness line” are widespread. “There is a disquieting pattern of claims,” says Israel Charmy, “of the ‘incomparable uniqueness’ of the Holocaust and a good deal of political power in many places in academia, museums, and communities to boost up these claims by pushing down and out nonadherents.” [CHARMY, p. x]

John Fox, a non-Jewish college teacher of the Holocaust, notes, from first-hand experience, the same disturbing problem:

“Some historians or writers are deemed acceptable for entry into the fold of the chosen: if you accept the totally absurd uniqueness theory (which refuses to acknowledge in the same breath as the Holocaust the millions of other victims of genocide in the 20th century), not only are you home dry but if you are non-Jewish you are actually feted. If you don’t argue you are excluded and damned to hell in terms of your profession.” [FOX, J., 3-19-2000, p. 47-48]

Elie Wiesel, a kind of semi-official guru of the Holocaust, invariably seeks to mystify the tragedy, elevating Jewish suffering (beyond others’ suffering) into a specially transcendent, holy, and sacred realm. “[The death camp of] Auschwitz cannot be explained nor can it be visualized,” he says, “Whether culmination or abbreviation of history, the Holocaust transcends history. Everything about the Holocaust is inspired by fear and despair: the [Jewish] dead are in possession of a secret that we, the living, are neither worthy of nor capable of recovering.” [MARTIN, p. 45-46] Elsewhere, Wiesel even declared that, “Remove the Jews from the Holocaust, and the Event loses its mystery.” [PAPPAZIAN, p. 17] (“For the many Jews who, like me, have experienced nothing of the horrors,” wrote Alfred Kazin, “Elie Wiesel became the embodiment of the Holocaust … [Yet] Isaac Bashevis Singer scoffed at his novels; Hannah Arendt
put him down as a publicity seeker; an Israeli novelist said bitterly of him: ‘The Holocaust – and me.’ … I thought synthetic the hysterically ‘religious’ atmosphere he built up in his books.” [KAZIN, p. 122]

Maxime Rodinson, a French Jew whose own parents perished at the hands of the Nazis, alludes to the undercurrent of Jewish ethnocentrism and racism in their Holocaust mythology:

“Contempt for or massacre of white Jews by white Europeans is not looked at the same way as the massacre of Armenians by Turks, of Blacks by slave traders, or of Gypsies, of Chinese in Indonesia, and so on. Auschwitz is elevated to a metaphysical phenomena, but not the butchery other peoples have suffered.” [RODINSON, p. 9]

David Stannard, author of a number of books about Native American “Holocausts” resulting from contact with European civilization, follows suit with a poignant condemnation of the racist origin of all such Jewish claims of exceptional suffering:

“The Holocaust hagiographers arguing for the uniqueness of the Jewish experience … are zealots who believe literally that they and their religious fellows are, in the words of Deuteronomy 7:1, ‘a special people … above all people that are on the face of the earth,’ interpreting in the only way thus possible their own community’s recent encounter with mass death … With its spiritual emphasis on the maintenance of blood purity (e.g., Deuteronomy 7:3; Joshua 23:12-13), and on the either tacit or expressed pollution fear of corrupting that purity with the defiling blood of others, the ideology of the covenant intrinsically is but a step away from full-blown racism and, if the means are available, often violent oppression of the purportedly threatening non-chosen.” [STANNARD, p. 193]

John Fox, a non-Jewish college teacher about the Holocaust in Great Britain, in a review of a book about the Holocaust by Jewish author Peter Novick, notes the undercurrent of Jewish racism in Jewry’s myths about the Holocaust:

“Since the early Sixties it has clearly not been the purpose of many American and Israeli Jews to over-concern themselves with objectivity about [the Holocaust] … Novick meticulously details the political and cultural purposes which lay behind the American and Israeli Jewish ‘management’ of the Holocaust over the past 40 years. In addition, he presents sickening example after example of the racism that dare not speak its name: Jewish racism.” [FOX, J., 3-19-2000, p. 47-48]

As Novick notes about the claim of Holocaust uniqueness:

“To single out those aspects of the Holocaust that were distinctive (there certainly were such), and to ignore those aspects that it shared with other atrocities, and on the basis of this gerrymandering to declare the Holocaust is unique, is intellectual sleight of hand.” [FOX, J., 3-19-2000, p. 47-48]

In some Jewish quarters there is even a sacred literature about the Holo-
caust, rivaling any Holy Book, likewise beyond criticism or questioning. Jewish survivors’ accounts are among the most hallowed testimonies and Elie Wiesel is one of the sacred authors. “The only completely decent ‘review,’” says George Steiner, “of the Warsaw Diary or [Wiesel’s] Night would be to re-copy the book, line by line, pausing at the names of the dead and the names of the children as the Orthodox scribe pauses, when recopying the bible, at the hallowed name of God.” [ROSENFELD, p. 9] Another Jewish critic, A. Alvarez, wrote in Commentary that “as a human document … Night is … certainly beyond criticism.” [WIESEL, first page]

This sacred book, Night, which – due to its painful origin – is so much considered to be flawless and beyond reproach, is an autobiographical account of Wiesel’s hellious experience in Nazi concentration camps, environments where human beings were reduced to their most basic, primitive, animalistic instincts to survive. But innocent suffering and Nazi tormenters are not the book’s main themes. Night’s central current is really about guilt, specifically the guilt engendered by the moral costs of personal survival.

Wiesel turns again and again with shame to the profoundly disturbing feelings that his own weakening father’s existence is a burden to Elie’s own chances for survival in the camps. This self-preservative mood – survival at all costs – is echoed by other fellow prisoners, including even the son of a rabbi who hurries to distance himself away from his father.

Adoring commentators of Night as sacred vestige lose sight of the fact that the book is only peripherally about the slaughter of innocents; it is more poignantly about the very human psychological wounds of survival, i.e., what does it cost – morally and spiritually – to survive, in this particular case, when rendered by Nazis to be subhuman? “Everyone who survived [the concentration camps],” another Jewish survivor, Natan Gierowitz has noted, “was indirectly involved with the extermination of other people.” [BOROSON, p. 17] Or as Polish Auschwitz survivor Wieslaw Kielar notes:

“Those who were best off [in concentration camps] were the people who had no scruples at all. They advanced [in the survival system] rapidly. They came to power, not squeamish about the means they chose, at the cost of human suffering and even of human life. The important thing was that, in this way, one made sure of one’s own position, one filled one’s stomach with the stolen rations of one’s hungry fellows.” [KIELAR, 1980, p. 70]

Such truisms of concentration camp survival is not only relevant to Wiesel’s concentration camp experience, it is also core to Jewish self-identity in the collective sense throughout the ages – in the sense that there is always attendant guilt to be paid for historic survival. In any context, for anybody, any people, what is the cost, ultimately, of “survival?” This cost – what the Jews had to do in their long history to survive, and prosper, at others’ expense – i.e., their double moral standards, et al, as usurers, profiteers, and exploiters of all sorts – is not part of their own popularly understood moral history of themselves. It is suppressed and denied. It had been, however, for many, very much part of the
Jewish self-conception ("self-hatred") in the century leading up to the Holocaust, as seen even in the vehement Zionist disdain for the *galut* (exilic) Jewish identity. [See later chapters]

"Climaxing ... all previous persecutions in the history of Jewish exclusion and suffering," says George Steiner, "the Shoah has given to [Jewish] history a particularity of darkness, a seeming logic in which the sole categorical imperative is that of survival." [STEINER, *Lowl*, p. 159] What kind of morality, we might well ask, attends the "sole categorical imperative" of survival?

Ultimately, the Jewish enforcement of the Holocaust as a unique and sacred Jewish catastrophe of victimization at the hands of — not just Nazis — but the generic Gentiles, in a conceptual straight line for literally thousands of years, affirms their self-conceived status as a caste of people beyond (for others) moral reproach and criticism. “One of the major effects of the ... Holocaust,” wrote Irving Howe, “… [is that] it dissolves any impulse to judge what the victims did or did not do, since there are situations so extreme that it seems immoral to make judgments about those who must endure them.” [HOWE, p. 432] This “dissolvement of judgment” is polemically and politically wielded by Jews today as a veil of sacred atrocity and victimization that is draped across the whole of Jewish history, thus completely nullifying and erasing Jewish responsibility, culpability, and blame for not only their actions — or inactions — in the Holocaust epoch, but for Jewish activities — or inactivities — in the whole of human history. Because of the overwhelmingly evil gravity of Hitler’s response to alleged Jewish social, economic, and political abuses of non-Jewish communities, the veritable mountains of complaints and criticism about Jews across the ages by Gentiles has been completely neglected. The Jewish Holocaust ideology — which accuses and blackens all non-Jews as complacent sinners in the Crime of crimes — functions as a methodological tool by which Jews do not need to atone to their fellow man for their own sins.

Even before the Holocaust experience begins for the author of *Night*, Wiesel was psychologically/religiously primed for it by the victim tradition of Judaism. At twelve years old, he writes, “during the day I studied the Talmud and at night I ran to the synagogue to weep over the destruction of the Temple.” The Temple was of course destroyed in the year 70 AD, 1,871 years before Wiesel ran to the synagogue to weep about it.

The alleged unique sanctity of the Jewish experience in World War II is approached by Jews from other angles. Shortly after the war, T. W. Adorno made a famous comment in which he suggested that the Holocaust was so sacred in its misery that it would be immoral to write poetry about it, to lyricize such horror, “to squeeze aesthetic pleasure out of artistic representation of the naked bodily pain of those who have been knocked down by rifle butts.” [HOWE, p. 427] Years later, Michael Wyschogrod followed up with:

“Art takes the sting out of suffering ... It is therefore forbidden to make fiction of the Holocaust ... Any attempt to transform the Holocaust into art demeans the Holocaust and must result in poor art.” [ROSENFIELD, p. 14]
Wyschogrod’s efforts to forbid art making from spilling into the Holocaust and profaning the sacred have been, of course, to no avail. There has been an avalanche of “poor art” about the Holocaust, almost entirely by Jews who try to connect more deeply to it victimhood symbology and to propagandize the “uniqueness” idea to others via sculpture, paintings, novels, poems, and monuments of all sorts and sizes.

And, of course, whatever else the art itself is about the Holocaust, it too is “unique,” “special,” “different,” apart from other art. Sara Horowitz, in a book about a whole genre of fiction about the Holocaust, declares “Holocaust fiction suggests the need for an expansion of categories, for new classifications, new ‘taxonomies.’” [HOROWITZ, p. 13]

Intrinsic to the Jewish insistence that the sacred Jewish Holocaust was unique is a desperate search for an explanation of the unfathomable horrors of their people under European fascism, and that the millions of Jewish lives lost were not piteously wasted. The incessant Jewish search – whether religiously or secularly based – is still towards a confirmation, or reconstruction, of their battered tradition of choseness: humankind’s transcendent sufferers.

“The expressions ‘one nation’ and ‘one people,’ implying uniqueness, have become catchwords of traditional religious parlance,” notes Yeshayahu Leibowitz, “In literary sources of Jewish thought and in various pronouncements of Jewish thinkers to this day, these expressions have come to represent basic tenets of faith. ‘Uniqueness’ is interwoven with other concepts such as ‘election,’ ‘being cherished,’ and even with ‘holiness’ in usages made obscure by the ambiguity of these expressions. Adherence to this idea of uniqueness may lead to great religious exaltation. But its indefiniteness invites perversion, distortion and corruption.” [LEIBOWITZ, p. 79] “The presumed uniqueness of the Shoah [Holocaust] has become vital to Judaism now,” says George Steiner, “…. In numerous complex ways it underlies and underwrites certain essential aspects of the ‘recreation of nationhood in Israel.’” [STEINER, Long, p. 159]

“The [Jewish] hostility towards anything that questions the uniqueness of the Holocaust,” notes Philip Lopate, “can now be seen as part of a deeper tendency to view all of Jewish history as ‘unique,’ to read that history selectively, and to use it only insofar as it promotes a redemptive script. Thus the Holocaust ‘mystery’ must be asserted over and over again, in the same way as was the ‘mystery’ of Jewish survival through the ages, in order to yield the explanation that God ‘wants’ the Jewish people to live and is protecting them. Being a secular, fallen Jew with a taste for rationalism and history, I cannot but regard such providential interpretations as superstition.” [LOPATE, p. 307]

This Jewish demand for Holocaust-Chosen People “uniqueness” resounds everywhere throughout the Jewish world, a self-conception that nestles – long before the Holocaust— at the very heart of Jewish identity. “This difficulty in categorizing the Jewish people,” says Hayem Donin, “may well be their uniqueness. It is a uniqueness which according to the believer was given its permanent stamp by the Divine command.” [DONIN, p. 9] Gail Shulman notes the flavor of being raised as a Jew in America:
“A child in a family with any Jewish consciousness cannot avoid growing up with a sense of uniqueness … The message was conveyed to me that I was not like everyone else: Living in a kosher household, staying out of school on the High Holy Days, eating special foods on special dishes at Passover, making Hannukah cards instead of Christmas decorations … – all were powerful expressions of the specialness of being Jewish … I thought I understood what it meant to be a member of the chosen people.” [SHULMAN, G., 1983]

Again and again, this ideological current of exceptionality is the bedrock of Jewish discourse about themselves. “We have surveyed the mutations of hatred against the Jews through thousands of years,” says Erich Kahler, “We have seen how it began and how it developed. Yet none of this can furnish a completely satisfactory explanation of a phenomenon unique in history … [What accounts for it is] only the composite character, the unique social structure of the people to which it attaches.” [GLATZER, p. 547] “I can’t help feeling in some way,” says famed Jewish historian Barbara Tuchman, “that the history of the Jews has revealed a kind of specialness, a uniqueness, in which they represented the tragedy of the human race, or humanity.” [TUCHMAN, p. 14] American scholars, declares Edward Shapiro, “[have] provide[d] both a greater role for ideas in the origins of American anti-Semitism and a greater appreciation of the uniqueness of American Jewish history.” [SHAPIRO, E., 1986, p. 213] “Israel,” says Michael Rosenberg, “cannot ever be a ‘state like any other state.’” [ROSENBERG, M., 1971, p. 81] “In Europe,” wrote James Sleeper and Alan Mintz, “the uniqueness and development of Judaism had been due in part to persecution.” [SLEEPER/MINTZ, 1971, p. 11] “American Jewish intellectuals,” says Michael Galchinsky, “have tended to assert that their diaspora is ‘exceptional.’” [GALCHINSKY, M., 1998, p. 185] “Since the early 1970’s,” says Allon Gal, “scholars have shown a great interest in the uniqueness of American Zionism.” [GAL, 1986, p. 363] “The meaning of the idea of the Chosen People,” proclaims Eric Kahler, “can be properly understood only in its connection with another, much more fundamental Jewish concept, a concept that is unique in the whole world … [the Covenant between God and Abraham].” [KAHLER, E., 1967, p. 14]

“The Jewish people,” declares Will Herberg, citing fellow Jew Carl Mayer, “represent a sociologically unique phenomenon and defy all attempts at general definition.” “The mystery of Israel,” adds Herberg, “is one that defies all categories of nature and society.” [HERBERG, W., 1970, FROM MARXISM ..., p. 110] J. L. Talmon even turns a common ploy, somehow reconciling polar opposites: Jewish “uniqueness” with Jewish universality, in an article entitled Uniqueness and Universality of Jewish History. [TALMON, J.L., 1970, p. 116] “We are not comparable. We are unique …,” declared Abba Hillel Silver, “This fact is the one key to an understanding of Jewish experience. To attempt to fit us into the framework of the commonly-held conceptions of race and culture, to liken us to other nations, is to miss the very quintessence of Jewish culture, to overlook the essential text and thesis of our life.” [GITTELSOHN, R., 1964, p. 25-26] (– Which, of course, is a claim, merely due to Jewish “Chosen People” definition, to extraordinary specialness). “The Jewish people is a unique phenomenon,”
wrote Nahum Goldmann, “and therefore no formula acceptable to all can be found to cover all the aspects of this phenomenon and to define it in a way satisfactory to the different shades of opinion within Jewish life.” [GITTLESOHN, R., 1964, p. 26]

In the influential Zionist journal *Midstream* titles of articles over the last decade and a half have included *The Ineluctable Uniqueness of Judaism, A Unique Feminism* (about early Jewish pioneers in Israel), and *Is Polish Anti-Semitism Special?* Joel Carmichael began another article with the declaration that “Xenophobia is commonplace, anti-Semitism unique.” [MAMLAK, GRYNBERG, FURSTENBERG] Later, he overlooked the millions of Russian dead in World War II to amazingly comment that “Hitler … utilized … the war in Russia for the sole purpose of destroying the Jews.” [CARMICHAEL, J., p. 16] Monford Harris entitled an article *Israel: The Uniqueness of Jewish History.* [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 77]

World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann noted his own thoughts about the Judaism’s “chosen people” concept, the origin of where declared Jewish “uniqueness” always comes from: “In spite of my attachment to the Jewish religion I do not like to talk about ‘the chosen people’ … Rather than ‘chosen’ I prefer the notion of a ‘unique people.’” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 14] Elsewhere he argued that “the Zionist political idea is absolutely unique and fantastic. You may claim that it is senseless or that it is magnificent, but in either case it remains unique.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 89] Holocaust theologians, notes Marc Ellis, “argue that the 1967 [Israeli-Arab] war represents a ‘unique’ type of victory. This uniqueness is seen in a number of factors, beginning with the particularity of Jewish existence and history, a return to the land of Jewish ancestry, and, especially, renewed access to the old city of Jerusalem and the Temple Wall.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 4] “It’s hard to compare anything to the horror of the Holocaust,” says “America’s best-known commentator on religious life,” Martin Marty, “It is a unique event, in so many ways.” Marty’s comments were in consequence of members of the Religious Newswriter Association of America voting for the Holocaust as the “major religious event” of the century. [MATTINGLY, T., 12-18-99]

“Christians must regard Jews as special,” says Richard L. Rubenstein, “and, at least in areas pertaining to God’s salvation, apart from humanity in general.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 12] “All other revolts, both past and future,” proclaimed Israeli Prime Minister Ben Gurion, “were uprisings against a system, against a political, social, or economic structure. Our [Zionist] revolution is directed not against a system, but against destiny, against the unique destiny of a unique people.” [GURION, in BIALE, *Power*, p. 4-5] “It has often been observed,” asserts Etan Levine, “that in all the annals of recorded history, there is no chapter more romantic, more inspiring, yet more complex and more inexplicable than the 2,000 year episode of the Jewish people in exile.” [LEVINE, E., 1983, p. 1-11] “I accept the idea,” says Marie Syrkin, “that their special experience has given Jews a unique understanding of the role of a minority in a given society.” [SYRIN, M., 1967, p. 118] “Hatred of the Jews has many parallels,” adds Ber-
nard Lewis, “and yet is unique ... The special and peculiar hatred of the Jews ... derives its unique power from the historical relationship between Judaism and Christianity.” [LEWIS, B., 1986, p. 21-22] Teachers, argues a textbook about the Holocaust, must “recognize and confront the unique and complex history of antisemitism.” [STROM/PARSONS, 1982, p. 47]

“The Bible typically goes to great lengths,” says Zev Garber and Bruce Zuckerman, “to point out that the disasters in ancient times were a consequence of the peoples’ inability to keep the covenant promises made at Sinai or to their incapacity to hold to the idealistic standards of justice demanded by the prophets. These demands are also seen as Israel’s special burden — a standard required of no other nation and to which no other nation could ever hope to aspire.” [GARBER, p. 204]

Ultimately, at root in all this polemic masked as history, if the horrors of the Holocaust can somehow be established (not proven) to be absolutely unique in human history, so profoundly special, so painfully inconceivable — either quantitatively or qualitatively — to all other sufferings, it implicitly usurps in a secular manner the rival claims of the Christian religious tradition, that a special individual, Jesus Christ, died for the sins of mankind. In the new Jewish Holocaust view, religiously or otherwise, the latent inference is always that Jews as a group have lit the way for humanity (something which they have been heralding about themselves — in one form or another — for centuries), now with their self-asserted communal martyrdom in the Holocaust.

S. Daniel Breslauer notes Eliezer Berkovits’ messianic views on the subject:

“The Holocaust, together with all other catastrophes in the Jewish past, represents one arena in which Jews can perform their chosen duty. All of history, even its tragic moments, presents opportunities for Jews to ‘fulfill their particular mission ... The Jew demonstrated how to create values, how to realize the ideal. By so demonstrating, Jews give value to being human ... ‘Only when the chosen ones accept the ‘decree’ does the world acquire the moral right to exist.’” [BRESLAUER, p. 10]

“The Holocaust, I fear,” says Rabbi Jame Lebeau, “has come to fill the same need, to play the same role for some Jews as Jesus’ death on the cross does for Christians.” [LEBAU, p. 4] “The Golgotha [site of Christ’s crucifixion] of modern mankind,” declared British Rabbi Ignaz Manbaum in 1966, “is Auschwitz. The cross, the Roman gallows, was replaced by the gas chamber.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 164] “It is strange that the Jewish stories [of persecution],” says Ann Roiphe, “read in a sense like a communal crucifixion stretched out in time with a resurrection [modern Israel].” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 194] “One of the things I find most striking about much of recent Jewish Holocaust commemoration,” says Peter Novick,

“is how ‘un-Jewish’ — how Christian — it is. I am thinking of the ritual of reverently following the structured pathways of the Holocaust in the major museums, which resembles nothing so much as the Stations of the Cross on the Via Dolorosa; the fetishized objects on display like so many fragments of the True Cross or shin bones of saints; the symbolic
resentations of the Holocaust – notably in the climax of Elie Wiesel’s Night – that employ crucifixion imagery. Perhaps most significantly, there is the way that suffering is sacralized and portrayed as the path to wisdom – the cult of the [Holocaust] survivor as secular saint.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 11]

The word ‘holocaust’ actually has sacrificial connotations; in Jewish religious tradition a holocaust is an offering to God, set afire. Sometimes animals were sacrificed. The Jews of Israel, however, seeking to distance themselves from the Nazis massacres of largely passive Jews, originally used the term “shoah,” meaning “destruction, catastrophe, devastation, ruin, waste.” [PETUCHOWSKI, p. 1-2] “Use of the word [Holocaust],” notes Richard L. Rubenstein, “to denote the destruction of Europe’s Jews assimilates genocide to the world of religious faith and implies that the victims offered themselves up in the tradition of Israel’s ancient martyrs al kiddush ha-shem (for the sanctification of the divine Name).” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 83]

In the West, modern Jewish secular convictions about the “Holocaust” is, hence, pseudo-religious in content. The word “holocaust,’ observes Wolfgang Sofsky,

“designates ritual martyrdom that Jews took upon themselves because they refused to renounce their faith. The expression thus forges a link, totally inadmissible, between the genocidal murder of the Jews and the fate of Jewish martyrs … By distortion of the term’s core meaning, the impression is generated that the mass murder of the Jews had some deeper religious impact – as if the victims had, in a sense, offered themselves up for the slaughter.” [SOFSKY, W., 1993, p. 6]

If, however, despite all the Jewish lobbying, “the” Holocaust is not unique in human history, it has nothing specially to teach us. Humankind just again repeats its pathetic follies and perversions, the same brutal viciousness manifest in new guises, in new eras, this time reflecting mankind’s most horrible base-ness via the rationalist, scientific, technological, and corporate forms of brutality.

“To see God as having a role in the destruction of the Jews,” says Garber and Zuckerman, “is difficult – nearly intolerable – but to divorce God from this most horrific of events would be far worse. For without the God of the Bible, who established the special relationship with the Chosen People, the genocide ceases to be a Jewish event.” [GARBER, p. 206]

“I cannot help but see this extermination pride as another variant of the Covenant,” argues Jewish critic Philip Lopate, “This time the Chosen People have been chosen for extraordinary suffering. As such, the Holocaust seems simply another opportunity for Jewish chauvinism. I grew up in Williamsburg, Brooklyn, surrounded by this chauvinist tendency, which expresses itself in an insecure need to boast about Jewish achievement in every field, the other side which was a contempt for non-Jews, the gentile.” [LOPATE, p. 299]

A number of Jewish scholars and organizations have doggedly persisted in a bizarre, arrogant game of victimhood one-upmanship over others’ dead,
searching for any angle to prove their claim of Jewish exceptionality: Jews were murdered faster than anybody else in history, Jews died more horribly, etc. Richard Rubenstein, a professor of religion, even digs up the old Chosen People hatred of Christianity paradigm to argue that “the religious element makes the Holocaust unique.” In this view, “the Holocaust was a Holy War in which post-Enlightenment European Christendom’s goal of eliminating Jews and Judaism from its midst was fulfilled by Hitler albeit by means other than most religious authorities would have preferred.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 16-17]

No one can successfully argue that the Holocaust was unique as a genocide purely on quantitative terms, using the (commonly claimed) number of six million Jews who died under Nazi rule. In a bizarre book about the subject, author Steven Katz laboriously undertakes to quantify, qualify, and otherwise dispassionately measure by numbers and statistics the history of human suffering at the hands of others (“We must,” notes Katz, “distinguish between the percentage of Jews lost and the percentage killed.”) Ironically, the author’s scholarly zeal for objective academic rhetoric in addressing the tortured and murdered totally dehumanizes – not unlike the Nazis’ own culture of detached scientism – his subject matter:

“Seeking to kill all of a group is descriptively, even ontologically, different from seeking to kill part of a group, but is not necessarily morally worse. For example, the killing of some X may be a greater evil (assuming one could measure such things) than killing all of Y, where there are more X than Y and the absolute number of X killed exceeds the total number of Y even though the killing of X (using a form of Bauer’s nomenclature) is not Holocaustal. [KATZ, p. 33]”

Katz notes that in this century alone there were far worse man-made catastrophes that have befallen people other than Jews. Joseph Stalin, for example, “willfully” killed up to twenty million people in Russia between 1929-39. In the 1940’s another twenty million more Soviets lost their lives as a consequence of World War II. Alexander Solzhenitsyn estimated that between 1929 and 1959 sixty-six million Russians were killed by “man-made famines and related forms of violence and war.”

In China, Katz figures between 34-64 million people died during the Chinese communist revolution in the 1930’s and 1940’s. In Turkey, between 35 and 60% of the Armenian population was killed by Turks in 1915-1917. Aborigines in Tasmania were entirely wiped out by the European conquest in the nineteenth century. [All KATZ, p. 97] In Central America, with the Invasion of the Conquistadors, some fifty million indigenous peoples were reduced to three and a half million in less than a century. [TRAVERSO, p. 106]

Katz, who goes as far back into antiquity as 731 BCE to count and qualify Jewish deaths at the hands of others, neglects – not surprisingly – to mention the seminal Biblical record of the Jews themselves as genocidal perpetrators. Having reviewed a range of other historical atrocities that might be termed “genocidal,” the author argues that “the Holocaust is phenomenologically unique by virtue of the fact that never before has a state set out, as a matter of
principle, and actualized policy, to annihilate physically every man, woman, and child belonging to a specific people.” [KATZ, p. 98]

Katz, of course, is wrong. As we have already seen, the ancient Jews articulated, “actualized,” and even celebrated in the Old Testament the precedential policy of a Holocaust upon the Canaanites, and others. This genocide is even, however horrific, part of Jewish – and others’ – religious belief. And while it was quantitatively smaller (tiny in comparison) to the 1940’s Holocaust, it was equal in genocidal intention to the Nazis of modern Europe. Katz and other Jewish scholars might quibble over the semantic technicalities of what a “state” means, as we know the word today. But certainly the ancient Israelites understood themselves as a nation, certainly a well-defined “state” of its own era, which is still part of Orthodox Judaic – and Zionist – belief today. That not all Canaanites and others were successfully wiped out is besides the point. Not all European – or even Polish – Jews were murdered either. As Katz notes, it was the intention to actualize a complete atrocity that counts, and the physical initiation of that process. Here the Jews themselves as violators take precedent, in religious and legendary form that has in no small way influenced the rest of human history.

This tendency by Jewish scholars to completely overlook their own people’s history of genocidal perpetration (such an attitude of genocidal “intent” even endures today among Orthodox (and many other) Jews to “wipe out” even the “memory” of Amalek) – yet minimize all other mass murders towards heralding their own victimization as consummate – is noted with impatience by Jasper Griffin. In a review of a book by a Jewish scholar, Peter Schafer, that explores the deplorable “anti-Semitism” of ancient Greece and Rome, Griffin notes that “it might be thought, in the present instance, that here are some other parallels in ancient texts to this zeal for the complete destruction of a people. We might find them, not in Greek or Roman sources, but in the biblical accounts of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites … The prophet Ezekiel had a similar fate in mind for the city of Tyre (Ezekiel 26), and so on; the ferocious author of the Revelation, a Jew and a Christian, who gloats over the prospect of earthly destruction followed by eternal torment for most of mankind, only twelve thousand from each of the twelve tribes of Israel being saved, perhaps represents the logical end of this line of thought. None of this is mentioned by Schafer.” [GRIFFIN, p. 57]

What can be said with certainty about the massacre of Jewry by the Nazis is that it is, thanks to Jewish publicity efforts, the most widely known atrocity – or historical event, for that matter – in history. (And the gigantic context for it – World War II – has been completely marginalized in a profound historical revisionism). Amidst decades of hand wringing and soul searching, the question surfaces again and again in Jewish discourse: Why did their God desert them like that? Fifty years later, this horrible experience is so much part of the modern Jewish psyche that it transcends all other self-conceptions. Beyond religion, beyond race, a Jew is someone who was sent to Nazi gas chambers. A Jew is someone whose life, whose history, is persecution. In our time the worldwide
Jewish community has taken this bit of recent history, crystallized it as a beacon for Jewish insecurity and uncertainty in the Diaspora, and transformed the murder of millions into a formidable ideological weapon. Although the Holocaust is the consummate modern symbol for man’s inhumanity to man, and Hitler had distinctly genocidal aims upon others, most Jews – distinctly separate from others in self-conception – claim it completely, and only, as inhumanity against their own. Says Moshem Leshem:

“Israeli and American Jews fully agree that the memory of the Holocaust (as they carefully shape it) is an indispensable weapon – one that must be used relentlessly against their common enemy, no matter how high the cost to Jewish psyche. Jewish organizations and individuals thus labor continuously to remind the world of it.” [p. 228, LESHEM]

For Jews like Jane Delynn, the hallowed fixation on Jewish Holocaust dead obscures all other catastrophes and miseries in human history:

“It is irrelevant to me whether Stalin’s victims surpass the number of Jews killed by Hitler. The number – six million – numbs me. All comparisons (again except perhaps for Stalin) are found wanting: 6 million is 5 million more than 1 million Cambodians; 5 and three-quarters more than a quarter of a million starved Bangladeshis; 5,975,000 more than 25,000 Armenians killed in the recent earthquake; 5,999, 668 more than 332 Palestinians Jews killed in the intifada 5,999,999 more than one American murdered on the Achille Lauro.” [DELYNN, p. 73]

The numbers of Jews lost is not the only numbing fact in Jewish commentary. It is the way in which Jews died en masse which so disturbs, and ultimately enrages, their modern counterparts (despite the fact that many non-Jews died in the concentration camps in the same manner). If most Jews had died in a blaze of returned gunfire – however hopelessly out-manned by Nazis – it would, it appears, have been far more palatable to Jewish conceptions of themselves as a noble community. In this context, even the horrible demise of non-Jews who were machine-gunned as they begged for their lives in cornfields or on street corners, slowly starved or frozen to death, are preferable to the impersonal murder factory which so many Jews submitted to so feebly. Inevitably, such modern Jewish reflection evokes a picking through the piles of the dead to speculate on their last moment pedigrees of humiliation, indignity, and dehumanization. And, most importantly, the sorting of who was Jewish, and who was not. That Jews did little, and usually nothing, to forcibly resist their fate (and in fact actually aided their own demise, [ARENDT] at the hands of the Nazis has created a psychological backlash amongst Jews in our own day, epitomized by overwhelming support and allegiance for an angry, militant, brutal, and defiant Israel.

“Some people have argued that Israel or Jewish life is too focused on anger at the Holocaust,” says Michael Lerner. “I disagree. In fact, the various commentaries and museums are a substitute for legitimate anger. They function to repress the real emotions Jews have every right to feel.” [LERNER, Goyim, p. 434]
The Holocaust has become the ultimate Jewish rallying point and the blood of their murdered brethren tightens like a vice their international unity. “Never again” is the deeply felt Jewish rallying cry, this defiantly militant admonition giving impetus to aggressively locate and combat any perceived anti-Semitic threat to worldwide Jewry. Given Jews’ self-proclaimed higher moral ground by virtue of their communal suffering at the hands of Gentiles in the Holocaust, many non-Jews typically fall silent in any debate when the Holocaust is wielded as the coup de grace. How can one, it is argued, presume to compare any injustice – Israeli-inspired or otherwise– with the tenor and scope of the Holocaust, the utmost of evils, the consummate destruction by a modern industrial civilization of all things human?

Among the modern Jewish recasts of history is the emphasis upon Jewish resistance and heroism in the Holocaust era, what Dina Porat calls “the valor [ization] of the Jews in Europe to a position equal to their suffering.” [PORAT, p. 169] “Unquestioningly the need to revise the Jewish image concerning the Holocaust is very strong,” wrote Jay Gonen in 1977, “… during the 1960s, the Holocaust was less frequently described to [Israeli] children as such in order to avoid the suggestion of a wholesale slaughter of passive victims.” [GONEN, p. 155] Emphasis was eventually placed, says Goren, on “the Holocaust and heroism” and “the Holocaust and rebellion.” [GONEN, p. 156] In reality, for those Jews who could afford it, “resistance” against the Nazis typically took the form of “petitions, ransom fees, and protection payments.” [GONEN, p. 152]

As Peter Novick notes:

“Jewish spokesmen had more reason than most to claim that their people had zealously resisted, since from the beginning there were many Jews who had scorned those who went ‘like sheep to the slaughter.’ The cult of Jewish resistance was particularly strong in Israel, where the full name of Yad Vashem [the Holocaust museum] is ‘Yad Vashem Martyrs and Heroes Remembrance Authority’; the full name of Yom Hashoah is ‘Day of the Holocaust and Heroism.’ But in the United States as well, the breadth and depth of Jewish resistance was a major theme of what Holocaust commemoration there was – the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising being the principal occasion of memorialization. Thus the event most atypical of the Holocaust was made emblematic of it – suggestive evidence of the (quite unjustified) shame that many Jews felt because of the absence of substantial Jewish resistance. At the time of the [former Nazi Adolf] Eichmann trial a topADL [Anti-Defamation Lague] official wrote that ‘perhaps a million … Jews were killed resisting the Nazi conqueror, fighting back against Hitler’s juggernaut, dying not on their bedraggled knees but on their blood-soaked feet.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 138-139]

One of the few Jewish armed resistances to the Nazis of any significance was the so-called Warsaw Ghetto uprising, a desperate revolt by entrapped Jews who recognized, at the very last, no other chance for survival. This event has become the taproot for a variety of myths these days about Jewish heroism.
“The [Israeli] fight for Jerusalem or the Negev desert,” says Michael Berenbaum, “came to be seen as an extension of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising. [Jewish] historians sought to recapture a tradition of resistance defined as armed struggle against an everywhere [Gentile] goal that was genocidal.” [BERENBAUM, p. 449]

Another Jewish “revolt” occurred when a group of Auschwitz sonderkommandos realized that they were soon to be exterminated. “When news arrived ... that 300 prisoners [including the sonderkommando squads] were going to be sent off in a [train] transport,” notes Barbara Jarosz, “the prisoners realized they would meet the same fate as their predecessors so they decided to carry out their plan and not let themselves dies without a fight.” [JAROSZ, B., p. 233]

The preponderant educational theme in Israel about the Holocaust, notes Arye Carmon,

“overemphasized the few examples of active resistance during the Holocaust (the general Holocaust memorial day is set annually to commemorate the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising). The overemphasis on active resistance was coupled, in the 1950s and 1960s, with an obsessive search for further examples of such resistance ... [CARMON, p. 79]. Since the middle of the 1970s ... the main feature of [Israel’s] approach [to the Holocaust] was the growing emphasis on the Jewish amida (stand). This approach implies that the Jewish response to the Nazis was basically active rather than passive and that the various ways in which Jews coped with Nazi decrees, collectively and individually, reflected both physical and spiritual resistance.” [CARMON, p. 81]

“It seems that the obsessional preoccupation with the behavior of slaughtered Jews, and whether they died as heroes or fighters,” says Jay Goren, “stems from historically accumulated feelings concerning a negative [Jewish] image. These feelings constitute a heavy inheritance.” [GONEN, p. 158] “Israeli youth ... were especially troubled by the perception of the Holocaust victims offering little resistance to the Nazis,” says Charles Liebman and Eliezer Don-Yehiya, “... Hence, the stress is on acts of forcible resistance by Jews.” [SAIDEL, p. 21]

All this is classical historical revisionism to meet the growing propaganda needs of the modern state of Israel. The contemporary Israeli search for noble Jewish defenders and warriors stretches deep into history. Amos Elon notes that

“It is unlikely that the memory of Boadicea, the first-century queen of the Britons who, like [Israeli hero] Bar Kokhba, staged a disastrous uprising against the Romans, could generate similar ceremonies [by modern national politicians], let alone passions, in today’s England. But in Jerusalem, the second-century uprising of Bar Kokhba against the Romans is liable to be evoked, polemically, as an event of almost contemporary significance.” [ELON, 1991, p. 179]

Jewish scholar Dina Porat notes the Israeli perspective on the Holocaust immediately after World War II as surviving Jews from Europe made their way to Israel:
“Slowly the suspicion developed [among Israelis] that those who survived had perhaps managed to do so because they had been unwilling to sacrifice themselves in the struggle against the Nazis. Emissaries sent to Europe to help the She’erit Hapletah, the saving remnant [of Jewry], and to direct it to Palestine, reinforced this view. To a Zionist emissary in Greece, those who returned from Auschwitz were cynical, lazy, money-grubbing idlers and window-smashers. According to an emissary in France, the survivors believed that the whole world owed them, especially the Jewish people. And in the opinion of emissaries in Germany and Austria: ‘Five thousand like these [those liberated from the camps] could turn Eretz Israel [the land of Israel] into a madhouse.’ In the yishuv and later in the state of Israel, there was a latent feeling that the Jews who survived possessed certain aggressive qualities. In a closed Mapai central meeting in 1949 [Israeli Prime Minister] Ben Gurion expressed what others dare not say publicly: ‘Among the survivors of the German camps were people who would not have been alive were they not what they were – hard, mean, and selfish – and what they have been through erases every remaining good quality in them.’” [PORAT, p. 162]

“There was [in Israel], repeatedly,” notes Peter Novick,

“the theme of the ‘survival of the worst.’ The future Israeli general David Sh’altiel, who accompanied a boatload of survivors to Palestine, reported his belief that ‘those who survived lived because they were egoistical and looked out, first and foremost, for themselves.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 69]

“Often,” said a Jewish official of the era, “it was the ‘ex-ghetto’ elements rather than the upper class or white collar groups who survived ... the petty thief or leader of petty thieves who offered leadership to others, or developed techniques of survival.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 68-69] Among the European Holocaust survivors, noted Zionist Abraham Klausner (who worked with them), “The number of people involved in the black-market is estimated at a minimum of 30%. This excludes those who traffic in what may be termed the ‘gray market’ or the basic food market ... The demoralization of the people increases rapidly. There is hardly a moral standard to which the people adhere.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 79]

Once in Israel, as many of the Holocaust survivors expressed deep allegiance to, and were malleable by, the Zionist cause, Ben Gurion’s harsh opinion of them softened, because, as he said, “the majority are precious Jews, precious Zionists, with deep Zionist instincts.” [PORAT, p. 164]

Since then, expressions of Jewish moral dearth, passivity and compliance to their own destruction in Europe during World War II was reconstructed to ideologically fit a mold deemed usable for the modern, defiantly militant, state of Israel. The Jews of Europe, formerly recognized by even Israeli leaders to have been “slaughtered like sheep,” were now reinvented as noble martyrs and resistance fighters. “Between 1986 and 1989,” says James Young, “[Israel television]
included – incredibly – a Holocaust quiz show, *The International Quiz on Jewish Heroism During World War II*. Taped in front of a live audience, panels of students would take questions from the state’s president on names, dates, places, and events of the Shoah [Holocaust] period highlighting instances of resistance and heroism.” [YOUNG, The Texture, p. 27] In the parlance of formal public discourse in Israel, the Jewish victims of the Holocaust have become “holy martyrs” and “the first to fall in defense of the state [of Israel].” [YOUNG, p. 275] The facts of Jewish passivity were replaced with myths of Jewish action in the face of catastrophe that “exemplified the values that have always been central to their faith, namely, the primary responsibilities of the individual to the community.” [CARMON, p. 84]

In the early years after the Holocaust, says Haim Bresheeth, “behind the question ‘Why did they not fight?’ which every Israeli child was taught to pose not as a query but as a historical judgment, was the corollary of that query: ‘We, the new Jews, will NOT go like lambs to slaughter ... this simplified picture ... has been relaxed in one area, which then became the rule – the few substantial acts of Jewish resistance were canonized.” [BRESEETH, p. 196]

For many Jews, the Holocaust confirmed their worse fears and has provided the profoundest evidence of hideous Gentile designs upon them if anti-Semitism is not forcefully addressed – like a disease – early. In this view there are always other potential Adolf Hitlers in the Jew-hating world who could create trouble for Jews if they do not subvert and/or silence them with concerted action. Within this defensive web inevitably fall those who dare to voice legitimate criticism of Jews and/or Israel. Such voices are immediately discredited: anyone who dares to criticize the policies of Israel is likened to an anti-Semite. Critics often take great pains to distinguish between their criticism of Israel and criticism of Jews. They know too well that to criticize anything about Jews is automatically considered to be anti-Semitism and, hence, bigotry: the death blow to any argument. Once securely rendered a bigot, racist, and all the rest, the critic is easily discarded as a raving fanatic and will not be taken seriously except by fringe elements like neo-Nazi or Ku Klux Klan, of which he is presumed to be at least a spiritual member anyway.

Hence, the Holocaust is wielded like an immortal shield to protect the Jewish community and deflect any and all criticism from outsiders. It garners sympathy, compassion and Gentile guilt. It is also raised continuously to protect the state of Israel and that country’s many disturbing policies. The Jewish state, its defenders maintain, guarantees refuge and/or military might for those who might threaten Jews anywhere. Amos Elon has complained that Israel’s absorption with the Holocaust has “an obsessive quality,” and that “inevitably some Israelis, at certain times and places, have found it unduly morbid, burdensome, and even contrived.” [SAIDEL, p. 17] “The institutionalization of the Holocaust,” says Rochelle Saidel, “as reflected in Israel’s official monuments and commemorations” provide for Israeli leaders a “utilization of the Holocaust as an ‘excuse’ for foreign and domestic policies.” [SAIDEL, p. 17]

In Israel, seminal “Holocaust museums” have long been instituted to
enforce the myths of modern Israel and Jewish identity. Of particular note is Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, a “must stop” on any Jewish visitor’s tourist package while visiting Israel. Philip Lopate, on these terms a very wayward Jew, saw through the artifice of the place:

“Institutions like Yad Vashem (the Holocaust Heroes and Martyrs Museum) and the Museum of the Diaspora in Israel ... are, in my view, essentially propaganda factories, designed to manipulate the visitor through a precise emotional experience. They are like a Tunnel of Horrors or a Disneyland Park devoted to Jewish suffering. The success of the exhibit depends entirely on entering a properly preprogrammed state and allowing one’s buttons to be pushed ... In my own visit to Yad Vashem ... I was disturbed by what seemed a theatrically partisan misuse of historical methods.” [LOPATE, p. 297]

“The visiting foreign statesman,” notes Avishai Margalit, “... is rushed to Yad Vashem even before he has had time to leave his luggage at his hotel. [He must come to understand] that all of us here in Israel are [represented in the room for murdered Holocaust] children and that Hitler-Arafat is after us.” [LOPATE, p. 298] “A visit to Yad Vashem is the opening ritual of every state visit to Israel,” concurs Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, “–usually the first stop en route from the airport to a hotel in Jerusalem. The aim of this ritual is to express Israel’s relation to the Holocaust, to present the country as the haven for survivors and as the answer to the insecurity of Jewish existence in the Diaspora. A second aim is to induce the appropriate feelings of guilt in the visitor.” [HALLAHMI, p. x]

Yad Vashem also, like many Jewish organizations, has educational programs to socialize influential persons to their world view. Since 1981, over 1,400 teachers, historians, and clergy members (about half non-Jewish) have journeyed to Israel for seminars on how to teach the Holocaust in their respective countries. [VROMAN, p. 35]

In 1992, controversy erupted in Israel’s Education Ministry over the way it sponsored 1500 Israeli youths every year to make pilgrimages to former Holocaust concentration camps sites in Poland. The Minister of Education, Shulamith Aloni, objected to what she called the young “Israeli chauvinists” who paraded around “with Israeli flags in the streets of Poland.” Israeli critic Tom Segev noted that the “students were required to wear purple sweatshirts with ‘Israel’ printed on them to remind the Poles that Jews “were still there.” The Ministry tour program dictated that the Jewish visitors would read special commemoration notes at Jewish memorial sites, including,

“As we stand beside your graves, we pledge that we will always defend the state of Israel, and will never leave it.” They then recited the “dead’s reply: ‘Yes, this is what we command you to do.’” [DERFNER, p 41]

In the original booklet (To Know and to Remember) passed out to participants in the March of the Living, Jewish hatred of Poles was emphasized:

“There is no longer any Jewish life in Poland. Only remnants of a few synagogues, most of which are used for other purposes, and cemeteries
... Everywhere we will be surrounded by local Polish people, and our feelings toward them will be ambivalent. We will hate them for their involvement in the atrocities, but we will pity them for their miserable life in the present. Let us not be carried away by negative emotions.” [WEINBAUM, p. 8]

Chicago Rabbi Byron Sherwin notes that “... a woman from Yad Vashem ... brought a group of Israeli teenagers to Poland. She told them that they were going there for three reasons: to see where and how Jews had lived, why the state of Israel was necessary, and how the Poles participated in the murder of the Jews ... Zionist ideology is built on the conviction that life outside Israel is unbearable for Jews. For them, the fate of the Jews of Poland and the Holocaust are proof of the correctness of Zionist ideology – that there are only two doors to Jews in the diaspora outside Israel: death or assimilation. Jews who think this way are therefore interested in maintaining the negative image of Poland.” [SHERWIN, B., p. 159]

Throughout the world, the Holocaust has become the greatest public relations tool of all time. And there is clear intention and design in the total artifice of the massive Holocaust propagandizing movement. “For Jews to solidify the place of the Holocaust with Jewish consciousness,” says Michael Berenbaum, Project Director of the Washington DC Holocaust Museum, “they must establish its importance for the American people as a whole. The process cannot be reversed for the decision has already been made.” [BERENBAUM, p. 457] Berenbaum calls this campaign “the Americanization of the Holocaust,” whereby the Holocaust story – as Jews present it – will be absorbed by “a black leader in Atlanta, a midwestern farmer, or a northeastern industrialist,” all towards “inform[ing] their current reality.” [YOUNG, p. 337] “In so many books and movies about the Holocaust,” observes Philip Lopate, “I sense that I am being asked to feel a particular pathos in the rounding up gentle, scholarly, middle-class, civilized [Jewish] people and packing them into cattle cars, as though the liquidation of illiterate peasants would not be so poignant.” [LOPATE, p. 293]

The profound misery of humankind in World War II has been largely transformed, rendered in the public mind to be solely a Jewish experience. The contextual event that permitted the Holocaust to occur, a world war, has already, in a half century, been largely rendered forgotten and invisible. Yet today everywhere one sees and hears about the Holocaust that tried to exterminate the Jews in Eastern Europe during the same period. Multi-million dollar museums are built (largely by Jewish funders) in Los Angeles, Washington DC, and other areas to memorialize the sufferings of the Jews. “There are no fewer than nineteen Holocaust museums in the United States, forty-eight research centers, thirty-four archival facilities, twelve memorials, and twenty-six research institutes.” [DAWIDOWICZ, p. 69] There are also hundreds of small research groups and five Holocaust libraries. [MILLER, p. 227]

“In 1981,” notes Gabriel Schoenfeld, “there were 93 courses being offered on the subject [of the Holocaust] in American and Canadian institutions of higher learning, ten years later that figure had nearly doubled, and it has con-
continued to grow throughout the 1990s.” The Holocaust Museum in Washington DC alone offers 25 annual fellowships on the subject. [SCHOENFELD, p. 42] In 1998, Israeli professor Yehuda Baer estimated that there were about 400 colleges offering courses on the Holocaust in America. “There is no doubt that it is something happening on a mass level,” he noted. [VROMAN, p. 35]

Movies and books continually stream out addressing yet another angle to Jewish suffering. In 1996 alone, for example, two Holocaust programs – one from England and one from France – won International Emmy Awards for television. In 2001, “three prime-time television dramas on Holocaust themes won top honors at [the] Emmy Awards,” including the four-hour long ‘Anne Frank;’ two awards for ‘Conspiracy’ (“a dramatic re-enactment of the 1942 Wannsee Conference, where Nazi leaders drew up the blueprint for the Nazi extermination of European Jewry’); and Brian Cox’s acting job in “Nuremberg” (“a dramatization of the 1945-46 trial of top Nazi war criminals.”) [TUGENTD, T., 11-6-01]

“The [Holocaust] memoirs,” notes Stephen Whitfield, “histories, films, television programs, plays, poetry, and fiction that have been published ... defy tabulation.” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 13] (In 1968 even the science fiction TV series Star Trek had an episode in which a peaceful people on another planet, the Zeons, sporting names like Abraham, Isaac, and David, were slated for extermination by the evil Ekosians.) [PEARL, p. 14]

(One spinoff from the Holocaust is an extended interest in condemning its creators, the Nazis, history’s consummate Jew-haters. In 1998, eternally keeping the face of the quintessential anti-Semite in public consciousness, 40 books about Adolf Hitler were published in the United States. In the movie world, noted the London Guardian, “1999 will be the year of the Nazi ... During the past 12 months, some 30 films either set during the second world war or within Nazi themes in a contemporary setting entered production in the United States ... The highest profile trio arrives here in the next few months: Life is Beautiful, a satirical Holocaust farce; Apt Pupil, a Stephen King lesson in Nazi evil, and American History X, a glossy neo-Nazi expose.” [FARROW, p. 8] The first film’s lead character is Jewish and the second and third are directed by Jewish directors, Bryan Singer and Tony Kaye, respectively).

“In America,” wrote Moshe Leshem in the 1980s, before the Holocaust obsession really took off, “the perpetuation of the Holocaust memory is now a $100 million-a-year enterprise, part of which is government funded. Books with Holocaust themes, documentaries, feature films, TV programs, memorials and museums are a staple of America’s cultural diet.” [LESHEM, p. 228] Yaffa Eliach, a Holocaust survivor and founder of the first Holocaust center in the United States, already noted in 1979 that American Jews had connected to the “vast educational and financial potential of the Holocaust ... One may sadly reflect that ‘there is no business like Shoah business.’” [LINENTHAL, p. 13] “The process of converting the Holocaust into a profitable commodity goes on,” wrote Gershon Mamlak in 1983, “Instead of elucidating its historic lessons, it has become a subject for self-aggrandizement and pseudo-scholarly works.”
In 1987, British chief rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits decried the “entire [Holocaust] industry, with handsome profits for writers, researchers, filmmakers, monument builders, museum planners and even politicians.” [SHAPIRO, H, p. 25] “At one Holocaust Museum in America, for example,” bemoaned Tom Gross in 1999, “for $39.95 there are miniature replicas of cattle cars in which Jews were transported to their deaths.” [GROSS, T., 11-28-99]

“It would be helpful,” argued Jewish author Lewis Fein in 2001, in the face of an avalanche of continued mass media Holocaust obsession, “– in fact, it may already be necessary – for Hollywood to impose a moratorium concerning the Holocaust. No more films, television dramas or Broadway tragedies about the Holocaust and its one-dimensional portrayal of Jews as sympathetic yet hapless victims, or the equally extreme depiction of all mid-century Germans as Nazi coconspirators.” [FEIN, L., 5-23-01]

In 1999, Judith Shulevitz noted a case of Holocaust fraud to get on the profitable bandwagon: “Bruno Doesseker is the real name of a Swiss author known to the world as Binjamin Wilkormirski, a Latvian Jewish concentration camp survivor and memoirist who is now accused of having wholly fabricated his harrowing tale of toddlerhood in the camps ... As fiction, it’s banal ... This raises the question of why so many critics were so moved by so many clichés.” [SHULEVITZ, p. A17] Earlier, in the academic realm, Jewish psychoanalyst Bruno Bettelheim (co-author of Dynamics of Prejudice and a prominent official in the American Jewish Committee’s psychoanalytic studies of anti-Semitism) [BETTELHEIM, p. 101] was found to have “lied about studying with Freud, whom he never met; lied about his academic degrees; lied about his time in the concentration camp and about the behavior he observed there.” [HEILBUT, p. 489]

In Hollywood, heralding the myths of the Holocaust, in 1999 Jewish actor Dustin Hoffman produced a TV movie that sought to socialize young Jews (and others) deeper into the Jewish victimology ideology. Its story centered on a teenage Jewish girl, disinterested in Jewish Holocaust obsessions, who is magically punished when she suddenly finds herself back in 1941, ending up in a Nazi concentration camp. “It just amazes me that many young people don’t know about the Holocaust,” said director Donna Deitch, “... The basic message of the movie is the message I get from [Holocaust] survivors, ‘Remember.’” [APPLEBOME, p. 3]

Among the big Shoah profiteers is concentration camp survivor Elie Wiesel, probably the foremost propagandizer of the Jewish experience in World War II, a man “who charges in excess of $20,000 plus first-class plane fares for the privilege of listening to his post-Holocaust thoughts and memories.” [BLAIR, p. 3] Among the earliest springboards to Shoah Business was the Diary of Ann Frank. The first agent and popularizer for the book, Meyer Levin, an avid Zionist, believed the young girl to be “a spokesperson for the Jewish victims of the Holocaust ... a means to popularize the message about Jewish persecution.” [BLAIR, p. 4] Ann’s father, Otto Frank – who survived World War II – had a less Jewish particularist sentiment about the death of his daughter; he and Levin became
embroiled in nasty lawsuits over control of the murdered girl’s commercial and political legacy. [BLAIR, p. 4] (Peter Novick, in *The Holocaust in American Life*, writes at length about how Ann Frank’s diary has been reconfigured, socially and politically, by Judeo-centric activists to be an expressly Jewish statement, and not a universalistic one.) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 117-120] By 1989 two letters written by Anne Frank were sold at auction for $160,000. [ROSENBERG, H. 3-3-89, p. 16] 600,000 people a year were visiting her hiding place from the Nazis in Amsterdam; in 1990 a close childhood friend of Frank, Jacqueline Van Maarsen, accused Frank’s stepsister, Eva Schloss, of exploiting Ann’s memory for a new Schloss book about the Holocaust. In a public feud, each claimed she knew the Jewish heroine better than the other. [SOCLOVSKY, p. 12]

In the broadcasting world, Gerald Green’s 1978 TV series, *Holocaust* (with Executive Producer Herbert Brodkin, Producer Robert Berger, Director Marvin Chomsky, and Gerald Green all Jewish) had an estimated audience of 120 million viewers in the United States and 41% of the TV audience in Germany. [ZIOLKOWSKI, p. 676] There was also a massive publicity campaign to keep *Holocaust* in public attention; there was distribution of “educational viewing guides,” a paperback edition of the program, and promotions for *Holocaust* as the “topic of the week” at churches and synagogues. “Reactions to the first American broadcast of miniseries ... was voluminous,” notes Jeffrey Shandler, “prolonged, conspicuous, and contentious, constituting a ‘big event’ in American culture above and beyond the miniseries itself ... [it] generated an exceptional quality and variety of print coverage ... [including] reports on such related topics as Holocaust education ... the American Jewish Committee and Jewish Anti-Defamation League published the results of studies of the program’s impact on American audiences ... [The publication], *Impact: Four Days in April*, saw greater awareness of the Holocaust, and its significance, than in three decades preceding.” [SHANDLER, p. 154-155, 165] Post-broadcast, NBC even had a one-hour news special about reaction to the program.

In 1977, M. T. Mehdi, head of the American Arab Relations Community protested the mandatory curriculum unit created by the New York Board of Education called *The Holocaust: A Study of Genocide*. Mehdi understood the latent current of this socialization process to be “an attempt by the Zionists to use the city educational system for their evil propaganda purposes.” [DAWIDOWICZ, p. 225] “Many public schools have adopted the recent *Facing History and Ourselves* curriculum on the Holocaust and genocide,” notes Marvin Wilson, “More than 25 percent of Catholic high schools have used some form of Holocaust education in their curricula.” [WILSON, M., p. 30] In 2000, students at a Jewish school in Baltimore made the news for attempting to collect 6 million cancelled stamps “to represent the number of Jews killed in the Holocaust.” The stamps would be exhibited as a “permanent display in glass cases as part of an effort to remember the Holocaust and its role in Jewish culture.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 4-3-2000] In 2001, eighth grade students at Whitwell Middle School in eastern Tennessee appealed for people to send in paperclips. The goal was to collect six million of them, “to represent the 6,000,000 victims of the Holocaust.” “We will build a sculpture with the help of a local artist,”
announced the directors of the project, “to be displayed in our town. The memorial sculpture is being designed by a California jewelry manufacturer and will stand as a lasting memorial for those who gave so much.” [about.com] In 1999, Denver’s 17-year-old Holly Cole designed an Internet web site about Ann Frank that won the “Best of Show Award” at the “Ninth Annual Ann Frank Competition.” [ESQUIBEL, C., 5-3-99]

In Georgia, Jewish director Sylvia Wygoda heads the Georgia Commission on the Holocaust. “With a $70,000 annual salary and as much as $20,000 a year in benefits, Wygoda earns more than any other Holocaust commission director in the country ... The Georgia Commission on the Holocaust now boasts political clout, the biggest budget of any such commission in the country and a sweeping mandate to teach Georgia’s public about the Holocaust and the dangerous legacy of intolerance.” Wygoda has even “hired an exhibit company to build a full-size replica of [Ann Frank’s] secret annex, two rooms complete with reproductions of Anne’s bed and writing table. Wygoda said she wanted all Georgians to learn about Ann Frank.” Wygoda has come under public fire for being “unable to produce substantial minutes and records of commission meetings where money was allocated and spent.” [ATLANTA JEWISH TIMES, 6-18-99]

On April 7, 1994 (“Holocaust Memorial Day”) the governor of New Jersey signed a bill, like many other states, requiring his state’s schools to teach about the Holocaust and other genocides. [LOSHIT, p. 5] By 1998, guided by the Holocaust Education Commission, 93 percent of New Jersey school districts had courses about the Holocaust and other genocides incorporated into their curriculums. The Commission specially trained 7,000 teachers. Some school districts even sent teachers on “Commission-led trips to Israel and Eastern Europe.” And how is the Holocaust and “other genocides” systematically to be taught? Paul Winkler, the Holocaust Education Commission’s director, told a New Jersey newspaper “that tailoring genocide to demographics [i.e., other atrocities against ethnic groups] is fine, as long as teachers make a connection to the Holocaust and the perils of discrimination.” [LLORENTE, p. A3]

In 1997, Martha Mekaelian complained in the Armenian Reporter that “other genocides” (like that of the Armenian at the hands of the Turks) in such school programs tend to be overlooked because of a singular emphasis on the Jewish Holocaust. Noting a mandatory teaching to school children of genocidal issues in Illinois, Mekaelian observed that there was not an

“equitable approach in their presentation ... Since fourth grade, the only Holocaust which has ever been taught is that of the Second World War. Such narrow-mindedness has no place in the public schools. Moreover, young impressionable students may ultimately infer that all other genocides pale in comparison to that of the Jews. Students are instructed to read books, which depict the events of the Holocaust in the personal lives of Jewish families, beginning at age 9. This instruction is referred to as the study of intolerance to ‘prejudice’. The children are taught the evils of prejudice, and the Holocaust is the focal example of
study ... Parents are led to believe that the events and leading figures of the Second World War will be emphasized in [a World War II history class in fifth and sixth grade]; but the reality is that the Holocaust is being emphasized and the Second World War receives only a mention.” [MEKAELIAN, p. 2]

Leaving no stone unturned to spread the tale of Jewish victimhood throughout America, in 1997 Holocaust icon Eli Wiesel, Anti-Defamation League director Abraham Foxman, and FBI director Louis Freeh spoke at the “first annual Holocaust memorial ceremony at FBI Headquarters in Washington DC.” The building also exhibited the ADL’s “Holocaust poster series” there and at branch offices throughout the United States. [ADL ON THE FRONT-LINE, Summer 1997, p. 5] During the 1996 ADL-sponsored Holocaust poster tour throughout FBI offices in the country, “special agent in charge, Robert Walsh, noted the closeness of the [FBI] Field Office to ADL.” [ADL ONLINE, 1996, p. 14] Since 1991, the ADL’s teaching program “Workplace of Difference” has been widely conducted for FBI audiences).

In one form or another, the “Holocaust is Unique” formula always reflects Judeo-centric propaganda that can be found pushed into anti-racist “educational” programs throughout the world. In Poland, a yearly conference for elementary and secondary school teachers is produced by Great Britain’s Spiro Institute for the Study of Jewish History and Culture. One Jewish academic at the teach-in, Jolanda Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, noted that “it is impossible to know the facts in teaching about the Holocaust, but to truly understand how one human being could have prepared such a fate for another it has to be taught that individual, unique people died in the camps, and the great majority of them were Jews. [AMBROSEWICZ-JACOBS, p. 67]” Thus primed, she later mentions another common Jewish teaching standby, reporting that “statements that the Holocaust was the work of Christians and that the swastika is a form of the cross stirred indignation [among the Polish teachers].” [AMBROSEWICZ-JACOBS, p. 69] She also noted that “religious affiliation [i.e., being Christian] should not conceal the variety of points of view, however, nor the variety of associations (the cross as a symbol of persecution through the centuries).” [AMBROSEWICZ-JACOBS, p. 69]

In 1998, a senior editor at Commentary magazine, Gabriel Schoenfeld, blasted the entire field of “Holocaust Studies” as a vehicle for propaganda. He wasn’t talking, of course, of expressly Jewish propaganda but, rather, Jewish “feminist” propaganda, an expression of in-house Jewish warring about how the murder of millions is politically exploited. “A 1983 conference at Stern College on ‘Women Surviving the Holocaust,’” complained Schoenfeld, “illustrates the lengths to which feminist scholars will go in pursuit of their propagandistic aims.” [SCHOENFELD, p. 45]

“[The Holocaust],” says Berenbaum, “is now the second most widely taught course of Judaic content – surpassed only by courses in the Hebrew Bible. The Holocaust is now taught in secondary schools throughout the country, television programs have proliferated; Green’s Holocaust was joined by the mini-
series on Wallenberg (a rescuer of Jews), Hershey’s *The Wall*, and Felan’s *Playing For Time*. All have attracted major audiences and have served as important, if flawed, vehicles for educating the American public.” [BERENBAUM, p. 449]

To read and watch such a steady avalanche of material, one might forget everything else that has ever happened in history save for the presumption that vile non-Jews might be lurking under any rock, intent upon harming world Jewry. Contextual information about World War II (and anything else) has evaporated. Meanwhile, a climate is enforced such that when a Jew merely mentions the Holocaust non-Jews are expected to sink into respectful, if not shamed, silence. “The Shoah, Auschwitz, Treblinka, Bergen-Belsen and all the other places of horror,” says Waltraud Herbstrith, of the Carmelite Christian order, “should make us silent, because silence in the face of this atrocity is the most appropriate prayer.” [HERBST, W., 1998, p. 3]

Not all, however, remain silent. Not all stand still to relentless Jewish attack, a half century after World War II. Jewish mass media expressions of their Holocaust history invariably antagonize other views – among them Ukrainian, Polish, and Czech groups who have taken offense at their own negative portrayals in Jewish history recreations. [SHANDLER, p. 161]

“Our preoccupation with the ultimate symbol of anti-Semitism, the Holocaust,” wrote David Klinghoffer in 1998, “has become notorious. There is no end in sight to the Holocaust history books, Holocaust novels, Holocaust television shows, Holocaust magazine and newspaper articles, chairs in Holocaust studies at universities, Holocaust museums, Holocaust poems, Holocaust paintings, Holocaust sculpture. In fact, the flow seems to be picking up speed. Every self-respecting synagogue in the Jewish community must now have its Holocaust memorial, the more elaborately grotesque, the better.” [KLINGHOFER, p. 10-13] In 2001, following a string of Jewish lawsuits in recent years against American companies (having something to do with the Holocaust), German Jews Kurt Julius Goldstein and Peter Gingold even had the chutzpah to file a *$40 billion suit against the U. S. government* because it had not bombed the Auschwitz concentration camp during World War II. [FORWARD, 4-6-01; SCHOENFELD, G., 4-11-01]

There are approximately 1,000 Holocaust organizations across the world, [VROMAN, p. 35] and nearly every American city of any size has at least one memorial of some kind to the theme of Jewish martyrdom. The larger ones, “those mammoth monuments, “says Evyatar Friesel, “often vying with each other for the last word for recognition as the last word in this or that aspect of memorialization, are unrestrained, even aggressive.” [FRIESEL, p. 230] “One does not have to aim at forgetting the unforgettable,” says Jacob Neusner, “in order to judge such ‘centers’ as nihilistic and obsessive, lacking ... dignity and faith.” [NEUSNER, *Holo*, p. 976] “Holocaust monuments seem to me primarily a sign of ethnic muscle-flexing,” says Philip Lopate, “proof that the local Jewish community has attained enough financial and political clout to erect such a tribute to their losses.” [LOPATE, p. 296] Jewish myopia centering on their historic suffering can run into public problems. A proposed Holocaust
monument (which included the Star of David) at a public park in Los Angeles was vetoed by the County Board of Supervisors for its sectarian implications; it had to be universalized to include all Holocaust victims, both Jews and non-Jews. [YOUNG, p. 303]

In Denver, Jewish plans for a Holocaust memorial on 27 acres to commemorate an infamous 1942 massacre of Jews at Babi Yar in the Ukraine met complaints from others in the Denver community. The local Ukrainian community stepped forward to point out to the city council that the Babi Yar massacre was not exclusively Jewish; Ukrainians had been murdered there too, including their nationalist poet, Olena Telihai.

The Ukrainians ultimately chipped in $25,000 for their representation at the memorial site, one in which one hundred “crabapple trees” were planted “to represent Jews killed at Babi Yar.” Today, however, says James Young, this contentious site has been largely “forgotten” by the Denver Jewish community, largely due to its diluted (i.e., non-Jewish representation) quality. “Denver’s Jewish community,” says Young, “grew alienated from the very site they meant to unify them.” [YOUNG, p. 296] This should come as no surprise, since Jewish unity, by definition, does not include any one else. It certainly does not include Ukrainians – some of whom are accused by Jews (like other non-Jews in Europe) to have collaborated with the Nazis. “Perhaps the inscription [at the Denver site],” snidely remarks Jewish scholar Steven Cohen, in the typical spirit of Jewish contempt for the Ukrainian-Americans of Denver, and of anywhere, “should read: ’Dedicated to the 33,000 Jews who died at Babi Yar and the Ukrainians who killed them.” [COHEN, Uses, p. 25]

Harold Troper wrote an entire book about Jewish and Ukrainian animosities in Canada, noting that:

“For some Canadian Jews ... Ukrainians still appear as a collective representation of evil. Thus when confronted, albeit infrequently, by Ukrainian sorrows, Jews feel it hard to find sympathy for those who they feel have been their persecutors.” [TROPER, p. 43]

Sometimes, as evidenced in Dallas at a local Jewish community center, creative angles of Holocaust remembrance can be peculiar. In a search for tactile connection to European Jewish misery, an actual European railroad boxcar that carried Jews to their deaths was purchased and reconstructed as an entrance into the Dallas memorial rooms. Its purpose was to give visitors a sense of “having been there.” [YOUNG, p. 298] Not surprisingly, some survivors of the Holocaust refused to pass through such a portal. Such persons were eventually provided “their own, hidden entrance (around the boxcar), a secret door for survivors only.” [YOUNG, p. 298] (There are at least three such boxcar souvenirs in American Holocaust museums. The fourth largest Holocaust museum in America, in St. Petersburg, Florida, has one of them). [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 11-4-99]

In Tucson, the local Holocaust monument is a symbolic architectural construction that “visitors can pass through on their way into a stunning complex of auditoriums, cavernous gymnasiums, weight rooms, swimming pools, and
tennis courts,” lending “a certain cast to all activities that take place in the center.” [YOUNG, p. 299] As early as 1964 an 18-foot bronze sculpture commemorating the Holocaust was erected in Philadelphia near the city hall: “It’s motifs included an unconsumed burning bush, Jewish fighters, a dying mother, a child with a Torah scroll, and a blazing menorah.” [MILTON, p. 12] Since the 1970s, several hundred public sculptures have been constructed in the United States and Europe that commemorate the Holocaust. [MILTON, p. 15]

Among the most ostentatious monoliths in homage to agonized Jewish narcissism (at a cost of $168 million) is the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC, as Hanno Loewy calls it, “a shrine to Jewish identity.” [LOEWY, p. 236] Two million people visited the shrine in its first year alone (opened in April 1993). Initially promoted by three Jewish members of President Jimmy Carter’s administration, it was conceived as a political concession to Jewish lobbying groups “to,” says James Young, “ placate Jewish supporters angered by [Carter’s] sale of F-15 fighter planes to Saudi Arabia. All such memorial decisions are made in political time, contingent on political realities.” [YOUNG, p. 293] A thousand rabbis were invited to a commencement function of the museum’s planners.

With Elie Wiesel originally at the helm of the museum planning commission, despite a number of requisite feints towards democratic universalism and the inclusion of non-Jewish victims of Nazis commemorated at the site, the edifice is Jewish in conception, attitude, focus, control, and funding. One Jew present at a planning conference became “almost hysterical” at the thought of having Polish [non-Jewish] victims represented with Jews. [MILLER, p. 257] On February 13, 1991, at a museum committee meeting where the Armenian genocide at the hands of the Turks in 1915 was being discussed for possible inclusion in the Holocaust Museum, “a prominent [Jewish Holocaust] survivor and council representative lost control and screamed [at the Museum Director], ‘ordering’ him not to mention Armenians in his presence again.” [LINENTHAL, p. 234] An early planning report for the Museum, warned advisor Seymour Bolten, could be understood as “patronizing and condescending toward the non-Jewish victims of the Holocaust – particularly Polish-Americans.” [LINENTHAL, p. 40] “Despite the overwhelming amount of documentation relating to the fate of the gypsies in Nazi Germany,” says Ian Hancock (himself of Gypsy descent), “which has been examined during the fourteen years the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has been in existence, that body, more than any other, rigorously persists inunderestimating and under representing that truth.” [HANCOCK, p. 40] What is this Holocaust museum’s essential perspective? “People had to grow,” the Museum Director, Michael Berenbaum, told Newsday, “Jews had to learn to be sensitive to non-Jewish victims and they, in turn, had to learn to be sensitive to the uniqueness of the Jewish experience.” [HANCOCK, p. 41]

Paul Berger, a prominent member of the United Jewish Appeal, explained in a Congressional hearing the necessity of the Jewish-centeredness of the proposed museum:
“Once you open the door to things that are not related to the Holocaust, where do you draw the line? ... I think the special historic experience of Jews as Jews is a different story, and reflects how the world has looked at Jews in a special way. That is not to say there haven’t been other kinds of sufferings. But to involve other kinds of sufferings distracts from the experience of the Jews as Jews.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 195]

Most of the Holocaust Museum’s ‘commission’ are Jews (“as Jews”). By 1980 the fifty Holocaust Museum Council members included two Blacks, two Polish-Americans, one Ukrainian American, and one Slovenian-American. Three-fourths of the Council members were Jewish. [LINENTHAL, p. 46] Among those appointed who were not Jewish, were those like David Wyman, a non-Jewish “special adviser to the Council.” And his perspective on the issues at hand? “Today I remain strongly pro-Zionist,” he wrote, “and I am resolute supporter of the state of Israel ... I look upon Israel as the most important line of defense against anti-Semitism in the world.” [WYMAN, p. xvi]

Referring to those non-Jews who were not so easily malleable to Judeo-centric aims, “each Eastern European ethnic appointment was at best a political necessity made only to satisfy White House concerns,” notes Jewish scholar Edward Linenthal, “and at worst an obscene incursion into the boundaries of Holocaust memory by those whose countrymen had persecuted Jews.” Some Jews didn’t think the Armenian genocide at the hands of the Turks in the early twentieth century merited inclusion at the Holocaust Museum. “Once you include Armenians as part of the Holocaust,” complained Yaffa Eliach, a Holocaust Museum council member, “I don’t see why other African tribes which are being annihilated at this very moment should not be included.” [LINENTHAL, p. 229] The first Romani (Gypsy), William Duna, to get on the Holocaust Museum council in 1987 accused the group of “overt racism” in its understate-ment of the Gypsy experience in World War II. [LINENTHAL, p. 245]

The Museum’s decision-makers “engaged in a long and bitter debate concerning the uniqueness and universality of the Holocaust.” [BERENBAUM, p. 453] In its formulative years, Seymour Bolton complained that although “Jews were first and primary subjects for extermination ... all Slavs of Eastern Europe were slated for decimation, degradation, and eventual liquidation ... [it was] morally repugnant to create a category of second-class victims of the Holocaust as Mr. Wiesel would have us do.” [LINENTHAL, p. 43] As to the formal terminology of who and what the Holocaust Museum was to address, Eli Wiesel ultimately framed a compromise for President Carter, defining the Holocaust as “the systematic, bureaucratic extermination of six million Jews by the Nazis and collaborators as a central act of state during the Second World War ... as night descended, millions of other people were swept into this net of death. ... While not all victims were Jews, all Jews were victims.” “In this way, “says Berenbaum, “[Weisel] negotiated the labyrinth between those who argued for a Judeo-centric uniqueness and the national requirement of universality imposed by the President [of the United States].” [BERENBAUM, p. 453]

Even some Jews, wrote Jacob Neusner in 1979, during the planning stages
of the museum, “find the Holocaust Commission puzzling. There has not been, after all, a commission created to memorialize the Armenian massacre in World War I (the first major act of genocide in this century), or the political violence and mass murder of Stalinist Russia and Maoist China, let alone the Nazi war against the Poles, Russians, South Slavs, Slovaks, and other people deemed by the racist Wissenschaft to be subhuman. And, to be sure, such commissions as these would prove equally puzzling to Blacks and Indians on our own shores, who surely would wonder why we commensurate these sorts of acts done abroad, which when they occur in our own land are forgotten.” [NEUSNER, Holo, p. 977]

In 1981 the President of the Polish American Congress complained that the Washington Holocaust Museum plans were highly prejudicial: pro-Jewish and anti-Pole. Museum Council member Rabbi Bernard Raskas responded that the Museum should focus more on “the long, sad and documented history of Polish anti-Semitism ... One might also philosophically reflect as to why it was that the Germans selected Poland as the site for Auschwitz-Birkenau death camps.” [LINENTHAL, p. 117] John Cardinal Krol, the Catholic archbishop of Philadelphia, was among those who contributed a recommendation to the Holocaust Museum Council. “His letter,” says Jewish scholar Edward Linenthal, “spoke about the importance of forgiveness, quoted a former President of the World Jewish Congress who claimed that Jews of the free world were also to blame for the Holocaust, and recommended that ‘a handy pamphlet, in an interesting and readable style ... would have a far more lasting effect than any statue or memorial ... The purpose of the pamphlet should be to affirm the dignity of every human and the sacredness of every human life.” Cardinal Krol’s letter, declares Linenthal, was “one of the most grotesque recommendations [to the largely Jewish council].” [LINENTHAL, p. 26]

In 1998 six people wrote a formal letter of protest to the director of the Holocaust museum, complaining about a film regularly shown at the museum, one that “advances a profoundly inaccurate thesis: that Christianity and Christian leaders were the initial cause of anti-Semitism and have at all times been its major proponents.” [WIESELTIER, 2-9-98, p. 42] The protesters were newsworthy because they were all “conservative” Jews.

Backstage at the museum, Jewish/Israeli wheelings and dealings (in suppressing other peoples’ commemoration of their own sufferings) were – as usual – two-faced and hypocritical. David Stanndard remarks that

“Turkish and Israeli government officials together pressured the White House, which was then involved in the planning for the United States Holocaust Museum, to reject any mention of the Armenian genocide in the museum’s exhibition. It is what happened on another occasion when the head of the Jewish community in Turkey, Jewish lobbyists in the United States and Israeli officials of the foreign office conspired with the Turkish government to prevent the United States from holding an official Armenian day of remembrance. And it is what continues to happen today when, among many other examples, a documentary film
on the Armenian genocide remains banned on Israeli television, and when an effort by people in Israel’s Education Ministry to produce high school curricula on the Armenian and Gypsy genocides was quashed by an oversight committee of government-paid historians.” [STANNARD, p. 196]

The (Washington) Jewish Week worried that “if Jews join in an effort to whitewash what happened to the Armenians, how can they expect other groups seeking their own diplomatic gains, to treat the Nazi Holocaust any differently?” [LINENTHAL, p. 239] The Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz traced the Jewish efforts to reject a proposed United States resolution to recognize a day commemorating the Armenian genocide. A Jewish community leader in Turkey, Jacque Kamhi hired Paul Berger, a Jewish American lawyer to lobby against it. The former Executive Director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Mori Amitay, also joined the lobbying effort, as did the former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Richard Perle, Washington lawyer Douglas Feith, and Mark Epstein, former Washington director of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews. The resolution in commemoration of Armenians was defeated. [LINENTHAL, p. 314] (Meanwhile, in Israel, a survey of 800 Israeli students at eight universities by Yair Auron, a professor in Tel Aviv, found that “most of them said they knew nothing about the genocide of the Armenians and gypsies.” [COCKBURN, P., p. 26]

In 1995, while in France, Bernard Lewis, a very prominent Jewish (and Zionist) emeritus professor of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University, told a Le Monde reporter that the Armenian disaster at the hands of the Turks didn’t qualify as “genocide.” This remark caused an uproar in France, where “Holocaust deniers” have faced jail and hefty fines for similar assertions about Jewish history at the hands of the Nazis. Four lawsuits were filed against him – three were dismissed by courts but the last resulted in a fine of “one symbolic franc.” Lewis’ comment in “connection to the Holocaust,” noted Jonathan Mahler, “has made the debate especially contentious within the Jewish community, where there is a special sensitivity to the status that the term ‘genocide’ confers. Those in Mr. Lewis’ camp say that to describe the massacre [of Armenians] as a ‘genocide’ is historically inaccurate and belittles the Holocaust’s unique place in history. The professor’s critics, for their part, say that refusing to label the massacre a genocide is akin to Holocaust denial.” [MAHLER, J., 8-18-95, p. 1]

Originally chaired by a Baltimore real estate developer, Harvey Meyeroff, the Washington Holocaust museum (the world’s most expensive Holocaust museum) is a secularly sacred edifice to Jewish identity and is located on the Washington Mall, nestled in the context of the Lincoln, Jefferson, and Vietnam Memorials, the Washington Monument, and the Smithsonian Museum. Behind the hallowed facades at the Washington site, different Jewish cliques struggled for power and control of the place, with rich families purchasing the prestige of prominent name plaques or entire wings named after them. [MILLER, p. 263-265] Plans were even made to honor wealthy benefactors by
entitling their names to “a theatre, kosher dining pavilion, library ... [and an] education, research, and archival center.” [LINENTHAL, p. 82]

The first museum design proposal was rejected by the Washington DC Fine Arts Commission because of its “almost unintended link to fascist architecture” and its “sheer size and aggressiveness” that threatened to “upstage ... the rest of the Mall’s monuments.” [YOUNG, p. 340] The actual arrangement to locate the proposed Washington DC Holocaust Museum on federal land next to the famous mall was done in haste and as secretly as possible. Edward Linenthal notes that “several members of the National Capital Planning Commission, a governmental agency charged with reviewing development and conservation plans in the District, were bothered ... by the fact that there was no public announcement of, or public hearing scheduled on, the issue of the land transfer ... All discussions of the transfer took place in executive and not open sessions of the planning commission meetings. Clearly, the [Museum] council was wary of what it feared might be mixed public reaction, and one planning commission member recalled that the pressure generated from politically well-situated council members to accomplish the transfer privately and swiftly was ‘enormous.’” [LINENTHAL, p. 63]

Among the enduring symbols of pluralistic democracy, the Holocaust museum stands out as a testament to one affluent ethnic group’s power to literally, physically, change the landscape of American values, inflicting its own grandiose perception of itself – humankind’s innocent martyrs – as part of the pantheon of American patriotic symbology. “Building [such a Holocaust memorial],” worried Henry Kissinger, “is likely only to re-ignite anti-Semitism.” [MILLER, p. 233] The Holocaust Museum is not small in scope; it is not humble. It is not modest. It is not a Zen garden to intimately reflect upon death, human suffering, and man’s inhumanity to man. It is, rather, institutionalized in concept, a grandiose self-hallowing of a particular ethnic people. The Holocaust Museum is a celebratory fortress, an elegant palace of pain, envisioned to anchor American public opinion to a certain sway; it is great ship designed to carry people somewhere. It is, after all, created to enforce the self-proclaimed Jewish myths of consummate persecution, rendered with tons of concrete immovable; like a giant billboard in the heart of the city of American government, it casts its shadow across the entire country. The Holocaust Museum has elbowed its way to the front of the line of American democratic tradition. Ironically, oblivious to its builders and believers, such a monumental edifice ultimately confirms in monolithic form a range of classical stereotypes about Jews, including excessive Jewish power and influence, self-obsession, exclusivity, “apartness” from non-Jews, clannishness, ostentation, and wealth, among others.

Jewish efforts to rationalize and justify such a huge building in America that memorializes something that happened across the world rests on pretty thin foundations. One of the most tenuous links is the fact that Americans across the world did contribute to the liberation of the German concentration camps (as did Russians, and others). With this as the entrée, more useful to Jewish and
Israeli propagandists, however, are the museum’s displays that emphasize negative (and, hopefully, guilt-inducing) links to its American context: “the restrictions on [Jewish] immigration [to America], the rejection of [Jewish] refugees during the war, and the refusal to bomb the death camps.” “Ironically,” claims Jewish scholar James Young, in such criticism of American policies during World War II, “the memorial will thereby Americanize the Holocaust, making it a pluralistic, egalitarian event.” [YOUNG, p. 338]

“Does the primacy of group identity among halakhic Jews,” counters Adam Garfinkle, “clash with the individualist ethos of the American ideal? Yes. And no placing of Holocaust Museums in Washington – at base an attempt to turn a Jewish experience into an American one so that American Jews can pretend that the Jewish parochialism they love and cling to and the American universalism they admire and need do not conflict – can change that.” [GARFINKLE, p. 15]

The subject of the Jewish Holocaust – the Jewish tragedy in Europe now distanced generations ago – has nothing whatsoever to do with America, let alone Washington D.C., or the patriotic memorials and monuments around it. As Howard Husock notes, “[The museum sets] a particularism which threatens to undermine the fragile foundation of civil religion,” [HUSOCK, p. 92], which, when we last looked, was supposed to be pluralistic and non-denominational. Even a polling firm hired by the Holocaust Museum Committee, Peter D. Hart Research Associates, noted that the Museum “should be in Germany or Austria, where these things happened.” [LINENTHAL, p. 64] Nor is this museum, in the context of the United States, about the Holocaust, inter-ethnic tolerance, or cultural pluralism and egalitarianism. Rather, the Holocaust Museum is a cynical monument to everything wrong in modern America: special power, special privilege, special people. It symbolizes the economic gulf between ethnic groups in a faltering multicultural experiment, as impoverished African-Americans who live blocks away from the $168 million boondoggle to Jewish self-hood can testify. How far could $168 million – say, in memory of the Holocaust victims and the spirit of human brotherhood – have gone towards battling injustice and alleviating suffering in the Black ghettos down the street?

“[Jewish Holocaust museums],” argues apologist James Young, a Jewish scholar, “have already inspired other persecuted minorities to demand national museums as well to commemorate their catastrophes. In the most ideal of American visions, the memory of competing “holocausts” would not continue to divide Americans from one another but may lead each community to recall its past in the light of another group’s historical memory.” [YOUNG, p. 304]

A monument suffering to pan-human suffering would dignify the “historical memory” of many roots. Armenians in this century had their own genocide at the hands of the Turks. Some argue that the Irish potato famine that killed million had British connections. There is the genocide and ethnic cleansings in Bosnia, Rwanda, Cambodia, and others in our own time. Native Americans can certainly lay claim to genocidal experiences in this country; African-Americans have their own historical miseries at the hands of others. Man’s inhumanity to man stretches in a continuous line across history. Why don’t Jews want to con-
nect with anyone else? If it is argued that their Holocaust Museum is justified because Hitler expressly singled them out, why must Jewish monuments to themselves echo Hitler’s own horrible conviction that Jews are different, Jews are special, and that Jews are, indeed, apart from others. Unless, of course, these tenets are part of Jews’ own world-view, from which Hitler appropriated it, and which belongs in some other country, if anywhere.

Howard Husock notes the underlying bedrock for the very conception, and ultimate meaning, of the Washington DC Holocaust memorial:

“One must also include the possible benefits museum supporters may quietly perceive for Israel. The memorial on the Mall represents a sure-fire way to spotlight day in and day out the historic justification of a Jewish state before Congress and the White House.” [HUSOCK, p. 32]

Efforts to propagandize the innocent museum visitors towards a sympathy for Jewish/Israel political views know no bounds. (The first director of the museum – Jeshajahu Weinberg – was an Israeli.) [LINENTHAL, p. 141] With their paid admissions, visitors to the Holocaust Museum are requested to type their age, gender, and profession into a computer; they are then each provided with an identity card of a Holocaust Jew who approximates the tourists’ own life, “turning all into victims for the day.” [YOUNG, p. 342, 344] As one critic noted, “Everyone [is] expected to enter the museum an American and leave, in some fashion, a Jew.” [YOUNG, p. 345]

The profound disbalance that Jews create about their sufferings during World War II is reflected, in overview, in a 1993 publication by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, Roots Amid the Darkness. In its extensive bibliography of recommended reading about the “Holocaust” of World War II, over fifty books are cited that focus on Adolf Hitler or some aspect of the Nazi regime; other books address general themes such as “Pursuing Nazis for Retributive Justice,” and genocide in general. Over three hundred other recommended books, however, expressly center upon some aspect of the Jewish Holocaust experience in World War II including European Jewish history, anti-Semitism, “Jewish leadership,” the “Final Solution,” organized rescues of Jews, and “Persecution and Extermination,” among other Jewish subjects. In comparison, books listed that address non-Jewish experiences are overwhelmingly about the Nazis, with a few exceptions addressing Christian-Jewish relations after the Holocaust, non-Jews who saved Jewish lives, and the like. Only one book was cited about the Nazi persecution of non-Jews generally. More specifically, five books are cited about gypsy victimization by the Nazis, three about homosexuals, one about prisoners of war, and two about Slavs. Only a handful of other cited volumes are non-Jewish accounts of some aspect of the era.

In this context of Judeo-centrism, the President’s Holocaust Commission recommended that “the study of the Holocaust become a part of the curriculum in every school system in the country.” [SILVER, p. 464] “One way of extending Holocaust memory into American public culture,” says Edward Linenthal, “was to have [Holocaust] Days of Remembrance become part of the national calendar.” [LINENTHAL, p. 27] To propagandize Jewish ethnocen-
trism as wide as possible, the Museum’s “Project Ahead” program “seeks to broaden the role of Holocaust education in the life of a neighborhood, city, county, regions, or state” so that “Holocaust education can become a more important element in the community.” [FEINGOLD, M. p. 280] “Polish American groups and some Catholic organizations,” says Marilyn Feingold, a faculty member at Rhode Island College, “object to materials which may tend to portray some of their respective group members in a negative light and these issues deserve appropriate examination. Public school teachers need clear guidance on these issues to assure that what we teach is defensible from a historical perspective.” [FEINGOLD, M. p. 281]

In Boston, like Washington DC, Jewish lobbyists and political power have pushed the Holocaust again onto the center stage of the American historical experience, as James Young notes, “into the very myth of American origins.” [YOUNG, p. 324] Boston’s Holocaust Memorial is now centrally located along the so-called Freedom Trail, interwoven with the likes of Paul Revere, the Boston Massacre, Bunker Hill, and other authentic sites of the American Revolution. (In 2001, a new bridge was even named after a former Boston regional director of the Anti-Defamation League – the Lenny Zakim Bunker Hill Bridge.) In New York City the “Living Memorial to the Holocaust” museum was built in Battery Park at the tip of Manhattan in view of the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island. “Visitors ... descend to a below-ground level where a transition segment on anti-Semitism will lead into a 450-foot arc that treats the history of the Holocaust chronologically, and thematically in the form of a ‘big monumental time-line.” [GODFREY, 10-30-87, p. 20] Original plans included a 34-story apartment complex connected to the Holocaust building, deemed by its critics, “Treblinka Towers.”

Increasingly, the Holocaust pops up in the heart of American tradition as a kind of Jewish Flag of Exceptionalism. “Some people,” remarks Young, “had difficulty accepting the Holocaust’s place on the [Boston] Freedom Trail, wondering what it had to do with the American Revolution.” [YOUNG, p. 328] In 1999, in Los Angeles, a $2 million “renovation and expansion” grant from the California Council for the Arts was awarded to a Jewish community site called the Skirball Cultural Center which allegedly represents “the intersection of Jewish heritage and American democratic values.” Here, relics from George Washington and the Declaration of Independence meld with those from the Holocaust. [HAITHMAN, D., 12-3-99, p. F2] In Albuquerque, New Mexico, in 1997, mayor Martin Chavez “was trying to head off what he thought could become a public art controversy ... He was concerned that the [new Holocaust] memorial might be ‘the dominant artistic focal point’ on the [Civic] plaza.” Supporters of the $40,000 sculpture, privately funded, largely by the local Jewish Federation, were requested to downscale four and a half feet. [STEINBERG, D., 5-19-97, p. A1]

Recognizing the trend in America, in 1997 the Royal Canadian Legion – Canadian war veterans – stepped forward to announce that they opposed the Canadian War Museum’s plans for a “face lift” to dedicate 7.7% of its space to
the Jewish Holocaust. The Legion noted that only 15% of the museum’s artefacts were displayed as it was with the available floor space. As reported in the Associated Press, “war veterans guides at the museum threatened to quit if they had to discuss the Holocaust as part of their duties ... several other veteran groups already have spoken out against the $2.2 million project, saying the Holocaust played no direct role in Canada’s wartime mission and suggested that any Holocaust memorial be established in a separate venue.” [CRARY, p. 7a] By the next year, there was talk about building a whole new War Museum. Jewish war historian Jack Granatstein was named the CEO of the organization formed to develop such a site. [WARD, J., 2-6-98] Earlier, in 1988, a former official of Canada’s External Affairs and International Trade and Commerce department began a new organization called the Society for Free Expression which was created to fight “Jewish cultural influence in Canada,” particularly manifest “by the introduction of Holocaust studies in Ottawa’s public schools.” Seeking to discredit it, a Jewish journal, the Jewish Week claimed that the new group’s founder, Ian Macdonald, had associations with “several Arab states and individuals” and “close contacts” with a leader of the Ku Klux Klan. [KAYFETZ, p. 21]

Across the Atlantic Ocean, in 2000 Great Britain’s Queen Elizabeth formally opened the “permanent Holocaust exhibition at the prestigious Imperial War Museum.” At a cost of $25 million, paid for by a lottery fund, the museum “regards [the show] as the most important project it has ever undertaken.” [DAVIS, D., 6-7-2000, p. 5]

In Tampa, Florida, the Tampa Bay Holocaust Memorial and Educational Center attracted 90,000 schoolchildren to be socialized to Jewish/Zionist martyrology in its first five years since it opened in 1992: “As they enter the museum, visitors first ... see a stylized menorah ... They will proceed to historical exhibits showing Jewish life before the Holocaust and continuing through the Nazi era.” [MOORE, p. 9]

In Japan, in 1988 Fumitatsu Inoue, a Japanese architect who received a scholarship from the Israeli Ministry of Education to study in Israel, and who spent twenty years there, was instrumental in the building of a memorial to the Jewish Holocaust in the town of Kurose in the province of Hiroshima. The Jewish Week reported that:

“Some critics say you cannot unite the two events: the suffering at Auschwitz arose from completely different conditions than those at Hiroshima. Yet Inoue and members of the Kurose committee who recently visited Yad Vashem don’t try to diminish the uniqueness of the Holocaust.” [BLACK, p. 27]

In 1999, the London Guardian noted that “the liberal novelist and pillar of the [German] intellectual establishment, Martin Walser, gave a speech criticizing government plans for a huge national Holocaust memorial in Berlin and complained that the Germans were constantly being made to atone for the crimes of the Nazis.” [TRAYNOR, p. 10] At a cost of $26 million and “by its position and size,” noted the International Herald Tribune, “the memorial by the New York
architect Peter Eisenman will be a dominant feature of the city.” (A large “Jewish Museum” in Berlin, designed by another Jewish American architect, David Libeskind, was scheduled to open a year later). [COHEN, R., 1-18-2000]

In Manchester, England, art critic Brian Sewell complained about a planned Holocaust center there: “The Holocaust has no particular relevance here. Is it possible to recall with any genuine feeling an event that is both outside our experience and time? Can we not say to the Jews of Manchester that enough has been made of this Holocaust and they are too greedy for our memories?” [NORMAN, P., 7-11-99]

In San Francisco, by 2000, a new Jewish Museum (not just Holocaust-centered) was being planned at an estimated cost of $100 million. With “national and international ramifications,” 80% of the funding for the place was expected to come from outside the San Francisco area. Millennium Partners – a firm headed by Phil Aarons – was scheduled to build the complex. The Jewish Bulletin of California noted what so often is a common theme with these self-celebratory Judeo-centric sites:

“In early 1997, [original architect Peter] Eisenman presented a design to the redevelopment agency that outraged the Jewish Museum’s future neighbors. Eisenman had designed a shared plaza that critics argued featured the Jewish Museum too prominently and directed foot traffic away from the others.” [i.e., away from other museums] ALTMANN-OHR, A., 2-18-2000, p. 1A]

Yet another Judeocentric “tolerance” museum is being planned for the California capitol, Sacramento. Pushed by California Assemblyman Darrell Steinberg, its conception is “based on the Simon Wiesenthal Museum of Tolerance.” [LUM, R., 3-3-2000, p. 67]

This leads us to yet another major American Holocaust museum of note, this one in Los Angeles: the $38 million Simon Wiesenthal Center (with branches, however, in New York, Chicago, Miami, Toronto, Washington DC, and Paris, employing 70 people). The founder of the Center and its “dean,” is an Orthodox rabbi, Marvin Hier who – in the words of the Los Angeles Times – “turned his brainchild, the Wiesenthal Center, into the fastest growing, highest profile Jewish activist organization in the world today.” [TEITELBAUM, p. 8] After luring $500,000 in 1977 from a rich Jewish businessman to get the dream project started, Hier managed to steal the famed Viennese Nazi Hunter, Simon Wiesenthal, his name, and his special reputation in the worldwide Jewish community, away from a cross-town Holocaust memorial organization, the Martyrs’ Museum, which had likewise sought to capitalize on Wiesenthal’s fame status for their own publicity and fundraising efforts. Hier cut a deal with Wiesenthal for the use of the Wiesenthal name for $5,000 a month and even bought off Martyr Museum complaints about the loss of Wiesenthal’s draw at a fund raising dinner for $25,000. [MILLER, p. 241] Appealing to Jewish fears of anti-Semitism and the secular Jewish religion of the Holocaust, in 1989 alone Hier managed to attract nearly $10 million in donations for the Center, and another $5.3 million for an adjacent “Museum of Tolerance.” Hier claims that 380,000
(certainly overwhelmingly Jewish) families around the world contribute economic support to his institution, one that the *Times* says “Hier intends to ... be a tourist attraction.” [TETELBAUM, p. 11]

Hier’s project has been assailed by many as the most vulgarly commercialized expression of Holocaust commemoration cynically known as “Shoah business.” A Center brochure describes the Museum’s high-tech “in your face” approach in addressing the murder of millions:

“As a searchlight comes on, you are at a replica of the gate of Auschwitz. You imagine Jews are being stripped, clothed in prison garb, numbered, having their heads shaved. You see historical film footage of Jews being ‘selected’ for work – or the gas chamber .... A searchlight sweeps the boundary fence. You are introduced to the Hell that was Auschwitz. You imagine that you are following the final steps of the victims along the rough road ... you view actual film records of the discoveries made by Allies when they liberated the camps ... and you hear the echoes of the victims – those who survived and those who did not. As you are about to leave the Holocaust section of the museum, how do you feel? Perplexed. Sad. Angry. Disgusted. Stunned. Ashamed. [MILLER, p. 19]

Piped in smoke and the screams of victims were considered as props for the site, but eventually rejected.

Not all Jews applaud the crass tone and motivation of the Wiesenthal Center and its emphasis on phobias of anti-Semitism and the negative in Jewish history. “People like Hier,” says Leon Wieseltier, the literary editor of *New Republic*, “do not understand the distinction between commemoration and entertainment.” [MILLER, p. 49] “How has Rabbi Hier managed to crack Hollywood,” wondered Robert Eshman, “in a way that has got to be the envy of every other Jewish organization in town? How does he manage to mark the suffering of the six million at a luxurious dinner featuring comedians and singers without cheapening it?” [ESHMAN, p. 4] “Ideologically,” says a rabbi across town, Harold Schulweiss of Valley Beth Shalom in Encino, “I am concerned with the imbalance in the Center’s regard for the Holocaust. It is the predominant event in the Jewish psyche. Jews have the Holocaust clinging beneath their skins, in their nostrils. The majority of the [Jewish] people out there find their strong and visceral identification through the Holocaust, and Hier has been able to tap into that.” [TEITELBAUM, p. 39]

“It’s a sad fact,” says one of Hier’s biggest financial backers, Samuel Belzberg, “that Israel and Jewish education and all the other familiar buzzwords no longer seem to rally Jews behind the community. The Holocaust, though, works every time.” [YOUNG, p. 306] (Belzberg’s brother William “has been a national Israel Bonds leader. The Belzberg brothers have been the chief financial muscle of the Simon Wiesenthal Center since its founding.” [TUGEND, 10-22-99] Hier’s Wiesenthal organization even has a filmmaking division, Moriah Films; among its most prominent efforts have been its “acclaimed Holocaust trilogy,” including Mark Harris’ *The Long Way Home*. (Rabbi Hier received his second Academy Award Oscar in 1998 as a film producer. Both his Oscars were

Such “tapping” of the Holocaust, observes Hanno Loewy, is “package [d] ... in such a way that it can actually be used as a substitute for identity and deployed as an instrument of policy ... So, whether, it is a matter of disciplining American Jews in order to temper any criticism they may have of Israeli politics, or keeping down-and-out Blacks and Latinos from looting the Jewish store owners around the corner – when you come right down to it, it is primarily a matter of increasing the influence of the Wisenthal Center on the Jewish community. For only a ‘Holocaust,’ which can happen to you again at any time and any place, which can happen to anyone, a ‘Holocaust’ – the harbingers of which are standing on the very next street corner – is no longer personally threatening but instead a confirmation of your identity. This ‘Holocaust’ is something you can – and must– ‘fight’ against, especially as a Jew (even if it is by sending a check to the Wiesenthal Center), for it is something which helps you to organize and affirm your own life, instead of questioning it with this kind of thinking, the Jewish history of persecution – this negative head start with experience, so to speak – leads to a secular, political claim to power.” [LOEWY, p. 236]

Hier’s preoccupation with anti-Semitism and stirring Jewish worry about it for funding purposes is legendary. In 1983 he hired an advertising agency to mail a packet to hundreds of thousands of Jews, requesting donations for a “Nazi-watch” program, claiming that anti-Semitic Americans were engaged in rebuilding nazism in Europe as part of a global network, a premise for which there is no evidence. Judith Miller writes that critics accused Hier of “a deliberate exaggeration of the threat of anti-Semitism for fund-raising purposes.” [MILLER, p. 245] In an extraordinary act of Jewish disunity, in 1984 the Anti-Defamation League (the premier Jewish “defense organization”) rebuked a Wiesenthal Center fund-raising letter that claimed a “new wave of anti-Semitism” in the United States and Europe; the ADL characterized the Wiesenthal form letter as being “replete with factual misstatements and exaggerations about the situation with respect to anti-Semitism and organized Nazi activity in the United States and abroad.” [FREEMAN, K, p. 6]

In 1998, Sol Littman, the Toronto-based representative of the Wiesenthal Center caused considerable outrage when he called the little Canadian town of Oliver (population: 9,000) “the hate capital of Canada.” Littman was busy attacking an Internet service provider, FTC, and its owner, Bernad Klatt, because the provider hadn’t censored “hate material” against Jews off its lines. The town of Oliver’s crime was that it and the local school district had used FTC’s broad Internet services. “Mr. Littman,” noted the British Columbia Report, “was reluctant to speak to the B.C. Report, and first attempted to discern whether the publication would depict him in a positive light.” [TORRANCE, K., p. 25] Littman didn’t fair well in the resulting article. The Canada journal titled the piece on him, “Who’s Spreading Hatred? Oliver Reacts with Fury to a Smear by a Toronto Jewish Activist.” [BR COL REP, 2-2-98, p. 25]
Jewish author Howard Jacobson recounts his troubling experience with another official of the Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles:

“He begins by talking to me about haters. Haters? I notice his verbal italicization. A hater is more than a noun coined from a verb; a hater is clearly a known type here, a person familiar and recognizable to Research, a distinct subspecies of individual. A hater. Like a psychopath or an arsonist. Someone defineable by many more characteristics than just the accidents of whom or what he may end up hating.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 179]

The Wiesenthal Center’s economic influence and nearness to Hollywood make it a necessary pilgrimage point for streams of politicians and celebrities seeking to clock in as “tolerant” personalities and court Jewish favor. Visitors have included everyone from Ronald Reagan to the French Ambassador to the United States to the Dalai Lama. Corporate relationships with the Center and its Museum have included everything from the GTE phone company to MTV television; the Center also “undertook a joint program with ABC” to expand its ‘Testimony of Truth’ video oral history of the Holocaust. Wiesenthal-sponsored exhibitions about the Holocaust have been presented as far away as China, Japan, and in minor a place as Aruba. The former director of the young museum, Gerald Margolis, built the connections needed to join the State of California’s Commission on the Prevention of Hate Violence. One Wiesenthal “national tribute dinner” honored Sidney Sheinberg, President and CEO of MCA, Inc., moviemaker Steven Spielberg and his wife who served as honorary chairpersons of the event, the governor of Texas gave the keynote address, and Jack Valenti, President and CEO of the Motion Picture Association of America served as the Master of Ceremonies.

In 1995 the Wiesenthal Center courted broad public controversy when – in the midst of budget cuts for a variety of social services in Los Angeles county – the Center’s Museum of Tolerance (which frames itself as an examiner of generic prejudice in America) was awarded a five million dollar grant from the State of California, a taxpayer gift that was to come out of money intended for public schools. (It was the second five million dollar grant the Center had scored from the State of California since 1986). [MORAIN, p. B3] The privately-owned Center’s application framed the Jewish site as an educational institution and the big money was pushed through government bureaucracy again by “friends in high places,” including the California State governor, Pete Wilson, who looked to Jewish money and good graces for an upcoming run for the American presidency. (Wilson owes much to the Jewish community. He won a 1982 U. S. Senate race against 15-year incumbent Pete McCloskey, a man singled out for defeat by Jewish organizations because of his critical views of Israel. In the words of the Washington Post, “Jewish political participation” defeated McCloskey. [CURTISS, p. 56] Wilson was also there to bend rules for Jewish organizations on other occasions. In 1987 Yeshiva Rav Isaacson, an Orthodox Jewish primary school in Los Angeles, made the news when the Federal Department of Health and Human Services department asked for a $1.8
million grant back that had been awarded as a Reagan administration “political favor” through the political influence of Rabbi Milton Balkany in New York. The *Los Angeles Times* noted that the school’s request for $2.3 million “far exceeded the $500,000 limit that the department had set for such grants,” but the school was awarded its $1.8 “on an ‘urgent’ basis two weeks later without having an independent review of it or comparing it with other grant applications”.... [The award could not] be used for religious, sectarian instruction or any other religious purpose.” [FRITZ, p. 1, 3] Then Governor Wilson came to the rescue. “At Balkany’s urging,” noted the *Times*, “Wilson has sponsored a bill, opposed by the Department of Health and Human Services, that would permit the Los Angeles group to use the money in a manner that does not have the government’s approval.” [FRITZ, p. 13]

In the case of the $5 million for the Wiesenthal Center, the *Los Angeles Times* had noted the foul odor of back room politicking emanating from the state money for Rabbi Hier. The Center had a few months earlier conferred its “National Leadership Award” upon Governor Wilson at a banquet of predominantly Jewish big shots at the Marriott Marquis Hotel in New York City. Attendees had included Michael Fuchs (chairman of Home Box Office), Alan Greenberg (chairman of the investment firm of Bear Stearns, of which Rabbi Hier’s son, age 25, was already a vice president), and New York financiers Nelson Peltz and Ronald Perelman. (Perelman, prone to surrounding himself with bodyguards, is listed as one of Forbes’ 400 richest Americans with ownership of everything from Marvel Comic Books and National Health Laboratories to Revlon and Gibraltar Savings and Loan) [FORBES, *400 Richest Americans*] All four men were on the Wiesenthal Center’s board of directors and were prominent money contributors in American political life. (Other influential board members included U. S. Senator Diane Feinstein, her investment banker husband, Richard Blum, and even a Hollywood glitz contingent of Frank Sinatra and Elizabeth Taylor).

Maxine Waters, a black Los Angeles Congresswoman, too familiar with the atrocious shortcomings of the schools in the African-American communities, was among those who objected to the multi-million dollar grant at taxpayers’ and schools’ expenses. She impugned Hier’s propaganda site for Jewish polemics and its claim that it was an investment in education, likening it to a purely business operation: “70,000 kids might go to McDonald’s every day, but we don’t pick up their lunch tab.”

Particularly damning for the state grant was the *Times*’ revelation that Hier’s personal Wiesenthal salary (“including benefits”) was $225,000 a year, and the fact that six of his associates there each made more than $100,000 apiece. [MORAIN, p. B1, B3] By 2000, critic Norman Finkelstein complained that

“A salary of over $500,000 for Rabbi Hier, his wife and son, who run the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles as a family business is outrageous. According to their 1996 federal tax returns, they collectively took in over $500,000 that year. Who knows? We can only speculate as to what was taken for expenses.” [TATUM, W., 9-27-01, p. 1]
Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the Simon Wiesenthal complex is where such state money goes to promote Jewish mythology at the Museum of Tolerance through its “Tools for Tolerance” program. Set up in offices across the street from the museum, the “Tools” program reflects the educational purpose behind the multi-million dollar museum: to socialize and sensitize visitors (especially targeting schoolchildren) to Jewish mythology about their history and their Holocaust. It doesn’t hurt that receptive ears in the school system have included a Jewish head of the Los Angeles School Board, Marcia Volpert, also formerly at the helm of the Jewish Community Relations Committee. Members of the Los Angeles and (“nearly all members” of the) Santa Monica city police departments have taken the “Tools for Tolerance” training, as well as many business and other professional organizations. [RESPONSE, back page, FALL 94-95]

In the context of deep interethnic conflict throughout southern California, a “Museum of Tolerance” is an attractive theme, particularly to local school systems. The Museum, and its system of in-house facilitators, have in fact served on large scale the Los Angeles and Ventura County School Districts, among others, to function as a multi-media means to educate children against racism, interethnic intolerance, and, of course, anti-Semitism. Sanctioned by local school districts as field trip options, school principals and teachers work with Wiesenthal staffers to plan school visits and studies about the Holocaust. Opened in 1993, by 1995 the museum claimed 600,000 visitors for the last year alone, including 77,000 school children. [MARGOLIS, SPR 95] “I believe,” announced former California Assembly Speaker Willie Brown, “that every child in our schools should be exposed to the types of materials on display at the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles.” [RESPONSE, SUMMER 95] (Jewish efforts to revise their history and socialize others to it, are international in scope. In Poland, “in 1993 the Jewish Historical Institute commenced publication of booklets designed for secondary schools. They contain selections of sources concerning the history of Jews in Poland, as well as popular essays on some issues.” [TOMASZEWSKI, p. 47]

Given the background of Jewish ideology about the Holocaust and its own historical ideas about “tolerance,” what, we need ask, does the Museum of Tolerance and its staff teach?

The Tools for Tolerance program provides, among other support, a Teacher’s Guide for study of the Holocaust. The guide itself outlines – in a conceptual overlay for experiencing the museum – a sequence of preliminary questions for students. Initially generalized as addressing generic “intolerance,” the sequence of questions shapes into final focus upon Jews as victims, the subject of most of the museum.

1. What is tolerance?
2. What is prejudice?
3. What is a stereotype?
4. What is a bigot?
5. What are civil rights?
6. What is genocide?
7. What is the Holocaust?
8. Who was Adolf Hitler?
9. What is a ghetto?
10. What is a concentration camp? [MUS. OF TOL. GUIDE, p. 3-5]

It is the classically Jewish funneling, as always under the hubris of pan-human universalism, the shape of the whole world into a disguised Jewish parochialism.

An 81-page educational kit, *The Holocaust, 1933-1945*, suggesting Wiesenthal Center guidelines for teaching about the Holocaust as the consummate “intolerance” is also provided for teachers. Of particular note is the advice of Mark Weitzman, National Associate Director of Educational Outreach at the Center (whose following commentary was adopted from his article in a Catholic magazine). In a brief aside noting that not only Jews perished in the Holocaust era, the author qualifies this concession by emphasizing traditional Jewish animosity for its rival religious faith: “Jews were victims, but the crimes were committed by persons raised in European cultures that were in great measure shaped by Christianity.” [WEITZMAN, p. 69] This equation of Christianity with the rise of fascism – no less in the context of a teaching guide for interracial, interethnic and interreligious tolerance – is remarkable, but not surprising.

Elsewhere Weitzman dictates that teachers should “include a unit on Jewish resistance, both physical and spiritual, to the Nazis. A presentation of Jews as only victims conforms to a negative stereotype.” What Weitzman doesn’t elaborate upon, of course, is that his discomfort with Jewish victimhood is discomfort with self-imposed Jewish tradition itself, and that Jewish “resistance to Nazis” was an inconsequential anomaly to the rule of Jewish passivity, stereotypical or not, and has only been conjured up in recent years as part of the Zionist warrior/hero and “Jewish pride” ethic.

When it comes to the millions of non-Jews who were murdered by Nazis, Weitzman counsels: “Do not omit non-Jewish victims of the Nazis. These include Gypsies, homosexuals, and Jehovah’s witnesses, among others.” The named groups had relatively small numbers of victims in the World War II era. The “among others,” of course, includes the millions of Polish and Russian Slavs who – aside from traditional Jewish apathy for them – are unmentioned because by sheer numbers of victims they endanger Jewish claims to massacre exceptionality.

“Be careful,” Weitzman then adds, after the Gypsy-homosexual concession, “not to lose the particularity of the Nazi genocide of Jews in a broad universality.” [WEITZMAN, p. 70] Weitzman, in his role as educator to thousands of teachers who will be educating California’s schoolchildren, later elaborates upon this classical Jewish “intolerant” and chauvinist streak in modern Jewry by admonishing teachers to

“Be cautious when comparing the Holocaust to other events. Easy comparison to other events, such as the mass murders of Armenians in
the early 20th century, or the contemporary issue of abortion, without historical reference, are demeaning to both the victims and opponents of Jews.” [WEITZMAN, p. 71]

Weitzman’s completely Judeo-centric diatribe of “do’s” and “don’ts” concludes with a subtle reference to Israel and the teaching of the rationale that justifies the Jewish state’s policies as a refuge for persecuted Jews everywhere:

“Explore the post-war Jewish reactions to the Holocaust. There include both political and religious responses. This will help to explain the backgrounds of many current events.” [WEITZMAN, p. 71]

In 2000, the Jewish Commissioner, Howard Safir, of the New York Police Department, announced that the Wiesenthal Center’s Tools for Tolerance program would begin training that city’s police force in “tolerance,” at a cost of “$225 per individual per day.” [GREENBERG, E., 4-14-2000, p. 8]

Upon arrival at the Museum site, visitors find their tour to be regimented by a guide who leads them, assembly-line style, through a timed sequence of exhibitions. The first display is a large room full of high-tech anti-racist messages declaring the usual platitudes against “intolerance,” a cacophony of competing videos, digital displays, and various interactive machinations that excite and war for the viewers’ attention. Stereotypes are not fair. Prejudice is not just. Holding a bias is stupid. Specific allusions to injustice include the African-American experience, as well as selected video tracts of interethnic warring in Bosnia, Rwanda, and other countries virtually no visitor knows anything about, nor can fathom.

Ironically, a museum of “Tolerance” is exactly what this place is not. It is, rather, a profoundly sophisticated propaganda factory, so disguised in its intolerant intentions that entire school systems have swallowed it up. The Museum of Tolerance is, at root, a covert dissemination center for the myths of Jewish martyrology. It represents the standard Jewish ideological fare: the foregrounding of Jewish particularism (their troubles unique and tantamount in the human experience), framed in its illusory context of examining the universality of injustice. While we see weeping Israeli victims of terrorist attacks in one video sequence, never do we see reference to the miseries of Palestinian Arabs at the hands of the Israeli state.

In fact, the Museum even actively contributes to its own version of intolerance. Moammar Gadafi, the Ayatollah Khomeini, and other sworn enemies of the state of Israel are stereotypically branded as consummate hate-mongers in photograph displays, configuratively associated with Mao Tse Tung, Fidel Castro, Benito Mussolini, former Ku Klux Klan member David Duke, and, in the broader context of the museum, the King of Hatred: Adolf Hitler.

Such images, even as they are mingled (as they are in the Museum) with an image of Mahatma Gandhi or Martin Luther King, do not engender reflections of tolerance and educated reason, but cynically reaffirm the broadest brush stereotypes of Good and Evil: any school kid can glance at the photo test on the wall and point out, as they are socialized to, the bad guys.

Any serious study of the Ayatollah Khomeini, for instance, must conclude
that, whatever his failings, he cannot be fairly dismissed as merely a stick-figure of hatred with Hitler. To his own Shia Muslim worldview, and that of his millions of followers, he was a model of religious piety, as well as a man who led a just revolution against an evil dictator, the Shah of Iran, who was supported by both the United States and Israel. Khomeini’s subsequent animosity for both nations is well known.

The Museum of “Tolerance” portrays Khomeini in a life-size photograph, his hand raised into the air as he presumably addresses the masses; the contextual inference is that he is a Hitleresque rabble rouser, demagogue, hate-monger. The Museum’s accompanying caption of Khomeini underscores this, saying: “Used with emotion only, words build barriers against communication and can incite us to violence.”

This caption could well fit an equivalent image of Israeli leaders like Menachem Begin, Ariel Sharon, Meir Kahane, and many others. But, on the contrary, one news report even claimed that Rabbi Hier was interested in founding a “Menachem Begin Yeshiva High School,” named in honor of the former right-wing Israeli prime minister, and head of the “Irgun” Jewish terrorist organization in pre-Israel Palestine. At Begin’s death, the Associated Press quoted Rabbi Hier’s eulogizing words and noted that he was “a longtime associate of Begin.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 3-9-92] As Edward Said remarks about Hier’s hero:

“For years and years Begin has been known as a terrorist and has made no effort to hide the fact ... In [his book Revolt] Begin describes his terrorism — including the wholesale massacre of innocent women and children — in righteous (and chilling) profusion ... Yet so strong is the consensus decreeing that Israel’s leaders are democratic, western, incapable of evils normally associated with Arabs and Nazis ... even a morsel as normally indigestible as Begin has been transmuted into just another Israeli statesman (and given an honorary LLD by Northwestern University in 1978 and part of a Nobel Peace Prize to cap it all!” [SAID, p. 44]

Shall we dismiss Said because he is an Arab – however respectable as a professor at Columbia University – and therefore “intolerant” and prejudicial? Even David Ben-Gurion, the first prime-minister of Israel and hero of Zionism, had this to say about Begin:

“Begin is clearly a Hitlerist type. He is a racist ... I cannot forget the little I know of his activity, and it has one clear significance: the murder of scores of Jews, Arabs, and Englishmen [by terrorist acts]; the pogrom [of Arabs] in Dir Yassin and the murder of Arab women and children; the Altadena [an Irgun-sponsored weapons-running ship], which was designed for the seizure of power [in Israel] by force ... These are not isolated acts, but a revelation of method, character, and aspiration.” [HABER, p. 255]

Begin will never show up as an icon of intolerance in a Jewish propaganda post. Instead there may yet be Jewish schools named after him. As Rabbi Abraham Cooper, the Director of the Museum of Tolerance, has revealingly admitted in the pages of the Center’s own magazine, “It is generally not the policy of
the Wiesenthal Center to discuss internal Israeli politics. The Center’s primary mission is to combat the enemies of the Jewish people.” [RESPONSE, FALL WINTER] Just for starters, that would apparently include generic Arabs, who are nowhere represented as fellow victims (at the hands of Israeli Jews) in the “Museum of Tolerance.” And of course, by traditional Orthodox dictate, the enemies of the Jewish people are the ‘goyim’: all non-Jews.

And what of Israel – the behind-the-scenes ideological pillar of the Museum of Tolerance, so sacrosanct from criticism? The modern Jewish state is a paragon of institutionalized intolerance and prejudice. Enforced as an expressly Jewish nation, discrimination is the law of the land. Israel is founded upon prejudice. Only Jews may immigrate to Israel and claim citizenship. And dictated by the Orthodox rabbinate (i.e., the likes of Rabbi Hier), modern Israeli law even forbids intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews. This law alone, notes Jewish scholar Georges Tamarin, creates a “situation of apartheid ... flagrantly violating paragraph 16 of the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. This [Israeli] law ... reminds at least many of the European immigrants [to Israel] of similar provisions in the infamous [Nazi] Nuremberg Laws forbidding mixed marriages.” [TAMARIN, p. 31] Israeli law even discriminates against other branches of Judaism that are not Orthodox, denying, for example, that Reform or Conservative conversion practices are legitimate. [The systematically institutionalized legal – and other – discriminations against Israeli Arab citizens, and others, will also be addressed in a later chapter].

In 1988, when Yitzak Peretz, the Israeli government’s Minister of Interior and a leading Orthodox rabbi, revealed his religiously-based racism about Arabs frankly and publicly to the local press, fellow Israeli Uri Huppert, a lawyer by occupation (whose expertise is victims of “religious coercion”) responded:

“There is nothing new or extreme about Minister Peretz’s declaration. To the contrary, it is relatively mild. The novelty lies in announcing publicly, through the media, the halachic stand on relationship with Gentiles. After all, the halacha forbids even employing a Gentile as a messenger; and it is doubtful whether a Jew may serve food to a Gentile. The Talmud morally categorizes people according to their relationship to the Commandment of Moses. An observing Jews is enjoined to show an especially high moral level to ‘a colleague of Torah and [observer of the] Commandments.’ He may be forgiving toward a ‘criminal’ Jew insofar as fulfilling the Commandments, but not to a Gentile, particularly a pagan. The Mishneh Torah of Maimonides (Rambam) deals with the commandments enjoined upon the children of Israel when their entry to the land of Israel coincides with the arrival of the Messiah. Here, their attitude toward the Gentile is specified to the last detail. Regarding non-Jewish women, for example: ‘A beautiful woman who refuses to stop worshipping idols after twelve months is killed.’ The general tenet is that anyone not a member of the people of Israel should be rejected. Even more, ‘any Gentile not upholding the Noachic commandments is killed
if under our rule.’ The Rambam goes further and determines that all living beings must uphold the Noachic commandments or else be put to death.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 38]

Huppert also notes the implications of Jewish Orthodoxy’s activist intolerance against Mormons living in Israel:

“One should not believe that Jewish Orthodoxy hates only Mormons ... The orchestrated campaign against the Mormons [by Orthodox Jews in Israel] is a warning to all non-Jewish religious beliefs in Israel. A generation of religious Jews has now arisen that is imbued with the conviction that it must participate in holy wars like the Christian crusades and the Moslem jihad ... This approach emphasizes only one aspect, although a significant one, of a wider struggle conducted by Orthodox Judaism against the Gentiles and against conflicting lines of thought within the religious Jewish community.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 64]

In the 1960s, Georges Tamarin, an Israeli faculty member at Tel Aviv University, was even dismissed from his post for his controversial work and views about prejudice in Israel, including his studies of Israeli schoolchildren and “the effects of chauvinism on moral judgment.” Selecting “the most extreme form of prejudice: the extermination of the out groups,” [TAMARIN, p. 185] Tamarin provided over 1,000 Jewish children in Tel Aviv between the fourth and eighth grade with either the written tale of Joshua’s Biblical genocide at Jericho or a comparable story about a genocide instituted by a General Lin, founder of Chinese dynasty 3,000 years ago. The children routinely studied the story of Joshua in the Israeli school system as “both a national history and as one of the cornerstones of modern national mythology.” [TAMARIN, p. 185] General Lin was obscure to them.

In two sets of results, 60% of one group of students “totally approved” of Joshua’s genocidal conquests; 20% expressed “total disapproval.” General Lin’s genocide, however, garnered only a 7% “total approval,” and a 75% complete disapproval. In a second set of children, 66% of the surveyed students expressed “total approval” for Joshua’s genocide, and 26% “totally disapproved.” 70% of the students “totally approved” of General Lin’s actions, and 62% “totally disapproved.”

These figures from Israeli schoolchildren who are socialized to their own Jewish/Israeli nationalist prejudices, suggested Tamarin, “unequivocally proves the influence of chauvinism and nationalist-religious prejudices on moral judgment.” [TAMARIN, p. 187] Reflecting on his ultimate firing for addressing such issues in Israeli academe, he noted that “I never dreamt that I would become the last victim of Joshua’s conquest of Jericho.” [TAMARI, p. 190]

In 2000, the results of a study about “hate” of ethnic and religious others among students in 168 Israeli schools (produced by the Hebrew University in Jerusalem) was so damning that its director, Dahlia Moore, remarked that

“The point is that this should be a warning to our society. These kids hate, and with such depths of hatred, our society is in deep trouble.” [PRINCE-GIBSON, E., 9-24-2000]
In 2000 too, the Israeli newspaper *Ha’aretz* reported that

“An annual report prepared by the U.S. State Department’s Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Division criticizes Israel for unfair treatment of Arabs, for vandalism and discrimination against Christian groups and non-Orthodox Jewish streams, and for sanctions against Muslim citizens who want to go to Mecca on haj pilgrimages.” [RATNER, D., 9-21-2000]

So much for the disingenuous Museum of Tolerance’s mission of universalistic tolerance, and to socialize people to keep open minds about cultural, ethnic, and religious differences, yet by central tenet completely shielding Jewish and Israeli “intolerance” from view. We need not hold our breath waiting for an indicting presentation at the museum about the evils of Orthodox Hasidic Jewry, a group of people who represent what famed Israeli author *Amos Elon* calls “a fanatical world of intolerance of other worlds of thought or ways of life.” [ELON, 1991, p. 185] Or, as Israeli *Uri Huppert* notes, “For some unknown reason it had long been hidden from us that religious Orthodoxy, both anti-Zionist as well as the messianic Zionist, is struggling not only against the desecration of the Sabbath but also against the values of tolerance.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 60] Nor can we expect to hear at the noble museum anything about Jewish Orthodoxy in general, a world view, notes *Susannah Heschel*, that “cannot permit itself to tolerate religious pluralism. There can either be one truth or no truth, and hence other modern forms of Jewish religious experience are heretical.” [HESCHEL, 1983, p. xxv] Incredibly, Heschel is not even talking here about traditional Judaism’s institutionalized bigotry and disdain of non-Jews. One needs not go that far. Orthodox Judaism is so incredibly intolerant of other world views, Heschel is merely referring to its fortress-like intolerance against others within the Jewish community.

And as *Bernhard Lang* notes about the origins of Rabbi Hier’s Orthodox Judaism, and the Christianity that evolved out of it:

“To what extent is the animosity between religious groups rooted in the Bible itself? If we look closely and honestly at the Hebrew Bible and Christian New Testament, we will see that the dominant attitude toward nonbelievers is not one of integration and tolerance, but of segregation and intolerance ... Religious leaders insisted that their people separate themselves from the gentiles. Social segregation and the prohibition of intermarriage were accompanied by strict control over apostasy.” [LANG, B., 1989, p. 114]

The aforementioned confession about Israel (the Museum of Tolerance will never criticize the Jewish state) from Rabbi Cooper underscores what lurks behind the multicultural, universalistic veiling of the “Tolerance’ enterprise: it is a multi-million dollar “educational” Disneyland, carefully seeded into the public school system, to propagate into those searching for moral truths a favorable receptivity to the Jewish (read also “Israeli”) self-celebrating universe. Once the Museum’s supposed universality of approach is thus composed, including tapes of Martin Luther King and other civil rights era speeches, visi-
tors are funneled into the narrower meat of the real program; the bulk of the Museum highlights the Jewish myth of consummate victims of intolerance as epitomized by their carefully framed story under Nazi Germany. (Among the optional highlights of the Museum visit is an intimate opportunity to sit in a small, windowless room and listen to an emotional Jewish concentration camp survivor recite the irrefutably horrible testimonies in daily lectures at 1, 2, and 3 o’clock in the afternoon, an environment where the only fitting response for a visitor is to sit quietly, deferentially, and absorb, rather than ask questions and seek enlightenment.)

“Upon entering the darkened Holocaust Center,” describes the Wiesenthal periodical, Response, “visitors become part of an environment where they are asked to become witnesses – as if brought back to the scene of the crime – and moved from exhibit to exhibit by synchronized computers.” [RESPONSE, WINTER 92, p. 8]

Jewish-oriented displays even include a section in a dimly-lit room that reflects current Jewish historical revisionism. Narratives herald the Jews of the World War II era as fighters and heroes. A handful of minor, atypical incidents of Jewish “armed resistance” to the Nazis are misrepresented as the norm of millions.

Elsewhere, a series of dioramas depict life for Jews in pre-Holocaust Germany, brief movies address the same theme, and tourists experience a presence in an architecturally correct gas chamber. Like other Holocaust museums, visitors are provided a magnetic card to intimately carry along during their wanderings: all cards carry the portraits of Jewish child victims (only Jewish, no one else). Eventually a print out of the child surveys the highlights of his or her human (but distinctly Jewish) story.

It should go without saying that a true museum of “tolerance” and mutual understanding would not be so chauvinistically motivated towards a particular people’s ideological agenda. Such a museum would not even need to be admonished to de-emphasize the Jewish polemic of specialhood, of “uniqueness.” Visitors would be provided with victim cards to represent peoples of all nationalities and allegiances who have been fatal victims of intolerance. Jews – and anyone else – would be rendered part of the human community, and not incessantly preeminent within it. Anything less is a political, and moral, farce of ethical subterfuge, the elevation of Jews above all peoples by underscoring the inevitable conclusion that some people count more than others. And again and again in this museum and the American culture at-large, Jewish religious, secular, and all other interests inevitably meld into virtually monolithic support for the chauvinist policies of the Jewish international hub, the modern state of Israel, a vital paradigm of multicultural, multiethnic, and racial intolerance.

The profound irony to all this, of course, is that “intolerance” for other peoples and their beliefs (in the Judeo-Christian-Islamic religious lineage) is a Jewish invention, seminal to traditional Jewish identity itself. “The Hebrew Bible,” notes Scottish Biblical scholar Robert Carroll, “contains much nationalistic writing and is therefore often very xenophobic in its outlook. Foreigners
may be tolerated under certain conditions, but generally they are despised.” [CARROLL, R., 1989, p. 159] Or, as Karen Armstrong, in her popular volume, A History of God, notes, Jewish intolerance was born with the insistence upon the rejection of all other gods in an age of polytheism, finding its most horrible expression in the Chosen People ethos:

“Today we have become so familiar with [religious] intolerance that has unfortunately been a characteristic of monotheism that we may not appreciate that the hostility towards other gods was a new religious attitude. Paganism was an essentially tolerant faith ... In the Jewish scriptures, the new sin of 'idolatry,' the worship of 'false gods,' inspires something akin to nausea ... [ARMSTRONG, p. 49] ... The dangers of ... theologies of election [the Chosen People concept] ... are clearly shown in the holy wars that have scarred the history of monotheism. Instead of making God a symbol to challenge our prejudice and force us to contemplate our own shortcomings, it can be used to endorse our egotistic hatred and make it absolute.” [ARMSTRONG, p. 54-55]

In 2000, Orthodox rabbi Marvin Hier, head of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, was afforded the opportunity to deliver his message of tolerance to millions at the Republican National Convention. [PR NEWSWIRE, 6-30-2000]

In homage to Rabi Hier, let’s conclude this section with famous Jewish author Isaac Asimov’s sense of “tolerance,” Holocaust guru Elie Wiesel, and Orthodox Judaism:

“[In 1977] I shared a platform with others, among them Elie Wiesel, who survived the Holocaust (the slaying of six million European Jews) and now will talk of nothing else. Wiesel irritated me when he said that he did not trust scientists and engineers because scientists and engineers had been involved in conducting the Holocaust. What a generalization! It was precisely the sort of thing than an anti-Semite says. ‘I don’t’ trust Jews because once certain Jews crucified my Saviour.” I brooded about that on the platform and finally, unable to keep quiet, I said, ‘Mr. Wiesel, it is a mistake to think that because a group has suffered extreme persecution that it is a sign that they are virtuous and innocent. They might be, of course, but the persecution process is no proof of that. The persecution merely shows that the persecuted group is weak. Had they been strong, then, for all we know, they might have been the persecutors.’ Whereupon Wiesel, very excited, said, ‘Give me one example of Jews ever persecuting anyone.’ Of course, I was ready for him. I said, ‘Under the Maccabean kingdom in the second century B.C., John Hyrcanus of Judea conquered Edom and gave the Edomites a choice – conversion to Judaism or the sword. The Edomites, being sensible, converted, but, thereafter, they were in any case treated as an inferior group, for though they were Jews, they were also Edomites.’ And Wiesel, even more excited, said, ‘That was the only time.’ I said, ‘That was the only time the Jews had the power. One out of one isn’t bad.’ That ended the discussion, but I might add that the audience was heart and soul
with Wiesel. I might have gone further. I might have referred to the

treatment of the Canaanites by the Israelites under David and Solomon.

And if I could have foreseen the future, I would have mentioned what is

going on in Israel today. American Jews might appreciate the situation

more clearly if they imagined a reversal of roles, of Palestinians ruling

the land and of Jews despairingly throwing rocks. I once had a similar

argument with Avram Davidson, a brilliant science fiction writer, who

is (of course) Jewish and was, for a time, at least, ostensibly Orthodox. I

had written an essay on the Book of Ruth, treating it as a plea for toler-

ance as against the cruelty of the scribe Ezra, who forced the Jews to ‘put

away’ their foreign wives. Ruth was a Moabite, a people hated by the

Jews, yet she was pictured as a model woman, and she was the ancestress

of David. Avram Davidson took umbrage at my implication that the

Jews were intolerant and he wrote me a letter in which he waxed sarcas-

tic indeed. He took asked when the Jews had ever persecuted anyone. In

my answer, I said, ‘Avram, you and I are Jews who live in a country that

is ninety-five percent non-Jewish and we are doing very well. I wonder

how we would make out, Avram, if we were Gentiles and lived in a

country that was ninety-five percent Orthodox Jewish.’ He never an-

swered.” [ASIMOV, I. 1994, p. 21-22]

As noted earlier, powerful Jewish efforts to recreate (Holocaust and general)

history favorable to Jewish/Zionist myth is international in scope. With the fall

of communism in Poland, wealthy Orthodox (and Zionist) American-Jewish

heir, Ronald Lauder [See later chapter for his political profile] is among those

able to move towards the money reigns of Poland’s economically-strapped Aus-

chwitz Museum, thereby shaping it to Jewish specifications. As always, “He that

pays the piper plays the tune.” As the American Jewish Yearbook noted about the

Auschwitz convent controversy: “Poland’s government took several highly visi-

ble steps to improve relations with foreign Jewish communities and their lead-

ers and with the State of Israel. Most observers suggested that the goal was to

improve Poland’s image among political and financial influentials who could


In this vein, the Auschwitz Museum’s in-house publication, ProMemora

noted in 1997 that

“a well-publicized project for the preservation and maintenance of Aus-

chwitz arose out of the activities of a special commission of preservation-

ists convened and sent to Oswecim [Auschwitz] by the Ronald Lauder

Foundation ... The German Parliament did take up the question of fund-

ing Auschwitz, since the Lauder Foundation had officially requested that

European governments act to maintain and conserve what was left of the

[concentration] camp ... From that time on, the Museum has received fi-

nancial assistance from the governments of various European countries.
It is thanks to the **Lauder** Foundation that the financing of Auschwitz be a matter of international concern and that many states now take part. The Lauder Foundation continues to undertake steps designed to involve more governments and its representative, Kalman Sultanik, is both a member of the International Council of the [Auschwitz] Museum and the Chairman of the Council’s Finance Committee.” [OLEKSY, K., p. 8]

Unnoted in *ProMemora*, Sultanik is also vice-president of the World Jewish Congress. The *New York Times* noted that in 1998 Sultanik “suggested during a visit to Poland that Auschwitz should be made an ‘extra-territorial entity’ [i.e., taken out of Polish national sovereignty] to insure respect for the site. That term is explosive in Poland because **Hitler** demanded an ‘extra-territorial’ road link from Berlin to Gdansk before invading in 1939.” [COHEN, R., p. 3]

Among the new changes at the Auschwitz Museum in recent years is the titling of the building dedicated to Jewish history at the concentration camp. The visitor is greeted now with the words “Jewish Martyrology” in stone at the door. The entire concentration camp grounds are also shut down once a year for the aforementioned Israeli patriotic pilgrimage of international Zionist high school students. For that day, the Israeli flag flies over the site with the Polish one, a curious concession given the stated efforts of the Museum to remain “apolitical.”

No politics at Auschwitz? In a 1997 *ProMemora* issue, Stephen Wilkanowicz, identified as a member of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum’s International Council, noted a new role for the Auschwitz Museum in Poland:

“A new ‘Education Center’ being created within the Auschwitz Museum, and other institutions with similar aims, could have great significance. They could also serve Israeli youth and Jewish youth in general ... to help in fulfillment of their duties not only to their own people but also toward the world. And these obligations have very concrete dimensions, associated mainly with the location and situation of Israel.” [WILKANOWICZ, p. 27]

Also, noted a *ProMemora* issue, “the annual three week Yad Vashem Memorial Institute Seminars have already become a foundation [at the Museum] ... [Polish] participants have an opportunity to visit that beautiful country [Israel] ... A seminar has been held in Oswiecim [Auschwitz] for people from Israel. Continuous cooperation in this field is planned. [OLEKSKY, p. 10]

Yet another dimension to increasing Jewish economic control of Auschwitz history is the Foundation for Commemoration of the Victims of Auschwitz-Birkenau Death Camp. (Birkenau is the camp a couple miles from the central Auschwitz site that largely murdered Jews; it is the most famous death camp for them). This organization, notes *ProMemora*, “has existed for seven years. It was founded in 1990 by people emotionally attached to the legacy of the former Auschwitz camp, who wished to make a personal contribution to its maintenance and to the dissemination about it. The majority of them are members of the International Council of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum.” [MARSZALEK, K., p. 127]
“The Museum has also,“ noted ProMemora, “succeeded in acquiring special buses [from Jewish benefactors in Canada] that shuttle back and forth between the main camp and Birkenau parking lots. The necessity of visiting Birkenau is stressed inside the main camp ... This is not the end of the tour, and ... visitors should now proceed to Birkenau.” [OLEKSY, K., p. 9]

THE AUSCHWITZ CONVENT CONTROVERSY

As reported widely in the world media, in the summer of 1989 seven American Jews, dressed in concentration camp-style clothing and led by Rabbi Avraham Weiss, climbed a fence and invaded a makeshift Carmelite convent in a former storage building “at Auschwitz” (the remains of a Nazi death camp), upsetting eight nuns who lived cloistered lives there since 1984. The Jews pounded on the door and shouted for 15 minutes, then climbed another fence to pray and blow horns in a courtyard. BART, p. 87 This aggressive Jewish intrusion onto the convent grounds near a site that Jews worldwide deem sacred to their own collective memory, and the eventual physical eviction of the Jewish intruders by Polish workers at the site, set off a firestorm of controversy. (Newsweek magazine quoted the Simon Wiesenthal Centers’ figures that 2.5 million Jews and 1.5 million non-Jews were murdered at Auschwitz. NEWSWEEK, 4-11-89, p. 32) The developments in the controversy were closely followed for weeks by the world’s news media, even making the cover of the New York Times.

The problem was rooted in international Jewry’s conviction that the Christian site was a desecration of Jewish memory at the metaphysical “Jewish graveyard” of Auschwitz. Modern Jewish Holocaust polemic claims Auschwitz as the central symbol of their self-styled World War II martyrdom. “It is not only a matter of the Auschwitz convent,” proclaimed the President of the World Jewish Congress (and Seagram’s alcohol company owner), Edgar Bronfman, “but the broader implication of historical revisionism in which the uniqueness of the Holocaust and the murder of the Jewish people is being suppressed.” [BART, Conv, p. 77]

Adolph Steg, an official of the Western European Jewish agency, Alliance Israélite Universelle, further charged that “the establishment of a Carmelite convent at Auschwitz has caused alarm and revulsion among Jews – among all Jews ... We do not think.. that there is anything excessive in proclaiming that the Jewish people has acquired, through the martyrdom of its children, inalienable rights to Auschwitz ... In the conscience of the world, Auschwitz is a symbol bound to the Jews alone.” [p. 48] (Jews regularly demand that others to genuflect to their Holocaust campaign: In 1999, for example, “Jewish groups [were] denouncing plans to build houses at a site in Warsaw from which hundreds of thousands of Jews were deported to their deaths.” [GRUBER, R., 3-30-99] In 1994 a California newspaper, the Pacific Sun, was forced to apologize “for publishing a political cartoon that compared the massacre of Palestinian worship-
pers [by a Jewish mass murderer in a mosque] in Hebron to the Holocaust.”[KANTER, L., 3-11-94, p. 3] In 1996, “a water ballet that France’s synchronized swimming team was to perform at the Olympics in Atlanta next month has been canceled after Jewish groups protested its theme – the Holocaust.”)[YANOWITCH, L., 6-6-96, p. 4]

The resultant controversy and international Jewish pressure campaign came as a shock to Polish society. Polish historiography has for decades considered the murdered three million Polish Jews as part of the six million Polish citizens murdered by the Nazis. Polish Jews were not accorded in Poland the separate status as special transnational super-victims and conceptual “separateness” that international Jewry demands. Weiss and his cohorts pushed this issue into explosive focus. Protesting Jews, says Edward Shapiro, see the Holocaust as “a distinctly Jewish experience, and the memory of the graves of the Jewish victims would be desecrated by the presence and prayers of the nuns.”[SHAPIRO, p. 6]

The western mass media overwhelmingly sided with international Jewry’s offence at the Christian site at the old Nazi camp, grounds that had become hallowed to them as the consummate symbol for Jewish victimization. As noted by the Times, Jewish organizations had protested about the nuns there two years earlier and a group of four prominent Catholic clergymen (three from other European countries, and the archbishop of the Polish city of Krakow, Cardinal Macharski) had agreed – as an act of good will – to assuage Jewish protesters and remove the nuns within two years and build an interfaith building nearby. “The Catholic side,” notes Wladyslaw Bartoszewski, “… made all the concessions.”[BART, CON, p. 47]

“Macharski was mistaken to sign (the agreement with the Jews),” a local Polish Solidarity official told a news reporter, “In the West you can build the Eiffel Tower in two years. This is Poland.”

The convent, leased from the local town, had existed in an old theatre building for over a year without notice. It only came to Jewish attention when a Catholic organization began soliciting funds to improve the building. A phrase in the solicitation that said that the convent would be “a guarantee of the conversion of strayed brothers from our countries,” was interpreted by Jewish critics to refer to them. However, the “strayed brothers” in the text, argued its authors, alluded to fellow Christians of Eastern Europe who had become atheists under the communist regime, which was finally in the process of collapsing.[CHROSTOWSKI, p. 23]

The western mass media framed the controversy to Jewish dictate, one that focused on an alleged Polish anti-Semitism, expressed here in a Polish Catholic reneging of a formal agreement with Jews to move the nuns and build a new interfaith site elsewhere.

The townsfolk of the Auschwitz area, regional officers, and the local religious official in the preeminent Catholic official whose jurisdiction included Auschwitz, Cardinal Jozef Glemp, took issue with both the negotiations about the convent without local input, increasing demands by the international Jewish community, and the seven American Jews’ confrontational tactics with the group
of Polish nuns. Indeed, an important broader context to the convent controversy was never addressed in the American mass media. To widespread Polish public opinion, Poland’s very sovereignty was at stake on the issue. Poland, after all, was at that very moment – through its Solidarity movement – in a patriotic fervor, wrestling free from Russian communist domination (of which many prominent Jewish communists had played an important role). This was the first time Poland had even a glimpse of self-rule since the Nazi invasion of 1939, which was immediately followed by Soviet communist takeover, that oppressive rule that was finally disintegrating during the convent controversy.

The backbone of resistance in Poland to both the nihilistic Nazis and atheistic communists had always been Catholicism. And in the midst of the Polish struggle for national freedom, with it at last in sight after more than half a century, what was perceived as a transnational cabal of Jews (fulfilling all stereotypes) began making demands about a spot on Polish national soil, a spot where at least hundreds of thousands of Poles had been murdered too.

Cardinal Glemp responded with anger to the Jews who assaulted and defamed the convent and insulted the nuns. Some of Glemp’s excerpted comments about the matter were reproduced widely, including in the New York Times. Among Glemp’s remarks that the media zeroed in were these:

“Dear Jews, do not dictate conditions that are impossible to fulfill... do you, esteemed Jews, not see that your pronouncements against the nuns offend the feelings of all Poles, and our sovereignty, which has been achieved with such difficulty? Your power lies in the mass media that are easily at your disposal in many countries. Let them not serve to spread anti-Polish feeling.” [NYT, 8-29-87, A7]

Of course the media did exactly that, vilifying Poland and Cardinal Glemp completely (Jewish “power in the mass media,” roundly scoffed at as part of the package of anti-Semitism, we will set aside for the moment. That subject deserves extensive attention in another chapter. For the moment, suffice it to say that the way Newsweek (Sept. 11, 1989) handled the story with heavy-handed bias in favor of the Jewish position, was not atypical. Three photos were used in Newsweek to illustrate the complex controversy: a head shot of Cardinal Glemp, an image of Polish workers pouring a bucket of water from a second story onto a Jewish protester, and, incredibly, a ghastly 1940’s image of a pile of naked corpses with this caption: “An emblem of Jewish suffering: Victims of the Death Camps.” Newsweek’s inflammatory article even claimed that “With Polish anti-Semitism rearing its ugly old head, many Jews and Catholics looked to the Polish-born Pope Paul II for a solution ... Catholic Poles are still infused with insensitivity and often outright anti-Semitism. Traditionally Jews have been accused of squeezing money from Polish peasants and of bringing communism to Poland – slurs that were repeated in Glemp’s homily.” [NEWSWEEK, 9-11-89, p. 36] As evidenced earlier, such “slurs” are part of the historical record. The Jewish historian selected for quotes in the article, the one from which Newsweek reporters called for “perspective” on the story, and the one whose overall perspective the reporters parroted, was Lucy Dawidowicz, an
activist Zionist, a “pop” historian, and the author of a number of extremely Judeo-centric volumes of history who is so enthralled with her people that, in one of her books, she calls them “the quintessential people of history, the Jews originated the idea of the God of history.” [DAWIDOWICZ, p. 125]

The Polish Catholic provincial superior of the Carmelite order of nuns at Auschwitz joined the media fray to remark that “the entire Polish society is opposed to moving the nuns out of Auschwitz and does not accept that others govern our country.” [NEWSWEEK, SEP 11, 1989, p. 35] “Why do the Jews want special treatment in Auschwitz for only themselves?” asked sister Teresa Magiera to a Polish-American newspaper, “... Do they consider themselves the Chosen People?” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 153]

A few days later, as the controversy continued to heat up with Jewish feelings of “repugnance” to the Polish Catholic leader, Cardinal Glemp added this:

“This is offensive. Suppose someone came to your home and ordered you to move a wardrobe. You would be justified in answering, ‘Stupid, that’s not your property.’ There are some Jewish circles who let themselves get carried away by their nerves.” [4-3-89, A1]

Cardinal Glemp’s defiance to Jewish pressures only aggravated international Jewish determination to oust the handful of nuns off a spot of Polish national soil all the more. On September 5 the Times reported that “in a meeting with the Cardinal, Senator Paul Simon, Democrat of Illinois, cautioned that the dispute could jar Polish-American relations and slow financial aid efforts.” [NYT] How a U. S. Senator could state that a Jewish parochial concern could harm “Polish-American” relations and “financial aid to Poland” is the height of arrogance worth a volume of exploration itself, addressing traditionally “anti-Semitic” notions of Jewish parochial influence and economic power in the American politic. Suffice it to say here that Simon was in fact profoundly beholding to the Jewish community; they had put him in office. Simon secured his senate seat when Illinois senator Charles Piercy became “the best known victim” of Jewish political lobbying. “Defeating Percy for reelection [in 1984],” notes J. J. Goldberg, “became virtually a national crusade among pro-Israel activists.” [GOLDBERG, p. 270] (Likewise, later President Bill Clinton, in appeasement to all the Jewish economic support in his campaign [see later chapter] and Jewish interest in Poland, provocatively appointed a Jew, Michael Neczewski, in 1992 as the Ambassador to Poland).

As for Cardinal Glemp, he was internationally branded as the intolerant voice of Polish anti-Semitism. “Cardinal Glemp,” declared Konstanty Gebert, “at the height of the Auschwitz controversy was met with approval by what seemed to be the majority of the nation. Clearly anti-Semitism of the traditional variety is alive and well in Poland.” [GEBERT, p. 28] Meanwhile, in Israel, apparently related to the Carmelite convent controversy, vandals damaged the remains of a 13th century Carmelite monastery. [RITTNER, p. 75]

On the same day that the Senator warned the Polish Cardinal about the holding of U.S. funds to help rebuild Poland, Rabbi Avraham Weiss of the Hebrew Institute of Riverdale, in the Bronx, the man who led the Jewish take-
over of the convent, announced that he was suing Cardinal Glemp for libelous statements Glemp allegedly made against the seven invading Jews. “The Cardinal has,” Rabbi Weiss had earlier told the media, “in almost classical anti-Semitic terms, chosen to portray Jewish victims as aggressors.” [NYT, 8-11-89, A4] (Weiss in later years was cited by convicted terrorist Era Rapaport (who bombed and maimed Palestinian mayors) as someone who “stood by me, a friend in need, after my action, guiding and strengthening my family and me.” [RAPAPORT, E., 1996, p. 279] Alan Dershowitz, one of the members of the “star” criminal defenders legal team that later managed to get O.J. Simpson off the hook for murder, told the news media that he would serve Glemp with lawsuit papers as soon as the Cardinal “left his plane” for an upcoming visit he had planned in several United States Polish communities. [NYT, 9-5-89, A8] (Glemp was forced to cancel the trip). Two years later Glemp was served a summons for the Dershowitz/Weiss suit as he left a cathedral in Albany, New York. Rabbi Weiss, noted the Jewish Week, “watched from around the corner.” [JW, 10-4-91, p. 9] Weiss had also earlier announced that he was going to sue the Polish workers who threw his group off convent grounds and the police who didn’t get involved in the fiasco. He also proclaimed that “If Israel does not administer and supervise Auschwitz, it will be impossible to preserve the unique message of this place where the Nazis tried to liquidate Jews.” [BART, Conv, p. 103] Weiss had also previously demanded that the Church punish the nuns for “watching in silence as workers beat Jews.” The nuns were likewise accused of turning their backs on Jews “just like your Church did 50 years ago.” [BART, Conv, p. 87]

Dershowitz later even filed lawsuit action against Cardinal Glemp in Poland, an action guaranteed to antagonize the Polish populace and resurrect the worst stereotypes of Jewish behavior for them. In the midst of the Auschwitz convent controversy, Dershowitz even publicly accused the Jewish citizens of today’s Poland of timidity and cowardice. [PAWLIKOWSKI, p. 109]

Well known lawyer, Alan Dershowitz, a major agitator in the convent controversy, merits further attention here. He has framed himself throughout his life as a sometimes unpopular crusader for “freedom of speech.” (See, for example his book, Contrary to Popular Opinion). His own account of his actions in the Auschwitz uproar are noted in his book, Chutzpah (Yiddish for “pushiness”). Dershowitz derides “one of Poland’s most prominent human rights lawyers,” Wladyslaw Sila-Nowicki, for “seeking to justify the role played by the Polish people during the Holocaust ... [Sila-Nowicki] invokes many classic canards of crude anti-Semitism: dual loyalty (“[The Jews] had to love their community more than the host community”), excessive wealth (“Who held the largest capital in Poland, the Polish majority or the 10% Jewish minority?”); Jewish success (“It is only natural ... that a community will defend itself against letting its intellectual elite become eclipsed by others, which was a particularly likely prospect in areas such as medicine or law.”)” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 147-148]
But particularly outrageous to Dershowitz was Sila-Nowicki’s assertions about the Holocaust that dismisses Jewish mythology about it:

“For us, Poles, it was often an astounding spectacle to see several thousand Jews being led from a small town along a road several kilometers long, escorted by only a few guards (six, sometimes four) carrying ordinary rifles ... Nobody escaped, although escape was no problem ... “ [DERSHOWITZ, p.]

For Dershowitz, the recitation of such historical facts – as also asserted by Raul Hilberg, and many other Jewish scholars – is “anti-Semitic assumptions.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 148]

Dershowitz’s preposterous tact to sue and harass Cardinal Glemp with technicalities, legal maneuvering, and other obsessive legalese on behalf of Rabbi Weiss, was for these particular words by the Cardinal:

“Recently a squad of seven Jews from New York launched attacks on the convent at Oswiecism [Auschwitz]. In fact, it did not happen that the sisters were killed or the convent destroyed, because they were apprehended.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 155]

From this, Dershowitz intended to provoke deeper Polish animosity by trying to prove libel, “that Cardinal Glemp had deliberately lied in accusing the ‘squad’ of New York Jews of intending to kill the nuns.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 153] The Jewish American lawyer’s self-appointed task was to dust off the minutia in his law books to find a way to prove that a public figure had “made false statements with ‘malice’: either actual knowledge that the statement was false, or reckless disregard of its truth.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 153] In the meantime, Dershowitz called Glemp “stupid” (in true lawyer weasel-like form, lest he be faced with some kind of libelous claim himself, he discreetly says that unnamed “Polish American leaders have told me that Glemp is, in fact, stupid.”) [DERSHOWITZ, p. 153]

But was Glemp’s statement of worry malicious? After all, the seven Jewish intruders had far surpassed all accepted norms of Polish civil decency and behavior. In the context of the Polish world-view, a trespass against the Catholic convent was an act of lunacy. And aggression. Who knows what such people were capable of? Dershowitz himself writes of his own mood when visiting Poland, that

“I went to Auschwitz-Birkenau – the site of the largest murder camps – expecting to be moved, perhaps to cry. But instead of my eyes tearing, my fists clenched. [DERSHOWITZ, p. 140]

Dershowitz’s fists literally started clenching again, as he notes in his book four pages later, in rage against the Poles, because Polish focus upon special Jewish Holocaust martyrology in Poland wasn’t expansive enough for him. [DERSHOWITZ, p. 144] Dershowitz also, like Rabbi Weiss, was having delusions in Poland, a man obsessed. In Polish streets he disdained that “passerbys all had characteristic Polish faces.” But, suddenly, overcome by narcissism, he felt a purely racist connection to a Polish stranger walking down the street. The stranger “bore a striking physical resemblance to me. His face looked very Jewish.”
Dershowitz cornered the hapless Pole and tried to assign him a Jewish heritage “in Yiddish, Hebrew, English. He did not understand and walked on. I could not help wondering whether he could have been of Jewish birth, one of the Jewish babies abandoned by its parents or given over to a non-Jewish family so that it might survive. Probably not, but the haunting possibility stayed with me for the remainder of the trip.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 146] This man, Dershowitz walking around Poland with his “fists clenched,” projecting himself into passing Polish strangers who had a “Jewish look,” is the individual who sought to sue a Catholic Cardinal who suggested that a group of such fanatics might well harbor violent potential.

So Dershowitz embarked upon a plan to hound Cardinal Glemp and, by extension, the Catholic church and the Polish people, invoking as true every anti-Polish stereotype (and every anti-Jewish stereotype for that matter) one can imagine in the process. “It was about time an anti-Semitic priest,” says Dershowitz, “was called to account for his bigotry.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 154] The angry Jew filed a suit against the Cardinal in the United States, thankful that Glemp’s “accusation of attempted murder by an American rabbi made before a very large audience [received] international media coverage.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 154] Dershowitz arranged to serve Glemp with a formal legal complaint to begin the suit when the Polish Cardinal arrived in the United States for a planned visit. Reluctant to engage in further controversy and being a continued target for harassment, such action forced Glemp to cancel his trip.

“It was,” says Dershowitz, “a great victory for decency. It was also a victory for Jewish power.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 156] Not satisfied with disrupting and alienating the Polish-American Catholic community, Dershowitz decided to go to Poland itself to try to sue Cardinal Glemp there. No Polish lawyer would work with him. Undaunted, Dershowitz returned to Poland with Rabbi Weiss yet again in 1990 to try to get his lawsuit going again. A group of Polish judges ruled that he did not have a legal case, “an embarrassment,” says Dershowitz, to the Polish legal system. [DERSHOWITZ, p. 160]

One last note about Alan Dershowitz. This man, one of America’s foremost criminal defense lawyers, has lucratively defended a range of much publicized criminal clients including the Jewish American spy for Israel, Jonathan Pollard, neo-Nazi religious fanatic Rabbi Meir Kahane, members of the Jewish Defense League, Rabbi Bernard Bergman (owner of a chain of nursing homes who was jailed for systemic exploitive immoralities against the helpless elderly), Claus Von Bulon, Mike Tyson, Leona Helmsley, and Michael Milken. Dershowitz is also a man who was especially reviled – even in the Jewish community – as a legal prostitute for his successful contribution to the legal defense of accused murderer O.J. Simpson (one of the victims was Jewish, Ronald Goldman). “Until the Simpson case,” wrote Dershowitz, “virtually all my hate mail was from non-Jews. Since the verdict, the majority has come from Jews ... Initially I hoped that some of the writers who identified themselves as Jews were imposters. But I have checked and, tragically, they are authentic ... “ [DERSHOWITZ]

Attacked by his own people, Dershowitz charges them with racism and, of course, internalized anti-Semitism absorbed from evil Gentiles:
“Lawyers are supposed to be paid for their time, especially by relatively wealthy clients. There is no shame in being compensated for one’s professional work. Yet the stereotype of doing everything ‘for the money’ was a dominant theme within the Jewish letters [to me]. It led me to wonder whether some Jews have not incorporated the anti-Semitic stereotype into their own thinking ... [The complaints from Jews] articulates a stereotype about Jews that usually comes from bigoted non-Jews: that all Jews care about is money. The word ‘greed’ appears over and over again; but this time from the mouths of Jews.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 27]

The irony to all of Dershowitz’s lofty moral posturing as a criminal lawyer is that it is innately ethically bankrupt. As he has himself noted, “Almost all of my own clients have been guilty.” [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 130] On one hand ascribing “anti-Semitism” to fellow Jews who pelt him en masse with criticism, he justifies his vocation and world view purely in terms of expediency:

“My responsibility as a criminal defense lawyer is not to judge the guilt or innocence of my client. Generally, I don’t know. My job is to advocate zealously, within the rules. That is what I did in the Simpson case, and I am proud of my work.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 27]

Dershowitz’s singular allegiance to function “zealously, within the rules,” without caring about “guilt or innocence” whatsoever, and conveniently dismissing all personal moral judgment as irrelevant to system rules, has, as he should know, profoundly disturbing precedent. This is Hannah Arendt’s description of (captured Nazi bureaucrat) Adolf Eichmann’s excuse for his own vocation, that of overseeing – from a comfortable office – the murders of millions:

“[What Eichmann did] as far as he could see [was] as a law-abiding citizen. He did his duty, as he told the police and the court over and over again; he not only obeyed orders, he also obeyed the law.” [ARENDT, p. 135]

Richard Rubinstein managed to frame the whole Rabbi Weiss affair with his own apparent psychoanalytic obsessions:

“[Weiss] gives no indication that he had any understanding of the kind of fearful primal associations that could be triggered in the psyche of theologically unsophisticated Polish Catholics when uninvited males entered a domain reserved for women who have devoted their lives to chastity and prayer. At the most primitive level, the symbolism involved in the idea of male invasion of a precinct reserved for pious virgins carries with it the most unfortunate sexual associations.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 44]

Curiously timed in the midst of the controversy, on September 14, nine days after the filing of lawsuit action against Glemp, President George Bush’s administration “ruled out any major, immediate efforts to provide economic aid to Poland in their struggles out of a communist economy. Even a food airlift was postponed. The New York Times noted that “Chris Goldthwait assistant general
sales manager for the Foreign Agricultural Service ... is expected to visit Poland shortly to try to provide an accurate picture of its food needs.” [NYT, 9-14-89]

Shortly after Pope Paul (of Polish origin) intervened into the international controversy to guarantee the removal of the convent from Auschwitz grounds, on September 24 “Secretary of Commerce Robert A. Mosbacher told Poland’s new Government this week that Washington would help lure private credits and investments (for Poland) here.” [NYT, 9-24-89]

On November 14, still following the convent story, the New York Times noted that Lech Walesa, the leader of Poland’s Solidarity movement, met with “about 70 leaders of Jewish organizations” in New York during a trip to the U.S. “Mr. Walesa ... complained that repeated accusations of Polish anti-Semitism are unfair and exaggerated, and create divisions that hamper Poland’s efforts to move towards democracy and a free market economy.” For their part, Robert K. Lifton, President of the American Jewish Congress, spoke for American Jewish groups in stating that Walesa’s “defense of Cardinal Glemp left the community quite cold.” [NYT]

So the western – particularly American – media consistently reported the controversy: the Poles as unreasonable anti-Semites and Jews as victimized innocents who merely sought justice against bigotry on their hallowed Auschwitz grounds. In always reflecting Jewish demands about Auschwitz as the central aspect of their stories, the mass media totally overlooked the Polish perspective to the controversy. For starters, few westerners – including demanding Jews – knew the geographical issues that are part of the Polish outrage. There are in fact three distinct concentration camp remnants collectively known as “Auschwitz” in the Polish town of Oswiecim: Auschwitz I (the main camp), Auschwitz II (Birkenau), and Auschwitz III (Monowitz). Auschwitz I – the place next to the where the convent was located – was opened in June 1940 expressly as a camp for Polish political prisoners. For the next 21 months inmates of the camp were almost exclusively Polish victims of Nazi roundups, mainly Poland’s “elite” educational strata, consisting of those with more than a secondary education. An estimated 270,000 Poles died in Auschwitz I. Jewish prisoners at Auschwitz I throughout World War II accounted for only 14% of the imprisoned population. Auschwitz II, however, (Birkenau), two miles away, was the local killing site reserved mostly for Jews. Over 90% of those murdered there (perhaps as many as 1.5 million people) were Jewish. Even here, however, the first gas chamber murders were 600 Soviet prisoners of war and 250 prisoners with consumption (tuberculosis). [BART, Conv, p. 6-11]

Aside from the fact that the main killing site for Jews was two miles away, the convent was not actually on today’s formal Auschwitz I grounds; it was next to it, but not obtrusive to any visitor. “People with no idea of the topography of the camp,” says a Jew and Polish citizen, Stanislaw Krajewski, “could have thought that the convent was in the center of the camp and that Jewish visitors would have to enter a Christian establishment. But in reality, no visitor is likely to find this building without specifically looking for it.” [KRAJEWSKI, p.45] Hershel Shanks, editor of the Jewish magazine Moment, visited Auschwitz at
the end of the convent controversy. “Yes, we saw the convent,” he wrote, “I con-
fess, I did not find it offensive. But I am in a distinct minority. You must seek it 
out to see it. You don’t pass it on the way from Cracow to Auschwitz. It is not 
near the only entrance of the camp. You must drive around to the site to see it. 
You can’t see it from anywhere in the camp ... The Jews seem to be denying the 
right of the Poles to pray for their own dead. Rabbi Avi Weiss who climbed over 
the convent walls to protest was seen as a madman – even the Nazis, we were 
told, didn’t touch the Church.” [SHANKS, p. 5]

When apprised of all the geographical facts of Auschwitz, the mainstream of 
Jewish histrionics was not abated. There were ashes of cremated Jews every-
where, anywhere, all over Poland. Adolph Steg, for instance, argued that it did 
not matter where the convert was technically located; the simple fact that it 
once served as a storage site for Nazi gas pellets – wherever it was located – was 

enough to render it hallowed and connected to Jewish sensibilities about Aus-
chwitz. “Who can fail to see,” he proclaimed, “that nothing signifies the Holo-
caust as uniquely as the gas?” [STEG, p. 49] (Apparently, it is only a Christian 

presence that is an insult to Jews. Since the convent controversy, Jewish Ameri-
can Director Steven Spielberg brought the desecrating chaos of a Hollywood 

film crew for the movie Schindler’s List to photograph “the Auschwitz scenes 
just outside the camp’s main gate.” [SHANDLER, p. 161]

“What made [Rabbi Weiss’] intrusion specially intolerable for the Poles, 
“comments Krajewski, “was the generally known fact that the Carmelite sisters 
are an enclosed order and do not meet strangers without special permission. 
The fact is that a Catholic man entering even a garden, which is also part of the 
 enclosure, without permission is liable to excommunication. [Rabbi] Weiss did 

not care or did not know, which comes to the same lack of respect for the nuns. 
... Psychologically, Weiss’ action was an act of war.” [KRAJ, p. 49] (One of the 

nuns of the convent was even a survivor herself of the concentration camp. 

CHROST)

Not only was the convent holy ground for Polish Catholics, it should have 
been for Weiss too. The Polish convent system had been particularly meritori-
ous in hiding Jews from the Nazis during World War II, particularly children. 
Matylda Getter, for example, and her order of the “Provincial of the Franciscan 
Sisters of the Family of Man” is herself credited with aiding over 1,000 Jews. 
[BART, Conv, p. 153] In writing about the Polish convents during the Holo-
caust era, Szyman Datner, a Jewish survivor and historian, noted that 

“In my research I have found only one case of help being refused. No 
other sector was so ready to help those persecuted by the Germans, in-
cluding the Jews; this attitude, unanimous and general, deserves recog-
nition and respect.” [BART, p. 102, Conv]

In this context, “anti-Semitic” Polish public opinion often felt, says Wla-

daslaw Bartoszewski, that “Western Jews had done nothing for their brethren 
during the war when the nuns sheltered children. American Jewry was particu-
larly criticized for its pushiness, in contrast to the war when they had remained 
passive. The Israeli treatment of the Palestinians and of the Intifada was con-
trasted with the peace-loving image which the Jews wanted to project in Poland.” [BART, Conv, p. 91]

Rabbi Weiss’ “acts of war” against others have continued with other victims. In later years he led agitations and protests against American visits by South African black activist Nelson Mandela (for shaking Moammar Gadafi’s and Yassar Arafat’s hands) and South African bishop Desmond Tutu (for criticizing Israel). Weiss also continued to protest the continued American imprisonment of American Jewish spy (for Israel) Jonathan Pollard, visiting him over 30 times in prison. Pollard, according to Weiss, “is a prisoner of conscience.” [BOLE, p. 18] In 1993 Rabbi Weiss was named “Rabbi of the Year” by the New York Board of Rabbis, which includes both Reform and Orthodox members. [GOLDBERG, p. 333]

While acknowledging the symbolic importance of Auschwitz to him, and others, as Jews, “at the same time,” says Krajewski, “the West does not sufficiently understand Polish suffering and its connection to Auschwitz. The historical fact is that the Nazis tried to crush the Polish nation; they not only introduced bloody terror but began to murder the Polish elite and destroy Polish culture. The Auschwitz camp was used for this purpose, which, during its first two years of existence, was its main function.” [KRAJEWSKI, p. 38] Krajewski even supported the continued presence of the Catholic convent at Auschwitz.

Another rare Jewish voice for Polish defense came from Jonathan Webber, a social anthropologist at Oxford University, familiar with the Auschwitz site:

“How come, in this age of pluralism and multicultural reconciliation, that we [Jews] find it so emotive that members of another faith wish to pray at or near a place that has been hallowed (if that is the right word) by massive Jewish martyrdom? Pray! Who are we, where have we got to nowadays, if we find a group dedicated to prayer and contemplation offensive to us?” [BART, Conv, p. 84]

(Similarly, in 1995, the Mormons were caught off guard by Jewish outrage and attack. A group of Mormons had made the mistake of thinking that posthumously baptizing 380,000 Jewish Holocaust victims, as a religious act of universalism, and entering their names into a Mormon computer base (the Mormons have one of the largest genealogical archives for all peoples in the world), was a good, and loving, action. (“Baptizing the dead,” noted the Los Angeles Times, “is a central tenet of the Mormon church.”) [LA TIMES, 5-6-95, p. B4] Jews didn’t see this action as benevolent. Jews are not a universalistic people after all, and even an abstract appropriation of Holocaust victims to the pan-human community is, for Jewry, a cardinal offense. The Mormons baptized the Holocaust Jews from, in their perspective, compassion. “Five major Jewish groups” made the national news, demanding that the names be taken off the Mormon lists. The troubling curiosity here, of course, is such intensive Jewish offense at such an abstraction, one, that to Mormon religious sensibilities, was well intended. May Christians pray, on their own terms, in a church, for Holocaust dead? May Buddhists perform blessings, in the context of their
own understanding of human existence, for the murdered Jews? Would Jewry really prefer neutrality in the world’s religious faiths to the issue of the Holocaust, or, worse, the obverse of Mormon compassion: condemnation? What do Jews reasonably expect from other religious groups, if not expressions of their religious beliefs?)

Rabbi Weiss’ trespass on the convent grounds was a staged incident for the media. He had informed local police of his intentions and made sure journalists were present to record outraged Polish reaction to his confrontation. After hours of failed negotiation with the New York Jews, and the reluctance of local Polish to remove the Jewish intruders, Polish workers at the convent physically evicted them. Reuters reported it as “one of the most abhorrent scenes of violence towards Jews to have taken place in many years.” [CHROST, p. 31] Abraham Foxman of the Anti-Defamation League called the incident “an intolerable return to the old Polish hatred and pogroms, practices which we thought had finally been given up.” Israel’s prime minister, Yitzak Shamir, outraged Poles by publicly asserting that “all Poles imbibe anti-Semitism with their mother’s milk.” [p. 33]

In the Polish popular press, opinion could best be exemplified by comments of journalist Jacek Wozniakowski:

“I must admit sincerely that if I were a worker busy repairing something in a building of the convent, then, risking accusation of barbarity, I would apply myself probably to throwing out the intruders whoever they might have been. The fact that during such incidents not everybody behaves velvet-like must have been part of the publicity apparatus: photographs, articles in the western press about the brutality of the Poles, about the new, dangerous wave of Polish anti-Semitism....” CHROSTOWSKI, p. 31

Jewish lobbying and bashing of Poles reached a crescendo in the 1990’s when Edward Moskal, head of the Polish American Congress and Polish National Alliance complained to Polish president Aleksander Kwasniewski about Poland’s “submissiveness” to Jewish pressures, enabling “Jews to take advantage of [Poland’s economic] situation and acquire more and more influence.” The Anti-Defamation League’s director, Abraham Foxman, demanded an apology from Moskal. “In implying Polish capitulation to Jewish demands,” said Foxman, “you raise age-old anti-Semitic claims of excessive Jewish power.” Moskal refused a retraction. [ADL ONLINE]

One of the very few American public figures to question the Jewish propaganda avalanche about the Auschwitz convent was Pat Buchanan, one of the Republican candidates for U. S. President in 1996. Buchanan told a Jewish reporter that

“[Rabbi] Weiss was run off the grounds of the Auschwitz convent, doused, roughed up, chased off. That got global attention. But the shooting up of the Church of the Holy Family (in Ramallah, in the West Bank, in January 1988, when Israeli troops reportedly opened fire to disperse Palestinian parishioners) did not. Alan Dershowtiz (the Harvard
law professor) in his very nice column about me, said that this type of incident is an everyday occurrence on the West Bank. I suggest that if a soldier somewhere went in and shot up a synagogue and chased out the congregation, there would be international outrage. If someone said this was an everyday occurrence, then we would all say, ‘Well, if it’s an everyday occurrence, that must be some kind of fascist state’ ... Meanwhile, we’d seen Pius XII under savage attack, we’d seen the Polish people and Polish Catholics in effect branded as anti-Semites, we’d seen Catholic history defamed, calls for cutoffs in aid to Poland until they caved in (by removing the convent). All this went on systematically.” [LAZARE, p. 32]

The Jewish reporter who solicited these Buchanan comments, Daniel Lazare, concluded his article by telling readers that Buchanan “runs the risk of opening the door for others to vent their latent anti-Semitism.” [LAZARE, p. 32] In other words, according to Lazare, Jewish actions don’t cause Gentile hostility, remarks by critics like Buchanan do.

Meanwhile, the Simon Wiesenthal Center continued to fan the embers of broader Jewish outrage, writing about the “presence of crosses, churches, convents, and chapels at the sites of Nazi concentration camps and death camps ... Said survivor Jack Reich: ”There were no bishops and nuns praying with their crosses for my [Jewish] loved ones when we were humiliated, starved, and murdered. This is nothing less than the spiritual desecration of what was predominantly a slaughterhouse for Jews.’ Historian Martin Gilbert said: ‘What the Catholic Church is doing is scandalous and grotesque.” [RESPONSE, p. 9, FALL WINTER, 1994/95]

The ultimate undercurrent through the convent controversy, of course, as always, is the usual Jewish double standard, one standard for Jews and another for everyone else, and the disturbing power of Jewish economic and political lobbying organizations and, indeed, their profound influence in the mass media. What would happen, one wonders, if a group of Catholics, led by a priest, invaded, planted a cross, and otherwise disturbed – refusing to leave – (for whatever “reasoned” righteous purpose) a service at a Jewish synagogue? We can rest assured that it would be the invaders who were vilified.

The real story of the Auschwitz convent controversy remains this: the international Jewish community banded together to condemn Polish Catholic parochialism and its 23-foot tall wooden cross beyond a fence at Auschwitz in an out-of-the way place that no Jew even noticed for years, trample the religious values of a handful of nuns, impugn Polish patriotism, and ignore the Polish inability to come up with two million dollars for an interfaith site across the world in Poland because Jews demanded it. Then they enforced the convent’s complete removal in an impoverished foreign country, only four years later Jews could cluster together to open their own $168 million dollar edifice to Jewish parochialism and chauvinism on the same subject in the secularly sacred context of American democracy and human universalism at the symbol-laden mall of Washington DC.
* Note: Controversy surrounding Christian symbols near Auschwitz continues. Jews have been lobbying for years for Polish authorities to dismantle a cross that stands today in the former Auschwitz convent’s garden. It was put there in 1979, on occasion of a visit by the Pope. In defiance of continuous Jewish demands in recent history, Poles erected over 200 wooden crosses at the papal cross site. Jewish pressure on the Polish government accelerated, the New York Times noted in December 1998 that, despite having escaped the oppressive communist state and Polish society rushing headlong into the celebration of private property, “the Polish government has drafted a law to be submitted to Parliament in the next few weeks that would put all former concentration and death camps and the land around them in the control of the state. The law would override all previous property claims; land would be bought at market prices.” [COHEN, R., p. 3]

In May 1999 the bill was signed into law and the wooden crosses were forcibly removed from the Auschwitz area. “Jews regard the crosses,” summed up Reuters in its news report, “as a desecration of what is, in effect, the largest cemetery of European Jews.” [INTL HERALD, Poland, p. 6]

Also in 1999, even the home where Pope John II (the focus of proud Polish Catholicism) grew up, in Wadowice, Poland, was under attack by a Jewish New York lawyer, Ron Balamuth. Balamuth filed suit in Polish courts for rights to the home, arguing that the site, today a Catholic shrine visited by 200,000 people are year, was owned by his grandfather, who died in the Holocaust. The usual Jewish efforts were then made to confiscate the Catholic shrine too into yet another memorial to Jewish martyrology. “This house has two symbolisms,” declared Balamuth’s (fellow Jewish) New York lawyer, Ayall Schanzer, “It is a holy site for Catholics but it also has tragic symbolism for all the families of Poland and Europe. We would like to see this other symbolism significantly recognized.” [WILLEY, D., 10-3-99, p. 33]

In the early 1980’s, Shoah, one of a number of widely distributed movies and TV productions about the Holocaust, and the best known before Schindler’s List, was released by its creator, Claude Lanzmann, a French Jew. The movie is part of the vast modern movement in the Jewish community to secularly reify the original Chosen People tenets of exceptionality through the prism of their “Holocaust.” Lanzmann insists that the Holocaust “is above all unique in that it erects a ring of fire around itself.” [HARTMAN, p. 63] The film was widely shown, it had numerous television venues and was well-received, especially in Jewish circles. It was a nine and a half hour documentary, shown in segments, largely based on a series of interviews with Jewish survivors of the Holocaust and Polish peasants who were asked, not to comment on their own situation during World War II, but about Jews. Lanzmann’s central thesis, remarks Wladyslaw Bartoszewski, is “that Jews went to their death because Poles were totally indifferent.” [BART, Conv, p. 24]

“In his treatment of the Polish peasants,” says Czeslaw Milosz, “Lanzmann was more a Parisian intellectual than a Jew, and exhibits the scorn for specimens by an
anthropologist.” [MILOSZ, p. 40] “Shoah is highly biased,” noted Omer Bartov, “and its biases are intensely personal, stemming directly from its maker’s own national and ideological prejudices and finding expression in his style of interviewing, his editing technique, and the context of his comments.” [BARTOV, p. 55]

One important Lanzmann interviewee, Jan Karski, a courier for the Polish underground in 1942, was concerned about what the filmmaker didn’t choose to use in his own eight hour interview with him:

“[The missing material] in the film, as well as even the general information about those who tried to help Jews, would have presented the destruction of Jews in a proper historical perspective.... People, normal people, thousands of people sympathized with the Jews or helped them.” [BART, Conv, p. 251]

Completely ignoring the Polish peasants’ plight under Nazi rule, (or under Jewish economic domination in Poland, for that matter) and denying them any dignity in their portrayal, Lanzmann frames his own bitter scapegoating against Poles by exclusively focusing on the Poles’ own critical comments about Jews, rendered in the film as venial barbs aimed at the destroyed Jewish people.

One peasant remarks, for instance, that

“Polish women worked. Jewish women only thought of their beauty and clothes. ... They were rich. The Poles had to serve them and work ... The capital was in the hands of the Jews ... All Poland was in Jews’ hands.” [LANZMANN, p.]

Lanzmann frames such words as an indictment of Poles, not of Jews, because Jews suffered the “uniquely” horrible tragedy of the Holocaust and are sacrosanct. In Lanzmann’s context, the “anti-Semitic” peasant shares guilt with the Nazis as persecutor. The filmmaker’s intention in this regard was made explicit in a magazine interview. Lanzmann, responding to a query by an interviewer if his film was accusation against Poles, responded: “Yes, it is the Poles who accuse themselves. They mastered the routine of extermination.” [KORBANSKI, p. 108]

The Poles mastered “the routine of extermination,” when Jews – as has been well-documented, and surely known to Lanzmann – were leading their own people to murder every step, every inch, of the way? Lanzmann’s “obsession with the complicity of the Polish population in the genocide...,” says Jewish scholar Omer Bartov, “is matched by his relative lack of concern with the Germans.” [BARTOV, p. 55-56]

With the release of Shoah, the Polish American Congress Executive Committee responded with a formal condemnation of the “prejudiced stereotype of Polish anti-Semitism,” and assessing Lanzmann’s work as a “cunning distortion of the truth, designed to justify his preconceived notion of Poles’ complicity in the extermination of the Jews by Germany during World War II.” [KORBANSKI, p. 108] (Lanzmann’s myopic world view is expressed more fully in his next film epic – five hours long – called Tsahal. Its subject is the Israeli army, and he approached it in such a way that even “most ... Israeli critics seemed to think ... [he was] too appreciative of its subject.” [HALIKIN, p. 49]
Lanzmann’s common Jewish attitude towards Poles was later echoed in Steven Spielberg’s feature film, *Schindler’s List*. (Apparently, Lanzmann’s personal ghosts guided him in vilifying Spielberg’s version of the Holocaust when the newer film first came out. “[Spielberg’s] Hollywood production,” complained Lanzmann, “commits a transgression by ‘trivializing’ the Holocaust, thereby denying its unique character.” “Mr. Lanzmann’s charges,” noted the [Jewish] *Forward*, “which were echoed widely in the French media, brought counter-charges from French intellectuals that what he was defending was the ‘unique quality’ of his own work, and essentially questioning whether anyone else was suitable to address the topic of the Holocaust.” [HALFF, p. 1] In *Schindler’s List* the only attention paid to Poles – who were themselves experiencing Hell under the Nazis – was when a young girl is highlighted shouting, “Goodbye Jews!” to crowds of Jews being led away by Nazis. The only scene in the entire movie about Poles is this one of vilification, despite the fact that this Holocaust story takes place in Poland.

**Stephen Dubner** notes the case of another Jewish-made documentary film shown on PBS, *Shtetl* – another that sought to demonize the Polish people:

“The filmmaker, Marian Marzynski, was a Polish-born Jew who, as a child during the war, was sheltered by Christians. Nearly all of his family was killed. Many years later he returned to Poland, acting as a guide for an American-born Jew who wanted to investigate his own family’s sh-*t*etl, Bransk. Marzynski, meanwhile, was interested in the idea of complicity, the degree to which the Polish Catholic peasants in Bransk had participated in the killing of the Jews doing the war.” DUBNER, p. 277

Negative stereotyping and the degradation of Poles regularly surfaces throughout Jewish discourse. In literature, one Jewish reviewer noted with excitement the reemergent American “Jewish novel” in the 1980’s. “Some new talents have lately emerged,” writes Mark Schechner, “... that who promise of restoring this literature to a place of importance in American letters.” [SCHECHNER, p. 169] One of the Jewish authors cited as a “new talent” is Art Spiegelman whose autobiographical *Maus: A Survivor’s Tale*, published by Pantheon (and nominated for a National Book “critic’s circle” Award) is illustrated as a kind of comic book in addressing the Holocaust. The book is an extremely compelling and painful human story, rooted in suffering, suicide, and mental illness, entwined in and out with the tale of the Holocaust. Ironically, Spiegelman’s alter-ego in *Maus* makes a disturbing commentary about the facts of his real life father, the book’s central character:

“It’s something that worries me about the book I’m doing about him. In some ways, he’s just like the racist caricature of the miserly old Jew. I mean, I’m just trying to portray my father accurately.” [SPIEGELMAN, p. 131-132]

Worried about facts that seem to confirm anti-Jewish stereotypes on one hand, Spiegelman freely and unapologetically propagates anti-Polish slurs on the other.
“One of the objections that arose to Spiegelman’s animal fable,” notes Schechner, “was his depiction of Poles as pigs. While the conception of Jews as mice and Nazis as cats did not make much of a stir, the pigs for Poles metaphor occasioned some consternation. Yet, outside the metaphor, Poles on the whole are treated positively…” [SCHECHNER, p. 177]

Outside of the pig’s metaphor? One wonders what reaction Jews would have if they were themselves cartooned as swine (but, “on the whole, treated positively”), particularly in the context of their terrors under Nazi Germany, terrors that were shared by Poles. How is it that Jews always get away with their ages-old double standard, a standard of benign innocence for Jews and a “pig” standard for others? Spiegelman even renders the insidious Nazis as a relatively positive “metaphor” as cats prowling around looking for meek “mice” Jews (ever innocent), who hide – in Spiegelman’s book – behind pig masks.

Spiegelman’s rendering of Poles as pigs resonates in Jewish lore:

“[A Jewish] child … might peer out into the streets and see the Gentile’s pigs snuffing and eating the corpses of the people [after Gentile violence] who until yesterday had lived next door. It was in character for the unclean animal to behave so, and inevitable that this scavenger activity would strengthen the symbolism of the pig as an object of disgust. Such experiences and memories, nevertheless contributed to the total picture of the goyim held by the Jews.” [ZBOROWSKY, p. 153]

In an Isaac Bashevi Singer novel, Yoshe Kalb, a Jewish brothel owner implores a rabbi not to take away his only Jewish girl because “the swine have to have one.” [BRISTOW, p. 51] And let us not forget here the Yiddish language itself which, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, even linguistically dehumanizes Poles, i.e., the verbs used for animal descriptions are also applied to non-Jews, for example, eating like “pigs,” and dying like “dogs.” [KRAMER, p. 107]

In this spirit of despisement and debasement of Poles, a 1995 volume published by Israel’s Hebrew University Alina Cala, presented the results of her interviews with Poles (collected one and two decades ago) about Jews, The Image of the Jew in Polish Folklore. Cala was surprised that “my interlocutors spoke willingly and colorfully, without concealing their opinions.” The author notes in her introduction that she went fishing for material in “the jungle of still lively prejudices against the Jews … anti-Semitism, which was morbidly fascinated by Jewish differentness.” And Cala concludes her volume with a final paragraph that the Poles lost “the opportunity to see oneself from a distance, through they eyes of others [Jews]. This is not an easy skill, so it is not wonder that the people of Poland have preferred their own phobias and obsessions.”

In between these ideological bookends that trash and stereotype the Polish people, and in her totally Judeo-centric view and complete reluctance to reverse her premise of Jewish victimization for even an instant, (in other words, to consider Jews from the Polish situation for a change), Calla provides a broad sampling of the Polish commentary she so loathes, with her own emphasis upon supposed irrational and completely baseless Polish “phobias and obsessions” such as these:
“[The Jews] exploited the peasants, [they were] greedy for money, cunning, egoistic…” [p. 30] “Impudent in trade, they even solicited in the church porches.” [p. 30] “There were rich and poor Jews, but there were no honest Jews... They cheated terribly ... They lived and enriched themselves at our expense.” [p. 62] “The Jews held all commerce in their hands. [p. 27]

“The respondents,” writes Cala, “rarely reflected on the origins of anti-Semitism. Those that did so most often looked for the reasons in Jewish separateness, the Jews’ alleged wealth and domination in trade and industry, or their political inclinations. “ [p. 59-60]

If Polish folk wisdom of Jewish economic domination in Poland is irrationally anti-Semitic, with no basis in fact whatsoever, what are we to make of the following Yiddish folk tale that traditionally circulated among the Jews of Poland?

“The Polish nobleman, Radziwell, who owned the little town of Nishwiz, chanced to be out of funds in Warsaw. He entered a Jewish banking house and asked for a loan. The clerk refused on the plea of not knowing him. The nobleman asked, “Did you ever hear of Nishwiz?” “Yes,” replied the clerk. “Do you know to whom it belongs?” “Surely I do. To the Rebbe [Rabbi] of Lekhivitz,” said the clerk. The nobleman left in disgust.” [NEWMAN, p. 289]

Or how about this excerpt from the 1892 Yiddish story Unease in Jacob, by Mendele Mocher Sforim (“Mendele the Bookseller”):

“This is the way of the Jews, the nature imbued in them from time immemorial, that whenever they see a fellow with a gold coin, let him be what he will, even a calf, a beast in human form – he becomes their God, and they bow down to him, dance and frolic before him, giving glory to his name.” [BRENNER, p. 77]

And what of this extraordinarily arrogant apologetic from the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia for the common and condescending Yiddish word, “goy,” that Eastern European Jews used (and most Jews still use) for all non-Jews?

“In later colloquial usage, the implication of contempt that attached to the word ‘goy’ was due to external circumstances. Thus, for example, in Poland and other countries of Eastern Europe, the Jews found themselves surrounded by a populace that was almost entirely illiterate. In view of their own high educational standards, it is not surprising if the word goy came to connote an ignorant peasant.” [UNIV JEW EN, v. 4, p. 534]

Isn’t this “they are beneath us” rationale, even defended by the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, the very essence of any institutionalized racism? (For the record, according to an 1897 Russian census, the literacy gap between Jews and non-Jews was not that stupendous: 50% literacy for Jews and 28% for non-Jews.) [STEINBERG, p. 99]

“The term goy,” notes Ewa Morawska, “referring to Gentiles [non-Jews], was
actually used to denote ‘peasant’ ... and that meant people and things (goyish) that were backward, ignorant, driven by corporeal, unrestrained instincts and physical aggression ... the goyim-peasants represented everything a Jew, including members of the uneducated strata of Jewish society, did not want to and should not be, and this value-laden distinction was inculcated in children from infancy.” [MORAWSKA, p. 16]

The Jewish scholars Zborowski and Herzog quote common Jewish opinion that existed about the impoverished Polish peasantry around Jewish communities:

“He [the peasant] has no worries. What’s he got to be afraid of? He gets drunk, beats his wife, he sings a little song.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 156]

“Jews harbored many unflattering images both of Gentile individuals and Gentile culture,” says Leibman and Cohen, “These negative images were constituent elements in traditional Jewish identity, reinforcing Jewish notions of their own individual and collective superiority, and contributed to ... the belief that Jews were all part of one extended family, and chosenness.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 37] “To Jewish children,” notes Jay Gonen, “intellectuals, scholars, and spiritual pursuits became identified as Jewish values, whereas sensual, gross, and menial preoccupations became identified as Gentile.” [GONEN, p. 136] “Yiddish folk wisdom percolated with disparaging phrases about slug-gish gentile intelligence,” says Joshua Halberstam, “contrasting Jewish mental gifts with the feckless reasoning of the peasants with whom they lived.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 57] Upon moving to Israel in 1967, an American Jew, Ze’ev Chafets, eventually decided to learn a little Yiddish along with the obligatory Hebrew. He was struck by the old Jewish Eastern European victimhood worldview fore grounded in his earliest Yiddish lessons, noting that he “was bemused to find that in the standard [Yiddish learning] text, early vocabulary words included Cossack, pogrom, and cholera.” [CHAFETS, p. 16]

Israel Shahak notes that “everywhere, Judaism developed hatred and contempt for agriculture as an occupation and for peasants as a class, even more than for other Gentiles – a hatred which I know no parallel in other societies. This is immediately apparent to anyone who is familiar with Yiddish or Hebrew literature of the nineteenth and twentieth century. [SHAHA, p. 53] ... Nobel Prize winners Agnon and Bashevis Singer are examples of this, but many others can be given, particularly Bialik, the national Hebrew poet. In his famous poem My Father he describes his saintly father selling vodka to the drunkard peasants who are depicted as animals. This very popular poem, taught in all Israeli schools is one of the vehicles through which the anti-peasant attitude is reproduced.” [SHAHA, p. 109]

Even today, modern Jewish novelists reiterate such anti-peasant, anti-Polish, and anti-Gentile themes. Chaim Potok’s novel In the Beginning has this parag:

“Goyim,’ his father said, “it’s a world that hates Jew.” Looking at the scar on his father’s face, Davey said: “Who hurt you, Popa?” “A goy a Polak. He wanted to steal my tallis, and I would not give it to him, so he
cut my face with a bayonet and took it, and none of the goyische soldiers with whom I had fought for years said a word or lifted a finger to help. The job of a Jew is to suffer, they think, the stinking Polaks.” [BLOOMFIELD, p. 27]

Modern Jewish scholarship still reflects this racist foundation against Slavs and peasants. In 1990 one could find this from a distinguished Jewish historian, Howard Sachar:

“The brutish life of the illiterate and superstitious muzhik [peasant] exercised no attraction whatever for the literate devoutly religious Jew. Virtually any hardship could be borne more easily than entrance into the bucolic and primitive Slavic world.” [SACHAR, p. 78]

Anti-Polish [and broader anti-Gentile] animosity in Jewish circles can run extraordinarily deep. In 1992 a Jewish scholar, Enzo Traverso, took offense that the turn-of-the-century Eastern European Jewish humanist and socialist, Rosa Luxemberg, expressed some affection for the Polish peasantry around her. “The contrast,” says Traverso, “between [Luxemberg’s] contempt for the Jewish tradition and her exaltation of Polish virtues is striking.”

Traverso quotes an excerpt from a Luxemberg letter:

“How delightful – fields of wheat, meadows, forests – the Polish language and Polish peasants ... a little barefoot cowherd and our magnificent fir trees. It is true, the peasants are hungry and dirty, but what a handsome race!” [TRAVERSO, p. 63]

This innocent pan-human endearment is apparently threatening and is defaming to the bedrock dogma of Jewish exceptionality. Traverso cynically remarks that:

“One is almost tempted to see in [Luxemberg’s] Polish version of [Nazi] ‘volkish’ romanticism, a typical form of Jewish anti-Semitism.” [TRAVERSO, p. 63]

While legions of Jewish scholars, propagandists, and apologists flood the English language media with Jewish perspectives and points of view about Gentile hostility in Poland, there is little translation of the Polish versions of Polish-Jewish relations into English. As John Grondelski notes, “Polish scholarship has, unfortunately, not received the attention it merits in the West in part because it has often remained in its original language and thus been linguistically isolated.” [GROND, p. 285]

SCHINDLER’S LIST

The popular movie, Schindler’s List (which had grossed four billion dollars by 1994), by Stephen Spielberg – a Jew who has subsequently instituted yet another Holocaust memory perpetuation agency, the Shoah Foundation, as a repository for Jewish oral history of the Holocaust – is a good example of the
standard stereotypes and Jewish reconstruction and decontextualization of history to singularly render themselves the world’s continuous and consummate victims of injustice. (In February 1997 this film was presented on national TV, sacred and hallowed, without commercial interruption. It is supremely ironic that the sponsor for this prime time showing on NBC was the Ford Motor Company. This corporation’s founder, Henry Ford, is widely reviled by Jews today as one of America’s most notorious anti-Semites. Corporations know which way the economic wind blows. By 1997 the company he founded was on their knees to the secular religion of the Holocaust, trying to buy Jewish redemption.)

“Schindler’s List,” notes Betsy Zelizer, “has generated a slew of unresolved questions about who has the right to tell the story of past events, and in which way.” [ZELIZER, p. 18] “This is a Jewish film” says Estelle Gilson, “from its opening shots ... the film speaks to secret places in the Jewish heart.” [GILSON, p. 12] “Uninformed viewers,” notes Andrew Nagorski, “which includes many Americans, may emerge from the film with no idea the war was aimed at more than the destruction of the Jews or that there were other victims of Nazi atrocities ... Moreover, the movie’s few fleeting images of Polish Catholics – such as the chilling scene of a young girl screaming with hatred, ‘Goodbye, Jews!’ as victims were herded into the ghetto – seem to suggest that the only role Poles played was to applaud Nazi terror.” [NAGORSKI, p. 152-157]

In another review of the movie, H. R. Shapiro notes who the Jews were – in real life – that worked intimately with Schindler:

“The Nazis formed the Judenrat to implement Nazi policy in the Jewish community and, more importantly, to divide and conquer the Jews and to crush any resistance to the Nazis. The Jews who worked with Schindler were all leaders of the Judenrat ... The Judenrat ... through secrecy and lies, convinced the Jewish masses that reports of horrors to the east were only rumors, and that Jews were merely being ‘resettled.’ With potential opposition thus neutralized, the Nazis were able to deport and exterminate most of the Warsaw Jews. By contrast, those who had some connection to the Judenrat and their associates, especially the privileged and the wealthy, survived the war.” [PIOTROWSKI, p. 70]

Spielberg is also disingenuous with the Talmudic epigram that starts the movie, as its pan-human, universalist theme: “He who saves a life saves the world entire.” Even taking this “life-saving” statement at face value, it is subject to interpretive manipulation. Some Jewish observers have noted that “this Talmudic saying, taken literally, is the ideological basis for an amoral survivalism,” i.e., saving “a” life is merely self-survival. [CHEYETTE, p. 233]

Yet this supposedly noble refrain is clouded even further. In the talmudic Mishna, Sanhedrin 4:5, the original really says this: “Whoever destroys a single Jewish life, Scripture accounts it to him as though he had destroyed a whole world.” It is quite particularist in its scope, i.e., it only cares about Jews, self-survival or not. Nonetheless, this literal fact does not hinder many Jewish non-Orthodox apologists from universalizing this chauvinist quote anyway. “Most
Jews whose study of the Mishna,” says Jacob Petuchowski, “is confined to the
standard edition continue to invest this statement with a particularist limita-
tion, while the few scholars who deal with textual criticism are aware of the
greater universalistic breath of the original statement.” [PETUCHOWKI, p. 8]
When dropping the adverb “Jewish” from the seminal source, insists the likes of
Petuchowski, one arrives at the “correct reading.”

“The Talmudic epigraph of Stephen Spielberg’s Schindler’s List,” adds Jewish
scholar Peter Novick, “‘Whoever saves one life saves the world entire,’ surely
reflected the universalist values of liberal Judaism as it had evolved in recent
centuries. The observant knew that the traditional version, the one taught in all
Orthodox yeshivot [religious schools], speaks of ‘whoever saves the life of
Israel.’” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 182-183]

Schindler’s List first appeared as a novel by Thomas Keneally, a non-Jew of
Irish heritage. The movie was based upon his meticulously researched story of
Oskar Schindler, a Nazi industrialist who had the moral courage and conscious-
ness to rescue, at great personal risk and inevitable financial destruction, 1100
Jews from the death camps under Hitler’s rule. Keneally writes that he
“intended to avoid all fiction, since fiction would debase the record, and to dis-
tinguish between reality and myths ...” [KENEALLY, p. 10]

So, taking the facts presented in the novel, where did Spielberg and Holly-
wood go with it? The sufferings under Nazi oppression is carefully rendered a
purely, innocently, and entirely Jewish experience. The fact that there was a
World War going on is barely noticeable. Spielberg’s movie is singularly The
War Against the Jews skirting the pan-human themes of good versus evil in
focusing entirely upon “evil versus Jews.” This is simply done, by ignoring some
facts, and emphasizing others.

For starters, it was important to render all Jews – as a block – as innocent,
unified, moral and holy people. Hence, Spielberg’s movie entirely ignores the
Jews who (in Keneally’s book) were absorbed in ruthless self-preservation,
profit, and intra-Jewish hatreds and who actively and openly functioned in the
Jewish ghetto as agents for the Nazi regime. The most sinister among them was
Symche Spira. “Spira,” writes Keneally, “was of orthodox background and by
personal history as well as temperament despised the Europeanized Jewish lib-
erals ... He took his orders from ... [the] SS headquarters across the river... [The
Nazis] had asked him to set up (a Jewish police force) and he recruited various
of his friends for it. ... Spira’s Political Section would go beyond the demands of
grudging cooperation and would be full of venal men, men with complexes,
with close-held grudges about the social and intellectual slights they’d received
in earlier days from respectable middle-class Jewry. Apart from Spira, there
were Szymon Spitz and Marcel Zellinger, Ignacy Diamond, David Gutter the
salesman, Forster and Gruner and Landau. They settled in to a career of extor-
tion and of making out for the SS lists of unsatisfactory or seditious ghetto
dwellers.”

Later we learn about another evil Jew in cahoots with the Nazis, one who, in
his desperately selfish actions, aids in stealing food from his fellow people,
many of whom will starve to death: “Amon [the concentration camp director] was ... selling a percentage of the prison rations on the open market in Cracow through an agent of his, a Jew named Wilek Chilowicz, who had contacts with factory management, merchants, and even restaurants in Cracow.” [p. 195]

But the exploitation of Jew by Jew in the original Schindler tale gets worse. Oskar Schindler went bankrupt in spending his fortune on saving Jews who worked at his factory. Incredibly, Marcel Goldberg, the man responsible for the final decision about what fellow Jews got on Schindler’s list – a list that meant the difference between life and death – demanded extremely hefty bribes from the desperate Jewish prisoners. To get on the list, he tells Poldek Pfefferberg, “it will take diamonds.” [p. 292-293]

Such predatory creatures – middlemen to the Nazis and life itself – cannot be shown in Spielberg’s film because they allude to the most horrible stereotypes of Jews. And Jews hating Jews and betraying Jews in the midst of their horrible torment is difficult to explain away. Certainly it clouds an easy division of the good guys and bad guys. If one attempts to explain the Spiras and Chilowiczs and Goldbergs of the Holocaust away as due to desperate inhuman conditions and primal survival instincts by which the Jews found themselves under Nazi rule, one then must likewise permit such excuses for anyone in those hellish times, including Germans who were sucked into the Nazi steam roller, and the Polish Slavs, who are widely villainized and demonized by Jews to this day for their alleged hatred and betrayal of the Jewish people to the Nazis. The Poles, who themselves were slated for mass extermination under Hitler, and who – as a largely impoverished peasant group – had centuries of socio-economic grievances against Jews, bore their own profound misery under Nazi occupation. But we do not hear about them, never whatsoever, in this film or anywhere else in Jewish Holocaust folklore. Decontextualizing history, Spilberg’s film is absolutely and exclusively Jewish. There is nothing else that matters but “saving Jews.” When we watch the Nazis drive their auto over a road of Jewish tombstones in Spielberg’s movie, the viewer does not know that there were Polish tombstones used in the same way in the very same concentration camp. [p.166] Although there were, by midsummer of 1940, 250 Poles working in Schindler’s factory, [p. 72] the movie’s factory is populated only with Jews. When we watch in horror Spielberg’s huge pile of burning Jewish bodies outside the Plaszow concentration camp, we are not informed that in the real world many of these corpses – there and elsewhere – were those of Poles and Gypsies [p. 253] When the movie Schindler – at great risk to himself – defies Nazi regulations and compassionately sprays water into a cattle car stuffed with Jewish prisoners Spielberg omits the fact that there are Poles in those cars too. [p. 265] Nor does the film director address the implications of Keneally’s observation that Jews and Poles and gypsies “kept brief residence” at the dreaded Birkenau concentration camp on their way to respective roads to Hell. [p. 306]

Spielberg never once alludes to any misfortunes but that of Jews in his movie. The sufferings of others is marginal – invisible – to his political theme. This systematic myopia, ostensibly shaped to sharpen the exclusive dramatiza-
tion of “Schindler’s Jews” in Nazi Germany – and Jews in general – leads somewhere: the rationale for the modern Israeli state.

Spielberg’s subtle political intention is evidenced at the end of his movie in his own interpretive addenda to Kineally’s Schindler story. When the Jews are released from internment in the film by the Russian army, they query amongst themselves where they should go. A Russian officer – himself a Jew – reminds them that they are not welcome in the West, or East, but might try a nearby town. The Jews, en masse, homeless and hungry, strangers in every country, reviled everywhere, are pictured in the distance moving across a field in search of a new home. Spielberg then cuts immediately to a similar shot of a group of Jews in the distance, in color now, distinct from the black and white movie. The “wandering” Jews in the farmer’s field in the fictive movie are now transposed to modern times in a short “documentary,” one that chronicles a group of “real” Jews who have lived to this day thanks to Schindler’s compassion and humanity. Schindler’s grave is in a Christian cemetery in Jerusalem and Spielberg has gathered a number of concentration camp survivors and their children to pay homage to the Righteous Gentile at his grave. “In the background,” writes Michael Goldberg, “we hear the strains of Yerushalayim Shel Zahav – ‘Jerusalem of Gold.’ Written in the aftermath of the Six Day War in 1967, the song celebrating Israel’s historic recovery of the ancient city, has become a virtual anthem.” [GOLDBERG p.]

In the last few minutes of the film, Spielberg has thus abandoned the Keneally version of things (from which the movie director snaked an entirely personal path anyway) and transformed the Schindler story into a piece of Israeli propaganda. Non-Jewish audiences are lured by the shocking horror of the Nazi story, then find solace that one of their own, a Gentile, had the moral courage to stand up for what is right and protect the Jews under his governance. With his coda in Israel, Spielberg deftly infers in the viewer the necessity for setting up the state of Israel as protection against violent anti-Semitism, which is the cornerstone of the Zionist belief system, and, indeed, modern Jewish identity. “Spielberg,” observes Goldberg, “... here seems heavy-handed, bent on wresting one particular emotion response from us: unalloyed support for the state of Israel.” [GOLDBERG, p.] “Schindler’s List,” says Steven G. Kellman, “is Zionist affirmation, a lustrous assertion that Israel is the only alternative to persecution if not eradication of Jews.” [KELLMAN, p. 10]

Underscoring the ideological manipulations and machinations at base in the film, the version of Schindler’s List that was released in Israel has a different song for its concluding scene. While “Jerusalem of Gold” finds a soft spot in the heart of diaspora Jews in their myths of Israel, in Israel itself this song’s connotational range is more expansive, even controversial, symbolizing “first the euphoria of the Israeli victory of 1967 and then the bitter fruits of conquest, occupation, and repression of others by the young Jewish state.” [BARTOV, p. 45] The new song in the Israeli version of the movie (Eli, Eli) “shift[s] the politics of the film’s ending from the Arab-Israeli conflict to the Israeli-sponsored ‘heroic’ aspect of the Holocaust.” [BARTOV, p. 59]
In our time, the systematic omission of all World War II contexts of the Holocaust — except those that reinforce the exclusivity of Jewish suffering — is endemic to Jewish discussion of the subject. The movie Schindler’s List evidences this profoundly. A reviewer in Poland (site of the film’s historical base and the movie production itself), remarked that the film was “not an anti-Polish film: Poland basically does not exist in it.” [SHANDLER, p. 161] Incredibly, Spielberg’s systematic omissions are exponentially compounded in a remarkably myopic review of the film in academia by Daniel Fogel, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chairman of the Advisory Council for the Jewish Studies Program at Louisiana State University. In a gushing and laudatory article about the film, Fogel nonetheless notes that “Spielberg’s departure from [Keneally’s book], principally in the form of omission, are striking ... As I inventoried discrepancies [between film and novel] with my students in a course on the literary response to the Holocaust, our puzzlement grew ...” I refer to Fogel’s review here in tandem with Spielberg’s myopic vision because of its profound implications, for here we come to the quintessential Jewish Blind Spot, always manifest as an ideological censorship. And we must bear deeply in mind that this is not a review by some small-fry bozo in a bar on a street corner, but by an academic hot-shot of some repute. This is a man who evidences — in his unwieldy bureaucratic titles — significant educational input as an “advisor” in the matter of “Jewish studies.”

After noting that he (and his class!) has made an inventory of “omissions” and “discrepancies” between book and novel, he proceeds to list the differences he found. These include the fact that the Spielberg film collapses many characters into the personality of Yitzak Stern and the fact that various scenes in the book are relocated to different ahistorical sites in the movie. Fogel also notes the movie’s changes in event chronology, an omission of some of Oskar Schindler’s “most memorable actions” of heroism against the Nazis, and a collapsing of events together for the sake of drama.

Incredibly, Mr. Fogel, Chairman to the Advisory Council for Jewish Studies, eminent educator, after stating that his self-appointed task was to look for omissions and discrepancies between film and book and to make an “inventory” of them, never notes the more politically sensitive — per Jews — omissions I have cited earlier. None of them. Zero. Zip. And omissions were what Fogel’s article, per his own thesis, was largely supposed to be what he was addressing. Mr. Fogel, adorned in the Emperor’s New Clothes, announced that he was “looking,” but had no inclination to “see.”

But he did see something. In fact, in his own list of the film’s omissions he still managed to bring in something that helps us to understand the kinds of things he was singularly looking for. Somehow, in his review of Schindler’s List, he manages to drag in journalistic commentary about former Ku Klux Klan member David Duke and his unsuccessful bid for Louisiana public office, and how a group of the righteous managed to stop him. We are left to wonder that perhaps Fogel thinks Spielberg should have been more explicit in allusions to the resident Nazis of America.
And what of Fogel’s students, those in his class who all sat around wracking their brains and sounding each other out as to the omissions and differences between Spielberg’s depiction of Keneally’s story? None of these students noticed the whoppers described earlier? Was this class in the “Jewish Studies” program, and does that dictate a limited line of seeing? Were they all Jewish kids who shared their mentor’s political blind spot? Or did Fogel, the educator, censor the obvious omissions cited here out of his own class? Or, worse still, were the students in his class intimidated by the sacred, self-righteous wail by yet another Jew in authority about the Holocaust and they could find no welcome space to speak what they recognized? Whatever the answers to these questions, it underscores the omnipresent limitations of critical discourse about Jews in modern America, even at a university. And, of course, that there are likely reprisals to face for those who dare to venture into the hornet’s nest.

As intended, Spielberg’s fictional Schindler’s List, which won seven Academy Awards, including Best Film and Best Director, has been monumental in confirming Jewish martyrology in the public mind as irrefutable “history.” The Wall Street Journal called the film “a valuable historical document.. a film almost entirely free of artifice.” The Washington Post declared that “Spielberg, so famous for manipulation, has let the material speak for itself.” One critic even suggests that “to question Schindler’s List [is] to trifle with the memory of the Holocaust.” [ZELIZER, p. 22] “Yet,” notes Barbie Zelizer, “Spielberg was not a reputed scholar of the Holocaust. Rather, he came from the widely contested terrain of popular culture, a known culture-monger best recognized for turning errant sharks, dinosaurs, and extraterrestrials into box-office hits.” [ZELIZER, p. 22]

Not atypically, Spielberg is another of the many influential public figures who have been “reborn” as a didactic Jew. He described himself as “bearing witness” in making the film; he mystifies his direction of the movie, calling the experience one that “any witness or victim would have. It wasn’t like a movie.” [ZELIZER, p. 23] “I think I’m prouder now of being a Jew than I ever was in my history,” said Spielberg, “... the movie is a result of what I went through as a person.” [ZELIZER, p. 25] Manipulative sectarian political use of the film as self-promotive leverage even included a New Jersey Jewish senator’s exploitation of the movie as a “campaign gimmick.” [ZELIZER, p. 33]

“Ivan the Terrible”: The Trial of John Demjanjuk

In April 1988 John Demjanjuk, an American stripped of his citizenship, was found guilty of Nazi war crimes by an Israeli court and sentenced to hang. Demjanjuk, born in the Ukraine, had immigrated to the United States after World War II and worked for decades as a factory worker for the Ford Motor Company near Cleveland, Ohio. His problems with an allegedly murderous past began in 1976 when he was identified in old photo IDs by Jewish Holocaust survivors as “Ivan the Terrible,” a particularly brutal and sadistic gas chamber
operator in the Nazi death camp of Treblinka. Crucial evidence against Demjanjuk included a 1951 photographic portrait from which he was recognized as Ivan and an identity card from the Soviet Union which allegedly proved that Demjanjuk was trained for duty in concentration camps. In 1986 the factory worker was extradited to stand trial in Israel, accused of being the man who had a personal hand in gassing to death as many as 850,000 people – most, if not all, Jews. This of course was no routine murder trial. John Demjanjuk was to be tried by and for the Jewish people of the world as a living symbol – and scapegoat – for the whole Holocaust, human magnet for fixated Jewish rage.

The American organization that initiated the investigation into Demjanjuk’s past was the Office of Special Investigations (OIS), an office of the Criminal Prosecution Division of the United States Justice Department. “The OIS,” notes Allan Ryan Jr., “has established a very close working relationship with Israel and, indeed, a number of the OIS’s staff is stationed full time in Jerusalem, at Yad Vashem.” [RYAN, A., p. 201-206] Founded in 1979, OIS owes its existence to Jewish lobbying groups who wanted a special investigation agency to track down World War II-era killers of Jews who resided in America. Before the institution of OIS, Jewish agencies themselves were doing most of the detective work; in the mid-1970s for instance, the Immigration and Naturalization Services’ list of 53 suspected Nazi-collaborators living in America was largely provided by the World Jewish Congress. [TEICHOLZ, p. 24] Particularly active in the push to create OIS was Jewish Congresswoman Elizabeth Holtzman who held a press conference in 1974 and “accused the government of failing to investigate and prosecute known Nazi war criminals living in the United States.” [TEICHOLZ, p. 24]

In 1978, Jewish members of Congress Holtzman (by then the Chair of the House Subcommittee on Immigration) and Joshua Eilberg directed the United States General Accounting Office to investigate the INS’s record of convictions of Nazi war criminals. [TEICHOLZ, p. 25] The intensity of INS prosecution was deemed to be grossly inadequate and the OIS was created a year later.

For any United States agency, investigations of Nazi war criminals often lead to Soviet records. In the midst of the Demjanjuk trial, an unnamed “American legal authority,” speaking on condition of anonymity, told a New York Review of Books reporter that the “Soviets could never understand ... our preoccupation with the murder of Jews. For the Soviets, the Nazis were the murderers of twenty million Russians. For us in America, ‘Nazi’ had become synonymous with the genocide of the Jews and our investigations of war crimes were almost invariably connected with the Holocaust. This, apart from many other things, made for an enormous cultural gap and distrust on both sides.” [SERENY, p. 32]

Short of the sensational accusations of being a mass murderer, Demjanjuk’s personal history as defendant in the most important trial in Israel since that of Nazi Adolf Eichman in 1961 is modest. Demjanjuk was raised of peasant heritage in the Ukraine at a time when millions of people faced famine. In 1932-33 alone some six million Ukrainians died as a consequence of Stalinist policies.
His family reportedly was forced to sell its home for ten loaves of bread. The young man eventually ended up in the Russian army, was captured by the Nazis in World War II and taken prisoner. From here, Demjanjuk’s life is mired in controversy. Depending upon one’s personal conviction, and in which scientific expert one finds most credibility, Demjanjuk was either a concentration camp operative or merely a Russian prisoner of war who has become a victim of Soviet forgeries and intrigue against ethnic Ukrainians and anti-communists.

Among Demjanjuk’s Israeli prison guards was a spy who sought to befriend the prisoner and elicit incriminating information from him. The best the spy could get was Demjanjuk’s evaluation that Jews “collaborated” with Nazis the same as any other survivors. “Any witness who speaks against me,” said Demjanjuk, “will be from the S.S. We had to collaborate.” The spy also learned that in the Ukrainian’s own “suffering at the POW camp, Demjanjuk said he would have killed for a loaf of bread.” The spy also testified that “Demjanjuk blamed the Ukrainian famine ... on a Soviet official named Kaganovich – who was, Demjanjuk said, a zhid – the derogatory term for Jew ... “

The death camp Treblinka – to which Demjanjuk has become ultimately, and unshakably, associated in the public mind as “Ivan the Terrible” – was located about sixty miles northeast of Warsaw. The camp was overseen by about 30-40 German guards; a subgroup of about 100 Ukrainians – originally prisoners of war – functioned as various operatives, including the running of the gas chambers. Jewish prisoners were themselves forced or co-opted into many of the most fundamentally repugnant death camp tasks: “the sorting of clothes, the shaving of female victims’ hair, the removal of corpses from the gas chambers, the extraction of gold teeth from the bodies, the burial, and later, on Himmler’s order, the excavation and burning of corpses.”

The problem with this whole scenario, however, as it pertains to John Demjanjuk, is that he was eventually proven innocent of the charges made against him. “Ivan the Terrible” from Cleveland came perilously close to hanging for an identity which was not his. Demjanjuk’s turmoil was not unique, although by far the most extensive and horrible. In 1978, for instance, 12 Jewish Holocaust survivors identified Frank Walus of Chicago as a Gestapo agent in Czestochowa and Kilsen. Walus lost his American citizenship; after the guilty verdict, however, the Walus defense team produced documentary evidence from German records that he had been an agricultural laborer in Germany when he was alleged to be a Nazi killer in Poland. His citizenship was restored.

Yoram Sheftel, Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer, has recounted the systematic injustice and abuse perpetrated against the accused Ukrainian-American (and his whole defense team) as a scapegoat for Jewish Holocaust hysteria. In his memoirs of the long ordeal, The Demjanjuk Affair: The Rise and Fall of a Show Trial, Sheftel depicts the whole trial as a disgraceful sham, a “frame-up.”
in which Jewish communal hatred, rage, and hunger for revenge precluded rea-
son. And justice.

At root, what Sheftel describes as a show trial was intended to reaffirm the
ideological pillars of the Jewish nation in its punishment of Jewish enemies, as well
as to socialize new generations to Israeli perspectives and mythologies of the Holo-
caust. “The trial was ... used as a means of educating young people about the real-
ities of the Nazi genocide of the Jews,” observes Gitta Sereny, “As a result, the
terrible accounts over many weeks by the survivors of Treblinka, heard by a live
audience of hundreds of schoolchildren and by millions on radio and television,
created their own momentum.” [SERENY, p. 33] The political function of the
Demjanjuk show trial for both Israelis and worldwide Jewry was based on the var-
ious mythomanias held of themselves as a redemptive nation and people. “The
symbolic re-enactments of victimization and victory, Holocaust remembrance
and Israel’s defense,” noted Jewish sociologist Egon Mayer about the psycho-
social undercurrents of the trial, “became the central communal rites of the Jewish
people.” [MAYER, NYT, p. 4, 17] In 1990 “Intercom Prime Time” on Channel 13
in New York City aired what the New York Times called an “absorbing account” of
“how Mr. Demjanjuk ... was identified by survivors ... [in this program] the ver-
dict goes against Mr. Demjanjuk.” The narrator of the program, E. G. Marshall,
linked this case’s importance to the 1961 Adolf Eichman trial which “became a
national obsession, an inquest into [Jewish] history and identity.” [GOODMAN,
W., p. c18] “Several of [the Holocaust survivors] who first identified Mr. Demjan-
juk,” noted the Times, “died before he was brought to trial, and the few who made
it to the courtroom seem driven by a compulsion to bear witness before they too
pass into history.” [GOODMAN, p. c18] Strapped then on the anvil of unrelenting
Jewish emotionalism was the scapegoat for worldwide Jewish rage and hatred,
personified in a single man, an accused Nazi-mass murderer and ages-old Ukrai-
nian enemy of the Jews, a Cleveland factory worker: John Demjanjuk.

Demjanjuk’s Jewish lawyer Sheftel of course never contested any aspect of
the facts of the Holocaust itself; he simply focused upon the fact that John Dem-
janjuk was not Ivan the Terrible, futilely fighting to keep everything else out of
the case, knowing full well that any semblance of objectivity and Demjanjuk’s
most basic rights to a fair trial would be hopelessly lost to the emotional tidal
wave of Holocaust appeal. A Jewish author, Tom Teicholz, wrote a 1990 book
about “Ivan the Terrible” when Demjanjuk’s death sentence appeal was still
unresolved. Teicholz’s predilection to the inseparableness of Demjanjuk the
defendant and the Holocaust itself is rendered in his many pages of emotional
reference to Treblinka, including “the screams of women, the weeping of chil-
dren, the pleas for mercy, for God’s deliverance, fill[ing] the air like the howling
of wild animals.” [TEICHOLZ, p. 10] Teicholz follows form in affirming the
Demjanjuk monster by repeating the flippant assessment of a Chicago Sun-
Times reporter who in 1977 insisted upon bringing Demjanjuk unwanted pub-
licity about an alleged Nazi past: “‘Get off my property,’ [Demjanjuk] growled,
stepping from beyond his power mower and picking up a bamboo rake ... ‘Go,
go. No questions. I answer nothing. Go.’ ... When Demjanjuk brandished that
rake it was easy to picture ‘Ivan the Terrible.” [TEICHOLZ, p. 63]
Although Sheftel repeatedly objected to the extraneous introduction of a Holocaust lesson in the trial, the Israeli judges and prosecutors colluded in wallowing in the explications of Nazi-inspired atrocities that were in no way contested by the defense, a litany of assertions about the Holocaust that bent the trial towards publicly reaffirming the ideological foundations of the Israeli state and modern Jewish identity.

The broader undercurrent of the Demjanjuk spectacle, and the wider accusation, was underscored by one of the three presiding judges, Zvi Tal, who – incredibly – interjected to steer the testimony of a witness (a historian) for the prosecution, asking him,

“Were there not additional reasons for the Germans to expect cooperation from the Ukrainians, for instance a long hatred and hostility toward the Jewish populations from the days of Chemlinitzki in the mid-seventeenth century, wasn’t that one of the reasons?” [SHEFTEL, p. 201]

Jewish hatred of Ukrainians is deep. In 1987 Ukrainian-Americans throughout North America rallied to Demjanjuk’s defense. Jean Berger, a Ukrainian woman now living in America, who had hidden Jews in her home from the Nazis and was shot in the leg for attempting to give bread to a Jewish friend, led a Ukrainian-American group to Israel to plead for a fair trial for Demjanjuk. Shortly thereafter the Deputy Speaker of the Israeli Knesset, Dov Ben-Meir, wrote to her group, invoking the old story of the massacre of (or revolt against) Jews by Cossack leader Bogdan Chmielnicki in the 17th century. “The Jewish people,” wrote Ben-Meir, “has a long score to settle with the Ukrainian people ... You go to church not only on Sunday, but also every day of the week, and ... you kneel there until bleeding in asking forgiveness for what your people has done to our people.” The Ukrainian organization denounced the letter, calling it an “inflammatory defamation ... against the entire Ukrainian nation.” [JW, 5-1-87, p. 17] Ukrainians in North America were the fundamental source of Demjanjuk’s staggering seven-year defense costs in Israel (the full legal battle lasted 17 years), eventually totaling over two million dollars. In the American Ukrainian community, the Demjanjuk trial became “a symbol of Soviet and Jewish persecution.” [SERENY, p. 32]

The official final court verdict that sentenced Demjanjuk to death was 444 pages long; 36 of 118 chapters detailed the Treblinka concentration camp and the story of the Holocaust, far adrift from the narrow essentials of Demjanjuk’s trial: was he Ivan the Terrible or not? One chapter entitled “Memorial” was dedicated “to the souls of the holy [Jewish] communities that have been lost and which are no more.” [SHEFTEL, p. 215] “Erecting a memorial to the millions of Jews killed in that unparalleled holocaust is indeed a sacred and noble task,” said Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer, Yoram Sheftel, “But when a judgment in a criminal trial pretends to this, the result is a shameful legal process that defiles the memory of the Jewish people slaughtered at Treblinka ... I have no doubt that Israeli legal history will name this the most shameful legacy ever written in the Hebrew language.” [SHEFTEL, p. 216-217]

Sheftel described with horror the abusive nature of the entire environment
in a court of law throughout the trial, and especially when the verdict of Demjanjuk’s execution was announced:

“The minute the word ‘death’ escaped from Judge Tal’s lips, a terrible commotion began in the courtroom. All the disorder there had been up to then was merely naughtiness compared to the chaos that erupted now. The unruly crowd began cursing, shouting, and screaming insults, ‘Death, death,’ ‘Death to Ivan,’ ‘Death to the defense attorney,’ ‘Death to all Ukrainians.’ ‘Death, death, death!’ The people were dancing, stamping their feet, waving fists in the air.” [SHEFTEL, p. 225]

From his 1990 book that was supportive of Demjanjuk’s conviction, Tom Teicholz’s version of the death announcement noted that

“The spectators rose to their feet and many broke out in spontaneous applause. The survivor witnesses who were sitting in the hall embraced. Then all turned, stunned, at the sight of teenagers near the back rows, standing on the chairs, hurling epithets at [Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer] Sheftel, and singing, ‘Am Yisroel Hai (Israel Lives).’ They were led by an elderly survivor, visiting from Florida, who egged them on like a coach at a soccer game.” [TEICHOLZ, p. 300]

Demjanjuk was deemed guilty by the Israeli press, public, and overseeing judges from the very start of the fiasco, a “trial” that was staged in a 400-seat auditorium especially arranged for the occasion, and continuously broadcast live on Israeli television and radio. For the Jews of Israel, and throughout the world, Demjanjuk was cast as the human face of ignoble villainy, the most recent scapegoat for the six million Jewish martyrs of the Holocaust. By the time he was finally released from prison, Demjanjuk was 73 years old, and perhaps the last chance the Jewish world had to wrack revenge upon a surrogate Adolf Hitler from the actual Holocaust era.

Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer, Yoram Sheftel, was acutely aware of the transcendent nature of the case and the dangerous passions it engendered; he foresaw the gross violation of his client’s most fundamental right: the impossibility of getting a fair trial in Israel. The very premise of the trial, noted Sheftel, was that “a man was guilty until proven innocent.” [SHAFTEL, p. 120] Blatantly underscoring this, soon after the death verdict was announced, the lead judge in the case, Dov Levin, gave a lecture tour to Jewish groups in America. As noted in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Levin told the Jewish Community Center in Norfolk, Virginia, that “we cannot be impressed by someone claiming ‘I am innocent.’ Innocence is not what you say in your testimony. Innocence must be proven.” [SHEFTEL, p. 194] “The judges [on the case], like the [Israeli] media,” says Sheftel, “had, to all intents and purposes, convicted Demjanjuk in advance, long before they did so officially in their verdict; so they did everything in their power to ensure his conviction.” [SHEFTEL, p. 200]

An Israeli judge, Haim Cohen, not associated with the case, told Israel’s Al Hasharon newspaper that the trial “was a spectacular [sic] for the people. Any resemblance to justice was purely coincidental.” [SHEFTEL, p. 207] “Take it from me, as someone who spent 17 years on the bench,” said retired judge Dov Eitan
(who eventually joined the Demjanjuk defense team to appeal the death sentence), “We are dealing here not with an error, but with something more serious.” [SHEFTEL, p. 217] “He meant,” adds Yoram Sheftel, “deliberate deceit.”

The bias against the Demjanjuk defense was all-encompassing throughout the Israeli court system, the mass media, and the public at-large. Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer, Yoram, Sheftel, noted Tom Teicholz, “was called ‘the most hated man in Israel.’ His Hebrew was said to be lower-class. He was the sort of lawyer, one attorney said, who represented pimps, prostitutes, and drug dealers. He seemed always to be spitting as he talked, a court regular said.” [TEICHOLZ, p. 179] A defense witness, a British historian of Russian descent, Nikolai Tolstoy, became upset with the blatant prejudice of the Israeli judges overseeing the case and announced, “I’m sorry, but if I am not guaranteed fair treatment, I will not be able to continue.” [SHEFTEL, p. 147]

Sheftel was also outraged upon discovering that the three presiding judges in the case (Israel has no jury trials – these judges decided the verdict) regularly reviewed Israeli newspaper clippings in their chambers and assembled them in albums. “The vast majority of these clippings constituted incitement against the defendant,” wrote Sheftel, “They utterly undermined the defendant’s right to a fair trial.” [SHEFTEL, p. 192]

A Dutch professor of psychology at Leiden University, Willem Wagenaar, who testified for the defense, believed “the photo spreads [arrangements of portraits from the World War II era by which observers respond with – or without – recognition] in which Demjanjuk was identified are all worthless, and may not be trusted.” [SHEFTEL, p. 158] Wagenaar’s disturbing experience in the case led him to write his own book about the problems of identifying people based upon 35-year old photographs, and the intrinsic bias, manipulation, and contextual inferences imbued in the recognition process. “I know of no other case,” he wrote in his book about the crucial photographic evidence in the Demjanjuk trial, “in which so many deviations from procedures internationally accepted as desirable occurred ... The legal proof of Demjanjuk’s identity was based on identification evidence [old photographs and Nazi documents] exclusively ... The Cleveland court [the OIS-inspired extradition proceedings] refused to hear expert witness on identification problems. The Jerusalem court allowed the defense to bring forward an expert, but declared that the testimony was irrelevant because the surviving witnesses could not make mistakes.” [WAGENAAR, p. ix] Wagenaar also meticulously itemized the innate bias in the photographic identification process of Demjanjuk in Israel, as well as its arbitrariness, and subtle manipulations, resulting in Holocaust survivors changing their minds about their memory, thanks to information provided by bureaucratic investigators. [WAGENAAR, p. 95-125] (A Treblinka survivor reunion in Tel Aviv in 1976 even provided an occasion for individuals already interviewed by investigators about “Ivan the Terrible” and Demjanjuk to discuss that news, thus enhancing other survivors’ “memory” of him. [NATHAN, p. 29]

From the very beginning of the trial, Yoram Sheftel, Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer, faced death threats, insults, and ostracization from Israeli society for
daring to represent the Ukrainian-American, a man already deemed in the public mind as being guilty of the most foul crime imaginable. At the funeral of a fellow Israeli lawyer who had recently joined the defense team (only to commit suicide) a regular member of the trial audience threw acid into Sheftel’s face. Ironically, the Israeli lawyer’s personal trauma was fortuitous for Demjanjuk; the appeal of his death sentence was delayed nearly a year while Sheftel’s eyes healed after operations on both of them in the United States. The time permitted more evidence in Demjanjuk’s defense to surface.

During the trial itself, Sheftel had difficulty finding a Jewish scholar willing to ignore widespread Israel opprobrium to testify in Demjanjuk’s behalf about historical aspects of the case. “Because of the public campaign against the defense,” says Sheftel, “I was determined that at least one of our expert witnesses be Israeli. I contacted several Israeli professors of history, directly and indirectly, but all rejected the idea out of hand. There can be no doubt they feared the media would attack them, and one of them told me frankly, ‘If I agreed to appear as a defense witness, I will no longer be invited to be interviewed as a historian on television.’” [SHEFTEL, p. 148] (He eventually did find one).

Jewish predilection to Demjanjuk’s guilt, worry for their careers and their tarnished credibility as dedicated Jews if associated with him, and their resultant reluctance to contribute to a fair trial, extended to America. Asked to be an expert witness in the psychology of photographic interpretation and memory for the Demjanjuk defense team, a Jewish professor of psychology in Seattle, Elizabeth Loftus, explained in Newsweek that she could not participate because her family and friends opposed her involvement in Demjanjuk’s defense. They had, of course, already decided him to be guilty by the accusations they had heard in the news. True, she could obliquely testify in Newsweek that “research has shown little or no relationship between a witness’s confidence and his or her accuracy of recall ... [but] in the eyes of many [my testimony for the Demjanjuk defense] would be seen as an attack on the handful of people who miraculously survived Treblinka and now wished to be believed. They would not understand that a questioning of one part of memory does not necessarily mean a denial of all such memory. Thus [my] testimony would be seen as an unmitigated assault on the only memories we have of Treblinka.” [LOFTUS, p. 10-11] Afraid then to give offense (and cause herself problems) to the monolithic wall of Holocaust Memory (whatever it is, accurate or not), Loftus shamefully withheld her crucial testimony as a Jew (her replacement was not Jewish and served to reinforce the largely sectarian nature of the prosecution/defense polarization), claiming solidarity with a higher moral allegiance than truth: the dictate of Holocaust survivor sensitivity and emotionalism. And their sacrosanct unaccountability.

“From a scientific point of view,” noted Debbie Nathan and Jan Haaken in a Jewish magazine years later, “there was every reason for [Loftus] to help Demjanjuk’s defense, and none to justify refusing. Yet she did refuse, in a dramatic illustration of the conflict between the disinterested pretensions of science versus the fervid politics of recovered memory – a politics that can affect even scientists ...” [NATHAN, p. 30]
... Elizabeth Loftus is Jewish, and although not religious, she could hardly have remained isolated from the forces driving the Demjanjuk prosecution ... [NATHAN, p. 94] ... Personal ties and fears of ostracism can create both strong solidarity and repressive silence. In Loftus’ case, both combined with guilt and the desire to make things right at any cost. Eventually, these politics would override science ... Loftus’ fear of once again betraying her Jewishness led her to rationalize her refusal to testify.” [NATHAN, p. 95]

So Loftus, the dedicated Jew, for reasons of allegiance to the emotions of the Tribe refused to be part of a scientific, rationalist challenge to Holocaust Memory as evidenced, for example, in the testimony of Holocaust/Treblinka survivor Eliahu Rosenberg. Early in Demjanjuk’s trial, in high court drama, Rosenberg walked up to Demjanjuk to inspect his face closely. “The courtroom,” noted Yarom Sheftel, “erupted with shouts of murderer! He should be killed!” [SHEFTEL, p. 47] “Beyond a shadow of a doubt – it’s Ivan the Terrible from the Treblinka gas chambers,” declared an emotional Rosenberg. “The man I’m looking at. I saw the eyes, those murderous eyes.” [SHEFTEL, p. 46] “Murderous eyes – merderische oygen,” says Sheftel in underscoring the deeper, ages-old Jewish contempt for Ukrainians (and others) in the case, “is a common Yiddish expression used of goyim by Polish Jews. Rosenberg knew that the eyes he saw were not the murderous eyes of Ivan the Terrible. One could say, however, that he said this under the influence of a show-trial being staged by the prosecution with the full court’s approval.” [SHEFTEL, p. 46]

A rather significant footnote to Rosenberg’s testimony here was the declaration written in his own handwriting that turned up later, found in a Warsaw Jewish archive; Rosenberg had testified in 1945 that he had witnessed the killing of Ivan the Terrible during an uprising. [WAGENAAR, p. 105] (Cross-examined about this document, the Holocaust survivor claimed that he had really only meant in 1945 that he had heard that Ivan had been killed, and there in the courtroom the real Ivan sat before him).

Testimony from Treblinka survivors riveted Israeli attention and was treated as irrefutable. Tom Teicholz noted the court testimony of Yehiel Reichman, for example:

“While I was washing [prisoners’ extracted] teeth ... with Finkelstein ... this demon Ivan’ – Reichman pointed spontaneously at Demjanjuk – ‘came with a drill ... He turned it into the buttocks of Finkelstein ... [He] was seriously wounded.” [TEICHOLZ, p. 152]

“Throughout this account,” observed Tom Teicholz, “Demjanjuk was slowly shaking his head no.” TEICHOLZ, p. 152

The appeal of Demjanjuk’s death sentence began to turn in the defense’s favor with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the release of relevant documentation about the real “Ivan the Terrible,” now identified as Ivan Marchenko. By 1992, notes Sheftel, the Israeli judges had before them 83 decades-old testimonies from 37 guards at Treblinka, “all of them indicating Demjanjuk’s innocence of the crimes for which he had been accused and convicted.” Serious cracks in the pros-
execution’s case widened when a former lawyer at OSI, George Parker, testified in 1992 that the United States government’s handling of the Demjanjuk case was “inappropriate and unethical.” [HARRISON, 11-13-92, p. A4] Parker left the OIS in 1980. “When I left the department,” he said, “I did not think [Demjanjuk] was Ivan the Terrible.” [HARRISON, 11-14-92, p. A2] More sensationally, it came to light that the Office of Special Investigations had knowingly withheld crucial evidence that would help Demjanjuk against the charge that he was the Treblinka gas operator. Under questioning in a U.S. court of inquiry, a former director of the criminal division of the OSI, Martin Mendelsohn, admitted “that the department refused to disclose requested evidence in a number of instances after determining that the materials were either irrelevant or exempt from disclosure requirements. [HARRISON, 11-14-92, p. 2] “Thus,” says Yoram Sheftel, “in August 1978 the OSI had in its possession a hundred pages which, we later found out, demonstrated Demjanjuk’s innocence. These had been deliberately kept from Demjanjuk’s attorney and obviously, from the courts as well. This was done in order to secure under false pretenses Demjanjuk’s denaturalization, extradition to Israel, trial and execution as Ivan the Terrible, when these authorities knew for certain that he was not the right man.” [SHEFTEL, p. 325]

The reason for this grotesque fraud? Massive pressure from the American Jewish and Israeli communities for a Nazi to kill. “OSI’s motives in the odious deed,” notes Sheftel, “...[was rooted in] a letter sent August 25, 1978 by Jewish Congressman Joshua Eilberg, Chairman of the House of Representatives’ Committee on Immigration to Attorney General Griffin Bell:

“Reports have reached me that deficiencies have been apparent in the preparation of the case of the U.S. v. Demjanjuk, a denaturalization proceeding against an alleged Nazi war criminal now living in Cleveland, Ohio. I wish to express my strong concern over the possible inadequate prosecution of the case. A repeal of the recent Federenko adverse decision to the government’s case in Florida will nullify and gravely jeopardize the long and persistent efforts of this subcommittee in ridding this country of these undesirable elements... The creation of a Special Litigation Unit [the OIS] within the I.N.S. was established to bring expertise and organization to this process. This Unit should be fully entrusted with these cases. I would strongly urge you to place the direction of the proceedings of the Demjanjuk case in the hands of the Special Litigation Unit. We cannot afford the risk of losing another decision.” [SHEFTEL, p. 329]

Alan Ryan, the head of OSI until 1981, told a newspaper in 1991 that, “It was one of the first cases we tried and we were very much on the line. If we lost the case, we probably would have had a very short lifespan.” [SHEFTEL, p. 331] “The feeling within the OSI that it had to succeed was intense,” notes Gitta Sereny, “for winning the Demjanjuk case could justify the agency’s existence.” [SERENY, p. 32]

In November 1993, the New York Times noted the “unanimous opinion” of a three-judge Federal Appeals panel in Cincinatti about the Demjanjuk case, that
“[OIS] prosecutors had withheld evidence in part to curry favor with Jewish organizations, which put pressure on them to prove that Mr. Demjanjuk was the notorious ‘Ivan the Terrible’.... The judges said the prosecutors had faced pressure from Jewish groups to win the case. They noted that Alan A. Ryan, Jr., the head of the Office of Special Investigations at the time, had even taken a lecture tour in Israel in 1986 that was sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith. In addition to Mr. Ryan, the court singled out the actions of [OIS] lawyer Norman Moscowitz ... The Judges said that the two were aware of the existence of evidence that would have been useful to the defense but failed to provide it in a timely fashion to Mr. Demjanjuk’s lawyers ... [It was also] obvious from the record that the prevailing mindset of OSI was that the office must try to please and maintain very close relationships with various interest groups because their continued existence depended on it.”

[LABATAN, p. A1, A20]

One of the judges of this ruling, Gilbert Merritt, later publicly complained that he lost an expected appointment to the United States Supreme Court because of Jewish disdain for his part in the Demjanjuk affair, and that he had been told by those in the know that President Clinton didn’t want to “go to war with the most influential national Jewish organizations.” “There was a strong feeling that this man was Ivan the Terrible and that it was anti-Semitic to say that there’s serious doubt about that,” Judge Merritt said in a 1995 TV interview, “They [Jewish organizations] made an all-out attack, during the course of this litigation, against me. “ Merritt’s critical observations only fueled further Jewish attack upon him. “He’s reinforcing his notion of Jews as powerful and interfering,” accused the Washington Anti-Defamation League director, Jess Hordes. “Judge Merritt has repeatedly displayed greater sensitivity to the rights of accused Nazis than to the victims of the Holocaust,” added Elon Steinberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress. [FORWARD, 2-10-95, p. 1]

“Besides raising concerns about the abuse of government power,” editorialized the Chicago Tribune after the Federal Appeals ruling, “this latest development in the unraveling of Washington’s case against Demjanjuk should serve as a cautionary tale about the dangers of zealotry.” [CHIC TRIB, 11-24-93, p. 1, 18] “Critics of the [OIS],” noted the Los Angeles Times, “... have claimed that it was under pressure from Congress, from American Jews, and from Israel to be aggressive in ferreting out former Nazis and that its lawyer-investigators became advocates for a cause.” [JACKSON, p. A13] An Atlanta Constitution editorial (entitled “Demjanjuk Case a Blot on Justice”) quoted the U.S. Appeals Court ruling, that “the prevailing mindset [at the OSI] was to please ... various interest groups because [the OSI’s] existence depended on it.” “For the record,” added the Constitution, “one of these groups mentioned by the court was the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.” [ATL CONST, p. A10] For its part, the ADL called the Federal Appeals ruling “fodder for anti-Semites.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 190]

While Demjanjuk sat in Israeli prisons for seven and a half years, and spent over $2 million to defend himself, the lawyers who perpetrated fraud at OIS
faced no discipline whatsoever. “History tells us that prosecutors who are condemned in judicial opinions never suffer any blemish on their careers” Stephen Gillers, an “ethics expert” at the New York University Law School told the New York Times, “If history is any guide, this case is ended yesterday.” [MAGLOCK, 11-19-93, p. A30]

Even when Demjanjuk was proven innocent of the crime for which he had been extradited, Israeli prosecutors sought other avenues to save face in the wake of a cataclysmic and much-publicized embarrassment. This involved Israeli stalling efforts to keep Demjanjuk and try him on some other Nazi-related charge, that perhaps he was a concentration camp guard or other such figure. “This,” says Yoram Shaftel, “was supposed to create a kind of moral, if not legal, justification for holding him in [an Israeli] prison for seven and a half years for being someone he was not.” [SHEFTEL, p. 352]

Sheftel was horrified by the implications of the looming scenario. The Israeli prosecutors had by now 87 testimonies of people in the Ukraine in the 1940s and 1950s about the real “Ivan the Terrible,” all proving that Demjanjuk was wrongly accused. But still the prisoner was not released. “A chill ran down my spine,” wrote Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer Sheftel, “Now, any low anti-Semite could, if he wanted to, argue that the Jewish state’s prosecution was unable to act in accordance with legal criteria in any trial that involved the Holocaust.” [SHEFTEL, p. 341] “Now, of all times, to listen to what Ukrainians said in a stupid interrogation!” Holocaust survivor Eliahu Rosenberg complained to the New York Times, “It’s all stupid nonsense.” [HABERMAN, 8-9-92, p. 1, 16]

On April 3, 1992, the Jewish socio-political implications of releasing Demjanjuk was made explicit in the Israeli newspaper Ma’ariv. A “senior prosecutor close to the case” was quoted as saying that

“So the most important thing now is at least to prove that Demjanjuk was part of the Nazi extermination machine ... otherwise ... we will be making a great contribution to the new world-wide movement of those who deny the Holocaust took place.” [SHEFTEL, p. 342]

On March 9, 1993, with Demjanjuk proclaimed innocent of Ivan the Terrible charges but still languishing in prison, the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz wondered, “The Demjanjuk case has not ended and that is bad ... Perhaps, God forbid, they are afraid to issue the verdict [of release] because of its problematic nature?” [SHEFTEL, p. 350] The Demjanjuk case, noted the New York Times, “has since raised questions about the fairness of Israeli justice in the context of the injustice of the Holocaust.” [JOHNSTON, D, NYT, 6-13, 92, p. A1]

Even when Demjanjuk was finally cleared for freedom, the date of release was held up five times as Israelis still desperately scrambled to find some sound reason to keep and retry him for some other crime. On the day of his acquittal announcement a petition was filed with the Israeli Attorney General’s Office to try the Ukrainian-American for something else. In America, the Sixth Circuit United States Appeals Court in Cincinnati announced that the extradition law that the United States had with Israel “forbids him from being tried on any other charges” other than the accusation he was sent there for: the crimes of the
identity of Ivan the Terrible. But growing numbers of petitioners and protesters in Israel demanded that Demjanjuk be retried. Petitioners included eight of eleven Sobibor concentration camp survivors in Israel, the World Jewish Congress, the Organization for Holocaust and Heroism Heritage, the Second Generation of Holocaust Survivors, and the Israeli representative of the Simon Wiesenthal Center (although the famous Nazi hunter himself, Simon Wiesenthal, publicly stated that it was time that Demjanjuk be freed. [BOSTON GLOBE, 8-22-93, p. 21] By now too, Yisrael Yehezkeli – the man who had thrown acid in Demjanjuk’s Israeli lawyer’s eyes – was proclaiming that Demjanjuk had murdered his whole family at Sobibor. [SHEFTEL, p. 370] In New Jersey, a Holocaust survivor came forward to claim that she recognized Demjanjuk as a concentration camp guard too. [WALL ST JR, 8-24-93, p. A1] Elizabeth Holtzman, the (now former) Congresswoman who was so active in the creation of OSI, complained in an editorial published in the Washington Post, declaring that “the Federal court in Cincinnati is wrong ... As the author of the Holtzman Amendment, the immigration law that bars Nazi persecutors, I ought to know ... Demjanjuk got the benefit of careful, objective legal proceedings, something that was denied to the Nazi victims ... We cannot allow the Demjanjuk case to destroy the Department of Justice Office of Special Investigations ....” [HOTZMAN, p. A29] Yehudah Raveh of the World Jewish Congress also argued against releasing Demjanjuk, “Since the Supreme Court found that Demjanjuk was a camp guard, he is not a human being, and therefore he does not enjoy the rights of a human being.” [SHEFTEL, p. 371]

The Chicago Tribune noted the situation in Israel with a critical editorial:

“Demjanjuk remains imprisoned in Israel, kept from leaving because Israeli prosecutors, in apparent defiance of the U.S. - Israeli extradition treaty, say they are considering charging him with war crimes other than those for which the United States originally extradited him. That’s not fair.... Americans remember and rightly abhor the Holocaust and support the pursuit of war criminals. But the surest way to undermine that support is to let that pursuit become a witch hunt. More and more, the Demjanjuk case has that aspect.” [CHIC.TRIB. 8-6-93, p. 1, 18]

The same week the Los Angeles Times noted

“The State Department warned Israel earlier this week that further detention of accused Nazi death camp guard John Demjanjuk would elicit a strong reaction from the United States, sources within the World Jewish Congress said Thursday ... The sources called the U.S. action a blatant interference in Israel’s internal affairs.” [LA TIMES, 8-13-93, p. 7]

The Washington Post noted the case, saying

“Due process and fair government conduct must be afforded in each individual case. This is not only for the sake of the accused. Deviation from this high standard is an affront to the Constitution, which protects everyone’s liberties.” [WASH. POST, p. 11-19-93, p. A28]

Ultimately, Israeli Attorney General Nili Arad was forced to concede defeat and denied all petitions to retry Demjanjuk on other grounds, saying:
“The public has no interest in opening proceedings against Demjanjuk on alternative charges if in the end there is no certainty that he will not be acquitted of those as well. An additional acquittal will look like a debacle and we cannot rule out such an acquittal.” [SHEFTEL, p. 372]

“The truth came out at last,” noted Yoram Sheftel, with satisfaction in his own vindication for ever taking the Demjanjuk case, “The Attorney General was forced to acknowledge that he did not have hard evidence to prove any alternative charge against Demjanjuk.” [SHEFTEL, p. 373] Debbie Nathan and Jan Haaken note further that even if it could have been proven that Demjanjuk had been at least a guard at another concentration camp, “although guards at Sobibor participated in the atrocities common at all the death camps, authorities had no evidence that Demjanjuk personally murdered anyone.” [NATHAN, p. 30]

When Demjanjuk finally flew home on Israeli El Al airlines, escorted by private bodyguards and Ohio Congressman James Traficant, the former prisoner was “heckled repeatedly by [Jewish] passengers.” [WALSH, p. A3] When his plane landed at Kennedy Airport in New York, 100 protesters awaited him. “Jewish extremists” soon announced their threats to kill him. [HALBERMAN, 9-23-93, p. A3] The Simon Wiesenthal Center announced a campaign to flood President Clinton with telegrams to “vigorously pursue” further action against the former Ivan the Terrible. [HUNDLEY, p. 1, 6] Columnist Pat Buchanan’s editorials defending Demjanjuk’s freedom made him out to be in some Jewish quarters a “defender of Nazi war criminals.” [NATIONAL REVIEW, p. 18]

When Demjanjuk finally flew home on Israeli El Al airlines, escorted by private bodyguards and Ohio Congressman James Traficant, the former prisoner was “heckled repeatedly by [Jewish] passengers.” [WALSH, p. A3] When his plane landed at Kennedy Airport in New York, 100 protesters awaited him. “Jewish extremists” soon announced their threats to kill him. [HALBERMAN, 9-23-93, p. A3] The Simon Wiesenthal Center announced a campaign to flood President Clinton with telegrams to “vigorously pursue” further action against the former Ivan the Terrible. [HUNDLEY, p. 1, 6] Columnist Pat Buchanan’s editorials defending Demjanjuk’s freedom made him out to be in some Jewish quarters a “defender of Nazi war criminals.” [NATIONAL REVIEW, p. 18] Among the Jewish protesters waiting for Demjanjuk at his home in the Cleveland suburb of Seven Hills was the familiar face of Rabbi Avi Weiss who vowed to “keep shadowing” the released prisoner [BRAUN, 9-23-93, p. A126] (presumably only when Polish Cardinal Glemp was not in this country).

“For some of Cleveland’s 60,000 Jews,” noted the Detroit News, upon Demjanjuk’s return to America, “a retired autoworker with a fourth grade education has become the living, breathing embodiment of the Holocaust.” [DICKERSON, p. A1] “He is not a victim or hero,” Rabbi Weiss told a reporter at a demonstration near Demjanjuk’s home, “... but one of the great symbols of Holocaust revisionism.” [PERTMAN, p. 6] The News noted that the local Ukrainian community felt a need to rally to Demjanjuk’s defense “because they themselves felt attacked – particularly by Jewish groups.” [DICKERSON, p. 9A] “Ukrainians have been called murderers and Nazis,” a local Ukrainian complained to the News, “I’ve never seen such hate.” A Seven Hills town ordinance was created to limit protests to four hours a day. The announcement that Attorney General Janet Reno planned an attempt to deport Demjanjuk drew a bitter reaction from William Liseynesky, president of the Cleveland area United Ukrainian Organizations. “She is under pressure from the Jewish community,” he said, “She’s just running scared from them, that’s all.” [PERTMAN, A, p. 6]

“There are those,” wrote Gitta Sereny, “– survivors and others – who maintain that Demjanjuk must have been ‘Ivan the Terrible.’ They need to believe it because it is unbearable for them to find that all the sorrow, the anger, the pain,
and all the effort have come to nothing.” [SERENY, p. 33] As late as 1995, in spite of the long trial that acquitted Demjanjuk, and in spite of the due process (innocent until proven guilty) of western-style democracies, Jeff Jacoby, a Jewish columnist at the *Boston Globe*, was afforded editorial space to still sow the Jewish community’s undying hatred. Jacoby’s vitriol is startlingly vicious in its single-minded hatred of the former Cleveland factory worker and its blanket animus towards the Ukrainian people:

> “Demjanjuk’s presence in this country is obscene ... Like many other Ukrainians, Demjanjuk was glad to help the Nazis massacre Jews ... At some point in 1943, Demjanjuk was transferred to Treblinka. So infamous was his sadism there that he was nicknamed ‘Ivan Grozhny,’ Ivan the Terrible ... Seven Jewish eyewitnesses, some of them trembling and weeping, identified Demjanjuk as Ivan the Terrible ... He would stab Jews as they were herded to gas chambers; he would slice off noses and ears with a saber; he would cut women between their legs; he would lash victims with a whip ... There’s only one place where Demjanjuk belongs. He’s 75; with any luck, he’ll be there soon.” [JACOBY, p. 15]

But Jewish efforts to hound Demjanjuk to death were not yet over. In May 1999, the U.S. Justice Department renewed “its court battle to strip U.S. citizenship from John Demjanjuk ... the new complaint alleges that he was a guard at the Sobibor extermination camp and at the Majdanek and Flossenberg concentration camps during World War II and served in the ‘Trawniki’ unit that participated in a campaign to annihilate the Jews of Europe.” [INTL HERALD TRIB, p. 10]

[Meanwhile, Israel treats Jews differently – per the death penalty – who collaborated with the Nazis. As Jewish scholar Peter Novick notes: “Many published diaries and memoirs were filled with denunciations of officials of the Jewish Councils (Judenraten) and the ghetto police they employed as [Nazi] collaborators, traitors, and murderers ... Indeed, the very law under which [former Nazi official Adolph] Eichmann was tried [and executed in Israel] had been instituted in Israel to punish Jewish collaborators. The Law for the Punishment of Nazis and Their Collaborators included Nazis as a matter of form, but there was no expectation that they would be bagged. Its real targets, everyone acknowledged, were collaborators among the [Jewish] survivors. Before Eichmann’s capture, dozens of Jews in Israel had been prosecuted under the law. (Some had been sentenced to death, though the sentences were commuted).”] [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 140]

* Note: In Canada there was a recent story of comparable Jewish fervor in that country’s Federal Justice Department War Crimes division, a section created in 1987 to hunt down ex-Nazis there. By 1997 Bill Hobson – the first head of the unit, and Arnold Fradkin, its first lawyer, were accusing the government department itself of anti-Semitism. Hobson even filed a $1 million lawsuit, attacking the man who succeeded him, Peter Kremer, claiming that Kremer “questioned the objectivity and legal advice of Fradkin, undermined his reputation and fazed him out of war crimes work because he was Jewish.”
A 260-page investigative report was written by the Osgoode Hall law dean John McManus in response to the charges. “I have been unable to discover any evidence of anti-Semitic incidents or attitudes in the work of the War Crimes section during Kremer’s term,” McManus wrote, after interviewing dozens of Jewish and non-Jewish colleagues and legal opponents of Kremer, “… indeed, the overwhelming impression I have gained from the discussions is that it is widely believed that the allegations being made against him are profoundly unfair.” The Canadian Jewish News noted that in the final report “Fradkin was described by colleagues, Jewish and non, as being ‘obsessed,’ and a ‘passionate zealot,’ and Kremer was justified in thinking he had lost objectivity on one case he had worked on for years … Despite Hobson’s gripes to the contrary, the report appears to be independent, mind-numbingly exhaustive and fair.” [BINDMAN, S., p. 32]

In 2001, yet another alleged ex-Nazi Ukrainian was being hounded by Canada’s (Jewish) Immigration Minister Elinor Caplan. A Toronto Star reporter, Peter Worthington, wrote a scathing article about Caplan’s efforts to deport Jacob Fast:

“[A] trial opens in Hamilton today to deport a 91-year-old deaf man with Alzheimer’s, who the government thinks lied to get into Canada 54 years ago. Immigration Minister Elinor Caplan wants Jacob Fast deported because he ‘probably’ didn’t tell the truth about being coerced into auxiliary police attached to a Nazi SS unit during the war. Fast was born in Soviet Ukraine in 1910. When he was accused, a couple of years ago, of working with the Nazis and mistreating prisoners, he denied it (don’t they all?). Ottawa has no records to show he lied when he and his family came to Canada in 1947 – a time when refugee screening was casual, and displaced persons were being settled in the thousands. Fast now lives in an old-age home in St. Catharines, cannot maintain a conversation because of Alzheimer’s, can’t defend himself, and won’t appear at his Hamilton trial today. This is a civil case, not a criminal one, so Mr. Justice Denis Pelletier of the Federal Court has ruled it’s not necessary for the defendant to appear in person. I have no knowledge of Mr. Fast (a retired auto worker), but the fact that he’s another Ukrainian targeted by immigration, smacks of prejudice, vindictiveness, vendetta. Wasyl Odynsky, of Toronto, who at age 17 was forced into auxiliary police in World War II as a perimeter guard at a concentration camp, is another Ms Caplan is determined to deport. The record shows that when young Odynsky refused to report to the auxiliary police and ran away, he was caught and told if he ran away again, his parents and family would pay the price. Another Ukrainian, Helmut Oberlander, has already been ordered deported. He was a teenaged translator for the Germans in World War II. As for Mr. Fast – what does it matter today what he did or didn’t do in World War II? We know the Nazis viewed Ukrainians as ‘subhuman’ and punished them rather as they punished Jews in Ukraine – Babi Yar in Kiev was a massacre of Ukrainians and Jews.” [WORTHINGTON, P. 11-28-01]
“Surely Jews understand that in identifying an anti-Semite one must use a sum-of-all-its-parts test. If it is yellow, has a four-foot neck, spots, and little horns, it is a giraffe.”

– Jewish comedian Jackie Mason and Jewish lawyer Raul Felder, 9-2000, p. 57

“If you want to understand anti-Semitism, read the Old Testament.”

George Orwell

“So long as there is a single anti-Semite in the world, I shall declare with pride that I am a Jew.”

Ilya Ehrenburg, Jewish Russian author, (in DERSHOWITZ, p. 14]

“Fighting anti-Semitism seems to be for some Jews more important than any other expression of Jewishness … The danger appears when one becomes dependent upon them for one’s identity, so that one begins to need anti-Semitism.”

Stanislaw Krajewski (Polish Jew)

“For some Jews and perhaps some of the Jewish leadership, the fear is that if anti-Semitism completely disappears then the Jewish community might erode or dissolve.”

Stanley Rothman (in STALLSWORTH, p. 67)

“And if real peace does come to Israel, the question will be asked: Can we, and how do we, survive without an external enemy?”

Avraham Burg, head of the Jewish Agency, [HARTUNG, J., 1995]

“The assumption of an eternal anti-Semitism … has been adapted by a great many unbiased historians and by even a greater number of Jews. It is this odd coincidence which makes the theory so very dangerous and confusing. Its escapist basis is in both instances the same; just as anti-Semites understandably desire to escape responsibility for their deeds, so Jews, attacked and on the defensive, even more understandably, do not wish to under any circumstances discuss their share of responsibility.”

Hannah Arendt, Origins, p. 7 (Jewish historian)

“The discounting of anti-Semitism is itself anti-Semitic.”

Evelyn Torton Beck, 1982, p. xxii
“[Jewish psychologist Jules] Nydes argues that such individuals [representing the “paranoid masochistic character”] tend to see themselves and groups within which they identify as victims who are being persecuted. This sense of persecution derives partly from unconscious feelings of guilt. The paranoid masochistic person engages in aggression against others because he or she expects to be attacked. His aggression, which is accompanied by feelings of self-righteousness, is rarely satisfying. Indeed, he can often achieve gratification only when he is punished, and the punishment is interpreted as confirming his preconceived sense of persecution … The typology is suggestive. [Jewish psychoanalyst] Theodore Reik, who was Nyde’s teacher, suggested that a ‘paranoid masochistic’ personality structure is modal among Jews.”

Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, Jewish authors, 1982, p. 133

“I felt that the bigotry always blamed on those who said anything negative about Jews was equally visible on the other [Jewish] side of the fence.”

Evelyn Kaye (Jewish author, p. 114)

“Privilege does not relieve the vulnerability to prejudice.”

Michael Paul Sacks, concluding his article about the “privileged” Jewish occupational elite in modern Russia, and non-Jewish hostility to it, 1998, p. 266

“For all my life, I have never felt any substantial anti-Semitism, and was rather indifferent to the Jewish community. Then something clicked, and I thought, Well, I am over 40, I have made a successful career, I have made a fortune. But what will tell my children when I am 70?”

Millionaire Leonard Nevzlin, upon becoming president of the Russian Jewish Congress [GORODETSKY, L, 5-23-01]

“We should be able to discuss Jews and their Jewishness, their virtues or their vices, as one can any other identifiable group without being called an anti-Semite. Frankness does not feed anti-Semitism; secrecy, however, does.”

Kevin Meyers (British journalist), p. 26

“Telling the truth is not anti-Semitic. Am I right?”

Joe Wood (African-American) p. 112

“It seems that [poet Allen] Ginsberg had traced an obscenity in the dust of a dormitory window; the words were too shocking for the Dean of Students to speak, so he had written them on a piece of paper which he had pushed across the desk to my husband: ‘Fuck the Jews.’ … ‘He’s a Jew himself,’ said the Dean. ‘Can you understand his writing a thing like that?’ Yes, Lionel could understand; but he couldn’t explain it to the Dean.”

Dianna Trilling (Jewish author) in BLOOM, p. 302
The foundation of modern Jewish identity is an ideological subscription to a presumed irrevocable omnipresence of irrational “anti-Semitism.” Jewish defense to this threat is the common denominator that creates cohesion among even the most disparate peoples of worldwide Jewry. “Being Jewish” – above all else, as archaic religious convictions have fallen to the wayside – is still conceived to be the noble bearing of special, continuous persecution at the hands of the rest of the world. This conviction – traditionally understood by Jews to be borne as punishment by God for transgressions against covenantal law – has been the core of Jewish religious belief in their diaspora. Non-Jews are an important part of this world view. To the traditional Jewish perspective, says Mark Zborowski and Elizabeth Herzog:

“the *goyim* represent, quite literally, an act of God. When they are persecutors they are also instruments of justice, punishing the Jews for transgressing the Law, and in any case they do not know better.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 154]


The notion that Jews, scattered throughout the world, are collectively victims at the hands of all others [i.e., today categorized as “anti-Semitism”], is a conceptual framework, originally religiously based, that actually precedes authentic history and is self-fulfilling. The foundation to understand the Jewish victim complex can be found in their Torah (the Old Testament), for example in Deuteronomy 28. What is today called anti-Semitism was originally conceived as God’s punishment of the Jewish people:

“And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people from one end of the earth unto the other … And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of they foot have rest: But the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind. And they life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night and have none assurance of thy life … and thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed always.”

It is clear that the Jewish conception of being continuously “persecuted” originates in religious conviction. As Jewish psychoanalyst Theodore Reik notes:

“The masochistic attitude of ancient Israel was recognized at least in their relationship with God, whose punishment they took as deserved without complaint. They considered also the cruelty with which they were treated by their powerful neighbors as punishment for their sins, especially for deserting their God. The paranoid attitude in the form of an idea of grandeur is obvious in the Jewish claim of being the ‘chosen people.’ There is even a subterranean tie between the masochistic and the paranoid attitude in the idea that God chastises those whom He loves. Such an exceptional position has been claimed by the Jewish people since ancient time.” [REIK, T., 1962, p. 230-231]
When emptied of purely religious content in modern times, the grand idea of “Jewish punishment by God” is reduced to its areligious backbone: “Jewish persecution by non-Jews.” The deep belief of the omnipresence of this is held by even secular Jews with as much conviction as any religion. And for most modern Jews this secular worldview still subliminally clings to the religious paradigm: among other things, Jewish insistence upon a moral superiority above others. Throughout history, hostility for Jews, noted Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, reinforced “their ethnocentric image as a ‘chosen people’ – the special animus of non-Jews towards Jews demonstrate [d] the truth of the Jewish claim that they were different, privy to a special status in divine creation – in short, superior to Gentiles.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p., 36] In Jewish eyes, the evidence for such a self-congratulatory perch is (aside from Old Testament referral) to be found most recently in the Holocaust – the terrible fruition of traditional canon, the proclaimed “most unique” of human-inflicted atrocities for which all non-Jews are held to be, in abstract, guilty. And all Jews, innocent.

The combined post-Holocaust Jewish emotions of shame, guilt, fear, and anger have reconstituted a renewed and roiled Jewish identity that reaffirms and pledges its conceptual distance from the rest of the world. Yet Jewish canon, both religious and secular, now militantly demands the pseudo-religious interpretation of the Jewish Holocaust to be sacred, for everyone; the Jews who were murdered in the context of World War II (and not non-Jews) are likewise hailed. The sheer gravity and allegedly incomparable scope of the mass killings of Jews is also proclaimed to render today’s Jews – genetic inheritors of the Tragedy of tragedies – beyond moral reproach. Jews are held blameless, irresponsible. Then, now, and across history.

The framework for this Jewish moral dialectic against the non-Jewish Other rests upon “anti-Semitism,” the age-old vehicle for Jewish punishment by God, still conceived as a metaphysical residue of hatred attested to by even secular Jews (post-Holocaust) in the ruins of an otherwise rejected Jewish religion. Underscoring the idea that it is the concept of Gentile hostility that most effectively binds Jews so tightly together, “When there is no anti-Semitism,” candidly admits Menachem Revivi, director general of an Israeli support office, “it’s much harder to maintain your Judaism.” [HYMAN, M., 1998, p. 85] “[Jewish mythology declares that] anti-Semitism is a mystifying disease,” note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “one with perhaps many permutations and with diverse origins, but at root one that is fundamentally irrational. This irrationalism only compounds the innocence of the Jewish victim.” These two authors, both Jewish, then feel obliged to add: “It is not our intention to challenge the truth of these myths, we subscribe in good part to most of them.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN p. 33]

In the political context of the modern nation of Israel, even its areligious state ideology – Zionism – includes Orthodox Judaism’s old conviction of an omnipresent “anti-Semitism” in all non-Jews to be central to its identity dogma. “Like the Nazi ideologues,” wrote Jewish anti-Zionist William Zukerman in 1960, “the Zionists take it for granted the Jews are a foreign and inassimilable
element in the body of all non-Jewish people … [and] that hatred for the Jews is something instinctive and mystical, forever engrained in the subconscious of every non-Jew, which can never be eradicated or cured.” [ZUKERMAN, p. 63]

“It is impossible to comprehend the largely irrational nature of [anti-Semitism], says popular Jewish polemicist Alan Dershowitz, “…The important point is that Jews are not to blame for anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is the problem of the bigots who feel, express, and practice it. Nothing we do can profoundly affect the twisted minds of the anti-Semites.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 102, 101] In a 1995 book about anti-Semitism in Japan, scholar David Goodman noted that “since anti-Semitism as we are defining it has nothing to do with Jews, much less ‘Semites,’ we will neither hyphenate nor capitalize the term.” [GOODMAN, p. 11] Another Jewish scholar, Daniel Pipes, in a book dismissing as nonsense a variety of conspiracy theories, outlined his own personal lens to understand the world, saying, “I spell [anti-Semitism] in lower case, without a hyphen (not anti-Semitism), to signal that it refers to an ideology and to imply that the phenomenon has almost nothing to do with the actions of Jews.” [PIPES, D., 1997, p. 27]

“The term Jew has been used as a term of abuse, a curse and an accusation for centuries,” says Irene Bloomfield, a Jewish psychotherapist, “It expresses the anti-Semite’s virulent and unreasoning hatred and contempt and has so often been the preliminary of attacks, pogroms, persecution, and death … The Jews had thus been an archetypical bad object and universal enemy from time immemorial.” [BLOOMFIELD, p. 26] “Among most anti-Semites,” adds another Jewish psychotherapist, Mortimer Ostrow, “we found that their irrational hatred was the expression of primary process thinking, that is, thought that is driven by feeling and not subjected to the discipline of reason, logic, and reality testing.” [OSTROW, p. 176] Early, and prominent, Zionist Max Nordeau declared that “the anti-Semitic accusations are valueless, because they are not based on a criticism of real facts, but are merely due to the psychological law according to which children, savages, and malevolent fools make persons and things against which they have an aversion responsible for their sufferings. Pretexts change, but the hatred remains. The Jews are not hated because they have evil qualities; evil qualities are sought for in them because they are hated.” [HERTZ, J., 1954]

“Anti-Semitism,” says prominent (Jewish) historian Barbara Tuchman, “is independent of its object. What Jews do or fail to do is not the determinant. The impetus comes out of the needs of the persecutors.” [CUDDIHY, p. 24] “We all know that anti-Semitism really has nothing to do with Jews,” says scholar Susannah Herschel, “It can flourish even in places where no Jews live.” “The psychic needs of the Christians – and not the actual characteristics of Jewish life,” asserts Todd Endelman, “give anti-Semitism its power and appeal.” “Jewish hatred is one-sided,” adds Ruth Wisse, “… and functions independent of its object.” “Anti-Semitism is oblivious to Jewish conduct,” declared the Jerusalem Post in 1990, “it is independent of the very presence of Jews.” [all: LINDEMANN, 1997, p. xvii]
“The existence of anti-Semitism and the content of anti-Semitic charges...,” wrote Daniel Goldhagen in his best-selling 1996 book about Germany and the Jews, “are fundamentally not a response to any objective evaluation of Jewish actions ... anti-Semitism draws on cultural sources that are independent of the Jews’ nature and actions.” [Goldhagen’s emphases; FINKELSTEIN, N., 1998, p. 11] “Let’s face it,” wrote Harry Golden, “anti-Semitism can’t possibly be explained; it can merely be recounted.” “Understand and explain the problem [of anti-Semitism] as much as you may,” said Lewis Naimier, “there remains a hard, insoluble core, incomprehensible and inexplicable.” [LINDEMAN, p. 11]

In Jewish folklore, even intra-community jokes reflect the same theme of Jewish categorical innocence as the cause of anti-Semitism. In the following case, it is a Jewish-created defamation of Poles and Poland: a “Pollock” joke:

“A few months after the end of World War I, the premier of Poland had a meeting with President Woodrow Wilson. ‘If you don’t meet our nation’s demands at the peace conference,’ warned the premier, ‘I foresee great troubles ahead. The Polish people will be very angry, and they’ll go out and massacre the Jews.’

‘And if your demands are met?’ asked Wilson.
‘In that case,’ responded the premier, ‘my people will be delighted. They’ll go out in the streets and get drunk – and then they’ll massacre the Jews.’” [NOVAK/WALDOKS, 1981, p. 60]

“When it comes to the millions of Jews who faced liquidation in Hitler’s Europe,” says Jewish author Michael Medved,

“historians make little effort to figure out what, precisely, the victims had done to make Der Fuehrer so terribly angry. With racial and religious antagonisms, we understand that rage can flourish with no basis in reality.” [MEDVED, M. 11-12-01]

“Jews don’t cause anti-Semitism,” declares Jewish novelist Ann Roiphe, “nothing provokes it, it’s always there ... The object of gentile racists and nationalist hate, chameleon-like, takes on the shape of that moment’s Jew.” [ROIPHE, A., 1992, p. 40] “The notion that anti-Semitism can be, in the slightest degree, the fault of the Jews,” proclaims well-known Jewish author Cynthia Ozick, “is in itself – even when it crops up, as it frequently does among Jews – a species of anti-Semitism.” [CUDDIHY, p. 24]

Eventual New York Times Executive Editor A. M. Rosenthal and reporter Arthur Gelb put the standard Jewish theme this way:

“The circumstantial evidence is that anti-Semitism is a mental disorder, because the anti-Semite sees certain human beings not as human beings but as objects. They are reflections of his own needs and passions and his inability to recognize them for what they are is such a severe form of irrationalism as to be a symptom of mental malfunction. The anti-Semite suffers from a fear of demons, but since he is not aware of his fear is convinced of the reality of demons – a clinical example of paranoia.” [ROSENTHAL/ GELB, 1967, p. 65]
“Not only does anything Jews do or refrain from doing have nothing to do with anti-Semitism,” notes a non-Jewish scholar, John Michael Cuddihy, with incredulity and exasperation, “but any attempt to explain anti-Semitism by referring to the Jewish contribution to anti-Semitism is itself an instance of anti-Semitism!” [CUDDIHY, p. 24]

Such widespread Jewish Orwellian doublethink loops of logic to fend off blame and responsibility for their historical deeds stems from the old Chosen People syndrome itself, popularly secularized as an impenetrable fortress of denial against all non-Jewish (or Jewish) critical attack, an intellectual ghetto with locked gates: by self-edict declared separate, blameless, unaccountable, and completely untouchable. “This reductio ad absurdum,” observes Cuddihy, “has stunning implications. It means that Jews have not been causal agents in their own history … They did not act and interact causally and historically with other groups in history. Morally blameless, the Jews … were outside of history, aspiring to … ‘angelism.’” [CUDDIHY, p. 24]

This outrageously ahistorical perspective is reflected in a comment by Elie Wiesel about the defining Jewish event of the 20th century: “The Holocaust is beyond politics and beyond analogies.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 76]

In the modern Jewish community post-World War II, notes Jewish critic William Zukerman, “criticism and self-criticism which were the basis of inspiration of the Enlightenment period, have been discredited as almost the equivalent of treason. By a kind of perverted chauvinistic reasoning, criticism of anything pertaining to Jews, whether it is of Israel, of the dominant nationalist party [of Israel], its institutions, or of its ideology, has been defined as anti-Semitism.” [ZUKERMAN, p. 68] Irving Kristol calls it his peoples’ “propensity to gloss over their own shortcomings and blame the always available anti-Semite for their misfortunes.” [KRISTOL, p. 278]

Milton Steinberg notes that:

“Unfortunately Jews, like other human beings, are so constituted as to be reluctant to pass adverse judgment on themselves. Hence, whether with justice or not they will hold their Jewishness at fault for whatever goes wrong in their lives.” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 78]

“The Cult of Victimhood,” observes David Klinghoffer, “performs two valuable services for us Jews with guilty consciences. First, as it does for everyone else, it assures us that, whatever we know we are doing wrong, we are really angels … But it does something else for us, which it may not do for other groups. We believe that any hostility we can detect on the part of non-Jews is entirely unmerited. We have done nothing to deserve it … We American Jews are not as ignorant as we seem. We know, in our souls, that we have gone astray; but, to borrow a hackneyed phrase of psychological jargon, we are in denial.” [KLINGHOFFER, p. 10-13]

Facing this suffocating shield, once defined as an anti-Semite for the crime of criticizing Jews, the offending individual is completely marginalized in modern America. “During the late 1950s and 1960s,” says Benjamin Ginsberg, “anti-Semitism has been successfully defined by Jews as a form of extremism in which only politicians on the lunatic fringe engaged. As a result, any effort to make
political cause of anti-Semitism seemed fraught with risk.” [GINSBERG, B., 1993, p. 187] Once labeled an “anti-Semite,” the stigmatized individual is even subject to the most preposterous of slanders, a virtual canon in much of the Jewish community. Criticizing Jews is anti-Semitism, and therefore equivalent to sending Jews to death camps. Says Konstanty Gebert, editor of a Jewish journal in Poland, :

“The reality of [the Nazi death camp] Treblinka exists, irremovably, and contemporary anti-Semites do not have the option of stating that it is not their goal.” [GEBERT]

Albert Lindemann notes such accusations with amazement: “Some writers go so far as to condemn the distinction [“between ‘irritation’ with Jews and calling for their systematic murder”] as morally dubious, thus making any irritation with Jews or criticism of them ‘anti-Semitic,’ a conclusion that takes on extraordinary dimensions when linked to such assertions as ‘all anti-Semitism is essentially the same’ or ‘a little bit of anti-Semitism is a little bit of cancer.’” [LINDEMANN, 1997, p. xiv]

Professor Lindemann wrote an extraordinarily unusual work, *Esau’s Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* (Cambridge University Press, 1997), a volume that seeks to “understand” anti-Semitism largely in terms of Jewish belief and action that elicits it. Not unexpectedly, the reviewer for the American Jewish Committee’s influential *Commentary* magazine decried the work in an article entitled “Blaming the Victim” as “deeply pernicious” and Lindemann’s “knowledge of Jewish history … [is] little better than that of the anti-Semites whose arguments he echoes.” [WISTRICH, 1998, p. 60-63] Likewise, John Landau reviewed *Esau’s Tears* in the Zionist journal *Midstream*, linking Lindemann’s reciting of the truths of history to Hitler fascism, warning readers that “It appears that anti-Semitism remains a respectable intellectual position on American and British college campuses, including history department, provided that it is expressed with a degree of good manners and restraint. We must not forget that the assault on Jews by German academics and intellectuals preceded, and helped to lay the groundwork for, the physical destruction of European Jewry.” [LANDAU, J., FEB/MAR 99, p. 44-45]

Central to the modern Jewish world view is the so-called “Holocaust.” “The Holocaust,” says Joseph Amato,

“serves as the point from which Jews can morally survey the entire past and classify all present society … Some Jewish thinkers consider the Holocaust [as] providing a singular point of wrong innocence against which they can judge everyone else. It has consciously been chosen by Jews to be their crucifixion: the great sorrow they must mediate. Non-Jews are tried by two questions: What did they do (collectively or individually, directly or indirectly, by commission or omission) to further anti-Semitism? What did they do to stop the Holocaust? The most severe judges find everyone guilty who did not risk his family’s lives to save Jews in the Holocaust.” [AMATO, p. 181]

Reflecting again the old Chosen People theme, Jewish convention also
insists that anti-Semitism is a “unique” form of prejudice. Non-Jewish historian John Higham, who had written about anti-Semitism in the 1950s, defended himself against Jewish attack, saying:

“[It is accused] that I have violated the uniqueness of anti-Semitism by comparing it with other exclusionary movements – illustrating the unwillingness of some Jews to measure their own experience on a general human scale, unless anti-Semitism is presented ... as the very archetype of all prejudices and anti-democratic attitudes. For me the uniqueness of anti-Semitism was not a foregone conclusion but a question.” [HIGHAM, J., 1986, p. 225]

(It is interesting to wonder what Higham might have said more freely about the subject if he was not so beholden to the Jewish community – his basic studies in this subject had been “generously” supported by the American Jewish Committee – [HIMMELFARB, M., 1986, p. 197])

Despite the long historical list of very legitimate complaints against Jews by people all over the world through history, the institutionalized self-celebration of the Nazis as a polar German “chosen people,” Hitler’s heralding of the ruthlessness of war as a noble enterprise, the Nazi determination to rid Germany of Jews via the clinically brutal scientism of mass murder, Eli Wiesel echoes many Jews in completely mystifying the Holocaust in his introduction to The Encyclopedia of the Shoah: “Unlike other tragedies, there was no logical reason underlying the tragedy of the Holocaust, and all attempts to discover rational reasons have failed.” [March of the Living, p. 5]

Jewish blameless innocence throughout history, framing itself as an eternal scapegoats for the old religious nemesis of Christianity, is elaborately and imaginatively expounded upon by Jewish critic George Steiner. Hyam Maccoby notes that Steiner’s

“theory of anti-Semitism [is that it] is caused by the atavistic pagan element in western religion by which Jews are regarded as a collective Executioner of a central human sacrifice. We have to do here with a shifting moral responsibility, by which the individual lays his moral burden firstly on Jesus himself, who dies to save him; and secondly, on the Jews who bring about the necessary death of Jesus ... In any event, the Jews have been elected, ‘chosen’ if you will, to the position of scapegoat so that all others can escape guilt into the innocence of childhood and recover the joy of Eden.” [MACCOBY, p. 34]

Roger Aments notes his discomfort as a Jew when the beliefs he had been emphatically taught about the Holocaust were challenged by the Buddhist world view, that humans must take responsibility for their actions that effect their fate:

“I had been shocked, a little outraged, by what I’d heard about the Buddhist view of the Holocaust. I could not accept that the suffering of the Jews was somehow a result of their previous actions. Wasn’t the knowledge of shared victimization the source of Jewish identification with the Tibetans? Weren’t we fellow victims, fellow innocent victims?
... In Buddhism, the whole notion of an innocent victim carried little weight in assessing how one responded to tragic circumstances.” [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 185]

Note the American Jewish Congress fury at Israeli rabbi and Shas party leader Ovadia Yosef (“who plays a critical role in coalition politics in Israel”) when he dared to challenge modern Jewish convention about the Holocaust. In 2000, he suggested that it seemed to him that “Holocaust victims were punished for sins in an earlier life.” However one might interpret this view, it is something considerably less than innocence. The AJC’s reaction was outrage, and formally, that

“Rabbi Yosef must be charged with knowing that his statements can be used as an excuse for Nazi barbarisms, as a kind of Nazi apologetics … He acknowledges the Holocaust but then claims God’s justification for its horrors. If that is not blasphemy, then nothing is.” [PR NEWS-WIRE, 2-6-98]

Berel Lang looks upon the widespread Jewish effort to elude their own honest history and attendant moral responsibility for it with concern. In modern Jewish historical revisionism, “the reasonable … concern to understand anti-Semitism has … nothing to do with Jews. This view … has served as a premise in the most serious historical attempts to analyze the phenomenon of anti-Semitism … This resistance to the possibility of a connection between anti-Semitism and Jewish history is … pernicious.” [CUDDIHY, p. 23-24] “Jews,” notes Robert Segal, “fear that a historical explanation [of anti-Semitism] will make Jews responsible for anti-Semitism, and will thereby excuse it.” [CUDDIHY, p. 34] “It seems clear that Jews exhibit an all-too common human failing,” says Albert Lindemann, “They actually do not want to understand their past – or at least those aspects of their past that have to do with the hatred directed at them, since understanding may threaten other elements of their complex and often contradictory identities.” [LINDEMAN, 1997, p. 535] “Jews come honorably to their paranoia,” adds Cuddihy, “Nevertheless, when it comes to their own behavior, they go on a moral holiday.” [CUDDIHY, p. 35]

This widespread Jewish “moral holiday,” however secularly guised, is nonetheless rooted in the old rabbinical ghettos; as we have seen, many centuries passed with Jewish history self-understood to begin and end with itself, the sacred history of a “people apart” unrelated to the history of others around them.

There is also – more importantly in a largely areligious age – an entire “science” (albeit a newly-created, and distinctly Jewish, one, even built in some ways upon a rabbinical model; some have called it a “surrogate religion”) [GAY, p. 19-20] to use in service to prove the modern Jewish theses of identity, an identity largely based upon an oppositional antithesis: lofty Jewish moral worth versus an omnipresent, generic, and irrational anti-Semitism. This controversial “science” to prove the major premises of Jewish self-conception is psychoanalytic theory, the invention of a Viennese Jew, Sigmund Freud, itself a field of endeavor and allegiance overwhelmingly populated, predominated, and propagated by Jews to our own day.

Let us start with the fact that all 17 original members of Freud’s Psychological
Wednesday Society were Jewish and most of his patients, by which Freud developed his theories of human neurosis, were women from “eminent Austrian Jewish families.” The original Society members, notes Dennis Klein, “were aware of their Jewishness and frequently maintained a sense of Jewish purpose and solidarity … [Their] feeling of positive Jewish pride formed the matrix of the movement in the psychoanalytic circle … it tightened the bond among members and powered their self-image of a redemptive elite.” [KLEIN, p. vii] (Absorbed with notions of elitism and clandestine intrigues, by 1912, six die-hard loyalists to Freud were joined in a behind-the-scenes “committee,” described by Freud as a “secret council composed of the best and most trustworthy among our men.” This group, said The Master, “would have to be strictly secret [Freud’s emphasis] in its existence and its actions.” [MASSON, 1990, p. 113])

“Freud,” says another Jewish author, Earl Grollman,

“may also have experienced the ‘essence of Judaism’ through his community activities with other Jews. Many of his important theories were delivered before the Fraternity of Jewish Students and the B’nai B’rith organization. Most of the colleagues in his movement were Jewish … But whatever the reasons – historical, sociological, psychological – group bonds did provide a warm shelter with other Jews, informality and familiarity formed a kind of inner security, a ‘we-feeling,’ illustrated even by the selection of jokes and stories recounted in the group. It is what Freud called ‘the clear awareness of an inner identity, the secret of the same inner construction.’” [GROLLMAN, E., 1965, p. 41]

“All over the world,” says Jewish psychoanalyst Earl Hopper, “Jews are drawn to the profession of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy. The 1990 roster of the International Psychoanalytical Association reads like the membership list of a synagogue.” [HOPPER, p. 18] “That vast apparatus of putative concern, psychiatry,” wrote Roger Kahn in 1968, “is largely a Jewish monopoly.” [KAHN, R., p. 53] “An area of medicine which Jews have made almost their own is psychiatry.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 119] “Jews,” says Ann Roiphe, also Jewish, “have rushed to psychoanalysis as lemmings to the sea.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 76] Psychotherapy is also in all respects so overwhelmingly a Jewish consumer domain that in a 1996 survey (in which nearly half of 17 psychoanalysts in a research project were expressly solicited as non-Jews), 75% of the patients for all of them (both Jewish and non-Jewish therapists) were found to be Jewish. [OSTROW, p. 27]

As James Yaffe observed in 1968:

“There is little question that a comparatively large proportion of the patients undergoing psychoanalysis in America are Jewish. It also seems to be true that Jewish parents are more likely than equally affluent non-Jewish parents to send their children for psychiatric treatment. Those who can’t afford analysis are just as enthusiastic about the blessings of less expensive psychiatry. According to one leader in the field, ‘If you open a mental health clinic and don’t advertise, Jews will be the only people who flock to it.’ In some sections of the Jewish community, in
fact, psychiatry has become a way of life, almost a substitute religion. In southern California it’s hard to find a Jewish family that hasn’t got at least one member in analysis.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 293]

With advancement out of the Jewish ghetto in the 18th century, and increased secular questioning about the religiously-based myths about themselves and how they fit into mainstream societies, over the last couple of centuries “the behavior pattern of assimilated Jews,” says Hannah Arendt, “determined by this continuous concentrated effort to distinguish themselves … created a Jewish type that is recognizable everywhere … Judaism became a psychological quality and the Jewish question became an involved problem for every individual Jew.” [ARENDT, p. 67] The Jewish novelist Franz Kafka, for instance, once remarked that poet Heinrich Heine’s “conflict with Jewry” was “exactly what made him so typically Jewish,” [SILBERMAN, p. 63] i.e., being Jewish, post-Enlightenment, was a war within the psyche about being Jewish.

“Whatever the reasons for their philosophical disarray and mental anguish,” observes Gerald Krefetz, “Jews were among the first groups to seek relief from psychologists, psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, and psychotherapists … perhaps psychiatry is today’s secular rabbinate.” [KREFETZ, p. 180] This theme is inverted from a negative to a positive and romanticized by Harriet Fromkin: “If we had no further illustration than the character of Freud, we should have a basis for suspecting some connection between the Jew and psychological genius.” [KAHN, R., p. 72]

Freud eventually directed his projective obsessions towards his Old Testament Jewish heritage, asserting – among other things – that the revered patriarch, Moses, may not have even been Jewish. And that Jews killed him. “Biblical religion, according to Freud,” said Joseph Campbell, “had the character of a neurosis, where a screen of mythic figures hides a repressed conviction of guilt which, it is felt, must be atoned, and yet cannot be consciously faced.” [CAMPBELL, MASKS, p. 126] Freud believed that Jews had a continuous anxiety and resentment about breaking the many laws of their Father God. Freud wrote that

“In the religion of Moses itself there was no direct expression for the murderer’s father-hate. Only a powerful reaction to it could make its appearance: the consciousness of guilt because of that hostility, the bad conscience because one had sinned against God and continued to sin. This feeling of guiltiness, which the Prophets kept incessantly alive … cleverly veiled the true origin of the feeling. The people met with hard times… it became not easy to adhere to the illusion… they did not observe the laws. The need for satisfying this feeling of guilt… was insatiable, more exacting, but also more petty… It [the feeling of neurosis] bears the characteristic of being never concluded… with which we are familiar in the reaction-formation of obsessional neurosis.” [KREFETZ, p. 181-182]

In the Freudian worldview, Richard Rubenstein explains that the blueprint to understand the troubled anti-Semitic mind (and everyone’s, for that matter) starts here:
“According to Freud, civilization and religion began with a ‘primal crime’ in which the father of the original human horde was cannibalistically murdered by his sons to gain sexual possession of his females. The unconscious memory of the deed continues to agonize the sons and their progeny, thereby causing the murdered father to be imagined as the ever-lasting Heavenly Father. For Freud, the supreme object of human worship [the Father God] is none other than the first object of human criminality.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 36]

From this bizarrely fictional speculation, a Judeo-centric argument can be, and is, often created that explains anti-Semitism in western tradition as Christianity’s (psychoanalytically-based) conflict with Judaism. This includes Christian envy of God’s favoritism of Jewry, traditional Christian belief that Jews were the killers of Christ (an echo of the “murder God” theme), Judaism itself as a “father” religion to Christianity, and on and on. In this scenario, Jews are scapegoated by Christians for the very death of God. Not surprisingly, the Freudian paradigm for the relationship between Christianity and Judaism is a violent one. “The Jews had a father religion,” said Freud, “and the Christians a son religion, and the subconscious is to kill the father from time to time.” [PERLMUTTER, p. 141] Hence, in this view too, Nazi fascism was not really (as declared and practiced by them) an anti-Christian creed, but – however incongruous – an expression of it. “In a sense,” declares Rubenstein, “the death camps [for Jews] were the terminal expression of Christian anti-Semitism … [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 43] … since the sins and guilts that beset the anti-Semites existence demands the death of the Jews.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 41]

Elsewhere in the psychoanalytic world, John Murray Cuddihy has even argued that the essence of Freud’s unconscious “id” theory was really the Jewish “ordeal of civility,” the struggle to “civilize,” to acculturate into the interpersonal norms of Gentile culture. (Freud’s name for frustrated human desire can even been seen as a pun on the Yiddish word for Jew: Yid). In this vein, Maurice Samuels reflected widespread social issues of the day when he suggested in 1932, however facetiously, that anti-Semitism was probably rooted in “a lack of niceness in the Jews. If the Jews would only temper their voices, their table manners and their ties, if they would be discreet and tidy in their enthusiasms, unobtrusive in their comings and goings, and above all reticent about their Jewishness, they would get along very well.” [SILBERMAN, p. 30] Albert Lindemann notes also the undercurrent of agitated Jewishness (antithetical to non-Jewish Others) in three major Jewish-dominated ideologies in the last 150 years: “Such modern ideologies as socialism, (both Marxist and anarchist), Zionism, and various forms of the psychiatric worldview (Freudian psychoanalysis and related schools) all emphasize the tainted or sick qualities of Gentile existence, be it in exploitive capitalism, aggressive nationalism, or repressive Victorian prudery.” [LINDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 14]

On one hand deconstructing their traditional religious faith in terms of collective neurosis, the Jewish nature of the psychoanalytic community yet echoes the exclusivist tribal ethic – the “choseness” and “apartness” from others – of
classical Judaism. “Psychoanalysis from its origins,” notes Kevin MacDonald, “has been a ‘science apart’ from the rest of psychology and psychiatry, resulting in two separate and incompatible discourses about human behavior. Psychoanalysis was and remains a highly authoritarian movement in which group boundaries are rigidly maintained and in which heretics are expelled.” [MACDONALD, p. 237] This ethos of a psychoanalytic chosen people was criticized by a Swiss psychiatrist, Eugen Bleuler, who was courted by Freud to join the early psychoanalytic movement. Bleuler resisted the absolutism of the Freudi ans, telling Freud that “this ‘who is not for us is against us,’ this ‘all or nothing,’ is necessary for religious and political parties … for science I consider it harmful.” [GAY, p. 145]

In 1990, a (Jewish) psychoanalyst, Jeffrey Mouisaieff Masson, former Projects Director of the Sigmund Freud Archives in London and thereby a member of the international psychoanalytic “inner circle,” wrote a volume exposing the secretive behind-the-scenes foundations of the psychoanalytic community:

“No book has yet told what it is like to undergo training as an orthodox Freudian psychoanalyst. Nor does any book tell what it is like to leave that profitable and prestigious profession – those who have been part of the inner circle of psychoanalysis either do not leave, or have left in discrete silence. Thus, until now it has been almost impossible to get an internal view of the workings of this ‘men’s club’ with its initiation rites; expectations of membership loyalty over truth; pressures to accept concepts handed down from the leader, no matter how irrational; xenophobic banding together against outsiders; and the punishment of anyone who poses questions or finally wants out. It is worth asking why no book like this has appeared before, since people have written accounts of leaving almost every other cult.” [MASSON, J. M., 1990, p. 1-2]

Many Jewish scholars these days are trying to more openly claim Freud as one of their own and find in psychoanalysis its distinctly Jewish foundation. (An important impetus in Freud’s construction of his theories of psychoanalysis is anti-Semitism. See Eric Grollman’s Judaism in Sigmund Freud’s World, for example, for a dose of this perspective). [GROLLMAN, E., 1965] While Freud always presented himself as an atheist and a completely “assimilated” Jew in mainstream Viennese society, there is evidence and argument that Freud was hiding his traditionally Jewish background and conflict with his (now believed to be) religious parents. Freud was even, beginning in 1897, a member of the Vienna chapter of the Jewish fraternal order, B’nai B’rith. Concerning their roots in traditional Judaism, Emmanuel Rice believes that Freud and his family were – to the public – deceptive at the least. “The fact,” says Emmanuel Rice, “that these people were lying either did not occur to or seem to bother them.” [RICE, p. 254] “It appears,” continues Rice, “the family environment of Sigmund Freud’s formative years was far more involved with Judaic scholarship, theological beliefs, and ritual practices than has been traditionally thought to be the case.” [RICE, p. 257] This has significant implications – by the very dic-
tates of psychoanalytic theory which demands an exploration of childhood experiences for the roots of adult psychological behavior– to understand what were Freud’s own “internal conflicts.” And it inevitably leads more deeply to a Jewish specificity in the very foundations of psychoanalytic theory, something that Freud emphatically resisted through most of his life, publicly conceding. Rice even asserts that Freud’s last major work, *Moses and Monotheism*, which scandalized traditional Judaism, must be understood not as scientific theory, but “as a novel with autobiographical elements.” [RICE, p. 235]

Freud was even married to a woman, Martha Bernaya, whose grandfather was the chief rabbi of Hamburg. Raised in an Orthodox household, after Freud’s death she resumed traditionalist customs. [GROLLMAN, E., 1965, p. 70–71]

As Jewish scholar Samuel Klausner notes:

“Freud himself was a Jew, and most of the members of his immediate Vienna circle were Jews. Admittance to the psychoanalytic movement required analysis by a previous initiate, a sort of ‘apostolic succession.’ The original Jewish group tended to analyze Jews. Unwittingly, psychoanalytic ideology may be couched in a Jewish ethic strange to individuals socialized in the Protestant ethic.” [GROLLMAN, E., 1965, p. 43]

Karl Abraham, a close disciple of Freud, took issue with the Master’s reluctance to concede that his completely rationalist view of human psyche – putting the human mind into square pegs – was particularly Jewish. “After all,” said Abraham, “the Talmudic way of thinking cannot suddenly have disappeared from us.” [GAY, p. 131] Freud’s technique, in its exegetical method, he suggested, was “essentially Talmudic.” [OSTROW, p. 25] Aaron Rabinowitz has even written a recent article that “enumerates and discusses some halachic [Jewish religious law] principles and values which are exerting influence on the practice of psychotherapy.” [RABINOWITZ, A., 2000, p. 193] Later in life, Freud admitted in a private letter that “in some place of my soul, in a very hidden corner, I am a fanatical Jew. I am very much astonished to discover myself as such in spite of all my efforts to be unprejudiced and impartial.” [HES, p. 232] In 1977, Freud’s daughter, Anna, guest speaking at a psychoanalytic convention in Jerusalem, created a furor when she announced that the notion of psychoanalysis as a ‘Jewish science’ “can serve as a title of honor.” [GAY, p. 118]

“Although Freud openly questioned all religion,” says M. H. Goldberg, “including Judaism, he always thought of himself as a Jew and raised his six children as Jews. In a letter to his fiancée written in 1882, Freud concluded that ‘something of the core, of the essence of this meaningful and life-affirming Judaism will not be absent from our home’.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 30]

“Freud’s Jewishness [was] ever present in his mind,” suggests Benno Weiser Varon, “This mind, by the way, was a Talmudic mind, searching and speculative.” [VARON, p. 9] Karl Krauss, a prominent Viennese leftist, journalist and baptized Jew, knew Freud and even declared psychoanalysis to be “the conquest of the confessional by the Jews of Vienna.” [VARON, p. 9] He also asserted that
“they have the press, they have the stock exchange, they also have the subconscious!” and that “psychoanalysis is the mental illness it purports to cure.” [WINOKUR, J., 1992, p. 151-152]

Freud himself wrote a special preface to the Hebrew edition of his volume, *Totem and Taboo*, speaking of himself in the third person:

“[He] has never repudiated his people, who feels in essential nature a Jew, and who has no desire to alter this nature. If the question were put to him: ‘Since you have abandoned all the common characteristics of your countrymen, what is there left that is Jewish?’ he would reply: ‘A very good deal and probably its very essence,’ though he could not express that essence clearly in words.” [VARON, p. 9]

Freud once wrote to a Jewish friend that “racial relationship brings you closer to my intellectual constitution.” [ARON, W., 1956-57, p. 290] Willy Aron adds that “in his famous address, ‘On Being of the Sons of the Covenant,’ delivered on May 6, 1926, on his 70th birthday, Freud spoke of ‘the irresistible attraction of Judaism and Jews’ and ‘of the clear consciousness of an inner identity, the intimacy that comes from the same psychic structure.’” [ARON, W., 1956-57, p. 293] Freud further noted his link to the “racial” dimension of Jewishness, that “I can say that I am as little an adherent of the Jewish religion as of any other religion, i.e., I consider them all important as objects of scientific interest, but I do not share the emotional attitudes that goes with them. On the other hand, I have always felt a strong feeling of kinship with my race and have fostered it in my children.” [ARON, p. 294]

Nathan Ackerman cites the following quotes by Freud about his Jewish identity: “A Jew must create a compensating culture or take the gamble of going stark crazy.” … “What bound me to Judaism … was not belief, and not national pride … There were other considerations which made the attractiveness of Judaisms and Jews irresistible … many obscure forces and emotions, all the more powerful the less they were defined in words: … Only to my Jewish nature did I owed the two qualities which had become indispensable to me on my hard road. Because I was a Jew, I found myself free of many prejudices and being a Jew, I was prepared to enter opposition and to renounce agreement with the compact majority.” [ACKERMAN, N., 1965, p. xii] “However abused,” adds Ackerman, paraphrasing Freud, “the Jew must remain true to his people; there is no other way: ‘It always seemed to me [said Freud] not only shameful but downright senseless to deny it.” [ACKERMAN, N., 1965, p. xiii]

“Psychoanalysis is widely thought of as a ‘Jewish science,’ says Arnold Jacob Wolf,

“Indeed, Freud took pains to avert just such a notion, though he himself was, the chief reason for it. The enemies of depth psychology still dismiss it as peculiarly relevant to Jews; its friends note with gratification the biblical roots of the new wisdom. Not only are many practitioners of the art, like the very first analyst, Jews by descent if not conviction, but there is a widespread conviction that the method, the spirit, and even the conclusions of psychoanalysis are para-Judaic …
Freud’s ancestry and the impact of his ancestry upon his deepest feelings are clearly and profoundly Jewish. His affinity for the Jewish style both mystical and rationalist is unmistakable. His newly emphasized prudishness together with his pioneering honesty in sexual matters is Talmudic.” [WOLF, A. J., 1965, p. 133]

Earl Hopper, who acknowledges that “my identity as a Jew is inseparable from my identify as a psychoanalyst,” understands psychoanalysis to be of course a “Jewish science,” but ascribes its roots to Freud’s view that psychoanalysis represents the revolutionary insights of a “marginalized” people, i.e., Jews had been in the past conceptually lumped by gentiles together with thieves, lepers, and misfits of all kinds. [HOPPER, p. 19] The insightful Jewish world view, this argument insists, has therefore keener “outsider” perceptions of the norms of mainstream cultures of the Jewish diaspora. And Jewish genius is to criticize and deconstruct them. (It is interesting that this “marginalized victim people” concept emerges from the minds of rich, elitist Jewish psychoanalysts who imprint their paradigms of victimhood upon usually affluent patient-sponges, Jewish or not).

Arnold Meadow and Harold Vetter even argue that Freudian theory is based on the “Judaic value system” including Judaism’s “this life” (not afterlife) orientation, a “rationalist control over ... sexual urges,” the “hidden meaning of words,” and the presence of the “Oedipus complex ... in Jewish culture, perhaps in peculiarly intense form.” [MEADOW, p. 164] This includes Freud’s notion, claim the authors, that a woman tries to make her husband her child to “act the part of a mother to him.” Furthermore, the authoritarian nature of psychoanalysis emphasizes “rationality as a basis for authority [which] closely parallels the authority relationship found in Jewish culture.” [MEADOW, p. 163] The patient’s resistance to the psychoanalyst’s insights into the patient’s troubles “is diminished by the analyst’s rational interpretation, or by the patient’s positive transference toward the analyst.” [MEADOW, p. 162] To follow the logic of psychoanalysis as an intrinsically Jewish revelation and world view, the patient’s “transference” is ultimately – whatever else it is claimed to be – a sensitization to “being Jewish.”

Economist Peter F. Drucker – whose parents knew Freud – has argued that one of the major reasons for the early resistance to Freud was not only his strange theories, but his elitist and exploitive ethics:

“Freud did not accept charity patients, but taught instead that the psychoanalyst must not treat a patient for free, and that the patient will benefit from treatment only if made to pay handsomely ... Medical Vienna did not ignore or neglect Freud, it rejected him. It rejected him as a person because it held him to be in gross violation of the ethics of healer.” [TORREY, p. ]

Freud, notes Sylvia Rothchild, had an

“inability to take any experience at face value. He treated his pupils as patients, urged them to ‘absorb things, not argue back.’ Freud had no wish to serve suffering humanity. He saw in that wish only sadism, ‘the
apparent desire to help the sick a device to conceal from oneself the wish to do the opposite’ ... He feared death, chased after money, position and reputation.” [ROTHCHILD, S., 11-26-98, p. 24]

(Yet, in allegiance to his Jewish identity, “whenever any of his works were translated into Hebrew or Yiddish, Freud refused to accept royalties.”) [ARON, W., 1956-57, p. 294]

In 1988, Jeffrey Moussaieff, the former Projects Director of the Sigmund Freud Archives and also Jewish, wrote one of his volumes attacking the psychoanalytic community, this book entitled Against Therapy, which outlines his enormous disillusionment with the principles and Thought Police practices of psychoanalysis. This includes Masson’s outrage over the field’s innately authoritarian manner, its manipulative control of patients, abridgement of ethical norms, and the systematic exploitation for personal profit of the emotionally vulnerable. Masson’s observations of the psychoanalytic community include many general themes from Jewish history we have often seen before. “It is the world of therapy,” he charges,

“it is therapy itself that is at the core of the corruption I have described in this book. Every therapist, no matter how kindly and benign in appearance and behavior, is sooner or later drawn into that corruption, because the profession itself is corrupt. A profession that depends for its existence on other people’s misery is at special risk. The very mainspring of psychotherapy is profit from another person’s suffering ... [MASSON, p. 251] ... Abuse of one form or another is built into the very fabric of psychotherapy – that power corrupts, that psychiatric power corrupts just as political power does and that the greater the power [over patients], the greater the propensity for corruption ... The psychotherapeutic relationship is a self-policing profession. The psychotherapeutic relationship is a privileged one, protected by a tradition of secrecy.” [MASSON, 1988, p. 168]

In another volume, Masson observes that Freud’s teachings became a “profitable profession with all the trappings of a jealously protected guild. The price for joining this fraternity is silence about its membership policy. Corruption is incorporated, not exposed; prejudice and bias have been accepted, even embraced.” [MASSON, 1990, p. 4] In this volume, Final Analysis, Masson exposes the Orwellian, irrational, and totalitarian world of the psychoanalytic community. As part of his training to become a psychoanalyst, Masson was forced to undergo five years of psychoanalysis himself (at a 1971 cost of $75 an hour, five days a week). [MASSON, 1990, p. 21] Masson discovered soon that the psychoanalyst, Irvine Schiffer (also Jewish), for his sessions was a manipulative, unethical, maniacally sexist, two-faced and exploitive dictator/liar who eventually sought to exploit Masson to further his own career, insisting that a paper Masson planned on writing should be partially credited to his therapist. [MASSON, 1990, p. 69-70, 75, 82-83] This therapist was also the president of the Toronto Psychoanalytic Institute. [MASSON, 1990, p. 21] In telling one’s most intimate and embarrassing secrets to another (with no parallel exchange), the confessor becomes profoundly
vulnerable and beholding to the Listener. As in all of psychoanalytic terrain, the therapist ultimately holds the revelations of the Confessor as a potential weapon against him. Masson was also outraged when the therapist inanely decided that Mr. Masson’s fundamental psychological problem was that he wanted to be a beautiful woman! [MASSON, 1990, p. 104] In his training to become a therapist in the secretive and authoritarian world of psychoanalysis, Masson was also told by a professor that copies of some psychoanalytic journals could not be exposed to the “lay public.” [MASSON, p. 111] Another taught that spies should sometimes investigate patients’ lives. [MASSON, p. 110]

In the early days of psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud was actually relieved to count Carl Gustav Jung – a non-Jew – as an adherent to the psychoanalysis bandwagon and was careful to keep him in the fold. “Gentile proselytes,” notes John Murray Cuddihy, “could shore up [Freud’s] self-doubt that psychoanalysis might not be, as its adherents claimed, a “science” at all ... but a social-cultural movement of Diaspora Jews.” [CUDDIHY, p. 77] Without non-Jews in the psychoanalytic fold, Freud and his Jewish associates ran the profound risk – with the emphasis on the likes of penis envy, the Oedipal Complex, strange sexual obsessions, the Death Wish, the focus on neurosis and anxiety, and all the rest of it – of being mercilessly ridiculed and humiliated as merely participants in a bizarre Jewish cult, evidence, for anti-Jewish critics, of Jewish degradation.

Freud, in a letter to fellow Jewish psychoanalyst, Karl Abraham, wrote: “You are closer to my intellectual constitution because of racial kinship while he [Jung] as a Christian and pastor’s son finds his way to me only against great inner resistances. His association with us is very valuable for that. I nearly said that it was only by his appearance on the scene that psychoanalysis escaped the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair.” [CUDDIHY p. 77] Later, in another letter to Abraham, Freud added: “Our Aryan comrades are really completely indispensable to us, otherwise psychoanalysis would succumb to anti-Semitism.” [CUDDIHY, p. 82] There are those who even suggest that Sabina Spielrin, a Jewish woman (and, as one journalist put it, “a compulsive masturbator”) who was Jung’s patient and lover, was a “honey trap’ offered by Freud ... to keep Jung in the analytic movement.” [KELLAWAY, K., p. 10]

Freud was a contemporary in Vienna of Theodore Herzl, the acknowledged “founder” of Zionism and modern state of Israel. “Freud had a high regard for Theodore Herzl and was closely acquainted with him.” [MEITLIS, J., p. 21] Herzl, remarks Cuddihy, believed that non-Jews are found “in two and only two varieties, namely ... overt and covert anti-Semites. Any wide reading in Freud puts it beyond doubt that he shared this conviction.” [CUDDIHY, p. 78] “Freud always gave a generous contribution” to the Zionist youth organization Hechaluz [the Pioneers] and in 1936 finally “openly aligned himself with the Zionist cause.” [BERKELEY, p. 235, p. 191] “Zionism,” Freud wrote in a private letter in 1930, “awakened my strongest sympathies, which are still faithfully attached to it today.” [GAY, p. 123] “We are all of the same blood,” Freud once told Jewish friend Jacob Meitlis. “Basically, all are anti-Semites. They are everywhere. Frequently it is latent and hidden, but it is there.” [MEITLIS, p. 20]
Dr. Leo Goldhammar, a friend of Freud, noted an arresting dream Freud had in the early 1900s. Goldhammar recorded a dream of Freud about Theodore Herzl. In this dream, as told by Freud, Herzl conveyed to Freud the idea of immediate action regarding Palestine if the Jewish people is to be saved. Freud remarked in his lecture on the dream that never before had he been interested in Herzl’s ideas. Some time later he met the real person of his dream on a bus and was struck by the great resemblance of the real Herzl to the image beheld in his dream.” [ARON, W., 1956-57, p. 294]

Freudianism proved useful in arguing Zionist theory. “The Zionist critique of assimilation ... [i.e., that Jews are perpetually destined to be a ‘nation apart’ as an inassimilable people in non-Jewish lands],” notes Donald Niewyk, “... rested on a certain conviction that all efforts to blend with non-Jews must lead unswervingly to deformed Jewish lives. The new discipline of psychoanalysis was mustered to demonstrate the neurotic effects of divided consciousness. Rootlessness and inferiority complexes were shown to generate everything from revolutionary activity to Jewish anti-Semitism, extreme German nationalism, and suicide.” [NIEWYK, D., p. 126]

“Freud’s Jewish identity,” says Sander Gilman, “echoes throughout the history of psychoanalysis as part of its rhetoric.” [GILMAN, p. 93] As such, it was – and is – a warped and constrictive system for a non-Jew. “When one rebels within or against psychoanalysis,” adds Gilman, “one seemingly natural rhetoric in which this rebellion takes place in articulation is an opposition to the ‘Jewish’ nature of the field.”

What non-Jew would respond positively, favorably, to the inevitable manifestations of Freud’s core belief about himself and his people, (an undercurrent of psychoanalysis), and how Jews traditionally treat those outside their own community? Freud wrote it this way:

“We may start from a character of the Jews which dominates their relationship to others. There is no doubt that they have a particularly high opinion of themselves, that they regard themselves as more distinguished, of higher standing, as superior to other peoples.” [FREUD, p. 105-106]

This is the very paradigm of the foundations of psychoanalysis itself. As Freud wrote, the doctor-patient relationship is a “situation in which there is a superior and a subordinate.” [MASSON, p. 3] That subordinate, of course, is the patient who, by virtue of the very principle of psychotherapy, does not negotiate understanding with an overseer, but must entirely bend to the analyst’s dictatorial will. And this dictatorial will, by conceptual origin, rationalist method, and omnipresent propagation, is Jewish-centered.

Freud’s sense of Jewish superiority was documented a number of times, once expressed in the context of the death of a Jewish colleague. “We were both Jews,” said Freud, “and knew of each other that we carried that miraculous thing in common which – inaccessible to any analysis so far – makes the Jews.” [GAY, p. 133] One scholar notes that “Freud’s undefined sense of Jewishness
represents a special case of his obstinate belief in the inheritance of acquired characteristics,” as manifest in their “harsh, obsessive, self-punishing religion.” [GAY, p. 133] Among Freud’s later disciples, A. A. Roback, a Jew and Russian-American psychologist, sought “the actual causes of the Jewish birth and nursing of psychoanalysis in the peculiar makeup of the Jew.” [GAY, Moment, p. 48]

Understandably, eventually Freud and Jung began having serious disagreements. Jung, attributing many of the Jews’ psychological problems to their own particular sense of rootlessness, decided that Freud’s special Jewish hang-ups couldn’t be generalized and universalized onto everybody else’s’ psyche too. Said Jung:

“The Jewish problem is a regular complex, a festering wound... Are we really to believe that a tribe which has wandered throughout history for several thousand years as ‘God’s Chosen People’ was not put up to such an idea by some quite special psychological peculiarity? If no difference exists, how do we recognize Jews at all? ... All branches of humanity unite in one stem – yes, but what is a stem without separate branches? Why this ridiculous touchiness when anybody dares to say anything about the psychological differences between Jews and Christians?” [HANNAH, p. 224-225]

Among Jung’s earliest rebellions against his mentor was to challenge Freud’s theory that children have incestuous desires for their opposite gender parents. And what, one wonders, of traditional Jewish obsessive concern with the prestige and pedigrees of their respective genealogical lineages (called “yicchus”) in association with Freud’s claim that all people reject their parents (Freud’s were not well off) and imagine them to be “members of an aristocratic and/or royal family”? [RICE, p. 239] Jewish author Frederic Grunfeld dismisses Jung’s disenchantment with the Jewish base of Freudianism thusly: “Freud was accused, not only by fools but even by C. G. Jung, of purveying ‘Jewish psychologyl.”” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 21]

Jung eventually defected from Freud and his Jewish circle, and became influential in the field of psychology in his own right. And what did this defection signify to Freud? “By the time Jung withdrew from Freud and others in the psychoanalytic community,” says Stephen Martin, “the accusation [against Jung] of anti-Semitism spread with alarming rapidity.” [MAIDENBAUM, p. 5] Even in 1991, a Jewish student applying for a postdoctoral grant from Hebrew University to train in Zurich as a Jungian psychoanalyst was told “that Jung was an anti–Semite at best and was in fact quite possibly a Nazi sympathizer if not an active party member.” [MAIDENBAUM, Introduction]

Early Freud follower Ernest Jones noted his sense of the nature of the Jewish psychoanalytic field:

“I became, of course, aware somewhat to my astonishment of how extraordinarily suspicious Jews could be of the faintest sign of anti-Semitism and of how many remarks or actions could be interpreted in that sense ... Freud himself was pretty sensitive in this respect.” [GROLL-MAN, E., 1965, p. 105]
One of the Freudian explanations for this anti-Semitism, “the deepest source of anti-Semitism,” says Judy Cooper, is “the Jewish practice of circumcision ... [Freud] considered this to be a primeval custom used as a symbolic substitute for castration and an expression of subjugation to the father’s will.” [COOPER, p. 7]

Freud, like most Jews in our own day, saw in any resistance to his will the latent pulse of anti-Semitism. When “the first foreign [Swiss] recruits to psychoanalysis rejected Freud’s ‘theory of anal-eroticism,’” says Cooper, he saw it as an anti-Semitic attack on the Jews of Vienna. Freud complained that

“There [in Switzerland] one hears just the argument I tried to avoid by making Zurich the centre [of psychoanalysis]. [They say that] Viennese sensuality is not to be found anywhere else! Between the lines you can read further that we Viennese are not only swine but also Jews.” [COOPER, p. 6]

Freud, says Cooper, argued that Jews were “free from prejudice which restricted others in the use of their intellect,” whereas “the Swiss [i.e., non-Jews] had to rid themselves of deep cultural attitudes, beliefs and prejudices to which they were profoundly attached, even though they considered themselves to be fully emancipated.” [COOPER, p. 6] Other anti-Semites in Freud’s eventual sphere, claims Cooper, included Virginia Woolf, one of Freud’s publishers; Ernest Jones, one of his biographers; and much of the early French Psychoanalytic Society of the 1920’s. [COOPER, p. 9]

A rare Pakistani psychotherapist, Masud Khan, who lived and worked in Britain, is afforded special attention by Judy Cooper (a Jewish psychotherapist who spent six years in therapy under him) as an anti-Semite. Khan complained that “the strength of the Jews is that they have no sensitivity about the contempt in which others hold them,” “what makes Jews insufferable is that in order to love themselves they have to be hated by others first,” and “the impact of the Judaic-Yiddish-Jewish bias of psychoanalysis was neither small nor slight to me.” [COOPER, p. 11] None of these Khan comments of course have any verifiable basis in reality for Cooper except as evidence for his irrational anti-Semitism.

Even Jeffrey Moussieff Masson, a Jewish critic of the “corrupt” foundations of psychoanalysis, blamed a Gentile (in training to become a psychoanalyst) for the death of a Jewish patient. Why? Because the non-Jew would not/could not bend to see the patient’s very particular Jewish world, one which is singularly welded to the lens of an omnipresent anti-Semitism. This (and a non-Jewish irritation with Freud’s compulsion for Jewish “themes”), decides Masson, is itself an act of anti-Semitism. To both the patient and Masson, the non-Jew learning to be a psychoanalyst is an anti-Semite. Masson’s comments reflect the implicit Jewish/Gentile divisive undercurrent about anti-Semitism within the psychoanalytic, and any other, field. “One of my fellow candidates was Catholic,” decides Masson,

“and was preoccupied with a Catholic theology. He had the misfortune to have as a patient a Jewish survivor of the concentration camps.
During one of the case seminars [at a Toronto university] he explained to the class that this patient suspected him of anti-Semitism. Since he had once complained to me that Freud was too preoccupied with ‘Jewish’ themes, I was sympathetic to her concerns. ‘I am asking for help,’ he said, looking miserable. I thought this only fair. No doubt he wanted to ask somebody else, somebody more sensitive to these issues, to take over the case. ‘How can I get her to understand that this is merely a projection, and a paranoid one at that? She is being chased all right, but her tormentors, her persecutors, are inside her own head. She can’t see that, and she thinks the worst problem is that she has fallen on a bad analyst.’ She was right, I thought. The class and the supervisor all urged him to redouble his efforts to provide this woman with ‘insight.’ But from class to class, things got worse. ‘She is convinced that she is locked into a life-and-death struggle with me, and if she cannot get me to change, she is going to kill herself. How do I get her to see that the change must be in her, not me?’ I could not see how this attitude could possibly help her. One day he came to class and was crying, ‘She killed herself.’” [MASSON, J. M., 1990, p. 106]

At root in this story here, Holocaust victim or not, there is indeed a profound therapist-patient struggle. It centers upon the Jewish demand that non-Jews sensitize themselves to the peculiar particulars of “being Jewish,” especially an insistence that non-Jews are, virtually by nature, irrationally anti-Semitic and that to deny this alleged “fact” is itself an expression of the irrational “disease.”

A clear example of this psychotherapy-induced Gentile sensitization to being Jewish is the case of non-Jewish journalist Ross Wetzsteon (“I was immediately drawn to the Jews because they seemed so attractive and because the WASPs seemed so repellent.”) Wetzsteon, after asserting the truths of Jewish “pushiness” and “vulgarity” as verifiable social traits (“Jewish vulgarity, in short, became a kind of intellectual and moral critique of the WASP mentality”), as well as his alienation from his own family and WASP culture, turns to explain how psychotherapy has liberated him from the “deceitful facade” of WASP identity. “I’ll never forget,” he writes,

“how much my therapy had to do with my pleasure. For me, therapy was primarily a means of liberating my inner vulgarity, of releasing a kind of pushiness and ostentation in my psychic life – it was a way of discovering that the things I valued most were radically opposed to the WASP ideals I’d internalized ... The important point is that it was quite clear to me that the Jew and the psychotherapist joined forces in the abolition of WASP hypocrisy, WASP decorum, and WASP censorship. I even came to see a parallel – while obviously aware of the disparities – between Jewish social liberation and my own psychological liberation. My ghetto was my head, my assimilation was through therapy ... So when I say that psychotherapy revealed to me the authenticity of feeling, I’m saying that the experience was a way of becoming a mensch [Yiddish
for ‘good man’]. Thus, to me, psychotherapy became what Freud most feared – a Jewish science ... I regard myself as an ‘honorary’ Jew.”

[WEZSTEON, R., SEPT 6-12, 1998]

Freud’s broad version of psychoanalysis as a respected “science” to this day has a constrictive ideological foundation. And what is the essential spirit of it? “The negative character of psycho dynamic theory,” suggests Martin Gross, “with its emphasis on abnormalities ... is a magnificent legacy of Freud’s own neuroses.” Freud’s official biographer, wrote that for nearly a decade up to 1900 the founder of psychoanalysis had his own “considerable psycho neurosis, characterized by swings of mood from extreme exhilaration to profound depression and twilight states of consciousness.” [EYSENCK, p. 38] Freud was also addicted to cocaine, and he prescribed it to others. [GROSS, p. 234-235; ROTHCHILD, S., 11-26-98, p. 24]

And, if one resists Freudian dictates? For the psychoanalytic Thought Police, it is evidence, of course, of anti-Semitism. “Even the ‘normal’ mind,” notes Frederick Crews, “in a Freudian view, is thought to consist of encrusted reaction formations against hideously aggressive impulses that remain capable of eruption; and what target of philistine malice could be more suitable than Freud and Freudians themselves, the bearers of the frightening news about those subterranean forces? To such a mindset, irreverence toward the official though mythic account of Freud’s triumphs takes on the appearance not just of a private neurotic ailment but of a pogrom in the making.” [CREWS, F., 1998, p. xxi]

Whether one addresses the Jewish dimensions of the field, psychoanalysis is so overwhelmingly Jewish that in some quarters critics of Freudian theory are considered instant anti-Semites, “not just allies of the Christian far right but as latter-day Nazis hunting down ‘Freudian Jews’.” [CREWS, F., 1998, p. xxi]

In recent years a firestorm of material has been published that attacks Freudian theory and “it’s malignant affect ... on American thought and culture.” [TORREY, Title Page] Freud, writes H. J. Eysenck, “was, without doubt, a genius, not of science, but of propaganda, not of rigorous proof, but of persuasion ... His place is not, as he claimed, with Copernicus and Darwin, but with Hans Christian Anderson and the Brothers Grimm, tellers of fairy tales.” [EYSENCK, p. 208] “Freudians are finding themselves on the defensive,” noted Frederick Crews in 1998, “and the strategies of special pleading that they adopt are themselves symptomatic of intellectual bankruptcy ... Thus it was Freud’s closest friend Fliess who pointed out in 1901 that Freud was ascribing his own thoughts to the minds of his patients.” [CREWS, F., 1998, p. xxviii]

Not unexpectedly, even Orthodox Jews have attacked Freudian theory and its perceived corrosive effect on traditional values. “The priesthood of Freud’s cult,” wrote Martin Kushner, “as a vested interest, tries to strengthen and perpetuate itself, not unlike any other vested interest.” [GAY, p. 97]

Freud’s influence in Western culture to this day remains incredible; it has permeated all facets of modern life, from literature to toilet training. Psychoanalysts head over half of the departments of psychiatry at American medical schools. “I am bewildered,” said Dr. William Sargent, a former head of St. Tho-
mas Hospital in England, “at the way direction and control of American psychiatry has been taken over since World War II by psychoanalysis.” [GROSS, p. 145] And as Kate Millet has noted, “The prestige of Freud’s sexual theories did not arrive at, still less maintain, such complete ascendancy [in Europe] as they achieved in the United States. In America, the influence of Freud is almost incalculable.” [MILLET, p. 178]

So where does this all lead us, per the subject at hand: Jews, non-Jews, and the subject of anti-Semitism? This is what Freud had to say about the reasons for anti-Semitism:

“With regard to antisemitism, I don’t really want to search for explanations; I feel strong inclination to surrender to my affects in this matter and find myself confirmed in my wholly non-scientific belief that mankind ... by and large are a wretched lot.” [ZUKIER, H., 1999, p. 118]

With the rigid conviction that anti-Semitism is an irrational, baseless animosity towards Jews, immediately after World War II and in the stormy months before the founding of Israel, American Jewish organizations began, quite literally, to plan their propaganda strategies. The revelation of Hitler’s atrocities against Jews publicly elevated Jews to widespread sympathy and an uncontested “higher moral ground,” disarming to our own day any public criticism of Jewry and only rarely the rising Jewish state of Israel. The practical question for Jewish organizations (particularly, but not only, the Zionist ones) was: how do Jews best ride this wave of popular sympathy for their plight under Hitler into the far future? To deflect any argument from the historical record scathing of Jews, it was deemed extremely important to implant in American public opinion the notion that any criticism of Jews had no rational causal basis and was, by definition, originated in mental illness. And an entire “science,” albeit a disguised Jewish one, was at their command to prove it.

As Jewish psychoanalyst Rudolf Lowenstein declared in 1951:

“Inaccessibility to reason is also one of the most typical characteristics of the anti-Semite, who is unable to re-evaluate his opinions and prejudices in the light of factual evidence that refutes them. The passions and the unconscious motives and mechanisms involved in his anti-Semitic feelings are too powerful to yield to reason or experience. We find therefore that although anti-Semitism cannot be placed in any one of the well-known clinical categories it is nevertheless frequently an indication of some sort of mental disturbance that could be classified among the social mental diseases.” [LOEWENSTEIN, R., 1951, p. 18-19]

Among the powerful Jewish lobbying organizations seeking to disseminate such notions was the American Jewish Committee, one of the many Jewish groups that actively support the state of Israel. (AJC’s efforts to effect social change in America include “the elimination of expression of religion in the public schools with special reference to the observation of Christmas,” opposition to quota-oriented affirmative action legislation (because it hurts Jews), and “continued campaigns ... to make people aware of Arab funding over American educational institutions.” [DOBKOWSKI, p. 39] The AJC also was
actively involved in the successful lobby of the Vatican to formally change traditional Catholic teachings that Jews killed Christ. [DOMBKOWSKI, p. 37]

Jewish communal organizations have long been active in socially engineering non-Jewish perceptions of the Jewish community against any instinct towards criticism (i.e., “anti-Semitism.”) As Eli Ginzberg noted in 1949, “Today at least among large numbers of American Jews, the ‘defense activities’ have usurped a position of priority. This was more or less inevitable since many of these Jews have lost all interest in positive Jewish values; their entire adjustment is externally oriented. Finally, we are confronted with the amazing belief among American Jews ... that the basic attitudes of the Gentiles toward the Jews can be significantly altered, if only the right ‘techniques’ are discovered and employed.” [HERTZBERG, A., 1989, p. 331]

A good example of this is the American Jewish Committee’s efforts to use Freudian theory to explain, and diffuse, the anti-Semitic threat. “A recent conference called by the most outstanding Jewish defense agency [AJC] in this country,” wrote Max Horkheimer (head of an AJC committee) in 1946, “... was attended by experts from all over America. Many questions were presented: In setting up a defense program against anti-Semitism, what type of propaganda should be used? What should be said? ... Should there simply be an appeal for fair play, to a sense of justice in the individual, to the ideals of democracy? The psychoanalytic answer would be in the negative. A mere appeal to the conscious mind does not suffice, because anti-Semitism and the susceptibility to anti-Semitic propaganda spring from the unconscious.” [HORKHEIMER, p. 2]

Here Horkheimer asserts that a rational appeal to democratic principles of fairness, justice, equality, and humanitarianism in an open and civilized forum to “clear the air” of anti-Jewish complaint will never work because the source of such complaint is – by the psychoanalytic definition – purely emotional and irrational. Jews, in this scenario, are always scapegoats for non-Jewish problems. A critique of Jewish identity and behavior is not, to the “normal” mind, even on the map. It is, by psychoanalytic definition, rationally impossible. Criticism of the Jewish community is thereby merely a manifestation of human psychological sickness. The only option for Jews, as Horkheimer and his psychoanalytic colleagues see it, is a “propaganda” that entirely denies “anti-Semites” (generally broadly considered to be anyone who criticizes Jews or Israel) a forum for their grievances. Hence, no credence or attention is afforded whatsoever to the very materially concrete and well-documented socio-economic roles of Jews that oppressed others through history; the centrality of money-making and exploitation of others in the Jewish world view and the traditional Jewish double moral standard towards this task; public animosity towards Jews throughout history as financiers, economic middlemen, and money dealers; legal sanctions for unethical conduct towards Gentiles in the Talmud; religiously sanctioned Jewish separatism, racism, and contempt for non-Jews; and the implications of all this to international Jewry, Israel, and modern times. (Horkheimer, by the way, was a refugee from Nazi Germany where he had been the Director of the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt,
a school noted for its Marxist and Freudian foundations. “Most of the roughly 50 members of the institution’s staff,” notes Nachum Gidal, “were of Jewish origin.” [GIDAL, p. 354] “Germans of Jewish background,” note Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, “dominated another important group of intellectuals during the Weimar period, the Frankfurt-based Institut für Sozialforschung, whose leading members became collectively known as the ‘Frankfurt School.’” This roster included some extraordinarily distinguished and influential figures, including T. W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse, and Walter Benjamin. With the exception of Karl Wittfogel, who left the Institute rather early to become an anti-Marxist conservative, all the initial members were of Jewish background (Adorno was half-Jewish). Most of the Frankfurt School were the sons of successful businessmen.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 86]

“In 1943,” notes Stuart Svonkin, when the Institute for Social Research set up shop at Columbia University in New York City,

“the American Jewish Committee entered into a contract with the ISR under which the institute was to investigate contemporary American anti-Semitism.” [SVONKIN, S., 1997, p. 33]

The fortification of the Jewish people and their influence over American public opinion by legions of committed Jewish psychoanalysts and their “science” in the hunt for the omnipresent anti-Semite and to eradicate its attendant irrational “prejudice” was begun in earnest. “In the first week, and months, after the end of the second World War,” notes J. J. Goldberg, “the organized Jewish community launched a broad ranging campaign to end prejudice and discrimination in America ... It was a huge, coordinated campaign, waged in the courts and the legislature, in the media and in the streets.” [GOLDBERG, J.J. p. 119] The result of this profoundly powerful lobbying effort is a ruthless political weapon, a one-way dictatorship of accusation against any kind of critic of Jews. As Rabbi Daniel Lapin notes the situation today, even “the unfounded charge of ‘anti-Semite’ brands the victim and leaves the accuser absolved.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 285]

Jewish author Stuart Svonkin notes that in the late 1930s

“the AJC and the ADL each launched ambitious programs aimed at unmasking rabble-rousers and ‘immunizing’ Americans against anti-Semitism ... Using the radio, the press, and other mass media, the AJC and ADL embarked on a joint campaign of public education that portrayed anti-Semitism as the opening gambit in a Nazi scheme to ‘divide and conquer’ the United States. Both agencies spent large sums of money producing and distributing leaflets, pamphlets, and books that provided a positive image of Jews while depicting Nazism as atheistic, antidemocratic, and un-American – not simply anti-Semitic ... The Jewish agencies’ propaganda campaign reflected the assumption that anti-Semitism was rooted in ignorance about Jews and Judaism ... Like their counterparts at the AJC, ADL staff members formed working relationships with reporters, publishers, newspaper columnists, radio sta-
tion managers, and moviemakers, through which they were able to counteract anti-Semitic stereotypes and emphasize the importance of interreligious unity. The ADL and the AJC both obscured the Jewish origins of their efforts by unobtrusively subsidizing newspapers, church groups, labor unions, professional organizations, and German American organizations that spread anti-Nazi, pro-democratic propaganda.” [SVONKIN, S., 1997, p. 15-16]

Glen Jean Sonne describes one of the successful American Jewish prototypes to silence a critic of Jewry, this one a preacher and right-winger, Gerald K. Smith, in the 1940s:

“Indeed there was a Jewish plan (‘plot’ is too strong a word); and it was more effective than many of Smith’s opponents anticipated. The strategy devised was to deny Smith any publicity. This plan evolved after several years of spirited debate within the Jewish community; it required a herculean effort to convince and coordinate the press as well as fellow Jews. Although never completely effective, the strategy reduced Smith from a highly publicized public figure in the 1930s to a pariah in the postwar period ...” [SONNE, J., 1986, p. 153]

Popular Jewish convention also held –as one 1950s study of Jewish American college students found – organized Jewish efforts to thwart anti-Jewish hostility should be accomplished “secretly.” “The desire to please and appease the powerful Gentile,” noted Joseph Adelson in discussing the results of his survey of Jews, “is reflected in the belief that organizational response to anti-Semitism, when it is necessary, should be of a quiet, secret, conspiratorial nature. Organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League should avoid stirring up public attention.” [ADELSON, J., 1960, p. 478]

By 1950, the “Department of Scientific Research” (headed by Horkheimer) of the AJC sponsored an influential study, led by Dr. Nathan Ackerman of Columbia University, designed to equate mental illness and anti-Semitism. The resultant volume, Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder (co-authored with Marie Jahoda), became an authoritative source and is cited in the bibliographies of many later books about anti-Semitism. Ackerman’s research was not exploratory investigation per se. Cloaked beneath the robes of psychoanalytic scientism, it was closer in spirit to a McCarthy-inspired witch hunt, which entered American political life a few years later. Information was merely solicited from American psychoanalysts by open invitation in this study to prove the thesis that anyone who complains about any aspect of Jewish behavior is crazy. (In 1996, Jewish psychoanalyst Mortimer Ostrow reported upon his own 9-year research project sponsored by the “Psychoanalysis Research and Development Fund” on the same topic: “We anticipated that the psychoanalytic method could be usefully applied to the phenomenon of anti-Semitism, since anti-Semitism seems to be largely irrational. Its ubiquity and presence cannot be explained by any realistic considerations.”) [OSTROW, p. 3]

The bedrock for such a study originates here: “[Freud’s] historic neurotic personality,” says Martin Gross,” has had a profound effect on our culture. It
has thrust Freud’s worst indispositions into our language, our mental habits, and our psychology ... one trait was his bad-tempered insistence that secret hostility was paramount in the human psyche.” [GROSS, p. 243] (Might this be a clue, one wonders, to distinctly Jewish “secret hostility.”)

In the introductory statements to his study of anti-Semitism, Ackerman notes that he and his colleagues are Jews. He then bluntly confesses his emotional bias on the subject of anti-Semitism, dismisses objectivity and “detachment from the issue” as being “logically and psychologically untenable,” declares that “value judgments enter into every step of social research,” and then begins – paradoxically and hypocritically – a discussion of the evils of “prejudice” and “prejudgment” (as expressed by anti-Semites) on the very next pages! [ACKERMAN, p. 1-4] “Inherent,” he boldly pronounces, “in the process of prejudgments is the danger of stereotypical thinking.” Lost in his zealous dedication to diagnose his preconceived world of endemic Jew-haters Ackerman somehow misses – from the very start – that his own “value judgments” are quintessential prejudgments.

Ackerman conjures up a broad definition of anti-Semitism, wide enough to catch virtually anyone in his “prejudicial” net (including plenty of Jews, as we shall see): “Anti-Semitism is any expression of hostility, verbal or behavioral, mild or violent, against Jews as a group, or against an individual Jew because of his belonging to that group.” [ACKERMAN, p. 19] That’s the entire definition. This net that even includes “any-mild-verbal-hostility” catches a lot of minions, and anyone short of a saint. In fact, it catches – as intended – everyone. Lest anyone dare to think that they are not themselves fertile grounds for the disease of anti-Semitism, Ackerman notes that “the difference between the ‘sick’ and the ‘healthy’ personality is one of degree and quantity rather than one of quality.” [ACKERMAN, p. 18]

This professor, in consort with the American Jewish Committee, contacted a number of “accredited” New York city psychiatrists – some were Jews, some were not. He doesn’t provide exact numbers or proportions. Ackerman only says that “a small number of psychiatrists were first approached.” [ACKERMAN, p.11] Later he says “the cooperation of psychoanalysts was then enlisted on a large scale,” [ACKERMAN, p.15] and he leaves it at that, except to add that some case histories were further solicited from two social-welfare agencies. [ACKERMAN, p.16] Suspiciously, he does not ever note, other than in these vague terms, the number of psychiatrists who participated in his project, let alone how many were Jewish and how many Gentile. Whoever they were, he asked them to submit case histories of patients who exhibited “signs of anti-Semitism” (the psychiatrists were to determine the “signs” as they wished – “The psychoanalyst was completely at liberty to include any fact that seemed relevant to the patient’s anti-Semitism”). [ACKERMAN, p. 11] Ackerman doesn’t note if the patients gave consent to use their personal traumas, fears, and pains for this study, or even if they were informed of its existence.

Ackerman then decided that it was “essential” that those under his employ (who interviewed the New York psychiatrists about anti-Semitism) had to be
themselves psychoanalyzed. “This,” he says, “helped to establish quickly an atmosphere of confidence between the psychoanalyst and research personnel.” [ACKERMAN, p.15] It would also, of course, be an invasive and authoritarian way to weed out anyone who might have questions about the direction, or methodology, of his project.

The conclusions reached by Ackerman and his colleagues from the collection of random case histories volunteered to them are self-fulfilling, and sometimes outright bizarre. Whose “prejudices and prejudgments” are we hearing about when Ackerman states that “some of the psychoanalysts said that they had not encountered a single case of anti-Semitism in all their practice, others declared that every patient they had ever treated, whether Gentile or Jew, showed some traces of it”? [ACKERMAN, p. 20] (Ackerman discreetly avoids telling us how Jewish and Gentile psychiatrists line up behind these opposite experiences).

A few highlights from his research conclusions are as follows:

• “Anti-Semitic reactions are found in psycho neurotics in various types; in character disorders, perhaps more particularly of the sado-masochistic type.”

• “All individuals ... suffer from anxiety.... In most cases it was of a special nature: it was diffuse, pervasive, relatively unorganized, and not adequately channeled through specific symptom-formation.”

• “Plagued by a vague apprehension of the world at-large, these patients seem to derive little, if any, strength from their own identity.”

• “It is extremely difficult for these anti-Semitic personalities to achieve satisfactory personal relationships.”

• “The very existence of the Jews ... is a constant and painful reminder of the anti-Semites own emotional deficiencies.”

• “The emotional deficiencies of these patients, extending beyond the sphere of human relations, seem also to have impaired their capacity to establish a satisfactory relationship with external objects.”

• “At the psychic level, anti-Semitic hostility can be viewed as a profound though irrational and futile defensive effort to restore a crippled self.”

• “In a pathetic and futile attempt at genuine acceptance by other human beings, these persons are often driven into a slavish imitation of habits and ideologies by those who represent cohesive power in their community.” [p. 69]

This is, of course, an entire volume of such material. But one of Ackerman’s more summary insights into the generic, stereotypical enemy is this: “The tendency to blame the outside world rather than oneself accompanies all the reactions of the anti-Semite.” This rebellious trait against the “outside world” and the refusal to blame oneself for the social, economic and political failings of the world would have to be considered endemic to the world’s greatest social thinkers and revolutionaries, humanitarians, artists and intellectuals of all kinds (including Ralph Waldo Emerson who wrote that “Society everywhere is in
conspiracy against the manhood of every one of its members ... The base doctrine of the majority of voices usurps the place of the doctrine of the soul.” Ironically, conversely, the tendency to “blame the outside world rather than oneself” has also always been a Jewish defense mechanism in denying Jewish responsibility for anti-Semitism.

Among the most extraordinary findings in Ackerman’s research was the ethnicity of the “anti-Semites” he and his cohorts discovered. Of the 40 case studies cited in the book, 8 individuals were themselves born Jews, another 3 were “half-Jews,” one more was “part Jewish,” another was married to a Jew, and yet another was “half-Jewish” and adopted by a Jewish couple. Only one of the non-Jewish anti-Semites, as Ackerman tells us, was “colored.” [ACKERMAN, p. 95-129] (Ackerman, of course, decides that the Black woman’s dislike of Jews was displaced. Didn’t she know that she really hated Whites? “But,” says the professor, “to admit hostility against all whites was realistically too dangerous, particularly since she was being advised by a white psychiatrist worker. She, therefore, displaced her hostility to the Jews.”)

Does this tell us, as these kinds of researchers would propagandize, that evidence of such great Jewish self-dissain merely evidences that the scourge of anti-Semitism is so prominent in American society that even large numbers of Jews blindly absorb it like mindless sponges? Or might it indicate that being Jewish is not sacrosanct, and that some parts of the Jewish experience – like any other people on earth – warrant reasonable criticism? And, further, might it not be psychologically healthy for those troubled with their Jewish identities to give free vent to their complaints and concerns in an open forum towards resolution, rather than stifle and deny some of the uncertainties of Jewish identity in the real world.

The function of Ackerman’s study was Orwellian in nature: its intent was to obfuscate real social, political, and economic realities regarding Jews and replace them with the world of Sigmund Freud: implanted illusions of personal inadequacies and mental illnesses. Such a “study” never once even remotely considered that the slightest “hostility” towards a single Jew, or Jews in general, was in any way legitimate. Rather, anyone who dares to question anything whatsoever about Jewry is categorized as a veritable species – an “anti-Semite,” this term itself a quintessential stereotype.

Ackerman even psychoanalyzed (by remote control) professional colleagues who refused to work with him on this study. For those principled psychoanalysts who declined to participate in Ackerman’s biased undertaking “for fear [that it] might detract from the more fundamental social and economic causes of anti-Semitism ... [Ackerman decided that] it appeared to us, in a few cases, as rationalizations for the wish not to be concerned with anti-Semitism at too close range, as an attempt to keep away from its horror and to avoid identification with its victims – in short, it seemed to be an expression of self-preservation.” [ACKERMAN, p.20]

The entire construct of this dubious scientific study would not merit the slightest attention 50 years later, except that its theses and conclusions remain
the foundation of Jewish public opinion today. In this “study” we find one of the monster embryos for the vast Jewish propaganda machinery against what is generically known today as “anti-Semitism.” Ackerman and co-author, noted the volume, “both are convinced that decisive social action should and can be taken to prevent the spread of anti-Semitism ... Indeed, one of the motives for undertaking this study was the concern for its potential pragmatic value.” [ACKERMAN, p.2]

There are precedents for such psychoanalytically-based manipulation which stretches to preposterous lengths in a socio-political context. Sigmund Freud himself turned into a naked political hack in using psychoanalysis in a book – finally published 28 years after his own death – to defame a U.S. President, Woodrow Wilson. It was, according to Martin Gross, “a classic of historical distortion” that was “greeted with an embarrassed apology from the psychological community.” [GROSS, p. 72-73] Even Jewish historian Barbara Tuchman wrote that [Freud and his co-author] “have allowed emotional bias to direct their inquiry, which has led to undisciplined reasoning, wild overstatement, and false conclusions.” [GROSS, p. 73]

It must be admitted, however, that widespread Jewish faith in psychoanalysis to explain the world for them, and sometimes impugn historical figures who are long dead, is not discriminatory. In 1993 a Jewish psychoanalyst, Avner Falk, turned his probe for neurosis onto Theodore Herzl, the Jewish Zionist hero. Falk’s book, subtitled “a Psychoanalytical Biography,” declares, according to one Jewish reviewer, that Herzl was “inwardly dependent on his parents, stunted emotionally, extremely arrogant and supercilious, completely self-obsessed, and [was] ... never really able to sustain close personal relationships.” [ADLER, p. 44] Herzl had a miserable personal life. He had three children. Pauline died of drug addiction, Hans converted to Catholicism and later committed suicide, and Trude spent a “lifetime of mental illness.” Of these Herzl children, only Trude had a child, Stephan, who also committed suicide. [STEWART, D., Genealogical chart, 1974]

Another Jewish psychoanalyst, Jay Gonen, even takes Freudianism so far as to explain the core of collective Jewish neurosis like this:

“Because of their covenant with God, because of their obedience to Him, the sons of Israel end up with shorter penises. Having yielded to circumcision, they will never be endowed with the same phallic prowess as the Gentiles, and will never have as good and big a penis as their mighty father. Thus, they have to be careful that Jewish women do not learn that Gentiles are more satisfying and they have to continue to love the God-Father whom they also unconsciously hate.” [GONEN, p. 14]

Prominent Jewish author Erica Jong underscores in the Jewish psyche a Freudian fear of castration as an important effect of circumcision – the defining rite of Jewish maleness: “After all, what does the ritual of circumcision say to a Jewish son? ‘Watch out. Next time I’ll cut off the whole thing.’ So Jewish boys are horny, but also full of fear about whether their cocks will survive their horniness.” [JONG, E., 1994, p. 60]
And what does the greatest symbol of anti-Semitism – the Nazi swastika – mean to a Freudian? Bizarrely enough, copulation! As Frederic Grunfeld describes it:

“Since the swastika is a schematic yet recognizable representation of two human figures in coitus, it acts as a powerful stimulus in deep layers of the psyche, according to the [also Jewish] psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich – ‘a stimulus that proves to be much more powerful the more dissatisfied, the more burning with sexual desire, a person is.’” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 71]

In 1981, a feminist, Susan Griffin (not Jewish?), wrote a book about pornography. Using a broad arsenal of Freudian frameworks, she linked pornography and anti-Semitism to the same sources of the sick mind, even dragging Holocaust heroine Ann Frank into the recipe. Adolf Hitler is of course the epitome of the Jew-hater. “In his book on the history of anti-Semitism,” Griffin tells us,

“Vamberto Morais records Hitler’s repeated mention of ‘Jews in caftans’ and the ‘filth’ and ‘stench’ of those caftan-wearers. He tells us ‘this becomes all the more ironical when one learns ‘that according to companions of Hitler who knew him when he was a younger man, and an artist, he himself ‘wore a long, shabby overcoat very much like a caftan, which had been given him by a Hungarian Jewish dealer in old clothes.’ And from Hitler’s fellow artist Ganisch we learn that he ‘had a dirty, unkempt aspect.’ But of course, we have known all along who ‘the Jew’ really was. We have known all along that this ‘Jew’ was Hitler himself.” [GRIFFIN, S., 1981, p. 197-198]

(Where might such a world view for Ms. Griffin have come from, that, on Freudian terms, Adolf Hitler – the consummate “anti-Semite” – sought to destroy himself through a scapegoat of innocent Jewry? In her dedication page to her work, Griffin notes that “I discussed the ideas in this book from the beginning with [Jewish feminist] Kim Chernin and we read one another’s manuscripts. She led me toward essentially psychological insights ... Tillie Olsen’s Silences and Adrienne Rich’s Of Woman Born deeply affected my thought as did Hannah Arendt’s Origins of Totalitarianism. [All these authors are Jewish] ... Although I take issue with certain of [Jewish author] Susan Sontag’s idea on pornography, her work On Photography entered my thinking continually. I feel especially indebted to the scholarship and insights of Lucy Dawidowicz regarding the Holocaust ... ... In addition to reading the manuscript and giving me invaluable support, Lind Levitsky shared with me a collection of racist images which she compiled for a study of racist stereotypes ... My daughter, Becky Levy, shared her school research into images of women on television.” [Did Mr. Levy dump her? No mention of him in the credits/dedication.] ) [GRIFFIN, S., 1981, p. vii, viii]

With Adolf Hitler and the Nazis ever seen in the grim horizon, and with the dubious moral position of the state of Israel to prop up, the psychological breakdown of the sick “anti-Semite” has been, for decades now, a booming
industry for Jewish psychiatrists and the Jewish community at-large. As always, an anti-Semite is defined extremely loosely for it is believed that anyone with even a seed of disenchantment towards Jews, left unchecked, could turn into an unwieldy monster.

Over the years, the Department of Scientific Research of the American Jewish Committee has in fact funded not only *Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder*, but a series of academic studies and volumes about the subject, including *Dynamics of Prejudice, Prophets of Deceit*, and the most referenced, *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950). Such studies had their conceptual origin during World War II. The motivation for them, and their sweeping judgments, must be understood in the context of their root, fear and paranoia. In the 1940’s Jewish organizations were extremely apprehensive of the possibility of a spreading Nazism.

*The Authoritarian Personality* is a thousand page tome stuffed with largely impenetrable statistical evaluations of American sample categories from interviews the authors conducted: college students, psychiatric patients, merchant marine officers, prison inmates, Unitarians, members of the United Electrical Workers Union, the PTA, the Kiwanis Club, and others. The volume elaborates similar premises and findings as *Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder*; criticism of Jews is equated with “the superstitious belief in witchcraft” which was eradicated thanks to “the results of modern science.” [p. ix] The authors likewise “hold the belief that anti-Semitism [which they never define] is based more largely upon factors in the subject and his total situation than upon actual characteristics of Jews ... ” [p. 3] And, of course, “For theory as to the structure of personality, we have leaned most heavily on Freud...” There are even chapters on the “ethnocentric ideology” of the generic anti-Semite, most peculiar since the Jewish tradition of the Chosen People has, throughout history, refined ethnocentrism as tightly as any people can to perfection. Essentially, notes sociologist John Higham, “*The Authoritarian Personality*” assigned to anti-Semitism an extraordinary importance by arguing that critical attitudes toward Jews reveal a basic personality type that threatens the survival of democratic society.” [HIGHAM, p. 174]

Gordon Allport, a Jewish psychologist and author of the influential *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954) remarked in 1981 that *The Authoritarian Personality* “stirred up the social sciences, particularly social psychology, perhaps more than any book published in this century ... There are some 500 studies based on this work ... The very fact that they called the authoritarian person “F,” measured by the F-scale which stood for Fascist, reflects the historical times ... everyone was anti-Hitler and everything he stood for, and it was to some extent a cultural product ... “ [EVANS, p. 63, 64]

In 1958, based upon the dubious Freudian premises of *The Authoritarian Personality*, another Jewish academic, Joseph Adelson, published the results of a survey of 242 Jewish American college students. The study examined Jewish acceptance of the reality of negative Jewish social traits or, as Adelson phrased it in political academeze of the era, it was “a study of minority group authori-
tarianism.” What Adelson was interested in was to what degree “anti-Semitic” attitudes were reflected in Jews themselves. (This is popularly known as “self-hatred” in the Jewish community and will be discussed a little later). The Jewish college students were asked to respond to a variety of sentences. They were given the choice of six numbered responses to each question. A “7” represented complete agreement and a “0” complete disagreement with the statement. Here are the Jewish scores for acceptance of some of the most “anti-Semitic” questions: (the “Mean for Total Group” follows each statement):

“There are many Jews to whom anti-Semitic statements do apply.” (4.49)
“I feel personally ashamed when I see Jews making themselves conspicuous.” (4.31)
“The Jewish group in this country would get along better if many Jews were not so clannish.” (4.12)
“I have often been embarrassed by the anti-social conduct of certain Jews in public life.” (4.05)
“Too many Jews try to intrude themselves into circles where they’re not wanted.” (3.33)
“Most Jews who meet a great deal of anti-Semitism bring it about by their own obnoxious behavior.” (3.20)
“A lot of anti-Semitism is caused by the number of Jewish radicals.” (3.19) [ADELSON, J., 1960, p. 481, 484]

In other words, a lot of Jews put some stock in “anti-Semitic” beliefs as part of verifiable reality. So how does Adelson (and his kindred apologists) explain this away? (– which was the ultimate purpose for this study). By ascribing JEWISH criticism of Jewish behavior – in psychoanalytic terms – as identification with a hostile, more powerful, Gentile society. “Prejudice [against the genre of Jew who is criticized by other Jews],” says Adelson,

‘is viewed as ‘rational’; its cause is the deviant behavior of the ‘bad kind of Jew.’ Still further, the definition of the self as a ‘good’ Jew permits a kind of identification with the aggressor, a sense of affiliation with the Gentile ... Perhaps it is unnecessary to note that the authoritarian image of the outgroup [Jews in Gentile society] incorporates the essential elements of the anti-Semitic stereotype; even the contradictions are retained, as in the attribution of both seclusive and intrusive motives. One important component of Gentile anti-Semitism is omitted; the Jews is never seen as a sinister or dangerous force. The theme of Jewish power, when it does appear, is greeted not with hostility, but with pride and admiration.” [ADELSON, J., 1960, p. 477] (In other words, Jewish “power,” a staple of the anti-Semitic charge which is publicly denied always, is secretly celebrated]

In essence, Adelson’s study attempts to explain widespread Jewish admission to truths about popular stereotypes about Jews as merely Jewish distancing efforts to gain acceptance to the world of the prejudicial, irrational, “authoritarian” Gentile majority culture.

Along with such AJC-sponsored titles about anti-Semitism, we can find on
the library shelves other such titles as *Anti-Semitism: A Social Disease, Anti-Judaism: A Psychohistory*, and still flowing, in 1990, *Anti-Semitism: A Disease of the Mind*, and, in 1996, *Myth and Madness. The Psychodynamics of Anti-Semitism* (i.e., the “anti-Semite’s” myths are expressed by “madness”). At one major Midwestern state university library a computer subject search of “anti-Semitism” coughed up 719 titles. By comparison, the generic word “flowers” only had 632 listings and “anatomy” 1110. The word “Polish” (including anything whatsoever about Polish people anywhere, as well as the word’s other potential meanings, including car wax) had 1361. Even the generic word “racism” (any kind, anywhere, at any time in history, of everyone else on earth) had 802 listings, only about 80 more than those texts that focused solely on injustices to Jews, a minuscule part of the world’s population. In our American society that has, even by many scholarly Jewish accounts, anti-Semitism “under control,” *The Index of Jewish Periodicals* listed 196 new articles on the subject in 1996 alone.

While a pair of Jewish psychiatrists write that “the higher the income of the father, the greater the proportion of anti-Semite,” (Else Frenkel-Brunswik and R. Nevitt Sanford, p. 103] in the same book a colleague writes that anti-Semitism is found “in those places where ... the pariahs of society meet. By this I refer to the cheap locales where chronic alcoholics, addicts, and psychopathic criminals gather. These are the psychological slums ... [that are used] as strategic positions in which to spread anti-Semitism.; they need mental sanitation...” [SIMMEL, p. 75]

“At some point in the course of analytic treatment,” says Rudolf Loewenstein, “almost all non-Jewish patients will manifest varying degrees of anti-Semitism.” [PERLMUTTER, p. 64] Moshe Leshem, joins in to note that “Freud attributed Christian resentment of the Jews to the son-father tension in the superego.” Maurice Samuel out-Freuds Freud in suggesting that anti-Semitism is an outlet for the yearning of Christians to free themselves from the inhibitive yoke of Jewish morality inherited in their faith and to open wide the gates to the pagan, orgiastic “id.” [LESHEM, p. 62-63]

Freud himself said, about his own invention: “Nor is it perhaps entirely a matter of chance that the first advocate of psychoanalysis was a Jew.” [THE JEWISH MYSTIQUE, p. 55] “Freud believed,” says Richard Bank, “in the inheritance of acquired characteristics and that in some unknown fashion, his Jewishness became part of his phylogenetic heritage. Thus, Freud identifies certain Jewish traits in himself and his adherents which provided a predisposition towards psychoanalysis.” [BANK, p. 21]

Some studies have even suggested that Jews are “prone” to “have fast and frequent mood swings ... alternative periods of elation and depression ... manic depressive psychosis, neurotic symptoms, and somatic complaints (nervousness, feeling uneasy, shortness of breath).” [MACDONALD, p. 211] In the 1970s a University of California study of 421 therapists “revealed that they feel irremissibly superior [to others] ... [yet] one concern among professionals, whispered within the establishment, is that [the psychoanalytic/psychiatric field] attracts people who are particularly anxious about their emotional stabil-
ity ... Psychiatrists appear at the top of the [occupational] list [of suicides].” [GROSS, p. 45]

Even one of Freud’s earliest disciples, Isidor Sadger, once ventured that “the disposition of the Jews to obsessive neurosis is perhaps connected with the addiction to brooding ... characteristic of them for thousands of years.” [GAY, p. 135] Molly Katz jokes that

“Natural-born Jews leave the womb with a worry reservoir that is filled early and replenished constantly. We worry about everything. Worrying is as essential to our well-being as a balanced breakfast. It is our duty, our birthright, and our most profound satisfaction. There are no exceptions to this rule. All Jews worry all the time. If there is nothing handy to worry about, we are breath-stoppingly creative at finding something.” [KATZ, M., 1991, p. 47]

James Yaffe blames Jewish neurosis largely on the Jewish family: “Psychoanalysts ... see a great many Jewish neurotics. The conditions of family life, both its virtues and its weaknesses, go a long way toward accounting for this.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 294] In an article on Jewish family life, Fredda Herz and Elliot Rosen also observed that “hypochondriasis is a common Jewish syndrome.” [HERZ/ROSEN, p. 367] Rudolph Loewenstein also makes note that it “occurs frequently in Jews.” [LOEWENSTEIN, R., p. 131-132] Other “possible” common “neurotic” Jewish traits he also cites are extremes of miserliness and ostentation – “[Some Jews] are spendthrift to the point of extravagance, driven in their spending by a compulsion to efface their sense of inferiority, an exaggerated terror of anti-Semitism,” and a “feeling of terror at being Jewish.” [LOEWENSTEIN, R., p. 132-133]

Indeed, more often evident than the proposed mental unbalance of the generic anti-Semitic Everyman in the many volumes about the generic mental illness of anti-Semitism are hints of their Jewish authors’ own peculiar neuroses:

“The anti-Semite is often both envious and suspicious of Jewish talking.” – Theodore Rubin, p. 75

“Reference is often made to the opinion once expressed by Freud that anti-Semitism is connected with the Jewish custom of circumcision ... Even today, we find deep in the unconscious of man the fear that his penis may be cut off if he sins ... ” – Otto Fenischel, p. 27

“We have come to know that in certain cases the basic complex at the bottom of the individual obsessional idea of the anti-Semite is the latent homosexual complex, that complex which produces hate as a defense against the dangers of homosexual love ... “ – Ernest Simmel, p. 35

“In the mind of [some anti-Semitic] patients ... the Jewish analyst is conceived as alternately as a mephistophelean personage or as an effeminate, emasculated man. The fact that Jews are circumcised and so in a sense mutilated stirs up in them superstitious horror, thereby revealing their unconscious fear of being mutilated or castrated as a punishment for forbidden desires. In some patients the analyst can observe at first hand the sadistic satisfaction derived consciously or unconsciously from
the idea of Jews being tortured and massacred. Neurotics who suffer from an intense sense of guilt and who live in anticipation of punishment protect themselves by projecting their faults onto the Jewish analyst or onto Jews in general. – **Rudolf Loewenstein**, 1951, p. 34

“The anti-Semite sees in the Jew everything which brings him misery – not only his social oppressor but also his own unconscious instincts which have gained a bloody, dirty, dreadful character from their socially induced repression.” – **Otto Fenichel**, p. 29 “The anti-Semites most buried and unconscious secret – from himself and others – is to be a Jew ... He believes that to be a Jew is to be able to transcend everything material, religious, and racial; to be a Jew is to be free; to be a Jew is to be the ultimate individual ... “ – **Theodore Rubin** p. 79

(‘This bizarrely narcissistic conviction is not unusual in Jewish psychoanalytic circles. Another therapist, **Herbert Strean**, suggests that this secret desire to be a Jew is “an envy which lies buried deep behind all anti-Semitic attacks.” [COOPER, p. 14]

“Norman Cohn ... stresses the role of the Jews as the castrating father in the paranoid fantasies of the anti-Semite. There is merit to Cohn’s hypothesis... For a balanced evaluation of the attempt to understand anti-Semitism primarily in terms of castration anxiety, see Erickson, *Childhood and Society.*” – **Richard L. Rubenstein**, p. 313

“The historical facts are that the anti-Jew trying to free himself from the pangs of anxiety, turns the tree of life into the tree of death, the cross, nailed his Christ onto it, and transformed his anxiety to this product of his perverse sado-masochistic imagination.” – **Ernest Rappaport**, p. 282

“It is a strange thing that the Jews have always been attacked – even before the rise of Christianity. The attacks have been so stereotyped, they have always followed the same pattern so closely that one is tempted to say that though the Jews, who have changed much in the course of history, are certainly no race, the anti-Semite in a way ARE a race, because they always use the same slogans, displaying the same attitudes, indeed almost look alike.” – **Max Horkheimer**, [in Simmel, p. 6]

Here Horkheimer declares the most preposterous of stereotypes, that “anti-Semites” across history, language, and culture are “in a way” racially linked. **John Murray Cuddihy** is on the right track when he raises up the obvious mirror to all the Jewish “analysts” who entirely obfuscate Jewish history, identity, religion, and deeds in their bizarre inventions of the roots of anti-Semitism: “The ideology of the Jewish intellectual is frequently a projection onto the general Gentile culture of a forbidden ethnic self-criticism. Shame for ‘one’s own kind’ is universalized into anger at the ancestral enemy.” [CUDDIHY, p. 5]

In 1951, **Milton Steinbeg** put Jewish “shame for one’s own kind” (very common in the Jewish community and called “self-hatred” – to be discussed a little later in this chapter) like this:

“[A Jew’s] association with the Jewish group is likely to touch him more intimately, at the very core of his being. For, as a Jew he is subject
to certain psychic influences, of which he may be unaware but which may affect his personality adversely nonetheless. Thus, he tends to regard himself as not altogether wanted by the majority society of which he wishes to be a part, the approval and acceptance of which he desires earnestly. Again, he is inclined to feel that his Jewishness exposes him to a special set of insecurities beyond those which are the lot of all men of his station ... The anti-Semite when he talks about Jews rarely addresses himself to them, but Jews overhear and may quite readily be convinced that the criticisms are quite justified by the facts, and applicable, not to them, of course, but to their fellows. The upshot of all this is that many an American Jew is in mortal peril of losing his sense of worth, his self-respect, his dignity in his own eyes. He may feel secretly ashamed of his Jewishness ... He may be haunted by the misgiving that, by the very virtue of the fact that he is Jewish, he is somehow a human being inferior to the Gentile.” [STEINBERG, M., 1951, p. 87-88]

There are, of course, other angles on the “all non-Jews are automatically anti-Semites” theme. Reflecting millennia-old Jewish hostility, special targets for odium are those who define themselves, or were raised, as Christians. There are no protective multi-million dollar Christian lobbying organizations and no generic word, like “anti-Semitism,” to brand Jewish hatred of, and prejudice against, Christianity into a defensive slogan that can be thrown in the face of critics. So Jews have a completely open field.

Some Jews go so far as to believe that, according to David Novak, “hatred and murder of Jews is something particularly Christian. Those that assert this position claim that the Nazi program for the extermination of the Jews is the direct historical consequence of Christian contempt for Jews. They thus hold that all Christians – whether actual perpetrators of atrocities against Jews or not – are considered to be eo ipso incorrigible anti-Semites. Dialogue with such incorrigible enemies can hardly be regarded as anything other than group masochism.” [NOVAK, DIA. p. 5]

There are many innovative angles reflecting Jewry’s contempt for Christianity. Maurice Samuel, for instance, decided that “the basic factor in intense anti-Semitism is hatred of Christianity – a hatred that cannot be openly acknowledged and is therefore projected onto Jews. When this factor enters, according to Samuel, an essentially unique phenomenon, not just another prejudice, is created.” [SIMPSON/YINGER, p. 330]

In the emphatic context of the Holocaust, Christians and Christianity itself are bitterly condemned today by many Jewish thinkers. Those Christians in good stead are considered to be only those who revise traditional Christian texts towards support of Jewish “particularism” and its modern political expression: Zionism. Any “Christian dialogue with Jews,” demands Emil Fackenheim, is predicated upon “the ‘destructive recovery’ of the whole Christian tradition.” [p. 282] Among Christian obligations to Jews, he declares that “Christians after the Holocaust ... must be Zionist on behalf not only of Jews but also of Christianity itself.” [p. 303]
Mark Gelber echoes this common Jewish blanket condemnation of Christianity in the *Jewish Journal of Social Studies*: “The widespread acceptance of anti-Semitic legislation and the nearly ubiquitous complicity of Gentile populations in the attempted Nazi destruction of the Jewish people is totally incomprehensible without the extensive background of the centuries-old phenomena of Christian anti-Semitism.” [GELBER, p. 4]

There are a number of Christian activists for Jewish/Zionist causes who have subsequently absorbed a guilt-laden notion about the Holocaust, accepting the presumption that Christianity and an innate anti-Semitism within it were a major part of the Holocaust’s cause. Among the most important to this movement of Christian Zionism were two authors of German heritage, Paul Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr, whose apparent shame of their German link was reconfigured along Christian lines. An ideological descendent, Robert Everett, a pastor in the United Church of Christ, goes so far as to say: 

“I see the Christian response to Israel and her survival as a sign of whether or not Christians care about Jews. The forces of Ultimate Evil seem again ready to strike against Jews ... Only those voices that speak of solidarity with Israel and her right to exist are able to call themselves servants of Life.” [p. 11]

There are a number of books that have appeared over the years that argue Christian culpability in the Holocaust. Christian Zionist writers have sometimes served as honorary Jews to more diplomatically deliver the hatchet blows of condemnation to other Christians. “As a Methodist minister,” says Richard Libowitz, “[Franklin Littell] maintains a credibility of Christian witness which make his charges far more difficult for Christian audiences to refute.” [LIBOWTIZ, p. 73]

Franklin Littell, founder and chairman of the Zionist-oriented Christians Concerned for Israel, focuses on indicting themes in his book, *The Crucifixion of the Jews*. His central thesis is that Nazi fascism was the natural expression of Christianity which, he argues, has always been “contemptuous or demeaning” of Jews. He argues this despite the fact that German Nazism was expressly anti-Christian and murdered masses of clergy in its extermination programs. (In Poland alone the Nazis murdered 1,932 priests, including six bishops, 850 monks, as well as 289 nuns. [BART, Convert, p. 150]) Littell then goes for maximum slander against the rival faith by claiming that “Christendum ... led directly to genocide.” [p. 1] If that’s not contemptuous and demeaning enough of Christians, he stuffs his whole volume full of this venomous, libelous hysteria, including “Before the Holocaust, the spirit of murder ... was well advanced in Christian circles.” [LITTELL, p. 49] and “Adolf Hitler ... and the death camps ... were legitimate offspring of a ‘Christian civilization ... [which] was formless and heathen at heart.” Littell’s questionable conclusions were published by a major publisher, Harper and Row in 1975, and his “research” was funded by a faculty research grant at Temple University and the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.

Another non-Jewish writer, Alan Davies, in *Anti-Semitism and the Christian Mind: The Crisis of Conscience*, demands “that every Christian owes to every Jew
[an apology] for the part which historic Christendom has played in the shaping of modern anti-Semitism.” Others of this ilk include a Jewish convert to Christianity, John Oesterreicher, Director of the Institute for Judeo-Christian Studies at Seton Hall University. As Alfred Lilenthal noted in 1983:

“Oesterreicher makes support for Israel ‘a test for every Christian,’ advocates arms aid for the Zionist state; rejects as ‘absolutely ridiculous’ the proposition that Palestinian self-determinism is essential to peace; and has publicly rhapsodized that ‘we must shout from the housetops that this state [Israel] has a right to live.’” [LILENTHAL, A., 1983, p. 494]

The continuous trashing of Christianity for crimes against Jews is a veritable cottage industry these days. Rosemary Ruether, described as a “female theologian,” worked with the Jewish lobbying group, the Anti-Defamation League, and one of its rabbis on her book Faith and Fraticide. Reuther is so Judeo-centric (as a guilt-ridden Christian) in her appraisal of Christianity that she claims that her faith would virtually collapse without its alleged basis of anti-Semitism: “Possibly anti-Judaism is too deeply embedded in the foundations of Christianity to be rooted out entirely without destroying the whole structure.” [RUETHER, p. 27] (Curiously, this is a counter-echo to the notion [often raised in scholarly circles] that modern Jewish self-identity needs the threat of omnipresent anti-Semitism to ensure its very survival against assimilation).

Widely heralded by the Jewish community as a splendid blow against Christian anti-Semitism, ironically, Faith and Fraticide didn’t protect Reuther’s later writings from the charge of anti-Semitism. Reuther was publicly word-whipped by a fellow feminist (Jewish of course) for making the sinful inference that the undeniably wrathful, dictatorial, and patriarchal Jewish Old Testament God was considerably more harmful to women than the Christian’s Jesus, patient champion of the dispossessed and downtrodden. [PLASKOW, p. 102] The publishing of the fact that the ancient male-centered Israelites exterminated people (including the Canaanites) whose religion included the worship of goddesses is also not appreciated. Reuther’s (and others’) allusion to the ideology of male domination enforced by the Jewish God was deemed by many Jews to be “anti-Jewish.” One guilt-ridden feminist of German-Christian heritage noted that [the criticism of Reuther] made clear to me once more how very necessary constant external [i.e., Jewish] correction is to us and how wrong it is to think we can finally rest at the present level of awareness.”] [WACKER, p. 113]

Not only was Reuther harangued for attacking Jewish male-centeredness, she reversed field since Faith and Fraticide and dared to attack in another book – with her husband – the holiest of Jewish holies, Israel. Denounced as a “liberal,” she came under attack from the aforementioned Christian Zionist, Franklin Littel, for her book, The Wrath of Jonah, which Littell calls “one of the most viciously partisan tracts to appear in the ‘Palestinian’ cause in the English language.” [LITTLE, Judaism, p. 518]

Reuther’s fall from Jewish grace is sharp. Her book about Israel, wrote David Biale, “is an anti-Zionist diatribe cloaked in the sweet light of Christian universalism; as such it stands as a singular warning of how a Christian critique
can slide unwittingly into the swamp of anti-Semitism. [BIALE, p. 406] ... [The Reuthers’] wild and unsubstantiated conspiracy theories, which inflate Zionist power beyond recognition, smell suspiciously like the older myths of a world Jewish conspiracy.” [BIALE, p. 409] Reuther, it seems, successfully confirmed the Jewish myth that all non-Jews – no matter what they say or do to defend Jews – are, inevitably at root, sooner or later, revealed to be vile anti-Semites.

Traditional Jewish martyrological canon insists that the most hated anti-Semites by Jews must be generic Christians because of their reputed persecution through the ages and the fact that the Holocaust happened in Christian Europe. “The crime against the Jewish people,” declares Rabbi Eliezer Berkovitz, “is the cancer at the very heart of Christianity... [HALBERSTAM, p. 232] In order to pacify the Christian conscience it is said that the Nazis were not Christians. But they were all the children of Christians ... [p. 226] ... Without Christianity’s New Testament, Hitler’s Mein Kampf could never have been written.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 238] “Let’s not shy away from the hard truth,” says Joshua Halberstam, “For many Jews, the unspoken lesson of the Shoah is that they cannot trust Christians with their children. Tens of thousands of Christians with crosses around their necks sent millions of innocent Jews and millions of other innocent men, women, and children to their horrid deaths while many of their fellow Christians cheered.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 226]

Stanislaw Krajenski, a Polish citizen and a Jew, writing from a land of first-hand experience, has argued that the common “Christian anti-Semitism is central to the Holocaust” theme is ridiculous. Krajewski writes that

“[Polish Christians] perceived their bond of common suffering [during the Holocaust] with Jews to be stronger than the bond of common Christianity with Germans. This is one reason why arguments to the effect that in Auschwitz Christians were murdering Jews sounds very strange in Poland, and to me as well. There are also other more objective reasons. For one thing, Christians were killed in Auschwitz too, and moreover there were anti-Semites among the victims. For another, Nazis attempted to revive paganism, not to express Christianity. Priests imprisoned in Auschwitz were treated with extra cruelty. Finally, as Jews were killed because they were Jews, homosexuals were persecuted and imprisoned because they were homosexuals. Yet to say that homosexuals were victims of heterosexuals in Auschwitz seems most inappropriate. The moral is that looking for the answer to the question who was killing whom in Auschwitz, we should take facts at face value. Nazis were the perpetrators and it was of supreme importance for them that they were Germans. That is why Germans have to share the responsibility. Not Christians: most of the Nazis at least neglected their nominal Christianity.” [KRAJEWSKI, p. 40]

“To put excessive emphasis upon anti-Judaic strictures of Christianity,” says Oliver Cox, “is to obscure the critical tribal form and meaning of Judaism ... Judaism has remained essentially a tribal religion...” [COX p. 185] In other words, Christian chauvinism has always been a reaction to the seminal Jewish
version of the same thing. And if one is to make the leap that blames the tenets of Christianity for the Holocaust, then one might better leap to a more evidentiary source for championing genocide, that explicitly evidenced in the Jewish Old Testament [See Holocaust chapter, p. 383].

One of the pillars of Jewish belief that Christianity has served as a foundation for modern anti-Semitism is the “blood libel” tradition: in the Middle Ages a widespread belief circulated amongst Christians that Jews needed Christian blood – particularly from children – for their rituals. In 1993 an Israeli scholar, Yisrael Yuval, published an article in the Israel Historical Society's journal that undermined Jewish interpretive convention about the blood libel tradition. Among other things, Yuval suggested that medieval Christian notions that Jews killed Christian children for their blood might have origins, however misconstrued, in authentic Jewish practice. Jews in Europe had been known to commit suicide en masse, with parents killing their children “as an act of piety,” when under forcible threat to convert to Christianity in the Middle Ages. Yuval also wondered if Jewish circumcision rites could have been mistakenly perceived and distorted by Christian observers as a quest for blood.

Yuval doesn’t mention this, but would not, to medieval peasant eyes, the sight of a Jewish mohel (circumcision specialist) cutting an infant’s penis, and then sucking its blood at the wound, as part of the traditional circumcision ritual, be a strong factual basis for sensational rumors? And how might the ancient Sephardic Jewish “folk practice” of eating parts of ancient human bodies be construed by local peasants in understanding Jewish tradition? As Raphael Patai noted in 1971:

“One of the most popular remedies among the Sephardi Jews was the mumia (i.e., mummy). This consisted of a piece of mummified human body which was pulverized and taken internally (often with honey-water, as a cure against all kinds of complaints. Its origin goes back to antiquity ... By the twelfth century, in response to growing demand, the Jews of Alexandria had developed a lively mummy trade. Among the Sephardi Jews mumia continued to be taken internally down to the present time, even among the Sephardim living in Seattle, Washington.” [PATAI, R., 1971, p. 149] [Patai says that this medicinal practice became “popular” in the non-Jewish European community in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. One would imagine that to be inevitable, especially given the fact that Jews have been so numerous as physicians throughout the centuries: “The Jews as physicians have always played an important part in the life of the human race ... In Spain and Italy their only competitors were the Moors.”] [OSBORNE, S., 1939, p. 22]

“The suggestion [by Yuval] that the Jews themselves,” remarks David Biale, “might have been responsible, even if indirectly, for the blood libel fell like a clap of thunder on the Israeli academic community ... Yuval’s opponents accused him of anti-Semitism and attempted to block his university promotion ... These intellectuals could not accept Yuval’s implicit assumption that Jewish practice might have some influence, no matter how indirectly, on the formations of anti-Semi-
tism. According to this view, anti-Semitism is a set of irrational paranoid fantasies that is utterly disconnected from the Jews.” [BIALE, p. 39-40, 45]

So numerous are the Jewish academic ideologues who research and reiterate real and imagined victimization of Jews at the hands of non-Jews through history that Norman Davies, a British scholar with expertise about Poland, has sardonically labeled them not to be professors of history, but professors of anti-Semitism. [DAVIES, N.]

Jews who spend entire careers, entire lives, dreaming up new angles of anti-Semitism have broken it down into a multitude of possibilities. There is “religious anti-Semitism, Christian anti-Semitism, anti-Christian anti-Semitism, pagan anti-Semitism, economic anti-Semitism, social anti-Semitism, racial anti-Semitism, black anti-Semitism, pathological anti-Semitism, eternal anti-Semitism, political anti-Semitism, Jewish anti-Semitism, and literary anti-Semitism, to name some of the most common types.” [GELBER, p. 13] Rudolf Loewenstein includes three of the above in his own demarcations, adding “xenophobic anti-Semitism.” [LOEWENSTEIN, R., 1951, p. 64] Sylvia Rothchild says that “zoological anti-Semitism” is the “irrational behavior of the [Russian] government.” [ROTHCHILD, 1985, p. 20] Leon Poliakov characterizes the anti-Semitism of late antiquity as social or political; the anti-Semitism of the Middle Ages as theological; and the anti-Semitism of the modern world as racial. The dominance of one form does not mean that the others are not present, but only that they serve a subsidiary function to the dominant expression.” [STROM/PARSONS, 1982, p. 46]

Letty Pogrebin, a founding editor at Ms magazine, defines anti-Semitism in the women’s movement into three types: “invisible” anti-Semitism, “insult” anti-Semitism, and “internalized oppression” anti-Semitism. The “invisible” genre is when non-Jews resist the Jewish propensity to incessantly rail about the Holocaust, as well as Gentile reluctance to accept “Jewish paranoia” and “Jewish self-centeredness.” “Insult” anti-Semitism is the demeaning of Jews in commentary, often disguised. “Internalized oppression” anti-Semitism is Jewish self-hatred [KESTENBAUM, p. 30] (i.e., when Jews realize that non-Jewish criticisms about Jews have truth to them). “Every culture,” Daniel Pipes informs us, “has its own brand of anti-Semitism.” [GRENIER, R., 11-13-85, p. C21]

Ernest Volkman’s own categorization of the “three major types of anti-Semitism” are “realistic anti-Semitism,” “Xenophobic anti-Semitism,” and “Chimeric anti-Semitism.” [VOLKMAN, p. 53-54] At the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, there is a department called the Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Anti-Semitism which publishes studies on “anti-Semitism, ancient or modern, from a broad range of perspectives: historical, religious, political, cultural, social, psychological, and economic.” [MODRAS, TITLE PAGE]

A sure sign of anti-Semitism in Madison, Wisconsin, noted Evelyn Tornton Beck, was that “I heard someone say that Jews were ‘taking over’ the local chapter of the national lesbian feminist organization in Madison.” [KESTENBAUM, p. 30] “I believe that Jewish lesbian feminists have internalized much of the subtle anti-Semitism of this society,” declared Irene Klepfisz, “They have been old
that Jews are too pushy, too aggressive; and so they have been silent about their Jewishness, have not protested against what threatens them.” [KLEPFISZ, I., 1982, p. 46] Recent anti-Semitism in the Australian lesbian movement? There was a 1999 article written to keep us informed of the subject by Hinde Burstin. [BURSTIN, 1999]

At every turn Jews find offense and insult. For instance, notes Kayla Weiner, “For many Jews, to be wished ‘Merry Christmas’ is to deny their personal reality and uniqueness.” [WEINER, p. 121] And, “any lack of sympathy for Israel and its survival on the part of Christians,” says Peter Medding, “is, for many Jews, indistinguishable from anti-Semitic prejudice.” [MEDDING, p. 110]

It is unfathomable for such Jews that Gentiles are largely disinterested in undying Jewish crusades of self-pity and victimization as central themes in their own (non-Jewish) lives. For Ruth Wisse, Gentile silence is not just silence, it “may be [because non-Jews are] reluctant to confront the subject of Jew-hatred because they are worried about stirring up latent anti-Semitism in themselves or others.” [WISSE, p. 48]

Complaining about the lack of sufficient homage by Gentile writers to “Jewish suffering,” Guy Stern’s obsession with Jewishness is probably the most audacious in blatantly encompassing the passively innocent as anti-Semites. It is what Stern calls “the anti-Semitism of silence. It is difficult to define ... Silent literary anti-Semitism is ... definitely an omission of a declaration of sympathy for Jewish suffering.” [STERN, p. 304] In this genre of accusers who essentially demand everyone to be activists for Jewish causes (and those who do not are anti-Semites), is Ernest Volkman, who labels this the “anti-Semitism of indifference.” In this view, there are those non-Jews who do not “attack Jews directly, but ...[they] assume that Jews do not even exist, that their concerns and survival are not even relevant questions.” [VOLKMAN, p. 12] Even when Jews aren’t even around to be anti-Semitic towards, the fact that they aren’t present may, of course, be evidence of anti-Semitism. Indeed, the lack of Jews everywhere, always, for some, may evidence latent anti-Semitism. Jewish Exponent reporter Michael Elkin, for example, was concerned that there were no Jews in the first “Survivor” TV episode. Was this because Jews don’t have enough of a macho reputation? “So ‘Survivor’ may be stereotyping Jews by having none?” he reasoned. [ELKIN, M., 7-13-00]

Jewish lesbian Irene Klepfisz also declares that “the anti-Semitism with which I am immediately concerned, and which I find most threatening, does not take the form of the overt, undeniably inexcusable painted swastika on a Jewish gravestone or on a synagogue wall. Instead, it is elusive and difficult to pinpoint, for it is the anti-Semitism either of omission or one which trivializes the Jewish experience and Jewish oppression.” [KLEPFISZ, I., 1982, p. 46] “The accusation of anti-Semitism against the [political] Left,” adds Arthur Liebman, “has not been limited solely to its critical or anti-Zionist position on Israel. Jewish liberals and Leftists have charged the Left with being anti-Semitic stemming from insensitivity to Jews and their problems, particularly anti-Semitism.” [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 353]
On the other hand, Alvin Rosenfeld turns with outrage to Gentile writers who dare to pay sympathetic attention to Jews and the Holocaust in an unacceptable manner, i.e., using poetic license to appropriate Holocaust imagery and Jewish victimhood to address (non-Jewish) personal suffering in their poems. Rosenfeld attacks the poet Sylvia Plath (ultimately a suicide) for this crime. He quotes this excerpt from one of her poems:

An engine, an engine
Chuffing me off like a Jew.
A Jew to Dachau, Auschwitz, Belsen.
I begin to talk like a Jew.
I think I may well be a Jew.
The snows of the Tyrol, the clear beer of Vienna
Are not very pure or true.
With my gypsy ancestress and my weird luck
And my Tarok pack and my Tarok pack
I may be a bit of a Jew.

This literary evidence moves Rosenfeld to proclaim that Plath’s lament of personal suffering, is at “its deepest level a poem about ... ‘what-I-do-to-you, you-Jew.” [ROSENFELD, p. 180]

In the silent – and, hence, unsympathetic and, hence, anti-Semitic – vein, George Steiner expresses outrage that T. S. Eliot’s Notes Towards a Definition of Culture failed “to face the issue [of the Holocaust and Nazi anti-Semitism], indeed to allude to it in anything but an oddly condescending footnote ... It is acutely disturbing. How, only three years after the event ... was it possible to write a book on culture and say nothing?” [STERN, p. 304] Probably, one suspects, in the same way Eliot neglected to mention Hiroshima, the Japanese “rape of Nanking,” the sack of Rome, the Irish Potato Famine, or non-Jewish concentration camp victims in the same volume. Not only that. As Peter Novick notes in his critical book The Holocaust in American Life, about how the Holocaust has evolved into a strong social and political tool (and obsession) for the Jewish community,

“Between the end of the war and the 1960s, as anyone who has lived through those years can testify, the Holocaust made scarcely any appearance in American public discourse, and hardly more in Jewish public discourse – especially directed to gentiles ... The memories and autobiographies of many highly committed Jews bear out the contemporary evidence that suggests the Holocaust wasn’t much talked about [until the late 1960s]. Alan Dershowitz, growing up in an intensely Jewish neighborhood in Brooklyn in the forties and the fifties, recalls no discussion of the Holocaust either with his schoolmates or at home.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 102-103]

This demand by Jewish critics for gentiles to pay requisite homage to Jewish victimhood mythologies (the neglect of which, to such complainers, is a symptom itself of anti-Semitism) is reflected also in Norma Rosen’s disdain for Eliot’s essay, The Idea of Christian Culture. “Though this book,” says Rosen, “... no where
slanders Jews, it nowhere mentions them, either as contributors to, or victims of, ... modern society.” [ROSEN, p. 10] Would Rosen argue that books and essays about “The Idea of Jewish Culture” would be similarly lacking without references to Christian accomplishment and Jewish anti-Christian sentiment?

“There is no consensus,” adds Anthony Julius, “on the number of references to Jews in Eliot’s work. Sometimes in the absence of any reference to Jews in an essay, or the refusal to acknowledge the anti-Semitism of a favored writer, [this] may be anti-Semitic.” [JULIUS, p. 6]

Jewish outrage for the lack of non-Jewish support towards Jewish self-absorption and their obsession with victimhood is manifest in other ways. During Israel’s 1973 Yom Kippur War against the Arabs, Adolphe Steg, a “leader of French Jewry,” complained that French Jews’ “anxiety” over Israel’s battles “found only a faint echo in their [French] environment, and the silence of their [non-Jewish] colleagues during those terrible days was painful. Not only did their colleagues remain silent, but when appealed to they could not help sharing irritation with the problems of the Jews, which they defined as an obsession ... By uncovering the extent of the lack of comprehension shown by these circles to [the Jews’] deepest concerns, the Yom Kippur War may have slowed the rush towards [Jewish] assimilation in France.” [HERMAN, p. 41-42]

Steg is clearly stating, hardly veiled, that a lack of French sympathy to transnational Jewish war aims was grounds for withdrawing French Jewry’s full commitment to their own (French) country, which accentuates the recurring cycle of accusation: Jews in the Diaspora are accused of holding dual national loyalties – one for Israel (possibly the foremost loyalty), and another for the Diaspora nation. Jews, in turn, as always, accuse their accusers of anti-Semitism.

Under such a world view, based on the infectious and omnipresent nature of anti-Semitism, Jews must be wary, to this day, of non-Jews everywhere. Covering all flanks in the political sphere, Abe Perlmutter warns that it’s not only the right wing gentiles who are anti-Semitic: “Accustomed to the rumblings of anti-Semitism from the far right, (our social scientists) are alert in one direction ... Violence from the right, it would seem, is extremism. From the left it is social protest. To Jews, scapegoated by both, the difference is without distinction.” [PERLMUTTER, p. 101] “Take, for example, “says Arthur Liebman, “the following which appeared in the U.S. Communist party’s Daily World on June 5, 1979: ‘Has nationalism wrapped in money turned all the ‘leaders’ of the Jewish people into stone?’ This type of language, the Left’s critics contend, either is anti-Semitic itself and/or contributes to anti-Semitism through reinforcement of traditional anti-Semitic stereotypes.” [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 350]

Michael Lerner, editor of the left-wing Jewish journal Tikkun, confirms this fear of leftist non-Jews in his book, The Socialism of Fools: Anti-Semitism on the Left, which was advertised in his own publication with a drawing that connotes crowds entering the gas chambers of the Holocaust. The “Socialism of Fools” phrase is credited to August Bebel as a description of anti-Semitism in the leftist community. It refers to traditional socialist animosity towards prominent Jewish European bankers, capitalists, and war profiteers – major symbols of
class oppression since the development of Marxist theory in the nineteenth century. Many socialists were also hostile to transnational Jewish “nationalism” and its attendant chauvinism. Even “Bebel, the socialist leader who stood in the vanguard of the fight against anti-Semitism in Wilhelmian Germany, called Jewish socialists brilliant but pushy, difficult to subject to party discipline.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 67] “Long barred by anti-Semitic laws and customs from agriculture, guild occupations, and the professions,” says apologetic Jewish scholar Arthur Liebman, “in the nineteenth century Jews were largely to be found in middlemen occupations: merchants, hucksters, estate managers, loan and mortgage collectors, and money lenders. These were popularly considered (and by segments of the Jewish community like the labor Zionists as well), to be non-productive or ‘parasitic’ occupations ... Many late nineteenth- and twentieth century Leftists obviously shared this economically rooted hatred of Jews as well as the long-engrained religious prejudice against them.” [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 331]

Illustrating the all-encompassing latitude of the charge of “anti-Semitism,” a term that is applied by Jews – as the need for it suits them – in any direction, an influential Russian Jewish Zionist and socialist of the early twentieth century, Ber Borochov, even proclaimed that “we must strike at the anti-Semitism of the Jewish capitalist.” [BOROCHOV, p. 82]

And what of this specifically Jewish socialist tradition, of which there was so much, with its origins in Eastern Europe? Says Israel Shahak,

“[Many] East-European Jewish socialists ... were themselves tainted with a ferocious anti-peasant attitude inherited from classical Judaism ... A typical example is their opposition to the formation of peasant cooperatives promoted by the Catholic clergy, on the grounds that this was an act of anti-Semitism.” [SHAHAK]

Jewish obsession with anti-Semitism in all directions has even afforded them their own share of draconian book burners. E. L. Dachslager argues for a ban of all books in American public schools that “defame, vilify, or otherwise promote a negative image of Jews.” [GELBER, p. 8] A lot of book shelves for classical Western literature would have to go empty. “Anti-Semitic” works cited here to be banned or censored could include books by William Shakespeare, Geoffrey Chaucer, Christopher Marlowe, Charles Dickens, Frank Norris, Theodore Dreiser, Ernest Hemingway (especially The Sun Also Rises), Celine, Henry Adams, Graham Greene, Evelyn Waugh, E.E. Cummings, Henry Miller, Byron Scott, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Henry James, Dostoyevsky, Trollope, Thomas Wolfe, and Ezra Pound. [GELBER, p. 8, 12] “I cannot resist the opportunity,” wrote Jewish author Richard Lewontin in the New York Review of Books in 1990, “... of making a remark about the anti-Semitism of American intellectuals during the early decades of this century. It was pervasive, if in a somewhat genteel form.” [LEWONTIN, R., 10-25-90]

“The Jew is a persistent figure in [Henry] James’ fiction,” notes Jewish author Michael Dobkowski, “He appears in ten of twenty novels, in eight short stories, one critical essay, and several travel essays. The Hebrew symbolizes basi-
cally the same areas of human experience that James explored in other literary themes – internationalism, bourgeois corruption, social stratification, genteel decline, the conflict between money and manners, and the exploitation of one human being by another for gain.” [DOBKOWSKI, M., 1979, p. 85]

Dobkowski sites other Jewish critics to add Anthony Trollope, Emile Zola, Guy de Maupassant, Edward Bulwer-Lytton, among others, as those who wrote anti-Semitic text about “the parasitic and usurious nature of the Jew.” Still others writing objectionable passages about Jews include major 19th century American authors William Cullen Bryant (Jews’ “unquenchable lust for lucre”) and Oliver Wendell Holmes (“the principal use of the Jews seemed to be to lend money …”). [DOBKOWSKI, M., 1979, p. 79, 105]

**William Faulkner? Dobkowski** notes that:

“In the beginning of Faulkner’s first novel, *Soldier’s Pay*, (1926), we meet a salesman named Schluss who says to some returning soldiers of World War I: ‘I would have liked to fought by your side, see. But someone got to look out for the business while the boys are gone.’ In his second book, *Mosquitoes* (1927) another sad-eyed Jewish salesman is said to remark: “You can’t ignore money ... It took my people to teach the world that ...’ Faulkner does not use this major character’s name, calling him ‘the Semitic man’ and ‘fat Jew.’ It is as if this anonymous entity – the Jew – represents something mysterious and pernicious that has infiltrated into American society.” [DOBKOWSKI, M., 1979, p. 103]


**Ann Roiphe** turns (almost with hysteria) the Accusation upon **William Styron**’s novel *Sophie’s Choice*:

“The book tells the story of a Polish woman who survived the [Nazi concentration] camp only to die at the hands of a Jewish madman in Brooklyn. I try to explain [to my non-Jewish friend] why I feel the book is so subtly anti-Semitic, why it offends me. The animus of the work seems directed at the Jewish literary establishment that Styron fears may steal his
limelight or not allow him a piece of the pie ... As I talk I find I am trembling; my hand is shaking. My kind friend is looking at me, puzzled. ‘You certainly feel strongly about it, don’t you?’” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 176]


Thomas Mann? “What is striking,” says Gilman, “about Mann’s text [in The Blood of the Walsungs, 1905] is that it is as much a critique of the Jew as parvenu in the (mocked) world of German high culture as it is a critique of the Jews as incestuous sibling.” [GILMAN, 1-31-98] Aubrey Beardsley? “Beardsley in England,” notes Jewish scholar George Mosse, “had satirized the fascination which the newest in art and literature held for rich German Jews through an opulent and corpulent Jewish audience in his black-and-white sketch of ‘Male and Female Wagnerians at a Performance of Tristan and Isolde.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 23]

The great poet William Blake? Jewish professor Karen Shabetai looks with concern as she scans his work for anti-Semitism, foregrounding the usual categorical, angelic Jewish innocence as the lens before her:

“Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno stressed the ‘blindness and lack of purpose of anti-Semitism’ for often its targets ‘are interchangeable according to circumstances.’ This underlying of anti-Semitism comes close to what occurs in Blake. Blake’s shifting attitude, marked by shrill moments of intense hostility [against Jews], bespeaks at the very least classic symptoms of anti-Semitism ranging from demonological superstitions inherited from the Middle Ages to resentment and anxiety about the Jews as the chosen people. More importantly, Blake’s anti-Semitism, while greatly at odds with his largely humanitarian program, casts a shadow – a haunting specter, perhaps – upon this received wisdom.” [SHABETAI, p. 149]

What about other titans of American literature? How about the great novelist Herman Melville (best known for Moby Dick)? Some of his “gallery of Jewish or judaized characters,” says David Meier, “are disturbing.” [MEIER, D., 9-2-99] Novelist Nathaniel Hawthorne, of Scarlet Letter fame? “In The Marble Fawn,” says another Jewish scholar, Robert Michael, “Hawthorne refers to the Jews as the ugliest, most evil-minded people, resembling ... maggots when they over-populate a decaying cheese. Hawthorne’s essay in his English Notebooks provides the
clearest expression of his hatred of Jews ... [He writes about the brother of the Jewish Lord Mayor of London, that] ‘for the sight of him justified me in the repugnance I have always felt for his race.” [MICHALE, R., 9-4-99]

Social critic Frank Norris, author of the classic The Octopus? His McTeague, says one Jewish critic, has “one of the most anti-Semitic portrayals in American fiction.” This is Norris’ description of a Polish Jew, Zerkow:

“He had the thin, eager catlike lips of the covetous; eyes that had grown keen as those of a lynx from long searching amid muck and debris; and clawlike, prehensile fingers – the fingers of a man who accumulates, but never disburses. It was impossible to look at Zerkow and not know instantly that greed – inordinate, insatiable greed – was the dominant passion of the man. He was the Man with the Rake, groping hourly in the muck heap of the city for gold, for gold, for gold. It was his dream, his passion; at every instant he seemed to feel the generous solid weight of the crude fat metal in his palms.” [DOBKOWSKI, M., 1979, p. 91]

What about George Orwell, creator of the great novel 1984 – the indictment of totalitarian thinking? “No doubt many Jews who read his first, autobiographical book, Down and Out in Paris and London (1933) which, like Homage to Catalonia, did not sell, suspected he was anti-Semitic,” says Milton Goldin. “This was not a far-fetched assumption, given three Jewish characters in the book, the first of whom owns a second-hand clothing shop and swindles his customers.” [GOLDIN, M., 9-4-99]

J. R. Tolkien (The Hobbit, Lord of the Rings) and James Joyce (Ulysses) have also come under Jewish scrutiny for signs of anti-Semitism. Both, barely, at least in the following Jewish magazines, evade the smear. But the Cleveland Jewish News asks:

“Was J. R. Tolkien antisemitic? ... Most troubling for many is Tolkien’s love for and use of the Norse pagan myth – the same ones the Nazis (and many present-day White Supremacists) turned to for inspiration. Also the Roman Catholic Church of his era (he was born in 1892), which he loved so fiercely, was known to harbor many with anti-Jewish sentiments ... Tolkien once said: ‘The Dwarves [in my fiction], of course, are quite obvious – wouldn’t you say that in many ways they remind you of the Jews? Their words are semitic obviously, constructed to be semitic. The Hobbits are just a rustic English people.’ That well may be his only recorded comment linking Jews with the Lord of the Rings. The stereotype is there if one wants to use it. The dwarves’ primary weakness, as revealed in the saga – to their own detriment as well as harm to the quest of the Fellowship – is a lust for gaining, protecting and hoarding jewels, gold and silver. “

The author of this article ultimately spares Tolkien the indictment of anti-Semitism, especially since the author is also on record as having rejected Aryan Nazism and praising Jewry. [BIRD, C., 12-14-2001, p. 56-]

The Jewish ethnic magazine Shofar, in the case of James Joyce, says:

“Joyce was both praised and condemned by critics for creating so prominent a figure in literature [Leopold Bloom, a Jewish character in Ul-
ysses] either for putting Jews once more on the literary map or for venting his own inherited antisemitism.” [BOWEN, Z., 4-3-2001, p. 171-]

Even influential writings in the lesbian and feminist worlds have come under attack from Jewish lesbians as being anti-Semitic. When Z. Budapest, in her The Holy Book of Women’s Mysteries, Part II, blames Judaism for destroying a goddess cult and instituting patriarchy, Jewish lesbian Evelyn Torton Beck can’t stand it. Budapest’s offending passage is this:

“The Jews carried a deep burden of guilt about what they had done to Lilith, the Great Goddess, and to cherubs in general. Lilith cursed them as a result, and in effect told them that nothing would go right for Jews again until her worship had been reinstated. Could this be the final solution to the Middle East crisis?” [BECK, E., 1982, p. xx]

“This passage,” says Beck,

“which is blatantly anti-Semitic, not only blames the Jewish people for bringing Jew-hating upon themselves, but it also suggests that they deserve it. Even worse, Budapest seems to support Hitler’s ‘final solution’ to the Jewish question – the annihilation of all Jews. The fact that several of Budapest’s coven sisters and supporters are themselves Jewish in no way mitigates the anti-Semitism of the passage; in fact, it serves to highlight the ways in which some Jewish women have internalized anti-Semitism.” [BECK, E., 1982, p. xx]

“Leading” lesbian fiction writer Rita Mae Brown is also accused of anti-Semitism for this passage about a Jewish character in her novel Rubyfruit Jungle:

“[Barbara Spangenthau] always had her hand in her pants playing with herself, and worse, she stank. Until I was fifteen I thought that being Jewish meant you walked around with your hand in your pants.” [BECK, E., 1982, p. xxiv]

Lesbian author Bertha Harris? Her “novel lover,” continued Evelyn Torton Beck, “shocked me by its reliance on Jewish stereotypes, associating Jews with violence, sex and money.” [BECK, E., 1982, p. xxv] What about Norta Koertge’s Who Was That Masked Woman? “This is a book,” says Beck, “in which most of the Jewish characters are ostentatiously rich, superficial, and sexually promiscuous.” Koertge also dares to write the following “anti-Semitic” passage:

“Take the Jews – they aren’t very well liked but they do okay – get into Who’s Who and all that stuff while the Poles stay down in Chicago and work in the steel mills – and the blacks – they’re even worse off. What makes the difference? Is it a case of native intelligence or cultural heritage or what?” [BECK, E., 1982, p. xxiv]

Even Black feminist Judy Simmons is singled out for attack for this part of one of her poems:

“Mine is not a People of the Book/taxed but acknowledged; their distinction is not yet a dignity; their Holocaust is lower case. “ [BECK, E., 1982, p. xxvii]

For those Jews who might be squeamish with the ominous implications of
outright book banning of authors who write critically of Jews, advises Mark Gelber, “sensitive teachers should consistently exclude ‘anti-Semitic literature’ from syllabi in the hope that this literature will be practically eliminated from the canon.” [GELBER, p. 12] As a last resort, we are advised, teachers could always present the offensive text with addenda materials flattering to Jews, thereby turning a literature class into an advertisement for pro-Jewish ideas about Jewish history.

Bizarrely, in the relentless Jewish search for “anti-Semitic” books and authors that – by the above standards – literally merit censorship and vilification, sinister culprits are to be found in the most astonishing of quarters: Jews themselves. This genre of literary anti-Semitism must be somehow excused by the Jewish Thought police, however, or their very logic of oppression implodes. Modern Jewish authors like Philip Roth, for example, whose unflattering stories about his people make his “Jewishness suspect,” [GELBER, p. 11] pose special problems to Jewish critics; as a Jew, however, he is generally afforded more anti-Semitic slack. The “anti-Semitic” genre in American literature includes a significant number of Jewish writers in the early and mid-twentieth century. In-house Jewish self-critical commentary is one thing, but when it leaks into the non-Jewish world it can be an embarrassing problem. Charles Angoff and Meyer Levin note that such authors

“began to produce ‘realistic’ portraits that, in a closed ghetto world, might have been accepted as self-critical, ironic, and satirical, but that in an open English-reading world had the unhappy effect of confirming from Jewish sources the most strident anti-Semitic summations of ‘Jewish character.’ Thus, Ben Hecht’s A Jew in Love was about a name-changed Jewish publisher who put all his energy into seducing young women, usually Gentile. This bestseller was followed by Jerome Weidman’s I Can Get It for You Wholesale and Budd Schulberg’s What Makes Sammy Run?, two skillfully written novels about Jewish business cheats ... A host of lesser works pictured Jews as gangsters and exploiters, to the point where the Jewish community began to ask, “Is there anything decent to write about?” [ANGOFF/LEVIN, p. 10]

Across the world, Jewish literature contributing to anti-Semitism by today’s Jewish standards even includes Theodore Herzl, the revered “father” of Zionism and the modern state of Israel, who was also a playwright. Bernard Avishai notes that “in 1894, Herzl wrote what he thought was his best play, The New Ghetto, which was full of anti-Jewish stereotypes – lives revolving around social climbing, marriage made for profit, stock-market manipulations.” [AVASHAI, p. 36] Herzl also loved the music of 19th century German nationalist and vehement anti-Semite Richard Wagner. So inspired was Herzl by Wagner’s music, he wrote: “Only on those nights when no Wagner was performed did I have any doubts about the correctness of my [Zionist] idea.” [RASKAS, p. 11] Likewise, in the literature tradition of Israel, there is the traditional Zionist condemnation of the European “ghetto Jew,” condemnations that closely parallel classical anti-Semitic attacks. [See chapter on Israel, p. 1725] In Shalmo Golan’s novel,
The Death of Uri Peled, for example, an indigenous Israeli tells a Diaspora Jew who has moved to Israel that “the fighters of our War of Independence died for you, so that this land could absorb the likes of you – refugees who arrive from many exiles. We spilled our blood for this country, and you, I’m telling you, don’t you turn it into a pigsty with your swinish galut [exilic/diaspora] wheeling and dealing.” [RUBINSTEIN, A, p. 135]

In Germany, prominent Jewish author Kurt Tucholsky had “created a character called Herr Wendriner as the prototype of the Jewish German businessman. Wendriner was interested only in money. He was egocentric, petty, cruel, and stupid. As Harold Poor, Tucholsky’s biographer, notes, these sketches were extremely popular in Germany during the [pre-Hitler] Weimar period.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 124]

Books about the Holocaust are especially delicate for the Jewish Thought Police. “The fact of the Holocaust and the anguish of its victims are not items for conjecture or debate,” demands professor Richard Libowitz, “To legitimate these materials [controversial books about the Holocaust, most which argue that the Nazi mass murder of Jews was not as large as popularly claimed], and to suffer their continuing presence within our libraries is to provide passive support for anti-Semitism in its latest guise. Individuals should check the periodical contents of their own institutions and should these items appear, initiate the procedure for their removal.” [LIBOWITZ, ASKING, p. 72]

David Gershom Myers, a Jewish associate professor of English at Texas A&M University, was also busy banning books within his reach in 1996. There were ten that drew his attention and ire. As the Austin American-Statesman editorialized about this censor in academe,

“[Myers] is on a crusade to remove from the college library books that deny the Jewish Holocaust under Nazi Germany ... Once works denying the Holocaust are prohibited, what’s next? Many, many books are offensive to someone, and banning any of them is a slippery slope indeed.” [AUSTIN AMERICAN-STATESMAN, 4-12-96, p. A14]

Myers successfully lobbied the university library to add new subheadings (“Errors and Inventions”) to the books’ listing under “Holocaust, Jewish History.” Some volumes were even cross-listed to his satisfaction under “anti-Semitism.”

Some of the early violence-threatening poems of the African-American poet Imamu Baraka – which in later years he publicly repudiated – expressed extreme hostility towards the Jews and were, by anyone’s standards, malicious. Rooted in a Black man’s perceptions of Jewish exploitation of his community, such poems are direct attacks of Jews; a resultant discussion, not of Jews per se, but of Jewish-Black relations are not only necessary but inevitable. Such poems are expressly about that subject. The still broader context of such work is the common 1960’s rise of “Black rage,” rooted in African-American frustration and disillusionment, and reckless expressions of hopelessness and anger. Baraka’s ravings against Jews were no more severe than his (and many other Black writers’) bitter writings against “white society” in general. (Interestingly, Baraka, formerly Leroi Jones, was once married to a Jew, Hettie Cohen).
There are various means to thrust the Jewish Thought Police’s self-obsession of their alleged misportrayals across history onto center stage of classical works of English literature. In an introduction to a reissue of Charles Dickens’ classic novel, *Oliver Twist*, for example, published by Bantam Books in 1981, Jewish author Irving Howe was afforded space to force the reader’s attention (for nearly four pages) to modern Jewish polemics surrounding Dickens’ character ‘Fagin,’ an “archetypical Jewish villain.” As preface to the novel, readers are served a mini-history of Jewish objection to the Fagin persona – a Jewish woman, it seems, had even written a complaint to Dickens that the character was too negatively stereotypical. Dickens actually wrote back to her, saying, “Fagin is a Jew because it is unfortunately true, of the time to which the story refers, that that class of criminal almost invariably was Jewish.” [HOWE, p. 369-373] (A real life model for Dickens may have been Ikey Solomon who had undergone a much publicized trial in England a few years before the book was written). The disturbing precedent Howe’s framing of the novel sets, of course (for those who have the power to enforce such things), is that any literature must be subject to polemical rebuttal in a kind of aggrieved “class action” to begin (and essentially merge with, and reframe) the original writing itself. Hence, a novel becomes – first and foremost – a polemical course on Jewish history and identity.

In 1962, *Oliver Twist* was recreated as a British musical comedy. Reflecting the revisionist times, the actor who played Fagin expressed the character, as one reviewer observed, “as the dottiest old dear imaginable.” [BELTH, p. 56]

This strategy of revisionism has become common. In 1997, for example, bowing to Jewish pressure, the Marin Center Showcase Theatre in San Rafael, California, agreed to a Jewish Community Relations Council question-and-answer discussion after each performance of Geoffrey Chaucer’s “Prioress’ Tale,” from his famous *Canterbury Tales*. “Hotly debated,” noted the *Jewish Bulletin*, “is whether the ‘Prioress’ Tale’ is indeed a satire of ... violently anti-Semitic attitudes or merely an expression of them.” [STERLING, 1997, p. 30]

One of the most famous negative portrayals of Jews in English literature is the character Shylock in Shakespeare’s play, *Merchant of Venice*. Written in 16th and 17th century England, Shylock reflects the Christian perceptions of the era; he is depicted as usurious, villainous, fraudulent, exploitive, and cruel. “The most effective way of making the play acceptable to post-Holocaust sensibilities,” notes Jewish critic John Gross, “in the view of many directors, is to underscore the prejudices of the Christian characters, and generally show them in an ugly light.” [GROSS, p. 329] In some productions of the play, Shylock is even completely reconstituted, as in Arnold Wesker’s version, where Shylock became “scholarly, impetuous, and warm-hearted.” [GROSS, p. 335] One French critic, Pierre Spriet, has even went so far as to dismiss the play entirely, suggesting that the work is so anti-Semitic, “it must be abandoned.” [GROSS, p. 345] In 1999, an actor on tour from South Africa, Percy Sieff, was portraying Shylock as “a worldly, successful businessman who has become embittered by discrimination and compensated by focusing on money.” [BLOCH, F., 9/10-16/99]
In 1994 Rabbi Richard Litvak spearheaded a protest of a performance of the *Merchant of Venice* by a Shakespeare theatre group in Santa Cruz, California. Jewish lobbying resulted in a plan for “discussion groups” and “program notes” about Jewish concerns about the Shylock character. Rabbi Litvak noted the effect of Jewish protest, turning the performance of a Shakespeare play into quite something else: “The director and the festival have expressed a commitment to try to make the play a vehicle for raising awareness of anti-Semitism.” [ROSENBERG, N., 5-27-94, p. 35]

“It was with great trepidation that I agreed to undertake the responsibility of commenting on yet another production of William Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice,*” wrote censorial Jewish professor Racelle Weinman in 2001,

“In this instance the venue is the PBS Masterpiece Theatre series ... I have come to the conclusion that the Holocaust negates the untenable premise of *The Merchant of Venice.* It should not be produced ... [T]he bottom line is that the text remains the text ... [Director Trevor] Nunn tries to make the character of the Jewish usurer, Shylock, more palatable by casting a Jew, Henry Goodman, in the role.” [WEINMAN, R., 10-4-01, p. 23-]

As early as 1912 Jewish American organizations were successfully lobbying the College Entrance Examination Board to remove the *Merchant of Venice* as a required reading for its tests. “School superintendents in all cities of 10,000 population or more” were then lobbied by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith to remove the text from study. “Between 1917 and 1920 many school systems discontinued study of the play.” [BELTH, p. 51-52]

*Mother Goose* was censored of its Jewish contents by the late 1930s:

“Jack sold his egg
to a rogue of a Jew
Who cheated him out
of half his due.
The Jew got his goose,
Which he vowed he would kill
Resolving at once
His pockets to fill. [DOBKOWSKI, M., 1979, p. 104]

A curious angle to all this, in view of the fact that the Shylock stereotype of the Middle Ages – a figure that symbolizes classically Orthodox Jewish separatism from non-Jews, exploitation and manipulation of Gentiles, communal resistance to defense obligations to the country in which they live, double moral standards for Jews and non-Jews, cheats, liars, ghetto-loving, et al – is held to be totally groundless today, yet it is a fact that the closest parallels in our own time to the Orthodox Jews of Elizabethan England are the black-dressed, self-cloistered Orthodox Hasidim of which there are today hundreds of thousands in Israel and America. (Eventually, the ultra-Orthodox Hasidic movement, which was created in the 1700s and represents a particular back-to-basics strand of Judaism, numbered about half of the Eastern European Jewish population. [LEVIN, M., 1966, p. xi] David Berger notes that “with the dawn of the 19th century, Hasidism .. became the dominant form of Judaism in much of
Eastern Europe, the heartland of 19th-century Jewry.” [BERGER, D., 2001, p. 24] Jewish scholar Solomon Poll even notes, for example, that, according to a Hungarian government report in 1914, Orthodox Judaism dominated the Jewish community in that country. And the attitude of Hungarian Jews not part of this traditional community? “Among the less observant and nonobservant Jews,” says Poll, “... they considered the observant Jews “old-fashioned,” “bigoted,” and “unreasonable.”) [POLL, S., 1969, p 14-15]

Not surprisingly, the perception by many secular Jews today – most particularly in Israel – of the self-segregated Hassidim (also called Haredi) communities is extremely similar to the classical non-Jewish Shakespearean-era perception of Shylock. An Israeli professor, Menachem Friedman, notes the characterization of these Ultra-Orthodox talmudists by secular fellow Jews in Israel: “The alienation and isolation of the Haredim, their eagerness to claim exemption from service in the Israeli army, their demands for increasing allocations for their society of scholars and sometimes unrestrained use of political power arouses resentment and even hatred among large sections of the Israeli public.” [FRIEDMAN, M, p. 190] [See also former, and later, chapters].

“Hatred of the ultra-Orthodox has deep roots [in Israel],” noted Israeli critic Laor Yitzhak in 1998,

“There is no offense so great that one cannot tag it on the Haredim – especially the guy with the black hat, frock coat, and side curls beloved of modern anti-Semites ... ‘Death to the black hatters’ is scribbled on toilet doors at the Tel Aviv School of Humanities; if fliers showing Haredi children and screaming ‘Kill them while they’re young!’ are being distributed in Kfar Saba, then it is those who participate in fomenting hatred against the Haredi minority who must prove there is not something behind their behavior frighteningly like anti-Semitism.” [LAOR]

Israeli scholar Yeshayahu Leibowitz notes the conflicts between secular Jews and the Ultra-Orthodox, and that “Perhaps we will reluctantly arrive at a separation into two nations [in Israel], with a differentiation not only from the aspect of marriage, but also with each going his historic way imbued by intense hatred [of the other].” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 40]

In 1986 the Jerusalem Post reported an Israeli poll that found one-fourth of its secular Jewish respondents called the Ultra-Orthodox – who like their ancestral counterparts have retreated into self-created ghettos, even in Israel – “opportunists, liars, and charlatans.” [LINDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 24] “There is much hostility to the Orthodox rabbinate among the majority (about 70% of the Jewish population) of secular Israeli Jews,” says Adam Garfinkel, “They see the rabbis as coercive and intolerant ... excessively political and unspiritual ... seeming never to have a word to say about kindness, humility, and God’s love for humanity ... To be blunt, some secular Israelis see the haredim as fanatical atavistic freeloaders who have yet to discover modern hygiene.” [GARFINKEL, p. 140]

In 2000, the results of study by Jerusalem’s Hebrew University about “hate” in 168 secular Israeli schools indicated that “47% of the Jewish students hate
haredim.” [PRINCE-GIBSON, E., 9-17-2000] A Jewish religious organization, Ahavat Israel, has even posted an entire section at its Internet site about what it calls “anti-Semitism in Israel”:

“Today, the attack upon the religious Jewish population is most heavily felt in the Israeli media, including newspapers, radio and TV ... In a recent 9 (Dec 98) column, Israel Eichler charges that many of the stereotypes used by the Nazis against Jews have been translated into Hebrew and employed to delegitimize the haredi (religious) public ... [Meretz political party founder] Shulamit Aloni described the haredi population as ‘suck[ing] from the same sinister passions which nurtured the Nazis’ ... ‘We have to storm Mea She’arim [a famous Jerusalem ultra-Orthodox enclave] with machine guns and mow them down,’ recommends left-wing darling Uri Avneri. ‘I would take all those weird people from Shas, Aguda, and Degel Hatorah and tie all their beards together and light a match,’ says Popolitika’s Amnon Danker. Yonaten Gefen announces his willingness to cast the first stone in the intifada [uprising] against haredim, and Prof. Uri Arnon tells a Kol Ha’ir interviewer, ‘Haredim should be suspended on an electricity pole’ ... Today ‘bloodsucker’ is a favored term for haredim ... ‘Parasite’ has become used so frequently in connection with haredim that the two have become virtually synonymous ... ‘When I see the haredim surrounded by their large families, I understand the Nazis,’ wrote sculptor Yigal Tumarkin – a statement which did not prevent him from being honored by Yad Vashem [Israel’s Holocaust memorial center]. And Tommy Lapid sees the haredim as having usurped the traditional Jewish role of ‘taking advantage of the gentile, trading in his blood, and laughing at him,’ only this time with the secular [Jewish] public in the role of the gentile.” [AHAVAT ISRAEL, 2001]

At another site, the Freeman Center for Strategic Studies, a Jewish author sites a list of anti-chasid charges compiled by the editor of the Israeli magazine NATIV:

“‘Black ants.’ ‘Dogs tied up in the back yard, barking psalms all nights.’ ‘Humming locusts.’ ‘Forces of darkness and kidnappers of Souls.’ ‘Vulgar baboons.’ ‘Barbarians, the Black Front ... representing the magical, bewitched and most primitive ... whose schools are colleges of darkness.’ ‘The darkest and and most horrible phenomena (sic) of our age,’ (by a senior Israeli diplomat in the United States). From two different members of the Knesset: ‘Leeches, snakes, suckled on the same evil urges as Nazism, greedy and domineering, evil and primitive, corrupt, parasites, ambitious.’ ‘A horrible evil, a black devil.’ Finally, Arie Stav quotes one of Israel’s best known writers: ‘A band of armed gangsters committing crimes against humanity, sadists, pogromchiks and murderers.” [WINSTON, E., 10-98]

“Stav [the editor of NATIV]” says Emmanuel Winston, “quotes even worse examples of statements and caricatures that are actually blood libel by the self-
styled ‘intellectual elite of the Israeli Left. They are authors, members of the
Knesset, senior journalists, diplomats and professors.” [WINSTON, E., 10-98]

In 2000, the Cleveland Jewish News reported that, in Israel, “there have been
many instances of anti-haredi graffiti on haredi synagogues, and even, in 1998,
the torching of two haredi classrooms in Pardess Hanna, where local secular
[Jewish] residents tried to keep haredim from moving into their neighbor-
hood.” [DERFNER, L., 6-30-2000, p. 10-]

Robert Eisenberg, whose parents are Yiddish-speaking Jews from Eastern
Europe, even notes what a Holocaust survivor had to say about the ultra-
Orthodox. Here Eisenberg speaks to an older Jewish couple in New Jersey:

“My [husband] Morris was in Auschwitz. Ask him what he thinks of
the Hasidim. Morris, come here,” she orders. He shuffles in like a Fog-
horn Leghorn auditioning for a part, cigar clenched firmly between his
teeth. ‘What do you think of the Hasidism?’ Without missing a beat in
he begins to intone,

Huset Ganef
Geh Ka’ Chrzanow
Koif a fayert Lieg in drayert.
(Hasid, you crook
Travel to Chrzanow, for a look
Buy a horse
Then drop dead, of course.)
It’s a child nursery rhyme my grandmother used to chant on those rare
occasions when she saw a Hasid in Nebraska.” [EISENBERGER, R., 1995,
p. 158]

In a 1982 book Jewish American author Earl Shorris noted the Hasids in a
chapter about Jewish shame ( “anti-Semitism?” “Self-hatred? “) for the behavior
of other Jews. Here Shorris is troubled by an encounter with Hasidic salesmen
at a photo shop in New York City:

“As we neared [the sale counter], now sweating like everyone else in the
salesroom, I saw that the salesmen were all young Hasidic Jews. A fat boy
in his twenties – his white shirt smudged; his fly partly unzipped below
his bulging belly; his spotty, untrimmed beard curling with sweat –wait-
ed on the customer next to me. When my turn came, he said, Well?
I want an AM-FM portable radio, one that sounds reasonably good.
You want ten dollars? A hundred dollars? what?
Somewhere in the middle. Fifty.
He thrust a catalogue in front of me, opened it to the pages devoted to
portable radios, and said, When you know, you’ll tell me.
The Hasidim have given up ritual bathing, I thought, for I could smell
him from across the counter. He stank of the gruel of seat and detritus
that collects in the creases of the body and sour. His clothes stank. He
eyeglasses were smudged. His hands were pale and dirty ... He went to
another customer. I could not think of the radio, only of him, of this Jew
who had presented himself to me. I chose a radio ... [A second Hasidic
salesman comes over to help him] ... We stared at each other for a moment, as if to compare our lives. I, too, wear a bear, a curly Jewish beard, once black, now turning gray. He knew what I was thinking. Well, what? he said. He did not hide his irritaion at my examination of him ... Hostility grew between us. He saw in my eyes what the Ostjuden [Eastern European Jews] had seen in the eyes of the German Jews. He could dance, he could fly, he could tell stories of the Baal Shem Tov that even Martin Buber did not know. How dare I look at him with scathing eyes! ... [As he left, he paid a female cashier for his purchase] ... I gave her the money. She gave me the package. We did not speak. She told me that she knew what I was thinking and that she had known similar thoughts. She smiled. It was not a real smile. It seemed to belong to a prisoner ... It’s difficult to be in a place like that ... I’m so put off by them. I have to keep reminding myself that we’re brothers.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 67, 68] ... Is it possible that Jews could rise completely above the pain of disapproval that we call shame?” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 72]

In the 1990s, secular Jewish professor Stephen Bloom tried to connect to his Jewish heritage via a Chabad Lubavitcher (ultra-Orthodox/Hassidic) community in the little town of Postville, Iowa. He went there with the legends of Jewish historic identity and was stunned with what he found. “Many of the Hasidim I had encountered in Postville pretended to be holy,” he wrote,

“but their actions displayed bigotry and racism of the worst degree. The book [Bloom wrote, entitled Postville] explored taboo topics such as bargaining, poor hygiene, atrocious manners, disrepair of homes, Jewish elitism, sexism, crime and prejudice directed a gentiles. In response, I’ve received dozens of hate letters, all from Orthodox Jewish readers, who essentially pose the same question as my father’s. To these readers, to criticize any aspect of Judaism is patently unacceptable. To them, I wasn’t a journalist doing my job. I was a self-loathing Jew, the worst kind of anti-Semite. I was embarrassing the family ... When journalists parachuted into Postville, if the locals said anything bad – or even neutral – about the Hasidic Jews, the response was swift and to the point. Mayor John Hyman was labeled an anti-Semite when he told a reporter for the Minneapolis Star-Tribune that the Jews in Postville don’t pay their bills on time [which Bloom found to be a true assessment].” [BLOOM, S., 2000, p. 355, p. 340]

What does all this mean? The foundation of animosity (defined as “anti-Semitism”) towards “traditional” Jewish behavior, as best manifest today by the cloistered, seclusionist, Jewish haredim/hasidic communities – a behavior that was a mainstay for centuries by all Jews in Europe and throughout the world, is so great that even other (secularized) Jews today express vehement disdain and outrage towards their obsessively “particularist” – and exploitive – fellows. And this is crucial: today’s haredim merely reflect meticulous attention to the ages-old religious laws of Jewish orthodoxy. As Michael Govrin notes, living under the Halacha – Jewish religious law – “until
two hundred years ago was the only way a Jew could define him or herself.”
[GOVRIN, M., 2001]

As Israeli Amos Elon notes, more mildly, about the tensions within the secular Jewish psyche when they visit Mea Shearim (the hasidic ghetto in Jerusalem):

“Modern Israelis ...are attracted to the notion of encountering their own roots and at the same time they are repelled ... When they gaze now at these bearded men, with their alarmingly pallid faces, at their ringlets and strange clothes, so unsuited to the climate, and at their tired looking wives, modern Jews are torn by conflicted feelings ... They see their own grandfathers and grandmothers, who went up as smoke through the chimneys of Auschwitz and Treblinka. ‘Because of Hitler you have no right to oppose this kind of Judaism,’ the [Israeli] novelist wrote in 1982.” [ALON, 1991, p. 189]

Melford Spiro, in a study of the Israeli kibbutz system (known for his socialist system), has the following commentary:

“Religious Jews – or more accurately, orthodox Jews whose ‘visibility’ is pronounced – are the objects of similar attitudes [among residents of the kibbutz]. A fourth-grade girl, asking her father if he had ever prayed, proceeded to describe with much laughter how the ‘Jews in Europe’ had prayed. Her description, accompanied by grotesque gestures, was in the tradition of anti-Semitic caricature. And from the other end of the age scale came this comment from an adult sabra [native born Israeli]: ‘I hate them (the orthodox Jews), and when I see them I can understand why people are anti-Semitic.” [SPIRO, p. 388]

Yet another angle on all this is Israeli Ashkenazim (Jews from Europe) views of their Sephardic (Jews from Arab countries, Iran, et al) fellow citizens. As Raphael Patai notes: “In addition to instability, emotionalism, impulsiveness, unreliability, and incompetence, the Oriental [Sephardic] Jew is accused [by other Israeli Jews] of habitual lying and cheating, laziness, uncontrolled temper, superstitiousness, childishness, lack of cleanliness and in general ‘primitivity’ and ‘lack of culture.’” [PATAI, in Selzer, p. 58] (This, of course, probably also reflects racist Jewish views of Arab culture, by which the Sephardic were inevitably tainted). In former centuries, “in some countries and places Ashkenazim and Sephardim refused to intermarry. At one time in the eighteenth century the Sephardic Jews in the town of Bordeaux in France tried to persuade the Christian authorities to forbid Ashkenazic Jews to live there. Here was the unbelievable spectacle of one group of Jews urging the government to banish another group of Jews!” [GITTELSOHN, R., 1964, p. 32]

In the early years of the 20th century, German Jews ostracized Jews from Eastern Europe. For example, “[In a small midwestern town] a student rabbi,” says Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn,

“there for the Holydays, was interested in discovering why the women of his Reform congregation seemed to be antagonistic to Hadassah, the women’s Zionist organization. After questioning several women and re-
ceiving answers which he knew were merely excuses, he finally found a young woman, new to the community, who explained the situation honestly. ‘Our women stay away from Hadassah,’ she said, ‘because the present members of the organization are mostly Russian and Polish Jews. Most of them are rather poor, and some of them haven’t completely lost their foreign accents. Because these women were the organizers of Hadassah here, our women, who are mostly German Jews, wealthier and more Americanized than they, rarely join Hadassah.”

‘GITTLELESOHN, R., 1964, p. 34’

Incredibly, intolerant ultra-Orthodox Jews of Israel are themselves guilty of what one Israeli newspaper called “Jewish antisemitism.” While a graffiti-laden Jewish tombstone in, say, Bulgaria is international news, the following kind of story never gets beyond in-house Jewish ethnic news circles. As part of interreligious conflicts between Orthodox and Reform/Conservative Judaism movements in Israel, the *Cleveland Jewish News* noted the following in 2000:

“The Israeli political and religious establishment condemned Saturday night’s arson at a Jerusalem Conservative synagogue, but something was missing from their statements – any hint that the fire might have been started by Jewish extremists, or Jews at all ... Chief Rabbi Yisrael Meir Lau, who in the past compared Reform Jewry (the term Israelis use for all non-Orthodox Jewry) to Hezbollah terrorists, condemned the arson, but couldn’t bring himself to use the term ‘synagogue.’ Instead he called it a ‘building specified for prayer by a stream,’ without specifying which religion the stream belonged to. In an editorial about the arson titled ‘Jewish antisemitism,’ The *Jerusalem Post* said of Lau’s remarks: ‘This type of refusal to recognize other legitimate streams of Judaism creates an atmosphere that may have led to the attack.’ The fire, which got within a few yards of the Torah ark, was the second arson in three weeks at the synagogue located in Ramat, a sprawling, increasingly hareidi (rigorously Orthodox) area of Jerusalem ...”

While Jerusalem Mayor Ehud Olmert, who visited the synagogue two days after the arson, declined to point a finger in any direction, a senior municipal official said, ‘Of course this was done by Jews ... In the past, arson and attacks of vandalism against Reform and Conservative synagogues have gone unpunished. No one has ever been arrested for the 1997 burning of a Reform nurse school in Mevasseret Zion, a suburb of Jerusalem, even though local Shah (Sepharid rigorously Orthodox) Party supporters had threatened the lives of Reform Jews in town only months before. Likewise, no arrests were ever made in the 1997 attacks on the Har-El (Reform) synagogue in Jerusalem, which included pouring acid on the synagogue garden, smearing excrement on the front door, painting swastikas and religious curses. The *Eshel Avraham* (Conservative) synagogue in Beer Sheva, which has woman rabbis, Gila Dror, can ‘expect to have its windows broken every couple of weeks,’ said Masorti (Israeli Conservative) movement spokesman Yonatan Liebowitz. The above, of course, is only a partial list.” [DERFNER, L., 6-30-00, p. 10-]
“As for the political and religious establishment’s refusal to accuse anybody of the crime – even when the enemies of the Conservative and Reform are only too well-known,” remarked Israeli rabbi David Rosen in response to these arsons and the fact that no one was ever charged with crimes for them, “This is an unfortunate reflection of the political intimidation carried out by the religious extremists.” [DERFNER, L., 6-30-01, p. 10-]

But let’s return to the easier, less complicated target of the Gentile version of “anti-Semitism.”

In the American literature world, more peculiar as a literary anti-Semitic source for Jewish outrage are E. L. Dachslager’s selected examples from the work of T.S. Eliot. Dachslager writes:

“Let us say, for example, we are teaching the poetry of T.S. Eliot and discussing specifically “Gerontion” and “Burbank with a Baedeker: Bleistein with a cigar.” What do we say about the references to the “Jew” who “squats on the window sill” or to Bleistein “with palms out / Chicago Semite Viennese?” Or to Eliot’s intention by such references and our reaction to them, to Eliot’s and to the poem?” [DACHSLAGER, p. 317]

These relatively innocuous lines are the most forceful that this Jewish scholar chooses from Eliot as evidence for endemic literary persecution of Jews?

Many Jews hold T. S. Eliot in special opprobrium. Norma Rosen argues that although anti-Semitic references in Eliot’s voluminous work “are not many, they are prime.” [ROSEN, p. 10] Among the most widely highlighted by Jewish critics are these three lines from an Eliot poem:

The rats are underneath the piles
The Jew is underneath the lot.
Money in furs ...

Let’s put this into some perspective. A lot of Eliot’s poetry was lamenting the materialist decadence and emptiness of modern society. Jews played – and play – their strong part in this. And unless the Thought Police are to seize complete control, artists have been generally afforded the latitude to criticize all and everything they so please; the best ones are expected to be controversial. Modern art, by its very nature, steps on toes. Even sacred ones. If not, shall all peasants, Poles, and non-Jews generally light their torches and assail the equally sinister stereotypical defamations of them in the distinctly Jewish Holies of literature? Take, for example, the great Jewish-Zionist poet Bialik, who wrote that “while Jacob [Jews] spends his time praising the Lord, Esau [Gentiles] spends his time drinking and beating his wife.” [GONEN, p. 135] Or Isaac Bashevis Singer, who wrote, “The peasants are extremely sound sleepers but the devil does not permit their young women to rest but leads them down back paths to barns where the [Jewish] peddlers wait in the day.” [SINGER, The Spinoza, p. 195]

Many American Jews charge Polish society with anti-Semitism. In 1980, their opinions were seemingly, to their eyes, confirmed when Isaac Bashevis Singer won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1980. Singer, born in Poland, moved later to the United States. The gripe was that he was not widely recognized, nor highly regarded, in his homeland and his works were difficult to find there. But,
as a young Jew living in Poland told Jewish American author Laurence Weschler, Singer’s work has nothing to do with Poland or the Polish people. It is completely Judeo-centric: “Singer didn’t concern himself with the Poles. Read those stories, as I have – I read them in English. Poles hardly appear in them and when they do they are portrayed as shadowy, alien figures. In a fundamental sense, Singer is not a Polish writer.” [WESCHLER, p. 35]

In another of Singer’s short stories, a non-Jewish doctor, Yaretzsky, seduces his deaf-mute maid, teaches obscenities to a parrot, and treats his female patients “outrageously ... Before they could say what was wrong, he made them disrobe.” [SINGER, The Spinoza, p. 7] Do we let such recurrent slurs of violence and lechery against non-Jews pass in the name of Art, despite the fact that there is a recurring, institutionalized pattern of such defamation in Jewish literature?

Arnold Eisen observes the same themes of defamation against Gentiles among other Jewish authors:

“When the Jewish protagonist in [Saul] Bellow’s The Victim accuses the gentile protagonist of being a drunkard, and the latter responds that all Jews see gentiles in this way, or when the honest Jew of Malamud’s The Victim is the victim of a sexually driven gentile who despite himself cannot master his own cruel urges – then, as Philip Roth has noted, we confront head-on the imagery of the [Jewish] folk imagination. Here one finds the rabbinic voice of the chosen people re-emergent. The moral Jew must separate himself from the licentious ways of the pagans, accepting responsibilities for the world (as in The Victim) against gentiles, who would lay the blame on powers beyond our control.” [EISEN, p. 142]

Here too Eisen, as a Jewish scholar, frames for us his own (and his community’s) typical double-standard: the Jewish anti-Gentile equivalent (at least) of stereotypical anti-Semitism is mildly described as the Jewish “folk imagination.”

This “folk imagination” is poignantly demonstrated in yet another Singer (Bellow too is a Nobel Prize winner for literature) short story, where Gentiles are (per long-standing Jewish tradition) portrayed as generically/genetically violence prone:

“A Jew should have a beard,” Haim replied. “You have to be different from the Gentiles in some way.” “The way you have lived, you’re a Gentile too,” Genia said. “As long as I have never beaten or killed anybody, I can call myself a Jew.” [SINGER, The Spinoza, p. 284]

Looking elsewhere, the New York Times called Michael Gold’s 1930s-era fictionalized autobiography about life in the Jewish section of Manhattan, Jews Without Money, a “masterpiece.” Here’s how he treats the non-Jewish Other:

“My mother sighed with relief ... Christians did not seem like people to her. They were abstractions. They were the great enemy, to be hated, feared and cursed ... We children heard endless tales of the pogroms. Joey Cohen, who was born in Russia, could himself remember one. The Christians had hammered a nail into his uncle’s head, and killed him. When we passed a Christian church we were careful to spit three times;
otherwise bad luck was sure to befall us. We were obsessed with wild stories about how the Christians loved to kidnap Jewish children, to burn a cross on each cheek with a red-hot poker. They also cut off children’s ear, and made a kind of soup. Nigger [a Jewish friend] had once seen Jewish ears for sale in the window of of a Christian butcher shop.

‘In the old days,’ my mother said, ‘the Christians hunted the Jews like rabbits. They would gather thousands in a big marketplace, and stuff pork down their throats with swords, and ask the Jews to be baptized. The Jews refused, of course. So they were burned in great fires, and the Christians laughed, danced and made merry when they saw the poor Jews burning up like candles. Such are the Christians... I would spend long daylight hours wondering why the Christians hated us so, and form noble plans of how I would lead valiant Jewish armies when I grew up, in defense of the Jews.” [GOLD, M., p. 164-165]

In Jewish circles, of course, this kind of “folk imagination” is not considered absurdly exaggerated prejudicial stereotypes, nor nakedly stereotypical racism, stemming from their religiously-based victimology mythos, but history. In the late 1970s a Russian Jewish émigré to America, summarizing Jewish life in Russia, told the American Jewish Congress that “to understand the problem of the average Jew in Russia, you had to understand a rabbit surrounded by wolves, trying somehow to live with them in the same forest.” [ROTHCHILD, 1985, p. 48] (Popular Jewish convention holds that the Soviet Union has long been a bastion of anti-Semitism and Russian Jewry a disadvantaged people. Reviewing 1989 Russian census data, and the profound representation of Jews in the upper occupational strata in that country, Jewish scholar Michal Paul Sacks conceded in 1998 that “the occupational data do not show discrimination against Jews in high-level positions.” Indeed, Sacks’ 1998 article about the subject even noted the Jews of Russia to be, occupationally, a “privileged” group.) [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 260]

And the fleeing “rabbit” motif is actually part of ancient Jewish folk/religious legend. “That rabbit is called the YαΚΝΗαΖ,” notes David Gilner,

“That word is an acronym to remind Jews of the order of blessings in Passover rituals. But in German it sounds like ‘jag den Has’ or ‘Hunt the hare,’ and so it became a familiar image in Haggadahs to represent the persecution of the Jews.” [SULKES, S., 4-21-97]

Of course Eastern Europans, in the Jewish “collective memory,” were/are rapists. Based upon the ages-old Jewish martyrlogical tradition, left-wing Jewish author Earl Shorris noted his racial hatred of Russians as he toured the country in the 1970s:

“We had no common ancestors [with Russians]. Tony [Shorris’s son], I said softly careful not to wake him, you will discover one day that you are not descended from Russians but from Jews who happened to live in Russia. And if you do have Russian blood, it entered the line when a Cossack fell on a Jewish woman and raped her. It’s either history or racial memory, but I know it’s true. This is not home. And where is home?
On his mother’s side Tony is descended from Sheikh Sason ben Saleh, who is descended from Abraham Sason, the Venetian mystic who claimed to be a direct descendant of Shephatiah, the fifth son of King David. I laughed aloud at the thought of traveling with royalty, and a Marxist-Leninist king at that! [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 149]

Howard Jacobson, in 1993, noted the “invidious” captions defaming non-Jews that he found beneath photographs at an exhibition at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. The photographs and accompanying texts romanticized Jewish Eastern Europe, but, typically, as one caption proclaimed:

“The peasants around were so uneducated that you could not speak with them about anything. Their interest was just vodka, only alcohol to drink. But a Jewish peasant – he was a wise man who knew about life, without having a radio or a newspaper or any information, nothing but his own thoughts and understanding.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 193-194]

“Sound like any Jew you know?” writes Jacobson, sarcastically,

“Sound like anyone you know? But even if there were such a paragon of [Jewish] peasant wisdom, gleaning understanding from the closed university of his own thoughts, is it necessary to rub the vodka-peasant’s nose in the disparity? Must the rest of humanity be humbled because a Jew is bright? Hasn’t a Carpatho-Ukrainian-gentile eyes? If you prick him does he not bleed? What a mix and what a mess it is, this dreaming nostalgic hotchpotch of misery and pride, arrogance and schmaltz. Who can wonder that it leads at last to the moral confusion of being proud of your misery, of being half in love with the cruelties that have been visited on you.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 194]

And what about celebrated Jewish Holocaust survivor Jerzy Kosinski, whose book, “The Painted Bird, zoomed to fame in the 1960s? He has long since been exposed as fraud and chronic liar, committing suicide in 1991. The Painted Bird was understood by most readers and admirers as an autobiography of Kosinski’s escape from Nazi-occupied Poland. It was commonly referred to as an “account,” “confession,” or “testimony.” Fiction or not, the book was an indictment of Poland and the Polish people. As James Park Sloan notes:

“In stark, uninflected prose, The Painted Bird describes the disasters that befall a six-year old boy who is separated from his parents and wanders through the primitive Polish-Soviet borderlands during the war. The peasants whom the boy encounters demonstrate an extraordinary predilection for incest, sodomy, and meaningless violence. A miller plucks out the eyeballs of his wife’s would-be lover. A gang of toughs pushes the boy, a presumed Gypsy or Jew, below the ice of a frozen pond. A farmer forces him to hang by his hands from a rafter, just out of reach of a vicious dog. In the culminating incident of the book, the boy drops a missal while he’s helping serve Mass and is flung by angry parishioners into a pit of manure. Emerging from the pit, he realizes that he has lost the power of speech.” [SLOAN, JP, 1994, p. 46]
The Painted Bird is merely a vicious caricature reflecting traditional Jewish folklore about the (omnipresently anti-Semitic) Other. It is as racistically “anti-Other” as any literature can possibly be. The Other is always a subhuman beast, meandering about in their animal instincts. (Kosinski, darling of the New York Jewish intelligentsia, was rewarded with a National Book Award for his next novel!) Early in the volume, The Painted Bird’s lead character, hiding among Christian peasants (with their help!) from the Nazis, is self-described as being from an elite class – he “spoke a language of the educated class, barely intelligible to the peasants of the east.” [KOSINSKI, p. 2] All and every peasant the boy meets in the book is a caricature of bestiality and brutality while the innocent boy himself is even afraid of farm animals. [KOSINSKI, p. 4] Nonetheless, he first finds refuge with an old Gentile lady who “looks like a green-gray puffball,” [p. 3] he watches brutal non-Jewish boys set squirrels on fire, [p. 6] he accidentally (?) burns the old lady’s house down with her in it, [p. 10] and he passes one of the many Christian shrines in the area which is described as “a rotting crucifix.” [p. 13] At the next village, the boy is attacked by a crowd, dragged by the hair, knocked unconscious, and carried home in a sack by a peasant to where “small children crawl out like cockroaches.” The peasant turns to whip the boy so “I would hop like a frog.” [p. 14-15]

The Jewish character is then purchased by a superstitious local folk healer (p. 16). The boy eventually ends up in a loft watching a miller below “lashing his naked wife with a horsewhip.” When these two sit for dinner, the boy equates them with two copulating cats that mate near them as they eat. [p. 36] The miller soon gouges a young man’s eyes out with a spoon [p. 37] Later the innocent Jewish child runs across a beastly, hyper-sexual woman called “Stupid Ludmilla:”

“It was said that Stupid Ludmilla lived with this huge dog as with a man. Others predicted that someday she would give birth to children whose bodies would be covered with canine hair [subtle reference to the classical Gentile character, Esau, in Jewish tradition who was the beastly hairy one?] and who would have lupine ears and four paws.” [p. 47]

An “entire herd of drunken peasants” soon raped Ludmilla “until she lost consciousness.” [p. 47] Another peasant, Lekh, delights in catching birds, painting them different colors, and releasing them so that they are pecked to death by their own kind. [p. 50] Sexually attracted to Ludmilla the beast-woman, two shepherds soon contribute their own savagery upon her, raping and beating her. Then comes peasant village women who “sat on her hands and legs and began beating her with rakes, tearing out her hair, spitting into her face ... One of the women now approached, holding a corked bottle of brownish-black manure. To the accompaniment of raucous laughter and loud encouragements from others, she kneeled between Ludmilla’s legs and rammed the entire bottle inside her abused, assaulted slit, while she began to moan and howl like a beast.” [p. 52-54]

The boy is soon beaten by a carpenter who “threw me down on a pile of manure. He delivered one more blow to my head and I fainted.” [p. 62] The car-
penter intends to drown the boy in a sack, but the man falls into a vat, devoured by rats. [p. 64] Then there is the barbaric blacksmith’s wife who rolls lice into a medicinal dough with horse and human urine, as well as cat excrement. [p. 67-68] The boy is soon attacked and “lashed” by partisans, who cruelly murder dogs, horses, and cats. A peasant is stabbed in the back at a Christian wedding; and “in the dusk, village lads were grabbing girls and pushing them into the barn ... Drunks stumbled across the threshing yard, cursing to each other and vomiting, harassing the lovers and waking the snorers.” [p. 87] Also, “while the adults usually left me alone, I had to watch out for the village boys. They were great hunters; I was their game.” [p. 90]

Soon peasants are pulling the clothes off dead Jews [p. 102] and lusting over family photographs of young Jewish women found on dead bodies. [p. 105] A Jewish woman, found alive, is raped. During the rape, the offending peasant “appealed loudly to the Virgin Mary for help” to attain a satisfying violation. Then he beat his victim. [p. 106-107]

Yet another peasant, Garbos, regularly beats Kosinski’s protagonist “for no reason.” [p. 123] The boy is also tossed into a manure vat by angry churchgoers (where he listens to Christian organ music from the excrement, [p. 146] and is seduced by a farmer’s daughter.) [p. 151-152] Kosinski eventually voices the recurrent Jewish revenge motif: “I myself hated many people. How many times had I dreamed of the time when I would be strong enough to return, to set their settlements on fire, poison their children and cattle, lure them into deadly swamps. In the sense I had already been recruited by the powers of Evil and made a pact with them. What I needed now was their assistance for spreading Evil.” [p. 160]

This despicable defamation of the Polish people has been challenged in recent years to be complete fabrication, the product of Kosinski’s sick mind. As early as 1982, an article in the Village Voice alleged that Kosinski needed help to write his own books and that some of his accounts of his past were contradictory. (Kosinski, widely beloved in the New York literary world, and rewarded for the vicious racism in The Painted Bird; he was twice the president of the writers’ organization, PEN. He won the National Book Award for another novel in 1968. And, as biographer Sloan notes, this pervert’s “celebrated nightly forays to Plato’s Retreat and S&M clubs the New York piers helped make those establishments fashionable.”) [SLOAN, 1991, p. 47] Edwin Diamond also notes the influential behind-the-scenes pro-Kosinski politics of the New York Times: “[C]ritics also trashed [Times chief editor A. M.] Rosenthal for his role in the Kosinski affair, a bizarre episode that roiled the New York literary-social-media world in the early 1980s ... Rosenthal and [“his chief deputy Arthur] Gelb [both Jewish] were both friends of Kosinski ... Barbar Gelb [Arthur’s wife] wrote a glowing literary appreciation of Kosinski in the Times Magazine four months before the Village Voice attack appeared.” Rosenthal also encouraged smears of the Village Voice article.) [DIAMOND, E, 1993, p. 178-180]

Sloan, in the course of writing his volume about Kosinski, even journeyed to the Jewish author’s Polish hometown. There he found that Kosinski’s stories
about his life in Poland were completely fraudulent. And that Kosinski was a betrayer of the good people who had saved him from the Nazis. Local villagers who knew him were even united today in stating that, after the war, Kosinski’s father had turned local people over to the Soviet secret police. The maniacal defamations in *The Painted Bird*, a major betrayal to Kosinski’s real-life protectors, also hurt people. As Sloan notes about his interviews with those in the village,

“The *Painted Bird* ... came as a shock. ‘We saved their lives,’ [one old peasant] said, brushing away tears with the back of his hand. ‘And he turned us into monsters’ ... Kosinski was never separated from his parents for any significant period. The local peasants, living in a culture suffused with anti-Semitism, were scarcely free of its grip, but by all accounts these particular peasants did something brave and good for the Kosinski family during the war. *The Painted Bird* is fiction. Kosinski borrowed the atrocities from other accounts, or made them up.” [SLOAN, 1991]

Sloan concludes his investigation thusly, echoing a theme that is extremely familiar:

“If the novelist trimmed his experiences to accord with a personal myth, the narrative that resulted fell on receptive ears. Certainly it was a myth that the world, demanding purity and innocence of its victims, was all too ready to appropriate. Now all must profess to be shocked – that a practitioner of the liar’s profession, a man who survived the war by living a lie, told lies.” [SLOAN, JP, 1991, p. 53]

Kosinski is not an anomaly in the Jewish world; his accounts of the beastly Gentile Other is rooted in the norms of the Jewish folk tradition. “Jewish belief in Catholic anti-Semitism,” wrote Jewish author James Yaffe in 1968,

“has something irrational about it. Jews cling to it in spite of evidence to the contrary ... Many Jews have an emotional reaction against Catholics which goes deeper than logic. I. B. Singer writes about the twinge of uneasiness he used to feel as a boy whenever he passed a nun on the street. Few Jews are unfamiliar with this twinge. And Bruce Jay Friedman, American-born and much younger than Singer, says that the Catholic school across the street from him, when he was a boy, seemed like ‘the battlefield – a scary mysterious place.” Yet he admits that he never got into fights with the Catholic boys – in fact, nothing ever actually happened.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 50]

In a similar vein, in one of Philip Roth’s novels, the main Jewish character, Alexander Portnoy, fantasizes a conversation with his father about striking his mother, “Deck her, Jake. Surely that’s what a goy would do, would he not?” [BRODKIN, p. 161] And what conclusions might we make about the bizarrely racist Jewish world view in the collection of legends about Baal Shem Tov, the revered 18th century founder of Hasidism?: 
“I heard once that they put a turnip on Besht’s [the holy man’s] table, but he refused to eat it. They asked him why, and he said, ‘This turnip grew in a gentile cemetery.’ [BEN-AMOS, p. 197]

“When the Besht came to the inn they offered him an upholstered bed. When the Besht came and saw the bed he cried: ‘Vey! There has been sexual intercourse with a gentile woman on this bed. How is it possible for me to sleep on it?’ [BEN-AMOS, p. 223]

In a religious story about the Baal Shem Tov, by Menachem Gerlitz, the generic Gentile is, typically, rendered to be dull, stupid, robotic, barbaric, unfeeling, and a veritable animal – in fact, even less than one. The story is actually intended as an illustration of some of the reasons for the traditional Orthodox daily prayer that thanks God for not having been born a goy. In a chapter actually entitled The Gentile Peasant, the Jewish hero – the Baal Shem Tov as a young boy named Yisraelnu – watches with fascination as an old peasant, “uncombed, sloppy, only half awake,” enters his barn yard. The boy is stunned when the old peasant drinks from a pail of water intended for his horse: “He slurped the water down noisily, his wild, long hair falling into the pail, the water dripping and slopping over the sides onto his clothing. He paid no attention, just continued to drink.” The peasant then pulled out

“a hunk of old, moldy black bread” and “cramped it into his mouth ...
... The farmer was absorbed only in his food and didn’t even give a thought to thanking the One Who had given him a mouth and food to eat [God] ... Even the fowl – Yisraelnu was thinking – hopped about, cackling happily as if singing their thanks to the Creator of the world ... Even the horse neighed happily ... Only the farmer, queer creature, gave no thanks, made no bracha, said no prayer, did not even lift up his eyes to the heavens. Yisraelnu lowered his eyes. He was ashamed to speak to this man. He turned around and went back into the forest where he loudly exclaimed: “Baruch ata ... Blessed are you, Hashem [God] ... for not having made me a goy.”

Yisraelnu thanked Hashem with his whole heart, understanding the meaning of that blessing and being grateful for it for the first time in his life. Thank G-d that he was not like that rough, coarse farmer who did not even know how to say a word of thanks to Hashem, who was even worse than his own animals and fowl!

The horse greeted the morning joyfully, so did the rooster. Even the birds in the forest sang their thanks. The entire world offered praise and song while that lowly farmer seemed to have been hitched up to a wagon. All he knew was how to run.

That goy – thought Yisraelnu – is his own slave, whose only reward is a pail of water and a hard lump of bread. As this thought crossed his mind, he suddenly remembered the next wonderful morning blessing: ‘Baruch ata ... Blessed are You, Hashem ... for not having made me a slave.’ A wonderful feeling enveloped his whole body. ‘I am not a goy! I am not a slave! Baruch Hashem!
Yisraelnyu felt like jumping and dancing, like running, to express his thanks to Hashem, the Creator of the world, for all the kindness He had shown him by not making him a goy or a slave.” [GERLITZ, M., 1983, p. 50-58]

Traditional Jewish views of the hated Christian is also reflected in a story by Sholem Asch, one of the most famous Yiddish novelists. In a tale about Jewish martyrology in the face of attacking Cossacks, painted as Nazi-like exterminators, Asch also writes:

“Shlomele opened the church for the priest and ran away swiftly so as to not touch the walls of the church. He stopped at a distance so as not to become ‘unclean’ from hearing the singing in the church. And when the priest’s bass voice reached him none the less, he covered his ears with his hands in order not to hear the sounds, which would stupefy his mind against the study of the Torah.” [ASCH, S., 1959, p. 48]

“Many folk songs ... used to be sung in the shtetl [the Eastern European Jewish village],” notes James Yaffe,

“songs which declared that all the goyim are drunkards and lechers, and thick-headed muzhiks. By implication, of course, this made the Jews a finer breed; the element of contempt in the song was accompanied by an element of self-congratulation ... Though the shtetl is far behind American Jews, it’s extraordinary how much of those old folk songs are still part of their consciousness ... It will be objected that the ... inhabitants of the shtetl were unsophisticated people with little experience of the gentile world. I can only say that in the course of my interviews [with fellow Jews], I found the same opinions held by people with wide experience of the gentile world.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 66]

Here’s one of famous Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal’s contributions to Jewish (folk) history:

“[Wiesenthal’s] own father used to tell him how a [Ukrainian] village priest, who loved his schnapps, but couldn’t always pay for his drinks, left his church key as security with a Jewish tavern-owner one Saturday night, promising to settle his debt out of Sunday’s collection. Next morning, when his Ukrainian parishioners couldn’t get in to attend mass, he told them: ‘The dirty Jew at the pub has locked you out. Go get the key from him!’ They did – by beating the Jewish pub-keeper within an inch of his life, smashing or drinking everything in his tavern, celebrating mass, and then extending the celebration with a little local pogrom, amen!” [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 24]

In Yiddish/Hebrew “folk tradition,” Romanians are called “amolek” (an analogue to the despised Biblical “Ameleks”), the Irish called “beytzimer” (a pun on the word testes), the Germans the pejorative “deitshuk,” the Italians “lokh” (noodle), the Moldevians “moldevan” (“a boor or lout, yokel”), and the Prussians “preissn” (cockroaches). Armenians were called “timkhe.” “This Hebrew word in the Bible,” noted Jewish scholar A. A. Roback, “with reference to Amelek, the hereditary foe of the Israelites, curiously enough, is employed by Jews
in Galicia [Poland], as a nickname for the Armenians, whom, for some reason, they look upon as descendants of that eternally despised people.” [ROBACK, p. 141] “Goy” (the categorical term for non-Jews), of course, means “an illiterate, coarse or lowbrow person.” A “goyische kop,” continues Roback, is a “Gentile head. A dunce, bonehead. It may be noted that the Gentiles referred to here were peasants, but the Jewish folk mind denies far-sighted, sensitive intelligence, understanding, and brilliance even to highly trained and distinguished non-Jews.” [ROBACK, p. 139-140] (Traditional Jewish defamations of those of African descent will be discussed more extensively elsewhere).

Here’s a Jewish joke about their Italian neighbors (in Brooklyn, New York):

“Why do Italian men leave their fly open? To help them count to eleven.” [REIDER, J., 1985, p. 44]

A joke from Jewish circles (published in 1981) celebrating Jewish intelligence, Gentile stupidity, and Jewish fraud, runs like this:

“On a train in czarist Russia, a Jew is eating a whitefish, wrapped in paper. A Gentile, sitting across the aisle, begins to taunt him with various anti-Semitic epithets. Finally, he asks the Jew, ‘What makes you Jews so smart?’ ‘All right,’ replies the Jew, ‘I guess I’ll have to tell you. It’s because we eat the head of the whitefish.’ ‘Well, if that’s the secret,’ says the Gentile, ‘then I can be as smart as you are.’ ‘That’s right,’ says the Jew, ‘And in fact, I happen to have an extra whitefish head with me. You can have it for five kopecks.’ The Gentile pays for the fish head and begins to eat. An hour later the train stops at a station for a few minutes. The Gentile leaves the train and comes back. ‘Listen, Jew,’ he says, ‘You sold me that whitefish head for five kopecks. But I just saw a whole whitefish at the market for three kopecks.’ ‘See,’ replies the Jew, ‘You’re getting smarter already.’” [NOVAK/WALDOKS, 1981, p. 91]

“Not surprisingly,” note William Novak and Moshe Waldoks about the above joke, “anti-goyism is rarely stressed in public discussions of Judaism ... But centuries of hostility between Gentiles and Jews have led to a large body of aggressive and unpleasant feelings on both sides.” [NOVAK/WALDOKS, p. 91] Another extremely disturbing joke circulated in Jewish circles (one directly paralleling the vicious “Too bad Hitler didn’t get all the Jews” tone) is noted by Jewish authors Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, who cite the work of Jewish psychoanalyst Theodore Reik:

“Reik explains Jewish wit as a safety valve that transforms perceived hostility toward non-Jews in a manner designed to reduce the danger of retaliation. Sometimes, however, Jewish jokes (told, of course, among Jews only) reveal the anger quite directly: ‘Little Moritz sees an historical film showing the early persecutions of the Christians. During a Roman circus scene in which many Christians are thrown to the lions, Moritz breaks out in sobs and says to his mother: ‘Look at that poor lion there, it has not got any Goy to eat!’ Under the guise of duty for the neglected beast is an old hatred and repressed cruelty towards Gentiles. It breaks
through here, surprisingly, and reaches the emotional surface.””
[ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 122]

While such Jewish defamations of the non-Jew, as part of the Jewish world view, identity, and folk history, are never foregrounded for popular analysis and discussion, Jewish attacks upon Gentile writings about Jews is omnipresent. Another Jewish attacker of T.S. Eliot, Anthony Julius, has recently published an entire volume assailing the non-Jewish author: T.S. Eliot, Anti-Semitism, and Literary Form. Among the most hated Eliot lines, again, by Jews, are from the pre-World War I poem, “Gerontion”:

My house is a decayed house
And the jew squats on the window sill, the owner
Spawned in some estaminet of Antwerp
Blistered in Brussels, patched and peeled in London.

“[This] passage,” declares Julius, “breathes hate ... The words (squat, sill, spawned, estaminet, blistered, etc.) intimate is ‘spit’ ... spitting at the Jew in this opening stanza is one of the few moments of passion in a poem that is animated by despair and exasperation ... “ [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 332]

For Julius, Eliot’s image of a Jew who “squats at the window” is not only an image of being spit at, but also equated in Julius’ mind with defecation. “‘Going to write to the Jews,’” explains Julius, “was slang in France for announcing a trip to the lavatory.” [KATZ, D. p. 11] Elsewhere, says the Jewish critic, Eliot evinced “indifference to Jewish pain” and edited a journal that had an unsigned review of a book about claims about the murder of Jews in Dachau. Among other things, the questionable review wondered why Jews, “among all unfortunates of the world, have a first claim on our compassion and help.” “Here,” says reviewer David Katz (himself Jewish), “Julius makes his most serious charge, suggesting that Eliot promoted the Holocaust by disputing the claims made by the victims.” [KATZ, D, p. 11]

Ultimately, notes Katz, “Eliot’s is a talent Julius cannot fully grasp outside of anti-Semitism. Julius has little patience for our appreciation of the supple ways of Modernism, linking its conscious fragmentation to an irrationality that courts anti-Semitism ... He finds Browning’s ‘Rabbi Ben Ezra’ a superior poetic monologue to [Eliot’s] ‘Gerontion’ solely because the former evinces a more favorable attitude toward Jews.” [KATZ, D, p. 11]

Another of the recent articles defaming Eliot, by Norma Rosen, reflects the same dictatorial idea, i.e., whoever criticizes Jews is by definition an anti-Semite and, hence, by this sole criteria, a bad artist. “It falls to those,” says Rosen, “who are willing to risk it (not only Jews, one hopes) to protest to the world that a writer cannot be great so long as anti-Semitism mars the work.” [ROSEN, p. 14] (This kind of censorship – if the author has ever in his/her life criticized Jews, all artwork from, or regarding, the artist is deemed qualitatively marred – was echoed in 2002 at the Academy Awards. Jewish online journalist Matt Drudge featured a report about a film nominated for a number of Oscars. The movie, A Beautiful Mind, is based upon the life of mathematical genius John Nash, who, according to the book upon which the film is based, was extremely critical
of Jews. “The root of all evil, as far as my personal life is concerned (life history) are Jews,” Nash is quoted as writing. The prospect of an Oscar for the film now seemed doomed. “Three Academy members have come forward to reveal how they’ve switched their votes,” reported Drudge. “Why am I voting for this Jew hater?” a veteran Academy Award member said earlier this week before voting. ‘I am a Jew! I fell sick to my stomach. “’) [DRUDGE, 3-5-02; DRUDGE 3-9-02]

Jewish fanaticism in defaming non-Jewish literary traditions in a fine-toothed combing for anti-Semitism is noted by H. M. Daleski in his review of S. S. Prawer’s volume about (non-Jewish) British author William Thackeray:

“In Israel at Vanity Fair, S. S. Prawer deals exhaustively – and exhaustingly – with the representation of Jews in Thackeray’s writings. This includes all the writings, not only the author’s many published books but also his manifold work as a journalist and his private letters. In addition, since Thackeray was a considerable illustrator and illustrated many of his own writings – not to mention the sketches that he included in many of his letters – Prawer provides numerous reproductions of his drawings of Jews ... [Prawer] quotes copiously and leaves us feeling reasonably certain that there is no mention of a Jew or an allusion to anything Jewish, no matter how recondite, that has escaped his capacious net ... The amount of material accumulated is so overwhelming that one might be led to suppose that Thackeray was obsessed with Jews; in fact most of the references, especially in the novels, are incidental, and when one comes across them in context, they do not draw quite the same attention to themselves.” [DALESKI, p. 223-224]

How about the great Russian novelist, Doestoevsky (of Crime and Punishment fame)? A French Jew, David Goldstein, denounced him as an anti-Semite in a book called Doestoevsky and the Jews. American Jewish scholar Gary Morson also expressed concern, saying that “it disturbed me that almost no one talked about [Doestoevsky’s] anti-Semitism.” Yet Morson also criticized Goldstein, saying,

“I was struck by how Goldstein handled the fact that earlier in his life Doestoevsky wrote in defense of the Jews. For me, such a turn of events raised the question of what made Doestoevsky change his mind, but for Goldstein, who began with the assumption that anti-Semitism is innate and that Doestoevsky was an anti-Semite ‘a priori,’ the articles on behalf of Jews were dismissed as hypocritical, a devious attempt to appeal to liberals. Goldstein’s model of anti-Semitism as a sort of congenital disease ... itself seemed perilously close to prejudice.” [MORSON, p. 82]

More recently, Russian novelist and famous Soviet prisoner and refugee (to America) from communism, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, also is branded by some as an anti-Semite. Under particular scrutiny is Solzhenitsyn’s Red Wheels, a novel based on historical fact, that described a Jewish assassin and financial sponsor of V.I. Lenin in less than flattering terms. “The facts are true,” says Israeli scholar Abram Ben Yakov, in reviewing the book, “but the glue between them is anti-Semitic.” [i.e., descriptions of the characters] [SINGER, N., p. 2]
Solzhenitsyn had come under Jewish investigation for “anti-Semitism” as early as 1972, when the Zionist journal, *Midstream*, published an article by Mark Perakh. Perakh, said the *New York Times*, felt that “a disproportionately large number of unattractive Jews appear in his work.” Among those defending Solzhenitsyn against attack was his wife, Natalia, who is half-Jewish. [GRENIER, R., 11-13-85, p. C21]

French playwright and novelist Jean Genet? “Whether or not Genet is an anti-Semite,” says Edith Wyschogrod, “...comes to the fore in the content of the Arab-Israeli conflict in [his] *Prisoner of Love*. In teaching Genet, it will not do simply to cordon off bigotry and condemn it; rather, one must show how it seeps into his aesthetic.” [Wyschogrod, p. 256]

The work of German philosopher Martin Heidegger is also dismissed by many Jews as, ultimately, the expressions of a closet Nazi. “Jewish philosophy,” says Robert Gibbs, “…disavows Heidegger, seeing him a Nazi, even if a somewhat idiosyncratic one. Itsuspects that his philosophy was comfortable to Nazism, if not actually inclined to it.” [GIBBS, p. 157] The Jewish philosopher Wittgenstein? There are some who think he too had an “anti-Semitic” streak. [SZABADOS, B., 3-99, p. 1-27]

In 2002, lobbyists succeeded in banning the Muslim holy book, the *Koran* (Quran), from the Los Angeles school system. As the *Los Angeles Times* reported:

> “Los Angeles city school officials have pulled nearly 300 translations of the Koran from school libraries after learning that commentary in the books was derogatory towards Jews. Copies of ‘The Meaning of the Holy Quran’ were donated in December to the Los Angeles Unified School District by a local Muslim foundation ... On Monday, [Jim] Konantz [director of information technology for the district] received a complaint from a history teacher who concluded some of the book’s footnotes were anti-Semitic.” [SMITH, D., 2-7-02]

With the modern world so hypersensitive to Jewish themes, in 1999, an eighth grader in Pennsylvania was even suspended from school for a week for turning in a fantasy paper about another planet entitled “Jewpiter,” described by teachers as a “racist essay.” The student denied that the paper was intended to be anti-Semitic and his outraged family launched a lawsuit against the school. [DUFFT, 4-27-99] In January 2000, a high school basketball coach at Seminole Presbyterian High School was fined $150 by the Florida High School Activities Association for violating a rule against the “use of profanity or other such gutter language by a coach.” Coach Jan Bennett’s reputed offense to officials was to say, “You can’t line people up like Hitler did to the Jews during the Holocaust.” [PURKS, S., 1-27-2000, p. 10C]

How about the world of visual art? Jewish art historian Eunice Lipton, in reviewing *Degas’* painting entitled “At the Stock Exchange,” says

> “If this picture doesn’t equate secretive, clever, and vulgar financial scheming with ‘Jew,’ I’ve never seen a picture that does.” [LIPTON, p. 289]
Even a Jewish author in England, Chaim Bermant, was taken aback by a fellow Jew’s search for anti-Semitism in some paintings by John Singer Sergeant, saying,

“Kathleen Adler, for example, in an essay on John Singer Sergeant, would have us believe that he was an anti-Semite because of his portraits of a Jewish art dealer, Asher Wertheimer, and family were less than flattering: Wertheimer is represented as looking slightly off to the side, in a manner which hints at furtiveness. This portrait could be and, indeed, often was, regarded as the very image of the stereotype of the rich Jew, excessively flashy and, since art dealing was viewed only slightly above money-lending, probably of somewhat dubious honesty. She points to the cigar in his hand and believes that it ‘indicates not only wealth but also vulgarity and sexuality,’ and has similar misgivings about the portraits of his wife and daughters. The fact that they were a true likeness seems to be an irrelevance.” [BERMANT, p. 7]

In 2001, Jewish lobbying groups expressed outrage that Swedish cartoonist Lars Hillersberg had received a governmental lifetime stipend. Nominated for the honor by the Swedish National Board of Artists, Hillersberg was declared by “Jewish community leaders” to be an anti-Semite. “I hate Jews,” Hillersberg had once remarked, “but not only Jews – I hate everybody.” [JEWISH CHRONICLE, 2-16-01, p. 7]

Classical music? Wagner is a given. How about Johann Sebastian Bach, particularly his masterpiece St. John Passion. As the Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine noted in 2001:

The idea that [Bach] and his St. John Passion may be anti-Judaic (against the religion, as opposed to the race) surfaced five years ago at Swarthmore College, and now seems clearly verified five years later by the academic community, as spelled out in a Temple University Jewish Studies-sponsored panel ... Even if the piece is only momentarily offensive – the general opinion, and one with which I agree – some in the financially fragile early-music world may not want to present it, for fear of protests already seen in some cities.” [STEARNS, D., 2-27-01]

The witch hunt bandwagon to find anti-Semites, and the search to smear the dead, are so great that in 2000 a Chicago-based librarian sent the following query to a Jewish-led discussion about anti-Semitism on the Internet:

“I am a reference librarian at a public library. My patron is an artist and amateur researcher who has been studying the work of French artist Marcel Duchamp. She believes she’s discovered anti-Semitic references and images in his work, and she wants to know if anyone else has ever commented on this. Is there any evidence indicating that Duchamp was anti-Semitic or a Nazi sympathizer? I’ve looked through our holdings on Duchamp and checked a few article databases to no avail.” [SLOANE, P., 10-27-00]

Alas, none of the scholars on the subject could help her (yet).

“The dilemma of appreciating the art of an anti-Semite,” says Bernard Ras-
kas, “is a matter that confronts every thinking Jew. Chopin, Degas, Kant, Rodin, Joseph Campbell, Ronald Dahl, etc., displayed forms of anti-Semitism.” [RASKAS, p. 6] And what of Jewish betrayers and works of art that celebrate Christian themes? “Should we play and listen to the works of Mendelsohn and Mahler, both of whom converted to Christianity? Should we conduct and play Handel’s [Christian] Messiah? Should Shakespeare not be read because Shylock has entered the English vocabulary as an anti-Semitic word? Should Israelis stop using [German-made] Mercedes cars as taxis and American Jews refrain from driving Volkswagens? Ambiguities abound.” [RASKAS, p. 11]

Ultimately, if aforementioned Jewish critics like E. L. Dachslager really want to censor all literature that criticizes Jewry, and others like Rosen want to at least demote them from greatness to unread obscurity, entire libraries will have to be burned down and/or trucked to inaccessible warehouses. Not only literature but American and world history will have to be totally reshaped (as is happening) to accommodate an image entirely flattering to Jews. The problem is that some of the greatest and most respected authors in American (let alone worldwide) writing, associated with the best of the American democratic tradition and progressive values, as well as some of the foremost political strugglers for American liberty, published sometimes bitter condemnations about the facts of self-absorbed Jewish particularism and behavior.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, for example, the great American essayist of self-reliance, transcendence of the material world, and the sacredness of individual expression and self-reliance (all anathema to traditional Jewish materialist collectivism) wrote that

“the sufferance which is the badge of the Jew has made him, in these days, the ruler of the rulers of the earth.” [EMERSON, p. 39]

As Jewish scholar Robert Michael complains, “[Emerson] saw Judaism, the Jewish idea, as a stumbling block to authentic human liberation. The Jewish God was cruel; the Jewish Law stifling. What was bad about Christianity was its Jewish substance. At the less ideological level, his work is also peppered with anti-Jewish sentiments ... In his journal entry for 3 July 1839, he wrote: In the Allston Gallery the Polish Jews are an offense to me; they degrade and animalize.” [MICHAEL, R., 9-7-98]

The great British poet, Lord Byron, wrote “Tis gold, not steel, that rears the conqueror’s arch ... Jews ... direct the world with all the spirit of their sect.” [FELDMAN, p. 638]

Mark Twain, whose novel Huckleberry Finn is usually regarded as a pioneering classic of interracial compassion, was solicited by the American Hebrew magazine in 1890 for his views on anti-Semitism. Twain wrote a short reply, for the most part expounding the requisite platitudes for the Jewish journal. [TWAIN, FABLES, p. 445-448] Twain elaborated more openly upon the anti-Semitic theme nine years later in Harper’s magazine:

“In the cotton states, after the [Civil] war, the simple and ignorant Negroes made the crops for the white planter on shares. The Jew came down in force, set up shop on the plantation, supplied all the Negroes
on credit, and at the end of the season was proprietor of the Negro’s share of the present crop and of part of his share of the next one ... The Jew is being legislated out of Russia. The reason is not concealed. The movement was instituted because the Christian peasant and villager stood no chance against his commercial abilities. He was always ready to lend money on a crop, and sell vodka and other necessities of life on credit while the crop was growing. When settlement day came he owned the crop; the next year or year after he owned the farm ....”

“In the dull and ignorant England of John’s time everybody got into debt to the Jew. He gathered all lucrative enterprise into his hands; He was the king of commerce; he was ready to be helpful in a profitable way; he even financed the crusades for the rescue of [Christianity’s Holy] sepulcher [from the Muslims of Jerusalem] . . . . He had to be banished from the realm... For the like reasons, Spain had to banish him four hundred years ago, and Austria about a couple of centuries later. In all ages Christian Europe has been obliged to curtail his activities. If he entered upon a mechanical trade, the Christian had to retire from it. If he set up as a doctor, he was the best one, and he took the business. If he exploited agriculture, the other farmer had to get at something else. Since there was no way to successfully compete with him in any vocation, the law had to step in to save the Christian from the poorhouse, even ways to get rich. This history has a very, very commercial look, a most sordid and practical commercial look ... I am convinced that the persecution of the Jew is due not in any large degree to religious practice. No, the Jew is a money-getter ... With precocious wisdom [the Jew] found out in the moving of time that some men worship rank, some worship heroes, some worship power, some worship God, and that over these ideals, they dispute and cannot unite – but they all worship money; so [the Jew] made it the end and aim of his life to get it. He was at it in Egypt thirty six centuries ago; he was at it in Rome when the Christian got persecuted by mistake for him; he has been at it ever since. The cost to him has been heavy; his success has made the whole human race his enemy.” [TWAIN, Conc. p. 360-363]

Curiously, a Jewish scholar bends the essay from which this excerpt comes, Concerning the Jews, to his own needs for Jewish confirmation. He sees in Twain’s piece “remarkable praise for Jewish characteristics and virtue while at the same time striving for balance ... What is really noteworthy about Concerning the Jews ... is its effect to make judgments based upon reliable facts rather than perceived myths.” [SARNA, p. 69]

In the mood of the Jewish martyr-hero tradition enforced upon modern America, in 1998 the Baltimore Sun decided that its readers would be interested not only in Twain’s 1898 article, but specifically an examination of whether it was anti-Semitic or not. Kenneth Lasson quotes this excerpt from Twain to conclude his own piece: “All other forces pass, but the Jews remain. What is the secret of their immortality?” [LASSON, p. 18]
H.G. Wells, the great British novelist and social critic, commented that
“A careful study of anti-Semitism prejudice and accusations might be of great value to many Jews who do not realize the irritation they inflict.”
The novelist D. H. Lawrence wrote:
“Why humanity has hated the Jews, I have come to the conclusion, is that the Jews have always taken religion – since the great days, that is – and used it for their own personal and private gratification, as if it were a thing administered to their own importance and well-being and conceit ... The material world dominates them with a base kind of fetish domination. Yet they know the truth all the while. Yet they cringe their buttocks to the fetish of Mammon [money] ....” [GOULD, p. 225]

Novelist Theodore Dreiser:
“He [the Jew] has been in America all of two hundred years, and he has not faded into a pure America by any means, and he will not. As I said before, he maintains his religious dogmas and his racial sympathies, race characteristics, and race cohesion as against all types of nationalities surrounding him whatsoever.” [GOULD, p. 298]

George Sand, the French author who skirted gender prejudice by having a male pseudonym, noted that
“I saw in the ‘Wandering Jew’ the personification of the Jewish people, exiled in the Middle Ages. Nevertheless, they are once again extremely rich, owing to their unfailing rude greediness and their indefatigable activity. With their hard-heartedness that they extend towards people of other faiths and races, they are at the point of making themselves kings of the world. This people can thank its obstinacy that France will be Judaized within fifty years. Already some wise Jews prophesy this frankly.” [1857]

James Fenimore Cooper (Last of the Mohicans)? “His 1831 novel The Bravo: A Tale depicts Jews as usurers whose shrewdness has enabled them to survive under oppression, but he hardly makes them likeable or sympathetic characters.” Other passages critical of Jews, and subject to “anti-Semitic” investigation by Jewish researchers, may be found in the work of the “phenomenally popular Mrs. E. D.E.N. Southworth” (1959) and Julia Ward Howe, mid-19th century the activist reformer. Francis M. Crawford, “one of the most successful novelists of the late nineteenth century,” also describes Jewish characters in unflattering terms and merits listing in a book about anti-Semitism. [DOBKOWSKI, M., 1979, p. 82-83, 88-89]

In 1932, in response to a request by the American Hebrew and Jewish Tribune for sympathetic commentary about Jews on the occasion of their new year, the Irish writer George Bernard Shaw lashed out, saying
“The Jews are worse than my own people... Those Jews who still want to be the chosen race – chosen by the late Lord Balfour – can go to Palestine and stew in their own juice. The rest had better stop being Jews and start being human beings. The day of races and nations are over.
The future belongs to the citizens of the world who know they are not better than other people.” [SHAW, B., 1932]

After the death of the eminent folklorist Joseph Campbell in 1987 (widely popularized in a series of interviews with Bill Moyer for PBS TV) “at least five people” came out on record to assail him as an anti-Semite. A former Jewish student, Eve Feldman, for example, claimed that in a meeting with her in 1968 Campbell “was sweating and pacing and running his fingers through his hair. He began spewing out this garbage, about how the college was going Jewish ... He said that the Jews had ruined 20th century culture and went through a list of Jewish artists ... It was horrifying. It was like watching someone have a fit or having them vomit uncontrollably all over you.” [GOULD, p. 357]

The great Indian pacifist, Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948) said in 1938

The cry for a national home for the Jews does not make much appeal to me ...Why should they not, like other people of the earth, make that country their home where they are born and where they earn their livelihood? ... The Palestine of Biblical conception is not a geographical tract. It is in their hearts ... As it is, they are co-sharers with the British in despoiling a people who have done no wrong to them. [GOULD, p. 397] (Indian leader Nehru and Chinese communist hero Mao Tse Tung also criticized the Jewish state). [MARX, K. /RUNES, 1959, p. viii]

Even some of the most celebrated heroes of American patriotism were critical – even caustic – about Jews, their clannish lifestyle, and their exploitive economic practices in America. No less a patriotic political figure than the first President of the United States, George Washington, singled out Jews for contempt when they, in their speculations in American currency, undermined the fragile early economy. In one account, Washington referred to the traditionally known “tribe” of Israel, dressed in the their uniformly black Orthodox clothing, as the “tribe of black gentry.” In a second criticism, he made reference to their traditional hanging of an effigy of Haman (an arch enemy of the Jews in ancient Persia), a yearly tradition everywhere for Jews at Purim.

“The tribe of black gentry work more effectually against us than the enemy’s’ arms. They are a hundred times more dangerous to our liberties and the great cause we are engaged in.” (1779)

“It is much to be lamented, that each State, long ere this, has not hunted them down, as pests to society, and the greatest enemies we have to the happiness of America. I would to God, that some of the most atrocious in each state, was hung upon a gallows, five times as high as the one prepared by Haman. No punishment, in my opinion, is too great for the man who can build his greatness upon his country’s ruin.” (1778) [SCHROEDER, p. 125-126]

It is astonishing that Jews, as an entity, were so noticeable for such criticism when at this time in early American history they numbered only 2500-3000 people, about one-tenth of one per cent of the population. [DANZGER, p. 19] Washington, in later years, formally passed along the expected political expediencies to the American Jewish community; some of those texts are still cited
by Jewish scholars to this day as evidence that Washington appreciated Jewish contributions to early America. (A 1790 letter Washington wrote to the Jews of Rhode Island is “still studied today in Jewish religious schools as a sort of founding charter of American Jewish freedom.”) [GOLDBERG, p. 83]

Washington’s exasperations with Jews as unscrupulous profiteers, detrimental to national interests, was similarly echoed by General Ulysses S. Grant (another future President) during the Civil War. Frustrated and enraged by incessant Jewish black market economic activity in the South, particularly in cotton, Grant tried to expel Jews as a group from Tennessee in 1862, stating that “Jews as a class violate every regulation of trade established in the Treasury Department, and also department orders.” [WERTHEIMER] This attempt by Grant, to single out Jews as an entity, during the pressures of the Civil War, is today considered by Jewish scholars to be one of the most profound acts of anti-Semitism in American history. Others who made similar charges about Jews were well-known Union army generals William T. Sherman and Benjamin Butler, as well as Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts. As Jewish author Michael Dobkowskki frames it:

“It was alleged by Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts and Generals Benjamin Butler, William T. Sherman, and Ulysses S. Grant, as well as others, that Jews were engaged in passing counterfeit money; that they fed the inflation by charging outrageous prices; that they were driving well-established Christian firms out of business by using unfair competitive methods and generally were parasites who thrived on the misery of others.” [DOBKOWSKI, M., 1979, p. 83]

As we have more than amply seen already, an exploitive Jewish history during war conditions is not uncommon. Another testament, in the aftermath of the Nazi invasion of Poland, is that of Chaim Kaplan who noted the reputation of immigrant Jews in the Soviet-Polish border areas: “The bad behavior of some of our people in the border towns which were annexed to Russia has made us all hated and unwanted ... Until the storm [war conditions] should subside, they occupied themselves with all kinds of ugly speculation, which has since become their livelihood and life’s work. The émigrés created an atmosphere of profiteering.” [KAPLAN, C., p. 90]

Another historical icon of American democracy, Thomas Jefferson, in a private letter, cited the works of others as his own opinion about Jewish ethics:

“Ethics were so little studied among the Jews, that, in their whole compilation called the Talmud, there is only one treatise on moral subjects. Their books of morals chiefly consisted in a minute enumeration of duties ... What a wretched depravity of sentiment and manners must have prevailed before such corrupt maxims could have attained credit. It is impossible to collect from these writings a consistent series of moral Doctrine.” [CAPPON, p. 383]

“Moses,” said Jefferson elsewhere, “... instilled into his people the most anti-social spirit towards other nations; the other [Jesus/the Christian] preaches philanthropy and universal charity and benevolence.” [GOULD, p. 75]
**John Quincy Adams**, another early American president, visited a synagogue in Amsterdam and bitterly remarked in his diary:

“I am sure [the Jews in Amsterdam] are all wretched creatures for I think I never saw in my life such a set of miserable looking people, and they would steal your eyes out of your head if they could.” [ADAMS, p. 59]

Commenting on Jewish religious identity, **Thomas Paine** (1737-1789), author of the famous American patriotic pamphlet *Common Sense*, wrote that

“The character of Moses as stated in the Bible is the most horrid that can be imagined. If those accounts are true, he was the wretch that first began and carried on wars on the score or on the pretense of religion; and under the mask, or the infatuation, committed the most unexampled atrocities that are to be found in the history of any nation.” [GOULD, p. 76]

**Henry Feingold** suggest that Jewish dual allegiance (to both Jewish and American identities) can be “especially vexing for the Jewish-conscious historians” who are especially numerous these days. Feingold cites traditional American folk heroes like **Henry Ford**, **Charles Lindbergh**, and **Ulysses S. Grant** as being first and foremost, to Jewish scholars, anti-Semites, as is rendered the entire American Populist movement at the turn of the twentieth century. [FEINGOLD, p. 36-37]

Famed World War II **General George S. Patton? Rabbi Marvin Hier**’s Holocaust documentary, *The Long Way Home*, says the *Baltimore Jewish Times*, “revealed that U.S. Army Gen. George S. Patton believed Holocaust survivors should be interned in Displaced Person camps. ‘People did not know that Patton wrote in his diary that Jews are the lowest of the low and have to be kept behind barbed wire,’ [Hier] said.” [HIRSCH, R., 4-24-98, p. 38]

Throw **Thomas Edison** into the list. Although author Neil Baldwin’s “editor thought Baldwin dwelled on Edison’s relationship with Jews too much” in his book about the great American inventor, all of the Jewish-related material remained. Edison, says Baldwin, had a “Shylock complex” about Jews. “I wish,” wrote Edison, “they would all quit making money.” [EZOR, p. 46]

Modern Jewish anti-“anti-Semitic” discourse insists that all such historical and critical commentary should never be put to the test of open evidential debate but, rather, that such criticism is merely part of baseless, groundless, and irrational prejudice. It should therefore, the argument goes, not be seen in the first place; it is best, in fact, forbidden.

This attitude of free speech suppression is exemplified these days, in an institutional sense, by one of the best known and most powerful Jewish lobbying organizations, the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, which, in the words of the American Civil Liberties Union, waged “a campaign pressuring Internet Service providers to censor the Web page of right wing hate groups housed on their servers.” [ACLU, Internet ONLINE, 1996] What exactly, one wonders, is a “right wing hate group?” Who decides its definition to bar their contribution to critical exchange? Would the former criticisms of Jews by **Mark Twain**, **George Washington**, and **George Bernard Shaw** rate as
“right wing hate” material? If so, would we have to conclude that everything else they had to say was no doubt subtly contaminated by “hate” too? Does the Wiesenthal Center “hate” anybody? Would its director, an Orthodox rabbi named Marvin Hier, censor the great Jewish philosopher, Baruch Spinoza, when he called traditional Jewry “a hating people?” What would Rabbi Hier say when publicly confronted with some of the most vile material in the Talmud? Should that be kept off the Internet? Should it be banned? Don’t people have the right to explore all facts and opinions available to decide their own? Isn’t that the most intelligent way to come to an opinion in the first place? Isn’t it the beauty of the Internet that, by its very unedited nature, it has the potential to be a democratic forum of profound proportions?

One of the Wiesenthal Center’s stock-in-trades is a kind of Inquisition against whatever it defines as anti-Semitism. High priority (by the Wiesenthal Center and virtually all other Jewish “watchdog” groups) are the so-called “Holocaust Deniers” espousing “Holocaust revisionism.” Often (but not always) right-wingers, Holocaust deniers argue that the Jewish Holocaust is a conspiratorial myth and never (or in minor form) happened. Whatever the merits of their arguments, one would presume that they would have, in a free society, the right to state their case and then be thoroughly discredited in the open exchange of contesting evidence. Not so. The Wiesenthal Center, and other Jewish lobbying organizations, and sometimes non-Jewish sympathizers, have largely succeeded in internationally censoring them. (The Wiesenthal Center even had the audacity in 2001 to “initiate an international campaign to have YMCAs around the world stop funding the world center.” Why does this Jewish lobbying group seek to fulfill anti-Jewish conspiracy theories and economically break a Christian organization? Because the YMCA’s world center in Geneva dared to indict the state of Israel in a report for its “oppression” of Palestinians.) [WOHLGELERNTER, E., 2-16-01, p. 1A]

“Holocaust denial is not a serious scholarly debate,” Antony Polansky, a Jewish professor and Holocaust survivor told a campus audience, “This is a new form of hate propaganda. This is not a form of first amendment issue.” [RESPONSE, SPRING, 1994, p. 7] Jewish critic Mary Lefkokwitz noted the case of a Northwestern University engineering professor, Earl Butz (author of a volume on the Holocaust entitled The Hoax of the Twentieth Century), in 1996: “It is entirely appropriate that a professor’s use of university property, even of something as tangential as a website, should come under scrutiny, if that professor uses it for the purpose of disseminating nonhistorical information as is claimed in the current controversy about a professor’s placing of Holocaust denial propaganda on the Northwestern University website.” [LEFKOWITZ, p. 186]

In 1994, Yale, Brown, and Harvard University were among those universities that refused to print an ad in the campus paper by “The Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust.” A few colleges did run the ad. Portland’s major daily, The Oregonian, published the ad and ended up under Jewish assault, eventually apologizing for its decision. [RESPONSE, SPRING, 1994, p. 7] In 1996 David
Irving, an alleged “holocaust denier,” had a manuscript, *Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich*, accepted for publication at St. Martin’s Press. Described by one reviewer as “soft pedaling ... German blame for the treatment of Jews,” under massive Jewish pressure the publisher reversed its decision to produce the volume. [RESPONSE, SPRING, p. 1996, p. 12]

In Canada, “Jewish pressure” sought, via trials in 1985 and 1988, to send Ernst Zundel to prison for publishing a pamphlet that claimed the Holocaust never happened. [DERSHOWITZ, p. 171] “Zundel was convicted in Toronto in 1988,” notes the *Toronto Star*, “of spreading false news but the conviction was declared unconstitutional in 1992 by the Supreme Court of Canada.” [TORONTO STAR, 4-18-95, p. A3] “Zundel – producer of a British-based writing called *Did the Six Million Really Die?* – was actually tried twice “on the charge of publishing views he knew to be false.” [BAIN, p. 45] The first trial was well covered by the Canadian news media and afforded Zundel widespread publicity. “Media coverage,” noted Sherri Aikenhead in *MacLean’s* magazine, “was so intense that it provoked fierce arguments – particularly among Jewish activists – about whose interests the reports served.” [AIKENHEAD, p. 44] For the second Zundel trial, none of the Canadian national news agency’s 100 member newspapers covered the story. “What is curious,” wrote George Bain in a *MacClean’s* editorial, “is the quickness and near unanimity with which the media managers insist that no representations to them, no feeling of pressure, affected their editorial decisions on how to play – or play down – the second Zundel trial. Curiously, only Ian Urquhart of the [Toronto] Star, the newspaper that (though ‘judiciously,’ as he puts it) covered the second trial throughout, acknowledged that he received representatives from the Jewish community about publicizing Zundel’s hateful views.” [BAIN, p. 45] Because of Jewish lobbying efforts, an El Paso, Texas, radio station cancelled its contract Zundel, and dropped his program there, “Voice of Freedom,” [RESPONSE, Spring 1994] as did cable station in California. (Haters of Zundel succeeded in burning his house down).

This particular Jewish tact of intensive lobbying for censorship is not new. We have seen the exact same thing as far back as 1700 when powerful Jewish lobbyists in Germany successfully censored Johann Eisenmenger’s scholarly critique about Jews. In 2001, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, attempted to sell at auction Sir Richard Burton’s anti-Jewish manuscript entitled “Human Sacrifice Among the Sephardine or Eastern Jews.” (Burton is best known as a 19th century world explorer and translator of *Tales of the Arabian Nights* and the *Kama Sutra*). This work about Jews was never published. As the Jewish Telegraphic Agency explains it:

“[Burton] was British consul in Damascus in 1870-71, but was recalled after disputes with his superiors, the Ottoman government of Syria, local Christian missionaries – and even a small clique of powerful Jewish moneylenders in Damascus ... W. H. Wilkins [tried to publish it in 1896 but] the Board of Deputies was on its guard and threatened to sue for libel. The book was withdrawn. The manuscript passed through...
several more hands before the Board managed to obtain it through court action in 1909.” [GREENE, R., 6-6-01]

The Board of Deputies of British Jews, notes JTA, “sought to sell the document after suppressing it for nearly 100 years.” Lord Janner, a former president of the Board, expressed outrage that the Board sought to sell the work. In failing to find a buyer (for over $200,000) the manuscript for sale brought attention to the work: it was “the worst of both worlds – the contents of this disgraceful document have been publicized, and the Board has not raised the resources it needs.” [GREENE, R., 6-6-01]

In efforts to boycott a prominent right-wing critic of Jews in the 1940s and 1950s, Gerald K. Smith, “working together,” says Benjamin Ginsberg, “officials of the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League would approach the publishers of major newspapers and owners of radio stations in cities where Smith had scheduled appearances, to ask that Smith be given no coverage whatsoever. If newspapers failed to cooperate on a voluntary basis, Jewish organizations were usually able to secure their compliance by threatening boycotts of Jewish advertisers. The strategy of dynamic silence was extremely effective.” [GINBSBERG, B., 1993, p. 124] The victim of this particular censorship was decried as a right-wing extremist. But this methodology in the suppression of free speech reflects Jewish tactics over history, to our own day, in suppressing any and all criticism about them.

“Some European governments,” wrote David Stannard in 1996, “have forcibly prohibited anti-Zionists from speaking in public. A California court has awarded $100,000 to a survivor of Auschwitz for the pain and suffering he endured in an effort to prove untrue the claims of an antisemitic organization that the Nazis did not kill Jews in gas chambers. In Austria the publishers of magazines attempting to minimize Jewish deaths in the Holocaust have been indicted and convicted for their efforts. A professional anti-Semite who publicly denied the reality of the Holocaust has been sent to prison in Canada. German law states that ‘denial of the Holocaust’ is punishable by up to five years in jail. And the United States has prohibited people who have expressed similar beliefs from entering the country. Other examples abound.” [STANNARD, p. 164]

In 1995 a young German was sent to prison for three and a half years for saying to tourists at Auschwitz that the Holocaust “is a giant farce.” [STANNARD, p. 200] In France, under “a new law [that] makes it a crime to publicly deny the Nazi murder of six million Jews” [RESPONSE, SUMMER 1991, p. 12] Jean Moulin University professor Bernard Notin was fined $2500 in 1990 and suspended from teaching. His crime was “an article that denied the existence of gas chambers at Hitler’s death camps.” [RESPONSE, SPRING, 1993, p. 11] Another Frenchman, Robert Faurisson, was fined over $21,000 for a similar crime. The magazine that published his denial of gas chambers was fined $55,000 [RESPONSE, SUMMER, 1991, p. 12] Faurisson, a teacher at the Sorbonne, even had his classes suspended. “The scale of attacks on Faurisson,” wrote Jewish author Noam Chomsky, “contrasts strikingly with the reach of his
own writings. How many readers have come across a line he has written, or heard his name, apart from these attacks?” [BRENNER, p. 347] Faurisson was physically assaulted on numerous occasions, and once was sent to the hospital for surgery to repair his face. A group called “The Sons of the Memory of the Jewish Children” claimed responsibility for the most brutal attack. “His jaw was smashed,” said a French fireman who gave the 68-year old man first aid, “They destroyed his face.” [GREISAMER, L., 10-1-89, p. 14]

In 1984 David McCalden, described by one Jewish magazine as a ‘professional anti-Semite,” was invited to speak at a yearly California Librarian Association conference in a program called “Free Speech and the Holocaust.” Although the CLA Executive Director, Stephan Moses, was himself a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany, he supported on principle McCalden’s right as a publisher to participate in the library convention. “Both McCalden’s right to free speech and the pressures applied to the CLA,” note Mark Elliot and Michael McClintock, “became hotly debated issues.” [ELLIOT, p. 36] Under intense and widespread Jewish pressure, McCalden’s invitation to speak was eventually cancelled. (In contrast, here’s what American Library Association officials say about the subject of such censorship, as noted in its booklet entitled “Intellectual Freedom:” “As a personal liberty, intellectual freedom forms the foundation of our democracy. It is an essential part of government by the people. The right to vote is not enough – we also must be able to take part in forming public opinion by engaging in open and vigorous debate on controversial matters.” [ALA, p. 1])

In 1996, in Switzerland, Reinard Peters was fined $4,000 by a Swiss court and ordered to pay $6,800 in legal costs “after being found guilty of breaking a law that makes it a crime to discriminate against ethnic groups or incite racial hatred ...” He was found guilty of publishing a brochure that “claimed Jewish greed was responsible for causing World War II.” [LEVY, T, 9-18-96]

In Poland, in 1998, Michael Chajn, a member of the Polish-Jewish Student Association at Warsaw University, managed (with the help of a Jewish magazine) to have removed from one bookseller’s shelves all books he personally declared to be “anti-Semitic.” Volumes included a book about “Jewish ritual murders,” “cooperation of Jews and Masons,” and another that states that “Jews were the majority in all [Solidarity – the anti-communist organization] ministerial positions since 1989.” In essence, Chajn and his Jewish supporters flexed their power to effectively censor anything in the bookstore they didn’t like. Who (other than the Jewish Thought Police) can confirm that such books are preposterous, insidious lies without being allowed to read them? Once such power to stifle free thought about themselves begins, where – and how – does it end?

Also in Poland, in 1999 professor Dariusz Ratajczak of Opole University fell under attack for writing that ‘there never existed ... a plan of systematic extermination of the Jews.” [GOLIK, p. 7] “According to the recent law of the National Remembrance Institute,” noted the Warsaw Voice, “such public sentiments are subject to a fine or a sentence of up to three years in prison ... The maximum punishment the university committee can inflict is a ban on work as an instructor.” [GOLIK, p. 7]
In March 1998, an 84-year old French convert to Islam, Roger Garaudy, was fined 150,000 francs (about $30,000) by the Paris Court of Justice for writing a book, *The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics*, which, among other things, argues that the Holocaust was exaggerated to help create the modern state of Israel. The book was published by La Vielle Taupe, described by the *Jewish Chronicle* as “an extreme left wing publishing house.” Garaudy was the vice-president of the French National Assembly from 1956-58 and a communist party official until 1970. On the day of the guilty verdict, Jews from the right-wing Betar (Zionist) organization violently attacked a group of Garaudy’s supporters inside the court building. Two Arab journalists were also beaten outside. “Crif” – “the largest umbrella organization of French Jewry” – condemned Garaudy’s volume as “a revolting ideological and political maneuver aimed at delegitimizing the very existence of Israel.” At an earlier press conference in Cairo, the book’s author noted that “in France you can attack the Pope or President Jacques Chirac. The important thing is not to criticize Israel or else you are lost. The media is 95 per cent in the hands of the Zionists.” [ZLOTOWSKI, p. 2] Curiously, before Garaudy took such a strong stand against Zionism, in 1978 World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann called Garaudy “a good friend of mine, whose courage and free-ranging opinions I much admire.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 204]

Other leftist-oriented “Holocaust-deniers” in recent years have included Paul Rassinier (a former communist who was incarcerated in the Nazi’s Buchenwald concentration camp), the aforementioned Robert Faurisson (a French professor suspended by his university for his writings on the subject) sociologist Serge Thion, Gabor T. Rittersporn, and Jean-Gabriel Cohn-Bendit. [MENDES, p. 108-111] (Even the writings of the pioneer of communism, Karl Marx, grandson of rabbis [he was also reported to have descended from the famous French Talmudic scholar Rashi on his father’s side, and the famous rabbi Maharal, Rabbi Low of Prague, on his mother’s] [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 235] have fallen beneath the censor’s pen. As Dagobert Runes notes about Marx’s most anti-Jewish texts: “It is interesting to note that most of Marx’s anti-Semitic references, in his correspondence, his journalist writings, and his books, were entirely eliminated by his various editors.”) [MARX, K., 1959, p. xii]

Jewish enforcement of its Holocaust dogmas has a transnational reach. In 1998, the *New York Times* noted that “the European Parliament voted to lift the legal immunity of Jean-Marie Le Pen, one of its members, so that a German prosecutor can begin a criminal investigation of remarks Mr. Le Pen made belittling the Holocaust ... [Le Pen] dismissed the extermination of the European Jews as a ‘detail of history.’ Since ‘Holocaust denial’ or ‘minimizing the crimes of the Third Reich’ is against the law in Germany, he can now be prosecuted there. Conviction could bring a fine and a prison sentence of up to five years.” [WHEATCROFT, p. A19] Le Pen, a well-known right-wing French politician, made the “belittling” comments in Munich, Germany.

It is indeed mind-boggling that anyone in our day and age can publicly deny with absolutely impunity the very existence of God with no care or repercus-
sion whatsoever, and freely impugn virtually anything else imaginable, yet to deny the Jewish Holocaust is grounds for persecution, censorship, and in many places – even in western democracies – fines and imprisonment. Denying the Holocaust is the new Blasphemy, powerfully punished with gags upon all and everyone through much of the world by a Jewish Inquisition that frames itself and its legends beyond reproach and question. And the latent issue here is not, of course, the reality of the Holocaust, (which surely did exist insofar as huge numbers of Jews were murdered, as well as others) but one group’s power to internationally control – and ultimately close – free discourse. That the Holocaust deniers are in grave error should be easy to argue and prove in open discourse. If any of the deniers are malevolently minded then open controversy would expose that too. But the denial of free expression – in this, as any, case – inevitably nurtures that which the New Inquisition seeks to stifle: the conviction among counter-believers that something indeed is being hidden by those who suppress and suffocate oppositional voices. And the denial of free expression sets the precedent for, and contagion into, any and all realms.

It is among the oldest of axioms of moral faith that a free public exchange of ideas leads inevitably to the truth. That the Nazis stepped in and killed this premise has relevance here. The Anti-Defamation League’s rationale (per Director Abraham Foxman) for the banning of all paid advertisements that argue that the Holocaust didn’t happen runs like this: “The intent of such advertisements attacking the facts of the Holocaust, and by framing this attack merely an unorthodox viewpoint or a challenge to ‘open debate,’ subtly encode traditional anti-Semitic images of Jews as controllers of academia and the media, and Jews as exploiters of non-Jewish guilt. These beliefs, of course, bear comparison to the preaching which brought Hitler to power in prewar Germany.” [FOXMAN, p. 322] Here Foxman turns reality completely upside down. Whoever argues for freedom of speech on philosophical grounds, and objects to unified Jewish attempts towards complete censorship of this – or any – issue, is bizarrely accused by Foxman of “the preachings which brought Hitler to power.”

In 1995 an 18-year old woman checked out The Hoax of the Century by the aforementioned Northwestern engineering professor, A. R. Butz, from the library of the small Canadian town of Didbury. The woman then “called Canada Customs and discovered the book is on a list of works denied entry into Canada but she was told that possessing the book was not illegal. [The woman] decided to turn it over to the Mounties [Canadian police] anyway, informing the public librarian, Tim Elliot, after the fact.” Informed of the status of the book, the librarian told the police he didn’t want the book back and they destroyed it. This story made the local news as a controversial issue, and Bernie Farber, a spokesman for the Canadian Jewish Congress, publicly complimented the library patron for taking the book to the authorities. [CANADIAN BUS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS 2-13-95, p. 25]

Popular Jewish hatred of “Holocaust revisionism” is so great that even Yehuda Bauer, a Holocaust historian at Hebrew University, was attacked for revising the number of Jews who were murdered in the Auschwitz concentra-
tion camp down to 1.35 million. “So sacred had the 4 million number become by repetition in the press,” says Michale Bernbaum, “that Bauer’s articles aroused immediate controversy. Survivors were upset that he was seeming to join the revisionists in diminishing the numbers of victims.” [BERENBAUM, *The Struggle*, p. 90] Among the most radical Jewish responses to “Holocaust revisionism” was the bombing of Holocaust doubter George Ashley’s home in Northridge, California, in 1986. [GEWERTZ] And, in the counter-anti-Holocaust propaganda wars, in 1998, the Zionist Organization of America countered with a publication, *Deir Yassin: A Lie*, that argues that a widely known, and much documented, Jewish-Israeli massacre of Arab villagers in 1948 never happened. [MAHLER, J., 3-20-98, p. 7]

Concerted Jewish efforts at censorship take many forms and guises, attacking the full spectrum of political thought, from right to left-wing, encompassing virtually any subject at all, as long as it addresses Jews. On June 19, 1977, for example, the respected news team of the *London Sunday Times* presented an article documenting systematic torture of Arabs in Israel and the occupied territories. In the United States, this major news story was covered by only one major media outlet, the *Boston Globe*. Why? “Any adverse publicity [of Israel],” noted Nicholas Von Hoffman in the *Anaheim Bulletin*, “is likely to win an editor vociferous abuse from the nation’s best organized lobby.” [SAID, p. 42] In 1990 the Foreign Press Association protested Israel’s banning of news about Soviet immigration to the Jewish state; the censorship was enforced, reported the *Boston Globe*, because of “a growing trend of negative coverage. [ROSENBERG, C2] In 1996, “in response to protests from Jewish groups,” Adolf Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* – an obviously necessary staple of reference in American college history classes – was banned in Hungary. An English version, published in Great Britain, was also banned at European University in Budapest. Permission had been requested to shelve the book at the college, noted the *Jewish Week*, “a university which is supported by [Jewish American] financier George Soros.” [PERLEZ, 1, 23]

In 1999, the great Jewish lobbying center, the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, successfully pressured the giant German Bertelsmann company from advertising *Mein Kampf* on its online bookstore. “We are aware that we are operating on the thin line between a publisher’s responsibility and the accusation of censorship,” noted a spokesman for Bertelsmann, upon taking the book’s availability off the computer system. Online bookstores Amazon.com and Barnes and Noble continued to refuse “to back down [to Wiesenthal demand], citing their First Amendment rights to promote free speech.” [LIEBERMAN, A., 9-21-99, p. 16]

In 1984 a play (*Garbage, the City, and Death*) by one of the world’s most heralded filmmakers, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, was shut down in Frankfort, Germany, by concerted Jewish pressure. The play was based upon a story of real-life local corruption in real estate dealings, battled on grass roots fronts by the left-wing Green Party. Jews were among the most prominent real estate wheelers and dealers, particularly a speculator named Ignatz Bubis, eventual chairman of the Central Council of Jews in Germany. A Fassbinder character in
the play, allegorically named Rich Jew, was based on Bubis. “There was much official corruption, bending of laws, and absence of codes or disregard for them where they exist,” noted Lothar Kahn about the real life story upon which the play was based, “… self-interest, greed, politics and poor management combined to create a situation that was widely deplored. Bubis does not appear unduly perturbed over the allegation that he served as prototype for Fassbinder’s Rich Jew, the character that gave rise to the charge of the play being anti-Jewish both in nature and effect.” [LOTHAR, p. 51]

In the face of Jewish protest, the producer of the play offered to rename Rich Jew as “A” and make other changes in the stage story. “By then, however,” notes Kahn, “the fact that changes were made at the insistence of ‘our Jewish friends’ would have become as much a source of resentment as being prevented from producing the play in the first place.” [KAHN, p. 52]

Ultimately, Jewish activists seized the stage for three hours to prevent the play from being performed. The producer finally capitulated to censorship, “citing the intensity of Jewish pressure.” While local Jewish spokesman, Michael Friedman, declared the incident over, with no hard feelings, Lothar Kahn suggested otherwise: “There are angry German critics who feel the Jews overplayed their hand and should not dictate what should be thought about anything.” [KAHN, p. 52] Fassbinder himself said that “the subject of Jews has been a taboo subject in Germany since 1945; in the end this must be counter-productive, for taboos inevitably lead to the tabooed subject creating dark and secret fears and mak[ing] enemies.” [KAHN, p. 51]

In the Netherlands, in 1987 the Rotterdam city council resisted Jewish demands and refused to censor the Fassbinder play in their own locality, spokeswoman announcing that

“The Rotterdam city council has decided the municipality has no jurisdiction to ban the play. It is a matter of free speech.” [REUTERS, 11-17-87]

Reuters noted that “Jewish leaders say they will demonstrate against the play” and “the Rotterdam Foundation for the Fight Against Anti-Semitism said it was considering taking the producers to court because they were violating Dutch laws against the discrimination of ethnic and religious communities. The producers say the play is constructive because it has stirred debate on the causes and results of anti-Semitism.” [REUTERS, 11-17-87]

In 1993, the American Jewish Committee closed down their nationally traveling exhibition about the history of Black-Jewish relations (as the AJC saw it) when Boston’s Black community allowed the local Nation of Islam chapter to contribute their own critical perspective to the show. [HOHLER, p. 21] The Jewish organization declared that the Nation’s point of view was anti-Semitic and cancelled the rest of its tour.

In 1999, the city of Toronto apologized to the Canadian Jewish Congress for allowing a photographic exhibition of Palestinian history under Israeli rule to be shown in a city venue. Howard Brief of the CJC called the photo exhibition “obscene,” the Jewish mayor of Toronto, Mel Lastman (originally from New
York) declared that “We’re not looking for people to bring their fights here. This is the magic of Toronto – you don’t bring your arguments or beefs here.” [DE MARA, 9-17-99] Local Jews also complained about some of the photos’ captions and that the time slot for the exhibition between the Jewish holidays of Rosh Hoshanah and Yom Kippur was “insensitive.”

The producer of the Palestinian show was an Anglican church organization. Reverend Robert Assaly responded to Jewish outrage, noting that

“Once again, even the very articulation of Palestinian history and culture is subjugated to the dominant political whims of another people or organization. Once again, Palestinian existence is not allowed to be understood on its own, but, in the mind of the CJC, must only be articulated in reference to the filters of Jewish history and faith. Thankfully, we no longer subject aboriginal history or Jewish Holocaust exhibits to the demands of their oppressors. The CJC’s attempt to silence truth belies its stated motives.” [ASSALY]

Toronto Star columnist Thomas Walkom followed up the story, discovering that the man who called the show “obscene” (Harold Brief, chairman of the Israeli Affairs Committee of the CJC) had never even seen the exhibition, let alone the “captions the Jewish community complains about all the time.” [WALKOM, T., 9-28-99]

In 1992, a Chicago librarian, David Williams, noted to an American Library Association annual conference that since 1967 the state of Israel has censored nearly 4,000 books in the occupied Arab territories of Gaza and the West Bank. Banned volumes include the plays of Sophocles, the novels of Egyptian Nobel Laureate Naguib Mahfouz, and The Battle for Peace by Ezer Weizmann, Israel’s President. Jewish overseers also censored all published texts by local Palestinians. Even a poet, Muhammad Albatrawi, a resident of the West Bank, noted that

“Every word of mine goes through the censorship office ... It goes without saying that this affects the work’s literary value ... I can never know in advance how the censor will react: sometimes I write something risky and he approves it without comment, and sometimes I write something totally innocent and it is banned completely. It can drive you crazy, because there is no logic to it.” [GROSSMAN, D., 1988, p. 158-159]

A resolution condemning Israeli censorship was passed by the ALA. At the next convention, notes Village Voice journalist Robert Friedman, “the fight to rescind the year-old resolution condemning Israeli censorship policies in the occupied territories drew more than 1500 librarians – three to four times more than usual.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 36] The Anti-Defamation League, Hadassah (the Zionist Women’s organization), and other sympathetic Jews joined forces in a massive campaign to denounce the ALA resolution, retract it, and slander the resolution’s original sponsor, David Williams, as an anti-Semite.

The resultant ALA rejection of its resolution against censorship, says Friedman, “was due to the large numbers of pro-Israel activists who came down [to the conference] at the behest of Hadassah [a women’s Zionist organization], the fear of many ALA members that the controversy was tearing the organization apart,
and a backlash against William’s overbearing and self-righteous personality ... The same week ... ALA officials announced that they had set up a task force – reportedly at ADL urging – to investigate Williams.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 39]

They would find that Williams was not new to controversy in Jewish quarters. In 1989, as head of the Middle East acquisitions department at the Chicago Public Library, he put together a bibliography of 147 books for the study of the Israel-Palestine conflict, including a mix of political views. Within a short time, Chicago’s chief librarian, Samuel F. Morrison, was fielding a call from a prominent Jewish patron who complained about some of the books on the list. Then followed a unified campaign by two Jewish lobbying organizations – the Anti-Defamation League and the Jewish Community Relation Council – which included targeting for attention the Jewish President of the Chicago Library Board, Cindy Pritzker, one of the heirs of – among other things – the Hyatt Hotel chain.

After reviewing William’s bibliographic list, head librarian Morrisson remained firm in support of it, noting that “libraries should provide materials and information presenting all points of view in current and historical issues.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 35] The ADL and other Jewish lobbying efforts persisted, however, even labeling David Shipler’s Pulitzer-prize winning book in the bibliography, Arab and Jew: Wounded Spirits in the Promised Land, as an “attempt at evenhandedness [that] results in distorted equivalences between Arab and Israeli actions.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 35] The ADL mobilized more local Jewish support to complain en masse to local governmental officials and eventually the Chicago library capitulated, adding more than 30 books selected by ADL and pulling David Williams, the librarian who made the bibliography, off the project.

Unrelenting Jewish pressure to force the library to emphasize Jewish-Israeli perspectives on the Middle East made the local news. A Chicago Sun-Times columnist, James Byrne, worried that the ADL’s eventual investigations into William’s past was reminiscent of McCarthy-era witch hunt. Summing up the whole story, Village Voice commentator Robert Friedman declared that “here was unequivocal proof that the ADL was attempting to censor a public library.”

In 1986, because of concerted Jewish complaint, the Toronto-area Waterloo County Board of Education in Canada “banned” William Shakespeare’s play, The Merchant of Venice, pending further input from the Ontario Human Rights Commission and Ministry of Education. The school board’s decision, noted the Toronto Star, “following an intense lobby that included testimonials from nine Jewish students, has again raised concerns about censorship of school books due to pressure from vocal minorities.” [FERRI, J., p. A18]

A few years later the Canadian Jewish Congress intervened in a planned performance of the Shakespeare play by the Stratford Festival. The play was finally performed but only, notes Sol Littman, after it was agreed that “care would be taken to make sure that the representation of Shylock steered clear of crude stereotyping and – best of all – the festival would arrange seminars for young theatre-goers to explain the historical context of the play and the social prejudices of the period.” [LITTMAN, S., p. A17]

By 1994, the Ottawa Citizen ran an editorial entitled “Beware of the Censor,”
noting that “Ottawa’s public high schools have quietly revised how and when they teach Shakespeare’s classic play, *The Merchant of Venice* ... Several Ontario school boards have either banned the work or restricted its teaching to senior grades ... The department heads [of Ottawa public schools] decreed that if *The Merchant of Venice* is taught, it must be presented in the light of an opinion paper written by members of the Jewish community ... *The Merchant of Venice* problem was not put to public debate by the elected [Ottawa Board of Education] trustees ... The result is literature chosen by stealth, in a climate of pressure and self-censorship.” [OTTAWA CITIZEN, p. A10]

The Jewish Thought Police is far reaching, and even within the Jewish community itself it invokes powerful pressures to silence those of moral conscience, particularly regarding the policies of modern Israel. Jewish scholar Marla Brettschneider notes that

> “During the research for my dissertation I heard countless [Jewish] individuals and group representatives from around the country relate stories about the censorious pro-Israel politics of the mainstream Jewish community. These people requested various levels of confidentiality, depending on how current or painful the story was, or on the stature of the individual or group in the community. There were often jobs on the line and the reputations of mainstream machers to guide ... [BRETTSCNEIDER, p. 90].... Unfortunately, students were not even willing to talk to me for background material ... I continued to find this a painful example of the fear progressive Jewish students feel about their activism. They feel they will suffer the wrath of the [Jewish] community as punishment for such work. [BRETTSCNEIDER, p. 90] ... [By the 1980s] Jewish students were more afraid to question, explore, critique, and speak out, especially when it came to Israel ... [In 1989] speaking as a progressive, I criticized Israeli politics and our role as North American Zionist/Jewish activists. Many of the students in the audience were upset by the fact that I was speaking critically on these issues. The reason they gave me for their feelings was that by airing our dirty laundry in public we help the anti-Semites who want to divide and conquer us ... But what most distressed me was this: If honest and critical self-evaluation cannot even take place in a closed room among highly active Jewish students at a Jewish conference, then it is hard to imagine where such desperately needed exploration can take place.” [BRETTSCNEIDER, p. 89-90]

Earlier, in 1979, an American Jewish organization called Breira was hounded out of existence by mainstream Jewry. Breira – never numbering more than 1500 members – sought, in its own words, to “break the ‘taboo’ on public criticism of Israel within the American Jewish community.” [WERTHEIMER, p. 399] “Breira activists,” notes Jack Wertheimer, “consistently interpreted the public controversy [in Jewish circles] as an orchestrated smear campaign.... [WERTHEIMER, p. 405] ... Breira was cast as a group of subversives to Israel. Its harsh critique of the organized American Jewish community, its program to
democratize and rechannel Jewish life in the United States, and its denigration of established leaders were barely noted.” [WERTHEIMER, p. 406]

In 1990 a Reform rabbi, Adi Assabi, in South Africa received 23 death threats from Jewish callers for allowing anti-apartheid Black leader Nelson Mandela a forum to speak at the rabbi’s synagogue. Mandela, the international hero of the human rights movement in South Africa who spent 28 years in prison, “outraged most South African Jews by his expressions of solidarity with Palestinian Liberation Organization leader Yasir Arafat and by photographs in the press of Mandela embracing Arafat.” [RAPHAELY, p. 10]

In 1998, Norman Rosenberg, the Executive Director of the New Jewish Agenda, a “progressive” organization, wrote an article in the (Washington) Jewish Week complaining about the dangerous censorship powers within the Jewish community; the Smithsonian Museum – rather than hold a planned lecture series in connection with Israel’s fiftieth birthday celebration – succumbed to censorial and harassment efforts by some American Jewish groups against “controversial” speakers. Those lobbied against were fellow Jews, including members of Israel’s Knesset, journalism, and universities. Rosenberg notes that

“In canceling the program ... the Smithsonian was bullied by a disinformation campaign led by a group of far-right Jewish ultranationalists. Rather than staying the course and presenting what was to be both a celebration of Israel’s democratic triumphs and an honest, fair, and intellectually rigorous examination of the unresolved issues which that democracy is wrestling with, the Smithsonian chose to fold at the first hint of controversy ... What we have here is nothing less than nascent Jewish McCarthyism ... Believers in free speech and free inquiry can only be appalled by this debacle.” [ROSENBERG, p. 20]

Four months later, Smithsonian magazine published the permissible image of Israel: a full page ad by the History Channel announcing the premiere of Israel: Birth of a Nation. “After 3,000 years of persecution,” proclaims the ad, “an Inquisition, and a Holocaust, you’re finally allowed to go home ... Join host Martin Gilbert as we take an intimate look at a nation born of resolve, courage, sacrifice and, ultimately, destiny.” [SMITHSONIAN, MAY 1998, p. 29]

Even in leftist Jewish circles, support for the noble principles of free speech and the hallowed Constitution can disintegrate when clouded by Jewish emotionalism. A good case in point involved the American Civil Liberties Union and a 1977 neo-Nazi march planned for Skokie, Illinois, a suburb with a large Jewish population. The town banned the march. Simply based upon the most elemental principle of the First Amendment, the ACLU argued an appeal on behalf of the neo-Nazis right to hold their event in Skokie. (The ACLU won the case, a Federal district court ruled that Skokie’s ban was unconstitutional, but the right-wing group never marched). In the wake of the ACLU’s involvement in the case, an estimated 15% of the ACLU’s national membership (presumably constituting the most liberal, “open-minded,” and principled lawyers and others in America) resigned. Most were Jews. In hindsight, Albert Foer, the Vice-
Chairman of the Washington D.C.-area ACLU, still felt the need to argue the issues of the case in a Jewish forum in 1998:

“The ACLU’s legal victory in Skokie was in fact a victory for Jews ...
The First Amendment stands as a protector of minority rights and the situation in Skokie, where Jews happened not to be a minority, was unique.” [FOER, p. 20]

Ever ready to brand any critic of Jewry or Israel an anti-Semite, organized Jewish efforts in patrolling knowledge, and in controlling and suppressing information are widespread and varied, focusing upon a range of subjects and issues, but always Jewish and/or Israeli-based. In Canada, for example, R. T. Naylor wrote an article entitled *Israel and the Cocaine Barons*. For Israeli Mercenaries, *It’s All In a Day’s Work* that was published in *Toronto’s Now* magazine in December 1989.

“When the article was first published,” says Naylor, “Israel’s propaganda arm in Canada began frothing at the mouth in indignation. The reaction included the usual smear stories planted by the Israel lobby in the Canadian Jewish News and the [ADL’s parent organization] B’nai B’rith Monitor. The point of the campaign was not to ‘correct’ the record, since the facts as stated were incontestably true, but to terrorize critics of Israel into keeping quiet.” [NAYLOR, p. 139]

In 1987, claiming that an NBC documentary called “Six Days Plus 20 Years: A Dream is Dying” was “biased,” the Israeli government forbid Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, Foreign Minister Shimon Peres and Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin from appearing on NBC News programs. [BOXER, 6-31-87, p. 3] The next year ABC faced Jewish demonstrations against “one-sided anti-Israel press coverage being given the current unrest in Israel’s administered territories.” [JW, 1-29-88, p. 8] The Anti-Defamation League attacked ABC coverage as “a mockery of journalistic responsibility,” and particularly singled out ABC news anchorman Peter Jennings. “Apparently,” said the ADL’s ‘Israel director,’ Harry Wall, “Israel’s actions have given license for the expression of anti-Semitism among certain representatives of the media.” [JW, 1-29-88]

Censorship of those seeking to document on film Israel’s many injustices, and crimes, against Palestinian Arabs is an institutionalized norm in America. In the 1980s, an American Jewish filmmaker, Joan Mandel, joined with others in producing a documentary film (*Gaza Ghetto*) about Arab conditions as veritable prisoners in the Israeli-occupied Gaza Strip. “I began,” she says, “to learn the intricacies of how forms of censorship were used against films about Palestinian. When I returned to the United States in 1984, over the course of the next two years ... I learned that I was involved in a war in this country – to redefine the limits of censorship ... [MANDEL, p. 187-188] ... [There is] censorship at all stages [in making a film about Israel] – production, post-production, funding, programming, and distribution.” [MANDEL, p. 190] Among the most ardent, and overt, censorial organizations are the Anti-Defamation League, the American-Israel Public Affairs Council (AIPAC), and CAMERA.

For his part, filmmaker Tom Hayes notes the endless censorial difficulties he had with PBS, and its grant-giving arm ITVS, over his film about Arabs under Israeli rule, “People of the Land”: 
“For me, work on Palestine was a test of the relevance of independent filmmaking. If you couldn’t get funding and dissemination for work about [Israel’s] super-power culpability in cultural genocide, then what exactly was the point of independent filmmaking? Entertainment? Media titillation?” [HAYES, p. 6]

In 1990 the Israeli government succeeded in briefly getting a New York State Supreme Court Justice, Michael Dontzin, to ban a book in America; an Appellate Court later overruled the censorship. The banned book, *By Way of Perception: The Making and Unmaking of a Mossad Officer*, described author Victor Ostrovsky’s life as an Israeli Mossad (CIA-like organization) agent and his moral disenchantment with the organization’s policies. The judge’s ban of the book disturbed First Amendment experts, especially that a foreign government could assert such influence in America. Attorney Richard Winfield called Judge Dontzin’s censorship “without precedent and egregious.” Attorney Floyd Abrams described it as “an aberration.” Critics said, noted the *Jewish Week*, that “it apparently marked the first time a foreign nation sought to stop publication of a book in the United States.” [JW, 9-21-90, p. 20] [See further Jewish-inspired censorial actions in the mass media section]

Under threat from a lawsuit from Israel, in 1991 the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, announced that it was still opening its complete set of photographs of the famous Dead Sea Scrolls to all qualified scholars interested in studying them. The original scrolls have been housed in a Jerusalem museum since 1947 and controlled by a “tight academic cartel” in Israel, particularly the Israel Antiquities Authority who limited access to scroll study to about 40 people over four decades. “Israeli officials,” noted the *Jewish Week*, “contend that open access to the uncompleted texts could prevent a ‘definitive interpretation’ of the scrolls.” [TUGEND, T, DEAD, p. 15]

In 1989 a radio talk show host, Jim Bleikamp, was fired by his Albany station manager, Dennis Israel, after a campaign against him by a local Jewish lobbying group, the Shield of David, with support from the ADL, Americans for a Safe Israel, and the [Jewish-based] Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting. Among Bielkamp’s crimes, says the *Jewish Week*, was an “accusation that Israeli soldiers are committing ‘genocide’ against Arabs ... [Bleikamp] acknowledged mentioning the word ‘genocide’ on the air, but says he did not mean to imply comparison between the Palestinian uprising and the Holocaust.” [WEISS, Y, p. 18]

In 1991 Linda Rios Brook, the head of Channel 11 in Minneapolis, lost her job because of her “outspoken religious views,” specifically for giving speeches as a devout Christian in which she said “that the Jews pressured Pilate into killing Jesus.” For this, Brook was accused of being an anti-Semite, although what she said has been a foundation of Christian belief (and Jewish belief) for centuries. The law firm of Milaretz and Associates headed a group of advertisers who withdrew their advertising contract with the TV station to “send a message” to Channel 11’s parent company, and force Brook out. [KATZ-STONE, p. 2]

In 2001, Michael Lopez-Calderon, a non-Jewish social studies teacher at
Hebrew Academy’s Rabbi Alexander S. Gross High School in Miami, made the news when he was fired for posting anti-Israel comments at a pro-Palestinian website, Palestine Media Watch. “Lopez-Calderon, a non-Catholic Cuban-American who believes Israel is oppressing the Palestinians, said the trouble began when he heard other teachers make what he felt were callous comments on the fatal shooting of a Palestinian teenager. ‘It broke me,’ he said.” [TALLAHASSEE DEMOCRAT, 3-10-01]

Also in 2001, the publisher of the Oneida Daily Dispatch (New York) fired its two top editors (Jean Ryan and Dale Seth) for an editorial that local Jewish lawyer, Randy Schaal, didn’t like. Alerting the local Jewish Community Federation of Mohawk Valley, the Jewish lobby began to pressure the newspaper. The editorial (its key excerpt linked: http://jewishtribalreview.org/oneida.htm) was charged with being “anti-Semitic.” [SUNG, E., 11-02-01]

In 1990, the New York Times noted that “a Harvard divinity professor’s verbal attacks on Jews, Judaism and Israel led to his dismissal as chief editor of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Dr. John Strugnell was quoted by an Israeli journalist as declaring that Judaism was “originally racist,” it was “not a higher religion,” and that modern Israel “is founded on a lie, or at least a premise that cannot be sustained.” Most of these observations, as this volume meticulously evidences, are undeniably true. The crime is to speak them freely. Strugnell was dismissed by the Times as having a rumored “drinking problem” and a “mental condition.” Laurence Schiffman, a professor of Hebrew and Judaic Studies at New York University, told the newspaper that “Here comes a custodian of these materials and [he] drenches the scrolls in the blood of the victims of anti-Semitism. How can we have confidence in the fairness and scholarship of a man who comes to the material with such deeply ingrained prejudices, prejudices which are repugnant to most of his colleagues, both Christians and Jews.” [WILFORD, J.N., 12-12-90, p. A14]

In 2001, a scientific journal published an article that assailed both Jewish (the “Chosen People”) and Zionist dogma. The journal was pressured so heavily by Jews that it quickly sought to rip out the article in its already published volume. As London’s Guardian noted:

“A keynote research paper showing that Middle Eastern Jews and Palestinians are genetically almost identical has been pulled from a leading journal. Academics who have already received copies of Human Immunology have been urged to rip out the offending pages and throw them away. Such a drastic act of self-censorship is unprecedented in research publishing and has created widespread disquiet, generating fears that it may involve the suppression of scientific work that questions Biblical dogma. ‘I have authored several hundred scientific papers, some for Nature and Science, and this has never happened to me before,’ said the article’s lead author, Spanish geneticist Professor Antonio Arnaiz-Villena, of Complutense University in Madrid. ‘I am stunned’ ... In common with earlier studies, the team found no data to support the idea that Jewish people were genetically different from other people in the region. In doing so, the team’s research challenges claims that Jews are a special,
chosen people and that Judaism can only be inherited ... [Human Immu-
nology’s] editor told the journal Nature last week that she was threatened
by mass resignations from members if she did not retract the article.”
[McKie, R., 11-25-01]

In England, in 1991, the Board of Deputies of British Jews announced that
they “may take legal action against Bob Beckman, the financial adviser, if he
repeats ‘anti-Jewish’ comments in his weekly business bulletin. Mr. Beckman,
who once advised LBC radio listeners on shares, was cautioned by the financial
watchdog Fimbra after the Board of Deputies of British Jews complained about
his inflammatory anti-Zionist comments in his financial newsletter.” According
to a BDBJ complainer, a whole issue of Beckman’s publication was devoted to
“Jewish conspiracy theory in the financial sphere.” The BDBJ said that Beck-
man’s writings constitute “incitement to racial hatred” and thereby subject to
action via the Race Relations Act.” [THE TIMES (OF LONDON), 4-21-91]

In 1990, someone at the Dartmouth Review – an ideologically conservative
newspaper at Dartmouth College – secretly inserted an anti-Jewish quote by
Adolf Hitler into the paper’s masthead as an act of sabotage. The resultant furor
drew a letter of complaint to the paper from a Jewish Congressman from Cali-
ifornia, Mel Levine, signed by 83 other Congressmen. The Review’s President
and two staff members were forced to resign. Dartmouth trustee Dinah
D’Souza ultimately attacked the President of Dartmouth College, James Freed-
man, who is Jewish, for his handling of the matter. Freedman, complained
D’Souza, was a “bully ... who had contributed to a lynch mob mentality on cam-
pus.” [BAKER, p. 6]

In 1990 Jewish journalists, editors, and publishers from around the world
gathered in Jerusalem for the Third International Conference of Jewish Media
to address worldwide issues and concerns in their community. Among the con-
cerns were these: “To what extent can [Jewish journalists] be critical of Israel?
How should they play articles that reflect poorly on Israel?” Gary Rosenblatt,
an editor of Jewish newspapers in Baltimore, Detroit, and Atlanta remarked
that “I once heard an editor say that [the totalitarian Russian communist news-
paper] Pravda has more independence than Jewish newspapers ... In some
[United Jewish Appeal-sponsored] federation newspapers, you would be hard
pressed to find a critical [letter to the editor about the federation or about
Israel].” [KEINOW, p. 22] A Jewish freelance journalist from Santiago, Chile –
Patricia Politzer – complained that

“I lived 16 years under a dictatorship in Chile and I am amazed to hear
things [at this conference] that I heard in Chile under [dictator] Pi-
nochet.” [KEINON, p. 22]

Politzer was referring to the likes of Michelin Ratzerdorfer, the editor of
Amit magazine. Ratzerdorfer, noted the Jewish Week, asserted “that journalistic
integrity must be redefined for Jewish journalists. Before putting pen to paper,
Jewish newspaper editors and writers must ask themselves whether what they
write will harm Israel, and whether they have the ‘moral right’ to write critical
editorials.” [KEINON, p. 22] A good example of the censorial basis of the con-
ference occurred in Jerusalem the same year as the journalistic gathering; efforts to stifle free speech were evidenced in the case of the *Jerusalem Post*, the only English language newspaper in Israel (and crucially important for that reason), which was purchased by Hollinger, a Canadian media group that installed publisher Yehuda Levy. The managing editor, David Landau, and 29 other *Post* staff members soon demanded that Levy be fired for his editorial premise of “a special responsibility to protect Israel’s image.” Instead, all 30 protesting staffers were fired with a half-hour notice, and Levy was retained.

“Journalism is an act of the spirit and that spirit has to be free,” said departing Managing Editor Landau, “This seems to have been lost on Mr. Levy, and our hope was that in the course of time Mr. Levy would come to understand the special nature of a newspaper in a free society. But those hopes have not been realized – quite the contrary.” [JEWISH WEEK, 1-26-90, p. 20]

In 2001, Jews gathered for a “special program for student journalists sponsored by the Jewish Agency for Israel and the World Zionist Organization at the General Assembly of the United Jewish Communities.” “Do Jewish journalists have more obligations than others?,” asked the *Jewish Bulletin* of Northern California, “Are they responsible first to their communities, and do they need to represent Israel in their newspapers?” [RAGOLSKY, H., 11-23-01] “On campus there is already so much anti-Israel sentiment that we have to be careful about any additional criticism against Israel,” Marita Gringaus told a reporter,

“This is our responsibility as Jews, which obviously contradicts our responsibilities as journalists.” [RAGOLSKY, H., 11-23-01]

“I’m a Jew before I’m a journalist,” added Uzi Safanov, a reporter for Long Island University’s school newspaper,

“before someone pays me to write. If I find a negative thing about Israel, I will not print it and I will sink into why did it happen and what can I do to change it.” (“If he eventually wrote about negative incidents that happen to Israel,” added the *Jewish Bulletin*, “he would try to find the way ‘to shift the blame.’”) [RAGOLSKY, H., 11-23-01]

In 2001, Debbie Ducrocq, the managing editor of the *Kansas City Jewish Chronicle*, was fired for printing a letter to the editor that was critical of Israel. Also, her “Conservative rabbi denounced her at shul and she had had to remove her children from a Chabad Sunday school.” [ELLIS, C., 3-16-01, p. 8] That same year, Jewish poets Chana Bloch and Chana Kronfeld were assailed by fellow Jews for briefly criticizing Israel at a poetry reading at the bastion of the “free speech” movement in America: Berkeley, California. “As an Israeli,” remarked Chana Kronfeld after ten angry people walked out on her, “I’m used to hearing people argue, but this was really extraordinary. I was really shocked and offended by the reaction. I really couldn’t believe that in a place like Berkeley or wherever there is a Jewish community that values open speech, that a five-minute statement could cause that kind of rude, vocal interruption.” [ESKENAZI, J., 5-18-01]

As evidenced here, efforts by many in the Jewish community to censor free speech and revise (and/or control) history are varied, well-funded and wide-
spread. In America, a central organizational player in efforts to limit intellectual discourse (with its $50 million a year budget), particularly regarding Jews and Israel, is the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith. “It is,” says Robert Friedman, “the most powerful Jewish organization in America. [It attempts] to determine what should be taught in our nation’s schools, what should be read in our nation’s libraries, and what should be publicly discussed about Israel at public forums. Through its 31 offices across the country, the ADL monitors school curricula, library acquisition lists, and public conferences and symposiums, working behind the scenes to stifle intellectual freedom.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 34]

Joan Mandel, a Jewish filmmaker, notes the stratagems of censorship used by the ADL when it comes to documentary films about Israel:

“[The ADL] equate[s] criticism of Israel and support for Palestinian rights with anti-Semitism. ADL tactics feature: warnings to institutions to ban screenings of ‘anti-Semitic’ films, and the preparation of ‘fact sheets’ distributed to members of local Jewish organizations to condemn films and filmmakers at public screening, and to use in protesting TV programs. ADL ‘vigilance’ campaigns include targeting Jews and Israelis who oppose the Israeli occupation or who actively support Palestinian rights. The ADL has set up a model of censorship that other mainstream Jewish organizations – the Council for Jewish Federations, the American Jewish Committee, and the Jewish Community Relations Councils – follow.” [MANDELL, p. 191]

The ADL has even regularly tried to defame and censor fellow Jew Noam Chomsky, an outspoken critic of Israel and Jewish chauvinism. Chomsky complained that

“When I give a talk at a university or elsewhere, it is common for a group to distribute literature, invariably unsigned, containing a collection of attacks on me spiced with ‘quotes’ (generally fabricated) from what I am alleged to have said here and there. I have no doubt that the source is the Anti-Defamation League and often the people distributing the unsigned literature acknowledge the fact. These practices are vicious and serve to intimidate many people. They are of course not illegal. If the ADL chooses to behave in this fashion, it has a right to do so; but this should also be exposed.” [CURTISS, p. 31]

Ostensibly a “civil rights organization,” and massively integrated into the American socio-cultural fabric as such, the ADL’s central purpose is to combat “anti-Semitism” (as it widely defines it) and protect Israel and Jewish mythologies from critical attack. Founded in 1913, “the ADL,” notes Friedman, “has successfully masqueraded as a civil rights organization concerned with the civil rights of all Americans.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 37] For decades it has functioned as a kind of private FBI, commissioning “independent contractors” as spies to infiltrate large numbers of American organizations throughout the political spectrum. “In many instances,” wrote eventual ADL Director Abraham Foxman (who is reported to keep a portrait of seminal right-wing Zionist Vladimir
Jabotinsky in his office), [FRIEDMAN, p. 38] “our agents were employed by an outside investigation agency operating as an independent contractor.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 37] As noted by the Washington Post, a former ADL General Counsel, Arnold Forster, had earlier admitted “that he was often a ‘source’ for the Mossad – Israel’s CIA.” [MCGEE, p. 12] “Foreign minister Yitzhak Shamir [has disclosed],” wrote Ignacio Klich in 1986, “that the ADL coordinates its activities with Jerusalem diplomats more than any other United States-based organization.” [KLICH, p. 38] In 1948, says Robert Friedman, “the ADL set up a joint intelligence-gathering operation with the government of Israel, an activity that seems to raise questions about its charitable, tax-exempt status.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 38] With the founding of the state of Israel in 1948, says former national ADL director Benjamin Epstein, “we have maintained an information-gathering operation since 1948 relating to activities emanating from the Arab Consular offices, Arab United Nations Delegations, Arab Information Center, Arab Refugee Offices, and the Organization of Arab Students.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 38]

For decades the ADL’s spying tended to be upon right-wing groups, but in recent decades it has equally monitored others across the political spectrum, any group or individual that expresses what the ADL perceives to be anti-Israel, or of course anti-Jewish, opinion, both generically deemed “anti-Semitic.” “During the spring of 1971,” notes Jack Porter, “the ADL mounted a campaign against a number of groups – Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Medical Committee for Human Rights, and the Student Health Organizations which called for better medical service in the ghettos and the restructuring of the health industry.’ The ADL implied that these groups were anti-Semitic. The Jewish Left responded that rather than combating anti-Semitism, the ADL was creating it where there was none.” [PORTER, p. xxxix] The ADL has also over the years shared information with the FBI and the Commerce Department “which reviews the files of applicants for government jobs, searching for ‘subversives.’” [FRIEDMAN, p. 37] According to Henry Schwarzchild, an ADL official from 1962-64, the ADL even spied on Martin Luther King, Jr. and passed surveillance information about him to the FBI. [FRIEDMAN, p. 38]

In 1983 the ADL published the names of fellow Jews (and 27 non-Jews) Rabbi Elmer Berger, Edmund Hanauer, Mark Lane, Alfred Lilienthal, Haviv Shieber, Israel Shahak, and Grace Halsell for disseminating “pro-Arab propaganda” in America. “Since I have earned my living as a writer since my high school days,” wrote Halsell, “it came as a surprise to learn that a Jewish organization chose, unilaterally and arbitrarily, to classify me not as a reporter, journalist, or writer, but rather as a propagandist.” [HALSELL, p. 20]

In 1994 the ADL mounted a major public relations attack on the “Christian Right” in America with a document called The Assault on Tolerance and Pluralism in America. The attack was so extreme and misguided that it engendered an extraordinary response from Jewish conservatives: 75 “neo-conservative” Jews, in a paid newspaper ad, accused the ADL of assailing others “whose only crime seems to be the seriousness with which they act on their Christian convictions.” [SILK, p. 298]
In April 1993 the ADL found itself embroiled in a much-publicized scandal that threatened to completely destroy its public image as a righteous civil rights organization. An FBI investigation into the activities of an “art dealer,” Roy Bullock, and Tom Gerard, a San Francisco police officer and former CIA employee, particularly regarding the selling of information to the South African government about American anti-apartheid activists, led a police investigation to the Anti-Defamation League. The same anti-apartheid activist information was being sold to both the South African government and the ADL. It was then discovered that Bullock had for years been on the payroll of the ADL as a spy, carefully distanced as an “independent contractor.” Bullock testified to the San Francisco police that the main client for his “information business” was the ADL, and he worked full-time for them, working under “fact-finding” director Irwin Suall. Bullock’s task “was to amass information – heaps of it, from physical descriptions to birth dates to press clippings, anything that might one day become handy – about ‘potential’ anti-Semites.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 42] The ADL directed him to infiltrate about thirty Arab-American and other organizations described as right or left wing. Bullock also sifted through garbage cans for phone numbers, mailing lists, bank balances, and group correspondence. Automobile license numbers were recorded at organization meetings and passed along to Tom Gerard who provided Bullock – and thereby the ADL – with the names, addresses, and driver’s license information of their owners.

Bullock was paid $29,150 by the ADL in 1992 alone, and $169,375 between July 1985 and February 1993. To distance him as far as possible from the ADL, his salary was channeled through a Los Angeles attorney, Bruce Hochman, a former President of the Los Angeles Jewish Federation and a former member ADL board member. KALMANOFSKY, p. 43 When facing legal problems for his “monitoring” activities, the ADL spent over $100,000 to help him in his defense. [KALMANOFSKY, p. 64]

Police investigators discovered that Bullock had 1,363 computer files with the names of 12,000 individuals categorized as “Arabs,” “Pinkos,” “Rights,” and “Skins.” Files were maintained for the Earth Institute environmental organization, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Arab Democratic Club, New Jewish Agenda, the Asian Law Caucus, among many others. Upon raiding ADL offices, San Francisco police found there – among other mountains of material – copies of confidential law enforcement reports, fingerprint cards, driver’s license photographs, and individual crime records from classified police sources. [MCGEE, p. A1]

The kinds of material confiscated by police from the ADL office, and the publicized results of Bullock’s and Gerard’s conversations with police, wrote Jeremy Kalmanofsky in the Jewish Moment magazine, “gives the appearance that the ADL spies on everyone with whom it disagrees, including left- and right-wing Jewish groups. America for Peace Now, the New Jewish Agenda, and Israelis Against Occupation appeared in Bullock’s files, as did the Jewish Defense League. Bullock also kept information about Greenpeace; KQED, the
[San Francisco] Bay Area’s public television station; and the anti-nuclear group SANE-FREEZE. Bullock’s list also includes under the category “pinkos” many groups that are critical of Israel or that favor a Palestinian state but are not overtly antisemitic.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 43]

In an editorial about the ADL scandal, the Los Angeles Times expressed shock at the breadth of ADL “monitoring” activities:

“It is no surprise that the ADL has kept close tabs on individuals and groups of all stripes in hate and violence, such as the KKK and the White Aryan Resistance. But why has the ADL collected information the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Greenpeace, Mills College of Oakland, the board of directors of San Francisco public television station KQED, the United Farm Workers, Los Angeles Times correspondent Scott Kraft and several members of Congress?” [LA TIMES, 4-14-93]

“The ethics of the whole ADL fact finding operation grows more ambiguous,” noted Jeremy Kalmanofsky, “when you consider the League’s monitoring of critics of Israel ... when an organization claims, as the ADL does, that it is dedicated to civil rights for all minorities, and yet monitors Arab-Americans for their opposition to Israel, it raises questions of how its various missions can be compatible.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 63] “A long time ago,” explained Kenneth Bialkin, an ADL director from 1982-86, “we came to view that many anti-Israel people use that as a shield for anti-Semitism. Not to say that everyone does, but anti-Israel bias is something we expose whether or not it’s anti-Semitic.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 63]

“The ADL’s strategy to defend itself [against all charges],” says Kalmonfsky, “was a siege mentality, describing the crisis as an ‘antisemitic Big Lie,’ referring reporters to 80 years of ADL history and rarely discussing the details of the Bullock case.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 64] The ADL General Counsel, Abraham Foxman, reported the Washington Post, “called such questions about ADL’s conduct ‘anti-Semitism.’” “I’m sorry if it offends people,” declared Foxman, “This is far reaching. We see a conspiracy. I see a conspiracy. It’s out there ... It’s proved every day.” [MCGEE] Afforded space in an Op-Ed article in the New York Times entitled “It’s a Big Lie, Hailed By Anti-Semites,” Foxman insisted that the scandal surrounding his organization was “on one level ... simply a question of media irresponsibility. But there is likely something else going on in some circles, something more sinister – something requiring more analysis. In a recent ADL public opinion poll on anti-Semitism, one of the most disturbing findings was that more than 30% believe Jews have too much power.” [FOXMAN]

The Jewish community at-large rallied to the ADL’s defense against criminal charges. “With virtual unanimity – from the Orthodox Union to Americans for Peace Now,” reported Jeremy Kalmanofsky, “the Jewish world has circled the wagons around ADL, defending its past work and urging it to stay its course.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 62]

Meanwhile, former United States Congressman Pete McCloskey led a law suit against the ADL by 19 monitored individuals, including peace activist Yigal
Arens, son of a former Israeli defense minister, Moshe Arens. [FELDMAN, p. A3] A coalition of Arab-Americans listed in ADL surveillance files also filed suit, charging that the Jewish organization invaded their privacy and passed along information about them to the governments of Israel and South Africa. “The ADL wanted information on the ADC [Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee],” reported the Washington Post, a group that challenges defamatory Arab stereotypes, because it considered the organization ‘a highly active pro-Palestinian propaganda group.” [MCGEE, p. A12] Another lawsuit against the ADL by individuals and groups included former California Lieutenant Governor Mervyn Dymally, former Los Angeles City Councilman Robert Farrell, the National Conference of Black Lawyers, the Bay Area Anti-Apartheid Network, the American Indian Movement, the National Lawyer’s Guild, the Coalition Against Police Abuse, and the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador.” [REICH]

A huge break for the ADL legal defense occurred when a San Francisco civil court ruled that the Jewish organization was somehow entitled to the “journalists’ shield law,” protecting them from contempt of court for refusing to release requested information. Not long after, the San Francisco District Attorney completely dropped its investigation into the ADL’s illegal spying activities. In a “negotiated settlement,” the ADL’s punishment was to pay up to $50,000 in reward money to solve hate crimes, and another $25,000 “to train [San Francisco chief prosecutor Arlo] Smith’s prosecutors how to teach schoolchildren about the evils of bigotry.” [PADDOCK, p. A32]

Those who had been subject to ADL spying were outraged with a legal resolution that rendered a “punishment” to be merely a reaffirmation of the ADL’s own prior activities and myth of itself. “Members of political groups who said they were spied upon,” noted the New York Times, “expressed outrage at the settlement.” [NYT, 11-17-93] “Individuals who had been targeted by the ADL,” reported the Los Angeles Times, “accused the District Attorney of caving in to political pressure and letting the group off too lightly. Often, ADL critics have said, people were spied upon simply because they took public positions at odds with the state of Israel.” [PADDOCK, p. A32] “Not only is there no admission of guilt,” complained Riva Enteen, a spokeswoman for a coalition of groups trailed by the ADL, “but it is ‘portrayed as good Samaritans waving the flag against bigotry.” [NYT, 11-17-93] “This demonstrates once again the enormous clout of the Israeli lobby in America,” said former Congressman Pete McCloskey, himself one of those targeting for surveillance by the ADL, “It’s an unusual result for what appeared to be an ironclad case. One wonders whether all defendants are treated the same under the law.” [PADDOCK, p. A32]

In 2000, however, in a separate case, the ADL lost for the first time a lawsuit brought against it. In Denver, Colorado, the regional ADL was forced by jury trial to pay a non-Jewish couple, William and Dorothy Quigley, $10.5 million. Why? Because the Anti-Defamation League had defamed the couple. The case began when the Quigleys and their Jewish neighbors, the Aronsons, began squabbling. The Jewish couple eventually began regularly taping the Quigleys’
private cordless telephone messages: an illegal act. Comments to friends by Dorothy Quigley were deemed by the monitoring Aronsons to be antisemitic, they went to the ADL for help, and the Jewish organization publicly declared the Quigleys to be “anti-Semites.” The Quigleys sued the ADL, the Aronsons, and the local District Attorney office that had joined the ADL’s presumed anti-bigotry efforts. (The Aronsons and the District Attorney settled out of court). As Jewish journalist J. J. Goldberg noted about the profoundly disturbing Thought Police dimensions to this case, where George Orwell’s (Jewish) “Big Brother” is everywhere listening:


(In the private sphere, in 1989 Arthur Green was ordered to pay $5.5 million by a Miami court for driving Denis Rety out of business. Green, a former vice-president of Temple Israel of Greater Miami and an activist in the Greater Miami Jewish Federation, became involved in an argument over whether “a veal chop was too tough” at Rety’s restaurant. Green “then wrote a letter accusing Mr. Rety of anti-Semitism threatening to put him out of business, according to court records ... [Green] distributed it to several prominent Jews in the community, including the Mayor and Vice Mayor of Bay Island and the president of a 1,000 member condominium association that has many Jewish members.” The court ruled that Green’s accusation of anti-Semitic statements from Rety were “completely fabricated.”) [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 2-19-99]

Meanwhile, on go the widespread ADL socialization activities against “intolerance.” Even as ADL spying was brought to light in the early months of 1993, the Los Angeles Times noted that “more than 100 southern California public school teachers attended the ADL’s free ‘World of Difference’ human relations clinic.” [FELDMAN, A32] This program to socialize people to multicultural tolerance in a framework most advantageous to Jews and the state of Israel has “trained” over 110,000 public school teachers, over 70,000 employees from 100 different companies, and staff and students at over 400 colleges. “Literally millions of people around the world have been reached by the program,” said Abraham Foxman, “and educated in the values it fosters.” [FOXMAN, p. 321] At an April fund-raising luncheon, even as the scandal was about to become publicized, at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, former United States Defense Secretary and later vice-presidential candidate Dick Cheney received the ADL’s “Distinguished Public Service Award.” (The ADL’s omnipresence, influence, and/or dominance, in molding public opinion to its own perspectives about “prejudice” may be noted in the case of Richard Lobenthal, for 32 years the head of the Michigan Chapter of the ADL, who was appointed in 1997 to be the interim executive director of Michigan’s American Civil Liberties Union. [SHEPARDSON, p. C5]

In 2001, an ADL Board Member, Carl Pearlston noted the destructive influence of the propaganda organization upon the American community. Pearlstein parted company with the Jewish group after 25 years of activism. “The program for changing hearts and minds,” he wrote,
“A World of Difference, was created in 1985 to change prejudiced feelings ‘sensitivity training.’ It is reportedly very successful, highly commended, and widely used by governmental agencies and many companies. Unfortunately, my exposure to the program at a leadership conference indicated that teaching the values of diversity, multiculturalism, and cultural relativism resulted in denigrating the values of diversity, multiculturalism, and cultural relativism resulted in the denigrating the values and achievements of Western civilization and the desirability of a common American identity. There is now a nationwide industry of multicultural activists teaching various ‘sensitivity’ programs which increase awareness of racial identity, and result in racial separation and racial hostility.” [PEARLSTEIN, C., 6-4-00]

In 2001, the national Anti-Defamation League director, Abraham Foxman, was caught up in a major scandal when he wrote a letter to President Clinton requesting a pardon for fugitive Jewish American criminal Marc Rich. Rich, an ardent supporter of Israel, had given ADL $100,000 shortly before Foxman decided to appeal to the president in Rich’s behalf. [BLOMQUIST, B., 3-24-01]

Even Jewish New York Times columnist William Safire suggested that Foxman resign over his ethical blunder.

(In Australia, newspaper columnist Heather Brown expressed alarm about the new “Racewatch” organization created in 1998. Instituted by Community Aid Abroad and B’nai B’rith—the ADL’s parent organization—it sought to enlist volunteers to report instances of “racist” comments made by anyone. Such comments would then be reviewed and enter a database to smear the alleged speakers at a later date. “Racewatch,” worried Brown, “lays the groundwork for the creation of blacklists and outright character assassination.” In a politically-correct world where virtually anything can offend someone else, and where some consider “assimilationist policy” itself to be “racist,” what exactly, wondered Brown, is a “racist” comment anyway? “It would seem,” added Brown, “that Racewatch is a dangerous invention, the beast that can consume the very lamb it was to protect. Have we really reached the level of the Brownshirts, of private armies of secret, appointed pimps ready to snoop and spy? ... The thought of a secret army being specifically created to spy on its fellow citizens underlines one frightening truth: Australia, 1998, is no longer the kind of place I thought I was living in.”) [BROWN, H., 8-15-98]

In the current celebrity field, everyone from media mogul Ted Turner to author Gore Vidal to actor Marlon Brando to South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu have been subjected to the accusation of anti-Semitism by Jewish lobbying organizations. (In 1984 Lucy Dawidowicz told the World Jewish Congress that Tutu was an anti-Semite and that Jews should not back his efforts to end apartheid in South Africa. [ROIPHE, p. 20] Tutu’s “crime” was to have accused Israel of complicity in South Africa’s suffocation of its Black populace.) Jewish singer Eddie Fisher declares in his autobiography that Arthur Godfrey, once “the host of radio’s most important amateur talent contest,” was also anti-Semitic. [FISHER, E., 1999, p. 10]
In 1997, Marlon Brando was attacked by the ADL for remarks he made about Jews controlling Hollywood during an interview on Larry King’s TV show. The (Jewish) Forward noted that “Brando made his tearful apology for uttering anti-Jewish canards on the Larry King show at Rabbi Hier’s Museum of Tolerance.” [FORWARD, 11-14-97, p. 14] “The surprise,” says Washington Post reporter Megan Rosenfeld, “is that Brando is not the only entertainer to have revealed his hidden depth of ignorance regarding Jews.” [ROSENFELD, p. G1] She adds pop star Michael Jackson, country singer Dolly Parton, TV personality Kathy Lee Gifford, and Whoopi Goldberg to the anti-Semitic list. In 1998, singer Shirley Bassey (“Goldfinger,” etc.) had to “appear in court to answer allegations that she slapped an employee [Hillard Levy] and called her a ‘Jewish bitch.’” [URQUHART, p. 3] The alleged incident happened five years earlier on the occasion of Levy being fired. For controversial former chess champion, Bobby Fischer (whose mother was Jewish), in 1992 there were media “reports characterizing him as anti-Semitic.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 9-1-92] In 1999, in Hungary, says the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Fischer “launched into an anti-Semitic rant during a rare live interview ... Fischer also claimed that Jews had invented the Holocaust to make money ... When the interview was later repeated, Fischer’s anti-Semitic comments were omitted.” [BOHM, A., 2-2099, p. 12]

In the religious sphere, Father Paul Marx (of Jewish heritage?), the head of the anti-abortion organization Human Life International, found himself in trouble when, as Rabbi Daniel Lapin notes, he “cited a factually correct detail about the Jewish community. He noted the prominence of Jews in the pro-abortion movement. For this he was accused of anti-Semitism; he is now regularly picketed by Jewish groups wherever he speaks.” (Even Jewish Boston Herald columnist Don Feder notes that a third of the organizations listed on the Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice letterhead are Jewish). [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 304] In 1999, the founder of the Moral Majority, Jerry Falwell, was publicly assailed for suggesting that the anti-Christ (“a full-grown counterfeit of Christ”) will probably be Jewish. [WEISS, J., 1, 24-99, p. 16A]

In 1998, hockey legend Bobby Hull found himself in hot water for comments he supposedly made to the Moscow Times in defense of Adolf Hitler. Hull, who was interviewed by a Russian reporter with the aid of a translator, reportedly praised Hitler in the context of remarks he made about cattle breeding. Hull claimed that what he said was completely twisted out of context and misrepresented, and another Russian translator present during the interview, Svetlana Murashkina, supported Hull’s version of the incident. To repair his career as a public figure, Hull inevitably had to make the familiar Pilgrimage to the usual place in search of Forgiveness. “Bobby Hull,” noted a Minneapolis newspaper, “has asked for, and been granted, a meeting with the Canadian Jewish leaders to explain pro-Hitler remarks attributed to him by the Moscow Times.” [STAR-TRIBUNE, 8-29-98, p. 26]

In 2001, Joaquim Agut, chairman of the Terra Lycos Internet company, was accused of making anti-Semitic statements at a business meeting. According to
a financial journalist, Augut asserted that Jews “have always tried to cheat me” and that he had Mafia acquaintances who could “take care of them.” Augut denied the allegations. An unidentified “Wall Street analyst” told a reporter that “If Jewish organizations come down hard on this incident, the leadership structure at Terra Lycos will again be up in the air.” [HELFT, D., 3-9-01] The same year, Ariel Musicant, president of Austria’s Jewish community and owner of a giant real estate investment company, announced that he planned “to sue [Joerg] Haider for what he terms the politician’s anti-Semitic attacks. Musicant told [Israeli newspaper] Ha’aretz that Haider is conducting an “‘anti-Semitic strategy’ – a crime for which, under Austrian law, the maximum penalty is 10 years in prison ... The immediate cause of Musikant’s suit is a statement Haider made at a Freedom Party rally two weeks ago. ‘I don’t understand how a man with the name of Ariel can be encrusted with so much dirt,’ Haider told the 2,000 people present, playing on the fact that Ariel is also the name of a well-known Austrian cleaning supply company.” [EITTINGER, Y., 3-11-01] Among Haider’s defenders was a Jewish member, Peter Sichrovsky, of Haider’s Freedom Party. Two of Sichrovsky’s grandparents were killed at Auschwitz. “If Jews say [Haider is] a Nazi, which is ridiculous,” Sichrovsky told the New York Times, “he can retort with cynical jokes about the Jews.” [COHEN, R., 3-25-01]

In 1986 Gore Vidal wrote an article in the Nation that impugned Norman Podhoretz and his wife Midge Decter as examples of prominent Jews whose loyalty – to Vidal’s sensibilities – leaned clearly towards Israel over America. Podhoretz used his editorship of the periodical Commentary, published by the American Jewish Committee, to brand Vidal’s article as a classic example of anti-Semitism, “the most blatantly anti-Semitic outburst to have appeared in a respectable American periodical since World War II.” [PODHORETZ] Podhoretz then wrote letters to thirty “liberal friends of the Nation,” seeking unified protest against Vidal’s piece. Twenty-one of Podhoretz’s targets ignored his appeal entirely. Of the nine who responded, “six disapproved of [Vidal’s] article; three resented Podhoretz’s letter ... two saw no anti-Semitism in the piece.” [BUCKLEY, NR, JE 6, 86; EDITORS, 1986]

In 1996 Ted Turner was publicly reprimanded by the ADL on two occasions for calling fellow media mogul, Rupert Murdoch, a “Nazi” and “like the late Fuhrer.” The ADL’s formal complaint had nothing to do with the insult to Murdoch (neither Turner nor Murdoch are Jewish). The ADL demanded that the word “Nazi” had a special meaning to Jews and should not be so trivialized. To ward off Jewish harassment, Turner apologized to the ADL on both occasions. [ADL ONLINE, 10-24-96, 10-2-96] In 1999, in a similar incident, the publisher of a professional football magazine, the Official Dallas Cowboys Weekly formally apologized (after a complaint by the Zionist Organization of America) for an article that called Washington Redskin owner Daniel Snyder “Hitler” and a “dictator.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 9-28-99] Snyder was also Jewish.

In this regard, Jews jealously guard not only the term but the concept of “Nazi” as exclusive Jewish political capital. In 1997, there were objections to an anti-union poster using Nazi-like cartoon characters by the Santa Monica (Cal-
California) Miramar Hotel. “Several Jewish and Santa Monica leaders,” noted a local Jewish newspaper, “... angrily marched into the hotel ... [and] demanded to speak to someone in charge.” [PFEFFERSON] In 2000, Michael Weinstein, president of the AIDS Healthcare Foundation, also charged that anonymously created posters appearing throughout West Hollywood, California, were anti-Semitic because they called him a “condom Nazi.” Weinstein was advocating “mandatory distribution of condoms at bars and restaurants” in largely homosexual West Hollywood. [POOL, B., 1-25-2000, p. B3] In 2000, in England, London mayoral candidate Ken Livingstone “came under attack from Britain’s Jewish community yesterday after he suggested that global capitalism had caused more deaths than Hitler. The Board of Deputies of British Jews described the remarks as ‘offensive’ while Labour and Tory opponents said they proved Mr. Livingston was unfit to become mayor of London. Mr. Livingstone said economists had estimated that in any year since 1981, up to 20 million people had died because governments cut back on health schemes to pay debts. ‘Every year the international finance system kills more people than World War Two. But at least Hitler was mad, you know?’ The comparison provoked an angry reaction from the Board of Deputies of British Jews.” [WAUGH, P., 4-12-00]

The Jewish Thought Police has also followed up in publicly policing the use of words in the English language. In 1997 the ADL began pressuring the publisher Random House against adding a new meaning for the world “Nazi” into its upcoming Webster’s College Dictionary. The offensive new meaning? Nazi: “A person who is fanatically dedicated to or seeks to control a specific activity, practice, etc.” This definition, so offensive to ADL sensibilities, was perhaps recognized to fit too uncomfortably the Jewish lobbying institution itself.

It cannot be denied that the word “Nazi” is used colloquially these days in such a manner and merits inclusion in any dictionary. But for the Jewish Thought Police so intent upon controlling even the meanings of words, anything having to do with the so-called Holocaust is sacred and anything short of a Hitler-style Nazi, frozen in time, is viewed as a trivialization of Jewish Holocaust dogma. According to an ADL press release to explain the group’s complaint, Abraham Foxman, the ADL national director, argued that “the role of editor [at Random House is] to inform the public that there should not be a ‘jocular’ usage of the word Nazi.” [ADL ONLINE, 1-13-97] (In an earlier attempt to censor history and language, in 1973 publishers of the Oxford English Dictionary were sued for refusal to delete the verb “jew” from the English language – colloquially widespread to mean “cheat”).

By 1989, under regular Jewish lobbying pressure, the Concise Oxford Dictionary’s second definition of “Jew” (after “person of Hebrew descent”) was sanitized over the years as “person who drives hard bargains, usurer.” Some Jews found even this objectionable, despite the dictionary’s qualifier noting that the definition was “derogatory” and “racially offensive.” The next edition was planned to be changed to accommodate Jewish revisionism even further, to
explain that the “deeply offensive” definition “arose from historical associations of Jews as moneylenders in medieval England.” Under continued pressure to excise the second definition entirely, S. K. Tulloch, the dictionary’s senior assistant editor, noted that the purpose of dictionaries are to “try to record the language as it is used, not as we (or someone else) would like it to be used.” [JW, 1-13-89, p. 2] Earlier, in 1982, pressure from the World Jewish Congress in Italy forced the publisher of the Dictionary of the Italian Language to recall all copies of the volume because of definitions of “Jew” and “Judaism” that were “insulting to Jews.” [JW, 5-30-82, p. 13] In 1984, Eve Kaplan, founder of the “International Committee of Cross Cultural Relations,” lobbied to change a Japanese dictionary’s unsatisfactory definition of the word “Jew.” [GOODMAN/MASANORI, p.29]

In 1995, after concerted Jewish pressure over a period of months, the publisher of a bible (The Christian Community Bible) in France, described by Jews as having “numerous passages with strong anti-Jewish connotations,” announced that it was “withdrawing the book from distribution.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 299] After Jewish complaints, in 2001, the verb “jew” was completely excised from the World Book Dictionary. “This was a definition left over from the 60s which we overlooked,” said Michael Ross, World Book’s publisher. “It’s a slangy term, and it doesn’t add anything to the body of human knowledge.” [LEVINE, S., JUNE/JULY 2001] Then there is Irwin Borowsky. Borowsky, “though not a particularly observant Jew, ... created the American Interfaith Institute, dedicated to ‘rethinking relationships among Protestants, Catholics and Jews ... Through books, international symposiums, and a scholarly newsletter, the insitute based at [Borowsky’s] Liberty Museum, proposes that \textit{hoi Ioudaioi} [the original Greek for “Jews” used in the New Testament] be translated not as ‘the Jews’ but with the equivalents drawn from the scriptural context, such as ‘the people’ or ‘the religious leaders’ or ‘some Jews.’ But most New Testament publishers are resistant. They say they have no right to modigy the word of God ... [O]ne major publisher that shares Borowsky’s views is the 183-year old American Bible Society, based in New York. Its 1995 Contemporary English Version, pitched to new English-readers, conspicuously avoids ‘the Jews’ in the problematic passages and substitutes alternative terms like ‘the leaders of the people.”’ [O’REILLY, D., 8-17-01]

In an odd way to prevent the spread of anti-Semitism, in 2000 the Anti-Defamation League bought six potential anti-Semitic World Wide Web domain names, including “kike.com,” and “kike.net,” so that anti-Semites couldn’t have them. [LUM, R., 1-14-2000, p. 1A]

In 1990, Michael Slomich, New England Director of the Jewish Defense League, drew considerable media attention in leading protests against the Hull, Massachusetts, community because of a series of old swastika designs in the tile floor of the Hull Town Hall. The building was built in 1923, years before the Nazis came to power with their appropriation across the world of the ancient symbol for good luck and fertility. The swastika was a popular symbol on picture postcards in America at the turn of the century. The design was even dis-
covered during an archeological dig in the ruins of an ancient synagogue in Israel. “Today tourists looking at these preserved ruins,” says M. Hirsch Goldberg, “can also see a swastika – another demonstration of how symbols change, since the swastika was once a sign of peace.” [GOLDBERG, M., 1976, p. 29]

Slomich led a group of complainers through Hull to demand the removal of the tiles, successfully forcing such unwelcome publicity upon the borough that the town council spent over $1500 to have the swastika motif extracted. Some critics felt the Jewish attack was misplaced and even ridiculous. A Native American professor at the nearby University of Massachusetts noted that the swastika was a positive symbol in his own culture; he objected to Jewish demands to excise them. “For many thousands of years, we have known and used that sign [the swastika]...,” professor Fox Tree wrote, “We do not have a national people’s defense league or access to our own media, television, radio and newspapers to tell our own side of the story.” [NEUMAN, E, p. 4-5]

“By destroying the swastikas in the town hall because a minority – most from out of town – does not like them, aren’t you doing the same as Hitler?” read one anti-JDL petition to leave the swastikas alone. “I’ve never seen so many anti-Semites come out of the woodwork,” declared the JDL’s Slomich, in evaluation of the controversy, “It was a victory for us, but I’m upset about the amount of opposition.” [NEUMAN, E, p. 4-5]
“A Jewish couple is traveling across the country and get to a small picture-postcard town. They stop for a bite. In the diner, the waitress makes small talk and finds out that they’re Jewish. She says, ‘You know something? We’ve never had one person arrested in this town.’ The Jewish wife says, ‘Really? Is the jail restricted?’” – Jewish comedian Milton Berle, [BERLE, M., 1996, p. 309]

Jewish historical revisionism, demands, and distortion spreads in all directions with self-righteous Jewish activists stepping forward in their respective occupational fields and disciplines to educate their non-Jewish peers against the omnipresent evils of irrational anti-Semitism and to present a favorable Jewish image.

On a smaller, grass roots scale, Jewish efforts to reform history and reality are everywhere. Steven Soifer, for example, in the field of social work, wants to “infuse content about Jews and anti-Semitism” into college social work programs as part of the educational mandate to “educate students about the differences among ethnic, racial, and cultural groups.” Soifer’s forum for complaint is the Journal of Social Work Education (1991) and here is a sampling of how he “educates” his fellow social workers:

“Jews are an oppressed group in U.S. society.” [p. 161]

This assertion, as we shall soon see evidenced in future chapters if anyone needs proof to refute the obvious, by all social, economic, and political measures, is ridiculous. Unless Soifer means that Jews in America are oppressed here by other Jews. In fact, he says as much later: “It is not uncommon for some Jews to perceive themselves as ugly, weak, complaining, pushy, caring too much about money, or being smarter than others. They may also exhibit feelings of powerlessness or attack other Jews for exhibiting supposed stereotypical behavior.” [p. 161]

“Falasha or Ethiopian Jews are often the targets of racism and classism as well as anti-Semitism.” [p. 162]

Soifer is right. But what he doesn’t mention is that the Falasha [Black Jews from Africa] face such discrimination and abuse – well documented – at the hands, again, of other (non-Black) Jews – in Israel, where almost all Falasha are currently living. [See later chapter about Israel, p. 1725.]
“Some … literature [that has “attempted to address the effects of anti-Semitism on therapy clients”] even appears anti-Semitic in nature … [arguing] that Jews themselves contributed to the problem of anti-Semitism, thereby blaming the victims of the problem.” [p. 157]

Soifer doesn’t detail the argument, nor does he mention that the article he cites to illustrate this charge was written by a Jewish author, C.G. Schoenfeld, in The Psychoanalytic Review which itself reflects a field and discourse, as we have already seen, that is predominately Jewish, including the Review’s editor, Theodore Reik, who selected the article in question for print. Schoenfeld suggests possible reasons for anti-Semitism that include self-enforced Jewish separatism from non-Jews through history, arrogant Jewish conceits of superiority, and Jewish preoccupation with money. [SCHOENFELD]

“It is important to realize that no one is ‘born’ Jewish; rather, it is a culturally and religiously acquired identity.” [p. 163]

Not only does Orthodox Judaism dictate that one is ‘born’ a Jew, but the possessor of such an identity – by traditional religious teachings – can never leave it (except in extraordinary excommunication occasions). “A Jew’s religion is not only his own business,” notes Michael Asheri, in explaining traditional Jewish dictate, “up to a certain point it is every Jew’s business and he has no more right to abandon it than a soldier has the right to abandon his comrades in the middle of a battle because of a ‘sincere’ conviction that the enemy is right. Such a man is considered a traitor and treated like one … In all laws concerning marriage, the rule is ‘once a Jew, always a Jew.’ This means that if a woman becomes an apostate, any children born to her will still be Jewish, even if they are born after her apostasy.” [ASHERI, M., 1983, p. 319-320] “There is the constitutive idea of Judaism itself,” says Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, one of the pre-eminent rabbis in Great Britain, “that the Jews are born into obligations … A Jew is a Jew by virtue of birth. This fact carries with it certain duties and obligations. Membership in the Jewish community is thus simultaneously a biological and ethical proposition.” [SACKS, J., p. 156-157]

“Because of the historical oppression and attempts at genocide against the Jewish people, most, if not all Jews, have learned to function and survive despite oppression, terror, and other abusive conditions. Thus, although many Jews appear to be doing well, often they are living in fear. Some Jews try to assimilate and pass as non-Jews. By being ‘invisible,’ they hope to escape another Holocaust.” [p. 163]

Jews are the wealthiest, most comfortable, ethnic group in America and there has never been anything remotely like “oppression, terror or other abusive conditions” for them in this country. With Israel and its nuclear bombs and Jewish hypersensitivity to the slightest criticism, and worldwide awareness to the Nazi barbarism in Europe in an endless Jewish publicity campaign, the notion of “another Holocaust” directed expressly towards Jews anywhere on earth is preposterous. Nor are Jews in hiding in America, trying to “pass as non-Jews”; they publicly celebrate their identity everywhere. Teaching social workers such nonsense is insidious.
But, of course, even to criticize Jewish perceptions and arguments here, by Jewish dictate, is rationally and morally impossible. It is, to Jewish dogma, naked anti-Semitism. And “anti-Semitism,” says Cynthia Ozick, a well known Jewish writer, at a conference held by the Partisan Review in 1994, “… has no need or real Jews. It can thrive where no Jews have lived, or where all the Jews are already dead. Anti-Semitism has nothing to do with Jews; it’s not about Jews. It is, and always has been, it always will be, about the body and soul of the anti-Semite.”[PR, p. 388]

Any argument that there may indeed be social, behavioral, and economic issues throughout history that are legitimate grounds for critical discussion and complaint about Jews are routinely rejected as automatically anti-Semitic in nature. And, hence, irrational. In fact, however, when Jews get too engrossed in detailed accusations against perceived “anti-Semites,” their assertions can become completely self-contradictory. Consider Moshem Leshem’s comment in his book, Israel Alone, about “Johann Gottlieb Fichte, the eighteenth century philosopher … [who] first sounded many of the themes that later became the staple fare of the modern anti-Semite: Jewish exclusiveness, their belief in their inherent superiority, their predilection for trade, their disdain for gentiles.” [LESHEM, p. 54] Yet Leshem, in this same book, earlier wrote of his own volition: “… In their [own] eyes, the Jews were a very different and superior people. To preserve that sense of spiritual uniqueness, isolation from the outside world was essential. Jews therefore limited their contact with gentiles to the strictly necessary. They might do business with the goyim, but they would not break bread with them …” [p. 18] A little exclusive, a little superior, and a little disdaining of Gentiles, no?

Or how about Leshem’s fond quotation of an Isaac Singer novel in which a character says: “I’ve long been convinced that there is a hidden Messiah in every Jew. The Jew himself is one big miracle.” There’s at least a wee bit of “superiority” in considering oneself a miracle, extraordinary vehicle for a Messiah, no? And how about Leshem’s observation about Theodore Herzl, the playwright and founder of Zionism and modern Israel: “His plays clearly show his preoccupation with the ills afflicting his own class, the Jewish bourgeoisie, especially the worship of money. He castigated the shameful self-serving falsity that permeated the over stuffed drawing rooms of equally over stuffed Jewish businessmen and stockbrokers … [p. 79-80] A little “predilection for trade” here, no?

So how is it that Leshem can nakedly state as fact (repeatedly throughout his own volume) the very same unflattering portrayals of Jewish behavior that Fichte used, yet call them “the staple of modern anti-Semitism” and dismiss Fichte as an evil anti-Semite for mentioning them? There are two possible answers. One is that a large portion of the Jewish noise about anti-Semitism is nonsense: merely part of Jewish political illusions and smokescreens. It is the “sustained noise” that Herzl encouraged to diffuse rational discourse and criticism towards distracting attention from the horrible policies of the modern Israeli state and a less than stellar Jewish past that has historically led to such hatred of them. Or, following a long Jewish tradition on such matters, unbe-
knownst to Mr. Leshem is the apparent fact that he, himself, in speaking negatively about Jews, has been somehow unconsciously wrestled and subsumed by Jew-hate and is, of course, the ten millionth (or so) Jewish anti-Semite.

Hannah Arendt, a Jew, flushes out this great maze of Jewish nonsense for exactly what it is worth:

“Jews concerned with the survival of their people … in a curious desperate misinterpretation hit on the consoling idea that anti-Semitism … might be an excellent means for keeping the people together, so that the assumption of eternal anti-Semitism would ever imply an eternal guarantee of Jewish existence. This superstition [is] a secularized travesty of the idea of eternity inherent in a faith in chosenness and a Messianic hope…” [ARENDT, p.]

Ultimately, there is really no escape for Gentiles from the endemic, omnipresent Jewish accusation of anti-Semitism. Jewish identity needs an antithetical and hostile Other to conceptually exist. Even if one defends Jews, and writes an entire volume attacking anti-Semitism – as did the well-known existentialist Jean Paul Sartre – there are Jews who are able to dredge up accusations of anti-Semitism in the very Gentile act of writing against it. Donald Kuspit notes the case of the Jewish art critic Harold Rosenberg who “finds that Sartre, despite his conscious intention to the contrary, is unconsciously an anti-Semite.” Reviewing Sartre’s work, Rosenberg argued that:

“From the image of the man limited to abstract ideas [Jews], it is but a step to that of the man dedicated to cash, since the chief abstraction in the modern world is, of course, money. The explanation that [Jews] are devoted to money fits together and provides a description of a kind of unlikable people.” [KUSPIT, p. 32]

Chaim Bermant notes another (what he calls “bizarre”) Jewish attack on Sartre by Susan Rubin Suleiman:

“Sartre has many things to answer for, but about the one thing he was not was an anti-Semite, and his Réflexions Sur La Question Juive [Reflections on the Jewish Question], published in 1946, became a classic defense of the Jew. Suleiman, however, sees something sinister in the very name: ‘Sartre chose a title […] the Jewish Question] that provoked tens and hundreds of anti-Semitic pamphlets and articles.’” [BERMANT, p. 7]

Hence, no matter what a Gentile says about Jews – good, bad, or indifferent, there is probably a Jew somewhere ready to condemn him. Richard L. Rubenstein even attacks non-Jews with a pro-Jewish bias; he asserts that even this is an equivalent of anti-Semitism: “Philo-Semitism is as unrealistic and pernicious as anti-Semitism, for it destroys our most precious attribute, our simple humanity.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 21]

Jewish determination to include any- and everyone into the accusative net of “anti-Semite” knows no bounds. Even the self-critical Jew, wracked with doubt, and shame, about his or her identity and/or critical of Jewish heritage, strangely, is also considered among Jews to be a veritable institution. This parallel tradition to the burdens of Jewish wonderfulness is Jewish anti-Semitism,
popularly called the “self-hating Jew.” “Self hatred, in fact,” declared James Yaffe in 1968,

“is a word often used to describe a common phenomena – Jewish anti-Semitism … The Jew believes all the epithets that the anti-Semite throws at him, even the ones that contradict each other. He believes that Jews are clannish and pushy, miserly and ostentatious, vulgar and excessively intellectual … [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 70] … In his attitudes toward anti-Semitism, the self-hating Jew is especially confused. The subject is on his mind constantly. He is far more sensitive to so-called ‘Jewish traits’ than most gentiles are.”[YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 72] … So why not recognize the truth? Hardly any Jews are entirely free from the effects of this disease [of Jewish self-hatred]. In AJC’s Baltimore survey [the American Jewish Committee’s study of the Jews of Baltimore in 1962], two-thirds of the respondents admitted to believing that other Jews are pushy, hostile, vulgar, materialistic, and the cause of anti-Semitism. And those were only the ones who were willing to admit it.”[YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 73]

“To this disease of the psyche [anti-Semitism/Jewish self-hatred],” wrote Milton Steinberg,

“some American Jews have fallen victim. How many, no one knows; but there are at least thousands who ‘think ill of themselves,’ who suffer from shame, who are plagued by a sense of inferiority – all because they are Jews. And occasionally one meets a Jew in whom the malady is virulent, a Jew who literally hates Judaism, and other Jews and himself.”[NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 76]

Jewish self-doubt, since the Enlightenment, created such widespread “anti-Semitic” feelings among Jews themselves that Max Nordeau (who became one of Herzl’s faithful Zionist organization men) estimated “that by the middle of the nineteenth century two-thirds of all the prominent personalities of Jewish origin no longer identified with Judaism in any form.”[LESHEM, p. 33] In 1848 a prominent European rabbi complained (however hyperbolically) that nine-tenths of the young Jews of his era “were ashamed of their faith.”[LAQUER, p. 9]

The pejorative word “kike” for Jews was coined by upper class New York City Jews to refer to the masses of Eastern European Jewish immigrants flooding into their city in the late 1800s. [GROSE, p. 32] Indigenous Jewish Americans’ sentiment about the new arrivals was little different than that of the average “anti-Semite.” “Prominent Jews in America,” notes Albert Lindemann, “seemed to corroborate precisely what Russian officials maintained about Russia’s Jewish population: it was clannish, religiously fanatical, and bent on domination.”[LINDEMANN, p. 219] “It is next to an impossibility to associate or identify oneself,” proclaimed influential Reform Rabbi Isaac Meyer Wise, “with that half-civilized Orthodoxy which constitutes the bulk of the [Jewish] population in those cities … We are Americans and they are not. We are Israelites of the 19th century and a free country, and they gnaw the dead bones of past centuries … The good reputation of Judaism must naturally suffer materially,
which must without fail lower our social status.” [GROSE, p. 32-33] A Jewish journal in 1893 complained that, for the American Jew, “on the one hand, here are his true relatives who are dear to him and whom he wants to help; on the other hand, what a blemish!” [GROSE, p. 32]

“Not only were most [of New York’s millions of Eastern European immigrant] Jews uncultivated,” says sociologist John Higham,

“but there is considerable evidence that they were loud, ostentatious, and pushing. Both Jews and friendly non-Jewish observers confessed something of this kind … In cartoons and in a good deal of middle class opinion, the Jew became identified as the quintessential parvenu – glittering with conspicuous and vulgar jewelry, lacking table manners, attracting attention by clamorous behavior, and always forcing his way into society that was above him … Before the 1930s, sober and humane observers took note of the core of reality behind the stereotype … The Jews symbolized the pecuniary vice and entered more prominently than any other ethnic group into the struggle for status.” [HIGHAM, p. 145-146]

“Between 1881 and World War I,” notes Joseph Bendersky,

“those Jews seen as the very physical embodiment of Old World stereotypes were immigrating to America by the millions. These despised Eastern Jews, so different in appearance, speech, and behavior, not only confirmed but augmented negative perceptions already evident in the era. So distinct and offensive were these immigrants that certain German-American Jews worried about being identified with them or wondered whether the very presence of such vulgar masses might engender the European variety of vocal, political, and violent anti-Semitism from which America had generally been spared.” [BENDERSKY, J., 2000, p. 34]

Emma Lazarus, a member of a prominent Jewish New York family and author of the famous “welcome huddled masses” quote on the Statue of Liberty, suggested that Eastern European Jewry should stop pouring into America: “For the mass of semi-Orientals, kabbalists, and Hassidim, some more practical measure of reforms must be devised than their transportation to a state of society [the United States] utterly at variance with their time-honored customs and sacred beliefs.” [GROSE, p. 32] “Not content merely to reject identification with Jews,” notes Howard Sachar, “[Jewish author] Simone Weil went so far as to identify the spirit of Nazism with the spirit of Judaism; Hitler, she insisted, was seeking only to revive under another name and for his own benefit the God of Israel, ‘earthly, cruel, and exclusive.’ It was devotion to such a God, she argued, that transformed the Jews into ‘a nation of fugitive slaves … No wonder such a people was able to give scarcely anything good to the world.” [SACHAR, p. 488]

Jewish “anti-Semitism” was also evidenced against Eastern European Jews in pre-Nazi Germany where “many assimilated Jews … considered themselves culturally superior to the Eastern Jews … [Jewish men of letters like] Theodor Wolff, for instance, the editor of the Berliner Tagleblatt newspaper, Georg Hermann, the author of the best-selling novel Jettchen Gebert and others exploded in tirades of hatred against the foreign undesirables.” [GIDAL, N., p. 399]
Walter Rathenau, a Jewish high-ranking German official in pre-Nazi Germany, noted under a pseudonym that Jews were an “Asiatic horde” and a “population of foreign stock.” “Look in the mirror,” he wrote, “This is the first step towards self-criticism.” [TRAVERSO, p. 94] “The hostility of German Jews toward the eastern European Jewish immigrants (Ostjuden),” says Adam Weisberger, “represented a form of redirected self-hate.” [WEISBEGER, A., 1997, p. 48]

Jewish American novelist Kathy Acker (author of ten volumes) notes traditional German Jewish elitism, even towards other Jews:

“My parents were high German Jews, and I was trained to run away from Polish Jews. And I have that childhood in me. It’s kind of a knee-jerk reaction … I was raised as a JAP [Jewish American Princess]; I just got ousted. I think I still have a little JAP elements. People who know me really see it. I’m really good when I have a dinner party or when I have someone clean my place. I was trained to be good with servants. I’ve got a real elitist streak in me; I just don’t take it seriously.” [BRESSLER/KAUFMAN, 2000]

In the late 19th century, Meyer Carl Rothschild (one of the heirs to the Rothschild fortune in Germany) wrote: “As for anti-Semitic feeling, the Jews themselves are to blame, and the present agitation must be ascribed to their arrogance, vanity, and unspeakable insolence.” [LINDEMANN, p. 103] A western European Jew, Chaim Kaplan, himself an eventual victim of Nazi terror, cited in his memoirs that in his personal experience living in Eastern Europe he had finally found one man that broke his negative stereotype of Polish Jews:

“Sometimes it bothered me that he was a superior person among the millions of lesser people, for as a type he contradicted my opinion about Polish Jewry. That is, the existence of Jakub Zajac clashed with my opinion about the Jews of Poland, which are not too positive. For years I settled among the Jews of Poland and I am known to them. I deal with them and I am well acquainted with their way of life and their cultural level as human beings and as Jews. To my great sorrow, I have not always spoken well of them. My opinions are based upon concrete examples, and from year to year the instances proving the validity of my opinions multiplied.” [KAPLAN, C., p. 76]

(Karl Marx, grandson of rabbis, once weighed in with a collective defamation of Poland’s Jews, saying “The Jews of Poland are the smeariest of all races.”) [MARX, K., 1959, p. vii]

German Jews shared non-Jewish German attitudes about the Jews in Eastern Europe. They were even important in the forming of such “anti-Semitic” views. As Steven Aschheim notes,

“East European Jews were held to be dirty, low, and coarse. They were regarded as immoral, culturally backward creatures of ugly and anachronistic ghettos. In large part this was a view formulated and propagated by West European and especially German Jews … [This] antipathy went hand in hand with the attempt to modernize Jewish life and thinking … Nineteenth-century German Jews, then, shared the general dis-
taste for the ghetto and what it symbolized, but because they themselves were products of the ghetto they internalized the distaste in a particularly intense and urgent way.” [ASCHHEIM, S., 1982, p. 3, 4, 11]

Secular Jew Stephen Bloom notes (in his study of an ultra-Orthodox Jewish community in Postville, Iowa) how Gentile outrage about obnoxious Jewish behavior towards non-Jews is automatically, still today, twisted into accusations of non-Jewish “anti-Semitism”:

“The Hasidim [ultra-Orthodox] were waging a cultural holy war, in Postville, Jerusalem, New York, Los Angeles, Paris – everywhere. The world was Jew vs. non-Jew, and the dichotomy existed in everything they did. Hasidic children went to separate schools, their parents arduously stayed among themselves. If the city of Postville tried to enforce an ordinance the Jews disagreed with, the immediate cry was anti-Semitism. If a local complained about noise from the shul [religious center], if anyone disagreed about annexation [into the town of a local Jewish-owned slaughterhouse], he or she was quickly branded an anti-Semite. Ultimately, I discovered, carrying on a conversation with any of the Postville Hasidim was virtually impossible. If you didn’t agree, you were at fault, part of the problem. You were paving the way for the ultimate destruction of the Jews, the world’s Chosen People. There was no room for compromise, no room for negotiation, no room for anything but total and complete submission.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 197]

Bloom’s honest conclusion about the tensions between the Jewish and non-Jewish communities in Postville are poignant:

“Many of the Hasidim I had encountered in Postville pretended to be holy, but their actions displayed bigotry and racism of the worst degree. The book [Bloom wrote called Postville] explored taboo topics such as bargaining, poor hygiene, atrocious manners, disrepair of homes, Jewish elitism, sexism, crime and prejudice directed at gentiles. In response, I’ve received dozens of hate letters, all from Orthodox Jewish readers, who essentially pose the same question as my father’s. To these readers, to criticize any aspect of Judaism is patently unacceptable. To them, I wasn’t a journalist doing my job. I was a self-loathing Jew, the worst kind of anti-Semite. I was embarrassing the family.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 355]

In 1950 prominent art critic Clement Greenberg announced that “it is only reluctantly that I have become persuaded that self-hatred in one form or another is almost universal among Jews – or at least much more prevalent than is commonly thought or admitted.” [GREENBERG, p. 426] “I’ve experienced anti-Jewish feelings I’d be ashamed to admit,” wrote Jewish author Philip Weiss in 1996, “I also sense that I’m not alone. One Jewish friend prays that her son won’t marry a Jew. A Jewish editor at the New Republic … once said to me over the phone, ‘I’ll have to Jew you down’ on a fee.” [WEISS, p. 24]

Important propagators of anti-Semitic stereotypes in the entertainment world, a field largely populated by Jews, were also Jewish. As Nathan Belth notes, “Many of the most objectionable anti-Semitic vaudeville acts were per-
formed by Jewish comedians, and Jewish movie producers were responsible for some of the films most damaging to the Jewish image.” [BELTH, p. 46] “It is a startling fact of American stage (and film) history,” adds Ellen Schiff, “that Jews have had a hand in creating virtually all the prevailing contemporary Jewish stereotypes.” [SCHIFF, E., 1986, p. 93]

“It is impossible,” wrote Jewish commentator Ralph Boas in 1917,

“for a Jew to live apart from his race for several years without looking upon his people in a new light. For one thing, distance has enabled him to focus. He has learned to sympathize more with those hotel-keepers whose ban upon Jews is a terrible thorn in the flesh of the man whose money ought to take him anywhere. He has come to see that the clan-nishness of Jews serves only to intensify what social discrimination may exist … And finally he has perceived that there is an arrogance of persecution, and that for a man to be continually assuming that people are taking the trouble to despise him for his birth is to postulate an importance that does not exist.” [BOAS, p. 149]

Another Jewish author, Joel Blau, wrote in 1930 that

“The Jew seems to be the cause of the irritation and unease everywhere. It is the mark of the gentleman, not only that he possesses ease, but, chiefly, that he knows how to put others at ease. This is an inimitable faculty and to its absence must be attributed most of the social discrimination the Jew complains of … The loudness and vulgarity he is often charged with are but extreme manifestation of this unease.” [BLAU, p. 170]

Selig Adler and Thomas Connolly, in their history of the Jews of Buffalo, New York, note the comments in 1922 of an unidentified Jewish businessman in that city:

“I am a Jew, of course. I never deny it. But I rarely have occasion to admit it. I don’t look much like a Jew and so few people know it … In fact, I learn more every day why Gentiles hate Jews! And, in fact, you know, I really don’t blame them in most cases.” [ADLER/CONNOLLY, 1960, p. 335]

In today’s “A Jew is Categorically Beautiful” mode, few Jewish observers take such historical comments seriously this day and age, except as a manifestations of their authors’ twisted misperceptions about being Jewish. Such is also the interpretation of Adam Hochschild, co-founder of Mother Jones magazine and son of wealthy Jewish mining mogul. Hochschild notes the papers he found in his father’s study after his death:

“A major, astounding point of Father’s memo [in 1940] is that if a wave of anti-Semitism sweeps over the United States, it will be the ‘shortcom-ings’ of the Jews themselves which are partly responsible. He talks about Jews who are too ‘loud,’ about low ethical standards in Jewish-dominated trades. He declares: ‘It is an unhappy fact, acknowledged by members of what may be termed the Jewish intelligentsia to each other but not to Gentiles, that a large proportion of the Jews in America are not properly edu-
cated to American business and social standards ... Young Jews should be told frankly that certain Jewish tendencies are regarded by Gentiles as anti-social; they would be made to realize the advantages of unobtrusiveness.” [HOCHSCHILD, p. 184-185]

For some Jewish lesbians, the states of being Jewish and being lesbian link at the same sources: victimhood, outsiders to the Norm, perceived character flaws, and so on. As Nomy Lamm suggests, “Not only was I missing a leg. I was fat, I was Jewish and I liked girls ... I had physical characteristics that felt distressingly Jewish to me, even if other people didn’t recognize them. My Jewish characteristics were the things that made me feel gross and unwomanly. I was fat and hairy, loud and bossy, coarse and unrefined.” [LAMM, 11-98]

“Attempts to escape from Jewishness,” says the Polish Jew Stanislaw Krajewski, “have been frequent at least since [Heinrich] Heine [a prominent German Jewish writer of the nineteenth century] who declared that Jewishness is a misfortune. Interestingly, I heard this dictum repeated recently by a distinguished Polish writer who had been raised in a shtetl [Jewish community] and had written about Jews throughout his life. The approach of equating Judaism with having a hump can easily lead to the famous, or rather notorious, Jewish self-hatred.” [KRAJEWISKI, p. 21] Heine once wrote that “those who would say that Judaism is a religion would say that being a hunchback is a religion.” [LINDEMANN, p. 15] Famous art patron Peggy Guggenheim noted her feelings during her visit to Israel: “The only thing that really impressed us was the Wailing Wall. It mortified me to belong to my people. The nauseating sight of my compatriots publicly groaning and moaning and going into physical contortions was more than I could bear, and I was glad to leave the Jews again.” [GUGGENHEIM, p. 47]

“I really dislike Judaism,” said prominent Jewish science fiction writer Isaac Asimov, “It’s a form of particularly pernicious nationalism ... Every once a while when I’m not careful, I think that the reason Jews have been persecuted as much as they have been has been to punish them for having invented this pernicious doctrine.” [RUBIN, B. p. 134] “I do not even love my people,” says the Jewish author Arthur Koestler. “I rather dislike them. Self-hatred is the Jewish patriotism.” [GILMAN, p. 333] Such “patriotism” has waved some pretty strange flags.

Certainly some of the most unusual cases of Jewish “self-hatred” have been in recent times. In 1978 a group of Nazis led by a man named Frank Collin made national headlines with their plans to march through Skokie, Illinois, a Chicago suburb populated with many Jews. Collin’s father (originally named Cohen) was a Jewish survivor of Dachau, a German concentration camp in World War II. In 1965, Daniel Burros, the King Kleagle of the New York Ku Klux Klan committed suicide when the New York Times exposed the fact that he was Jewish. [PERLMUTTER p. 64] Strangely, Burros knew another Burros, this one Robert, an activist in the far-right American Renaissance Party. Robert’s father was Jewish. Both men hid their Jewish backgrounds from each other. [ROSENTHAL/GELB, 1967, p. 171] (American Civil Liberties Union activist David Hamlin, in his personal account of the Skokie case, even notes another alleged Jewish [CASH, K.,}

In 1966, Richard Wishnetsky grabbed a microphone from a rabbi at a bar mitzvah ceremony in Detroit, shouted that “This congregation is a travesty and abomination. It has made a mockery by its phoniness and hypocrisy the beauty and spirit of Judaism. It is composed of people who on the whole make me ashamed to say I am a Jew.” Wishnetsky then pulled out a gun and killed the rabbi and himself. [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 273]

In England, a British Jewish novelist, Gilbert Frankeau, wrote an article in 1933 entitled, “As a Jew I Am Not Against Hitler.” [ROSEN, p. 214] In Russia, by the mid-1990s, the head of the right-wing nationalist Liberal Democrat Party, Vladimir Zhirinovsky, was being wrote about as a potential “dictator.” His “ideas and behavior,” write Vladimir Solovpov and Elena Klepinkova, “are often reminiscent of Hitler … [His] anti-Semitism is not like Hitler’s, but more like that of Karl Marx; that is, it is not visceral but theoretical.” [SOLOVPOV/KLEPIKOVA, p. viii, p. 37] Zhirinovsky’s father, Volf Isaakovich Eidelstein, was Jewish.

Some of the most sickening cases of “self-hatred,” if we are to believe Hannah Arendt, by deeply disturbed people, were in Nazi Germany. Nazi Field Marshall Erhard Milch was “generally known,” according to Arendt, to have been “half-Jewish,” as was Reinhard Heydrich, whose “Office of Jewish Emigration” organized the extermination of four million people, mostly Jews. Even Hans Frank, the merciless Nazi Governor General of Poland, in which the Holocaust largely occurred, says Arendt again, was “probably even a full Jew.” [ARENDT, ET, p. 118] “The forty-two volume journal [Frank] kept of his life and works … was one of the most terrifying documents to come out of the dark Nazi world.” [SHIRER, p. 662]

Some Jews even seek to find Jewish self-hatred in Adolf Hitler. Hitler, claims M. H. Goldberg, “had reason to fear that his father’s father was a Jew.” Goldberg even says that a Pope elected in 1130, Anacletus II, was Jewish, “but to find his Jewish connection we must go back a few generations.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 114]

The shocking bottom of Jewish self-hatred is manifest in an infamous, and often referred to, excerpt by an unnamed Jewish intellectual in pre-Nazi Germany:

“It is there all the time, it is within me: this knowledge about my descent. Just as a leper or a person sick with cancer carries his repulsive disease under his dress and yet knows it himself every moment, so I carry the shame and disgrace, the metaphysical guilt of being a Jew … Germany, your walls must remain secure against penetration. Remain hard! Remain hard! Have no mercy! Not even with me.” [SILBERMAN, p. 37]
Even the German, Wilhelm Marr, the self-proclaimed “Father of anti-Semitism,” the man who is credited with the creation of the word “anti-Semitism” in the 1870’s, and who wrote a book called The Victory of Judaism Over Germany, is often described as being at least partially Jewish. (The respected Jewish historian Simon Dubnov calls him so, and The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia lists his father, Heinrich, as a Jew of considerable theatrical accomplishment. [UJE, v. 7, p. 366] True or not, (a biographer, Moshe Zimmerman, doubts the claim) there were definitely “self-hating” Jews in Marr’s close proximity. He married four times in his life – two of his wives were “half-Jewesses” and a third a “full Jewess,” whose mother’s maiden name was Israel. [ZIMMERMAN, p. 36, 70]

Among prominent nineteenth century anti-Semites, says Albert Lindemann, “an astonishing number of them had at some point in their lives not only extensive contact with Jews but also remarkably positive experiences with them – close friends, respected teachers, even lovers and spouses!” [LINDEMANN, Antisem, p. 188] “A major facet of the new anti-Semitism [in the late 1800s],” notes Jay Pilzer, “was that many of its spokesmen were very well-respected intellectuals.” [PILZER, J., 1981, p. 10]

“To us [Jews],” wrote W. D. Rubinstein in 2000,

“European antisemitism appears to be a weapon of the strong against the weak, a kind of ideological sadism. To European right-wing nationalists of the post 1870 period, however, antisemitism appeared to be a weapon of the weak against the strong, and attempt (as they saw it) by a downtrodden nation to regain control over its resources from a separate, distinctive minority which appeared to dominate its economy – an aim not unlike that of anti-colonial movements in the Third World vis-a-vis the Europeans and foreign entrepreneurial minorities (like the Chinese throughout South-East Asia). The Zionist movement understood this perfectly well, however disturbing such a perspective may seem to us viewed with post-Holocaust eyes. Moreover, research is most likely to demonstrate very considerable actual Jewish over-representation in many other social and political areas which figured largely in the litany of continental antisemitism of the post 1870-period, especially Jewish participation in the radical left, the liberal professions, in journalism, and in the media.” [RUBINSTEIN, WD, 2000, p. 18-19]

Self-hater, who can say, but certainly one of the most sensationally bizarre Jewish apostates was Sabbatai Zevi, who lived in the seventeenth century. Zevi announced himself to be the long-awaited Messiah; he eventually could count on over a million Jewish followers throughout the world. He immigrated from Turkey to Egypt, raised eyebrows by marrying a prostitute, then moved to the Jewish community in Palestine to continued ecstatic adulation. The Turkish sultan, however, took wary notice of Zevi’s activities and demanded that the Jewish Messiah convert to Islam or he would be executed. To the profound shock and disillusionment of his believers, Zevi thereupon publicly proclaimed himself to be a Muslim.

The renowned Jewish metaphysical philosopher, Baruch (Benedict)
Spinoza, disciple of Descartes, was warned and then excommunicated from the Amsterdam Jewish community for his controversial writings. These included an indictment of his own “hating” Jewish people:

“The love of the Hebrews for their own country was not only patriotism, but also piety, and was cherished and nurtured by daily rites till, like the hatred of other nations, it must have passed into their nature. Their daily worship was not only different from that of other nations (as it might well be, considering the way they were a peculiar people and entirely apart from the rest), it was absolutely contrary. Such daily repro- bation naturally gave rise to a lasting hatred deeply implanted in the heart: for all hatreds none is more deep and tenacious than that which springs from extreme devoutness or piety, and is itself cherished as pi- ous.” [SPINOZA, p. 229]

Spinoza’s work includes a rationalist critique that impugned the Biblical claims of Jewish history. His writings, say Norman Cantor, “constitute a fundamental threat to traditional Judaism, ultimately more perilous than the conventional Christian anti-Semitism.” [CANTOR, p. 194-95]

A nineteenth century Jewish socialist (and later Zionist), in France, Bernard Lazare, said that

“Everywhere up to the present time, the Jew has been an unsociable being … The Jewish nation is small and miserable … demoralized and corrupted by an unjustifiable pride.” [LINDEMANN, p. 61]

The Jewish-born journalist Walter Lippman wrote to Harvard University’s President in 1922 in support of limiting Jewish enrollment: “I do not regard the Jews as innocent victims; They hand on unconsciously and uncritically from one generation to another many distressing personal and social habits … My sympathies are with the non-Jew. His personal manners and physical habits are, I believe, distinctly superior to the prevailing manner and habits of the Jews.” [LIPPMANN, p. 149]

Stanley Kubrick, the famed (Jewish) filmmaker of 2001: A Space Odyssey, Dr. Strangelove, and A Clockwork Orange, was christened a self-hater by some after he had died. The New York Post announced that

“the late Stanley Kubrick once remarked that ‘Hitler was right about almost everything,’ and insisted that any trace of Jewishness be expunged from the ‘Eyes Wide Shut’ script that author Frederic Raphael was writing for him … And Kubrick was downright acidic on the subject of [Stephen Spielberg’s film] Schindler’s List. ‘That was about success, wasn’t it?’ he reportedly said. ‘The Holocaust is about six million people who get killed. Schindlers List was about six hundred people who don’t.’” [DREHER, R., 6-16-99]

Yet another, particularly tragic, Jewish “self-hater” was Otto Weininger, whose strange deprecative ideas about Jews and women have afforded him a kinky cult status amongst some intellectuals, a Diane Arbus of philosophy. Weininger, a convert to Protestantism, floating around the edge of the Freud group in Vienna, committed suicide at age 23 in 1904, not long after his con-
troversial book *Sex and Character* was published, a misogynist work that managed to also offend with the strange claim that Jewish males were intrinsically effeminate.

Prominent nineteenth century French Jewish socialist Ferdinant Lasalle: “There are two classes of men whom I hate, journalists and Jews,” he once wrote. “Unfortunately, I belong to both.” [WEISBERGER, A., 1997, p. 47] Prominent turn-of-the-century European Jewish socialist Rosa Luxemburg noted the complexion of the audience at a 1902 political meeting: “Half the hall, and *comme de raison* the best places in front, were naturally taken by Russians or rather by Jewboys, from Russia – they were sickening to look at.” [WEISBERG, A., 1997, p. 97] “The eternal truth,” said Arnold Schnitzler, a Jewish doctor and contemporary of Sigmund Freud in Vienna, “is that no Jew has any real respect for his fellow Jews, ever.” [CLARKE, R., 8-2-99, p. 5]

And, of course, let’s not forget Jesus Christ, a Jew, (who, Messiah or not, rebelled against Jewish conventions of his time) and many of his early followers who were Jews, all apostates, and the long lineage of trouble that they have effectively caused upon those who never left the fold. “The founder [of Christianit],” notes R.J. Zwi Werblowsky in the Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion, “and its early adherents were all Jews.” [WERBLOWSKY, p. 158] “Like Jesus,” says M. H. Goldberg, “all the apostles were Jews, as was the first Pope. Jews wrote all of the books of the New Testament except for those written by Luke.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 67] It would seem that “anti-Semitism,” in the religious context, as it is presently conceived, was in its origins an in-house Jewish dialogue.

The psychologically-charged term “self-hating Jew” is a harsh one. It was created and is commonly used by the Jewish community as a pejorative term for member critics of *communal* Jewish selves. The stigma of “self-hating” linguistically atomizes the offender and distances him from the rest of the community as a “self” in a remote negative orbit. No person accused of being a “self-hating Jew” is likely to see it that way. But to admit that such a person (short of Jewish Nazis and other truly unbalanced types) has possibly legitimate grievances and complaints against Jewish tradition, behavior, or heritage is too threatening, especially since there has been so many “self-haters” running around. If termed, distanced, and understood as self-haters, the community rides the waves of criticism, safely above them. Self-haters are then easily dismissed – no matter how many there are – as unfortunate mental cases infected with disillusions and delusions from Gentile culture. Self-haters internalize Gentile criticism (and accept it as true) about Jewishness. Of course, there is a psychoanalytic invention to explain how this all works, a theory which supports popular Jewish conventions about anti-Semitism and Jewish self-hatred: this is the notion of psychological transference and any victim’s “identification with the aggressor.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 83]

Smothered by the Tidal Waves of Jewish self-glorification, rebellious Jews like Alain Finkelkraut must occasionally come up for air:
“There’s no other way to say it – I was sick and tired of being Jewish. Disgusted … saturated … stuffed to the gills with it … I’d had enough, been worn out from repetitions, was numbed by the hackneyed clichés about our peoples’ peerless destiny, bludgeoned with the constant refrain about a people who no one loved. The prize goose was asking for mercy – not God’s, or the systems’, but from those feeders, my parents and their perpetual Jewish obsession.” [FINKELKRAUT, p. 102]

Philip Roth expressed similar feelings in his famous novel, Portnoy’s Complaint, renowned in Jewish circles as a very self-consciously Jewish piece of fiction:

“And that goes for the goyim, too! We all haven’t been lucky enough to have been born Jews, okay? Because I am sick and tired of goyische [the Yiddish term for non-Jews; it is pejorative] this and goyische that! If it’s bad it’s the goyim, if it’s good it’s the Jew! Can’t you see, my dear parents, from whose loins I somehow leaped, that such thinking is a trifle barbaric? That all you are expressing is your fear? The very first distinction I learned from you, I’m sure, was not night and day, or hot and cold, but goyishe and Jewish! … Oh, how I hate you for your narrow-minded minds!” [ROTH, P., 1969, p. 74]

“Having reasserted connection to the [Jewish] tribe in grand terms,” said Ann Roiphe, about her renewed dedication to Jewish identity, “I immediately felt claustrophobic and this claustrophobia cannot be hidden or denied.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 183] “Perhaps to be Jewish is to be trapped always with other Jews,” wondered Daphne Merkin, “even with those other Jews one doesn’t like. There is a stifling quality to enforced tribalism, a negative air space, like being in a gas chamber. It is difficult, for instance, to conceive of having the luxury of disliking the person standing next to you in a gas chamber.” [MERKIN, p. 17]

Yet another recent Jewish “self-hater” of some renown, forcing his way out of Merkin’s Jewish “gas chamber,” is Bruno Kreisky, Chancellor of Austria in the 1970s. His Jewish pedigree is substantial: he lost both his parents to the Holocaust. But Kreisky was a freethinker in office who chose mainstream Austrian society as his complete identity orientation; he felt no ties whatsoever to Jewish or Zionist mythologies. A prominent Jewish scholar of anti-Semitism, Robert Wistrich, noted “the neurotic features” of Kreisky’s “Jewish complex.” [WISTRICH, p. 78] And the Jerusalem Post complained that (in Kreisky) “a depravity of mind is clearly indicated.” Chancellor Kreisky’s “depravity” and offense to Jews and their secular religion of Israel included zingers like these:

“The fact of being a Jew is for me without meaning.”

“If Jews are a people, they are a wretched people.”

“[Simon Wiesenthal, the famed fugitive Nazi hunter] is a Jewish fascist – happily one finds reactionaries among Jews… I am the only one who can stand up to him because of my Jewish origins, anybody else trying to stand up to him would immediately be accused of being anti-Semitic and against the Jews.”
“I don’t submit to Zionism. I reject it … There is nothing that binds me to Israel or what is called the Jewish “people” or to Zionism.” [WISTRICH, p. 78-95]

“Kreisky,” once declared famed Jewish activist and post-war Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal, “has severed himself from the Jewish community of destiny. And, in my eyes, anyone who does that is a deserter.” [WIESENTHAL, p. 6] To the Jewish community at large, such a “deserter” – one who completely rejects allegiance to the principals of Jewish tribalism – epitomizes Jewish self-hatred.

Strong currents of “self-hatred” have been part of Jewish communal identity at least since the Enlightenment when Jewish religious-inspired traditions of “apartness,” insularity, parochialism, “specialness,” et al were devalued by the broader European intellectual movement towards human universalism. In this context, notes Talcott Parsons,

“it is not surprising … that the Jews have often displayed a rather extreme sensitiveness in matters touching self-respect and status. So long as their emotional attachments were limited exclusively to the Jewish community and all that mattered to them was the honor in which they had been held in their own community, they remained relatively free of conflicts. As soon, however, as they were permitted, through emancipation, to participate as members of the larger community, the balance was largely lost and they found themselves torn between two worlds and victims of serious emotional difficulties.” [PARSONS, p. 109]

“If we look for pathological cases of Jewish self-hatred among North American Jewry,” wrote Jacob Neusner in 1981, “we should easily find them. But on the whole, self-hatred takes a different form here. It is merely neurotic, but it is not limited to individuals. It characterizes the community as a whole, and is reflected in the Jewish community’s commitment to nonsectarianism, and in its niggardly support for the cultural, scholarly, and religious programs and institutions that makes Jews Jewish.” [NEUSNER, Stranger, p. 56]

In 1964, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations published a book (Modern Jewish Problems) for Jewish high school students. Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn addressed Jewish self-hatred/anti-Semitism:

“Is there anti-Semitism among Jews themselves? Would it surprise you to hear that there is anti-Semitism even among Jews themselves? Strange though this sounds, it is true. We call this Jewish self-hate. Very often Christians who are criticized for discriminating against Jews justify themselves by pointing to this Jewish anti-Semitism. Indeed, this strange hatred has at times been so widespread that a great German Jewish scholar [Theodore Lessing] once wrote a book called Der Jüdische Selbsthass, or Jewish Self-Hate. Jewish anti-Semitism manifests itself in many ways. One of the most obvious is the instance of the Jew who refuses to have any association with Jews, the Jewish community, or Judaism. The following are some of the reasons given by such people. 1) Jews are are too clannish. 2) Jews are loud and chauvinistic. 3) Jews
are too concerned with themselves and their own survival.” [GITTEL-SOHN, R., 1964, p. 135-136]

This famous book about Jewish self-hatred was that, in the 1930’s, of a Jewish German physician, Theodore Lessing – a man who had converted to Christianity and then back to Judaism again. Der Judische Selbsthass was a classic on the widespread phenomena of Jewish self-hatred. Jules Carlebach summarizes Lessing’s basic thesis like this:

“There is a fundamental principle in the Old Testament that the fate of the Jewish people is always a consequence of their own behavior. Suffering therefore implies sin and guilt. Logically, the greater the suffering, the greater the guilt. Here, for Lessing, is the root of self-hatred. Other people have interpreted their misfortunes by pointing to those who brought misfortune to them, whereas the Jews enmeshed in their conviction that they have brought misfortune on themselves, can see their tormentors only as instruments of God. The tormentor in turn can use the Jews’ own view of his guilt to explain why he ill-treats Jews. Hence anti-Semitism is not a product of ill will, national egoism or hate and jealousy in international competition. It is the Jewish conception of meaning in history.” [CARLEBACH, p. 334]

The notion that Jewish self-hatred (and its parallel in others – anti-Semitism) is (religiously) divinely instilled and/or (secularly) has origins in Jewish action, and that it stems from Jews’ own psycho-religious views of themselves, has – in the post-Holocaust era – fallen into extreme disfavor among most secular Jews. Lessing’s view that in Jewish tradition blame for Jewish misfortune falls inevitably upon Jews themselves – in the wake of the likes of Auschwitz and the birth of an aggressive nationalist spirit, per Israel – became way too much to bear. Accordingly, Jewish theorists – seeking to escape the religious burdens of cosmic blame and now united in a new “psycho-politic,” began creating new conceptual models for understanding self-hate that refocused upon complete Jewish innocence and victimization by others through history, totally repositioning blame, responsibility, and God’s wrath away from them.

Among such proponents was Kurt Lewin, who decided that Jewish self-hate stemmed from Jewish inability to live up to mainstream, non-Jewish standards of perception, behavior, and even physical appearance. (Who, one wonders, Jew or non-Jew, can live up to today’s myths of popular American culture, from Ozzie and Harriet to Marilyn Monroe and this month’s airbrushed figure on the cover of Vogue magazine?) It is true, however, that throughout history, Gentiles, with their own standards of behavior, have always looked askance at their Jewish counterparts. In 1942, for example, a non-Jewish Harvard professor, Talcott Parsons, “the most influential sociologist of our time,” argued that reasons for anti-Semitism included Jewish “oversensitiveness to criticism” and “abnormal aggressiveness and self-assertion … The ‘chosen people’ idea held by the Jews is another source of friction … [SILBERMAN, p. 56] … Since many Jews are typical ‘intellectuals’ they are unaware of the extent to which they offend the nonrational sentiments of others.” [PARSONS, p. 116]
The logic of the turn-of-the-century work, *Anti-Semitism and Modern Science*, by Jewish Italian Cesare Lombroso, is likewise dismissed by Nancy Harrowitz:

“He turns his attention to the Jews themselves and their role in instigating anti-Semitism, what we would view today as a classic example of ‘blame the victim.’ Most of the book is devoted to derisive accounts of Jewish cultural and religious practices.” [HARROWITZ, p. 115]

The classical notions that Jews are pushy, loud, and obnoxious have been—until more recent times of defiance and assertions of “Jewish is Beautiful” themes—subjects on which many Jews felt deep need to brood upon. “[The Jew, in identifying with mainstream, non-Jewish culture],” explains Gordon Allport, “sees his own group through [non-Jewish] eyes … since he cannot escape his own group, he thus in a real sense hates himself— or at least the part of himself that is Jewish. To make matters worse, he may hate himself for feeling this way. He is badly torn. His divided mind may make for furtive and self-conscious behavior, for ‘nervousness’ and a lasting sense of insecurity. Since these are unpleasant traits, they augment his hatred for his own Jewishness and then aggravate the conflict. The circle is vicious and never-ending.” [ALLPORT, p. 151]

Ultimately, these days non-Jewish society is commonly held responsible by Jews for their own cycles of neurosis, an attitude expressed by Sander Gilman who, in 1986, wrote an entire volume on the subject of Jewish self-hate. Gilman loyally followed the standard “Jew as victim” motif and locates the origin of Jewish self-hatred not even partially in Jews themselves, nor their community, but in non-Jews and their culture which are both perceived, as always, to be eternally victimizing them. (An interesting expression of this displacement, transnationally, came from Jewish communist ideologue Roman Werfel, under critical fire for his role in the post-World War II brutal oppression of Polish nationalism: “I’m against self-criticism. It’s a disgusting Stalinist custom which derives from the [Russian] Orthodox Church.”) [TORANSKA, p. 113]

When a Jew criticizes his own community so severely that he disavows it, or simply allows this identity to fade, by Jewish standards, it is never part of reasonable discourse to presume that the defector might have even the grain of a legitimate cause. Rather, as modern institutionalized canon in Jewish commentary, responsibility is automatically deflected, i.e., there cannot be a cause in the Jewish community itself for “self-hatred.” Jews are superior to others, especially morally, after all. Of course the cause must therefore stem from the evil non-Jew and their standards that omnipotently oppresses Jews.

Hence, per Gilman and modern Jewish interpretation, Jewish self-hatred occurs when Jews internalize Gentiles’ malicious ideas about them. Gilman doesn’t say it that simply; he spends an entire chapter trying to blind the reader with academese, like this:

“Self-hatred results from outsiders’ acceptance of the mirage of themselves generated by their reference group – that group in society which they see as defining them – as a reality. This acceptance provides the criteria for the myth making that is the basis of communal identity. This
illusionary definition of the self, the identification with the reference
group’s mirage of the Other, is contaminated by protean variables exist-
ing within what seems to the outsider to be the homogeneous group in
power.” [GILMAN]

This leads inexorably to the conclusion that Jews need accept no blame for
anything, even their own concepts of themselves. This “Alien Gentile in Jewish
Brain” is stock-in-trade in Jewish circles. Michael Lerner, editor of the leftist
Jewish journal, Tikkun, claims that “Jews have been victims of ‘internalized
oppression,’ taking the viewpoint of those who disdain them and making it
their own.” [LERNER, p. 5] Based on a foundation of Freudian psycho-babble,
Barbara Breitman blames non-Jews for endemic Jewish neurosis, outrageously
lifting blame from Jews for even their own thinking. The following is a classic
example of twisted Jewish “Victimspeak,” a system of complete irresponsibility
by which all blame for individual thought and action is surrendered to exterior
forces:

“For Jews, the masculine and feminine archetypes in the collective un-
conscious have been reversed by the anti-Semitism of the dominant,
white, male Christian culture. Jewish men may well experience them-
selves, and be experienced by Jewish women as somehow less masculine
than men of the dominant culture; Jewish women may well experience
themselves and be experienced by Jewish men as somehow less feminine
than women of the dominant culture. Although Jewish men and women
may blame each other for this phenomenon, the insidious process has
its roots in anti-Semitism.” [BREITMAN, B., 1988, p. 112-113]

Breitman even blames non-Jewish culture for “interfer[ing] in relationships
between Jewish fathers and sons, preventing a critically important identifica-
tion between the generations of men.” [BREITMAN, B., 1988, p. 104]

In this kind of “everything’s your fault/we don’t control our own private
lives” context, Norman Cantor can thereby excuse Jews en masse and blame
Muslim mind control (while slurring Islamic society) for Jewish immorality in
southwestern Europe in medieval times:

“Rabbinical court records of the fourteenth century show a Jewish
propensity to adapt to the lifestyle of Muslim society. Among the
Sephardim [Jews of Spain and Portugal], polygamy, concubinage, adul-
tery, and wife-beating were common.” [CANTOR, p. 186]

Sander Gilman never admits the obvious, that an important reason for
Jewish apostasy and disenchantment (“self-hatred”) over history has been the
inevitable rejection by some Jews of the elitist and seclusionist tenets of the
“Chosen People” mythos, or even to escape Jewish self-hate itself as an indige-
ously oppressive outcrop of traditional Jewish religious belief. It is irrefutable
that some people just don’t like where they came from, whether it’s Judaism or
Christianity, Kansas or New York. Centuries ago Christianity and its idealized
teachings of Christ offered (however unfulfilled) anyone a step closer to the
dream of human universalism, a concept intrinsically foreign to seminal Jewish
beliefs. The people who led this movement were also Jewish, and, hence, to
Jews, **betrayers**. In the wake of the Enlightenment, more and more Jews sought to assimilate into the purely **secular** non-Jewish community. And in the last century and a half, “self-hating,” utopian-minded Jews have played important roles in the development of socialism and communism, ideologies that espoused human universalism and egalitarian principles devoid of religious argument. These new ideologies (at least in theory) rejected traditional religious, social, and economic elitism, as well as the growing network of capitalism, an antithetical economic system that created and expanded new kinds of economic elites, a system which Jews had been instrumental in creating.

It is also intriguing to note that so many post-Holocaust Gilman-like Jewish scholars claim that the reason for traditional Jewish insularity and clannishness was caused by ostracization by non-Jews, and anti-Semitism. This perspective entirely ignores the deeply entrenched “people apart” syndrome and attendant psychology (“assimilated” Jew or not) of Jewish identity that has been religiously and secularly maintained across history. It also ignores the typical Jewish emphasis upon chronic class-climbing (ostentatious “yicchus,” et al) and vigorous Jewish attempts to plug their Jewish identities into the world of the non-Jewish economic, cultural, and political **aristocratic** and **upper class** model. The overwhelming mass of non-Jewish commoners around them through history could equally – or even more than Jews – claim a demeaning rejection by the upper class standards of any era. Nor could a non-Jewish commoner self-image pitted against an upper class standard ever be considered anything but sorely lacking.

Gilman stretches all the way back to the early Middle Ages to pull out some of the seminal self-hating Jews. He turns up a whole chapter-full who, in the medieval religious contest between Judaism and Christianity, chose not only to voluntarily convert to Christianity, but to critically expose their former community as well. Gilman’s list of tattletale apostates – some former rabbis – is long. Jewish apostate writers who took Christian names include Flavius Mithridates, Immanuel Tremellius, the German monk Hermann, Nicholas Donin, Johannes Pfefferkorn, Antonius Margaritha, Samuel Marocanus, Paulus Staffelsteiner, Paul of Prague, Franco de Piacenza, Christian Gerson, Johann Gottlieb, Johann Mentes, Christoph Christian, Paul Kirchner, Moritz Christian, Adam Librecht, Gottlieb Hamburger, and on and on. These are the kinds of people, born Jews, who were instrumental, with their caustic pens, in enflaming Christian hostility towards medieval Judaism. As William Popper notes, “The Dominican [friars] showed themselves the most consistent enemies of Hebrew literature; and the sternest among the Dominicans were the converted Jews.” [POPPER, p. 8] By the year 1500, “the history of all such troubles (concerning Christian hostility to Jewish religious texts) becomes now almost entirely a history of apostates.” [POPPER, p. 22] (Jewish apostasy as a source of Jewish misery is as much a part of Jewish history as anything else. Even in 1868 a Jewish convert to Christianity, **Jacob Bronfman** charged that a Jewish community organization, a “kahillot,” banned by the Russian czar, **Nicholas I**, existed and was interrelating with international Jewish organizations. [LINDEMAN, p. 130]
Gilman admits that “the complex self-definition of these converts … [played] a role in shaping the attitudes of the Christian world towards the Jew.” But he argues, “since the initial model chosen by the convert is a model of the Jew through the eyes of the Christian world, it is of little wonder that the Christian community formed their attitude toward the Jew substantially by the convert’s testimony.” [GILMAN, p. 17]

But if Jewish converts to Christianity were raised as Jews, how could their “initial model” of Judaism be the distorted Christian one? Gilman’s chauvinistic polemic assumes that scores of converted Jews completely severed all links to verifiable reality once they became brainwashed as Christians – despite decades of life and intimacy as Jews in the Jewish community – their sole purpose became, however, to propagandize Christian fictions about Jews, fictions which came from detailed criticisms of Jewry that only Jews in such eras could have known so intimately in the first place.

And where does Gilman go with his arguments? What is his modern polemical core?:

“Thus one of the most recent forms of Jewish self-hatred is the virulent Jewish opposition to the existence of the state of Israel.” [GILMAN]

Jewish scholar Jay Gertzman follows this typical Gilman scenario with his analysis of the sensational self-hating Jew, Samuel Roth. Roth, once a committed Zionist [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 259, 261] was a famous New York smut dealer, who was imprisoned twice on obscenity charges. He was cheated by fellow Jews in the 1930s and published in 1934 his own work entitled Jews Must Live, one of the most “anti-Semitic” tracts in history. As Gertzman explains Roth’s deconstruction of Jewish identity, all criticism of their heritage is assailed:

“The vulnerability of his situation inspired a neurotic identification with the aggressor, with those who had been prosecuting him: the Christian moral authorities who spoke for decency. He internalized their contempt, and to exorcise it wrote an anti-Semitic tract demonizing the ethnic middlemen with whom he had worked and lived. Jews Must Live is an ultimate consequence of pariah capitalism, of vulnerability and ambivalence about personal identity that accompany it, and of the strange symbiosis with personal identity that accompany it, and of the strange symbiosis with authority that lives at its heart … [The book] reiterated Jewish stereotypical traits such as hatred for gentiles and desire to remain isolated from them, prioritizing of wealth over patriotism, total lack of compassion for those with whom they deal, sexual neuroses, fear of physical labor, shyster lawyering, heartless real estate swindling, and control of prostitution.” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 258]

“Jewish history,” wrote Roth,

“has been tragic to the Jews and no less tragic to neighboring nations. Our major vice is parasitism. We are a people of vultures, living on the labor and the good nature of the rest of the world … The first of all Jewish creeds is that Jews must live. It does not matter how, by what, or to what end. Jews must live. So a return was made to the ancient policy of con-
quest by the more peaceful and deliberate means of cheating, lying, and pimping … The young Jew learns that before anything else he is a Jew, and that before anything else, comes his allegiance to the Jewish people.” [see http://www.hiddenmysteries.com/cartwebtv/item139.html]

In an influential volume on prejudice in the 1950’s, *The Nature of Prejudice*, the author Gordon Allport, a Jewish psychologist, asserted that “there is some evidence that the psychoneurotic rate is relatively high among Jews.” [p. 158] (Norman Kiell suggests a rate of Jewish neurosis that is two and a half times higher than Catholic and Protestant communities. [KIELL, p. 130]) Allport did not in the least consider that at least some of the reasons for this “psychoneurosis” might be found in the tenets of Judaism itself, endless webs of restrictive rules and regulations, relentless pressures to achieve as a Jew, a Persecution Complex instilled in children at an early age, and the psychological implications of a community that has been obsessed for thousands of years with a self-definition that frames them all as God’s “others,” and, hence, everywhere they went in the world, implicit “outsiders.” Allport’s reasons for the high rate of neurosis among Jews is, as always seen by them, entirely displaced. The origin of their psychological problems is never in themselves and their own belief systems, but, rather, that Jews were – and are – “victims of discrimination.” [ALLPORT, p. 158]

Following form, Henry Gold decides that classical Jewish neurosis is entirely rooted in Gentile oppression. “About twenty centuries of intermittent persecution,” he says, “and the ever readiness to escape it would tend to produce an infectious state of insecurity.” [GOLD, p. 134] Putting aside the fact that any people can equally claim “twenty centuries” of stress and “insecurity” (that’s called “life” and “history”) too, Gold adds other causes of Jewish neuroses including “unexpressed resentment” towards non-Jews, inferiority feelings and a resultant “success compulsion,” isolation and insularity, and “centuries of deprivation of ownership and cultivation of land.” [GOLD, p. 134-135]

Yet Jewish scholarship ignores the obvious. Might not a large part of Jewish neurosis stem from the traditional religious demands upon Jewish identity? In most contexts, might the suffocating avalanche of religious rules and regulations be reasonably understood to be a creation – and enforcement – of neurotically compulsive behavior? For starters, upon rising from bed, for example, “one is not allowed to walk four cubits (six feet),” states the *Code of Jewish Law*, “without having one’s hands washed, except in cases of extreme necessity.” [GANZFRIED, S., p. 3] The first piece of clothing to be put on must be the *tallit katan*. Before the morning ritual washing, “one should not touch either the mouth, the nose, the eyes, the ears, the lower orifice or any kind of food.” [GANZFRIED, S., p. 4] After negotiating a list of other specific morning rules, once outside, “a man should be careful not to pass between two women, two dogs, or two swine. Nor should two men permit a woman, a dog, or a swine to pass between them.” [GANZFRIED, S., p. 7] Life is regimented in all respects. While praying, “if one had let wind, one is forbidden to utter anything holy until the bad odor had ceased; the same applies to a case where the bad odor had issued from his neighbor. But if one is engaged in the study of the Torah,
one need not interrupt his study on account of a bad odor that had issued from his neighbor.” [GANZFRIED, S. p. 10] “One who suffers pain from overeating may stick his finger in his throat in order to vomit.” [GANZFRIED, S., p. 131]

As part of “work” prohibited on the Sabbath (Saturday), Orthodox Jews are expressly forbidden to open a door or window close to a candle, pour boiling gravy on pieces of bread, put fruit on a hot stove, prepare horseradish, touch fruit under a tree, get honey from a beehive, remove dry peas from pods, crush pepper in a mortar, “wipe anything with a sponge that has no handle,” spit where the wind could spray the saliva, shake water off clothing, put saffron into soup, pull off dead skin from the fingernail area, “suck blood from the gums,” tie an animal to a tree, draw a picture “in liquid spilled on the table,” “make a musical sound” (“unmusical sounds” are acceptable), and so forth. If a particular kind of knot in clothing causes pain, “it may be loosened by a non-Jew.” [GANZFRIED, p. 89-103]

Who would not be driven crazy by an entire volume (such a dictatorial volume exists), an entire life, of this? How many Jews, once exposed to other options, might feel inclined to want to escape it?

This very fertile field for at least some of the origins of Jewish self-hatred – completely ignored by the legions of “Jewish victims of anti-Semites” propagandists like Gilman and Allport – is simply the tyrannical regimentation of religious dictate, as well as attendant expressions of Jewish culture, lifestyle, and worldview itself; its classical obsession with status, money, and achievement; its chronic oppression of women; and its celebration of guilt. This celebration is deeply embedded and enforced as the Jewish persecution complex, so much evidenced by professor Gilman himself.

“This sense of persecution,” writes Fredda Herz and Elliot Rosen, “is part of [Jewish] cultural heritage and is usually assumed with pride. Suffering is even a form of sharing with one’s fellow Jews.” [HERZ, p. 367] Suffering for being Jewish is one of the very pillars of Jewish self-conception and is loyally understood to confirm, not detract from, traditional notions of Jewish superiority. The psychological burdens radiating out from the demands of being a member of the Chosen People, and the ethical conflicts it engenders in a democratic society, instills – in the view of Arnold Eisen – “a profound guilt and ambivalence generated by the inability to bear the weight which the demands of [Jewish tradition] impose.” [EISEN, p. 22]

The Jewish “chain of tradition,” notes Yosef Yerushalmi, engenders “enormous weight, the gravitational pull of the Jewish past, whether it be felt as an anchor or a burden … [There is a] powerful feeling that one cannot really cease being Jewish … [ROITH, p. 30]

Meanwhile, says Evelyn Kaye, “the basic duty of the Orthodox parent [the root of Jewish tradition and heritage] is to create a permanent sense of guilt in their children. Perhaps they find a coin in the pocket of the coat they are wearing on the Sabbath, and agonize over whether it is worse to take the coin out and thus touch money on the Sabbath, or leave it there and have to carry it around all day [both options forbidden in Orthodox Judaism]. Perhaps they
read the wrong prayer from the prayer book during the service and miss the special prayer for the New Moon.” [KAYE, p. 57]

“Guilt,” says psychological researcher Rebecca Adler, “is just one trait in a mass of neuroses that Jews regularly attribute to themselves. The laundry list is long: Jews are hypochondriacs, Jews whine, Jews are worrywarts, Jews are anal-compulsive, Jews are orally fixated.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 152] “Guilt is just one example,” observes Joshua Halberstam, “of this tendency of American Jews to see themselves as neurotically driven or ‘psychologically overwrought.’” [HALBERSTAM, p. 153] As Jewish author Marcelle Clements notes about having relationships with Jewish men:

“Study ulcers, shingles, and perpetual back problems. Bone up on asthma. Learn to use words like prostate and epididymis conversationally. If you’re looking for a specialty, concentrate on the alimentary canal, starting with impacted molars and ending with spastic colons. Don’t forget lethal dyspepsia. Sleep disorders is a required course. Learn first aid: a small cut on the finger can always lead to tetanus. Be prepared for mysterious ailments: I know a Jewish man whose tongue hurt for two years. Be sure to take an interest in every orifice. Understand from the start, however, that you don’t have the tiniest, tiniest chance of ever beginning to match a Jewish man’s interest in his own symptoms.” [LEVINE, J., 1992, p. 72]

“Clements took a beating from Anti-Defamation types,” notes Judith Levine, “for the perceived anti-Semitism of her attack (a Jew herself, she apologized in advance).” [LEVINE, J., 1992, p. 72-73]

This neurosis/guilt/hypochondria has a basis, not in the surrounding Gentile society, but in traditional Jewish identity itself. “According to most psychiatrists,” says James Yaffe,

“the difference [between “the fundamentalist” and others] lies in his highly developed sense of guilt. This is the motivating force in people who blindly and unquestioningly perform religious rituals; it is, I think, the key to the personality of the Orthodox Jew … If you believe that God has laid down over six hundred rules and regulations for you to obey, and that your credit in His eyes depends on how well you obey them, how can you help but feel guilty? … But the Orthodox Jews’ sense of guilt has consequences that go far beyond his religious practice. It cuts through his whole life. It affects his tastes, his opinions, almost every aspect of his daily contact. It does this primarily by instilling in him a feeling of separation from other people.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 117-118]

“The fact is undeniable,” said American Zionist Ben Frommer in 1935, “that the Jews are collectively unhealthy and neurotic. Those professional Jews who, wounded to the quick, indignantly deny this truth are the greatest enemies of their race, for they thereby lead them to search for false solutions, or at most, palliatives.” [BRENNER, p. 23]

In such contexts, is it any wonder that so many Jews “hate” the demands of where they came from? Is it any wonder that in the Jewish therapy groups of a
San Francisco therapist, Judith Klein, a question that commonly surfaces during her practice is the worry amongst patients that Jews have “survived as a people at the cost of being crazed?” [KLEIN, p. 38] And what of the rest of Jewish tradition? Exploring problems in Jewish families (in a social work context), Herz and Rosen cut through defensive smokescreens to note that:

“Success is so vitally important to the Jewish family ethos that we can hardly overemphasize it.” [p. 368]

“Jews may have trouble allowing themselves to have a good time without ‘accomplishing anything.’” [p. 367]

“Today, in most Jewish families and communities, it is obligatory that all children go to college; graduate and professional studies are often expected as well. When this is not achieved parents frequently perceive it as a failure requiring therapy.” [p. 368-369]

“Financial success is also highly valued in the Jewish family. While Jewish attitudes toward money are often stereotypically portrayed, it would be an error of omission to pretend that money has not been an extremely important status symbol for the Jewish family.” [p. 368-369]

“Given the idealistic demands of the Jewish family system for success and achievement, it is hard not to feel a failure no matter how much one accomplishes … A vicious cycle may develop in which family members devalue each other in order to bolster individual self esteem … This attitude is extended to the outside world as well, when Goyim [non-Jews] are viewed critically and often condescendingly….” [p. 370-371]

Jewish popular mythology for public consumption proclaims exceptionally loving and well-adjusted nuclear family bonding. “Mythmaking about the Jewish family, and particularly about the role of women in that family, has become virtually a preoccupation of the contemporary Jewish community.” [HYMAN, p. 19] “Jews living in the Diaspora,” says Mimi Scarf, “have frequently spread much propaganda about themselves in order to keep a low profile and as a consequence have tended to downplay social problems of their own. Thus, Jews are not alcoholics. Jewish fathers do not desert their children. Jewish mothers do not batter their children, Jewish men do not beat their wives …” [SCARF, p. 51] “Although it is tempting to teach our children that the Jewish family is superior to all others … [we] must admit that our idealized concept of the Jewish family is … a myth.” [SCARF, p. 63]

“For too long,” said Rabbi Arthur Schwitzin in 1999, “the Jewish community has been in collective denial about drug and alcohol among our own. Our grandparents passed on a comforting myth, a self-aggrandizing belief in Jewish immunity and moral superiority, with this saying, ‘Shiker is a goy,’ which means, only gentiles drink. This is not the case.” [SERVISS, 6-13-99, p. 3]

In 1988, attorney Joel Steinberg made New York headlines for putting his wife in the hospital with “severe internal and external injuries” and beating to death his adopted six-year-old daughter. [JACOBY, p. 8-9] In the [New York area] Orthodox community where I grew up,” says Jeanette Friedman, “there was plenty of domestic abuse and violence – all ignored as a matter of course. Now,
because this condition is getting worse, not better, in all denominations of Judaism, I decided to speak out … The results of domestic violence were everywhere: my friend’s sister ran away from home; a pregnant classmate was kicked in the stomach; another classmate divorced a few weeks after her wedding; and a married woman jumped off a bridge. I was 19 when I married and I knew I was in trouble.” [FRIEDMAN, J, p. 1-2] In 1989 the Jewish Week reported that “wife-battering and other forms of domestic violence are ‘surprising frequent’ within the Jewish community, according to a legal expert in the field. In fact, said Dr. Samuel Klagsbrun, domestic violence ‘exists at an extremely disturbing level,’ more so within segments of the Orthodox than among more assimilated sectors of the Jewish community.” [GILMAN, S., Dom, 3-17-89] “The domestic violence-free Jewish community is a myth,” says Jewish social worker Bob Gluck, “It is a dangerous myth, for it is its perpetuation which provides a cloak for abuse to continue unabated.” [GLUCK, B., 1988, p. 163] [The Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse has an online bibliography – 25 paper pages long – entitled Bibliography of Sources on Sexual and Domestic Violence in the Jewish Community: http://www.mincava.umn.edu/bibs/jewish.htm SPIEGEL, M., updated on 4-11-2000]

Gluck’s analysis of the Jewish male’s endemic blaming of others for his own failings may well hold clues for comprehending the Jewish mental fabric of collective identity – per Jewish self-hatred, suspicion of non-Jews, and even the underlying premises of the modern state of Israel:

“A significant reason why male emotional pain sometimes gives way to [male] domestic violence is the underlying sexism and negative attitudes toward women in Jewish tradition and broader society. Jewish abusive men tend to deny negative feelings about self and externalize them onto others. Female partners are convenient targets because of the legion of negative images all Jews learn about Jewish women. Abusive men attempt to muzzle difficult emotions by controlling others and by lashing out in violence.” [GLUCK, B., 1988, p. 166]

Elsewhere, Gluck notes that “a Los Angeles study found that 50 percent of the Jews interviewed reported instances of violence – and a hospital emergency room worker was quoted as reporting that 20 percent of Jewish married women were battered, as are all married women. In Israel, it is estimated that 30 percent of Israeli children grow up in homes where their mother was abused.” [GLUCK, B., 1988, p. 169]

In 1980, a study of Jewish family violence (conducted by Hebrew Union College and the University of Southern California) surveyed the presumably most religiously and morally attentive Jews: active members of Los Angeles area synagogues. “The findings,” says Betsy Giller, one of the investigators, “are alarming.” From a sampling of 209 respondents, 22 spousal abuse cases and 118 child abuse cases (as well as 4 sexual abuses) were reported. Going against traditional wisdom, those with higher incomes were found to be more likely to be abusive. And who gets blamed for all this Jewish family violence? Jews who make moral decisions in the privacy of their own homes? Of course not. The
'blame stretching' goes in the usual direction, borrowing heavily from the Jewish Persecution Tradition. It's the non-Jews' fault, as usual. “Violent oppression of Jews,” decides Giller, “such as the experience of pogroms in Europe, the immigrant experience in the early 1900’s in America, and, most powerfully, the experience of survivors of the Holocaust and their families serve to generate rage and model violent means of interaction which find expression within the family.” [GILLER, p. 105]

This apologetic crutch (blaming Gentiles for everything) is undermined by a New York rabbi, Philip Skolnick, who finds a steady stream of abused Jewish wives coming to his door for help. “Coming to terms with domestic violence in the Jewish community,” says Skolnick, “means coming to terms with the myths that inform our Jewish lives, and accepting them for what they are: myths. To give up some of these myths implies ceding our claim to being special, and giving up our specialness makes us just that much more ordinary, vulnerable.” [SKOLNICK, p. 3]

In the early years of the twentieth century, famed Jewish anarchist Emma Goldman was one of the foremost pioneers of what came to be known much later as the feminist/women’s liberation movement. As Alix Shulman notes

“From the very beginning, her father, whose fury and beatings she remembered as ‘the nightmare of my childhood,’ continually complained that she, his firstborn, had been born a girl. Her mother supervised her sex training with traditional rigor. Not only did she threaten to whip Emma for ‘touching’ herself, but when she discovered Emma had started menstruating at age eleven, she gave her a stinging whack across the face, explaining, ‘This is necessary for a girl when she becomes a woman, as a protection against disgrace.’ This gesture made a lasting impression on the child.” [SHULMAN, A., 1970, p. 7]

Goldman was born in Russia in 1869. And why did she emigrate to America? Pogroms? Gentile anti-Jewish hatred? “Terrified of her father’s plans for her,” says Shulman, “Emma fled to America…, settling in Rochester, New York, with a sister.” [SHULMAN, A., 1970, p. 8]

How about Jewish sexual relations? In the group therapy of Judith Klein, “a consistent finding in all [Jewish] groups is that stereotypes almost never include positive valuation of the sexuality [of Jews] of the opposite sex. [Jewish] men and women both end up feeling de-sexualized by the opposite sex members … Messages [are] inherited from Jewish parents about open sexual appreciation of each other … Inevitably Jewish families were seen as non-sexual environments. Many men were given the message to ‘have sex with Gentile girls but find a Jewish girl to marry.’” [KLEIN, p. 40] This tendency for Jewish men to want to bed non-Jewish women David Desser and Lester Friedman call “the cult of the shiksa,” [p. 28] i.e., “Jewish men pursuing Gentile love-goddesses (shiksas).” [p. 23] (The pejorative Yiddish word “shiksa,” so commonly used by Jews in referral to non-Jewish women, as we have seen, is rooted in the Hebrew word for “abomination.”) [SIEGEL, R., p. 397] Philip Roth addressed this desire for non-Jewish women in his novel Portnoy’s Complaint, saying:
“I am so awed that I am in a state of desire beyond a hard-on. My circumcised little dong is simply shriveled up with veneration. Maybe it’s dread. How do they get so gorgeous, so healthy, so blond? My contempt for what they believe is more than neutralized by my adoration of the way they look … O America! America! It may have been gold in the streets to my grandparents, it may have been chicken in every pot to my father and mother, but to me … America is a shikse nestling under your arm whispering love love love love love!” [NOVAK/WALDOKS, 1981, p. 100-101]

Among such cases of Jewish men obsessionally chasing Gentile women is the disturbing case of famed Jewish author Arthur Koestler, who spent a lifetime doing it. But as David Cesarani adds,

“There is evidence that as well as his consistent violence against women, Koestler was a serial rapist. The fact that he was the author of textbooks on sexual practice and interpersonal relations that were progressive for their time, and are enlightened by even today’s standards, is just another indication of the massive contradictions in his personality.” [CESARANI, p. 562]

Elsewhere, Cesarani such “contradictions” to be rooted in Jewish identity turmoil: “Yet Jewishness was always there, expressed through anxieties and neurotic behavior patterns in the classic symptoms of displacement and repression.” [CESARANI, p. 567] Koestler even violently raped Jill Craigie, the wife of a friend.

The ugly root of Freudianism in traditional Judaism (or vice versa) is noted by Estelle Roth who notes that

“Freud’s attitude to sexuality reflects anxiety and hostility towards women and their sexual proclivities and his emphasis on restraint and moderation appear very similar to the Jewish ethical code, ‘regarding sexual impulses and equating them with the Yezer Ha Ra,’ the evil impulse which has to be overcome.” [ROTH, p. 33]

“Traditional Jewish life,” notes Martha Wolfenstein, “involved strong defenses against sexual impulses. The preponderance of rituals, and avoidance of hedging every act, strongly suggests a compulsive character … It seems likely the sexual relations were … carried out as quickly as possible, to get the thing done and out of the way, that sex was brief and isolated from the rest of life. It was shameful, for instance, for a man and wife to see each other naked.” [WOLFENSTEIN, p. 525] In traditional Orthodox Judaism, notes James Yaffe, “a married woman is supposed to shave her head, according to the law, and then wear a wig (a shietel) for the rest of her life.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 100]

And what of the mother in Jewish family life? “The concept of the Jewish mother,” says Jewish therapist Kayla Weiner, “as being overbearing, dominating, and ‘enmeshed,’ to use the term of system therapists, is demeaning and racist in that it fails to understand the gender structure in the Jewish family.” Weiner explains the source of the “problem” of intermarriage with non-Jews. “In some cases,” says Weiner, “a Jewish man may marry a non-Jewish woman as
a rejection of the ‘Jewish mother’ whom he has learned to disparage as much as the rest of the society, and then urges his wife to convert to Judaism so that his children can be raised Jewish. His desire to belong to the dominant culture and still retain a part of his heritage often results in a conflict when his wife converts and he ends up with exactly what he was attempting to reject. The attitude of many Jewish men towards their mothers has negatively affected the relationship between Jewish men and Jewish women.” [WEINER, p. 123]

The important point that Weiner entirely overlooks of course is that Gentile society – blamed for “disparaging Jewish mothers” – hardly knows anything at all about them, (nor cares to know anything), except for those images that Jewish comedians, and the like, incessantly harp upon. Who on earth knows the intimate nuances of “Jewish mothers” but Jews?

How about this indictment of Jewish mothers by Jewish psychotherapist, Earl Hopper?

“The aspirations and appetites of Jewish women are higher than their achievements, and, therefore, they live vicariously through their children, especially their sons. Without Jewish mothers many of us [therapists] would be without patients.” [HOPPER, p.22]

In interviews with Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, before illusory American stereotypes could even take hold, Ruth Landes and Mark Zborowski note that Jewish mothers in the old country were “known for nagging, quarreling, worrying, and hypochondria.” [LANDES, p. 33]

Rachel Josefowitz confirms the same general premise:

“In the American context the Jewish mother is reduced to a clinging figure, hopelessly holding onto her earlier folkways, living through her husband, her sons and daughters, preventing them from achieving the American male-defined goals of autonomy and independence, and causing them guilt, neurosis, and other discomfort. [JOSEFOWITZ, p. 253]

Josefowitz fails to recognize the striking similarities between “American-defined goals” and traditional Jewish goals of material success and achievement.

And what about Jewish women’s “self-hatred”? Resisting the thought of being Jewish can certainly make sense to a woman who considers that in traditional Jewish culture:

“Woman is by nature sinful.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 133]

“Woman is dangerous, not only because she herself lacks virtue but still more because she arouses in man a desire stronger than his will and judgment.” [ZBOROWSKI, p. 134]

“[Jewish culture] is set up as a man’s culture, with women officially subordinate and officially inferior. The man greets each day by offering thanks to God ‘that Thou hast not made me a woman.’ Each day the woman in her early morning prayers offers a praise to God ‘who has made me according to thy will.’ [ZBOROWSKI, p. 135]
This prayer, notes Rachel Adler, really addresses “the hated [female] body which men every morning thank God is not theirs.” [ADLER, p. 15] The Jewish Bulletin featured a story about an Orthodox woman who was devastated by this prayer:

“Some years ago, Rivkah Lubitch’s daughter Re’ut asked a question that would change her mother’s life. ‘Mommy, why does God hate girls?’ the 6-year old asked. Lubitch, who considered herself a feminist, asked her daughter why she thought so. ‘Because the boys say the prayer thanking God for not making them women,’ Re’ut replied.” WALL, A., 11-23-01]

“Rabbi after rabbi,” says Rabbi Gerald Skolnick, “reluctant to change the traditional formulation of the blessing [for men], has split hairs by trying to explain how the blessing is not sexist, or demeaning, to women. I know all the explanations because I was brought up on them. But the reality is that the blessing says what it says … There are in halakhic [Jewish religious law] literature repeated groupings of women in categories with slaves, minors, fools, deaf mutes, and the like which are so offensive as to take one’s breath away … The issue is an attitude which was deeply and systematically imbued into Judaism.” [SKOLNICK, p. 3-4] (Meanwhile, in a later issue of the same Jewish periodical in which Skolnick’s comments appeared, Claire Kinsberg wrote: “Lines from [Muriel] Rukeyser’s poetry, ‘to be a Jew in the twentieth century / is to be offered a gift,’ have been used as an epigraph on more than one contemporary Jewish feminist story.”) [KINBERG, SHMA]

The large Conservative Judaism movement has tried to mask the demeaning implications to women in such prayers by resorting to a semantic change:

“Instead of thanking God for ‘not having created me a woman,’ the new blessing seeks to avoid invidious comparison and thanks God for ‘having created me a man.’” [DANZGER, p. 291]

In a study of depression in middle-aged women in Los Angeles county, sociologist Pauline Bart found that “Jewish women are roughly twice as likely to be diagnosed depressed as non-Jewish women … None mentioned any accomplishment of their own, except being a good mother.” According to Bart, they demonstrated a classic pre-illness “of martyrdom with no payoff … to make up for the years of sacrifice …” [KAYE, p. 165] Among younger generations, “A high percentage of anorexics,” says Schnecter, “are Jewish women.” [SCHNECTER, p. 246]

Leslie Hazelton notes traditional Jewish values that hideously oppress women as applied in today’s Israel:

“By giving secular legal status to religious law, Israel has raised an insuperable barrier to equality for women. To call the laws of Orthodox Judaism (the only Judaism accepted in Israel) sexist is an understatement: they do not recognize woman’s existence as a full human being. To say that they promote a double standard avoids the issue: they promote only one standard, the male one. Women are not allowed to give evidence in Rabbinical courts, the courts that control marriage and di-
voice, since they are considered emotionally unreliable … Women are classed with children, the mentally deficient, the insane and criminals, none of whom can testify in Rabbinical courts. Women cannot be judges in these courts either. They have no place in the public life of Judaism, whose attitude to women in public is succinctly expressed by Joseph Caro, author of the fifteenth-century code of Jewish law, the Shulhan Aruch: ‘A man shall not walk between two women, two dogs or two pigs, and two men shall not allow a woman, a dog or a pig to walk between them.’” [HAZELTON, p. 41]

Evelyn Kaye, who was raised as an Orthodox Jew, wrote an entire volume, The Hole in the Sheet, documenting the miserable life women face under traditional Judaism. Women are not only forbidden from testimony in court, they cannot even sign a document as a legal witness. [KAYE, p. 18] “Orthodox and Hasidic men … ,” she says, “believe women are wicked, unreliable, sexual temptresses … When I walk past the Hasidic Jews on the streets of New York, I feel them avoid me as I pass. It’s rather like being a leper.” [KAYE, p. 19]

Menstruating women face rules “about what they may touch (not their husbands…), where they may go (nowhere alone), and with whom they may speak (only Jews.) [KAYE, p. 20] “Masturbation is forbidden. And during sexual intercourse, there are strict rules about what you may wear, what you must think and how you must behave … The entire event must be carried out in pitch darkness, and at no time must a man look at his naked wife … Women are expected to be completely modest and withdrawn, and at no time are they supposed to show themselves without covering … In order to protect the modesty of the wife during intercourse, a sheet is kept between her and her husband, with a hole at the appropriate place for the correct connection to be made.” [KAYE, p. 20-21] [See also Samuel Heilman’s chapter about the institutionalization of repressed sexuality in today’s ultra-Orthodox communities: HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 313-350]

The man and woman should not talk “at copulation or immediately before, excepting about matters directly needed for the act.” [KAYE, p. 124] “When having intercourse … [the man’s] intention should be not to satisfy his personal desire, but to perform his marital duty, like paying a debt …” [KAYE, p. 125] And the dangers of criticizing all this? “It is difficult to speak out,” says Kaye, “The immediate reaction is the passionate cry of anti-Semitism.” [KAYE, p. 175] It should not be surprising that so many Jewish women were in the vanguard of the women’s liberation movement, including Betty Friedan, Susan Brownmiller, Robin Morgan, Gloria Steinhem, Erica Jung, Shulamith Firestone, Andrea Dworkin, and many others.

While Susan Schneider perceives anti-Semitism in the “Jewish American Princess (JAP)” stereotype (that depicts Jewish women as vain, materialist, cold, ostentatious, manipulative, and demanding), she concedes its origin to Jewish novelists like Philip Roth and Herman Wouk, and Jewish standup comedians. “The verbal hostility between Jewish men and women goes back far,” says Susan Schneider, “… The jokes Jewish men tell about Jewish women have no
parallel in other cultures; there’s no comparable œuvre of jokes about Greek or Baptist or Irish women.” [SCHNEIDER, p. 290] “Who has done the most to inject anti-Semitic images into the popular culture?” asks Rabbi Daniel Lapin, “Just think of mean stereotypes such as the notorious JAP, or Jewish American Princess. Is it the work of Jesse Helms, Pat Buchanan or Newt Gingrich? No, it is the work of Jewish artists like Woody Allen, Roseanne Barr, Philip Roth and Howard Stern that portrays Jewish women as unresponsive, selfish, and materialistic.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 292]

“When Jews themselves participate in an environment hostile to Jewish women,” complains Evelyn Torton-Beck, reframing intra-Jewish assault as Gentile attack, “the dominant culture is quick to follow suit.” [TORTON-BECK, p. 20-21] “Jokes about the greed of Jewish women,” says Ann Roiphe, “began to spread and they contained the message of Jewish materialism. But by directing antisemitic whisperings against females, bigotry was slipped past the general public, and Jewish males became vehicles for antisemitic propaganda as they happily repeated slurs aimed against their wives and sisters.” [ROIPHE, p. 455] Melanie Kaye-Kantrowitz even blames the “persecution [of Jews] by Gentiles” for, as she says, “the nosiness characteristic” of Jewish culture. “If you constantly monitor information,” she explains, harkening to the eternal Jewish persecution complex of the millennia, “you may be able to ward off disaster.” [KAYE, p. 1]

Jewish author Bob Gluck even places problems within Jewish male/female relationships at the feet of Gentiles:

“The Jewish community succeeds in denying abuse in our midst because we project negative aspects of the male experience upon women. Recall that it is the Jewish woman who is stereotyped as bossy, tough and aggressive. She is considered able to handle any challenge, and she (especially when single) is often seen as a dangerous provocateur. Jewish men are the ones traditionally and popularly perceived as the victims in gender relations. Meanwhile, in the morass of these stereotypes, the Jewish home is supposed to be a protected island of peace. Our difficulty acknowledging Jewish domestic violence is compounded by our great fear of anti-Semitism; conditioned, we may naively believe, by how the wider world perceives our character and actions … In our communities, information perceived as negative travels rapidly. There is a way in which our experience of anti-Semitism has caused us to internalize fault for our national experience into internalized negative self-image.” [GLUCK, B., 1988, p. 168]

The stereotype of the JAP may well be based in reality if one accepts the 1967 perspective of Jewish psychiatrist Alexander Grinstein about the preponderance of Jewish women “between the ages of 30 and 35 [who were] very well-dressed in the height of fashion. [Their] grooming is impeccable and [their] hair is styled in the latest vogue. [Their] jewelry, of which there is a good deal, is likely to be heavy and noisy. [They] tend to be overdressed for the ‘ordinary’ occasion.” [GRINSTEIN, p. 79] There were so many of these women as a dis-
tinct “type” that it was hard for him and a colleague to “distinguish one woman from another.” [GRINSTEIN, p. 79]

Such women, said the psychiatrist, “live in rather large houses in the better middle class neighborhoods and have two or three children. There is at least one maid, with additional help for ‘heavy cleaning;’ the maids are usually colored; the women themselves, Jewish.” [GRINSTEIN, p. 79-89]

These women, says Grinstein, “identify themselves with [their mothers]. The same shallowness, the same emphasis on money values, the same competitiveness that their mothers have.” [GRINSTEIN, p. 93] “Have you been doing some upscale shopping lately?” Sherry Etrog, a Jewish school psychologist, asked author Joshua Halberstam in 1997, “the JAP isn’t some bigot’s fantasy. Jewish suburban women, though of course not only Jews and not only suburbanites, are ravenous consumers. Young Jewish girls too … the GAP JAP” [HALBERSTAM, p. 111] Meanwhile, Etrog’s own sister, also a school psychologist, chose indignant denial about the subject: “Don’t fool yourself. We certainly are dealing with bigotry here … It’s called classic anti-Semitism … It galls me that Jews themselves, even Jewish women, even my otherwise intelligent sister, buy into this slander.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 112]

There are numerous joke books about the “JAP” by Jewish authors. Nor are they all by men. Anna Sequoia (née Schneider), for example, has one called The Official J.A.P. Handbook. Here one can learn the prima-donna foundations of this world, which few non-Jews know in detail:

“Where to be born (not Staten Island) and what to be named.
Education: Can you wear your mink to college?
The single years: Daddy buys the co-op; Mommy hires the cleaning lady.
The first marriage: God forbid, a second.
The Mercedes years.
Charge plates: you buy and Daddy pays.
Breaking the engagement and keeping the ring.
Schools: Radcliffe Scmadcliffe.
Employment: for others, of course.”
[SEQUOIA, A., 1982, p. COVER]

Jeffry Mallow, in critiquing the JAP stereotypes, concedes the influence of Jewish novelists and other Jewish commentators in sealing the image in American popular consciousness. But he then totally ignores the long tradition of Jewish social-climbing, ostentation, “appreciation of money” (to use George Mosse’s phrase), and Talmudic-sanctioned materialism to claim his allegiance to Jewish victimhood at the hands of Gentiles: i.e., the JAP stereotype has no Jewish basis of origin. All the negative qualities of the JAP stereotype, Mallow insists, are expressly Gentile traits:

“The Jewish writers have described a woman who, with the arrival of the Jews into the American middle class, has come to adopt some of the unsavory characteristics of the Gentile Princesses who preceded her. But, in a classic anti-Semitic reversal, these characteristics now have become defined as Jewish.” [MALLOW, p. 13]
(This is the same ploy Jewish scholar Jay Gertzman uses to nobly reinvent the Jewish immigrant-created smut industry in New York City as an echo of non-Jewish America: “They recognized the values and espoused the tactics of fellow citizens, explored the erotic fascinations of the latter, and manipulated and accepted the manipulation of those with whom they dealt … What erotica dealers wanted was not bald power to impose their wills but fulfillment of the American Dream: protection from material wants, the deference that financial security yields, and a secure identity as a citizen enjoying the privileges of democratic society … In their actions they were not subversives – political, moral, or sexual. Those who were Jewish immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants were especially interested in assimilating into American culture … The minority middlemen gave people what they wanted, publishing sexually explicit books, magazines, and photographs. Sometimes, they justified their business as a contribution to society.” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 47] In other words, such Jews assimilated into American society by being pornographers, giving the non-Jewish public what it wants. Dirty magazines become, for these people, the Jewish gateway to America. Pornographic activism allowed them to just blend into their new land).

While “in 1988, the American Jewish Committee formalized the proliferation of the JAP stereotype as a form of anti-Semitism,” [FORWARD, 10-23-98, p. 1] Claudia Setzer, a Catholic convert to Judaism, certainly spoke for most non-Jews when she told a Jewish interviewer that she had never heard a JAP joke told by a Gentile, her family wouldn’t have understood them, and “the only people I ever heard tell JAP jokes were Jews.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 113]

Rachel Josefowitz Siegel on the other hand, distances the Jewish community from blame or responsibility for their own selves and public image:

“These negative images of Jewish women [the materialist-oriented JAP and guilt-ridden mother] are typical of the internalized oppression and devaluation experienced by members of minority groups, when they absorb the values of the dominant culture. When Jews lived in ghettos their only contact with the dominant culture was through brutal victimization … We must remember that the terms are still set by the dominant culture.” [SIEGEL, p. 254]

In Siegel’s article, she rejects Grinstein’s condemnations of what he sees as expressly Jewish qualities in second generation American Jewish women. “Their own crudeness,” wrote Grinstein, “and inappropriateness in their dress, the excrescence of harshness in their behavior toward their children, loudness in their manners, the lack of accepted [non-Jewish] values – all speak for an identification with some of their mothers’ striking primitive characteristics.” [GRINSTEIN, p. 252] “Contemporary Jewish men,” notes Bob Gluck, “– abusive or not – seem to often harbor modern negative stereotypes of Jewish women. Their assertiveness is often considered threatening, the sign of a ‘castrating bitch.’ The Jewish woman is, in appearance and character, contrary to the American Jewish male image of the ideal mate for a man who is successful in American society (blond and quiet). It is interesting to see how many non-
Jewish men find these same characteristics appealing. Might it be that the abusive man lashes out at his Jewish partner in part because she is an ever-present reminder that he himself is Jewish?” [GLUCK, B., 19788, p. 166]

Even in feminist circles, complains Melanie Kaye-Kantrowitz, “[Gentile women] see Jewish women as aggressive, bossy, tense, driven, difficult, not to mention loud and pushy.” [KAYE-KANTROWITZ p. 8] (Yet, in another context, she writes that “I hate to admit it, when [my half-Jewish daughter] Lisa calls a person so Jewish I know what she means. Sleeve-grabbing urgency. Demanding.”) [KAYE-KANTROWITZ, 1990, p. 191] For some, Jewish Congresswoman Bella Abzug fulfilled all stereotypes – she once noted that “there are those who say I’m impatient, impetuous, uppity, rude, profane, brash and overbearing.” [ABZUG, B., 1972, p. 3] In Judith Klein’s Jewish therapy groups, participants are encouraged to pose questions about the public image they maintain:

“Do I fit the stereotype of the over-intellectual, arrogant, yet dependent, non-physical Jewish male?” “Am I the smothering, achievement-oriented, demanding, nerve-wracked Jewish woman?” [KLEIN, p. 38]

How real is the JAP? Apparently so bizarrely verifiable that another Steinberg who attacked his wife, this one Steve in 1981, who stabbed her 26 times, was acquitted by a jury after listening to “a progression of witnesses testify to Elana’s incessant shopping, her habitual whining and complaining … and … unending demands for clothing and furniture.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 110]

These controversial “Jewish characteristics” have been reformulated by Jewish deniers, apologists, and polemists as complete antisemitic falsehoods or, at the very least, merely qualities that have been incongruously copied from surrounding Gentile culture. Those Jews who concede such behavior as having some factual basis tend to attribute it not to Jewish choices of behavior in their own lives, but to the results of historical non-Jewish oppression of the Jewish community.

In any case, this ongoing argument has for decades centered upon the notion of a Gentile “civility” that is pitted against a traditional Eastern European Jewish culture that champions “pushing forward” at all costs as its “uncivil” hallmark of intercommunication. Siegel calls this pushiness a “nurturing,” and in the context of mainstream non-Jewish society a “devalued … self-assertion.” [SIEGEL, p. 253]

In the midst of all this, lies the Jewish community’s continuous struggle with its own collective face in the mirror and the incessant echoes of “Jewish self-hatred.” Ironically, in an editorial crusading against “Jewish anti-Semitism,” the Jewish Radical newsletter seemed to break ranks in arguing that anti-Jewish sentiment is endemic to Jewish belief itself:

“Yom Kippur is a veritable festival of self-criticism and Jewish prophetic and rabbinic literature is filled with admonitions for Jews to look inward and become aware of their alleged faults and limitations. All of the great disasters of Jewish history were traditionally explained by the prophets and rabbis not as a result of the power of anti-Semites, but as a result of the sins of the Jews. Carried to extremes, this tradition of Jewish self-
criticism is easily transformed into a tradition of Jewish anti-Semitism.”
[JEWARD, p. 8]

The “paradox … of this singular people,” notes Abraham Millgram, “[is that] we discover that Israel is alternately blessed and cursed, exalted and denounced by its own spokesmen.” [MILLGRAM, p. 4] “Both explicitly and implicitly,” says Monford Harris, “the Bible is extremely critical of the Jews. The Jews are not pictured as ethically and morally superior to all other nations; they are pictured as failures … No national literature contemporary with the Bible is so severely critical of its people as the Bible is.” [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 89, 92] As Chaim Bermant observes:

“The Jew does not believe in original sin, but, especially where tradition has entered into his upbringing, he has a pronounced sense of guilt, instilled in him by endless generations of prophets and preachers. There are, after all, few denunciations more sweeping than those of Jerimiah: ‘For among my people are found wicked men: they lay wait as he that seteth a snare; they set a trap to catch men. As a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit; therefore they become great, and waxen rich. They are waxen fat, they shine: yea they overpass the deeds of the wicked …’” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 34]

Here’s part of what religious Jews ritually confess on the yearly Day of Atonement:

“We have trespassed, we have been treacherous, we have robbed, slandered, acted perversely. We have been wicked, presumptuous, violent, deceitful. We have counselled evil and spoken falsely. We have rebelled, provoked, committed iniquity. We have transgressed. We have oppressed. We have been stiff-necked. We have acted wickedly. We have corrupted. We have committed abominations. We have erred and have caused others to err … [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 15]

Sometimes even well-meaning non-Jews, caught up in the post-Holocaust fervor of Judeo-centrism, can take swipes at “self-hating” Jews. The existentialist king, Jean-Paul Sartre, (beloved by many Judeo-centrists for his book about anti-Semitism) asked friends to “psychoanalyze” the French Jewish scholar, Maxime Rodinson, who was a fervent anti-Zionist, a harsh critic of Israel, and critic of Jewish ethnocentrism. “Judeo-centrism,” wrote Rodinson in reply, “is now characteristic of Jews and non-Jews alike … I … remain convinced that such attitudes … are extremely harmful, as pernicious, for the comprehension of facts and situations, as they are for one’s ability to influence the facts… I neither hate nor despise myself. I have never denied my Jewish origin. But nor have I regarded it as a mark of glory that automatically makes me superior to others, that suffices to protect me from intellectual or moral error….” [RODINSON, p. 9]

Among the many Jewish apostates of all political persuasions was Karl Marx, the famed founder of communism. Marx was of Jewish heritage. His father converted to Christianity and young Karl was raised in a Christian household. He eventually grew to reject all religious creeds as being “opiates for the masses,” psychological tools of oppression to keep the masses in their mea-
ger places, futilely planning on better times in a supposed afterlife. Marx rejected the Jewish conviction that Jews were the consummate victims of human history. In his broader humanitarian view, it was the poor masses of ALL humanity—the proletariat—exploited by economic oppressors who were the greatest (and continuous) sufferers in the world. Too many Jews, in Marx’s view, were part of the economic matrix that suffocated them.

Marx was part of a “radical” German intellectual community—many of them Jews—in the early and mid-1800’s that sought to articulate possibilities for new social, economic, and political systems—universalistic and egalitarian in scope—that transcended then current religious dogma. Marx’s ideas echoed and elaborated upon other social critics of the era. Other free-thinking Jews were attacking the social values and mores around them too, including as targets fellow Jews and Judaism. David Strauss (1808-74), for example, summarizes Jules Carlebach, “explained the contrast between the open hostility of peasants [to Jews] and the favorable attitude of human theorists towards Jews by claiming that only the peasants knew ‘the real actual Jew’ who would deprive them of their last cow if they could not meet their debts.” [CARLEBACH, p. 102] Strauss underscored the German problem with Jews to be “Jewish dishonesty in business” and the “persistent particularism of the Jews who deliberately separated themselves from their German fellow citizens by their rituals and ceremonial laws.” [CARLEBACH, p. 102]

Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-72), another Jewish “radical” of the times, understood Judaism to be “Jewish ethnocentrism enslaved by law.” [CARLEBACH, p. 109] He remarked that “the Jews have maintained their special peculiarities down to the present day. Their principle, their God, is the practical principle of the world—egoism in the form of religion. Egoism centres and concentrates man upon himself, but at the same time it limits his theoretical outlook because he is indifferent to everything which is not directly related to his own welfare.” [MEHRING, F., p. 97] Yet another Jewish social philosopher, Moses Hess (1812-75) may have been especially influential to Marx’s view of European Jewry. Hess, who was a pioneer thinker in the founding of Zionism, when addressing Jewish influence in the monetary and financial worlds, wrote that “the Jews, in the natural history of the social animal world had the world-historic mission to bring out the predator in mankind. They have finally completed the task.” [CARLEBACH, p. 123]

Among his many volumes of socioeconomic theory, Marx had fiercely unkind words for the people of his own origins—Jews, and their relation to capitalism. Marx’s best known commentary about them was in response to an article in 1843 by Bruno Bauer, another controversial theorist of the times. Bauer argued that once Jews and Christians gave up their respective religious faiths, they would become mutually “emancipated” from their factionalism and discriminations.

But Marx’s criticisms of Jews went beyond religion. He bitterly wrote:

“What is the Jews’ foundation in our world? Material necessity, private advantage. What is the object of the Jews’ worship in this world?
Usury. What is his worldly God? Money. Very well then; emancipation from usury and money, that is, from practical, real Judaism, would constitute the emancipation of our times.” [MARX, K., 1959, p. 37]

Marx also argues that

“Thus we recognize in Judaism generally an anti-social element which has reached its present strength through a historical development in which the Jews eagerly collaborated. Jewish emancipation means, ultimately, the emancipation of humanity from Judaism. He has already emancipated himself in the Jewish way: the Jew, who is, for example, merely tolerated in Vienna, determines by his money power the fate of entire German Empire. The Jew, who is without rights in the smallest German state, decides the fate of Europe … This is no isolated fact. The Jew has emancipated himself in the Jewish fashion not only by acquiring money power but through money’s having become (with him or without him) the world power and the Jewish spirit having become the practical spirit of the Christian peoples. The Jews have emancipated themselves to the extent that Christians have become Jews.” [MARX, K., 1959, p. 38]

Marx bemoans the fact that, as he sees it, even the newly founded nation of America was emulating Jewish materialism, where the American considered “the world to be no more than a stock exchange, and he has no other destiny here below than to become richer than his neighbor. Trade has seized upon all his thoughts, and he has no other recreation than to exchange objects.” [MARX, p. 32-36]

“The law of the Jew,” wrote Marx, “lacking all solid foundation, is only a religious caricature of morality and of law in general … The social emancipation of Jewry is the emancipation of society from Jewry.” [MARX, K., 1959, p. 42, 45]

These are strong – and in the celebratory pro-Jewish political climate of 1990s, even dangerous – accusations. Is there any truth to them, or are they merely the twisted ravings of an irrational nineteenth century Jewish anti-Semite? It is profoundly ironic that such charges by Marx later found currency in the most astonishing of places: Theodore Herzl, the “father” of modern Israel, and the Zionist movement itself. In fact, Herzl’s writings and political theories reflect a lifelong embarrassment and disdain with both shallow, wealthy Jews in Western Europe and the unsophisticated blinder-based ghetto dwellers in Poland and Russia. Zionism, after all, was founded upon some socialist principles, the changing of objectionable Jewish “types,” and its own myths emphasized the reforming of a Jewish national character based on hard, honest, physical labor in the farm fields of the Holy Land.

A number of other “Zionist philosophers,” like Theodore Lessing, were also harsh on their own people. According to Daniel Niewyk, Lessing understood Jews to be “the victims of historical developments that had deprived them of intimate contact with nature and the soil, they had grown overly intellectualized and morally and physically decadent under the Western world’s implacable
pursuit of Mammon [the God of money]. Their resulting preoccupations with security and material wealth had brought them a half deserved reputation as exploiters.” [NIEWYK, p. 137]

“Zionism,” says Moshe Leshem, “wanted to efface the image of the ‘trading Jew,’ grubbing for profit in undignified, unhealthy Galut [exile] occupations. This was one area in which the picture of the Jews as drawn by the anti-Semites and that limned by the Zionists came agonizingly close to being identical.” [LESHEM, p. 84]

Some of Herzl’s written observations in his diaries about his own people qualify by today’s standards as strongly anti-Semitic:

“We Jews are a vain people. We supply the biggest quota of snobs of ‘good society.”’ [p. 97]

“I looked at the Paris Jews and saw a family likeness in their faces: bold, misshapen noses; furtive and cunning eyes.” [p. 11]

“We cling to money because [the rulers] flung us onto money.” [p. 9]

“I wanted to write a Jewish novel … I wanted in particular to contest the suffering, despised, and decent mass of poor Jews with the rich ones. The latter experience nothing of anti-Semitism which they are actually and mainly responsible for.” [p. 5]

“All Jews who are well off are my opponents. So I am beginning to have the right to be the biggest of anti-Semites.” [p. 481-482]

It is extremely troubling for Jews today that Karl Marx, one of the most influential social thinkers and humanists in history, was both a born Jew and, as evidenced by his writings, a “Jew-hater.” And to all the scholars (many Jewish) who still pour over his secular humanist texts as analytic masterpieces to this day, Marx’s nasty remarks about Jews (from a man who was consumed with exposing and explaining social injustice) are deeply troubling, and must be explained away. And how do they do this? By character assassination and psychoanalyzing him, of course. “Psychic structures may be more significant determinants than social forces,” says Jules Carlebach. “and we must therefore look at an attempt to explain Marx’s self-hatred from a psychoanalytic perspective.” [CARLEBACH, p. 337]

The scholars shake their wise heads in unison. How could the champion of all the world’s underdogs, so brilliantly insightful in the realms of social and political theory, have so terribly faltered in his understanding of his own origins? 150 years after Marx’s words about Jews in his own society, modern apologists insert themselves into his boots to proclaim that Marx really didn’t see what he saw. When it came to Jews – of which by traditional Jewish definition, Marx was still a member – he didn’t know what he was talking about.

One critic claims that Marx’s “anti-Semitism” merely “reflected the norms of society.” (The man most associated in world history with the threatened destruction of the “norms” of such a society?) Another (a typical Jewish chauvinist) says “It was a tragic misunderstanding of the Hebrew roots of his humanism;” yet another sees his severe criticism of his own disavowed people “as an attempt to disassociate himself from a despised race and proclaim him-
self a non-Jew.” Perhaps, suggests one scholar, his comments about Jews were “the natural reaction of baptized Jew” who had “little or no knowledge of Judaism.” Maybe Marx’s animosity towards Jews, voices another, stems from his “difficult relationship with his mother and [her] narrow minded egoism in money matters.” Robert Misrahi suggests that Marx “wishes unconsciously to expiate his father’s guilt and complicity with the Prusso-Christian monarchy for having baptized his family to pursue his legal career.” One observer even turns the greedy tables to suggest that Marx’s criticism of Jews was really “a projection of his [own] obsession with money, his frustration at finding himself without an inheritance, and the desire to wreck vengeance on the ethnic group from which he descended.” [ALL QUOTES: WISTRICH, p. 14] “The sheer violence of Marx’s anti-Semitism,” adds David Auerbach, “– together with other distorted aspects of his personality – indicates a pathological element. [AUERBACH, p. 47] This author suggests that a full understanding of Marx’s animosity towards Jews should include a range of psychological variables, including feelings emanating from the fact that the hero of communism had a bad case of boils. [AUERBACH, p. 46]

The implications of a voluntary “Exodus” OUT of the Jewish community, in varying degrees, over the past few hundred years is a matter of great concern to those who hold tightly to their 4,000 year old identity. For those Jews who cling to an elitist sense of themselves, any kind of apostate – religious, cultural, or otherwise – is a source of embarrassment and threatens to destabilize the entire surviving system. The apostate impugns the beliefs of those left behind. Nazi enemies a Jew can dialectically understand, at least to the point of Nazi inhumanity, although even this can be stretched to fit traditional Jewish theology of special punishment from God. But how does one explain it to oneself when bonafide members of the Chosen People choose not to be chosen anymore?

“M’shumad, or apostate,” notes Michael Asheri, in describing traditional Jewish thinking, “is an ugly word in Jewish speech … A m’shumad is not buried in a Jewish cemetery nor is he mourned by his family. On the contrary, his brothers are supposed to celebrate his death as the demise of an enemy of Israel.” [ASHERI, M., 1983, p. 319-320]

To the communal Jewish psyche, the most horrible concept imaginable is not the threat of extermination of Jewry in the Holocaust. There is something far more sinister, a much more dangerous threat. It is assimilation. When Jews choose to surrender ancient claims to specialness – whether religious, racial, or cultural – and completely blend into the surrounding non-Jewish society, it is a slap in the face to those who remain in the perpetual ideological “ghetto.” The free selection by Jewish individuals to surrender the ancient burdens of superiority and elitism (and its undercurrents of guilt and inferiority) that has been passed down through the centuries is difficult for the defenders of the perpetual fort to comprehend. What can be more horrible than when legitimate members of the Chosen People consciously abandon all the Jewish myths and CHOOSE extinction? In highlighting Nazi savageries against Jews there is powerful affirmation for the surviving tribe that has weathered another terrible obstacle.
Whether Jews chose to be martyrs or not, they were gruesomely sacrificed, and this reinforces—against horror—the remaining community. But when a Jew just waves goodbye and walks out the door beneath the menuza forever, of his own free will, those behind are left to brood upon threats to Jewish identity that are not—almost comfortably, in comparison—external. “If leaving the Jewish people,” explains Rabbi Jonathan Sacks about traditional Jewish thinking, “regardless of transgression, is itself a fundamental sin, a determination not to leave the Jewish people is itself a fundamental virtue.” [SACKS, J., p. 130]

Among the most horrible Jewish apostates are those that do not blend into mainstream secularism, but who, according to one 1982 study, make up in America 6% of the Reverend Moon’s Unification Church, 12 per cent of the Hare Krishna movement, and 25 per cent of Zen Buddhists. [DANZGER, p. 77] Joseph Goldstein, Jack Kornfield, Jacqueline Schwartz, and Sharon Salzberg studied Buddhism in India and Thailand and returned to the U.S. to found the Insight Meditation Society in Massachusetts, “one of the most successful Buddhist teaching institutions in America.” [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 8] The well-known Naropa Institute was founded by Tibetan Chogyam Trungpa, but he “used to joke that his students formed the Oy Vay school of Buddhism.” David Rome, also Jewish, was Trungpa’s personal secretary; Robin Kornman was a member of his “inner circle.” Ram Dass (Richard Alpert) is also a well known writer/master on Hinduism. His father was chairman of the (Jewish) Joint Distribution Committee during World War II. [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 9, 266]

9% of Church of Scientology members are also reputed to be of Jewish heritage. [SELENGUT, p. 95] Even America’s best-known “practicing witch,” publicly known as Starhawk (Miriam Simhof) adjusts Jewish Holocaust-type victimology to her new identity, proclaiming that “to be a witch is to identify with 9 million victims [witches] of bigotry and hatred.” [DRESNER, p. 14] “Anyone who cultivates the power of his or her will,” proclaims Margot Adler, an elder with the Covenant of the Goddess and granddaughter of prominent Jewish psychoanalyst Alfred Adler, “can become a witch.” [DRESNER, p. 15] Other newsworthy Jewish “witches” include Lexa Rosean (originally: Ora Leiba) and Emunah D’vorah. [MARK, J., 1999, p. 1] (Even Anton LeVay – born Howard Stanton Levey – was Jewish. Founder of the Church of Satan, he was “a self-loathing man of Jewish descent who embraced fascism toward the end of his life.” [CHURCH OF SATAN/1]

One of the reasons so many (mostly young) Jews join such religious organizations, says Charles Selengut, is “the professed (though by no means realized) universalism of cult movements; they are disenchanted with what they perceive as the parochialism of Judaism.” [SELENGUT, p. 104] One convert out of Judaism even told Selengut that “Judaism was so ethnic and nationalistic it wasn’t a religion.” [SELENGUT, p. 103]

Common Jewish chauvinistic inability to fathom that some of such organizations’ members might leave the ideological fold of “God’s Great Victims” for simply positive reasons in the extra-Jewish universe is reflected by a Jewish scholar who decides that “the experience of persecution and fear of the Holo-
caust is probably related to the disproportionate numbers of American Jews who join various cults.” [DANZER p. 289] “Other Jewish critics,” says Charles Selengut, “assert that it is the psychologically maladjusted who join new religious movements and describe Jewish converts as people who are ‘selling their souls for the security of slavery.’” [SELENGUT, p. 95]

Margaret Brearly goes so far as to proclaim that “New Age” movements in general “could pose as serious a medium- and long-term threat to Jewish identity as Nazism did in the 1920s and 1930s “[and] it … could eventually lead to the destruction of many Jews and all Jewish identity.” [BREARY, p. 269] Ms. Brearly’s brush is broad for New Age Nazis. Innately antisemitic New Age movements listed included the Unification Church (moonies), Scientologists, Zen Buddhists, New Age “travelers,” modern pagans, Wiccan witches, “post-Christian” feminists, occultists, the Transcendental Meditation (TM) movement, and EST followers. [BREARY, p. 258-259] “At a deep, esoteric level,” worries Brearly, “New Age ideology is Aryan and racist…” [BREARY, p. 260] although, oddly enough, “a significant number of New Age leaders and their followers are themselves Jewish in origin.” [BREARY, p. 259] (In 1987 the Israeli government even published a 500-page report “on the threat posed by mystic sects to Israeli society.” [JW, 3-13-87] According to the document, 5,000 Israelis were members of groups like Scientology, Transcendental Meditation, Bhagwan Rajneesh, EST, and others.) When Jewish American Phillip Gordon decided to join the Hare Krishnas and become Kurma Dasa, his parents sent him to a psychiatrist. [COLLINS, E., 2000, p. 31]

Hannah Newman’s online web site (originally posted by the Jewish Student Union at the University of Colorado) highlights “camouflaged anti-Semitism in an enlightened global society.” Her article, The Rainbow Swastika (http://jewishtribalreview.org/rainbow.htm), indicts the entire “New Age” movement as anti-Semitic, a world view that seeks to destroy Jews and Judaism. Alleged anti-Semitic individuals and organizations include Buckminster Fuller, Maharishi Yogi and his Transcendental Meditation organization, Greenpeace, Planned Parenthood, Bread for the World, Bahais and Sufis, Unesco, Scientology, the Theosophical Society, “pop singers John Denver and Judy Collins,” the Hunger Project, “most health food stores,” and many, many more. Newman’s list of such people who espouse such anti-Semitic currents even includes Jews like Erich Fromm, science fiction author Isaac Isamov, Alvin Toffler, and Theodore Rozak. [NEWMAN, H., 2001]

How about vegetarianism as an expression of anti-Semitism? Hitler, and other anti-Semites, have toyed with it, after all. In 2001, Pat Sloane became confused at the online discussion of mostly fellow Jewish scholars at the discussion group H-Antisemitism (http://www2.h-net.msu.edu/~antis/):

“Contrary to what you [Simon Weil] say, it’s not unusual for vegetarians to feel compassion for animals, or to disapprove of cruelty to animals. An example is Leonardo da Vinci, who not only was a vegetarian but also purchased cage birds in the marketplace in order to set them free. I regard these as admirable attitudes that can be defended on either
a religious or ethical level, and I’m a bit surprised to find you slamming them as ‘antisemitic.’ Without resorting to who said what, could you please explain in simple language why you find an objection to cruelty to be ‘antisemitic?’ What has compassion for animals even got to do with Jews?” [SLOANE, P., 5-10-01]

Although many Jews are activists (and leaders) in such New Age movements, the most threatening of all Jewish apostates, though, is the one that forsakes the Jewish identity for that of the centuries-old religious rival, Christianity. “Many Jews feel a horror for those who convert to Christianity,” observes James Yaffe, “To some extent this is a hangover from the ancient belief that converts are, by definition, traitors.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 67] All apostates, however, surrender the same thing. Karl Stern, a Jewish psychiatrist who converted to Catholicism after the Holocaust, noted what he had to give up as a Jew: “No matter what dangerous straits my people were [in], I knew that, as far as the ultimate truth was concerned, I could not make resentiment the basis of my future life… Intermingled with resentiment there is a good deal of pride, not only of wounded pride, but of pride pure and simple, of a feeling of national superiority.” [STERN, p. 183]

Compare this passive, apostatic attitude with those of Jews who vigorously maintain their “superior” nationalist resentiment all the more, renewed, in the face of the Holocaust. “The attitude of the non-Jewish world,” observed well-known art critic Clement Greenberg in 1950, “the chief cause of our self-hatred, provides a strong practical as well as psychological argument for the uses of a Jewish national selfishness … Most nationalist Jews want above all else power for their people, or at least a share of power … The self-hatred of the nationalist Jew has been greatly aggravated by the scale and mode in which Hitler slaughtered us.” [GREENBERG, p. 429]

Ze’ev Chafets – an immigrant to Israel – remembered seeing with some non-Jewish friends, as a fifteen year old boy, a brief documentary in Pontiac, Michigan, that depicted some Holocaust victims. In joking banter about the film later, Chafets notes that

“In the midst of the laughter, I felt a sharp sense of shame. It suddenly struck me that those people in the movie were connected to me. It was a horrifying realization, and I remember looking at the other guys, kids I had grown up and known all my life, and thinking, ‘Why, these are goyim’…. A seed had been planted. Looking back, I realize that that night marked the end of my Jewish innocence, that it was the moment I made the connection between myself and the fate of the Jews.” [CHAFETS, p. 91-92]

This is Rich Cohen’s own version of the compression of Jewish embarrassment about the Holocaust, Jewish rage, Jewish separateness, and the need to project all this upon whoever is symbolically available:

“For people like me, who were born long after Germany was defeated, the worst part of the Holocaust was never the dead bodies; it was the way Jewish victims were portrayed. In history class at my junior high school
in Illinois, we were forced to sit through films, spooled by some A/V geek, that showed images of the Holocaust: all those Jews waiting to be shot, looking ahead with already dead eyes, trees in the background, hands covering their genitals ... There was only a silent, wide-eyed mass, the shame of being marched naked, being seen by women, by men. If, in just one of those photos, a condemned man had his arms stretched wide, a big circumcised prick swinging free, his eyes alive, then all the deaths would have been one degree easier to take. For forty minutes I would sit there, surrounded by non-Jewish classmates, my eyes burning, my neck starting to itch. At recess I would walk up to Clay Mellon, biggest kid in our school, the bully who ran everything, and say, “You stupid asshole.” [COHEN, R., 1999]

Saul Bellow, the Jewish novelist, recounts the story of a Jewish woman in 1946 who, upon watching films depicting Jewish corpses and concentration camp survivors, remarked: “I don’t think the Jews can ever get over the disgrace of this.” Bellow adds: “The disgrace ... hovers over us. It must be dealt with. It is not merely “something,” in history, but a spiritual ordeal for all of us.” [PARTISAN REVIEW, p. 374]

“Disgrace” seems a peculiar word choice. And a perplexing, disturbing one. One can readily understand shock, horror, anger, rage, and even the instinctual desire for revenge upon, specifically, the perpetrators. But disgrace? How is disgrace linked, as it is to Bellow, to the “spiritual?” Are we talking about a loss of status here? A loss of prestige? Is there a foot race here somewhere? A degradation of communal honor? Apparently falling into a horrible abyss from the commonality of man is not as great a fall as the drop from “grace,” from chosen-ness. The label of disgrace is supposed to originate in the subject’s own action or inaction, isn’t it? Did Bellow think the victims were guilty of something? Who is ever disgraced by innocence?

Or is it, as apostate Stern alluded to, just plain old pride, that Jews are haunted by the “disgraceful” spectacle of a world audience of non-Jews watching what could be perceived as a group of people, profoundly vulnerable, rendered quite average like all others, but “chosen” for a concentrated horror, being literally bulldozed away by violent, powerful, merciless, and sadistic cretins? This sobering image has given rise to its antithesis in our own time: the Jewish bully who, understanding himself threatened in all the world, lashes perpetually out, in all directions, with guns and propaganda, obsessed with the notion that continuous, relentless attack is the best defense. This strategy is used militarily against Arabs in and around Israel, and in throughout Diaspora, in a preemptive war of words. Something sacred that had been lost, has at last been retained. Forget the Holy Ark and the self-defined Jewish struggle back towards God and redemption. As Bellow calls it, the modern state of Israel has given Jews back, of all things, their “manliness.” [BELLOW, PR, p. 374]

The best-selling novel Exodus, by Jewish author Leon Uris, in creating a web of mythic Jewish/Israeli super-heroes, apparently fulfills the same Jewish need. As Melvin Urofsky notes, “What American Jews sought was not propaganda
(although no one objected to the adoption of a more positive view of the Jewish character), but reassurance that at long last a Jew need not be ashamed of his alleged cowardice.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 242] The lack of Jewish defensive response to Nazi violence has long weighed heavily on the Jewish community, as typified in the comments of a prominent German-Jewish refugee from Hitler, Karl Tucholsky:

“Jewry has suffered defeat, a defeat which it deserves. It is not true that it has fought for thousands of years. It did not fight. And now they [Jews] crawl out, sad, beaten, up their ears in shit, broke, robbed of their money – and without honor – Heroism would have been the better business here. Why did they not choose that way? Because they are not able to be heroic; because they have no idea what it is.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 124]

Hence, this lost Jewish “manliness” is an old theme in Jewish scholarship. Reviewing the psychoanalytic therapies of nearly 50 Jewish American communists, Jewish authors Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter explain the struggle for maleness in this sector of the Jewish world:

“In many cases, [therapist Herbert] Krugman notes, joining the Communist party allowed both male and female members to express hostility against nonparty authority figures without feeling guilty. Thus it enabled the male members, who tended to emphasize toughness and hardness, to convince themselves that they were ‘real’ men. The women, who were unable to identify with their fathers as successful male figures, instead used the party to try to ‘become’ men.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 131]

“The theme of seeking compensation for masculine inadequacy,” add Rothman and Lichter, “can be found in the writings of many Jewish radicals and some nonradicals.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 137] As Jewish social worker Bob Gluck observes more generally about the male Jewish community:

“Social stereotypes in Jewish men contain a component of denigration of their masculinity (‘wimp,’ ‘momma’s boy,’ ‘sissy Jew-boy’). Such emotional (and physical) assaults are not only received from outsiders, but are passed down from generation to generation from fathers who were similarly denigrated in their own youth, and who yet struggle to overcome their own identity confusion and self-hate. The result is a heritage of rage which can rarely be acknowledged or directly expressed. Popular myth states: ‘Jewish men aren’t angry people. They are warm, calm and patient.’ The experience of many raised in at least the Eastern European Ashkenazi heritage, with which I am most familiar, suggests a more complex reality. Anger and bitterness are part of this reality. Jewish men may even be more emotionally expressive in their anger than those in the societal mainstream.” [GLUCK, B., 1988, p. 165]

(Not surprisingly, Gluck blames Jewish male self-conception and “the history of assaults on [Jewish] gender identity in adolescence” on “anti-Semitism.”) [GLUCK, B., 1988, p. 165]
Jewish American Paul Cowan recalls what motivated him to go and live on a kibbutz in Israel:

“Passive Jews. Jews who don’t fight back. Womanly men who can’t make love as well as Gentiles. Who are paralyzed with self-doubt and fear. Who got to the gas chambers passively. Passive. That was the word that defined me. I had to change somehow. I realized that year, that I could only change myself – and my image of myself – among the bravest of my own people: the Jews who lived in Israel. Within weeks of my arrival there, an explosion had taken place in my consciousness. I could never have imagined the new ways, woven into details that most Israelis take for granted, that I learned to obtain the sense of identity, the sense of pride, that I had sought through my adolescence.” [COWAN, P., 1982, p. 104]

In any case, the restoration of Jewish “manliness” is THE most defining post-Holocaust Jewish experience on the planet. And at the end of the twentieth century this attitude best defines Jewry as manifest in Israel, and the international communal Jewish defense of it. Where religion, culture, and race had failed as a unifying force in the world of Jews, secular or religious, Ashkenazi or Sephardim, the desire to swagger around with swords and machine guns and multi-million dollar propaganda factories to scare off Nazis (and Arabs, and anybody else) has come to define Jewry in our age, stockpiling Uzis and atom bombs, sworn to protect Jews – and Jews only – everywhere, and to revenge history’s alleged injustices upon them. “If … the muscular Jew complex,” says Shalom Carmy, “driving Kahanist types [followers of militant rabbi Meir Kahane] to violent interaction with Gentiles, is largely absent from the halls of Ponivezh and Lakewood [an American Jewish suburb], the lamentable tendency to dehumanize the goy is not.” [CARMY, Rel, p. 21]

Take Paul Breines, self-described as “an educated, nonreligious, non-Zionist, middle-aged, middle-class, male American Jew on the political left [who] … cherishes … ideals of gentleness and nonviolence.” He was “unsettled” to find in himself a deep attraction to a Mossad (Israel’s CIA) character in a Ken Follett novel.

“I was seduced,” says Breines, “by Nat Dickstein. I delighted in his killings and warmed in ways I was neither prepared for nor pleased with to the great and, in my eyes, altogether un-Jewish exploits of this remarkably lethal Jew. The achievements of Dickstein’s Jewish body brought on adrenalin rushes and raised goose bumps of excitement. This arousal – it amounted to that – was as lively as my understanding of its intensely ideological, even racist, source. I was aware that the other bodies in the novel, those of the largely incidental Russian and the more central Egyptian characters, were the stock figures of Anglo-American cold war ideology and Arab-fearing bigotry and were thus nonpersons even before Dickstein did them in. Yet as Dickstein finished them off, I experienced a visceral pleasure.” [BREINES, p. 10]

Part of Breines’ liberal concern is the increasing support world Jewry – and especially in America – has for violent vengeful sentiments, originating in their
transnational mythos of persecution and their own sense of physical weakness as small minorities in host countries over the centuries. The 1967 Israeli victory over the Arabs was for world Jewry, as always noted in Jewish literature, was profoundly exhilarating – a milestone towards regaining a lost dignity. For world Jewry, after centuries of allegedly puttering around with quill pens in the synagogue libraries and added up profits in leather-bound ledgers, it proved that they had finally rejoined the mythos of physical power, as daring, ruthless, and victorious warriors. More ominously, notes J.J. Goldberg, “Jews were responding to Israel’s great victory by retreating into a politics of fear and suspicion.” [GOLDBERG, p. 138]

Paul Breines’ book about increased popular Jewish interest in themselves as brutal warriors and powerful killers is called Tough Jews. Reflecting increasing Jewish fascination in such a theme, this is the same title that a few years later Rich Cohen chose for his own volume about the many Jewish American gangsters in the early years of the twentieth century. Cohen’s theme, similar to Breines’ (who is more concerned about it), is to romanticize, idealize, and identify with Jewish thugs and murderers. These books celebrate an abstract vengeance against the omnipresent evil Gentile/anti-Semite. “My father’s friends cling to the romantic image of the Jewish gangster in their formative years,” Cohen writes,

“those following the Holocaust, as they were faced with the image of dead, degraded Jews being bulldozed into mass graves, here was another image, closer to home – Jews with guns, tough, fearless Jews. Don’t let the yarmulke fool ya. These Jews will kill you before you go around killing them … [COHEN, R., 1999, p. 20] … The Jewish gangster has been forgotten because no one wants to remember him, because my grandmother won’t talk about him, because he is something to be ashamed of. Well, to me, remembering Jewish gangsters is a good way to deal with being born after 1945, with being someone who has always had the Holocaust at his back, the distant tom-tom” six million, six million, six million.” [COHEN, R. 1999, p. 31]

Elsewhere, Cohen even lovingly equates Jewish mobster assassins with Israeli hero/soldiers: “To me, these killers seem about as skillful as the Israeli commandos who slipped into Entebbe, freeing Jews held hostage at the airport in Uganda. These were men hand-picked by Lansky for their cool.” Red Levine (who never killed on the Sabbath) stabbed one victim six times. Another victim, notes Cohen, “wild-eyed and dying, lunged at the killers, [and was] shot four times. The killers then ran through the office and into the hall. I like to think of them out there, the sound their shoes made on floor, sliding around corners, wheels spinning.” [COHEN, R., p. 66]

While Israeli novelist Amos Oz writes a novel (A Late Love) about an “elderly hero [who] daydreams about an Israeli armored column marching through Europe avenging the blood of innocents,” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 89] the site of the Holocaust is too far away for the Jewish reader for pragmatic attack. Meanwhile though, the vicarious appeal of beating up a scapegoat for the endlessly
heralded Jewish victimization through European centuries runs deep. Amnon Rubenstein notes that when Israeli invaded Lebanon in the 1980s, then-prime minister Menachem Begin “justified the war and the cruelty inflicted upon the [Arab] civilian population by invoking repeatedly images and memories of World War II and the Holocaust … The PLO [Palestinian Liberation Organization] were equated with Nazis.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. x]

“How splendidly ‘we’ had fought, I told myself,” says American Jewish journalist Robert Silverberg, after Israel’s 1967 war, “how fine it was that ‘we’ had once again foiled the Arabs. We: I, no Zionist, hardly even a Jew except by birth, was amused by an audacity in identifying myself with the Israeli warriors.” [SILVERBERG, p. 18] “The creation of the state of Israel,” remarked Peter Schrag, “made it possible for every Jewish kid in the Bronx to imagine himself a gunfighter mowing down Arabs in the Negev.” [SCHRAG, p. 109] “The glorious fighters of Israel,” gushed a Denver Jewish newspaper, “have made an automatic hero of every Jew in America, yea in the world.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 358] “The Israeli victory in the Six-Day War in 1967,” said Sol Linowitz, the founder of Xerox, “was the end of the image of the Jew as a loser.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 21-22]

The primordial, and tribal, satisfaction Paul Breines finds in the murder of stereotypical Arabs and Russians has, of course, its disturbing parallel in the German population of the 1920’s and 1930’s. During and after World War I, they too had their own suffering, identity crisis, national weakness, and all the rest. And they too had a sense of communal bond and grievous mistreatment at the hands of others. They too increasingly perceived foes as dehumanized stick figures and proceeded on a brutal course through the 1940’s to vanquish them. As the Nazis saw it, one of their primary – but not only – enemies was Jews.

Later, in another context, Breines quotes Sigmund Freud who told Hans Herzl (son of the symbolic “founder” of Zionism, Theodore Herzl) that “Your father is one of those people who have turned dreams into reality. This is a very rare and dangerous breed …” [BREINES, p.31]

Breines points this Freud quote towards “anti-Semitic mass political movements of the turn of the century,” but doesn’t address the obvious resonance here with his own violent and vengeful “dream” feelings as a Jew and their potential expression through the state of Israel. He entertains this notion, later, obliquely; one is left to presume that for any Jew to make direct parallels of any sort between the state of Israel and Nazi Germany is sacrilegious.

Breines goes further, however, becoming rhapsodic in his vicariously experienced killings: “I capitulated, thrilling to the brutal melody of Dickstein’s executions … My imaginations, guided by moral conscience, changed the novel’s Egyptian and Soviet agents into the embodiment of every anti-Semite that ever lived and Dickstein’s killings into acceptable, even admirable, examples of retributive justice … As embodiments of every anti-Semite who ever lived, they simply must be killed…” [BREINES, p. 15]

If this kind of indiscriminating psychic energy, coming from a self-
described “gentle, nonviolent non-Zionist leftist,” “guided by moral conscience,” was ever unleashed in tandem with a national objective (probably towards the generic “anti-Semitic” everyman), we will find unmasked the consummate Nazi. And if this is the “gentle” Jew speaking, what might lurk in those vengeful Jews who see at every turn in history a tormenter, and who have no illusions of themselves as being “gentle, nonviolent, and non-Zionist?”

Take the 1995 case of Leon Bor (Borshevsky), an Israeli who, apparently, obsessed with private demons, hijacked a bus in Cologne, Germany. As the Jewish Telegraphic Agency tells it:

“Bor walked down the aisle of the bus and asked the blindfolded and bound passengers their nationality. When a 64-year old woman said she was German, Bor shot and killed her, then took a Polaroid picture of the body. Bor then had a passenger take a picture of him in his combat uniform.” [SEDAN, G., p. 3]

Jews at-large have an enduring “desire for revenge” against the Germans, noted James Yaffe in 1968,

“It almost as if some symbiotic relationship now exists between the Jews and Germans. We can never break loose from them; we’re doomed to go through the ages together, tied to them by our hatred…. [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 58] … Jewish feeling about Germany, however, must be seen in perspective. It is a special and extreme case of a feeling which Jews have had about gentiles for a long time, long before Hitler came along. It is expressed in an old folk saying which Jewish mothers have been passing on to their children for centuries: ‘Scratch a goy and you’ll find an anti-Semite.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 59]

Jewish need for some kind of “revenge,” deeply born by many American Jews whose very essence of identity is rooted in the idea that they have been passive bearers of persecution for centuries, is graphically reflected in this sickening account by a Jewish concentration camp survivor, Sonja Milner:

“[Upon liberation from Auschwitz] one day we experienced a sense of deep satisfaction. As we were walking about in the city [Danzig] we saw some Germans lying in a field … A battalion of Russian soldiers passed by. The soldiers fell upon the Germans and began to rape the young girls, the women and children. Some ten or twenty of them fell upon a little girl and raped her. We watched and beamed with satisfaction. We were finally being avenged … At that scene of rape and violence, another picture superimposed itself. It was my own niece and nephews that I saw being ripped apart by the Germans. My nieces and nephews were seven, five, and three years old. Still our revenge was vicarious.” [ROIPHE, p. 18]

The Jewish survivor’s indiscriminate revenge (in this particular case, wishfully unfulfilled in support of Russian savagery, even against an innocent child so long as she is German) is indeed vicarious, as is most of modern American Jewry’s communal identification with the gruesome tales of the Holocaust itself. This kind of horrible tale has become the foundation of a Jewish world view, both angry and fearful, finally expressed via the creation of the state of
Israel (exemplified in Menachem Begin’s comment: “No one has the right to tell us what is or is not moral.”) Jews now have in their hands the capacity to exact violent retribution upon enemies or – as is so common to Israeli military history – pre-emptive strikes against those who are suspected of being enemies.

“Let me put it this way,” says Jewish American author Jane Delynne, who frames the undercurrents of all this clearly, “I am not interested in justice for anyone, unless there is justice – first – for the Jews. Poland has yet to enact a memorial to its three million murdered Jews. I was glad when Solidarity was crushed, and Poland was placed in a state of martial law.” [DELYNN, p. 76]

As Michael Milan (a pseudonym for a former Jewish American member of an alleged secret FBI murder squad) has written:

“All I heard about when I was growing up was that the Jews all over Europe were getting beaten up and killed. Why didn’t they fight back, we asked ourselves? Kill a few of them. Kill all of them. Even as a kid you get to thinking it’s me against them, and the only way to stay alive is to be meaner, tougher, and faster than everybody else. I never lost that attitude.” [MILAN, M., 1989, p. 8]

This is the attitude, not of someone who witnessed atrocities against Jews first hand, but heard about it happening across the world. Who is Milan’s “them,” in such a context?

“If … modern [Jewish] nationalism is born from a sense of resentment,” says Shalom Carmy, “then we must honestly confront and evaluate that component of our Jewish national feeling.” [CARMY, Red Zion, p. 21] “How does a Jew continue to exist in a world in which the Holocaust occurred?” asks Jane Delynn, “To my mind, there is only one possible genuine response: rage.” [DELYNN, p. 78] Such an American Jew, like so many obsessed with a communal persecution complex, have, notes Israeli scholar Boas Evron,

“a burning urge to pay the goyim back in kind. Thus, through the Israeli army, they want to square accounts with the goyim for all the humiliations and persecutions they have suffered personally or in their historical memory – even if that score is not settled with the Christian gentiles who, as a rule, were the actual persecutors, but with their Arab neighbors and more particularly the hapless Palestinians subject to Israeli rule (conveniently defined as ‘partners of the Nazis.’) This kind of Jew still suffers from the inclination of the caste-community member to view all non-Jews as goyim, all of whom are anti-Semitic, all blacks, whites, reds, and yellows – falling into a single, undifferentiated stereotype of a hostile, menacing foreignness.” [EVRON, p. 111]

Jewish interest in “revenge” goes deep back into traditional Jewish identity and history. “In no other religion in the world,” noted sociologist Max Weber, “do we find a universal deity possessing the unparalleled desire for vengeance manifested by Yahweh [the Israelite God].” “According to Weber,” says Amy Newman, “the Jewish religion is a ‘religion of retribution’ through and through, not only in distant past but in contemporary society.” [NEWMAN, A., 1998, p. 163]

A self-perceived history of physical weakness through Jewish history in their
Diaspora is a profound sore spot for modern Jewry. Over and over again, Jewish scholars cite a famous recollection by Sigmund Freud about his father who refused to challenge a Gentile thug who knocked his hat into the mud. The young Freud was deeply scarred, ashamed of his father’s reluctance to stand up to the bully. This tale – one of debilitating physical weakness – has become one of the quintessential symbols used to explain modern Jewish militancy, that fervently aggressive posture that atones – through the armies of the state of Israel – for past, collective, humiliations.

In this light, Barbara Breitman discusses a dream Freud once discussed in his *Interpretations of Dreams*, where psychoanalytic theory and Jewish perceptions of “anti-Semitism” (especially the Jewish version of it, called “self-hate”) become intricately entwined:

“Here, Freud acknowledges his unconscious choice to identify with the aggressor to preserve an experience of himself as powerful. What he does not fully grasp is that he has become the perpetrator of anti-Semitism in his own psyche, turning with a vengeance not on His Excellency, but on his own Jewish self who he ‘mishandles’ as if harming someone else because ‘they are Jews.’ To maintain an inner experience of the self as powerful, to avoid the pain of experiencing the self as helpless victim, the unconscious choice is made to identify the self with the non-Jewish aggressor, and to disassociate the self from fellow Jews, the victims.” [BREITMAN, B., 1988, p. 104]

Breitman thereupon recounts the Freud/Father “hat in the mud” incident too as being a psychic key to Jewry’s collective sense of itself. Freud was ashamed of his father after this incident, and began to feel emotional alignment with the famous warrior/leader Hannibal, who made his own son, as Freud noted, “swear before the household altar to take vengeance on the Romans. Ever since that time, Hannibal had a place in my fantasies.” [BREITIMAN, B., 1988, p. 105]

As Breitman notes:

“The core of the conflict is revealed. To identify with his Jewish father is to identify with the victim, to feel humiliated and emasculated at the hands of non-Jewish men who present an everpresent threat to one’s own prowess. To be a hero, to be a ‘man,’ the son feels he must model himself after a non-Jew, albeit a Semitic general, forsaking not only his Jewish identification but his own identification with his own father. In Freud’s mind there are only two untenable choices: to feel like a man and not identify with his father and with other Jewish men, or to identify with Jewish men and not feel like a man … Freud has not only become a perpetrator of anti-Semitism in his own psyche, he suffers the guilt of denying his flesh and blood.” [BREITMAN, B., 1988, p. 105]

How is such wounded Jewish psychic undercurrent concretely manifest today? “The American Jews [visiting in Israel] get a big thrill from guns,” says Jewish novelist Philip Roth, “they see Jews walking around with guns and they think they’re in Paradise. Reasonable people with a civilized repugnance for violence and blood, they come on tour from America, and they see guns and
they see beards, and they take leave of their senses.” [ROTH, quoted in BREINES, p. 22]

The obsession with the “otherness” of being Jewish and an automatic, however unjustified, preoccupation of “anti-Semitism” is illustrated in a tale by Breines: “… [When I was] seven or eight … my father strode from our house to challenge an infamous neighborhood crank who had been intimidating my playmates and me. To the best of my recollection, anti-Semitism played no role in the episode, but I nevertheless perceived it as having Jewish significance…” [BREINES, p.19] “I scrutinized my own experiences,” also says Ze’ev Chafets, “Had Harry Kelly, the basketball coach benched me because I was Jewish? Were my lousy grades in Algebra the result of prejudice? Even in my heavy [Jewish] conscious state, I couldn’t believe it. The fact was that I had almost no personal experience of anti-Semitism beyond a little ethnic hazing in which I gave as good as I got. I had no rational reason for identifying with Jewish suffering – but I couldn’t help it … I felt myself becoming more and more Jewish. It was an involuntary, even unwelcome development; sometimes I felt like a victim of the Invasion of the Body Snatchers. But I couldn’t deny that it was happening.” [CHAFETS, p. 92]

The paranoiac Jewish obsession with their myths of omnipresent persecution is one of the foremost foundations in the Jewish community; the belief in a cosmic dialectical anti-Semitism and discrimination against Jews has become integral to modern Jewish identity and is (as it has always been) one of the defining features of Jewishness. As some have suggested, it seems as though Jews cannot forge a modern identity without a counter-balance of omnipresent persecution: either illusorily or by Jewish actions to attract it. The grip it has on the Jewish psyche, too often blinding them to all else but their own sense of eternal victimization, can reach flabbergasting proportions. It is exposed in one of its most publicly neurotic forms in this illustration by Seymour Lipset:

“San Francisco provides an example of how some Jews can totally ignore reality. Polls taken among contributors to the San Francisco Jewish Community Federation have found that one-third believe that a Jew cannot be elected to Congress from San Francisco. A poll reported such results in 1985 when all three members of Congress from contiguous districts in or adjacent to the city were Jewish, as were two state senators, the mayor and a considerable part of the city council.” [LIPSET, p. 156]

If modern San Francisco is so wonderful for Jews, where does Jewish anti-Semitic paranoia there come from, San Francisco’s anti-Semitic past? Hardly. Earl Raab, an assistant director of the San Francisco Jewish Relations Council wrote in 1950 that

“The Jewish community in San Francisco has been called, with reason, the wealthiest, per capita, in the country. There is, at the same time, a startling poverty of anti-Semitic tradition. San Francisco, for cities of its size, is the nation’s ‘white spot’ of anti-Jewish prejudice … At times Jewish citizens have concurrently held the presidencies of the Chamber of Commerce, the Community Chest, the Board of Education, Art, Fire,
and Harbor Commissions, and many other appointive and elective posts; it is a situation that cannot be duplicated in any other city with a six percent Jewish concentration.” [p. 230]

Earlier? “In early San Francisco Jewish mayors, judges, financiers, and merchants helped to construct the basic institutions of the city.” [HIGHAM, J., 1957, p. 26]

Regardless of this extraordinarily open climate, in San Francisco, in the 1990s a Jewish psychotherapist, Judith Klein, who runs “ethnotherapy” sessions in San Francisco to cure Jewish patients of self-hatred. One of her exercises is to have each patient stand before a group and say, “I’m a Jew,” and then whatever else comes to mind. One patient, a veterinarian, relates that:

“When I did it, to my utter shock, from God knows where, I ended up crouched behind a chair, with my hand making like a gun, saying, ‘I am a Jew and if you try to hurt me because of that I’ll kill you.’” [BERSHTEL, p. 50]

“Most Jews,” says Evelyn Torton-Beck, “even the most assimilated, walk around with a subliminal fear of anti-Semitism the way most women walk around with a subliminal fear of rape.” [TORTON-BECK, p. 22] Indeed, in a 1970s survey by the National Institute of Mental Health, “Jews almost leaped off the chart in terms of their intrinsic distrust of others.” [ISAACS, p. 148] A +4 rating in the study indicated the “most trusting” group; a -4 the “least trusting”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish Catholic</td>
<td>+2.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Protestant</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic Catholic</td>
<td>1.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Protestant</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Catholic</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Catholic</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Anglo-Saxon Protestant</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-3.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 217]

Leon Hader, a reporter for an Israeli newspaper, notes the case of this defensive (at any costs) world view applied to the state of Israel:

“Three years ago at the height of the Intifada [Arab uprising against Israeli rule], I appeared before an American Jewish group to discuss American media coverage of Israeli actions in the West Bank. I circulated among the audience unlabeled translations from articles on the Palestinian uprising from Ha’aretz, Yediot Aharonot and Ma’ariv, all written by mainstream Israeli journalists and columnists. I asked my American audience to guess where these reports had been published. About half of the audience guessed that they were from a PLO [Palestinian Liberation
Organization] organ, and the other half attributed them to some ‘anti-Semitic’ magazine.” [HADER, p. 27]

In England, Irene Bloomfield, a Jewish therapist, relates the story of a non-Jewish therapist who suggested (“quite perceptively,” says Bloomfield) that a well-to-do Jewish patient’s obsession with having “everything in his house … [ready] for imminent departure might have something to do with being Jewish. The patient “reacted furiously, accusing the counselor of anti-Semitism, and during the following week he talked to numerous friends about this, and they all said, ‘The man is obviously an anti-Semite. Don’t go back to him.’ [Jews] thus project our own hostility onto anyone who is not one of us.” [BLOOMFIELD, p. 27]

In 1994, the Slavic Review entertained a spirited debate between scholars James L. Gibson and (Jewish scholar) Robert J. Brym. It was about a familiar theme. Gibson took to task an earlier article co-written by Brym about an alleged increase in anti-Semitism in Moscow. “My main point of criticism,” wrote Gibson, “of the Brym and Degtyarev article are:

- their measurement of ‘anti-Semitism’ is highly suspect, with low face validity to their indicators.
- the criterion they impose for assessing the levels of anti-Semitism – the number of ‘hard-core’ anti-Semites in the United States – is unreasonable, and even if that criterion were reasonable, the data they employ for the US are misleading.
- most importantly, Brym and Degtyarev draw conclusions about the political implications of their findings that are not warranted by their limited data and analysis … A proper analysis of available data suggests that their conclusions about the seriousness of the anti-Semitism problem in Russia are exaggerated and unnecessarily pessimistic … Those who refuse to acknowledge discrimination against Jews or who believe in a Zionist plot against Russia are deemed to hold anti-Jewish attitudes.” [GIBSON, J. FALL 1994, p. 830]

“Hostility towards Jews,” wrote J. J. Goldberg in 1996, “as measured by opinion polls [of non-Jews], has dropped to what some social scientists consider the zero point … Anti-Semitism virtually has vanished from American public life. By contrast, the percentage of Jews who tell pollsters that anti-Semitism is a ‘serious problem’ in America today doubled during the 1980’s, from 45 percent in 1983 to almost 85 percent in 1996.” [GOLDBERG, p. 7] “In 1997,” notes Rabbi Daniel Lapin, “the American Jewish Congress’s Annual Survey of American Jewish Opinion found that 95 percent of American Jews believe anti-Semitism in the United States is a ‘very serious problem’ or ‘somewhat of a problem.’” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 295]

In 1992, Michael Lerner was still painting a picture of absolute Jewish paranoia about omnipresent anti-Semitic boogeymen:

“Many Jewish organizations rarely fight the more deeply ingrained anti-Semitism that is part of the collective unconscious of Western society. Their deep pessimism about non-Jews expressed inside the Jewish
world as “goyim-bashing’ discouraged them from ever beginning a full-scale assault on anti-Semitism … One reason the public consciousness has never fully addressed anti-Semitism is the real and surplus powerlessness of Jews.” [LERNER, SOCIALISM, p. 62]

Such hallucinatory assertions about Jewish powerlessness [see later chapters] by the editor to Tikkun magazine, so far removed from any semblance of reality where tens – if not hundreds – of millions of dollars are poured into a continual war against “anti-Semitism,” are absolutely mind-boggling. What planet, one wonders, are people like Lerner living on?

“For Jews today,” says Rabbi Howard Singer, “feeling safe is almost a form of disloyalty to Jewishness. We view safety almost with a survivor’s mentality – with guilt. How dare we be safe? We do not have a right to safety. Quite aside from the objective situation, there [is] very definitely an identification of fear with a kind of loyalty to the essence of the historic Jewish predicament. Who are we to be different?” [SINGER, p. 74, in STALLSWORTH]

“The [Jewish] outer coating,” says Stephen Isaacs, “may be resplendent with the rhetoric of universalism and equality, but inside, most Jews maintain a sophisticated, subterranean scanning system. This radar performs at peak efficiency around non-Jews, ever alert to the slightest nuance, swiftly sensing intimations of anti-Semitism.” [ISAACS, p. 24] Isaacs even suggests that for a non-Jew to use the word “Jew” could have anti-Semitic implications:

“[The word Jew] is clipped and harsh and, when used by a non-Jew, is considered as almost pejorative in itself, as if in other surroundings, it might be followed by, say, bastard. Its use by a non-Jew almost automatically makes him suspect of being an anti-Semite, for anti-Semites often use Jew as a verb, as in to jem someone down in price.” [ISAACS, p. 24]

“Negroes,” complained Jacob Cohen in 1967, “have never learned that it is impolite to call a Jew a Jew in public, perhaps because they are called Negro so irrelevantly, so often.” [COHEN, J., 1967, p. 13]

“It is very understandable,” says Irene Bloomfield, “that we suspect Gentiles of being anti-Semitic when they refer to our Jewishness; it can become a pathological, rather paranoid knee-jerk reaction of seeing even the most innocuous reference to our Jewishness as a criticism or attack which means to a number of us that we therefore do not have to examine what is said to us, and that our past sufferings justify us in behaving badly toward any non-Jew since he/she could be a potential anti-Semite.” [BLOOMFIELD, p. 27]

The accusation of anti-Semitism has thus taken the form of a collective Jewish neurosis and phobia based upon a mythic martyrlogical past, a fabrication serving as a contrived tool for Jewish solidarity and identity against the real threats to modern Jewry: increasingly assimilation by Jews into mainstream American culture and intermarriage to non-Jews. (Meanwhile, while Jews point fingers at phantom oppressors when negative views of Jews in popular opinion are at record lows, Jewish scholars found in 1990 “that more than half of all American Jews continue to hold traditional negative stereotypes of non-Jews.” [CHANES, p. 21]
Jack Ruby, the killer of Lee Harvey Oswald, “was always extremely sensitive to anti-Semitism.” “There was nothing that would get him angrier faster,” remarked his brother, Earl. “Jack was real touchy about anything said bad about Jews, and he would fight with anyone who said it.” [POSNER, p. 353] Upon arrest, the phobic undercurrent of Jewish identity finally imploded in Ruby’s mind. His Holocaust-mania fueled his ultimate descent into madness. Jailed for the murder of President Kennedy’s assassin, Ruby’s sister Eva noted that

“‘he thinks they are going to kill out all the Jews and he has made remarks that 25 million Jews have been slaughtered, on the floor below, in the jail. Sometimes it’s planes going over and they are dropping bombs on Jews.’ He told Eva [his sister] that he could hear and see Jews boiled in oil and that he had recurrent visions of his brother Earl and his children being dismembered. The police guards used to watch him put his ear to the jail wall and say, ‘Shhh! Do you hear the screams? They are torturing the Jews again down in the basement.” [POSNER, 1993, p. 401]

A. M. Rosenthal, eventually Executive Editor of the New York Times, and Times reporter Arthur Gelb wax poetic (and hyperbolic) about the Jewish blameless innocence of it all:

“What is a Jew? A Jew, among other things, is a prisoner caged in the ugliest of cages, the mind of his own enemy. The enemy is the anti-Semite and over and over Jews ask, ‘What is an anti-Semite and why is he?’ They struggle for the answer because there is almost nothing more important in their lives to understand, but most often they cannot comprehend, any more than the guppy in the tank comprehends the approaching piranha – the guppy sees the piranha, knows him, knows the fate approaching, the teeth, but comprehension of the killer born is beyond the comprehension of the victim born, the victim the killer so desperately needs.” [ROSENTHAL/GELB, 1967, p. 61]

How strange does this all get? In 1993 an Orthodox Jewish woman sued her former employer, the Detroit Jewish News, for anti-Semitism. [FIZGERALD, p. 19] And Jewish author Janice Booker, in a volume about Jewish stereotypes, pushed a reviewer, fellow Jew Lori Ginzburg, out the door, over the edge, and into the twilight zone when Booker found Jewish self-hate integral among those “in the process of railing against anti-Semitism.” [GINZBURG, p. 35]

In 1996, disappointed Jewish psychoanalyst Mortimer Ostrow bemoaned the fact that studies of Gentile patients under Gentile therapists failed to turn up much anti-Semitism. “We had hoped,” he says,

“that the non-Jews would be able to prove more plentiful case material than the Jews, who, we knew, seldom encountered pronounced anti-Semitism in [therapy] sessions. In fact, we were surprised to find that the non-Jewish analysts too encountered little explicit anti-Semitism in their practice.” [OSTROW, p. 27]

At root here, there is indeed an illness. But it is a profound collective neurosis in a large group of people whose very identity must be bolted to martyrlog-
ical legends of the past. “For Jews wallowing in victimhood,” notes Edward Shapiro, “a decline in anti-Semitism is unwelcome since it requires that they rethink the content of their own Jewish identity. This is why Jews in America continue to believe they are a beleaguered people, despite all evidence to the contrary, and why they inflate the importance of minor antisemitic incidents.” [SHAPIRO, 1998] The core of Jewish identity may have become, worries Arthur Hertzberg, merely “a society of anti-anti-Semites.” [HERTZBERG, 1989, p. 331]

As one old joke goes, circulated in Jewish circles:

“Two Jews meet on the street.
‘Dave how have you been?’
‘N-n-not so good. I was just turned down for a j-j-job.’
‘Where?’
‘At a r-r-radio s-s-station. D-d-damn anti-S-S-S-Semites!’”
[NOVAK/WALDOKS, 1981, p. 85]

Lesley Hazelton suggests that, with the same undercurrent, hostility to Israel is crucial to Jewish identity in binding them together:

“I think it was Mussolini who once said that he welcomed more enemies, because the more he had, the greater his status. And sometimes I wonder if we are not caught in that same self-defeating bind.” [HAZELTON, L., 1984, p. 61]

Fellow Jewish author Earl Shorris even suggests that the “dangers” of Jewish identity – so rooted in victimhood and the antithetical threat “anti-Semitism” – is actually an attractive thrill:

“Has not often been admitted, but some Jews are pleased by the very difficulty of being a Jew. They find the relentless discomfort a spur, a heightening of the awareness of being alive. Mountain climbers and racing-car drivers claim a similar pleasure in putting themselves at risk. All daredevils know the thrill of danger. A Jew can find it at a cocktail party or a business lunch when an anti-Semitic remark suddenly comes into the conversation. His nerves sing with tension, a chill comes into his gut, he fears himself, the chance that he will fail this test of his courage, of his sense of himself. The moment does not endanger his physical life; but he feels the threat to his humanness, to his dignity; and he knows that without dignity he turns into a thing that can be bought and sold, he returns to the time before his exodus from Egypt.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 47]

In 1996, a Jewish college student, Jacob Faturechi, wrote an extremely unusual (and honest) article about the fact that the word “anti-Semite” is grossly overused:

“Pat Buchanan is an anti-Semite. Rush Limbaugh is an anti-Semite. Richard Nixon was an anti-Semite. Pat Robertson is an anti-Semite. Jerry Falwell is an anti-Semite. Jesse Jackson is an anti-Semite. Louis Farrakhan is an anti-Semite. Every third person whose name I have ever heard is an anti-Semite. It is absolutely shocking how much I hear this person or that person is some kind of racist or other. If all of it were true,
I would not be surprised to see David Duke elected president in 1996. There are allegedly enough anti-Semites out there to repopulate the SS. I guess my ears might especially perk to the word anti-Semite because I am Jewish and I hear such accusations every day. What I barely ever hear is the reasons for these things … The news media has cried wolf one too many times. The word anti-Semite is thrown around like a racial epithet for all gentiles.” [FATURECHI, J., 2-23-96]

David Klinghoffer notes, in an unusually honest and insightful appraisal, the completely illusory nature of the American Jewish accusation of anti-Semitism in the 1990s:

“For many of us Jews lately, everything and anything is ‘remindful of the Holocaust.’ The truth is that anti-Semitism has become an obsession with us … In the American Jewish community we’ve got anti-Semitism without anti-Semites … [The biblical Jews] understood Gentile hostility to us to be an expression of God’s displeasure with us as a community. We [Jews today] understand it to be essentially meaningless … They believed in collective responsibility … We modern Jews have completely lost the consciousness of collective responsibility … Our fear of Gentiles who don’t like us, our made-up, manufactured fear, is the greatest comfort we can give ourselves. The impulse to see anti-Semitism where it isn’t is so powerful it infects Jewish culture at every level, among religious and secular Jews alike … If God, the true God, were to put us on the couch, I think that… he would tell us there is no such thing as anti-Semitism, at least not the way we understand it. We American Jews aren’t suffering at all right now. For us, life couldn’t be better … In the book of Leviticus, God explains to the Jews the ways he will reward us if we guard His commandments, and punish us if we do not. All of us together. Among the punishments there is an interesting line that describes the condition of modern Jews perfectly: ‘the sound of a driven leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee, as one flees from the sword; and they shall flee when none pursues.” [KLINGHOFFER, p. 10-13]

But let us conclude this chapter section with a mind-boggling summation of the all-encompassing irrationality in the knee-jerk charges of anti-Semitism that radiate in all directions towards bizarre affirmation of the Jewish essence. As Louis Jacobs notes, with little sense of the grandiose, innate absurdity of it all:

“The Bible is full of castigations by the prophets of Israel of the shortcomings of their own people. To quote [important turn-of-the-century Jewish author Israel] Zangwill again: ‘the Bible is an anti-Semitic book.” [JACOBS, L., 1995, p. 77]

In the strange, surreal world of Jewish convictions about anti-Jewish hostility, every innocent, let’s allow Jewish author Richard Perloff to neatly wrap things up for us:
“To paraphrase Leon Trotsky, we [Jews] may not be interested in anti-Semitism, but anti-Semitism remains interested in us.” [PERLOFF, R., 8/21/98, p. 7]

By the 1960’s, wealthy Jewish “defense” and propaganda organizations – intent upon keeping the idea of anti-Semitism as a kind of Public Enemy Number 1 in the public eye – expanded their patrols of the subject via “scientific” surveys. But their emphases had expanded. Such researchers backed down from the many absolutes implicit in the psychoanalytic theory of the origin of anti-Semitism (called here “the emotive” theory). After all, if such a purely negative psychological construct was accepted, it would be impossible to recommend any remedy for something that entirely emanated from the deepest roots off human personality. As at least some Jewish observers recognized, there’s really no sense in sponsoring research into a problem if there’s no possible cure. Researchers’ concerns were thus broadened into the practical, worldly realm, into the so-called “cognitive” field, an approach that allowed the delicately qualified concession that there could be causal reasons for hostility towards Jews. At a cost of $500,000 the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL) embarked upon a fifteen-year program – via a variety of survey studies – to explore what, if anything, bugs the American public about Jews. And how to control it.

Cloaked as a champion for human rights, as noted earlier, the ADL has been for decades a well-known and extremely well-financed Judeo-centric propaganda organization, an organizational expert in social engineering. It has notably parted company with other minority advocacies when they are perceived to adversely effect Jewish interests. The ADL has fought affirmative action quota-oriented legislation, for instance, since it would hurt the disproportionate number of Jews in middle and upper-class employment. And it “originally favored censorship laws as a means of combating defamatory portraits of Jews.” [DUBKOWSKI, p. 73] The ADL is a massive propaganda machine. It’s “offices in New York’s United Nations Plaza house its full time national officials and its trained staff who have the assistance of hundreds of volunteers.” Over 100 individuals make up its national committee and it has 26 regional offices. [DUBKOWSKI, p. 73] “No other ethnic group in America by 1975,” says Norman Cantor, “could come close to matching the way in which the ADL protected Jewish reputations and negotiated Jewish access to place and power. Eventually the ADL’s bold policy in the 1980’s of identifying anti-Zionism or even severe criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism gained a large degree of public acceptance.” [CANTOR, p. 409]

Maximum scientific credibility for the ADL’s efforts to afford Jews broader “place and power” was afforded by commissioning in the 1960s the Survey Research Center of the University of California and the National Opinion Research Center to carry out the investigations on the American public. This project, conceived by the Program Director of the ADL, Oscar Cohen, and paid
for by that organization, literally bought the University’s credibility and funneled their fundamentally Judeo-centric concerns within a grandiose humanitarian title, now called: “The University of California Research Program on Patterns of American Prejudice.”

In one of these resultant ADL studies, published in 1969 as *The Tenacity of Prejudice*, by Gertrude Selznick and Stephen Steinberg, surveys were conducted upon a wide variety of Americans and were tabulated into a statistical analysis of results, complete with an authoritative-sounding configuration called the “Index of Anti-Semitic Belief,” by which investigators decided whether someone was an anti-Semite or not. Among the many pages of placebo questions asked of the American public, there were a core of eleven (constituting the “Index”) that the surveyors were most interested in. Respondents to these questions were classified as being anti-Semitic if they gave what was defined as “anti-Semitic responses to at least five of the eleven items that make up the Index.” [TENACITY] By this method, in the late 1960s, over a third of the respondents in America were ultimately considered to rank “high” in anti-Semitism.

Probably sensing what the survey questions were after, some interviewees automatically responded with the platitudes of modern politically-correct culture. A hint at some of the mindless, dissimulating, or intimidated people that today’s propagandists (Jewish or otherwise) are successfully creating is evidenced by those in this study who absolutely insisted that Jews are not different from anyone else whatsoever:

> “Some respondents refuse to accept even quasi-factual statements about Jews … they consistently go out of their way to deny that Jews and non-Jews are in any way different.” [TENACITY]

Incredibly, as evidenced here, years of “sensitivity to others” socialization in modern western society have created the extremist condition whereby the simple perception of obvious identity differences between ethnic groups can itself be weighed as “prejudicial.” Daring to discern virtually any commonality in an ethnic group is routinely dismissed as a “stereotype.” Yet, meanwhile, like many, if a given generality is conceived positively, Jewish author Eric Kahler felt free to declare in 1967 that “Wherever we place its origins, there exists a distinct Jewish character … There exists a quality that distinguishes us as a group that in some way sets us apart from all other groups. This is demonstrated by evidence.” [KAHLER, E., 1967, p. 5]

The problem in such an ADL study of prejudice, too, is that some of the traits attributed to the general Jewish populace by those deemed to be anti-Semites are—even to the investigators’ eyes, as well as the Jewish community itself—true. Among standard “anti-Semitic” perceptions, for example, as noted in the *Tenacity* volume, is that Jews are “clannish.” Of course this statement is, by any historical or current measure, true. [See later scholarship on the subject] In the same year this ADL study was published, a Jewish sociologist, Herbert Gans, even noted in his own research that “calling [Jews] clannish is close to the truth—and a truth that is celebrated by Jews themselves when the word cohesive
is substituted.” [GANS, p. 11] Jewish journalist Philip Weiss’ perception of this hypocritical double standard by Jewish organizations—i.e., non-Jews are anti-Semites for pointing out Jewish clannishness while Jews in fact celebrate their allegiance to each other—which was stated this way:

“When the Anti-Defamation League surveys the goyim, one of the questions it asks is whether they think Jews stick together. If they say yes, that’s evidence of anti-Semitic attitudes. [The ADL’s] urging Jews to stick together on one hand while at the same time blasting the world for believing that we stick together: I don’t think you can really have it both ways, but that’s the outsider box Jews have helped construct for themselves.” [WEISS, p. 29]

In 1957, sociologist John Higham noted in an American Jewish Historical Society publication that Jewish immigrants to America had been “more or less uncultivated, but also there is considerable evidence that many were loud, ostentatious, and pushing. Both Jews and friendly non-Jewish observers confessed something of the kind.” [HIGHAM, J., 1957, p. 9] As Higham further notes about Jewish “stereotypes” after the Civil War: “In cartoons and a good deal of middle class opinion, the Jew became identified as the quintessential parvenu—glittering with conspicuous and vulgar jewelry, lacking table manners, attracting attention by clamorous behavior, and always forcing his way into society that is above him. To treat this stereotype entirely as a scapegoat for somebody else’s psychological frustration is to over-emphasize the irrational sources of ‘prejudice’ and to clothe the Jews in defensive innocence ... Until twenty-five years ago sober and humane observers repeatedly took note of the core of reality behind the stereotype.” [HIGHAM, J., 1957, p. 10] “In answer to a question posed in 1938, ‘What kinds of people do you object to?’, Jews were mentioned by 35 percent of [American] respondents; the next-highest category, at 27 percent, were ‘noisy, cheap, boisterious and loud people,’ followed by ‘uncultured, unrefined, dumb people’ at 14 percent and then all other other types.” The following year, another Roper poll found that 53 percent of the Americans asked believed Jews were different from everyone else and that these differences should lead to restrictions in business and social life.’ [GOODWIN, D.K., 1995, p. 102]

In 1968, Jewish author James Yaffe noted the results of an American Jewish Committee study conducted six years earlier in the Jewish community in Baltimore. Yaffe’s subject was a criticism of Jewish “self-hatred,” i.e., widespread belief in the Jewish community that many “anti-Semitic” criticisms were true. As Yaffe observes,

“So why not recognize the truth? Hardly any Jews are entirely free from the effects of this disease [Jewish self-hatred]. In AJC’s Baltimore survey, two-thirds of the respondents admitted to believing that other Jews are pushy, hostile, vulgar, materialistic, and the cause of anti-Semitism. And those were only the ones who were willing to admit it.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 73]

So what are we to make of this profound contradiction? Is Jewish self-criti-
cism at root, as Yaffe suggests, a “disease?” So on one hand, entire institutions embark on crusades to weigh and eliminate irrational prejudices against Jews, while, on the other, even many Jews themselves testify that such beliefs are not always prejudices, but often based on facts indeed. It is clear here that the ADL’s accusation of prejudice is manipulated as a device to deflect criticism of genuine, verifiable collectivist behavior. Jewish “clannishness,” for example, as perceived by Jews from within the community, is in fact a cherished ideal. As institutionalized in modern America, however, if this very same quality is noted by non-Jews, it is held to be an unfounded, stereotypical misperception. Furthermore, popular convention holds that the “prejudiced” individual cannot discern the respective qualities of Jewish individuals from those ascribed to the Jewish collective body. To the degree that this is true, the Jewish collectivity, rooted in Judaic tradition, defines this perception in quite the same manner and is precedentially responsible for it. Likewise, the celebration of common Jewish traits and a collective character, world view, communal destiny, et al, as we shall soon see, is the foundation of a growing body of modern Jewish literature. The issue is not in Jewish circles whether the collective character does or does not exists, but what exactly it is.

Of course there are other “prejudicial” perceptions about the Jewish community that have basis in fact. The Jewish authors of the Tenacity of Prejudice study conceded, for example, “some basis in reality” for the following “anti-Semitic” statements from their own Index of Anti-Semitic Belief. The following sentences were provided to those surveyed who were to decide whether they were true or false:

- The movie and television industries are pretty much controlled by Jews.
- Jewish employers go out of their way to hire other Jews.
- Jews stick together too much.
- Jews like to be at the head of things. [TENACITY]

It is credit to Jewish propaganda organizations, such as the one that funded this study, that they are effectively doing their job when only 47, 49, 52, and 54 per cent, respectively, of American interviewees believed these four statements to be true, when even those who created these statements concede that they all “have some basis in reality.” [See evidence throughout this volume that underscores the essential reality of each of these four statements.]

This admission of “some basis in reality” in key anti-Semitic prejudices, of course, is a serious problem for researchers who know that their ADL sponsors did not spend $500,000 to hear the likes of such concessions. So how do the researchers explain these four acknowledged “realities” away, statements that are supposed to be among the core of an anti-Semitic repertoire? Like this:

- “It is frequently contended, often by Jews themselves, that beliefs such as these should not be regarded as anti-Semitic since they have at least some basis in reality. This argument assumes a basic distinction between “true” beliefs and “false” beliefs about Jews. Undoubtedly some generalizations about Jews are more warranted than others. But the distinction between “true” and “false” beliefs is misleading if it implies that people typically
acquire their “true” beliefs about Jews in one way and their “false” beliefs in another.” [TENACITY]

Incredibly, these four aforementioned statements of “reality” about Jews are already four of the five needed (of the eleven statements of the “Index of Anti-Semitic Belief”) for an individual to be considered – per the ADL study – an anti-Semite. In other words, within a large number of survey questions that disguised the ADL’s specific Jewish interest, if a respondent accepted at least five of the eleven statements researchers considered to be anti-Jewish, the person formally qualified as an “anti-Semite.” The other seven anti-Semitic statements from the Index about Jews presented to interviewees were:

• Not as honest as other businessmen.
• Too much power in the business world.
• More loyal to Israel than America.
• Control international banking.
• Shrewd and tricky in business.
• Have a lot of irritating faults.
• Use shady business practices to get ahead.

[See past and future chapters that explore kernels of truth in each of these realms]

As even the Tenacity authors point out, “Have a lot of irritating faults” is a vague enough statement that it may be reasonably applied to virtually any people. If any reader accepts this about Jews, and is inclined to accept the earlier four statements that had “some basis in reality” even to the researchers, that’s anti-Semitic statement number five and the reader is, by the formal terms of the study, a certified anti-Semite.

One item not formally on the Anti-Semite Index List, but an interesting aside nonetheless, is that the authors noted that 60 per cent of their nationwide respondents believed Jews had “more money” than other people. [As we shall soon see, the Jews today are clearly, and demonstrably, the wealthiest ethnic community in America]. For their part, the ADL researchers diplomatically conceded that Jews “exhibit at least their fair share of concern for achievement and success. At the same time the connection between Jews and money is one of the oldest elements of anti-Semitic ideology.” The “connection between Jews and money” is also, as we have amply seen through history to the present day, true. The ADL-sponsored researchers wrote this even as part of the $500,000 dangled out of their own pockets. What other ethnic group in America could afford so spectacular a sum in the 1960s to simply try to determine what other people think of them?

From the money angle, Tenacity of Prejudice explains the broad-based anti-Semitic perception this way, where the verifiable Jewish-money connection is linked to other alleged Jewish attributes:

“A sizeable majority of respondents believe that Jews are wealthier than other Americans. Why shouldn’t they? The middle-class status of Jews is a firmly established fact. But the anti-Semite tends to hold all his beliefs about Jews with the same conviction: Jews ARE shrewd and
tricky. Jews DO have too much power in the business world. Jews ARE more loyal to Israel than America. These beliefs can and often do provoke feelings of hostility in the person who holds them. [TENACITY]

In other words, in overview, if an individual only believes “with conviction” in one or two of the posited criticisms about Jews from the Index of anti-Semitism statement list provided by researchers, the respondent is not categorized as an anti-Semite. This is because, as even the researchers concede, there is a “basis in reality” in at least SOME of the criticisms. But if the critic becomes more than casually focused on any one or two of these negative statements about Jews in general, and is consistent in believing a range (at least five) of such characteristics as credible, the casual critic is suddenly a threat to Jewish self-defensive orthodoxy because he has recognized a logical relationship between a number of critical comments. He then qualifies for castigation by Jewish-funded dictate as being maliciously intended, an irrational anti-Semite.

In Jewish defensive orthodoxy, then, being an anti-Semite is not merely the conviction that any of the above mentioned characteristics of Jews is in any way true, because they may well be true. Rather, anti-Semitism is understood as a package of belief, the systematic understanding that a variety of statements (as few as five from the “Anti-Semite Index”) have “some basis in reality.” Being an anti-Semite in this view is the recognition of a web of alleged Jewish collective characteristics: an exceptionally strong attachment to money, prominence in Hollywood, disproportionate power, adept in “tricky business dealings,” and so on. The recognition of these relationships, note the researchers, tends to cause hostility against Jews. And here is where a presumed threat to Jewry lies.

In 1979, another book, Anti-Semitism in America, appeared as a “wrap-up” volume to the ADL’s fifteen year investigative program. This book, by Harold Quinley and Charles Glock, summarized the results of a number of earlier academically conducted ADL-funded surveys and studies about anti-Semitism, including Tenacity of Prejudice. This newer book also highlighted survey results about perceptions of Jews within the American Black community, church groups, schools, and – another of the “educational powers” – the mass media.

Quinley and Glock essentially pick up where the other volume left off ten years earlier, still bending facts about the Jewish general community into anti-Semitic misperceptions. As always, however, unless these authors wish to be regarded as completely blind, they must make the cautious concessions:

“Another common stereotype of Jews is that they are clannish… The perception of Jews as clannish has some basis in fact and can thus be accepted without necessarily being a symptom of prejudice.”

“In an allusion to Jewish pride, Jews are often referred to scornfully in anti-Semitic propaganda as the Chosen People… Since this is a part of traditional Jewish religion, it can hardly be taken as an indicator of anti-Semitism.”

“The view that Jews are money-oriented is an old and central part of anti-Semitic ideology. In the United States, a majority of Jews are in fact
monied in the sense of having above average income.” [QUINLEY, p. 3-4]

Thus stated, the authors then note only pages later that “the results cited so far reveal anti-Semitic belief to be fairly common among non-Jewish Americans. Such traditional images of Jews as dishonest, clannish, prideful, and pushy continue to be widely subscribed to in America.” [QUINLEY, p. 5] How can these authors equate perceiving Jews to be “clannishness and prideful” with anti-Semitic belief when they just stated, in the same chapter, that these very same qualities had factual basis and were not anti-Semitic? Again, it is the propagandists’ need to fit their preconceived formulas. And one of the formulas is simply this: the difference between an anti-Semite (or Jewish “self-hater,” for that matter) and anyone else is that that the anti-Semite observes a series of facts about the self-defined “Jewish community,” reflects upon them as a whole, and views the entirety critically.

And here we find the researchers’ ideological foundation: again not necessarily that the so-called anti-Semite’s views are erroneously based, but that his belief system is colored by sweeping judgmental “prejudice.” And prejudice is unfair, unfactual, irrational, and even un-American. To be “prejudiced” against anybody or anything in late 20th century America is, by popular socialization, tantamount to harboring the thoughts of a criminal. The danger, as the argument goes, is that the prejudicial patching together of a series of “partial truths” results in distortion of the whole. As Quinley and Glock stated it in 1979:

“Jews in America are in fact more well-to-do than the average American, and it is also true that Jews ‘overwhelmingly reject Christ as the savior.’ There is a grain of truth in the popular stereotypes concerning Jewish influence in the media, motion picture, and banking industries. Jews do not ‘control’ these industries, but they are disproportionately active in them. There can also be particular contexts in which Jews do act in ways predicted in the stereotype. Under some conditions, Jews have sought to “stick together” to a greater extent than non-Jews.

Anti-Semites are unable to distinguish between the partial truths contained in these tendencies and the stereotyping involved in prejudice.” [QUINLEY, p. 197]

It would seem that an argument based upon “partial truths” versus, presumably, full ones, is largely an exercise in semantics. What exactly are the “complete truths” that the authors of these studies have in the wings that all intelligent and reasonable people can unanimously agree upon? Of course all Jews are not wealthy. Of course all Jews aren’t working in the mass media. Of course not all Jews – every single one of them – “stick together.” Of course all those born Jews don’t even call themselves Jews anymore. Of course any assertion about anything whatsoever is probably going to be a “partial truth.”

The researchers’ own tact is to completely ignore Jewish history and its separatist identity, its Talmudic foundations and collectivist ideology, taking “partial truths” and explaining them to their liking:
“[Anti-Semites] conceive of Jewish wealth not resulting from the occupational and educational characteristics of Jews, but as evidence Jews are money-oriented and materialistic. Likewise, they explain the presence of Jews in the motion picture or media industries not in terms of career choice, and as a consequence of the historic exclusion of Jews from other industries, but as an indication of a Jewish attempt to control the communications media in America. [QUINLEY, p. 197]

[An entire chapter will discuss Jewish dominance in the mass media p. 741, later]

Will Jewish media stars Ted Koppel or Barbara Walters, Stephen Spielberg, and the Jewish founders of ABC, CBS, and NBC tell us that they fell into their fields because they were “historically excluded from other industries?” And isn’t it the inherent tendency for any large business concern – Jewish or otherwise – to strive towards vanquishing its competition and establishing a comfortable monopoly, based upon ruthless, purely self-aggrandizing and nepotistic attitudes? Doesn’t any serious large business enterprise– existing solely for the profit of its owners – at least attempt, if it is in any way feasible, to “control the industry?”

Curiously, the ADL researchers found that the anti-Semite is not merely a single-minded stick figure as some might imagine. Researchers were somewhat surprised to have their own stereotypes challenged when they discovered that those they termed “anti-Semites” even recognized a variety of good qualities in Jews:

“It is not entirely clear what should be made of such findings. They would seem to indicate that Jews are widely admired and that a reservoir of good will exists towards them. At the same time, it is apparent that many of the positive responses were given by respondents scoring high in anti-Semitism. Indeed, it seems to be a characteristic of prejudice that certain “positive” stereotypes exist alongside negative ones.” [QUINLEY, p. 11]

There were other ADL studies exploring the roots of anti-Jewish animus. Most Jews don’t like Christmas carols sung in public schools, for example, and it was discovered that “most Americans clearly support the singing of Christmas carols in the schools and are unsympathetic to charges that this constitutes discrimination against Jews.” [QUINLEY, p. 16] Other survey results revealed that, when it comes to the Holocaust, as early as the 1970s, “43 percent [of American respondents] agreed with the statement that Jews should stop complaining about what happened to them in Nazi Germany.” [QUINLEY, p. 18]

And the researchers’ concluding comment on this? :

… Lack of special sympathy for Jews is often but not always grounded in anti-Semitism.” [QUINLEY, p. 19]

When turning to surveys for anti-Semitism in the African-American community, Blacks are disproportionately poor, as Jews are disproportionately well off, and that’s how Blacks know them. For decades Jews have been close contact with the Black community as slumlords, merchants, and agents of various
kinds. It’s impossible to ignore this relationship. Largely based upon their economic relationships with Jews [see later chapter], “blacks are more disposed than whites to be prejudiced against Jews.” [QUINLEY, p. 55] As Jonathan Kaufman notes:

“A poll in 1983 showed blacks the most hostile to Israel of fifteen groups surveyed. They were also among the groups holding the highest percentage of anti-Semitic attitudes. Anti-Semitic attitudes increased among more educated blacks … This was the only form of bigotry that increased with education.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 229]

“Contrary to popular opinion,” noted researcher Ronald Tskukashima in 1979,

“Black anti-Semites tend to come from less ghettoized areas of Los Angeles and higher socio-economic backgrounds … Those selectively hostile toward Jews feel that they have too much economic power in the Black community and indicate they would like to see them leave.” [TSKUKASHIMA, R., 1979, p. 63]

The Black writer, James Baldwin, put it this way:

“Jews in Harlem are small tradesmen, rent collectors, real estate agents, and pawnbrokers; they operate in accordance with the American business tradition of exploiting Negroes, and they are therefore identified with oppression and are hated for it. I remember meeting no Negro in the years of my growing up, in my family or out of it, who would really ever trust a Jew, and few who did not, indeed, exhibit for them the blackest contempt. [QUINLEY, p. 54]


“The existential human contacts between Jews and Negroes in the inner city are merchant–customer, landlord–tenant, social worker–client. These are inherently tense, unequal relations. They are fraught with conflict and resentment.” [COX, p. 195]

“The Negro job in the small, Jewish community business,” added Oliver Cox, “may appear particularly to be exploitive. Other relationships, such as teacher–pupil, conform to the pattern of subordination.” [COX, p. 195]

Malcom X explained common Black animosity towards Jews, saying:

“The Jew is hypersensitive. I mean, you can’t even say ‘Jew’ without him accusing you of anti-Semitism … In every black ghetto, Jews own the major businesses. Every night the owners of the businesses go home with the black community’s money which helps the black community stay poor. But I doubt I have ever uttered this absolute truth before an audience without being hotly challenged and accused by a Jew of anti-Semitism. Why? I will bet that I have told five hundred such challengers that Jews as a group would never watch some minority systematically si-
phoning out their community’s resources without doing something about it. I have told them that if I tell the simple truth, it doesn’t mean I am anti-Semitic; it means I am simply anti-exploitation. [GOULD, p. 565, in the Auto of Malc, p. 286-287]

“[There] is a double standard,” said NAACP leader Ray Innis in 1968, “that characterizes much of the dialogue on black anti-Semitism … Jews can and have criticized black leaders, especially those considered to be militant or nationalistic, with impunity. If a Jewish organization issues a statement tomorrow harshly criticizing a black leader, it will not be accused of anti-black sentiment. But let a black leader criticize Israel or a Jewish group, and he automatically becomes anti-Semitic.” [GANS, p. 11]

“Nobody talks to Jews the way they should be talked to,” remarked controversial Black leader Lewis Farrakhan, “When somebody says something that might upset the Jews, they say, ‘Don’t say that because it’s anti-Semitic.’ So you run up a tree and shut your mouth. But Farrakhan ain’t running nowhere.” [MAGIDA, p. 153]

The ADL researchers’ conclusions about one of their studies on the mass media is most revealing about the ultimate motivations behind all of these ADL-financed studies of anti-Semitism. In 1961, Adolf Eichmann, an important Nazi leader and murderer of Jews, was kidnapped by Israeli agents and brought to trial for his life in Israel. After a much-publicized show trial, he was found guilty and executed. The ADL funded research into how the American public responded to the trial, which was covered by most of America’s important news organizations. Not surprisingly, the bottom line – as deemed by ADL and its academic researchers – to the investigation of the mass media, and certainly to all the ADL’s survey research over 15 years, (i.e., the reason ADL saw fit to spend a fortune for them) was this:

“The final criterion on which the net impact of the trial was judged [for this study] was its success in winning increased sympathy for the Jewish people and for Israel.” [QUINLEY, p. 126]

The then-President of the State of Israel, Ben Gurion, stated Israel’s intentions in the trial clearly, equating all anti-Jewish feeling throughout history with Nazi gas chambers:

“It is not an individual that is in the dock at this historic trial, and not the Nazi regime alone, but anti-Semitism throughout history.” [BELL, The Alphabet, p. 306]

Of even more important note in the research about the Eichmann trial was its implications for future use; how, exactly, might American public opinion might be influenced in favor of Jews and Israel? An important discovery was that most Americans are not very aware of world events; many are entirely apathetic. Nine percent of the respondents to the ADL’s survey, apparently paying partial attention to news reports, even though the German Nazi Eichmann on trial was a Jew. Presumably, in order to fully propagandize, an audience would have to be paying attention to the details of the propaganda. Not so. Somewhat
to the researchers’ surprise, although the American public really didn’t really
care to digest much of what was going on with Eichmann, the fact that the
media’s presentation of the trial was, itself, sympathetic did “win the sympathy
of the apathetic majority,” and many “were moved to feel a greater sympathy for
Israel and the Jewish people.” [QUINLEY, p. 128]

The researchers were taken somewhat aback by an apparent contradiction:
while most Americans absorbed little information about the trial, and were
realistically not in any position to have an informed opinion about the matter,
they were moved en masse to personal sympathy by the media’s empathy for
the Jewish propaganda event. The authors note that:

“Their favorable response appears largely to have been a reflection of
their desire to conform to the favorable attitudes they discerned in the
mass media… That the mass media were the instrument through which
this generally positive response was elicited is thus of importance. It sug-
jects that the mass media may have a powerful cumulative effect on is-
suess that remain of low salience for extended periods of time. On such
issues, the majority do not take the trouble to become even minimally
informed so they can arrive at an independent judgment. Rather, when
it becomes appropriate for them to have an opinion, they search for
clues as to what the proper opinion is. [QUINLEY, p. 129]

Here we have the real fruit of the ADL’s $500,000 into anti-Semitism: the
very real prospects for social engineering. What the Jewish researchers and
sponsors discovered back in 1961 has had profound implications for their
sophisticated propaganda campaigns in the future. Americans knew, and still
know, little about Jews and Israel. It was – and continues to be – an opportune
climate for Jewish lobbyists, apologists and propagandists to lead the media
towards educating the ignorant masses. *

* Preying upon public ignorance in America is not difficult. A Gallup poll
in 1975 discovered that 30% of the American populace didn’t know what
important event happened in 1776. In 1981, only 13% knew the Reagan admin-
istration favored the “Contras” in Nicaragua.

** The German-Jewish historian/philosopher, Hannah Arendt, covered the
Eichmann trial for the New Yorker and had some intriguing insights for the rela-
tively few readers who read that magazine. Among them, she pointed out the
disturbing similarities between Nazi race laws (that forbade Germans from
marrying or having sex with Jews) and Israel’s own legal counterpart, whereby
Jews were likewise forbidden – by ancient religious codes embedded in rabbin-
cal law – from marrying or having sexual relations with non-Jews. By Jewish
law, children of Jews marrying non-Jews in other countries were considered
bastards, she noted, while, in Israel, “children of Jewish parentage born out of
wedlock are legitimate.”

“Israeli citizens, religious or nonreligious,” she added, “seem agreed upon
the desirability of having a law that prohibits intermarriage [with non-Jews] … they are also agreed upon the underdesirability of a written constitution in which such a law would embarrassingly have to be spelled out.” In this context, at the Eichmann trial itself, Arendt wrote that “there was something breathtaking in the naïveté” of the Israeli prosecutors condemnation of Nazi Nuremberg [race] laws of 1935, when parallels could actually be found in such Nazi laws and those of the Israeli state. “The better informed among the [press] correspondents were well aware of this irony, but they didn’t mention it in their reports.” [ARENDT, p. 7]

*** The use of the word “anti-Semite” is used so broadly by Jews that even Arabs are routinely called anti-Semitic. This is a particularly odd misnomer, since Arabs – like Jews – are themselves linguistically (and “racially”) Semitic. Facing no Diaspora over the millennium, Arabs are even more purely Semitic, however one defines it, than Jews are. No matter. To chauvinist Jewish popular opinion that continuously misuses the term to mean “anti-Jew,” only Jews are Semites of consequence.

Traditional belief in both Arab and Jewish lore is that both Semitic groups are familially related right up to Abraham, the seminal patriarch for both. The Jewish ancestral lineage is considered to have followed through Abraham’s son, Isaac. Another boy sired by Abraham – Ishmael, born illegitimately to Abraham’s “maidservant”, Hagar – is understood to have begun the Arab racial line. Hagar and her infant son, according to Old Testament and Quranic sources – fled into the perilous desert at the angry instigation of Abraham’s (considered today “Jewish”) wife, Sarah, who had followed up on Abraham’s permission to treat Hagar as Sarah wished. Sarah was at the time still barren and wrought with jealously over Hagar’s child; she did not conceive Isaac, the first Jewish progeny – so the Old Testament says – until she was 100 years old. [GEN 20.16]

In the religious view, only God’s miraculous intervention saved Hagar and her infant from perishing in the desert. In Islamic tradition, the reputed water source that saved them – the well of Zamzam – is part of Muslim worship today at Mecca, in Saudi Arabia.

In any case, the Jewish Semitic clan of elite self, distinct from those who are not as legitimately pure, cuts this ruthlessly. A religious foundation for Jewish anti-Semitism (or whatever you call it) against Arabs can be found in the Old Testament [GEN 20.16]: “Thou [Hagar]… shalt bear a son … Ismael … He will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man’s hand against him…” In this vein, other respected Jewish religious texts can be found “likening [Ishmael] to an ass or a dog.” [MARX, p. 44] Rabbi Tzvi Marx even encountered a “prestigious scholar” in Israel who argued that Ishmael was technically referred to in the Torah as a “manlike wilderness,” not really a wild man, thus completely dehumanizing him and all Arabs. [MARX, p. 95]
Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn’s listed his “Pyramid of Hate” (the most “frequently heard” of alleged “anti-Semitic” beliefs) in a textbook for Jewish high school students, in 1964:

1. All Jews are secretly united to overthrow governments and establish Jewish rule over the entire world.
2. The first step in this plan is to control the finances of the country by dominating the banking system and stock markets of the country.
3. Jews dominate the industry and big businesses in America, and are therefore the wealthiest group in the country.
4. Jews try to avoid such occupations as farming and physical labor, and crowd into occupations and professions that are easier.
5. Jews completely control the newspapers and press of this country.
6. Jews influence the public opinion of America unduly through their control of the movies and the radio.
7. Jews are responsible for Communism.
8. Most Jews are criminals.

[GITTELSOHN, R., 1964, p. 122]
“If anything distinguishes American Jews today within the context of American society it is the special deference that society accords them.”

Charles Liebman/Steven Cohen, p. 7

“I have found that being Catholic means having less status than being Jewish. I see it in the media, in the newspapers, in the intonations; I do not see how one can avoid that feeling or sensibility.”

Michael Novak, [in Stallsworth, p. 71]

“I’m half Jewish and half nothing.”

(four-year-old boy in an elevator, to his friend), [COWAN, P., 1987, p. 245]

“Too many Jews have turned away from the modern project, from the Enlightenment and the idea of progress, to barricade themselves in an angry tribalism.”

Norman Birnbaum, Tikkun, p. 111

“The Jews in America … have become very powerful as a lobby and can afford the luxury of being hypersensitive. Any little thing that you say in criticism is seen as a criticism against the people. They seem to want to be seen as infallible.”

South African Bishop Desmond Tutu, Nobel Peace Prize Winner

“When Jews see themselves as superior to all other human beings … they are claiming license to do what is forbidden to others.”

Yehoshafat Harkabi, former chief of Israeli military intelligence, p. 180

“I didn’t hear that polio was cured today. I heard that a Jewish doctor cured polio today.”

Godfrey Cambridge, Black comedian, SIMONS, p. 135-136

“[Black Americans have] an envy of the Jewish position and an exaggerated notion of their power, which is standard in the anti-Semitic imagination.” – Henry Feingold, Jewish scholar, p. 77

“American Jews have exerted an extraordinary impact upon the character of the United States.”

Stephen Whitfield, Jewish scholar, [AMERICAN SPACE, p.20]
“It is all very puzzling. Who are these people, Christians wonder, who have moved so rapidly from obscurity to positions of prominence, even influence, in American society … [and] why do Jews seek to stick together so much?”

Charles Silberman, Jewish scholar, p. 26

“The period after World War II, especially, was a time of advance. Before then Jews had moved into the entertainment field, dominating Hollywood, and had begun to move into medicine, the sciences, academia, journalism, and cultural life in general. By the 1960s, they were disproportionately represented in most professions having to do with the creation or dissemination of culture.”

Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, Jewish authors, 1982, p. 96

“Jews in America are a power group; is it unreasonable for some people to ask whether Jews have too much power?”

Jerome Chanes, Jewish scholar, [in Weiss, p. 32]

“We Jews still prepare ourselves to fight the things the world plans on doing to us. It ain’t true … Jews are not victims. We are the players.”

J. J. Goldberg [in Silverstein, B., p. 5]

Transcending religion, race, or any other traditional Judaic reference, modern American Jewry is often described these days as a voluntary (from the perspective of the individual, not the community, which claims Jews by birth to the “community of fate”) polity, a secular organizational network with emphasis upon social, educational, economic and political activism. It is an organization that unifies atheists and the religious, rich and the less affluent, Sephardim, Ashkenazi, and any other self-defined “Jew” within a communal solidarity to Jewish “peoplehood” and its four unifying pillars of Jewish identity: 1) belief in a communal identity of historic persecution and victimhood and the uniqueness of Jewish suffering in the Holocaust, 2) belief in the omnipresent threat of an irrational anti-Semitism, 3) allegiance to the modern state of Israel, and 4) a dedication to helping others Jews.

The secular Jewish polity is a very adjusted model of the old obsolete “kehilla” self-governing organization that the Jewish community in Europe used to mediate with – and distance itself from – the surrounding non-Jewish people and cultures. While today’s Jewish polity is world’s apart in method and structure from the old institution, its purpose for existence today has moved towards what is was in ancient times: Jewish people distinct from, and often at the expense of, others. (Since the late 1960s, there has been a major shift in fundamental American Jewish attitudes: from helping fellow Jews assimilate fully into American mainstream society, to its polar opposite: massive amounts of money raised to support all aspects of “being Jewish.”) [SINGER, p. 220] The largest
and best known expression of this polity is the United Jewish Appeal, an entity that has some 225 “federation” sub-branches throughout the country. (In 1999, the UJA merged with other groups to form the “United Jewish Communities.”) Such organizations claim a supportive base of 95% of all Jews in America. [WOOCHER] (One UJA fundraising brochure summed up its sense of itself by stating that “the programs of [our] agencies … are not merely organizational endeavors, even ‘good works’ … they are expressions of the essential meaning of Jewishness.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 19]) By 1980, 4,600 “key leaders” traveled to Israel that year alone on UJA “missions.” [SILBERMAN, p. 198]

Still other Jewish polity expressions (what Daniel Elazar describes as “government-like institutions” [ELAZAR, p. 217] include B’nai Brith (and its Anti-Defamation League), Haddassah, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the National Council for Jewish Women, and a variety of overtly Zionist organizations, most linked to the American Zion Federation. The central Jewish lobbying organ for Israel is the American Israel Political Action Committee – AIPAC. By 1982 Jewish Americans had “no less than 340 national organizations.” [KREFETZ, p. 71] More than eighty were expressly Zionist or other pro-Israeli groups. [WAXMAN, p. 134]

This modern American Jewish polity is often noted as a quintessential “civil religion,” a secular belief system that elicits deeply-felt allegiance of religious depth and proportion. “It has become a commonplace in recent years,” notes Peter Novick, “that Israel and the Holocaust are the twin pillars of American Jewish ‘civil religion’ – the symbols that bind together Jews in the United States whether they are believers or nonbelievers, on the political right, left, or center.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 147] (The modern Jewish attachment to Judaism as a formal religion in most of the twentieth century has been weak. A 1971 study revealed that only 17% of American Jews attended religious services more than once a month; this was in comparison to 65% of non-Jews who did so). [FORSTER, p. 128] As in any religion, the secular Jewish polity beliefs are articles of faith. They need not make logical sense to an outside observer; even some of its adherents may recognize – and struggle to resolve – various incongruencies, paradoxes, and hypocrisies in its central tenets. As the Random House dust jacket blurb noted for James Yaffe’s 1968 volume The American Jews: Portrait of a Split Personality, “no people on earth are more riddled by contradictions than the American Jews.” [YAFFE, 1968]

These inconsistencies largely stem from Jewish attempts to rationalize their traditional (and current) notions of their exalted selves as the Chosen People in the context of a modern western society that socializes against such chauvinism, a pan-human perspective that most Jews themselves give public lip service. Jewish reluctance to surrender, however, (whatever form of) their self-perceived hereditary specialness as central to Jewish identity has created for some a lingering moral and psychological dilemma, one that the Jewish polity resolves by dissimulation and/or equivocation, by enforcing the preposterous and paradoxical Jewish myth that it is Jewish chauvinistic exceptionality itself that created the notion of pan-human universality. “[The Jewish polity believes that] America is,
Jonathan Woocher, “and in pursuing the civil Jewish version of Jewish destiny, they are merely reinforcing the terms of America's own understanding.” [WOOCHER, p. 102]

“Whether Jews define themselves as ‘just Jewish,’ ‘ethnic Jews,’ ‘nonreligious Jews,’ or some other phrase that classified them as more assimilated,” noted Gary Tobin in 1988, “most know that they are different from other Americans…. [TOBIN, p. 70] … For most Jews, there continues to be a ‘them’ and an ‘us,’ even though the ‘us’ is in some ways part of the ‘them’ … [TOBIN, p. 73] … The majority of American Jews continue to struggle to maintain their separate identity.” [TOBIN, p. 74] “Despite their strong desire for integration into American society,” wrote Nathan Glazer in 1972, “Jews do not, on the whole intermarry and do maintain themselves apart. How to resolve this contradiction is one of the major dilemmas of Judaism in America.” [GLAZER, p. 10]

This “contradiction” is clearly manifest in the very principles of Jewish identity that are diametrically opposed to the founding principles of Americanism. As Adam Garfinkle observes:

“The principle of individualist equality that flows from American sacred texts and the American experience cannot be reconciled with the hierarchical, communal principle that flows from halakhah, Jewish religious law. Many try and some claim success, but ‘success’ is mere illusion. Most American Jews have two religions the way some men have one wife and one mistress, or some women one husband and one lover. It is a condition that can be managed, learned from, even enjoyed, some times for long periods. But it can never be brought to true reconciliation.” [GARFINKLE, p. 4]

After a 1950s survey of American Jews, researcher Joseph Adelson noted the “confusion” some Jews had in grappling with stereotypes about Jews that seemed to them to be true, all centering on the contradictions of Jewish identity and “self-hatred” (i.e., self-criticism):

“It should be emphasized that the nonauthoritarian [a 1950s-era term for the non-prejudiced] are not free from conflicts and confusions about being Jewish; indeed, they frequently seem more disturbed than do the authoritarian [i.e., “prejudiced” Jews who put stock in some stereotypes], in part because of a lesser rigidity of defense and in part because their political beliefs are often at variance with underlying feelings concerning Jewishness [the human universalist/Jewish chauvinist tension]. It is doubtful whether many individuals, Jewish or Gentile, can completely avoid incorporating our society’s stereotype of the Jew. The point is that the authoritarian Jew accepts the stereotype and recasts it to meet the circumstance of his Jewishness; the nonauthoritarian Jew rejects its validity, fights its existence within himself, and is sometimes ridden by guilt when he unable to do so completely.” [ADLESON, J., 1960, p. 479]

Zalman Posner, in championing the Orthodox Chabad Lubavitcher religious world view and bemoaning the fact that there are too many secular Jews who have been misguided by concepts of human universalism, addresses the
religious root in the conflict between “Christian” identity and Jewry’s traditionally separatist, and intolerant, core:

“I suggest that the American Jew conceives of religion and discusses it in Christian terms. He grapples with religious difficulties, because a Jew must examine Judaism, but he does so with Christian categories. His conflict is not necessarily a Jewish one, but one of reconciling divergent viewpoints, the Jewish and the Christian, that were never intended to be reconciled, for they represent thoroughly different values.” [POSNER, Z., p. 31]

Stephen Steinlight, a former American Jewish Committee official, observes that

“Jews regularly identify with ‘belief in social justice’ as the second most important factor in their Jewish identity; it is trumped only by a ‘sense of peoplehood.’ It also explains the long Jewish involvement in and flirtation with Marxism. But it is fair to say that Jewish universalistic tendencies and tribalism have always existed in an uneasy dialectic. We are at once the most open of peoples and one second to none in intensity of national feeling. Having made this important distinction, it must be admitted that the essence of the process of my [Jewish] nationalist training was to inculcate the belief that the primary division in the world was between ‘us’ and ‘them.’ Of course we also saluted the American and Canadian flags and sang those anthems, usually with real feeling, but it was clear where our primary loyalty was meant to reside.”


“The American Jew,” says Charles Liebman, “is torn between two sets of values – those of integration and acceptance into American society and those of Jewish group survival. Those values appear to me to be incompatible.” [LIEBMAN, C., THE AMBIVALENT …, p. vii; QUOTED IN O’BRIEN, 2000] As Paul Cowan once underscored about his renewed Jewish identity, and the distinctness between that and being American: “Until 1976, when I was thirty-six, I had always identified as an American Jew. Now I am an American and a Jew. I live at once in the years 1982 and 5743, the Jewish year in which I am publishing this book.” [COWAN, P., 1982, p. 3]

“Every prayer and ritual observance in Judaism,” says Arthur Koestler, “proclaims membership to an ancient race, which automatically separates the Jew from the racial and historic past of the people whose midst he lives.” [KOESTLER, p. 287] “Above all,” says Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, “the otherness of Jewish law as something given by God and interpreted by authoritative rabbis runs counter to the fundamental thought of modernity.” [SACKS, J. p. 157] “Traditional views of the Gentile and the fear of anti-Semitism persist,” wrote Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen in 1990, “…. This sense of estrangement from the non-Jew and fear of the non-Jew remain not only for Israelis and not only for those most deeply committed to the Jewish tradition.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 40]

Edward Bernard Glick notes his people’s traditional identity like this:

“The Jewish people (as the American dictionary calls them), dos yid-
dische folk (as Yiddish speakers refer to themselves), and am yisrael or ha’am ha’yehudi (as Hebrew speakers refer to the concept) denote a transnational, multilingual, historical, and religious group which professes a oneness, a unity, a whole, a solidarity, and a partnership that predates by millenia the modern Jewish state. The concept applies to all Jews in the world, whether they realize it or not, whether they want it or not, and whether they like it or not. For Jewish peoplehood is Judaism, which is a religion in the gentile sense. And the proof of this is that no other religious group in the world so steadily and so steadfastly calls itself a people. Do the multifarous denominations of American Protestantism, concerned as they may be with the fate of foreign Protestants, call themselves the Methodist people, the Baptist people, the Episcopalian people, or the Presbyterian people? Do American Catholics … call themselves the Catholic people, even though catholic is a synonym for universal? Do American Muslims, American Hindus, and American Buddhists use the word in reference to their creeds? No.” [GLICK, E., 1982, p. 125]

As large numbers of Jews left the hearts of big cities over the years, in 1959 Rabbi Albert Gordon’s study called Jews in Suburbia noted that “Jews seldom come to know non-Jews any better in suburbia than they did in the big city … To what extent is this condition the result of Jewish self-segregation? Scrutinizing each of the communities in this study with this question in mind, I discovered first of all that … their closest friendships are reserved for other Jews who have the same community, class, synagogal and organizational interests. This primary friendship is natural – and characteristic of every kind of suburb.” [GORDON, A., p. 170] Arthur Hertzberg notes that in post-World War II America, “even those Jews who affirmed neither religious nor ethnic identity admitted that they were most comfortable with other Jews. Even the most ‘anti-Jewish’ Jews reported that at least four out of five of their friends were Jews. This was true even of people of Jewish origin who had converted to one of the branches of Christianity. Jewish businessmen and professionals … did business much of the time with Americans of all origins and persuasions. They lunched often with their customers or clients, but they went home to have dinner and play cards, or to play golf on weekends, or to go to the theater or symphony, with other Jews.” [HERTZBERG, A., 1989, p. 325]

“In one study,” noted Susan Schneider in the 1980s, “78% of the Jews (as compared to 14% of Protestants) say that they have ‘regular interactions’ with at least five households of [their] relatives. What may be a uniquely Jewish way of keeping the kinship ties is the ‘cousins’ club,’ meeting regularly to create family networks that reinforce every member’s sense of belonging, of having a reference group or ‘home room’ even in adulthood.” [SCHNEIDER, p. 265] “Jews appear to be, by origin and authentic nature, a tribe,” says Jewish author Eric Kahler, “a primordial social structure and hence, in spite of their dispersion the closest related of historical communities, closer related among each other than the locally associated members of a modern nation.” [KAHLER, E., 1967, p. 10-11]
By scholarly – or any other – accounts, the Jewish tradition of a clannish collectivism and communal self-promotive unity – religiously or otherwise – endures for most Jews today. “The American Jewish community is cohesive,” wrote Alan Zuckerman in 1991, “… Because most American Jews occupy distinctive niches in the general social, economic, and political structure of the United States, each Jew makes decisions about friends, husband or wife, neighbors, workmates, and political associates from a set of persons, most of whom are Jews… [ZUCKERMAN, p. 15] … The ties of residential concentration and social class place the American Jewish community into a distinctive niche in the general society.” [ZUCKERMAN, p. 22] “The community of class and status among Jews,” says Calvin Goldscheider, [and] occupational concentration and educational achievement at high levels [results] in [Jewish] social bonds, economic networks, and common lifestyles and interests … [GOLDSCHEIDER, p. 135]… The common assumption that increased levels of education and occupation would lead to assimilation of the American Jewish community [into mainstream society] … seems to be unfounded. An examination of the empirical evidence has pointed to the very opposite conclusion. The uniqueness of the stratification profile and the distinctive social mobility patterns of American Jews mark Jews off from others and binds Jews to each other.” [GOLDSCHEIDER, p. 136] “The commonality of class and status among Jews,” agrees Esther Wilder, “is distinctive and results in social bonds, economic networks, common lifestyles and interests.” [WILDER, 6-96]

“In America as elsewhere,” noted Benjamin Ginsberg in 1994, “… Jews are outsiders who are often more successful than their hosts … And, to make matters worse, Jews often, secretly or not so secretly, conceive themselves to be morally and intellectually superior to their neighbors.” [GINZBURG, p. 8] “To be a Jew,” wrote Eugene Borowitz in the 1970s,” means to have a bond with every other Jew – and somehow know how to find him.” [SILBERMAN, p. 76] “In social intercourse with other Jews,” says Theodore Reik, “informality and familiarity form a kind of inner security, a ‘we-feeling.’ They know each other and there are not many things which need to be explained. Meeting and speaking with other Jews is accompanied by the feeling that they are ‘my kind of people.’ It is what [Sigmund] Freud calls ‘the clear awareness of an inner identity, the secret of the same inner construction.’” [REIK, T., 1962, p. 228-229]

Early in his acting career, Marlon Brando recalls walking with a Jewish friend in New York City:

“There was a woman in front of us with blond hair wearing a mink coat and we were talking about her, when Caroline said, ‘She’s Jewish.’ I asked, ‘How do you know?’ She answered, ‘Well, it’s because … I don’t know, she’s just Jewish.’ I said, ‘You mean to say, just because she has blond hair and a mink –’ She interrupted, ‘Look, I’m a Jew, and I know what Jews are like from the front, back, side or top.’ ‘Well, how can you tell a Jew from a non-Jew?’ She replied, ‘Well, you have to be Jewish to know that.’ I was stunned, and I thought Caroline had remarkable powers of perception.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 75]
Erich Kahler recalls an incident involving a fellow Jew (poet Richard Beer-Hofmann) in Berlin:

“His face was wrapped in a woolen scarf [against the cold] so that only his eyes could be seen. An old orthodox Jew in his caftan came down the stairs and stopped him. ‘The gentleman is one of us (Der Herr ist einer von uns),’ he said to Beer-Hofmann, ‘he will tell me how I can get to the Nollendorfplatz.’ The eyes alone were enough to reveal a Jew to a Jew.” [KAHLER, E., 1967, p. 6]

Former New York Times Executive Editor Max Frankel notes the following in his autobiography:

“The best reporters and editors normally have no race, sex, or religion. They may charm or muscle their way into strange places, but they try not to THINK male or female, black or Jewish. Still, there always comes a time for exceptions. I remember reliving the shudders of refugee life at the sight of Hungarians trudging across a frozen frontier swamp. I never totally banished that twinge of smug American security when interviewing high-ranking Germans. And there’s no denying the conspiratorial bond that suddenly appeared when an old man on a park bench in Kiev whispered, *Bist ah yid?* Are you a Jew? was a question often put to me, and with decidedly different inflections. In Communist countries, it came from Jews who meant thereby to ask whether they could trust me with seditious conversation. In Israel, it was asked to discover whether I would ever put my feelings for the Jewish state ahead of my journalistic mission. Now that I had charge of editorials at the Times, the question was usually hurled with contempt; I was obviously a Jew, but in the eyes of many Jews, an unworthy one for daring to criticize the Israeli government. So whenever I turned to the subject of Israel, there was no escaping my skin.” [FRANKEL, M., 1999, p. 397]

“Jewish civilization should have vanished a long time ago,” says Henry Feingold, “that it did not and does not may also be part of Jewish exceptionalism. It may well be that Judaism is governed by different rules … Jews are a subgroup in this dynamic society; but they are also more Jewish, as measured by the concern for Jewish people throughout the world.” [FEINGOLD, p. 52] “90% [of American Jews] claim to feel ‘very close’ or ‘fairly close’ to other Jews,” noted Alan Zuckerman in 1991, “… Even when they select non-Jews [as spouses and friends], most Jews have strong ties which pull them back to the Jewish community.” [ZUCKERMAN, p. 27]

In 1993 Joel Kotkin noted that “an estimated 50 per cent or more of American Jews send their children to an ethnic school, and over three-quarters of young men undergo the traditional bar mitzvah ceremony. In contrast, counterpart systems promoting specifically Italian or German language, culture, and history largely have disappeared in most major countries of immigration. Even among inter-married couples … a large majority claim that most of their friends were Jews.” [KOTKIN, p. 35] In 1988 eight of ten American Jews still participated in some sort of yearly Passover ritual. [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN,
One study showed that as late as the 1970s, “96% of American Jews only had Jewish relatives, 77% had all their closest friends as Jews, 60% belonged to Jewish community organizations, virtually all of them gave to Jewish charities, and 90% felt a strong attachment to Israel.” [FORSTER, p. 129]

In a 1982 study of the American Jewish community, “61% of the respondents reported that ‘all,’ ‘almost all,’ or ‘most’ of their friends were Jewish. “About two-thirds of American Jews still form their closest friendships with other Jews,” noted Stephen Whitfield in 1988, “The process of acculturation may have blurred distinctions between Jews and their gentile neighbors, but a sense of peoplehood has not been entirely suppressed.” [WHITFIELD, AM, p. 6] In 1988, Gary Tobin could still write that “a study of the Jewish population of New York City found 70% of respondents saying that all of their three close friends are Jewish.” [TOBIN, p. 69] In a 1990 survey of American Jews, 60% selected the statement “I see the Jewish people as an extension of my family”; only 23% disagreed. 74% agreed that “As a Jew I have a special responsibility to help other Jews”; only 14% disagreed. [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 18] (Jews in Russia? Jewish scholar Zvi Gitelman in 1994 “found that Jews overwhelmingly reported that their closest friends were Jewish.” [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 264]

“No matter where I was,” says Ze’ev Chafets, about his travels across America in 1986, “– in a Jewish farm town in New England or a black synagogue in Queens, in a gay temple in San Francisco or among the Jews of the Louisiana bayou – I always felt at home. I came to the United States feeling like an Israeli; I left reminded that I am also, as a friend in Detroit put it, an MOT – a Member of the Tribe.” [CHAFETS, MEMBERS, p. 8-9]

Stephen Bloom notes his enduring Jewish identity this way:

“Despite the lack of Jewish worship and observance, and my family’s total assimilation into everything American and secular, we were thoroughly Jewish as was our very essence. The world was split into two distinct halves: Jews and gentiles. Jews were always sought in business or social dealings over gentiles. A common expression used by Jews to describe a slow, dense person was – and still is – ‘He’s got a goyisher kop,’ which literally means ‘He’s got a gentile head’ but figuratively means ‘slow-witted.’ First question when I came home and boasted of making a new friend was ‘Is he Jewish?’ ‘God forbid!’ (my father’s expression) if I should ever go out with a gentile girl, and ‘Oy vey!’ (which literally means ‘Oh, pain!’) if I ever got serious with her. All my parents’ friends were Jews.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 63]

“This clannishness, as it appears to others,” says Charles Silberman, “is rooted in the sense of destiny that Jews the world over share with one another – a destiny that has some transcendent (and transcendental) significance.” [SILBERMAN, p. 76] (“The destiny of the Jewish people,” writes Jean Francois Steiner, “… no earthly power has ever been able to defeat.” [HOWE, p. 445]) This clustering, in the largest sense, has a very geographical flavor; over 95% of American Jews congregate in cities and nearby suburbs; in fact, 80% of them live in only ten population centers – New York City and Los Angeles are the two
largest. [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN, p. 6] A third of all American Jews live in the New York-New Jersey area. [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 5] (City-wise, by 1999, the greater Miami Jewish population, about 653,000 people, ranked second only behind New York City). [BELKIN, D., 5-6-99] Linking modern Jewish American geography to their roots in a separatist ghetto past, in 1978 Nachum Goldmann added that “even today Jews have a tendency to live in a neighborhood of their own, in an environment that facilitates the life of their community.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 66] [for world geography of the Jews, see: http://jewishtribalreview.org/geog.htm] (American Jews are overwhelmingly of Eastern European background. By the late 1950s, more than four-fifths were estimated to be of Eastern European descent). [GRINSTEIN, H., 1959, p. 73]

Decades earlier, the descendants of other peoples who had immigrated to America with the last major Jewish wave had already assimilated into American culture. In 1964, Arthur Hertzberg was noting that “the grandchildren of the Italians, the Slavs and the rest have become completely assimilated culturally … The … European immigrants of the last century have failed to provide Jews with a parallel for their devotion to some continuity for their own subculture.” [HERTZBERG, p. 287]

James Yaffe notes that

“In 1962 AJC [the American Jewish Committee] studied the Jewish community in Baltimore and came to these conclusions: Jewish employees are much more likely to work for Jewish employers; although most Jews claim they don’t care what religion their doctor or lawyer professes, they nevertheless use Jewish doctors 95 percent of the time and Jewish lawyers 87 percent of the time; the great majority of them say that it doesn’t matter to them if their children go to a school that has only Jewish pupils in it – yet 90 percent send their children to schools which are predominantly Jewish.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 65]

In 1973, Harry Golden noted that:

“Affluence and the census explain two of the obvious characteristics of Jewish mobility: when Jews move, they all move at once and they all want to move to the same place. For Jews want the enclave. They cluster.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 43]

This clustering has a transnational flavor. As Harold Troper noted about the Jews of Canada in 1999:

“Even today, no other ethnic group in Canada is as institutionally complete, nor does any other group have a comparable degree of communal self-awareness, as measured by knowledge of organizations and leaders, voluntarism and reading of the ethnic press, community fund raising, and individual self-identification. Compared to most other groups, and certainly compared to other ethno-European groups, Jews are a highly identified, unassimilated group … Many Jews in Canada demonstrate a deeply held feeling of mutual interdependence and transnational identification with Jews everywhere that defies any explanation.” [TROPER, H., 1999, p. 228, 232]
Woocher, in his volume about the Jewish American polity, notes that: “The civil religion knows that the goals of Jewish group survival and social integration [with mainstream American society] are indeed in tension. Civic Judaism’s world view and ethos in fact incorporates a host of assertions which are potentially contradictory.” These include the Jewish insistence that they are “under siege” while they enjoy unprecedented freedom, prosperity, and opportunity in America, the notion that all Jews are “one people” when in fact they are – in modern times – as diverse as any other group in every possible manner (except perhaps, throughout most of the world, for their usual similarities in relatively high income and social status), the idea that the modern state of Israel is their “home” when they have perfectly fine homes here (indeed, homes that are even “safer” than the Jewish ones overseas), the common secular Jewish belief that Judaism’s distinctive ideals are social justice, equality, et al when mainstream American society’s ideals are (and have always been since the founding of the nation) no different, and the expending of so much time, energy, and money on themselves as Jews (much of it internationally) when the American social contract expects a foremost Jewish responsibility to their fellow Americans (or simply fellow humans) as equal members of the American polity. “Civic Judaism,” notes Woocher, “is … a religion of thorough-going ambivalence, of paradox, and inconsistency.” [WOOCHER, p. 98] We might also add the fact that Jews portray themselves always as victims, when they are in fact the wealthiest and most influential ethnic group in America.

While, David Davis, a Jewish professor at Yale can, like most American Jews, completely mythologize Jewish history as “a testing ground for American ideals, especially the ideal of apportioning rewards according to individual merit as opposed to hereditary privilege or ethnic identity,” [DAVIS, D., p. 27] another Jewish professor, Adam Garfinkel, states more honestly, and bluntly, that “the underlying harmony between Jewish and American values vanishes upon close inspection.” [GARFINKLE, p 5]

Concerned about his peoples’ modern schizophrenic identity, Jewish scholar Jacob Neusner wrote:

“Why American Jews sustain the contradictory position of deeming the state of Israel to be critical to their own existence as a distinctive, self-sustaining group in American society, and also insisting that they and their future find permanent place within American society, has to be worked out. Here is a strange civil religion … What is puzzling is not that political events – the destruction of a group, the formation of a national state – should generate dislocation in society and so in people’s imagination. It is that the state of dislocation should be made into a permanent and, if truth be told, normative condition of a group.” [NEUSNER, STRANGER, p. 3]

Among the most disturbing paradoxes, however (one not lost to many Jews, but rarely addressed publicly) is the one that James Madison foresaw in the very establishing of the American constitution. In a free society of competing ideas and interests, there is always the inevitable danger that a powerful “faction” (or
factions) could successfully coagulate to disbalance the fullest expression of pluralistic opinion and subvert the idealized democratic process. The obvious example of this is the innocent “one person, one vote” democratic principle which is a trivial cosmetic to hide the powerful economic interests that function offstage where real political power, influence, and decision-making lies. Ironically, in the honing of the modern liberal American state of multicultural and pluralistic tolerance (which Jews were influential in demanding, to the letter of the law, in recent decades) the conditions were established whereby American Jewry could launch itself as a minority “superpower,” to the inevitable detriment of others in the American social experiment, Arabs, and those in other parts of the Third World, and at the expense of the very pluralistic ideals which Jews have exploited to chauvinist ends. In the American cultural tradition of “rugged individualism,” the relentless Jewish collectivist entity – economic, political, and social – could, and is, vanquishing all foes in its aim of Jewish exclusionist allegiances, an aim that ironically seeks to bend the full American polity to the Jewish exclusionist will. This aim has thus far been successful, especially per American popular views toward the modern state of Israel. Part of the strategy (intentionally or de facto) is to weaken all competing unification efforts by potentially larger non-Jewish polities; numerically weaker ones (i.e., “minorities”) have served as Jewish allies in so far as the Jewish polity may lead them to expressly Jewish goals and benefits. In recent history other American ethnic groups – particularly Blacks – have rebelled against Jewish hegemony in the modern contesting tribal battles called multiculturalism, which Jews were instrumental in creating to protect their own “particularism.”

Indeed, the modern American milieu of “cultural pluralism” (laid bare, the celebration of ethnic ethnocentrism as a foundation of the American cultural milieu) affords the American Jewish community the safest framework for its own expression of global Jewish nationalism. Zionism, the modern secular ideology of transnational Jewish allegiance (a hard-core political creed and not merely a champion of Jewish “culture”), owes much of its success to its careful nurturing amidst America’s Jewry and American society at-large. An Israeli professor of history, Allon Gal, notes that

“A major characteristic of American Zionist ideology is its acceptance of the concept that has become known as ‘cultural pluralism’ … This philosophy … has typified American Zionist thought since the early twentieth century … True, the focus of Zionist interest has been on building an autonomous Jewish community in Palestine. But the successful development of the Jewish community in America and its constructive relationship with the pluralistic society at large have always loomed large in American Zionist thought and deed. Living in democratic and pluralistic America, Zionists (http://jewishtribalreview.org/zionismmlink.htm) looked for a general American rationale for creating the Jewish state against many heavy odds.” [GAL, p. 20]

“Pluralism,” remarks Kevin MacDonald, “serves internal Jewish [American] interests because it legitimizes the internal Jewish interests in rationalizing

Jews have been the foremost activists in molding public institutions and opinion towards what is today called “political correctness,” intergroup “tolerance,” the celebration of ethnic differences, and and multiculturalism. “While the intergroup relations field included representatives of various racial, religious, and ethnic communities,” notes Stuart Svonkin,

“Jewish organizations played the leading role in defining the movements tactics and objectives. Among the Jewish agencies that became involved in intergroup relations, the American Jewish Committee (AJC), the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith (ADL), and the American Jewish Congress (AJC) were the most active and influential. These three national secular agencies aspired to function as the Jewish community’s department of state formulating and implementing policies to shape American Jewry’s relations with other American communities … The AJCongress explicitly favored cultural pluralism and strongly supported Jewish nationalism. These two commitments were closely connected; Horace Kallen, who developed the theory of cultural pluralism, was himself an ardent champion of both the AJCongress and American Zionism.” [SVONKIN, S., 1997, p. 1, 23]

This man, Kallen, most credited with the conception and development of cultural pluralism (the ethnocentric vehicle by which Zionism could unobjectionably thrive in the United States) was an American Jewish professor, most active in the teens and 1920s. He argued a sharp distinction between “nationality” (being Jewish) and “citizenship” (being American). [SCHMIDT, p. 38] One author calls Kallen “the grandfather of multiculturalism;” his important collection of essays was entitled Culture and Democracy in the United States. “Although the ideas contained within it had little impact at the time,” says John Miller, “they became enormously influential later in the century. Horace Kallen was the first multiculturalist.” [MILLER, p. 80]

Kallen was also so great a Zionist that he was the “leader and guiding spirit” of “an elite secret society called the Parushim, the Hebrew word for ‘Pharisee’ and ‘separatist.’” [GROSE, p. 54, 53] “You will be subject,” stated the inductor in the Parushim swearing-in ceremony, “to an absolute duty whose call you will be impelled to heed at any time, in any place, and at any cost.” [SCHMIDT, p. 77] Kallen wrote to the prominent German Zionist, Max Nordeau, in 1914, saying, “[I] t happened to be my turn to lead the secret organization here in America which is aiming to turn the Zionist movement in a political direction, from within. Our order is called Parushim … Our present purpose is one of
quiet propaganda and education in ‘the political idea’ … It is our desire and plan to organize brotherhoods all over the world.” [SCHMIDT, p. 79] “[A]n organization which has the aims we have,” Kallen wrote to a fellow American Zionist leader, “must work silently, and through education and infection rather than through force and noise.” [SCHMIDT, p. 83] Under great influence of Kallen’s thinking was a Jewish United States Supreme Court Justice, Louis Brandeis (who was also the eventual director of the Federation of American Zionists). “Certainly Kallen wished to ‘instruct’ Brandeis,” notes Sarah Schmidt, “and perhaps, covertly, even to manipulate him. But Kallen’s preference was for the role of anonymous, self-effacing string puller.” [SCHMIDT, p. 85]

“Against those powerful Jews who argued that a Jewish nationalism was unpatriotic and seditious,” notes Kevin Avruch, “Brandeis put forth the contrary notion: ‘Zionism is the Pilgrim inspiration and impulse over again.’” [AVRUCH, K., 1981, p. 30]

Using the idea of cultural pluralism to buttress his Zionist arguments, Horace Kallen, notes David Levering Lewis, “rejected assimilation and proposed instead that Jews retain their ‘racial’ uniqueness, the better to enrich American society.” [HERTZBERG, p. 283, LEWIS p. 553] Henry Feingold notes that:

“Writing in the definitive Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups, Philip Gleason finds a ‘racialist’ dimension in Kallen’s approach to the pluralism idea and suggests that the number of Jewish thinkers attracted to the notion – Franz Boas, Mordecai Kaplan, and others – has the earmarks of a Jewish intellectual conspiracy to create space for a Jewish culture. There may be some truth in that idea … The legitimacy of Zionism would not have been established without the ideological rationale put forward by the cultural pluralists.” [FEINGOLD, p. 54]

Kallen wrote that “[human associations] have constituted communities tending to preserve and to sustain the continuity of the physical stock. Empirically, race is nothing more than this continuity confirmed and enchanneled in basic social inheritances. It is hardly distinguishable from nationality.” [in MILLER, J., p. 84] He also asserted that “men may change their clothes, their politics, their wives, their religions, their philosophies, to a greater or less extent; they cannot change their grandfathers.” [BIALE, D., 1998, p. 25] Elsewhere, Kallen addressed the idea of anti-Semitism as the veritable foundation of Jewish identity: “Anti-Semitism imposes a unity upon Jews whether they like it or not … Only by working together may each be better defended than if he worked alone. This fact should guide Jewish education … It has to recognize that Jews are members of one another; that each Jew carries a responsibility, not only as an individual but as a member of a group called Jews.” [KALLEN, 1954, p. 188-189]

Working for decades for acceptance in American society at-large, many Jews have even deceptively championed – for popular consumption – Judeo-centric Zionism, however incongruously, as a universalistic creed. As Allon Gal observes
American Zionist thinkers emphasized the non-nationalist or ‘higher’ social and ethical goals as the fulfillment of Zionism; the rationale of Zionism was perceived as its service to the betterment of mankind. In pure form this ideology held that serving the human race was the only, or the chief test of Zionism.” [GAL, 1986, p. 363]

The notion of a “mission” to serve humanity (although there is absolutely no evidence that Zionism has ever benefited anyone on earth but Jews) blended well with American democratic ideals and self-conceptions. With the acceptance of cultural pluralism and its institution into the American social fabric, notes Peter Grose, “the way lay open … to link Jewish group identity, through Zionism, to the American Dream.” [GROSE, p. 55] “Once Kallen became convinced that the American Zionist movement was developing in accord with his ideas,” notes Sarah Schmidt, “he began to use his contacts with the non-Jewish media as ‘propagandists’ for the Zionist cause.” [SCHMIDT, p. 93]

(While World War II, Zionist propagandistic activities had enormously grown and accelerated. As Zionist historian Melvin Urofsky notes: “The Zionists, throughout the war period, carefully cultivated Christian America. From a standpoint of practical politics alone, the Zionists recognized that only if the larger community supported their aims would they be able to influence government policy. A minority, no matter how efficacious its propaganda or skillful public relations, no matter how many important contacts it has made, cannot affect American foreign policy unless it either neutralizes the majority or wins it over to active support of its cause.” [UROFSKY, 1978, p. 35])

Yet even an American environment of mutually tolerant ethnicities is not what traditional Jewish identity really seeks. Zionism is not only interested in “foreign policy.” As Arthur Hertzberg wrote in a B’nai B’rith publication in 1964:

“[Cultural pluralism] has not … succeeded in achieving its very patent ‘Jewish’ purpose, to reorganize America in such a fashion that all of its various communities would so live their lives that the Jews could, in the very act of being themselves, be just like everybody else. There are two keys to this failure: politics and culture. In both dimensions the Jews have acted uniquely and not like any of the other minorities.” [HERTZBERG, p. 284]

In other words, even in a revised American socio-cultural system that been entirely reformed to accommodate “patent Jewish purpose,” cultural pluralism is still not enough for those Jews who refuse to completely assimilate, it is merely a means to discretely reach strata even more foreign to the founding principles of America: Jews implicitly demand a special dimension of “uniqueness” – their own caste – outside the realm of all others in the American experiment, by which they can connect to their Jewish brethren throughout the world. Even Israel Zangwill, the Jewish writer who is generally credited with popularizing the term “The Melting Pot” (the long-dead concept of America as a kind of homogenized ‘soup’ of immigrant cultures) to describe American society (via his successful 1908 play of the same name), was eventually a Zionist.
“He gave more and more of his energy to this cause as time passed, and retreated from his earlier position of racial and religious mixture.” [GLAZER/MOYNIHAN, p. 289-290] (This is what Zangwill wrote about the traditions of his own people: “Beware of the goyim, his elders told Jacob … They are goyim, foes of the faith, beings of darkness … drunkards and bullies, swift with the fist or bludgeon, many in species, but the worst of the goyim are the creatures called Christians.” [GONEN, p. 133]

Nathan Glazer still felt confident in publishing the following in 1972 in his classic volume, American Judaism:

“There are different branches of Judaism today, and they take somewhat different attitudes to assimilation, but even the most liberal interpretation of Judaism must fight the assimilation of the Jews … Jews have been prominent in the fight to forward the assimilation of ethnic groups … [Yet] there comes a time – and it is just about upon us – when American Jews become aware of a contradiction between the kind of society America wants it to become – and indeed the kind of society most Jews want it to be – and the demands of the Jewish religion. This religion after all, prohibits inter-marriage, asserts that Jews are a people apart, and insists that they consider themselves in exile until God restores them to the land of Israel.” [GLAZER, p. 9] (In a footnote Glazer partially exempts the Reform Judaism movement who “don’t consider themselves in exile; they do disapprove of intermarriage.”)

Richard L. Rubenstein, among many Jewish intellectuals, increasingly echoes such entrenched “particularist” themes (and, hence, Zionism) in the 1990s, arguing that: “The secular humanist is most cognizant of abstract universal values that are shared with other human beings … [but] one must be a particular kind of person to be a person at all. The conception of humanity in general is a meaningless and tragic abstraction.” [RUBENSTEIN, R. p. 238]

“Cultural pluralism,” says Henry Feingold, “… became part of a strategy to permit more space for the expression of Jewish particularity … some argue that, in its unwavering support of Israel, American Jewry had gone beyond its bounds. If that is true, it is a measure of America’s extraordinary tolerance of American Jewry’s particularity.” [FEINGOLD, p. 149] “Legitimizing the preservation of a minority culture in the midst of a majority’s host society,” says Howard Sachar, “pluralism functioned as an intellectual anchorage for an educated Jewish second generation … until the emergence of Zionism in the post-World War II years swept through American Jewry with a climactic redemption fervor of its own.” [MCDONALD, p. 299]

Strident activists at all levels in shaping American culture, Jewish organizations have long fought for open and diverse immigration to America, mainly to divert the homogeneity of Christian culture around them. In an increasingly diverse society, Jews are less easily singled out for criticism or attack. “Increasing ethnic heterogeneity,” noted Jewish activist Earl Raab, “as a result of immigration, has made it even more difficult for a political party or mass movement of bigotry to develop.” [MCDONALD, p. 300] “Jewish influence on immigra-
tion policy," observed Kevin McDonald, "was facilitated by Jewish wealth, education, and social status. Reflecting its general disproportionate representation in markers of economic success and political influence … [Jews] were able to command a high level of financial, political, and intellectual resources in pursuing their political aims." [MCDONALD, JEWISH, p. 301]

In the 1920, Horace Kallen’s ideological counterpoint, American sociologist Edward Ross, criticized “the endeavor of Jews to control the immigration policy of the United States," [MCDONALD, p. 319] especially in lobbying for more and more Jewish immigrations to America. “The systematic campaign,” complained Ross, “in newspapers and magazines to break down all arguments for restriction and to calm nativist fears is waged by one and for one race. Hebrew money is behind the National Liberal Immigration League and its numerous publications.” [MCDONALD, p. 312] (Even today, 300,000 Israeli citizens are living in America; from a total Jewish Israeli population of about four million people, this means that every thirteenth Israeli lives in the United States, extremely favorable American immigration policy towards that country).

Later, as part of a concerted strategy, notes Irving Kristol,

“Ever since the Holocaust and the emergence of the state of Israel, American Jews have been reaching towards a more explicit and meaningful Jewish identity, and have been moving away from the universalist secular humanism that was so prominent a feature in their prewar thinking. But while American Jews want to become more Jewish, they do not want American Christians to become more Christian.” [in FEIN, p. 245]

Jewish deconstructive attack upon the Christian world view may be noted more recently in an incident in 1994 when the preeminent Jewish American “defense agency”, the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, turned on the conservative Christian community with venom, publishing a report entitled *The Religious Right: the Assault on Tolerance and Pluralism in America*. It proclaimed that the conservative Christian movement was an “exclusionist” movement seeking to “restore what it perceived as the ruins of a Christian nation by seeking more closely to unite its version of Christianity with state power.” [SILK, p. 296] The ADL attack caught the Christian community by surprise. Outraged, they pointed out that their own struggle for a voice in America was no different than anyone else’s, including Jews.

A major focus of the ADL assault was upon Pat Robertson, a leader of the Christian Coalition and the Christian Broadcasting Network, a man who has for years even hired a formal Jewish liaison – Ben Waldman – to act on his behalf in the Jewish community. (The head of Robertson’s legal center, the American Center for Law and Justice, is Jay Sekulow, a Christian who was born Jewish. Another Christian, Lou Sheldon, head of the Traditional Values Coalition, was also born to a Jewish mother). [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 275] Robertson was particularly outraged by the Jewish attack, and noted his stellar record in supporting Jewish and Israeli issues. The Christian Broadcasting Network, for example, had donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the United Jewish
Appeal and other Jewish charities; Robertson had also lobbied American politicians against arms sales to Arab adversaries of Israel. He even was involved in supportive activities for convicted Jewish American spy (for Israel), Jonathan Pollard. [SILK, p. 297] The Christian Coalition responded with its own report that documented the inaccuracies and offenses in the ADL’s efforts to stifle Christian expressions within the context of religious pluralism, A Campaign of Falsehoods: The Anti-Defamation League’s Defamation of Religious Conservatives.

A rare voice of reason in the Jewish community, Rabbi Daniel Lapin, noted publications by both the ADL and the American Jewish Committee (for example, its The Political Activity of the Religious Right: A Critical Analysis) that defamed the Christian community, writing:

“[The ADL] published a book filled with unfair and untrue defamation of religious conservatives. It contained such unreservedly unbalanced as, ‘The religious Right brings to the debate over moral and social issues a rhetoric of fear, suspicion and even hatred.’ As a rabbi and a Jew, I was embarrassed at the tone of both of these books. Had any Christian association published anything comparable about the Jewish community, cries of anti-Semitism would have rung out far and wide – and been justified … [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 40] … Even a quick glance at publications and direct-mail appeals from the Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress and others, reveals a level of rhetoric that far exceeds the bounds of civilized political discourse. Their words demonstrate that many Jewish organizations do not merely consider devout, politically active Christians to be misguided – they consider them evil. I believe that if the term anti-Semitism is to retain any intellectual and moral integrity, we must also today admit to the term anti-Christianism. If one is to be fought, then surely both should be.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 41]

(Meanwhile, a Jewish ethnic magazine can feature, merely as a curiosity, a “Modern Orthodox” rabbi, Mayer Schiller, for his championing of “race separation.” The magazine explains that the rabbi, a teacher in good standing at the Yeshiva University High School for Boys, doesn’t teach “hatred for racial minorities, but a rejection of post-Enlightenment universalism and secularism.”) [EDEN, A., 4-13-01]

Jewish anti-Christian bashing is expressed in many ways. In 1999, Rabbi Fred Guttman wrote an angry editorial in a Greensboro, North Carolina, newspaper, complaining about an earlier article in the paper about a Christian business directory. “The guide,” the directory’s publisher had explained, “performs a service for the Christian consumer, enabling him to find and do business with fellow believers.” [WILLIS, V., 1999, 11-15-99, p. B1] Incredibly, not only did Rabbi Guttman decide for everyone that the story had no news value, he also had the profound gall to compare the nature of such a directory (that sought merely to network in business with other dedicated Christians) to be parallel to Nazi intent! How so? “As a Jew reading this article,” he complained,
“I could not help but recall the Nuremberg laws of 1935 [the Nazi race laws]. These laws mandated a boycott of all non-Aryan businesses in Germany … The guide implies that there should be an economic boycott of non-Christian businesses. Thus, the parallel to the Nuremberg laws is certainly fitting. Even more disturbing was the forum that the News and Record chose to give such free and positive publicity to such a nonnewsworthy item. It saddened me that a group that encourages bias and bigotry through de facto economic boycotts would receive support from the News and Record. At the very least, the News and Record should consider taking an editorial stance against this so-called ‘Christian’ yellow pages.” [GUTTMAN, F., 11-26-99, p. A22]

Rabbi Gutman’s outrageous attack upon, and defamation of, a local Christian interest in networking with like-minded people created a stir in the Greensboro area. Gutman’s hypocrisy is breath-taking. Throughout multicultural America there are Iranian business directories, Arab business directories, Armenian business directories, Muslim business directories, and many others including, of course, Jewish business directories. (See, for example, the national Jewish “yellow pages” by Sharon and Michael Strassfeld. Or the one called The Jewish Yellow Pages: A Directory of Goods and Services by Mae Rockland Tupa. Or note England’s Benjamin Cohen who became a millionaire at age 17 for his Jewishnet Internet site. He “started Jewishnet from his bedroom and aimed to provide a business directory for the community.”) [DAILY MAIL, 1-6-2000, p. 83] And the intensity of Jewish collective support for each other has few, if any (as we will continue to explore), equals in modern America.

In another version of the usual Jewish double standard and anti-Christian attack, in 2000, Texas governor and presidential candidate George W. Bush, was publicly assailed by the American Jewish Congress for declaring June 10, 2000 as “Jesus Christ Day” in Texas (formal state recognition of the tenth anniversary of a grassroots “March for Jesus” day). The AJC complained that the governor “affixed his signature and the seal of the state of Texas to a proclamation establishing ‘Jesus Day’ [which] demonstrates the willingness to place the imprimatur of government literally on one faith.” Bush’s office responded by noting that the AJC never complained when the U.S. Congress had earlier proclaimed a day commemorating ultra-Orthodox Hassidic rabbi Menachem Schneerson. Nor did the AJC complain about Bush’s formal Texas proclamations that created an “Honor Israel Day,” a “Holocaust Remembrance” day, a day honoring Austin’s Orthodox Chabad House, a commemorative day for the Baha’i religion, and a special day of honor for a community of Sikhs. Even Bush’s Republican (partisan) colleague, Matt Brooks, head of the Republican Jewish Coalition, observed that “This is again a sad example of the American Jewish Congress and other organizations showing their anti-Christian bias. The Jewish community has to stop beating up on Christians for belief in their faith.” [FINGERHUT, E., 7-13-2000]

Four months after Bush’s “Jesus Day” proclamation, a New York Times reporter, Laurie Goodsein, still was reporting that
“What seemed purely ceremonial has turned into a controversy for George Bush. As word of Texas’s Jesus Day has spread through the email, Jewish newspapers and church-state separatists, the Republican presidential nominee has come under criticism for insensitivity to people of non-Christian faiths and a disregard for the First Amendment.” [GOODSTEIN, L., 8-6-2000, p. 14]

As scholar Kevin MacDonald writes about the undercurrent at work in such Jewish anti-Christian activism:

“It is not surprising that a powerful strand of Jewish intellectual activity in the twentieth century has been to pathologize highly cohesive, collective gentile social structures, gentile nationalism, gentile authoritarian political groups, and gentile ethnocentrism. It is clearly in the interests of Jews to advocate the continuation of the quintessential Western cultural commitment to individualism as the best environment for the continuation of Jewish collectivism.” [MACDONALD, p. 264]

“Nothing is more foreign to the spirit of Judaism,” noted influential pre-Zionist author Moses Hess in the 19th century, “than the idea of the egoistic salvation of the isolated individual.” [WEISBERGER, A., 1997, p. 126]

The implications of Jewish collectivism in capitalist society were addressed by a prominent Jewish socialist, Bernard Lazare, in France, in 1894:

“Bourgeois society is based entirely upon competition between man and in the field of the daily necessities of life. It affords us the spectacle of individuals fighting bitterly one against the other … In this state of society Darwin’s principle of the struggle of life dominates … If we conceive, then, in the midst of such a community, based upon egoistic action, associations of citizens strongly organized and gifted, animated for many centuries by the spirit of common action, and knowing by instinct and experience, the advantages which they may derive from union, it is certain that such organizations by directing their activity towards the same end as that pursued by the scattered individuals around them will possess such an advantage in the struggle as to assure them an easy victory. This is just the role which is being played by the Jews of the middle class in modern society … [LAZARE, p. 168] … The Jew … increases his advantage by uniting with his co-religionists possessed of similar virtues, and thus augments his powers by acting in common with his brethren; the inevitable result being that they out-distance their rivals in the pursuit of any common end. In the midst of a disunited middle class, whose members are engaged in a perpetual struggle against one another, the Jews stand united as one. This is the secret of their success.” [LAZARE, p. 169]

In our own day, the effect of an economically empowered Jewish “extended family” actually enforcing a disempowered Gentile individualism has profound political implications, grossly advantageous to Jews. Following the classical pattern of Jewish and upper strata Gentile collusion against the non-Jewish masses (as evidenced throughout history with everything from Court Jews in league with
absolute monarchs to Jewish communists as an integral part of Russian totalitarian elite), one recent study suggested that, even today, high status non-Jews tended to be individualist in attitude, disinclined to join groups, but were often found in economic and political association with Jews. [MACDONALD, p. 264]

The typical institutionalized Jewish device these days to “pathologize” Gentile group affiliations is to stigmatize them as being anti-Semitic in nature: morally, and – more importantly – legally, impermissible in the American universalistic fabric. (Hence, a rabbi can gain public forum and be taken seriously in declaring that local Christian efforts to economically collectivize is a manifestation of Nazi fascism, while, at the same time, a cornerstone of Jewish identity to this day is that very same thing). The Jewish polity (led by its collectivized “defense agency” heads – the Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, over 100 Jewish “community relations councils,” et al) functions as a massive, unified “attack dog” to destroy any semblance in others of a solidarity similar to their own, or, rather, any that could pose a power threat to Jewish collectivism. Some Jews believe, says Benedict Viviano, “that Jews … are safest when Christians are weak … Thus [such Jews] … foster publications which blame the Church for all the suffering of the Jews throughout history in an undifferentiated fashion.” [VIVIANO, p. 354] In historical overview, as Jewish author Walter Jacob notes,

“The Jewish scholars of the mid-nineteenth century realized that the Church could now be attacked without fear of retaliation. Its power had faded, and its influence was constantly diminishing. The decline of Christianity was a hopeful sign. Jewish scholars saw it as beneficial for Judaism and mankind, for they believed that Judaism or a new religion akin to it would eventually become dominant. Although this optimism is gone, the weakening of Christianity is still welcomed by many contemporary Jews.” [JACOB, W., 1974, p. 230]

Jewish-born Sigmund Freud and psychoanalysis has come to play a profoundly influential role in modern America. Jewish scholars Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note Freud’s views of Christianity, at root in this psychological movement:

“Though it is sometimes forgotten today, Freud’s work was profoundly subversive to the cultural underpinnings of European Christian society, a subversiveness of which he was not unaware. There is evidence that some of the impetus for the creation of psychoanalysis lay in his hostility to Christianity.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 125]

These two scholars also note the nature of the widespread modern Jewish leftist/liberal/radical assault upon the Christian world:

“In sum, the aim of the Jewish radical is to estrange the Christian from society, as he feels estranged from it. The fact that the United States is no longer ‘Christian’ in any real sense, or that Jews have moved to positions of considerable power and influence, is of little import. Its Christian base is still unconsciously identified as the decisive oppressive element … Thus many radical Jews, even when they do not identify with Juda-
ism, unconsciously retain a generalized hostility to Christian culture. Again, Portnoy [the leader character in Philip Roth’s Portnoy’s Complaint] is a good example. Only on the analyst’s couch is he willing to admit the hostility he feels.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 125]

Russian-Israeli author Israel Shamir notes that Jewish hatred for Christians and Christianity is a consistent theme to this very day:

“Rami Rozen expressed the Jewish tradition in a long feature in a major Israeli Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz: ‘Jews feel toward Jesus today what they felt in 4c or in the Middle Ages … it is not fear, it is hatred and despise [sic]. For centuries Jews concealed from Christians their hate to Jesus, and this tradition continues even now. ‘He is revolting and repulsive,’ said an important modern religious Jewish thinker. Rozen writes that this ‘repulsion passed from observant Jews to the general Israeli public.’” [SHAMIR, I., 2001]

Secular Jewish journalist Stephen Bloom was surprised when an ultra-Orthodox Jew reprimanded him for saying hello to a non-Jewish stranger:

“‘The goyim,’ Lazar told me, as we crossed the street again, three blocks from the shul, ‘will always be goyim, no matter how nice they are to you. So what’s the point?’ Lazar’s comments underscored the Hasi-dim’s contempt for non-Jews, which wasn’t limited to the Postville [Iowa] gentiles, but to all Christians … But if truth be told, Lazar’s antigentile sentiment wasn’t limited to just Hasidic Jews. The Hasidim put into practice what many Jews just talked about. Lazar’s gentile-bashing reminded me of the Yiddish aphorism Er shmekt nit un er shtinkt nit (‘He doesn’t smell and he doesn’t stink’), used derisively to describe non-Jews, who are viewed as inconsequential and unimportant. The maxim wasn’t very different from the expression my own parents used about the simpleton who’s got a goyisher kop [non-Jewish head].” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 196]

Jewish author Paul Cowan notes what happened when a group of Jews and their Christian spouses all got together in a room to air out their differences:

“In one of our largest, most polarized groups almost all the gentiles perceived the Jews’ responses [to Christianity] as another sign of their clannishness. ‘You seem to me like a wall of people,’ said a New York-born Catholic who was married to a Jew from Philadelphia. ‘When I’m around Jews, I feel like a persecuted minority.’ ‘I was just amazed at all the hostility,’ said a woman from rural Pennsylvania who raised as a Mennonite but now describes herself as an agnostic. ‘None of the Jews here seem able to tolerate religious differences.’ Her husband, who was born into a very prosperous, very assimilated Jewish family, agreed, ‘I’m not used to Jews victimizing other people.’ It wasn’t victimization. The exercise had unleashed a powerful tribal memory. But the words Jews used to describe the cross enraged most Christians. ‘I’ve been married to you for three years and I didn’t realize you had such disrespectful feel-
ings about my religion,” a Methodist woman said to her Jewish husband.” [COWAN, P., 1987, p. 184]

How deep is modern American Jewry’s animosity to others? In one 1988 study, a third of Jewish respondents went so far as to regard “the religious and racial identities” of even Catholic and Black liberal Democrats as grounds for suspicion.” Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen attribute this paranoia to Jewish beliefs “from their mythic past. Strong nationalist, ethnic, or religious loyalties of Gentiles increase the likelihood of their being anti-Semitic. The safest goy is one devoid of strong group commitments.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 48-48] Jewish suspicion, distrust, and disdain for non-Jews is so great that even converts to Judaism – those who are incapable of claiming an expressly hereditary lineage to the Jewish Chosen People mythology – are subject to widespread Jewish rejection and discrimination. “The strong familistic thrust among Jews,” remark Liebman and Cohen, “has meant that converts have been treated with some degree of suspicion. At the very least, it has meant that Jews do not relate to converts in the same way they relate to those born Jewish.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 23]

Even overtly anti-Semitic non-Jewish organizations like the Ku Klux Klan (successfully marginalized from mainstream white society) and the Nation of Islam (unsuccessfully marginalized from mainstream Black society) are – however condemned and attacked by Jewish strategists – essentially other peoples’ echoes of the genetically-based Chosen People ethos, a Jewish gift to mankind. Why is the idea of American Jewry banding tightly together expressly for their own interests and advancement any less repulsive than “white people” (or anybody else) doing the same, especially when Jews, by all measures of economic and political influence, are as a “special interest” group incomparably far more powerful? The fact that American Jewry can get away with it in the illusory world of “public relations” is due to grand design. The important difference between Jews and others is that the Jewish polity is – as it has been throughout the centuries – dissimulative in its hostility and suspicion of the non-Jewish Other; the Ku Klux Klan and the Nation of Islam are overt in their animosity to, and “separateness” from, those who are not their racial and ideological kindred.

(Note, for example, the results of a case of a Ku Klux Klan lawsuit in 2000 against the University of Missouri at St. Louis. The Klan sought to purchase a 15-second promotion after National Public Radio’s “All Things Considered” program at the college radio station. The university refused the Klan air time, claiming that subsequent bad publicity would damage the university economically, and an Appeals court upheld the college’s decision. As disreputable as the KKK’s overt racism is to most Americans, the Klan’s lawyer, Robert Herman (who is Jewish), had a valid point about free speech double standards when he noted that “if the radio decides its listeners don’t care for Jews, can they keep Jews off the air too?”) [MCMURRAY, J., 2-17, 2000]

In a discussion about left wing Jewish efforts “to change society,” Jewish scholars Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note that

“The basic thrust is to undermine all aspects of culture which contributed to his or her own marginality. Thus Jews in the United States and
Europe have been in the forefront of not only political radicalism, but also various forms of cultural subversion ... Often such subversion involves an attack upon genuine inequities or irrationalities. However, the attack is generally not directed at the particular inequity or irrationality per se. Rather, such inequities or irrationalities are used as a means for achieving a larger purpose: the general weakening of the social order itself.” [ROTHMAN, p. 130, in Prager, p. 70]

Elsewhere, they note:

“In almost every country about which we have information, a segment of the Jewish community played a very vital role in movements designed to undermine the existing order. This was true even in the United States where Jews have achieved unparalleled economic, cultural, and social success.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 110]

“Modern political history,” notes Jewish author Philip Mendes, “indicates a clear connection between being Jewish and being radical.” [MENDES, P., 1993, p. 9]

Maurice Samuel, a Zionist and popular Jewish American chauvinist in his time, put Jewish radicalism this way, in his confrontational book of 1924, *You Gentiles*:

“We Jews are the destroyers, will remain the destroyers forever, NOTHING that you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which is not your [Gentile] nature to build ... Those of us who fail to understand that truth will always be found in alliance with your rebellious factions until disillusionment comes, the wretched fate which scattered us through your midst has thrust this unwelcome role upon us.” [BRENNER, ZIONISM, p. 23]

Samuel, a naturalized American citizen and secretary of the Zionist Organization of America, was no marginalized crank. Louis Kaplan notes that he “played a major role in re-Judaizing American Jewry from the 1920s until his death in 1972 ... Samuel reminded the Jewish-born universalist of his day (and ours) that love of humanity is too nebulous and superficial, even mawkish. Concern for all human beings begins with caring for the specific. Let the individual Jew hold dear the Jewish people.” Samuel, adds Emmanuel Goldsmith, “played a major role in the emergence of the American Jew’s sense of Jewish identity and in the American Jews’ definition of Jewishness.” And Milton Hindus called Samuel “the most popular platform personality of American Jewry.” [KAPLAN, p. 453-465]

“A powerful force driving Jews toward radicalism is their sense of alienation from American society,” says Nathaniel Weyl, “… They often espouse values at variance with those of the majority and coalesce in a congregation or political party with the characteristics of a despised elite.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 148-149]

Sam Lehman-Wilzig, like many Jews, in the Zionist journal *Midstream* romanticizes the Jewish deconstruction of the non-Jewish world, asserting that Jews are the essential seed of human progress and enlightenment:
“Whether outside the campus or inside the laboratory, the Jews con-
tinue to heroically challenge the political and intellectual conventional
wisdoms of the age … By constantly constituting an ‘oppositionist’
force on the world scene … the Jew continually constitutes a mighty
thorn in the side of world society.” [LEHMANN-WILZIG, p. 24]

Jewish left-wing radical Saul Alinsky even introduced his 1971 book, Rules
for Radicals, with this dubious inspiration:

“Lest we forget at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgement to the
very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and history (and who
is to know where mythology leaves off and history begins – or which is
which), the first radical known to man who rebelled against the estab-
ishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom
– Lucifer.” [ALINSKY, S., 1971, pre-table of contents page]

In the religious sphere, Jewish attacks upon Christian collectivism in Amer-
ica, effecting strategies to insure Christian religious marginalization, have gone
on for decades now. “In its newly adopted role as a beleaguered minority,” notes
an unsympathetic David Hollinger, “… the complaint of Christians as the ‘newest minority’ insists that Christians are discriminated against, and that
their opinions are not taken seriously. Everyone but traditional Christians, it
seems, gets the chance to speak out.” [HOLLINGER, p. 33] Jewish legal lobby-
ists realize that there is no particular “Christian” polity without religion as its
base (and even this is divided along various sectarian lines). While there is cer-
tainly residual “Christian” influence in the values and mores of a secularized
Christian people, there is no collective, secular, nationalist Christian political
to that of the Jews’. The Christian polity dissolves, or is atom-
ized, when secularized; Jewish solidarity endures secularly, transformed along
the mythological base of its hereditary line, its historical transnational Jewish
patriotism, and its “we-them” principles, whether religious or not. Indeed,
Judaism has always been preserved as both a religion and a nationalist entity –
a “nation-religion.” Or, as Jewish scholar Nicholas de Lange, observes, “To be a
Jew means first and foremost to belong to a group, the Jewish people, and the
religious beliefs are secondary, in a sense, to this corporate allegiance.” [DE
LANGE, N., p. 4] In modern times most Jews have discarded the Judaic religion
but renewed the nationalist foundation of their collective self-identity. As such,
the American constitutional principle that “separates between Church and
state” plays into non-religious Jewish hands; hence, most American Jews
understand themselves not fitting into a religious context, but rather as an elite
(and usually racial), secular caste in the American system.

Alice Bloch is an activist feminist and lesbian, two identities that are
emphatically rejected by traditional Judaism. Yet Bloch remains ardently
“Jewish,” noting her identity – that so much mystifies non-Jewish acquaint-
ances – this way:

“Jewish identity is important to me because being Jewish is an integral
part of myself: it’s my inheritance, my roots. Christian women some-
times have a hard time understanding this, because Christian identity is
so much tied up with religious beliefs. It is possible to be an ex-Catholic or an ex-Baptist, but it is not possible to be an ex-Jew.” [BLOCH, p. 117]

About 20 gay synagogues have even been created throughout America in the last three decades, places where homosexual men and women assert a Jewish religious identity, despite the fact that mainstream Judaism rejects them. [WERTHEIMER, J., 1993, p. 76]

Sylvia Boorstein, a former psychologist who teaches meditation and Buddhism in northern California’s affluent Marin county, has even written a book about how she manages being an “observant Jew” and a Buddhist at the same time, somehow grafting the Buddha onto her root identity. “I am a Jew,” she writes, “because my parents were mild-mannered, cheerful best friends who loved me enormously, and they were Jews. I am a prayerful, devout Jew because I am a Buddhist.” While visiting Jerusalem, she notes troubles she had with some Israelis, but then reaches back into the Holocaust epic, thinking, ‘I’m in the middle of a locker room with naked Jewish women, and we’re all safe here.’ And I was so happy that these women about who I’d been harboring all these terrible thoughts were alive, I was overwhelmed with love for them. I thought, ‘This is wonderful. They can swim however they want. Now I have my values straight.’” [BERSON, M., 4-5-97; TULLER, D., 3-9-97]

“Jewish Buddhists,” seemingly a contradiction in terms, are fond of calling themselves JUBUs. [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 6] Roger Kamenetz notes the case of friend Marc Lieberman:

“He married a fellow Buddhist practitioner, Nancy Garfield, in a Vietnamese Buddhist temple in San Francisco. Not just a phase anymore. Still, when I visited them in San Francisco, I noted that he made kiddush on Friday night and sent his son from his first marriage to a Hebrew school. Even as a Buddhist he seemed a better Jew than I was.” [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 10]

Psychologist Wendy Orange also flirted with Buddhism, but in later years returned full-force to her Jewish identity, even moving to Israel. The beginning of her return to her tribal identity, as she recounts, began with a dream:

“It’s the Jewish High Holidays, but I’m at a Buddhist retreat. Meditations are over; I drift towards a run-down section of town where I enter a dissolute tavern. That’s when I hear Hebrew melodies. They grow louder, obliterating the Buddhist chants and gongs. When the sad cantorial fades away, I sidle up to a degenerate guy and am, at the dream’s end, madly trying to kiss him, even though he’s more or less drowning in his beer.” [ORANGE, W., 2000, p. 14]

Ms. Orange wondered what this dream meant. Her Jewish therapist had an answer:

“Oh, that’s an easy one. This dream points to your neglected Judaism. It’s telling you to search for your ethnic roots .... Your dream shows that you’re ‘drunk’ on the wrong religious practices. Study the great Jewish scholars now. One day, with luck, you’ll go to Israel.” [ORANGE, W., 2000, p. 15]
Alan Lew has written his own book on the Jewish Buddhist theme, with the twist that he followed the universalistic path of Zen to ultimately return to his tribal home as a rabbi:

“[There was] a guru named Rudrananda, or, as he was known, Rudi. Rudi’s real name was Albert Rudolph. He was a Jewish guy who grew up in Brooklyn … [LEW, A., 1999, p. 51] … One day Norman [also Jewish] invited me to come with him to the San Francisco Zen Center to hear a famous Japanese Zen master talk. At least half the people at the Zen Center were Jewish, but the Japanese Zen master, thinking that since he was in America everyone was Christian, based his lecture on a text from the Gospel … [LEW, A., 1999, p. 60] … [At the Berkeley Zen center] Mel Weitsman, the Zen priest, would already be seated … There were usually only about four to six people present at any session. Sometimes we would joke about how there weren’t enough for a minyan, realizing most of us were Jews – Mel, his wife, Liz Horowitz, Norman, another man named Ron Nester, and me … [LEW, A. 1999, p. 63] … The Zen Center I belonged to was a strong, positive community, and the connections between the people were deep and real, but it wasn’t a blood connection. There was not the essential and permanent bond that comes with family. I felt this most strongly when I took [son] Steve with me to holiday gatherings at the zendo [Zen center]. Looking through the window at this Jewish family across the way, I experienced a profound and surprising sense of longing … [LEW, A., 1999, p. 99] [At a Los Padres mountains Zen monastery] there was a ceremony for the installation of Steve Weintraub, the new head monk, or shuso … Like me, Steve Weintraub had grown up on Brooklyn … Steve Weintraub was of course Jewish. Whenever I came into the room, I checked to see who there looked Jewish. I wondered if anyone knew that I was Jewish, and if they cared. I had been doing this unconsciously ever since we moved to Pleasantville, but I had just recently become conscious of it. The more I meditated, the more aware I became of the contents of my unconscious mind.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 111]

Lew eventually had an “Orthodox Jewish wedding.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 142] His next wife, Sherril Jaffe, a writer, was also Jewish. [LEW, A., 1999, p. 145] Lew ended up at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Manhattan where “JTS required rabbinical students to spend one year in Israel.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 202] In Israel, he notes, “there was a deep joy to being in Israel and studying Torah in Jerusalem. I had the familiar sense of coming home.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 207] At the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem, Lew is at first intimidated by a black-dressed Chasid leading prayers, but suddenly recognizes him:

“Suddenly the scales fell from my eyes and I realized that I knew him from Sproul Plaza in Berkeley [University of California]! The long ponytail that he used to wear then had migrated around the side of his head and had become sidelocks. He was a middle-class Jewish kid from New Jersey. Sixteen years ago he had been pretending to be a native American; now he was pretending to be a Chasid.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 212]
Lew eventually ended up in the San Francisco area again as a rabbi. “Jews,” he says,

“who had been practicing Buddhists started lining up outside my office to speak to me. Some of them had been practicing Buddhists for twenty or thirty years, and they were quite happy with it; nevertheless, they felt haunted by their Jewishness, and they had never been able to shake it. They begged me to suggest something for them to do about it. I didn’t know what to tell them. Norman and I decided to hold a colloquium, a panel discussion on Judaism and Buddhism. He and I and several teachers of Jewish meditation would be on the panel. We expected around fifty people, but hundreds of people showed up. What did they all want? … My goal was to help Jews deepen their Jewish practice with Buddhist-style meditation techniques, and Norman’s interest was in reaching out to Jewish Buddhists who wanted to have some way to express their Jewishness.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 286]

“It was in a Buddhist monastery, meditating, “concludes Lew near the end of his volume, “that I realized who I really am. I am a Jew. A Jew can use the practice of meditation to illuminate his or her Jewish soul. And meditation can help us slow down enough so that we can once again experience the beauty of the Jewish path.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 306]

Joachim Prinz noted, in 1973 (in his volume about the community of Jews who faked their lives as Christians for centuries in Spain), the “Jewish” Muslims (the *jadidim*) of the Meshed area of Iran:

“They fast during the holy weeks of Ramadan and also on Yom Kippur, the Jewish Day of Atonement. They celebrate all the Jewish as well as the Mohammedan holidays, but economic necessity forces them to keep their shops open on the Jewish Sabbath … After a hundred years after their incomplete conversion the *jadidim* retain a dual allegiance to the law of the Koran and that of the Torah which poses neither a religious nor a psychological problem for them.” [PRINZ, UJ., 1973, p. 7]

Elsewhere Prinz notes the case of Franz von Mendelssohn, of German Jewish descent, whose family was – for generations – Christian:

“When Hitler came to power the head of the banking house, Franz von Mendelssohn … was president of the Lutheran Churches in Germany … [He] announced that he had resigned from his office in the Church, although, even according to the anti-Jewish Nuremberg Laws, he was considered an Aryan. ‘I feel,’ he said with great emotion, ‘that a descendant of the Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn could no longer pretend’ … ‘[It is] too late,’ he said, ‘Too late for me [to return to Judaism]. I and my ancestors have been brought up as believing Christians for four generations. I can only return to my people, not to its faith. I identify with their pain, their fate, their pride.’ He did not return to Judaism, but his daughter, Eleanora von Mendelssohn, a well-known actress, became an Orthodox Jew.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 12-13]
Famed Holocaust guru Elie Wisel describes French Catholic Cardinal (and possibly the next pope) Jean-Marie Lustiger’s enduring Jewish identity:

“He insists that having been born a Jew, he will die a Jew … [WIESEL, E., 1999, p. 170] … ‘I feel Jewish,’ the archbishop responds. ‘I refuse to renounce my roots, my Jewishness’ …. He goes on to make the point that his Jewishness annoys anti-Semites and that this does not displease him. Why should he make them happy by turning his back on the people they execrate?’ [WIESEL, E., 1999, p. 171] … [He] is determined to remain a son of the Jewish people … He acts accordingly; anyone who requests his assistance in defending a Jewish cause can count on his support … During the scandalous affair of the Carmelite convent a Auschwitz [the ‘scandal’ was that nuns wanted to keep a cross at their convent next to the former concentration camp, against international Jewish demands to take it down], for example, his interventions [on behalf of Jews] must have raised a few eyebrows in Rome. As must his sympathy for the State of Israel, of which he is the most devoted defender inside the Catholic Church.” [WIESEL, E., 1999, p. 171-172]

Simon Wisenthal notes the case of prominent Austrian politician Otto Bauer:

“Jews were the founders of the Social Democratic Party in Austria. Always the leadership was Jewish – from Viktor Adler to Otto Bauer. Yes, Adler became a Protestant but Bauer once said: ‘I am a Jew, but for me is the Judaism not a nation, not a religion, but a shared fate.’ And you cannot leave it because then you are a deserter. This why he remained a Jew.” [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 345]

Secular Jew Stephen Bloom puts Jewish identity like this:

“I was a Jew through and through, from my curly brown hair and robust nose to the synapses in my brain and the corpuscles of my blood. A day, an hour, didn’t go by without my reflecting in some way on my culture and my religion. Religious culture and devotion to faith are two different things, and while I wasn’t willing to become more attached to the organizational rigors of my faith, I wasn’t about to let go of what I carried inside me every day.” [BLOOM S., 2001, p. 21]

Anne Roiphe notes, even in the secular world, the pseudo-religious dimension (the faith) of modern Jewish identity to its tribal foundation, Zionism, and its Israel-centeredness:

“Zionism, religious or political, is still mystical in nature. It requires a passionate emotional commitment to the redemption [of Jews] – it is not a position for rationalists, for universalists. It requires unthinking commitment to one side of the story. It grants the rewards of [Jewish] togetherness.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 31-32]

When professor Blu Greenberg was asked what it meant to her to be a Jew, she replied:
“How can I answer that question? Everything in my life has always been connected to my Jewishness. For me, being Jewish is the same thing as being alive. They’re inseparable.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 25]

As Jean-Francois Steiner has noted about his Jewish identity: “The Jew, more than any other man, realizes himself within his national community; as a Jew he can exist only insofar as he belongs to it.” [STEINER, J., 1967, p. 149]

Meanwhile, the continuing institutionalized efforts of the nationalist Jewish polity to impugn, weaken, and reconstruct non-Jewish organizations to Jewish qualifications is expressed even in continuous attacks upon the Catholic Church. It is another age-old Jewish moral double standard: one application for themselves, and another for others. While unified Jewish lobbying organizations can successfully pressure (using arguments of universalism and ethnic and religious tolerance) even the Vatican to formally excise traditional references to “Jews who killed Christ” in their seminal New Testament literature, (proclaimed by Pope Paul VI in 1965 in a document known as \textit{Nostra Aetate}), the entire foundation of Jewish Talmudic racism, exclusionism, anti-Christian and anti-Gentile malice and chauvinism can go not only unchallenged, but completely unmentioned. \textbf{Always}. And not only does it go unmentioned, but to dare to raise such pertinent subjects is condemned as Gentile bigotry! Israel Shahak notes the supreme Jewish audacity and hypocrisy in still using the Holocaust to guilt-trip Christians into changing aspects of their very religious doctrine (per perceptions of Jews) without getting good faith Jewish “religious adjustments” (or even secular ones) in return.

Take one of the most aggressive Jewish demands in Christian terrain. Riding Gentile sympathy for Jewish suffering in the Holocaust, Jews have successfully demanded a change in official Catholic (and other Christian) belief; the Church has accordingly excised from its formal teachings the notion that Jews were responsible for the crucifixion of Christ. Yet, Jewish religious literature itself actually takes full credit for killing Christ. “According to the Talmud,” notes Israel Shahak, “Jesus was executed by a proper rabbinical court for idolatry, inciting other Jews to idolatry, and contempt of rabbinical authority. All classical Jewish sources which mention his execution are quite happy to take responsibility for it. In the Talmudic account the Romans are not even mentioned.” [SHAHAK, p. ] According to the millennia-old Jewish book about Jesus – \textit{Tol’doth Yeshu}, Jewish professor Joseph Klausner notes that “the sages of Israel recognized [Jesus] and arrested him. They took and hanged him on the eve of Passover.” [KLAUSNER, p. 54] “Jesus,” notes the 1997 \textit{Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion}, “was arrested as a potential revolutionary and executed (by crucifixion) by order of the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate, probably at the instigation of Jewish circles who feared the Roman reaction to messianic agitation.” [WERBLOWSKY, Z., p. 368]

Another Israeli, Israel Shamir, notes the usual dissimulation of modern Jewry, this time regarding the killing of Christ:

“Joseph Dan, a professor of Jewish mysticism in Hebrew University in Jerusalem, writing on the death of Jesus stated, ‘The modern Jewish
apologists, hesitantly adopted by the church, preferred to put the blame on Romans. But the medieval Jew did not wish to pass the buck. He tried to prove that Jesus had to be killed, and he was proud of killing Him. The Jews hated and despised Christ and Christians.’ Actually, adds professor Dan, there is little place to doubt that the Jewish enemies of Jesus cause his execution.” [SHAMIR, I., 2001]

Typically, Jewish professor Ellis Rivkin proposes that Jews could not be responsible for the death of Christ, because it was, rather, the “system’s” fault. “If,” he says, “we are to assess responsibility, we once again find ourselves laying it at the feet of the Roman imperial system … It was not the Jewish people who crucified Jesus, and it was not the Roman people – it was the imperial system, a system that victimized the Jews, victimized the Romans, and victimized the spirit of God.” [author’s emphases: RIVKIN, p. 256] By this all-encompassing victimhood logic then, it is abstract ideas (and not people) that bear ultimate responsibility for human crimes, and we may thereby absolve all victims of German fascism, defined in this manner to include even the Nazi perpetrators themselves, who must be understood as mere pawns, caught in the web of social forces greater than them.

In any case, releasing modern Jews from the group responsibility for the historic accusation that they killed Christ has no forgiveness counterpart in the Jewish community where anti-Christian animosity – and even hatred – runs deep, so much so that Christians are branded as being generically anti-Semitic. Christianity itself is even repeatedly declared by many as a foundation of German Nazism. And a collective guilt is often demanded upon all of Christian heritage.

“The Catholic Church has certainly gone a long way in transforming its theology of Judaism,” liberal Rabbi Byron Sherwin noted in 1992, “particularly in comparison to the way things were before the Second Vatican Council. Theological changes have led to changes in relations with Judaism. The Jewish community, I think, has so far not responded.” [SHERWIN, p. 154-155] “Since the late 1960’s,” says J.J. Goldberg, “the [formal] dialogue [between Christian and Jewish organizations] brought extensive changes in Church teachings about Judaism. Oddly, there has been no reciprocation: to the frustration of Catholic participants, Jewish participants have never agreed to an examination of Jewish teaching, because of an Orthodox ban on interreligious ‘disputation.’” [GOLDBERG, p. 62]

This is an old and enduring Jewish theme. In fact, such one-sided manipulation is an unshakably endemic part of “being Jewish,” as we can see in Karl Marx’s critique about the subject 150 years ago:

“When the Jew demands emancipation from the Christian state, he asks that the Christian state gives up its religious prejudices. Does he, the Jew, give up his religious prejudice? What right, therefore, has he to demand of others the abdication of their religion?” [CRUSE, p. 169]

Jewish myopia on the subject of Christian-Jewish relations is always a given. This is how Rabbi Byron Sherwin, vice-president of the Spertus College of
Judaism in Chicago and advocate of a “dialogue” with Catholicism in Poland completely neglects the self-enforced nationalist, separatist core of Jewish history and identity (noted throughout scholarship everywhere as the Jewish “nation apart” self-conception), charging that common Polish perceptions of this Jewish fact is a foundation for irrational anti-Semitism:

“When I came here [to Poland] for the first time, I was shocked by the terminology ‘Polish nation’ and ‘Jewish nation.’ This terminology assumes that, even though they lived in Poland, the Jews were not part of the Polish nation or people. If you start with the assumption that someone is an outsider, that very assumption is the basis for prejudice.”

[SHERWIN, p. 162]

Sherwin’s view, of course, represents the best (most Jews do not even feign a working relationship with the organized Catholic community) the Jewish community has in “dialogue” with Catholicism. Sherwin’s view is the usual historical revisionism (via the modern myths of multicultural tolerance) to completely gloss over endemic – past and enduring – Jewish ethnocentrism. Jews have always understood themselves everywhere in their diaspora as “outsiders.”

In 1976 a Catholic priest, Father Andrew Greeley, wrote with agitation about the ages-old Jewish double moral standard:

“A Jewish leader chided me because Catholics were not vigorous enough in their support of Israel. It was not, he told me, high enough on our agenda. I asked him how high Ulster was on his. He told me that was different. How different?”

After addressing continuous anti-Catholic prejudice in America, Father Greeley then added, “The point is that such attitudes are so unquestionably held by the New York liberal intellectual establishment (and particularly by its Jewish component) that they have become indiscussible assumptions.” [GREELEY, p. 75]

The continuous exhortations by Jews to crucify Christianity itself (and particularly the Catholic Church) as innately malevolent is institutionalized in the Jewish community. The Christian faith is relentlessly forced into a defensive posture against an omnipresent Jewish ideological aggression that ceaselessly makes demands from its self-celebrated position of higher moral certitude (per its “unique” Holocaust perch). The Catholic Church is especially badgered and harassed as worldwide Jewry demands a humbling “apology” for not doing more to help the Jews in World War II; some Jews go so far as to insinuate that Catholic church members were somehow active murderers. The Jewish onslaught of Catholicism is so incessant, and accepted by the western mass media so unquestioningly, that in 1997 the New York Times ran a headline proclaiming:

“Apology and the Holocaust. The Pope’s In a Confessional and the Jews are Listening.” [BOHLEN, p. 10]

Let us reflect upon the conceptual implications here. The traditional form of a confession is this: the confessor (the Pope) gets on his knees to the listener/pardoner (the Jews) who mediates between confessor and God. In January 1998
the *Jewish Week* interviewed new Anti-Defamation League chairman Howard Berkowitz who – with nine other audacious associates – were soon to visit the Pope in the Vatican. What for? Interfaith “dialogue?” Berkowitz said that

“We want to talk to him about opening the Vatican archives as they relate to World War II … We want to see baptismal records and other documents regarding the church’s activities during the Holocaust. We have developed a good relationship with members of his senior staff and we want to explore these things.” [AIN, S., ADL, p. 9]

Here then we have the ADL and the World Jewish Congress, poised as self-appointed police powers, *chutzpah*-supreme, arrogantly demanding another religious organization’s private records, as part of the Grand Jewish Inquisition. If the Jewish Interrogators have only Goodness at heart, let us suggest that, in good faith, they first open their own closets for public scrutiny (as the ADL was so reluctant to do when sued by a host of individuals and organizations for illegal spying upon them in 1993). Especially interesting would be to see how they act in America as foreign agents for Israel. A confessional to kneel down and come clean to the American people is always open to them.

“Heep in the files of the State Department,” notes Catholic priest and sociologist Andrew Greeley in 1997, “someone found a dispatch from the 1940s reporting a rumor that Nazi money stolen from Jews had ended up in the vaults at the Vatican. B’nai B’rith, adopting the tone of a prosecuting attorney, has demanded access to Vatican archives to determine whether the rumor is true.” [GREELEY, 1997, p. B14] Greeley’s newspaper editorial was called “Cheap Shots at Catholic Church.”

For decades now, since the “Holocaust,” Jewish organizations have been aggressively lobbying the Catholic church for religious concessions (and more). In a 1960s case, Jewish commentator James Yaffe suggested concerted Jewish intrigue:

“Much has been written about Jewish influence on Vatican II [changes in formal Church perspectives about Jews]: how ADL and AJC both sent lobbyists to Rome; how Cardinal Cushing of Boston set up an audience with the Pope for Rabbi Heschel and the Jewish Theological Seminary; how an audience was granted to the wife of a millionaire who had just given a large endowment to Pro Deo University; how an audience was granted was to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg; how Rabbi Tanenbaum was the only Jew left in the Vatican when the statement as finally issued. It’s a good story, a kind of theological James Bond adventure.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 48]

In 1998, concerning another concerted Jewish demand, “in a long awaited apology,” the Pope publicly proclaimed regret for the “errors and failures” of Roman Catholics during the Holocaust era. “The apology,” noted the *Boston Herald*, “contained in a 12-page document released in Rome yesterday wasn’t good enough for Jewish leaders in Boston and around the world who said the statement was ‘too little too late.’” [SULLIVAN, p. 10] “It is ironic,” wrote David Novak, himself Jewish, “that the Pope should be the focus of criticism, inas-
much as there has been no other pontiff in modern times, perhaps in all history, who has done more to develop a rapprochement with the Jewish people and Judaism … My own view is that the Jewish response [to the Pope’s “apology”] is largely mistaken, and that it reflects a misunderstanding not only of Catholic theology but of Jewish theology as well. The Jewish leaders’ reactions were not just uncharitable, they were also unjust.” [NOVAK, 1999]

In 1992, a similar concentrated Jewish attack upon the entire nation of (largely Catholic) France was fielded by President François Mitterand. The Jewish community was pressuring the government to issue a public apology for anti-Semitism during World War II. Mitterand refused. “The issue,” noted the (Montreal) Gazette,” is one of the most emotional in modern France.” [GAZETTE, 7-15-92]

In 1999, on the occasion of the Pope’s visit to Israel, the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz began a story with the following, reflecting the intense Jewish antipathy towards Catholicism:

“It is important to bear in mind that the extermination of the Jews during the Holocaust was conceived and perpetrated by Hitler, not by the Catholic Church. For Europeans, this almost goes without saying. In Israel in recent years however, one might have got a rather different impression.” [CREMONESI, L., 3-22-2000]

In any of a myriad of possible ways the Pope offends the Jewish community. His 1987 crime? He met with Kurt Waldheim, the head of the United Nations who was assailed by Jewish groups for alleged Nazi connections during World War II. When the Pope later visited San Francisco, local Jews found cause to march in street demonstrations against the Catholic leader. The local left-wing Jewish magazine, Tikkun, even took out ads in the local media declaring that “The Catholic Church has been responsible for the deaths of more Jews than the PLO [Palestinian Liberation Organization].” [BIALE/ROSENBAUM, p. 251] The chief rabbi, Robert Kirschner, of San Francisco’s oldest synagogue, Temple Emanu-El, took the occasion to preach an especially zealous sermon about the “anti-Judaism” of Catholicism. David Biale and Fred Rosenbaum note the immediate results of his anti-Christian attack in the liberal San Francisco community:

“Kirschner wept when he learned of a specific case in which a Catholic woman, accompanying her Jewish husband to the temple for the first time, became distraught upon hearing the sermon and, convinced that Jews regularly preached hatred of Christianity, vowed never to return to the synagogue again. Other mixed couples put letters under his office door, informing him, in several instances, that his remarks had driven a wedge between husband and wife.” [BIALE/ROSENBAUM, p. 258]

A Jewish folk singer, Hugh Blumenfeld, noted in 1999 American Jewish resistance to even listen to a song of “whimsy” he had written about Jesus:

“It’s funny. They had a great time with it all through Israel. But with an American Jewish audience, sometimes all you have to do is say the word ‘Jesus’ and they go ballistic.” [KATZ-STONE, 1999, p. 47]
The Jewish resistance to a mutually honest and open dialogue between the two faiths runs deep in the Jewish community; for Jews, “interfaith dialogue” is simply Christian theological concessions demanded by Jewish attackers. Another typical example of Jewish enmity for Christians was Rabbi Barry Cytron’s disturbing experience in a Minnesota-area Jewish-Christian interfaith dialogue program he helped to pioneer. The first presentation, by Jewish and Christian religious authorities, was to a mostly Catholic, and a minority Protestant, audience. They, wrote Rabbi Cytron, “welcomed the opportunity to hear our thoughts. The questions they asked were challenging and thought provoking. Most of all, they were gracious and hospitable.” The second interfaith presentation was before a Jewish audience whose mood “was not warm and gracious, but cold and angry. [They weren’t] particularly interested in dialogue … Why were they so angry? Why so unrelenting in their view of Christianity? Why so harsh in their judgments?” [CYTRON, p. 11-12]

(Compare this kind of widespread Jewish animosity for Christianity with Stanley Lippman’s acceptance as a computer programmer for the Board of Global Ministries of the World Methodist Church. This organization even paid for his further studies – a master’s degree in computer science. Lippman is today the “principal software engineer” at Walt Disney Studios. [SIEGEL-ITZKOVICH, J., 7-20, 98] Can we imagine a comparable openness to Gentile employment in the heart of the Jewish Theological Seminary, which is only a few blocks away in Manhattan from the Methodist center?)

As Jewish author James Yaffe noted in 1968:

“The Jew and the Christian enter into dialogue for entirely different motives. The Christian wants to learn more about Judaism and Jewish life. His sense of guilt has made him dissatisfied with his present view of Christianity; he hopes to find values in Judaism which will help him rethink his Christian ideas. But the Jew’s motive is much simpler. He wants Christian anti-Semitism to come to an end. He wants the Christian to admit the harm he’s done and stop doing it. He may not be conscious that he has this motive. He may sincerely believe that he has joined the dialogue in order to exchange ideas, broaden his horizons, learn more about Christianity. But once the formalities are over, anti-Semitism is the only subject he really wants to discuss.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 47]

This is the Jewish polemic Walter Jacob noted about the rival faith in 1974, in his volume Christianity Through Jewish Eyes:

“Many [Jewish] thinkers, and a host of minor writers, preachers, and essayists, used the new found freedom from the ghetto as an opportunity to vent their feelings against the religion of the oppressor … In Western Europe, after Voltaire, almost anything could be said with impunity … The beginnings of this Jewish study of Christianity were rather angry, as if polemic were necessary to arouse interest in the problem and the air had to be cleared before a true discussion could begin … The complacency of the Christian majority had to be shaken and Judaism shown to be an equal, if not superior, form of religion.” [JACOB, W., 1974, p. 2]
Such Jewish attitudes are long standing. And “angry” Jewish polemics continues unabated. A sympathetic book (*The Nazarene*) by prominent Jewish author Sholem Asch in the 1950s about Jesus Christ even caused him to be “isolated from a significant portion of the American Jewish intellectual establishment.” The ostracized work’s crime, notes Peter Goldsmith, was that it was “an attempt to claim a place for Jesus among figures of Jewish inspiration.” [GOLDSMITH, P., p. 88]

In 1997 Oakland, California’s Catholic Holy Names College (whose faculty, quite liberally, is about 10% Jewish) faced newsworthy controversy when a number of Jewish faculty members complained about a play being produced on campus about Edith Stein, a Jew who made the decision to become a Catholic nun in 1933 in Poland. Promotional photographs for the play were attacked for making the actress playing Stein look “grim and serious” as a Jew and happier as a Catholic. “The pictures sent a certain feeling through me,” said Martin Lampert, a Jewish professor of psychology at the college, they “could be viewed as: Judaism isn’t the way to go but Christianity is.” [CAPLANE, p. 1a]

“Christmas,” says popularly known Jewish polemicist and lawyer, Alan Dershowitz, “the most joyous holiday to Christians, has been among the most dreaded of days throughout Jewish history … The nativity scene … is not a religious symbol …; it is an insult to the memory of the many Jews for not accepting the divine birth depicted in the ‘secular’ nativity scene.” [DERSHOWITZ, CHUTZPAH, p. 332] The idea that the nativity scene is not a religious symbol is of course strange news to the millions of Christians who had been thinking it was. As we see here, and time and time again, for the many Jews like Dershowitz (who pride themselves on being “liberal,” “open-minded,” et al) being a Christian is to be a virtual criminal, a living “insult” to Jews.

Likewise there is deep Jewish contempt for Easter, the day Christians celebrate in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. When popular Jewish theologian Emil Fackenheim thinks of Easter, for instance, he insists upon somehow seeing Jewish dead bodies and Nazi concentration camps; Christianity is equated with German fascism: “[Christianity’s] greatest celebration has unhappy memories for Jews – and, after Auschwitz, for conscientious Christians too.” [FACKENHEIM, HOLO, p. 18] “Our [daughter] Kate,” adds Jewish author Ann Roiphe, “does not believe in Christian charity (reports of pogroms have caused her to regard Easter as more than a matter of bunnies and jelly beans).” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 13]

In 1999, prominent author Mary McCarthy took offense to depictions of Christianity in Philip Roth’s novel *The Counterlife*. “I’m not a Christian (I don’t believe in God),” she wrote to him, “but to the extent that I am and can’t help being one (just as a ‘nice Jewish boy’ can’t help being Jewish), I bridle at your picture of Christianity. There’s more to Christmas trees, that is, to the idea of Incarnation, than Jew hatred … I confess that the crib with angels and animals and a star is to me a more sympathetic idea than the Wailing Wall.” [MCCARTHY, p. 98]

In 1999, Eugene Fisher, Associate Director of the Secretariat for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops,
wrote with concern about the continual shrillness of Jewish attack upon the Church:

“Many Catholics are understandably confused as to why some in the Jewish community feel constrained to second guess so much of what are, after all, internal matters of the life of the church … Why beat up Catholics all the time. Why not go after somebody else once and a while? … So how is it that when we recognize our American story in the Jewish-American story, many Jews seem to miss what is to us the obvious point, that to attack the papacy is to raise up for us the specter of the Nativist bigotry we thought we had left behind after John F. Kennedy’s campaign for the Presidency? … If Jews are to communicate with American Catholics, there will need to be a softening of the rhetoric until the volume is turned down enough so that we Catholics can hear what they are saying. Right now, the discourse is too loud to be comprehensible.” [FISHER, E., 9-11-99]

In 1999 too, the Vatican’s liaison to the Jewish community, Edward Cardinal Cassidy, broke off discussions with the Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultation, an organization that tended to function as an appendage of the World Jewish Congress (the WJC, as well as the Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, and other Jewish organizations, has been consistently publishing critical reports about Vatican policies). [GREENBERG, Dealing, 1999, p. 12] “Those secular organizations that pretended to be the sole representatives of world Jewry, as far as we are concerned, are not valid [interfaith discussion] partners,” complained Vatican aide, Father Remi Hoeckman, “They are campaigning against the Church.” [GREENBERG, Battle, 1999, p. 13] A special problem too is that Orthodox Jewish organizations are never part of the “interfaith dialogue” process. As the Jewish Week notes, traditional elitist Jewish thinking holds that Jews “should not engage in theological discussions with gentiles.” [GREENBERG, Battle, 1999, p. 13]

Christians are everywhere bullied by demanding Jewish accusers. Rabbi Daniel Lapin has expressed concern about Jewish bigotry towards the Christian faith:

“To attempt to intimidate people of other faiths into being afraid to speak openly of their beliefs is, in my mind, one of the most foolhardy things the Jewish community has ever done. It is wrong. It is immoral. It is hypocritical. And it is dreadfully unwise politics. Let us pray that it doesn’t come back to haunt us.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 289]

In 1998 Jewish scholar Susannah Heschel openly explained the concerted Jewish effort to reconstruct Christianity to Jewish wishes in today’s academe, a formidable base for attack in American society at-large:

“Jewish studies [at universities] emerged not as a politically neutral field concerned with describing the history of the Jews but as a politically charged effort to reconceive Christian history as well … Telling the story of Christ’s origins from a Jewish perspective was an act of Jewish self-empowerment … Jewish theologians initiated an effort to destroy
the image of Judaism in Christian theology as part of their project of self-definition ... Modern Jewish thought has been formed not simply by creating a Jewish historical narrative but by attempting a rebirth of the Christian mythic potential under Jewish auspices ... The modern Jewish retelling of Christian origins is not merely a matter of Jews wishing to ‘set the record straight.’ Rather, it demonstrates Jewish desire to enter the Christian myth, become its hero, and claim the power inherent in it.” [HERSCHEL, S., p. 107, 109, 110]

This – which is based upon the Jewish creation, enforcement, and exploitation of Christian “guilt” for the Holocaust, politically melded to the myths of the state of Israel – is evidenced popularly in the following Business Week news item in 1998:

“Organizers of the Israel Jubilee Conference, scheduled for April 29 through May 3 in Orlando, Florida, today announced a massive effort to mobilize America’s estimated 15 million pro-active, pro-Israel Christians to strike a blow against anti-Semitism in the United States and around the world. During the coming weeks, 50,000-100,000 Christians are expected to sign a pledge of solidarity with Israel, making a ‘personal commitment to view any anti-Semitic act against a Jewish individual, family, business, or synagogue as an act against one’s own church, and to oppose it by every means possible.” [BUSINESS WEEK]

Meanwhile, Jews relentlessly subvert, attack, and deconstruct whatever might be defined as a “Christian” world view (and never the Jewish one) throughout American culture. In the academic world of art, for example, Jewish art historian Eunice Lipton admitted in 1996 that

“There is a relentless subversion of Christian art that proceeds in the work of many Jewish art historians.” [LIPTON, p. 288]

In an article that notes widespread Gentile avoidance of saying anything that could be remotely construed as even slightly offensive to Jewry, Jewish professor Nancy Jo Silberman-Federman closes her article about humorous Hanukkah cards by describing this one, a put-down of Christian tradition:

“Cha*nu*kah (Kha’no’ka), n: 1. Festive holiday when people of Jewish ancestry joyously celebrate not having to put a large dead pine in their living room.” [SILBERMAN-FEDERMAN, p. 227]

When in recent years Stephen Dubner rejected his parents’ conversion from Judaism to Christianity, he gravitated towards Jewish Orthodoxy and an old theme. “The more vigorously I embraced Judaism,” he said, “the more vigorously I was inclined to assail Catholicism.” [ELIE, p. 19] (“On what grounds had [my father] so grossly obliterated my birthright?” proclaimed Dubner, “What kind of Jew would do that to a son?” [DUBNER, p. 228]) The influential late 19th century Jewish historian, Heinrich Graetz, once even wrote his friend Moses Hess (early theorist of what became Zionism), saying, “We must above all work to shatter Christianity.” [LINDEMANN, ESAU’S, p. 91] Animosity towards Catholicism and betraying Jewish “self-haters” is so great among Jews that in Argentina, Orthodox Jews even “boycotted the 1985” [Catholic-Jewish

“It may be the effect of working on this book for many months now,” wrote author Ann Roiphe about her project on the Jewish persecution tradition and Jewish identity in America, “it may be the result of constant reading of Jewish history, but I am feeling a new and peculiar irrational hostility to my Christian neighbors … The Gospel according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John works as well as reciting the story of the little pigs to Jack the Ripper as he is about to go out into the London night.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 121]

In Israel, the ancient Jewish contempt and hatred for – and discrimination against – Christianity is institutionalized. The former Sephardic Chief Rabbi of Israel, Ovadiah Yosef, when asked what a Jew should do when he comes across a Bible that contains both the Old and New Testaments, advised that the Christian part should be torn out and burned. [SHULWEISS, p. 56-57] (In 2000, Ovadia’s grandson, Yonatan Yosef made the international Jewish news when he “was accused of stockpiling weapons for a right-wing organization that attacks Arabs.”) [GLEIT/HAUSMAN, 2-18-00] The popular American musical play, Jesus Christ Superstar, was banned in Israel. [AVISHAI, B., p. 301]

Also in the Jewish state, Yeshofat Harakabi noted with dismay in 1989 that “two young men exhumed the body of a Christian woman who had not converted to Judaism from her grave in a Jewish cemetery, even though she had lived for many years as a member of the secular Jewish community, and her son had served in the Israeli army and regarded himself as a Jew. The two were tried and convicted but, as was reported in the press, the local religious court and the Israeli Chief Rabbinate in Jerusalem expressed support for the deed.” [HARKABI, p. 180-181] Such Orthodox defilation and grave-robbing was against the Anghelevici family, whose matriarch, a Gentile, born a Christian, had married a Jew. After repeated insistence by the family that she be buried next to her daughter in a Jewish cemetery, “the body was found one morning flung on the outskirts of a nearby Moslem cemetery.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 176]

Georges Tamarin noted in 1973 that “the Hebrew University decided to remove a group of statues representing Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed donated by a famous sculptor, because of the angry reaction of some Orthodox professors. The trustees of the Mann Auditorium in Tel Aviv refused to accept the donation of an organ, since some of the spectators might be reminded of a church; the directors of Kol Yisrael felt obliged to explain why it permitted Prof. Flusser to mention the life of Jesus (which might have a missionary influence!) in a talk about the significance of the Galilee.” [TAMARIN, p. 59]

“According to a recent report in the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz,” noted Rabbi Harold Schulweiss in 1989, “Rabbi Eliezer Waldenburg, the winner of the Israeli prize in Judaica, stated that he supported ‘the application of the halacha that a Gentile should not live in Jerusalem.’ According to Rabbi Waldenburg, ‘in order to apply the halacha correctly, we should have to expel all Gentiles from Jerusalem and purify it completely.’ Another Ha’aretz report tells us that the Sephardic chief rabbi of Israel, Mordechai Eliyahu, interprets halac-
As forbidding Jews in Israel from selling apartments – ‘not even one’ – to Gentiles.” [SCHULWEISS, p. 57] Earlier, noted Michael Jansen, “there has been violence against Gentile places of worship and two Russian nuns living in the Ein Karem suburb of Jerusalem were murdered.” [JANSEN, p. 17] In 1983, a group of students from a Jewish religious school disrupted a classical music concert in Jerusalem featuring Handel’s “Messiah” (which is based on a Christian theme). [JANSEN, p. 16] “It was learned afterward that Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi Avraham Shapiro had sanctioned a nonviolent demonstration [against the Handel concert].” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 59] And Uri Huppert reports that in 1984

“a Jerusalem church was damaged in an attack similar to the torching of a Baptist Church in the summer of 1983. That attack was reminiscent of an attack on a much wider scale twenty years earlier, when one thousand yeshiva students went on a wild rampage against Catholic churches in Jaffa, Haifa, and Jerusalem.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, pp. 109-110]

In 2000, notes the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz,

“[A U.S. State Department report gives] special emphasis to the plight of Jehovah’s Witnesses [in Israel] … This year’s report says that 120 complaints [about Jewish harassment] submitted to the police by members of this sect in 1998 and 1999 went unanswered.” [RATNER, D., 9-21-2000]

In 1997, the Israeli newspaper Yediot Ahronot reported that

“Two weeks ago on Saturday night hundreds of Orthodox Jews broke into the community’s place of worship, totally demolished it and stole the public address equipment. The books and pamphlets were piled in the yard and a large bonfire was lit. While the books were burning, Orthodox Jews danced around the bonfire. Alvin Neupot, a veteran member of the Jehovah’s Witnesses community said, ‘… Although the destruction and arson took place on the main street, a short distance from the home of Member of the Knesset Maxim Levy, who is also Lydda’s mayor, and hundreds of people danced around the bonfire, no one stopped them. Only when the owner of an adjacent shop feared that the fire would spread, were the police called in.’” [KOREN, 3-30-97]

In 1997, a news report noted the horrible case of a Jew in New Jersey:

“A jury recommended a life sentence on Monday for a Jewish man who said he drugged and suffocated his children because he could not allow his ex-wife to raise them as Christians. Attorneys for Avi Kostner, 52, argued that mental illness had warped his sense of reality, and pushed him to kill his children.” [SUN-SENTINEL, p. 3A]

In 1990, 150 Jewish nationalist zealots aggravated religious tensions during Easter week in the Old City of Jerusalem by moving into a 72-room building, St. John’s Hospice, in the center of the Christian quarter, “only yards” from the Holy Sepulcher, the reputed site of the tomb of Jesus in Christian tradition. The intention was to establish a strong Jewish presence towards eventual expansion throughout all non-Jewish sectors of the Old City. The unspoken long-term
intention is to make the whole area Jewish. “Armed Jewish settlers,” notes Glenn Frankel, “escorted by Israeli police, had occupied the site in the middle of the night …, a move that caused howls of protests from Christian leaders in the United States and Europe and deeply embarrassed American Jewish leaders.” [FRANKEL, p. 232] “For ten days,” says Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, “the Israeli government denied any role in the event. Finally it admitted that it had secretly funneled $1.8 million to the group, 40% of the cost of subletting the complex.” [OSTROVSKY, p. 334]

Six years earlier, Israeli journalist Lesley Hazeleton noted an incident involving an American Jew in the Holy City:

“Only a few months in Israel, [he] had joined a yeshiva provocatively set up in the Moslem Quarter of the Old City, and rented a room in the Christian Quarter nearby. On Easter Saturday that year, which was also Shabbat, a Syrian Orthodox procession returning from services at the Holy Sepulcher had paused beneath his window, headed by a troop of boy scouts playing drums. The drums drove him mad with anger; they were an intolerable desecration of the holiness of his Sabbath day. So he had poured a cauldron of boiling water onto the boys in the street below. Five were taken to the hospital for treatment of burns.” [HAZELETON, L., 1984, p. 109]

In 2001, The Jewish Week noted:

“Violence against Christians in Jerusalem appears to be rising as concerns increase over the millennium and its affect on fervent cult groups making pilgrimages to the Holy Land, Israeli officials said this week. Jerusalem police said they are investigating a recent wave of threats and assaults against Christian organizations in Jerusalem. In one incident, vandals hurled stones at Jerusalem’s St. Andrew’s Church of Scotland two weeks ago, breaking several of its stained-glass windows. In another wave of incidents, photographs of a bullet shot through the forehead of one of the Swiss Catholic women whose apartment in the ultra-Orthodox neighborhood of Mea She’arim was burned down last November were plastered outside two churches and a Bible bookstore on New Year’s Eve, police said … The bookstore, a non-denominational organization, publishes Bibles in different languages. [Owner Judy] McClean believes the incident was the result of [Jewish ultra-Orthodox] hareidi violence against Christian organizations.” [GREENBERG, E., 1-22-99, p. 45]

In 2001, Russian/Israeli Israel Shamir noted that:

“On Christmas Eve, according to a report in the Jerusalem local paper Kol Ha-Ir, Hassids customarily do not read holy books, as it could save Jesus from eternal punishment (the Talmud teaches that Jesus boils in hell). This custom was dying out, but Hassids, the fervent nationalists, brought it back to life. I still remember old Jews spitting while passing by a church, and cursing the dead, while passing by a Christian cemetery. Last year in Jerusalem, a Jew decided to refresh the tradition. He spat at [the] Holy Cross, carried in the procession along the city. Police
saved him from further trouble, but the court fined him $50, despite his
claim that he just fulfilled his religious duty.” [SHAMIR, I., 2001]

In 1999, in a clear policy to politically “divide and conquer” Arabs of Christ-
tian and Muslim faith in Israel, the Israeli government allowed a mosque to
built in Jesus Christ’s hometown, Nazareth, next to a hallowed Christian shrine.
Israeli policy on the matter, noted the Los Angeles Times, “set off bitter recrimi-
nations between the Vatican and Israel … The Vatican said Israel bore the
responsibility for ‘creating the basis for instigating divisions.’ “The decision of
the Israeli government,” noted a Vatican spokesman, “seems to lay the founda-
tion for future conflicts and tensions between the two communities, Christian
and Islam.” [LA TIMES, 11-24-99]

In 1997 a proposed bill was even sent to the Israeli Knesset [parliament] to
make mere possession of [Christian] “missionary” literature in the Jewish state
a criminal offense. “Will it be illegal,” wondered a Christian observer in Israel,
“to possess a New Testament?” [HALEVI, Y, p. 17-18] Also in Israel, in recent
history the messianic Gush Emunim organization has revitalized a Middle-
Ages Jewish prayer requesting God to see to it that Christians, Jewish apostates,
and heretics “may perish instantly.” “This process of reversion,” noted Israel
Shahak, “happened in the period when the Catholic Church … removed from
its Good Friday service a prayer which asked the Lord to have mercy on Jews,
eretics, etc. This prayer was thought by most Jewish leaders to be offensive
and even anti-Semitic.” [SHAHAK, p. 93]

“Even today,” notes another Israeli author, Israel Shamir,

“Jews in Israel refer to Jesus by the demeaning word Yeshu (instead of
Yeshua), meaning ‘Perish his name.’ There is an ongoing argument,
whether His name was turned into a swear word, or [the] other way
around. In a similar pun, the Gospel is called ‘Avon Gilaion,’ the booklet
of Sin.” [SHAMIR, I., 2001]

In the context of all this, Rabbi Yechiel Epstein, founder and president of the
International Fellowship of Christians and Jews (IFCJ), has yet managed to
acquire over $20 million in donations from well-meaning (and incredibly igno-
rant) American Christians to finance immigration to Israel and the absorption
of Russians and Ethiopian Jews into the Jewish state. [COHEN, C., 1999] In
1999, the IFCJ commissioned a Gallup poll in Israel, discovering – to their
shock – that 75 percent of the Israeli respondents knew so little about Chris-
tianity that they were not even aware that December 25 was a Christian holiday.
As Israel Shamir notes about such exploited, and gullible, Christians:

“The majority of the Christian Zionists are simple misled souls, people
of good intentions but little knowledge. They think they ‘support Jews,’
but they promote the Christ-hating spirit among the Jews. It was not in
vain that a hero of the Zionist Bible, Leon Uris [author of Exodus], kept a
poster in his room saying ‘We crucified Christ.’ It was not in vain that an
Israeli soldier on the roadblock to Bethlehem told me yesterday, ‘We
starve the beasts. It was not in vain that the Gospel was burned on a stake
Israel, while anti-Gospel literature is widely spread; that new immigrant
Jews embracing Christianity are persecuted and deported; that every preacher of the Christian faith in Israel can be sent to jail according to new anti-Christian laws; that Israeli archeologists erase the Christian holy sites and memories off the face of the Holy Land.”) [SHAMIR, I., 2001]

Conversely, while Israelis know nothing about Christianity but disdain, a massive pro-Israel lobby does a virtually air-tight job in socializing Christian tourists in Israel to one-sided Jewish propaganda: particularly emphasizing the theme of noble Jewish defense against hostile, antisemitic Arabs. As James Wall, former editor of The Christian Century and a visitor to Israel nearly twenty times, noted in 2000:

“Another brick in the passionate firewall that defends Israel from criticism is less well known but no less effective – the systematic development and control of the tourist trade among American Christian church pastors and laity. In controlling its Bible land tourism, Israel can insure that tour members hear only good things about Israel and can make it difficult for tourists to have any sort of meaningful discourse with Palestinians.” [WALL, J., 2000, p. 9]

Dominated by Jewish tour guides, few Christian tourists ever get to even see Christian Palestinians, let alone hear their version of the Israel-Arab conflict. Many American pastors are even provided free trips to Israel by tour agencies as bait to bring paying parishioners later. “The pastors are nominal tour leaders under the Israeli-approved guides,” says Wall, “… These experiences are almost always devoid of any interaction with Palestinian Christian organizations.” [WALL, J., 2000, p. 10]

Back in America, meanwhile, Jewish lobbying organizations continue to intrude upon and disrupt Christian affairs – local or international – with impunity. In 2001, the Simon Wiesenthal Center embarked on a campaign to economically boycott the international YMCA center in Geneva because the Jewish lobbying group didn’t like a YMCA report that criticized Israel’s abuse of Palestinians. The Wiesenthal organization also had the gall to lodge a formal protest in 1993 with the Vatican for its consideration of the sainthood of Pope Pius XII. His alleged crime? Doing nothing to save the Jews during World War II. “While it is normally not the practice of non-Catholics to comment on the worthiness of the Church’s candidates for sainthood,” wrote the Center’s Rabbi Marvin Hier, “Pope Pius XII must surely qualify as an exception to the rules.” [RESPONSE, p. 10, Spring 1993] (Likewise, Jewish lobbying groups – ever meddling in Christian internal affairs – found “insult” and “mischief” with the Russian Orthodox Church’s decision to canonize the last of Russian’s Romanov tsars, Nicholas II). [FORWARD, 8-25-00, p. 8]

In 1999, a controversial book by non-Jewish author John Cornwell rode the wave of popular Jewish hostility towards the much maligned Pope. Sensationally entitled “Hitler’s Pope,” the essence of this hack-job volume may be gleaned by this extraordinary editorial comment from Commonweal magazine: “Once again, the conventional wisdom seems to treat Catholicism and fascism as synonyms.” [COMMONWEAL, 11-5-99]
Cornwell condemns Pope Pius XII as an anti-Semite; his main piece of evidence is a single letter he found in which the Pope speaks harshly about his own experience with Jewish communists who headed a violent coup in post-World War I Germany. “Pacelli’s [the Pope’s] constant harping on the Jewishness of this party of power usurpers [Bolsheviks],” asserts Cornwell, “is consistent with the growing and widespread belief among Germans that the Jews were the instigators of the Bolshevik revolution, their principal aim was the destruction of Christian civilization. But there is something about the passage that is repugnant and ominous. The repeated references to the Jewishness of these [communist] individuals, amid the catalogue of epithets describing their physical and moral repulsiveness, gives an impression of stereotypical anti-Semitic contempt.” [CORNWELL, p. 75]

Among the critical responses to Cornwell’s book was that of Ronald Rychlak, who argues that Cornwell’s book was “not a work of honest scholarship, and was written to justify a conclusion that had been reached in advance.” [RYCHLAK, R., 4-2000] Rychlak attacks Cornwell’s theses from the very start of the book – its cover:

“[The book] carried a picture of Pacelli dressed in formal diplomatic regalia as he leaves a reception given for German President Hindenburg in 1927. Beside him stands a soldier of the Weimar republic. Those who do not recognize the differences in uniform details could easily confuse the Weimar soldier with a Nazi soldier because their distinctive and similar helmets. Use of this photograph, especially when coupled with such a provocative title as Hitler’s Pope: The Secret History of Pius XII, gives the impression that Pope Pius XII is leaving a meeting with Hitler. Unfortunately, this is not the only dishonest aspect of the book.” [RYCHLAK, R., 4-2000]

The Jewish attack on Pope Pius XII had become a crusade. Washington Post columnist Richard Cohen had joined in with his own syndicated column, proclaiming that “Pius XII is unsuited for sainthood.” [COHEN, R., p. 11A] For Rabbi Hier’s part, he later added that “there is no denying that Pius XII did wonderful work to rescue the Jews of Rome in late ‘43 and ‘44. But where was he when he could have made a difference in saving the lives of six million Jews?” [SULLIVAN, p. 10]

Hier refers to the fact that the Pope, even according to Jewish researcher Picas Lipid, was instrumental in saving as many as 800,000 Jewish lives. [WENISCH, p. 7D] In 1958, at Pope Pius IX’s death, then-Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Emir stated that “we share in the grief of humanity when fearful martyrdom came to our people, the Pope’s voice was raised for its victims … We mourn a great servant of peace.” [WENISCH, p. 7D]

In broader perspective, Rabbi Hier’s moral chauvinism and chutzpah in meddling in Church business is mind-boggling. While the Pope is condemned for the crime of “silence,” in June 1994 the Chicago Tribune noted that another rabbi (Orthodox, just like Hier) had something very public to say. Rabbi Shlomo Goren made a public call for all Jews to commit murder. In the midst of the
painstaking peace process between Israel and the Palestinians, Rabbi Goren declared that “as long as [Palestinian leader Yassar Arafat] declares jihad against the Jews and works to wrest Jerusalem from our hands, his status is that of one who intends to kill, and every Jew is commanded to kill him.” [HUNDLEY, p 1, 6]

Is Rabbi Goren a nut? A madman convinced that his religion tells its followers to kill people? An obscure fanatic that no one would ever take seriously? Rabbi Goren was the closest thing to a Pope a Jew can be. From 1973 to 1983 he was the Chief Ashkenazi Rabbi of Israel. The public call for Arafat’s murder also came from a Jerusalem City Councilman, Shmuel Meir (who was not reprimanded by the mayor), and Knesset member Hanan Porat. Can we imagine in the 1990s a Pope or a priest publicly announcing that all Christians should join in murder, as religious policy, like the Jews? (This commandment to kill [called a *din rodef*] is sanctioned by Jewish tradition. In 1999, the Chief Sephardic Rabbi of Jerusalem, Shalom Masbash, even issued such a death sentence against two Jewish members of his own congregation. [WORLD PRESS REVIEW, 7-99])

Rest assured no Wiesenthal letters of complaint headed out to Israel in protest of a living former Jewish “Pope,” or any other rabbi, commanding murder. Rather, they would turn to assail some imagined Christian slight against Jews, like for instance, the formal Simon Wiesenthal Center complaint against a Memphis-area intra-Christian organization of sixty Black and White churches organized to fight racism along Christian tenets. Their crime? They didn’t invite Jews to a Christian organization. [RESPONSE, p. 11, WINTER 1992] (What intra-Jewish religious aggregation – encompassing Orthodox, Reform, Conservative, Falasha, Sephardim, or any other conceivable expressly Jewish conglomeration – has, for any purpose, ever included Christians?)

In 2001, Israel’s Chief Rabbi Meir Lau broadened the Jewish religious sanction of murder. As the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* reported, while the Jewish state was being internationally condemned for its policy of assassinations against Palestinians:

“Israel’s practice of killing Palestinian militants has the full backing of Jewish religious law, according to a statement made yesterday by Chief Rabbi Israel Meir Lau. Quoting ancient sages and Biblical passages, Lau explained that Israel is now fighting a war of commandment, mandated by God. Lau referred to an oft-quoted Jewish precept, He who comes to kill you, rise up and kill him first.” [HAARETZ, 7-27-01]

The Jewish strategy to propel Jewish chauvinism under the shield of the values of pluralistic tolerance in the lands in which they live, and at the same time attack parallel expressions of Christian solidarity, is not new. The respected historian, D. W. Brogan, noted its existence, for example, in France of the 1880s:

“In certain parts of the [French] administration, it was rare to find a practicing Catholic in a position of power. A Jewish prefect could, with impunity, observe Passover, but a prefect who was openly zealous in the observance of Easter might find himself under violent attack from a paper like the *Lanterne*, whose main stock in trade was anti-clerical scur-
rility, and whose editor was a Jew, the great ‘priest-eater,’ Eugene Mayer.” [LINDEMANN, p. 69]

In 1995 a Polish priest, and a pastor of the successful anti-communist Solidarity movement, Henryk Jankowski, came under attack as an anti-Semite for his public comments about Jews, particularly those about Jerzy Urban who, the reverend said, “publicly declares he is a Jew, and who insults [our] national feelings, our president, and the Polish-born pope, the church, and its primate.” [JER POST, 6-28-95] “Urban,” noted the Jerusalem Post, “the widely despised communist government spokesman during Poland’s martial law crackdown in the early 1980s, is now the editor and owner of a strongly anti-Catholic weekly publication, known for obscenity.” [JER POST, p6-28-95]

Over the centuries and with the recent self-promotive tool of American cultural pluralism, the traditional Jewish moral worldview has largely overtaken traditional Christian values. This is far from an irrational “anti-Semitic canard,” but a self-evident truth. One need only look to what Christian and Jewish values were in the Middle Ages. Christianity sanctified human universality, humility, poverty, and non-materialism. The ideals of the Chosen People were “particularist,” usurious, exploitive, and materialist. Even stripped of its religious base, which value system today is pre-eminent? Which looks more familiar to us?

In the mid-1800s, Karl Marx, had a sharply caustic view of Jewish economic and materialist influence in Europe, arguing that

“The Jews have emancipated themselves to the extent that Christians have become Jews … Money is the zealous one God of Israel, beside which no other God may stand. Money degraded all the gods of mankind, therefore robbed the whole world, of both nature and man, of its original value. Money is the essence of man’s life and work, which has become alienated from him. This alien monster rules him and he worships it. The God of the Jews has become secularized and is now a worldly God. The bill of exchange is the Jews’ real God.” [MARX, K., 1959, p. 38, p. 40]

As Jewish scholar Gordon Lafar notes about the different moral emphases of Judaism (particularist) and Christianity (universalist):

“The debate between universalism and particularism is thus partly also a debate between self-interest and self-sacrifice, between the selfish and selfless. Part of the rationale for universalism is that it embodied a rejection, or at least a suppression, of self-interest. To advocate a particularist position is, at least to some extent, to accept an ethic that is comfortable with self-interested behavior.” [LAFAR, p. 201]

As Lafar also notes, “Neither poverty nor humility are Jewish virtues, and the tradition is largely devoid of stories glorifying the virtuous poor man.” Poverty and humility were virtues of Christianity; self-sacrifice was central to the moral code of the human family concept, central teachings of the Christ who is anathema to the traditional Jewish world view. Christ taught that the poor and the dispossessed were blessed; he reportedly knocked over in disgust the money
changing tables in the Jewish temple, after all. However one looks at it, whether Christ was the son of God, a man, or merely a legend, the ultimate sacrifice of his life for all human beings is – on compassionate, pan-human, universalistic terms – a very noble story. This sacrifice is, of course, in sharp distinction to Jewish “particularist” tenets whereby Christ’s sacrifice for everyone is regarded solely as the ultimate act of a Jewish betrayer.

In 2000, an upstate New York newspaper highlighted the problems the Catholic Church was having nationwide in finding young men interested in careers as priests:

“[The Church] blame a modern society that glorifies young millionaires who make their fortunes on the Internet and Wall Street – but not priests who must take a vow of poverty.” [NOGAS, C., 2000, p. 4A]

“One of the great intellectual champions of human universalism, the Enlightenment philosopher Immanuel Kant,” notes Lafar, “explicitly equates morality with self-denial and immorality with self-interest.” [LAFAR, p. 200] In this vein, notes Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, “twentieth century Jewish history seemed conclusively to refute the universalism of the Enlightenment. Particularism had returned to Jewish thought.” [SACKS, J., ONE, p. 11]

In 1937, with the rise of Nazi fascism in Europe, an editorial in the liberal Protestant Christian Century poignantly confronted (in a way that is forbidden today) some of the obvious reasons for anti-Semitism, underscoring the tenets of traditional Judaism:

“Any group in the cultural life of the community which deliberately insulates itself by nondemocratic barriers against the free movement of the democratic process is inevitably in for bad treatment … Everyone knows that the psychology of society is such that any group is a social irritant if it insists upon being a permanent minority, and utilizes undemocratic means to maintain itself as such. The only religion compatible with democracy is one which conceives of itself as universal, and offers itself to all men and all races, and cultures. The Jewish religion, or any other religion, is an alien element in American democracy unless it proclaims itself as a universal faith, and proceeds upon such a conviction to persuade us all to be Jews … Judaism … has been racial, in the sense of hereditary, culture sanctions by its religion. It has been such through the ages … Does Christianity submit any more readily to the democratic process than Judaism and Jews? The answer … is a positive yes. Christianity is not and never has been a racial faith.” [MORRISON, p. 862-863]

In the religious context, how about yet another Jewish double standard? While modern Jewry obsessively calls to task – morally, politically, legally, and every other way – even the slightest evidence of negative opinion about Jews by others (all lumped by Jews under the generic heading of “anti-Semitism”), and Christian theologians have been “reworking and emending various passages from the New Testament thought to be anti-Judaic in teaching,” [WILSON, p. 33] Liebman and Cohen remark that “it is remarkable how traditional nega-
tive images [about Gentiles by Jews] are sustained despite their tenuous relation to the objective conditions and experience of American Jews. We suspect that these images have retained their resonance because they remain central to the conceptions of Judaism and what it means to be a Jew. One cannot choose to remain Jewish, least of all in a society that offers the option of not remaining Jewish, unless one has a positive conception of the Jewish self as opposed to the Gentile other. One way to sustain such a conception is by maintaining an image of the anti-Semitic Gentile.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 55] (The classical Jewish stereotype of a non-Jew – still widely maintained – includes the presumption that Gentiles are uncontrollable anti-Semites, primitive in nature and unrefined, brutish, uninterested and unable to perform conceptually, unable to have loving families, are untrustworthy in business with Jews, and are veritable alcoholics.) [LEIBMAN/COHEN p. 51]

As we have repeatedly seen, Jewry’s double standards are continuous through history. As Franz Mehring notes about European Jewry in the Enlightenment’s early years:

“The Jews were delighted when enlightened criticism took the Christian religion to task, for they had themselves always cursed it, but when the same criticism turned its attention to the Jewish religion they howled aloud as though humanity itself was betrayed.” [MEHRING, p. 97]

A civic religion has, like any religion, specific rituals. Perhaps not surprisingly, Jonathan Woocher notes that the most important ritual in the modern Jewish polity that has survived Orthodox synagogue culture is fund-raising. “The elements [of the fund-raising ritual],” he says, “have often been criticized and satirized for their shallowness and ostentatiousness on the one hand, and their overheated rhetoric and pretentiousness on the other … Despite this, the ritual [of the fund-raising] campaign has been a singularly effective instrument for mobilizing Jews and producing a sense of communal solidarity.” [WOOCHER, p. 151] By 1973 the United Jewish Appeal system alone collected $600 million a year. “The UJA campaigns,” notes Israeli critic Matti Golan, “have become the focus of Jewish activity. In fact, they’re the glue that holds Jewish life in America together.” [GOLAN, p. 104] By the 1980s at least half of UJA money was yearly going to Israel. “Over 50 percent of the UJA’s allocations,” notes Edward Shapiro, “support social, welfare, educational and economic development projects in Israel. And the importance of Israel and the UJA defined status within the Jewish community.” [SHAPIRO, Jewish Americans, p. 170] “The UJA is not just a service organization and its federations,” notes Israeli professor Menachem Kaufman, “Since 1948 it has been a living link between the American Jewish community and Israel.” [KAUFMAN, M., p. 219]

In 1960, one Jewish commentator, James Warburg, ran into trouble when he questioned whether donations to the UJA should continue to be tax-deductible. As Melvin Urofsky notes:
“Why should donations to the UJA be tax-deductible, he asked, ‘when so large a proportion of them flow directly or indirectly into the hands of a foreign government which openly engages in propaganda attempting to influence the policy of the government of the United States?’” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 341]

Israeli universities raise another $100 million a year from diaspora sources for the Jewish state; the Hadassah organizations raise another $50 million a year for their own projects in Israel. [ELAZAR, p. 230] The Israel Bond organization also each year “sells about half a billion dollars in Israeli bonds to American Jews and their friends.” [SHAPIRO, Jewish Americans, p. 170] “Thirty-five of the largest and most active of the national organizations,” notes Chaim Waxman, “are affiliated with the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish American Organizations, for which Zionist and pro-Israel activity is the major emphasis.” [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 103] “Secrecy is, perhaps, the most outstanding characteristic of the conference’s activities,” says David Whalen, “While hardly the proverbial ‘Learned Elders of Zion,’ the Conference seems to believe that it can advocate Jewish causes most effectively from behind a veil of sorts … The Conference’s charter is not public … The Conference seeks to discourage internal discord from translating into uncoordinated or ambiguous support for Israel. To this end a formal yet mysterious relationship has been developed with the powerful American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC).” [WHALEN, p. 78-79] “In the early 1950s, with Israel having consolidated its statehood,” notes Dan Raviv and Yossi Melman, “all the major American Jewish groups turned Zionist.” [RAVIV, p. 55]

“Virtually all the great names of Jewish business,” notes Joel Kotkin, “– Rothschild, Kadoorie, and Warburg among them – contributed to the building of the state [of Israel].” [KOTKIN, p. 33] By 1991, Israel had still remained a giant welfare state. Thanks to Jewish international philanthropy and Jewish lobbying for American government largesse, “Israel had emerged as the single largest recipient of charity, grants, and assistance per capita in the world, the bulk of it from America.” [KOTKIN, p. 66]

By 1985, that year’s gifts and endowments to the Federation/UAJ totaled $1.128 billion [KOSMIM, p. 20], and it has averaged nearly a billion dollars each year ever since. [HALBERSTAM, p. 41] Total Jewish philanthropy through various agencies to a realm of causes in 1985 was estimated by one researcher to be $3.1 billion, more money than the Gross National Product of some Third world countries, and more than the military budgets of nations like Cuba and Turkey. [KOSMIM, p. 28] Looked at another way, the United Jewish Appeal raises yearly more money than the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the March of Dimes, and the National Easter Seal Society, combined. [WHITFIELD, AM, p. 14] Of all Jewish charity, by the 1970s two-thirds were believed to be to expressly Jewish causes, the rest to hospitals, museums, colleges, and other such institutions in which Jews usually also had a stake. [KOSSIM, p. 20]

Jewish money, wherever it went, had enormous effect. “Around the turn of
the present century,” notes David Dalin, “a handful of Jews, mostly of German origin, came to exercise a profound influence on American philanthropy, creating a multiplicity of charitable institutions that continue to shape our world. It was an impressive group, including in its ranks the banker Jacob Schiff, the financier Felix Warburg, the industrialists Daniel and Simon Guggenheim, the merchant Nathan Straus, and the jurists Julian Mack and Mayer Sulzberger. But its foremost member was surely [Sears-Roebuck magnate] Julius Rosenwald.” [DALIN, D., 1998]

Generalized philanthropy is of course also valuable for tax write-offs. Take the case of the Jewish chief of the Walt Disney corporation, Michael Eisner. He “put Disney [stock] shares into his personal foundation. For Mr. Eisner, as for any donor in his situation, the donation had two tax advantages: it reduced his taxable income, perhaps by the full $116 million, and he did not have to pay capital gains taxes on the donated shares.” [NY TIMES, 12-20-98, p. 10] Forbes magazine notes the case of wealthy elderly Jewish real estate developer Robert R. Riser, who was angered that, at his (and his wife’s) death, some $40 million of his fortune would probably go to inheritance taxes. By creating a private foundation, notes Forbes, “if all goes according to plan … the family’s medical and Jewish charities will get tens of millions; the IRS, nothing.” [NOVACK, J., 11-10-99]

“Jews are twenty-three times as likely to establish foundations for Jewish causes than Catholic are for Catholic causes, or Protestant for Protestant causes.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 41] In the 1987 edition of the Foundation Directory, country-based grant programs included 75 for Israel, 13 for the entirety of all the countries of Africa, 4 for Italy, 3 for Poland, 6 for France, and 2 for Scotland. [KOSMIN, p. 24] In one 1978-80 survey of American Jews in a leadership development programs, notes Kevin MacDonald, “51% agreed that providing social and legal services for Jews was a high priority, and only 2% viewed it as a low priority. However, only 4% agreed that providing social and welfare services for anyone in need was a high priority, compared to 7% who viewed it as a low priority.” [MACDONALD, p. 102] By 1993, a variety of Jewish private money sources, like the Charles H. Revson and Wexner foundations (distinct from the UJA and other Jewish “club” organizations), were estimated to have a total “financial giving capacity of $350-500 million, “oriented toward the collective well-being of the Jewish people.” [ISRAEL, R. p. 1]

The largest Jewish philanthropy organization in America – with assets of $1.8 billion – is the Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation. It is estimated that about two-thirds of its funding goes to Jewish causes. [MOMENT, 12-31-98, p. 57] From Italy, the $50 million heading to Israel at the death of Aladar Fleischman was “one of the largest bequests by an individual to Israeli organizations.” [PERRY, V., 6-10-99] From Canada, the ultra-Orthodox Reichmann family “ranked among the most munificent philanthropists of this century, giving away hundreds of millions of dollars, almost all of it to narrowly benefit their coreligionists. At the peak of [the Reichmann’s] Olympia and York’s prosperity, the family supported a thousand schools and other religious institutions scattered around the world but concentrated in Israel.” [BIANCO, p. xvi] Jewish organiza-
tion studies determined in 1996 that there were about 3,500 foundations that provided money to “something Jewish.” By 1999, according to the Jewish Funders Network, this figure was 5,500. [GOLDMAN, J., 4-29-99] In 2001 Jewish business writer Steven Silbiger wrote that “there are now more than seven thousand independent Jewish foundations funded by individuals or families with total assets estimated at $10 billion or $15 billion.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 47]

Jews are also adept at getting huge sums from non-Jewish foundations. In 2000, for example, five Philadelphia-area Jewish organizations, including the Jewish Community Centers of Greater Philadelphia, landed $4.65 million from the Pew Charitable Trusts. Three of the four grant recipients were linked to the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia. [SILVERSTEIN, M., 1-13-2000, p. 11]

In 1998, Newsday noted that

“This year, for the first time, United Jewish Appeal’s gift of $300 million to Israel is likely to be eclipsed by philanthropic aid sent there by family foundations and tax-exempt ‘American Friends of …’ organizations. And that does not take into account additional uncounted millions that flow from Jews in the United States directly to religious institutions in Israel.” [FRIEDMAN, J., p. A7] (Nor does this include the yearly billions of dollars effectively lobbied from unknowing American taxpayers for Israel – see later chapter)

A Jewish American journalist, Glenn Frankel, writes that some Israelis are not always thankful for the huge sums of money coming their way:

“[Israelis] saw American Jewish money increasingly was going to the most entrenched, reactionary and corrupt elements of their society – the political machines and small party interests that sustained Israel’s social and political paralysis … [Israeli author Matti] Golan defines the relationship between American Jews and Israeli Jews as corrupt, superficial, and deceitful. He finds repugnant the UJA fund-raising campaigns that exploit and distort Israel’s problems in order to raise money. He mocks the hypocrisy of American Jews who … assuage their guilty consciences and their insecurities by donating money to Israel … Many Israelis believed that diaspora Jews were moral cowards; still, both sides needed one another.” [FRANKEL, G., p. 215, 216, 218]

American Jews also send millions of dollars to Israel for its presidential and other political campaigns. The Jerusalem Post wrote that “American Jews contributed $6 million to $8 million to Israeli campaigns in the 1996 elections, despite the 1994 [Israeli] law barring foreign donations [to political campaigns].” [COHLER-ESSES, L., 2-19-99, p. 1]

J. Bruce Nichols, an official at the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs, also notes the maverick political complexion of the major Jewish organization involved in international Jewish immigration, refugee, and resettlement issues. “The AJDC [American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee],” he notes, “to this day has always received the bulk of its [economic and other] support from the Jewish community. This fact has at times encouraged an
almost brash sense of independence of Jewish philanthropy from the aims of [the American government].” [NICHOLS, p. 40]

In 1984 Carl Levin, a Jewish Congressman from Michigan, publicly complained about American Jewry’s lack of commitment to the universalist fabric of America and their non-Jewish neighbors. The *Jewish Week* noted that Levin believed

“Jews as individuals and groups lag behind other religious groups in lobbying their Congressmen on issues of universal concern, and their activity makes conspicuous the lesser lobbying of Jewish groups for such concerns … He said he received and welcomed many visits and calls and mail from Jewish groups ‘about Israel, about Soviet Jewry and about Ethiopian Jews.’ But he felt he was ‘not lobbied enough by many of the groups and individuals about concerns that are not, strictly speaking, Jewish.” [GOLLAB, 10-19-84, p. 10]


In 1961 Jewish sociologist Daniel Bell wrote:

“One is a Jew, discharging one’s obligation as a Jew, through membership in Jewish organizations. In the *embourgeoisement* of Jewish life in America, the community has become institutionalized around fund raising, and the index of an individual’s importance too often is the amount of money he donates to hospitals, defense agencies, philanthropic groups, and the like. The manifest ends are the community functions being served, but frequently the latent end is the personal prestige – *yichus*. This kind of institutional life may even lend itself to historic forms of corruption: of simony, when those who have risen high in Jewish organizations receive their rewards in appointive office in Jewish life; and of indulgences, when leadership is simply the reward of wealth. And in performance of charity as a way of Jewish life, self-satisfaction may take on the face of righteousness. The most sensitive of the Jewish agency professionals, lawyers, and businessmen have often deplored this situation, yet are trapped in the system.” [BELL, REFLECTIONS, p. 319]

“How can a community such as this,” complained William Zukerman, editor of the *Jewish Newsletter*,

“whose highest ideal is mechanical fund-raising, be a source of nobility and greatness? Can the interminable big-and-even-bigger Bond and UJA drives, the Hadassah teas, the gaudy banquets, the garish publicity and appalling bad taste, be the soil from which greatness will spring? Can salesmanship, even when clothed with the mantle of philanthropy, be anything but shallow and sterile?” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 226]
“In most communities,” notes Stephen Isaacs, “if a Jew fails to make a name professionally or politically, being a big giver to federation is usually the principal route to his becoming a member of a Jewish country club.” [ISAACS, p. 19]

“With fund-raising the major priority,” said Edward Shapiro in 1992, “the emphasis in contemporary Jewish life is on philanthropy rather than Jewish learning or piety. The local Jewish federations, rather than the synagogue or the yeshiva, has become the major point of Jewish life and the major dispenser of prestige … Many observers have severely criticized this ‘check book’ Judaism, but they have been unable to suggest any alternative to even this attenuated Jewish identity that would appeal to acculturated and sophisticated Jews.” [SHAPIRO, E., Jewish Americans, p. 170]

As former World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann noted in 1978: “Another feature characteristic of Americans in general, and therefore Jews in particular, is the influence wielded by finance in the United States … In America Jewish life is dominated by the rich … The ‘money men’ concentrate on consolidating their social position: it costs money to become president of a big community organization.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 152] (This focus on money to Jewish causes is so intense that in 2000 a Pittsburgh synagogue even made the news for suing a member of its congregation who reneged on a pledge; the $900 he ultimately gave was deemed too far short of an earlier $25,000 promise. Legal proceedings against him were soon instituted.) [GRAHAM, J., 7-31-2000, p. 6]

In 1998, in an article entitled “Titans of Industry Join Forces for Jewish Philanthropy,” the Wall Street Journal noted the existence of a “Mega Group” of about twenty extremely powerful Jewish businessmen whose meetings were exclusively, and entirely, about “being Jewish.” Formal members included Leslie Wexner (chairman of The Limited, Inc.), Edgar and Charles Bronfman (of Sea-gram’s/PolyGram/Universal Studios, et al), Charles Schusterman of Samson Investment Company, Baltimore real estate tycoon Harvey Meyeroff, Leonard Abramson (the founder of U.S. Healthcare), Lester Crown (who, among other things, is a military defense mogul), Laurence Tisch (chairman of Loew’s and former chairman of CBS), financier Michael Steinhardt, Max Fisher (a Detroit area tycoon), and Marvin Lender (a bagel mogul). The Journal wrote:

“‘We want to make it cool to be Jewish,’ says Edgar Bronfman, whose company’s keen sense of image has made it one of the world’s most successful marketers.” [MILLER, L., 5-4-98, p. B1]

By 2000, Jewish organizations had committed $210 million in its “Birthright Israel” program to give young American Jews (ages 18-26) round-trip airfare to Israel and 10 days of “educational programming” about Jewish identity and its links to modern Israel. [PR NEWSWIRE, 6-15-2000] From Palm Beach, Florida, in an unrelated program to connect Jews to a Zionist root, the Commission of Jewish Education’s “Newlywed Israel Incentive” program even pays local Jews who get married $2000 to take their honeymoon in Israel. [HAYES, R., p. 1B]

“American Jews are obsessed with their own perpetuation,” noted Jonathan Rosenblum in a 1998 issue of the Jerusalem Post, “Millions of dollars of federa-
tion money are earmarked every year for projects in Jewish continuity, and a group of 11 Jewish millionaires recently committed $18 million to the creation of Jewish day schools across denominational lines. One finds no comparable level of concern among any other ethnic group.” [ROSENBLUM, p. 8]

The central icon of allegiance for Jewish transnational solidarity and the major object of Jewish money rites is the modern state of Israel, the country which, says Nathan Glazer, “after 1967 … became the religion of American Jews.” [LIPSET, p. 157] “Nobody can deny the intensity of the American Jew’s feelings about the state of Israel,” noted James Yaffe in 1968, “Polls taken in 1967 during the six-day war showed that 99 percent of all American Jews supported Israel wholeheartedly against the Arab nations. Hardly any Jews who lived through those days didn’t feel a weight of anxiety on his spirits – and a wild elation when the weight was finally lifted.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 181] “The [1967] war,” says Jack Wertheimer, “… converted American Jewry to Zionism. Whereas American Jews had demonstrated sympathy in the past, Israel was now incorporated into the very structure of American Jewish identity.” [WERTHEIMER, J., 1993, p. 30] Even earlier though, “today all Jews are Zionists,” noted a Buffalo (New York) rabbi as early as 1936, “That is as true as any statement so brief can be in so controversial a field as Jewish life.” [ADLER/CNOLLY, 1960, p. 390, 460] “American Jewry is deeply committed to the state of Israel,” wrote Monford Harris in 1965, “of this there can be no doubt.” [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 80]

As Milton Plesur noted in 1982:

“Another issue that concerned postwar American Jewish community was that of Zionism and the special relationship between American Jews and the state of Israel. Zionism had come to influence the organizational structure of Jewish life on both the national and local levels. Most synagogues, Jewish community centers, religious schools, and virtually all the organizational societies that composed the American Jewish community espoused the Zionist cause.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 194]

In 1981, a World Jewish Congress report noted

“In the past three decades, Israel has served most Western Jews as a surrogate for the traditional Judaism from which they had strayed. Concern and support for Israel increasingly became the chief source and expression of their sense of Jewish identity. Fund raising, chiefly for Israel, and political activity to ensure the security and survival of Israel, have been the major activities of Jewish organizations during this period, especially in the United States [WALINSKY, L., 1981, p. 61] … There can be no doubt that Israel will continue to play the central role in Jewish life.” [WALINSKY, L., 1981, p. 69]

“Solidarity between the Jews of the west, Israel, the Soviet Union, and threatened diaspora communities has become more than the object of activism,” says British Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, “it has become a carrier of identity.” [SACKS, J., One, p. 11] “I speak to many Jewish communities around the world,” says Yitzhak Herzog, “and what strikes me is that each community is of
a different nature than the other. The common denominator that I find in all is Israel. They are obsessed with Israel and you can say that Israel, in effect, has become their religion, as well as a social and political idea which they are involved.” [HERZOG, p. 20] “Jewish communities throughout the world,” noted Irving Louis Horowitz in 1976, “have increased their ‘particularistic’ interests in Israel, often at the expense of their ‘universalistic’ concerns for others. Israel unifies the Jewish community worldwide, giving it a sense of solidarity that transcends psychological anxieties and geographical differences, however sharp or obscure.” [HOROWITZ, I., 1976, p. 361]

Even in Costa Rica, for example, a Jewish scholar noted in 1987 that “today, as in the past, Costa Rican Jewry has tended to adopt a unified political stance only vis-a-vis the question of the state of Israel.” [GUDMUNDSON, p. 229] Venezuela? “Nearly a thousand Venezuelan Jews have settled in Israel,” noted Howard Sachar in 1985, “Zionism is also the principal motif of Venezuelan Jewish education.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 266] Brazil? “It seems,” says Henrique Rattner, “that the main objective of Jewish politics in Brazil today concern the defense of specifically Jewish interests in the fight against anti-Semitism and the preservation of the state of Israel and of the Brazilian Jewish community’s identification with it.” [RATTNER, p. 199]

France? “No other western Jewish community has been as passionately pro-Israel as French Jewry,” noted the Jerusalem Post in 1997, “– defying media charges of dual loyalty … More than 30,000 French Jews visit Israel each year and over a thousand are currently studying at Israeli universities.” [PICKETT, W., p. 7] The Jews of Brussels, in Belgium? “An affluent community, the 24,000 Jews of Brussels have developed their own version of a United Jewish Appeal. Contributions are generous and the lion’s share goes to Israel. If Brussels Jewry evinces a distinguishing feature, it is its Zionism and secular character.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 46]

South Africa? “South Africa’s small but influential Jewish population of 118,000,” wrote Seymour Hersh about the late 1970s and early 1980s, “were always large contributors to Israeli bond drives and charities; now [with the 1977 election of Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin] they became more vocal in their support for Israel’s more conservative political parties, including Menachem Begin’s Likud Party.” [HERSH, S., p. 264] “Zionism had from its beginnings cast a spell upon the Jews of South Africa,” adds Barnet Litvinoff. [LITVINOFF, B., p. 184] “Nowhere else in the Jewish world, conceivably,” observes Howard Sachar, “was Zionism so integral a feature of Jewishness as South Africa … South African Jewry has not rested in its exertions on Israel’s behalf. The Zionist Federation remains by far the most important organization in Jewish life.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 187, 190]

Canada? In 1999, in Montreal, the Quebec prime minister’s brother, Gerard Bouchard, “initiated a conference for French and Jewish Quebeckers because he wanted to know why, as a minority, Jews are not more sensitive to French Quebeckers fears for the survival of their culture [in English-dominated Canada] and why they seem to focus on anti-Semitism in Quebec and not in English Canada

Russia? American Jewish efforts to Zionize the Jews of former communist Russia was noted in a 1999 article in the Baltimore Jewish Times: “United States Jewish groups have contributed heavily to building synagogues, community centers, and schools in Russia … Privately, many Jewish leaders say that community building encourages many [Russian] Jews to make aliyaḥ [emigration to Israel] by building a sense of Jewish identity that will be Israel-centered.” [BESSER, 4-30-99, p. 30] And as Irving Horowitz noted as early as 1979, “The fact that Israel can call upon a hidden Jewish constituency overt in the United States and covert in the Soviet Union does indeed give weight and substance to the Israeli claim that it is not simply a small power which can be regulated or mortgaged at the behest of the major powers, but a force of international socio-economic weight as well as national interests.” [HOROTWITZ, I., 1979, p. 104]

Argentina? Like many – probably most – Jews, news mogul Jacobo Timerman equates raising verifiably troubling questions about Jewish collectivist behavior the world over as tantamount to expressions of Nazism:

“In Argentina, in 1980, thirty-five years after Hitler’s defeat, on the army-controlled television channel in Buenos Aires, one heard the following questions voiced by a journalist who has practiced his profession for twenty years and is not naive, the brother of a general who heads the press services of the military government: Why aren’t there any poor Jews? Why do Jews give so much money to Israel? Why don’t Jews marry Catholics? Why do Jews consider themselves superior? A repetition of the insults and defamations of Nazi rulers, stemming from one of the most powerful forces in Argentine life, the army. It’s easy enough to react to this anti-Semitic campaign, to feel offended.” [TIMERMAN, J., 1981, p. 144]

In 2001, the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles featured an article about the immigrant Jewish Iranian community in that city, based on a familiar theme:

“Persian Jews are facing challenges familiar to previous generations of Jewish immigrants; among them, dilution of traditional values and assimilation. ‘There is no question there is an influence of materialism,’
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[Sam] Kermanian [head of the Iranian-American Jewish Federation] said. ‘Some of the old values are still holding the community together, but, obviously, this is something that will not last forever. We know that within a generation or two, we will assimilate into a larger landscape. Our goal is to make sure that we assimilate into the American Jewish community rather than the secular American landscape.” [AUSHENKER, M., 6-20-01]

Incredibly, of all the cultural, ethnic, and religious aspects of being Jewish, in a 1988 Los Angeles Times national survey 17% of American Jews believed that support for the state of Israel was the most important part of their Jewish identity. [WAXMAN, p. 137] Even more startling, a 1990 American Jewish Committee survey of “American Jewish leaders” across the country found that 81% listed the “safety of Israel as the most important item on the Jewish agenda today.” Nearly half of the leaders were under fifty years old, 94% were married to fellow Jews (plus 3% to spouses who had converted to Judaism), a quarter of them had a household income between $200,000 and $499,000, and another third between $100,000-$199,000. [AIN, SURVEY, p. 28]

A 1983 poll of American Jews at-large found that 20% had even written to an elected official on behalf of Israel. [BRENNER, p. 123] The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey found that 76% of American Jews described themselves at least “somewhat attached to Israel.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 188] Of high importance to an overwhelming number of those who call themselves Jews, 85% of Jewish respondents in the 1983 poll favored strong United States support for Israel, a figure that is consistent with other surveys. [WAXMAN, p. 136-137] (Meanwhile, says Jewish critic Lenni Brenner, “American Jewry has one of the weakest military traditions in America. Many Jewish immigrants came here to get away from conscription.” [BRENNER, p. 131]

In 2001, a survey of American Jews by the Israel Policy Forum, the Jewish Week, and the Wilstein Institute of Jewish Policy Studies found that 89% of respondents felt “strongly favorable” or “somewhat favorable” toward Israel. (Only 3% felt “somewhat unfavorable” and 2% “strongly unfavorable” toward the Jewish state. 5% ventured no opinion and 1% didn’t answer). 59% also felt “strongly” or “somewhat favorable” to Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, who at the time was facing a possible trial in Belgium for war crimes in Lebanon. The top five “most important issues or problems facing the Jewish community in the United States” were not considered to be poverty, urban blight, health care, pollution, etc. They were 1) Anti-Semitism, 2) Peace and Security for Israel, 3) Terrorism, 4) Intermarriage (marriage to non-Jews), and 5) U.S.-Israeli relations. [JEWISH WEEK, 11-20-01]

A 1998 national poll conducted by the Los Angeles Times and Newsday found that 43% of American Jewish respondents had donated money to Israel in the past year; 60% of those over 65 years of age said they had given money in the same time period to the Jewish state. [FRIEDMAN, J., p. A7] “For me to be a Jew today,” said Canadian Sarah Tobin in 1990 (she had lived in Israel for a few years),
“means having a personal relationship with Israel. This is my bottom line, my definition of Judaism. Israel is the overriding reality in Jewish life today. It tempers, it touches, it colors every aspect of our Jewish behavior and thoughts … Most of the Americans who support Israel don’t know any Israelis at all … What is my connectedness? My connectedness is the concept, the mythology. Reality is secondary. It can’t change my connectedness.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 148-149]

“For tens of thousands of Jewish Americans,” says Joyce Starr,

“Israel has become so central to their lives that dedication to ‘the country’ has become a religion unto itself, without religiosity. Deeply committed American Jews spend the better part of their working and/or leisure hours thinking about, working on behalf of, and worrying about the State of Israel … The centrality of Israel to the lives of committed American Jews is all but impossible for Israelis to fathom. Israel has become the anchor of life, the psychological spring of renewal, the singular rationale for feelings of self-worth for hundreds of thousands of American Jews.” [STARR, 1990, p. 159]

“The image of Israel,” note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “so central to the lives of American Jews, is projected as that of a country surrounded by enemies bent on its destruction … And the Holocaust itself, which along with Israel has assumed central symbolic importance in American Jewish life, reminds Jews above all of their precarious status among the hostile Gentiles. These themes tend to be combined in appeals by Jewish organizations for funds.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 32] “American Jewish life,” wrote Seymour Lipset and Earl Raab in 1995, “embodies a kind of ‘cultural Zionism,’ which recognizes Israel as its spiritual center, inspiring rather than assembling the Jews of the world.” [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 130] Since 1967, notes Allon Gal, “virtually all American Jewish community organizations have become supporters of the Jewish state and have developed some variation of ‘a vision of Israel.’ [GAL, p. 13] Since 1967 too, notes Theodore Solotaroff, “the survival of Israel has been the paramount concern of organized Jewish life and probably the paramount source of Jewish identity.” [BARACK-FISHMAN, p. 279]

“The oneness that holds Jews together,” says Edward Shapiro, “is no longer Judaism or anti-Semitism but Israel … Israel provides the link that bonds Jews together, no matter how remote they might be from any involvement in Jewish society or religious life. The Jewish thing most Jews have in common [is] … contributing at least a nominal sum to the United Jewish Appeal.” [SHAPIRO, E., Jewish American, p. 169] “Central to the understanding of American Jewish identity,” notes Marla Brettschneider, “is this idea of being pro-Israel … By the 1970s, as the [Jewish] mainstream organizations began to wield unprecedented power in Washington D.C., the litmus test for the stance constituting such an attitude reached hegemonic proportions … Many had come to feel that on issues relating to Israel, the American Jewish community had become a closed political space, an area where neither dissent, nor even debate, is tolerated.” [BRETTSCHNEIDER, M., Cornerstone, p. 1-2]
Research studies by the American Jewish Committee, noted David Schnall in 1987, “indicate that U. S. Jews overwhelmingly support Israel by every standard definition of the term. Over 90 per cent said they paid special attention to media reports about Israel, and a similar proportion declared themselves ‘pro-Israeli’ or ‘very pro-Israeli.’ In addition, about three-quarters said that caring about Israel was a very important part of their Jewish identity and that they frequently talked about Israel with friends and relatives.” [SCHNALL, p. 122]

In 2001, the United Jewish Communities (formerly the United Jewish Appeal)– the foremost Jewish solidarity organization – announced its new “$4 million solidarity campaign titled ‘Israel Now’” to propagandize for the Jewish state and sanitize its miserable human rights record towards the Palestinians. “Campaign highlights” included:

- “Heavy promotion of solidarity missions to Israel.”
- “Advocacy- and media-training for campus and community activists … ‘to train their leadership to become strong advocates on behalf of Israel.’”
- “A ‘media tour’ that will take Israeli spokesmen and U. S. Middle East experts – scholars, journalists and other opinion-shapers – into key communities across North America to meet with local media.”
- “A Solidarity Shabbat on Sept. 22-23 that will reach out to synagogues, churches and university campuses to show that ‘support for Israel extends beyond the Jewish community.’” [JORDAN, M., 6-19-01]

Ironically, and astoundingly, few Jews have firsthand knowledge of the object of their intense allegiance and dedication – Israel. 85% of all American Jews have never visited Israel (1989); this even included Ivan Boesky, then chairman of the New York City-UJA Federation. [GOLDIN, p. 8] (A 1990 survey suggested 75% of American Jews between the ages of 26-44 had never visited Israel). [WAXMAN, C., Weakening, p. 383] “Not one percent, not even .001 percent of American Jews,” complained Israeli scholar Etan Levine, “come to settle here; not one in 10,000 join our ranks. More German Christians than American Jews come here as tourists.” [LEVINE, E., p. 208-223]

The relatively few Americans who do go to Israel tend to visit under the auspices of various propagandizing tour packages. “Most American Jews,” note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “are ignorant of even the most rudimentary features of Israeli life. For example, fewer than a third of our sample of American Jews in 1986 knew (or guessed) that Menachem Begin (a former prime minister and veteran of the right-wing Likud bloc) and Shimon Peres (then Prime Minister and head of the Labour alignment) were members of different parties.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 83-84]

A long term Jewish-American resident in Israel, Ze’ev Chafets, noted that “I was visiting Rachel’s Tomb, near Bethlehem, when a tour bus full of American Jews arrived. They were straight out of central casting, dressed in bermudas and sports shirts with little alligators over the
pockets, weighted down by expensive cameras and souvenirs of the Holy Land. As they crowded into the tiny building that housed the tomb, an old Yemenite Jew dressed in a dirty robe and wearing long side curls hung on the fringe of the group. He held out his hand, palms up, in the universal posture of supplication, mumbling Hebrew psalms as he approached one of the tourists. “Beat it,” the American said roughly. “I’m not giving any money to an Arab.” “He’s not an Arab,” the tour guide explained, “He’s a Jew.” [CHAFETS, p. 221]

Ann Roiphe notes her Jewish American psychoanalyst friend Anna Ornstein “who says that nothing destroys her more than a threat to Israeli safety … It is possible to be connected to the events in Israel without ever having set foot on the soil or having made plans to move. That is one of the contradictions and complications of being Jewish.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 187]

Of those few American Jews who have seen up close the day to day realities of the Israeli state, other than as a tourist, most are disillusioned. From 1948-68 for example, of the 20,000 American Jews who immigrated to Israel, nine out of ten came back to live in the States. [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 83-84] Overall, since 1948, about half of the Jews who moved to Israel returned to America. [STARR, J., 1990, p. 179] In fact, “Israelis emigrating to the United States, yordim, have far outnumbered American Jews moving to Israel.” [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 131] [For that matter, in 1985 more New York Jews went to Israel dead (387), to be buried, than to live (76)]. [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN, p. 14] In a 1963 investigation of immigration to Israel, “in some cases,” said Harold Isaacs, the reasons American Jews moved to Israel “had to do not with being an American or a Jew but being one’s own peculiar and troubled self with problems that they were trying to solve by running off from one place to another. Many people mentioned this as a factor, but almost always, of course, in talking about somebody else.” [ISAACS, H, p. 71] (“I was told,” added Isaacs, “that there had been eleven cases the previous year of mentally ill people who had been shipped off to Israel by relatives in America and who had been shipped right back to America by health officials.” [ISAACS, H, p. 72]

Melvin Urofsky notes another problem for those who decide to move to Israel, that even among a nation of Jews, the sense of “Otherness” endured:

“The novelty of living in an entirely Jewish surrounding, of no longer feeling unique because of one’s Jewishness, soon wore off, only to be replaced by a sense of being different because one was an American.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 272]

And what exactly is Israel? What are its tenets towards other people? How does it compare to the democratic and universalist principles of America? What kind of country does world Jewry so emphatically support? A later chapter will address this issue at length, but for now, here’s what Jewish reporter Leon Hadar, a former correspondent for Israel’s Jerusalem Post, observes about the double standards of Jewish political allegiance, and its consequent mythmaking:

“Members of the American Jewish community have been in the forefront of the struggle for civil and human rights, separation of church
and state and for free immigration to the United States. They would have been the first to protest any attempt to impose Christianity as a state religion in America, to pass a “law of return” limiting immigration to white Christians, or to force citizens to carry identity cards indicating their religion or ethnic origin. But those same American Jews do not question their support for a state [Israel] which applies these and other discriminatory policies in its treatment of its Christian and Muslim minorities.” [HADAR, p. 27]

A survey of 443 Jews in a “leadership training” program (1978-80) at the United Jewish Appeal revealed a range of disturbing attitudes among leadership in the American Jewish polity. Every single one of them agreed with the statement “When the state of Israel is threatened, all Jews are threatened.” From there, 70% of the respondents stated that they were more emotionally moved by listening to Israel’s nation anthem (the Hatikvah) than the Star-Spangled Banner. (Another 7% of the total “weren’t sure” about it.) 97% of these people even believed that the conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors was the most important problem facing American Jews. Yet by almost a two to one margin these future Jewish leaders rejected the notion that Jews are “overly concerned with Israel.” 95% even declared that “I’m happy to be an American.” Not surprisingly, over 60% agreed with the assertion (even in this non-religious context) that “The Jewish people is the Chosen People.” Another 15% claimed they “weren’t sure” if they were the Chosen People or not, leaving only the remaining 15% to outright reject this aged source of Jewish racism and chauvinism, and inevitable Gentile hostility. “Perhaps … the most important [myth of civil Judaism],” says Jonathan Woocher, “[is] the barely distinguished reaffirmation of the myth of Jews as a chosen people … In short, the myths of civil Judaism are the myths of a modern messianic religion.” [WOOCHER, p. 131-132] “A secular holiness,” notes Emil Fackenheim,” side by side with the religious, is becoming manifest in contemporary Jewish existence.” [SACKS, J., p. 136]

Particularly noteworthy in the UJA survey was the Jewish leadership response to the statement “The primary loyalty of American Jews must be to the United States and their fellow Americans.” Over 50% (58, 52, and 56 per cent in three distinct groups) disagreed. Coupled with the “not sure” response, 77, 67, and 71% of these future Jewish polity leaders did not agree with this statement of loyalty to their fellow Americans.

In this context, it is certainly legitimate to wonder about the implications of the well known statement by the prominent 20th century American rabbi, Stephen Wise: “I may have been an American for sixty-four years, but I have been a Jew for four thousand years.” [HERTZLER, p. 76]

Such clues to American Jewish nationalist sentiments – certainly among the UJA leadership – have been a continuous public relations problem throughout their history around the world: the issue of “dual Jewish loyalty,” one primary loyalty to international Jewry as a transnational brotherhood, and a second loyalty to the non-Jewish societies in which they live. This second loyalty has existed only since the Enlightenment. Before that Jews harbored no pretense of
loyalty to the non-Jewish societies in which they lived. “The Jewish case [in
Europe],” says Jacob Katz, “has often been compared with that of other reli-
gious minorities, such as the Catholics in England or the Protestants in Austria.
As opposed to these minorities, however, who in all respects were regarded as
part of the local population, Jews perceived themselves, and were perceived by
others, as belonging to another country.” [KATZ, J. J. Jew, p.

In 1942, before modern Israel was even founded, J.O. Hertzler wrote that
the non-Jew typically

“feels that the Jew, despite his protestations to the contrary, is still a
‘foreigner’ at heart; still divided in his loyalties and sympathy; still not
completely a national, not quite one with him; still living ‘off’ him but
now with him. Many of the Jews, he feels, are still a people more inter-
ested in their own nation and their own people than in their allegiance
to the countries in which they have thrown their lot…. [Non-Jews] do
not cherish among them people who want to be part of them and yet
separate from them.” [HERTZLER, p. 77]

“The more committed majority among Jews,” wrote Arthur Hertzberg
twenty-two years later, “represents a uniqueness in both culture and politics, an
apartness from all other Americans, that they both will and choose.”
[HERTZBERG, p. 293] (This aspect of Jewish American identity was dramati-
cally manifest in 1825 when Mordechai Noah, the former American consul to
Tunis, bought land on an island in the Niagara River in upstate New Y ork to cre-
ate a Jewish separatist colony from other Americans.) [SCHMIDT, p. 7]

Ever present and enduring, in 1996 Henry Feingold noted that

“It is a residual feeling of belonging to the Jewish people that gives
American Jewry a strange and persistent duality that is reflected in vir-
tually every facet of their experience in America. They are in America
but never completely of it. Something is held back … I have called this
phenomenon ‘American Jewish exceptionalism,’ by which I mean not
its superior achievement but the unique duality it possesses.” [FEIN-
GOLD, p. 35]

Feingold’s “exceptionalism” – a not too subtle play on the Chosen People
idea – exists (and by traditional Jewish definition, always will) for those who
insist upon the classical exclusionist, particularist, elitist and nationalist tenets
of “being Jewish,” and is the primary source for anti-Jewish hostility, popularly
mystified by Jewry today as an irrationally demonic “anti-Semitism.” “Anti-
Semitism,” notes Oliver Cox, “tends to be triggered by a dominant society’s rec-
ognition of Jewish participation in cultural advantages of the community, to an
enviable degree, but still remaining alienated from the parent group. Jews, in
other words, tend to identify with the host people according to their own
advantage.” [COX, p. 184]

A recent real-life paradigm of this – in sensational form – is the story of a
fabulously wealthy Jewish business tycoon (who once even owned the New York
Daily News), as told by John Gross:
“A Jew from an obscure part of the Eastern Central Europe arrived in England. Starting from nowhere, he accumulated a vast fortune. Those who knew him realized he has amassed it by the most ruthless and brutal means, though he is able to keep up a facade as a public benefactor. He changes his name to one which nobody would take to be Jewish; when the question of his Jewishness is raised, he announces that he is a member of the Church of England … Then, in his later years, he reverts to his origins. He dies, and although for most of his career he has been firmly embedded in English public life, his is buried in Israel. His funeral – an Orthodox Jewish funeral – takes place on the Mount of Olives, amid a blaze of international publicity. Within days of his dying, his malfeasances are exposed: they involve colossal swindles of a particularly nasty kind, including ripping off five hundred million pounds from a pension fund. Thousands of ordinary workers see their pensions disappear … In fact what I have given you is an account (if anything a toned down account) of the career of the late Robert Maxwell.” [GROSS, p. 380-381] (Some of Maxwell’s own words were read at his funeral, including these: “I do believe in the ethical lessons of Judaism. I love and admire my peoples’ devotion to the study of the Torah. I definitely see myself as a Jew. I was born a Jew, and I shall die a Jew, so help me God.” [MAXWELL, E. p. 35]

Gross’ telling of this tale was in a panel discussion about “anti-Semitism;” there was no noticeable anti-Jewish reaction to Maxwell’s lifelong deceit. “An affair of this magnitude,” says Gross, “would once have produced a torrent of antisemitic comments, possibly even antisemitic violence. In the 1990s, the dogs didn’t bark.”

Dogs barking or not, in a frank discussion of what Adam Garfinkle calls the “two religions of American Jews” – Judaism (and its chauvinist particularism) versus Americanism (and its avowed universalism) – in 1996 he noted that:

“Properly understood, the two conflicting belief systems claim allegiance over most of the same realm; it follows that no one can be fully true to both.” [GARFINKLE, p. 4]

This classic irresolvable Jewish universalist-particularist tension is evidenced in the remarks of Louis Brandeis, a Jewish Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court and prominent community leader in the early twentieth century (Brandeis University is also named after him). In 1910 he said:

“Habits of living or thought which tend to keep alive differences of origin or classifying men according to their beliefs are inconsistent with the American ideal of brotherhood, and are disloyal.” [LEWIS, p. 544]

Five years later Brandeis said the irreconcilable:

“To be good Americans, we must be better Jews, and to better Jews, we must become Zionists.” [LEWIS, 555]

Brandeis, notes Edward Shapiro, “was careful to describe Jews as a ‘people’ and not a ‘nation,’ in part because he did not want Zionists to appear un-American and guilty of ‘dual loyalty.’” [SHAPIRO, Jewish Americans, p. 160-161]
A popular slogan in circulation among American Zionists at the time was “Silence in America, Service in Palestine.” [LEWIS, p. 554] Such open sentiment in 1916 worried prominent Jewish American financier Jacob Schiff:

“Thanks to the preaching and machinations of Jewish nationalists we [Jews] are gradually being forced into a class by ourselves and if this continues, it will not be many years before we shall be looked upon by our fellow citizens as an entirely separate class, whose interests are different than the grass [roots] of American people.” [LEWIS, p. 554]

Schiff also resisted the Zionists elsewhere, insisting that, “I am an American pure and simple and cannot possibly belong to two nations.” [Schmidt, p. xi]

In the same era, the (Jewish) American ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau, worried that Zionism “would cost the Jews of America most of what they had gained in liberty, equality, and fraternity.” [Auerbach, p. 336] “As Zionism grew stronger in America,” notes James Yaffe, “the reaction against it [by some Jews] grew stronger too. From the beginning most of the German Jews [in America] were opposed to it … It wasn’t long before [Zionism] began to seem less nonsensical and distasteful than downright dangerous. What these obstreperous Zionists seemed to be saying was that a Jew in America owed his first allegiance to some foreign country. The louder and longer they went on saying this, the more chance there was that somebody besides their fellow Jews would hear them … The horrid old question was raised, What will the goyim think?” [Yaffe, J., 1968, p. 184]

“In maintaining a dualistic relationship,” wrote J.O. Hertzler, “[Jews] run counter to all the principles of acceptance and assimilation, realistically considered. To become one with a people, particularly in the sway of modern nationalisms, you have to cease being, and wanting to be, something else at the same time… The Jew alienates himself from every people of the world among whom he seeks refuge. As long as he preserves his racial and spiritual unity, he cannot hope to have complete civil and personal unity with non-Jews. ‘Special’ minorities are suspected, not accepted.” [Hertzler, p. 77]

The enduring issue of dual loyalty took formal shape in the modern nation-state era with the 1860 birth, in France, of the International Israelite Alliance – the granddaddy of Jewish “defense agencies” – an organization that sought, very publicly, a transnational Jewish solidarity. One of its members, a French politician, Isaac Adolphe Crémieux, went against French government policy in cooperating with France’s enemies, England and Austria, in attempting to free a group of Jews accused of murdering a monk in far away Damascus. Jewish activists in the issue included the very powerful Rothschild, Montefiore, and Arnstein banking families, and various European, American, and Egyptian statesmen were heavily lobbied. With the ultimate release of the imprisoned Jews, says Howard Sachar, “the diplomats saw the deeper issue: the complex machinery of a modern foreign ministry had been thrown out of gear largely by the persistence of a handful of Jews.” [Sachar, p. 144] “What was hailed as a new solidarity by Jews,” says Albert Lindemann, “appeared as the reaffirmation or reemergence of a very old and ominous one to other observers. For them
Jews remained, as they had been for centuries, a peculiar nation spread throughout the nations of Europe.” [LINDEMANN, p. 38]

The issue of dual loyalty remains today, more so than ever with the establishment of the Jewish state of Israel in 1948. As the president of the World Zionist Congress, Nahum Goldmann, boldly proclaimed in 1959, “American Jews must have the courage to openly declare that they entertain dual loyalty, one to the land in which they live and one to Israel.” [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 293]

This perspective has been taken deeply to the American Jewish heart and in “multicultural” America, Jewish dual loyalty is openly celebrated. “Never in modern times,” wrote Michael Meyer in 1990, “have Jews in the West been more committed to Jewish peoplehood. And most of them see Israel as its chief embodiment.” [GORN, p. 235] “As Zionist ideology assumed a central role in Jewish identity,” says Israeli Meron Benvenisti, “doubts about it amount to the negation of Jewish consciousness.” [BENVENISTI, p. xi] “There is no single Jewish community in this country,” said Bruce Arbit (head of a computer company that identifies Jews for mailing lists) in 1986, “There are different groups with varying ideologies. The only thing that unites them is support for Israel.” [CHAFETS, MEMBERS, p. 53] American Jews funnel hundreds of millions of dollars to the Israeli state every year out of their own (and others’) pockets, as well as billions more that Jewish lobbyists shake out of the United States government and American taxpayers for foreign aid. Huge efforts must be exerted in the Jewish community to stifle and disguise this issue, mainly in reinforcing American popular ignorance and uninformed opinion, securing that most non-Jews have not the slightest idea that there is even an issue to investigate.

“It is alarming,” wrote a Jewish anti-Zionist, William Zukerman, in the decade after the founding of the state of Israel,

“to discover how Israeli nationalism has penetrated into American life and thought. It has not only deeply affected organized Jewish communal life, philanthropy, the synagogue, the press, the lecture forum, social centers and clubs, but it is also attempting to influence American literature, at least that literature created by American Jews … [ZUKERMAN, p. 126] … The average Zionist is very sensitive about the question of double loyalty. The fanatic becomes furious when the subject is merely mentioned; the more tolerant person tries to evade it. But none can escape it. The specter of dual loyalty doggedly follows Zionism like its shadow … [ZUKERMAN, p. 228] … This new nationalism and spirituality … can convert American Jewry into a ‘colony,’ or worse yet, into a satellite which takes orders and lives merely for the sake of its ideological parent.” [ZUKERMAN, p. 232]

In 1982, another Jewish anti-Zionist, Alfred Lilienthal, wrote that

“This and this alone is the issue: will American Jews allow Zionism to separate themselves from America as a special collective whose fate is outside and beyond the American fate? … The sentimental affection that Americans of Irish (or Italians or French) birth have for their country of origins offers no analogy to the feeling toward Israel exhibited by
many American Jews … It is beneath anybody’s self-respect to go on pretending that Zionism was merely an attempt to enrich American folklore by promoting a Jewish counterpart to the St. Patrick’s Day Parade. Zionism is a hard-headed political creed which proposes to subject American Jews to the sovereignty of Israel.” [LILIENTHAL, p. 231]

“This curious [Jewish] feeling [for Israel],” says Jewish author James Yaffe, “has very little in common, I think, with anything that the Irishman feels for the Free State or the Italian for Sicily. No Sicilian ever loved his country for its military power; no Irishman in his right mind ever praised the Free State for its tremendous economic expansion. What they feel for the old country is all nostalgia, but the American Jew’s feeling for Israel has something else in it.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 190] “American Jews have a profound dedication to Israel,” noted Irving Friedman, the executive vice-president of the United Jewish Appeal in 1973. [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 120] “Even if they are not Zionists according to classic definition,” noted David Mittelberg in 1999, “most American Jews are pro-Israel. They support Israel ‘politically, economically, and emotionally.’” [MITTELBERG, D., 1999, p. 7]

Former American Jewish Committee official Stephen Steinlight admits Jewish “dual loyalty” freely; it began to trouble him when the balkanized American society Jews have been instrumental in creating seemed to be threatening Jewish interests (i.e., that other minority groups were seizing the Jewish-inspired model):

“We cannot pretend we are only part of the solution when we are also part of the problem; we have no less difficult a balancing act between group loyalty and a wider sense of belonging to America. That America has tolerated this dual loyalty – we get a free pass, I suspect, largely over Christian guilt about the Holocaust – makes it no less a reality.” [STEINLIGHT, S., OCTOBER 2001] http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back1301.html

“In recent years,” notes Jewish scholar Peter Novick, “it has become not just permissible but in some circles laudable for American Jews to assert the primacy of Jewish over American loyalty. ‘We are Jews first and whatever else second,’ says Rabbi Haskel Lookstein, the author of a searing indictment of American Jews’ reaction to the Holocaust.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 34]

“No other people in the world is so attached to its country of origin – Palestine [i.e., Israel] – as the Jews,” wrote Nahum Goldmann, head of the World Jewish Congress and World Zionist Organization,

“who are bound by feeling and religion, as well as by utterly mystical ties … [GOLDMANN, 1978, p. 7] … The Jews are the most separatist people in the world. Their belief in the notion of the chosen people is the basis of their entire religion. All down the centuries the Jews have intensified their separation from the non-Jewish world; they have rejected, and still do reject, mixed marriages; they have put up one wall after another to protect their existence as a people apart, and have built their ghettos with their own hands.” [GOLDMANN, 1978, p. 8]
In 1959, in a survey of 1,000 teachers in Jewish schools in the United States, only 48 were found to be “teaching Israel as a subject of study.” By the early 1980s, 98% “included Israel/Zionism in some form or another as part of the curriculum.” [ACKERMAN, W, p. 179-180] By 1996, some 40-45% of all American Jewish children attended part-time Jewish schools where there is, notes Walter Ackerman, “an increased commitment to the idea that Israel is central to the identity of Jews growing up in America.” Noting the preponderance of Israelis actually teaching the courses in Jewish American schools, he adds that “today it is doubtful that Jewish education in the United States could function without Israelis.” [ACKERMAN, W, p. 187-188]

As James Yaffe noted in 1968:

“Synagogues around the country have become Israel-minded: they raise money for Israel; they say prayers for Israel on the Sabbath; they display Israeli flags and play Israeli melodies; they teach Israeli folk songs and dances in their religious schools; they sell Israeli popular art, like dolls, prayer shawls … Israel has also become a major political issue among American Jews. Most of them don’t know what the Diaspora is and aren’t aware of being in it, yet they would almost automatically vote against any politician, Jew or gentile, who they felt was anti-Israel.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 187]

In a textbook for Jewish high school students published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in 1964, Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn tells his students:

“Our continued financial and political help is still needed by Israel ... Intelligent, well-trained Americans can help Israel immeasurably by their willingness to to volunteer for limited periods of service there. During the Arab War of 1948, many young Americans – including some Christians – volunteered for military service on Israel’s behalf because they saw in the new State an expression of the highest and finest American ideals of democracy.” [GITTLESOHN, R., 1964, p. 223-224]

“Popular Jewish attitudes [have] underwent a profound ‘Israelization,’” wrote Peter Novick in 1999,

“The hallmark of the good Jew became the depth of his or her commitment to Israel. Failure to fulfill religious obligations, near-total Jewish illiteracy, even intermarriage, were all permissible; lack of enthusiasm for the Israeli cause (not to speak of public criticism of Israel) became unforgivable … The presence of Israeli artifacts in the living room became as mandatory as a mezuzah on the doorpost. (In none of this was any knowledge of Israel required. A survey in the 1980s revealed that fewer than a third of American Jews knew that the archenemies Menachem Begin and Shimon Peres were members of different parties).” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 148]

“In a bulletin of the Washington Heights, New York, Sunday School of the Y.M.H.A. and Y.W.H.A. (Sunday School Life, Chanukah issue),” noted Alfred Lilienthal in 1982, “one reads this extraordinary pledge of young Americans:
‘Here is our pledge, Israel: I pledge my loyalty to God, to the Torah and to the Jewish people and to the Jewish state … When a questionnaire was issued to pupils of the public school system in Galveston, Texas, 102 students answered the question ‘What is your nationality?’ with ‘Jewish.’” [LILIENTHAL, p. 23]

And the results of such socialization? Take, for example, the case in 1999 when an American Jewish teenager, Abraham Derman, made international news when he cut through a razor wire fence at Boston’s Logan airport, climbed into an open jet unnoticed, and rode with other passengers to London. Why? He “told investigators that he wanted to go to Israel and had hopes the stunt would help him get a job with Mossad [Israel’s international spy agency].” [BORGER, J., 7-30-99, p. 15]


In 1981, Jewish author Ann Roiphe went to her daughter’s kindergarten class and listened to another mother gush about her own child drawing pictures of the Star of David:

“Look at that Jewish star, look at the picture of her family. She knows she’s Jewish. Jewish and family; those are the two pillars of her identity. Isn’t that really healthy?” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 50]

Roiphe, looking around the room at non-Jewish children, observed that “None of the Christian children had drawn crosses or churches.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 52]

“To the extent that we may identify Zionism with support for Israel,” notes David Schnall, “ – and there will be some who object to this identification – the United States Jewish community has been ‘Zionized.’ The battles of the past – fears of dual loyalties … have not so much been won as made irrelevant.” [SCHNALL, p. 122]

In the wake of the 2001 terrorist attacks in America, and worries about increased balkanization of American ethnic cultures that could undercut Jewish ethnocentric interests, Stephen Steinlight (former Director of National Affairs for the American Jewish Committee) had some confessing to do:

“We cannot consider the inevitable consequences of current [immigration] trends – not the least among them diminished Jewish political power – with detachment … We Jews need to be especially sensitive to the multinational model this crowd (many of them Jewish) is promoting. Why? Because one person’s ‘celebration’ of his own diversity, foreign ties, and the maintenance of cultural and religious traditions that set him apart is another’s balkanizing identity politics. We are not im-
mune from the reality of multiple identities or the charge of divided loyalties, a classic staple of anti-Semitism, and we must recognize that our own patterns are easily assailed, and we need to find ways of defending them more effectively as the debate goes on. Much public opinion survey research undertaken in recent years continues to indicate that large numbers of Americans, particularly people of color, assert that Jews are more loyal to Israel than the United States. For Jews, it is at best hypocritical, and, worse, an example of an utter lack of self-awareness, not to recognize that we are up to our necks in this problem. This has been especially true once we were sufficiently accepted in the United States to feel confident enough to go public with our own identity politics. But this newfound confidence carries its own costs; people are observing us closely, and what they see in our behavior is not always distinct from what we loudly decry in others. One has to be amused, even amazed, when colleagues in the organized Jewish world wring their hands about black nationalism, Afrocentrism, or with cultural separatism in general without considering Jewish behavioral parallels. Where has our vaunted Jewish self-awareness flown? I’ll confess it, at least: like thousands of other typical Jewish kids of my generation, I was reared as a Jewish nationalist, even a quasi-separatist. Every summer for two months for 10 formative years during my childhood and adolescence I attended Jewish summer camp. There, each morning, I saluted a foreign flag, dressed in a uniform reflecting its colors, sang a foreign national anthem, learned a foreign language, learned foreign folk songs and dances, and was taught that Israel was the true homeland. Emigration to Israel was considered the highest virtue, and, like many other Jewish teens of my generation, I spent two summers working in Israel on a collective farm while I contemplated that possibility. More tacitly and subconsciously, I was taught the superiority of my people to the gentiles who had oppressed us. We were taught to view non-Jews as untrustworthy outsiders, people from whom sudden gusts of hatred might be anticipated, people less sensitive, intelligent, and moral than ourselves. We were also taught that the lesson of our dark history is that we could rely on no one.” [STEINLIGHT, S., OCTOBER 2001] http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back1301.html

“No other ethnic group in American history has so extensive an involvement with a foreign nation [Israel],” wrote Melvyn Urofsky in 1975, “No other nation relies upon a body of private individuals who are neither residents nor citizens of their land to underwrite a major portion of their budget. American Jews buy Israeli bonds, give generously to the United Jewish Appeal, lobby [American] government representatives to pursue pro-Israel policy, travel to Israel (where they are greeted with ‘Welcome Home’ signs), respond to every crisis in that part of the world, and yet maintain passionately that they are Americans first and Jews afterward.” [UROFSKY, p. 1]

Jewish “peoplehood,” Zionism, and all other nationalist allegiances to Israel today are in fact enduring abrogations of the very condition for the granting of
equal rights to Jews with the rise of the Enlightenment in Europe in the 18th century, as epitomized in the famous quote by Clermont Tonnerre in 1791:

“Everything shall be denied to the Jews as a nation; everything should be granted to them as individuals. They are obliged to become citizens. Some argue that they do not want to be. Let them say this themselves and let them be expelled. It is impossible for them to be a nation within a nation.” [FEUERLICHT, p. 45]

As England’s Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations, Jonathan Sacks, noted 200 years later:

“Enlightenment thought had stressed the idea of universal humanity on one hand and the abstract individual on the other, freed from the constraints of tradition to make his own world of meanings through his choices. This was a language into which traditional Jewish identity could not be translated … The terms of emancipation liberated Jews as individuals, not as a collectivity.” [SACKS, J., One, p. 9-10]

“To have insisted on apartness, of course,” notes Leonard Fein, “has meant also to reject the liberal dogma of universalism. The extraordinary tension, within the Jewish communities of Europe, between those who saw the Enlightenment, with its presumed tolerance and humanity, as the best hope for Jewish survival, and those who insisted on clinging to more traditional and more parochial patterns, is an argument which has not yet been put to rest.” [FEIN, Israel, p. 6]

The question, as always, begs to be answered, yet again in our own day, as it has always been: As a collective group, where do primary Jewish loyalties really lie? With America, or with Israel? With fellow human beings at hand, or Jews across the world? Do Jewish loyalties lie primarily in contributing to the improvement of deteriorating socio-economic environment in the universalist land in which they live, or does their honest allegiance point first to Israel and the particularist demands of Jewish brotherhood? How do Jews explain it when they not only have “dual loyalties” to America and Israel, but even dual passports (as is a virtual certainty with any American Jew who emigrates to Israel) to these countries as well? (At the same time it is illegal in the respective states in America to even hold dual-state drivers’ licenses). American Jewry answers the question the way it has for decades: bringing up the question of dual loyalty, they argue, is a malicious act of anti-Semitism and their dual passports, dual allegiances, and deep roots in Israel are merely “an expression of American democracy.” “Many American Jews,” notes J. Bruce Nichols, “feel a dual loyalty to the United States and to Israel. Public political criticism of Israel is taken by some as a personal attack on the American Jewish community, Israel’s chief supporters.” [NICHOLS, p. 164]

The political and ethical absurdity of American Jewish immigrants to Israel still maintaining their legal right to vote in American elections on issues they may not even know or care about (save how they affect their new country, Israel), is well illustrated in a 1988 article in The Jewish Week:

“Thousands of immigrants from the United States, holding dual United States-Israeli citizenships, are voting in two elections this
As Americans they will have a say in the November 8 presidential elections; as Israelis, they voted November 1 for prime minister. On domestic issues in the United States they may be poorly informed, but when it comes to Israel and the Middle East, they know better than most American Jews.” [REBIBO, p. 7]

The basis for this situation stems from the 1960s when an American Jew had his citizenship revoked for voting in an Israeli election. He filed suit (Efroyin v. Rusk) to get it back, and on May 29, 1967 the United States Supreme Court “ruled that Congress did not have the power to pass laws depriving Americans of their nationality without their consent.” [ISAACS, p. 6] “The Israeli government quickly revised its immigration laws to enable Americans to ‘back into’ Israeli citizenship without having to give up their American rights.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 362] Thanks to such American Jewish legal efforts and lobbying, dual citizenship – formerly forbidden – was now assured. (This particular case was convenient and curiously well-timed for those American Jews operating that very moment – some in military capacities – in Israel. On June 5, 1967, one week after the Supreme Court ruling, Israel attacked Arab positions to begin the Six Day War. Between 1,000 and 1,500 Jews of American citizenship served in the Israeli army in this military clash). [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 180]

On the other hand, in 1987 the U. S. State Department repeatedly protested “discrimination” in Israeli passport policy, especially “the confiscation of passports and other restrictions on American citizens of Palestinian Arab origin when they arrive in Israel.”) [JEWISH WEEK, 5-22-87]

Before the modern state of Israel was even founded, as Melvin Urofsky notes:

“As early as May 1945, Palestinian Jewish leaders, preparing for the possibility that they would have to fight for independence, had looked to the United States as a possible reservoir of [Jewish] soldiers … Hagannah [forerunner to the Israeli army] began serious recruitment of these [Jewish American military] veterans in the fall of 1947 through such cover agencies as Land and Labor for Palestine, the Palestine Vocational Service, and Service Airways. Under the guise of informing prospective settlers about Palestine, these front groups, all connected and financed through the Sonneborn Institute, spread the news that a variety of interesting jobs were about to open in the Holy Land … In order to protect the citizenship of the Americans, Israeli officials administered an oath of allegiance, so that it could be said they served ‘with’ rather than ‘in’ the Israel armed forces.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 180-181]

“Under the then current [American] law,” notes Joseph Heckelman, in explaining this dissimulative allegiance oath, “taking an abstract oath of allegiance to a foreign government (or voting in a foreign election) was clearly a cardinal offense, whereas actually risking one’s life in the service of a foreign government could be presumed to be less reprehensible.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 181] Among those Jewish Americans killed in the Israel’s 1947-48 war with the Arabs was West Point graduate David “Mickey” Marcus, a Colonel in the American army and
member of Dwight D. Eisenhower’s staff in World War II. “Of the more than three thousand men buried at the United States Military Academy at West Point,” noted Melvin Urofsky in 1978, “Mickey Marcus is the only one to have been killed while fighting under a foreign flag.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 182]

Among the most disturbing dimensions to this kind of two-faced positioning is the chameleon-like status of the recent right-wing prime minister of Israel: Benyamin Netanyahu. Netanyahu (whose father taught at Cornell University in New York) spent the first grade in Israel, the second and third in the United States, grades 4-8 in Jerusalem, and high school in Philadelphia. He served in the Israeli military and then received a BA and MA degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has always held dual American/Israeli citizenship, which allowed him to garner American student loans for his college education. Although he has publicly claimed to have relinquished his American citizenship to serve as the Israeli prime minister, no one has ever been allowed access to his actual records on the subject. “Interestingly,” notes Israeli political scientist Neve Gordon, “the status of his [citizenship] files in the United States has not changed, so according to U.S. law Netanyahu remains a U.S. citizen.” [GORDON, N, p. 11]

The most sensational expression of the dual loyalty issue in America in recent years was the 1987 case of Jonathan Pollard, an American-born Jew who worked in a sensitive position in the U.S. Navy. Pollard became a spy for the Israeli government and passed along more than 800 “top secret” documents to his “first loyalty.” For seventeen months he had been in daily contact with Israeli co-conspirators, two of whom were given military promotions in Israel after Pollard’s spying concluded. [BOOKBINDER, p. 130] The United States government prosecutor in the case, Joseph di Genova, stated that Pollard’s spying “was the largest physical compromise of United States classified information in the twentieth century.” The Defense Secretary at the time of Pollard’s arrest, Caspar Weinberger, wrote a 46-page document to the Federal Court, noting that he “could not conceive of greater harm to national security’ than Pollard’s deeds. [FITCHETT, J., p. 1] At the first news of the Pollard case, an American Jewish Committee member in Washington DC warned that “if it was perceived in America that we had come to the defense of Pollard because he’s a Jew, our credibility as a Jewish community would be down to zero overnight and Israel would be the loser.” [BOOKBINDER, p. 132]

But as the story about the Jewish American spy unraveled, it didn’t turn out to be as threatening to the Jewish community as some has feared. After all, one of the most disturbing aspects of the whole Pollard affair was that so few Americans had any grasp of what was going on in the case. A New York Times/CBS poll in 1987 was undertaken one month after Pollard’s sentencing and attendant news publicity about military promotions for two Israeli liaisons who aided in Pollard’s spying. “A very surprising finding,” says Hyman Bookbinder, “was the amount of general ignorance of the Pollard case. Only 18% of American non-Jews knew that it was Israel for whom Pollard had spied. 13% thought it had been the Soviet Union!” [BOOKBINDER, p. 137] That same year saw no
cut in America’s economic aid to Israel “despite the Federal budget crisis that required protracted negotiations and cuts in many domestic programs. The full $3 billion for Israel in military and economic aid, the same as the preceding year, was approved – all of it outright grant.” [BOOKBINDER, p.]

Within a few years the proclamation could be heard in the Jewish community that Pollard was sentenced to prison for so long, not for his crime, but because of anti-Semitism. [DERSHOWITZ, p. 309] “Israel must become intimately involved in the Jonathan Pollard case,” the (New York) Jewish Week editorialized in 1991, “Israel’s founders envisioned a state that would protect any Jew, wherever, who suffered from anti-Semitism. Pollard is unquestionably such a victim.” [JEWISH WEEK, 5-31-91, p. 24] “Grass roots Jews reacted with mixed and complex emotions,” says Alan Dershowitz, Pollard’s lawyer, “…. But some Jews were … understanding of, if not sympathetic with, a Jewish zealot who put Israeli survival – at least as he perceived it – before the bureaucratic niceties of the [United States] classification system … [DERSHOWITZ, p. 285] … Momentum began to build slowly on Pollard’s behalf in both Israel and the United States. There was still no public criticism [of Pollard’s sentence] by the Israeli government or by the major Jewish organizations. But the [Jewish] mood was changing perceptibly in Pollard’s favor.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 304] Amidst the “changes” was a 1990 supportive statement for leniency towards Pollard signed by the American Jewish Congress and the West Coast B’nai B’rith. Further support came from prominent Jewish public figures, Eli Wiesel and Arthur Hertzberg, a former President of the World Jewish Congress – Philip Klutznick, the leaders of three major rabbinical seminaries, and the Washington Board of Rabbis who asked the President to commute Pollard’s sentence. [GINZBURG, p. 217] In January 1996 the state of Israel awarded Pollack, still imprisoned, formal Israeli citizenship. “Pollack’s lawyers,” noted the Boston Globe, “hope the Israeli government will act to free him the same as it does prisoners of war and soldiers missing in action.” [BOSGLO, 1-25-96] (It wasn’t until 1998 that Israel formally admitted Pollard spied for them).

By late 1997 Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu claimed to have raised the issue of Pollard’s release to Israel with President Clinton on three occasions, and for the first time an Israeli official – Immigration Absorption Minister Yuli Edelstein – visited Pollard in prison. In December 1997 Netanyahu’s “diaspora affairs adviser,” Bobby Brown, declared that “the time for mercy has come … The feeling throughout Israel is that we should do whatever we can to try and help bring about the American decision to free him.” [AIN, S, p. 35] (This reflected Israeli public opinion. A newspaper poll found that 90% of those surveyed in the Jewish nation thought their country should help Pollard and his wife, who was also implicated, in a lesser degree, in the spying. [FRANKEL, p. 218] One innovative tact in Pollard’s defense in the American Jewish community is to change a defense into an assault, charging that not only was the convict’s long prison sentence motivated by anti-Semitism, but that Israel was entitled to whatever information he stole from the U.S. military. In a 1998 issue of the Jewish Journal of Los Angeles, Anne Roiphe appealed to fellow Jews, saying
“Maybe we haven’t found the smoking gun [of anti-Semitism], but most of us believe in some way [Pollard’s] unequal treatment, this odd matter of why Israel didn’t have the information Pollard gave them, is related to anti-Semitism.” [ROIPHE, Jewish Leaders, p. 8]

An extremely rare voice in the Jewish community was that of Joseph Aaron:

“The Jewish community’s behavior [about the Pollard case] has been shameful. Almost all Jews, and even more sickeningly, almost all Jewish organizations have taken up Pollard’s cause. They have called for his release and have either stated or implied that anti-Semitism is keeping him in jail … Now you have to believe that every top American official – Democrat or Republican, civilian and military, executive branch and legislative – is an anti-Semite or you’ve got to recognize that Pollard did such overwhelming harm that all agree he must be punished by staying in prison the rest of his life. Still, most American Jews call for his release … how many Jews have I heard say, ‘Well, he was doing it for Israel’ – as if that made it OK or at least not so bad, as if doing it for Israel is any kind of excuse or explanation or factor.” [AARON, J., 2000, p. 21]

A few years later after Pollard, a Jewish army engineer, David Tenenbaum admitted to passing along classified information to an Israeli officer at the United States Army Tank Automotive and Armament Command in the Detroit area. [JEWSH BULLETIN, Inter] In fact, from the mid 1960s to mid 1980s there have been 40 formal United States investigations into Americans working for Israel. [FINDLEY, p. 125] By 1963, notes Seymour Hersh, American officials felt that “extensive penetration of the United States government [by spies for Israel] needed to be curbed.” [HERSH, S., p. 162]

A 1979 CIA report noted that “Israel is devote a considerable proportion of their covert operations to obtaining scientific and technical intelligence. This has included attempts to penetrate certain classified defense projects in the United States and other Western nations.” [GREEN, S, p. 253] In 1971, for instance, a Swiss court sentenced a Jewish-Swiss engineer, Alfred Frauenknecht, to four and a half years in prison, “but only after he had transferred to Mossad [Israel’s CIA] agents some 200,000 blueprints and the specifications for the precise machine tools used in the Mirage’s [the French military jet] construction.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 235]

In 2001, Shawn Pine, a Jewish reserve officer in the U. S. Army, charged anti-Semitism when he was stripped of his security clearance and was forced “to give up command of an intelligence unit.” Why? Pine, born in America, emigrated to Israel and served in its army in the late 1970s. He returned to the U.S., went back to college, and served for nine years in the U.S. Army. Bouncing back to Israel in 1995, he studied at Hebrew University and served part time in the Israel Defense Forces. As the Jewish Telegraphic Agency put it: “Anti-Israel feelings may be ‘endemic’ in the U.S. Army’s intelligence, Pine believes. ‘When they see a Jew, they see Jonathan Pollard,’ he said.” [SAMBER, S., 10-29-01]

Victor Ostrovsky, a former Israeli Mossad officer and secret agent, left that organization because of moral conscience. In his 1990 book, By Way of Decep-
tion: The Making and Unmaking of a Mossad Officer, Ostrovsky reported that about two dozen Israeli agents are “actively spying, recruiting, organizing and carrying out covert activities, mainly in New York and Washington, which they refer to as their playground.” [OSTROVSKY, p. 269]

Throughout the world, many Jewish citizens of other nations in all walks of life function as extensions of Israel’s CIA. They are called, in Hebrew, sayanim. (“Our greatest advantage,” noted Mossad official Shmuel Toledano, in reviewing his career in the Israeli spy agency, “was always that we had people who could pass for any nationality. Arabs, Germans, whatever.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 191]) These sayanim, says Ostrovsky “are a unique and important part of the Mossad’s operation. Sayanim – assistants – must be 100 per cent Jewish. They live abroad, and though they are not Israeli citizens, many are reached through their relatives in Israel … There are thousands of sayanim around the world. In London alone there are about 2,000 who are active, and another 5,000 on the [Mossad] list. They fulfill many different roles. A car sayan, for example, running a rental agency, could help the Mossad get a car without having to complete the usual documentation. An apartment sayan would find accommodation without raising suspicions, a bank sayan could get you money if you needed it in the middle of the night, a doctor sayan would treat a bullet wound without reporting it to police, and so on. The idea is to have a pool of people available when needed who can provide services but will keep quiet about them out of loyalty to the cause … One thing you know for sure is that even if a Jewish person knows it is the Mossad, he might not agree to work with you – but he won’t turn you in. You have at your disposal a nonrisk recruitment system that actually gives you a pool of millions of Jewish people to tap from outside your own borders … The one problem with the system is that the Mossad does not seem to care how devastating it could be to the status of the Jewish people in the diaspora if it was known.” [OSTROVSKY, p. 86-87]

In an unprecedented action, at the request of the state of Israel in 1990, an American judge banned publication of Victor Ostrovsky’s book (from which the above quotation is excerpted) until the New York State Supreme Court Appellate Division rescinded the censorship. “The Israeli government,” noted the Jewish Week, “claimed the book could imperil Mossad agents by blowing their cover.” [JEWISH WEEK, 9-21-90, p. 20] In 1995 Ostrowsky sued a Canadian television station that interviewed an Israeli journalist, Yosef Lapid, who proclaimed on air that he hoped “a decent Jew in Canada” would assassinate the telltale former Mossad member. [KEZWER, G., 2-12-95, p. 8] Ostrovsky’s house in Canada was also burned down.

Loyal Jews of various nations work in the service Mossad. In 1999, for example, the Jerusalem Report reported an interview it had with former Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev’s son:
Israel gave the CIA a copy of your father’s famous speech denouncing Stalin, delivered behind closed doors at the 20th Party Congress in 1956. How did the [Israeli] Mossad get a hold of it?”

Sergei K.: “The daughter of a Polish party leader had a Jewish boyfriend, and that boy worked for the Mossad. The boyfriend found a copy of the speech on the Polish leader’s desk and ‘borrowed’ it for a while.” [JERUSALEM REPORT, 9-13-99]

One such sayan, New York-based Jewish American Howard Schack, even wrote a book about his adventures as a volunteer for Mossad, entitled A Spy in Canaan. My Secret Life as a Jewish-American Businessman Spying for Israel in Arab Lands. “What did I,” he wondered one day, “a middle-aged Jewish-American businessman, have to offer [Israel]?

The next day as I sat at my desk in my construction company I realized that before me lay something that might prove useful to Israel. Heaped on my desk were plans and specifications for an offshore naval expansion program in the Red Sea and Persian Gulf that had been put out for bids by Saudi Arabia. These plans had come to me quite routinely. My firm had exactly the experience needed to carry out portions of the project. Reviewing the plans, I wondered if the government of Israel was aware of them … I had dealings with foreign governments that took me all over the globe, bringing me in contact with hundreds of executives who did business worldwide, especially in the Middle East.” [SCHACK, H. 1993, p. 7]

Schack – member of the Chamber of Commerce, the Shriners and Kiwanis clubs, and other community organizations [SCHACK, H., 1993, p. 17] – contacted the Israeli consulate in Washington DC, offering his espionage services for Israel. “I conduct business in the Middle East,” he explained to a consular official, “I have access to projects such as public buildings and massive capital development projects from Kuwait to Libya. My credentials permit me to work intimately with Western firms that have construction contracts in those countries.” [SCHACK, H., 1993, p. 8] Schack was soon assigned to a Mossad “handler” and was even provided a spy camera.

From the very formation of the modern state of Israel, American Jewish sayanim have aided the Jewish state at high administrative levels. A good example was a Jewish American ‘mole’ in the United States veteran’s bureaucracy. Thousands of American Jews served in the Israeli military during the founding of the Israeli state in 1947-48, despite a United States State Department decree noting that those who enter foreign armies “cease to be entitled recognition as [U.S.] citizens during the period of such service,” and that they would lose their American passports. [GREEN, p. 52] Nonetheless, in 1948 a Unites States Security Group of Army Intelligence report noted that

“There presently exists among [branches of Israel’s armed forces] a plan to recruit former [U.S., almost all Jewish] army officers … It was reported that someone in the Pentagon who had access to [classified] officers’ AGO (Adjutant General’s Office) files and who is making avail-
able to these organizations the names of former officers thus qualified.”

[GREEN, p. 53]

This Pentagon source was identified as Colonel Elliot A. Niles, “an ardent Zionist, formerly a high official of B’nai B’rith.” His brother, David, was an aide to President Harry S. Truman, “one of two or three most influential persons in the White House on Middle East policy matters.” [GREEN, p. 54]

Meanwhile, while American Jews can vociferously condemn with indignation the well-earned suspicions of their dual national loyalty which they themselves (quite literally by the millions) have solidly secured for their entire community, in Israel the standards for the evaluation of entire groups of people is quite another matter, where the actions of a handful of people indict as suspect a community of millions. Take the case of Ze’ev Chafets, Head of Israel’s Government Press Office, an American Jew who immigrated to Israel, and his refusal to allow Palestinian laborers to work in his Jerusalem home:

“Is it fair to discriminate against everyone for the crimes of the few? Maybe not, but how do you tell the good guys from the terrorists?”

[FRANKEL, p. 239]

In the Middle East context, Michael Bar-Zohar notes the omnipresence of Jewish spies (working for “Shai,” the early Israeli spy organization) during the British rule of Palestine:

“No one know when or how or where the ubiquitous, wraith-like Intelligence Service of the Resistance originated. The British knew it existed, but they could never put their finger on its nerve center, identify its directors, or discover its headquarters in spite of the fact that there were thousands of Shai agents. Nearly all the Jewish police, military officers, and inspectors worked for Shai unbeknownst to their British bosses and their Arab colleagues. The same was true of postal workers, telephone operators, hotel chambermaids, cafe waiters, newspapermen, secretaries, typists, and the Jewish department heads in the British bureaucratic system. Shai also maintained networks of Arab agents who reported on what went on in the headquarters of the Arab tribes and in the secret meetings of influential Palestinians … It was seldom that a confidential telephone conversation, an exchange of official correspondence, or a coded telegram escaped detection by the invisible antennae of the Jewish espionage.” [BAR-ZOHAR, M., 1972, p. 19-20]

In today’s world, dual loyalty, ever encouraged in the Jewish community (i.e., Jewish chauvinism and allegiance to Israel as an inalienable American democratic right), left completely unchallenged by all in modern American culture for fear of being branded an ‘anti-Semite,’ has invariably given arrogant rise to nakedly hostile and subversive statements by those obsessed with Jewish identity. Consider the words of Jane Delynne, an American Jew who has reaped the benefits of life in America with three published novels, an Elizabeth Janeway Prize for Prose Writing, a Book of the Month Club Fellowship, and a New York Foundation Fellowship for the Arts. Her forum, from which the following is quoted, is not some obscure, fanatic off-the-edge cult magazine, but a 1989
book on Jewish identity by powerhouse publisher Random House, a fact that
testifies to the disturbing acceptability of this kind of attitude – as a legitimate
opinion – in the Jewish American community:

“The existence of Israel is the reaffirmation of Jews as the chosen peo-
ple … Israel is suffused for me with a moral meaning absent from the
existence of any other nation in the world. If there was a war between
the United States and Israel, I would choose Israel. Sometimes I think I
am secretly glad for] its occasional brutality so that the world will know
there is a monster out there – a monster who will never forget [the Ho-
locaust]. Although in general I believe in nuclear disarmament, I am
glad] Israel has the atomic bomb, and the continued existence of Israel is
the only cause for which I consider it justifiable to use nuclear weapons.
Let me put this in its starkest and ugliest light: I am not sure, but I be-
lieve that, if the choice were between the survival of Israel and that of the
remaining 4 or 6 billion people of the world, I would choose the 4 mil-
lion [Jews].” [DELYNN, p. 65]

Such a conviction merits serious attention for many reasons, among them
the fact that some American Jews were even instrumental in helping Israel
secretly develop its own arsenal of nuclear bombs. Seymour Hersh notes that:

“A few American nuclear physicists were known to have emigrated to
Israel after World War II; one was a veteran of the Manhattan Project
[America’s nuclear bomb-making effort] who had worked until 1956 in
the most sensitive areas of nuclear reactor design … The CIA had even
been tipped off about the fact that Israel was raising large sums of money
for Dimona [the site of Israel’s nuclear bomb center] from the American
Jewish community.” [HERSH, p. 58]

Among the friends of Ernst David Bergmann (the “founder” of the Israeli
atom bomb, whose father was one of leading rabbis in Berlin) was Lewis Strauss,
the American Jewish chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in the 1950s.
Strauss knew well of Israel’s clandestine efforts to build nuclear weaponry.
“Strauss’s [Jewish] background and his strong feelings about the Holocaust,” notes
Seymour Hersh, “cannot be disregarded in analyzing why he did not tell anyone
– especially [his AEC chairman predecessor and eventual head of the CIA] John
Mc Cone – about Dimona. Fair or not, the issue of ‘dual loyalty’ – exemplified by
Strauss’s actions – has been a very real concern to the American intelligence
community since the creation of the state of Israel in 1948.” [HERSH, p. 89]

Another Jewish American sometimes mentioned as possibly influential in
the development of Israel’s nuclear bombs was Z alman Shapiro who had a
nuclear fuel processing business in Pennsylvania. Shapiro was an activist in the
Zionist Organization of America. In 1965, the Atomic Energy Commission
found that 200 pounds of enriched uranium was missing from his company’s
storehouses. Nothing was ever proven, but the “CIA … found Shapiro’s long-
standing ties to Israel to be of continuing interest … Shapiro, as the CIA and
AEC never learned, did have a secret life. He had met and befriended many of
Israel’s senior nuclear scientists.” [HERSH, S., p. 247]
“The dual loyalty question,” wrote Anne Roiphe, like Jane DeLynne, in a 1995 volume (which included articles by prominent Jewish authors, including Abraham Foxman of the Anti-Defamation League), “is one that anti-Semites use to isolate us politically in America. We’re not supposed to discuss it. But the truth is that … we are only Americans as long as America reins in its anti-Semites. We are Jews forever under all circumstances.” [ROIPHE/CHANES, p. 464]

“Under all circumstances.” What conclusions should the reasonable, impartial, and just observer make about the following Zionist volume that is published every year in Israel? In English, it is entitled, *Who’s Who in Israel and Jewish Personalities from All Over the World*. More bluntly, however, in its seminal version in Hebrew it is called, *Who’s Who In Israel and In the Work for Israel Abroad*. [See national library online OCLC subfield] Those Jews listed in the volume who are noted to be “working for Israel abroad” include:

- **Frank Lautenberg**, a Jewish American U.S. senator from New Jersey and former chairman of the United Jewish Appeal
- **Paul Rose**, a former member of the British Parliament
- **Arne Melchoir**, member of the Danish Parliament (and former member of the Danish Zionist Federation)
- **Lionel Stoleru**, the Minister of Planning for the French government (and chairman of the France-Israel Chamber of Commerce)
- **Simone Weil**, member of the French Parliament (and former president of that organization)
- **Roy Welensky**, former Prime Minister of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
- **Stanley Clinton Davis**, a former member of the Belgium Parliament [A reader of this work states that he was a member of the British Parliament]
- **Michael M. Fidler**, former member of the British Parliament
- **Benzion Netanyahu**, professor of Judaic Studies at Cornell University and father of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu
- **Fredman Lincoln**, president of the Royal Navy Reserve Officer’s Club in England
- **Abraham Foxman**, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League
  Stanley Fuld, retired chief judge for the state of New York
- **Ezra Kolet**, retired Joint Secretary and Chief Controller of Chartering for the government of India

Others on the list include the **Leonard Bernstein** (the famous composer), actor Theodore Bikel, **Edgar Bronfman** (chairman of the World Jewish Congress), and others who live throughout the many countries of the world as judges, newsmen, bankers, lawyers, dentists, real estate moguls, librarians, and other distinguished careers. In 1987, nearly a million adult American Jews (of a total man, woman, and child U.S. population of approximately six million people) felt it important enough to actually register to vote in that year’s World
Zionist Congress elections. [GOLDBERG, JJ, 9-12-97] By the 1940s, 955,000 American Jews (of a total man, woman, and child population of 5 million) “formally belonged to one of dozens of Zionist organizations.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 126] Yet even those who are not formal members of such organizations often have strong attachments to Zionist policies and the state of Israel. As Kevin Avruch notes about studies of American Jews who immigrated to Israel in the late 1960s and early 1970s: “Anywhere from 40 to 65 percent of all American olim [immigrants to Israel] were not members of any Zionist organization in the United States … It is important to understand that commitment to Zionist ideology can exist quite separate from a concomitant commitment to Zionist organizations.” [AVRUCH, K., 1981, p. 50]

To begin to understand the origins of the insistent Jewish dual loyalty conviction, we must refer of course to Jewish genetic “Chosen People” and “Nation Apart” foundations of identity. As Jewish scholar Will Herberg observes, “Built into [the Jewish] being is a transnational, transcultural, transpolitical dimension that makes him irrevocably and irreducibly ‘different.’” [HERBERG, p. 272] But it is also necessary to spotlight another keystone of traditional Jewish identity throughout the world: galut, a Hebrew word meaning “exile.” Originally (and for many still today) grounded in religious conviction, the notion of galut has been emphatically renewed in contemporary Zionist secular ideology. The basic premise of galut is that Jews are everywhere estranged and alienated from the people and cultures around them, they are intrinsically unfulfilled and restrained as Jews, this condition is innately irresolvable, and the only true remedy for Jewish dissatisfaction in galut is – in both religious Orthodoxy and Zionist ideology – a return to the homeland of Israel. “The galah [galut/exile],” says A.B. Yehoshua in his article entitled Exile as a Neurotic Condition, “and our attitude to it defines the essence of the Jew.” [YEHOSHUA, A., p. 15]

“Down through its history,” notes the Encyclopedia Judaica, “the feeling of galut has been one of the most permanent and prolific incentives in Jewish thought.” [ENCY JUD, v. 7, p. 294] In traditional religious terms, “the very soul of the Jew is affected in the galut, which renders him ‘unclean with inequities’ (Song R. 8:14) … The galut detracts from the completeness of the Kingdom of Heaven (Mid. PS to 97:1) … [ENCY JUD v.7, p. 279] … From the beginning the galut [starting with the Biblical exile from the Holy Land to Egypt] was a phenomenon which demanded an explanation … The [religious] sages could not be satisfied with a general answer about the sins of the [Jewish] people, and they gave their opinion about the specified causes of the destruction of the second temple. Unlike the first exile, which resulted in idol worship, incest, and the shedding of innocent blood, the second destruction [of the temple] was caused by baseless hatred and love of money (Yoma 9b).” [ENCY JUD, v.7, p. 78]

In modern Israel, notes Batya Keinan, an official of the Zionist/Socialist MAPAM party, “The lowest and most disgusting thing you can say about someone in Israel is ‘He’s galutii,’ meaning from the Diaspora and not one of us.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 165] As recently as 2000, the president of Israel, Moshe Kat-
sav, was still publicly calling for Jews worldwide to give up their lives in other countries and move en masse to Israel. [HOFFMAN, G., 9-11-2000]

**Samuel Heilman** notes this traditional Jewish separatist view in today’s ultra-Orthodox:

“Many of [the ultra-Orthodox] tried to remain strangers and sojourners in the contemporary secular world. That was the essential message they read in the promise by God in Leviticus 20:26: ‘And I will separate you from the nations to be for Me.’ One should not try to be a Frenchman, a German, an American, or even a secular Israeli or any other kind of citizen, but always a Jew. The world beyond the Jewish one was essentially evil and one must ‘distance oneself from it … so as to not learn its ways.’ Jews could never forget that they were in exile.” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 18]

“Abraham cut this groove,” says **Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg**, “and his descendants deepened it. Jews in every era have struggled to reconcile two opposing inclinations. They have wanted to maintain a separate and special culture, even as they have wanted to be accepted by the majority. This desire to be both different and the same is the root of great turmoil on three levels: It is the source of tension within the souls of individual Jews who do not know to which culture they belong; Jewish factions keep quarreling with one another about how much of the majority culture is admissible before it compromises the Jewish character; and Jews are always trying to achieve equilibrium with the rest of society, balancing their otherness with their desire for inclusion.” [HERTZBERG, 1998, p. 49; quoted in O’BRIEN, 2000]

In 1921, Jewish immigrant **Maurice Samuel** became an American citizen. Yet Samuel, a prolific author, and a secular Zionist, only three years later wrote:

“If I have long pondered this question of the Jews and gentile it is because I suspect from the first dawning of Jewish self-consciousness that Jew and gentile are two worlds, that between you gentiles and us Jews there lies an unbridgeable gulf … [SAMUEL, *You*, p. 9] … I do not believe that this primal difference between gentile and Jew is reconcilable.” [SAMUEL, *You*, p. 23]

This ancient religious self-perception of Jewish identity, equally manifest in a secular, usually Zionist, form, has profound impact in mainstream Jewry’s general sense of its communal self and its position in the United States. **Shalom Carmy** notes that “One way of keeping alive a sense of Galut in America is to inculcate an instinct to snideness toward ‘their’ [non-Jewish] culture, from baseball to apple pie. Another is to limit, as a matter of principle, active concern for the affairs of American society, to cultivate a studied *schadenfroh* toward the moral adversities that rock it. The most forceful way of nursing an awareness of **Galut**, however, is to dwell on anti-Semitism.” [SHALOM, p. 60-61]

“My own feeling is that **Galut** is still very much part of the Jewish community,” noted **Justin Hertog**, a faculty member at Vassar College, during an academic conference about the subject, “… My self-conception of my Jewishness
is always in tension with my identity as an American. And I presume that most American Jews feel the same … The assumption that Jews should desire to ‘integrate’ [into American, or any other, non-Jewish society] seems wrong to me. Why should Jews desire to give up all they have suffered over the millennia? Why should Jews attempt to be like American Christians?” [HERTOG, p. 14]

“To be honest,” says Janet Kirschheimer, an assistant to the president of the National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership, “I have never felt truly American. I grew up in two different worlds: one that didn’t exist any more [her parents were from Germany] and one in which I didn’t feel at home [America].” [KIRSCHHEIMER, J., 4-5-01]

“America may be a very comfortable and accommodating exile and many even be favorable to many forms of Jewish creativity,” noted Bruce Saposnik of New York University at the same gathering, “Jews will choose to live here both comfortably and Jewishly. They will nevertheless always be living in exile.” [SAPOSNIK, p. 37] “Exile diminishes the soul of every Jew – in Israel or abroad,” added Yosef Abramowitz, “who have not found union between the self and her or his Jewish self. Exile diminishes the collectivity of the Jewish people where a union has not been created by Jews … And Exile, Galut, is Jewish life in America.” [ABRAMOWITZ, p. 18] “Deuteronomy 12:29-13:19 is a passage of warning,” says Jewish college freshman Steven Stryer, “directed at the Israelites entering Canaan. The problem of assimilation that is addressed are familiar to Jews today, in Israel and the United States.” [STRYER, p. 90]

Popular Jewish American author Cynthia Ozick addresses Galut and its alienation from non-Jewish culture this way:

“As we more and more pour not only the Jewish sensibility, but the Jewish vision, into the vessel of English, we achieve the profoundest invention of all: a language for our need, our possibility, our overwhelming idea. If out of this new language we can produce a Yavneh for our generation within an alien culture, we will have made something worthwhile out of the American Diaspora, however long or short its duration.” [OZICK, p. 34] [Yavneh was town where Jews were allowed to have a religious academy under Roman rule. “It was out of Yavneh,” says Ozick, “that the definition of Jewish life as a community in exile was derived.” [OZICK, p. 35]

(Meanwhile, in view of this issue of Jewish-American unassimilability and the role of Israel in it all, a note of irony. In 1998 a few hundred people held a rally in front of the offices of the Boston Herald newspaper in protest of an article by (Jewish columnist) Don Feder who had called Puerto-Ricans “inassimilable.” He “described Puerto-Ricans as immigrants – even though they have been citizens of the United States since 1917 – and equated Spanish speakers to criminals, welfare recipients, and aliens.” The Hispanic protesters demanded a personal apology from Feder, noted the Boston Globe, but “Feder has been in Israel and unavailable for comment.” [VALDES-RODRIGUEZ, p. B4])

David Ben-Gurion, the widely revered first prime minister of modern Israel, once stated that “the basis of Zionism is neither friendship nor sympathy
but the love of Israel, of the state of Israel … It must be unconditional love. There must be complete solidarity with the state and people of Israel.” [LILENTHAL, p. 231] This, of course, underscores a huge, but unspoken, problem in America – widespread Jewish American sympathy, allegiance, and, for many, primary loyalty to Israel. Jews are numerous in important positions of power throughout American society, including the military and defense contracting firms. In 1996 a Pentagon security office issued an internal memo warning employees about Israeli (and other “close ally” countries) efforts to steal military and intelligence secrets. Jews were singled out as an example of susceptibility, by virtue of their “strong ethnic ties” to the Jewish nation. The Pentagon memo more generally noted that other country’s search for spies and traitors focused on “ethnic targeting, financial aggrandizement, and exploitation and identification of individual frailties” of American citizens. “Placing Israeli nationals in key industries,” the memo also said, “… is a technique utilized with great success.” The warning also cited Israeli theft of optics information and radar test equipment in the past.

By any measure of rational, historical, moral, and experiential examination, the memo addressed a legitimate issue of concern, but modern America is – for all its ‘political correctness’ – completely paralyzed in coping with it. For fear of offending American Jewry for an honest assessment of a reality that the American Jewish community itself has created for its individual members, the Pentagon was positioned as “discriminatory” and had to disavow and condemn the warning when it was leaked to a Jewish magazine. “This Pentagon memo’ is a distressing charge,” declared Anti-Defamation League Director Abraham Foxman, “which impugns American Jews and borders on anti-Semitism.” [SMITH, p. A1] Certainly the President of the United States – beholding to so much Jewish economic and political influence – cannot speak freely about the issue of Jewish dual loyalty. Seymour Lipset and Earl Raab note that “as recently as 1992 President George Bush complained bitterly that ‘thousands’ of Presidential lobbyists, obviously mobilized by American Jewish organizations, had descended on Washington to oppose his position on certain loan guarantees … for Israel. Jews saw this as a dual-loyalty reference, and the President eventually made an apology.” [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 128]

With absolutely no one around with the courage to stand up to the charge of “anti-Semitism,” Jews are increasingly emboldened to test the limits of dual loyalty tolerance even in American intelligence agencies. In 1999, for example, Adam Ciralsky, a Jewish CIA employee began proceedings to sue the spy unit for anti-Semitism. His lawyer was Neil Sher, the former head of Israel’s foremost lobbying organization in America, AIPAC. Ciralsky’s loyalties had become suspect to his employer when he failed a lie-detector test when questioned about his family’s “contacts with right-wing politicians like Prime Minister Netanyahu,” and whether his family donated money to “Israeli government causes.” “I think that it is important that he state openly he and his family’s support of the [Israeli right-wing] Likud party,” noted one commentator in a CIA document. “He may be simply withholding on this issue, because it paints him and his family as extreme supporters of Israeli hard-liners in the Likud Party,
and he wishes to avoid being seen as a lover of Israel.” [HENRY, M., p.4] Another CIA memo noted that Ciralsky’s lack of candor “will not be misunderstood by the CIA, for we are sophisticated and broad-minded enough to understand the unique ties that bind American Jews to their brethren in Israel.” [HENRY, M., p. 4] The Jerusalem Post noted that Ciralsky’s dual loyalty suspicion was “not the first such case. An FBI counterintelligence agent won a six-figure settlement and a lifetime annuity for being suspended after a trip to Israel.” [KOHN, M., p. 9B] Ciralsky was investigated, noted a Florida newspaper, because he “did not fully reveal a relationship with two people holding dual U.S.-Israeli citizenship, both employees of Israeli defense firms with possible ties to Israeli intelligence.” [PRESS JOURNAL, 2-7-2000]

“CIA memos,” noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “single out Ciralsky’s Jewish background, including his proficiency in Hebrew, trips to Israel and a Judaic studies minor in college … He was also asked about connection to his great-grandfather’s first cousin, Chaim Weizmann, Israel’s first president. He was not, however, asked about a previous internship at AIPAC [Israel’s American lobbying organization].” [DORF, 4-14-99, p. 13] For popular American consumption, TV’s “60 Minutes” perspective (via Jewish reporter Leslie Stahl) on the Ciralsky case was that “the former CIA lawyer says he is not a spy and was targeted for investigations because he is a religious Jew.” [60 MINUTES, online, 2-6-2000]

“[My client’s] family visited, they support Israel, they support Jewish causes like the UJA, buying Israel Bonds,” Ciralsky’s lawyer declared, “If contributing to UJA and Israel Bonds makes one suspicious and questions your loyalty, then the majority of American Jews would be under suspicion.” [HENRY, M., p.4]

And here – the irony of his statement beyond the lawyer’s grasp – we have the crux of the problem, a condition that Zionism is creating for the Jewish community at-large.

In a similar kind of attack, with the legal aid of B’nai B’rith Canada’s “League for Human Rights,” charges of anti-Semitism in the Canadian armed forces were made in Canada in 1998 by a Jewish naval reserve officer, Andrew Liebman. He was allegedly told in 1991 that, with high tensions in the Middle East, he could not be granted a promotion to a high position in the Arab country of Bahrain during the Persian Gulf War because he was Jewish. The Canadian Forces’ policy was “designed,” the Forces argued, “to maintain peacekeepers’ neutrality and [to] avoid inflating already-tense situations.” B’nai B’rith wanted Jews anywhere and everywhere, no matter what the surrounding conditions, and asked a Canadian court to rule that country’s policy had been discriminatory and unconstitutional. [CSILLAG, R., p. 3]

Investigations of Jewish loyalties are not unwarranted. The issue of dual loyalty in the spy context, for example, has a very substantial history in the American Jewish community with some disturbing precedents during the post-World War II American-Soviet “Cold War.” In recent years, with the collapse of the Soviet Union’s communist regime, KGB and FBI archives have been increasingly accessible for scholarly examination and it is has become starkly clear that a large pro-
portion of American spies for communist Russia were Jewish. They were instrumental in helping the Soviet Union secure American nuclear bomb secrets, as well as other espionage. In the 1950s, notes Ronald Radosh and Joyce Milton, “fear that the Jewishness of so many of the atom-bomb spy suspects would provoke an anti-Semitic reaction led to a defensive attempt [by Jewish organizations] to prove the patriotism of America’s Jewish community and ‘scare off’ Jews who might be attracted to the Left.” [RADOSH/MILTON, p. 353]

“What has proven most disturbing,” noted the Jewish Exponent in 1999, “is the picture we have of the extent of the betrayal – truly overwhelming in sheer bulk. The fact that many Jewish [American] radicals participated in espionage [for Russia] sticks in peoples’ throats … Spies, spies everywhere … [Recent books about the subject] are invaluable for what they add to our knowledge of the [Cold War] period and may yet spur a bout of soul-searching among the remnants of the progressive community in America, so many of whom were – and are – Jewish … [Such betrayers] allowed the Soviet Union to develop atomic weapons years before it may have been [otherwise] possible.” [LEITER, p. 46]

Kevin MacDonald notes the 1950s case of Andhil Fineberg of the American Jewish Committee and his exploring of Jewish defensive strategies over the

“repercussions of the fact that the great majority of communist spies were Jews … Fineberg suggested that the best way to combat this threat to Jews was to de-emphasize Jewish group identity of ‘good Jews’ like Bernard Baruch as well as a ‘bad Jews’ like the communist spies. Identifying people like Bernard Baruch as Jews ‘reinforces the concept of group responsibility’ and ‘the residue in the mind of the average American person whom the editorial is intended to influence, is likely to be, ‘But why is it all those atomic spies are all Jews?’ Fineberg argued that an attempt by Communist Party members to portray their persecution as anti-Semitism would be ‘devastating’ to Jews generally and recommended that the AJCommittee reply to charges linking Jews and communism to the effect that ‘criminals operate as individuals, not as members of religious or racial groups.”’ [MACDONALD, p. 25]

A variety of people of course functioned as spies during the Cold War, but among the disturbing implications of such recent revelations is that the Soviet side of the Russian spy system was in large part Jewish too; a critical examination of the Soviet transnational spy system points in no small way to Jewish networking. As high-ranking KGB officer Pavel Sudoplatev noted in 1994, “The men and women [in Russia] who were most influential in acquiring atomic bomb secrets for the Soviet Union were all later purged because they were Jewish [i.e., Soviet intelligence officers were eventually driven from the ranks because of allegations of a ‘Zionist conspiracy’ within it].” [SUDOPLATEV] Or, as Jewish scholars Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter noted in 1982:

“Allen Weinstein’s study, Perjury, seems to indicate that Jews constituted a substantial majority of known members of the Soviet underground apparatus in the United States during the 1930s. Soviet agents
whose backgrounds were probably Jewish include J. Peters, Lee Pressman, Harry Dexter White, Marian Bachrach, Hedda Gomperz, and many others.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTGER, 1982, p. 100]

On the American side of the Soviet spy network, perhaps the most famous spy case in American history centered on two Jewish communists – Ethel and Julius Rosenberg – who were convicted and executed in 1953 for passing along secrets to the Soviet Union. Harry Gold and David Greenglass were also Jewish accomplices. Until recent intelligence disclosures, for decades many Jews have held that the Rosenbergs “were blameless [and] … that the couple had been framed by the FBI and had been executed out of a mixture of anti-Semitism and the government’s wish to set an example to all self-professed radicals.” Recent investigations, however, noted the Jewish Exponent, “had to conclude that their subjects were guilty as charged.” [LEITER, 2-4-99, p. 57]

Curiously, “by design or destiny,” also said the Exponent, “all the principals in the [Rosenberg] case were Jews. The presiding judge was Irving Kaufman, the prosecutor Irving Saypole was assisted by Roy Cohn, and the defense lawyers were Alexander and Emmanuel Bloch, father and son. To redress the balance, the jury was all gentile.” [LUVIA, Y., 7-2-93, p. 1x] (This situation paralleled a similar court case in South Africa, the Rivonia trial, where there was a “prevalence of Jews in the [Communist] Party … In a striking echo of the Rosenberg Trial in this country,” notes David Biale, the prosecuting attorney, Percy Yutar, was himself Jewish and may have been partly motivated to show that Jews could be loyal to the regime.”) [BIALE, D., 2000, p. 64]

“The [Rosenberg] jury complexion, noted the Toronto Star in 1986, “has prompted charges that the Rosenbergs were victims of an anti-Semitic cabal.” [AGES, A., p. M5] By 1999, however, the Jewish Exponent noted that “with the unearthing of voluminous evidence from the files of the FBI and the Kremlin, those who cling to the notion that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and [Gentile] Alger Hiss were innocent deserve to be compared to people who believe the world is flat.” [TOBIN, J., 3-11-95, p. 33]

Peter Novick notes the dimensions of Jewish communist spies in that era:

“Lucy Dawidowicz – later well known as an historian of the Holocaust, but in these years the American Jewish Committee’s expert on the percentage of Jews among ‘hostile witnesses’ before various investigative bodies. Jews, she found, often made up 75 percent or more of the totals. Worst of all, producing something near panic among mainstream Jewish organizations, was the number of Jews figuring in espionage prosecutions: the Amerasia case, the Canadian Spy Ring, the Judith Coplon case – culminating in that ultimate disaster for Jewish public relations, the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell, Harry Gold, and David Greenglass.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 92]

There was also Nathan Silvermaster, “a Russian-born economist who worked for the [American] Farm Securities Administration [and] established a network of friends in government to provide Soviets material and to aid the U.S.S.R. during World War II.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 189] Jewish-Russian Isak
Akhmerov was the Soviet control officer of Yakov Golos (also Jewish), “the chief organizer of espionage activities through the American communist party.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 219] Gregory Kheifetz, Jewish too and one of the main organizers of the American Communist Party, had worldwide assignments from the Russians. [SUDOPLATOV, p. 84-85] Soviet agent Naum Isakovitch Eitingen “used his connections in the [American] Jewish community to obtain new papers and identity.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 79] The Rosenberg’s Russian case officer was also Jewish, Sam Semyonov (real name: Abe Taubman).

Controversial, prominent, and fabulously wealthy Jewish entrepreneur and art philanthropist Armand Hammer had long been under suspicion – he was called by his secretary “the Pimp of the Politburo.” [KUROPAS, p. 7] “Armand and his father,” notes Edward Epstein, “had become crucial parts of the Soviet clandestine organization [in America] …”[EPSTEIN, 1996, p. 103] … By 1940, British intelligence had developed a lengthy dossier on Hammer. It identified him and his associates as part of the Soviet ‘secret regime’ in the West.” [EPSTEIN, 1996, p. 152] FBI files notes that Hammer “had been a Soviet courier,” “he had laundered funds for the Soviet Union,” “he had helped recruit Soviet spies and position them in the United States government,” and “he had been, in the 1920s, a key link in a network that provided money to espionage rings in New York and London.” [EPSTEIN, 1996, p. 170]

Carl Blumay notes the fundamentally Jewish nature of Hammer’s contacts in early Soviet Russia:

“From the moment of his arrival [in Russia] he was surrounded by old family friends, among them Ludwig Martens, whom Lenin had appointed to head the Soviet mining industry after his deportation from the United States; Boris Reinstein, whose functions as Soviet propaganda minister included serving as guide to visiting Americans; Julius Hammer’s [Armand’s father’s] partner, Abe Heller, whom the State Department categorized as ‘a notorious Bolshevik’; and the Hammer family’s European representative, Boris Mishell, whose first assignment was to locate a Mercedes Benz for Armand.” [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 43]

Maurice Halperin, who while heading “the research department of the Office of Strategic Services, America’s main intelligence agency at the time, gave hundreds of American diplomatic cables to the KGB.” [LEITER, p. 46] Bella Gold in the U.S. Commerce Department and Sonya Gold in the U.S. Treasury Department [WEINSTEIN, A.; VASSILEV, p. 167] were among those working with the aforementioned Nathan Silvermaster, a U.S. Treasury Department official who was also working as a Soviet espionage “group handler.”

Theodore Hall (also Jewish: original last name Holtzberg), while working on the nuclear bomb in Los Alamos, New Mexico, was “the only American scientist known to have given the Soviet Union details on the design of an atom bomb.” [ALBRIGHT/KUNSTEL, p. 9-17] In 1945, Philip Jaffe, editor of Amerasia magazine, was arrested by the FBI. “Jaffe,” noted the Jewish Exponent, “[was] a committed sympathizer [and had] contacts with Soviet intelligence agents and said he wanted to spy for them.” [LEITER, 8-22-96]
The only known U.S. Congressman to have spied (beginning in 1937) for the Russians was also Jewish, Samuel Dickstein, for fifteen years a Democratic Congressman from New York, and later a judge. The Russian NKVD (precursor to the KGB) codenamed Dickstein “the Crook” because of his “mercenary instincts.” Consummate hypocrite and deceiver, Congressman Dickstein was also “the founding father” of the (HUAC) House Un-American Activities Committee – the organization that sought to expose Russian communist agents in American government and popular culture in the 1950s. [GUARDIAN, 1-27-99, p. 6] (Ten of the nineteen people subpoenaed by HUAC were Jewish, as were six of the ten who were indicted by the committee). [NAVASKY, p. 113]

Among non-Jewish Americans spying for the Soviets were some whose espionage roots revolved around sexual affairs with Jewish Russian agents: Elizabeth Bentley was the aforementioned Jacob Golos’ lover. [WEINSTEIN/VASSELEV, p. 84] Martha Dodd’s partner was Soviet agent Boris Vinogradov. In Bentley’s case, after Golos died, she defected from the espionage ranks. Jewish Soviet agent Joseph Katz was assigned the task of killing her, but the murder was never carried out. [WEINSTEIN/VASSELEV, p. 108] In Dodd’s case, she never knew that her love affair with Vinogradov was being directed from Moscow. She eventually married wealthy Jewish-American businessman Alfred Stern, who also became involved in Soviet espionage activities. Stern was influential in setting up a music business, with a Jewish-American Hollywood producer, Boris Morros, as a front for Soviet espionage efforts. “Most Americans who spied for Moscow during the 1930s,” notes Allen Weinstein and Alexander Vasselev, “were antifascist admirers of the Soviet Union whose involvement in espionage had ideological roots. There were two noteworthy exceptions, one a U.S. Congressman [the aforementioned Samuel Dickstein] and the other a Hollywood producer [Boris Morros]. [Both] offered their services as Soviet agents for a price tag.” [WEINSTEIN/VASSILEV, photo section] Even Marilyn Monroe’s Jewish psychoanalyst, Ralph Greenson, was secretly an agent for the communist Comintern. (Monroe had a series of romantic affairs with the president of the United States, John F. Kennedy, and innocently shared information she gleaned from him with Greenson). [WOLFE, D., p. 384]

In later years, the only known Soviet spy to have penetrated the CIA (1973-77), described “in intelligence circles … as one of the most important spies in United States history” was Karl Koecher. He was also Jewish. Koecher, notes Ronald Kessler, “gave his Czech handlers and the KGB details of dozens of ‘top secret’ CIA operations targeted at the Soviets and U.S. allies alike. He supplied them with classified CIA documents, lists of photographs of CIA employees in the United States and overseas and names of U.S. government officials who might be blackmailed into cooperating with the Soviets.” Koecher and his wife Hana were enjoyed their American stay in the fullest of ways; they were extremely active in group sex orgies, nudist retreats, and wife-swapping events. [KESSLER, 4-17-88, p. C1]

There were a significant number of Jews working on the American Los Alamos nuclear bomb project, including some from other countries like Hans Ber-
the, Emilio Segre, and Edward Teller. (Jewish equivalents in England included Rudolf Peierls). Such Jewish immigrants were so important in the development of the bomb that Richard Rhodes, in his Pulitzer-prize winning *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*, devotes an entire chapter to their “exodus” from Europe, particularly Germany and Hungary. Jewish scientists involved in the bomb, Albert Einstein and Leo Szilard, even managed to get Jewish economist Alexander Sachs to convey to President Franklin D. Roosevelt the urgency of building the nuclear weapon. A colleague jokingly called immigrant Jewish bomb developers Szilard, Teller, and Eugene Wigner “the Hungarian conspiracy.” [RHODES, R., 1988, p. 306, 308]

The director of the atomic bomb program was also Jewish, J. Robert Oppenheimer. “I had a continuing, smoldering fury about the treatment of the Jews in Germany,” he once said. [RHODES, R., 1988, p. 445] The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, for that matter, in that era was also Jewish, David Lilienthal. “The most vital information for developing the first atomic bomb,” says former top KGB official Pavel Sudoplatov, “came from scientists designing the American atomic bomb at Los Alamos, New Mexico – Robert Oppenheimer, Enrico Fermi, and Leo Szilard.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 172] (Of the three, Fermi was not Jewish, but his wife was). Jewish Soviet agents Gregory Kheifetz and Elizabeth Zarubin “persuaded Oppenheimer to share information with ‘antifascists of German origin’ … Oppenheimer, together with Fermi and Szilard, helped [the Soviets] place moles in Tennessee, Los Alamos, and Chicago as assistants in those three [nuclear] labs.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 190] Others seminally influential with Oppenheimer included Jewish actor Solomon Mikhoels and Yiddish poet Itzik Feffer (later murdered in Soviet purges) – Russian nationals on a tour of the United States with the Moscow Yiddish State Art Theatre. [SUDOPLATOV, p. 188] Soviet intelligence noted in 1944 that Oppenheimer, head of America’s nuclear weapon program, was a “secret member” of the American Communist Party. [WEINSTEIN/VASSILEV, p. 183-184] For Szilard’s part, the army’s head of atomic bomb security, Leslie Richard Groves, thought the scientist was “the kind of man that any employer would have fired as a troublemaker.” “Groves,” says Richard Rhodes, “seems to attributed Szilard’s brashness to the fact that he was a Jew.” [RHODES, R., 1988, p. 502] Groves also suspected the scientist of being a spy and had him put under surveillance, but caught him doing nothing illegal. [RHODES, R., 1988, p. 506-507]

(Jewish involvement in weapons to invoke “holocausts” are a steady theme. In later years the “father of the neutron bomb” was also Jewish: Samuel Cohen. “Few people know the man behind the neutron bomb,” noted the *New York Times* in 1982, “J. Robert Oppenheimer and Edward Teller, the key scientists in the development of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, are well known but only dedicated students of weaponry have heard of Mr. Cohen.”) [NEW YORK TIMES, 3-28-82, sec. 1, p. 34]

On the Soviet side of the Russian-American spy rings, “the [Russian] men and women who were most influential in acquiring atomic secrets for the Soviet Union
were all later purged because they were Jewish.” [SCHECHTER, p. 301] These early 1950s purges in Russia (centering on alleged Zionist intrigue in the Russian intelligence agency and other departments) began with the alleged “confessions” of Naum Shvartsmann, whose own job was to edit “falsified confessions extracted from prisoners.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 300-301] Brutal Soviet dictator Josef Stalin grew suspicious of increasing Russian Jewish interest in the new nation of Israel. The principal focus of this concern was the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, an organization created to raise support for the Soviet Union from western Jewry in lobbying other governments against the threat of Hitler. But, to Stalin’s chagrin, the JAC soon “brought an extraordinary stirring of Jewish consciousness in its own ranks, reflecting the prevalent mood of Soviet Jewry as a whole … [It expressed] feelings of [Jewish] national solidarity and Jewish pride … They were frequently so carried away by their faith and enthusiasm as to overlook the JAC dominant objective, namely, that of spreading Soviet propaganda … JAC speakers and writers increasingly resorted to biblical imagery, Talmudic references, and Jewish historic symbols.” [GILBOA, p. 46-48] Soviet poet Perets Markish, for example, publicly talked about “Jewish brothers” around the world, declaring that “we are one people, and now we are becoming one army.” [GILBOA, p. 47] For Stalin, the JAC was turning into a anti-communist threat. Voices were also heard around the world like that of Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz who announced that, “Let us remember that if we do our full duty, we not only help to smash Hitlerism, but bring back Russian Jewry to the fold of Israel.” [author’s italics: GILBOA, p. 54]

Shortly after the founding of Israel in 1948, Foreign Minister Golda Meir visited the Soviet Union. Her arrival, notes Stuart Kahan, “brought with it a welcome far beyond anything contemplated. Soviet Jews poured into the streets of Moscow. They surrounded her hotel day and night. Her very appearance brought thunderous roars of approbation. Stalin was in shock. He called an emergency meeting: ‘The Jews have still not been able to adapt themselves or become acclimatized like other minorities. Only very few can – or want to … They constitute an ever present danger. Every Muscovite Jew has foreign connections. We are threatened by the danger of Zionism.’” [KAHAN, S., p. 250] Among those deeply moved by Meir’s visit was Polina Zhemchuzhina, the Jewish wife of Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov. Joshua Rubenstein notes that Zhemchuzhina met “members of the Israeli delegation at a diplomatic reception … [and] she could hardly restrain herself. ‘I’ve heard you attend the synagogue,’ Zhemchuzhina told Golda Meir, speaking in Yiddish. ‘Very good. Keep going. The Jews want to see you.’ When Meir asked how she knew Yiddish so well, Zhemchuzhina proudly responded, ‘Ich bin a Yiddische tochter’ (I am a daughter of the Jewish people), a phrase she repeated several times. Zhemchuzhina asked about life in Israel, about the Negev [desert], and conditions on the kibbutzim. She parted from them with tears in her eyes, saying, ‘I wish all will go well for you there and then it will be good for all Jews.’” [Rubenstein, J., p. 262]

Zhemchuzhina herself was arrested by Soviet security a couple months later and sent into exile.
Although Zionism was banned in Russia under tsarist rule, Nora Levin notes that in the year of the Russian revolution, 1917, the Zionist movement had 300,000 members (of a total Jewish population of 3.5 million) in 1,200 chapters throughout the country. [LEVIN, N., 1988, p. 3, 7] Zionism prevailed in many pan-Jewish organizations – for example, 60% of the vote in the All-Russian Jewish Congress. In nine Ukrainian provinces, in 193 kehillas (traditional Jewish self-governing bodies), 36% (the largest number of any ideological group) of the delegates were Zionists. “When the Bolsheviks took power,” notes Nora Levin, “Zionism was unquestionably the dominant movement in Russian Jewish life.” [LEVIN, N. 1988, p. 7, 87] Zionism’s free expression after the Russian revolution was stifled by 1919, however, when the new communist government perceived the demands of expressly Jewish nationalism to be a threat. That year the new government also began forcing Zionist offices to close. Communist Party leader V.I. Lenin had called Jewish demands for national autonomy a “Zionist idea … one which is reactionary in its political implications.” [LEVIN, N., 1988, p. 17] “There is no doubt,” says professor Nora Levin, “that had the [Russian] anti-Zionist campaign been relaxed, many Jews would have joined or rejoined Zionist groups, thus crippling communist control.” [LEVIN, N. 1988, p. 94]

The theme of purges of various dissidents, real and imagined, in communist ranks, is a continuous one in Soviet history. Jews were periodically one of the major targets. Ironically, anti-Zionist purges in the 1930s “were all under [Jewish communist leader Lazar Kaganovich’s] orchestration, and he relished it … All Jewish cultural institutions were liquidated. The Communist Party apparatus and the ministries at all levels were purged of Jewish personnel.” In the later anti-Zionist purge, prominent Russian Jewish leader S. M. Mikhoels “was shot to death in Minsk … the order had been given by Lazar with Stalin’s approval.” [KAHAN, S., p. 250]

Common Jewish-enforced convention in the West holds that Stalin’s anti-Zionist purge (and others in Soviet history) was rooted in baseless anti-Semitism. (Jews, of course, were not the only ones subject to brutal purges in the Russian communist past. As Jonathan Franklin notes, “it would be totally erroneous to suggest that the Jews were the only victims of the purges. Initially, at least in the years 1949-51, those communists suspected of national deviation … were in the greatest danger and, throughout, ‘Titoism’ remained a major form of anathema held in readiness to fall almost at random on the leaders of the [communist] bloc countries.” [FRANKLIN, J., p. 320]) Philosemitic former KGB official Pavel Sudoplatov, whose perspective is that of a man with a Jewish wife who was a lieutenant in the Russian spy organization, condemns the 1950s anti-Zionist purge as unwarranted. Jewish scholar Barnet Litvinoff notes, however, that “any Jew who does not absolutely denounce Zionism can, with some truth, be charged with accepting it. By this interpretation, the [Zionist] movement is [in 1969] strong in the Soviet Union.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 87]

Or, as Sylvia Rothchild notes:

“In 1965, Elie Wiesel was in Moscow in time to witness the Simchat Torah celebration. He was astonished to find crowds of young people
dancing and singing in front of the synagogue on Arkhipova Street, as he reports ‘openly celebrating their faith in the people of Israel.’” [ROTHCHILD, S., 1985, p. 19]

Whatever the case, the charge of “Zionist conspiracy” as a “fifth column” looms as an endless, terrible cycle. Those with primary allegiance to the Jewish state invariably create suspicion in others for all Jews in positions of political power. Those Jews innocent of Zionist allegiance nonetheless gravitate towards Israel as insurance against anti-Jewish hostility. Hence, the problem – in a self-fulfilling loop – grows like the nature of anti-Semitism itself: Gentile suspicion of, and outrage at, Jewish alienation and intrigue, followed in consequence by further Jewish alienation, followed by further Gentile alienation, and so forth. Prominent Jewish Russian Zionist Natan Sharansky (famous among international Jewry for his fight to emigrate to Israel) stated the problem succinctly: “I loved Russian culture … but I was a Jew because of anti-Semitism.” When Sharansky was interrogated by the KGB for his Zionist activities, he writes that “I was eager to show the agent that I was a loyal citizen just like him, although I already knew in my heart that wasn’t true.” [SHARANSKY, p. xiv]

With the Soviet purge of Jews in its intelligence ranks, 50 colonels and generals were arrested, including the Deputy Minister of Security, Andrej Sverdlov, son of the first president of the Soviet Union. Such Jewish characters as Grigori Maironovsky, head of the “top secret toxicological laboratory” who had “personally liquidated a number of the most important enemies of the Communist Party and the Soviet government” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 279] also met their ends. Jews, notes Sudoplatov, were deeply entrenched in the communist elite everywhere: “Key members of the Politburo like Voroshilov and Molotov had Jewish wives; Kaganovich was Jewish.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 300] (Even in America, Earl Browder, for many years the head of the American Communist Party, had a Jewish wife, Raissa Berkman. Polish communist strongman Wladeslaw Gomulka also had a Jewish wife.) [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 82]

Although there was also a purge of Zionist Jews in the Soviet system in 1922-23 (particularly members of the Politzi Zion: “Police of Zion”), by 1933 “in every major ministry at the time, Jews held top positions.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 288] By 1937, “some students of the Kremlin power struggle put the number of Jewish military officers executed at 500, not less than twenty of them generals.” In power struggles not solely aimed at Jews, one-third of the 75,000 Red Army officers were purged from the ranks of communist leadership. [LITVINOFF, B., p. 79] In September 1948, not long after the declaration of the founding of the new nation of Israel, a Jewish Communist Party member, Ilya Ehrenburg (later an elected member of the elite Supreme Soviet), “published a bitter tirade in Pravda against those Jews who looked with approval at Israel and Zionism.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 84]

In Czechoslovakia, Rudolf Slansky, the Vice-Premier of the country, and “considered the most powerful man in the country” was put on trial in 1952 along
with the Deputy Ministers of National Defense, State Security, Foreign Trade, and Finance. Of the 14 on trial, 11 were Jewish. Romania’s Jewish Foreign Minister, Anna Pauker, also were tried. “Large numbers of Rumanian Jews,” notes Barnet Litvinoff, “were imprisoned on the grounds of Zionist activities.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 90] One Jewish Czech of intrigue, Otto Katz, had “developed a number of Communist cells in the Hollywood film community and was a key participant in the conspiracy to kill Foreign Minister Masaryk. He was executed during the Slansky purges.” [GREENBERG, M., p. 44]

Indictments against Slansky and other Jewish communist leaders in Europe stemmed in large part from association with American Jews (and self-proclaimed communists) Noel and Hermann Field, who were involved in a variety of European intrigues and were ultimately imprisoned for allegedly spying for the United States. [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 76-85]

Further along in the Soviet spy world, other Jewish Soviet intelligence operators in America included George Gamo, who provided Moscow with “the names of left wing [American] students who might be recruited to supply secret information,” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 192] Lev Vasilevsky, who from Mexico City headed efforts to get information from nuclear bomb director Oppenheimer, and Leonid Eitingon, who set up two Polish Jewish agents on America’s west coast. The early lead scientist in Moscow’s intelligence agency who studied stolen atomic spy secrets was also Jewish, Yakov Petrovich Terletsky.

Fleeing Stalinism, the most prominent Soviet spy ever to defect to America, General Alexander Orlov (originally Leiba Lazarevich Feldbin) was also Jewish. In the 1930s Orlov set up a Soviet spy school outside of Barcelona. An American Jew, Morris Cohen, “became one of the elitist of the elite at the special school,” [ALBRIGHT, p. 31] and Cohen’s first Russian spy controller in New York was also Jewish, the aforementioned Semyon Semyonov. [ALBRIGHT, p. 33] “Why [defector] Orlov never told American authorities about Cohen after the general received asylum in the United States in mid-1938 remains Orlov’s secret.” [ALBRIGHT, p. 32] Senator James O. Eastland once called Orlov “the highest ranking officer of the Soviet State Security [later KGB] ever to come to the side of the free world.” Yet, with access these days to KGB archives, in an entire 1993 volume about Orlov, John Costello and Oleg Tsarev assert that “Orlov had played a subtle game of wits, first with the FBI and then with CIA interrogators. This enabled the Soviet agents he recruited and former colleagues he could have identified to continue clandestine operations against the West. Orlov’s case was therefore a classic: it was the record of a man squeezed between divided loyalties with little room to maneuver.” [COSTELLO/TSAREV, p. 10-11, p. xi, xii] (Other prominent Soviet Jews who defected to the U.S. were Valter Krivitsky (Samuel Ginzburg) and Ignati Reis (Natan Poretsky). [VAKSBERG, p. 97] )

From Poland, Jozef Swiatlo, also Jewish,

“won international fame on account of his defection in 1953. [He] was head of Section One [in the Polish government], which dealt with foreign intelligence services and their infiltration into key party and state positions.” [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 70-71]
Another Polish Jew, Jerzy Bryn, a diplomat, attempted to defect from Poland to the West, changed his mind, and was sentenced to life in prison for treason. [CHECINSKI, M., 1982, p. 152]

Elsewhere, the “most senior Soviet intelligence officer ever convicted in America,” Colonel Rudolf Abel, [ALBRIGHT, p. 245] was also Jewish, later freed in 1962 in exchange for American spy plane pilot Francis Gary Powers. Likewise, the “Resident Director of all Soviet spy networks in France between World Wars I and II” was Jewish, Ignace Reiss. [GREENBERG, M., p. 44]

In Britain, shockingly, the fifth Soviet spy known to have penetrated British intelligence was an heir to the fabulously wealthy capitalist Rothschild fortune, Nathaniel Meyer Victor Rothschild. An entire volume, entitled “The Fifth Man,” about his betrayal was published in 1994. Rothschild “supplied espionage material to the Russians on work in everything from nuclear weaponry and radar to germ warfare developments at the biological center.” [PERRY, p. xxii] Roland Perry also notes that Rothschild “was camouflaged as the Fifth Man by virtue of his powerful position in the [British] Establishment. The vast wealth of his banking dynasty embedded him in the power elite more than the other members of the [spy] Ring of Five. It was a perfect cover and served to shield him. He seemed the epitome of the ruling class in twentieth century Britain, and therefore the least likely to be a traitor … Rothschild was more loyal to his Jewish heritage than anything English … Rothschild assisted in the creation of a homeland [Israel] for the Jews who had been dispossessed [in Europe].” [PERRY, p. xi]

Another of the preeminent five Soviet spies in Great Britain was (non-Jew) Kim Philby. Alice Kohlman, notes the Jerusalem Post, was “the Jewish woman who had been Kim Philby’s first wife, and by some accounts, instrumental in leading the young Philby to work as a Soviet agent.” [ARAD, p. 21] Klaus Fuchs is another non-Jewish spy who served ten years in a British prison. A Jewish espionage associate, Ruth Werner (born Kuczynski), was never caught.

Canada? Erna Paris notes that

“The highest ranking Jew in the Canada Communist Party was Sam Carr [born Shloime Kogan] … Carr’s crucial role as principal recruiter of Soviet spies was revealed in the 1946 Royal [Canadian] Commission on Espionage.” [PARIS, p. 171]

Canada also had its own Jewish Congressman-traitor:

“The man who actually transmitted Canadian atomic information to Russia was Fred Rose (born Rosenberg), the only communist MP [Member of Parliament] … The effects of Rose’s conviction ricocheted through the Jewish community of Montreal … The primarily Jewish voters of Cartier [an area in Montreal] … found themselves represented in Parliament by a convicted spy.” [PARIS, p. 174, 175, 181]

Upon release from prison in 1951, Rose moved to communist Poland. [PARIS, p. 176]

Communist East Germany? “Markus Wolf, the mastermind of former East
Germany’s spy network” was in 1993 “charged with treason, espionage, and bribery.” In recent years, noted the Associated Press, Wolf “has had more appreciation of his Jewish roots.” [COSTELLO, K., 5-3-93]

In the years leading up to, and during, World War II, a Polish Jew, Leopold Trepper, headed a Soviet spy ring (known as the “Red Orchestra”) in western Europe that was able to infiltrate the Nazi General Staff in the early 1940s. Trepper was an early member of the Zionist Hechalutz organization. [PERRAULT, p 16] Likewise, in the early 1930s, another Jewish communist, Isiah Bir (nicknamed “Fantomas”) headed a Soviet spy ring in France. His number two man in command, Alter Strom, was also Jewish. [PERRAULT, p. 18]

In Trepper’s network, in earlier years, a traitor to his organization was an unnamed Dutch Jew, a “former head of a Soviet Spy ring in the United States.” [PERRAULT, p. 21] Trepper’s spy network, notes Gilles Perrault, consisted of “a high proportion of Jews.” [PERRAULT, p. 49] These included Leo Grossvogel, Jules Jasper, “Camille,” the Sokols, Abraham Raichman, “Captain” Gurevich, and many others. Trepper survived the war and, under the alias Leiba Domb, became a publisher, specializing in “Jewish classical literature.” [PERRAULT, p. 509]

During World War I, Dr. Isaac Strauss, a Jewish spy for Germany, was arrested in the United States. [BENDERSKY, J., 2000, p. 56] Incredibly, there were even Jewish spies working for Hitler’s Aryan fascism, some of whom “had prewar careers as criminals … The fact that several were so easily ‘turned’ [to work for Hitler] suggests that opportunism, rather than ideology, was often the dominant motive.” Such spies included Hans Arnheim (sentenced to death in 1940 by the French who captured him) and Joseph Jakobs (part-Jewish; sentenced to death by the British in 1941). Rudolph Korda, a Hungarian-Jewish journalist, also headed a German spy ring till 1942. Karl Molnar (described as “part Jew”), chief of the Hungarian intelligence in Istanbul, was “a valuable collaborator with the Abwehr [the Nazi intelligence organization].” Ivan Lissner, described as “a German half-Jew,” was a collaborator in Germany itself; he was even a Nazi party member. In Shanghai, Hans Mosberg served Nazi spy interests. “The terrible fact,” noted the Jerusalem Post, “remains that their actions contributed, each in his own degree, to the Nazis’ anti-Jewish and anti-human war machine.” [WASSERSTEIN, B., 4-9-99, p. 5B]

* In 1999, Iran tersely rejected the formal protests lodged by the French minister of France “that the arrest [of 13 Iranian] Jews [on accusations of spying for Israel] was intolerable.” The ambassador “summoned the Iranian ambassador [in France] to express France’s anger.” [INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 6-22-99, p. 4] This small item meriting international attention and formal French “outrage” bears further scrutiny. Most such news reports on the subject neither itemized the charges against the Jews, nor evidence for or against them. As always, the reportage of such an occasion, with no context whatsoever, merely encourages the reader to absorb between the lines evidence of yet another case of endemic, irrational anti-Semitism. This time from Iran. Yet there are strong historical contexts and precedents for such accusation.
Israel’s Mossad was long prominent in the former Iranian Shah’s secret police network (See later chapter). As recently as March 1998 too, three Mossad agents made the news after trying to bug a Muslim activist’s home in London. Only a few days later another four Israeli spy members were arrested in Switzerland after bugging another Lebanese Muslim’s home. These incidents, and the failed attempt to assassinate an anti-Israel Hamas official in Jordan, forced the head of Mossad, Danny Yatom, to resign. [MAHNAIMI, U., 1998]

And there has always been widespread Israeli spying on Arab countries, using Israeli Jews who originally came from those very lands.

Take for example, Israel’s original spying unit on Arabs called Shin Mem 18, [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 43] created for the “infiltration and implantation of Israeli agents in Arab countries.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 43] Or take for example the case of Yolande Harmer, “born in Egypt to a Turkish-Jewish mother,” who” posed as a journalist in her home country and took “on a succession of lovers, some of them simultaneously, mostly from Egypt’s rich and powerful and from the foreign diplomatic corps in Cairo.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 61]

In 1998, the Times of London noted the profoundly ruthless and dedicated degree that Israeli espionage can go. In a newly-discovered story, the paper revealed that “members of an Israeli undercover unit in the 1950s went so far as to marry Muslim women and have children by them to ward off suspicion … The unit was designed for long-term espionage. Its members, Sephardim from a variety of Arab countries, were taught to speak in Palestinian accents … Ironically, because they had been so rigorously taught the Koran, some became teachers, which gave them perfect cover for spying.” [WALKER, C., 9-30-98] (So, when seemingly ridiculous Polish communist-era “antisemitic and anti-Zionist propaganda” proclaimed that “Jews had been instructed by their ‘world center’ command post to marry Polish girls in order to gain influence over the population and thus be able to pursue their subversive and espionage activities more effectively,” what are we to reasonably think of it? [CHEMCINSKI, M., 1982, p. 217]

Other Israeli spying units (later blending into today’s Mossad) using indigenous Arab-speaking Jews included Shai (the Arab Division of the Jewish Agency political department) and Palmach’s “Arab Platoon.” In the 1950s an Israeli spy, Major Avraham Dar, “recruited a group of Egyptian Jewish youngsters and set up underground [Zionist] cells in Cairo and Alexandria.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 108] In 1954 “the [Jewish] Egyptian network embarked on its bombing spree … [However] a bomb went off prematurely in the pocket of one of the group, Philip Natanson, as he was about to enter the Rio Cinema in Alexandria. Natanson was arrested and that night the Egyptian security police arrested the rest of the network: Dr. Moshe Marzuk, Shmuel Azzar, Marcelle Ninio, Victor Levi, Robert Dassa, Meir Za’afran, Meir Meynhas, Eli Ya’akov, and Azzar Cohen.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 111]

Quite possibly echoing the recent Jewish-Iranian spy accusation, Israeli intelligence “activated a wide range of European contacts to try to improve the treatment or obtain the release of the Cairo defendants. Among those
approached were French parliamentarians such as Couve de Murville and Daniel Maier and leading British and French lawyers.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 113] The West German government was even persuaded to act on behalf of one of the Israeli spies, Max Binnet, recognizing his questionable German citizenship. “After his death,” note Ian Black and Benny Morris, “in a rare piece of inter-Arab intelligence cooperation, the Iraqis informed Cairo that Binnet … had been mentioned in the 1951 Mossad ring trial in Baghdad [regarding] the extensive spy network that had operated in Iraq and Iran.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 113] In 1965, in another situation, Eli Cohn, born and raised in Egypt, was the “first Israeli spy caught and executed as an Israeli.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 48]

In Morocco, in the 1950s “hundreds of Jewish volunteers were mobilized in a Mossad-led Jewish self-defense organization.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 176] “Over 100 [Jewish Moroccans] went abroad – mostly to Israel – for military training, though some were trained in Morocco itself: cells and ‘units’ were organized in the main towns (eventually there were twelve local units); arms were bought and dispensed in underground caches … The members were trained in the uses of pistols, sub-machine guns and knives. At its height [the Jewish Moroccan secret cell] had 600 members (and in Algeria and Tunisia, another 600 altogether).” [MORRIS/BLACK, p. 176]

Zionist intrigue in Eastern Europe? From the early years of the Israeli state, note Ian Black and Benny Morris, “new Jewish immigrants [to Israel] from behind the Iron Curtain, Israeli diplomatic missions, and Jewish communities in Eastern Europe all served as valuable sources of intelligence.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 136]

In response to French parliamentary speaker Laurent Fabius’ recent call to release the imprisoned Iranian Jews before a trial, Iran’s Tehran Times responded, saying that “Mr. Fabius is probably under the influence of Zionists.” [AGENCE PRESSE FRANCE, 7-3-99] Fabius too is of Jewish heritage.
“Since the last great wave,” says Woocher, “of social activism in America in the 1960’s, the rhetoric of Jewish pursuit of social justice has been somewhat muted within the polity. Greater attention has been paid to the tasks of Jewish self-preservation; the polity has, in the view of many observers, ‘turned inward.’ [WOOCHER, p. 87] In other words, as the Jewish community achieves increasing influence in the American economic and political worlds, it is inevitably gravitating back to the ideological base that has served Jews throughout history: the insular preoccupation with “being Jewish,” Jewish self-promotion at others’ expense, and the refocusing of a delineation between Jewish selves and outsiders. “For most of [American] history,” says Gordon Lafar,

“American Jewry avoided the conflict between universalism and particularism by identifying its selfish interests with the broader dictates of liberal universalism. Indeed, in the early part of this century, the circumstances of American politics conspired to offer Jews an easy congruence between the general principles of liberalism and their particular economic and social interest … In recent years, however, the marriage between liberal universalism and Jewish particularism has unraveled … It has become increasingly apparent that the community’s selfish interests diverge from the dictates of abstract universalism, leading the Central Conference of American Rabbis to note in 1976 that ‘until the recent past our obligations to the Jewish people and all humanity seemed congruent. At times now these two perspectives appear to conflict.’” [LAFAR, p. 181]

“Even during the Berkeley sit-in of 1964,” notes Stephen Whitfield, “according to one report, Hatvikal [the Israeli national anthem] was sung; and Students for a Democratic Society was packed with Jews, whose Jewish identity was often disguised or downplayed.” [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN, p. 114]

Using the always reliable Jewish device pointing to an irrational, endemic anti-Semitism as an omnipotent threat to Jews, Ruth Wisse in 1992 framed her move to political conservatism in terms of Jewish self-protection:

“Gentiles invented … [anti-Semitism]. Its defeat requires, on the part of the victims and onlookers, a temporary sacrifice of the liberal optimism upon which the whole of democratic society is founded.” [WISSE, p. 46]

Large scale Jewish abandonment of social justice movements was evidenced during the wake of the Vietnam war era, especially after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. There were many Jews active in leftist political organizations, but with the state of
Israel increasingly understood by the Left to be an imperialist and/or colonialist nation positioned against Third World struggles, "faced with the choice," says Seymour Lipset, "of giving up their attachments to Israel or dropping their ties to the Left … a significant and visible number of Jewish leftists dropped out of the New Left." [LIPSET, p. 158] "Jews who had thought that being Jewish did not matter," says Charles Silberman, "… discovered in 1967 that Jewishness lay at the heart of their being." [SILBERMAN, p. 201] "We believe," proclaimed a Jewish socialist group called Chutzpah, "that the form and content of most Left criticism [of Israel] is inescapably anti-Semitic." [LIEBMAN, A, ANTISEM, p. 350] A Jewish sociologist in France, Raymond Aron, even declared that "If Israel disappears, I do not wish to survive." [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 9]

"Resigning in droves," notes J.J. Goldberg, "from liberal and left-wing groups, [Jews] attacked those who did not do so as traitors to their own kind." [GOLDBERG, p. 140] "[Jews] were forced to choose," says Arthur Liebman, "between their ethnic identification and community and their universalist political movement … Most chose their ethnic identity." [LIEBMAN, A. p. 526] "When universalistic policies conflicted with ethnic imperatives," note Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, "as in the case of radical critiques of Israel, Jews were torn in opposite directions, and their attachment to radicalism was weakened." [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 114] "After 1967," remarks Gerald Sorin, "support for Israel became the common denominator of American Jewish life, so much so that no Jew who was not a staunch advocate for the Jewish state could expect to occupy a responsible position in any major Jewish organization." [SORKIN, p. 215] "A number of ex-revolutionary Marxists of Jewish background," says Alan Wald, "had become pro-Israel after 1948 and had substituted either Zionism or some other form of Jewish ethnic identity for the revolutionary internationalism to which they had once adhered." [WALD, p. 15]

A 1996 book about convicted anti-Arab terrorist Era Rapaport even begins: "How does a nice Jewish boy from East Flatbush, Brooklyn, a gifted social worker, a marcher for civil rights, a loving husband and father, end up blowing off the legs of the PLO mayor of Nablus [in Israel]?" [RAPAPORT, E., 1996, p. 1] "Ezra," wrote an old friend to him in prison, "what did Israel do to you? You, the freedom fighter. You who walked arm in arm with thousands of Blacks in D.C. You, one of the best drug-prevention workers I’ve chanced on. The devoted social worker who could make a desolate human being feel like this life was worth living. Who got beaten up for defending the underprivileged. What happened to you? How could you? Are Arabs not people?" [RAPAPORT, E., 1996, p. 22]

Left-wing journalist (Village Voice) Paul Cowan recalls being in the Peace Corps when the 1967 war began:

"I remember walking down to the Peace Corps office, and feeling quite lonely when I realized that none of the other volunteers was as disturbed as I was. I decided to go to the Israeli Embassy, and volunteer to serve … When I got back to the United States, and became part of the [Vietnam] anti-war movement, I found myself increasingly uncomfort-
able with the left’s attitude toward Israel. I was a dove, but sometimes [non-Jewish girlfriend] Rachel and I would hear a criticism of Israeli military policy and find ourselves reacting very differently. She would assume that Israel was partly to blame; I’d wonder whether the criticisms contained a hint of anti-Semitism.” [COWAN, P., 1987, p. 19]

Israel’s 1967 Six Day War and 1973 Yom Kippur War, says Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, “evoked a sense of Jewish solidarity on the one hand, and distinctiveness from the gentile nations on the other. It strengthened deeply rooted tendencies in the Jewish tradition to stress the uniqueness and isolation of the Jewish people.” [SAIDEL, p. 19] In 1969, in the midst of this Jewish exodus from universalist ideals, Leonard Fein surveyed his people and wrote that “the overwhelming ambiguity – one might even say contradiction – of the modern era may be stated as follows: precisely at a time when the rhetoric of universalism has reached an unprecedented peak, and precisely at a time when the myths associated with universalism have become part of conventional wisdom, the tribal instinct has reasserted itself with overwhelming vigor.” [FEIN, ISRAEL, p. 3]

By the late sixties, says Common Cause president David Cohen, “the Jewish community began to look inward and deal with its own interests.” [STANFIELD, p. 1849] By the early seventies, says Jack Porter and Peter Drexler, “the Jewish Left concern[ed] itself primarily with four basic issues: Israel, Soviet Jewry, the Jewish Establishment, and Jewish oppression in America [sic: the alleged oppression of Jews]. A conspicuous phenomena [was] the revival of the Zionist ideology on campus.” [PORTER, p. xxx]

Jonathan Sacks also noted Jewry’s trend towards turning back to traditional Jewish religion (and its “particularism”) in 1994: “In the past two decades [Jewish] orthodoxy has risen to great prominence within most Jewish communities throughout the world, most strikingly within Israel and the United States, two communities where it had previously seemed a marginal presence destined for eclipse. In part this has been due to demographic factors, in part to the clarity of orthodoxy’s beliefs and the high level of commitment it evokes from its adherents.” [SACKS, J., p. ix] “Orthodox Jews,” noted Jack Wertheimer in 1993, “have assumed unprecedented positions of power and influence within the Jewish the organized Jewish community. Since the mid-1970s individual Orthodox Jews have risen to leading administrative posts in the Council of Jewish Federations, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, the World Jewish Congress, and a range of local federations and other Jewish agencies. Their presence is symptomatic of a shift in priorities in these organizations to what have been deemed ‘survivalist’ issues and away from the traditional ‘integrationist’ agendas.” [WERTHEMIER, J., 1993, p. 122]

Even the Reform Judaism movement, the largest and most liberal Jewish religious branch in America, by 1999 was formally turning back to the past. Its Central Conference of American Rabbis, by a 324-68 vote, “endorsed a return to traditional practices such as wearing yarmulkes, keeping kosher, and praying
in Hebrew” which reflected “a yearn for a return to some of the old ways.” [STORY, P., 5-27-99, p. A3]

In 2001, David Berger noted the extraordinary presence of the international ultra-Orthodox Lubavitcher Chabad movement:

“I was recently taken aback to learn, for example, that Chabad rabbis constitute 50 percent of the rabbinate in England. In Italy, Milan has a powerful Chabad presence … Any Jewish traveler in France, where the Lubavitcher directory lists 35 major emissaries, will testify to the visibility and significance of Chabad institutions and services there. 13 of 26 synagogues in Sydney, Australia, are led by Chabad rabbis, and the kashrut authority in that city, in the words of my informant, ‘is supervised by one rabbi only – Chabad of course.’ A Dutch Jewish journalist informs me that more than half of the major Orthodox rabbis in Holland are Lubavitch Hasidim. The head of the rabbinic court for the entire city of Montreal is a Chabad rabbi. The Lubavitch directory lists eighteen major centers in Brazil … In a significant number of American communities anyone seeking an Orthodox presence – sometimes any religious Jewish presence – will find it only in Chabad. As for Israel, the movement is disproportionately represented there among the country’s rabbis and religious functionaries and its political influence testifies to its impact. Finally, the role of Chabad in the former Soviet Union, a vast territory with a population of a half-million Jews, deserves special mention. The recently formed federation of Jewish communities has installed a Chabad emissary named Berel Lazar as the country’s chief rabbi … The activities of Chabad dwarf those of all other Jewish religious movements. According to one very informed Russian Jew, Chabad will before long come to be seen in his country as synonymous with Judaism, and all other Jewish religious groups will be perceived as sects.” [BERGER, D., 2001, p. 25]

Reflecting a growing chauvinist sentiment in the United States – Eugene Borowitz argued in the 1970s that it was time for a Jewish unmasking, a shedding of self-deceptions, a removal of inauthentic American assimilationist skins in a return to a fundamental, and primal Jewish identity. Borowitz wrote that the traditional melting pot ideal (of all immigrants coming to America to mix into a collective cultural soup) was malevolently conceived. “The melting pot ideal,” he said, “[is] a maneuver by WASPS to maintain power by making themselves the image of American life, thereby relegating all other groups to inferior status … the individual remains the legal recipient of civil rights, but his community now demands proper recognition and significant power.” [BOROWITZ, p. 50]

Borowitz is reflecting here on modern Jewish power shifts in changing traditional Jewish aims to hide in public the private Jewish identity. As one old “Jewish aphorism” phrases it: “Be a person when you go out in the street and a Jew in your home.” [HEILMAN, C., 19992, p. 16]

In modern days, this clandestine approach to Jewish identity has been completely reversed – “being Jewish” is openly celebrated everywhere in popular
Howard Jacobson notes his own experience in renewing, to obsessive degree, like so many, his Jewish identity:

“My own progression from thinking I must have been a switched baby, so Jewish didn’t I feel, to knowing myself to be so exclusively Jewish that I barely had room to know anything else, was not entirely welcome to me. Jew, Jew, Jew. The word hurt my eyes. Friends – even Jew, Jew, Jew friends – began to wonder whether I had other subjects of conversation. [JACOBSON, H., 1993/1995, p. 6]

“It may be hard to recollect – or, for younger people, even to imagine,” wrote Jewish professor Paul Lauter in 1996, “but a quarter century ago few Jewish-American intellectuals, where ever they located themselves on the political spectrum, saw Israel as central to their political, much less personal, identity. Within a year or two, however, the state of Israel launched its quite successful effort to convert American Jewish identity with Israeli nationalism … The sharply secular Jewishness that had shaped my conscience flagged before the revival of an organized piety generally linked to a fevered Zionism.” [LAUTER, p. 43]

Spearheading “Jewish revival,” American Jewish institutions are even active in pulling Jews who had successfully assimilated into other peoples in other lands back into the international tribe. In Poland, for example, many of the few Jews remaining there in the communist era after World War II married non-Jews and raised their children as Poles. With the return of capitalism to the Polish state in the 1990s, however, American Jewish cosmetics heir Ronald Lauder (founder of the “Ronald Lauder Foundation”) and “his advisor, Rabbi Chaskel Besser, believe in the viability of Jewish life in Eastern Europe and emphasize the return of assimilated youth to the Jewish fold.” (see http://jewishtribalreview.org/jidele.htm) [Weinbaum, p. 27] This includes Lauder’s establishment of a Jewish school, summer camps, publications, genealogy projects to trace lost Jewish roots, and other programs. “Indeed,” notes Laurence Weinbaum, “in recent years the Lauder Foundation and Jewish communal life in Poland may have become synonymous.” [WEINBAUM, p. 27] Lauder, an avid Zionist, has also been a key economic supporter of former Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu. In 1998, during a visit to Poland, Netanyahu “called on young Polish Jews to learn Hebrew and move to Israel.” [WEINBAUM, p. 8] The dimensions of this new-found Jewishness struggling to be reborn in Poland may be clearly noted in the subtext of this observation of Laurence Weinbaum:

“A heated debate erupted [at the Jewish Community of Warsaw organization] over whether or not non-Jewish spouses of Jews could qualify for membership [in the JCW]. The most interesting aspect of this debate was the fact that many of the younger Jews – who had come out of the closet more recently – were the most adamant in refusing to admit the non-Jewish spouses. This new-found orthodoxy mirrors trends that can be found in other Jewish communities that have undergone revival.” [WEINBAUM, p. 43] [Among the pioneers of the Jewish orthodox revival in Poland is Konstanty Gebert, editor of the Jewish journal Mi-
drash and a journalist who writes for one of Poland’s largest newspapers, under the name of Dawid Warszawski. [WEINBAUM, p. 32])

“Many Jews,” says Lucy Dawidowicz, “found [that] their ideas of war, which had been shaped by Vietnam, were irrelevant to Israel. Views on pacifism, civil disobedience, resistance to government, and the inherent evil of military might were suddenly questioned.” [GLAZER, AMERICAN, p. 171] “In 1967,” wrote Village Voice columnist Nat Hentoff, “I was trying to learn how to be a pacifist … Then came the Six Day War. ‘How are we doing?’ I’d ask … I wasn’t asking about the state of nonviolence in the world.” [BRENNER, p. 341]

Hence, as is so common throughout their long history, another Jewish moral double standard was asserted: arm Israel to the teeth and cut back American military spending. “Though it is true that Jews,” says Seymour Lipset, “almost to a person, are supportive of Israel against the Arabs, and favour giving military and economic aid to Israel, they, more than any other identifiable ethno-religious group, also tend to be against a strong American military posture and a high spending level for Americans armaments.” [LIPSET, p. 153] During the Vietnam War, President Lyndon Johnson complained that “a bunch of rabbis came here one day in 1967 to tell me that I ought not send a single screwdriver to Viet Nam, but on the other hand, [the United States] should push all our aircraft carriers through the Strait of Tiran to help Israel.” [HERSH, p. 191] The results of a Carnegie Commission of Higher Education study in 1975 noted that “the proportion of Jews favoring immediate withdrawal from Vietnam as of spring 1969 was twice that of non-Jews.” [LADD/LIPSET, p. 159]

Yet, notes Chaim Waxman, “American Jews who subscribe to the basic tenets of political liberalism do not apply the same rules to Israel … Israel is not subject to the same rules that apply to political entities, but rather to what may be called ‘family rules.’” [WAXMAN, p. 142] “In other words,” says Charles Silberman, “the rules of genteel civility are limited to Gentile society; the rules of personalistic familism apply to the extended Jewish family, to all members, rich or poor.” [LEIBMAN/COHEN, p. 21] This double standard of “family rules” is dramatically illustrated by a Canadian Jew, Mordechai Nisan (who was raised in western democracy) and his views of non-Jews in his second homeland, Israel. Writing for the World Zionist Organization, Nisan says:

“The Land was the special divinely granted territorial promise of Abraham and his seed … Non-Jews, without a role on the highest plane of religious endeavor, are thus without a role on the plane of public activity … Those of ‘the tribe’ are the sole bearers of authority to determine national affairs in the state of Israel.” [HARKABI, p. 154]

“I don’t know how many Jews share his belief,” wrote Yehoshafat Harkabi in 1989, “but the publication [of Nisan’s] article in a leading Zionist periodical is cause for grave concern.” [HARKABI, p. 154] Even in an “American issues” context, the Jewish double moral standard is blatant. “It is remarkable,” wrote Alan Dershowitz in 1991, “how some secular Jews who regard United States senator Jesse Helms as a Neanderthal, regard the Lubavitcher [an Orthodox
Judaism movement] rabbi – who shares Helm’s right-wing views on virtually every issue – as the epitome of wisdom.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 335]

**Charles Liebman** and **Steven Cohen** are especially critical about American Jewry and its in-group chauvinism. In 1990 they wrote that

“American Jews need to square their Jewish familialistic sentiment with American conceptions of equality and western conceptions of liberalism and humanism. In these conceptions there is something archaic, unenlightened, and intolerant about asserting the primacy of one’s kin or clan … The primary attachments ought to be to their friends or coworkers or to those with whom they share acquired traits, not to those among whom they happen to be born. Jews in the United States have to answer for the implicit particularism of the Jewish tradition, to mention the notion of chosenness, which has implications of superiority.”

Many observers even argue that the presumed Jewish altruism and social activism in the American civil rights movement of the 1960’s had baser motives. **Benjamin Ginsberg** argues that the multicultural coalitions spearheaded by Jews in the civil rights era “was a political tactic” to “undermine the power” of those establishment social forces that hindered further Jewish socio-economic advancement. [GINSBERG, p. 125] In 1975 Hasia Dinner wrote a PhD thesis about the way that “Jewish support for black causes was a way for Jews to broaden their own rights without becoming conspicuous by advocating their group interests.” [FEINGOLD, p. 130] “Jewish leaders,” wrote Diner, “representing different socio-economic classes, ideologies, and cultural experiences committed themselves to black betterment and gave time, money, and energy to black organizations. The spectrum was so wide and the involvement so extensive that one must conclude that these leaders acted out of peculiarly Jewish motives … [My] book demonstrates that Jewish ends were secured by involvement with blacks.” [DINER, p. xiv, xii]

(Similarly, Jewish author **Peter Novick** notes the changing Jewish strategy in using massive Jewish attack against generic prejudice as a tool in fending off specific anti-Jewish hostility:

“In recent decades, the leading Jewish organizations have invoked the Holocaust to argue that anti-Semitism is a distinctively virulent and murderous form of hatred. But in the first postwar decades their emphasis – powerfully reinforced by contemporary scholarly opinion – was on the common psychological roots of all forms of prejudice. Their research, educational, and political action programs consistently minimized differences between different targets of discrimination. If prejudice and discrimination were all of a piece, they reasoned that they could serve the cause of Jewish self-defense as well by attacking prejudice and discrimination against blacks as by tackling anti-Semitism directly.”) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 116]

As **Jonathan Reider** frames this issue: “Jewish liberalism can also be seen as a self-protective device of a minority caught in a hostile plural society. **Milton Himmelfarb** has described this logic as ‘that Jewish par-
ticularism which likes to regard itself as universalism.” [sic] [REDIER, J., 1985, p. 48]

“The Jewish struggle for equality and fair treatment,” says Jonathan Kaufman, “was linked to the struggles of Blacks for greater opportunity. It was not a struggle of equals; Jews did not consider their plight equal to that of Blacks. But they recognized in the Black struggle for civil rights elements that could benefit them and conditions with which they sympathized.” [MARTIN, p. 131] Hence, perhaps three-quarters of the funding for the three major civil rights organizations – the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, The Congress of Racial Equality, and Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference is attributed to Jewish sponsorship. [MARTIN, p. 132]

“Any support of human rights in general by Jews,” says Israel Shahak, “which does not include the support of human rights of non-Jews whose rights are being violated by [Israel] is deceitful … [Jewish] support of Blacks in the South was motivated only by consideration of Jewish self-interest.” [SHAHAK, p. 103] “The major role [that Jews] once played in the civil rights movement,” says Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “[is a] myth … [that] enhances the self-image of a Jew as a caring and sensitive minority selflessly contributing to improve the lot of other minorities.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 17] “Among the many myths life and history have imposed on Negroes,” wrote Black author Harold Cruse in 1967, “… is the myth that the Negroes’ best friend is the Jew.” [CRUSE, p. 476] “The Jews who were to become neoconservatives re-examined their relationship to blacks,” observed Jewish commentator Earl Shorris, in 1982,

“They had always agreed with Cervantes’ decription of the world as composed of two families, the Haves and the Have-Notss, but they realized that Jews in America had moved into a new family and blacks had not. The interests of the Haves are different than the Have-Nots … The new attitude toward blacks led to a new attitude toward affirmative action and public welfare … A return to quotas [‘affirmative action ‘] would have the effect of displacing many Jews … Only a large and very powerful central government could redistribute wealth on an equal basis, and the Jews stood to lose a great deal in the equalizing of wealth. In the language of the neoconservatives, all of this had to do with Jewish interests … Among the chief Jewish interests, said the neoconservatives, was Israel.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 23-24]

Jews in the academic world have had a well-known reputation for political liberalism, a tendency confirmed in American academia by a 1975 Carnegie Commission on Higher Education study that surveyed 60,000 American college and university faculty members. Jewish professors, for example, were found to be about twice as likely as their Catholic and Protestant counterparts to support the legalization of marijuana. They were significantly higher in support of “student radicalism” on campus and other deconstructions of the WASP-created status quo of society. Yet, when Jewish faculty members were questioned about issues that were more poignantly closer to home (i.e., the “standards” of the American university system itself of which Jewish professors
now had a power stake), “it is striking,” noted the authors of the Commission study, “that the gap between Jewish and non-Jewish faculty is smaller for items which pertain to academic standards. Jews were only moderately more willing than others to waive academic standards in appointing members of minority groups to the faculty, or in admitting them to the student body. Jewish faculty were only slightly more favorable than the faculty as a whole to offering a program of black studies.” [LADD/LIPSET, p. 159]

“In candor,” wrote Arthur Hertzberg in 1964 about American Jewry in general, “it need be added that the Jewish masses appear to be moving toward a position on race less liberal than the views of their leaders and more akin to the outlook that is conventional in comparable segments of the gentile community.” [HERTZBERG, p. 286]

Not quite. In fact, according to a Harris survey in 1978, full in the face of the Jewish myth of their exceptional concern for pan-human justice, Jews were significantly more inclined to racist attitudes than other (“non-Jewish”) whites:

“Jews were less likely to state that they wanted their children to go to school with blacks (21% of Jews, 32% of non-Jewish whites), and more likely to say that they did not want their children to go to school with blacks (21% of Jews, 14% of non-Jewish whites), less likely to favour residential integration than non-Jewish whites (46% versus 39%), [and] less likely to favour full racial integration than non-Jewish whites (25% versus 35%).” [RUBINSTEIN, p. 144]

[Note also the Israel chapter, where anti-black racism against Ethiopian Jewish immigrants to the state is endemic, and the Black Hebrew (African-American immigrants) have been for years refused land for a cemetery: they have been forced to bury their dead in the local dump]. [ARBELI, 10-3-99]

In 1998 two Jewish researchers reported the results of their study of ethnocentrism among 330 students at Canada’s York University. Citing “intrafamilial nepotism” as “sometimes referred to as kin selection,” Jews (among WASPS, Asians, Italians, Blacks, and “other Europeans”) were found to have the highest “mean ethnocentrism scores” – i.e., were the most ethnocentric in perception. [SILVERMAN/CASE, p. 400] “WASPS” were the least ethnocentric of all groups measured.

In a 1960’s civil rights era study, three researchers, notes Seymour Lipset, “isolated a large sample of Jews” and “discovered, among other things, that at the same middle-class income level, 40 to 60% of the Jews had part time servants, as against 0 to 5% of the Protestants. People outside the South who had a full-time servant were preponderantly Jewish. Relatively few Christians had one … Since these servants are almost invariably Negro, this fact reinforces the image in the Black community of the Jew as economic exploiter.” [LIPSET, The Soc of, p. 124]

The severe class-conscious tradition of having non-Jews do their menial work goes back far into Jewish history. Even as early as 1890, the U.S. Census Bureau found that 70% of the 10,000 Jewish American families surveyed had at least one servant. [SILBERMAN, p. 45] And, as Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note about the Jews of Germany:
“While most Irishmen were still day laborers in the 1880s, only one in eight German Jews was a manual laborer … The fact that 40 percent of German Jewish families had at least one servant indicates that many were ‘making it.’” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 95]

Jewish author Ann Roiphe wrote in 1981 about her childhood:

“I have a picture of myself at a birthday party. I am perhaps three or four. I am watching a magician with a group of other children. My governess stands in the doorway with the other governesses. They are all wearing white uniforms. They are smiling at the magician. I am in velvet and party shoes and my hair has been brushed as straight as possible. I look at the other governesses: Shinke, Ilse, Greta, and Hanna. Guardians of my childhood companions. All the governesses are German and all the children are Jewish and the year is 1938.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 127]

Roiphe was from a very wealthy family. Not all Jews could afford German maids. “On the eve of the Depression,” writes Roberta Feuerlicht,

“more than half of working Black women and a quarter of working Black men were servants. In the 1930s, when most Black women were unemployed because of the Depression, on certain corners of the Bronx there existed what was called the Bronx Slave Market. Black women gathered at 8 AM, rain or shine, summer or winter, hoping to be hired by Bronx women to do housework for fifteen to thirty cents an hour. Most of these housewives were Jewish; business was best before the Jewish holidays … Most middle-class Jews grew up with the ‘schwartze’ (literally, ‘black,’ but actually ‘nigger’) who came to clean once or twice a week. She never really had a name; she was always the ‘schwartze.’ Women used to ask each other, ‘Is your schwartze free on Thursday? My schwartze didn’t come in this week.” [FEUERLICHT, p. 190-191]

Another Jewish author, B. Z. Goldberg, portraying employing Jews and employed Blacks as somehow economic equals, wrote the following apologetic about the Jewish-dominated “slave market”:

“These slave markets were located in the poorer Jewish neighborhoods. Many of the women coming to select Negro help had never had their housework done for them – they now first came to the market because of the cheapness of the labor. Poor themselves they had the Negro woman do the heavy work, the easier chores they did for themselves, and they were stern taskmasters.” [GOLDBERG, B.Z., 1967, p. 57]

In 1935, the NAACP magazine The Crisis featured an article entitled “The Bronx Slave Trade.” “Fortunate indeed,” it noted, “is she who gets the full hourly rate promised. Often, her day’s slavery is rewarded with a single dollar bill or whatever her unscrupulous employer pleases to pay. More often, the clock is set back for an hour or more. Too often, she is sent away without any pay at all.” [MAGIDA, p. 165] “Some Negro domestics,” wrote Black scholar Kenneth Clark in 1946, “assert that Jewish housewives who employ them are unreasonably and brazenly exploitive.” [GLAZER, Negroes, p. 29] Whatever the case, remarked Jewish observer Lenni Brenner about the Jewish community in the
1980s, “It may be said with scientific certainty, that in this day and age a social stratum with such a vastly disproportionate addiction for maids can never again be the cutting edge of ideological progress.” [BRENNER, p. 81]

The Jewish author of a biography on Nation of Islam leader Lewis Farrakhan “believes [that Farrakhan’s] Depression-era childhood and his mother’s employment in the service of Jewish families may have sparked his early gripes against Jews.” [KATZ, p. 4] “Quite possibly,” says this biographer, Arthur Magida, “Farrakhan … absorbed his mother’s attitudes towards Jews … She and other black women congregated on street corners and bargained with mostly Jewish middle-class housewives for their services as day laborers.” [MAGIDA, p. 165]

“For most Jews,” noted James Yaffe in 1968, “the only Negroes they ever meet are either domestic servants, menial employees or delivery boys. The [Jewish] immigrant housewife used to refer to the Negro woman who helped her around the house as the schwartze – a Yiddish word meaning ‘the black one.’ It wasn’t a term of hatred but of contempt, and its connotations remain in the minds of many Jews today.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 263]

“Like many Hasidim [ultra-Orthodox Jews],” says Stephen Bloom in his book about the Chabad organization in Iowa,

“Lazar made no point in concealing his dislike of ‘the niggers,’ as he called them. They were not only goyim, they were black – two of the worst characteristics anyone could possess … Lazar’s reference to shvartzers brought back a memory from long ago. During the summers I spent in Miami Beach as a boy, my grandparents automatically referred to blacks as shvartzers, as did millions of American Jews at the time, and as some American Jews still do … Grandma Rose told me that ‘the shvartzeh’ was coming. ‘Whose that?’ I asked. ‘You know, the cleaning lady,’ she replied.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 231]

“Anti-Negro sentiments,” notes Hasia Diner, “was a subject of real pain in [New York’s] Yiddish newspapers and they took every possible opportunity to expose and condemn it.” [DINER, p. 71] In recent history, the first time John Grethren, a Black convert to Judaism, entered a synagogue, “he had barely advanced a few steps before he was handed a coat and hat by an older woman, who sweetly asked him to ‘take care of it’ for her.” [ROMANOFF, p. 215] (And who too often are the security guards and janitors at Jewish synagogues and other communal sites? Howard Jacobson’s travels, for instance, led him to African-American guards at a gay synagogue in Los Angeles, and a Black janitor at the World Lubavitch Headquarters synagogue in New York City. [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 147, 197-198] The Los Angeles Simon Wiesenthal Center likewise employs African-Americans to physically protect visitors and staff).

When Nina Skopnic told her parents that she was romantically involved with a Black man, “they were appalled – they stopped paying my college tuition and wouldn’t return my phone calls. Even later, when Jim decided to convert to Judaism, they wanted nothing to do with us. It was very painful…. [My] parents had always been active in liberal causes, particularly in cultivating Black-
Jewish influence in my home town. I really had no idea they were bigots … I had not only lost my parents, but I lost total faith in everything they had taught me to believe in.” [ROMANOFF, p. 214]

Edwin Diamond notes the comments of the chief editor of the *New York Times*, A. M. Rosenthal, when he spoke at the Sutton Place Synagogue in 1988 – soon after Jesse Jackson’s well-publicized reference to New York City as “Hymietown”:

“I advised Jesse to make a healing gesture,’ perhaps by meeting with Jewish leaders to counteract the effects of his ‘Hymietown’ reference to New York. ‘But he couldn’t rise to it, and that was pity. The proper question is, ‘What can we do to heal the rift between these historic allies, Jews and blacks?’” Several members of the audience were visibly displeased. Rosenthal sought to reassure them. ‘The Hymietown remark was disgusting,’ Rosenthal said, ‘But has no one in this room ever made an antiblack remark?’ A woman quickly shouted, ‘No!’ Rosenthal just as quickly turned to her, and said with the fast mouth of a *New Yorker*, ‘Then you should run for president.” [DIAMOND, E., 1993, p. 172]

In 1998, the *New York Daily News* reviewed an autobiography of Edgar Bronfman, the head of the World Jewish Congress (one of the most powerful Jewish lobbying organizations), starting out by noting that:

“Billionaire Edgar Bronfman has campaigned vigorously against anti-Semitism, but the Seagram’s chairman saw red when his son wanted to marry a black woman. ‘Sherry offered to convert [to Judaism],’ wrote Bronfman, ‘which, though well intentioned, was not the point.’” [RUSH, p. 14]

In June 2001, Mel Lastman, the New York-born Jewish mayor of Toronto, made the international news with a racist statement that effectively destroyed that city’s bid for the Olympic games. As Canada’s *National Post* reported:

“An ‘ignorant, racist’ joke by Toronto’s Mayor may have sunk the city’s bid for the 2008 Olympics, Canadian politicians and community groups say. Before leaving on a goodwill visit to Kenya this month to promote the city’s quest for the Summer Games, Mel Lastman spoke to a free-lance journalist about the trip. ‘What the hell do I want to go to place like Mombasa [for]?’ Mr. Lastman asked. ‘Snakes scare the hell out of me. I’m scared about going there, but the wife is really nervous,’ he said. ‘I just see myself in a pot of boiling water with all these natives dancing around me.’ The remarks met universal condemnation yesterday.” [WALLACE/WANAGAS, 6-21-01]

Marx Kahende, Kenya’s deputy ambassador to the United Nations complained that “the racial intonation of his statement speaks well of his state of mind. I think he is deranged.” Margaret Parsons, executive director of the African Canadian Legal Centre, added that Lastman’s comment was “not only uninformed [and] ignorant but it is also racist … He should know in this day and age that these kinds of remarks are not acceptable.” [WALLACE/WANAGAS, 6-21-01]
Also in 2001, the coach (Phil Gershon) of Israel’s champion basketball team, Maccabi Tel Aviv, spoke to a group of Israeli military officers. While discussing African-Americans who play in Israel’s professional league, an Israeli newspaper noted his comments:

“‘Even among blacks there are different colors. There is dark black, and there is mocha. The mocha type are more clever, and the darker color usually come from the street.’ The report said that the often overly-vivacious Gerson drew laughter from his listeners. He then continued unfazed: ‘I am not joking. You can see the standing of those with a bit more mixture in their color, such as Andrew Kennedy. You can see his personality. He will check you out, he is clever. The other (darker) blacks are stupid. They will do whatever you tell them, like slaves.”  
[ALON, G., 7-4-01]

Jonathan Kaufman notes that African American author Alice Walker (“The Color Purple”) is married to Mel Levanthol, a civil rights lawyer but that

“One day, she traveled to Brooklyn where Levanthol was cleaning out his apartment, and she was shocked by how coldly his family treated her. A woman on the street – who, she said, was not Levanthol’s grandmother but ‘could have been’ – came up to her and said, ‘You don’t belong here.’ It was her first exposure to Jews who could be bigots like white southerners.”  
[KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 262]

“A new focus has been found for racial hatreds,” wrote Chaim Bermant in 1977,

“and possibly next to a Black or a Hindu even the immigrant Jew can feel more like a WASP or an Englishman. In any case few Jews are now immigrants and they are established sufficiently to regard themselves as part of the host society and, indeed, to share in its prejudices. If some Jews … were in the vanguard of the movement for racial equalities, not a few have the disdain for the schwartzes (Blacks) which they used to have for the Ukrainian peasant and may, indeed, feel the more integrated in the host society for sharing its antipathies.”  
[BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 37]

With the rise of Nelson Mandela and black power against white hegemony in South Africa, an estimated 40,000 of the 130,000 Jews of that country emigrated elsewhere. [KRAMER, L., 11-27-98, p. 24a] In 1997, South African Chief Rabbi Cyril Harris, now that white rule had collapsed, found it expeditious to formally apologize to the Black community around them: “The Jewish community of South Africa confesses to a collective failure to protest against apartheid. Distancing oneself from the anguished cry of the majority and myopically pursuing one’s own interests can never be morally justified.”  
[BELLING, p. 11] This echoes the Jewish community’s self-protective neglect of human rights issues for Blacks in America’s Civil War era. “The oldest fraternal organization in America,” wrote Black author Harold Cruse, “the Germanic B’nai B’rith, established in 1843, never involved itself even in the moral crusade of the [anti-slavery] abolitionists. As a body, American Jewry took no actions, either pro or
con, even while the Christian churches were vent by warring factions over the issue.” [CRUSE, p. 478]

“Racial intolerance is the Jewish community’s dirty little secret,” wrote Michael Davis, the editor of the Baltimore Jewish Times, in 1994, “… Let’s acknowledge that there are men and women in our community who would not abide stereotypical comments about Jews, but would not hesitate in making stereotypical remarks about their neighbors half a mile away.” [DAVIS, M., p. 17]

Perhaps real estate giant William Levitt was the kind of Jew the Baltimore Jewish Times had in mind. The highly public Levitt maintained a “policy of racial exclusion” in his famous Levittown development tracts in the 1950s, refusing the allow African-Americans to purchase homes. He lost a lawsuit about the issue in 1959. [SVONKIN, S., 1997, p. 104-106]

“The image of Judaism I grew up with was almost all negative,” wrote Village Voice senior editor Jack Newfield, “I grew up in a house owned by my grandfather who would not let Blacks into the house. He was a religious bigot … But I think I have always been very positive about Jewish culture and Israel … I was always instinctively a supporter of Israel.” [BRENNER, p. 340]

“One is driven to the hypothesis,” says Israel Shahak, “that quite a few of Martin Luther King’s rabbinical supporters were either anti-Black racists who supported him for tactical reasons (wishing to win black support for American Jewry and for Israel) or were accomplished hypocrites.” [SHAHAK, p. 26]

“[Jewish] loyalists,” declared Thelma Thomas Dalevy, president of the mostly Black Delta Sigma Theta sorority in 1979, “are not compatible with the struggle of black Americans for equal opportunity under the law. Indeed, we question whether their loyalties are first with the state of Israel or the United States.” [STANFIELD, p. 1849]

Yet, “Jews cannot afford to engage in or tolerate political tactics or public rhetoric that seriously threatens to discredit blacks,” observes Benjamin Ginsburg, “This is one of the major reasons that Jewish racism, often expressed privately, seldom manifests itself publicly. African-Americans are simply too important to the legitimacy of the American domestic state. If Jews engage in attacks on blacks or permit doubts to be raised about the merits of their political claims, then Jews are, in effect, undermining a major moral prop supporting the institutions from which they themselves derive enormous benefits and through which they exercise considerable power.” [GINZBURG, p. 153]

Harold Rosenberg, reflecting on the largely Jewish leftist intellectual circles around him remarked in 1959 that

“The new [leftist] elite was less concerned with social criticism that with the imminent rewards of bonding together. The fact that a new togetherness, not new ideas, was its aim accounts for the murderous style of its factional fights and its vile treatment of dissident individuals.” [in KOSTELANETZ, p. 71]

Many Jews, says African-American scholar C. Eric Lincoln, expect that “support of black causes in the past should in effect provide them with some immunity from black rage when Jews themselves assume the role of oppressor.
But Blacks are likely to view any Jewish oppression as being doubly damning because it is two-faced.” [LINCOLN, p. 178]

Jewish author Milton Plesur leans on some old stereotypes to explain Black-Jewish tensions this way:

“Negroes and Jews, despite a common alliance in past years against discrimination, have evidently gone separate ways. The Jew, using education as a leverage, has become one of the most successful minorities from the point of view of assimilation, and the anti-intellectual blacks, the least successful. Another explanation for negative Jewish-Black feelings is that even though Jews have real concern for the rights of the Negro, many disdain what they perceive as their carefree and careless life, seemingly the very antithesis of the work ethic that most Jews cherish.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 129-130]

The many laws resulting from Jewish efforts to aid the Black underclass in attaining a fair “piece of the American pie” can – and have been – used, and exploited, by the Jewish middle and upper-class to further their own already existent economic advantages and secure even more pie slices for themselves. By the end of the twentieth century Jews have created a very comfortable and profitable socio-economic niche for themselves: they self-configure as part of the “white” establishment power structure or, alternatively, as a hideously oppressed minority, depending upon the benefits or disadvantages of any given situation. “It is no accident,” notes Naomi Seidman, “that a film like the recent Zebrahead (1992) portrays a Jewish adolescent in the role of would-be African-American, or that Woody Allen’s Zelig (1983) wryly describes its protagonist as a Jewish man who is able to transform himself into a Negro or an Indian.” [SEIDMAN, p. 256] “We must learn to live,” advises Felice Yeskel, “in this contradictory position of relatively privileged insiders, who are also invisible outsiders.” [YESKEL, p. 3]

“The consciousness Jews have of themselves,” noted David Biale in 1998, “[is that of] occupying an anomalous status: insiders who are outsiders or outsiders who are insiders … In contemporary America their historical dualism has reached its greatest extremes. Never before have so few barriers existed to Jews entering the corridors of political, cultural, and economic power. Yet the path to integration has also created enormous contradictions in Jewish self-consciousness … At a time when Jews are enjoying their greatest acceptance as part of the majority, never before has Jewish identity been founded so centrally on a history of victimization.” [BIALE, D., 1998, p. 5]

This two-faced capacity – as “insider” and “outsider” – is evident, for example, in the academic world. Numerically empowered (profoundly disproportionately represented: see numbers elsewhere) throughout America’s prominent universities as faculty members and administrators, some in the Jewish community see themselves and their “particularity” as integral to western culture and are demanding inclusion in academe at the most powerful levels: in the so-called “canon,” that core of literature western universities have
always required of its students as essential to the comprehension – and continuance – of western civilization. Professor Bennett Graff, for instance, demands the “opening of the canon to Jewish works”; he objects that the many Jewish studies programs proliferating across America thanks to rich Jewish sponsors are “merely ghettos that gentiles visit once and a while.” He wants Jews to “fight” for the place of Jewishness in the core requirements of the modern university. [GRAFF, p. 8-9] Lisa Bean at the University of Michigan throws a feminist slant on the issue; she’s disturbed by the “regular diet of white, Christian male authors [in] … courses in the university setting … I have been somewhat resentful.” [BEAN, p. ] David Kaufman at Brandeis University wonders, “Should not every student be required to study the Holocaust, for instance?” [KAUFMAN, p. 14] Stuart Svonkin at Columbia University also suggests that “only an environment which fosters an appreciation of Jewish contribution to American culture among Jews and non-Jews alike can alleviate anti-Semitism which [engenders] stereotypes [of Jews].” [SVONKIN, p. 16]

These, of course, are the growlings of a powerful community (but only 2.5% of the American population) at the top of the socio-economic pyramid demanding changes of traditional standards of knowledge to suit their own world view. On the other hand, while Jews demand pre-eminence for their own sense of themselves as a kind of communal centerpiece in western – and human – history, they also attempt to self-adjust to a role as a marginalized, oppressed minority in order to reap attendant benefits there. Few Jews can understand that the authentically oppressed and marginalized ethnic Americans don’t want to share scraps with Jews who are so socially, economically, and culturally pre-dominant as oppressors themselves.

A Jewish professor, Edward Alexander, expressed his bewilderment and indignation when Jews were unanimously rejected for inclusion by a coalition of multicultural groups at the University of Washington:

“Although someone schooled in the ways of diversity-training might suppose that such questions as whether the Jews are a minority in this country and whether anti-Semitism is a form of racism are hardly abstruse, they aroused intense debate. All the minority student groups – African-Americans, Native Americans, Asian-Americans, and Chicano/Latino – vigorously opposed the inclusion of Jews [for an Ethnic Studies course requirement] because they are not ‘people of color.’” [ALEXANDER, p. 7]

As noted here, despite affluent Jewry’s claim to still be minority victims, Jewish men are easily understood by Third World coalition groups as “white” males. And, as Cheryl Greenberg notes, “little can be generalized about multiculturalism beyond its commitment to dethroning the white male voice.” [GREENBERG, C., 1998, p. 56]

Jewish sociologist Irving Horowitz even declares an “anti-Semitic” element underpinning such rejection: “It is a matter of historical irony that a profession [sociology] mired in genteel right-wing anti-Semitism at the beginning of the century should now find itself enmeshed in a far more acerbic left-oriented
anti-Semitism by the end of the century. Thus, well-respected figures in sociology like Joseph Scott vigorously oppose the inclusion of Jews in minority student groups because they are not ‘people of color.’” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 92]

Kicked out of the “minority” world, Jews are thereby lumped together with their historical enemies, largely “whites” of European heritage. And once frozen out of the coveted victim circle, some Jews get mad. In 1999, for example, another Horowitz, this one David, faced – and embraced – the inevitability of Jewish “whiteness” in the American cultural milieu. Horowitz, a former 1960s leftist now-turned Republican, wrote a book (Hating Whitey) that evidences and assails endemic African-American racism against generic “white” people, of which Jews are now considered so much a part. Horowitz, angered by Black racism and the profound double standard in American culture, as he argues, against examining it (while “white” racism is highlighted at every turn), nonetheless is silent about the way that “anti-Semitism” is constantly used as a device against all others in quite the same way. Horowitz even wields the charge of anti-Semitism as part of his own “white” polemic. Complaining about the endless insistence of African-American demand, he heralds (in contradistinction) his successful Jewish identity, declaring that:

“Ask the Jews. For two thousand years Jews of the diaspora have not been able to free their destiny from the power of gentiles. But in America, they have done very well, thank you, and do not feel oppressed.” [HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 83]

This assertion, that “Jews don’t feel oppressed,” is absurd. Four pages later, Horowitz admits as much, declaring that “the racial left wants to redistribute social goods according to its own plan and its own standards of ‘justice,’ which exclude persecuted minorities like Asians, Armenians, and Jews.” [HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 87] Suddenly Horowitz’s Jews go from “do not feel oppressed” to being “persecuted minorities.” (And Asians and Armenians are “persecuted” in America?) The socio-psycho-political foundation of “being Jewish,” to this day, is after all a claim that anti-Semitism in America (even when it is by all evidence nonexistent) is omnipresent and everywhere a threat. This Jewish world view is exploited as a political device and is an exact parallel to Black demands about the omnipresence of white racism, and the continuous demand for amends. Horowitz declares the Black claim to be an erroneous crutch; but he cannot grasp the same fiber in his own heritage. Indeed, African-American collectivist demands follow the well-hewn Jewish model.

“Although our self-perception is that the Jewish people in America are a minority and subject to exclusion and/or discrimination in various contexts,” bemoaned Jewish professor Charles Sheer, “the ethnic groups involved in the multi-culturalism movement do not view us in this fashion. Often they go to great lengths to exclude us.” [SHEER, p. 6] “Most Jews,” observes Cheryl Greenberg, “do not see themselves as privileged, as simply white people, as insiders in American society. Instead, they view themselves as outsiders who belong beneath the multicultural umbrella as an insecure minority with a separate culture and set of beliefs and values.” [GREENBERG, p. 60] “My natural allies
[African Americans, Hispanics, etc.]” says Sara Horowitz, “do not always seek dialogue with me. Increasingly I and a growing number of progressive critics and scholars in Jewish studies notice that we are talking almost exclusively to each other.” [HOROWITZ, S., 1998, p. 118-119] In a testament to Jewish power and chutzpah, the exception that proves the rule, another Jewish professor, Stephen Whitfield, notes that “multiculturalism represents the only formulation in this century from which Jews have largely been excluded.” [WHITFIELD, Most p. 8,]

This kind of rejection is hard to swallow for most Jews, since the “oppressed, persecuted minority group” template demanding power is, after all, quintessentially Jewish. In 1992 Charles Sykes wrote a popular book entitled A Nation of Victims: The Decay of the American Character. The first chapter has the following observations:

“Something extraordinary is happening in American society … American life is increasingly characterized by the plaintive insistence, I am a victim … The mantra of the victims is the same: I am not responsible; it’s not my fault … The ethos of victimization has an endless capacity not only for exculpating one’s self from blame, washing away responsibility … but also for projecting guilt onto others … The new culture reflects a readiness not merely to feel sorry for oneself but to wield one’s resentments as weapons of social advantage … The route to moral superiority and premier griping rights can be gained more efficiently through being a victim … [SYKES, p. 11] … Tragically, a victim’s rage that is redirected from the oppressor toward rival victim groups ultimately turns against the victim himself. For self-hatred is the final destination of any attempt to yoke one’s sense of identity and power to one’s weaknesses, deficiencies, and perceived victimization.” [SYKES, p. 17]

All such jargon describing the victimhood cosmology – self-hatred, the eschewing of responsibility, ascribing blame to others, instilling guilt in others to assuage one’s own, wielding resentments as “weapons of social advantage,” the claim to moral superiority, et al, is – as we have more than amply seen earlier – historically and seminally Jewish. These are notions that have been developed, nurtured, and cultivated for many hundreds of years from the very roots of the Jewish martyrlogical and chosen sufferer traditions. The Jewish victimhood mythos, however, is enforced and afforded a special strata for itself and cannot be itself criticized, investigated, or even noted in respectable discourse. Even Sykes overlooks (or intentionally skirts) the important Jewish dimensions of his discussion about modern America’s obsession with psychotherapy, a lawyer-ridden society that seeks to dismiss personal responsibility for profit, and the full-blown expression of the victimhood syndrome in America; Sykes falls prey to one of his own insights into current censorship:

“Victim speak insists upon moral superiority and moral absolutism and thus tends to put an abrupt end to conversation; the threat of de-
ployment is usually enough to keep others from ever considering raising a controversial subject.” [SYKES, p. 16]

American victim culture is a relatively recent historical development, born only after World War II, taking firm hold in the 1960s, and spreading in the wake of the systematically developed Jewish Holocaust model that is manipulated as a moral control prestige system over all others. Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanics, women, homosexuals, and later the handicapped, fat people, short people, and virtually anyone else who dreams of some impairment later joined the struggle for entrée into the Victimhood Galaxy and its attendant homage. And rewards. In the ratings system of victimhood power, note the feelings of Gene Oishi, a Japanese American, about his internment in a camp for those of Japanese descent during World War II:

“It occurred to me … that I did not like talking about the experience not because it was so bad, but because it was not bad enough … I envied the survivors of Japanese prisoner-of-war camps for the stories of brutal mistreatment they had to tell. I even envied the Jews for what they suffered in the German concentration camps.” [AMATO, p. 183]

“Odd as this sounds,” says Terence de Pres, “there is among us an envy of suffering. It increases with education, and it reveals the bitterness felt when history renders our own pain trivial.” [AMATO, p. 183] “The all-pervasive claim to victimhood,” notes art critic Robert Hughes, “tops off America’s long-cherished culture of therapeutics … To be vulnerable is to be invincible. Complaint gives you power …” [HUGHES, p. 9] “Jews cherish feelings of exclusion [from American mainstream society],” says Philip Weiss, “not just because there is wisdom in foreboding but because these feelings are useful. They preserve our position as outsiders, a status that has certain moral and practical advantages. As an outsider you have motivation: to get in. And you get to be demanding without any sense of reciprocity.” [WEISS, p. 30]

Post-Holocaust, popular western culture reflects ancient Jewish religious self-identity in rendering the world’s Jews, categorically, as a persecuted and marginalized underclass. In Germany, where German guilt for World War II crimes remains so high, Carmelite prioress Anna Maria Strehle equates the modern misery of the world’s drug addicts, the homeless, and other disempowered people with generic Jewry, the wealthiest ethnic strata in most countries in which they exist in any sizeable number:

“What is our attitude toward Jews and other minorities, guest workers and refugees, toward the ever-growing number of unemployed, drug addicts, homeless? Do we feel solidarity with them, do we take their part even when it leads to disadvantages for us?” [STREHLE, A., 1998, p. 17]

(Ms. Strehle, it would seem, has it in reverse. What “disadvantages” are in store for those who are inclined to not rally around Jewish victimhood mythologies?)

“Identifying oneself with the ‘real suffering’ of a chosen class,” notes Joseph Amato, subtly alluding to the Chosen People ethos, “people, group, race, sex, or historical victim is the communion call of the twentieth century individual. It
is his sincerity, his holiness, his martyrdom.” [SYKES, p. 16] “In the waning years of the twentieth century,” notes Shalom Carmy, “as other sources of authority have lost their power, victimhood has come into its own … Members of groups, with access to some historical grievance, find it convenient to be judged not by the color of their skin, nor by the content of their character, but by the size of the chip on their shoulder.” [CARMY, p. 61] “Victimhood,” notes David Klinghoffer, “used to be considered something about which a normal person would feel ashamed. No longer. Amid the clamoring of would-be victims we find – ourselves, American Jews.” [KLINGHOFFER, p. 10-13]

Famous talk show moralist “Dr. Laura” Schlessinger demonstrates the powerful lure of the Jewish victim mythos precisely – how she suddenly decided that she was Jewish (her father’s heritage, not her mother’s) while watching a TV program about the Holocaust:

“Suddenly, we’re hearing Elizabeth Taylor’s voice-over as they’re showing actual footage of the Nazis lining up women with their babies, and mowing them down into a pit. My son says, ‘What is this? Who are they?’ And I say, ‘Those are Nazi soldiers.’ And he says, ‘What are they doing?’ And I say, ‘They’re murdering Jews.’ He say, ‘What are Jews?’ And I say, ‘Our people.’ He turns to me and says, ‘What are you talking about?’ And at that moment I thought, It’s time I claim my heritage.” [BANE, V., 1999, p. 184]

Jewish scholar Peter Novick notes the absurdity of American Jews today as “victims”:

“By the 1980s and 1990s many Jews, for various reasons, wanted to establish that they too were members of a ‘victim community.’ Their contemporary situation offered little in the way of credentials. American Jews were by far the wealthiest, best educated, most influential, in-every-way-most-successful group in American society – a group that, compared to most other identifiable minority groups, suffered no measurable discrimination and no disadvantages on account of their minority status. But insofar as Jewish identity could be anchored in the agony [Holocaust] of European Jewry, certification as (vicarious) victims could be claimed, with all the moral privilege accompanying such certification.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 8-9]

Hence, being a child of Holocaust survivors frees feminist Evie Litwok, for instance, to feel comfortable in being completely obnoxious to other people. And she knows she’s obnoxious. The world owes her, after all. “I’m perceived as intimidating and overbearing: in other words, Jewish,” she says, “Well, my style is the result of my being a child of survivors of the Holocaust. I was brought up to take risks. That style is a threat to some women. They’ve tried to destroy the behavior I need to survive.” [POGREBIN, p. 64] “One woman, addressing a Jewish conference,” notes Susan Schneider, “astonished her audience by comparing her outcast status as a lesbian to the characteristic alienation of the Jews. ‘What’s most lesbian about me is also what is most Jewish about me.’” [SCHNEIDER, p. 315]
Jewish lesbian Andrea Dworkin (self-declared child molestation victim, rape victim, and former prostitute) even guises her hatred of men literally, and bizarrely, within the Jewish victimhood model. In Dworkin’s book, *Scapegoat*, notes reviewer Nicci Gerrard:

“she tells the history of the making of Israel and draws parallels between the Jews and women. Her sections are (often relentlessly) comparative – the chapter titles make this absolutely clear: Pogroms/ Rapes; The State/ The Family; Hate Literature/Pornography … The Holocaust is put side by side with the systematic oppression of women … Women are metaphorical Jews. Men are the Nazis.” [GERRARD, N., 6-18-2000, p. 11]

Other chapters are entitled Zionism/Women’s Liberation, Homeland/Home, The Chosen/The Evil, and Jew Hate/Women Hate. “Male pleasure,” writes Ms. Dworkin, “is inextricably tied to victimizing, hurting, exploiting.” [SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, 11-29-92] In 1999, a group of Israeli teenagers on a tour of Auschwitz and other concentration camp sites in Poland made international news when, after making the rounds of the death camps, they invited some strippers to entertain them at night. Thane Rosenbaum decided to excuse this Jewish embarrassment by asserting that the atrocities borne by Jews in the Holocaust is, apparently, a kind of Jewish license for virtually any immoral behavior: “The Nazis rewrote the rules of offensiveness and redefined for eternity what is barbaric and grotesque. When in the presence of monstrous deeds, maybe it’s appropriate not to be on one’s best behavior.” [ROSENBAUM, T., 12-2-99, p. B11]

By virtual of being an oppressed “outsider” and bearing its long tradition of victimhood, Gail Shulman proclaims her entitlement to moral superiority and the renewed “apartness” of Jewish tradition:

“Despite my being a feminist who is not a traditional Jew, it is my very Jewishness which is at the root of my feminism. Feminism is prophetic movement concerned with justice for the oppressed, compassion for those who suffer, a sense of history, of community, of righteousness, and the courage to live in opposition.” [SHULMAN, p. 108]

(Curiously, in the very same book (*On Being a Jewish Feminist*), Shulman’s editor, Susannah Heschel, notes – with the weight of history behind her – that “the examination of Judaism’s treatment of women in its laws, customs, and teachings makes many of us [Jewish women] question whether it is desirable – even possible – for a feminist to be a Jew.” [HESCHEL, S., 1983, p. 113] Jewish apologetic usually works to reconcile the intrinsic “Being a Jew liberates me”/ “Being a Jew suffocates me” schizophrenia evidenced by these women.)

While paying lip service to all requisite minority platitudes, at root the Jewish propensity is, however, to cut slack from all others in the continuing minority battles for social justice when Jewish collective self-interests are jeopardized. This is evidenced for instance, in massive Jewish activism against affirmative action quota programs in the 1970’s – led by the three major Jewish “rights” organizations: the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish
Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League. [GINSBERG, p. 149] Jews – deeply and disproportionately empowered throughout the American socio-economic and political scene, stood to lose considerable rungs up the ladder to the chronically underrepresented if affirmative action rules and laws remained firm. If a certain number of African-Americans must be included in pieces of the American pie, conversely, how could, Jews, representing merely 2.5 percent of America’s population, justify and safely secure their 20, 30, 40 or more percent of the powerful rungs of professional America (lawyers, professors, students, etc.)? Would it only be generic “whites” displaced by quotas to promote disadvantaged minorities? (This profound Jewish affluence even has parallels in the Soviet Union. “Soviet ‘affirmative action’ policies that began in the 1960s,” notes Michael Paul Sacks, “favored the growing pool of qualified candidates among the eponymous ethnic groups of the fifteen union republics, especially when they resided within their homelands. Jews were also losing out because they were already greatly overrepresented in higher education relative to their proportion in their population.”) [SACKS, M. 1998, p. 250]

As Jonathan Kaufman notes:

“Faced with the prominent opposition of many Jews to aggressive affirmative action programs, many blacks cried betrayal. Jews appeared to be willing to fight for civil rights when it affected rednecks in the South but not when it threatened their own interests. There was admittedly a healthy degree of self-interest at stake. Jews had not raised great objections to affirmative action programs that focused on blue-collar jobs. But large numbers of Jews routinely applied to medical school, law school, and other graduate schools.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 223]

The most famous legal challenge to quota-based affirmative action programs was in 1973, by Allan Bakke, a white male denied a place in a California medical school because of minority quota rules. His lawyer was Reynold Colvin, “an active member of San Francisco’s Jewish community” who “served several terms as president of Temple Emanu-el, the most influential and politically powerful synagogue in the city, and he has also been president of the San Francisco chapter of the American Jewish Committee.” [DREYFUSS/LAWRENCE, p. 33] Among those Jewish organizations filing formal legal briefs in Bakke’s behalf was the American Jewish Committee itself. Adapting to the needs of the case, as it is grossly advantageous to Jewish collectivity, the Jewish community configured in defense of individualist expression: “Bakke should be judged as an individual when the medical school decides whether to take him or not. He should not be denied admission just because he is a member of a particular group.” [DREYFUSS/LAWRENCE, p. 95]

A second pioneer lawsuit was filed by Marco De Funis, a Sephardic Jew, who was trying to be admitted to the University of Washington Law School. “In both cases,” says Cheryl Greenberg,

“black organizations filed amicus curiae briefs in behalf of the university’s affirmative action policies while most Jewish agencies filed briefs in opposition. It was the first time black and Jewish organizations had
publicly and formally positioned themselves on opposite sides of the civil rights question.” [GREENBERG, C., 1998, p. 72]

In 1969, Albert Vorspan, Director of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism of the American Hebrew Congregations and Central Conference of American Rabbis, noted the essential disengagement of the Jewish community from distinctly American problems to reinvest itself into concerns particularly Jewish:

“The American Jewish community is silent on the paramount moral issues facing the nation … As the inner city has become the new racial frontier in American life, Jewish groups increasingly lag behind Christian involvement in the urban setting. Christian leaders talk about the urban crisis the way Jews talk about the Israeli crisis – as a matter of sheer survival …. Most synagogues stand in suspended isolation from the central problems of the [American] community.” [COX, p. 186]

In 1968, after noting some historical Jewish pluses in the civil rights world, Jewish author James Yaffe then noted the softer Jewish underbelly on the same theme:

“The [Jewish] defense agencies, which took an early lead in the civil rights struggle, appear to have fallen behind in recent years. In poverty programs, street demonstrations, and other activist tactics the Christian churches are way ahead of the Jews; the implication is that the Jews withdrew from the fight as soon as it really became dangerous. Official Jewish support of open housing has been compared by certain skeptics to actual Jewish practice. When Negroes move into a neighborhood, the Jews move out; they don’t have to riot, as the Poles or the Italians did, because they’re wealthy enough to buy houses elsewhere … The synagogues are as much a part of this recent withdrawal as the [Jewish] secular agencies … Furthermore, under certain circumstances Jews are just as capable of active anti-Negro behavior as anyone else. At a meeting on bussing in Long Island a Jewish housewife said, ‘The niggers should be sent South to be lynched!’ She turned out to be a member of the local chapter of the American Jewish Congress … On the personal level few Jewish parents would react with anything less than horror if their child married a Negro.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 260]

“Some [Blacks] … perceive a new Jewish hard line towards blacks,” notes African-American scholar C. Eric Lincoln,

“and they attribute it to the supposition that since the Jews have finally arrived, and Blacks are no longer needed as levers for their advancement, then Blacks are expendable … [LINCOLN, p. 181] … Many blacks see [Jewish charges of] anti-Semitism as nothing more than a product of Jewish guilt for the Jews’ progressive abandonment of the Civil Rights cause.” [LINCOLN, p. 178]

The struggle to disempower “mainstream” non-Jewish America by Jews singularly bent on self-propulsion has often found Jewish expression via the cloak of the Black community. In using African-Americans to argue the merits of eth-
nocentism, one recent Jewish author even condemned the principle of universalism (in a latent defense of Jewish particularism), as another form of “white” oppression: “The celebration of communitarian real-life experience [of minorities] helped resist the alienating representations of ‘universality’ that actually addressed only the needs of the white males.” [FEHER, p. 275] This of course is transparent nonsense. Were it not for the universalist tolerance of the “white male” majority in America, and the self-conscious attempt at the destruction of its own ethnocentrism, by sheer force of numbers minority particularism would not have ever been permitted to exist, if “minorities” were even allowed to immigrate here. And the fact remains that the best example we have of the ultimate fulfillment of ethnic particularism in recent history is “white universalism’s” opposite: the “particularism” of Aryan Nazi Germany.

From the very start of Black civil rights struggles in America, as well in the legal battles to eliminate any vestiges of religion out of the public education system, Jews have funded, directed, and pulled the strings of nearly every important legal battle, but hidden themselves from public view. Moving with United States Presidents, members of Congress, cabinet members, and diplomats, from the 1880’s till World War I wealthy and prominent Jewish Americans (like Jacob Schiff, Oscar Strauss, Lewis Marshall, and others) functioned as revitalized “Court Jews” in an American context. “They were prepared to use their influence,” says Naomi Cohen, “on behalf of fellow Jews … [They] co-opted [non-Jewish] men of similar stature and outlook to whom they were tied socially or by business … singly or in small groups they presented their request to the proper official. The basic rule was secrecy.” [COHEN, p. 315] (Such under the table intrigues by the Jewish rich and powerful was, and is, intrinsic to Jewish history. Jewish researcher Kevin Avruch notes the case of Jewish Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis during the World War I era: “[He was] a confidant of President [Woodrow] Wilson … Through Wilson, he had access to American power. He gradually assembled about him a particularly able group … For the first time an efficient Zionist apparatus was organized in America.” [AVRUCH, K., 1981, p. 30] An Israeli historian, Michael Stone, notes its expression in later years, in another political context: “During [President] Truman’s first term, there grew up a small, almost clandestine circle of wealthy Jews … who had entrée into Truman’s inner sanctum [who] subtly pull[ed] strings behind the scenes … By virtue of their influence at the White House [they] enjoy[ed] positions of prestige in the fledgling state of Israel.” [COCKBURN, p. 26]

This ancient behind-the-scenes Jewish strategy was also exemplified by Louis Marshall, a wealthy lawyer, who was elected President of the American Jewish Committee lobbying group in 1906, a position he held for the next 23 years. He was the most prominent Jewish activist of his era and he was opposed to civil rights lawsuits being instigated by Jewish organizations “because he believed that it would bring the dissatisfaction of American Jews out in the open” and engender anti-Jewish sentiment in the broader American population. Grounded and founded as a “federation of Zionist groups concerned with the affairs of international Jewry,” [IVERS, p. 55] Marshall’s American Jewish
Committee strategy entailed the use of dispossessed African-Americans as their own legal ramrod, recognizing “that a legal principle established by one minority group will often accrue to the benefit of the other.” [IVERS, p. 54]

Marshall, and all other Jewish planners, had no qualms in sacrificing the African-American community, for example via the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) – a group not only largely developed and funded by Jews, but essentially run by Jewish leaders until the Black empowerment movement of the 1960’s took issue with the idea of Jews and their money controlling a supposedly Black organization. “Jewish involvement with Afro-Americans intensified after 1915,” notes David Levering Lewis, “taking on the urgency of a special mission; Jews of influence and wealth rapidly moved … to virtual management of Afro-American civil rights organizations … [LEWIS, p. 547] … Privileged Ashkenazim reached for the Afro-American leadership and even helped create it, hoping, as Louis Marshall remarked in 1924, that the success of Afro-American civil rights organizations ‘may incidentally benefit Jews.’” [LEWIS, p. 564] One Jewish acquaintance of Roland Gittelsohn put the underlying issue at stake more bluntly: “The more prejudice exists in this country against the blacks, the safer we Jews will be. They are a lightning-rod for our protection.” [GITTELSOHN, R., 1967, p. 43]

Jewish author Hasia Diner suggests another reason why Jews took such keen interest in the control of Black civil rights organizations. While Blacks as a collective group in early twentieth century America were themselves powerless, Jews, notes Diner, forged links with “powerful liberal whites” interested in Black issues: “The Jews undoubtedly realized that blacks possessed no power, but it was not among them they were casting about for friends.” [DINER, p. 154] Jewish authors Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter even psychoanalyze the many Jewish leadership adventures in civil and minority rights movements:

“The identification of some Jewish males and females with the Russian proletariat during the Soviet revolution, with Irish and Italian workers during the 1930s, and with the black underclass or third world nations during the 1960s may have reflected motives beyond mere sympathy with the underdog. Kazin and Himmelfarb have suggested that in both the 1930s and the 1960s many Jewish radicals were projecting their own needs and desires upon those groups. The needs of male and female radicals were somewhat different, though. Both were driven by the desire to fill narcissistic deficits. Males could identify with a powerful cause to quiet doubts about their masculinity … Both sought a sense of power but for slightly different reasons: the male to convince himself he was a male, the woman to satisfy that part of her psyche that shared a male identification.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 129]

For years W.E.B. DuBois was the only Black officer in the NAACP, which was largely directed, funded, and controlled in its early decades by Jews like Henry Moskowitz and Joel Spingarn. [ARSON, p. 140] (In 1913 Spingarn announced a yearly award named after himself, the “Spingarn Medal,” for the “highest and noblest achievement of an American Negro.” [DINER, p. 138]) In
a later era, and another Black organization, the Southern Leadership Christian Conference, a Jew – Stanley Levison – even wrote Martin Luther King’s speeches for him. [MARTIN, p. 132] Levison has been described as one of King’s “closest personal advisers.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 66] This voice of “Christian Leadership,” Levison, was also discovered by the FBI to have been a former Communist party member. [KAUFMAN, J., p. 66]

Another Jew, Marvin Rich, was the “chief fund-raiser and key speech writer for the Congress of Racial Equality – CORE”, [GINZBURG, p. 145] and his position was later filled by another Jewish attorney, Alan Gartner. In the 1960s, “in CORE, younger and more militant members blocked efforts by [James] Farmer to name one of his Jewish advisers president of CORE, insisting the post be filled with a black.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 76] In the same era, the Executive Director of the American Jewish Congress, Will Maslow, was also a CORE national board member. (He resigned in outrage when one African-American CORE official, Clifford Brown, angrily declared that Hitler hadn’t “killed enough” Jews). [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 327]

Another such Black civil rights group was the National Urban League, greatly funded by the Sears-Roebuck magnate, Julius Rosenwald. Edwin Seligman (“descended from one of the wealthiest and most prestigious Jewish families”), was the first chairman of the organization. Its first Executive Board included Abraham Lefkowitz and Felix Adler – later joined by Seligman’s brother George and Ella Sachs Plotz. In 1932, six Jews “served as officials” at the Urban League’s Chicago branch. [DINER, p. 186] Following Jewish philanthropic donations, Salmon O. Levinson began directorship of the Abraham Lincoln Center (a social work center for Blacks and whites) in 1917. [DINER, p. 181] Jacob Billikopf, also Jewish, became chairman of Howard University, a Black college, in 1935. Fisk University also had influential Jewish board members. To this day, Rabbi David Saperstein serves as an NAACP board member.

“By the mid-1960s,” says Jonathan Kaufman,

“Jewish contributions made up three-quarters of the money raised by SNCC [Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee], CORE, and SCLC. So important were contributions from Jews to SCLC, Jesse Jackson recalled later, that for a time King’s advisers debated whether they should call the group simply the Southern Leadership Conference, eliminating the reference to ‘Christian.’ In phone conversations with King, Bayard Rustin, one of King’s top advisers, would remind him to include references in his speeches to the ‘Judeo-Christian tradition.’” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 66]

Jewish actor Theodore Bikel, a Zionist activist, was once “one of SNCC’s most prominent supporters.” [VOLKMAN, p. 215] Howard Zinn was also a Jewish SNCC “adviser.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 67] SNCC African-American leader Stokely Carmichael’s “first demonstration was a pro-Israel rally held in front of the United Nations by the Young Socialist League.” (He later became very vocally anti-Zionist). Another SNCC Black leader, Robert Moses, “had gone to the Jewish socialist camp, Camp Wo-Chi-Ca, as a child and befriended many Jews from radical and socialist homes.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 67]
Even the sometimes violent Black Panthers had Jewish sponsors. David Horowitz, once co-editor of *Ramparts* and head of a Black Panther’s Learning Center Planning Committee, recalls the Baptist school the radical organization wanted to buy in Oakland, California:

“*Ramparts* had helped [the Black Panther] Party become a national franchise … I offered to help [Black Panther leader] Huey Newton with the Party’s community projects and to raise money for the Panther school … In the next months, I raised more than one hundred thousand dollars to purchase the building … The Center [the Church] was operated by a front I had created called the Educational Opportunities Corporation … [Later] underneath all the political rhetoric and social uplift, I suddenly realized was the stark reality of the [criminal] gang.”

[HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 98, 99, 100, 104]


What about the Southern Poverty Law Center, famed fighter for the impoverished and African-American rights, especially in the South? It is based in Montgomery, Alabama, and in 1996 the local *Montgomery Advertiser* printed an embarrassing expose about the Center. The salary, noted the paper, for SPLC president and CEO (as well as SPLC co-founder) Joseph Levin was $137,798 a year. Not bad for a fighter on behalf of those mired in poverty. The Center’s Legal Director, Richard Cohen, made $151,420. But that’s not all. The *Advertiser* further noted that

“One thing remains a constant at the nation’s wealthiest civil rights charity, the Montgomery-based Southern Poverty Law Center: All the top-paid, top-level management jobs are held by whites.” [RICHARDSON, S., 8-29, p. D7] [No notation of the percentage of Jews within this “white” nomenclature is noted]

In SPLC’s 25-year history “no black person has held a top-level management position, and only one black staffer has ever been among the top five paid positions.” In SPLC’s team of five lawyers, one was African-American. [RICHARDSON, S., 8-29-96, p. D7]

The next year, an editorial writer, Rose Sanders, expressed outrage in the same newspaper that the SPLC publicly condemned Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam (a hero in large parts of the Black community) as a racist. She pointed out the hypocrisy of the charge, noting that

“Joseph Levin says he is not a bigot, but how does he explain the bigotry evidenced by the employment practices at the Poverty Law Center? An example of the Center’s racial prejudice is illustrated by its racial tolerance program. The program did not have a single black employee. No black person helped shape or design the program.” [SANDERS, R., 9-22-97, p. 7A]

The granddaddy of Black civil rights organizations, the NAACP, “took shape”
at the estate (“Troutbeck”) of Joel Spingarn who became its Board Chairman in 1915. He served in this position until 1929 when he became, instead, the president, till 1939. He was succeeded by his brother Arthur (for many years head of the NAACP’s Legal Committee) till 1966, when another Jew, Kivie Kaplan, “a millionaire manufacturer of patent leather,” [HILLEL/LEVINE, p. 127] took over. “By 1968,” note Hillel Levine and Lawrence Harmon, “the perceived paternalistic leadership style of Kaplan and other prominent Jews in the civil rights movement was coming under increasingly sharp attack. Activists called for his resignation; Kaplan refused.” [HILLEL/HARMON, p. 127] Only with Kaplan’s death in 1975 did the NAACP – 64 years after its founding – have the opportunity to elect its first Black president. [GOLDBERG, p. 24]

“Litigation,” notes Hasia Diner, “was the Association’s most potent weapon … Many of those lawyers and legal advisors were Jews. In fact, Jews made their greatest impact on the Association in this area.” [DINER, p. 128] Jewish lawyer Nathan Margold’s 1929 “report became the bible of the NAACP’s legal efforts.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 91] Jack Greenberg headed the 1960s-era NAACP Legal Defense Fund. In 1982, still at the helm, a Black student coalition at Harvard protested Jewish paternalism and the fact that a white Jew “was heading the country’s premier black legal organization.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 119-121]

Joel Spingarn, who served as both the NAACP Chairman of the Board and as a major in the U.S. Military Intelligence Department (MID) during World War I, was revealed in recent years by the Memphis Commercial Appeal to have “used his [NAACP] post to obtain critical information for MID.” [MARTIN, p. 49] Another such “liberal” Jew on the NAACP membership rolls included Judge Julian Mack (of the U.S. Court of Appeals), the first President of the American Jewish Congress. Mack was also president of the Zionist Organization of America from 1918 to 1921. He and Louis Brandeis, notes Thomas Kolsky, “dominated American Zionism from 1914 to 1921 and also in the 1930s.” [KOLSKY, T., p. 26]

With Jews holding the purse strings to many ostensibly Black organizations, in 1976 Black activist Julian Bond sought the directorship of the NAACP. Although critical of Israel, Bond found it necessary to sign a yearly “Black Americans in Support of Israel (BASIC)” statement “if he was to have any chance of winning the NAACP position, given the powerful influence of Jews within the organization.” [GINZBURG, p. 169] In the early years of the NAACP, adds Hasia Diner, “heavy Jewish involvement may explain why the [NAACP] conference passed the ‘Russian Resolution,’ which protested the expulsion of Jews from the city of Kiev, Russia.” [DINER, p. 136] Later, African Americans like William Pollard, Deputy Director of the NAACP, took “many trips” to Israel, although socialization to the Jewish/Israeli perspectives was not always completely successful. [STARR, J., 1990, p. 251]

Clues to the nature of Spingarn’s NAACP may be gleaned from the following quotes from B. Joyce Ross, author of J.E. Spingarn and the Rise of the NAACP:
• “Spingarn’s failure to relinquish the power he wielded in the NAACP comprised one of the greatest paradoxes of his career.” [p. 69]

• “Spingarn’s familiarity with New York’s most reputable financial institutions and his expertise in the management of stocks and bonds enabled him to become one of the key formulators of the NAACP’s financial policy.” [p. 57] (He also had a “special influence” at publishers Harcourt, Brace and a “special relationship” at Alfred Knopf). [LEWIS, p. 562]

• “The NAACP became a closed corporation … [resulting in] a tremendous narrowing of the broad base of authority suggested by the Association’s constitutional structure, with a concomitant tendency toward a self-perpetuating Board of Directors.” [p. 52]

• “The central office’s tight control of the branches meant essentially that a few New York administrators determined NAACP policy on a nationwide scale.” [p. 58-59]

• “[W.E.B. Du Bois], the only Black executive officer [until 1916] contended that it was absolutely necessary that he have a large measure of autonomy lest the Association with its preponderance of white executives, should become a white dominated organization with Negroes as mere helpers … From an administrative standpoint [Du Bois’] demand for autonomy was a potential threat to the organization’s basic unity.” [p. 61-62]

• Even though W. E. Du Bois, one of the foremost Black leaders of the day, received a full salary from the Association for his services, he frequently was obliged to solicit personal loans from Spingarn." [p. 57]

The early Black nationalist Marcus Garvey “stormed out of the NAACP’s headquarters in 1917, ‘dumbfounded’ by the apparent domination of whites.” These included Board Chairman Joel Spingarn, his brother Arthur who was pro bono counsel, Herbert Lehman of the Executive Committee, Arthur Sachs, Herbert Seligmann – director of public relations, and his secretary Martha Gruening. [LEWIS, p. 553] (A particularly curious instance occurred in 1962-63 when the labor union expert at the NAACP, a Jew named Herbert Hill, led an attack on the – largely Jewish – International Ladies Garment workers union, for racism [“discrimination.”] [GLAZER/MOYNIHAN, p. 178] Other NAACP activists included Felix Frankfurter (“an active Zionist who is credited with drafting the Balfour Declaration, the 1918 statement of the British government favoring the establishment of the Jewish homeland in Palestine” and Herman Lehman who “was also a Zionist and lent a hand in the Palestine Economic Corporation. Among Louis Marshall’s “primary activities” included “serving as president of the American Jewish Committee.” Herman Moskowitz “worked ardently in the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and the Jewish Social Service Association.” [DINER, p. 123]

In later years Marcus Garvey ran into trouble with the law concerning his part-ownership of a steam line business. “I am being punished for the crime of the Jew Silverstone [an agent of the Black Star line],” he complained, “I was persecuted by Maxwell Mattuck, another Jew, and I am to be sentenced by Judge
Julian Mack, the eminent jurist [and an NAACP board member]. Truly, I may say, ‘I am going to Jericho and fell among thieves.’” [MAGIDA, p. 166]

The omnipresence of Jewish investment in Black life was elsewhere to be found. “There were musical and literary equivalents of the role that the Spin-garns were to play in the operation of the NAACP,” says Stephen Whitfield, “that Melville Herskovits was to play in the discovery of a viable African past, that other scholars of Jewish birth were to achieve in reconstructing Afro-American history.” [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN, p. 48]

In spite of all this socio-economic evidence of Jewish paternalism and oppression of the Black community, some Jews, like Roland Gittelsohn, have insisted upon understanding in Freudian and Christian-Jewish dialectical terms the resultant African-American “anti-Semitism.” Gittelsohn plunges his periscope into the Black man’s unconscious, dredging up stuff, he says, the African-American does not recognize:

“Anti-Semitism is perhaps the only sociological phenomenon through which the Negro can identify with the white majority, can himself become part of the dominant social sector by which he is ordinarily excluded and victimized. By virtue of his black rather than white skin, the Negro feels inferior. By virtue of his Christian rather than Jewish faith, in a predominantly Christian nation he acquires an illusion of superiority. Not that a psychological process so subtle as this is actually articulated. But the very fact of its being unconscious makes it more operative and insidious.” [GITTELSOHN, R., 1967, p. 42]


In 1996, Arthur Magida of the Baltimore Jewish News wrote a Pulitzer Prize finalist book about the about Nation of Islam Leader Louis Farrakhan. Another book, called Looking for Farrakhan, is by Jewish author Frances Lewisohn. Peter Goldman wrote a book about Malcolm X. Martin Duberman wrote a biography of Paul Robeson. David Levering Lewis has recent book about W.E.B. DuBois. “The black model,” says sociologist Irving Horowitz, “has served as a stimulus to those Jewish sociologists interested in specifically ethnic themes.” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 78] (Conversely, there are Jewish authors like Daniel Levitas who has written a book on anti-Semitism and “is an expert on the subject of white supremacist and neo-Nazi organizations.” [ATLANTA BUSINESS LEAGUE, 2001] In this vein, Jews also tend to dominate modern “hate-moni-
toring” organizations, founded to discredit ethnocentric activism parallel to their own. Central focus is upon “white hate” and sometimes the likes of African-American hero Louis Farrakhan, but mention of Jewish racist currents – especially abundant in pro-Israeli and ultra-Orthodox organizations – are extremely rare. For most “hate-watch” groups, mention of Jewish “hate” is nonexistent. Examples of this trend include the (Jewish-run) Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, Rabbi Hier’s Simon Wiesenthal Center, Brian Levin’s Study of Hate and Extremism department at California State University, and David Goldman’s “Hate Watch” organization.)

“Those who wrote of blacks as subjects,” says Jewish scholar Peter Novick, “were overwhelmingly Jewish.” However, notes fellow Jewish scholar Jonathan Schorsch, “Blacks … could safely stand as subjects [in Jewish historical review] in their own right only if such subjectivity did not threaten certain conceptions of Jewish passivity and disempowerment.” In other words, as always, Jews are never interested in taking responsibility for their own honest history. Schorsch speaks here of the foundation of Jewish self-understanding: its myths of noble moral virtue and chronic victimization. Hence, Jews, even as slaveholders, routinely categorize themselves as victims, and powerless. Modern Jewish histories about African-Americans demand the location of both Blacks and Jews as victims, no matter what the historical scenario. When this paradigm does not fit, which is often, as in the case of Jewish slaveholding, Jewish victimization of others is routinely ignored, blamed on others (usually “Christian” society), or minimalized. [See Schorsch’s article about Jewish historians’ dissimulation of Jewry’s slaveholding past: SCHORSCH, J., 2000]

In 1967, African-American author Harold Cruse observed in “one of the most influential books ever published in the black community,” that

“In fact, the main job of researching and interpreting the American Negro has been taken over by the Jewish intelligentsia to the extent where it is practically impossible for the Negro to deal with the Anglo-Saxon majority in this country unless he first comes to the Jews to get his instructions.” [VOLKMAN, p. 215-216]

While Jewish authors have fallen over one another defining all aspects Black life, African-American sociologist Kenneth Clark noted also that “in practically every area of contact between Negroes and Jewish people, some real or imagined ground for mutual antagonism exists.” [HERTZBERG, A., 1989, p. 338] “When Jews called conferences about ‘the Negro in the United States,’” notes Arthur Hertzberg, “blacks felt patronized.” [HERTZBERG, A., 1989, p. 338] Not only were they patronized, they often were tokenized – even smothered. When, for example, at the height of Black-Jewish tensions in 1967, Shlomo Katz edited a volume entitled Negro and Jew. An Encounter in America, featuring 27 authors from a “symposium” by Midstream magazine about the subject, only four were African-American. All the other 23 authors afforded commentary were Jewish. [KATZ, S., 1967]

For excerpts from other chapters, about African-Americans in the Jewish sports agent and sports entrepreneurial world: http://jewishtribalreview.org/
Likewise, Jewish pre-eminence in academic circles in authoritatively defining and legislating another peoples’ culture and identity even has parallels in Islamic and Arab studies, a field that is extremely politically charged. “In the universities of the West in the 1950s,” says Norman Cantor, “Jews were still holders of many important chairs of Islamic Studies, whereas, at that time only one ethnic Arab, Philip Hitti, a Lebanese Christian teaching at Princeton enjoyed a major reputation … In the 1970s … the three leading historians (in Princeton’s Department of Near Eastern Studies Department) were all Jews … the most eminent of all, Bernard Lewis … a confirmed Zionist. [Edward] Said’s celebrated Orientalism (1978) sounded a clarion call to ethnic Arabs to liberate their historiography from Jewish imperialists.” [CANTOR, p. 126] In 2001, Jewish scholar Hillel Fradkin became head of the “Ethics and Public Policy Center” – a Washington think tank that focuses on religion, ethics, and public policy. Fradkin, who replaced Jewish scholar Elliot Abrams, has a degree in Islamic thought and “said programs on Muslims in society will be one of his priorities.” [WITHAM, H., 10-29-01]

James Zogby, president of the Arab American Institute once noted the profound credibility gap between Jewish and Arab commentators about the Middle East: “Time and time again, Arabs are regarded as having a bias, a point of view, while Jews are considered Mideast experts.” [HALSELL, G., MARCH 1993, p. 9]

Jewish author Peter Novick notes a recent case of astounding historical revisionism that suits the ideological and propagandistic needs of modern Israel:

“The assertion that Palestinians were complicit in the Holocaust was mostly based on the case of the Mufti of Jerusalem, a pre-World War II Palestinian nationalist leader who, to escape imprisonment by the British, sought refuge during the war in Germany. The Mufti in many ways was a disreputable character, but postwar claims that he played any significant part in the Holocaust has never been sustained. This did not prevent the editors of the four-volume Encyclopedia of the Holocaust from giving him a starring role. The article on the Mufti is more than twice as long as the articles on [top Nazi leaders] Goebbels and Goring, longer than the articles on Himler and Heydrich combined, longer than the article on Eichmann – of all the biographical articles, it is exceeded in length, but only slightly, by the entry for Hitler.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 158]

Jewish historical interpretation of others’ lives is everywhere to be found, recently including the likes of Daniel Levine’s Popular Voices in Latin American Catholicism, Miriam Cohen’s Workshop to Office: Two Generations of Italian Women in New York City, and Ivor Shapiro’s muckraking volume subtitled The Crisis of Faith and Conscience in One Catholic Church (Shapiro was apparently once an Anglican minister from South Africa) and on and on.

Jewish professor Barry Shain is described by one newspaper this way:
“Although he was raised in Beverly Hills, California, and is Jewish, his specialty is the study of how Protestantism and Catholicism have influenced American culture since the founding of the republic.” [LUCIER, J., 3-2-98, p. 12] (Where, one wonders, is the book by anyone [other than Jewish self-congratulatory fluff] about the profound Jewish influence upon the same thing?)

Interested in the Miami-based American Institute of Polish Culture? It was founded in 1972 by Blanka Rosenstiel, also Jewish, who remains the organization’s president. Her Special Projects department lists her two special interests at the Institute: “the lack of information about Polish history and culture in American school textbooks, and Polish-Jewish relations.” Institute policy also declares that “Jewish American organizations are calling for the introduction of the Holocaust to the curriculum of our public schools. We, at the American Institute of Polish Culture, fully support this initiative.” [AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF POLISH CULTURE, 2000, ONLINE]

The natural right and obvious merits of any individual to investigate (or even champion, as in Rosentiel’s case) another ethnic community is not the issue here, of course. This volume itself is a case in point. The issue is collective ethnic power and its influence in the limitation of the full expression of ideas. And interpretive balance. One would be very hard pressed, for example, to find a non-Jewish academic willing to risk his or her career within the context of omnipresent Jewish hypersensitivity to write a critically interpretive book (unlike the recent fawning “The Gifts of the Jews. How a Tribe of Desert Nomads Changed the Way Everyone Thinks and Feels,” ad nauseum) on “popular voices of Judaism,” the “crisis of faith and conscience” in Judaism, or “two generations” of anything Jewish. (Two that do come to mind in very recent history, however critically guarded, are California professors Albert Lindemann and Kevin MacDonald. Both have both faced defamatory charges of anti-Semitism by Jewish reviewers for their work). As (controversial) African-American professor Tony Martin observes, “Aside from the exceptional occasional work by a Gentile Judeophile, scholarly writing on the Jewish experience is for all intents and purposes a Jewish monopoly.” [MARTIN, T., p. 52]

The issue here is also the degree to which any academic investigation might be unduly influenced by an interpretive ethnocentric convention, part of an intellectual unity that expresses a “particularist” Jewish (including Zionist) perspective (a world view that is emphatically and widely declared these days as an inescapable matter of self-introspection by the Jewish community itself). Few academics would impugn, for example, the massive attack in recent decades upon “white” anthropology’s collective power in interpreting – and hence dictating – from its own lofty perch the essential life experiences of disempowered, vulnerable Third World Others. As, for example, Wilbur Jacobs, in his 1972 book about American Indians, noted: “Since most of our history is written by white writers, many have come to ask whether much that has appeared in print is biased or unreliable.” [JACOBS, W., 1972, p. 1]

If political correctness dictates that “whites” view the world through a biased lens, why spare the Jewish (a formidable and populous subgroup within
the “white” author elite) lens the same kind of critical scrutiny? A Jewish member of academe or the publishing elite is also a member of a collectivist power group with an extremely strong, and particular, political agenda, overtly or covertly, and bearing a much ballyhooed community self-assertion of “specialness” in understanding the world. When it comes to “objective” Jewish scholarship on Jewish history and identity, the Middle East, and Israel, for example, its collective bias is in most cases transparent.

Take, for example, secular social anthropologist Samuel Heilman’s Orthodox “in-house” field work with ultra-Orthodox Jews. As Heilman writes, about the illusion of social scientist objectivity, and his own myths about the Jewish past:

“One cannot separate the observer from the observations. Even though he restrains himself by ‘objectivity,’ his personal experiences, participation, and empathy are crucial to what he sees … My interest in [ultra-Orthodox Jews], as I reflect upon it now, affected not only my search for roots and experiences in Judaism. It was also influenced by the fact that I had been raised and still am an Orthodox Jew … For me the search for the haredim began indeed as a search for the utopia of the past in which my grandparents lived.” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. xvi-xvii]

Take also, for example, in the case of Jewish review of the Gentile outsider, the aforementioned author of a biography about Louis Farrakhan. Among the experiences that shape Arthur Magida’s lens to view the world were his positions as the Senior Editor of the Baltimore Jewish News and Editorial Director of Jewish Lights Publishing. Noting the growing animosity between Blacks and Jews and the Nation of Islam’s role in this, Magida writes that

“Jews and Farrakhan spoke a different language. Each said they were espousing ‘truths,’ but they were truths of different colors … Farra-khan’s truths, while clothed as historical and verifiable, were emotive truths rooted in the furies of black pain, fueled by the NOI’s racial-religious messianism, and stirred by a clever strategy to catapult separatism to the vanguard of the black agenda.” [MAGIDA, p. 141]

And the Jewish “truths” that grappled against Farrakhan’s ahistorical emotionalism? Magida sums them up in one sentence, merely in passing, as if they are—to the rational mind—unassailable: “The Jewish truths were linear and historical.” [MAGIDA, p. 141]

Let’s switch Magida’s attack upon Farrakhan’s “truths,” placing the word “Jews” where “Farrakhan” was, and see what we have:

“Jews and Farrakhan spoke a different language. Each said they were espousing ‘truths,’ but they were truths of different colors. … The Jews’ truths, while clothed as historical and verifiable, were emotive truths rooted in the furies of Jewish pain, fueled by the Jewish community’s racial-religious messianism, and stirred by a clever strategy to catapult separatism to the vanguard of the Jewish agenda.”

This Jewish/Zionist revision more than fits; as amply evidenced throughout this volume, it is “true,” as “linear” and “historical” as any “truth” can be.
While Jews have marched to the fore in defining Black Studies, throughout American popular culture Jews have likewise hidden behind a Black veil. “For most of the twentieth century,” notes Stephen Whitfield, “Jewishness as an explicit subject was mostly concealed … [and often] disguised in blackface … In 1954 a Cleveland disc jockey named Alan Freed brought to a certain culmination this Jewish penchant to wear a black mask. Freed introduced white teenagers listening to his radio program to the [Black] music that he named ‘rock and roll.’” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 48-49]

“A Negro actor states in bitter terms,” noted Kenneth Clark in 1946, “that he is being flagrantly underpaid by a Jewish producer. A Negro entertainer is antagonistic to his Jewish agent, who, he is convinced, is exploiting him.” [GLAZER, NEGROES, p. 29] “We’ve been loyal to you [Jews],” bitterly challenged Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan, reflecting widespread Black opinion, “We give you our talent. You manage us. You get the money.” [GOULD, p. 560-561] [See later sections for further information about common Jewish managerial control over African-American professional sports stars and the music world].

Taking agency and entrepreneurship to a new level, the African-American New York Beacon pointed out the central role of middleman Jose “Yosi” Medina in the extortion plot to elicit millions of dollars from African-American actor Bill Cosby by Autumn Jackson, a woman who claimed to be Cosby’s illegitimate daughter. Once Medina was in court and on trial for his role in the scheme, Medina’s lawyer announced that his client – due to hitting his head in a bathtub accident in 1983, “doesn’t remember where he’s from” but he remembers “always being Jewish.” [HAYS, p. 3]

Another such Medina character is Michael Fitzpatrick. Fitzpatrick’s mother was Jewish and he asserted a radical Jewish identity as an activist in the right-wing Jewish Defense League. In 1977 he was arrested for his involvement in the bombing of a Russian book store in New York City. In the 1990s he became newsworthy again. As the estranged father of the son of Qubillah Shabazz (Malcolm X’s daughter), he made plans with her to assassinate Nation of Islam Leader Louis Farrakhan. (Shabazz blamed Louis Farrakhan for a role in the murder of her father). The FBI wiretapped their conversations. Eventually Fitzpatrick came under increased media scrutiny and suspicion, that it was he who was implanting the idea of murder in Shabazz’s mind, a device by which he could get FBI aid in seeking relief from a Minneapolis cocaine charge. [MCENROE, P., 1-14-95, p. 1A; DALY, M. 6-4-97; TERRY, D., 3-5-95, p. 20]

For decades Blacks were used by Jewish generals as the front-line troops in litigation battles over discrimination and minority rights. Louis Marshall had even begun, in 1909, to litigate NAACP cases himself, and he later served on that organization’s Board of Directors. [IVERS, p. 40] With Jewish leaders safely nestled and hidden in the heart of what was publicly known as a Black organization, “in the South no small number of African-Americans feared that forcing whites to implement such radical legal doctrines would intensify their resentment towards blacks.” [IVERS, p. 221]
“High public profile as Jews was anathema,” notes David Levering Lewis about decades of Jewish civil rights involvement, “Support of and participation in the Afro-American civil rights movement was seen … as a stratagem exactly meeting Jewish needs … [LEWIS, p. 554-555] … Upper class Jews … increasingly encouraged the new Afro-American leadership … which employed agitation and publicity as principal weapons to force the glacial pace of civil rights. By establishing a presence at the center of the civil rights movement with intelligence, money, and influence, elite Jews and their delegates could fight anti-Semitism by remote control.” [LEWIS, p. 555]

In academe, notes Irving Horowitz, “while other minorities such as blacks, women, and gay-rights activists take a high profile, the Jewish group has opted for a low profile.” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 91] A good case in point is Jewish social scientist Franz Boas, often called the “father of anthropology.” As Marshall Hyatt notes,

“Feeling that a scientific investigation of race prejudice centered on Jews would leave him open to charges of subjectivity, Boas used Afro-Americans as a substitute … He surmised that if he could abolish racism as it pertained to blacks, Jews would also benefit to some extent. Boas was guilty of ethnic chauvinism. By his own example and his pronouncements, he demonstrated that Jews had progressed under persecution. He did not make the same claim for blacks … He sought to focus on racism itself, using blacks as a surrogate for his real concern [Jews].” [HYATT, M., 1990, p. 97-98]

The Black civil rights movement has provided Jewish nationalism plenty of hiding places over the years. Nathan Glazer even used it as an apologetic for the standard charge against Jews of dual national loyalty. “Some Jews had always been troubled by the problem of dual loyalty,” he admits, and then leaves the essence of this “troubling problem” hanging, merely excusing it away by noting that Black civil rights militancy (and its “distinctive group interests”) “made it easier for Jews, too, directly to support the interests of the state of Israel.” [GLAZER, AMERICAN, p. 174] “The conventional wisdom among Jews,” says Henry Feingold, “has long since concluded that the animosity toward African-Americans has served as a major deflector of hatred against themselves. Thus, a group that has inadvertently served as a shield for American Jewry is generating what may ultimately be identified as the most indigenous form of American anti-Semitism.” [FEINGOLD, p. 77] “All the bigotry and hatred focused on the Black man,” complained Malcolm X, “keeps off the Jew a lot of heat that would be on him otherwise.” [GOULD, p. 565] Barnet Litvinoff noted the comparable situation in Great Britain: “A million colored people, mostly from the Caribbean Islands, India, and Pakistan, have arrived in Britain in recent years, … providing new targets for the Englishman’s prejudices … Each one has unwittingly done the Jews a service. He has diverted attention from one kind of minority to another.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 170]

Even in far left-wing American political organizations like the Communist Party, in the 1960s Blacks began rejecting Jewish hegemony. “The period of Jewish
dominance in the Communist Party,” says Harold Cruse, a Black intellectual and former communist, “… culminated in the emergence of Herbert Aptheker and other assimilated Jewish communists, who assumed the mantle of spokespersonship on Negro affairs, thus burying the Negro radical potential deeper and deeper in the slough of white intellectual paternalism.” [CRUSE, p. 147]

Jewish leadership efforts to exploit the impoverished Blacks for Jewish struggles for upper class aims (i.e., access to exclusivist clubs, hotels, and universities) was even reflected in the comments of the President of the Hebrew Union College, Julius Morgenstern, in 1913: “It is not the Negro, nor the Chinese, nor the Indian who seeks to force their way into hotels where he is not wanted … It is the Jews, and Jews alone …” [IVERS, p. 59] In 1947 Black NAACP director Roy Wilkins was asked to join the steering committee of an American Jewish Congress campaign to outlaw discrimination in New York graduate schools. Wilkins, recalls a former AJC head, “said it was not a major problem for [African-Americans]. He said they had very few people in colleges seeking admission to graduate schools.” [GOLDBERG, p. 314]

Another American Jew at the turn of the century, Walter Lippmann (who generally steered clear of the Jewish community) wrote:

“I waste no time myself worrying about the injustice of anti-Semitism. There is too much injustice in the world for any particular concern about [Jewish access to] summer hotels and college fraternities.” [CUD-DIHY, p.143]

“In Boston,” says Norman Cantor, “[Jews] sought entry to Harvard in 1910, to solidify their fellowship with the Brahmins against the Irish proletarian immigrants.” [CANTOR, p. 269] Mordecai Kaplan, founder of the “Reconstructionist” Judaism movement, noted in 1933 the “different class interests” of Eastern European Jews coming to America, their “professional careerism,” and their strong “desire for social climbing.” [EISEN, p. 27] The 1922 Jewish enrollment at Harvard – the most elite, most status-conscious, and one of the most expensive schools in America – was already 20% of the student body. [FEINGOLD, p. 95] (Columbia University’s 1920 enrollment was 40% Jewish). [BELTH, p. 98] A quota was suggested by Harvard administrators to limit further Jewish enrollment. While Blacks barely could find the most menial of jobs, and immigrant Slavs, Catholics, and others faced prejudice and discrimination where they mostly rested at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder, the Harvard quota is immortalized by elitist-minded Jews today as one of the most famous evidences of “anti-Semitism” in American history, still examined with outrage by Jewish scholars in our own day. As early as 1918, Jews made up 9.7 percent of American college enrollment, including 23.4 percent of all students in dentistry, 27.9 percent in pharmacy, 21.6 in law, and 16.4 of all those studying medicine. “Clearly,” notes Hasia Diner, “this group eagerly sought economic mobility.” [DINER, p. 5]

(Note in contrast the mood of a private Jewish club, noted by James Yaffe in 1968: “Most Jews seem to feel like the members of a club in the Midwest whose admissions committee recently proposed to admit non-Jews. There was loud
opposition and the proposal was turned down. One man expressed the consensus of opinion: ‘We’ll be overrun by non-Jews. We won’t feel comfortable here any more.’” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 64])

By 1972-74, as about 2.5% of the American population, Jews constituted the following percentages of major university undergraduate enrollment: UCLA 29%; University of Miami 31.5%; University of Chicago 27.5%; John Hopkins 40%; Brandeis 60%; Rutgers 29%; Princeton 29%; Columbia 32.5%; Boston University 38.1%; Cornell 27.8%; Hofstra 43.5%; New York University 40%; Syracuse 35%; Temple 32.5%; SUNY-Albany 25%; University of Pennsylvania 40%; Brown 22.5%; Emory 25%; University of California at Berkeley 19.5%; Harvard 25%. [SLAVIN, p. 172-179] By 1969 a study by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education found that 17% of the faculty at the seventeen top-ranked universities were Jewish. In law schools the percentage went up to 36%, in sociology 34%, economics 28%, physics 26%, history 22%, and philosophy 20%. [HOLLINGER]

In Canada, where Jews are less than one and a half percent of the Canadian population, by 1969 “more than a quarter” of the enrollment at Montreal’s prominent McGill University was Jewish. [LITVINOFF, B., p. 172] A Jew, Ruth Wolfe, became chancellor of the University of Toronto in 1993. Bernard Shapiro was appointed to be “principal of McGill University” in 1994, the same year that Ian Segal became head of Canada’s Simon Fraser University. [SINGER/SEL-DIN, 1995, p. 225] Gloria Gerson, an American visitor to Brazil, noted in 1999 that Rio de Janeiro’s Pontifica Catholic University

“is among the most prestigious schools in Brazil. Surprised to encounter another Jew [there], I was shocked to discover that the school, where Christianity is a required course and nuns run a snack bar, is in fact 20% Jewish.” [GERSON, G., 11-19-99, p. 1]

By the 1960s, numbering about two and a half percent of the American population, as two Jewish scholars note:

“One in five lawyers in the United States was of Jewish ancestry. Jews also constituted 12 percent of the faculty of law schools in the United States and, more importantly, 38 percent of the faculty at elite law schools … In sum, Americans of Jewish background have become an elite group in American society, with a cultural and intellectual influence far beyond their numbers. Writing about the ‘Eastern Establishment,’ Thomas Dye lists a number of symbolic figures to which this establishment looks. Four of seven listed are of Jewish background.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 98]

And Jewish mothers beaming about “my son the Jewish doctor” is no gross stereotype. In 1934, for example, “more than 60% of the 33,000 applicants to medical schools were Jews … Between 1932 and 1933, more than 90% of Americans studying medicine in Europe were Jewish.” [JUTHANI, 3-5-97] “In 1948,” says James Yaffe, “10 to 15 percent of the medical students in New York state were Jewish. By 1954 this had risen to 50 percent – in some schools it was as high as 80 percent.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 52] Because the field is so much popu-
lated by Jews, Ann Roiphe notes that “Even anti-Semites may one day need a Jewish doctor.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 177]

A speculative medical aside for a moment: With all these Jews going to medical school over the last few decades, what are we to make of the fact that American secular medical culture has for decades emulated Jewish religious tradition in dictatorially circumcising the vast majority of American Gentile males? This century the American circumcision rate has been as high as 85% of the male population. A Jewish author, Ronald Goldman, notes that “from a global perspective, most of the world rejects circumcision: over 80 percent of the world’s males are intact (not circumcised). Most circumcised men are Muslim or Jewish. The United States is the only country in the world that circumcises most of its male infants for nonreligious reasons.” [GOLDMAN, R., p. 2]

Surveys have found that a huge number of Americans are ignorant about this extremely personal subject; many aren’t even aware, with certainty, what circumcision is. Because it has not often – until recently – been a subject of public discussion, because infants had no choice in the matter, and because the medical world has been routinely trusted to know what’s best for babies, for decades a veil of ignorance has been draped across the subject. “In one study,” notes Goldman, “34 percent of men incorrectly identified their own circumcision status. In another study, half of the mothers questioned did not know if the father of their child was circumcised … My own research of 60 adult graduate students revealed that 38 percent of the women and 45 percent of the men were not sure of the difference between a circumcised male and an intact penis.” [GOLDMAN, R., p. 29]

In recent years, there are increasing objections – even from some Jews, like Goldman – to the routine circumcision of American male infants. More and more medical practitioners are rejecting claims that a circumcised penis is more hygienic than an uncut organ, as well as that it helps to prevent sexually transmitted diseases. Most perplexing in all this is how and why circumcision has developed as a norm for behavior in America on such a wide scale, a dictate of the medical profession and not the populace at-large. Rosemary Romberg, married to a Jew, is among those who have written an entire volume criticizing the omnipresence of circumcision in American medical society. As she notes, “I have learned that none of the medical arguments for circumcision are justified.” [ROMBERG, p. xxi] Yet, she observes, “If we take a stand against Jewish ritual circumcision we run the risk of being labeled anti-Semitic.” [ROMBERG, p. 59]

In her investigations into the subject, Romberg once even interviewed a rabbi, asking, “There are many Jewish doctors in the United States. Do you think that their influence could have anything to do with the popularity of circumcision in the United States today?” [ROMBERG, p. 71] The rabbi of course said no, and Romberg herself later rejected the possibilities of a conscious Jewish influence on the issue as being unfounded. She ultimately decided it may be, at least in part, the result of an abstract openness to the idea of circumcision because of the Judeo-Christian link. [ROMBERG, p. 105] Others suggest its prominence rooted in a Christian-based anti-sexual morality, an American obsession with hygiene, and other postulates.
But is Romberg’s question to the rabbi – inferring that Jews would have a vested interest in mass circumcision – one that is so easily dismissed? With the huge numbers of Jews in the medical world, their high proclivity to publish their medical opinions, and their disproportionate influence in the field, is it an unreasonable question to wonder about? Romberg notes a very important point in her initial speculations about Jewish medical influence in having American males, in large numbers, circumcised. To traditional Jewish thinking, a Jewish male must be circumcised. There is no choice in the matter. Given this fact, as Romberg says, “In other times and places [circumcision] has brought ridicule and persecution upon the Jews. In the United States today, the Jew does not stand out as different for having a circumcised penis. Have Jews been the cause, directly or indirectly, of the widespread popularity of routine infant circumcision in the U.S.? There are many Jewish doctors in the U.S.” [ROMBERG, p. 104]

Always highly attuned to threats of anti-Semitism, religiously convinced that Gentiles must sooner or later rise up for no reason against them, and for centuries seeking to mold the safest niches possible within non-Jewish communities, the secular American custom of circumcision offers the Jewish (male) community the extraordinary opportunity to physically blend into American society, without having to abandon its traditional genital marker which, in European society, was the absolute test for determining who was, and who was not, Jewish. There was no hiding from the malicious anti-Semite. “The exposed penis,” writes Jewish Feminist Andrea Dworkin, taking it to the furthest abstraction, “reifies the vulnerability of the Jewish male.” [DWORKIN, A., 2000, p. 115] For whatever reason, the fact remains that the careful – and guarded – Jewish process of assimilation in America is such that in this regard, on the procreative organ, it is the Gentile males who have effectively assimilated, only this century, to Jewish religious tradition.

At Princeton, when by 1999 the Jewish percentage of the entering freshman class dipped to 10% (still a Jewish overrepresentation of their American population by 400%), it was cause for alarm in Jewish circles that they were there dwindling. Princeton, noted the Jewish Week, is a wonderful place for Jews. It had even “financed the $4.5 million construction of a state-of-the-art center for Jewish life, which operated in 1993 and is operated jointly by the university and Hillel.” [GOLBERG, Trouble, p. 16] (Likewise, at Harvard, noted Charles Silberman, the national Jewish Hillel organization had moved “from the periphery of the campus to its very center.” [SILBERMAN, p. 255] At UCLA, in 1998 Jewish media moguls Edgar Bronfman, Lew Wasserman, and Steven Spielberg each contributed $1 million to the $6 million Hillel community center at UCLA, “one of the largest Jewish student centers in the country.”) [HOWARD, B., 6-2-98, p. D12] At the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, in 1993 18% of the undergraduate student body was Jewish. “Ann Arbor’s [Hillel Center] is largely a social and political center,” noted the Baltimore Jewish Times, “… [It] houses seven Israel-related groups …” [NEUSNER, N., 2-26-93, p. 68]

“What does it mean,” wondered concerned Jewish journalist Philip Weiss in 1996, “that members of a group that makes up 2.5 percent of the population accounts for two-fifths of the [student] positions at one of the principal staging
areas for the American Establishment [Yale]?” [WEISS, p. 30] (Weiss neglected to mention that the president of Yale, Richard Levin, appointed in 1993, is also Jewish, as is, for that matter, the president of Harvard, Neil Rudenstein, and Princeton, Harvey Shapiro. In fact, noted Edward Shapiro in 1998, “five of the eight presidents of the Ivy League colleges and universities have Jewish parents.”) [SHAPIRO, E., 1998] (In 2001, Jewish economist Larry Summers replaced Rudenstein as the head of Harvard). The Dean of King’s College in England and the president of prestigious Cal Tech are also Jewish. In recent years Barry Munitz stepped down as the chancellor of the California State University system for a position in the art world. By the early 1970s, Jews were also presidents of the University of Pennsylvania, University of Cincinnati, MIT, Rutgers, [SKLARE, 1974, p. 261] and so on. (In Chicago alone, in 1973 Jewish presidents headed the University of Chicago, Roosevelt University, and Chicago City College). [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 207]

In 2001 the Cleveland Jewish News noted some of the concerns of new Cleveland State University president Michael Schwartz:

“Four antisemitic incidents have recently occurred on the campus of Cleveland State University (CSU), prompting new president Michael Schwarz to issue a ‘zero tolerance’ policy. ‘If we find the people (who committed the acts), they are out (expelled),’ he says .... The first incident happened shortly after Sept. 11. The Cleveland Hillel Foundation, which serves Case Western University, Kent State University and Oberlin College in addition to CSU, received a threatening phone call with regard to a Hillel banner featuring a Star of David that hangs in CSU’s University Center. The call was placed shortly after the banner was hung, and the caller warned, ‘If you don’t take down that f–ing flag, we are going to kill you,’ reports Hillel executive director Marcia Bloomberg ... The second call came ‘just after we hung a big banner announcing the Birthright Israel trip’ at CSU, she added .. Also during this time, an Israeli flag was stolen from the University Center and a large globe on the first floor of the main library was defaced. ‘It looks like someone took a key and scratched out the name of Israel. The intent was pretty clear,’ Schwartz explains.” [HERWALD, M., 11-20-01, p. 3-]

In 1998, Justin Danielewitz, a Jewish student at Harvard University, was afforded space in a major Jewish magazine to complain that he had been passed over in his application for an “executive position” at the university newspaper, a forum whose “prominent alumni are too numerous to list; their bylines grace the pages of the country’s most prestigious newspapers and magazines.” The college employers, it seems, wanted more ethnic “diversity” on the newspaper staff. Already, as Danielewitz observed, at least seven of the ten columnists were not only Jewish, but also from the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area. Of course the author’s complaint was not that Jews dominate the campus newspaper, but that their influence was too liberal for his taste. Ultimately, the two individuals chosen over him to be co-chairmen of the newspaper’s editorial board were those who overtly championed in their interviews the importance
of ethnic diversity. But, incredibly, notes Danielewitz, not only were those selected over him “white Jews themselves, but white Jews from that most dreadfully over represented tri-state area. In light of this embarrassing fact, how they could have considered themselves appropriate role models for a newly diverse paper remains a mystery.” [DANIELEWITZ, April 1998]

Way back in 1968 Jewish author James Yaffe noted Jewish dominance in prestigious Ivy League schools. “At Harvard,” he wrote, “the faculty, dominated by Jews, makes a special effort to hire qualified non-Jews. At Brown a few years ago the Jewish editors of the newspaper ran an editorial urging non-Jews to join, assuring them that they wouldn’t meet with prejudice.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 52] At the University of Michigan, noted the Baltimore Jewish Times in 1993, “Many of the staffers on the Daily, the campus newspaper, are Jewish … Many prominent faculty members are Jewish … Virtually the only major activity in which Jews don’t have a high profile is athletics.” [NEUSNER, N., 1993, p. 68]

Among the most important Harvard keys to a career in Washington DC political journalism is Martin Peretz, a 1960s-era professor of American vice-president Al Gore. “For more than a quarter of a century,” notes Todd Kliman, “Marty’s Peretz’s undergraduate seminar in social theory at Harvard has functioned as a kind of Future Pundits of America clubhouse.” [KLIMAN, 9-98] Peretz is the owner of the New Republic, a prominent journal he and his wife bought years ago with her inherited Singer Sewing Machine fortune. The New Republic’s “Jewish-consciousness is more than palpable,” reports Kliman, “It’s pervasive (says Peretz: ‘I will not publish anything in the magazine that is anti-Israel’) … Proof of the New Republic’s Jewishness is not merely to be found in its unwavering support of Israel, as many have noted. It’s also seen in its brand of inquiry, its willfully contrarian approach to so many issues of the day.” [KLIMAN, 9-98]

Elsewhere in the college field, in 1995 the Anti-Defamation League arranged to send 13 university newspaper editors to Holocaust sites in Poland. (Editors included those from the University of California, Duke, Emory, Harvard, John Hopkins, University of Michigan, Michigan State, University of Mississippi, University of Notre Dame, Vanderbilt, West Virginia, and the University of Wisconsin.) “The aim of the mission,” said ADL, “is to sensitize tomorrow’s journalists to the Holocaust and issues of concern to the Jewish community.” ADL ON THE FRONTLINE, OCT/NOV 1995]

Of all the imaginable expressions of discrimination against Jews, another of the most famous “anti-Semitic” incidents in American history occurred in 1877 when a wealthy and prominent Jew, Joseph Seligman (who had once been offered the Secretary of Treasury position by President Ulysses S. Grant) was refused lodging at the Grand Union Hotel in the vacation resort town of Saratoga Springs, in upstate New York. [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 131] The hotel – described as the “Queen of American resorts” – was managed by Judge Henry Hilton who had a personal grudge against the prominent Jewish investment banker. “The controversy was front-page news for the entire summer.” [SILBERMAN, p. 48]

Meanwhile, upper-class German Jews like Seligman, with their own nose-to-the-sky postures of arrogance and elitism, were saints? As Edwin Freedland
notes, “there was a time when in some cities, Baltimore for example, Jews of different backgrounds exclusively joined different country clubs. B’nai B’rith, created by German Jews, originally would not allow the admission of Eastern European Jews.” [FREEDLAND, p. 514]

Past incidents of American Gentile “anti-Semitism,” per the likes of Seligman, still referenced and complained about by Jewish scholars in our own day, bear further reflection, for it echoes a fundamental undercurrent of Jewish complaint as they continue to move en masse quickly up the American socio-economic ladder. Jews have never been disbarred from the best jobs working in coal mines or dumping molten steel at smelting plants. And it remains a fact today that discrimination against 99% of the American population at such elite hotels, clubs, Harvard, and other haughty reservoirs of wealth and power remains endemic to the fundamental dividing lines of modern – and past – society: money and class, not “anti-Semitism.” The Jewish stampede to the top of everything in the socio-economic pyramid knows no shame, and those they stood (and stand) upon in their wars of admittance to the highest of WASP echelons are the unmentioned rungs – as always – of Jewish history. As David Desser and Lester Friedman note, despite grandiose mythologies about Jewish “social conscience,” the overwhelming majority of Jews have been far more concerned with maids, their yicchus, and other signs of social status: “Instead of turning to secular political movements, the majority of American Jews pursued … materialism and economic gain.” [DESSER, p. 17]

For all the Jewish obsessions of an alleged endemic American anti-Semitism, it is a fact that nothing in the American historical record compares in Jewish life to the “animus against Catholics [which] was translated into a political one by the Know Nothing Party.” [FEINGOLD, p. 75] Nathan Belth notes that “the torments suffered by the Catholic immigrants of the nineteenth century fill some of the blackest pages of American history. Violence – killings, burnings, general destruction – were commonplace. Vilification, degradation, constant political attack was their ever-present burden.” [BELTH, p. 16] In the 1854 United States Congress, the Know Nothing party “held 8 of 62 seats in the Senate, and 104 of 234 seats in the House.” [BELTH, p. 18]

And no anti-immigrant incident matches the mass massacres of Chinese workers in the 1880s. In an ethnic dispute among miners in 1885, a mob of 150 people – half armed with rifles – attacked the Chinese section of Rock Springs, Wyoming, killing 28 people and wounding 15 others. In 1887, in what became known as the Snake River Massacre, 31 more Chinese miners were murdered by a mob in Oregon. [DANIELS]

John Higham also notes that

“As late as 1916, the leading anti-Japanese organization in San Francisco, the Native Sons of the Golden West, held a mass meeting to raise funds for persecuted European Jews.” [HIGHAM, J. 1957, p. 25]

Jewish obsession with status and control is made quite clear in a 1991 book, Chutzpah (Yiddish for pushiness), by Harvard teacher and lawyer Alan Dershowitz:
“The byword of past generations of Jewish Americans has been *shan-da* – fear of embarrassment – in front of our hosts. The byword of the next generation should be *chutzpah* – assertive insistence on first class status among our peers.” [DERSHOWTIZ, p. 9]

As Dershowitz so deftly puts it, the issue is not Jewish “equality” with other Americans, but collective supremacy as “first class” citizens. (Apparently reflecting a long Jewish tradition about themselves, even today’s’ ultra-Orthodox male Hasidic dress of “black knee breeches, white stockings, and long back caftan, topped by the fur-brimmed *shrayml* on Saturdays and holidays, the discarding of which is considered to this very day by the Hasidic Jews as the equivalent of becoming a renegade, was adopted by their ancestors in the sixteenth century in imitation of the costume worn by the Polish and Russian upper classes.”) [PATAI, R., 1971, p. 159-160] Steven Aschheim notes collective Jewish class goals during their assimilative efforts in pre-Nazi Germany:

“What was the substance of Jewish assimilation? In practice it was linked to the process of *embourgeoisement*. German Jewry never had a wide social base. Jews did not integrate into some abstract *volk* but into the middle class, and they spent much of the nineteenth century internalizing the economic, ethical, and aesthetic standards of that class.” [ASCHHEIM, S., 1982, p. 7]

The current rupture in Black-Jewish relations (surveys consistently show Blacks with the highest anti-Jewish feelings in America) is in part the result of the fact that the Black community has merely evolved and followed the particularist Jewish model that formerly directed them under the guise of collective universalism. For decades both Jewish and Black communities largely followed, at least ostensibly, a purely assimilationist strategy in America (as epitomized by the NAACP). The universalist and assimilationist ideal (which has been trashed by Jews and their subgroup emulators in today’s America) was actually championed by some African-Americans in the early Civil Rights era, a perspective that threatened the Jewish model of tribal particularism. The Jewish scholar Nathan Glazer wrote in 1964 that:

“The force of present-day Negro demands is that the sub-community, because it either protects privilege or creates inequalities, has no right to exist. That is why these demands pose a quite new challenge to the Jewish or to any other sub-community. The Jewish community has come up with a convenient defense of Jewish exclusiveness – namely, that everyone else is doing it too. The thrust of present-day Negro demands is that everyone should stop doing it.” [GLAZER, NEGRO, p. 34]

By 1993 the Congressional Black Caucus was even borrowing the standard Jewish tribal word – “Covenant” – to describe their own solidarity with Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan. [GOLDBERG, p. 329] In fact, even the Black nationalism of the Marcus Garvey movement in the early 1900s (which some called “African Zionism”) was modeled on Jewish nationalist concepts. “Africa for Africans!,” and a strident doctrine of a unique, racially purified destiny in resurgent Mother Africa exploded upon the American scene in 1917,” notes David
Levering Lewis, “... Afro-American leadership was ... influenced by analogies of history and intellect and prone to describe itself in the manner of Jews, as an ancient special people, achieving superiority by suffering ... [LEWIS, p. 562] ... Pan-Africanism was strikingly similar to ... intellectual Zionism.” [LEWIS, p. 557] Hasia Diner notes that “the [New York] Yiddish newspapers described Galvanism in the language of Zionism. The anthem sung at Garvey’s conventions were called 'the Negro Hatikvah' (the ‘Hatikvah’ being the Zionist anthem), and the newspapers claimed that Garvey wanted to take his people out of Galut, the Hebrew word for diaspora.” [DINER, p. 76] As Garvey himself noted: “A new spirit, a new courage, has come to us ... at the same time as it came to the Jew: When the Jew said, ‘We shall have Palestine,’ the same sentiment came to us when we said, ‘We shall have Africa.’” [MAGIDA, p. 166]

Internationally too, some African nations have followed the “Holocaust/ Jewish victimization is unique” model (also part of the Zionist ideological package) to demand international reparations for the old slave trade. A presentation to the United Nations from African nations in 2001 asked the UN to “affirm that the slave trade is a unique tragedy in the history of humanity, particularly against Africans – a crime against humanity which is unparalleled, not only in its abhorrent barbaric feature but also in terms of its enormous magnitude, its institutionalized nature, its transnational dimensions and especially its negation of the essence of the human nature of the victims.” [MCGREAT, C., 5-21-01]

Jewish philanthropy, including Sears-Roebuck mogul Julius Rosenthal, also aided the projects of the prominent Black southern activist, Booker T. Washington. “It seems,” says Hasia Diner, “that Washington’s views on the meaning of ethnic group identity and success were reinforced by his contacts with Jewish philanthropists ... Washington mentioned that black separation was a necessary expedient in the economic development of the race.” [DINER, p. 171] Washington’s own association with Jewish benefactors led him to write what they themselves could have written:

“There is, perhaps, no race that has suffered so much [as the Jews] ... But these people have clung together. They have a certain ... unity, pride, and love of race; and, as the years go on, they will be more influential in this country ... The Negro [must] learn ... to imitate the Jew in these matters.” [DINER, p. 171]

By the 1930s Julius Rosenthal was “condemned by a group of black doctors from New York” for “his policy of financing and advocating separate [medical] institutions for American citizens of Negro descent,” arguing that such a system produces “a sense of servility, suppressed inspiration and creates artificial and dishonest standards.” [DINER, p. 178]

In a 1974 article in Sociological Review entitled Jewish Self-Interest in Black Pluralism, sociologist Oliver Cox explored the way that organized American Jewry has guided the multiethnic plurality movement to make its own Jewish nationalist commitment less conspicuous. One of the most important proponents of the new divisive worldview (in which comparatively weak minority
ethnic identities are encouraged, and the dominant “white and/or Christian” identity is systematically pathologized and dismantled) was the American Jewish Congress. The AJC, says Cox, “put out considerable literature (purportedly scientific and impartial) and influenced public information media; and, most spectacularly, it has sponsored an Annual Conference of Ethnic Communities in many large metropolitan centers. In the process of producing these national celebrations the Jewish promoters are largely hidden.” [COX, p. 192]

Widespread Jewish support for “cultural tolerance,” says Charles Silberman, “stems from Jewish conviction that they are only ‘safe’ from unwanted attention when they are surrounded by a plethora of other communal self-identities and behaviors. It is this belief, for example, not approval of homosexuality, that leads the overwhelming majority of American Jews to endorse gay rights and to take a liberal stand on most other so-called ‘social issues.’” [SILBERMAN, p. 350]

“Jews,” says Oliver Cox, “have been campaigning intensively against the tradition of cultural assimilation in the United States. Assimilation has been disparaged and referred to in pejorative terms … If … Americans could conceive of their ideal society as a stable network of national cultural ‘ethnics,’ they could reverse their traditional tendency toward cultural assimilation and establish a new kind of society hospitable to the peculiar Jewish isolationism. The desideratum comes in many guises.” [COX, p. 187]

“The drive for Black Power, “wrote Jewish author Alan Vorspan in 1969, “is, ideally, opening Americans to new and true pluralism in which Jews will be one of the most important beneficiary groups.” [COX, p. 188]

The segregationist Black Power movement, and its own ‘dual citizenship,’ notes Cox, whatever its short term positives, with its Jewish model of tribal chauvinism and isolationism, risks ensuring anti-Black racism the same way that Jewish chauvinism has always created anti-Semitism. Ironically too, the Jewish desire to “retard Negro assimilation in the interests of social pluralism,” says Cox, has an inevitable backlash: Black anti-Semitism. “No matter … how specious or inapplicable such a program might be for Negroes, it still will be advocated for them if it seems to serve the purpose of the Jews.” [COX, p. 190-191]

This whole scenario – of Jewish inculcating in Black political consciousness its own Black tribal chauvinism to protect Jewish tribalism – has had some backlash, in that the Black community has turned hostile to Jewish “exclusivity.” This backfired strategy has parallel in the political machinations of the Jews in Israel where, in the Israeli nurturing of the Muslim political organization, Hamas, against the PLO, Hamas has grown to be the far greater threat to the Israeli state.

Ironically, while the Jewish community has actively sought to destroy the unified socio-cultural model in America to foster its own ethnocentric aims and agenda, the central magnet of distinctly Jewish allegiance – the modern state of Israel – is a country modeled on America’s own deconstructed “melting pot” paradigm, with the simple racist twist that it is exclusively structured for Jews only. As the first President of Israel, Ben Gurion, proclaimed:
“Within the State the difference between various kinds of Jews will be obliterated in the course of time, the communities and tribes will sooner or later fuse into our national and cultural entity.” [COX, p. 187]

Particularly since the 1960’s, with growing Jewish chauvinism about Israel and renewed obsession with “particularist” Jewish identity (both of which ran vehemently counter to the ideal of the American ethnic “melting pot”), as well as enduring racial problems, the Black community evolved into the same paradigm as the Jewish one, completely rejecting not only the “white” values of mainstream “melting pot” American society, but also – by now nakedly apparent – the Jewish chauvinism that exploited Black suffering for Jewish economic, social, political, and nationalist gain.

“I was in college with Jews in 1955 when the society was closed to them,” says controversial African-American professor Leonard Jeffries, “The civil rights struggle helped to open up American society to Jewish people. But the tragedy is that once they got in and won access to jobs and wealth, they closed the door behind them.” [GOLDBERG, p. 328]

Even in the history of American theatrical entertainment, with Jews like Al Jolson, Eddie Cantor, Sophie Tucker, and Fanny Brice rubbing burnt cork on their faces to appear onstage as “mammy singers” and “coon callers,” upwardly mobile Jewish exploitation of a static, immovable and disempowered Black underclass is symbolically revealed in this observation by Claire Pajackowska:

“Of the number of Jewish performers who appeared in ‘black-face,’ it has been said: ‘Blacks became a mask for Jewish expressiveness with one woe speaking through the voice of another.” [PAJACKOWSKA, p. 24]

Not quite. As Stephen Whitfield writes:

“The histories of African-American and American Jews may not mirror each other very much; it now looks a bit eccentric ever to have believed that their destinies were entwined … Irving Berlin … wrote ‘God Bless America’ (1938) in the same year that Langston Hughes lamented that ‘America never was America to me.’” [WHITFIELD, A of B, p. 35]

For starters, unlike the Black community, from which there can be no escape from expressly racist discrimination, modern Jews choose a worldview and allegiance that, by its very exclusionist tenets of intra-Jewish tribal solidarity, has always – sooner or later – attracted anti-Jewish hostility, wherever they have lived in their diaspora.

In America, while Blacks floundered in social and economic despair, Jews used them like stepstools to zoom up throughout American society. “Because of the speed with which talented Jews injected themselves into general society,” says Jewish scholar Stephen Whitfield, “a sensation of being shot from cannons, American Jewish culture could never be far from its demotic origins.” [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN, p. 10] “Jews,” says Gordon Lafar, another Jewish scholar, “… are sufficiently integrated into positions of social and economic power that it makes sense to think of them as bearing a special responsibility for those made poor in the cause of the [American economic] system’s operation.” [LAFAR, p. 204]
Jewish exploitation of the Black community in the slums of New York City, for example, is legendary. It is also a situation that some Jews have tried to disguise by hiding behind, as deemed necessary, a generalized, and universalized “white face.” A good example of this is a 1973 scholarly study by a Jewish academic, David Caplovitz, entitled Merchants of Harlem. Conducted through Columbia University for the Harlem Commonwealth Council, “an organization that strives to stimulate Black enterprise,” the survey divided 259 interviews with business owners in Central Harlem into two categories: “black” and “white.” Never in his discussion of the survey does Caplovitz mention the word “Jew.”

This is profoundly disingenuous, especially disturbing for a scholar supposedly seeking the sharpest of truths. Simply stated: Caplovitz attempted to hide the crucial fact that the overwhelming majority of the hated business exploiters in the poor Black slums, who went home to better communities at night, were Jewish.

How Jewish were these “whites” in Harlem? A reading of one of Caplovitz’s own bibliographic sources notes that an earlier study in the same area – central Harlem – found 80% of the “white” store owners to be Jewish. But the real percentage was probably even higher. Sociologist Herbert Gans (also Jewish) noted that “since the study limited itself to ‘neighborhood stores,’ and excluded the large shops on 125th and other major business streets, it underestimates [my emphasis] the proportion of Jewish ownership.” [GANS, p. 4]

Hasia Diner notes that in 1935 there was

“a Harlem campaign against white merchants. The goal of the campaign was to force white merchants in the black community, by means of a boycott, to hire black employees, and pickets were set up around selected shops. The campaign was led by Sufi Abdul Hamid (Eugene Brown), and its rhetoric was laced with anti-Semitism since many of the Harlem merchants were Jewish … Referred to [in Jewish newspapers] as the ‘Black Hitler,’ Sufi’s anti-Semitism was seen as part of a worldwide outbreak rather than as a natural outgrowth of black-Jewish economic relations. [DINER, p. 79] … By mid-March 1935 the Yiddish newspapers could not help but discuss the existence of intense widespread anti-Jewish feeling in Harlem… For three nights, beginning on March 19, rioting ravaged the business district of Harlem … [200 stores were destroyed and the Yiddish newspapers referred to the riots as pogroms].” [DINER, p. 80]

How widespread has been the Jewish commercial exploitation in the slums and ghettos in America at-large? “Whites” (with the 80+ percent Jewish presence) were found to own about 47% of the stores in Central Harlem. [GANS, p. 5] A U.S. government Kerner Commission study of fifteen other American cities found parallel situations, that “39% of the ghetto storeowners were Jewish.” As evidenced in Caplovitz’s Harlem study, Black ownership was usually in small scale service establishments like barber and beauty shops; “whites” owned 74% of the food stores, 72% of the apparel stores, 89% of the hardware stores, furniture, and appliance stores, and over 60% of the liquor and drug stores. [GANS, p. 5]
And as Cheryl Greenberg notes:

“Walter White of the NAACP investigated anti-Jewish attitudes in the black community. His informal survey of black leaders around the country revealed widespread concern about Jewish business exploitation of African-Americans and a certain level of frustration of Jewish unresponsiveness to such problems … Even Jewish civil rights agencies recognized the patronizing and occasionally racist behavior of Jewish store owners and launched programs in New York, Chicago, Miami, Detroit and several other cities to improve their interaction with the local African American community.” [GREENBERG, C., 1998, p. 66]

In 1964, Jewish scholar Gary Marx noted that anti-Jewish attitudes among African-Americans especially existed in “Negro city slums, such as New York’s Harlem and Chicago’s Bronzeville, where the tradesmen, rent collectors, and real estate agents tend to be Jews.” [ROSE, P., 1981, p. 62]

In 1967, Thomas P. Hoving, then director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, came under fierce Jewish attack for his support of a museum exhibition about the local African-American community, *Harlem on My Mind*. This title, referring to a song written by Jewish composer Irving Berlin, also came under heavy criticism by African-Americans for its implicit paternalism. Such paternalism was also reflected in the fact that the show’s curator, Allon Schoener, was also Jewish. Hoving’s crime against the Jews was to refuse to censor the introduction to the exhibition’s 255-page catalogue. Written by a young African-American woman, Candice Van Ellison, it included the likes of the following:

“Behind every hurdle that the Afro-American has yet to jump, stands the Jew who has already cleared it. Jewish shopkeepers are the only remaining ‘survivors’ in the expanding black ghettos … the lack of competition in the area allows the already-exploited blacks to be further exploited by Jews … Psychologically speaking, blacks may find that anti-Jewish sentiments place them, for once, within a majority … our contempt for Jews makes us feel more completely American in sharing a national prejudice.” [VOLKMAN, p. 207]

Hoving, “under unbelievable pressure, so great I don’t think one person could stand it,” finally caved in and ordered the withdrawal of the catalogue (16,000 had been already sold). [VOLKMAN, p. 208] For curator Allon Schoener’s part, he publicly insisted, “There was no attempt on my part to provoke anti-Semitic feelings. As a member of the New York Jewish community, I believe we must face the realities of the world in which we live. Miss Van Ellison has merely drawn attention to the facts.” [HOVING, T., 1993, p. 172]

In 1967, Harry Golden put an apologetic, noble breadwinner spin on Jewish economic pre-eminence in America’s ghettos, and that massive Jewish exploitation of the African-American poor had its positive sides:

“The Negroes burned the Jewish stores in Watts in 1965 and Jewish stores in Detroit twenty years earlier, because, in the main, Jewish stores were the only ones to burn. The Jew was often the only white man in a Negro ghetto. He was there because he was willing to take a chance he
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could make a modest living out of the poverty-stricken slum … In countless instances, the Jewish store was the place to which the Negro came when in trouble, when a Negro parent needed a lawyer, or advice on other important matters. I do not mean that there was no exploitation of the slum Negro. Indeed there was. The poor always pay more for less and the Negro is no exception.” [GOLDEN, H. 1967, p. 61-62]

“Before August 1965,” says Jewish author Paul Jacobs,

“when the burning and rioting [in the Watts section of Los Angeles] took place, most of the furniture and clothing, and a good many of the liquor and grocery stores in the area were Jewish-owned, and many of the owners did act in the way described by the [African-American] women [that Jacobs interviewed]. Specifically, in addition to charging high prices for often inferior merchandise or standard brands, some shopkeepers also made the women purchase an item like a broom or a mop before they would cash their welfare checks. The liquor store owners, too, often insist that a bottle of expensive liquor be purchased before they will cash the checks.” [JACOBS, P., 1967, p. 76]

In Watts, “Jews owned 80 percent of the burned and looted furniture stores; 60 percent of the food markets and 54 percent of the liquor stores … Some of them [were] cheating and unscrupulous people.” [JACOBS, P., 1967, p. 78] Common Jewish perspective to the attacks against Jewish-owned stores was “anti-Semitism.” As Lenora Berson noted in 1971:

“Although no observers at any of the first series of riots [in Watts] recall hearing anti-Jewish slogans, the Jews nonetheless read a kind of anti-Semitism into the fact that the majority of white victims were Jews. Until the riots, the larger Jewish community had no doubt been ignorant of the extent of the Jewish presence in the Negro slums. Or perhaps they had only been subliminally aware of the fact that ghetto shopowners and ghetto landlords were frequently Jewish; for some knowledge prompted them to see the simile of the pogroms … As the second, third and fourth summers of violence followed rapidly on the first, black hostility toward Jews became more obvious. Increasingly intermingled with the cries of rage against whites were words of hatred for the Jews … Watts, unlike previous riot sites, had never been a Jewish residential neighborhood. It had from the first been occupied by poor Negroes. Nonetheless its economic life was governed by Jews, a fact that was brought forcefully home by the openly anti-Jewish declarations of many of the residents.” [BERSON, L., p. 338-341]

According to a 1970 survey of residents of two African-American enclaves in Los Angeles (319 people interviewed in the Avalon and Crenshaw locales), 87% of Black respondents had contact with Jewish merchants, 67% had experience as an employee of a Jew, and 34% had experience with Jewish landlords. “About 1 in 3 reported they have experienced some form of mistreatment in their contacts with Jewish merchants, landlords, or employers (33, 35 and 37 percent respectively).” [TSUKASHIMA, R., 1978, p. 39]
Slum lording is another huge story. “Antagonism to the ‘Jewish landlord,’” wrote African-American scholar Kenneth Clark in 1946, “is so common as to become almost an integral part of the folk culture of the Northern urban Negro.” [GLAZER, NEGRO, p.] Abraham Cahan, editor of the Jewish Forward, noted that at the turn of the century the Harlem area of New York City “usually swarmed with Yiddish-speaking real estate speculators.” [SCHACHTMAN, p. 78] In 1979, Jesse Jackson came under heated attacked by Jewish groups for drawing public attention to “Jewish slumlords.” [STANFIELD, p. 184]

In Boston, for instance, “in 1965 Boston’s CORE chapter published and distributed a list of largely Jewish property owners cited for state and city code violations.” Seeing the list, the head of the local Anti-Defamation League, Sol Kolack, warned his national office that slum housing “loomed as a major cause of tension between the Boston Jewish and Negro community.” [LEVINE/HARMON, p. 185] “The image of the Jewish slumlord was so strong,” note Hillel Levine and Lawrence Harmon,

“in fact, that it could not be even erased by the Jewish ‘checkbook warriors’ who contributed almost 75 percent of the operating expenses of CORE, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The issue of the Jewish slumlord was always close to the surface.” [LEVINE/HARMON, p. 185]

“The biggest problem” in Boston for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee civil rights group,” notes Jonathan Kaufman, “was that several Jews were the large landlords in the black ghetto of Roxbury and had a reputation for rent gouging and overcharging.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 79] Such a Jewish “notorious slumlord” in the Boston area was Maurice Gordon.

Among other prominent Jewish slumlords in Boston were Israel, Joseph, and Raphael Mindick. They “were among the largest property owners in the South End, where they managed 44 multifamily buildings with eight hundred tenants, mostly black and Hispanic.” The Mindick family even named ten “shell companies” in shady business arrangements after names found in Psalms 19 of the Torah. [HILLEL/HARMON, p. 190] Black and Hispanic protesters planned to demonstrate at Israel Mindick’s synagogue, Beth El, where he “held a leadership role,” [LEVINE/HARMON, p. 184] until the local rabbi promised to demonstrate with the protesters, providing the rally was held elsewhere. The protesters, declared Mindick, “are a bunch of anti-Semites.” [LEVINE/HARMON, p. 189]

And what of some of these Jewish real estate wheelers and dealers, still a great proportion of inner-city slumlords to this day? Among the most sensation-nally newsworthy in recent history include:

• Alexander Spitzer, of Los Angeles. In 1989 the Los Angeles Times noted him to be the “financier behind some of Los Angeles’ worst slums” and a “central figure in the city’s landmark lawsuit this year against slumlords and their lenders … The investors have included prominent Jewish professors, rabbis, and [Jewish] Soviet émigrés. Spitzer, a Holocaust survi-
Vor, has been a prominent member of the city’s Jewish community for many years.” [MCMILLAN, p. B1]

- **Samuel Rappoport**, of Philadelphia. In 1993 a *Philadelphia Inquirer* editorial urged that the “Philadelphia government step up efforts to rid [the] city of slumlords like Samuel A. Rappoport.” [INF BANK, PHL INQ, p. A22] In 1994 the *New York Times* noted that “Mr. Rappoport owned a substantial amount of commercial real estate in downtown Philadelphia, becoming a multimillionaire by acquiring decaying center city properties when prices were low and reselling them at higher prices … When the city wanted to build the Pennsylvania Convention Center, it had to buy property held by Mr. Rappoport … The same was true when the city made plans for a new courthouse and detention center … As a result of his generosity to Israel, Mr. Rappoport was honored by the Jewish National Fund for paying to reclaim five housing sites in the Negev desert for Jewish immigrants.” [NEW YORK TIMES, 9-10-94, p. 26]

- **Sam Israel**, of Seattle. “When Sam Israel died [in 1994],” noted the *Seattle Times*, “he owned more property in downtown Seattle – and had done less with it – than any other private landowner in the city … Some of Israel’s buildings housed artists and low-income tenants. They could afford cheap rents, although many complained about the crummy conditions and called him a slum lord.” [KEENE, p. A1] Israel owned 40 prime parcels of downtown real estate as well as the entire west side of Soap Lake and 9,700 acres in Grant County. Israel’s will, noted the *Chicago Tribune*, “left instructions to keep his empire together after his death … [worth $100-200 million], Israel’s will leaves all his properties to the Samis Foundation, which he established in 1987. The foundation supports Jewish education and various projects to benefit the nation of Israel.” [NOGAKI, p. 9G] “Israel the man,” noted the *Seattle Times,” loved Israel the state.” [KEENE. A1]

- **Jack, Harold and Dennis Topletz**, of Dallas. In 1999, the *Dallas Observer* noted these men to be “among the most notorious slumlords” in the city. Their attorney said that over the past twenty years he had been involved in contesting some 9,000 city code citations against their many slum properties. “32 Topletz houses,” said the *Observer*, “are under police scrutiny because drug dealers have rented them at some time in the past two years … Scores of … the Topletzes’ houses … are on the most blighted streets of South Dallas, West Dallas, and Oak Cliff.” In 1994 the Dallas city attorney filed a lawsuit against the Topletz family and “a number of other relatives who … own interests in some of the houses: Gloria Schwartz, Bennie A. Goodman, Evelyn Lisner, Richard Suckle, Abe Levin, Gladys Levin, and Ivy Rabinowitz.” In 1995 Jack Topletz shot and killed a “would-be robber” at his mansion. “Dallas police filed a murder charge, but a grand jury declined to indict.” The Topletz empire also has included “mortgages and loans to black churches” at interest rates sometimes twice that offered by savings and loans organizations.” There is no
doubt that the family has made a lot of money,” noted the Observer, “They have donated millions to their temple, Congregation Shearith Israel, where an auditorium bears their name.” [KOROSEC, T., 6-3-99]

• Vicki Reynolds and Murray Pepper. Reynolds, the mayor of opulent Beverly Hills in metropolitan Los Angeles, may or may not be Jewish. Her husband, Pepper, is. In 2000, the couple was publicly embarrassed when local news reports noted that they were part-owners of an interesting property in Arizona: “Phoenix’s most notorious slum property,” which had just been raided by police. Violations of housing laws, noted a police investigator, “could run into the hundreds.” The couple’s lawyer said his clients owned “less than 51 percent” of the 156-unit apartment complex. And it was Pepper “who gave Reynolds a 2.89% interest in Canyon Square Apartments as a gift.” Pepper had earlier made the news in 1997 when he and another Jewish businessman set up the first Cotsen-Pepper Master Teacher Fellowship Award: $30,000 to a teacher to “focus public attention on the contributions of teachers in the Los Angeles-area Bureau of Jewish Education-affiliated religious schools.” [VALERI, T., 7-27-97; POOL, B., 10-11-00, p. B1]

• Lou Wolf, of Chicago. In 1995, the Chicago Sun-Times cited Wolf as a “notorious slumlord and convicted arsonist.” [SMITH, W., p. 45] Wolf, said the same paper the next year, “has been one of the city’s most notorious real estate owners for three decades. He was dubbed ‘Chicago’s Worst Landlord’ by Chicago Magazine in 1989.” [NEUBAUER, p. 4] In 1992, Wolf’s “associates” – Melvin Glick and Gregory Berkowitz – were defenders in a civil racketeering lawsuit against them filed by the city. [IHERJIRKA, p. 4]

• Charles Swibel, of Chicago. In 1990, upon his death, the Chicago Tribune noted that Swibel “was a favorite target of Chicago newspaper editorials because of his ownership of West Side slum and Madison Street Skid Row properties.” [CHIC. TRIB., p. 1-20-90, p. C5] “This will be a loss to the Jewish community,” noted a Chicago politician, “because he was a shining example of his heritage.” [CHIC TRIB, 1-20-90, p. C5]

• Mordechai Ben-Horin, of Los Angeles. In 1989 Ben-Horin and Dan Tepper were “the latest in a long, tangled strand of investors to own the Cameo, one of the city’s worst slums … Yet a third man, Rami Greenwald, is listed by the secretary of state’s office as [their slum lord] firm’s president.” [WOOD, p. 1] The Los Angeles Times noted also that the “late Los Angeles philanthropist, Ben Weingart, … made his fortune in Skid Row real estate.” [WOOD, p. 1]

• Barry Mankowitz, of Washington DC. Mankowitz, who was featured in a 1989 journal for “turning good,” avowed that ‘his role was to ‘bleed the property’ in low-income housing owned by his employers in the inner city slums of Washington DC and Baltimore. ‘We didn’t keep the houses fixed up,’ he says. ‘Being on the profit side, it wasn’t our philosophy to do it.’ The idea was to ‘sell and get out.”’ [SCHRIENER, p. 32]
• Marcus Lehmann and Morris Wolfson, of New York City. “Their tenants live in a dozen Manhattan tenements, mostly in Harlem,” noted New York’s Daily News in 1995, “that have been hit with some 5,000 housing violations in recent years.” [MICHELINI, p. 2]

• Arthur Schreiber, of Cincinnati. In 1996 the Cincinnati Enquirer reported that Schreiber “is a slumlord who uses federal funds to make money while providing substandard housing for the poor.” The slumlord was sued by the local Legal Aid Society twice. Sue Livensparger, an attorney for the rights organization, noted that Schreiber was “one of the most difficult landlords for us to deal with.” In court proceedings, Schreiber declared his worth to be close to $3 million, including Israel bonds. [McWHIRTER, p. B1]

• Mark Glass, of Brooklyn. Glass was tried in 1997 for plotting the murder of two of his tenants. Assistant District Attorney Francine James noted that Glass was “much more than a slumlord, but a very violent and unconscionable man, an individual who for years has systematically intimidated, threatened, and engaged in acts of arson, illegal eviction of tenants, and now the worst of all crimes – the conspiracy to kill.” [HURTADO, p. A37] Short of murder, “prosecutors say Glass was trying to get rid of tenants who complained about squalid conditions,” noted the upstate Buffalo News, “then take advantage of recent changes in rent control laws to charge a higher rent.” [DUBVIK, p. 6A]

• Jeffrey Friedman, of Cleveland. Chairman and CEO of Associated Estates Realty Corporation, he and other members of the Milstein family own about 15 percent of the firm. AER owns or manages 35,000 apartments in 15 states with $143 million in revenue in 1998 alone. Many are federally subsidized low-income units. In 1999 Associated Estates repeatedly made headlines in Cleveland for three of its run-down, “lead-contaminated and pest-ridden” apartment complexes which housed 1,400 families. “End,” headlined a Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial, “subsidized squalor.” “While there are conditions of which we are not proud,” announced AER vice-president and general counsel Martin Fishman, “they are not conditions which threaten the health of the tenants. We took our eye off the properties for a short time and for that suffered dramatic consequences.” [AP, Problems] At least 67 children were contaminated by lead. Associated Estates also “falsely claimed that filthy apartments were ready to rent,” [PLAIN DEALER, End, p. 10B] The company even charged the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (from which it had received $94 million over the years) $73,000 for everything from “pizza and cellular phone bills” to fees for a public relations firm, William Silverman & Co., and a consultant, George Engel, to “defend the property’s reputation and image and to present the property in the best light to the public and the media.” [O’MALLEY, p. 1A]

• Abraham and Michael Slochowsky, of Brooklyn. The Village Voice noted that “in the mid 1980s … Abraham Slochowsky … made headlines for
his role in the largest arson ring in the country – a scheme that burned 37 buildings in three boroughs, injured 44 firefighters, and netted the enterprise more than half a million dollars in insurance money.” In 1998, 570 housing violations still remained on their slum holdings. “In at least seven buildings across Brooklyn, tenants live for days without heat, months with rotten plumbing, and years without locks on their front doors.” [LOBBIA, J., p. 34]

- Alan Ross, of Berkeley, California. In 1999 the San Francisco Examiner noted that “Alan Ross, owner of the Aldrich Hotel Tenderloin district, was shocked to hear his building was on the list [of San Francisco’s Ten Worst Residential Hotels]. Ross, a Berkeley professor, said he leased the hotel to an operator.” [SULLIVAN, K., 1999, p. A1]

- Baruch Singer, of New York. Singer owns over 50 buildings in poor neighborhoods in Manhattan, north of 96th Street. Five Harlem buildings alone have garnered nearly 2,000 housing code violations. In 1995, one of his slum buildings collapsed, killing three people. The technical landlord of the building, Marcus Lehman, has never even seen the building. He has also been known to use pit bulls “to expedite at least one illegal eviction.” In 1999, City councilman Bill Perkins called Singer “the worst slumlord I have ever seen in Harlem.” Singer’s former partner, Leslie Westreich, is a disbarred lawyer. An official from HUD noted that the loss of his license to practice law was “definitely related to his conduct in real estate.” Singer has friends in high places. New York State Assemblyman Sheldon Silver sponsored a bill “intended to benefit Singer only” in his attempts to acquire a building. Under heavy media fire for his help of the slumlord, Assemblyman Silver explained that “Baruch’s father [Yitzhak Singer] is the rabbi of my synagogue. When your rabbi’s son asks for assistance, you try to help.” [NEWFIELD, J., 11-9-99, p. 4; NEWFIELD/O’MAHONY, p. 6]

- Gerald Schuster, of Boston/New York. In 1999 the Village Voice publicly wondered why Hillary Clinton attended a $500,000 fund-raiser hosted by Schuster’s wife, Elaine. “Real estate tycoon” Schuster inherited his Wingate Construction Company from his father-in-law, Bert Siegel. As early as 1977 a Boston newspaper has called Schuster one of that city’s worst slumlords with 1,200 housing code violations in a two-year span. Schuster’s company took over the management of the Beekman Housing Project in the South Bronx in 1996, a complex that has been since subject to “at Least” 1,600 housing violations. [VEST, J., 12-21-99, p. 31]

- Milton Avol, of Los Angeles. Avol (nicknamed “the Rat Lord”), a Beverly Hills neurosurgeon, was sentenced in 1988 to serve 30 days “in one of his own run-down, vermin-infested buildings.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, p. C6] Avol was once called “the most recalcitrant slumlord in Los Angeles” by a city prosecutor. [AP, 8-31-88]

- Aaron Kempe, also of Beverly Hills. In 1989 a judge ordered Kempe to spent 45 days in his own run-down hotel. Kempe was permitted, howev-
er, to leave the hotel an hour a day to “attend religious services at a Beverly Hills synagogue.” [HARRIS, M., 1-27-89]

• **Morris Grass**, of Brooklyn. In 1988 Grass – like Avol and Kempe across the country – was sentenced to be “under house arrest for 15 days in one of his own dilapidated buildings.” [JETTER, p. 19]

• The **Metz** family and **Harvey Vengroff**, of Long Island. These people were noted in a 1999 Long Island newspaper article as prominent slumlords in their region. “Since 1988,” announced the *Long Island Voice*, “the village of Hempstead, the Nassau County district attorney’s office and the state attorney general have sued and investigated the Metz family numerous times for an extremely varied report card of violations, including rent-gouges and harassing tenants, renting low-income state-assisted apartments to ineligible tenants, defrauding co-op buyers in Rockville Center, mishandling security deposits and accepting federal rehab funds without working on the properties.” Patriarch James Metz’s daughter, Katie, is a 1998 graduate Columbia’s Graduate School of Journalism and a practicing journalist. **Harvey Vengroff**, aside from slum lording holdings, is the owner of the second-largest collection agency in America. He owns two Rolls Royces and five boats. [FRIEDMAN/HARKAVY, 5-19-99, p. 10]

• **Sam Menlo**, of Los Angeles. “Case files bulge with the bureaucratic legacy of Sam Menlo’s life as a landlord: code violations, thousands of them, at rental units beset with everything from vermin and mold to wretched plumbing. With a real-estate empire spanning Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange Counties, Menlo has a 30-year track record of skirmishes with city and state agencies, capped last fall with a sentence to live for a time in his own filthy Anaheim complex … Some units were so moldy that mushrooms sprouted from the ceiling … Menlo was no small-time landlord without the means to fix the place up. He was an extremely wealthy man – and one continually in trouble with cities throughout the region … Menlo, as owner and operator of the [Nursing homes], battled Los Angeles County and the state Department of Health services for eight years during the 1970s over more than 2,000 health code violations and 78 counts of alleged criminal neglect at his nursing homes. Investigators found patients lying in beds full of excrement and urine and one patient with bedsores infested by maggots… At synagogues and charities throughout the region, Menlo has an entirely different reputation: that of a Holocaust survivor of exceptional decency and philanthropy. In letters to the court in the Anaheim case asking for leniency, at least 10 rabbis or directors of Southern California Jewish schools, synagogues or associations enumerated Menlo’s generosity. ‘He’s a fine man. He’s just a marvelous person,” said Rabbi Yonason Denebeim of the Chabad of Palm Springs, where Menlo has donated thousands of dollars over the last 15 years. “I wish there were more folks like him.” [Menlo is worth $154 million] [YOSHINO, Y., 12-30-01]
• **Stuart Kaplow**, of Columbus, Ohio. “[Judge] Pfeiffer’s warning came after E. 9th residents reported that Kaplow was not complying with a May 29 order by the judge after the landlord pleaded guilty to four housing-code violations. Pfeiffer told Kaplow that he must live in one of his apartments until he fixes code violations in more than 20 of the 700 housing units he owns throughout Columbus. To comply with Pfeiffer’s order, Kaplow was to move by midnight Monday from his $1.3 million home.” [RUTH, R., 6-14-01]

Another version of the exploitation of American urban areas, in this case in the Hispanic community (and the “funnel profits to Israel theme”), is the case of Irving Moskowitz, controversial Miami-based gambling baron in the small metropolitan Los Angeles city of Hawaiian Gardens. Moskowitz has repeatedly made international news for his support of right-wing Jewish groups and their projects in Israel. In 1999, the Hawaiian Garden’s city attorney, Julia Sylva, quit her position in outrage at Moskowitz’s callous exploitation of the local community. She charged that over $58 million raised in Moskowitz’s Hawaiian Gardens operations go to Israel each year “and the city gets zero.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 3-24-99] She also noted the disturbing conflict of interest of Jewish attorney Beryl Weiner, who was both Moskowitz’s lawyer and the attorney for Hawaiian Garden’s redevelopment agency. Sylva contended that city development plans would in effect subsidize new Moskowitz casino expansion with $20 million of taxpayer money. [SHUITE, p. B1]

Moskowitz actually pays the city $200,000 a month. He owns a third of the town’s commercial property. He is so powerful in this Hispanic community (he lives in Florida and Israel), that when he once stopped his monthly payments the city had to lay off all 21 members of its police force. Rabbi Haim Dov Beliak, who lives in a nearby city and is critical of Moskowitz’s far-right views about Israel, notes the Hawaiian Gardens situation: “It’s the kind of company town in which Moskowitz calls all the shots.” [TUGEND, T., 7-16-2000]

Another such Jewish entrepreneur, in another ethnic community, was Paul Ziffren. “When Ziffren first came to L.A. during World War II,” notes Dennis McDougal,

“He demonstrated just how well [Jewish politician Jacob] Arvey had taught him the lessons of political exploitation, by organizing a consortium of investors who bought property vacated by Japanese-Americans during their wartime internment. Ziffren worked closely with attorney David Bazelon, yet another Arvey protégé, who had been appointed by [President] Truman to oversee ‘alien’ land sales. Bazelon did such a good job that President Truman rewarded him with a federal judgship. Ziffren did such a good job that dozens of shady Chicago investors, including partner Alex Louis Greenberg, earned tidy profits from his real estate consortium.” [MCDOUGLAL, p. 141]

“We have to understand who our true enemies are,” declared Sherry Brown, the African-American president of the Frederic Douglas Community Improvement Council in southeast Washington DC, in 1979, “Jews have historically
profited as slumlords and merchants from the suffering of black people.” [STANFIELD, p. 184] As Leona Fulani, head of the “black-led, women-led, multicultural, pro-gay” New Alliance Party once observed: “I do not believe it is insignificant that a slumlord is Jewish.” [COHEN/BUDMAN, 2-21-92, p. 13] Radical left-wing SDS activist Steven Simone Cohen explained in 1972 his personal abandonment of Zionist and Judeocentric activism: “After a while I began looking around and seeing that the ghetto merchants and landlords were all Jewish and were exploiting the blacks like mad. And all those self-righteous Jewish liberals openly spout the most incredible racism. That finally clinched it for me.” [ADELSON, A., p. 126] “In America,” once noted Malcolm X, “the Jews sap the life-blood of the so-called Negroes to maintain the state of Israel, its armies, and its continued aggression against our brothers in the East. This every Black Man resents.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 135]

Blacks even faced overwhelming Jewish hegemony in the New York school systems. A 1964 report noted that of 1200 top-level administrators and 800 principals in the New York City schools, five people were black. “By 1967 approximately two-thirds of New York’s teachers, supervisors, and principals were Jewish.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 138] “By 1967 approximately two-thirds of New York’s teachers, supervisors, and principals were Jewish.” [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 138] “Now,” said Nathan Glazer, “the Negro teacher works under a Jewish principal, the Negro social worker under a Jewish supervisor … What makes this situation even worse is that part of the blame for the poor education of Negro children can be placed on this white (but concretely Jewish) dominance.” [GLAZER, NEGRO, p. 30] “We are witnessing today,” proclaimed Brooklyn’s Afro-American Teachers’ Association in the 1960s, “in New York City a phenomenon that spells death for the minds and souls of our black children. It is the systematic coming of age of the Jews who dominate and control the educational bureaucracy of the New York public school system … In short, our children are being mentally poisoned.” [GINZBURG, p. 154]

By 1990, while 80% of New York City’s school children were not “white,” three-quarters of the school principals, assistant principals, teachers, and guidance counselors were. Most of these people remained Jewish. [ZUCKERMAN, p. 23] New York City school politics, note Hillel Levine and Lawrence Harmon, have reflected the “largely Jewish-led United Federation of Teachers.” [HILLEL/HARMON, p. 213] (In the broader national sphere, when Albert Shanker stepped down in recent history, after many years (1974-1997), as the president of the American Federation of Teachers, another Jewish official, Sandra Feldman, took his place. Elsewhere in the union world, Andrew Stern is president of Service Employees International Union, representing workers in casinos and hospitals. Stern is also vice-president of the Jewish Labor Committee). [SMITH, B., 6-5-98, p. 1]

This Black-Jewish educational wars, common to urban areas, surfaced in Oakland, California, in 1999. As a Jewish ethnic newspaper framed it, in terms of Black anti-Semitism:

“Oscar Wright lit the fuse in December when he remarked that an attempt to oust the district’s superintendent was a play for ‘white and
Jewish control’ of the predominantly minority district. He has continued to make such comments at school board meetings and to the press, which has in turn given wide coverage to his statements. Wright, 76, is a community activist and the appointed co-chair of the school district’s Task Force on African-American students. He has a history of anti-Semitic speech dating back to at least 1993. ‘Wright should be removed from the task force,’ said Jan Malvin, who works for Oakland’s Human Relations Commission and has been following Wright’s case for several years. Malvin, who is Jewish, said, ‘The issue is racist rhetoric at the school board in general. Anti-Semitism is part of the bigger picture.’ In 1993, Wright told the board that a cadre of Jews from the schools to the government to businesses was responsible for some of the ‘wickedest acts of institutional racism against black people.’ Local Jews didn’t want to hear it again. ‘He’s the wrong person to hold an official position,’ said Barbara Bergen, regional director of the Anti-Defamation League ... Wright’s anti-Semitic epithets, however, are apparently directed at school board member Dan Siegel and Alameda County Superintendent of Schools Sheila Jordan. Both are Jewish ... Wright has not been the only one to denounce Jews in the Oakland school district in recent history. Superintendent Jordan said that when she was on the school board from 1988 to 1992, a flurry of anti-Semitic remarks was hurled at Jewish board members. Some Jewish members ended up resigning.”  
[SCHUSTER, J., 3-5-199, p. 12A]  

In 1959, before heightened Black-Jewish tensions, in a survey of businesses in the same Harlem area that David Caplovitz later disingenuously analyzed in 1964, the same author was more open in his assessments about the economic dynamics of the inner city: “Many, if not all, of the merchants [interviewed] happen to be Jews and many of the customers are Negroes.” These merchants, says Roberta Feuerlicht, “used all the traditional tricks to prey upon the poor: installment plans, overpricing, and switch-and-bait tactics. [FEUERLICHT, p. 191] (Even in a study of the Jews of Costa Rica, Lowell Gudmundson observes that “this development of installment credit to the lower orders was by all accounts a Jewish innovation in Costa Rican commerce.” [GUDMUNDSON, p. 222] This attitude, as noted elsewhere, is a long Jewish tradition. During the California Gold Rush, Charles Elmer Upton noted similar kinds of hijinks from Jewish merchants he saw in the Placerville area: “During the summer and fall of 1849, Jewish peddlers frequently came into the foothills with merchandise to sell to the Americans and the Indians … A blue or red shirt would sell for at least half an ounce of gold and the Jewish trader would invariably get the better part of the bargain, as the settlers had no means of weighing their gold. The peddler would put the desired article of purchase in one side of his scale and insist upon the buyer’s pouring sufficient gold dust into the other side to balance the goods. But, while the Americans were invariably cheated in all these transactions, it was the poor, ignorant Indians who suffered the worst in their dealings with those rascally traffickers. Doubtless my readers can readily understand how so many of these self-same Jews afterward became
wealthy and prominent merchants in various California towns.”) [LEVINSON, R., 1978, p. 27]

The Black poor of New York would choose, said Caplovitz, between “foregoing major purchases and thereby forfeiting whatever self-esteem is to be derived from consumption, or being exploited.” [FEUERLICH, p. 191] “Owners of tenements and stores,” tempers Herbert Gans, also a Jewish scholar, “exploit the slum dwellers whatever their race or religion.” [GANS, p. 6] The clinical sociological term for such Jewish exploitation of the poor is “succession”: i.e., as one lower-economic caste group leaves the American ghetto, another takes its place. This theory fails to explain the fact, however, that so few of the millions of other European immigrants who came to America with the Eastern European Jews at the turn of the twentieth century could be found so furiously exploiting the ghettos.

With incessant currents of Jewish Judeo-centrism and Black counter-ethnocentrism increasingly sparking serious tribal animosities between them (in 1998 a phone poll of 999 people noted that African-Americans are four times as likely to have “anti-Semitic” attitudes than whites [THE RECORD, 11-25-98, p. L1], in 1996 a Jewish scholar, Mary Lefkowitz, came out with a much-discussed volume entitled Not Out of Africa: How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History. The book is a strident attack upon a current in modern African-American scholarship which, among other things, claims that ancient Greek culture was really rooted in – and owes a deep debt to – African civilization. In this scenario, even Socrates turns up a Black man.

Why, one wonders, of all scholars of the Greek classics, would it be a Jew who stand ups to defend the traditional Greek and Roman foundations of western civilization? Lefkowitz passionately flags the predictable platitudes of the search for truth, academic integrity, et al, but a more likely answer is to be found (along with a Lefkowitz credit to Simon Wiesenthal Center scholar Harold Brackman) in her passing mention of an Afro-centric Black scholar who teaches – aside from the Africanization of Greek culture and the greater gravity of the Black slave “Holocaust” over the Jewish one – that Jews aren’t really Jews. Africans are. (In this scenario, Ashkenazi [European] Jews are “imposters.” Note for instance, the directly confrontation and appropriative title of one of the volumes of this genre of Black scholarship: The African Origins of Modern Judaism).

For Jews, of course, such a charge is more than ridiculous, more than explosive; it is beyond comprehensibility, far beyond even the obscenities of the accursed “Holocaust deniers.” When some Blacks dare to impugn Jewish identity itself, as merely white fakers, it is the grounds for an ideological tribal war of the most profound proportions. Yet Black attempts to claim the even higher loft of Jewish martyrlogy identity for themselves cannot be dignified, and legitimized, by Jews in open discourse, by expressly confronting it. (The same is true, for instance, in invitations Jewish scholars get from “Holocaust deniers” to publicly debate them about whether the Holocaust really happened. “To debate them would imply two sides,” says Herschel Shanks, “with room for legitimate disagreement. [For Jewish scholars] to appear with them … would
only give the lie wider exposure.” [SHANKS, p. 5]) So how can Jews attack the Black “Afro-centrist” position and claim the hallowed rung of “being Jewish” itself without attacking Black appropriation directly and conferring legitimacy upon the defilers of the Jews’ own “myths of history?”

The Greeks.

“Africans are demanding that ordinary historical methodology be discarded in favor of a system of their own choosing,” complains Lefkowitz, “This system allows them to ignore chronology and facts if they are inconvenient for their purposes. In other words, their historical methodology allows them to alter the course of history to meet their own specific needs … Everyone should be aware that there are real dangers in allowing history to be rewritten … Writing and teaching such ethnic histories, each with its own brand of ‘ethnic truth,’ sanctions the inventions of falsehood.” [LEFKOWITZ, p. 8]

It should go without saying, of course, (but it must be noted because Jewish myth is so thoroughly “naturalized” in the modern world) that such a condemnation can also be used with equal academic force and moral authority about the Jewish myths of martyrology that so many of them enforce as irrefutable “history.” All Jewish misfortune is defined by their myths of victimization at the hands of irrational anti-Semites. In the ghetto situation, Black wrath against Jewish (and others’) exploitation of them and other injustices have sometimes exploded into riots in America’s inner cities. Such violence is typically understood by Jews involved in the exploitation of the Black community as an assault upon Jewish innocence. It is an old, recurring Jewish theme. Jews act negatively towards others, Gentiles react negatively back. And thus arises the paradigm for Jewish comprehension of the world: “anti-Semitism.” “Jews are not like others in their reaction to crime,” says Stephen Isaacs, “In their reactions to the threat of neighborhood disruption. There is a sense of déjà vu, for disruption of neighborhoods was part of the pogroms in Eastern Europe. Jews had a very special reaction to the black rioters in the ‘60s for the same reason.” [ISAACS, p. 178]

Afrocentric ideology in fact borrows heavily from deconstructive engines within European-centric culture that are largely Jewish. Black scholar Molefi Kete Asante, in his volume entitled The Afrocentric Idea, argues that “the critical theorists, particularly those of the Frankfurt School, are engaged in a somewhat similar enterprise [as Afrocentrists] in re-orienting thinking. The difference, however, is profound. Jurgen Habermas, Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno, and Max Horkheimer are essentially embroiled in a Eurocentric family debate over the nature of ideology.” [ASANTE, 1987, p. 4] The Marxist-Freudian Frankfurt school, as noted elsewhere, was overwhelming a Jewish intellectual enterprise (both Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud were also Jewish) – all those cited here by Asante, as those embroiled in a “Eurocentric” reorienting of ideology, are Jewish. Asante even quotes Raymond Geuss who wrote that the Marxist and Freudian view “exhibit such strong similarities in their essential epistemic structure that from a philosophical point of view they don’t represent two different kinds of theory, but merely two instances of a single new type.” [ASANTE, p. 4]

Meanwhile, in the face of inner city riots and throughout the civil rights era,
in the face of a virtual stasis of poverty in the African-American community, the editor of Harper’s magazine, Willie Morris, a non-Jew who was part of the New York Jewish publishing clique, observed that

“It was disconcerting to discover that political liberals and radicals, whose warmth and spirit I admired, all had summer homes, as I myself would one day.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 76]

Morris was referring to the likes of Lionel Trilling, Jason Epstein, and Robert Silvers, literary powerbrokers of the 1960’s and 1970’s Jewish liberal intellectual establishment, each who was a member of The Century, Manhattan’s most prestigious private club. [KOSTELANETZ, p. 76] Epstein – public champion of the New Left’s ideological struggles for the impoverished and the oppressed – had a “cabin cruiser … at Manhattan’s seventy ninth street basin … European wardrobes, the proper private schools for the kids, the English boot maker … [all] classed, in radical parlance anyway, with the problem [of modern materialist culture] and not the solution.” [NOBILE, p. 95] Even Jewish communists tended to come from petite bourgeois origins and had difficulty connecting to common working people. [LIEBMAN, A. p. 499]

Many 1960s Jewish “liberals” and “radicals” functioned within a status paradox. As members of the bourgeoisie, they attacked the bourgeoisie, vicariously, expressing their “radical” side through identification with the Black civil rights movement. “The most popular negative figure in current Negro writing,” noted Arthur Hertzberg in 1964, “is no longer the white oppressor or the Negro Uncle Tom, it is the white (often Jewish) amateur Negro …. [HERTZBERG, p. 295] …. [These] alienated Jews have, in essence agreed with the gentile attack on middle class culture; they have even quite openly accepted the identification of this unlovely world with the Jewish bourgeoisie.” [HERTZBERG, p. 295]

“Contemporary Jewish radical youth are often the offspring of affluent, successful parents,” wrote Milton Plesur in 1982, “but those same parents did not allow prosperity or a move to the suburbs destroy their idealism. And as a matter of fact, many of them were considered the radicals of an earlier day.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 137]

Even in the 1920s Maurice Hindus argued that the Jewish tendency towards political “radicalism” or “liberalism” was not motivated by universalist altruism but, rather, its use as a guise for a particularist self-fulfillment:

“Basking in affluence, [the Jews] may find radicalism – or its milder brother, liberalism – intriguing, but usually as a diversion, as a means of intellectual escape, rather than a method of social change or a code of social behavior.” [PORTER, p. 12]

Irving Howe, in reviewing his life among fellow Jewish political radicals, observes that widespread Jewish dedication to left wing universalism was illusory; at root there was always a particularist Jewish current:

“Together with what intellectuals (or Socialists) wrote and thought there was also what we felt, and what we felt was rarely in accord with what we wrote or thought. In the daily course of our lives – the lives of, say, young Socialists born to Jewish parents – the fact of Jewishness fig-
ured much more strongly than we acknowledged in public. We still didn’t ‘identify’ with a Jewish tradition, yet in practice we grew increasingly concerned with Jewish themes. [HOWE, 1982, p. 251]

“In short,” adds Jack Porter, also Jewish, “it is the material condition of life that will propel the Jew into radicalism, and when such conditions improve [for him], the Jew will tend to leave radical movements, except for certain vestigial aspects.” [PORTER, p. 12]

Resultant recognition of, and responsibility for, Jewish exploitation – at every level – of the Black community is completely lost to mainstream Jewry. “Jews are furious with the African-American community,” wrote Joshua Halberstam in 1997, “This anger is but one emotion in a throng of others that includes fear, frustration, alienation, a sense of betrayal, disdain, and utter bewilderment. Especially bewilderment. ‘Where,’ Jews wonder, ‘did all the [Black] venom come from?’ … [HALBERSTAM, p. 240] …. More and more Jews are becoming indifferent to the protests and complaints of African-Americans.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 242]

What about the Hispanic community, other Jewish brothers and sisters in early civil rights wars? The exploitation of impoverished Mexican-Americans in Jewry’s bid to scale the American socio-economic ladder parallels that of Jewish-African-American history. In Los Angeles, a Jewish politician, Ed Roybal, rose to power in 1949 via a coalition of “Eastside Jews and Latinos.” “Out of 40 invited guests [to a fund-raiser for Royal],” notes the Los Angeles Times, “15 showed up – all Jews … The money went to established Community Service Organization (CSO), which promptly set about mobilizing the largely dominant Mexican American community … Jewish support for CSO had even broader ramifications as the organization went on to become a powerful force both in Los Angeles and throughout the state.” [FEINGOLD, D., 10-21-98, p. E1]

When UFW leader Cesar Chavez “organized his first field worker strike in Oxnard in 1958, the funds came from Los Angeles-based Jewish labor leader Ralph Helstein’s United Packing House Workers of America.” Other major Jewish supporters of the UFW’s early grape boycott were Sigmund Arywitz and Max Mont. Politician Howard Berman, “friend” of Chavez and “now a Congressman representing a largely Latino division in the Valley,” authored California’s Agricultural Labor Relations Act. “The ties,” says Dolores Huerta, co-founder of the UFW, “was very, very strong with the Jewish community and have continued through the years.” “The Jewish community,” notes Julian Nava, the first Mexican American to be elected to the Los Angeles school board, “was fundamental not only in fund-raising but in lending the support of many community groups.” [FEINGOLD, D., 10-21-98, p. E1]

This Jewish assistance all seems noble, but the pattern over time exactly mirrors the situation between Jews and Blacks during the civil rights era: Latinos have been merely stepping stones for collective Jewish advancement. When the Jewish community secured their enormous socio-economic and political power, for years incongruously mixed in the ranks of impoverished Hispanics
and African-Americans, they then abandoned their non-Jewish colleagues in the civil rights struggle. As the *Los Angeles Times* noted in 1998,

“The income levels of Jews rose dramatically in the decades following World War II, creating a class divide between the two groups … The communities literally grew more distant … Some Latinos felt that the Jewish community has retreated from the cause of social justice.” [FEINGOLD, D., 10-21-98, p. E1]

As Danny Feingold adds about today’s looming Jewish economic oppression of poor Mexican Americans,

“As a Jew,” notes a local Coachella Valley newspaper, “he contributed time and money to Israeli causes.” [HENRY, M., 3-9-99, p. B1]

As Jewish scholar Joel Kotkin notes about traditional Jewish/Hispanic relations: “Unlike Jews and Gentiles, or African Americans, Jews and Latinos share little history or mythology. For the most part, their contacts have been opportunistic. Jews have employed Latinos in garment factories, as maids and gardeners and serviced them as customers in a host of enterprises from Whittier Boulevard to Santee Alley and Pico-Union.” [KOTKIN, J., 3-25-01, p. M, p. 1]

Members of the Hispanic community these days have even taken hits as ‘anti-Semites.’ In San Francisco, in a situation paralleling Jewish hegemony in New York City schools over the African-American community, Latina activist Pilar Mejia, principal of Cesar Chavez Elementary School, was transferred from her position after complaints by Jewish teachers and the intervention of the strident American Jewish Congress lobbying organization. Her crime? “One of the most outspoken defenders of immigrant children,” noted the *San Francisco Examiner* in 1999, “[Mejia] apologized today for having openly lamented that ‘three white Jewish women’ were teaching Spanish-speaking kids.” Mejia’s gripe rested on the fact that 65% of the children in her school “spoke little if any English.” Frank Duhl, a Jewish ex-husband, came to Mejia’s defense against the charge that she was anti-Semitic. “I’ve known Pilar for 30 years,” he said. “We have two sons. She is not anti-Jewish. The superintendent removed her because she was accused of intolerance. This is a woman who has been fighting intolerance and injustice all her life.” [GUTHRIE, J., 2-10-99, p. A1]
Growing Jewish-Hispanic balkanization is even reflected in the politics of a street name change. In 1995, in metropolitan Los Angeles, city managers in the San Fernando Valley decided to rename a street in honor of Cesar Chavez. The obscure street to be changed was called Kalisher. Kalisher is a Jewish surname, and soon enough a local Jewish actress, Bonnie Kalisher, came forward with a petition of 500 signatures requesting that the street keep its original name. Kalisher had discovered that the street was named in 1874 after a Jewish immigrant named Wolf Kalisher (no direct relation), a man who, she said, had helped local Native Americans. [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 5-28-95, p. B18]

Jewish activism has been sharply expanding recently into forging pragmatic political bonds with the Hispanic community, largely because the Mexican-American community of the southwestern United States has been enormously growing and stands to wield political influence by virtue of their population numbers. Although Jews and Latinos have little in common (for example: enormous gaps in wealth and social status, enormous gaps in religious concerns, and an enormous gap in support for bilingual education), “Top organizations and leaders met here this week,” noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency in 2001,

“at the first national Jewish Latino summit to discuss the development of a common agenda and ways to strengthen the alliance between the two groups … The Jewish community – organized, wealthy and politically savvy – and the Latino community, the fastest-growing minority group in America, need each other to help push their common legislative priorities, leaders say … A joint declaration of principles discussed at the summit is being circulated among Jewish and Latino groups, according to Diana Siegel Vann, Latin American Affairs director for B’nai B’rith International, which co-sponsored the summit. The declaration calls for fair portrayals of Jews and Latinos in the media, strengthening of public education, support for Israel [emphasis added], increased aid to Latin America and economic empowerment for minority communities … New America Alliance and B’nai B’rith International have started a Latino Jewish Fund that will help support the growing relationships between the two communities at the national, state and local levels.” [SAMBER, S., 4-2001, p. 29, 34]

The Jewish community is already trying to guilt-trip and sensitize the Latino community to its own absurdly remote role [per Spain, and per European Catholicism] in the history of anti-Semitism. “Half of the Latinos in a Jewish-sponsored survey,” noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “said they were unaware of how Jews were treated during the Spanish Inquisition.” [SAMBER, S., 4-2001, p. 34] Here’s a lack of concern where propagandizing Jewish organizations, of course, seek remedy.

In 2001, the same year as the above bonding, the Chicano/Hispanic online magazine La Voz de Aztlan, looking into traditional Jewish self-interest in bonds with minority communities, voiced harsh condemnations of Jewish political exploitation and manipulation of the Los Angeles Mexican-American community. [See article 1 (http://jewishtribalreview.org/larazjews.htm), and then a follow-up, article 2: (http://jewishtribalreview.org/razjew2.htm)]
When a prominent Hispanic Los Angeles mayoral candidate, Antonio Villaraigosa, was challenged by a reporter about his past anti-assimilationist (pseudo-Zionist) Latino ideology, he did not respond directly to the question, but shielded himself with platitudes about his strong Jewish connections:

MOTTEK: “It has been reported Mr. Villaraigosa that when you were at UCLA you were active in a Latino rights group which among other things says in its constitution that it is in favor of forming a separate republic in the Southwest United States. Do you hold the beliefs of that organization as your own and do you still support the group and what do you tell kids that see this kind of stuff on the Internet?”

VILLARAIGOSA: “I say that we have to do everything to combat hate and ignorance. I say that we need to do what the [Simon Wiesenthal] Museum of Tolerance has done. I know, because later in June I’m going to be honored by the Museum of Tolerance. I put together over the last six years more than 18 million dollars for this museum. I put money for this museum. That amount of money is unprecedented in the history of this state. I put money together for this museum because I agree with the Rabbis who work here. Rabbi May, Rabbi Cooper. I supported this museum because they have the tools for tolerance program in our schools and in our police department. I’d like to get the person that worked on that Website in one of those programs so that we can teach them the need to come together and not vilify one another. I’m proud of the fact that this is a great country. This is a country of opportunity and this is also a country of free speech. So I honor his right to free speech, I just hope that he works on the tolerance.” [MOTTEK, F., 5-31-01]

The Jewish brotherhood’s “behind the scenes pressures and backstairs diplomacy” [IVERS, p. 36] was the strategy of the civil rights era, as it has been in the Jewish community for centuries. In 1913 Marshall even arranged for fellow American Jewish Committee member Adolph Ochs – owner and publisher of the New York Times – to highlight and criticize the murder trial of an accused Jew, Leo Frank, in Marietta (near Atlanta), Georgia. Marshall persuaded Ochs to embark on a campaign to emphasize Frank’s innocence, and keep the fact that he was Jewish hidden. [IVERS, p. 41] (Similarly, in 1892 a group of prominent Jews even convinced the New York Times (pre-Ochs ownership) to send a reporter to Russia – at the Jews’ expense – expressly to do an expose of the Jewish condition in Czarist Russia and help temper American public opinion to increased Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe). [GOLDBERG, p. 102] Och’s activism at his newspaper for the Brooklyn-born Frank caused “hate mail … to pour into the Times office, much of it addressed to Ochs, who had a guard posted outside his office.” [LEITER, R., 4-15-99, p. 4]

Frank, a prominent member of the Atlanta Jewish community (he was the president of the local B’nai B’rith lodge), was accused of sexually molesting and murdering a 14-year old girl in his employ at his pencil factory. “There was a lot
of sweatshops that at ten cents an hour employed young teenagers,” says Marvin Schwartz, “and a lot of them were owned by Jewish people – Jews from up north, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, places like that.” [SIMONS] A Jewish millionaire in Chicago, Albert Laskey, joined in the national campaign to free Frank, raising funds for legal fees ($160,000 from his own pocket alone; the murdered teenager made 12 cents an hour in Frank’s factory), and to network with important American newspaper editors to defend the accused Jew. William Randolph Hearst’s Atlanta paper, the Georgian, was especially singled out for Jewish pressure until it too called for a new trial. [LINDEMANN, p. 247] Even Jewish socialist newspapers (reflecting the many leftist Jews working in New York’s garment district) abandoned their usual ideological base in highlighting Frank’s identity as a Jew above all else. “Leo Frank was a capitalist,” notes Hasia Diner, “but the newspapers never noted this. They reacted to Frank not as socialists, but as Jews.” [DINER, p. 228]

Tom Watson, a Populist politician in the South, took an active public role against Frank and, notes Albert Lindemann, “repeatedly observed that a non-Jewish convicted murderer, no matter how flagrantly unjust his trial, would never have benefited from such a massive infusion of money, nor would a non-Jew have benefited from such a network of men who had privileged access to those who form public opinion in the United States.” [LINDEMANN, p. 266] Watson’s image today is painted by Jewish commentators to be singularly anti-Semitic and racist. But “the Populist movement,” notes Arthur Liebman, “… was essentially a mass democratic movement intent upon democratizing an inequitable political economic system … Populism at its peak was one of the largest progressive political and economic reform movements ever to appear in America. It was primarily made up of farmers …” [LIEBMAN, A, p. 335] In 1896 the Populist Party platform included the charge that “the influence of European money changers has been more potent in shaping legislation than the voice of the American people.” [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 83]

Jewish-Black relations became strained over the Frank case. “It briefly threatened Afro-American-Jewish goodwill,” notes David Levering Lewis, “when the Jewish-owned New York Times demanded that Georgian authorities try the Afro-American janitor, sole witness to the crime, as the guilty party.” [LEWIS, p. 547] For Jews, it was “alarming that Frank was the first white in the postbellum South to be convicted of a capital offense on the testimony of an African-American, that an established Jewish merchant could be more vulnerable than a Black janitor.” [LEWIS, p. 547]

Despite the fact that there were five Jews on the grand jury that indicted Frank [LINDEMANN, p. 251], that the Atlanta Constitution under a Jewish editor was among Frank’s most vehement accusers [LINDEMANN, p. 247], and that Frank was far more resented as a rich northerner than a Jew, the 1913 trial is popularly known today in the American Jewish community as one of the most famous ‘anti-Semitic’ incidents in American history. Modern Jewish scholarship has decided the girl was really murdered by an African-American. (The key bit of evidence for this scenario is the testimony of a Black man,
Alonzo Mann, who in 1982 announced that 63 years earlier he had seen another Black, Jim Conley, struggling alone with the murdered girl’s body. Both African-Americans worked for Frank. Conley’s testimony in 1913 had been that he had helped Frank dispose of the body). Of the rare non-Jews who have cared in recent years to scrutinize the old case, the niece of the murdered girl still argues that Frank was indeed guilty of murder. In either event, in 1913, waiting in jail through numerous rejected appeals for a new trial, and now the governor’s impending pardon, Frank was dragged from jail and lynched by a mob.

Even if Frank was completely innocent, continued Jewish fervor about one of its few (are there any others?) American martyrs, many decades after the incident, is intriguing. The factory owner’s murder is still the subject of bitter outrage in many volumes and articles by Jewish writers in our own day. This enduring Jewish agitation and outrage is especially odd given the fact, and perspective, that between 1889 and 1919 only two Jews, 2,522 Blacks, and 677 others were lynched in America, [LINCOLN, p. 176] including eleven Italians hung at one time in New Orleans in the largest single vigilante incident.) [FEUERLICHT, p. 187]

The Frank case was influential in forming today’s foremost Jewish “defense agency,” the Anti-Defamation League in 1913. On March 12, 1986, enduring Jewish lobbying efforts succeeded in getting Frank a formal pardon by the Georgia State Board of Pardons and Paroles to clear his name, and swept this old taint from the Atlanta Jewish community. Still, in 2000, Jews were focusing on the Frank case as a symbol of anti-Semitic injustice; a play entitled “The Lynching of Leo Frank,” by Ron Myers, was headlined at the Marietta Theatre (not far from where Frank was killed). Tom Watson Brown, the great grandson of Tom Watson, and also a lawyer, maintains that Frank was murdered by a mob “because Jews bribed the sitting governor to commute Frank’s sentence.” At least one news report declared there to be still anti-Semitism in the area in 2000, and that the play agitated animosity towards “Philip Goldstein, a Jewish City Councilman and businessman, who has angered some Mariettans with his plans to build a condo/high rise near the [town] square … [Goldstein’s family] owns much of the real estate around the square … Most buildings in the square are owned by Jews, especially the Goldsteins.” [HENDRICKS, B., 8-22-2000]

In 2001, a Jewish professor from Washington DC, Jonathan Turley, embarked on a campaign to get an old statue of Tom Watson removed from the Georgia State Capitol. One Georgia Jewish legislator, Mitchell Kaye, agreed with him, declaring: “It appears inappropriate to have a statue of a hate-monger.” [POLLAK, S., 9-22-00]

While some agitated that the city and the mob’s descendents should formally apologize for the lynching, Watson’s great-grandson declared that “maybe the Frank people should apologize for bribing the governor.” There is even a plaque to Frank at the site of his murder. Clearly reflecting modern Holocaust theology and the Jewish eternal victimhood cosmology, local rabbi Steve Lebow told a reporter that “Memory is the key to redemption, as one of the great rabbis said. It’s a religious obligation to remember.”
The age-old Jewish policy of disguising their hand behind legal and political challenges was also evidenced in the decades old Jewish struggles against “religion in the schools,” a steady series of lawsuits that were popularly perceived in America (during the Cold War against atheistic communism) as assaults upon Christianity and the heart of traditional Americanism. In a steady stream of lawsuits against school systems across America, wealthy Jewish organizations and their lawyers hid behind non-Jewish fronts in assailing everything from voluntary leave time for prayers to government subsidies to parochial schools. “The Jewish defense agencies,” says J.J. Goldberg, “avoid high profile test cases with Jewish plaintiffs, so as to minimize anti-Jewish hostility.” [GOLDBERG, p. 123]

“The major Jewish agencies,” notes Greg Ivers, “were well aware that mass public opinion would regard a Supreme Court ruling that such well established practices as school prayer and Bible reading were unconstitutional as the moral equivalent of a dagger in the heart of the traditional Christian values so long embodied in the American civic and religious cultural milieu.” [IVERS, p. 114] “No group,” notes Edward Shapiro, “has been more active than Jews in insuring that the wall between church and state not be breached.” [SHAPIRO, E., 1998] “The most prominent and powerful of American Jewish organizations,” noted Nathaniel Weyl, “have been energetic and uncompromising instigators of measures to bring about total separation of Church and State. The suits are frequently initiated and financed by the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation League.” [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 305] (Meanwhile, American Jews zealously and overwhelmingly support their Israeli “homeland” that is antithetical to the foundations of American tolerance and multiculturalism. As American-born Israeli Diaspora Affairs minister, Bobby Brown, has stated: “In America, it would be abhorrent for the government to build a church. Here, when we start a new community, we have to put in offices, and we have to put in a shopping center, and we also put in a synagogue. We put two synagogues. One for the Sephardic and one for the Ashkenazi. We are a Jewish state, so there is a government involvement in religion. Even the Christian right in America – it would be abhorrent for them to start a Christian Right Party! America as a society would find that abhorrent. In Israel, we have now twenty-three Knesset members representing religious parties.”) [HYMAN, M., 1998, p. 96]

Meanwhile, in an early American “separation between church and state” case, Zorach versus Clausen, as part of the negotiation by Jewish interest groups behind the case, it was deemed that “the principal litigants be non-Jewish as well as ‘a non-Jewish organization’ … serve as lead counsel. … Although the Jewish organizations would build the case, write the briefs, and, in consultation with whoever ‘represents’ Zorach, direct the litigation, their names would not go in the public record.” [IVERS, p. 87] This methodology was the norm for the following decades. The non-Jewish lawyer selected to “lead” the case was Kenneth Greenawalt and the organization to sponsor it was the American Civil Liberties Union (a group that is in theory non-partisan, but had, for example, in the early 1980s a 40% Jewish membership. [KREFETZ, p. 263]

In Indianapolis, Gerald Houseman notes the stealth with which the Jewish
Community Relations Council and the Indiana Civil Liberties Union sought to pressure the city to remove Christmas nativity scenes from a park:

“[They] realized the explosive potential of the issues and from the beginning it was understood that the only practical approach to the Parks Department, or to officials generally, would be one in which compliance with the separation clause would be sought in a quiet atmosphere, one which would be well-guarded from the glare of publicity.” [HOUSEMAN, p. 23-24]

J.J. Goldberg notes the same secretive strategies evidenced today in Jewish efforts to lobby for Israel:

“Pro-Israel PACS [political action committees] are particularly mysterious because their names do not reflect their goals. A list of seventy-four pro-Israel PACs published … include names like Americans for Better Citizenship, Citizens’ Organized PAC, Flatbush Midwood Political Action Committee, and the largest pro-Israel PAC pack, National PAC. Not one name refers to Israel.” [GOLDBERG, p. 273]

Richard Curtiss notes with concern the same thing:

“Normally a PAC is established to serve the purposes of a company … or a cause … Its purpose is defined by its title. [Edward Roeder, who publishes an annual directory of political action committees, came] across well-heeled, vaguely-defined PACs with non-descriptive titles such as National Political Action Committee, Joint Action Committee for Political Affairs, Citizens Organized Political Action Committee, Roundtable PAC, Desert Caucus, Florida Congressional Committee, or San Franciscans for Good Government. At the same time he was struck by an omission. Suddenly, after 1983, there were no PACs that mentioned Israel, Judaism, Zionism, or the Middle East in their title.” [CURTISS, p. 345]

“I don’t know that it’s necessary for outsiders to know who we are,” one official of such a PAC told Roeder, “It’s a small group of Jewish fund-raisers raising money from mostly Jewish contributors and we can explain who we are to them.” [CURTISS, p. 346] (In 1992, pro-Israel PACs donated to about two-thirds of that year’s Senate races). [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 269] Today there are about 75 such pro-Israel PACs; an all-women organization – JAC-PAC – is one of the wealthiest. [BRETTSCHNEIDER, p. 24]

A similar sort of deceit has often played a role in even Jewish personal histories; in the 1940s and 1950s, especially, personal name changing was particularly high in the United States: “Some 50,000 Americans filed petitions with state courts each year seeking permission to change their family names; 80% of them were Jewish.” [SILBERMAN, p. 59] “What prompted the changes?” asks A. A. Roback, “Commercialism, social aspirations, confirmation, escapism?” Roback noted that new Jewish names included the likes of Clark, Warren, Perry, Hargrove, Grant, Ross, Forrest, McKinley, Knight, Ford, Webster, Williams, Pearson, Spencer, and Sherry. [ROBACK, p. 126] Given the incessant nature of Jewish particularism, the question then must be asked: Is this more usually a
manifestation of disingenuous assimilation, or – as the old Marrano tradition set firm precedent – merely disguise?

As George Gilbert notes about Jews in the world of photography: “Names were changed for whimsy, for theatricality, for self-aggrandizement but for most Jews in the twentieth century a protective camouflage.” Of particular note was the “female Jewish photographer” who “sought to attach to herself a German [Jewish] name that would add prestige to her image. She changed her named to Lisa Rothschild. Her agency won some sales for her but she sought acceptance at Life [magazine]. With sly intent, she again changed her name, this time to Lisa Larsson after noting that Roy Larsson was Life’s chief executive. Editors believing her to be kin to their top boss began to request her services.” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 323-324]

“Within the New York Times,” says J. J. Goldberg, “the efforts of the [Jewish] Sulzberger family to avoid letting theirs be seen as a Jewish newspaper is legend. The most discussed was the practice of forcing reporters with obviously Jewish names to use their initials … A. M. Rosenthal became the Times’ first Jewish executive editor in 1976. Every executive editor since has been Jewish as well.” [GOLDBERG, p. 302, 1996] In Europe too, Jews have often sought to hide their Jewish backgrounds.

In the early 1900s, with Jews massing into “night law schools,” Jerold Auerbach notes that a “senior partner in the prestigious New York firm of Evarts Choate and Sherman was deeply incensed that so many Polish and Russian immigrants –whose names were Abraham, David, Hyman, Israel, Isidore, Isaac, and Morris – had legally changed their names to ‘Sherman.’” [AUERBACH, p. 255] Likewise, in similar such cases, four New York attorneys named Ferris filed suit against Adolph Finkelstein who wanted to change his name to Arthur Ferris; the Chicago meat packing firm Libby, McNeil, and Libby also filed suit against Samuel Lipsky and his son (in a similar business) who sought to change their names to Libby. [FRIEDMAN, L. p. 211-212]

Popular syndicated advice columnists “Dear Abby” (Abigail Von Buren) and “Ann Landers” – the Friedman twins – both adapted WASP names in print. Werner Erhard, the founder of the “est” personal growth groups, was born Jack Rosenberg. In the early decades of American professional baseball, “of eight Cohens in the big leagues seven took non-Jewish names.” [JAHER, F., 10-31-01, p. 61]

“In the 1920s,” notes Pawel Sudoplatov, a former Russian KGB official, “Jewish cheka [secret police] officers adapted Russian names so as to not attract attention to their Jewish origins.” [SUDOPLATOV, p. 31] In Russia during anti-Zionist purges, notes Yehoshua Gilboa, “the Soviet press would add in brackets the original Jewish names of persons charged with cosmopolitanism, alongside the names they were known by, if the latter had a misleading Russian or Ukrainian sound. Thus, persons who used pseudonyms in various fields of activity were identified: Yefim Markovich Stebun was shown to be Chaim Mordkovich Katznelson (added after his name in brackets); Alexander Isbakh (Isak Bakhrakh); Zhadanov (Lifshits); Martich (Finkelstein); Yakovlev (Holtsman);
Melnikov (Melman); Yasny (Finkelstein); Kholodov (Meirovich); Vicktorov (Zlochevsky); Sanov (Smulson); Volin (Katz); Gan (Kagan); Burlachensko (Berdichevsky); Svetlov (Sheidlin). “[GILBOA, p. 159]

Alan Wald notes reasons cited by Jews for name-changing in the American socialist and communist movements:

“The fact that many radical Jews assumed non-Jewish names for party or professional reasons is cited as further evidence of a bias against Jewish ethnicity in the movement, and perhaps even a manifestation of Jewish self-hatred: Irving Horenstein became Irving Howe; Joseph Friedman became Joe Carter; Albert Glotzer became Albert Gates; Emanuel Geltman became Emanuel Garrett; Felix Mayerowitz became Felix Morrow; and so on.” [WALD, p. 15]

“The most famous of American changed names,” notes James Yaffe, “is Belmont – nothing but a French translation of the solid old German Jewish name Schoenberg. Gallicizing, in fact, has been almost as popular among Jews as Anglicizing. The name Levine has lent itself particularly well to this. The New York telephone book is full of Le Viens and La Vines and, most imaginative variation of all, La Vignes. No matter how you slice them, they’re all Levine.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 70] Today, the third most common Jewish surname in America, after Cohen and Levy, is Miller. [AVOTAYNU]

In Hollywood, where Jews have always predominated, for decades name changes were mandatory to hide ethnic backgrounds. Joseph Levitch became Jerry Lewis, Issure Danielovitch became Kirk Douglas, Emmanuel Goldberg became Edward G. Robinson, Julius Garfinkel became John Garfield, Theodosia Goodman became silent screen star Theda Bara (an anagram for “Arab Death”), to begin a very long list. Actor Tony Randall, alluding to the famous non-Jewish journalist Upton Sinclair, notes the case of Leonard Spiegelglass:

“When Leonard Spiegelglass, who was already established in New York as a writer, came to Hollywood he changed his name for a short while to Leonard Sinclair. Leonard, who became a very good friend of mine, changed it back when his friends began calling him Upton Spiegelglass.” [RANDALL, 1989, p. 119]

Jewish theatre mogul Joseph Papp (Papirofsky) even convinced two of his “wives and several close associates [that] he had been born a Polish Catholic.” [EPSTEIN, H., 1994, p. 53]

Jewish science fiction writer Isaac Asimov recalls an incident that struck him about Jewish name-changing:

“I am tired of being told, periodically, by Jews, that I am not Jewish enough. Let me give you an example, I once agreed to give a talk on a day that happened to be the Jewish New Year. I didn’t know it was the Jewish New Year, but if I had it would have made no difference. I don’t celebrate holidays, not the Jewish New Year, not Christmas, not Independence Day. Every day is a workday for me, and holidays are particularly useful because there is no mail and no telephone calls to distract me. But I received a call from a Jewish gentleman soon afterward. He had noted
in the paper that I had spoken on the holy day and he berated me for it rather harshly. I kept my temper and explained that I didn’t observe holidays, that if I hadn’t given the talk I certainly would not have attended synagogue services. ‘That doesn’t matter,’ he said. ‘You should serve as a role model to Jewish youth. Instead, you are simply trying to hide the fact that you are Jewish.’ This was too much for me. I said, ‘Pardon me, sir, you have an advantage over me. You know my name, but I don’t know yours.’ I was taking a chance, of course, but I won. I won’t use his real name, but it was completely equivalent to the following. ‘My name,’ he said, ‘is Jefferson Scanlon.’ ‘I see,’ I said. ‘Well, if I were trying to conceal the fact that I was Jewish, the first thing I would do, the very FIRST thing, would be to change my name from Isaac Asimov to Jefferson Scanlon.’ He hung up the phone with a bang and I never heard from him again.” [ASIMOV, I., 1994, p. 18]


“was telling everyone in New York that he was from New Mexico, an orphan who had been on the road for years. But, as in Minneapolis, he was rather ingenuous and let little things slip out that made friends suspect he was middle class, Jewish, and no orphan. Shortly before Dylan hit the Village for the first time the folkies had discovered that Jack Elliott [another prominent folk singer also known as ‘Ramblin’ Jack Elliott] was actually Elliott Adnopoz, son of a Brooklyn doctor. Then Elliott became seriously ill and relatives from Brooklyn with names like Goldstein had come calling, and his secret was out.” [SCADUTO, p. 66]

When the Jewish singing duo Simon and Garfunkel started out their careers, they didn’t go by their real names. Paul Simon recorded as Tico, “true Taylor,” Jerry Landis, and Paul Kane. Art Garfunkel went by Artie Kane. “Art and Paul feared anti-Semitism would hurt their chances for success,” notes Morella and Barey, “This self-protective attitude outraged [their] black producer: ‘What the hell is your music anyway? You want to be the black man’s brother, but you don’t want to take any heat!’ He pointed out that Paul and Art were trying to capitalize on the social and political movements of the day. They wanted to deal with injustice and prejudice – but only in their songs.” [MORELLA, p. 35]

The times have, of course, changed. In our own day of multicultural celebration, “being Jewish,” so much celebrated in the mass media, has become a desirable quality. “Columbia’s decision to be honest about the duo’s ethnicity put Simon and Garfunkel in the forefront of making ‘Jewishness’ not only acceptable but desirable in the popular culture of the late sixties,” note Morella and Barey, “The subsequent success of Dustin Hoffman, Richard Benjamin, Barbara Streisand, and George Siegel confirming this trend.” [MORELLA, p. 35] Even in politics, in some places today a Jewish name is a giant bonus
(especially where there are large numbers of Jewish voters) and its advantages are jealously guarded. Jewish chauvinism can even be nakedly exploited. In 1988, for instance, a New York Republican, Richard Libowitz (whose father was Jewish, but whose mother wasn’t) was a challenger for the seat of a Jewish judge, Joan Lefkowitz. A serious campaign issue for Jewish voters and the Jewish press was whether or not Libowitz considered himself to be Jewish.

“I’m convinced he was selected [to run in the election] because of the similarity of the name [to Lefkowitz] and the conclusion that Jewish voters would draw – that he is Jewish,” complained the Jewish chairman of the Westchester Democratic Party, Richard Weingarten. The Jewish Week reported Jewish attitudes about the issue:

“Asked if his name indeed might confuse some voters into believing he’s Jewish, Liebowitz replied: ‘I’m not responsible for what people believe … I don’t think there is any attempt to fool the public.’ Asked to set the record straight [by the Jewish Week] about his religious beliefs Liebowitz declined: ‘I refuse to bring religious affiliation into this race.’”

This is the emphasis focused upon in the Jewish community, such avid separators – as it benefits them – of “Church and state.” The incumbent judge, Joan Lefkowitz, is then puffed by the Jewish Week for one thing, her Jewishness:

“In contrast [to Libowitz], Lefkowitz’s campaign materials says she is a director of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith and of the Young Israel of Scarsdale. Lefkowitz, who is Orthodox, was also not shy about telling an interviewer for a Westchester newspaper that her daughter attends the local Soloman Schechter school, a Conservative [Judaism] institution.” [AIN, p.]

Whether a political candidate is a Jew or not is apparently an important issue for many Jewish voters. In 1990, for instance, a Jewish Minnesota Republican senator, Rudy Boschwitz, even made a campaign issue of the alleged fact that his Democratic rival, Paul Wellstone (also born Jewish), was not as Jewish as Boschwitz was, i.e., that Wellstone had “no connection whatsoever” to the Jewish community. [ATL CONST, 11-12-9, p. A10] In 1996, Leon Albin’s Congressional campaign in Maryland included two separate pamphlets to be distributed to voters, one for Jews and one for non-Jews. The material for Jews listed his involvement in the Talmudic Academy, the Jewish National Fund, and the Ner-Tamid Greenspring synagogue. Conversely, non-Jews were not even informed that he was Jewish. [GOLDBERG, L, DOUBLE, p.]

In another case, in 1998 rumors that Brooklyn/Queens congressional candidate Anthony Weiner’s mother wasn’t Jewish made the New York Post threatened to undermine his campaign among Jewish voters. The Jewish Week noted, “Asked if this was a legitimate campaign issue, Councilman Noach Dear of Borough Park, one of Weiner’s four Jewish rivals, said, ‘Let the people decide.’” [DICKTER, p. 22] In 2000, Stephen Shaiken, a Jewish recipient of a mailer by California state legislature candidate Barbara Heller, was outraged at the particular Jewish focus of the piece. Heller noted that she and her husband
“are longtime AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee] members, have traveled to Israel with the San-Francisco-based Jewish Community Federations, have twice participated in Volunteers for Israel and are members of Congregation Rodef Sholam in San Rafael.” “The thinking seems to be,” complained Shaiken, “that I should vote for her because I’m Jewish. There was nothing about living-wage issues, or issues about environmental degradation. It was all ethnocentric issues.” [BRANDT, J., 2-18-2000, p. 33A]

While it is considered an anti-Semitic act for non-Jews to systematically document who around them is Jewish, in the Jewish community such identification is integral to Jewish belief and solidarity: to search out and make connections to others of the clan. Some even make millions of dollars doing it. Bruce Arbit and Jerry Benjamin of the A.B. Data company, for instance, run a computer company in suburban Milwaukee that employs 225 people; their business is solely to make lists of Jewish names and addresses to sell to Jewish groups looking for their own kind and pro-Israel politicians. (A.B. Data claims to have been responsible for raising $4 million for pro-Israel California senator Alan Cranston by canvassing the Jewish community for $20 checks.) [CHAFETS, MEMBERS, p. 53]

Both Arbit and Benjamin are self-avowed Zionists and by the mid-1980s they claimed to hold the names and addresses of two-thirds of the Jewish households in America. How? By tabulating synagogue rosters and merely scanning Jewish-sounding names in phone books, looking for what they describe as the 80,000 common Jewish names. “Take the name Gordon,” says Arbit, “It’s a borderline name. Sheldon Gordon from Long Island is likely to be a Jew. Bubba Gordon from Tennessee, probably not. It’s a matter of probability and common sense.” [CHAFETS, MEMBERS, p. 51] Since only about half of all Jews still sport their original Jewish last names in America, it takes some creative detective work to track down the others. “We look [also] for Yiddish or Hebrew first names,” notes Arbit. “It’s interesting that Jewish yuppies like Hebrew names for their children.” [CHAFETS, MEMBERS, p. 51]

In 1962 the Jewish-sponsored landmark United States Supreme Court case that banned prayer in public schools – Engels v. Vitales – was opposed by 80% of all Americans. [WHITFIELD, p. 69] (Prominent “petitioners” for the banning of prayer included “several Jewish organizations, including the American Jewish Congress, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 327] Public opposition came from everywhere, including former United States Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Herbert Hoover, as well as Church leaders as diverse as liberal Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr and evangelist Billy Graham. While Jews were essentially targeting the perceived threat of Christianity as a socializing force upon Jewish children in public schools, the subsequent Jewish-inspired erasure of all religious and spiritual advocacy in the
American educational system has inevitably accelerated modern America’s many problems of moral decay. Stripped of any kind of spiritual nurturing in the public sphere, modern Americans are deluged with the exploitive ethics of purely secular materialism and opportunism, in the schools or otherwise, values that have in fact been a survivalist subset of classical Judaism, as we have seen, for centuries. “Most Catholics,” says Naomi Cohen, “followed Cardinal Spellman, McIntyre, and Cushing and condemned what they called a frightening trend towards secularism, materialism, and atheism.” [COHEN, p. 172]

An earlier, 1951 non-denominational prayer in New York schools was legally (and successfully) attacked by the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish War Veterans, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith and the rabbinical associations of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism. [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 314]

In 1988 while non-Jews in democratic America supported a constitutional amendment to permit prayer in public schools, 71% to 18%, Jews were against the amendment by a 74% to 18% margin. And while 81% of white non-Jews supported the right for Jews to display a menorah for Hanukkah on public property, only 37% of Jews supported the idea. [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 107] “Jews have a special reason to feel threatened by religion in public life,” suggests Jewish scholar Barry Rubin, “since its manifestation would be overwhelmingly Christian and implicitly anti-Jewish.” [RUBIN, p. 242]

The strong Jewish motivation in taking up such cases to rid public schools of religious taint was their traditional fears of assimilation that could hinder Jewish collectivism. Many of the cases they litigated addressed the unconstitutionality of “voluntary” religious time or prayers at public schools which, at least in theory, could be expressed by any religious persuasion, or not at all. Jewish concerns were that “pressure (put upon) students to attend the on-campus religious classes … encouraged students to attend classes outside their true faith or being harassed or ridiculed, a situation that was most prevalent among Jewish students.” [IVER, p. 80] In this vein, Jewish organizations fought for “the elimination of religion in the public schools with special reference to the observance of Christmas.” [DOBKOWSKI, p. 38]

Yet Jewish lobbying groups can be completely two-faced, as necessary, when it comes to supporting Jewish religious desires, quite literally demanding that all other people bend to Jewish religious dictates. In 1987, for example, the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation League joined forces in a lawsuit against North Babylon High School on Long Island, New York, to shift an entire school graduation ceremony from Saturday to another day to accommodate a Jewish student, David Smith, who “observes the Sabbath [Saturday] and therefore could not attend.” The Jews were victorious: a court order directed the whole school to adopt to David Smith’s religious worldview. The school district was troubled by the ruling and formally noted in an appeal that

“In a society as pluralistic and diverse as the one we all share, everyone must be prepared to accept inconveniences and sacrifices in order to preserve religious freedom for all.” [AIN, JW, 12-18-87, p. 5]
A similar legal attack took shape in 1997 when five Jewish Orthodox Yale undergraduate students sought to subvert the university’s policies that enhanced intercultural tolerance. Fully understanding that admission to Yale included the condition that underclassmen must live in dormitories with all kinds of other students to expand their cultural horizons, the five Orthodox Jews banded together, complaining about sexual promiscuity and alcohol in the dorms and demanded the privilege (denied all others) to move off the campus. The students hired a lawyer, Nathan Lewis who, noted the New York Times, “is well known in part for a series of cases he has argued – some before the Supreme Court – that tried to establish the rights of Orthodox Jews to follow the strictures of their religion in American institutions like the military.” [GLABE RSON, p. 1, 45] Richard Brodhead, the dean of Yale, defending the university’s housing policy, arguing that, “If you allow all groups based on affiliation or conviction to separate themselves from the whole university community, you open the door to all kinds of self-segregation that this place has worked very hard against.” [GLABERSON, p. 49]

In 1982 Jewish efforts to bend the world to Jewish religious wishes took the form of the American Jewish Congress “ask[ing] the Supreme Court to review a prohibition against the wearing of yarmulkes [traditional knitted skullcaps for Jewish males, fastened to the hair with bobby pins or clips] by Jewish high school basketball players.” [JEWISH WEEK, 12-10-82] The Illinois High School Association, the defendant in the case, had a policy forbidding anything on a player’s head except a sweatband, for fear of creating physical hazards.

Elsewhere, while Jews spearheaded the tearing down of public financing for Christian schools, J. J. Goldberg noted in 1996 the case of New York State Assembly member Dov Hiskind,

“an Orthodox Jew, militant Zionist, and one time lieutenant to Rabbi Kahane of the far-right Jewish Defense League. Nominally a Democrat, Hiskind’s principal connections are not to his fellow Democrats, nor even to other Orthodox Jewish Democrats around Brooklyn but to a network of Talmudic academies and rabbinical associations peppered throughout the district and across New York city. Over the years, Hiskind’s office has funneled hundreds of thousands of dollars in state discretionary funds to these institutions, much of it through the Hasidic-led Council of Jewish Organizations.” [GOLDBERG, p. 259]

In Canada, notes Erna Paris:

“In 1966 the Jewish community happily elected Dr. Victor Goldbloom to the Quebec legislature … In 1968 Montreal Jews were delighted when Goldbloom negotiated provincial recognition for the network of private Jewish day schools and public funding was finally provided on a percentage basis.” [PARIS, E., p. 102-103]

In 1988 the American Civil Liberties Union (not the Anti-Defamation League, not the American Jewish Congress, et al) sued the United States government for funding not only religious organizations, but those in other countries. Bad press helped rescinding an $8 million gift to the New York City-based
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Jewish Orthodox group, Ozar Hatorah, to build a *yeshivot* (religious school) in France. For years discrete Jewish activists manipulated the United States government into sending millions of dollars to religious groups through the Agency for International Development. Between 1983 and 1988, for example, the American government gave $2 million to Ohr Somayach (a Jewish Orthodox school in Jerusalem), $400,000 to the Shaalum Teachers’ College in Israel, $500,000 to a chassidic teachers’ college in Jerusalem (the American College of Belz), and $750,000 to the Beth Rivka girl’s school. [ROSENBERG, H, JW, 3-18-88, p. 28] Still ongoing, in 1993, with widespread charges of fraud surrounding Orthodox recipients of United States Department of Education “Pell grants” (up to $300 million), the *Baltimore Jewish Times* noted that Jewish activists in Washington are concerned that the investigation [into the fraud] will focus on the large number of government grants to religious schools in Israel. This could also address the broader questions of whether such indirect aid by the government to religious institutions in another country is appropriate.” [BESSER, WASHINGTON, p. 40]

Among the exposed Orthodox scams for government money was that of the Skverer Hasidim of New Square, New York where “hundreds of the village’s young men were paid a total of $10 million dollars of federal government tuition and housing assistance for doing something they would have done anyway – studying Talmud in the *beis midrash* (house of study). Four men, the masterminds of the scheme, were sentenced last October [1999] to prison terms.” [BERGER, J., 2-28-2000, p. 50]

On the other hand, in a decades-old process, as noted by Rabbi Albert Gordon in 1959, Jewish American parents who seek “to counteract the influence of the Christmas season upon their children … [act] through their national and local Jewish agencies, as well as through their congregational leaders, … [to] carry on a consistent campaign to root out purely religious sectarian festivals from tax-supported [American] public schools.” [GORDON, A., p. 189] In an incident in 1957 that became the norm in America years later, Rabbi Gordon noted that “a Christmas play to be presented by children in the sixth grade of a public school was banned after heated debate and charges that Jewish pressure groups had interfered with school. Christian parents, aroused by the action of the district superintendent, were bitter.” [GORDON, A., p. 191]

During Jewish efforts to remove a Christmas manger scene from a park in Indianapolis, an angry observer wrote to the *Indianapolis Star*:

“So many of us are growing exceedingly tired of having a vocal minority tell us that we may not display the scene of the Nativity in our public parks. Wasn’t our revered and treasured Constitution written on the premise of majority rule?” [HOUSEMAN, p. 31]

On the other hand, Orthodox Jews have freely set up religious spatial boundaries (called *eruv*) with poles, wires, and other devices throughout parts of most major – and some minor – American cities (the White House is even framed within one). The conceptual demarcations are ways for pious Jews to circumvent religious laws against carrying objects out of the realm of the
“home” on Saturdays. The eruv conceptually appropriates the entire area within its limits, where Orthodox may carry things about with no religious worry. As an obvious target for “the separation of Church and religion” issue (public grounds appropriated for expressly religious artifacts and purposes), in the 1980s the American Civil Liberties Union sued the city of Long Beach, New Jersey, for permitting Orthodox Jews to construct an eruv in the city. In United States District Court, the Orthodox Jews won the case. [NEWTIMES, 1996]

In Brooklyn, notes Jewish scholar Jonathan Reider:

“In the late 1980s the Italians’ resentment of the growing presence of Orthodox Jews in one corner of Carnarsie [a section of Brooklyn] gave birth to a new form of reactive ethnicity virtually overnight. The Orthodox had constructed a ritual fence of wire, which was coiled around the telephone poles. When the fence was unrolled on the Sabbath, certain religious prescriptions could be lifted ... That visible ethnic presence bothered an Italian man ... [He said] ‘Now the Jews and Italians are battling, and the Christians want to put crucifixes on their door and on the telephone poles for their identity purposes. But the rabbi said that anyone with that idea is an anti-Semite. I say, don’t use that one on me. As soon as things don’t go their way, they pull that thing about anti-Semitism.’” [REIDER, J., 1985, p. 196]

Conversely to Jewish favoritism in such eruv cases, in Hawaii in 1988, Jewish groups successfully sued for the removal of an illuminated cross at a marine corps base near Pearl Harbor. The cross was a local landmark for over twenty years and its removal sparked an “outcry from people living near the base.” [CARROLL, p. 12]

Meanwhile, taking the Jewish double standard as far as it could be employed for a decade, in the wealthy enclave of Beverly Hills, California, (where 62% of the population is Jewish, including the mayor, MeraLee Goldman), in 1999, after a “6-year-long battle,” the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals declared that the city had “violated the First Amendment by allowing the Orthodox Jewish religious group Chabad to erect a 27-foot tall electric menorah” in a local park “for the past 10 years.” The Court noted that Beverly Hills had followed “an ad hoc policy that allowed for religious favoritism.” [DUNN, M.K., 1999]

In 1984, in another separation of Church and state issue, the ACLU sued New York City for its long-standing program that provides funding to local religiously-based foster care agencies. William Donohue notes that the eventual agreement about the matter actually had “one exception: the terms apply to everyone but Orthodox Jews. According to the stipulation, an exemption to the agreement may be granted to those children whose religious beliefs ‘pervade and determine the entire mode of their lives’ and ‘whose parents, for sincere religious reasons, believe it is imperative that their children continue to practice the extensive religious customs and rituals that have been part of the child’s life.’ The sole group designated for exemption were Orthodox Jewish children.” [DONOHUE, 1994, p. 110]

“It would be an interesting study,” noted Jewish sociologist Natan Glazer,
“to determine just how the United States evolves in the popular mind from a ‘Christian’ nation into a nation made of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews … [and] how the Jewish group, which through most of the history of the United States has formed an insignificant percentage of the American people, has come to be granted the status of most favored religion.” [EISEN, p. 129]

In upholding the constitutional separation of Church and State, in a disturbing 1989 Supreme Court decision, a 5-4 ruling held that a nativity scene sponsored by a Catholic Church on courtyard grounds in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, was illegal. A Christmas tree nearby on the same public property was acceptable. In the same city plaza was also located a Jewish menorah sponsored by the local Lubavitch movement (a strand of Orthodox Judaism). Because, as one Supreme Court Justice noted, the Jewish Chanukah period can be understood as a “cultural as well as religious holiday,” the menorah was ruled to be “constitutionally permissible.” The Supreme Court logic was that, in allowing a religion-free Christmas tree as a secular symbol to be displayed on public grounds, Orthodox Jewry’s religious sponsorship of its Chanukah symbol had to be permissible too. As Justice Blackmun put it:

“It would be a form of discrimination against Jews to allow Pittsburgh to celebrate Christmas as a cultural tradition while simultaneously disallowing the city’s acknowledgment of Chanukah as a contemporaneous cultural tradition.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 332-334]

This “contemporaneous cultural tradition,” very much part of the Jewish religious tradition, celebrates a guerilla war in 165 BCE by Judah Macabee and his sons which established a dynasty known as the Hasmonean. “Bear in mind what this holiday is really about,” says Adam Garfinkle, “a military victory, the regaining of [Jewish] independence, and principled resistance to assimilation ….” [GARFINKLE, p. 23-24] Later, “the policy of [land] conquest carried out by the Hasmoneans,” notes Jewish scholar Peter Schafer, “led to a major expansion of Jewish territory, achieved by expulsion and dispossession of non-Jewish population groups.” [SCHAFER, p. 66]

The net result of all this in Pittsburgh? The Lubavitch religious group gets their religio-nationalist symbol of anti-assimilation and Jewish land expansion on public property, and the Catholic group gets an areligious Xmas tree, which symbolizes what? Gift giving?

In contradistinction between the eager Jewish separation between “Church and state,” three years earlier, in 1986, the Los Angeles Times ran an article about that city’s free provision of palm fronds for local Jews (sort of like giving out free Christmas trees?) The fronds were used for the traditional building of a make-shift shelter for the Jewish Sukkot holiday. No one was complaining. “The city,” noted the Times,

“has been supplying palm fronds from palm trees it has trimmed at no charge for years … The distribution is not widely publicized and depends on word of mouth in the Jewish community … Synagogue representatives bearing official letters from the street tree division … have
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first pick, up to a maximum of 100 fronds, while others individuals were limited to 15 each.”

32,000 fronds that year were taken at Los Angeles area distribution sites. Jewish struggles with each other to get fronds included “pushing, shoving, screaming matches and occasional fisticuffs.” [CHAZANOV, M., 10-19-86, pt. 9, p. 1]

How far the double standard for mainstream Jewry? In 1985 the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York sent a memo to 400 churches and synagogues urging them not to rent meeting space to the “Jews for Jesus” organization. The Jews for Jesus group sued the JCRC for discrimination; they lost the case. (What, one wonders, would have been the result had a Christian organization circulated such a memo warning others not to rent space to Jews?) The burning issue here, of course, is that mainstream Jewry conceives itself as still fighting wars with a Christian enemy. And Jewish betrayers to it are especially intolerable. “While American Jews,” notes Edward Shapiro, “have accepted the presence within their ranks of homosexual Jews, Buddhist Jews, communist Jews, and humanistic (i.e., atheistic) Jews, they have drawn the line at ‘Messianic Jews’ or ‘Jews for Jesus.’” [SHAPIRO, E., 1998]

Over the years the mainstream Jewish community, adamant defender of minority rights, has been ruthlessly hypocritical in its harassment of the Jews for Jesus movement. Facing repeated pickets at their Philadelphia synagogue by Jewish groups, Yohanna Chernoff notes what she faced as a Jew who believed in Jesus:

“Vicious flyers were delivered to homes of believers; harassing calls were made in the middle of the night; parents of Messianic Jews were coming under persecution; rocks were thrown; threats were made … As we broke through the [picket] lines [to the temple], one man on the street snarled at me, ‘I will lie, cheat, burn and even kill, if I have to, to keep one more Jew from walking into that building.” [CHERNOFF, p. 212]

In 1985, Jewish groups mounted a national protest of the pro-Christ Jewish defectors. “This new opposition was very serious,” wrote Chernoff,

“There were constant bomb threats and death threats; our tires were punctured, our children spit on, and items were stolen from around the synagogue. The antagonists would take down the license plate numbers of those attending our services, call their place of business and try to get them fired. For more than nine months, we seemed to be featured on local television or some other media at least once a week. We never got good press in the secular newspapers because the articles were written mostly by Jewish people.” [CHERNOFF, p. 215]

For the major protest demonstration against the Jews for Jesus synagogue, billboard space next to the building was purchased, saying THERE IS A CULT IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD! GUARD YOUR CHILDREN! About a thousand demonstrators marched to the Messianic synagogue from the Jewish Community Center two blocks away. The disturbing result, for mainstream
Jewry, was that the Jews for Jesus group garnered massive publicity. [CHER-NOFF, p. 216]

Having ennobled themselves as defenders of Black and areligious rights to the letter of the law in the U.S. Constitution, some Jewish scholars argue that traditional Jewish liberalism has served its purpose and that there are strong signs of a Jewish drift towards conservatism: a protective approach to Jewish upper class economic status and the state of Israel. This drift is evidenced, on the one hand by a renewed religious interest in Jewish religious Orthodoxy, and, in the secular sphere, growing number of Jewish “neo-conservatives” and the shift of some Jewish magazines, like *Commentary*, (as epitomized by its editor of many years, Norman Podhoretz) away from liberalism and towards unbending support to the considerably less than liberal Jewish state of Israel. Many liberal Jews have likewise dropped former support for “Third World liberation struggles” against oppressive regimes and dictatorships, especially since the Palestinian struggle for human and national rights itself boils in the heart of Jewry’s sacred albatross, Israel. “The American Jewish intelligentsia,” says W. D. Rubenstein, “straddles the entire political spectrum. Yet for the first time in American Jewish history, it can no longer be assumed that Jews will inevitably position themselves on the left, as had been the case throughout this century.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 126]

“The inward turn on the part of much of American Jewish leadership,” notes Peter Novick,

“– their insistence that ‘Is it good for the Jews?’ be the first, if not the only, question that Jews ask themselves – inevitably mandated a rightward turn as well. By the 1970s Jews were preeminent among the ‘haves’ in American society, and the gap between Jews and non-Jew, in income as well as in representation in all elite positions, widened over subsequent decades. Jews had everything to lose and nothing to gain from the more equal distribution of rewards which had been the aim of liberal social policies … The political movement called neo-conservatism was almost exclusively a Jewish affair; *Commentary*, published by the American Jewish Committee, became America’s best-known conservative magazine.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 183]

“In 1972 alone,” noted one study of American conservatism, “[Nathan] Glazer, Sidney Hook, Lewis Feuer, and Seymour Martin Lipset appeared in the [conservative] *National Review*. What did these men have in common? None had been previously known as a conservative. All were Jewish. Three (Glazer, Feuer, and Lipset) had been at Berkeley (birthplace of the student revolution) early in the 1960s … Perhaps most interesting was the fact that all had at one time been ‘radical.’” [JACOBY, p. 87]

“If Jewish intellectuals gravitated toward radicalism in large numbers,” notes Russell Jacoby, “they also hastily beat a retreat … Not simply Glazer, Hook, Feuer, and Lipset but Irving Kristol, Lionel Trilling, Daniel Bell, Leslie Fiedler, and scores of others traded in their red [socialist-communist] pasts for blue chip careers … [JACOBY, p. 87] … The long view suggests not how many,
but, compared to the non-Jews, how few Jewish intellectuals remained radicals and dissenters.” [JACOBY, p. 88] By 1997, noted Murray Friedman, “conservative Jews occupy high posts at conservative think tanks and foundations, such as Bradley, Heritage, Hudson and the American Enterprise Institute.” [FRIEDMAN, p. 51]

What of all of the Jewish associates of William F. Buckley’s politically conservative journal, the National Review in its early years? As George Nash notes:

“These premature Jewish conservatives had something else in common; each in his youth had been a student radical.” [NASH, G., 2000, p. 130]

Frank Chodorov had been an anarchist, Morrie Ryskind once joined the Intercollegiate Society of Socialists. William Schlamm “joined the Communist Youth Movement” and was once the “editor-in-chief of the Austrian Communist Party’s periodical Die Rote Fahne (Red Flag).” Eugene Lyons “worked in the New York office of the Soviet agency Tass for four years” and later was UPI’s correspondent in Moscow. “Although [Lyons] was never a formal member of the Communist Party,” says Nash, “he was enthusiastic nonetheless, determined to use his new journalistic post ‘in the furtherment of the cause.’” Frank Meyer joined the Communist Party of Great Britain and became “the national secretary of the Party’s student bureau and overseer of several hundred disciplined Party members in British universities.” Marvin Liebman “joined the Young Communist League in New York City.” Ralph de Toledano, and editor at Newsweek, never formally joined the communist movement, but was, as he wrote, on the Communist Party’s “cozy periphery.” [NASH, G., 2000, p. 130-132]

(Among these men, Liebman was also an activist in the Zionist American League for a Free Palestine, Chodorov became an “ardent supporter of Israel,” and Toledano was an “Israeli sympathizer,” telling a rabbi that his “trip [to Israel] in 1969 was one of the most moving travel experiences of his life.”) [NASH, G., 2000, p. 146-147]

In 1975, Jewish historian Daniel Boorstin was appointed to be the Librarian of Congress by Republican President Gerald Ford. Boorstin had once been a communist activist as a Harvard student, but by the 1970s he was “an active Republican and outspoken foe of the antiwar and civil rights movements.” [WIENER, J., 1991, p. 55, 59] Even the Christian evangelical World newsweekly (which has over 100,000 subscribers, reasonably comparable in size to the “premier magazine for evangelical Christians,” Billy Graham’s Christianity Today, which has a circulation of 150,000) is edited by Marvin Olasky. Olasky is a “Jew turned Marxist turned born-again Christian … [He] oversees the magazine from his custom-built home in the posh hills of Austin, Texas … He declared himself an atheist at 14, and became a committed Marxist at Yale – even joining the Communist Party and touring the Soviet Union.” [PERINA, K., JUNE 2000]

“The Left is concerned with the oppression of workers, Third World people, including the Palestinians, people of colour, homosexuals, and so on …,” wrote Philip Mendes in 1996, “Jews in turn have moved away from the Left and socio-
economic margins of western society into more established economic and social circles.” [MENDES, p. 108]

Jews starting out as youthful “socialist” radicals who end up making complete ideological U-turns, with the same fervor into its capitalist opposite are legion: expeditious sell-outs to economic self-interest, pushing to the fore whatever the social milieu. The corrupt socialist activist Bernie Cornfeld [see later chapter, p. 1047] who eventually swindled people around the world out of tens of millions of dollars was a sensational example, as was Martin Frankel [see elsewhere, p. 1131], multi-million dollar scamster of the Vatican. Frankel was described by a former professor who knew him in earlier years as having “political views [that] were left-wing and unconventional.” [KAHN, J., 6-25-99, p. A1] Jerry Rubin, the co-founder of the anarchist 1960’s “Yippie” party who ended up in a suit on Wall Street, is another example of this trend, the plugging into whatever ideology that could propel self-interest. “Politics and rebellion distinguished the 60s,” Rubin wrote in 1980, “Money … will capture the passion of the 80s.” American-born Rubin “picked up an interest in the New Left while studying sociology in Israel.” [COLLINS/SPEACE, 1995, p. 615-616]

Seth Glickenhaus also started out as idealist socialist, grew into “a cross between an anarchist and a libertarian,” and eventually settled on being a fabulously wealthy financier. Between 1987-97 his Wall Street investment firm, Glickenhaus and Co., “topped the ratings in estimates gains.” [GIZPENC, p. 8] In Poland, the complete ideological change of Jewish communist propagandist Jerzy Urban to the winds around him is breathtaking. “Jerzy Urban reigned as Poland’s prince of propaganda for almost 10 year. The acid-tongued spokesman for the former communist government enjoyed international notoriety as he clearly and sarcastically orchestrated the news during the dark years of the Solidarity trade union. Now, too, years after the fall of communism, Urban is still in the news business, but with a strange and lucrative twist. Urban is a crusading capitalist – editing his own newspaper and writing books.” [VANCOUVER SUN, p. B10] (In Russia, with the demise of communism, most of top capitalist entrepreneurs are Jews.) [See mass media chapter, p. 1141, section 2]

Crain’s Chicago Business journal noted the case of another Jewish business mogul, this one in computer software, in 1988: “One of the highest paid CEOs in the United States, Mitchell Kapor of Lotus Development Corporation … is a former disc jockey who played the Byrds and the Dead and supported radical political groups.” [HENDERSON, A., 76-13-88, p. T14] Then there is the case of Jewish entrepreneur Gilbert Trigano, who headed the decadent luxury resort world of “Club Med,” international playground of the rich, and built it to power. Trigano “was a grocer’s son and former member of the French communist party.” [REGULY, E., 3-25-88, p. 24]

Then there is the case of Jewish politician Norm Coleman:

“Coleman was a radical college protestor in the 1970s. He was a moderate DFLer [Democrat] when elected mayor of St. Paul [in 1993]. He defected to the Republican Party less than two years ago, and in June he
told conservative activists at the state party convention that their agenda was his.” [SMITH, D., 10-21-98, p. 1A]

How about Marxist homosexual, “radical historian,” and “oracle for the New Left” Harvey Goldberg? “In his seven years at the University of Wisconsin [leading up to a 1970 bombing on the campus],

“he had created a virtual cult. Thousands of students who, as a result of the Cold War had reached college age knowing nothing of the socialist tradition, had been introduced to that forbidden fruit by Harvey Goldberg. His classes had become like conveings of a revolutionary republic … [BATES, T., 1992, p. 52, 53] … After a bout with liver cancer, Harvey Goldberg passed away in 1987. His executors discovered a stock portfolio that the secretive professor had managed himself. He had died a millionaire.” [BATES, T., 1992, p. 445]

Former Jewish leftist Ronald Rodash notes that

“A few months ago, an obituary appeared of the last living survivor of the Triangle Fire, a Jewish woman who went on in life to lecture throughout the nation to college students about the fire and the cause of labor, which eventually unionized the garment grades. The obituary ended with the amazing note that her granddaughter was one of the top executives in Hollywood of a major motion picture company! One can be assured that in the recent negotiations with the writers who were threatening to strike, we know which side of the issue her granddaughter was.” [RADOSH, R., 6-5-01]

Journalist Ross Wetzsteon, married to a Jewish woman, notes in an article championing Jewish identity that “through my marriage I came to know another Jewish ‘type,’ the Communist as stockbroker, perusing with equal fervor The Daily Worker and the Wall Street Journal.” [WETZSTEON, R., SEPT 6-12, 1998] David Horowitz, former communist, even once raised money to buy the Black Panthers a building in Oakland, California. Today he’s a conservative activist and ardent Zionist, at every occasion condemning the leftist principles of his past life. A. M. Rosenthal, chief editor of the New York Times, notes Edwin Diamond, “was raised in a socialist household … [His sister Ruth was] a member of the Young Communist League … None of Rosenthal’s red-diaper background was surprising, given the secularist ideals of the time among many immigrant Jews.” [DIAMOND, E., 1993, p. 170-171]

Billionaire capitalist (and Jewish) oil tycoon Armand Hammer started out as a secret courier for the Soviets, “delivering money [from Russia] to communist leaders in the United States.” [EPSTEIN, E., 1996, p. 64, 67] Among his American-based family’s early holdings in Russia during early years of the communist revolution was an asbestos mine. (“The conditions under which the miners worked were horrendous even by Russia’s low standards.”) [EPSTEIN, A., p. 92] Later Hammer profited from the sale of Russian art in New York City. He also became involved, through his firm United Distillers, in the mob-linked liquor business. [EPSTEIN, p. 147] “Hammer celebrated his fifty-fifth birthday cruising around Manhattan on his yacht.” [EPSTEIN, p. 162] Lifelong atheist,
in later life Hammer reverted back to his Jewish roots, choosing the *bar mitzvah* name Avraham Ben Yehuda Maccabee. [EPSTEIN, p. 21]

Wealthy British Jewish media mogul Robert Maxwell was in some ways a Hammer clone. Maxwell also was once a courier and money launderer for Soviet Russia, [DAVIES, p. 7] later becoming a fabulously rich and particularly corrupt capitalist. [See “Maxwell” in the index]

Yet another such (American) ideological chameleon is Harvey Wasserman – former hippie, socialist, SDS member, co-founder of *Liberation News Service*, and author of the popular anti-establishment *Harvey Wasserman’s History of the United States*. By the late 1980s Wasserman was president of his family’s *Wasserman Uniform and Shoe Company*, selling Mace and other equipment to police departments. [CHAFETS, p. 185-187]

Wasserman too – the former universalist activist and radical for a common humanity – has, in later life, made the familiar pilgrimage back to Jewish tribalism, saying:

“I’ll admit something that’s a little strange – I feel more comfortable around Jews. I know that’s strange, considering the life I’ve led, but it’s the truth. I feel more comfortable. I was amazed to discover that I wanted to have children with a Jewish woman. It’s completely inconsistent but that’s how I feel.” [CHAFETS, p. 189]

Wasserman’s common-law wife is even more chauvinist, raising the familiar shield of the Holocaust to deflect direct exposure of her naked racism, remarking that the father of her children

“had to be a Jew. Harry’s great, I love him. But even more important, I could trace his family all the way back to his great-grandparents, and all of them were Jews … I could never have a child with a gentile, or someone with gentile blood. You see, somewhere in his genetic history there could be someone who put my family into the gas chambers.” [CHAFETS, p. 191]

What about the sleazy television talk-show host Jerry Springer, son of Holocaust survivors? “I’ve never changed my politics,” he says today. A journalist adds that “Mr. Springer likes to say [this] about his transformation from ‘60s anti-establishment idealist to talk-show high sleazio … He sees the media criticism of his show as the ultimate bias of elitism and racism.” [LIPPERT, B., 5-3-98, p. D6] This is a man who “lives in a 91st floor penthouse apartment overlooking Lake Michigan in Chicago’s ritziest neighborhood and is ferried to and fro in a chauffeur-driven limo.” [CAREY/WITHERIDGE, 11-2-98] Wealthy New York theatre mogul Joseph Papp? “From the age of fifteen till he was in his early thirties, Joe had been a Communist.” [EPSTEIN, H., 1994, p. 16]

And what are we to make of the strange leftist universalism of prominent Jewish author Arthur Koestler and the psychological currents behind it? The (Jewish) *Forward* notes that a professor of Jewish studies in England, David Cesarani,
“makes the claim, based on allegations by the author’s former friends, that Koestler was a ‘serial rapist.’ The assertion that one of this century’s renowned anti-totalitarian thinkers was a violent dictator in her personal relationships with women ignited debate in the British press about whether Koestler’s private life overshadows his public contributions … [Cesarani] seems to see Koestler’s Jewishness as an all-encompassing force that had an impact on everything from his sexual promiscuity to his ideas about communism.” [BRAHMS, p. 11]

Like many Jews, Village Voice writer Paul Cowan is a “fugitive from radicalism who has converted to [Jewish] Orthodoxy.” [BRENNER, p. 337] As a wealthy student at elite WASP prep school Choate, he and other Jews refused to recite Christian-oriented school prayers: “I remember holding my head high those nights, feeling an incredibly strong surge of tribal loyalty that I’d never before experienced … After the four years at Choate … once I’d been through that experience, my mother’s message about the six million [Holocaust victims] became, perhaps, the single most important fact of my life.” [COWAN, P., 1982, p. 12, 15] But the consummate symbol of the exploitation of anti-materialist themes for profit is probably Jewish pop star Bob Dylan who made a very lucrative career singing social conscience “moral” ballads about dignity and righteousness in the 1960s. Meanwhile, Dylan led a reclusively elitist and affluent life from limousines. Apparently not rich enough, in 1996 one of his most famous songs, “The Times They-Are-A-Changin’” was sold to a bank in Montreal, Canada, for use in an ad campaign. As one London newspaper noted, many former Dylan followers were “furious” about the new use of the song that was once “an anthem for the sixties generation that waged war on materialism and philosophized on the evils of pin-striped suits.” [MILNER, C., p. 4]

“Now Jewish interests and welfare,” notes Stephen Whitfield, “without which Jewish moral values cannot be perpetuated, are dependent upon a secure and thriving Israel, whose enemies in the world arena are usually emanated from the left.” [WHITFIELD, p. 120, American] “Scratch an American Jew,” notes longtime Jewish activist Earl Raab, “and you find a democratic voter, but if you scratch deeper, you will not find a liberal.” [FRIEDMAN, M., p. 48] “Most Jews in New York,” says New York University professor Mitchell Moss, “are concerned with safety, quality of life and taxes, not public schools and social services, the two largest areas of public expenditure. Almost half of the Jews in New York send their children to independent and religious schools.” [FRIEDMAN, M, p. 50]

This compartmentalized American Jewish identity – one which Ze’ev Chafets sees as containing both “a political liberal and a Jewish conservative,” [CHAFETS, MEMBERS, p. 53] an identity that, first and foremost, celebrates the deconstruction of the surrounding non-Jewish order – is a common one. In 1996, Jewish “universalist” Paul Lauter bemoaned the political direction the Jewish community has taken in America in the past three decades:

“For many [Jews] what defined the difference [between Jews and non-Jews] seemed not to be the kind of doubleness on which I agonized and
thrive. Rather, it had to do with Shabbat candles, yarmulkes, and mikvahs – with the triumph of ritual over reason and, more darkly sometimes, of born-again fanaticism over what it is that links us [all] as humans .... I want to be offensive here, otherwise why write in a book about Jewishness when it no longer means ‘progress’ … A few years ago I heard chuckles at Tammy Bakker’s hairdo, at Jimmy Swaggart’s sex life, at Marilyn Quayle’s literalist theory. But I had to wonder at the silence before the born-again Jewish pieties that, as surely as other fundamentalisms, have helped underwrite [Jewish] ayatollahs across the face of the earth.” [LAUTER, p. 45]

In the 1993 Los Angeles mayoral election, Republican millionaire Richard Riordan won with 50% of the Jewish vote over a liberal alliance against him. 71% of Jewish voters supported his reelection. In New York City, two-thirds of the Jewish voters have supported Republican Rudolph Giuliani. Jewish voters there include 300,000 Orthodox Jews (a quarter of the New York Jewish population) and a large Russian Jewish immigrant population (200,000, about 20% of the local Jewish population) who tend to vote conservatively. A 1996 survey by the Indianapolis Jewish Federation even found that only 29% of the local Jewish respondents in a survey described themselves as liberal; less than half called themselves Democrats. [FRIEDMAN, M, p. 50]

As politically organized American Jewry slowly drifts right, over the last couple of decades or so, some social activists in the Catholic Church have formed an informal political wing often termed “liberation theology,” a religious perspective that focuses on human rights, particularly in Central America where a number of military juntas (many with Israeli aid, both weapons and training) have persecuted peasant populaces. Some Jews see in such universalist Catholic social activism a threat to Jewry and, ultimately, Israel, which has important political relationships with a wide-range of military juntas and dictatorships around the globe.

“In the old days,” says Milton Himmelfarb, “the Catholic church was in the right. Now the Catholic Church, or many eminent Catholics, are way out on the Left. Maryknoll sisters, nuns, are cheering for Marxist-Leninists in Nicaragua. Nuns! .. Though they do not single out Jews as Jews, they do single out Israel as an enemy and the bourgeois system as well.” [STALLSWORTH, p. 101] “The leadership of the left-of-center Christendom today,” says Rabbi Ronald Sobel of Temple Emanu-El in New York City, “is for us anathema and frightening.” [STALLSWORTH, p. 103]

In 1985, Joel Carmichael, the editor of a prominent Zionist magazine, Midstream, published his own article about the Catholic Pope, described by the Jewish Week as an accusation that “the Pope was a virtual Marxist whose attempted assassination may have been engineered as ‘camouflage’ [of close links between the Russian communists and the Vatican].” An Italian newspaper, Corriere della Sera, noted the piece, calling it an “insane attack upon the Pope.” [BOROSON, 5-29-87] Even a trustee of Midstream, Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg, felt obliged to resign in protest of the Pope article.
On the other end of the political spectrum, the Christian religious right is likewise suspect by Jews. While many evangelical Christians are ardent supporters of Israel (former Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin even made courtesy phone calls to Jerry Falwell, thanking him for his support), Jews are wary of the evangelical belief that the Jewish return to Israel is a precondition for the return of the Messiah and everyone becoming Christian. Yet, “using extensive TV and radio spots throughout the United States, particularly in Bible Belt communities,” a Chicago rabbi pulled in $5 million in 1997 from Christian evangelists for the United Jewish Appeal. The UJA’s international link organization is the Jewish Agency. Although the Agency is happy to accept the $5 million, that department’s chairman has refused to meet anyone from the rabbi’s Christian-soliciting fund-raising group. “Since taking office,” notes the Jerusalem Post, “[Jewish Agency head Avraham] Burg has told people that he aims to deal only with matters that concern the Jewish people, because it is their agency. He does not plan to deal with groups whose [Christian] fundamentalist agenda contradicts his world view.” [COHEN, A., CLOSE, p. 11]

It is ironic that when the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, the Reform Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the National Council of Jewish Women, and other Jewish agencies united in the 1970’s to successfully eliminate government aid to parochial schools (which did not endear them to the Catholic school system, and others), even the Jewish Orthodox community (who stood to lose aid to their own schools) opposed the secular Jewish agencies. (Meanwhile, in “democratic” Israel, in 1996 the Ministry of Education ran ads announcing that “We spend 26 million shekels [$8.5 million], among other things, implementing the Shenhar Commission Report [on beefing up Judaism in state schools].” [HALEVI, p. 17]

In 1999, an extremely rare rabbinical voice rose in defense against the avalanche of Jewish attack upon Christianity. Orthodox Rabbi Daniel Lapin wrote that

“Because it is so unusual these days for a rabbi to say nice things about Christians, I consider it necessary to explain that I am not now, nor have I ever been, Christian … [But] it is … my great concern that all Americans – including Jews – are endangered by a weakening of Christianity in our society today … Jews should stop speaking and acting as if Christian America is their enemy … I am perfectly at ease recognizing that America is primarily a Christian nation. In fact, I am grateful for the country’s Christian foundation, because it that religious foundation that has made it possible for Jews to live in safety in this country for over 200 years.” [LAPIN, p. 70]

Lapin also criticized the Anti-Defamation League for forcing “a cancellation of Navy support for a [Christian] Promise Keepers rally in Norfolk [Virginia] … Lapin condemned the ADL for ‘anti-Christian bigotry.’” [Gold, P., 10-27-97]

Lapin is an anomaly, however. Protestants too (as well as Muslims, for that matter) have been assailed by Jewish lobbying organizations. “Spokesmen for Jewish organizations,” says Yaakov Ariel, “have characterized the anti-Israel
criticism and involvement of liberal Protestants as part of the process – at times unconscious – by which traditional anti-Semitism has been transformed into anti-Israel sentiments.” [ARIEL, p. 339]

A local Anti-Defamation League member in the South even wanted to sue a city that had the word “Christianity” on a city seal on its garbage trucks. The national ADL deemed it too minor to be worth the expense to hassle it, but the American Jewish Congress got involved because it thought the garbage truck seal “was a major constitutional issue.” [IVERS, p. 199] In 1978 an article in the New York Times Magazine by Jewish novelist Ann Roiphe evoked a famous response: a flood of outrage vented in protest letters by Jewish readers who were offended by what they regarded as betrayal in writing warmly about a Christian holiday; her piece was entitled “Christmas Comes to a Jewish Home.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 47]

In April 2000, a Jewish judge, Avern Cohn, noted why he was part of a 2-1 ruling by the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals (in a case argued by the American Civil Liberties Union) that declared Ohio’s motto, “With God, all things are possible,” to be unconstitutional:

“When Jesus spoke to his disciples, he was explaining to them what was needed of them to enter Heaven and achieve salvation, a uniquely Christian thought not shared by Jews and Muslims.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS 4-26-00]

One would imagine that to any religion, including Judaism and Islam, the notion that “With God, all things are possible” makes sense (and according to recent surveys in America, most people still do believe in the presence of a “God”); the point of condemnation was that the phrase is noted in the Christian New Testament (Matthew 19:26). Meanwhile, in 1999, Florida’s Department of Agriculture went ahead with governmental sponsorship in “labeling kosher foods [foods expressly created to meet Jewish dietary laws], a position some warn will push it over the line separating temple and state.” The label says “Kosher from Florida.” [DATE, S., 6-10-99, p. 1A]

In 1998, in Australia, full in the face of federal anti-discrimination laws and its Equal Opportunity Act, a Jewish dating agency appealed an earlier court ruling and was allowed to discriminate against all Gentiles in its advertisements exclusively aimed at fellow Jews. Jewish organizations are so often two-faced in their legal arguments against discrimination – as evidenced here, as discrimination benefits them, they sometimes argue for it. The Executive Council of Australian Jewry provided affidavits to the court requesting the right for the dating agency in the name of Jewish separatism. The court ruled that

“the dating service was on the borderline of the scope of the Act, but the decision [in the Jewish favor] was necessary to assist Jews who were disadvantaged in finding a life partner … [The judge] said the decision should not be viewed by other racial groups as a precedent for segregating activities.” [COURIER-MAIL, 8-29-98]

In Canada, in 1998, after a Swissair jet crash, a Calgary newspaper editorial complained about the religious double standards that had taken hold in that
country: “Someone ordered Christian references in the United Church and Catholic parts of the [common memorial service for killed passengers] to be deleted while Jewish, Muslim, and other references were left untouched … The muzzling of the Christian parts of the service is disturbing because it smacks of the mindset which dictates that since Christianity is the predominant religion in Canada, it is offensive to minorities and therefore must be stifled when members of those minorities are present.” [CALGARY HERALD, p. A12]

Meanwhile, in Israel, by 1997, writes Yossi Halevi in the Jerusalem Report:

“Aryeh Deri, head of the ultra-Orthodox Sephardi-Shas Party recently demanded that the military suspend soldiers’ visits to churches as part of army-organized historical tours of Jerusalem, because Orthodox Jews believe it sacrilege to enter a church; Chief of Staff Amhon Lipkin-Shahak promptly complied. And some Orthodox officials in the Ministry of Religious Affairs, acknowledged a senior official there, ‘deliberately sabotage anything to do with Christians, whom they hate.’” [HALEVI, Y. p. 16]

Jewish dissimulation to their non-Jewish neighbors is endemic to their survival strategy in America. There is, to this very day, a Jewish enforcement of communal silence around Gentiles when it comes to Jewish attitudes about themselves as Chosen People and its meaning. “The real test facing both Israeli and diaspora Jews,” argues Israel Shahak, “is the test of their self-criticism which must include the critique of the Jewish past. The most important part of such a critique must be detailed and honest confrontation of the Jewish attitude towards non-Jews. This is what many Jews justly demand from non-Jews.” [SHAHAK, p. 103]

Yet, as Shahak knows, it is culturally institutionalized that such Jewish “self-criticism” from the Jewish community can not happen. It is epitomized in the common Yiddish phrase, “A shanda fur the Goyim,” which means “It’s a shame for the non-Jews to know.” [GILLER, p. 103] Ann Roiphe notes that there are two self-inflicted taboos all Jews function under to remain in the tribe. The first is the guilt-trip pressures instilled to never leave the Jewish community, and the second “major taboo for the Jewish nation is against speaking out, informing the goyim, airing dirty linen. This taboo had its legitimate base in the desire not to deliver ammunition into the hands of the anti-Semitic enemy.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 198] “Not only must Jews keep their own sins out of the gentile gaze,” notes James Yaffe, “they must be careful not to expose the sins of their fellow Jews.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 62] “I seem to detect,” said the Jewish author Philip Rahv, “[in some of the passages of Jewish author Leslie Fiedler] the tone of an informer to the goyim, and the less said about that the better.” [In CUDDIHY, p. x] This defensive and secretive attitude finds expression in the political realm too, especially per Israel, where American Jewish leaders exercise a “self-imposed policy of refraining from public criticism of Israel.” [BOOKBINDER, p. 131]

Yehoshafat Harkabi, a former Chief of Israeli Military Intelligence, wrote a book (1989), Israel’s Fateful Hour, that, among other things, outlined the fascist-like movement growing in the Jewish community, largely based upon a
revival of traditional messianic and racist Judaism. “A case can be made against me,” he wrote, “that by revealing these tendencies of the Jews and Israel I am providing ammunition to enemies. I find myself in a painful conflict … A conspiracy of silence about these beliefs and this use of the tradition allows them to go unchallenged and encouraged those who propagate them. There can be no remedy without first identifying the problem. By hiding our shame from outsiders we hide it from ourselves as well … Religious extremists [in the Jewish community] are not a negligible element.” [HARKABI, p. 182]

Jewish reluctance to address – and their tendency to dodge – such issues (those that swirl around Jewish self-concepts of specialness as the Chosen People and their presumed destiny in that regard) are long standing. In 1937, Clayton Morrisson, editor of the liberal Protestant journal The Christian Century, complained that Jewish secretiveness is evidenced “in all the conferences between Jews and Christians, where ‘tolerance’ and ‘mutual appreciation’ are the major notes. The Jews do not bring in to the conferences a fully candid expression of their own aspirations. The essential problem is not stated; it therefore cannot be confronted.” [MORRISON, p. 734]

In the same era, Ben Halpern, editor of the Jewish Frontier, complained to his community that “Judaism has become ‘the public facade that Jews present to America’ and the criterion of selection was simply what would please [Gentiles].” [EISEN, p. 134] “For Halpern,” notes Arnold Eisen, “the core of galut [exile] was the Jewish conviction that ‘the real history of the world is, after all, the history the Jews as a people have known, while the history of other peoples is essentially irrelevant.’” [EISEN, p. 134]

In 1949 the editor of Commentary, Elliot Cohen, noted that Jewish intellectuals were facing a “self-imposed censorship” in their own community “for fear that the goyim [non-Jews] hear and use it against us.” [EISEN, p. 131] In later years the Jewish editor of Midstream observed, “that many, too many, feel that for reasons of ‘public relations’ it is inadvisable to discuss this subject [Chosen People] – that it is a theme to be avoided if not suppressed.” [EISEN, p. 137]

In 1958, Jewish sociologist Herbert Gans wrote that

“the Jews form a strong in-group, with well-verbalized attitudes to the non-Jewish out-group. The Jewish cohesion, the in-group attitudes and the anti-outgroup feeling that accompanies it, are expressed frequently at the informal parties and gatherings where the friendly atmosphere and the absence of non-Jews creates a suitable environment. These feelings are verbalized through the Jewish joke, which expresses aspects of the Jews’ attitudes toward themselves as well as toward the out group, or through direct remarks about the out group. At parties which are predominately Jewish, it is necessary to find out if everyone is Jewish before such attitudes can be expressed overtly. When someone in the gathering who is assumed to be Jewish turns out to be otherwise, the atmosphere becomes tense and the non-Jewish person may be avoided thereafter.” [SKLARE, p. 228]

In reference to Jewish authors more safely publishing articles out of non-Jewish earshot, in Hebrew, and in Israel, David Biale notes in 1996 that “certain
things might be said (in North America) in what Sander Gilman has called the ‘secret language’ of the Jews, but not in the lingua franca of the scholarly world. As free and unapologetic as Jewish studies may seem in North America, anti-Semitism (may not) have really been vanquished from our imaginations.” [BIALE, BETWEEN, p. 177]

Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen note that in Israel in 1988 what they described as a “blatantly racist” advertising campaign caused Arab politicians to remind their Jewish neighbors that many Israeli Arabs understood Hebrew too:

“Even when speaking to general audiences (which in theory includes non-Jews as well as Jews) Israelis speak as though what they say will be heard only by other Jews.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 167]

An empowered majority, the Jews of Israel feel they have nothing to politically worry about. “By contrast,” note Liebman and Cohen, “American Jews and the Anglo-Jewish Press are aware that what they say to Jews can be heard and read by non-Jews.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 167]

On the subject of Jewish chosenness expressed as overt racism in seminal Jewish religious texts, an Israeli rabbi, Tzvi Marx, wrote recently in a public letter to his son:

“Don’t let anyone persuade you that one should not realize this issue [of Jewish racism in religious texts] in print, that it’s like washing the dirty linen of the Jewish people in public, an act of disloyalty.” [MARX, p. 46]

In a 1983 book expressly about the Chosen People concept in America, Arnold Eisen notes that

“[Jewish public discourse about their idea of chosenness] may be dishonest to the extent that it masks sentiments deemed too dangerous for expression. If the presentation of Judaism and Jews has … been greatly influenced by the need for successful ‘public relations,’ nowhere would this be more true than in the case of the single subject most likely to arouse gentile indignation – Jewish chosenness.” [EISEN, p. 146]

It seems plausible that those attitudes of twenty years ago have not vanished entirely and that the continuing Jewish silence on such matters reflects a lingering sense of moral superiority … The desire to maintain some distance from gentiles – even as one seeks their approval – has probably not disappeared, if only so that one might enjoy some private space in which to discuss Jewish concerns with other Jews without worrying about being overheard.” [EISEN, p. 146]

If one is ethnocentric one does not need to appear to be so … [The Jewish tradition is to] be a human being in the streets and a Jew in your home. The division can only work, of course, if those who one meets in the street are not visitors in one’s home, and the opinions which one voices in the home are not heard outside it.” [EISEN, p. 145]

In the context of the modern Jewish polity and its civil religion, the essences of Jewish communal identity and its ultimate aims are not publicly articulated; they are, in fact, disguised, avoided, or dissimulated.
“Civil Judaism,” says Jonathan Woocher, “does not often speak at length about why Jewish survival is important; the validity of (that) goal is a given.” [WOOCHER, p. 75] “It is almost as if Jews have become fixated on survival for its own sake,” says Leonard Fein, “without ever having been very eloquent about why it is that such survival matters. That, in fact, is why I use the term instinct.” [FEIN, New, p. 144] “American Jews,” says Jacob Neusner, “although many continue to affirm their Jewishness, have no clear notion of how they are Jewish, or what their Jewish heritage demands of them.” [NEUSNER, Holo, p. 978] “Jews continue to feel an emotional allegiance to their coreligionists,” agrees Gordon Lafar, “But with no philosophical justification for particularism, these bonds take on the form of crude commitments … that can be asserted but not explained.” [LAFAR, p. 180] “The insistence by some that the Holocaust must be the core of Jewish self-reflection today,” says Peter Berger, “has the function of freezing the presence of anti-Semitism in the consciousness of Jews – and thus covering up the question why one should be a Jew.” [CUDDIHY, Holo, p. 73] “We have not yet formulated,” wrote Jewish author Gary Tobin in 1999, “a set of beliefs, behaviors, and institutional structures that define what it means to be a Jew in the pluralistic society that we ourselves have helped to build.” [TOBIN, G., 1999, p. 6]

“We have rarely had to ask ourselves truly deep existential questions,” says Egon Mayer, “the answers to which mark the autonomous moral agent: what do we believe? Why do we want to be apart from others as a culturally distinct entity?” [MAYER, NYT, p. 4, 17] The great crisis of the [Jewish] nation,” says Yeshayahu Leibowitz, “the hurt of my people’ (Jer. 8:21), is that today we cannot tell what it is that makes them Jews.” [LEIBOWITZ, p. 84] “Ultimately … the assertion of Jewish unity leads to the assertion of a special Jewish destiny,” says Woocher, “… what the destiny is, is often left vague or unstated by civil religion spokespersons.” [WOOCHER, p. 71] “Obfuscation, hidden agenda, double-talk and, commonest of all, double think,” noted David Vital in 1990 about Jewish common discourse about Israel, “are still very much the order of the day.” [SACKS, J., p. 9] “Critical observers of the American Jewish civic religion, including some of its thoughtful adherents, have at times expressed concern that Jewish survival has become an end in itself in the Jewish polity.” [WOOCHER, p. 76]

“Jews have not stopped being Jews,” notes Nathan Glazer, “… It is not that most Jews in this country submit themselves to Jewish law. They do not. Nor can they tell you what the Jewish heritage is.” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 9-10] “If the anti-Semites have indeed been beaten back,” says Fein, “what is left to connect us (as Jews)? If Jewish survival is assured, what is left for us to be concerned about? More precisely, if the threat to Jewish survival does not come from without, we who profess to care for that survival must turn inward. And that is something we prefer not to do.” [SHAPIRO, AN., p. 8]

What does all this vagueness mean? Why don’t Jews want to face themselves and the essences of their communal identity? How can the motivating reason and goal for such incessant Jewish self-obsession be left unstated unless the mil-
lions of members of the variant expressions of the modern Chosen People club are uncomfortable with what the real reason might be? Or, are they merely reluctant to reveal it and its implications? Can it be that the honest core of historical Judaism, Zionism, and Jewish “peoplehood” cannot be honestly faced, that its traditional core of elitism, chauvinism, ethnocentrism, racism, and other anathemas to modern pan-human thinking can not, in good conscience (nor safely), be **overtly** championed?

Gerald Blidstein, a professor of Jewish Law at Ben Gurion University in Israel, has, in 1994, faced the ominous implications of what lies always unstated:

“I sense … in both the educational apparatus, as well as in synagogues and social gatherings in both Israel and the U. S. … a growing infatuation with power and violence, perhaps as a backlash of the Holocaust … For it seems that only the particularist is legitimate in our community, not the universal … Democracy is an alien value, to be tolerated and indeed exploited around the world, but it does not really oblige us in our deepest being … I find the current intolerance not merely impoverished but sinister.” [BLIDSTEIN, p. ]

“Many American Jews,” says *Norman Birnbaum,*

“… cannot tell whether they are supremely secure in the United States, or menaced by countless (internal as well as external) enemies. Their attachment to Jewish moral substance has become increasingly ritualized: after all, many would be hard put to say what precisely it is. The official leaders of the Jewish community are brilliant tacticians. They are adept at playing upon the community’s fears and manipulative in their approach to the rest of American society. Their narrow conception of Jewish interests is designed for the short run, and entails dangers for the Jewish community which will become increasingly evident in the next decades.” [BIRNBAUM, p. 112]
MONEY, CLASS, AND POWER

* Note: Positions of power and ownership are always in flux. Companies are bought and sold these days with extraordinary frequency and career rungs change quickly. The facts noted in the next chapters for those of current power should be regarded as an overall pattern and not an absolute freeze point for any individual and his/her controlling interests. Such facts are also merely a general sampling, and may be regarded – in overview – as the proverbial “tip of an iceberg.”

In the following chapters, too, many people are identified as being of Jewish heritage as part of this investigation of Jewish power in America. Often Jewish journals and scholars identify them. Sometimes too, when the subject is portrayed in a good, or at least neutral, light, they are identified as such in the popular mass media. When Jews make the news for being in trouble with the law, they are more often freely identified as Jews in the European press than in the United States. In America, they are more likely noted neutrally, as “white,” “Russian,” “Iranian,” or other ethnicities under which Jewish identities may be subsumed.

Sometimes the Jewish heritage of the powerful or newsworthy is difficult to ascertain, but their ethnicity can often be decided via articles about relatives, relationships to Israel, synagogues, religious holidays, cultural indicators, or Jewish-configured political organizations and other tangential leads. Many surnames (Cohen, Katz, Kaplan, Levy, Levine, Levin, etc.) are instantly recognizable to the informed as Jewish and, even if a small minority of individuals with such names are only “half-Jewish” or, rarely, converts to some other religion, the familial link to the Jewish community (especially in homage to the Holocaust and often modern Israel) may fairly be presumed to be no small thing. For purposes here, that allegiance, and all it entails, is the crucial determinant in determining who is Jewish. The ambiguous “community of fate” is, after all, one of the major self-defined measures of Jewish identity. This is particularly true of those who hold power of some sort in popular culture: most of these people are in significant degree part of a Jewish network, especially an economic and political one.

In these senses, this work follows the lead of the Jewish community (and the Jewish ethnic media) itself. (Many individuals, however, who may well be Jewish, had to be left out of this assemblage because public information was too weak and names were too ambiguous to presume that they had a Jewish background). This entire methodology (ironically ascribed by Jews as a manifestation of anti-Semitism if it represents anything less than an intention to flatter Jewry) is popular in the Jewish world itself, often noted as “nose-counting” or “bean-counting”: usually a celebratory emphasis of who exactly is Jewish and/or its attendant search for allegiances. As Jewish scholar Nathan Glazer has noted about this phenomena, and its tinge of paranoia:
“A leading figure in the Jewish community affairs relates that a Jew eagerly asks, in any situation, ‘How many are Jews?’ And when he gets an answer, he asks suspiciously, ‘How do you know?’”

[NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 3]

Efforts here to determine specifically who is Jewish are, in some ways, more extensive than most Jewish organizations’ demographic studies themselves. In a 1999 investigation of the Jews of the Miami area by the Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County, for example, the way to ascertain who was Jewish was simple. Ten percent of common Jewish names were merely tallied, and compared to other years, from phone books. From this base, estimates were made. This method of determining Jewish population numbers “has been used by Jewish demographers across the country for 40 years.” [BELKIN, D., 5-6-99, p. B1] An American Jewish Committee examination of voter patterns in the Philadelphia was in large part “based on surnames gathered from voter-registration records.” [FELDMAN, S., 3-2-2000, p. 1] Jewish author George Gilbert, like many, notes in his introduction to his volume about “Jewish photographers,” that “for the purposes of this study, individuals are deemed Jewish even if they do not meet the halakhic structure responsible for traditional Jewish religious criteria: being born of a Jewish mother.” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. ix] Stanley Rothman’s and S. Robert Lichter’s definition of Jewry to qualify for inclusion in a book about Jewish political radicalism goes like this: “We classified students as Jewish if the ethnic background of both parents was Jewish, or if only one parent was of Jewish background but had raised the child as a Jew or without religious training.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 213] In 1973 Harry Golden noted United Jewish Appeal methodologies to find the Jewish nouveau riche to pester for philanthropic donations: “[UJA] researchers go over every prospectus issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission, attentively study advertised stock offerings in every city, and plow through hundreds of year-end reports to the stockholders issued by major industries, always on the lookout for that Jewish name that they have never read before.” Another UJA division scans obituaries, looking for affluent Jews by surname, intent upon contacting survivors. [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 119] No apologies are thereby made for such popular Jewish research methodologies that are in large part followed here.

“Having money is a good thing, having power over money is even better.”
Old Yiddish folk saying [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 16]

“Money goes to money.”
Old Yiddish folk saying, [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 179]

“The rich breed more rich.”
Old Yiddish folk saying, [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 251]

“The rich man’s way is without fair play.”
Old Yiddish folk saying, [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 251]

“Villains fare well in this world, saints in the next world.”
Old Yiddish folk saying, [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 84]

“Behind every fortune lies a crime.” – Balzac
“Jewish money,” noted Gerald Krefetz, “– its purported influence and power– is one of the oldest canards of anti-Semitism. Therefore, the topic is usually dealt with in the softest of voices by Jews for fear of raising the specter of anti-Semitism; and by non-Jews for fear of being tarred by the brush, of being called anti-Semites for even ventilating the subject. The omission is startling since money – its use and abuse, its acquisition and disposition – was and is a central element in the Jewish experience.” [KREFETZ, p. 3]

As an Eastern European Jewish fable notes about the subject of anti-Jewish hostility, traditional tension between Jewish haves and Gentile have-nots, and the wisdom of keeping relative Jewish affluence hidden:

“Once the good-hearted rabbi of Chelm was interrupted in his devotions by the sudden appearance of one of his townspeople, Yankele, bleeding and howling in pain. The shabbes-goy [non-Jewish Saturday servant for Jews] had gratuitously punched Yankele in the mouth. The rabbi asked solicitously if he could inspect the damage. But when Yankele opened his mouth, the rabbi was horrified. How does a Jew come to have such a healthy set of teeth? Are these the very teeth that Yankele had exposed to the shabbes-goy? Well, then, no wonder he had been brutalized. For a Jew to show such strong teeth is in itself a provocation. The rabbi counseled Yankele never to show his teeth to any Gentile again.

In subsequent weeks, although Yankele keeps his mouth dutifully shut, the shabbes-goy beats him up repeatedly. Each time the rabbi, after due analysis of the situation, discovers a provocation: once Yankele had carried a loaf of bread home from the marketplace, obviously attracting the shabbes-goy’s envy; a second time he had strayed too far out of town, obviously transgressing what the shabbes-goy considered to be the Jew’s legitimate bounds. Finally, after still another beating, the rabbi realizes the gravity of the situation and calls a public meeting of the local Jewish elders to resolve the matter. The meeting unanimously concludes that Yankele is too dangerous to keep in town. At the rabbi’s suggestion he if forced to leave, and the shabbes-goy’s wages are modestly raised to placate him and ‘move him to pity.’” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 98-99; written by WISSE, RUTH]

“Jewish success in America,” says Henry Feingold, “appears to rest partly on the pre-existing Jewish culture (which gives it behavioral cues, a unique entrepreneurial vision, plus connections and capital); and American culture (which gives it a success ethos, economic opportunity, and open society).” [FEINGOLD, p. 41] “Jews,” noted Israeli scholar Boas Evron in 1995, “are among the most powerful, best integrated and wealthy groups in the United States, Britain, and France.” [EVRON, p. 48] “Jews,” adds Joseph Heckelman, “are disproportionately visible in every area of human endeavor. In other words, Jews are disproportionately successful.” [HECKELMAN, J., p. 68] “Success is a basic fact of Jewish American life,” observed Roger Kahn in 1968, “… Success surrounds and infects their lives. Success in business; success in educating children; suc-
cess in entering the most hotly-sought endeavors. Jews are business owners, business managers, professionals, writers and artists. Few are laborers. Virtually none is a farmhand.” [KAHN, R., p. 4]

Karl Marx’s mid-19th century comment that America had already become “Judaized” (i.e., commercialized and rendered excessively materialistic) through Jewish influence upon America’s own stringent brand of Protestantism, was echoed in 1911 by the Jewish anthropologist, Maurice Fishberg:

“Fifty years ago the criminology of the Jews was a good indication of what modern society is coming to under commercial and financial activity. In this respect, as was the case with many other peculiarities, such as the excessive number of psychopathics and neuopathics, the Jews have only been the advance agents. Many publicists of Europe have, in fact, often designated conditions in the United States as ‘Jewish.”” [FISHBERG, p. 549]

“The power of commercialism in the United States was hardly to be denied,” says Albert Lindemann, “The English themselves were often taken aback by the commercial scramble in the United States in the nineteenth century, by the ‘Jewish soul of the Yankee.”” [LINDEMANN, p. 206] “It has been the Jews,” says Edward Shapiro, “who taught Americans how to dance (Arthur Murray), what to wear (Ralph Lauren), how to behave (Dear Abby and Ann Landers), and where to complain (David Horowitz). [SHAPIRO, Anti-Sem, p. 1] Jews even gave the world the idealized images of the Barbie doll and Superman. “If you live in New York or any other major city,” said comedian Lenny Bruce, “you are Jewish.” [RUBIN, p. 89]

As Chaim Bermant notes:

“There is probably less anti-semitism and certainly less overt anti-semitism in the world today than at any other time since the rise of Christianity. Auschwitz is, of course, one reason; another is the decline in religious fanaticism and, indeed, in religious belief in general, and while rampant secularism may be a threat to Judaism it has made life easier for the Jew. A third reason, which is connected to the second, is that the western world has become more Jewish. The commercial drive which was said to characterize the Jew and which was regarded with such disdain by the European (if not the American) bourgeoisie, has become, if not respectable, then at least more widespread and acceptable …” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 37]

“If the religious traditions of the shtetl had accustomed Jews to think of luxuries as a type of instrument for dignifying the holy days,” says Andrew Heinze, “the secular American environment refocused this awareness.” [HEINZE, p. 5] … By exploiting the Jewish concept of honoring a holiday, merchants and consumers turned the religious occasion into a pretext for shopping … [HEINZE, p. 66] … As a pretext for shopping, Jewish holidays merged subtly with the fashion cycle.” [HEINZE, p. 67] “The turn of the century New York Yiddish press,” writes Paula Hyman and Deborah Moore, “abounded with references to the enthusiasm of Jewish women, even the newly arrived, for the latest style of
dress and interior decoration. Furthermore, there were certain clear contrasts between Jews and other groups in respect to the consumption of goods … [Jewish] attraction to new kinds of products and pleasures also contributed to the rapid development of a resort culture among Jews, which set them apart not only from other immigrants, but from virtually all Americans of similar modest means.” [HYMAN, p. 24] Among the best known of these resorts in the Catskill Mountains was Grossinger’s.

“In the 1860s and 1870s,” notes William Leach, “luxury was seen by many Americans as morally corrupting … By the 1920s, luxury seems to have lost for many people much of its negative meaning.” [LEACH, p. 295] “The modern definition of luxury,” decided an influential Columbia University economist, Edwin R. Seligman, in 1927, “is neutral so far as ethical connotation is concerned.” [LEACH, p. 295] “Nourished by American conditions and values,” says Andrew Heinze, “Jewish merchants were able to make a profound impact in the era before World War I. In the areas of street marketing and film marketing, they would completely change the prevalent mode of operations, thereby demonstrating that Jewish adaptation in America entailed the creation as well as the reception of new forms of consumption.” [HEINZE, p. 181-182] “The contemporary historian John Higham,” notes Edward Shapiro, “has concluded that the Jewish emphasis on the materialistic and competitive values of business is also ‘deeply ingrained in American life.’” [SHAPIRO, p. 11]

Even modern advertising and the selling of “brand names” can be traced to Jewish origins, particularly rooted in the Jewish Rothschild banking monolith in Germany in the 1800s. The House of Rothschild, notes Sam Lehman-Wilzig, “developed … institutionalized advertising. Advertising today is taken for granted as a central cog in the capitalist system, especially in regard to fueling demand. This was not always the case; for as [German economist Werner] Sombart points out, a pretty display in a window was considered unethical business practice a mere three hundred years ago. Noteworthy is that this institution was elevated by HR [the House of Rothschild] to new heights, advertising not any specific product but a corporate name.” [LEHMAN-WILZIG, p. 256]

In a more recent expression of the “brand name” archetype, Christopher Byron traces the Israeli Nakash brothers (of Jordache jeans) road to success in America in the 1980s:

“Steeped in the Middle Eastern arts of obliqueness and guile, the brothers seemed manipulative by nature. And as the youngest of the three, Avi’s guile certainly showed through when he came up with a gimmick that would make them all rich. Catching on quickly to the American way of doing things, he suggested that they forget about the product and invest in the image instead. In other words, spend the money on an ad campaign … And what more mesmerized the masses than sex, wealth, and social power … If a four-dollar swatch of denim could be turned into a symbol of success, there was just no telling how much people would be willing to pay for it … [The first TV commercial they personally created] the three networks all rejected … as lewd, but New
York area independents agreed to carry it, and within weeks Jordache was the rage of every high school in the Greater New York area.” [BYRON, p. 34-35]

Another example of the artificial construct of economic value is the entire world of diamonds, largely controlled internationally by Jews. The idea of an “engagement ring” (and specifically a diamond one, as an expression of eternal love) is a recent phenomena, created by advertising agencies to sell more diamonds. David Koskoff notes that:

“Harry Oppenheimer [the head of the South African-based De Beers diamond syndicate] is usually credited with augmenting demand [for diamonds] through advertising, which De Beers undertook in 1939 … Most diamantaries [those in the diamond trade] appreciate that the value of their product is illusory and dependent on the props maintained by De Beers.” [KOSKOFF, The Diamonds, p. 272]

In 1993 the Israeli author Amos Oz paraphrased a Jewish critic’s referral to the special Jewish entrepreneurial vision:

“We Israelis hear now and then that the very state of Israel might have been a mistake … George Steiner goes even further by adding that a national state per se is vain, childish, anachronistic, and a dangerous concept. We should aspire to ‘Judaifying’ the entire world by turning it into the arena of one hundred different civilizations, rather than a single nation state.” [OZ, p. 117]

“Western civilization,” says Albert Lindemann, “is undeniably a ‘jewified’ civilization, however offensive the word may be to our ears because of the ugly use made of it by anti-Semites … Anti-Semites believed that Jews were everywhere, and in a sense they were almost everywhere that counted in modern society.” [LINDEMANN, Esau’s, p. 20]

WASP economic and social dominance in America was well along in the process of being dismantled when Jewish commentator Peter Schrag wrote in 1971 that

“In the last twenty-five years, dissecting the establishment has become a highly popular academic endeavor. C. Wright Mills (among others) took it on in The Power Elite, E. Digby Baltzell in The Protestant Establishment, G. William Domhoff in The Higher Circles and Who Rules America? One might suspect that the very existence of these studies indicates that the subject bears more resemblance to a carcass than to a living body.” [SCHRAG, p. 161]

The first immigration group of Jews to America came in the colonial era; they were largely Sephardic and established themselves as a merchant elite. “They were “among the founders of such Establishment institutions as the New York Stock Exchange, Columbia University, New York University, the American
Hayman Levy was the largest fur trader in colonial America; even Daniel Boone was hired by a Jew, "Jacob Cohen, and other Jewish merchants to survey the land, mark out roads and locate land claims in Kentucky." [DAVIS, D., 129] A second immigrant group arrived in the middle of the 19th century; some of these “made their way into investment banking, where they were joined by an equally successful group of Jews stemming from the banking houses established by the Jews in Germany.” [FEINGOLD, p. 39]

By the 1870s, “proportionally speaking, in no other immigrant group have so many ever risen so rapidly from rags to riches.” [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 11] “Many Jews,” noted Richard Zweigenhaft and G. William Domhoff, “were influential in founding the very clubs that helped set the upper class apart from the rest of society … Like the Sephardim who preceded them, the wealthiest German Jews were accepted in the most prestigious social clubs, and many interacted with and were entertained socially by ‘the best’ of gentile society.” [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 10] In 1889 62% of American Jews in the occupational world were either bankers, brokers, wholesalers, retailers, collectors, or agents. 17% more were professionals. [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 82]

The third wave of Jewish immigrants, the largest, came from Eastern Europe at the turn of the twentieth century and mostly settled in New York City; occupationally, these Jews gravitated to the clothing industry. Between 1881 and 1924 over two and a half million Jews from Russia alone came to America aggravating – with their allegedly rude and “uncivilized” mode of living – not only non-Jewish Americans but indigenous Jewish-Americans as well, who worried that their Eastern European brethren’s “customs and manners … imperil[ed] their ascent.” [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 12-13]

(A more recent - -1980s – Jewish immigration, with the fall of the Shah, was that from Iran. “This,” says the Los Angeles Times, “was one of the richest waves of immigrants ever to come to the United States. Their first toehold in their new land was no squalid, crowded ‘Little Tehran,’ but rather the gracious hillsides of Trousdale Estates in Beverly Hills, and other nearby neighborhoods of the Westside and San Fernando Valley.” [MITCHELL, p. J1] By the late 1980s, one of five students in the posh Beverly Hills (which is, as noted earlier, mostly Jewish anyway) school system were “Iranians”; most of these Iranians were Jews. [MITCHELL, p. J1] Hundreds of thousands of Jews from Israel have also emigrated to America in recent years. “I would … venture a guess,” says Israeli sociologist B.Z. Sobel, “and suggest that at least in the case of the United States, the Israelis currently arriving represent the most gilded of immigrant groups to reach American shores in this century.” [SOBEL, B., p. 149] Jews from Israel in America have been rated with an economic “productivity index of 6.8,” the highest of any ethnic group. “Those Jewish immigrants from Israel,” notes Steven Silbiger, “were seven times more likely to have the highest concentration of higher incomes and the lowest rate of dependency on public assistance than any other group studied.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 4]

Then there are the recent Russian Jewish immigrants to America since the
1970s – approximately 400,000 in the metropolitan New York area alone. As the Jerusalem Post noted in 2000 about the results of an American Jewish Committee survey: “The Russians are the most educated immigrant group in America’s immigrant history and are more highly educated than American Jews as a whole … after six years in the U. S. most of the employed Russians are similar to American Jews in terms of annual income and attitude.” [HENRY, M., 1-13-00, p. 3])

“As early as 1885,” notes Joel Kotkin, “… Jews, mostly from Germany, owned 97% of all the garment factories. By the early twentieth century Jewish domination of the ‘rag trade’ [in America] was virtually complete, with Jews accounting for between 50 and 80 per cent of all haymakers, furriers, seamstresses, and tailors in the country.” [KOTKIN, p. 48-49] By 1915 the “clothing trade” was America’s third largest industry, behind only steel and oil. [LEACH, p. 93] “Jews largely created the American clothing production industry, replacing homemade clothes and tailor-made clothing.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 46] “Jews,” says Milton Plesur, “were the chief source of operatives for the ready-made clothing industry, but by the 1920s, they constituted less than half of the operatives and by mid-century less than 28 percent. In the meantime, Jews have risen to management and ownership, thus achieving almost exclusive control of the entire wearing apparel industry.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 161] The modern bra, for instance, was a Jewish marketing invention, promoted by the Maiden Form Brassiere company owned by William and Ida Rosenthal with Enid Bissett, founded in 1923. Likewise, the suits of “Hattie Carnegie [born Herietta Kanengeiser] led a fashion empire that set the pace of American fashion for nearly three decades.” [HYMAN, p. 207]

In more recent history, Jews have congregated in, and dominated, the “fashion” aspects of the clothing industry – founding everything from Guess, Gitano, Jordache, Calvin Klein, and Levi-Strauss jeans to Ralph [Lifshitz] Lauren cosmetics. (The Jordache and Guess companies – both founded by recent Jewish immigrants to the United States – were involved in particularly nasty lawsuits and underhand unscrupulous maneuvers against each other. The companies’ manipulations are documented in a 1992 volume entitled: Glamour, Greed, and Dirty Tricks in the Fashion Industry: The Bizarre Story of Guess v. Jordache. In 1985, one of the brothers who owns Jordache, Joe Nakash, was elected in Israel to be the president of the Boys’ Town Jerusalem Society. “This is the message I want to convey to those who care about Israel’s future,” Nakash said, “That in addition to providing its students with a superb education, Boys’ Town builds and develops their character, their conviction and their commitment to their homeland.” [JEWISH WEEK, 5-3-85, p. 22]

At Levis-Strauss, in 1982 Robert Haas “became the fifth generation family member to run the company (his father, Walter A. Haas Jr. was CEO from 1958 to 1976.” [MUNK, p. 36] Warren Hirsch, president of Murjani International initiated the blue jean craze in recent years with the designer label “Gloria Vanderbilt.” Alfred Slaner headed Kayser-Roth into the 1980s, “the largest clothing manufacturing establishment in the world.” [GREENBERG, M., p. 73]

French-born Maurice Bidermann (born Maurice Zylberberg) “was the mas-
termind of one of the largest [clothes] manufacturing networks in the world, with thirteen thousand workers in thirty-four factories. Producer of Pierre Cardin and Yves Saint-Laurent suits, his plants in France, the United States and Hong Kong churned out nearly $200 million in designer duds each year … He was the older brother of Régine, the jet-set nightclub owner of New Jimmy’s and Regine’s, in Paris and New York.” [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 196] The president of Bidermann’s companies in the U.S.? Also Jewish. Michael Zelnick.

“Of all the monarchs in the garment industry,” note Steven Gaines and Sharon Churcher, “… Carl Rosen [of Puritan Fashions; Chief Financial Officer: Sam Rubenstein] was the biggest and richest … Rosen owned two Rolls-Royces, both painted gold, and the one he kept at his Palm Springs estate once belonged to the queen mother of England … Reportedly … Carl supplied hookers and dirty weekends to Las Vegas for the buyers.” [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 216] “The [Dan] Millstein name [of coats and suits] had become familiar to every American household … [Seymour] Fox was in a league of his own in the fashion business, a mogul even wealthier than Millstein. Fox was known not only for his exquisite, high-priced fashions but for his grand lifestyle, replete with stretch limousines and a beautiful mistress, the Women’s Wear Daily columnist Carol Bjorkman.” [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 49, 56]


In 1995 another Jewish garment mogul, Calvin Klein, who had a serious problem with cocaine and Quaaludes over the years [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 208], was condemned by a range of parent and social welfare groups for an advertising campaign featuring images by Jewish photographer Stephen Meisel. Adolescent models, notes Henry Giroux, were photographed

“in various stages of undress, poised to offer both sexual pleasures and the fantasy of sexual availability … Angry critics … called the images suggestive and exploitive, and condemned Calvin Klein for using children as sexual commodities. Other critics likened the ads to child pornography.” [GIROUX, p. 16-17]

This was an old theme for Klein. Earlier suggestive commercials with and adolescent Brooke Shields had garnered condemnation from a variety of groups, including a feminist group called Women Against Pornography. (Klein’s key partner in his initial years was fellow Jewish entrepreneur Barry Schwartz. Another Jewish friend, described as Klein’s “mentor,” was Nicholas de Gunzburg, the “fur and fabric editor” of Vogue magazine). [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 97-98]
The **Guess** company (founded by the Jewish Marciano brothers, who share control of the firm with the Nakash family, who are also Jewish) has also followed the same advertising strategy to sell jeans. “Media Watch,” noted the *Los Angeles Times* in 1990, “a feminist group in Santa Cruz, has called for a boycott of **Guess**, charging that its ads demean women, integrating sex with violence.” [SCHACTER, J., 1990, p. D1]

Elsewhere, Estelle Sommers founded the **Capezio** dancewear brand, **Ann Klein** [originally Hannah Golofski] has become a widely recognized “designer” brand, as has **Donna Karan** and her **DKNY** label. **Isaac Mizrahi** and **Tommy Hilfiger** are other famous Jewish fashion brands, as is that of the Iranian-Jewish mogul of perfume and self-promotion, **Bijan** (Pakzad), also known as the “designer of what’s probably the world’s most expensive menswear.” [DORFMAN] **Rudi Gernreich** and **John Weitz** are other Jews who have been prominent fashion designers. Designer **Arnold Scassi**’s last name is Isaacs (his original surname) spelled backwards. **Kenneth Cole** (originally: Kenneth Cohen) developed popular lines of shoes, belts, and leather jackets. **Judith Lieber** manufacturers luxury handbags. **Liz Claiborne** founded her company with her Jewish husband Arthur Ortenberg and Leonard Boxer. She retired in 1989 whereupon Jerome Chazen became chairman of the firm. Other prominent executives in the company are Harvey Falk and Jay Margolis.

In 1988, **Nicholas Coleridge** listed the American “power buyers” (those who buy for stores) of the fashion world. Most of the people listed are Jewish, and a huge percentage of the stores are Jewish-owned:

“Daria Retain, fashion director of **Neiman Marcus**; Ellin Saltzman, director of fashion and product development at **Saks Fifth Avenue**; James Fowler and Mary Talbot, vice-president and design buyer of Jacobsons Stores, Michigan; Kaye von Bergen, designer buyer of Bendel’s; Lois Ziegler and Sue Bicksler, fashion directors of **J.C. Penney**; Bernie Ozer, vice-president of the Associated Merchandising Corporation; Barbara Weiser of Charivari; Barbara Warner, formerly of Barneys, who virtually single-handedly turned the store into an upbeat designer terminus; Lynne Manulis, president of **Marthas**; Joan Weinstein, president of Ultimo; James Sullivan, fashion director of **Jordan Marsh**; Missy Lomonaco, fashion director of **Bonwit Teller**; Betty Hahn, designer buyer of **Garfinkel’s**; Washington; Jean Navin, vice-president and fashion director of **Lord & Taylor**; Kal Ruttenstein, vice-president and fashion director of **Bloomingdales**; Terry Melville, fashion director of **Macy’s**; and Sal Ruggerio of **Marshall Field**, Chicago.” [COLERIDGE, p. 259]

In 2000, the **National Post** noted the heart of the garment district in Montreal, Canada – the Jewish center of Chabenel Street. The article addressed the bribery of store buyers by clothing makers and its long tradition in the Jewish community. (In Yiddish: “**Az men shmert nit, fort men nit.**” – If you don’t bribe, you don’t ride). Kickbacks, noted **Doug Robinson**, a Canadian fraud squad officer is “a dirty secret of the industry.” [KUITENBROWER, P., 4-1-2000, p. D1]

Elsewhere, Israeli-born Elia “Tahari is among the most respected names in
department and specialty stores.” [HOOD, p. 1E] In California Severin Wunderman’s company, the Severin Group ($500 million a year in sales), remains “the sole manufacturer, marketer, and distributor of Gucci timepieces and Fila sports watches.” These products’ retail cost run between $225 and $14,000 apiece. “The word ‘demanding’ is repeatedly used to describe [Severin]. In addition to shouting and breaking things, he has tossed more than one cellular phone out the window of his chauffeur-driven Rolls Royce.” [HOWLETT, p. E1] The head of the French luxury jewelry firm, Cartier, is also Jewish: Alain Dominique Perrin. In 1996, during a visit to Israel, he announced “plans to donate an unspecified percentage of the revenue from the sale of $10 million worth of jewelry to WIZO [the World International Zionist Organization].” [CASHMAN, 1996, p. 14] Kenneth Jay Lane, “the fake jewelry king,” [HORYN, C., 12-12-99, sec. 9, p. 1] is also Jewish. Nudie Cohen, head of Nudie’s, was the “costume designer who pasted Nashville in rhinestones in the 1940s and ‘50s.” [LONGINO, M., 9-8-2000] He supplied the Hollywood/Las Vegas cowboy image to people like Roy Rogers and Gene Autry. Others fitting such stars were “Nathan Turk and his East coast counterpart Rodeo Ben (Bernard Lichtenstein), both Eastern European immigrants” whose “clothes brought western wear into its heyday.” [MOORE, B., 2001, p. E3] Adrian’s was the logo of Adrian Goldberg, a famous dress designer for Hollywood in the 1930s and ‘40s. Sidney Toledano is today’s president and CEO of Christian Dior.

The Chanel company, which makes “the most expensive perfume in the world,” was founded by non-Jew CoCo Chanel, but built to power by the Jewish Wertheimer brothers. As the London Independent notes:

“In 1924 [Chanel] sold 90 per cent of the rights to Chanel No. 5 to Pierre Wertheimer, who, with his brother Paul, owned Bourjois, the largest cosmetics company in France … They bought out Chanel – couture house, perfume and all – in 1954.” [JOBEY, L., 11-27-90, p. 12]

Feeling that “she was being cheated” by the Wertheimers, Chanel had sued them in 1934. [MOUBRAY, J., 2-10-98, p. 18]

Diane von Furstenberg (original name: Diane Simone Michelle Halfin) founded a “fragrance and fashion empire.” Stanley Kohlenberg, head of Revlon’s domestic Group III, was “recognized as one of the premiere marketing men in the fragrance industry.” [GAINES/CHURCH, p. 182] Samuel Rubin founded the Faberge perfume company. Max Factor built a cosmetics empire, including waterproof mascara and long-lasting lipstick. Helena Rubenstein sold “beauty and royalty.” “The names [of Jewish entrepreneurs] Helena Rubenstein and Estee Lauder [born Josephine Esther Menzer] became virtual synonyms for cosmetics in the twentieth century.” [HYMAN, p. 27] Adrien Arpel opened 500 skin care salons across America. “A legend in the cosmetics industry…. although Arpel is not a formally observant woman, she is very conscious of her Jewish identity.” [HYMAN, p. 67-68] Vidal Sassoon built an business empire based on hair care. (Sassoon, funder of a research unit on anti-Semitism at an Israeli university, was the recipient of the first American Jewish Congress “Beauty Hall of Fame” award). Non-Jew Grace Mirabella, for 17 years the editor of Vogue magazine, notes that
“all the models, actresses, and photographers of London” hung out a Sassoon’s hair studios. [MOIRABELLA, G., 1995, p. 127]

Jack Rosen is chairman of the **Hazel Bishop** cosmetics company (as well as being the CEO and chairman of **Continental Health Affiliates** and the CEO of **Infu-Tech**, two major health care corporations). [PR NEWSWIRE, 3-13-98] Shirley Polykoff at Clairol introduced to America her advertising catchphrases: “Does she or doesn’t she?,” ‘If I have only one life to lead, let me live it as a blonde,’ and ‘Hate that gray, wash it away.” [BAER, p. 158]

The Gottleib family founded the **Gottex** swimwear line. Marvin Winkler (philanthropist of an Orthodox Chabad “Immigrant Camp” in Hollywood) and Jay Schottenstein bought the **Gotcha** surf wear company in 1996 (also including the **MCD** and **GirlStar** brands. Adam Tihany is one of America’s best known upscale “restaurant designers,” his work includes Manhattan’s Le Cirque 2000. Maurice Stein owns **Burbank**, “one of the world’s largest suppliers of cosmetics, skin, and hair products to the entertainment industry.” [WILGOREN, p. A1] Israeli-born Gil Gamlieli is co-owner of “Manhattan’s celebrated **Gil Gamlieli Beauty Group**.” [EPSTEIN, M., p. T6] Even a Satmar hasidic Jew, Victor Jacobs, is CEO and Chairman of **Allou Health and Beauty Care**.

Chicago’s Irving Harris became a millionaire with his **ToniHome Permanent**. **Mr. Blackwell** – creator of the world’s “worst” and “best” dressed lists, is a Jewish fashion designer who changed his name from Richard Selzer to Dick Ellis to, lastly, Blackwell. Britain’s Trevor Spero founded the **Flame** model agency and **Scene** magazine, which covers the fashion industry. New York’s **Fashion Institute of Technology** “grew from the dream of a small group of successful Eastern European Jewish immigrant manufacturers … [who ultimately created] a thriving college of art and design, business and technology. [NEWS-DAY, p. A39] FIT’s chairman of the board was still in Jewish hands in 1998, in the person of Edwin Goodman. “By the late 1930s,” notes **Henry Feingold**, “Jews could be also found in the creative departments of the full-service advertising agencies as the experts in marketing surveys, motivation research, and the psychology of consumption.” [FEINGOLD, p. 104]

Brett Goldberg sells Dead Sea mud as a skin lotion. His business (**Ahava’s** hand cream) took off when he met and married Eve Berenblum, head of **Sak’s** cosmetics department. The American-born Goldberg has dual American-Israeli citizenship and volunteered for the Israeli army. [BERMAN/SANDERS, 1-11-99] Sydell Miller and her husband Arnold started **Matrix Essential**, a hair care and skin products company. Sidney Kimmel heads the Jones **Apparel Group**; its clothing lines include **Jones New York**, **Evan-Picone**, **Saville**, **Nine West** shoe stores, and movie production interests. The CEO of the **Jo Ann Stores** chain (1065 stores nationwide; also sometimes called **Cloth World** and **Jo Ann Fabrics**) is Alan Rosskamm. Co-founded by his father, the firm’s 1997 sales alone were $975 million. Bob Sockolow is the president and CEO of San Francisco based **Rochester Big and Tall Clothing**. The founders of the **Banana Republic** clothing retail chain were Bill Rosenszweig, and Mel and Patricia Ziegler. The **Eddie Bauer** outdoor clothing empire is headed of course by Eddie
Bauer; he is also Jewish. Jeffrey Swartz is the president and CEO of the Timberland shoe and boot firm.

In 1997 The Limited Inc. (Leslie Wexner, CEO) was accused by the AFL-CIO of subcontracting garment work in the Dominican Republic that paid workers $21 for an 80-hour work week. The Limited’s 3,000 outlets and brands include Abercrombie and Fitch, Structure, Express, Lane Bryant, Henri Bendel, Bath & Body Works, and Victoria’s Secret, among others. [FORWARD, 5-30-97, p. 1] (Abercrombie and Fitch’s 2001 summer catalogue attracted a coalition of groups as diverse as the National Organization for Women and Concerned Christian Americans in protest. The catalogue was condemned as “soft porn.” An earlier A&F catalogue – Naughty or Nice – was “denounced” by the Michigan attorney general’s office.”) [CRARY, D., 6-22-01] In 1986, Linda Wachner, also Jewish, president of Max Factor, U.S. Division, maneuvered a hostile takeover of the Warnaco Group, effectively seizing control of much of the women’s underwear market (including the brand names Warners, Olga, Valentino, Scaagi, Ungaro, Bob Mackie, and Fruit of the Loom). Wachner was henceforth the CEO of Wanaco, “one of the highest paid and most powerful businesswomen in America in the 1990s.” [HYMAN, p. 27] Elsewhere, Howard Gross is the CEO of Miller’s Outpost’s chain of 220 stores; Robert Siegel became the CEO of the Stride Rite store chain in 1993. Donald Fisher is founder and CEO of the giant clothes retailer The Gap. He too is Jewish, [ALT-MAN-OHR, A., 4-14-2000, p. 64A] as is Millard Drexler, another top executive at the company.

By 1984 41% of Jewish households had an income of $50,000 or more, four times the proportion of non-Hispanic whites. [SILBERMAN, p. 118; SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 4] And while Jews constitute just 2.5 per cent of the American population, by 1990 more than twice as many Jews as non-Jewish whites had household incomes over $50,000 a year; the average Jewish American’s income was also two to three times higher than the average of all other Americans. Two-thirds of all adult American Jews between the ages of 25 and 64 had graduated from colleges or universities, worked as professionals or managers, and lived in households with incomes over $50,000 per year. [ZUCKERMAN, A. p. 22] As 2.5% of America’s population, by the late 1980s Jews “accounted for 13% of executives under the age of 40.” [ROIPHE/CHANES, p. 451] By 1990, almost 90% of American Jews were in white-collar occupations. The rest tended to work as jewelers, watchmakers, waiters, hairdressers, cosmetologists, electronic repair technicians, or in security careers. [HARTMAN, p. 118] “The pace of socio-economic change,” says Calvin Goldscheider and Alan Zuckerman, “and the levels attained are exceptional features of Jews compared to non-Jews.” [LIPSET, Unique, p. 3]

In a study of Boston Jews in 1975, 60% of Jewish males in the work force were categorized as professionals. One quarter of them were physicians. Less than 3% of Boston’s male Jewish workforce (ages 30-39) could be classified as “workers.” [GOLDSCHIEDER, JOBS, p 5] By 1996, Jews were “two to three times more likely to work as professionals or managers than other Americans
... For several decades now, Jews have been distinguished by their extraordinary socioeconomic achievements.” [WILDER, E., 6-96]

For Jews of Eastern European heritage, their dramatic trajectory of wealth building in America has occurred in the last century or so. “The Jewish explanation for their common affluence,” says Liebman and Cohen, “is ‘the myth of the lower East Side,’ according to which Jews arrived in the United States as an impoverished group and by dint of hard work, sacrifice, and determination rose to prosperity … It is not too far-fetched to suggest that this myth also alleviates the guilt that Jews may feel over their present prosperity and material comfort.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 17]

“Even when compared to others of similar social characteristics,” says Stephen Whitfield, “such as years of education, Jewish families still earn more. Even in families with no one working, Jewish families earn more.” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 7] “Jewish academics,” noted Marshall Sklare in 1974, “… are also considerably more prosperous on the average than their Gentile counterparts.” [SKLARE, 1974, p. 20] “Earnings from investments of one sort or another are apparently greater among Jews,” notes economist Thomas Sowell, “as are other advantages based on the past.” [KREFETZ, p. 8]

Asserting fears of anti-Semitism, Jews try to keep their collective economic power from being widely known by non-Jews. “Some Jews,” writes Edward Shapiro, “are embarrassed by references to Jewish affluence for fear that any discussion will encourage the anti-Semitic stereotype of vast Jewish wealth and economic power … Marxists, true to the teachings of the founder of their cult, have continued to identify Jews and Judaism (and now Israel) with commercial exploitation and capitalism. Little wonder, then, that Jews and their friends, despite evidence to the contrary, and even though they themselves know better, prefer to deny, ignore, or explain away Jewish wealth. … Jews would prefer to believe, and have others believe, that they are like everyone else, only more so. This stance has the advantage of not attracting attention.” [SHAPIRO, p. 9]

“Given that the myth of the ‘all-powerful Jew’ is identified with Nazi propaganda,” says Lenni Brenner, “it should not surprise us that there are still many people who are squeamish about bringing attention to the sociological changes that have converted a community once unique in America for its mass radicalism into a pillar of capitalism.” [BRENNER, p. 61] “Even today,” noted Steven Silbiger in 2000, “many Jewish people would rather reserve the subject of their success for private conversations rather than fuel the fires of anti-Semitism. Older Jewish-Americans, in particular, have downplayed their success and their Judaism in an effort to avoid unwanted attention and possible trouble.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 3]

Harry Golden notes Jewish economic standing in a religion-based report in the 1957 Bureau of Census survey and Jewish organization attempts to hide this information:

“This report, intended to furnish data on the economic and social characteristics of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, was almost immediately suppressed at the insistence of religious organizations and groups. Nota-
ble among these groups and organizations were the Jewish social-action agencies, who feared the news about Jewish incomes, education levels, and mobility would feed anti-Semitism.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 6]

“From Buenos Aires to Baghdad,” says Joshua Halberstam, “from the days of Rome to the present, the world talks about Jews and their special relationship to wealth … The really peculiar part of these slogans about Jews and money … is the equivocation with which Jews react to the charges … Proud of their financial achievements, American Jews often congratulate themselves and their success, but when a non-Jew points to the same Jewish affluence, American Jews become extremely nervous and suspect lurking anti-Semitism.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 10] “Writing about money and Jews is inflammatory no matter how cautious it is handled,” wrote Gerald Krefetz in an apologetic introduction to his book, Jews and Money, (1982), “As I examined the available literature on the subject it became clear to me that in recent years no one had scrutinized the scope of contemporary Jewish economic activity in America. The reason for this neglect was not hard to find: … the subject of Jews and money was best not discussed for fear of raising the anti-Semitic ghost again.” [KREFETZ, p. ix, x] When Jewish economic power is (rarely) openly addressed, Jewish dissimulation strategy is usually to emphasize the risky, precarious nature of their business dealings and their supposed relative marginality to the American social, economic, and political system. [SHAPIRO, p. 9]

“Those who do not want to confront the reality of the wealth of the richest portions of modern Jewry,” notes Brenner, “tend to overemphasize the poverty of the poorest section.” [BRENNER, p. 61] In 1983, for instance, some Jewish organizations were claiming that 13-15% of American Jewry was “economically disadvantaged and vulnerable.” Such a figure, however, notes Lenny Brenner, is afforded by an American Jewish Committee study which defines “poverty among Jews at 150 per cent of the Federally defined poverty level … Two-thirds of the poor are elderly. A large proportion of these are widows.” As early as 1955, researchers were noting that Jews were “underrepresented in the population below or close to the poverty line.” [WEYL, 1968, p. 173]

As early as 1902, Isaac Max Rubinow, a Jewish medical inspector for the New York Board of Health wrote:

“I must express my conviction (which will evoke protest among the intelligentsia of New York) that the Jewish masses are better off economically than the other immigrants [to America], and extreme poverty is not prevalent in the Jewish section. I think that I am familiar with the horrors of dire poverty. As a medical inspector for the New York Board of Health I had to spend several months in the poorer sections of Brooklyn. When I beheld the privations of the Irish, the Italians, the Negroes and others, I had to admit that the condition of the Russian-Jewish masses is more or less satisfactory.” [RUBINOW, I., 1959, p. 96]

“The percentage of Jewish households with income less than $20,000 is half that of non-Jews.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 4] The Jewish working class appears to be vanishing from all but the largest communities,” wrote Jewish sociologist
Marshall Sklare in 1955, “– the phenomenon of an American Jewish working class may turn out to be characteristic only of the immigrant era.” [SKLARE, M., 1955, p. 215]

“It is disingenuous to pretend,” says W. D. Rubenstein,

“that since the end of the war there has not been a fundamental change in the status of Western Jewry … Understandable reluctance to discuss Jewish socio-economic advantage in an explicit fashion has led to the neglect of an important trend: the steady rise of Western Jewry into the upper-middle class, together with the broadening of Jewish membership in the institutional elites of most Western countries … The rise of Western Jewry to unparalleled affluence and high status has led to the near-disappearance of a Jewish proletariat of any size: indeed, the Jews may become the first ethnic group in history without a working class of any size.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 51]

This increasingly elite caste status for Jews throughout the world is not true in Israel, of course, because that country’s population is largely Jewish. Any elite caste depends upon—and is supported by—a large sub-caste beneath it. Although there is an institutionally enforced Arab underclass in Israel, the assumption of wealth, power, and status for all Jews as a class in that nation is impossible because it necessitates the economic exploitation of the local population, which is largely other Jews too. This, notes Israeli sociologist Sammy Smooha, poses a paradoxical problem for the Judeocentric Israeli state: “In contrast to Jews in western societies where they constitute a negligible minority (for instance, Jews in the U.S. number only 2.5 percent of the population) and where therefore most of them can reach the highest strata, most Jews in Israel cannot be in top positions as long as Jews make up 85% or more of the population.” [SMOOHA, S., p. 176] Or as Jay Gonen, another Israeli commentator, put it:

“Everywhere in the world the Jews are the most successful businessmen, but not in Israel, everywhere else they are financial wizards, but not in Israel. You know why? Because here in Israel they can only deal with other Jews.” [GONEN, J., 1975, p. 274]

What is not explicitly stated here by such Jewish commentators (although it is certainly inferred) is that the Jewish diaspora’s economic, political, and social self-advancement in capitalist society—as a collectivity—is contingent upon the exploitation of Gentiles below it. In Israel, by the demographic dictates of Israeli policy that insist upon a strong Jewish population dominance, (even with the import of cheap Arab labor from Gaza and the West Bank) there are not enough exploitable non-Jews to go around. (One might argue, however, that the $3 billion a year the United States government provides for the Jewish state, and similar funds from other nations, thanks to international Jewish lobbying, is a collective kind of exploitation of non-Jewish lands). Per Israeli scholar Simha Flapan notes that “the 1.25 million Palestinians who came under Israeli rule provide cheap labor for the Israeli economy, supplying nearly 100,000 workers for agriculture, public works, construction, light industries, and private services. The Palestinians became Israel’s ‘water carriers and hewers
Jewish workers moved up the social ladder to positions of management, the professions, trade, and public service.” [FLAPAN, S., 1987, p. 239]

All this, of course, has profound implications. Harry Triandis, while not addressing the Jewish dimensions to the issue, notes the broader context in America for the growing elite as a significant part of the American upper classes:

“The gulf between the rich and the poor is becoming larger. In the 18th century the gross national product per capita … of the rich was twice that of the poor; in 1950 this ratio had become 50 to 1; in 1990 it was 70 to 1.” [TRIANDIS, p. 15]

Today’s Jewish high status and attendant world view represent the material opposite of much of immigrant American Jewry’s sense of itself at the turn of the twentieth century. As Hasia Diner notes:

“Both left-wing radicalism and Zionism shaped the political and ideological lives of many Jews who emigrated to the United States beginning in the 1880s … [DINER, p. 7] … Socialism proved such an attractive political philosophy to these immigrant Jews because of the brutal sweatshop conditions under which so many worked, usually in factories owned by other Jews … [DINER, p. 9] … [In 1925] such predominantly Jewish unions as the ILGWU, the United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers, and the Furrier’s Union all sent [communist] May Day greetings to … the black socialist magazine, the Messenger.” [DINER, p. 202]

This radically universalist expression, or whatever else it was (transitory strategy to deconstruct the existing Christian-oriented culture?), has proven over the years to have been remarkably illusory and shallow—merely a means to a self-promotive end—as Jewry has quickly ascended the American economic ladder. As Arthur Hertzberg notes about America’s early twentieth century Russian Jewish population, supposedly rooted so deeply in socialist ethics, “Jews were uniquely visible in this stampede toward wealth because they were moving more rapidly upward from the poverty of their youth than any other group in America. This intense passion for success was noted by others, and not always with approval.” [HERTZBERG, A., 1989, p. 331]

(In Latin America too, notes Judith Elkin, immigrant Jews were quick to dismiss their European-based socialist political radicalism in their new environments: “Jews had never developed linkages with non-Jewish campesinos; … Contact with the proletariat was broken. This is a startling fact, considering that so large and so vocal a portion of Jewish immigrants arrived with leftist and universalist ideals.”) [ELKIN, 1998, p. 148]

As Nathan Glazer noted about the American social and political world in 1971:

“All the roles that Jews play are roles that the New Left disapproves of, and wishes to reduce … [The Left is critical] of all private business, and of its whole associated institutional complex—lawyers, stockbrokers, accountants, etc.—in which Jews are prominent. The kinds of society it ad-
mires have no place for occupations in which Jews have tended to cluster in recent history.” [SHAPIRO, E., 1999, p. 199]

As early as the mid-twentieth century, American Jewry was already largely stratified out of the traditional “working class.” In a survey of 14 American cities between 1948-53, proportions of Jews in “non-manual positions (i.e., proprietors, managers, administrators, officials, clerks, salespeople, etc.) ranged from 75 to 96% of the Jewish working population.” [SKLARE, p. 138] “The distinction between manual and non-manual work,” wrote Nathan Glazer in 1958, in reviewing the survey,

“is today considered a crucial one for determining the social status of individuals and groups … [GLAZER, MIDDLE, p. 139] … The rise in the proportion of professionals has been accompanied by a fall in the number of Jews engaged in the lower-levels of white-collar work – as clerks and salesmen … The rapid decline in the numbers of Jewish secretaries and salesmen in recent years is a phenomenon apparent to the naked eye; the available figures support this impression … [GLAZER, p. 139] … What has happened … is that the Jewish economic advantages, already perfectly obvious in the thirties … has borne fruit in the fifteen years of prosperity since 1940.” [SKLARE, p. 139] (By 1970, one-third of one percent of American Jews were involved in manual labor occupations. [HALBERSTAM, p. 27])

Glazer found the 1953 research intriguing for other reasons too. No matter what field of economic endeavor Jews chose, and no matter where they chose it in America, Jews earned more money than non-Jews, even those in the same locale, with the same education, and the same occupation. To explain this endemic disparity, Glazer notes that

“Ultimately, social explanations must resort to history, and explain a present peculiarity by discovering any earlier one. We think the explanation for the Jewish success in America is that the Jews, far more than any other immigrant group, were engaged for generations in the middle-class occupations, the professions, and buying and selling.” [SKLARE, p. 142]

“Whereas many [immigrant] Poles,” says Andrew Heinze, “looked for unskilled jobs in the steel industry and thus settled in industrial towns like those of Pennsylvania, Jews from the same part of the Old World concentrated in major cities where they could work in skilled and semi-skilled trades and in retailing, the occupations for which they were prepared … Digging coal, forging steel, laying railroad track, and building bridges did not bring newcomers into contact with the trends and nuances of American fashion. The manufacture and sale of ladies’ underwear, children’s’ dresses, and men’s’ suits did.” [HEINZE, p. 99]

University of Michigan professor Arthur Evans Wood noted in 1955 some interesting information in his sociological study of the Polish enclave of Hamtramck in Detroit. 70% of the 43,000 residents of Hamtramck were (non-Jewish) Poles or of Polish (also peasant) heritage, attracted there to work in
local automobile factories. The City Attorney for the city was Jewish, however, William Cohen. Although there were few, if any, Jews living in Hamtramck, he also was co-owner of one of the city’s two main newspapers, the *Hamtramck Citizen*. “A fascinating additional reminder of an old world situation,” wrote Wood,

“is to be found in the dependence of the Poles in Hamtramak upon the Jewish attorney, Bill Cohen, for frequent legal services. The relationship is somewhat like that between the village folk and the Jewish tavern keeper [in the Old Country] … The serviceableness of Cohen to various and opposed Polish [political] factions over the years is reminiscent of an old Polish proverb, ‘*Jak bida, to do zyda.*’ (when in need go to the Jew).” [WOOD, A.E., p. 80, 233, 84]

Edward Kantowicz, in his study of Polish Americans in Chicago, notes

“Throughout much of partitioned Poland, Polish-Jewish relations consisted of Polish peasants bargaining for goods or money with Jewish shopkeepers and moneylenders. Such an economic relation led often to ill feelings and a pervasive sentiment among peasants that they were being exploited by the Jews. In America, Poles and Jews often ended up in a similar economic relationship. Whereas the peasant Poles generally took up industrial work in the New World, the Jews frequently continued in occupations similar to those they had practiced in the Pale. Thus the business streets of [Chicago’s] Polonia were lined with many shops and stores owned by immigrant Jews, and the Poles again found themselves dealing day by day with Jewish shopkeepers and moneylenders. Very early this caused resentment. In 1895 one Polish newspaper called for an increased Polish effort to establish and patronize their own businesses since ‘the Jews, the leeches of Polish society, have monopolized business in this section of town.” [KANTOWICZ, E., 1975, p. 118]

A 1950s-era study of the Jews of Detroit, Michigan, found:

“There are extremely large differences in the occupational structures of Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant families. A large majority of the heads of Jewish families hold white-collar jobs (73 percent); the heads of non-Jewish families, especially Catholics and Negro Protestants, are heavily concentrated in the blue-collar occupations. Jewish family heads are particularly clustered in the ‘proprieter, manager, and official’ classification. The proportion of Jews in these ‘tradesmen’ jobs (42 percent) is between three and four times greater than that for Catholics or white Protestants … The contrast in occupational distribution of the fathers of Jewish and non-Jewish family heads is enormous. Approximately 75 percent of the non-Jewish fathers were in farming or held blue-collar jobs, whereas almost the same proportion of Jewish fathers were in white-collar occupations. Many of the Jewish fathers who held white-collar jobs were probably hucksters, peddlers, or small trades, and merchants; but the fact remains that their background was typically urban … One of the most striking features of the economic status of Jewish
families in Detroit is that almost one-half of the family heads are self-employed, although only 10 per cent or less of the heads of non-Jewish Detroit area families work for themselves ... The median annual income of the heads of Jewish families during the 1951 to 1954 period was $6,200. This figure is considerably larger than the median incomes of non-Jewish family heads. The high Jewish income, of course, is related to the upper occupational status of the group. The large number of Jewish family heads who made $10,000 or more annually is striking. One-third of the heads of Jewish families earned this much money, as compared with less than one-tenth of the heads of non-Jewish groups. [GOLDBERG/SHARP, 1960, p. 113, 114]

More recently, in addressing the claim by many Jews that their community is “a light unto nations” with higher moral standards than others, Lenny Brenner, a Jewish critic, notes that “modern Judaism is a light unto no one ... American Judaism is the paradigm of hollow worldly success.” [BRENNER, p 357] Concerning the possible movement by some Jews from the Jewish tradition of self-employment into salaried professions and the effect it could have on donations to Jewish causes, Steven Cohen remarks that

“One need not be overly cynical to realize that self-employed entrepreneurs have a greater ability to hide their income from the Internal Revenue Service than do most salaried professionals.” [BRENNER, p. 79]

In recent years, according to one Jewish count, of the top fourteen American billionaires, at least four were Jewish. [SHAPIRO, p. 8] Of the 40 wealthiest Americans, sixteen (40%) were Jewish, as were 23% of the four hundred richest Americans. “Or,” says Joshua Halberstam, “to put this another way, there are more Jewish billionaires in the United States than the total number of billionaires of France and England combined.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 12] Every year the Forbes “rich list” as an extraordinarily disproportionate number of Jews. Jewish author Steven Silbiger examined the 1999 Forbes “richest 400 people” list and announced that

“Jewish individuals accounted for 23 percent of the entire group, 36 percent of the top fifty and 24 percent of the billionaires – eleven, eighteen, and twelve times their relative percentage in the U.S. population at large. And these percentages in the Forbes 400 have been consistent over time, although the players change from year to year; studies of the lists from 1982, 1983, and 1984 conducted by others reveal similar figures.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 86]

Silbiger, investigating who exactly of this list was Jewish, explored public information sources and knowledgeable Jewish organizations. As Silbiger discovered, 15 of these moguls do not wish to be known publicly, at least in this wealth context, as Jewish; the rest of Silbiger’s 1999 list is rendered here (http://jewishtribalreview.org/forbes.htm). An earlier (1980) list of America’s wealthiest Jews may be found here (http://jewishtribalreview.org/1980.htm).

As early as 1955 a researcher suggested that 20% of America’s millionaires
were Jewish, and Jewry at-large accounted for 10% of America’s total personal income, [WEYL, 1968, p. 173] about four times their percentage of the population. By 1973, Harry Golden noted that “New York [the heart of the American business and communications empire] is the one city Jews transformed into a Jewish city. They are the warp and woof of its fabric … Jews own roughly 80 percent of New York City’s businesses.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 8-9]

And the other American economic and mass media nerve center: Los Angeles? As Joel Kotkin noted in 2001,

“In the neighborhoods and marketplaces that comprise 21st-century Los Angeles, two ethnic groups predominate: Jews and Latinos. Although others, including Asians, African Americans and Anglo Gentiles, play important roles, these two groups shape the social, economic and cultural contours of the city … Jews reign over many of the most dynamic parts of the city’s economy, from Hollywood to real estate, from cyberspace to the garment business. They are well-represented at both the elite and grassroots levels of L.A. business. Jews, whether from Eastern Europe or the Middle East, boast among the highest entrepreneurship rates of any group in the city’s ethnic mosaic, according to Cal State Northridge demographer James Allen; nearly half the Los Angeles Business Journal’s list of richest Angelinos are Jews … Unlike Jews and Gentiles, or African Americans, Jews and Latinos share little history or mythology. For the most part, their contacts have been opportunistic. Jews have employed Latinos in garment factories, as maids and gardeners and serviced them as customers in a host of enterprises from Whittier Boulevard to Santee Alley and Pico-Union.” [KOTKIN, J., 3-25-01, pt. M, p. 1]

In 1999, Jewish Canadian billionaires included Barry Sherman ($1.83 billion), Leslie Dan ($1.56 billion), and Saul Feldberg ($1 billion). Sherman is chairman and CEO of the Apotex pharmaceutical firm, and Dan heads rival Novopharm Ltd. “[These] two Toronto-based companies control about 90 percent of Canada’s market for generic, low-cost drugs.” [CANADIAN PRESS NEWSWIRE, 2-6-97] Sherman “donates heavily to Jewish causes and the state of Israel.” [THOMPSON, A. 2-11-92, p. C1] Dan funded a CD-Rom produced by Israel’s Yad Vashem “to help teach the Holocaust.” [CANADIAN JEWISH NEWS, 12-5-96] (From America, Harold Snyder founded Biocraft Laboratories, a manufacturer of drugs, in 1964. It was sold to the largest pharmaceutical company in Israel, Teva, in 1996, an organization where Snyder serves as a board member.) [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] The third Jewish Canadian billionaire, Feldberg, a Holocaust survivor, moved to Israel, and later to Canada. He heads the Global Group and the Teknion Corporation, two office furniture conglomerates. [GILBERT, N., 7-2-98, p. 15] In earlier years, Max Tanenbaum was “the leading Jewish industrialist in Canada.” [DRABINSKY, G., 1995, p. 120]

Also in Canada, “the proportion of Jews earning over $75,000 [per year] in 1991 was close to four times that in the Canadian population as a whole.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1995, p. 235] In Spain, by 1991, the Koplowitz family’s construction empire was worth $1.2 billion.
In France, when Marcel Dassault [born Marcel Bloch] died in 1987 he was “the richest man in France.” [FONG, p. 148] He was a member of the French Parliament and had founded the aviation company that manufactured the Mirage fighter jet. Dassault was born a Jew, but formally converted to Christianity. Another French mogul of Jewish descent, Marcel Bleustein-Blanchet died in 1996. He was the founder and chairman of Publicis, “the giant advertising company he founded as a teenager.” Bleuistein-Blanchet “gave France its first advertising agency, its first radio news program, and its first opinion polls.” [THOMAS, R., 1996, p. 50] Publicis has offices today in 19 countries (top two executives in 1996: Elizabeth Badinter and Michael Levy). Also, “the Citroën, one of France’s most popular cars, is named for a Jew [Gustave André Citroen] who was a pioneer in France’s automotive industry … During World War I he produced munitions for the French government, but at the war’s end he turned to the mass production of automobiles.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 108-109] [Today’s richest person in France in 2002? http://jewishtribalreview.org/bettencourt.htm]

According to Forbes magazine, by 1998 Michael Dell was the seventh richest person on the planet, worth $16.5 billion, and also the youngest to have ever been listed on the Forbes 500 “rich list.” He is the head of the Dell computer company, a direct-sales firm. Dell is an active philanthropist in the Austin, Texas, Jewish community. In 2001, Dell Ventures, a division of Dell Computers, announced plans to invest in hi-tech development in Israel. [GORDON, B., 1-21-01]

In 1999, the richest man in Los Angeles was also Jewish, Gary Winnick (worth over $6 billion). “Winnick is the fastest among today’s top entrepreneurs to make his first billion dollars. He did it in a breathtaking 18 months.” [TUGEND, 10-1-99] Syndicated columnist Richard Reeves calls the first time he ever saw Winnick “one of the most disgusting events I’ve endured in many years of watching the way the world works.” Because Winnick had paid a sizeable sum for a Democratic Party fund-raiser, he was afforded time to speak to the crowd. “This egomaniac,” wrote Reeves, “who could afford the tab got up and rambled on about how rich and daring he was and how great his kids were.” Then he put a cap with his telecommunications company’s logo (Global Crossing) on the head of Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. “It made you cringe to be a citizen of the world’s greatest democracy,” wrote Reeves. “But that’s the way it works these days.” Winnick’s company expected to lay 100,000 miles of fiber-optic cable to 27 countries and 200 cities by mid-2001. He has pledged $40 million to start an institute named after himself in Israel. “He also funds other pro-Israel programs.”[MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

In Great Britain, the (London) Daily Mail noted a 1999 study by a credit research organization, Experian:

“A survey identifying Britain’s wealthiest family names by their postcard areas has produced a fascinating insight into the national makeup of the 50 surnames most common among the movers and shakers… More than 20 are from Jewish families … There are more Cohens in the top group than any other family name. Just behind are Levy, Bloom, and Wolf
MONEY, CLASS, AND POWER

… This [trend] is confirmed by other surveys, for instance the Sunday Times Rich 1999, which featured three Cohens, Betterware multimillionaire Andrew, Courts furniture chain tycoon Bruce, and DIY store boss Frank. Hugely wealthy Levys include 59-year old Peter, chairman of the London-based Shaftsbury property company, while the Wolfs are represented by Sir John, a legend in Britain’s films.” [POULTER, p. 19]

Jews are approximately half of one percent of England’s population, but, in 2001, 14 of them ranked among Great Britain’s 100 richest people. Joe Lewis is the wealthiest, worth 2.2 billion pounds. “Mr. Lewis made his fortune in the restaurant trade and, subsequently, in foreign exchange dealing.” Mark Pears (and family) is worth about 600 million pounds, owning about “20,000 flats and houses.” Jewish concerns of the Pears clan include Maccabi Union and Jewish Care. Gerald Ronson, based in real estate, is worth 75 million pounds, and David Lewis and family (“fashion, property, travel, and banking”) are worth 350 million pounds. [LEVITT/KOHEN, 4-27-01, p. 14]

The story in Australia, where Jews represent less than a half of one percent of population, is the same. As that continent’s Jewish ethnic magazine Generation. Jewish Life observed in 2000:

“Every year they are out there for all to see. There it is, in full salacious detail: the BRW Rich List, that quintessence of pennies envy, the vehicle of voyeurism that sums up the worst and most popular features of modern journalism. Each year, it parades the names of Australia’s wealthiest, and the Jewish ones are always prominent. In fact, this year, their collective wealth totaled more than $23 billion, close to 40 percent of New Zealand’s GDP. The names themselves are all too familiar. There’s shopping centre king and former delivery truck driver Frank Lowy ($2.6 billion) and the cardboard magnate Richard Pratt. They are the second and third richest men in Australia.” [Others noted include the Smorgon family, Scheinberg family, Harry Triguboff, Boris Lieberman, John Gandel, Solly Lew, Marc Besen, Nathan Werdiger, Joseph Gutnick, Ted Lustig, Max Moar, Eddie Kornhauser, Isador Magid, Barry and Norman Bloom, Chaim Liberman, Morry Fraid, Ruben Fried, Nathan Baron, Henry Krongold, Isi Liebler, Drvin Graf, Peter Joss, Eddie Kornhauser, Henry Roth, Philip Wolanski, Rodney, Kathy, and Roxanne Adler, Ruth Simon and David Herrman] … “The Jews on the BRW list represent a group that accounts for a ridiculously small proportion of the general population – only 0.4 percent in fact, according to the 1996 Census. So why the prominence?” [GETTLER, L., 2000, p. 23]

Jewish observer Leon Gettler suggests possible reasons for Jewish prominence in Australian wealth-building, including an immigrant ethic, Talmudic principles, Jewish networking (“Maybe it’s just the tribal nature of the Jews”), chutzpah (pushiness), peer pressure (“keeping up with the Cohens”), a this-world materialist focus, and a survivalist mentality. (“Many of the Jews who graced the BRW Rich Lists emerged from the ashes of the Holocaust.”) [GETTLER, L., p. 23-27]
In America, in comparison to other minority communities, there are no Hispanics and one Black in the Forbes “richest 400 people” list, minority populations that are larger in America than their Jewish counterparts. [LIPSET, p. 4] “When I read through the [1996] Newsweek story of the ‘Overclass 100,’” wrote Jewish journalist Philip Weiss, “I began counting the Jews, something I’ve done since childhood, but soon gave up, overwhelmed by my tribe’s prevalence among the powerful, troubled by what this means in the new American class paradigm of haves and have-nots.” [WEISS, p. 27] “The Jewish economic and social profile diverges dramatically from that of Gentile Americans,” notes Edward Shapiro, “Jews are wealthier, more likely to be found in the professions, academia, and the upper ranks of business, and attend universities in greater numbers … Jews in Canada, Central and South America, and Europe exhibit the same characteristics.” [SHAPIRO, E., 1998]

From a total American Jewish population of about six million, by 1992 Matti Golan (an Israeli government official) noted that over 300,000 Jewish households (of a total population of about six million people) in America had incomes over a million dollars a year. [GOLAN p. 60] “Will there be as many Jews receiving Nobel Prizes in the 21st century as in the 20th?” wonders Emanuel Rackman in the Jewish Week; “There is cause for pessimism in Jewish circles, and I cannot dispel it. The likelihood is that more Jews will be in Forbes’ listing of multi-millionaires but not on lists of those making giant contributions to the advancement of science … Supreme value is now placed on the acquisition of wealth rather than intellectual and moral excellence.” [RACKMAN, 1-8-88, p. 24]

By 1993 the two most highly paid corporate executives in the U.S. were Jewish – one at a Hollywood studio, and the other at a Wall Street investment bank. [CANTOR, p. 404] Most of Jewish wealth is self-made in the last century or so (as opposed to Gentile-inherited opulence), [WHITFIELD, American, p. 7] a trajectory that has no reason to plateau. About half of the Jewish super-rich built their fortunes in real estate and construction, most notably in the New York City area, but also all across the country, including Detroit, San Francisco, Miami, Washington DC, Indianapolis, and Oklahoma City. [LIPSET, p. 15] Edward S. Shapiro specifically cites Jewish “real estate barons” Alfred Taubman in Detroit, Melvin Simon in Indianapolis, Stephen Muss in Miami, Monte and Alfe Goldman in Oklahoma City and Walter Shorenstein in San Francisco. [SHAPIRO, 1987, p. 14]

“In real estate and construction,” adds Abraham Korman, “there have been major Jewish builders in San Francisco (Walter Shorenstein), Detroit (Philip and Max Stollman), New York (Samuel Lefrak), and Washington [DC] (Charles Smith) … Melvin Simon of Indianapolis is one of the major shopping center developers in this country.” [KORMAN, p. 24] The Simon Property Group is indeed “the nation’s largest mall owner in the United States, “including the Mall of America in Minneapolis. [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] “In the construction and real estate fields,” notes Milton Presur, “there are such giants as Webb and Knapp; the Uris Brothers; Tishman; Levitt; and Rudin and Wolfson Enterprises.” [PRESUR, M., 1982, p. 163]
San Francisco's Walter Shorenstein owns “one of the nation's largest and healthiest real estate empires,” [KING, R., p. AS1] worth $405 million. He was noted in 1999 by the San Francisco Examiner as “San Francisco's biggest landlord,” owning “about 25 percent of the city's downtown rental property.” [BRAZIL, E., 11-5-99, p. A4] Also in San Francisco, Richard Swig – winner of Israel's Golda Meir award – founded the posh Fairmount hotel chain; he also served as on positions for the Anti-Defamation League and the Jewish Community Federation. By the 1880s, Adolph Sutro, a Jewish immigrant from Prussia, alone owned “roughly one-twelfth of the land in San Francisco.” He also became the mayor of the city. [NEWITZ, A., 1-13-99]

In a March 2000 letter to an online magazine, famed San Francisco poet Lawrence Ferlinghetti singled out a Jewish real estate developer who was central in the cultural destruction of that city:

A developer from Michigan, Scott Seligman, who runs Sterling Bank and Seligman Western Enterprises, wants to gentrify the Mid-Market zone. Not to make the City a better place but to make his bank account a little fatter. Hew wants a better class of tenant. No more photographers or poets or translators or editors or painters. No more small businesses serving the City.” [FERLINGHETTI, 3-8-01]

In 1989 the Los Angeles Times called Martin Selig “Seattle's biggest property owner.” He had recently sold Seattle’s tallest building for $354 million. [DIETRICH, B., 11-20-89, p. D1] A decade earlier in Seattle, Forbes noted that Jack Benaroya (also Jewish), “for 30 years built the Seattle area's largest real estate empire: 8 million commercial square feet, about 90% industrial, including 5 business parks.” [FORBES, 10-27-86, p. 290]

Another Jewish real estate developer, William Levitt, is credited – or blamed - for the creation of “massive tract developments of single family homes … He shaped the American dream, a house of one's own for a small down payment and an endless mortgage.” [KREFETZ, p. 50] Levitt was instrumental in the invention of “suburbia”: sprawls of mass-produced uniform tract houses. Between 1947 and 1951 his company constructed 17,447 homes for 75,000 people on Long Island, known today as Levittown. He also created another housing conglomeration – also called Levittown – in Pennsylvania. George Ritzer notes that:

“Levitt and Sons thought of their building sites as large factories. Instead of having the product move, as one the automobile assembly line, the Levitt's product, the emerging house, was stationary, and it was the workers who moved around the building site … Said Alfred Levitt, one of the sons: ‘The same man does the same thing every day, despite the psychologists. It is boring; it is bad; but the reward of the green stuff seems to alleviate the boredom of the work.” [RITZER, p. 28]

By 1973, Arthur Cohen was chairman of Arlen Realty and Development Corporation, “a corporation that controlled some $1.7 billion of U.S. real estate.” [CARRUTH, E., 1973, p. 184] … Shopping centers are the largest single element of Arlen’s business, and the company is one of the nation’s largest...
builders (as well as operators) of them.” [CARRUTH, p. 187] Cohen and three associates held 49 percent of the voting shares in the company.

By 1982, another Jewish real estate mogul, Samuel J. Lefrak, alone owned 55,000 apartments in New York City and another 30,000 elsewhere, run by some 350 different companies, each owned by the Lefrak family. [KREFETZ, p. 81] By 1982 too, “the great majority of the New York landlords [were] Jewish” including the prominent family names of Uris, Durst, Tishman, Rudin, Horowitz, Ravitch, Minskoff, Milstein, Sol Goldman, and Frederic Rose, a former President of the Jewish Philanthropies of New York. [BAER, p. 195] Before financial problems in the late 1960s, William Zeckendorf was “master, at one time, of possibly the greatest of all real estate empires.” [BLACKWELL, E., 1973, p. 534] In the early 1990s the Rudins owned buildings worth $1.5 billion. Other huge Jewish real estate empires include those of Aaron Gural, Leo and Alexander Bing, the Resnicks, Fishers, Koeppels, Wiens, Cohens, and Silversteins. By 1929 A.E. Lefcourt’s 24 buildings (many skyscrapers) placed him “among the largest landlords in the city and squarely in the ranks of its wealthiest men.” [SCHACHTMAN, p. 117]

Most New York “real estate barons,” confirmed Tom Schactman in 1991, are “white and Jewish.” [SCHACHTMAN, p. 21] By the 1920s, “a survey found that 80 percent of the speculative builders in [New York] city were Jewish although Jews made up only 40 percent of the 10,000 builders in the metropolitan area. The [Jewish] immigrants’ domination of the field worried some; the chairman of the board of the United States Realty and Home Improvement company called the ‘foreign element … a disturbing feature in real estate today.’” [SCHACHTMAN, p. 111] Architecturally, “even the shopping center was a [Jewish] émigré contribution, pioneered by Viennese-born Victor Gruen … In Chicago, [Ludwig] Mies became the virtual inventor of industrial design.” [HEILBUT, p. 143]

The premier real estate trader in the ritzy Hamptons area of Long Island was (until he choked on a piece of steak and died in 1991) Allan Schneider. Schneider was both Jewish and homosexual, although he hid both. He was, says Steven Gaines, “the most powerful broker in all the Hamptons – the ‘Pasha,’ as he was affectionately called by his staff, with offices in Southampton, Bridgehampton, Sag Harbor, and East Hampton and revenues approaching $100 million … [He had] domination in the Hamptons real estate market … He not only substantially changed the face of the landscape, but his own life was in some ways a metaphor for the new Hamptons: a stage upon which nouvelle society could invent itself.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 4, 45, 48] How about “the largest private landowner in all of East Hampton?” That would be Evan Frankel, who “held the deed to more than 1,000 acres of developable land … at one point he owned so much land that it was estimated he paid 50 percent of all the real estate taxes in East Hampton. Not coincidentally, at various times, he held seats on the town planning board, the board of directors of Southampton Hospital, and the advisory board of the East Hampton Free Library.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 170]
Another Jewish real estate mogul, Ben Tobin, once a part owner of the Empire State Building, was, like most, “a major benefactor to Jewish charities.” [NITKIN, p. 6B] Down the street, Jack Weiler’s nationwide holdings equaled 5 million square feet in New York alone; 1.5 million more were owned in California. “A new community of more than 2,000 homes and 5,000 residents on the southern ridge of Jerusalem was named Kiryat Jack Weiler because of his support for Israel and his ability to coax others to help as well.” [VAN GELDEN, p. 26] Frederic and Earle Mack’s Mack Company, based in New York and New Jersey commercial and industrial development, merged with another firm in 1997 to form the Mack-Cali Realty Corporation “which boasted a combined market capitalization of $3.4 billion … Like his brother Earle, Frederic Mack has long shown an abiding interest in U. S. relations with Israel … Mack is currently on the national board of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the nation’s largest and most influential pro-Israel lobby.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

In July 2001, a private company took over control of the ill-fated World Trade Center. Silverstein Properties (president: Larry Silverstein) signed a 99-year lease to run the landmark business complex for $3.2 billion from New York City’s Port Authority (chairman: Lewis Eisenberg). [SCT NEWSWIRE, 7-25-01] The retail section was also controlled by a Jewish entrepreneur. As the Jerusalem Post noted after the 2001 terrorist attack:

“Australian businessman Frank Lowy, who emigrated to Australia from Israel in 1952, owns the 99-year lease for the 425,000 square foot retail portion of the destroyed World Trade Center. Lowy is the chairman and founder of Westfield Holdings, the manager of Westfield America Trust, which has a 57 percent stake in Westfield America Inc … Westfield said today that it has insurance cover against terrorist attacks and its earnings will not be materially affected. In a statement to the Australian Stock Exchange the retail chain said that ‘investment in the retail component of the World Trade Center is fully insured for both capital and loss of income,’ adding ‘the insurance cover includes acts of terrorism’ … Today [Lowy] is the second wealthiest man in Australia and was recently ranked as the 209th wealthiest man in the world by Forbes magazine. Westfield is the fourth-largest shopping mall owner, with operations in Australia, the US, the United Kingdom and New Zealand. Lowy is philanthropically involved in the Jewish community in Sydney as well as Israel, including sponsoring the Overseas Students School of Tel Aviv University which is endowed in his name and being associate international chairman of the Israel Democracy Institute.” [BERGER, S., 9-12-01]

In the New York city government sphere,

“for more than four decades, without ever holding public office, Robert Moses ruled in New York like a potentate. He spent an estimated $27 billion on public works: highways, bridges, parks, tunnels, beaches, playgrounds, dams, public buildings, and public housing. He was in large part responsible for the construction of the Lincoln Center, the
United Nations, Co-op City, and the Coliseum. His most impregnable power base was the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, where he reigned as chief executive from 1933 to 1968. He had helped draft the legislation that created the authority and that at the same time ensured its existence in perpetuity by empowering it to issue new bonds. The never-ending stream of bridge and tunnel tolls gave Moses control over a bond-issuing agency with exiguous accountability; during his tenure the authority, although a public agency, was as autonomous as the privately governed Metropolitan Museum.” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 93]

Another Jewish mogul, Aaron Ziegelman, is in “the controversial business of buying low-rent buildings in New York City, renovating them and selling the apartments as condominiums. The New York Times called him ‘one of New York’s biggest co-op converters.’” [KLEIN, A., p. 10] One of Ziegelman’s pet projects is to reconstruct an Eastern European village in Israel; he has also donated a million dollars to the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College in Philadelphia and a million and a half to the National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership.

Yet another Jewish real estate mogul is Jerry Speyer. He married into the Tishman family, also Jewish; the family’s firm “Tishman Realty” became the largest “builder-owner” in the United States. [TRAUB, p. 68] Fellow Jewish real estate developer Bernard Mendik told the New York Times Magazine in 1998 that “right now, Jerry [Speyer] is the Number 1 real-estate developer in the world.” [TRAUB, p. 62] Today Speyer’s Tishman-Speyer Properties owns 36 million square feet of building space, valued at $10.5 billion. Among other sites Speyer’s firm owns include Manhattan’s Chrysler Building and the Messerturm in Frankfurt, Germany (Europe’s second tallest building). He has served on the boards of both Columbia University and the Museum of Modern Art. Speyer, says journalist James Traub, “operates in that elite sphere in which wealth, public-spiritedness, and proper table manners converge to form a colossal nexus of power, but one almost invisible to the outside world.” [TRAUB, p. 64]

In 1995, Business Week highlighted another Jewish real estate mogul, Steve Green:

“Most people have never heard of the 49 year-old real estate maven. But Steven J. Green’s empire is growing fast. His personal holdings include 120 retail properties across the United States, which he estimated is worth $500 million. Through partnerships, he has a stake in a real estate company in Britain that owns 22 office properties in European business centers, an industrial project in Eastern Europe, and a retail development in Moscow’s Red Square. And he’s the chief executive of Astrum International Corporation, a $1 billion company that owns Samsonite, American Tourister, and Culligan brands.” [WOOLLEY, p. 116]

By 1940, Albert M. Greenfield’s real estate business in Philadelphia was the largest in the city. By age 35 he had “accumulated” 27 building and loan associations and was known as ‘one of the most influential men in the city.” [SKLARE,
In early Los Angeles, Kaspare Cohn “was one of Southern California’s largest landowners.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 233] By the 1970s, noted one Jewish observer, the (Jewish) Hellman family’s Farmers and Merchant Bank, “excepting the state, is the largest property owner in California.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 233]

In Chicago, Sam Zell is “one of the biggest property owners in the country.” [ALLEN, J. p. C1] Zell built his fortune on slum lording or, as the Chicago Tribune puts its, the “buying of distressed properties and resurrecting them … Zell acquired troubled apartment buildings in Florida, Reno, and Las Vegas.” [ELSNER, p. C1] “If you viewed us as a group,” said partner Burton Kanter, “we were the biggest landlords in Reno.” [ELSNER, p. C1] In 1976 Zell and three associates were indicted in a tax shelter scheme over a Reno hotel transaction. Zell cut a deal with the government, but his brother-in-law went to prison. [ALLEN, J. p. C1]

Chicago-based Neil Bluhm, president of JMB Realty, and partner Judd Malkin, noted Forbes in 1990:

“are among the few 1980s property owners to remain high on the Forbes Hundred [richest Americans list]. Each is estimated at over $770 million, although they tell people they are each worth just under $1 billion.” [BERSS, p. 352]

JMB’s reach is far, owning even the prestigious Century City office complex – home to many in the Hollywood entertainment world – in West Los Angeles. Nearby, in Beverly Hills, Guilford Glazer oversees his own $474 million real estate empire, including the Del Amo Fashion Mall, “the largest shopping mall in the world.” [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 415] Glazer, notes Forbes magazine, is “active in Jewish American causes. [He] built [an] Israeli community center with buddy Armand Hammer.” [FORBES, 10-12-98] A Beverly Hills neighbor is Eli Broad, co-founder of Kaufman & Broad, the Los Angeles area’s “largest home builder.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, 10-22-99] In 1977, Jewish mogul A. Albert Taubman “purchased 77,000 acres of some of the best land in southern California between Los Angeles and San Diego.” Taubman, based in Detroit, “by the mid-1960s … was building shopping centers in California, the nation’s ongoing Mecca of real estate development … It was Taubman who continually upped the stakes in mall development, again raising eyebrows by building them bigger than anyone else, placing more stringent demands on tenants and charging higher rents for retailers who set up store under his roof.” [HIGGINS/HOOVER, 5-3-01, p. 4a] A Holocaust survivor, Frank Lowy, owns Westfield America, the largest shopping mall company on the West Coast, including eight properties in Los Angeles, eight in San Diego, and four in Northern California. In St. Louis, Missouri, “Lowry has five malls and is the city’s biggest landlord.” In Australia, Lowy’s home base, his “mall empire … has blanketed the continent.” The global asset value of his company’s holdings is $13.2 billion. [COOLIDGE, 10-19-98]

Also in Chicago, “Philip Klutznik and his American Community Builders, and his later Urban Investment and Development Co. went on to build much
of the face of Chicago over the last half century.” [OLIVER, p. A16] He is largely responsible for the planned Chicago suburb of Park Forest and he owned the downtown landmark Water Tower Place.

In Washington DC, yet another Jewish real estate king, Charles Smith, controlled “Washington’s greatest real estate fortune.” [HAGGERTY, M. p. F10] His son Robert, and son-in-law Robert Kogod today run an empire of 2,000 employees, 14,000 apartment units (20,000 counting the ones they also manage), and interests in 54 office buildings. Their total worth was estimated by the late 1980s to be $3-5 billion. Other area Washington area Jewish real estate moguls include the Hafts, Mort Zuckerman, Albert Abramson, Ted Lerner, Bernard and Carol Gewirz, Robert Rosenthal, Estelle Gelman, Herman Greenberg, Abe Pollin, Myer and Adrienne Arsht Feldman, Joel Meisel and Barry Cohen, among others. [REGARDIE’S, p. 64-] As Barbara Matusow notes about an earlier Jewish generation in the nation’s capitol:

“Morris Pollin eventually became a leading builder and developer in the area – the path to wealth for so many other Jews of humble origins … Abraham Kay parlayed his earnings from a grocery store on Capitol Hill into vast landholdings in the suburbs. Morris Cafritz, the city’s richest developer, used to hawk newspapers… Nearly all the other first generation success stories – car dealer Joe Cherney, Giant Food’s patriarch Nehemiah Cohen, Macke Vending’s Hyman Goldberg, lumber merchant Isadore Turover – also had major holdings in real estate.” [MATUSOW, B., MAY 2000, p. 79]

In Houston, Jewish real estate mogul Jerry Moore is worth over $400 million, owning over 140 shopping centers. Forbes noted that he bought

“shabby, low-profit but promising strip centers and turn[ed] them into born-again cash machines … Moore lives with his wife in an authentic 18th-century, 40-room French château (transported from France and reassembled in Houston’s ritzy Memorial section). He owns 22 Ferraris, 14 Rolls Royces, and over 200 well-restored antique Dusenbergs, Packards, and other vehicles.” [FIELD, p. 32]

Elsewhere in Houston, David Mincberg owns “one of the largest apartment firms in the city.” [HOUSTON CHRONICLE, 1998] He is also chairman of the Harris County Democratic Party and president of the Jewish Federation of Greater Houston.

Also in Texas, based in Dallas, the Centex real estate company “is one of the nation’s largest home builders, with operations in 53 markets in 19 states.” [NEW YORK TIMES, 9-3-98] Its CEO is also Jewish, Laurence Hirsch.

In Boston, “the young professionals who began favoring Boston as a place to live around the time of the Vietnam War are ensconced in their lairs, many of them either built or financed by [Mark] Goldweitz.” [ROBINSON, p. 61] In 2000, Jerome Rappaport sold his massive Charles River Park development – apartments and condos – for $300 million. [Van Voorhis, S., 2-14-00] Other Jewish real estate moguls in Boston include “the Krupp brothers, Philip and William, who made a killing in real estate,” as well as Stephen Karp, Julian
Cohen, Bruce Beal, Steve Fishman, Ron Drucker, Dick Friedman, Alan Leventhal, and Edwin Sidman, among others. [BOSTON MAGAZINE]

Owner of properties throughout New England, Holocaust survivor Simon Konover – owner of over 11 million square feet of real estate – “is a staunch supporter of Jewish charities.” [CHAINSTORE, p. 92] Richard Penzer has a “real estate empire” in Pittsburgh; in Chicago, by 1988 William Adler had developed over 100 suburban and industrial properties and thousands of homes.

In Los Angeles, by 1992 Jona Goldrich and Abraham Lurie alone controlled 25% (worth $250 million) of the luxurious Marina Del Rey beach area. “For years,” notes the Los Angeles Times, “Goldrich has been active in Jewish affairs.” [RABIN, J., p. B1] Goldrich has been “a major builder of residential and commercial projects throughout California” and a “major player” in the $400 million Channel Gateway project near Marina Del Rey. In 1991 he was awarded a controversial contract by the Los Angeles County to control over 18 acres of prime Marina Del Rey waterfront for the next 70 years. “Mark Nathanson [also Jewish], a Beverly Hills real estate broker and a member of the California Coastal Commission,” noted the Los Angeles Times, “was a leading supporter of the lease extension [to Goldrich] when the five-member Small Craft Harbor Commission met last week.” Nathanson was appointed to this position by Los Angeles County Supervisor Mike Antonovich, who is also Jewish. “Nathanson,” observed the Times, “is the target of a federal political corruption investigation in Sacramento.” [RABIN, J., 12-23-91, p. B1] For Abraham Lurie’s part, he was once even a business partner with the brother-in-law of Saudi Arabia’s King Fahd. In 1992, before economic problems, Lurie was described as Marina Del Rey’s “biggest developer.” [RABIN, J., 7-29-92, p. B1]

In Miami, Jewish real estate moguls include Craig Robins. As one journalist notes:

“[Robins] is Miami’s most celebrated purchaser and rehabber of dilapidated buildings … A few in Miami Beach gripe that Robins’ rep and political clout have made him and [his company called] Dacra Inordinately influential in the city, greasing the skids for any proposed project that has his name on it.” Robins’ partners include his brother Scott and New York-based developer Tony Goldman. [KISSELL, T., 6-15-99]

Even in Mormon-dominated Utah, John Price is the (Jewish) chairman and CEO of JP Realty, “among the top commercial real estate developers in the Intermountain West, owning and managing properties in Utah and nine surrounding states.” These holdings include 12 enclosed shopping malls, other shopping centers and various commercial and industry buildings. [KNUDSON, M., 3-23, 97] In Denver, Sally Barry made local news when she fought prominent real estate developer Jordan Perlmutter’s plans that would obscure beautiful views of the Rocky Mountains from popular Robert Clement Park. [GREEN, C., 2-22-95, p., B7] Also in Denver, Israeli-raised Shaul Baruch, son of a rabbi, was noted in 1995 as a “wealthy land developer” who had recently purchased “443 acres of prime dirt near Denver International Airport.” [REBCOOK, J., 12-5-95, p. A47]
In Omaha, Nebraska, as an addenda to the real estate world, Phil and Harley Schrager own the **Pacesetter Corporation**, the “largest independent, direct-seller and manufacturer of residential building and improvement products in the United States.” [JEWISH PRESS, 3-31-2000, p. 1]

In Canada, the **Reichmann** family has an international real estate empire and, by the 1980s, before financial troubles, were reputed to be “one of the wealthiest families in the world.” [BUCHINSKY, p. 4] The Reichmanns owned the largest real estate empire on earth, as well as the world’s largest newsprint producer (**Albitibi-Price**), plus various other holdings. The former Deputy Minister of Finance for Canada, **Marshall Cohen**, directed the large **Olympia and York** division of the Reichmann sprawl. “The Reichmann’s main business vehicle, Olympia and York Development,” notes **Anthony Bianco**, “was the greatest property development company in Western history.” [BIANCO, p. xv] “At the peak of their success … the Reichmann’s donated $60 million annually to [Jewish] Orthodox institutions worldwide.” [ATLAS, p. 264] The Jewish **Reichmann** and **Bronfman** families were instrumental in building New York’s tallest landmark, the World Trade Center, and in the late 1970s, the Reichmanns had major downtown development projects in ten American cities. [BIANCO, p. 368] “In Florida, Olympia and York generally invested along with the Shapiro family.” [BIANCO, p. 399]

“Seagrams [owned by the Montreal-based Bronfman family] are not only the largest liquor empire in the world, but the largest private land-owners in Canada.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 68] Also from Montreal, Maxwell Cummings’ real estate company has owned land and buildings across North America. In 1948 he built an apartment complex “which was the largest privately owned housing development in Canada … Throughout his life, Cummings has played an important role in the Jewish community.” [BEAUDIN, p. A4] Cummings, who died in 2001, was “a leading developer of low-cost housing in Canada.” [EISENTHAL, B., 5-24-01] An Orthodox Jew from Toronto, real estate baron Stephen Mernick, even bought (for $139 million) the 500-acre PTL Christian theme park in North Carolina (after the sex scandal that swept Jim and Tammy Bakker into ruins). [DOLPHIN, p 38]

Also in Canada, Jewish mogul Peter Munk, while heading “one of the world’s most valuable gold mining companies, **Barrick Gold**,” also controls “Toronto’s landmark CN Tower, lots of office space in New York, and what is described rather coyly as effective ownership of the Sears Tower in Chicago.” [FINANCIAL TIMES, 6-30-98, p. 21] In 2000, Jacob Ghermezian died. A Jew from Iran, he “built a real estate empire in Canada.” [KIRCHNER, S., 9-14-2000, p. 11]

Even in a place like Sacramento, California, Mort Friedman “is prominent in two of the most public arenas in town, law and development.” [DELSOHN, p. A1] Both a lawyer and a real estate developer (including Sacramento’s Market Square mall), his personal fortune is estimated to be about $100 million. Friedman has worked “for improved U.S.-Israeli relations,” says the **Sacramento Bee**, “He lobbied Congress and met with Israeli leaders as an officer of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.” [DELSOHN, p. A1]
In 1989, a roomful of such Jewish real estate barons and assorted slum lords gathered to hear the Jewish New York State Attorney General, Robert Abrams, speak at the “Greater New York Real Estate and Construction Division of the State of Israel Bonds.” Real estate mogul Sheldon Solow received the “Israel Peace Medal.” Abrams, noted a news wire dispatch, “as a public official and even before that, … has been a strong voice on behalf of Jewish causes … [and an] ardent champion of the state of Israel … While he was borough president, he successfully persuaded the New York City Board of Education to incorporate Jewish Heritage Week into the curriculum of public schools.” [PR NEWSWIRE, 11-3-89] The chair of the Real Estate Board of New York at the time (1988) was also Jewish: Larry Silverstein. Such men no doubt included David Steiner, head of Steiner Equities Group, “a real estate concern which oversees millions of square feet of commercial and industrial property from its New Jersey headquarters.” Steiner is a former president of AIPAC, the foremost lobbying agency for Israel in America. [MOTHER JONES, 3-5-01]

In Europe, in 1997, the Deutche Presse Agence wire service noted that “Berlin’s Jewish community is currently in turmoil, its standing in the city tarnished by reports of dubious real estate dealing and political in-fighting among some of its members.” [FREEMAN, C.] Jewish entrepreneurs were noted to have even swindled Holocaust survivors. “Our image is tarnished in the public eye by all the talk of corruption and scandal,” the wire service was told at the Jewish Community Center of Berlin.” “Recently,” noted the Agentur, “a [Jewish Community Center leader’s] husband was investigated by the police, reputedly for forcing a woman from Riga into prostitution. There have also been media reports of a [Jewish] Community member ruthlessly driving up property rents in east Berlin.” [FREEMAN, C.]

Of the 21 members of Berlin’s Jewish Community organization, 17 were noted to be “involved in real estate or property management.” [FREEMAN] The chairman of the Central Council of Jews in Berlin, Ignatz Bubis, also owned 40% of the Sheraton Hotel in Tel Aviv till his death in 1999. The London Guardian noted that “All his adult life Bubis insisted that he would live in Germany but did not want to be buried there [“he wanted to be buried in Israel”] and “although Bubis came to reflect the secularization and worldliness of modern German Jewry, he once said he would be ‘very upset’ if his daughter married a Gentile.” [TRAYNOR, p. 10]

Another German Jewish mogul, Moritz Gertler, was recently described by one London newspaper as “one of Germany’s wealthiest private property owners.” [NISSE, p. 1, 2] In 1998, a French wire service noted the Jewish Fiszman family, rooted in German real estate, as “one of Germany’s wealthiest families.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 10-1-98] (Other wealthy post-war Jews in Germany include Emil Januscek (in clothing), the “banker Feuchtwanger, in Munich, and Rosenthal, the manufacturer whose porcelain has a worldwide reputation.”) [KATCHER, L., 1968, p. 176]

In Vienna, Austria, Ariel Muzicant heads the “largest association of Austrian Jews.” (Today’s Austrian Jewish population is about 15,000). He was also born
in Israel. “I am the biggest broker in town,” Muzicant told the *New York Times* in 2001, “So, yes, I know the mayor and deputy mayor. I am bigger than the second- and third-largest brokers combined. I build, broker, lease, and sell commercial real estate.” A rival Jewish leader condemned Muzicant as a “man who advertises real estate on the Web page of the Jewish community he is supposed to represent.” [COHEN, R., 3-25-01]

In England, the firm owned by Jewish moguls Michael and Peter Freeman was picked by *Estates Times* to be “one of the top 10, and possibly top five, quoted property companies in the UK” by the year 2000. [ESTATES TIMES] Michael Price, also Jewish and active in British real estate (and who owns 6% of the powerful Chase Manhattan bank), was noted by the *Times* of London to have “recently emerged as one of America’s most aggressive investors. It is the nightmare of every American executive to wake up in the morning and find that Mr. Price has just bought a stake in his company.” In 1993, Sighismund Berger (who father was a leading figure in Britain’s Jewish Orthodox Satmar sect), facing economic woes, was still described by the *London Observer* as “arguably UK’s largest private landlord.” [PARKER-JERVIS, ONLINE]

“Mention any high-profile development,” noted the London *Guardian* in 1991,

“and Godfrey Bradman’s been there too; in particular, he favours mega schemes: Finsbury Avenue (half a million square feet); Broadgate (3.5 million feet); Chafford Hundred in Essex, the biggest residential project in Britain. And of course the 125-acre King’s Cross development, the largest single inner-city scheme in Europe.” [COLES, GUARDIAN]

Bradman is also, noted an observer in the *Guardian*, “part of that north London set of Jewish businessmen who go to each other’s charity dos.” [COLES, GUARDIAN] Yet another Jewish British real estate force is Gerald Ronson, “one of the country’s most celebrated property tycoons” who in 1990 “was fined pounds 5 million and did six months in jail for his part in the Guinness share-dealing scandal.” [BARNETT, A., p. 3] Other British Jewish real estate tycoons include Mark Pears (whose family owns an estimated 20,000 flats and houses), and “London property brothers Eddie and Sol Zaky, whose Topland Group’s portfolio is worth 1 billion pounds.” The Zakys are from Israel. “I would forecast that unless peace comes soon,” says Philip Beresford, compiler of a newspaper “rich list,” it would be a logical step for Israelis to settle in Britain.” [LEVITT/KOHEN, 4-27-01, p. 14]

Even in Hungary, in 1995, “Israeli-owned real estate development companies have started or prepared projects in Budapest worth $350 million that range from family apartments to renovations of abandoned hotels to massive shopping malls. The total development market size is estimated to be $1.6 billion.” [O’LEARY, p. 28] And, as the *Jerusalem Post* noted in 2000, “over the past few years, many Israeli companies have invested in real estate in Eastern Europe, and in Poland and Romania in particular.” These Israeli companies include Olimpia Real Estate Holdings, Kardan Real Estate, and Elscint Limited. In
In 2001, the Israeli newspaper, Ha'aretz, noted that “Israeli real estate companies are the largest and most active in some Eastern European countries … Companies like Europe Israel have invested hundreds of millions of shekels in buying and developing East European commercial centers. Kardan Investments has been operating several years in Poland and has set up thousands of square meters of office space.” The article, however, focused upon increased Israeli real estate movement in Great Britain. Israeli companies there include Giron Development and Building and Dorot. But the “most prominent Israeli company in the British real estate scene is Alony-Hertz.” [LINDMAN, C., 6-27-01]

Turning from real estate to other economic activities in America, in Los Angeles, the Hellman family “virtually invented banking in Los Angeles during the 1860s,” and controlled the Farmer's Bank, the Merchant's Bank, and Wells Fargo in San Francisco. Achille Levy also founded the Bank of A. Levy and Kaspare Cohn the Union Bank (for decades Los Angeles' premier “middle-market” bank.) [KOTKIN, p. 58-59] In 1988, Sidney Brody was the director of the largest bank in Los Angeles. [KORMAN, p. 58]

By 1927 Jews “became conspicuous in the thriving used car market.” The founder of the Yellow Cab Company in 1915 was Jewish. By 1924 90% of the American scrap metal business was Jewish-owned. [FEINGOLD, p. 91] In Canada, scrap metal millionaire Morris Lax was the victim of an unsolved murder in 1993. Guy Crittenden notes “the closed-shop nature of the scrap business” and that, during a lawsuit, Jewish scrap metal millionaire [Morris] Lax supporters [didn't] deny he was crooked (though perhaps not more so than some others in the business).” [CRITTENDEN, G., 2001] Chester and Morris Waxman, business associates of Lax, built to power “one of the top three scrap-recycling enterprises in Canada.” Chester, the Jewish community’s Man of the Year in 1979, eventually was involved in a 14-year lawsuit with his brother (who initiated charges) which provided “a veritable parade of witnesses who have leveled accusations of fraud, conspiracy, diversion of funds, racehorse-breeding schemes, evidence tampering and betrayals of deathbed promises.” [CRITTENDON, G., 2000]

“By the 1920s, Jews owned most of Detroit’s dry-cleaning establishments.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 77] By 1937, as a quarter of New York City’s population, Jews already represented 55-65% of the area’s lawyers, dentists, and physicians. [MARCUS, J, p. 316]

By the 1970s, one of five lawyers in America at-large were Jews. [ISAACS, p. 23] In Israel, by 2000, there was a lawyer for about every 300 inhabitants of the country; “no other country in the world has as large a number of lawyers in proportion to populations as does Israel.” [ALPERT, C., 6-2-2000, p. 4]
In law, says Arthur Goldberg of the New York City law firm Goldfarb and Goldberg, “the field of personal injury really expanded in the forties and fifties. A dozen or so developed this area of law, and most of them were Jewish. Emile Zola Berman, Aaron Broder, Jacob Fuchberg, Harry Gair, Herman Glaser, Alfred Julien, Joseph Keller, Charles Kramer, Moe Levine, Harry Lipsig.” [KREFETZ, p. 193] Prominent Jewish lawyer Alan Dershowitz has claimed that 40% of the “pre-eminent lawyers” in New York and Washington D.C. are Jewish. [JEJRLLA, p. 6] Stan Chesley, a lawyer who worked on the Agent Orange class action suit in 1984, alone donated $2 million to the United Jewish Appeal in 1992. Morris Shenker was known for decades as the “lawyer for the mob.” Federal investigators who searched through his affairs for more than 40 years finally indicted him six months before he died in 1989. [LHOTKA, p. 1A] In 2000, the Cuban immigrant family that tried to keep child refugee Eilan Gonzalez from returning to Cuba with his father was represented by Roger Bernstein, who sometimes acted as their public spokesman.

Probably the most famous, flashy, and controversial divorce lawyer in recent history (and best known lawyer in America) was Marvin Mitchelson. His “private life,” notes the (American Lawyer) Recorder,

“was the part of the show and as glitzy as his public one. He had all the trappings of a star: a Rolls-Royce, the $5 million Hollywood mansion, nights at the opera, and constant travel to Europe. He enlivened his marriage to an Italian starlet, Marcella Ferri, with sexual liaisons, champagne and cocaine … The California Bar, despite its reluctance to discipline a very successful attorney, was already investigating allegations of neglect, fraud, and malpractice from his former clients.” [STANFORD, p. 6]

Among Mitchelson’s many sensational cases was that of Vicky Morgan, a high-paid prostitute who sued one of her clients, Alfred Bloomingdale, the Jewish head of a large chain store. Lurid details of his sadomasochistic needs made headlines, particularly noteworthy because Bloomingdale was known to be close to then-president Ronald Reagan. [JENKINS, p. 147-150] Mitchelson has also been a heavy drug user, especially cocaine. Suppliers have included fellow lawyers Bruce Pearlman and Martin Klass. [JENKINS, p. 89-92] Two women eventually publicly stepped forward to claim that Mitchelson had raped them, followed by another five former female clients who “claimed they were victims of Mitchelson’s improper sexual advances or physical assaults.” [JENKINS, 1992, p. 229] Mitchelson’s own defense lawyer against such charges was also Jewish, Howard Weitzman, “one of the best criminal lawyers in the country,” soaring to media fame when he successfully defended car maker John DeLorean. The case against DeLorean, charged with seeking to sell and distribute $60 million worth of cocaine, was widely deemed to be extremely strong. [JENKINS, p. 6] Another Los Angeles lawyer “hustling publicity” in “that pack” was Robert Steinberg. [JENKINS, p. 85]

By the late 1980s, yet another Jewish lawyer, Raoul Lionel Felder (at a fee of $450 per hour) had seized the crown for many as the king of divorce lawyers, representing Robin Givens against her boxer husband Mike Tyson, Mrs. Carl
Sagan, Mrs. Martin Scorsese, Brian De Palma, and other Hollywood celebrities. In 1978, one author listed Felder, Irving Erdheim, Morris Halpern, and Mitchell Salem Fisher as four of the top six divorce lawyers in New York; collectively they were known as the “bombers.” [GOULDEN, J., 1978] In Washington DC, by 1993 Marna Tucker, also Jewish, was a “$275 an-hour queen bee among Washington divorce lawyers.” She was also the first woman to head the D.C. Bar (with a membership of 60,000). [HARRINGTON, W, 1-24-93, p. W8]

Looking for a lawyer to defend you against charges of drug dealing? Gerald Goldstein of San Antonio, Texas, is one of the best in the business, “a man who has made his reputation championing civil rights and his fortune defending dopers, two activities that frequently and fortuitously overlap.” [SWARTZ, p. 114] In 1985 Goldstein managed to get the government to return $10 million to a drug smuggler; he also figured out how to get the biggest marijuana dealer in San Antonio freed. He also has represented prominent Mexican drug lord Juan Garcia Abrego.

Another prominent Jewish lawyer, Barry Slotnick, has defended the president of Panama’s General Mills, Eleta Almaran, on charges that he conspired to import 1,300 pounds of cocaine every month to Georgia for a total value of $300 million. In 1998 Slotnick could be found as the lawyer for Felix Komarov, an immigrant from Russia with known ties to the Russian mafia. Steven Lerman was the first lawyer for Rodney King, the African-American who awarded $3.8 million after he was videotaped being beaten by Los Angeles police. [ROHRLICH, T., 8-16-2000]

O.J. Simpson’s famous trial “dream team” of defenders included, of course, a Jewish lead lawyer Robert Shapiro (who took over from Howard Weitzman) as well as Alan Dershowitz and Barry Scheck, among others. A staff writer at the New York Times, Jeffrey Toobin, describes an early meeting Shapiro had with other lawyers about the case:

“One after another, the Jaguars, the BMWs, and the odd Porsche pulled off the Avenue of the Stars and slipped into the nearly deserted underground parking garage. The owners of these cars, about two dozen of the top lawyers in West Los Angeles, greeted each other with slightly embarrassed smiles … They came because everyone wanted a piece of the case – the defense of Orinthal James Simpson against the charges that he had murdered his ex-wife Nicole and her friend Ronald Goldman [also Jewish] … This was, as they sometimes joked, the West L.A. Jewish mafia. ([Skip] Taft and [Robert] Kardashian were among the very few non-Jews in the room). In fact, as the group settled in, Alvin Michaelson whispered to his neighbor, “This is what it must have been like at Apalachin” – the infamous gathering of mob chieftains in upstate New York in 1957. It was a famously inbred group, and their connections to each other often stretched back decades.” [TOOBIN, J., p. 3, 6]

Other lawyers present included Larry Feldman, Roger Cossack, Michael Nasitir, Skip Miller, Jay Jaffee, Dick Sherman, Richard Hirsch, and Patricia Glasier. [SCHILLER/WILLWERTH, p. 128]
Toobin, who spent two years reporting the Simpson case, notes that both Shapiro and his lead African-American lawyer, Johnny Cochran, had privately conceded that O.J. Simpson was the murderer. “Their dilemma, then,” says Toobin, “was the oldest, as well as the most common, quandary of the criminal defense attorney: what to do about a guilty client. The answer they decided, was race. Because of the overwhelming evidence of Simpson’s guilt, his lawyers could not undertake a defense aimed at proving his innocence … Instead, in an astonishing act of legal bravado, they sought to create for the client – a man they believed to be the killer – the mantle of victimhood.” [TOOBIN, J., p. 11]

On the other side of the case, prosecuting Simpson, was Marcia Clark, who also gained media celebrity from the trial. She is also Jewish (originally Marcia Kleks) and speaks fluent Hebrew. Her father, Abraham, was an Israeli who settled in America in 1953. Marcia’s first husband, Gaby Horowitz, was also Israeli. [TOOBIN, J. p. 302] Clark notes that she was a “rising star” under Los Angeles District Attorney Ira Reiner [also Jewish] and that “to this day Harvey Giss remains the only prosecutor in L.A. County who has ever gotten a death-penalty conviction against a client of Leslie Abramson [another well-known Jewish criminal defense attorney – among her newsworthy cases was the Mendenez brothers’ murder trial].” [CLARK, M., 1997, p. 7] Another key member of the O.J. Simpson prosecution team was Hank Goldberg, the Deputy District Attorney for the County of Los Angeles. The young man, Ron Goldman, murdered with Nicole Simpson was Jewish. Even Nicole Simpson’s friend, Faye Resnick, who made the media rounds with a “tell-all” book about Simpson and his wife, was a convert to Judaism. Her third husband, Paul Resnick, was Jewish. [RESNICK, F., 1994, p. 17, 42]

Alan Dershowitz, famed criminal defense lawyer and successful defender of O.J., once wrote this about the ethics of his chosen field:

“Some criminal lawyers claim to represent only innocent clients. Don’t believe them! No full time criminal lawyer represents a significant number of innocent clients … The criminal lawyer’s job, for the most part, is to represent the guilty, and – if possible – to get them off… Defense lawyers are an egotistical lot – and the challenge of ‘getting off’ an obvious guilty defendant is a great ego trip. It is also a great source of clients; and clients mean money; and money means the good life that so many defense lawyers crave.” [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, p. 117-118]

Awash in ego-delight at beating the system and an increasing cash flow, Dershowitz damns himself and his colleagues. Casting ethics aside, all become partners in the extension of criminal actions, bonded in spirit with the freed criminal’s illegal act, the lawyer an accessory in the cheap thrill of “getting away” with it.

In 1999, Dershowitz even agreed to take the case of white supremacist Matt Hale (a law school graduate who was refused the possibility of applying for a law license). Hale is founder of the controversial World Church of the Creator. Dershowitz publicly announced that he would be willing to represent Hale on the condition that their lawyer-client confidentiality premise was officially
breached, and Dershowitz could have a free hand in continuously attacking Hale’s racist views. Hale declined this offer, and chose another Jewish lawyer, Robert Herman, instead. “It’s unfortunate really,” explained Hale, “but the sad fact is that most of the First Amendment lawyers are Jews.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS STATE AND LOCAL WIRE, 3-26-99]

Among those physicians who have “expert” reputations in murder trials is Israel-raised Owen Spitz, today a resident of Michigan. He is, noted the Detroit News in 2000, “at the top of the list of for-hire forensic experts … With 46 years of experience, he’s the dean of them all.” Spitz has been involved in many major murder cases, from the Kennedy assassination to the O.J. Simpson trial. [SINCLAIR, N., 3-19-2000, p. 1]

Leading up to World War II, Mendel Silberberg was “the most important entertainment attorney in the country.” [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 297] Much more recently in Hollywood, the names of Jake Bloom, Kenneth Ziffren, Barry Hirsch, Bruce Ramer (also president of the American Jewish Committee), and Eric Weissman are also among the many prominent Jewish movie star lawyers. Bloom is “probably the most powerful show business attorney in Hollywood.” [CARTER, B., 1994, p. 71] Tom Pollock also started out as a lawyer for superstars and became the head of Universal Pictures, and later MCA. By 1999, Richard Volpert was “reportedly among the city’s highest paid lawyers and exerts considerable political influence.” His wife has headed the Los Angeles County School Board. [TUGEND, 10-22-99] Lawyer Sidney Sheinberg also became the chief of MCA; lawyer Alan Levine became the head of Sony Pictures Entertainment. Another Ziffren lawyer, Paul, became chairman of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee that hosted the Olympics in 1984. Ziffren’s “political mentor” was Jake Arvey (also Jewish), “the mob-connected head of Chicago’s Democratic Party.” Ziffren was “also a close friend and associate of Chicago Mafia boss Frank Nitti.” In the 1960s Reader’s Digest published an article “chronicling Ziffren’s long-standing ties to major organized crime figures.” [MOLDEA, D., p. 136-137] Another such lawyer, Eugene Bernstein, was the “Mob’s tax lawyer.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 142]

Another Ziffren friend was lawyer Sidney Korshak, omnipresent in Hollywood, and for decades “the Mafia’s top lawyer. He was also a man who symbolized that curious American social phenomenon of the evolution of organized crime into increasingly legitimate business.” [WALKER, M., 1-23-96, p. 14] Sidney’s brother Marshall was a prominent politician in Chicago’s Democratic political machine; Marshall, also linked to organized crime, was also once the State of Israel Bonds “man of the year” and was that organization’s campaign chairman in 1981. Marshall’s daughter, Margie, is today “Chicago’s best known publicist.” [CHICAGO SUN-TIMES, 1-20-96, p. 41]

In 2000, Los Angeles magazine featured an article entitled Raging Bulls, about “attack dog” attorneys for the rich and famous. Jewish lawyers overwhelmingly dominated the story. (“These are the guys you call when you might have to get into the gutter,” noted reporter Ross Johnson. Martin “Mad Dog” Singer (who charges $400 an hour) represents Arnold Schwartzzenegger, Bruce
Willis, Demi Moore, Sylvester Stallone, Eddie Murphy, Céline Dion, Roseanne, Jim Carrey, Jean-Claude Van Damme, Priscilla Presley, Dennis Rodman, and other Hollywood stars. Marshall Grossman (of whom “six of the top eight students” in his graduating law class were Jewish), and who has Steven Spielberg as a client, “has twice been named among the nation’s best litigators by the National Law Journal.” If I couldn’t sue my friends in this business,” music lawyer Don Engel told the magazine, “I wouldn’t have a business. “Engel has litigated so many cases that only the nastiest ones stand out in the clutter.” Clients have included ‘N Sync, Donna Summer, Don Henley, Boston, and Meat Loaf. Stanton (Larry) Stein’s clients include Robert Redford, Sean Connery, Jane Fonda, and Madonna. “He apprenticed under Frank Rothman, the éminence grise of L.A. litigators.” [JOHNSON, R., MAY 2000]

In Australia, noted the American Jewish Yearbook in 1995, “Lillian Lieder was appointed to the Queen’s Council (senior members of the [lawyers’] bar); one of only six women, four of them Jewish, ever to be appointed in Victoria.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1995, p. 359] The first chairman of the Victoria Bar Association was Jewish, as was the 1966 chairman, William Kaye, who had “forthright dedication with every important Jewish and Zionist cause.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 176] In 1999, American Lawyer magazine heralded corporate lawyer Joe Flom, who “was instrumental in [the] reinvention of American business, helping to engineer many of the biggest proxy fights of the sixties and the hostile tender offers of the seventies and eighties.” [MORRIS, 12-6-99] In New England, another lawyer, Lew Weinstein, head of a local Zionist Association, “played a significant role in the restructuring of the skylines of Boston.” [LEVINE/HARMON, p. 50, 53]

The extraordinarily absurd Jewish propensities to “sue,” and the elaborate manipulations Jewish lobbying pressures can accomplish, may be measured in the case of the (lawyer) father of Alisa Flatow. This young American Jewish woman was killed in a 1995 suicide bomb attack by a Palestinian in Israel. Her father’s response was to sue the entire nation of Iran, as responsible for promoting terrorism: “Islamic Holy War.” Incredibly, in a Washington court, he won a settlement for $247.5 million, a case completely ignored of course by Iran. The double standard here is staggering. While a Jewish lawyer can successfully sue Iran in America for a quarter of a billion dollars because his daughter was killed by Palestinian suicide bomber who probably had eight cents to his name across the world, the Palestinian people themselves remain completely legally paralyzed in fighting an avalanche of oppression (including murder) against them by the Jewish state of Israel. [See chapter about Israel, p. 1725, and the institutionalized “terrorism” against the Palestinian people]

In 2000, the Ira Wasserstein family also embarked upon a lawsuit against the country of Syria, demanding $330 million “under a law that allows American victims to sue states responsible for terrorist acts.” Ira Wasserstein had been killed in the bombing of a bus. The lawsuit charges that Syria supported the Islamic group Hamas, which champions violent rebellion against the oppression of Palestinians by the Jewish state. Also in 2000, the Eisenfeld and Duker
families, each which had lost family members to violence in Israel, won a $327 million judgment against the country of Iran for its support of anti-Israel movements. [SAMBÉR, S., 8-3-2000, p. 6] These three American Jews, the Jewish-lobbyed courts have deemed, are collectively worth about $1 billion. The hundreds, if not thousands, of Palestinians who have died in recent years as victims of Israeli state terrorism are, correspondingly, worth nothing.

In April 2001, an Israeli, Esh Kodesh Gilmore, filed a lawsuit in America, against Yassar Arafat, the Palestinian Authority (the acting government of the Palestinian people) and the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Her husband had been killed by an Arab in Israel and she decided Arafat and the collective Palestinians were responsible. For her American Jewish lawyer, David Strachman, “it is the third such case he has pursued against the PLO under the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1991, which allows Americans who have been harmed in terrorist attacks abroad to take action against the perpetrators in American court. ‘If the PLO and terrorists knew that every time they killed an American they would pay $100m or $200m, at some point they are going to wake up,’ Strachman said.” [MAHNAIMI, U., 4-29-01] This lawsuit was filed even as Jewish Israelis had slain over 400 Arab Palestinians (including numerous children) and wounded thousands during their most recent “Intifada” against Israeli rule.

At the same time, the family of Michael Norzhich, an Israeli soldier murdered by a Palestinian mob when he took a wrong turn in the West Bank, sued the Palestinian government for over $20 million. [HAAS, D., 1-26-01]

In 2001, two Jewish parents, Eleanor and Charles Kadish, even filed suit against the Jewish Community Centers of Greater Los Angeles. Why? Because of a failure “to provide the necessary security” against the likes of white supremacist fanatic Buford Furrow, who shot over 70 bullets at the Jewish center and injured their son. [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 5-1-01]

In 2001, two German-Jews – Kurt Julius Goldstein and Peter Gingold – filed the most absurd lawsuit of them all (seeking $40 billion), a guaranteed incitement to anti-Semitism. “In a bizarre addition to the Holocaust-related suits now winding their way through the courts,” noted the [Jewish] Forward,

“two German-Jewish survivors of the Auschwitz death camp are suing the American government for its failure to bomb the camp … The suit was filed with the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia on January 2 … In the past few years, Jewish survivors have filed numerous lawsuits against Swiss banks, German companies and other European entities and governments, leading to several multi-billion-dollar settlements. Recently, however, the focus has been shifting toward America’s role in the Nazi atrocities and their aftermath. A lawsuit, since dropped, was filed against IBM alleging that its German subsidiary colluded with the Nazi regime.” [FORWARD, 4-6-01]

The lawsuit against the U. S. government, notes Gabriel Schoenfeld,

“follows in the wake of lawsuits that have been initiated against more than a few American corporations, including giants like General Motors and Chase Manhattan Bank, for allegedly contributing to, or benefiting
financially from the Holocaust. Is justice finally being done, or is something far less admirable going on?"

Among the prominent legal “ambulance-chasers” is Michael Hausfeld whose

“firm has made a specialty of filing class-action suits, mostly on ‘behalf’ of shareholders of such corporations as Amazon and MCI for alleged violations of the law. When successful, these actions bring pennies to shareholders and princely fees to Mr. Hausfeld and his associates. Another lucrative line of business – with a similar division between ‘clients’ and lawyers – is Holocaust litigation. Though he cloaks himself in the rhetoric of a noble cause, Mr. Hausfeld’s preferred methods include subjecting target companies to a blitz of adverse publicity in an effort to compel cash settlements.” [SCHOENFELD, G., 4-11-01]

By 2001, lawyer Hausfeld and partner Edward Fagan had moved towards cashing in on African legal claims for slavery restitutions from First World countries:

“In the first significant sequel to the legal and moral process of Holocaust restitution, a South African coalition advocating Third World debt relief has reached out to Jewish groups and activists to share expertise in several key aspects of the campaign. Two lawyers who were active in securing restitution for Holocaust victims, Michael Hausfeld and Edward Fagan, said they have been consulting with the South African group, Jubilee South Africa. Both men said they would be filing class-action lawsuits against companies that they say profited from and helped to prop up the racist apartheid regime.” [CATTAN, N., 11-30-01]

Moving along into other realms, by the 1950s, Jews owned three of the top four cigar-manufacturing firms, almost half of North America’s alcohol distilling companies (including the Bronfman family’s Seagram and Lewis Rosenthal’s Schenley – the two largest) and at least 90% of apparel chain stores. [SACHAR, p. 409; BERMANT, C., 1987, p. 66] (Both Seagram and Schenley had mob links in the creation of their dynasties. In Schenley’s case, “Rosenthal’s lifelong involvement with the Mafia came to light only in 1970, when the New York State Legislative Committee on Crime established that he and mob characters had formed a consortium to smuggle liquor during Prohibition.” [SUMMERS, A., 1993, p. 248] “When [Seagram founder] Sam [Bronfman] died in 1971, the company owned thirty-nine distilleries and eighteen wineries, scattered throughout the world and the United States, and producing about 114 different brands of beverages including America’s most popular brands – Chivas Regal, Seven Crowns and Seagram’s V.O.” (Bronfman was for decades the President of the Canadian Jewish Congress). [BERMANT, C., 1987, p. 68-69] At his death in 1987, another Jewish alcohol mogul, Paul Kalmanovitz, was worth $500 million. His personal mausoleum cost $6.5 million. He had built an empire of second-rate beer brands in different regions of the country, including Pabst, Hamms, Olympia, Falstaff, Lucky Lager, Pearl, Regal Pale, and Grace Brothers. [COTHRAN, G., 1995] Maurice Kanbar founded the Skyy Vodka
firm. As Chaim Bermant notes about the heavy presence of Jewish ownership in the alcohol world, now and over the centuries:

“If there is anything as Jewish as the garment trade it is perhaps the drink trade, which may seem surprising in a people as sober and as abstemious as the Jews. Both their abstemiousness (from drink at least – if a Jew becomes intoxicated it is usually on food) was no doubt one of the reasons for their prominence in the trade; they never felt tempted to consume their own stock.” [BERMANT, C. 1977, p. 66]

By the mid-to late-1800s preeminent Jewish regional specialty and department stores included Filene’s in Boston, Macy’s in New York, and those of the Kaufman’s in Pittsburgh, the Lazaruses in Columbia, Ohio, the Goldsmiths in Memphis, the Sangers in Dallas, the Spiegelbergs in New Mexico, the Goldwaters in Arizona, and the Meiers in Portland. Mervyn Morris, an activist at the Anti-Defamation League, founded the California-based department store chain called Mervyn’s. By the 1960s, the largest store in New York’s African-American ghetto of Harlem was Jewish (Blumstein’s), as was the largest department store in Atlanta (Rich’s). [KAUFMAN, J., 1988, p. 39, 111] And, “even if you’d never been there,” notes the Atlanta Jewish Times, “you’d still recognize Cohen’s Department Store in Alma, Georgia. You know, the Jewish-owned emporium on the main street of a hundred rural southern towns, the place where locals, and their children, and their children’s children, have shopped for generations.” [LEOPOLD, T., 12-24-99]

“By the time the War of Rebellion [Civil War] became a stark reality,” says Louis Swichkow,

“[Jews] were considered a vital element in the economic and financial fabric of the rapidly expanding city [of Milwaukee]. A quick glance at the more prominent business establishments that flourished during that period reveals that of the fourteen leading firms of merchant tailors and clothiers in Milwaukee in 1862, five were owned and operated by Jews.” [SWICHKOW, L., 1957, p. 37]

Even in the remote and tiny desert tourist town of Tombstone, Arizona, the local Long Horn restaurant and Branding Iron souvenir shop is owned by Jews. A Jewish visitor asked one these merchants about anti-Semitism in the area. “One or two try to agitate,” came the reply,

“But that makes us angry, and the more angry we get, the more determined we are to stick it out. The thing is’ – and he whispers this so that even Richard, who is standing next to me, shouldn’t hear it – ‘to beat them economically.’ ‘And is that what you’re doing?’ Some play of light in his eyes, some infinitesimal movement of his body which I infinitesimally duplicate with mine, expresses the freemasonry of Hebraic exclusion which exists between us, ‘What do you think?’ he says.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 269-270]

Jews also dominated merchandising in the California Gold Rush areas in the mid-19th century, and many became wealthy from their sales:
“Historians of this [Gold Rush] period, both scholarly and popular, overlooked the dominance by Jewish businessmen of the retail economy in practically every mining camp and town in the Mother Lode and Northern mines of California and in every other mineral discovery in the American and Canadian West. Those writers who noted the presence of Jews but criticized them because they were not miners also criticized them because they were merchants. The romantic writers of this period wrote in favor of the miner, and any class of people, such as merchants, who took money from miners were regarded as exploitive … The merchants became some of the richest men in the gold rush region … [In 1860] in Calaveras County, Jewish taxpayers constituted only 3.1 percent of all taxpayers in the county and 0.34 of the total population. Yet these fifty-five taxpayers declared themselves to be owners of 7.8 percent of all the real and personal property in the county and accounted for 7.2 percent of the total tax assessment that year. In adjacent Tuolumne County, eighty-three Jewish taxpayers made up 3.6 percent of the taxpayers, and 9.51 percent of the total population, but owned 6.67 percent of the real and personal property and were assessed for 8.43 percent of the total tax … Jewish merchants in the cities and towns of the Mother Lode were among the wealthiest residents … All of the Jews who came to California at this time were born in Europe.” [LEVINSON, R., 1978, p. 26, 38, 61, 62]

In Nevada City, for instance, in 1861, 14 of 17 drygoods stores were Jewish-owned, as were all six tobacco sellers. In Placerville, in 1862, 23 of 26 clothing merchants were Jewish and two of four tobacco sellers. [LEVINSON, R., 1978, p. 30]

As Henry Feingold notes about the history of Jewish merchantry in America:

“The breadth of Jewish embourgeoisement, especially through merchandising, surpassed other groups. Jewish department store ownership, for example, was merely the tip of the iceberg, the visible part of a merchandising interest which reached into virtually every town in America. In many cases the Jewish merchant preceded the development of the town or hamlet, which was organized around him.” [FEINGOLD, H., 1988, p. 535]

“As by the end of the nineteenth century,” notes Chaim Bermant,

“of the five major German groups [i.e., department store firms], three, Schocken, Tietz, and Wertheim, were in Jewish hands. In America, too, the biggest, and certainly the best known of the groups, tended to be Jewish owned.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 59]

But “if one were to look for the one industry that Jews do have a lock on,” wrote Gerald Krefetz in 1982, “it would be … the toy industry,” with a “strong Jewish presence” in many of the major firms, including Mattel (CEO, Jill Barad), Hasbro (an abbreviation of Hassenfeld Brothers), Ideal, Mego, Gabriel, and Marx. Ruth Handler at Mattel created the Barbie Doll as an American cultural institution. “The Handlers left the company and the toy business in
1975 because of legal problems connected with alleged financial malfeasance by Ruth.” [HYMAN, p. 29] Sylvia Hassenfeld was the Hasbro CEO in 1990. She was also chairman of the Jewish Agency’s Rural Settlement Division for Israel, president of the Joint Distribution Committee, and was the holder of other prominent Jewish and Israel-oriented posts. [STARR, J., 1990, p. 140] Beatrice Alexander, an earlier proprietor of a successful doll company – Madame Alexander’s Doll Factory – “was a devoted Zionist.” [HYMAN, p. 34, 35] The Cabbage Patch doll-fad came from the COLECO company, founded by the Greenberg family. [ETKES/STADTMUER, 1995, p. 172] The Lionel Train company was founded by Joshua Lionel.

In Chicago, Walter Mander was “one of the nation’s leading entrepreneurs in the cattle industry.” His Lincoln Meat Company (which he heading from 1952 to his retirement in 1990) was one of Chicago’s most prominent slaughterhouses. [CHICAGO SUN-TIMES, 12-23-97, p. 79] In South Carolina, Arnold Tenenbaum is the CEO of Chatham Steel. Arnold’s cousin, Sam, retired as the company’s vice president in 2000. [GRESOCK, S., 8-3-2000] In Washington DC, Israel Cohen built the regional powerhouse Giant Food supermarket chain. “He controls a veritable monopoly,” wrote reporter Frank O’Donnell, “and can pretty much set the prices of one commodity that nobody can live without: food.” [O’DONNELL, p. 130] Giant also has pharmacies in 94 of its food stores, where drug profit margin can be 40 percent. Melvyn Estrin is another economic powerhouse in the Washington DC area. Starting out in the wholesale drug supply business, “he secured financing for another early undertaking, University Research Group, a social-science consulting firm formed by academic refugees from the Kennedy administration. He ended up owning the company, which today generates some $30 million a year. Around the same time, Estrin acquired American Health Services, a chain of 17 psychiatric hospitals and nursing homes that later sold for $36 million.” [GREENBERG, R., p. 78]

Jewish entrepreneurs also were – and are – prominent in various other kinds of companies, from department stores to computer companies, founding, and/or later owning or controlling: Sears-Roebuck, (“Julius Rosenwald’s accomplishments at Sears showed him to be a true pioneer of modern business – Henry Ford is said to have borrowed the assembly-line technique from the great retailer”) [DALIN, D., 4-98] Petrie Stores, Toys R Us (current chairman: Michael Goldberg; founder Charles Lazarus), Revlon (founder: Charles Revlon), Family Dollar Stores (founder: Leon Levine); Gimbels, I. Magnin (founder: Mary Ann Cohen), Nieman-Marcus, Bloomingdales, Saks Fifth Avenue, Abraham and Strauss, Hearn, May Company, Simplicity dress patterns (James Shapiro), Xerox (CEO: Sol Linowitz; founded by Max Palevsky), Automated Data Processing (founded by Henry Taub and Frank Lautenberg, the latter both a U.S. Senator from New Jersey and president and chairman of the United Jewish Appeal), Federated Department Stores (Fred Lazarus), Allied, Interstate, Adray’s, Ohrbach’s, Joseph Magnin, Colonial Penn Insurance, Crate and Barrel (Gordon Seagel), Zody’s, Loehmann’s, Spartan Industries, Levitz Furniture, E.J. Korvette, (founder: Eugene Ferkauf), Cost-Co (Jeffrey Brotman), Cost-Plus (Andrew Kattan), Waldbaum’s, Stop-and-Shop,
B. Altmans, Richs, Sterns, ShopRite, Bergdorf’s, Falstaff and Pabst beers, David Oreck vacuum cleaners, Slim-Fast (founder: S. Daniel Abraham, who “has spent most of his political and charitable energies in the last decade supporting Israel and the troubled Middle East peace process. He helped fund Birthright Israel, a program which sponsors tours of Israel for young American Jews” and he “also helped fund a tunnel alongside Jerusalem’s Western Wall, which became a flash point between Palestinians and Israelis in 1996”), [MOTHER JONES, 3-5-20] the Great American Cookie Company (400 stores; founder Michael Coles) and many, many others.

Ben and Jerry (Ben Cohen and Jerry Greenfield) ice cream was Jewish-founded, and Reuben Matheus (a major contributor to Jewish fascist Meir Kahane) founded Haagen-Daz. Baskin-Robbins was also founded by Jews: Burton Baskin and Irving Robbins. Michael Illitch owns Little Caesar’s Pizza. Steve Adler founded the Big and Tall chain stores. Israeli Ike Starkman founded the Jerry’s Famous Deli shops. He is active in the American Israel Political Affairs Committee and “leans to the right in Israeli politics.” [TUGEND, 10-22-99] Jean Nidetech founded Weight Watchers. [ETKES/STADTMAUER, 1995, p. 173] Florine Mark is also president and CEO of the W. W. Group, “the largest franchise of Weight Watchers International.” She is also a board member of the Weight Watchers Foundation, as well the Executive Committee for the United Jewish Appeal National Campaign. [ROBINSON, M., 5-4-2000, p. 17] Len Feinstein is co-CEO of Bed, Bath and Beyond. Ray Schoenbaum is the CEO of the Shoney’s chain of 1,200 restaurants in 28 states, including Shoney’s, Captain D’s Seafood, Pargo’s, and Fifth Quarter. Schoenbaum’s father founded the company. [ATLANTA JEWISH TIMES, 4-9-99]

The Jewish Pritzker family controls the Marmon Group, which over the years has “bought the Hyatt hotel chain, Royal Caribbean cruise line, Braniff Airlines, Continental Airlines, McCall’s magazine, Montgomery Securities and Ticketmaster, among many others.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 33]

From Miami, William Singer, “the Hamburger King,” founded the Royal Castle hamburger chain, which by 1965 had 144 restaurants in Florida, Louisiana and Georgia. [BIANCO, A., 1991, p. 41] “Royal Castle’s rigid policy of racial segregation (blacks could order through a window but not come inside),” notes Anthony Bianco, “made the chain a favorite target for demonstrations by civil rights groups … These were times when a man could own a company that was overtly racist and sexist yet still be named Miami’s Outstanding Citizen, as Singer was in 1959 … He began his rise to social prominence by supporting specifically Jewish causes …” [BIANCO, A., 1991, p. 41]

In the late 1960s, the Fifth Avenue Coach Line in New York City, notes infamous lawyer Roy Cohn, “was the largest private transit system in the world, with over two thousand buses in Manhattan and the Bronx and revenues exceeding $60 million a year … By 1960, [Harry] Weinberg [‘a colorful millionaire from Baltimore who had made his bundle on transit systems from Scranton to Honolulu’] had become the largest shareholder in Fifth Avenue, and he hired me to wrest control from the establishment crowd.” [COHN, R., 1988, p. 182]
Macy’s department store is of course a seminal Jewish institution. By the 1930s, notes William Leach, “Macys [department store] was so big and so successful that it was beginning to function not only as a mythical symbol of American mass consumption but also the epitome of economic force.” [LEACH, p. 281] It had attained the biggest volume of any department store in the world. At one time Macys, and Abraham and Strauss, were “the two biggest stores in New York [and] owned … by the same Jewish family.” [SIEGEL, p. 107]

Henry Bloch founded the best known American tax-consulting firm, H&R Block. Samuel Liedesdorf was “founder of one of the largest accounting firms in the nation.” [ETKES/STADTMUER, 1995, p. 173] Nathan and Gordon Sherman founded Midas Muffler (Midas International), America’s leading muffler company with 1415 stores. The Pep Boys (“Manny, Moe, and Jack”) automobile supply chain was founded by Emmanuel Rosenfeld (Manny), Maurice Strauss (Moe), and non-Jew W. Graham Jackson (Jack). Jackson left the business in the 1920s and Strauss’ brother I.M. became “Jack.” The first Pep Boys CEO (also Jewish) to be outside the founding families was Mitchell Leibowitz in 1990. [CUFF, D., 4-2-90] Ray Firestone, also Jewish, became chairman of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, his family’s business, in 1966. [ETKES/STADTMUER, 1995, p. 165]

Eli Jacobs headed a group of companies including Memorex, the Telex corporation, and Jos. A. Bank Clothiers. In 1993 alone Sam Zell bought the Schwinn bicycle company, 91% of 16 radio stations, and the Sealy bed company (originally founded by Saul Ostrow). He also controls Reaco D.S. (a chain of 1150 drug stores) and the Carter Hawley Hale department store chain. “Zell is among the wealthiest men in the country,” noted the Seattle Times, “with a reported net worth topping $880 million.” [LANE, p. E1] By 1996, Lou Weisbach’s Chicago-based Ha-Lo promotional products company (coffee cups with corporate logos, etc.) was worth $400 million. [REKHA, B., 12-16-96, p. 13]

By the 1980s, Kohlberg Kravis (Jerome Kohlberg; Henry Kravis), corporate takeover specialists, controlled everything “from Duracell batteries to Safeway supermarkets.” [BURROUGH/HELYAR, p. 130] There’s also big money in education. Kindercare is owned by an affiliate of Kohlberg Kravis Roberts. Twice Kindercare’s size (and company #150 on the Forbes private 400) in the education market is Knowledge Universe, founded by jailed junk bonder Michael Milken, his brother Lowell, and fellow Jewish mogul Larry Ellison. KU, noted The Nation in 1999,

“has bought or purchased stock in everything from Children’s Discovery Centers (CDC, also known as Knowledge Beginnings), the nation’s sixth-largest preschool company, with 25,000 toddlers in nearly 300 locations across the United States; to Spring, Britain’s largest vocational training firm. KU owns or has invested in more than a dozen companies involved in computer training, proficiency testing, educational toys, strategic counseling and CEO training, as well as private, for-profit schools (nearly 400 at last count, ranging from preschool to secondary) … Companies like Milken’s are not just competitors with pub-
lic schools; they are poised to supplement the traditional classroom, viewing public and nonprofit educational institutions – as well as for-profit firms – as both potential customers and avenues to a vast consumer base … Milken has talked of dominating legal training and college prep courses, according to former insiders … Educators worry that if curriculum and the tools of teaching (let alone schools themselves) are controlled by conglomerates like Milken’s, many of the virtues of public education will be lost … The dirty little not-very-secret is that educational establishments, which still shape our society more than any other institutions, are being turned over to those who see life as one giant Risk board … The future may belong not to teachers and students but to the new proprietors of knowledge – corporate executives and investors.” [BAKER, R., 5-3-99]

Joe Neubeuer (built to power a) is CEO of Aramark Corporation, mostly a food services and building maintenance company across 22 states. Its accounts include everything from washing McDonalds’ laundry and prisoners’ clothes to distributing magazines. “It does over $6 billion with just $2.7 billion is assets,” notes Forbes magazine, “… Aramark employs 150,000 people, most of them earning just above minimum wage. Managing them efficiently is the responsibility of Neubauer’s top 4,500 employees.” [BERMAN, P., 12-1-97] Aramark “for years … has committed and admitted to unfair and illegal trading practices, including violating federal anti-trust laws. Also, Aramark has been suspected of having massive organized crime connections in its transportation and vending-machine divisions … A mental retardation center owned by Aramark was decertified in Texas, and the company has paid large fines for failing to meet nursing home standards in Texas and California. In Colorado, ARA nursing home abuses were described by an assistant state attorney as ‘the most severe disregard of patient care in any case to my knowledge’ … According to the Wall Street Journal, Aramark also has links to organized crime. Reportedly, Aramark paid an ex-FBI agent – and former ARA employee – $167,000 plus lawyers’ fees out of court not to discuss his deposition, which highlights the dining service corporation’s organized crime connections.” [BURKART/DONOHO/ODEKIRK]

Elsewhere, Sam Fox, chairman of the Republican Jewish Coalition, founded and heads the Harbour Group which has “acquired more than 120 manufacturers that produce everything from funnels and industrial springs to pressure washers and do-it-yourself repair kits.” He is an activist in pro-Israel issues [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] Ira Lipman owns Guardsmark, “ones of the nation’s largest security firms,” with offices in more than 400 cities in the U. S. and Canada. [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

Lillian Vernon (originally: Lillian Menasche Katz) “is founder and chairman of the Lillian Vernon Catalogue, one of America’s largest direct-mail businesses.” “According to a National Opinion Research Poll,” writes Ms. Vernon, “over forty-three million Americans recognize my name, and one in four
American households receives the Lillian Vernon Catalogue.” [VERNON, p. 9] 

**Spiegel’s** is another Jewish-founded mail order company, founded in the nineteenth century. The **Trianc** company (run by Nelson Peltz and Peter May) bought the **Snapple** beverage company in 1998. The CEO of **Dunkin Donuts** (the country’s largest donut chain) is Robert Rosenberg. His father, Bill, founded the firm. Another Jewish CEO, Howard Schultz, bought and built the **Starbuck’s** coffee shop chain into a 1300-site empire across America. Dennis Eder is president and CEO of **CareAmerica**. Russ Solomon is the CEO of **Tower Records**. Leonard Weinglass founded and chairs the 1435-store **Merry-Go-Round** chain. Larry Hochberg founded and owns the **Sportmart** chain. In 1993 he was honored at a Friends of the Israeli Defense Forces dinner in Chicago. “I feel the American Jew can feel more secure,” said Hochberg, “because of the [Israeli army] efforts.” [JACOBS, J., p. 12]

In 1973 Irving Shapiro became the chairman of one of America’s most “blue-chip” WASP corporations, **E. I. Dupont**, and later also chairman of the Business Roundtable, a group of CEOs from America’s most prominent 200 corporations. By 1986 a Jewish family, the **Bronfmans**, held almost a quarter of du Pont stock. [CHRISTOPHER, p. 115] (Shapiro also served on the board of directors for **IBM**, **Citicorp**, and **Continental Insurance**). By 1980 five of 16 board members of America’s largest munitions maker, **General Dynamics**, were Jewish, including Lester Crown whose family had the greatest ownership in the company, and who was also on the board of **Esmark** and **TWA**. [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 28] Ralph Lazarus, Chairman of **Federated Department Stores**, also sat on the boards of **Chase Manhattan Bank**, **General Electric**, and **Scott Paper**. [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 30] By 1965 two Jews – Sidney Weinberg and Frederick Cullman III (the Chairman of the Board and CEO of Philip Morris), even sat on the board of the **Ford Motor Company**, [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 32-33] the company whose founder, Henry Ford, is generally considered in the Jewish community to be the most powerful and influential anti-Semite in America’s history. Weinberg also sat on the boards of **Knight-Ridder** newspapers and **Seagram’s**. (“After Henry Ford’s death,” notes Stephen Birmingham, “it was a Jewish bank – **Goldman, Sachs, and Co.** – which first brought out Ford stock, and under the guise of Sidney Weinberg, devised the intricate construction of the Ford Foundation. Today Weinberg is the chief financial advisor to Henry Ford II…. The ironies of high finance never cease. When great money is to be made, much can be forgiven.” [BIRMINGHAM, OUR, p. 350]

For years, another Jewish entrepreneur, Victor Potamkin, sold more **Cadillac** automobiles than anyone else in the world. He and his sons owned 54 automobile franchises of all kinds, stretching from New York to Florida. Another Jewish mogul, Victor Markowicz, is co-founder and co-chairman of Gtech, a giant firm that “runs 29 state lotteries and 50 in foreign countries … In 1993 alone Gtech paid $11 million to its consultants and lobbyists around the country.” [RATCLIFFE, p. 1]

Marcus Bearsted founded the firm that became then **Shell Oil Company**. His son “became chairman of the Shell Oil Company after his father.” [GREENBERG,
Baltimore’s Jacob Blaustein founded Amoco (American Oil Company.) By 1957 the Blaustein’s were the eleventh richest family in the United States. “One of the family’s favorites philanthropies is the American Jewish Committee, and for many years Jacob was its honorary chairman.” [KREFETZ, p. 83] Blaustein, said World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann, was “a big oilman and notorious anti-Zionist who later became a friend of mine and a great friend of Israel.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 36] In Detroit, by the 1980s Max Fisher was “one of the richest and most influential men in the country.” [FLAX, p. 64] His millions began with the Marathon Oil company and spread to other investments, including United Brands and real estate ventures. “His prodigious funding for Jewish causes has put Fisher on a first name basis with every prime minister of Israel … Fisher’s annual gifts to Jewish causes alone have amounted to more than $500,000 [a year].” [FLAX, p. 64]

By August 2000, three Israeli-based companies, the African-Israel Group (at 21%), Rosebud (at 19%), and the Alon Israel Oil Company (at 60%) owned the American operations of the Total Fina oil company. Fina includes 1,700 gas stations, refineries, pipelines, terminals and other holdings, and even partial control of 7-11 markets at 170 gas stations. [BERGER, S., 10-3-2000] In France, Henri Deutsch, also of Jewish heritage, “owned one of the two or three largest French petroleum companies and pioneered the development of aviation fuel.” [GREENBERG, M., p. 69]

Jews also founded or later controlled the company that makes Ex-Lax (founder Isaac Matz), the Hudson Pulp and Paper Company, and Olivetti-Underwood (famous for typewriters). James Zellerbach’s Crown Zellerbach “was one of the dominating firms in the world paper market.” Howard Gilman, in Georgia, headed Gilman Paper, the largest privately-owned paper company in the United States” and “one of Georgia’s top industrial polluters.” With Gilman’s death, Bernard Bergreen executes the Gilman estate. [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] Joe Katz founded Papercraft: “It’s Kaycraft line was the biggest-selling gift-wrap brand in the country.” [BIANCO, A., 1991, p. 33] “The Block family (Joseph, Philip, etc.) founded and managed the Inland Steel Company.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 162-163]

Samuel Zemurray “controlled a majority of the stock in the United Fruit Company, which dominated the economies of a number of Central American countries.” [GREENBERG, M., p. 72-74] Jacob Kaplan headed the Welch’s Grape Juice company as well as controlling “half the export of blackstrap molasses in Cuba … [He was also] as it turned out, a major backer of Fidel Castro’s munitions factories. It caused no less than a national scandal when in 1964, a congressional investigative panel claimed that the CIA was using Kaplan’s J. M. Kaplan Fund as a pipeline for $1.25 million in funding for a Costa Rican CIA training center.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 200-201]

In 1992, David E. R. Dangoor was appointed to be the executive vice president for the Philip Morris International tobacco company. He noted the strong Jewish influence in the marketing of his company’s carcinogenic products:
“Do you know the story? I’m surprised that business magazines don’t look at the genius of the origins of Philip Morris. The reason we’re the powerhouse we are is because of a couple of guys in the 1950s and 1960s. They rolled the dice four times and always came up sixes. The Cullmans. With the Cullman family coming in, the Jewish mind entered the tobacco industry, which had been traditionally clinically free of Jewish executives and Jewish interests. I should tell you that I’m Jewish myself – a Jewish Swede. The industry, till then, was run by southern Protestants. What happened was that Jewish executives took over. I don’t want to name all the executives because, you know, some Jews don’t like to be remembered as Jews and others do. So I’m not going to get in trouble here. But there were five extremely senior executives…. So they decided to look at their broad portfolios and reposition their brands and stock. And the brand they started with was Marlboro. And you know the rest. They made a macho campaign for men out of a woman’s cigarette. The point is, the whole attitude changed.” [ROSENBLATT, p. 22]


Jewish historian Cecil Roth notes the first man ever documented to have smoked tobacco was Jewish: Mestre Bernal, a doctor in the Christopher Columbus expedition to the New World. Roth further notes early Jewish entrepreneurial efforts in the recreational habit of smoking tobacco:

“Jews have been closely associated with the tobacco industry … Jews were engaged at an early date in the tobacco monopolies in Italy; it was a Jew who first introduced the use of snuff to Venice; and in Spain, in the seventeenth century, persons engaged in the tobacco trade figure with significant frequency among the Marranos punished by the Inquisition. In Holland, tobacco was unknown until 1611. In that very year, a Jew named David Abendana sold a barrel of tobacco to a merchant in Hoorn, and from that date, tobacco-importing and tobacco-working played a very important part in the economic structure of the Amsterdam community. In the seventeenth century, a good part of the tobacco consumed in Germany was imported through the [Jewish] Spanish and Portuguese communities of Hamburg. The Jewish interest in the tobacco industry, therefore, is not a recent development: Jews have interested in it from the first.” [ROTH, C., 1940, p. 258-259]

(In Pittsburgh, by the late 1800s, “the only major industry in Pittsburgh that employed Jews was stogie making, which itself was largely Jewish-owned. Stogies, which were made by rolling a fiber filler in tobacco leaves, were cheaper than fine cigars and exploded quite nicely in dozens of early silent-film comedies.”) [BIANCO, A., 1991, p. 27]

Another Jewish mogul, John Schiff, “served through the 1970s as a director of such well-known firms as Getty Oil, Uniroyal, Kennecott Copper, Westinghouse, CIT Financial, and A&P.” [ZWEIGENHAFT, p 35] Alan Greenspan, later to become Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, by 1977 was a member of the
board for Morgan Guaranty Trust, Mobil, and General Foods. [ZWEIGENHAFT, p. 40] By 1980, Bernard Rappoport, founder of American Income Life Insurance, was one of the twenty “most powerful men in Texas.” [WALDMAN, p. 339] Les Melamed (originally: Leybl Melamdowitz; described in 1995 by the Jewish Forward as “one of the most powerful people in the world of finance”) became the CEO of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, Richard Bogomolny the CEO and president of New England’s First National supermarket company. Eric Pfeffer became the president of Howard Johnson International; Stanley Fischer became the first Jewish deputy manager of the International Monetary Fund in 1994. Harvey Golub became the CEO of American Express in 1993. The Tisch family owns the Loews Corporation; its holdings include Loews Hotels, Lorillard Tobacco, insurance giant CNA Financial, and the Diamond Offshore Drilling Company. [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

The two largest “biotech” companies of the 1990s also have Jews at the helm: Genentech’s CEO and chairman is Arthur Levinson. The chairman and CEO of Amgen is Gordon Binder. From Australia, Chabad Rabbi Joseph Gutnik, by the 1990s one of the richest men in that country, owned 20% of the biotechnology company Autogen, considered today his “flagship company.” [HANDWERKER, H., 5-15-01]

In 1990, Richard Rosenberg became the CEO for the BankAmerica Corporation. Rosenberg, described by the New York Times as “on his way to becoming, quite possibly, the most powerful banker in the nation,” is active in the Jewish Community Federation. [POLLACK, A., p. D1] In 1999, billionaire Maurice Greenberg still headed American International Group, “the largest United States underwriter of commercial and industrial insurance.” [BROWN/DONOVAN, 6-5-99] He also controls SunAmerica.

By 1998, Alexandra Lebenthal was the “youngest woman president of a Wall Street firm.” [HENLEY, 1998] The same year, Heidi Miller, formerly the Chief Financial Officer of fellow Jew Sandy Weill’s Travelers Corporation, took the same position at the world’s largest financial organization, Citigroup, running the combined $700 billion assets of Citicorp and Travelers. Forbes magazine headlined Miller as “one of the most powerful women executives in the United States.” [MCCORMACK, p. 88] Curiously, Miller’s PhD dissertation was “the role of Argentinean labor unions before the ascent of dictator Juan Peron.” [MCCORMACK/LENZER, 8-10-98] Her counterpart in England may be Carol Calley (her mother was an Austrian Jewish refugee). “Today,” noted the London Daily Mail, “Carol Galley is said to be the second most powerful woman in Britain, after the Queen. This is probably wrong. The Queen may have influence, but it is Galley who is responsible for around 70 billion [pounds] of our pension fund savings. As a result, she has the kind of power about which modern heads of state can only dream. That such power should be concentrated in the hands of one woman is astonishing enough.” [DAILY MAIL, p. 24]

The Republic Bank in New York is worth $52 billion, but it is only a part of Edmond Safra’s global financial empire. Safra, a Jew born in Lebanon, lived (till his death in 1999) mostly in Geneva, but held Brazilian citizenship. His “world-
wide banking empire” made “Safra the envy of global finance … No other banker since the era of Morgan or Rockefeller has been so successful an entrepreneur.” [WEISS, G., p. 98] In 1990, Safra purchased Israel’s fifth largest bank, the First International. He and his brothers also owned Sao Paolo’s Banca Safra in Brazil and the Trade Development Bank (the sixth largest bank in Switzerland). Safra was originally from a Jewish community in Aleppo in the Middle East. “There is no Jewish community in the diaspora that resembles Aleppo in the closeness of its members,” says Safra’s representative in Israel, Yigal Aron, “It’s like one big clan. To this day, they are closely connected.” [WEISS, G. p. 98]

In 1989, Ed Artzt, also Jewish, became the CEO of Procter and Gamble. Journalist Alicia Swasy’s 1993 book about the company has an entire chapter about Artzt, entitled “the Prince of Darkness,” his nickname among employees. Known for his temper and ruthlessness, “many of those who have left the company,” notes Swasy, “are glad they got out before the Artzt years.” [SWASY, A., 1993, p. 65]

Other top Jewish executives in America of the mid-1990s include Leonard Abramson (CEO of the US Health Care Corporation), Harry Kamen (chairman, CEO, and president of MetLife), Gerald Greenwalt, the CEO of United Airlines, Jeffrey Katz (who became the CEO of Swissair in 1998), Paul Fribourg (CEO of Continental Grain), Charles Hurwitz (CEO of the Maxxam Corporation), David Komansky (of Jewish-Irish parentage, CEO of Merrill Lynch), Robert Shapiro (CEO of Monsanto), Reuben Mark (CEO of Colgate-Palmolive), Steven Goldstone (CEO of RJR Nabisco), Alfred Lerner (Forbes’ 51st richest American and CEO of the credit card-lending giant MBNA), Bram Goldsmith (chairman and CEO of City National Corporation, and a former president of the Jewish Federation in Los Angeles), Morry Weiss (CEO of American Greetings, America’s largest greeting card company. It was founded by Weiss’ father-in-law, Irving Stone, who has been a trustee for the Jewish Community Federation, Yeshiva University, and Young Israel). Josh Weston is the CEO of Automated Processing, and chairman of the Boys Town Jerusalem Foundation of America), Alan Greenberg is the CEO of Bear, Stearns, and Co., Jonathan Kraft (CEO of Rand-Whitney Containerboard and director of the Rand-Whitney Group’s International Forest Products – he’s also on the board of directors of the New England-Israel Chamber of Commerce. Herbert Siegel remains the CEO of ChrisCraft Industries – he took over the company in 1968. This firm originally built boats but is increasing involved in mass media ventures. Diversified in it products, “it was the largest producer of DDT by 1972 when the government banned this deadly chemicals.” [HOOVER, p. 225]

In 1999, the CEO of City National Bank was Russell Goldsmith; of Harley-Davidson motorcycles, Jeffrey Bleustein; of Staples office supply store chain, Thomas Stemberg; and Office Max, Michael Feuer. Bernie Marcus is the CEO of Home Depot and Arthur Blank is the company’s chairman. Both are Jewish and in 1996 they donated a combined $20 million to the Atlanta Jewish Federation campaign. Even the president and CEO of today’s Ringling Brothers and
Barnum and Bailey Circus is Jewish, Kenneth Feld. (Irvin Feld, his brother Israel, and another investor bought the circus in 1967). [BLACKWELL, E., 1973, p. 164] Feld Entertainment, which also includes Disney on Ice, is the largest “live entertainment company” in the world. In 2001 the company faced scandal when it was revealed it had hired a former CIA official to harass a journalist who sought to write an expose about the firm, including its abuse of animals and the homosexual escapades of founder Irwin Feld. [STEIN, J., 8-30-01] Sidney Feltenstein is Chairman, President, and CEO of A & W Restaurants (famed in the 1950s for its root beer), with over 800 sites. [CRAIN’S, 6-97, p. E10]

In 1998 Jack Greenberg became the McDonalds fast food corporation’s new CEO and president. Shortly thereafter, Greenberg named Alan Feldman (formerly of Pizza Hut) as president of the McDonalds USA Division. In 1992 George Cohan retired as chairman, president, and CEO of McDonalds Restaurants of Canada LTD., but remained chairman of the corporation’s executive committee. (The chairman of the Board of Directors of the philanthropic Ronald McDonald House is also Jewish, Jerome Turk, the CEO of Las Vegas-based Fitzgerald’s).

Also in Canada, in 1998 Gerry Schwartz (CEO of the 14th largest Canadian company, the ONEX Corporation) and Heather Reisman (CEO of Indigo Books and Music) donated $6 million to the United Jewish Appeal, one of the largest such donations ever in Canada. Schwartz’s estimated worth is about $500 million. The Toronto Globe and Mail noted in an editorial Reisman’s decision to ban Hitler’s Mein Kampf from her giant bookstore chain:

“It is entirely within Heather Reisman’s province to order her Chapters and Indigo bookstores to stop selling Mein Kampf, just as she could order them to stop selling Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone. She runs the merged chain, and is ultimately in charge of what books they do or don’t stock and will or won’t order for customers. Was she right to do it? Not in our opinion … Hitler’s textbook for what became the Holocaust may appeal to a few warped neo-Nazis, but it is also essential reading for students of the Third Reich, of the Holocaust and of the climate and reasoning that can produce such horrors … Ms. Reisman’s edict has another effect. It reminds Canadians of how important it is to have competition for a monolith such as Chapters/Indigo … Given the dominance of the Reisman empire, the federal government should also look at easing the Canadian cultural laws to allow foreign companies such as Amazon.com to set up warehouse in this country, to increase competition and choice. As Ms. Reisman made evident this week, choice is not something we can count on her for.” [TORONTO GLOBE AND MAIL, 11-30-01]

Onex subsidiaries include Sky Chefs, Celestica, ClientLogic, Lantic Sugar, Dura Automotive Systems, J. L. French, American Buildings, Phoenix Pictures, and Vencap Inc. “The couple’s interests outside of work and children,” noted MacLeans magazine, “include Liberal politics, buying and renovating
houses, Israel, art, books, and, as corny as it sounds, each other.” Onex even owns a 15% stake in actor Robert Redford’s Sundance Resort in Utah. [NOBLE, K., 10-11-99]

Peter Godsoe is the chairman and CEO of Canada’s Scotiabank. Murray Keffler’s Shoppers Drug Mart chain entails 670 stores throughout Canada; Mel Lastman (by the 1990s the mayor of Toronto) founded the Bad Boy appliance chain and Sam Sniderman Sam the Record Man stores in the same country. Sam Steinberg “developed his mother’s grocery store into Quebec’s leading supermarket.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 254]

In England, Lord Arnold Weinstock built the GEC company into Britain’s largest industrial company, including the manufacture of radios, TVs, and washing machines. Bernhard Baron controlled the Carreras tobacco company. Anita Roddick, “one of Britain’s most recognizable businesswomen” is joint chairman of the Body Shop, a chain of 1600 stores. She is also “now one of the richest women in Britain.” [HAYES, D., p. 5-12-98] (Lord) Swaythling (David Montagu) is “one of Britain’s richest men,” a member of the Samuel Montagu “banking dynasty” and chairman of the Rothman International tobacco group. [DUN, p. 4, 5] Stanley Kalms, chairman of Dixon’s (the UK’s largest appliance retailer) also heads Freeserve, that country’s largest Internet server. Ken Foreman, also Jewish, heads the giant garbage collector company, Attwoods. [BEVAN, J., 10-2-94, p. 24] The What Everyone Wants discount chain made Gerald and Vera Weisfeld millionaires. Britain-based Steve Rubin owned the Reebok shoe company (he bought a 51% share of the American firm in 1981). The CEO of Reebok International is Paul Fireman, also Jewish. (Robert Louis Dreyfus, also Jewish, heads the Adidas-Solomon company). (Lord) Michael Marks is “scion of the Marks and Spencer [chain store] dynasty” with an estimated fortune at over $50 million. Josef Sieff, “whose family founded the Marks and Spencer chain … was a prominent backer of Israel.” [LEE, J., 12-12-97] (Lord) Alain Sainsbury “revolutionized the retail food industry in Britain – sales at his stores reached $20 billion a year. Harry Solomon is Chairman and founder of Hillsdown Holdings, “one of the world’s largest food manufacturing companies.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1994, p. 246] “The Sears, Roebuck of Britain in Great Universal Stores, headed by a Scottish Jew, Sir Isaac Wolfson.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 63]

Chaim Bermant also notes the case of British chemical mogul Ludwig Mond:

“In 1872 he bought the right to develop the process [of extracting sulfur from alkali waste] and acquired a site at Winnington, Cheshire, not far from the Liverpool docks and with a good rail link to the limestone deposits of Derbyshire. However his plans were greeted with hostility in the neighborhood, which feared, not without justice, that the establishment of a large chemical works would destroy the character of the surrounding countryside. Local labourers refused to work for him and he imported Irishmen. Hills were flattened and woodlands felled and towers and chimneys rose in their place. He was on site daily to supervise
the building operations and spurred the labourers on with threats and curses, ‘Don’t call me Sir,’ he would roar, ‘I am not a gentleman.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 74]

From Italy, in 1997, Antoine Bernheim, was “the man behind one of the largest and boldest takeovers in French business history – the [$10 billion] hostile bid by Italian insurer Generali for its French rival AGF.” Bernheim was both the Chairman of Generali and a senior partner in Paris-based investment bank Lazard Frères. [FINANCIAL TIMES, 10-18-97, p. 7]

In Mexico’s Baja California, the largest department store chain – 24 stores – is Dorian’s, founded by Miguel Goldstein and Salomon Cohen. [FOX, p. 23]

Focusing on New York’s Puerto Rican community, Salomon Levis filed to set up an American mortgage firm in New York in 1998. Levis also owns the San Juan-based Doral Financial Corporation, the number one mortgage marketing firm in Puerto Rico. In 1999 French-born Philipe Reichstul (also Jewish) became president of Brazil’s largest company – Petrobras (an oil company). By the 1990s, Jewish entrepreneur Michael Smolens’ textile factory was the largest employer in Haiti (he has also has been involved in businesses in Mexico, Hungary, Jordan and Azerbaijan). GREEN, D., May 31, 2001]

This is what Steel Profiles magazine said about Brazil’s Benjamin Steinbruch in 1997:

“It is just over a year since Benjamin Steinbruch was crowned the new king of Brazilian industry. The 44-year-old entrepreneur had just put together the consortium that bought a controlling stake in Companhia Vale do Rio Doce (CVRD), the world’s biggest iron ore company, in what was Latin America’s largest privatisation. In a dramatic auction at the Rio de Janeiro stock exchange, he snatched the company from the clutches of the strong favourite, a consortium led by Antonio Ermirio de Moraes of the Votorantim group, the grand old man of Brazilian capitalism. It was the most audacious in a series of acquisitions of companies being privatised, that have catapulted Mr Steinbruch from being the unknown heir of a family textiles group to one of the most important businessmen in Latin America in the space of just four years ... In 1993 he persuaded Vicunha, the family business, to take a 9.3 per cent stake in CSN, Brazil’s largest steel company. He later got Bamerindus, the retail bank, to sell him its 5 per cent stake and he became chairman ... In 1996 he talked the CSN board into taking a 7.25 per cent stake in Light, the Rio de Janeiro electricity distributor, with Mr Steinbruch collecting the chairmanship. His formidable powers of quiet persuasion were at work again last year when he pulled together an unlikely group of investors, including NationsBank of the US, to buy the controlling stake in CVRD for R$3.34bn ($2.9bn). The deal gave Mr Steinbruch control of a company that is the cornerstone of the Brazilian economy. His ambitions did not stop there. This year, through Vicunha, he has been in the winning consortium for two of the nine new cellular phone licenses the government has sold ... The huge concentration of power in his hands is
another habit he shares with more traditional Brazilian business leaders. He has so far resisted the appointment of a chief executive at CVRD, describing the idea as ‘premature’ “.[see http://steelprofiles.com/ceo/profiles/Steelbruch/steinbr.htm]

In 1999 French-born Philippe Reichstul (also Jewish) became president of Brazil’s largest company – Petrobras (an oil company).

In Australia, where Jews are .5 percent (i.e., half of one percent) of the total population, “Jewish roots permeate every segment of the economic life of the society which has developed in South Africa since European development began in 1652.” [KAPLAN, M., p. 9] Joseph Gutnick, an “ultra-Orthodox” Jew, has mining interests that by 1998 made him “one of the richest men in Australia … [His] support of Benyamin Netanyahu in the 1996 Israeli election won him many friends – and enemies – in Israel.” [FRIED, E.]

(Russia, after the collapse of communism? Jewish dominance in the capitalist entrepreneurial elite endures.) [See the mass media, part 2, chapter, p. 1213]

George Herscu, a Jewish immigrant to Australia from Romania after World War II, “nearly four decades later … was the boss of one of that country’s largest development companies, the Hooker Corp … In December 1990, he was convicted of bribing a Queensland state cabinet minister and packed off to jail for five years. Before his demise, however, Herscu collected an odd assortment of American name-brand retailers that included Bonwit-Teller, the specialty store company; B. Altman & Co., the carriage trade Fifth Avenue department store chain; 80 percent of the Merisamer Jewelry chain based in Sacramento, California; a majority joint-venture interest in Parisian, a highly-regarded specialty store business based in Birmingham, Alabama; and 80 percent of the troubled Sakowitz women’s specialty store in Houston.” [TRACTENBERG, J., 1996, p. 118]

Donald Gordon founded Liberty Life, “the South African financial services giant,” valued at over $5 billion. He also “achieved the ability to participate in the takeover of the largest industrial company in South Africa.” [KAPLAN, p. 10] Tony Bloom was chairman of the “largest food processor” in the country, the Premier Group. “South African Breweries, under the leadership of Dick Goss, had built up over the previous two years [1970s] the largest industrial empire in South Africa … South African Breweries controls AFCOL, the largest furniture manufacture group, and AMREL, the largest furniture retailing group – both of which originated from the businesses of the Lubner family.” [KAPLAN, p. 21, 23] Meyer Kahn headed the large chain store OK Bazaars.

A particular Jewish international specialty has long been jewelry and rare gems. The South African De Beers mining company (variously described today as a cartel, a monopoly, or a syndicate) has for decades monopolized the diamond trade, controlling 85% of the world’s uncut diamonds. Although De Beers was founded by a British [non-Jewish] entrepreneur, Cecil Rhodes, “the syndicate in London to which Rhodes contracted to sell De Beers’ entire production of diamonds in 1893,” notes Edward Epstein, “was made up of ten firms … All of these firms were interconnected by marriage and family ties, and all were owned by Jewish merchants … [EPSTEIN, p. 76] … According to the records of the British
East India company, Jewish traders controlled virtually the entire diamond traffic at the end of the eighteenth century.” [EPSTEIN, p. 78]

Among those prominent in the race to diamond riches against Rhodes was Jewish entrepreneur Barney Barnato (Barnett Isaacs).

In 1929, a wealthy South African Jew, Ernest Oppenheimer and his Anglo-American company became the controlling shareholder of De Beers; he became the chairman of the board. His younger brother was appointed to direct the De Beers’ distribution arm in London, the Diamond Corporation. When Ernest eventually retired, his son Harry succeeded his father for decades as chairman of the board.

Today, notes Jewish author Edward Epstein, the international “diamond pipeline” is a “critical component of the diamond invention – made up of a network of brokers, diamond cutters, bankers, distributors, jewelry manufacturers, wholesalers, and diamond buyers for retail establishments. Most of the people in this pipeline are Jewish, and virtually all are closely connected through family ties or long-standing business relationships.” [EPSTEIN, p. 171] The American core of this web is located in New York City, a $1 billion dollar business, largely populated by Orthodox Hassidic Jews. Among the best known American jewelry retail stores is the Jewish-founded Zales, which alone holds an empire of 1700 stores across the country. “Eastern European Jews clearly control Antwerp, New York and Tel Aviv – the important centers of the diamond trade,” notes David Koskoff, “… Because so much of the [diamond] trade is in cash and unrecorded currency, the ‘diamantaires,’ the businessmen involved in one or more aspects of the diamond trade, are in the happy position of being able to create whatever books they wish, to file pretty much whatever tax returns they want to file … Tax evasion became part of the warp and woof of the diamantaires’ culture.” [KOSKOFF, p. 5]

In 1982 Epstein authored an investigation into the completely artificial value of diamonds, especially as created and enforced by the De Beers monopoly. The reason he began his research, says Epstein, was that “the possibility that the value of diamonds was artificially sustained by a conspiracy intrigued me.” [EPSTEIN, p. 269] This, as Epstein found, included the marketing invention of the diamond engagement ring as a lover’s expensive – albeit useless – symbol of eternal love. And when it’s time to sell a ring back to a jeweler? “Selling diamonds,” notes Epstein, “… can be an extraordinarily frustrating experience for a private individual.” [EPSTEIN, p. 235] This is of course because the supply and demand for diamonds is completely artificial, and any seller outside the Jewish-dominated in-group can only get a poor fraction of whatever was paid for a gem.

“The heart of the diamond trade,” noted Newsweek in 1977, “is a nine-story building in London known popularly as ‘the Syndicate’ and officially as the Control Selling Organization … The CSO virtually [completely has] control over the price of the uncut gems, whatever the condition of the world economy.” [ATLAS, p. 95]

The Jewish state of Israel has today an important stake in the diamond market. In the early twentieth century, the mayor of a town in Israel (then Palestine)
“had determined that most of the world’s diamond business, including the De Beers cartel, was, as he put it, ‘in Jewish hands,’ and he persuaded himself that most of these Jews would be sympathetic to the idea of creating a diamond industry in Palestine [Israel].” [EPSTEIN, p. 174] After consultations with Harry Abrams, the managing director of De Beers’ distribution firm in London, by 1940-41 De Beers was providing the future state of Israel with a limited supply of diamonds, which became the foundation of its large diamond industry. By 1997, Israel exported $2.96 billion worth of polished diamonds to the United States, 42.3% of the market share in this country. [BENSON, p. 126]

In Germany, Hanns-Peter Cohn is the current CEO of the famous German camera and optic firm, Leica Camera AG. With the 1999 takeover of Promodes, the 16th largest retailing firm on earth, the French-based Carrefour became number 2 (CEO: David Bernard; his family owns 38.5 percent of the voting rights in the company). “Carrefour is “strong in Asia and Latin America and Promodes in Europe … Carrefour has the top spot in the key market of Brazil … Promodes has recently opened stores in Indonesia, South Korea, and China.” [BARRETT/CARREYBOU, p. 1]

By 1997, American Sean Shayan, a 21-year old of Jewish-Iranian heritage, had founded and headed the Global World Media Corporation, worth $350 million. Shayan’s focus was the youth drug culture and his “Herbal Ecstasy” (a largely legal competitor of the illegal drug Ecstasy) was the center piece of his economic dynasty. Banned in Britain, Florida and New York, Herbal Ecstasy was elsewhere legal. Shayan’s product is described by critics as high in caffeine, with an impact similar to amphetamines. [TAYLOR, S., 4-13-97, p. 7]

Ira Rennert’s Renco Corporation was listed by Forbes in 1997 as the 51st largest private company in America. It controls everything from the Magnesium Corporation of America in Utah to the manufacturer of Humvee military vehicles. Rennert’s personal fortune is estimated at over $500 million. Since 1995, his companies (a number of them mining concerns) have been cited by the Environmental Protection Agency for 29 violations of law. In 1998, the EPA declared the magnesium firm to be America’s “top dumper of toxic chemicals.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS STATE AND LOCAL WIRE, 4-19-2000] Another famous Jewish mining family are the Guggenheims:

“In 1848 Meir Guggenheim, then twenty, came to America from Switzerland and … acquired an interest in the Leadville mine, Colorado … He had seven sons, most of whom went into different branches of mining, and he acquired mines and smelters in the American South West, Mexico and South America. In 1901 he merged his interests with that of the American Smelting and Refining Company. His second son, Daniel, by now head of the company, opened up new mines in Bolivia, Chile and West Africa, while the eldest, Isaac, headed the Guggenheim Exploration Company which developed new areas in different parts of the globe. The Guggenheims were involved in every stage of production of non-ferrous metals as well as chemicals and even diamonds.” [BERMAN, C., 1977, p. 73-74]
From Israel, Ted Arison owns a controlling 47% of the **Carnival Cruise** company, “a fleet of 37 cruise ships that is the largest of its kind in the world.” [LIPSON] Its total estimated value is $21 billion. Arison moved from Israel to America in the 1950s, made his personal fortune (estimated at $4-5 billion), and then returned to Israel to live in the 1990s. “Arison,” notes the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz*, “is considered the biggest philanthropist in Israel. His contributions are channeled through the Arison Foundation … He is known to be close to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and contributes to his campaign.” [PERETZ, S.]

*Ha'aretz* also noted the complexion of the international cruise ship business in 1998:

“The meteoric rise in **Carnival Cruise**’s worth has been matched by similar growth for the company’s major competitor, **Royal Caribbean**, whose market value is currently $6 billion. What the two companies have in common, besides their arena of business, is Israeli ownership … Last summer, the two companies waged a fierce bidding war to purchase another cruise firm, **Celebrity**. The winner was Royal, which paid the far from piddling sum of $1.3 billion. Remarkably enough, Celebrity also belongs to the ‘Israeli Club,’ as 50 per cent of its shares were held by a shipping firm controlled by the Recanati family … As of last September … the three companies have become even more closely involved with one another. The three families not only own hefty sizes of giant shipping lines, they also control large portions of three Israeli banks.” [LIPSON]

In 1999 **Carnival Cruise** lines gained unwanted attention when news reports noted that “its crew members were accused of sexually assaulting passengers and fellow workers aboard its ships 62 times in a five-year period that ended last August, a rate of nearly one a month.” [FRANTZ, p. 2] In the vacation business, Susan Shapiro is also president of **GIANTS**, an association of about 2,000 American travel agencies.

In 1999, Craig Koch became CEO of the **Hertz rent-a-car** company (shifting from the company’s presidency). “The Number 2” car rental company, **Avis**, (along with the **Ramada and Days Inn**, and **Century 21** real estate franchises) is part of the Cendant company. The CEO of Cendant is Henry Silverman. The Avis CEO is Martin Endelman. (In 1999, Cendant agreed to pay stockholders $2.8 billion “to settle widespread accounting fraud.”) The **Budget** rent-a-car firm was also founded by yet another Jewish entrepreneur, Jules Lederer.

By 1987, a Jew (Michael Blumenthal) headed **Burlington Industries**, another was vice-president of **General Foods**. By 1988, worth $1.6 billion, Marvin Davis controlled **Davis Oil Company**, Denver’s **Metro Bank**, and **20th Century Fox**. From 1922-1940 Gerald Swope was the President of **General Electric**, but he hid the fact of his Jewish background. From 1947-1961 Philip Sporn, also Jewish, was the head of America’s largest utility company – **American Electric Power**. Harry Gray, “the dominant figure in the U.S. Technologies Corporation” – one of the major industrial corporations in America – was, says bloodhound Jewish scholar **Abraham Korman**, also Jewish. “There is … con-
siderable evidence that Mr. Gray, despite his denial, was born and raised Jewish and lived as a Jew until he was past thirty, when he changed his name, his life, and apparently his background. According to the accounts of relatives and other records, Harry Gray is actually Harry Jack Grusin, the son of Jacob Grusin, a Jewish immigrant from Latvia.” [KORMAN, p. 67-68]

The son of a Russian Jewish concert manager and an Italian mother, Harold Geneen built ITT to power. The London Daily Telegraph noted that Geneen was

“the mastermind of ITT, one of America’s most powerful – and to some observers, sinister – multinational corporations. Geneen’s conglomerate acquired the reputation of being, in the words of historian Anthony Sampson, ‘accountable to no nation, anywhere: and held together … by one man, against whom no one cared to argue’… ITT became the subject of investigations by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, the Watergate Special Prosecutor, a Federal Grand Jury, and the specially formed sub- committee on multinational corporations which threw new light on Geneen’s ruthless use of lobbyists and spies to further ITT interests.” [DAILY TELEGRAPH, 123-97]

In 1998, Steve Ballmer became president of monopolistic computer software giant Microsoft. In 1999, he also became that company’s CEO. He is the fourth richest man in America, worth $20.1 billion. Ballmer, whose mother is Jewish, has contributed a “generous” donation to the Jewish National Fund. [BERMAN, S., 4-21-2000, p. 1] And, as the Jewish Exponent observed in 1999, “Jewish employees [at Seattle-based Microsoft] estimate their number at 10 to 15 percent of the company.” [MONO, B., 12-30-99, p. 1] Nate Kantor, became the president of MCI International in 1982, helping it to become a telecommunications giant. David Colburn, also Jewish, is the President of Business Affairs at the America Online internet server. Jan Brandt, also Jewish, is president of marketing for the same firm. [JEWWHO, 2000] Steven Kirsch founded Infosseek, one of the major Internet navigation services. [MOTHER JONES 3-5-01] After the merger of Internet access providers Netzero and Juno in 2001, the resulting company (United Online, Inc.) became the second largest Internet access provider, only behind AOL. The chairman and CEO of Netzero, and now United, is Mark Goldston. [REUTERS, 6-7-01]

In April 2001, Jewish movie mogul Terry Semel became the CEO of Yahoo. (He was, that same year, a co-chairman of the Israeli Film Festival). JEWISH POST, 2001]

In 1997, Andrew Grove, a Holocaust survivor worth $300 million today, was named Time magazine’s “man of the year.” Grove drew attention as chairman and CEO of Intel, a company that manufactures over 90% of the world’s microprocessors. [EPHROSS, p. 22] Intel’s popular Pentium II computer chip was developed at Intel’s plant in Haifa, Israel. Israel’s Digital Signal Processing company is also the world’s largest manufacturer of customized computer chips.” [FRANKEL, p. 274] “After the Silicon Valley [the high-tech center in northern California] and Boston,” notes Yaacov Yisraeli of the Israel America
Chamber of Commerce, “Israel is the most important high tech area in the world.” [ALBUM, 1999] IBM has one of its four world research centers there, as does Microsoft. In the Silicon Valley itself, notes the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California, it is “full of Israelis and Israeli high tech companies.” [JE WISH BULLETIN OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, 11-5-99, p. 24]

Among such entrepreneurs is David Gilo, an immigrant from Israel with dual American-Israeli citizenship, heads Vyvo Inc., a Silicon Valley telecommunications firm that sells “equipment that provides wireless, high-speed data connections to homes and businesses … Gilo made headlines recently for his $100 million investment in Israeli start-ups, promoting Tel Aviv as the next Silicon Valley.” David Shimmon’s fortune is over $100 million, thanks to his investments in Kinetics Group, “a firm that makes equipment used in semiconductor manufacturing.” Bernard Schwartz heads Loral Space and Communications (a prominent weapons firm that is branching out into telecommunications). [MOTHER JONES, 3-5-01]

ICQ (“I seek you”) was a firm founded in Tel Aviv, Israel, “the brainchild of four Israeli computer programmers … [Within six months] it claimed the title of world’s largest online communication network.” [NIESE, A., 11-15-01] Another Israeli computer company, StarBand, “is America’s first consumer two-way, always-on, high-speed satellite Internet service provider.” [CEO: Zur Feldman; President: David Trachtenberg] [http://www.starband.com/whoweare/index.htm] Starband is part of the Israeli company Gilat Satellite Networks, Ltd.

Even Jewish-American Home Depot co-founder Bernard Marcus “is also working to link the Israeli economy to his home state. The country has the second-highest density of start-ups after Silicon Valley, and the hardware mogul has helped persuade state officials to offer the Israeli firms incentives to relocate in Georgia.” [MOTHER JONES, 3-5-01]

Isabel Maxwell, daughter of corrupt British Jewish mogul Robert Maxwell, is “president of the Silicon Valley’s hottest internet investment company” –CommTouch … The company was founded in 1991 by a group of technology-savvy former Israeli army officers led by Gideon Mantel, a bomb disposal expert … [Ms. Maxwell] has a deep affinity for Israel … CommTouch employs 400 staff. Its head office is in Silicon Valley. R&D sales are run from Tel Aviv.” [CASSY, J., 6-22-00, p. 26]

A list of other Jewish computer barons must include Mitchell Kapor, who, as head of Lotus Developer Corporation (makers of Lotus 1-2-3 and Symphony software), was by 1988 “one of the highest paid CEOs in the United States.” [HENDERSON, A., 6-13-88, p. T14] Another, Mark Cuban, sold Broadcast.com, which includes Audio.Net, in 2000 for about a billion dollars. Herber Becker, founder and CEO of BEE Multimedia, is a “strictly observant Jew … [who] does not have a television in his home. That has not stooped him, however, from developing software that allows TV to be broadcast live on the Internet … He claims to be the first to make this technology a reality.” [ARNOLD, J., 9-7-00]
Then there is Lawrence Perlman, co-chairman of Seagate, “the world’s largest disc-drive maker.” [WALL STREET JOURNAL, 3-30-2000] John Roth is the CEO of prominent computer systems giant Nortel Networks. Benjamin Rosen, long time CEO of the company that sells the most computers, Compaq Computer, is “a pioneering figure in the personal computer industry and a founding investor in both Compaq Computer and Lotus Development.” In 1999, Compaq Computer CEO Eckhard Pfeiffer took a severance pay package of $420 million when he left that position. [MARKHOFF, J., 9-29-2000, p. C7; ANGELO, J., 8-16-99, p. 34] The CEO, President, and Chairman of rival Packard Bell NEC, the second-largest computer maker, was Beny Alagem, until he stepped down in 2000. He too is Jewish.

Lawrence Ellison is the CEO of Oracle Systems, Inc., the foremost producer of computer software for corporate databases. (Ellison has built a $150 million home in Woodside, California, featuring “a ten-building compound modeled after a Japanese imperial villa”). [LI, D., 4-1-01, p. 7] The aforementioned Michael Dell, head of Dell Computers, is one of the richest people on the planet. Sandy Lerner is the “founder of network software giant Cisco Systems.” [WALSH, M., 12-23-96, p. 17] Irwin Jacobs founded and heads Qualcomm, Inc., “the telecommunications company [that] has grown to $3.3 billion in annual revenues by providing wireless telephone service, mobile satellite communications, and Internet software.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

In Russia, Anatoly Karachinsky, Jewish like all the others noted here, is head of Information Business Systems and is “regarded in Russia as the country’s answer to Bill Gates. [He] is about to become the country’s first high-technology dollar millionaire.” [FINANCIAL TIMES, 10-2-01] Karachinsky “set up NewspaperDirect, a system that allows newspapers from anywhere in the world to be printed on a desktop.” [FINANCIAL TIMES, 10-2-00]

Jewish American billionaires who are under 40 years old (who have made their fortunes in computers and high technology) include Rob Glaser, the CEO and Chairman of Real Networks (worth $2.27 billion); Monte Zweben, the Chairman, President, and CEO of Blue Martini Software (worth $1.69 billion); and Jerry Greenberg (co-CEO and co-founder of Sapient) (worth $1.47 billion). Others with high-ranking fortunes who are under 40 include Eric Greenberg, Chairman of Scient (worth $603 million); Danny Lewin, co-founder and CTO of Akamai Technologies (worth $591 million at age 32), and Dan Snyder, head of Snyder Communications, (with $540 million). [DIBA/WATSON9-18-2000, p. 112-120] Among the above, Lewin was killed in the 2001 terrorist attack upon the World Trade Center. “In July,” noted CNN, “Lewin was named one of the Top 10 people of the Enterprise Systems Power 100, a list of industry leaders chosen for their effect on the IT (information technology) landscape and for their ability to influence the industry’s direction … Born in Denver, Colorado, and raised in Jerusalem, Lewin is an officer in the Israel Defense Forces, having served in the country’s military for more than four years.” [SIEBERG, D., 9-11-01]

In 1998 Fortune magazine ran an article about five of the twenty multimillionaire Holocaust survivors who donated at least a million dollars to the
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United States Holocaust Museum in Washington D.C. These included Fred Kort, chairman of the *Imperial Toy Company*; Nathan Shapell, chairman of *Shapell Industries*, builders of 64,000 houses in the Los Angeles area; William Konar, creator of the “Yankee-sounding name” *Clinton Merchandising* company; Jack Tramiel, founder of the *Commodore* International computer company; and Sigi Ziering, chairman of the *Diagnostic Products Corporation* (his Jaguar license plates read “K9HORA,” a phonetic approximation of a Yiddish phrase meaning “ward off the evil eye.”) [LOOMIS, p. 64]

Under Albert Lasker’s [1880-1952] “creative direction and eventual ownership, the Chicago [ad agency *Lord & Thomas*] ranked first in the world in stature and size.” [ETKES/STADTMUER, 1995, p. 178] In 1986, Allen Rosenshine, chairman of the *BBDO* advertising agency, announced a merger with the sixth, twelfth, and sixteenth largest agencies to create the largest advertising firm on earth, now called, *Omnicon*. By 1987, however, with the acquisition of the *Ted Bates Worldwide* firm (headed by Bob Jacoby), the British-based *Saatchi & Saatchi* firm became the largest advertising conglomerate. Nearly 40 other companies had been devoured by Saatchi & Saatchi in the previous decade.

Founded by Maurice and Charles Saatchi – Jews of Iraqi heritage – their company was “the largest marketing and communications company in the world … By mounting the ad industry’s most aggressive acquisitions charge over the past decade, Saatchi & Saatchi had bought ad agencies, public relations firms, corporate communications companies, market research groups, and consulting firms.” [MILLMAN, p. 22] Some credited British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher’s *Saatchi & Saatchi* ad campaign to be responsible for her rise to power by “slick advertising and promotion” for the Conservative Party. [FALLON, p. 4]

Likewise, another of the three largest ad conglomerates on earth – the *WPP Group* – is headed by a Jew, Martin Sorrell, formerly the financial director of *Saatchi & Saatchi*. In a hostile takeover, WPP absorbed *JWT*, another major ad firm that owned *J. Walter Thompson*. WPP later also bought out the prominent *Oglivy Group* and its *Oglivy Mather Agency* [1990s CEO: Shelley Lazarus] for $864 million. [STABINER, p. 26]

Among the best known Jewish advertising executives is Bill Bernbach, described by one newspaper as “the innovator and legend of the trade.” [MCCANN, p. M6] By the 1990s, Bernbach’s son, John, was the president of the prominent ad firm *DDB Needham* in New York. A British Jew, Tony Kaye, has been described as “probably the world’s most successful director of television commercials” and he is “fiercely proud of being Jewish.” [ELLISON, p. 14] His car license plates read “JEW ISH.” In 1987, Robert Goldstein, the vice-president for *Procter and Gamble*, was killed in a rafting accident. The *New York Times* noted him as “one of the most powerful figures in advertising, supervising a national advertising budget of more than $1 billion, the world’s largest.” [CREEK, p. B4]

One of the largest public relations firms in the world is *Edelman Worldwide* (29 offices and 60 affiliates), founded by Daniel Edelman who remained
Chairman and co-CEO through the 1990s (the President and co-CEO is Daniel’s son, Richard). [HOOVER, p. 245] A Jewish entrepreneur, Edward Bernays, was an early king of the public relations world. [ETKES/STADTMAUER, 1995, p. 177] A nephew of Sigmund Freud, Bernays “started out as a theatrical press agent and was widely regarded as ‘the father of public relations.’” [EPSTEIN, H., 1994, p. 155]

In England, the *Daily Telegraph* noted in 1993 that Lynn Franks, daughter of a Jewish butcher, was

> “the most successful, the most abrasive, the most respected and, sometimes, the most loathed public relations person in London... Franks is famous for being probably the only PR in London who is better known than many of her clients. She is also the inspiration and model for the television comedy *Absolutely Famous*. The monstrous Edna – self-centered, neurotic, frequently inebriated, armed with portable telephones and crystals ... That was Lynn Franks. Franks sold Brylcream and Swatch watches as if they were part of a New World religion.” [BROWN, M., 1993]

Jewish entrepreneur Bob Walker sold his American Program Bureau (APB) in 1980, billed by the Guinness Book of World Records as “the world’s largest lecture agency.” He bought it back in 1993. The agency books 2,000 appearances by speakers (many celebrities) per year. [ROSENBERG, S., 4-6-2000, p. 17] Mark Pollick founded and heads the Giving Back Fund, a company that runs charity foundations for rich people. Clients include everyone from Magic Jonhson to Britney Spears. “For the first 17 years of his career, Pollick tried Holocaust studies ... He directed the Center for Jewish Studies at Harvard, opened a Holocaust museum in Miami, [and] ran a foundation for renowned Holocaust survivor and Nobel laureate Elie Wiesel.” [WEISS, J., 1-1-02]

Another Jewish entrepreneur, Edwin Land, founded and headed the Polaroid photographic corporation. In California, Alfred Fromm “was one of the pioneers of the modern California wine industry,” originally marketing wine produced by the Brothers of Christian Schools monastery. [NOLTE, p. A20] Other noteworthy Jewish heads of companies include Armand Hammer of Occidental Petroleum; Leon Hess of Amerada, of Hess Petroleum; Ben Heineman of Northwest Industries; Nathan Cummings of Consolidated Food (Sara Lee frozen foods, et al), Charles Bludhorn of Gulf + Western; Harry Weinberg, the “richest man in Hawaii” [BRENNER, p. 77]; and Michael Blumenthal of Burroughs, and Bendix.

Jewish entrepreneurs could also be found in heading a floor covering business (GAF), computer hardware (TRW), and even temporary personnel agencies (Manpower – the founder, Elmer Winter, is also a former president of the American Jewish Committee and chairman of the Committee for the Economic Growth of Israel). The founders of both the Rite Aid (CEO: Martin Grass) and Block drug store chains were also Jewish; Rite Aid is the largest drugstore chain in America. The oil fortune of Leon Hess made him by 1969 the 21st richest man in America and eventual owner of the New York Jets football team from 1977
into the late 1990s. Sonny Werblin, the president of MCA Television and president and CEO of the Madison Square Garden company had bought the Jets in 1964, in partnership with Phil Iselin and Hess. [BRINSTER, D., 5-8-99, p. B7]

In the professional basketball world, by the 1940s and 1950s, says Peter Levine, “[Jews] continued their association with the game as coaches, scouts, and general managers of NBA teams. By the 1960s, Jews were more likely to be found in NBA boardrooms than on the hardwood floor. Following an entrepreneurial tradition established by the likes of Abe Saperstein, Frank Basloe, and Eddie Gottlieb, men like Maurice Podoloff, Ben Kerner, and, more recently, Harry Glickman, William Davidson, and David Stern have played critical roles as club presidents and league commissioners in establishing the NBA as a capitalist enterprise.” [LEVINE, P., p. 70]

Jewish influence in the power corridors of professional basketball was noticeable as early as 1953:

“Track and football-star-turned-sports-announcer Marty Glickman had been telecasting NBA games until 1953, when the National Broadcasting Corporation took over NBA telecasts. Glickman was a famed and excellent basketball announcer but he was replaced because Tom Gallery (NBC sports head) and Maurice Podoloff (NBA commissioner) felt that with Podoloff as commissioner, Haskell Cohen as NBC public relations chief, and Glickman as sports announcer the NBA was identified with too many Jews. Perry Smith, executive producer of NBC telecasts of the games, later told Glickman: ‘It came down to the fact that Galley and Podoloff didn’t want three Jewish names at the top of the NBA.’” [JAHER, F., 10-31-2001, p. 61]

In 1999 the Jewish Week worried about an “ugly racial clash” between striking professional basketball players (85% black) and the team’s owners, of which “nearly half of the 29 team’s owners were Jewish … [Also] most top NBA officials are Jews, beginning with Commissioner David Stern … [Today’s Jewish presence in the NBA is that of] landlords and shopkeepers … Jewish sports executives as a group are unusually devoted to Jewish causes. Most are major UJA donors. David Stern has been honored by both UJA and Israel Bonds, and personally supported a [Jewish] Soviet refugee family. New Jersey Nets owner Henry Taub is a former national chairman of the United Jewish Appeal. Washington Wizards owner Abe Pollin actually changed his team’s name from the Bullets after [Israeli prime minister] Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated.” [GOLDBERG, J.J., Going, p. 14]

(The Jewish state of Israel has a professional basketball league, and a number of Americans who can’t make the NBA play there. Most of these players are Black. In 2001, Phil Gershon, leaving as coach of the Maccabi Tel Aviv team (both Israeli and European champions), was quoted in an Israeli newspaper as telling a group of military officers that

“even among blacks there are different colors. There is dark black, and there is mocha. The mocha type are more clever, and the darker color usually comes from the street.” The report said that the often overly-vivacious Gershon drew laughter from his listeners. He then continued
unfazed: ‘I am not joking. You can see the standing of those with a bit more mixture in their color, such as Andrew Kennedy. You can see his personality. He will check you out, he is clever. The other (darker) blacks are stupid. They will do whatever you tell them, like slaves.’”)

[ALON, G., 7-4-01]

Over the years Edward Ginsberg held partnership in the New York Yankees and the Thistledown Race Track; he was a former head of the Chicago Bulls as well as the director of Israel’s El Al airline and the First Israel Bank and Trust. Max Winter was the president of the Minnesota Vikings and Lakers in their early years. The Crown family has owned interests in the Chicago Bulls, the St. Louis Blues, and the New York Yankees. Marvin Krattner, “a Manhattan real estate investor, was owner of Ebbets Field in Brooklyn [home of the Brooklyn Dodgers].” [KIRSCHNER, S., 9-14-2000, p. 11]

By the early 1980s Jewish individuals owned or controlled a huge number of professional baseball, basketball, football, hockey and other sports teams. A sample includes the San Diego Chargers, Seattle Supersonics, Milwaukee Brewers, San Francisco Giants, Philadelphia Eagles, Chicago Black Hawks, Cleveland Browns (Art Modell), Oakland A’s, and part of the New York Knicks. [BAER, p. 30] (By the 1990s, both the New York Knicks and New York Rangers were owned by Viacom, headed by Jewish mogul Sumner Redstone). SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 32] Sidney Shlenker, head of Pace Entertainment, owned the Denver Nuggets from 1985-89. Al Cohen was also one of the three owners of the Boston Celtics (he was also the chairman of the basketball owners’ Board of Governors, beginning in 1986). Philip Mack owned the Minnesota Twins. Richard Bloch was president of the Phoenix Suns and also the chairman of the owners’ Board of Governors. A Jewish entrepreneur, Ed Snider, still owns the Philadelphia Flyers pro hockey team (he also a board member of the Simon Wiesenthal Holocaust museum in Los Angeles. He also owns Prism, the largest regional pay-per-view TV network in America, as well as Spectator, which includes TicketMaster and the Philadelphia Spectrum sports center). Irwin Jacobs controlled the Minnesota Vikings. Jeff Smulyan, the CEO of Emmis Broadcasting, owned the Seattle Mariners (“Smulyan has won civil service awards for his efforts on behalf of Jewish causes … Reclaimed land in Israel has even been forested in his name.” [PRICE, p. C1]

Bud Adams owns the (football) Tennessee Oilers (formerly in Houston) and Les Alexander owns the (basketball) Houston Rockets. Al Davis also eventually owned the Oakland Raiders, Carroll Rosenbloom the Los Angeles Rams, and Abe Pollin not only the Washington Wizards but also the Washington Capitals. “Pollin,” noted the Jerusalem Post in 1997, “the most senior owner in the NBA, [was] a close friend of the late [Israeli] prime minister Yitzhak Rabin.” [KUTTLER, p. 20] Pollin, with fellow real estate developer Albert Cohen, also built Washington D.C.’s entertainment and sports complex, the Capital Centre. Jewish entrepreneur Daniel Snyder also owns the other professional team in the nation’s capital, the Washington Redskins (football). “The rest of the National Football League,” noted the New York Times,
“has taken notice, not only of Snyder’s fat wallet, but of his brashness, and some say, his outright arrogance … Snyder earned his first million by the time he was 20, and by 31, he was the youngest chief executive of a company on the New York Stock Exchange.” [FREEMAN, M., 8-6-2000, p. 1, 24]

There’s more. By the 1990s Thomas Werner was the chairman of the San Diego Padres and Jerry Reinsdorf (described by *Sports Illustrated* as “one of the most powerful, loathed, and loved men in sports”) [SWIFT, p. 76] controlled both baseball’s Chicago White Sox and basketball’s Chicago Bulls (Michael Jordan et al). In 1992 Bob Lurie, also Jewish, sold the San Francisco Giants for $110 million to a group of investors including (Gentile) George Shinn, Walter Shorenstein, Warren Hellman, (Gentile) Charles Schwab, and Richard Goldman (the mayor’s chief of protocol). “Shinn,” noted the *San Francisco Chronicle*, “gives motivational speeches and several books, one of which is called ‘Good Morning, Lord’…. Before leaving for San Francisco, he asked [Larry] Baer whether he should bring autographed copies of the book for local investors. Baer, knowing that many of the potential San Francisco investors were Jewish, said it would not be a good idea.” [CARLESEN, p. A1] Nine of today’s 22 part-owners of the San Francisco Giants are Jewish, including Larry Baer, the Giants’ CEO. [ALTMAN-OHR, A., 4-14-2000]

In Michigan, William M. Davidson, owner of the fifth largest glass manufacturer in the world, Guardian Industries, owns the Detroit Pistons basketball team (Davidson’s glass factory branch in Israel is the “largest single undertaking of private industry in that country.”) [MAGINA, p. 42] Davidson also owns a women’s professional basketball team, the Detroit Shock. (Davidson’s gifts to Israel include a 1999 gift of $20 million to a scientific center, the Weizman Institute). Michael Illitch, also Jewish, owns the Detroit Tigers baseball and Detroit Red Wings hockey teams. Chris Cohan owns the Golden State Warriors. Larry Tanenbaum owns the Toronto Raptors. Charles Bronfman owned the Montreal Expos, later owned by New York art dealer Jeffrey Loria (Loria once commissioned Jewish artist Larry Rivers to “portray four millenia of Jewish history.”) [HEBREW UNION COLLEGE, 1999] Malcolm Glazer owns the Tampa Bay Buccaneers. Hollywood producer Jeffrey Lurie bought the Philadelphia Eagles in 1994 from another Jewish mogul, Norman Braman. Eli Jacobs sold the Baltimore Orioles in 1992. Norm Green owns pro hockey’s Minnesota North Stars (later, the Dallas Stars). Howard Katz sold the Philadelphia 76ers in 1996 to the Comcast Corporation (whose Jewish chairman is Ralph Roberts. Chief Financial Officer for the 76ers? Andy Speiser, also Jewish). [SALISBURY, G., 3-30-99, p. 65] Walter Haas (for years the head of the Levi-Strauss clothing company) was the principal owner of the Oakland Athletics (where he installed his son and son-in-law as executives) till the team was sold to Steven Schott and Kenneth Hofman in 1995. Eugene Klein, described by *Sports Illustrated* as America’s “most successful thoroughbred [horses] owner,” owns the San Diego Chargers. By the early 1990s, Robert Tisch was co-owner of the New York Giants and Howard Milstein owns part of the New England Islanders. Fred Wilpon owns the New York Mets. Jeremy Jacobs owns the Bos-
ton Bruins hockey team. Lewis Katz is the “principal owner” of the YankeeNets company, which controls the New York Knicks basketball team (president and CEO: Harey Schiller). Randy Levine is president of the New York Yankees.

Robert Irsay (originally: Robert Israel) died in 1997; at the time he owned pro football’s Indianapolis Colts (moving them from Baltimore.) His son Jim took over ownership. The Baltimore Sun noted that Irsay was

“remembered best for his drunken public appearances and unstable management … Mr. Irsay became something of a legend for his public denunciation of players and staff in Baltimore, and calling in plays from the owner’s box.” [MORGAN, p. 1A]

Tom Matte, a broadcaster for the Colts in Baltimore noted that Irsay “never created any good will. He only created bad will. And that’s why the fans hated him.” [MORGAN, p. 1A] His own mother called Irsay “a devil on earth.” [MORGAN, p. 1A]

Donald Sterling owns the Los Angeles Clippers basketball team (he also owns over 5,000 apartment complexes in southern California, including 22 in Beverly Hills. [TURNER, p. 8] Herb Kohl owns the Milwaukee Bucks. Mark Cuban, well-known for accumulating fines for emotional outbursts against referees at games, bought the Dallas Mavericks in 2000. Robert Kraft owns (football’s) New England Patriots. (Kraft’s wife, Myra, is one the board of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee; she travels to Israel “at least four times a year” and “besides the state of Israel and her own Jewish heritage,” notes the Boston Globe, “Kraft counts family above virtually everything else.” [KAHAN, p. C1] Robert Kraft also owns his team’s playing site, Foxboro Stadium. “Some people have said,” noted Newsday in 1997, “that Kraft abuses power. After Kraft pursued and bought the tiny Robertson Paper Box Co. in Montville, Conn., in the 1980s, and built a new plant … [the] move resulted in 300 layoffs.” [ZIPAY, p. 79]

Ted Arison (CEO of the Carnival Cruise company, who also lives in Israel) owns the Miami Heat. Mel and Herb Simon (owners of the biggest shopping mall in the United States, among 130 others across America) own the Indiana Pacers basketball team. (Herb’s wife, Diane, has served as the Democratic National Convention chairwoman). [APGAR, p. 1A] Phil Granovsky, until his death in 1995, was part-owner of the Toronto Raptors; he was also twice the local chairman of the United Jewish Appeal. Stan Kasten is the president of both the Atlanta Hawks and the Atlanta Braves. Randy Levine is president of the New York Yankees. In 1997 Jon Stoll and Ken Horowitz became owners of Miami’s new professional soccer team. Ed Tepper owns the Philadelphia Kixx soccer team. In 1998, Al Lerner bought the new Cleveland expansion football team for $530 million. (It was named the Cleveland Browns and Art Modell’s original Cleveland Browns that had moved to Baltimore was christened the Baltimore Ravens). Murray Pezim, “one of Canada’s richest citizens” [1991] owns the British Columbia Lions in the Canadian professional football league. [LOONEY, p. 90] Even an ultra-Orthodox rabbi, Joseph Gutnik, by the 1990s one of the richest men in Australia, is president of the Melbourne Football
Club. In 1999, Howard Milstein, already co-owner of hockey’s New York Islanders, led a group that sought to buy the Washington Redskins.

A few of these sports moguls have questionable pasts, having been linked (though never convicted of anything) with characters in the criminal underworld. Early in his career, Art Modell (owner of the Cleveland Browns/Baltimore Ravens) was chums with Ben Marden, “a former bootlegger and casino operator in Havana who was associated with [mobster Meyer Lansky]... Modell also had ties to several bookmakers and gamblers.” Modell was also partner in a horse-racing operation with Morris Wexler, who was described as one of the ‘leading hoodlums’ in running Empire News Service by a Congressional committee. Wexler was also “linked to [Jewish mobster Moe] Dalitz’s Mayfield Road Gang” in Cleveland. [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 106] Modell was also an associate of William Weinberger, the eventual head of Cesar’s Palace in Las Vegas. One of Weinberger’s business pals, Jerome Zarowitz, was “convicted for trying to fix the 1946 championship game.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 107]


“Molinas, who had had a Jewish middle-class upbringing in the Bronx, was a sort of double prodigy in his own right. He took up both gambling and basketball in 1944, when he was 12 years old, and by the time he was starring for Sturyvesant High Scholl and then Columbia University, he was working with a mob-backed bookmaker – betting against his own team, at times throwing games outright, at other times playing hard enough to win but intentionally bungling shots and dropping passes in order to stay under the point spread. ‘To Molinas, playing in a rigged ball game was more exhilarating than playing it straight,’ Charlie Rosen writes in ‘The Wizard of Odds.’ ‘Was it time to kick a pass out of bounds, or get called for a three-second violation? Or should he go on a scoring binge to make his own statistics respectable? ... Molinas loved the idea of playing so many secret games at the same time’ ... Molinas was, briefly, one of the premier high-scoring forwards in the fledgling N.B.A., before he was suspended for gambling during his first and only season with the Fort Wayne Pistons.” [KONIGSBERG, E., 3-2-02]

Carroll Rosenbloom (owner of the Los Angeles Rams) and mob-linked Morris Schwebel and Lou Chesler were the three largest shareholders in Seven Arts, a firm that once managed to buy the film libraries of Warner Brothers, 20th Century Fox, and MCA/Universal. [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 109] Rosenbloom (well known as “a notorious gambler”) [MOLDEA, p. 133] and his associates built the first casino in the Bahamas, the Monte Rio. [MOLDEA, p. 131]

Another Jewish sports mogul, Sonny Werblin (owner of the New York Jets) “maintained close personal and business ties with Chicago mob attorney Sidney Korshak [also Jewish] who represented the underworld’s interests in Hollywood.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 136] Werblin, also a division head at MCA in
Hollywood, “was very close” to NBC head Robert Sarnoff (also Jewish) and managed get the television network to extend a five year contract to the fledgling American Football League (rival to the old National Football League), thus ensuring the new league’s survival. [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 137]

There are also questions about Eugene Klein (owner of the San Diego Chargers). As Dan Moldea notes

“In March, 1970 San Diego Chargers owner Gene Klein was registered at the twenty-one-room Acapulco Towers in Mexico during a meeting of major underworld figures … Among those in attendance was [Jewish mobsters] Meyer Lansky and Moe Dalitz … Klein was one of twelve stockholders in the hotel, who also included [Jewish lawyer to the mob] Sidney Korshak and Moe Morton, a major gambling figure in California.” [MOLDEA, p. 232] (Other co-owners included Phil Levin. “Through his holdings,” notes Moldea, “Levin exercised considerable control over the New York Knickerbockers of the NBA, the New York Rangers hockey team, and Roosevelt Raceway on Long Island.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 466]

Klein was also once fined $20,000 by the San Diego County District Attorney’s Office which accused him of an “indiscriminate use” of drugs. The current head coach and eight players were also put on probation. The former Chargers head coach, Sid Gillman was also “placed on probation by the NFL for forcing his players to take drugs. Also punished for prescribing excessive amounts of amphetamines was Dr. Arnold J. Mandell, who was fired by the team psychiatrist but not charged with any crime.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 259] Mandell, also Jewish, was the co-chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at the University of California in San Diego.

In 1983, Jewish mogul Steve Belkin backed out of a deal to buy the Boston Celtics basketball team, citing too much negative media publicity and his “guilt by association” with close business associates. Belkin owned a company called Trans National. His vice president, Henry Lewis, had been “convicted, of kidnapping charges in 1969, and again on a bookmaking charge in 1977. He was allegedly under investigation for gambling charges.” Lewis’ brother, Alan, was president of Trans National and the Lewis’ father, Edward, was also “a convicted bookmaker.” In later years Belkin’s interests bloomed towards common Jewish themes: he became friendly with officials at the Anti Defamation League and the Combined Jewish Philanthropies and “for the last year years,” noted the Boston Herald in 1999, “he and wife, Joan, have taken 160 people to the Holocaust Museum in Washington DC.” [UPI, 7-29-83; RESENDE, P., 2-21-99, p. 35]

Jewish author Robert Friedman wrote a book about the “Russian” mafia in 2000; “Because the Russian mob was [and is] mostly Jewish, it was a political hot potato, especially in the New York area, where the vast majority of refugees were being resettled by Jewish welfare agencies.” Friedman’s book includes a look at “Russian” mafia influence in the National Hockey League “by threatening players from Eastern Europe and Russia and extorting money from them.” [BONNER, R., 11-16-00]
In 2002, in Israeli, the professional Israeli Football Association (i.e., soccer), Shalom Ibn-Ezra, was embroiled in scandal when five referees were arrested “for allegedly taking money in exchange for fixing matches.” “The police,” noted Israeli newspaper *Haaretz,*

“have a list of suspects who are not referees, but are known to be involved in running illegal gambling. Some of them have a sporting past ... There is sufficient evidence floating around to cast a shadow over the viability of Israeli soccer. It is important that [sports minister Matan] Vilnai and Shalom move quickly, because after the next criminal fiasco, there will be nothing left of Israeli soccer to save.” [KOFMAN, R., 5-8-02]

In 1984 David Stern became commissioner of the National Basketball Association and, as noted earlier, is still at the heal into 2000 (NBA publicist through the 1970s, Haskell Cohen, was also a columnist for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency. Deputy NBA Commissioner Russ Granik is also Jewish). Robert Kraft, also Jewish, president of the National Football League from 1967-1970, bought the New England Patriots in 1993. Sara Levinson is president of NFL Properties, the league’s merchandising division. Bud Selig, 35% owner and former CEO of the Milwaukee Brewers, has been the “acting” Major League Baseball commissioner since 1992, formally becoming the official commissioner in 1998. (In 1999 baseball’s National and American league president offices were eliminated, thereby centralizing decision making in Selig’s office). Sandy Alderson is one of major league baseball’s vice presidents, for “baseball relations.” By the 1990s Alan Rothenberg was the president of the professional soccer league, U.S. Soccer. Val Ackerman is president of the Women’s National Basketball Association. In 1982 it was noted that Marvin Miller, as Executive Director of the Major League Players Association, “has single-handedly transformed baseball from being merely an American past time to a big business.” [WALDMAN] For the baseball owners’ part, under the cloud of a 1994 players’ strike Jewish lawyer Richard Ravitch worked for them as their chief negotiator with the baseball union. On the other side of the battle, representing the union, was Donald Fehr who asked time off “so he and several members of his staff could prepare for Yom Kippur, the Jewish holiday.” [FISH, p. D3] Well-known professional sports coaches include Red Auerbach, Larry Brown and Marv Levy. [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 31]

At only age 28, Charles Harris was the number two executive in public relations at the Los Angeles Dodgers. “People always ask me how I could leave that for Israel,” he says [he emigrated to the Jewish state], “But I knew that if it didn’t work out here, I was young enough. I could always go back into sports.” He eventually contracted to represent Major League Baseball in Israel. [ORBAUM, S., 7-28] And the Jerusalem Post noted the case in 2000 of Jewish baseball player Shawn Green: “When he compelled his former team, the Toronto Blue Jays, to trade him, he stipulated that he go to a team with a large Jewish fan base.” [ORBAUM, S., 7-28]

Gil Stein is both a former president and CEO of the National Hockey League. He was also the NHL’s vice-president and general counsel for fifteen
years. The current National Hockey League Commissioner, Gary Bettman, is also Jewish (this makes the current – 2001 – commissioners of professional baseball, basketball, and hockey each Jewish). Under criticism during a 1994 strike, New York’s Jewish-dominated Village Voice reported that

“Bettman has confided that his discomfort is increased by the tinge of anti-Semitism that hovers in the strike rhetoric. Toronto columnists have referred to Bettman as ‘nebbish’ and complain the league is now run by ‘New York lawyers,’ and players have joked that Bettman’s wife would rather ‘go shopping’ than watch a hockey game – all of which can be construed as a code word for ‘Jew’ … Some the game’s patron saints, such as the Leaf’s Conn Smythe and broadcaster Foster Hewitt, the original ‘Voice of Hockey,’ were known by associates to harbor anti-Semitic sentiments.” [EXTON/ SKOLNICK/KLEIN, 10-11-94, p. B28]

As the NHL’s senior Vice President and Director of Hockey Operations, Brian Burke, complained:

“In my mind a couple of writers [in Toronto] are clearly influenced in their coverage by the fact that Gary Bettman and much of the league hierarchy are American and that Gary Bettman and some of the other league higher-ups are Jewish.” [GORDON, J., 10-23-94, p. B28]

For National Football League commissioner Paul Tagliabue’s part, in 2002 he was awarded the American Jewish Congress’ Louis D. Brandeis Award for “excellence in the law and commitment to the public good.” “Tagliabue, who pledged to support Israel’s war on terror,” noted the Jerusalem Post, “until ‘terrorism against civilians in Israel is no longer perpetrated and the integrity of the State of Israel is assured.’” [RADLER, M., 4-25-02] On November 13, 2001, the Archive of American Jews in Sports, a division of the American Jewish Historical Society, presented “its inaugural Hank Greenberg Sportsmanship Award to [deceased Jewish baseball player] Hank Greenberg and professional sports commissioners Bud Selig, Paul Tagliabue, Gary Bettman and Don Garber.” [http://www.ajhs.org/about/media_press]

Even the famous Black theatrical basketball team, the Harlem Globetrotters, was headed by a Jewish entrepreneur, Abe Saperstein, who bought the Savoy Big Five in 1927 and renamed them. [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 31] Red Klotz, also Jewish, still “owns and organizes Globetrotters’ opponents, who have played under various names, from the Reds to the Washington Generals to the current New York Nationals.” [JENSEN, B. 2-9-01, p. B15]

In the sports media world, Steve Greenberg – former deputy major league baseball commissioner – is the president of the Classic Sports Network. Howard Katz is president of ABC Sports (ABC Sports was sued in 2000 by fired reporter Lesley Visser for age discrimination). Harvey Schiller is president of Turner Sports. Steve Bornstein is president of the ESPN sports broadcasting company (where Al Bernstein has been an on-air “boxing analyst” for 18 years). A new [1998] ESPN boxing promoter is Russell Peltz.

“When ESPN became implanted in the national consciousness, Chris Berman emerged as its biggest star” and Ray Firestone is ESPN’s “master inter-
viewer.” Both Berman and Firestone are also Jewish. [QUINDT, F., 1994, p. D1] In 1990, Robert Irsay, then owner of the Indiana Colts (and also Jewish) made the news for apologizing to another Jewish reporter, ESPN’s Fred Edelstein, for saying, “Edelstein’s a little Jewish boy and he doesn’t know what he’s talking about.” [SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE, 11-20-92, p. C2] For the roving (female) reporter role on CBS’s 2000 NCAA basketball championships, we had Bonnie Bernstein. [This is just the tiniest beginning of a story. See later Mass Media chapter about Jews in prominent positions in the mass media. Also, see http://jewishtribalreview.org/sports1.htm to read one Jewish online web site’s listing of Jews in prominent positions in the sports world].

In 2000, Atlanta Braves relief pitcher John Rocker, represented by the Jewish sports agency SFX, found himself in a kind of Jewish web, becoming America’s nationally vilified scapegoat for political correctness when (Jewish) Sports Illustrated writer Jeff Pearlman reported Rocker’s comments about New York City. He didn’t like riding on the Number 7 subway train, Rocker told Pearlman, with

“some kid with purple hair next to some queer with AIDS next to some dude who just got out of jail for the fourth time next to some 20-year old woman with four kids … The biggest thing I don’t like about New York are the foreigners … Asians and Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything up there. How the hell do they get in this country?”

These comments, excerpted from Pearlman’s story, were splashed across the newspapers of America and Rocker made international news as a mindless bigot. (Jewish) baseball commissioner Bud Selig fined Rocker $20,000, suspended him for a month, and ordered him to undergo psychiatric counseling. Weeks later Rocker passed Pearlman alone in a hallway, and bitterly yelled at the reporter for betraying his confidence. Pearlman reported this incident too, and Rocker was soon disciplined again and sent to the minor leagues.

Nat Hentoff (also Jewish) of the Village Voice was one of the few public voices that addressed the earlier context of Rocker’s hostile comments:

“There was more to the Sports Illustrated interview than the parts that led to [Rocker] becoming a pariah. But the full details of New York fans’ abuse of Rocker has been largely neglected by the media.”

Rocker complained in the original article of being spit at by New York Met fans, he had bottles and batteries thrown at him, people screamed that they copulated with his mother, and someone threw beer on his girlfriend. Emotionally reacting to New York hostility with hostility, privately to the reporter, Rocker came close to losing his baseball career. Conversely, when reporter Pearlman was invited to speak publicly about the furor he had instigated, “he ducked interview requests from the Ted Koppels and Larry Kings of the world.” [CLIMER, D., 4-23-2000; MORGAN, M., 6-22-2000, p. D2; HENTOFF, N., 2-8-2000, p. 39]

Jews have also long dominated the boxing world, as promoters, managers, agents, and other entrepreneurs. “So many of the fighters, trainers, promoters, and managers were Jewish,” notes Allen Brodner about the sport’s foundations,
'that it would have been difficult for anti-Semites to obtain a foothold.” [BODNER, p.4] For decades, Ray Arcel and Whitney Bimstein were the foremost trainers in the sport. Other prominent Jewish trainers included Heinie Blaustein, Freddie Brown, Manny Seaman, Charley Goldman, and Izzy Klein. Rocky Marciano’s trainer (Al Weil) was Jewish, as was Rocky Graciano’s (Irving Cohen). But, notes Bodner, “probably in no area of boxing were Jews important for so long a period as in the promotion of matches.” [BODNER, p. 11]

Mike Jacobs, for instance, was a famed Madison Square Garden promoter – pioneer Black heavyweight fighter Joe Louis fought for him 25 times. Jacobs, says Peter Levine, “became [in the 1930s and 1940s] boxing’s dominant figure. Anyone who fought in a major bout in the United States went through ’Uncle Mike.” [LEVINE, P., p. 183] As a promoter, notes Jack Newfield, Jacobs had “total control, total monopoly” over Joe Louis. [NEWFIELD, J., 1995] Over objections from many in the Jewish community, Jacobs even promoted the German Nazi’s heavyweight contender, Max Schmeling, in 1936 to fight Louis in New York City. Schmeling won, a propaganda boost for Aryan fascism. Incredibly, even Schmeling’s manager was Jewish – another Jacobs, this one Joe. A proposed Schmeling fight for the world heavyweight crown against then-champ Jimmy Braddock never materialized, reportedly due to pressures put upon Braddock’s own Jewish manager, Joe Gould. [LEVINE, P., p. 186]

“Max Baer,” also notes Steven Silbiger,

“was the heavyweight champion in 1933 and wore a Star of David on his boxing trunks. Although he is often mentioned as a Jewish sports hero, he was not even Jewish. By passing as a Jew, though, he developed a loyal following of Jewish fans who supported his career.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 31]

Other prominent Jewish promoters have included Harry Markson and Teddy Brenner. Nationally/internationally, Sam Silverman staged fights in Boston, Jack Solomon in London, Herman Taylor in Philadelphia, Harry Glickman in Seattle, and Bernie Feiken in Baltimore. In recent history, controversial promoter Bob Arum, originally a Harvard-trained lawyer, has often been in the public eye. Arum’s Top Rank firm has managed many of recent history’s most famous boxers, including Mohammed Ali, Sugar Ray Leonard, Marvin Hagler, Tommy Hearns, Roberto Duran, George Foreman, and Oscar De La Hoya. More recently too, for example, when controversial heavyweight fighter Mike Tyson left Black boxing entrepreneur Don King in 1998, Tyson’s new “advisors” were Shelley Finkel, Jeff Wald, and Irving Azoff (the latter two also prominent in the recording industry). [SPRIGER, AN EERIE, p. C1, C4] One of Tyson’s early co-managers was Jim Jacobs. Across the world, Rodney Berman, also Jewish, “is not only the leading boxing promoter in South Africa, but his Golden Glove Promotions is one of the top companies in the field worldwide.” He promoted Hasim Rahman’s victory over Lennox Lewis in the 2001 heavyweight championship. [BELLING, M., 4-27, 2001]

In 1997, the “first female boxing manager,” Jackie Kallen, also Jewish, was inducted into the Michigan Jewish Sports Hall of Fame. That same year she was
the commissioner of the new “International Female Boxers Association.” “That’s what men want to see,” Kallen says, “Sex sells. Men like to see beautiful women tie their hair back, go in there, and beat the … out of someone.” [SPRINGER, S., p. C10]

The Everlast Company, which for years monopolized most of the boxing equipment market, was also Jewish-owned, as was the sport’s periodical bible, Ring Magazine (run by Nat Fleisher). In horse racing, Sam and Dorothy Rubin even owned John Henry, the most profitable race horse of the early 1980s. Hollywood Jews built the Los Angeles Hollywood Park race track (MGM head Louis Mayer was by 1945 the “second leading money winner in America.” [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 263, 265] A Jewish entrepreneur in Texas, Jerry Meyer, is the chairman of Pinnacle Brands, which sells over $150 million worth of sports products and souvenirs a year. [FRIEDMAN, p. 32] The Sorin family founded and controls the famous Topps baseball card company. Mike Levy is the CEO of Sportsline, USA, an internet website worth $285 million.

Eventually, Jewish gangsters like Meyer Lansky, Dutch Schultz, Waxey Gordon, Bugsy Siegel, Arnold Rothstein, and Lepke Buchalter helped move the criminal underworld into boxing. “The gamblers who did business in the rear of each fighting club,” observes Allen Bodner, “were Jewish, as were many of the managers and promoters. It was a logical step for the Jewish racketeers to move aggressively into boxing.” [BODNER, p. 130]

The world of sports betting and gambling has long been largely Jewish as well, influenced in many spheres by the Jewish criminal underworld and the Italian Mafia. Mort Olshan, for example, was “perhaps the most renowned football [betting] handicapper in the United States and publisher of the widely read Gold Sheet.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 29] From Minneapolis, Billy Hecht’s Gorham Press “became the first national odds making institution. Many considered its newsletter to be a bible for gamblers.” Leo Hirschfeld became a partner at Gorham Press in 1940, and its name changed to the Weekly Gridiron Review. [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 61] Moses Annenberg created The Daily Racing Form (for the betting on horse races) in 1922, soon to be embraced by the criminal underworld. William Kaplan created Kaplan Sports in the 1930s and the bulletin Handicapped. Kaplan “was also a close associate of Sidney Wyman, a former St. Louis bookmaker and a known front man for mob casino operations in Las Vegas.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 86] Sam Minkus was “the owner of National Publications of Miami, the largest producer of football betting cards in the United States.” [MOLDEA, p. 87]

Brooklyn-born Robert Martin “has been the most influential sports odds makers in the United States since the 1950s.” Close associates were Julius Silverman and Meyer Schwartz. All three “were convicted of illegal gambling activities” and sentenced to five years in prison, but the surveillance system used to watch them was declared to be illegal and they were freed. [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 192] “During the 1950s and 1960s, the outlaw [sports betting] line was controlled by the New York Mafia … The man responsible for managing the outlaw line for the Chicago Mafia was Frank Larry ‘Lefty’ Rosenthal.” [MOLDEA,
In Boston, Burton “Chico” Krantz “became a notorious Boston bookmaker who ended up as a key government witness against leaders of the mob in New England to whom he was forced to pay ‘rent,’ or protection money.” [KORSEC, T., 1-27-2000]

In 2000, Jay Cohen, founder of an online sportsbook called World Sports Exchange (wsex.com: “the Internet’s most popular and profitable online gambling site”), and partners

“were charged by the US government with taking sports wagers by phone and over the Internet, in violation of the Wire Act. Cohen returned to the US to stand trial and was convicted by a New York jury. He was fined $5,0000 and sentenced to 21 months in prison.” [CASINO NEWS, 1-10-01] (Head of the “International Association of Gaming Attorneys?” Lloyd D. Levenson.) [PR NEWSWIRE, 9-28-99]

“Pick up a player, any player,” declared Black Enterprise magazine, “among the ten highest paid black athletes in the National Basketball Association (NBA), the National Football League (NFL), or Major League Baseball, and 29 out of 30 have an agent who is anything but black.” [CLAY, p. 48] These agents are overwhelmingly Jewish; those noted by Black Enterprise include Marvin Demhoff, Steve Zucker, Barry Axelrod, and Leigh Steinberg (who had the largest stable of NFL athletes, about 70, by 1995). Steinberg, noted the New York Times, “does the bidding for nearly every quarterback in the NFL.” [HIRSCHBERG, L., 11-17-96] “Leigh Sternberg,” adds the (Jewish) Forward, “virtually created the modern sports agent in 1975.” [Smith, B., 9-4-98, p. 18] He also “underwrites the Anti-Defamation League’s Steinberg Institute.” [ALTMANOHR, A., 1-7-2000, p. 38]

In 2001, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette called another Jewish agent, Tom Reich, “a super agent, a pioneer in his industry and one of the most influential men on the landscape of pro sports in the 21st century.” Reich was

“the first agent to win a baseball player a contract worth $1 million a year, counting deferred payments. Reich with the Pirates’ Dave Parker in the last 1970s. [He was also] the first agent to win a hockey player a contract worth $2million: Reich with the Penguins’ Mario Lemieux in the late 1980s …[Reich] long ago set up shop in Los Angeles, Florida and New York, the first and last because of their market importance, the middle one because, well, doesn’t every Jewish boy of his generation crave a Miami abode?” [FINDER, C., 4-29-01]

By 1996, another Jewish sports agent, David Falk, had 38 clients in professional basketball, the largest number of any agent. These were in large part a group of elite players like Michael Jordan, Patrick Ewing, Alonzo Mourning, and Allan Iverson. (Falk, marketing whiz, conceived and pushed the “Air Jordan” basketball shoe as well as a Warners movie featuring Michael Jordan and Bugs Bunny). “We don’t want to grow to fast or become too large,” he said about his agency called F.A.M.E., “We want to remain a boutique for star players.” [BANKS, L., 1-21-96] “Since Falk controls a large block of top players,” noted the New York Times, “he can in many ways dictate the structure and the eco-
nomics of the entire league. Falk is considered the second most powerful person in the NBA after its commissioner, David Stern [also Jewish].” [HIRSCHBERG, L., 11-17-96, p. 46]

Another prominent sports agent in the basketball world, Arn Tellem, is also Jewish (by 1997 he was the agent for 22 players, including Kobe Bryant and Reggie Miller). Tellem also has a reputation for representing temperamental and controversial players (described by the New York Daily News as “infamous clients”), including Latrell Sprewell, J. R. Rider, and baseball’s Albert Belle. Tellem started out in the agent business with partner Steve Greenberg, who has since become the president of Classic Sports Network. [COFFEY, W., 12-7-97, p. 102]

Both Tellem’s and Falk’s companies were bought out in 1998-1999 by SFX Entertainment, a talent agent conglomerate founded and headed by Jewish entrepreneur Robert F. X. Silberman. [See Mass Media section] David Falk became the chairman of SFX’s sports division, SFX Sports Group. [SANDOMIR, R., 1-30-2000, p. 15; NEW YORK TIMES, 10-1-99, p. D6]

Basketball hero Magic Johnson has been represented by Leo Rosen since 1987. Eric Grossman is the agent of controversial baseball star Daryl Strawberry. Alan Hirchfeld (with a number of past problems with the law) went into business with boxer Mohammed Ali, founding Champion Sports Management. [JENKINS, p. 175] African-American golf star Tiger Woods’ agent is Mark Steinberg. (Famous Black golf pro Arthur Ashe’s father even “was a driver for a wealthy Jewish man in Richmond, Virginia, named William Thalhimer.” [BERKOW, IRA, 12-26-95, p. D12] Superstar Ken Griffey’s agent is Brian Goldberg. [msnbc.com, 7-28-01] Mark McGwire’s agent as he chased major league baseball’s single season home run record was Bob Cohen.

McGwire’s home run challenger in recent years has been Sammy Sosa. In 2000, Sosa made the news when his charitable foundation in the Dominican Republic was revealed to be close to bankruptcy. “Chase Kaufman,” noted the Associated Press, “a member of the foundation’s board, said he once bought Sosa’s brother, Jose, a sports car with money from the foundation…. Adam Katz, one of Sosa’s agents, told [Fortune magazine], ‘I can assure you there’s been no impropriety.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 4-4-2000] Katz also represents other players on Sosa’s Chicago Cubs baseball team. Sosa is also a client of Tom Reich. [FINDLER, C., 4-29-01]

Other prominent Jewish sports agents include Lawrence Fleisher who “was not only the [NBA] union’s general counsel and strategist but also the biggest agent to NBA players, with a roster of more than 30 clients, most of them stars.” [CHADWICK, p. 39] And down South, “no agent in the NFL,” said a Florida newspaper in 1995, “has ever had as many players on one team [17] as [Drew] Rosenhaus has with the [Miami] Dolphins, and so in this new era of free agency, no agent has wielded so much potential influence over a single team.” [MELL, p. 1C] Rosenhaus’ autobiography is called A Shark Never Sleeps. Wheeling and Dealing with the NFL’s Most Ruthless Agent. “I was born – to be an agent,” says Rosenhaus. “I was nurtured to dominate in this business from the day my parents brought me home from the hospital.” [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997,
He was born, too, to a very affluent family: “My first car was a Porsche 944, then I had a Delorean. I had cars like that in high school because my dad would sacrifice the world so that I could be THE MAN. Cars were the thing at that age. They identified you. So my dad, whatever it took, found a way to make me the man.” [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997, p. 25]

Rosenhaus got his start in the business under fellow Jewish agent Mel Levine who was at the time “the hot agent.” [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997, p. 48] (Marvin Demoff was also “one of the top agents in the business.”) [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997, p. 76] Rosenhaus began scheming to betray Levine as soon as possible, taking over his employer’s clients: “[Levine] had let the shark into the fish pond. It was a day Mel would never forget … By the time I got into the car and started driving, I knew it was just a matter of time before I took over. Within fifteen minutes of getting the job, I wanted to make ME the top guy.” [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997, p. 52] Rosenhaus’ road to the top was made easier by the fact that Levine soon went to prison: “Almost over night, Levine was out of business. The claim was Levine stole money from his clients. I was shocked. Levine was charged with certain white collar crimes and ultimately he went to jail on a tax charge. The suspicion that Levine was another one of those agents who stole money from his clients spread like brushfire. He lost his clients. Money got lost – and when that happens, bad things follow.” [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997, p. 89] Levine had earlier “beaten an NCAA investigation that claimed he had purchased cars for a number of college recruits. This huge scandal in South Florida was called ‘Auto Gate.’” [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997, p. 48]

“Agent,” confesses Rosenhaus about his chosen career, “considered a four-letter word, or referred to as the ‘A word,’ is synonymous with being a sleazeball lawyer. I became the face for this picture. I became the poster boy for greed in sports today. I wanted to be famous; I became infamous.” [ROSENHAUS, D., 1997, p. 112] Sports Illustrated even featured him on its cover (July 15, 1996), calling him “The Most Hated Man in Pro Football.”

The firm Magnum Sports and Entertainment (Chairman: Charles Koppelman; President and CEO: Robert Gutkowski; head of the football division: Joel Segal) by 2001 represented over 40 National Football League players. [http://www.wwentertainment.com]

Another prominent Jewish lawyer/agent, Frank Rothman, also represented the National Basketball League itself, as well as National Football League. Still another, Bob Woolf, represented 9 of the 12 Boston Celtics in their most recent championship years, 14 of the members of 1967 Boston Red Sox (a championship year), and 2,000 clients in total. “I’m very Jewish-oriented,” said Woolf in 1992, “[and] … I’m proud of the basketball tournament that’s been held in my name in Israel for the past 15 years.” [ROTHENBERG, p. 22]

In 1990, sports agents Lloyd Bloom and Norby Walters were convicted by jury trial of “racketeering, racketeering conspiracy, conspiracy, and two counts of mail fraud.” An appeals court overruled the conviction. These agents preyed upon college athletes, breaking NCAA collegiate rules to sign sports stars to contracts before they finished college. In a three year period, 58 athletes were
signed from 32 different schools. Walters, also a booking agent (for a short time even the agent of African-American singer Dionne Warwick) and nightclub owner, had ties to organized crime. (Mobster Michael Franzese even testified that he invested in the two agents’ business start-up costs). Bloom was initially convicted of fraud and making extortionist threats to former clients. In 1992, Bloom only pleaded guilty to mail fraud. [FIFFER, S., 1989, 4-14-89; FIFFER, S., 1989, 4-23-89; LEGAL INTELLIGENCER, 8-31-92, p. 4]

In Great Britain, Jonathan Barnett and David Mannaseh own Stellar Management, the agency for “nine of Britain’s top athletes.” They both are members of the same synagogue. Barnett “is a patron of Girl’s Town – Or Chadash, an Israeli-based charity, assisting underprivileged children and adults. The charitable interests of his Israeli wife, Nava, include Jewish Care.” [LEVITT, L., 3-201, p. 19]

Going to buy a hot dog at a sports event? Chances are good that you’ll be putting money into the hands of Larry Levy, co-founder – with his brother – of Levy Restaurants. This firm owns “more than 20 major sports, entertainment and convention foodservice concessions,” as well as 21 restaurants in a variety of cities, including New York and Chicago. Contracts include “several new Major League sports venues in Denver, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Indianapolis, Miami and Cleveland.” A new National Basketball Association store in New York City also features a Levy restaurant. [WALKUP, C., 8-10-98]

In the bodybuilding world, Joe Gold founded the famed Gold’s Gym and, later, World Gym. But another Jewish entrepreneur, Joe Weider, has long dominated the sport as the most aggressive business monopolizer of weight training products and bodybuilding competitions. Weider started the Mr. Olympia bodybuilding contest in the 1960s; he brought Arnold Schwartzzenegger to America in 1968. By the late 1990s Weider’s empire was worth $400 million and nephew Eric Weider was installed as the CEO of the Weider Health and Fitness company. The Weiders run 12 brands and produce about 1,400 products; in the nutrition category, these include Tiger’s Milk, PrimeTime, Fi-Bar, Signature, Great American Nutrition, Excel, Metaform, and Victory. Weider products can be found in 38,000 retail outlets, in every American state. [CHAIN DRUG REVIEW, p. 260] Bob Paris, a former Mr. Universe also under contract to Joe Weider, and whose personal manager was also Jewish, Harry Kessel, notes that

“For good or bad, Joe and his brother Ben control bodybuilding. The company they both privately own publishes magazines (Muscle and Fitness, Shape, Flex, and Men’s Fitness), makes vitamins and other supplements, training equipment, and fitness clothing. Joe is publisher of the magazines and overseas operations of the empire. His brother Ben keeps a low public profile as far as all the companies are concerned, but is president of the International Federation of Bodybuilders (IFBB), an organization with 160 or more member nations that for all intents and purposes is the only legitimate international bodybuilding organization … The Weider brothers claim that the IFBB and the Weider companies
are separate and completely unrelated. Only a naive fool would believe that.” [PARIS, p. 72-73]

In what Paris suggests is a “monopoly” of the Weider firms and the IFBB, the most exceptional bodybuilders are inevitably forced to sign promotional contracts with Weider for his product endorsements and to pursue a career in the field. “They put a clause in the IFBB rule book,” says Paris, “that says an athlete can be suspended just for publicly criticizing or questioning any of the policies of the IFBB or its officers.” [PARIS, p. 74]

In the field of violent spectacle, Robert Meyrowitz, president and CEO of SEG Sports, is the brainchild (and Executive Producer) behind the regularly scheduled Ultimate Fighting Championships where “almost anything goes – elbow chops, head butts, knees to the groin (only eye gouging and biting are frowned upon).” [PLUMMER, p. 86] Meyrowitz, noted Forbes, in his earlier years, was “one of the leading radio impresarios in the United States, supplying hundreds of stations with canned programs.” [NEWCOMB, p. 328] His new company markets brutal fighting on pay-per-TV, in 1995 reaching 300,000 American homes for $24.95 per showing. By then, however, his bouts were formally banned in three states – Kansas, Ohio, and South Carolina. Senator John McCain of Arizona joined many protesters, saying that he objected to the UFC on “a moral level … [It embodies] the decay of American society. And I’m opposed because of risk to the health of the combatants.” [PLUMMER, p. 86] By 1998, because of continued angry nation-wide condemnation, Meyrowitz’s promotions were formally banned on many pay-per-view networks, including Cablevision Systems, InterMedia Partners, CI, Time-Warner, Adelphia, Jones Intercable, and Request.

Promoter Don Gold, at a company that distributed UFC bouts on videotape (Vidmark Entertainment), noted that the action in one of their most recent tapes “was very violent. There was a lot of blood, broken bones, and some fighters were taken away in an ambulance. But people into martial arts will love this.” [FITZPATRICK, p. 57] Rich Goffman, a marketing executive at Star Video, who had an advanced screening of the Vidmark tape, observed that “on one hand, it was sick and I was horrified because it was so brutal. On the other hand, it was unique and nothing like anything I’ve ever seen before.” [FITZPATRICK, p. 57]

In the world of scripted theatrical (i.e., “fake”) wrestling, Eric Bischoff heads the World Championship Wrestling organization. David Meltzer publishes the Wrestling Observer. [BACHMAN, J., 4-8-2000] One of the major promotions of the WCW is a former professional football player, Bill Goldberg, known simply in all the sensational hype by his clearly Jewish last name. He recalls what image he sought to create in his wrestling character, i.e., what would be his best marketing ploy:

“I was considering calling myself the Beast, or the Annihilator, and I even went so far as considering the name ‘the Mossad,’ after the Israeli secret service.” [GOLDBERG, B., 2000, p. 50]

He decided on simply his last name, which has become a media icon for
Jewish physical (and other?) power. Goldberg’s managers are also Jewish, Barry Bloom and Michael Braverman. The man Goldberg fought early in his career for the U.S. title in this world of creation and illusion was also Jewish: Scott Levy, known professionally as “Raven.” [GOLDBERG, B., 2000, p. 74] (Other Jewish wrestlers in the circuit include Dean Simon [stage name: Dean Malenko] and Barry Horowitz). [GOLDBERG, B., 2000, p. 110] Goldberg, so recognizably Jewish, was introduced into the WCW with over 150 straight (scripted) victories. Although Goldberg’s accomplishments are merely orchestrated, theatrical illusion, he notes that

“there is a marketing company in New York that conducts surveys to determine the popularity and marketability of celebrities and athletes. The result is called the Q rating. Michael Jordan [the basketball star] had the highest Q rating in the country for ten years. At one point in 1998, he dropped to number two behind … yes, as strange as it may seem, it was Goldberg the wrestler.” [GOLDBERG, B., 2000, p. 116]

“Thanks to the tremendous media coverage,” he notes elsewhere, “my popularity was skyrocketing. It’s funny, because people have actually come up to me and asked if Goldberg is my real name.” [GOLDBERG, B., 2000 p. 110]

Goldberg was the only wrestler listed in the 1999 Sporting News “Most Powerful People” in sports. “Goldberg,” notes Daniel De Vise and Jared Varsallone, “once appeared on the front page of the newspaper USA Today beside a headline that read, ‘How Bad Is Wrestling for Your Kids? … The Jewish National Fund will present him with its prestigious Tree of Life award this fall in Israel.” [DE VISE/VARSALLONE, 8-6-2000]

“I have received various honors and awards from Jewish organizations,” he says,

“I’ve been asked to give out awards at the Maccabee [sport] games in Israel and to speak at the Young Jewish Men’s conference. The Jewish National Fund wants me to dedicate a water project in Israel, and I was offered a ride on the Estee Lauder family plane … One thing’s for sure, when I do decide to give up wrestling, I could have a long and profitable career on the Bar Mitzvah circuit.” [GOLDBERG, B., 2000, p. 111]

In 1996, Jewish entrepreneurs Marvin Winkler and Jay Schottenstein bought into the Gotcha company, an organization that “owned U.S. Surfing, OP Pro Surfing Championship, a television show and three extreme-sports magazines. A year later, they owned a controlling interest in both companies.” [EARNEST/RECKARD, 10-10-99, p. C1] Going hiking? Mark Goldman is Chairman of Eastpak, a Massachusetts-based backpack manufacturer. [GELBWASSER, M., 6-11-98, p. 2] Bowling? In 2000, Rob Glaser became one of three owners of the Professional Bowlers’ Association (PBA). [PEZZANO, C., 3-26-2000, p. S19] The head of Brunswick, the billiards and bowling firm founded in the late 1800s, was John Brunswick. He was also Jewish. His son-in-law, Moses Bensinger, took over the company at the founder’s death. [JEWHOO, 2000]

Going skiing? By 1973, Mark Fleischman and Robert Millman headed the
company (Davos) that ran “the biggest ski area in the world,” Mt. Snow, in Vermont. [Berry, I.W., 1973, p. 113] More recently, “two of the country’s largest ski operators” are Vail Resorts (its holdings, rooted in Colorado, include Vail, Beaver Creek, Breckenridge, and Keystone) and the American Skiing Company (which includes Steamboat Springs and Sunday River in Maine. In 1997 alone, this firm also bought Heavenly at Lake Tahoe and Wolf Mountain – now called The Canyons – in Utah). The CEO of American Skiing is Les Otten, son of Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany. The CEO of Vail Resorts is Adam Aron. [GONZALEZ, E., 1999, p. 1G] The (Jewish) Crown family also own Colorado’s Aspen Skiing resort company. “Aspen [Colorado] is the Crown’s playground,” notes Chicago magazine, “Lester and at least three of his children own homes there, and family members are on the boards of the Aspen Foundation and Aspen Institute.” [LALICH, p. 50]

By 1986, Lester Crown was also a huge shareholder in General Dynamics, owning with a brother about 23% (the largest portion of any owners) of America’s biggest military defense contracting firm. His father, Henry, merged his Material Service Corporation with General Dynamics in 1959, and “guided the big company to preeminence in the weapons market.” [BIDDLE, Sec. 3, p. 1] “In 1974,” notes Lenni Brenner, “Lester, a Chicago Democratic contributor, was named an unindicted conspirator in an attempt to bribe members of the Illinois legislature. He was granted immunity in exchange for testimony. In spring 1985 the Defense Department instituted proceedings to revoke his security clearance because he concealed the Illinois scandal from them for eight years … In 1986 Lester was named ‘Honorary Fellow of Jerusalem’ for donating an undisclosed sum for a huge cultural center. Did that government know of Lester’s and General Dynamic’s legal problems? Of course. Why then did they honor him? Because that is the morality of modern Israel.” [BRENNER, p. 68]

General Dynamics was also fined $676,000 for passing gifts to Admiral Hyman G. Rickover (also Jewish), the retired head of the Navy’s submarine program. Rickover was formally censured for accepting General Dynamics payoffs over a 16 year period. [BIDDLE, SEC. 3, p. 1] “Henry Crown,” noted the New York Times,

“handpicked David Lewis in 1970 to be General Dynamics’ chief executive … On May of this year [1985], the Pentagon’s Inspector General, Joseph H. Sherick, formally recommended that Mr. Lewis and two other top General Dynamics executives be banned from military contracting. He said they ‘lack the business integrity and honesty required of high-level officials in corporations that do business with the government.” [BIDDLE, SEC 3, p. 1]

Lester Crown has also been the chairman of the board of the Overseers of the Jewish Theological Seminary and an officer of the United Jewish Fund. His seats of corporate boards have included the New York Yankees. In 1994 the Crown family still owned 4.2 million shares of General Dynamics, worth $390 million.

Another very recent, very successful, and very profitable military-oriented (and mass-media oriented) company is the Loral Space and Communications
Corporation. The core of its business is the manufacture and operation of telecommunications satellites. It owns and operates the Telstar satellite system. By 1992, the company was also billing “the Pentagon about $3 billion a year for such things as anti-missile decoys for ships, a Marine airborne reconnaissance radar, a countermeasures set for the P-3 patrol aircraft, and infrared jammers for Navy and Air Force fighters.” [DEFENSE AND AEROSPACE, p. 1] The chairman and CEO of Loral is Bernard Schwartz who was honored in 1989 as the “Man of the Year” by the American-Israel Chamber of Commerce and Industry. [AEROSPACE AMERICA, p. 11] In 1998 the Pentagon’s Defense Technology Security Administration accused Loral of selling missile technology secrets to China. A special nine-member Congressional panel was set up to investigate the allegations. [VELOCCI, p. 40] At the same time, “questions were also raised because Schwartz is a longtime Democratic donor who, in the 1996 election cycle alone, gave more than $600,000 to the party, making him the largest individual giver.” [SACRAMENTO BEE, p. A1] [See Government section for further dimensions to this and the Clinton White House]

Ronald Perelman (worth $4-6 billion) is an Orthodox Jew who “claims to talk to his rabbi every day.” Perelman owns the Revlon cosmetics company, as well as Max Factor, Germaine de Monteil, and Yves Saint-Laurent. He also owns Marvel Comic Books and the film production center, New World Entertainment. A Revlon foundation donated $2.3 million to Machne Israel, a Lubavitch (Orthodox Jewish) group, as well as $600,000 to other Jewish organizations.” A reporter for US News and World Report likened Perelman to his Marvel comic characters as an “egomaniac exploit[ing] naive people in an effort to consolidate power and expand his empire” and “A living monument to junk-bond acumen, Perelman’s appetite for acquisitions seems to rival that of planet-eating Galactus.” [VEST, p. 52]

Perelman’s mansion in the posh Hamptons area of New York, notes Steven Gaines,

“is the most heavily guarded and secure compound in the East End. This is particularly unusual in a community where year-round residents leave the doors to their homes unlocked and the summer crowd feel safe enough to park their foreign sports cars with the tops down on Newtown Lane while they pick up pizza at Sam’s. The only other house known to employ guards is [Jewish movie mogul] Steven Spielberg’s Quelle Barn … The richer Perelman has become and the greater the notoriety, the more futile his Orwellian attempts to control his environment. In late August 1995 Perelman’s caution backfired when his security chief and a maintenance man tried to extort $500,000 from him by threatening to blow the whistle on an eavesdropping device Perelman had planted in the house, which they claimed he was going to use to listen in on guests attending a fund-raiser for Senator John Kerry. Perelman contended that the device was only used to monitor the safety of Samantha, his daughter with [gossip columnist] Claudia Cohen … Since staff turnover [for Perelman] is high (mostly because Perelman
frequently fires people), each member of the corps of maids, cooks, handymen, cleaning and grounds maintenance crews, and landscapers is asked to sign a confidentiality agreement. It is also said that the household staff is asked to make themselves scarce if they see Mr. Pereleman in passing. Each Friday at a roll call for staff, a set of dicta and rules are handed out to every employee. Perelman, who is an observant Jew and keeps a kosher household, has standing orders that no food, not even candy bars, may be carried into the ‘kosher buildings’ on the estate … In the Hamptons, Ron Perleman is both envied and despised … The Creeks [his estate] was so rich in culture and history that even the richest man in New York State has managed to cheapen it.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 94-97]

In the 1960s, notes Joshua Halberstam, “American Jews were once again in the vanguard of a new wave of entrepreneurial banking. They helped introduce the conglomerate, a multipurpose holding company with synergistic disparate profit centers and new investment banking centers: Lehman Brothers, Lazard Frères, Loeb Rhoades, Goldman Sachs, Salomon Brothers, and their associated financial cowboys, including Saul Steinfeld, Laurence Tisch, and Meshulam Riklis.” [HALBERSTAM, p. 34] “The conglomerate era of the sixties,” says Gerald Krefetz, “… was really a none-too-subtle attack on establishment corporations. Though the accounting was devious and the newly issue paper of dubious value, the conglomerate posed as a substantial threat to the corporate status quo … [KREFETZ, p. 13] … Jewish conglomerate-builders from the flamboyant to the conservative spearheaded the attack.” [KREFETZ, p. 13]

Among the dreams of rich American Jews, an Israeli (Meshulam Riklis) immigrant nurtured one of the most noteworthy. Riklis, “the inventor of leveraged buy-outs, or conglomerating” (and financier for his young wife Pia Zadora’s whirl at a film career), described in an interview the disturbing implications of his methodology towards exponential corporate control:

“Here was the greatest possible bonanza: that a minnow could swallow a whale … In those days you could control a company with maybe only 25 or 30 per cent of the stock … If I could get control of a company I could liquidate it, then buy control of a larger company. I’d start the string going and at the end buy control of a very large company … If you have three marbles, you can buy seven marbles, and seven marbles can control 100 marbles … My scheme was that if I could get American Jews to give me their money instead of turning it over to the UJA (United Jewish Appeal), their investment would not only work brilliantly, but subsidiaries could be established in Israel. This is Riklis’ brilliant scheme for peace in the Middle East! … With every company being an American subsidiary, then the U.S. will make sure that there is peace and tranquility.” [BRENNER, p. 73]

In Tribes, How Race, Religion, and Identity Determine Success in the New Global Economy (Random House, 1993), Jewish author Joel Kotkin suggests that “being Jewish” will be a lot more meaningful then “being American” in the new
global economy. With the dissolution of modern nation states and their self-concept of some form of universalism (the best example, of course, being the collapse of the Soviet Union into ethnic mini-states) “increased emphasis on religion and ethnic culture,” says Kotkin, “often suggests the prospect of humanity breaking into narrow, exclusive and often hostile groups … [KOTKIN, p. 3] … Beyond such visions lies the emergence of another kind of tribalism, one forged by globally dispersed groups … As the conventional barriers of nation-states and regions becomes less meaningful under the weight of global economic forces, it is likely such dispersed peoples – and their worldwide business and cultural networks – will increasingly shape the economic destiny of mankind.” [KOTKIN, p. 4]

Kotkin singles out five of the “most powerful” transnational tribal groups to argue his thesis – the Jews, British, Japanese, Chinese, and Indians. He identifies in them three important qualities:

1) A strong ethnic identity and sense of mutual dependence…
2) A global network based on mutual trust that allows the tribe to function collectively beyond the confines of nations or regional borders.
3) A passion for technical and other knowledge from all possible sources.” [KOTKIN, p. 3-5]

“Certainly fate,” writes Kotkin, “often the prime genetrix of history, has played a critical part in assigning these groups their roles as global tribes – and then compelled them to play it. This is clearly evidenced in the case of the Jews, my own people, who in many ways represent the archetype of global tribalism.” [KOTKIN, p. 6]

What Kotkin overlooks, of course, is that “British tribalism,” as a world economic power, is a thing of the past. A place like Australia has no particular allegiance to England as American Jews have to Israel. Kotkin notes that British “business forms” and the English language remain “preeminent” throughout the world, but, as he totally omits, such things have no residual value to British imperialism.

Likewise, international Japanese tribalism as a physical diaspora is no where near as notable as the Jewish version. Nor do Japanese-Americans, for example, exemplify the profound allegiances to Japan as an intertwined transworld mix of racial, economic, ethnic, and religious people. Japanese economic power, in recent years, is also on the wane.

The Chinese world diaspora is likewise problematic (vast areas of China, for example, are not even ethnically Chinese, the Taiwanese are a hostile subgroup, and so on) and Indian “tribalism” is more rather a conglomerate of mutual hostile sub-tribes including Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and others, let alone traditional barriers like castes that militate against unified collectivism.

That leaves Jews, who, it can be argued, are even the very human model of the transnational multinational corporation, with branches and transworld corporate loyalties throughout a myriad of nations. “The ethos of self-help,” says Kotkin,
“... characterizes virtually all the ascendant global tribes ... some of whom at times express a desire to model their organizations and communal ethos around the Jewish template.... [KOTKIN, p. 262] Such negative images of Jews – penny pinching slumlords, con men, and financial manipulators – have within them a certain element of historical truth, up to an including the involvement of a number of Jews in both traditional organized crime and some of the more monumental security scandals of the late 1980s ... [KOTKIN, p. 10-11] ... Jonathan Seidel – a professor of Jewish history at Stanford University – has criticized Jewish financiers including Michael Milken and Ivan Boesky of unfairly using Jewish ‘networks’ to enrich themselves.” [KOTKIN, p. 264]

Some scholars like Walter Russell Mead, a fellow at the World Policy Institute, warn of a worldwide trend away from elected government control of societies towards privatization: “Even core government activities, like the administration of justice and the provision of order, are increasingly moving into private hands.” [MEAD, p. M1] However plagued by problems in execution, democratic governments are at least nominally, and theoretically, run by elected representatives. Increasingly, private profit-making organizations and wealthy individuals are attaining unheard of power in making decisions in their own interest – answerable to no one – that effect the lives of millions.

Mead cites three 1997 examples of the problem. In Israel, “Miami bingo entrepreneur” Irving Moskowitz is blatant in subverting delicately balanced United States-sponsored Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations. Moskowitz has thrown all nations to the winds in funding an extremely controversial, and deliberately expansive, Jewish presence in the Muslim quarter of Jerusalem’s Old City; he has donated millions of dollars to right-wing Jewish causes, including at least $2.5 million to the American Friends of Ateret Cohanim, an organization dedicated to rebuilding the ancient Jewish temple on the spot where the Dome of the Rock (the third holiest shrine in Islam) now stands. [DORF, JUST, p. 42]

Wealthy financier George Soros (originally Schwartz) is also cited by Mead: the prime minister of Indonesia has singled out Soros for the destabilization of his country’s stock and currency market. In an interview in 1995, Soros (who has also been especially active as a “philanthropist’ in Eastern Europe, helping to change that area’s communist economic base to a capitalist one) remarked upon his personal worldview, saying: “I went through a rough patch in 1962, when I was practically [economically] wiped out, and it affected me deeply. I had some psychosomatic symptoms, like vertigo. It made me realize that making money is an essential part of existence.” [SOROS, p. 14]

In 1994, the London Guardian also noted that

“the EC [European Community] and representatives of the French and Belgium governments have accused [Soros] of orchestrating ‘an Anglo-Saxon plot’ to undermine the French currency, the British government blames him for driving sterling from the European Monetary System. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission leaked allega-
tions that Soros was near the centre of an attempt to corner the U.S. government bond markets.” [LEWIS, M., p. 14]

Soros also appears in other contexts as a powerful individual – by virtual of economic power – seeking to influence public policy. In 1999 the National Rifle Association “named Mr. Soros and another private foundation as part of a ‘vast conspiracy to bankrupt gun manufacturers with lawsuits’ and change ‘the constitutional right of Americans to bear arms.” [OTTAWAY, p. 10] Soros, a man concerned with the social ills of society? “I am basically [in business] to make money,” he said to CBS News in 1998, “I cannot and do not look at the social consequences of what I do.” [FREEDLAND, p. 18]

The third Mead example is Ted Turner (of CNN fame) who has personally pledged $100 million, broken down in yearly installments, to the United Nations, an act that – beyond any government policy – affords him international power and the ability to effect millions of people. Two of Mead’s three examples of private influence – the two most clearly negative, Moskowitz and Soros – are Jews.

“Capitalism is inegalitarian but pluralistic,” notes W. D. Rubinstein, “It is the structured inequality (and pluralism) of the western world … which for Jews is its most redeeming feature, for it presents them with the opportunity to magnify the importance of their small numbers … [RUBENSTEIN, p]. … The ability of Jews to function as a well-organized interest group within the larger elite is … enhanced … by their geographical residence in important urban centers, and their common viewpoints, especially on the maintenance of security of the state of Israel … [RUBENSTEIN, p. 60] … Israel is the rallying point and focus for Jewishness amongst the Jews of the diaspora and its existence makes it imperative that Jews everywhere should preserve their places in the [world’s] elite.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 38]

Please note that there is considerably more information about Jews and monetary influence in Chapter 6, p. 123.
* Jewish dictate holds that the Jewish collective community is morally superior to all others and that, throughout history, they are victims of innocence. The next two chapters represent merely the beginning of an inquiry into this enforced myth, a myth represented everywhere in American popular culture as fact.

Among the economic fields in which Jews today are especially visible is investment banking – “Wall Street,” including interconnected networks of lawyers and other legal and economic manipulators stretching deeply into Hollywood and the mass media. Since the 1800s the “Old Crowd” of German-Jewish banking families (the Seligmans, Lehmans, Goldmans, Sachs, Warburgs, Schiffs, Loebs, et al) had predominated the field; a “New Crowd” of Jews has in recent decades taken their place. After World War II, melodramatically note Judith Ehrlich and Barry Rehfeld, “economic power in America and Wall Street was shifting … Fresh faces came forward as if answering a call … They were the children and grandchildren of Italian, Irish, Poles, and other Europeans who were not of Anglo-Saxon ancestry. But most of all they were Jews.” [EHRLICH, p. 12] This is not to suggest of course that the seminal Jewish American investment firms are today inconsequential. Far from it. In 1999, for instance, Goldman, Sachs and Co. stretched across the world to become the “single largest and controlling shareholder of South Korea’s largest bank, Kookmin. [BLOOMBERG NEWS, p. 11]

“In the world of high finance,” observed Gerald Krefetz, “Jewish interest is concerned with investment banking, a broad catchall for activities ranging from tendering advice to underwriting securities. The heart of investment banking is public offerings and private placements, the risking of capital – sometimes one’s own, but more often other peoples’ – to finance new companies, or expand old ones.” [KREFETZ, p. 54] The nature of Wall Street entrepreneurship might well be presumed in the title of a 1986 volume by Ken Auletta: *Greed and Glory on Wall Street: the Fall of the House of Lehman, or Martin Meyer’s Nightmare on Wall Street: Salomon Brothers and the Corruption of the Marketplace* (1993). Both Lehman and Solomon are Jewish-founded firms.

A French Jewish commentator, Bernard Lazare, noted Jewish propensities in high finance in the late 1800s:

“The man of the lower middle class, the small tradesman at whom speculation has probably ruined has much clearer ideas of why he is an
anti-Semite. He knows that reckless speculation [by financiers], with its attendant panics, has been his bane, and for him, the most formidable jugglers of capital, the most dangerous speculators, are the Jews; which, indeed, is very true.” [LAZARE, B., p. 173]

Finance, investment banking, brokerage, and commodities are the speediest ways (short of outright crime) to get rich in America; by 1988 the stock and bond market and linked economic activities totaled 12 trillion dollars a year (six times the value of the assets of Fortune’s top 500 companies). “Where the money went,” note Ehrlich and Rehfeld, “and what happened to it were greatly influenced by Wall Street power brokers.” [EHRLICH, p. 19] Corporate mergers, acquisitions, and takeovers have become an especially lucrative field. “By the 1980s, says Ehrlich and Rehfeld, “along with [Gentile] T. Boone Pickens, and a few others … the [Jewish] New Crowd was at the very core of the mergers and acquisitions field.” [EHRLICH, p. 15]…. [This circle of money men] bought luxurious homes, expensive art, high-priced foreign cars, designer clothes and jewelry; they hosted or appeared at the right parties.” [EHRLICH, p. 16] … The old WASP establishment had seen its wealth eroded by changing tax laws and inflation … arriviste Jews began to appear on the boards of such time-honored WASP institutions as the Museum of Art, the Metropolitan Opera, and the New York Public Library.” [EHRLICH, p. 5] … The New Crowd broke the stranglehold of the Establishment WASP bankers and [older Jewish] Our Crowd competitors … and extended profit centers to newer financial activities such as block trading, risk arbitrage, a wide range of retail securities products, financial futures, listed trading of options, and junk bond financing that helped companies expand and made almost every company vulnerable to a takeover, a leveraged buyout that restructured corporate entities and raised critical debt levels.” [EHRLICH, p. 394]

In the 1970s, “hostile turnovers,” notes James Stewart, “bore an unsavory taint. They generated bad feelings, especially toward those who represented the attackers. This sometimes alienated other clients. Much of the WASP investment banks and loan firms preferred to leave such work to the other firms, many of them Jewish.” [STEWART, p. 25] “Various techniques and instruments were used in the Wall Street boom of the 1980s,” says Norman Cantor, “but the most consequential – and lucrative was the floating ‘junk’ (low grade) bond to provide capital for involuntary takeovers of one company by another … Fiscal critic Benjamin Stein [sees] the junk bond device as a huge fraudulent Ponzi scheme generating temporary money pools that could be looted by ruthless investment bankers and corporate executives and their overcompensated lawyers.” [CANTOR, p. 402]

William Leach traces the influence that those in investment banking have had in shaping America, both economically and in influencing the nation’s values:

“The growth of investment banking and mass consumption industries were (and still are) closely related developments … Bankers assisted in undermining the competitive ethos by directing business interest toward concentration and easy economic fixers. They helped local monopolies
become major national ‘players’ almost instantaneously. Banker-inspired megalomania reinforces an already clear pattern in the economy away from ‘making goods’ to ‘making money.’” [LEACH, p. 275]

There is a long list of Jewish entrepreneurs on Wall Street who, as a group, have been influential in literally changing the American economic system. Sanford I. Weill, for instance, “amassed a brokerage empire and eventually became President of American Express;” he was later “recognized as one of the most powerful Jewish businessmen in the nation.” [EHRlich, p. 13] John Gutfreund rose to become the chairman of Solomon, Inc., “one of the most powerful securities firms in the western world.” Felix Rohatyn “perhaps more than any other, was linked with the flood of massive corporate combinations that re-shaped American business for much of the past three decades.” [EHRlich, p. 14] Sanford C. Bernstein & Co., valued at around $3.5 billion and with assets of $90 billion, is “one of the biggest closely held U.S. money managers.” It manages $55 billion “for institutions, such as pension funds, endowments and foundations, and $35 billion for wealthy individuals.” [BLOOMBERG NEWS, INTL HERALD, p. 10]

Other influential Jewish Wall Street ‘players’ (financiers, lenders, borrowers, advisers, lawyers, et al) in recent years have included Alan Greenberg, Ira Harris, Bruce Wasserstein, Jerome Kohlberg, Henry Kravis, Peter Cohen, Joseph Flom, Martin Lipton, Victor Posner (“a onetime Baltimore slumlord” [FORBES, p. 45] who was indicted in 1982 for $1.25 million in income tax evasion and filing false tax returns [BRENNER, p. 72]), [Posner is “the flamboyantly wealthy Miami Beach financier [who has] been discredited as one of the most unprincipled and destructive modern corporate raiders.” [BIANCO, A., 1991, p. 31], Nelson Peltz, the Belzbergs, and many others. Alan Greenberg is the head of Bear Stearns, Stephen Schwarzman founded the Blackstone Group, a prominent investing firm. Well-known traditional Jewish investment banking houses include Lehman Brothers, Lazard Frères, Goldman Sachs, Salomon Brothers, Bache & Co., and Cantor/Fitzgerald. [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 78-79] “Jews took the lead in the ‘60s,” notes Jewish business author Steven Silbiger, “with new investment banking techniques that helped introduce a conglomeration craze by using multipurpose holding companies … The concentration of Jewish-owned securities firms created well-paying employment opportunities at all levels of the securities industry: securities analysts; portfolio managers; and stock, bond and futures traders; brokers and deal-makers. Among the equity holders of the Jewish investment banking and trading firms on Wall Street are hundreds of Jewish millionaires. Upward mobility based on merit and high salaries has made working on Wall Street a Jewish-friendly career choice … Although exact figures for the numbers of Jews are not available, they no doubt have a leading and disproportionate role on Wall Street.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 78-80]

In a book entitled The Money Machine, about the KKR company (Kohlberg, Kravis, and Roberts), the author address three more Jewish Wall Street members:

“Here were three men who started a firm in 1976 with a few million dollars and ten years later had control over what is believed to be the largest
corporate empire in the world … Why did their names arouse such intense emotions, ranging from envy, to awe, to fear?” [BARTLETT, p. x]

By 1999, KKR controlled 23 companies. Among others, its stable included the Amphenol Corporation, Boyd’s Collection Inc., Idex Corporation, Kindercare Learning Centers, Primedia Inc, and Gillette. It also made $5.9 billion profit in 12 years of ownership of America’s second largest food retailing chain. By the 1980s, the company had “$45 billion in buying power,” a sum “greater than the gross national products of Pakistan or Greece.” [BURROUGH/HELYAR, p. 130]

A Jewish investment financier, Jeff Beck, has been afforded an entire volume about his life, entitled Rainmaker. “By the end of the 1980s,” notes its author, “[Beck] was living a life of deceit so absolute that in effect his true personality had become turned inside out … [BIANCO, A., 1991, p. 18] … As money and money-making were glorified in the Reagan years, Beck’s pursuit of wealth and the social status derived from it flowered into a full-fledged mania.” [BIANO, A., 1991, p. 12]

Another Jewish financier, Carl Icahn “rose from obscurity to become one of the most feared corporate raiders in the country, Chairman of TWA, the largest shareholder in Texaco and USX (formerly US Steel) and a billionaire … [EHR- LICH, p. 15] … [Icahn was] perhaps the most successful financial predator of them all.” [EHRLICH, p. 290] Icahn is particularly notable for his repeatedly ruthless campaigns to take over unwilling companies, loot them for obscene profits, and – successfully taking them over or not – spitting them out again, leaving a wake of relative ruin. In 1982, for instance, Icahn warred with the whole community of Danville, Virginia, in his hostile bid to takeover a corporation called Dan River. Townspeople unified to resist him, investing retirement money and other savings into company stock. The company finally resisted the financial predator with a leveraged buyout; Icahn, however, managed to strip the town’s economic lifeblood of $8.5 million.” In another much publicized financial effort, during early attempts [eventually successful] to take over TWA Airlines the company president, then C. E. Meyer, Jr., called Icahn “one of the greediest men on earth.” [BROCK, p. 171] By 1998 he was attempting to take over Pan Am airlines.

In an attempt to ward off Icahn’s efforts to take over the Phillip’s petroleum company, it had to go $4.5 billion deeper in debt, as well as cut hundreds of millions of dollars of capital expenses, sell off $2 billion in assets, limit investor dividends, and tighten budgets. 5,000 fewer employees were working for Phillips by the time Icahn was through. [BRUCK, p. 191] Icahn walked away from Phillips unsuccessful after a 10-week struggle to seize the company, but $52.5 million richer. “The business establishment took notice [of Icahn’s recurrently nasty dealings],” notes Connie Bruck, “One close associate of Icahn recalled that Laurence Tisch [the Jewish] chairman of Loews and now of CBS, Inc., said to him, ‘Tell Carl to cut this out. It’s not good for the Jews.”’ [BRUCK, p. 160]

And what of this sensitivity to issues of Jewish concern on Wall Street, Jewish solidarity, and Jewish economic influence, particularly (but not only) with regard to Israel? In 1974 Stephen Isaacs noted a premiere example:
“Gustave Levy [is the] managing partner of the important Goldman, Sachs, and Company investment banking firm … Many have regarded Levy as the most powerful single individual on Wall Street, able to make or break men and companies almost casually. He personally controls the movement of billions of dollars. ‘Gus is very conscious of being Jewish. He’s very conscious of the problems it can cause,’ said Philip Greer, a one-time stockbroker who had reported on Wall Street … ‘When you talk about Jewish muscle, Gus will back off – ‘I don’t make waves, [he says], ‘I’ve got it, and I can use it, and I know how to use it, and I do use it, but I’m not going to talk to you about it because then that redneck in Alabama is going to get very upset and I don’t want him to know about it.’…. In the Six Day War Gus was sending money over [to Israel] like crazy. He would have financed the whole war all by himself. And he made no bones about whether you were Jewish or not. ‘You need Goldman, Sachs. I need you now. If I don’t get you now, you aren’t getting me later.’ It was as simple as that. He could’ve raised it from Schwartz or O’Reilly, it didn’t make any difference to him, because they’re both after the money that Gus controls.” [ISAACS, p. 263]

In 1995, Wall Street financier Michael Steinhardt (wizard of the moneymaking device, the “hedge fund”) closed his company, Steinhardt Partners, to concentrate more deeply upon spreading the message of Jewish and Israeli identity so dear to him. With a personal fortune of $400 million, he joined as a member of a consortium that bought Israel’s Bank Hapoalim and the Maritime Bank. One of his brainchildren, called “Birthright,” was by 1998 still in its developmental stages; it is a plan to bring all young American Jews for trips to Israel, to renew their roots to Jewish and Zionist identities. “As part of the birthright of every Jew on this planet, we want to offer free trips to Israel in their formative years,” says Steinhardt. [RABINOVICH, p. 20] A building in Manhattan for renewal of Jewish identity was purchased, and there has been sponsorship of the Jewish Campus Service Corps to pull young Jews to Jewish programs at national campus Hillel centers.

By late 1999, “Birthright” was in progress, at a cost of $210 million. “Fund-ed by the Israeli government, in partnership with Jewish philanthropists and communities abroad,” college-age Jews in America competed in a lottery for free-trips to Israel with the expressed purpose of being socialized into deeper identification with the Jewish state. The goal is to transport 50,000 Jews a year to connect to the tenets of Zionism. Not all Jews are happy with the program. The chairman of the World Jewish Congress, for example, Isi Leibler, thought there were many more worthy applications of the funds. Many Jews getting in on the program too, he noted, were already “from affluent homes.” [GREENBERG, J., 2000, p. A1]

“It can be said,” suggested Gerald Krefetz in 1982, “that Jewish wealth is generated from the financial side rather than the operational side. Many wealthy Jews have climbed the corporate ladder through law, accounting, and investment banking. Apparently, they are more at home massaging numbers
than dealing with technical or substantive problems of production … [KREFETZ, p. 69]. … If Jews are drawn to the financial side, it is probably due to the fact that in the last decade or two the financial tail wags the industrial dog.” [KRAFETZ, p. 69]

“Greed knows no bounds,” said the New York Director of the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1986, “there’s always someone who makes more than you do. Investment banking is the new gold mine.” [HOWE, p. 413] In the same year New York psychiatrist Samuel Klagsbann, who had “a lot of lawyers handling mergers and acquisitions” as patients, noted that for these people “business is God.” [HOWE, p. 413]

“In the field of takeovers and mergers the sky is the limit,” said prominent Jewish financier Felix Rohatyn (later President Bill Clinton’s ambassador to France), “Not only in size, but the type of large corporation transactions. We have gone beyond the norms of rational behavior. The tactics used in corporate takeovers, both on offense and defense, create massive transactions that greatly benefit lawyers, investment bankers, and arbitrageurs, but often result in weaker companies and do not treat shareholders equally and fairly … In the long run we in the investment banking business cannot benefit from something that is harmful to our economic system.” [EHRLICH, p. ]

In 1986, Dennis Levine was the first to be caught, a “dealmaker” at Drexel Burnham Lambart, for his “insider trading [exploiting confidential company information] which opened the doors to the greatest scandal in Wall Street history, a scandal that “caused grave concern within the Jewish community.” [EHRLICH, p. 17] Not long after, Martin Siegel was also arrested. As the scandal opened up, it was discovered that these wealthy criminals were overwhelmingly Jewish, including all its central players. “What was particularly upsetting from a Jewish perspective,” notes Ehrlich and Rehfeld, “was the fact that the [criminal] network began, in part, when one member first introduced another to a third at a United Jewish Appeal function.” [EHRLICH, p. 340]

Connie Bruck, a Jewish journalist, notes that

“Privately, [lawyer Martin] Lipton expressed another concern, one shared by many of the businessmen and lawyers who were part of the Jewish establishment in New York, and by some of the Drexel contingent as well. They feared that the common strain among these nouveau entrepreneurs and their nouveau banks at Drexel – an overwhelming majority were Jews – would unleash a backlash of virulent anti-Semitism … As one Drexel client … put it: ‘It used to be that the Jews would go [to WASP lenders] and they’d beg for money, and they’d be rejected while the Gentile would come in and they’d all go to lunch and smoke cigars. Now it’s a shift of power to the Jews. Drexel is making these huge sums of money and the banks comparatively little. The problem is, all the entrepreneurs are Jews with the exception of [T. Boone] Pickens and [Carl] Lindner – and Lindner, a long time supporter of Israel, is the most Jewish non-Jew I’ve ever known.” [BRUCK, p. 205] (In 1999,
Lindner became controlling owner of the Cincinnati Reds professional baseball team.)

“It is hard to grasp the magnitude and the scope of the crime that unfolded beginning in the mid-1970s,” wrote a *Wall Street Journal* editor Dennis Stewart, “in the nation’s market and financial institutions. It dwarfs any comparable financial crime, from the Great Train Robbery to the stock-manipulation schemes that gave rise to the nation’s securities laws in the first place. The magnitude of the illegal gains was so large as to be incomprehensible to most laymen.” [STEWART, p. 115] “[Michael] Milken [and] some of his Drexel colleagues and anointed players,” says Connie Bruck, “had made more money in a shorter period of time than any other individuals had done in the history of this country.” [BRUCK, p. 20]

“A variety of critics voiced their apprehension about what they saw as greed that had gone out of control,” says Ehrlich and Rehfeld, “… over the course of the next three years, it was revealed that more than a dozen insiders – many of them members of Wall Street’s most powerful firms – as well as one of the hottest houses on the Street, had amassed millions of dollars in illegal profits. The accused were charged with violating securities laws that prohibited insider trading, that is, they used material confidential information primarily about impending merger bids, to profit from securities and transactions.” [EHRLICH, p. 338]

“During the crime wave,” says Stewart, “the ownership of entire corporations changed hands, often forcibly, at a clip never before witnessed. Household names – Carnation, Beatrice, General Foods, Diamond Shamrock – vanished in takeovers that spawned criminal activity and violations of securities laws. Others, companies like Unocal and Union Carbide, survived but were heavily crippled. Thousands of workers lost their jobs, companies loaded up with debt to pay for the deals, profits were sacrificed to pay interest costs on the borrowings, and even so, many companies were eventually forced into bankruptcy or restructurings. Bondholders and shareholders lost millions more. Greed alone cannot account for such a toll. These are the costs of greed coupled with market power – power unrestrained by the normal checks and balances of the free market place.” [STEWART, p. 16]

A major wheeler-dealer in the 1980s scandals was Ivan Boesky, who was (only a year before his ‘public disgrace’) also the Chairman of the New York area United Jewish Appeal. He also was a member of the board of both Yehsiva University and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, as well as a self-described “founder and supporter” of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles. “Boesky’s Jewish involvement,” noted the *Jewish Week*, “resurfaced in the media at the time of his sentencing in December, with revelations that he had been taking classes at the Jewish Theological Seminary while awaiting sentencing and that leaders of some organizations that benefited from his gifts had written character references to the court, attesting to his generosity. The letters have sparked a new internecine debate among Jewish activists. Some claimed that Jewish philanthropies were ‘going to bat’ for a confessed felon because they had ‘gotten their cut’ from his ill-gotten wealth.” [GOLDBERG, JEWISH WEEK, 1-8-88, p. 41] “Many Jews,” wrote Ehrli-
and Rehfeld, “worried that his trading abuses could cast a pall over the entire Jewish community. Not only was he the most important figure in the scandal, he was deeply involved in Jewish philanthropy.” [EHRLICH, p. 341], including a $2.5 million donation to the Jewish Theological Seminary for a library to be named after him and his wife.

This former head of the UJA was a particularly nefarious character. He had been fined for violating New York Stock Exchange trade laws in the 1970s; [EHRLICH, p. 317], his 1985 book Merger Mania was written by a ghost writer, Jeffrey Madrick, and largely patterned (without saying so) on an existing volume by Guy Wyser-Pratte. [EHRLICH, p. 326] Boesky was the time of man who watched his employees throughout his company by a video system in his office; [p. 324] he paid up to $5 apiece for catered lunches so employees wouldn’t have to leave their desks, [p. 36] and “screamed at [employees] regularly.” His oldest son, Billy, is reported to have called his father “stark raving mad.” [p. 40] Upon Boesky’s installment as the UJA campaign general chairman, he told his Jewish audience: “We must make an enormous effort to encourage people’s sense of responsibility – to be sure that at the very top we have the right attitudes about giving to the campaign. Attitude filters down.” [JEWISH WEEK, 6-29-84, p. 7]

The biggest fish caught in the Wall Street scandal, however, was super-billionaire Michael Milken, the “junk bond king,” who was charged with racketeering and mail and securities fraud. Milken single-handedly threatened to fulfill in real life the most profound of traditional anti-Semitic nightmare fantasies. A former Milken associate, notes Jewish journalist Connie Bruck, saw in Milken “the force of … obsession, the megalomania, the conviction of a cause so just that the end justifies the means and, finally, the conceptualization of the corporate vehicle as a means of extending control nationwide – and then worldwide.” [BRUCK, p. 358] “Many billions of dollars were at his command,” notes Bruck, “capital, as Milken had been saying and proving for a long time, was not a scarce resource. The only limits to his power, it seemed, would be the limits of his fertile imagination.” [BRUCK, p. 359] Milken, sometimes present at Simon Wiesenthal functions [BRUCK, p. 313], was well-known for being able to assemble billions of dollars overnight to aid corporate takeovers. At a yearly Milken-centered conference of the world’s leading corporate takeover specialists, affectionately called the Predator’s Ball, a close Milken associate, Donald Engel, arranged for high-priced prostitutes to service the gathered “predators.” [BRUCK, p. 15]

The goal of Milken and his predatory cronies, says Leon Black of Drexel Lambart (the company that was ostensibly Milken’s employer) was to finance “the robber barons who would become the owners of major companies in the future.” [BRUCK, p. 149] (Black’s father, Eli, was the “rabbinically-trained corporate chieftain of United Brands” who in 1975 jumped out a skyscraper window when it was revealed that he was paying bribes to foreign governments). [BRUCK, p. 65] Among the players in this scenario, Black particularly noted robber barons Carl Icahn, Henry Kravits (who guided a $6.2 billion buyout of
the Beatrice company), Samuel Heyman (chairman of GAF who bid $6 billion for Union Carbide), Ronald Perelman, and a lone Gentile, Rupert Murdoch (who was financed by Milken to take over Metromedia). [BRUCK, p. 245] “By … 1985…,” says Connie Bruck, “Milken was moving his players across the M&A [corporate mergers and acquisitions] field as though it were a chess board.” [BRUCK, p. 106]

Ron Perelman’s rise is typical. Closely associated with Milken, his mentor’s junk bonds supported a variety of Perelman-inspired corporate invasions. Perelman seized a resistant Revlon with a company one-eighth its size, Pantry Pride. (In 1991 he installed Jerry Levin to head it). He also took over a group of tottering Savings and Loans for $315 million, suddenly controlling $7.1 billion in assets. In 1982 Perelman faced a lawsuit in his takeover of Technicolor. “Taken as a whole,” says Connie Bruck, “the complaint painted a picture of Perelman allegedly using deceit and secret deals – money here, position there, whatever it took – to buy off the necessary people and get the company.” [DEALY, p. 308] In Perelman’s hostile takeover of Revlon, he tried to bribe the CEO of that company, Michel Bergerac. [BRUCK, p. 194]

Another key Milken crony was Fred Carr (born Seymour Fred Cohen), head of the Beverly Hills-based First Executive Corporation, described by Benjamin Stein as “the largest insurance catastrophe in the history of the United States.” [STEIN, B., p. 86] Others who made use of Milken junk bonds to build illusory business empires include Perry Mendel and Richard Grassgreen of the conglomerate Enstar (in Montgomery, Alabama). Enstar eventually went bankrupt, becoming, notes Benjamin Stein, “a source of rage, frustration, and loss for the people of Montgomery. They were taken, and taken badly.” [STEIN, B., p. 111] Mendel and Grassgreen were convicted of fraud in 1991.

Milken has had a powerful hand in a wide range of other attempted corporate takeovers. “He would cause frightened managements,” says Bruck, “to focus on short term gains and elaborate defenses rather than research and development that makes for sustained [corporate] growth. It would cause the loss of jobs, as companies were taken over and broken up.” [BRUCK, p. 19] Milken aided, for further example, Eli Jacobs’ acquisition of the Memorex Corporation in 1986. And during the banking Savings and Loans scandals of the 1980s, Columbia Savings had a branch office one floor above Milken’s own office; Columbia CEO Thomas Spiegel eventually purchased about $4 billion of Milken’s junk bonds. [DEALY, p. 307] In the early 1980s Saul Steinberg, with Milken financing, had attempted a hostile takeover of the Disney corporation. “Steinberg got calls from friends, Jews and non-Jews alike,” notes Joe Flower, “warning him, saying, as Steinberg later characterized it, ‘Saul, it’s going to be you – and with the name Saul Steinberg it’s clear where you are and what you are – taking over another white Anglo-Saxon Protestant company. In all the little towns of America they’re going to say, ‘That Jew took over Walt Disney. What would Walt say?’ But the warnings did not make Steinberg hesitate. ‘They just made me angry.’” [FLOWER, p. 112]
In 1969 Steinberg had tried to take over one of the most important banks in America, the $9 billion Chemical Bank. “Those who … combined against him,” noted Connie Bruck, “included not only the director and management of Chemical, but most of the banking business, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and the legislature of New York state, and members of the Federal Reserve Board and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.” [BRUCK, p. 36]

Although Milken eventually agreed to accept a six felonies conviction and pay $600 million (a sum larger than the yearly budget of the Securities Commission that sought to prosecute him) [p. 16], the prosecution of fabulously wealthy Milken was no easy matter. There was, for all intents and purposes, no money limit to his personal defense. He and his firm, Drexel, planned to spend up to $650 million to fight his conviction. [STEWART, p. 347] This included a massive $140 million public relations campaign to change his public image from criminal to hero, an effort “revolving around the theme that [he and his company] help[ed] to raise money [that] benefited every American.” [STEWART, p. 346] The public relations firm Milken hired referred to him as a “national treasure.” [STEWART, p. 377] In an effort to control public discourse about himself, Milken even bought the rights to photographs of him at all the news wire companies. [STEWART, p. 372] In February 1986 he even offered to pay journalist Connie Bruck to not finish, and publish, a book she was working on about him and his associates. [STEWART, p. 381] Expecting a significant Black presence in the New York City jury that would try him, Milken hired an expert on public relations in the Black community; the wealthy financier suddenly had an interest in the underprivileged and paid for 1,700 ghetto kids to go to a Mets baseball game. [STEWART, p. 400] Milken clients and sycophants even took out full page ads in major papers, including the New York Times, proclaiming, “We Believe in You.” [STEWART, p. 418]

Milken ended up spending only a little over two years in prison, a small sacrifice for the staggering amount of wealth he accumulated. He was sentenced, notes Jewish scholar Norman Cantor, “by a Gentile woman judge who was married to a prominent Jewish lawyer. Eventually she found grounds for sharply reducing his sentence … The skill of some Jewish billionaires in skirting the limits of the law but somehow emerging unscathed, with the aid of high-priced Jewish attorneys, and a compliant press, was remarkable.” [CANTOR, p. 404] Milken court fines alone eventually amounted to $1.1 billion. Still on probation, in November 1997 the New York Times noted that “evidence of further illegal behavior since his release might well cause the government to request further sanctions against Mr. Milken, including even his return to prison.” [TRUELL, D4] Since prison, Milken has been busy collecting tens of millions of dollars, “counseling” the MCI Communications Corporation, advising principal players in the Time-Warner- Turner Broadcasting mass media merger, and working with financier Ronald Perelman. In 1996 the New York Times noted Milken’s presence in Israel in negotiations with a company called the Eisenberg Group. “The Milken Group,” said the Times, “might invest in Israeli Chemicals, of which the Israeli government owns 48.5%.” [NYT, 8-14-96] The Eisenberg Group at the fore of all this is headed by Shaul Eisenberg, the richest man in Israel, who, “says Alan Vorspan, “[is] the
shadowy Israeli billionaire who had been brokering Israel defense technology to China for more than ten years … ‘Arms merchant of the world’ is not synonymous with a ‘light unto the nations.’” [VORSPAN, p. 31] “The arms business,” note Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, “was and remains central to [Eisenberg’s] operation.” [COCKBURN, p. 17] Other holdings include everything from chemical factories in Korea to projects in Central America. [COCKBURN, p. 12-13]

Dennis Stewart, a non-Jew and an editor at the Wall Street Journal, came under fierce attack for “anti-Semitism” for his book about Milken and the Wall Street scandals, the Den of Thieves (a title taken from this New Testament verse: “And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the table of the money changers, and the seats of them that sold doves. And say unto them, it is written. My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves.” [MATHEW, 21:12-13])

A lawyer for Milken, a man we have run across before, Alan Dershowitz, tried to use the now standard Jewish defense argument – an accusation of anti-Semitism – as a tool to spare his criminal client jail time. Dershowitz published editorial pieces in the Wall Street Journal attacking Stewart. He also paid $45,000 for a full page ad in the New York Times the next day to outline his accusations, and half-page ads in other papers, everywhere charging anti-Semitism. In a letter to the New York Times Book Review section Dershowitz attacked both Stewart and the Review’s reviewer of Den of Thieves, Michael Thomas, (a “money” columnist for the New York Observer) for alleged anti-Semitism. “Both,” Dershowitz wrote, “seem preoccupied by Jews.”

In defense, Thomas (whose novel Hanover Place and its free exploration of Jewish corruption on Wall Street has also been called anti-Semitic) said:

“If I point out that 9 out of 10 people involved in street crime are Blacks, that’s an interesting sociological observation. If I point out that 9 out of 10 people involved in securities indictments are Jewish, that is an anti-Semitic slur. I cannot sort the difference.” [HOYT]

When business journalist Connie Bruck published The Predator’s Ball, a volume about Milken and the junk bond world, a Drexel lawyer (where Milken worked) accused her of anti-Semitism. “I remember a lawyer at Chas Gordeon and Reindel screaming at me and accusing me of anti-Semitism,” said Bruck later, “And I’m Jewish, so that made it more unpleasant. It all comes from Milken. Milken told friends of his, who repeated it to me, that he believed the government’s investigation was fueled by anti-Semitism.” [HOYT]

“If Stewart is guilty of anything,” wrote Allen Sloan of Newsday, “it’s breaking the Cohen Rule when dealing with ethnic groups. It’s only safe to identify a person ethnically or racially in a positive context … Down deep we all understand the rules. But these rules shackle journalists and muffle the truth. They amount to censorship … By blasting Stewart (a full page ad, for crying out loud!) for doing nothing more than stating the truth, Dershowitz has attempted to discredit his reporting by besmirching his character – and, in the process, making Milken seem a victim of religious bigotry. Dershowitz’s accusations, be-
side the point and below the belt, is a form of scapegoatism that comes perilously close to what it purportedly condemns.” [HOYT]

Across the ocean, England had its own very publicized Jewish financier scandal at about the same time – sometimes known as the “Guinness Four” affair. It was, noted the (London) Independent, “the most notorious insider dealing fraud of the Eighties,” a plot to boost the share value of the Guinness corporation. [BRAID, p. 1] On trial were Gerald Ronson (head of Heron International), Ernest Saunders, Jack Lyons, and Anthony Parnes. They were all convicted, but each received reduced, short-term jail sentences. “All four defendants,” noted the Times (of London), “… are Jews … Any attempt to incite anti-Semitism because of Jewish financial misbehavior has to be deplored and opposed. But any attempt to minimize or excuse the offenses is also unacceptable … In folk prejudice the ‘Jewish banker’ is an unkind cliché, but herein lies the problem. He exists … Quiet voices are to be heard that such [beat the system] attitudes are more common than ought to be any Jewish financier. And recognizing that such a malady exists is the first condition for curing it.” [LONGLEY, 9-1-90]

Only a few years earlier, in the 1980s too, was the case of yet another prominent Jewish American entrepreneur, Marc Rich (father’s name originally Reich). “In the shadowy, secret world of commodities trading,” noted John Ingham and Lynne Feldman, “Marc Rich had no peer … Appellations for Marc Rich have included ’ruthless tycoon,’ ‘vengeful businessman,’ and ‘scheming marketeer.’ Often called the most corrupt man in this fraternity of free booting capitalists, Rich was also among the most secretive.” [INGHAM/FELDMAN, p. 550] Rich even managed to profit off millions of barrels of oil from Iran during the Iranian hostage crisis. In 1983, he and associate, Pinky Green, fled to Switzerland to avoid a warrant out for their arrest. (Rich has deep ties to Israel and has been involved over the years in “negotiating the return of captured Israeli soldiers and Jewish dissidents. In a controversial move, President Bill Clinton pardoned Rich’s crimes as he left the White House in 2001. “Several Israeli officials wrote Clinton in support of [Rich’s] pardon.”) [MSNBC, 2-2-2001]

Perhaps Rich had occasion in Europe to run into fellow white collar criminal Gerald Goldwell. Goldwell, notes a volume entitled Organized Crime in Europe, epitomized those involved in “extensive international fraud … making use of several shell companies and of insolvent firms … The leader of one of the largest such organizations was Gerald Goldwell, a well-known American fraudster, whose career of 15 years in business crime made him one of the most experienced crime entrepreneurs in his field.” [DUYNE, p. 12] Based in Amsterdam, Goldwell’s criminal scope included Bermuda, Dutch Antilles, the Bahamas, Canada, Luxemburg, Germany and Panama.

In 1980, in Switzerland, a Jewish immigrant from Bulgaria, Eli Pinkas, and his wife committed suicide as their swindles began collapsing down upon him. After his death, noted the Washington Post, “it was revealed that the quiet executive was, in fact, a master swindler who created an elaborate portfolio of false documents and records to steal more than $140 million from an international
array of banks and industries.” The Pinkas scam was noted as the “biggest private financial scandal in recent Swiss history.” [BERRY, J., F., 7-20-80, p. A1]

At about the same time in Panama, in an unrelated criminal enterprise, Jewish entrepreneur Isaac Zafrani “in two years time, had become the most powerful video pirate in the world. By selling fraudulent copies of first-run films, Zafrani, more than any other single operation world-wide, posed the greatest threat to legitimate video and theatrical interests.” By 1984, his profits in the bootleg business were about $20 million. [FRANKLIN, P., p. 113]

In fact, the whole Jewish state of Israel is an Isaac Zafrani. As Israel’s Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies noted in March 2000:

“Israel is known the world over for intellectual properties rights piracy. Indeed, it is likely that Israel will soon be downgraded from the second worst rating of violating countries to the worst by the International Property Alliance (IPA), the international organization fighting software and intellectual property crimes of piracy.” [INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STRATEGIC..., 2000]

“In 1998,” notes the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz, “an American delegation visited Israel to investigate the issue and found Israel to be ‘an international center for pirate distribution’ – estimating that the extent of the forgery industry reached tens, maybe hundreds, of millions of dollars. The U. S. delegation threatened to impose sanctions against Israel by increasing duty tax for Israeli imports to the United States. The delegation also noted that the Israeli forgery industry has grown in recent years because of the infiltration of organized crime.” [ALON, G., 6-22-01]

The 1980s also highlighted young Jewish swindler Barry Minkow of Reseda, California, whose misdeeds entitled his story to be immortalized in an entire volume, subtitled The Kid Who Swindled Wall Street. Minkow was sentenced to prison. “Barry,” notes Daniel Akst, “succeeded in creating not a corporation, but the hologram of one.” His ZZZZ Best firm, founded on carpet-cleaning, eventually was worth $200 million. As a result of Minkow’s scams, “widows and orphans lost their money. Hard working folks lost their jobs, or had their careers ruined, their lives stained, their hopes turned to ash.” The author who recounts Minkow’s business career calls him a psychopath, “someone who can act without regard to conscience, victimizing people again and again without remorse.” [AKST, D., p. 5, 6, 270] Minkow associates included Maurice Rind, “a stock swindler before financial fraud was fashionable.” [AKST, D., p. vii]

In a 1994 case, Martin Wolfe of Baton Raton, Florida, was the “principal figure” in a nationwide investment scam involving pizza vending machines, defrauding some investors of their life savings for nonexistent machines. “You have to plant the seed,” Wolfe once told a business audience, “so the seed grows into an oak, and the oak grows into greed, which takes over the whole body. Greed is good.” [IWANOWSKI, J., 3-20-94, p. E1] In 1996 investors in California’s Pioneer Mortgage firm lost $250 million. As the San Diego Union Tribune observed, “Many got in because Pioneer’s Chief Executive – Gary Naiman – was very active in his synagogue and activities related to Israel.” [BAUDER, D., 1-19-96, p. C2]
In Arizona, in 1997, Ben Friedman “pleaded guilty to 3 of 73 felony charges of securities and tax frauds … [He] bilked his investors out of more than $2.5 million and the state of Arizona out of more than $5 million in unpaid taxes.” After a five year investigation into Friedman’s wheelings and dealings, the Arizona State Department of Revenue concluded that “This is the largest tax prosecution involving personal income taxes the department has ever undertaken. All the Arizona personal income tax cases prosecuted to date would not equal what Mr. Friedman evaded.” [SILVERMAN, A., 5-14-98]

In 2002, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) “accused [Reed] Slatkin [a Jew who became a Scientologist] of running a Ponzi scheme shortly after her filed for bankruptcy in May 2001. (A Ponzi scheme is a phony investment plan in which money provided by later investors is used to pay artificially high returns to the initial investors, with the goal of attracting as many investors as possible). Slatkin’s alleged scheme is said to be one of the biggest cases of investment fraud in American history.” [WEING, G., 1-11-02]

Beginning in 1977, the FBI launched a secret investigation into the world of white-collar crime. Known as “Abscam,” the investigation eventually led to a number of bribe-taking Congressmen. The central player recruited by the FBI sting operation to penetrate the world of white-collar fraud was an expert in the field, life-long swindler Mel Weinberg, “who had worked North America and five other continents, fleecing public officials, movie stars, dictators, generals, mobsters, political terrorists, and ordinary businessmen with democratic impartiality.” [GREENE, 1981, p. 2] Weinberg was set up as a representative for a fake wealthy Arabian oil sheik, Abdul, and his networking for the FBI in the white collar underworld netted people from a number of backgrounds. In the Jewish community, these included Herman Weiss, Joe Meltzer, William Rosenberg (“a picture version of the affluent swindler”) [GREENE, 1981, p. 9], Ben Cohen (a Miami lawyer “who once represented the Florida gambling syndicate,”) [GREENE, 1981, p. 129], Marvin Rappaport (“who was anxious to supply Abdul with sex films”), [GREENE, 1981, p. 129], and Greg Katz (“who had become a millionaire through a series of corrupt deals with New Jersey Democratic officials spanning thirty years.”) [GREENE, p. 162]

In Argentina and other Latin American countries in the late 1970s, notes Jerome Barromi, there were “a series of financial and political scandals involving prominent Jews.” Among those charged was Mexican-based “powerful financier” David Gravier; family members him were also arrested and “accused of having laundered and recycled money from the Montoneros, acquired by bank robberies and kidnapping wealthy businessmen.” (At least one prominent member in the revolutionary Montoneros organization, wanted by the government, was given refuge, on the basis of his Jewish credentials, in Israel). [SACHER, H., 1985, p. 299] “With several other Jewish investors, most of them Mexican, Gravier used his family bank to purchase controlling shares of the American Bank and Trust, a major New York financial institution. He then skimmed $50 million out of ABT, precipitating its collapse and the liquidation of $180 million of its deposits.” Among the depositors were generals in Argen-
tina’s military. [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 304] In 1977, “a new scandal erupted, the bankruptcy of the Jewish-owned (the Argentine Madanes family) aluminum factory, ALUAR.” [BARROMI, p. 31] “Then came the [Jose Ber] Gelbar scandal,” notes Jewish scholar Howard Sachar, “involving the first Jew to serve in a Peruvian cabinet. ‘Accused of graft in accumulating the fortune required for purchasing his vast investment [in ALUAR],’ he fled to the United States. [SA-
CHAR, H., 1985, p. 304]

In 2001, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency covered a panel discussion about the Jewish situation in Argentina, noting:

“According to Argentine Jewish expatriates in the audience, the Jewish leadership in the country is entrenched, incompetent and corrupt. They also claimed that the two Jewish-run banks were linked closely to a corrupt government and played fast and loose with the community’s money. When the banks failed, some $26 million in communal assets were lost overnight. ‘My brother can get over losing his money, but he cannot get over the fact that Jews betrayed other Jews, [Rabbi Alfredo] Borodowski said.” [JORDAN, M., 6-28-01]

In Australia, noted the 1994 American Jewish Yearbook, there were arrest warrants out for

“Abe Goldberg and a business associate, Katy Rochelle Boskowitz … over the multimillion dollar collapse in 1990 of the Linter textile and investment group and alleged fraudulent borrowing and misconduct. Boskowitz was arrested, but Goldberg remained in his native Poland … which has no extradition treaty with Poland. Robyn Greenberg, convicted of fraud following the demise of a women’s investment and finance group in western Australia, was sentenced to 17 years in prison. Some saw the harsh sentence as inspired by anti-Semitism. Others by sexism.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1994, p. 373]

In the wake of the much-publicized Wall Street scandals, in 1987 the New York Jewish Week devoted a seven page “special report” entitled “Are We Facing a Crisis in Jewish Ethics?” to the theme of recurrent Jewish corruption. The newspaper noted that

“Four years ago, Jewish bankers in the Jewish state conspired in what has become known as Israel’s bank shares scandal. Of the four banks, one was owned by Histadrut [Israel’s labor federation], one by the Jewish Agency, and one by Mizrahi. Last year, a New York yeshiva that was the seat for a grand rabbi was involved in a money-laundering scheme for area businesses. Some of them were reported to be illegal. Two officials of the school were indicted and convicted. This year a prominent Wall Street figure and a lay leader of the New York Jewish community pleaded guilty to insider trading violations on what is said to be a massive scale. Several others have since been indicted – and most so far are Jewish. And then there are the various corruption scandals currently plaguing New York: public officials betraying the public trust
by lining their own pockets – and, or so it would seem, almost all of them Jewish.” [JEWISH WEEK, 5-15-87, p. 25]

Jewish names swirling in New York City scandals in the late 1980s included Alex Liberman, Stanley Friedman, Marvin Kaplan, Michael Lazar, Lester Shafran, Shelley Chevlowe, Victor Botnick, Jay Turoff, Melvin Lebetkin, Geoffrey Lindenauer, Charles Berg, Bernard Sandow (head of New York’s Parking Violations Bureau) and Donald Manes (Queens Borough president), among others. [NEWFIELD/BARRETT, 1988; THE RECORD, 3-18-88, p. C22] Friedman (head of the Bronx Democratic Party), Lazar (City Transportation Administrator) and Shafran (Director of the City Parking Bureau) were convicted of racketeering (involving bribes, kickbacks, et al). Kaplan, who had a $22 million contract with New York City’s parking bureau, was convicted of perjury. [LUBISCH, A., p. B3]

In 1998, the tide had not abated: the lament in the Canadian Jewish News was still the same: “In recent years a wave of financial scandals have shaken the Jewish community. How to conduct one’s business ethnically is emerging as a central concern among rabbis and responsible community leaders.” [CAN JEW NEWS, Business Ethics] In 1999, the same Jewish newspaper followed up with another article about this insistent subject, saying:

“Unfortunately, all too often (once is too often) we hear about ritually observant Jews involved in white collar crimes: tax evasion, money laundering, embezzlement and fraud. Perhaps even worse is the attitude that one so often hears in casual conversation: ‘I am only an employee, so I can’t write off personal expenses,’ or ‘Of course I pay my contractor in cash,’ thereby helping him evade his tax responsibility and thus stealing from the honest taxpayer … For some, the phenomenon is culturally based … [Because of historical discriminations against Jews] Jews had to resort to cheating. This attitude was then carried over to our democracies … It does not require a very close examination of our general business practices to realize that a serious problem exists… We must continue to work until people stop and say: ‘What a wonderful Torah the Jewish people have. Look at the honesty and integrity of of those who keep it.” [KELMAN, J., 10-14-99, p. 9]

In 2001, 51 people were indicted for fraud worth millions of dollars in a rigging of McDonald’s promotional games. “The scheme [involved] friends and close-knit family members, including a husband and wife.” Jerome P. Jacobson, the scam ringleader and director of security for Simon Marketing Inc. (the firm contracted by McDonald’s to run its promotional games: i.e., Monopoly and Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?), “embezzled more than $20 million worth of winning McDonald’s game pieces from his employer.” Names of those indicted are hard to come by, but those listed with Jacobson by the Miami Herald were Bernard Weintraub and Adam Zucker. (Unindicted CEO of McDonalds? Jack Greenberg). Attorney General John Ashcroft announced that “the complaint alleges that Jacobson provided the winning game pieces to his friends and associates who acted as recruiters. These recruiters then solicited others who falsely
and fraudulently represented that they were the legitimate winners of the Mc-
Donald’s games.” [MIAMI HERALD, 12-9-01] [CNN, 8-22-01]

In the Jewish homeland, in 1994, Agence France Presse noted that “investi-
gations, scandals, and trials involving securities dealers and the country’s big-
gest banks have shaken Israel’s financial markets as they’ve never been shaken
before.” [SCHATTNER] This included the arrests of Vladimir Saar and Arie
Shafir for securities crimes, as well as the jailing of Amos Weiss, “one of Israel’s
leading securities dealers.” [SCHATTNER]

Three years later, in 1997, not much had changed in the name of “Jewish
ethics” in the Jewish homeland. The Cleveland Jewish News began an article by
stating that “Israel seems to be going through a golden age of corruption and
criminality,” and then listed those in the so-called “Bar-On affair,” including
Knesset member Arye Deri’s trial for accepting bribes; building contractor Dav-
id Appel’s “cheating poor immigrants out of hundreds of thousands of dollars
in government compensation”; the investigation into the Prime Minister’s chief
aide Avigdor Lieberman’s falsification of documents; Dror Hoter Isha’i, head of
the Israel Bar Association, and his trial for income tax evasion; and an investi-
gation of Jerusalem mayor Ehud Olmert for falsification of election campaign
government is chockfull of other senior figures who have been accused of cor-
ruption and/or malfeasance.” [DERFNER, Corruption, p. 8] These include po-
lice investigations of Shas Knesset member Rafael Pinchasi, Internal Security
Minister Avigdor Kahalani, former Justice Minister Ya’acov Ne’eman, former
Shas Knesset member Yair Levy, Labor Knesset member Binyamin Ben-Eliezer,
and National Religious Party member Avner Shaki. “As for the mayors who have
gone on trial for corruption and other sorts of crimes,” notes the News, “the list
is far too long to mention.” [DERFNER, p. 8]

In 1994 the chairman of the Jewish Agency, Simcha Dinitz, had earlier
joined the crowd when he was charged with fraudulent use of agency credit
cards and other indiscretions, [HOFFMAN, D, p. A12] and in 1996 the Jewish
National Fund weathered “a scandal over alleged financial mismanagement.”
[FORWARD, 3-21-97, p. 4] In 1997, an Israeli millionaire, Nahum Manbar, was
convicted of treason for selling material to Iran that has value in the manufac-
ture of poison gas. A member of Manbar’s legal defense team was even found
to have had simultaneous affairs with the judge on the case, the Israeli prime
minister’s media advisor, and a Shin Bet secret police officer. [BORGER, p. 16]
That same year, Dudu Topaz, a major Israeli television personality, was exposed
for the fraudulent system of his game show.

In 1999, Ofer Nimrodi, chairman of one of the largest newspapers in Israel,
Ma’ariv, went to prison for four months “for electronically eavesdropping on
his two competitors as well as on other media figures.” A former employee, Rafi
Pridan, was also reported “to have tapes of his old boss planning to murder the
publishers of two rival newspapers, plus a private eye who once help put Nim-
rodi – and Pridan – in jail for wiretapping.” [MAKOVSKY, p. 63]
Recent Israeli military-related scandals include a controversial over an early release date from jail for an air force general, Rami Dotan, who was imprisoned for embezzling $12 million, and Yehuda Gil, a senior Mossad [Israeli CIA] official, who was finally caught inventing – continually for ten years – information from an entirely fabricated spy in Syria. Enjoying the status of being a spy legend in Israel, Gil’s total fictions nearly brought Israel to war with its Arab neighbor. [DAVIS, D, p. 10]

In 1999, the Associated Press reported that “several former officials of Israel’s biggest bus company are suspected of accepting millions of dollars in bribes” [AP, Israel's] and in another story that “Israeli police have recommended that outgoing Justice Minister Tsahi Hanegbi be charged with corruption.” [AP, Police] That same year too, “Israeli police arrested a local official of the ultra-Orthodox Shas party [Yehuda Kehati] – a key ally of Prime Minister Benyamin Netanyahu – Saturday over allegations of fraud in connection with Monday’s elections for parliament and prime ministership … Fraud allegations are nothing new in Israeli politics.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, Ultra] A little while later came losing Prime Minister Netanyahu’s turn: “Two months after bowing out of public life, Benyamin Netanyahu was back in the spotlight at the center of a police probe by the national fraud squad. Israel’s former first couple are suspected of corruption, abuse of trust, attempting to suborn witnesses, and hindering the investigation, which centers on 100,000 dollars of renovations and other work at two Jerusalem homes.” [WEGMAN] In 2001, the Washington Post noted that, with 1994 changes in Israeli election laws, “as a result many Israeli politicians resorted to a wide range of illegal and semi-legal ways to raise money, including setting up nonprofit organizations, whose records are shielded from public inquiry.” [DOBBS, M., 2-21-01] That same year, after a building collapsed in Jerusalem killing 23 people, the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz noted that

“Construction regulation in Jerusalem has been under a cloud since November 1999, when a huge corruption scandal exploded under the city’s construction regulation department. After a six month undercover operation, Jerusalem police uncovered a ring of municipality officials who systematically accepted hundreds of thousands of shekels in bribes from architects and contractors.” [AVRAHAMI, I., 5-27-01]

In 1999, in examining Israeli Likud Party fund-raising, the Jewish Week noted that “almost $300,000 appears to have vanished somewhere between the United States and its Israeli charitable destination. And at least under $160,000 – donated by right-wing philanthropist Dr. Irving Moskowitz to a fund-raiser linked to Likud – was never reported to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, as required by law.” [COHLER-ESSES, L., 2-19-99, p. 1] In 2001, “[Israeli] His-tradut Teachers Union head Avraham Ben-Shabbat and his deputy Uri Groman, were placed under 14 days’ house arrest by Tel Aviv District Court … after both admitted to fraudulently obtaining academic degrees, then using them to receive higher pay.” [SOMMER, A., 12-11-01]

And let us not forget the swindles befalling some of the immigrants to Israel from the former Soviet Union. In 1996, a class action suit was filed against Va’ad
(the Ukrainian Jewish immigration umbrella organization), an immigration activist named Yosef Zisels, the Jewish Agency, and the Liaison Bureau of the Israeli government. “According to the charges,” notes the Jerusalem Post, “the immigrants gave money from their savings and the sale of their property to Zisels to transfer to Israel at the advice of emissaries working for the agency and bureau. However, they claim they were not paid the sums half a year later, as had been stipulated in the contract with the Va’ad.” [TSUR, p. 6] Then came the 1999 investigations of “lawyers who reportedly cheated thousands of elderly Israelis out of more than half a billion dollars by offering to help them obtain German pensions. [i.e., Holocaust-era reparations]” [BARSHI]

In November of 1999 the Montreal Gazette noted that

“It was scandal, and lots of it, that truly occupies the country’s [Israel’s] attention. There was a scandal of lust, scandal of greed, scandal of corruption. There was a scandal involving the national soccer team for losing a key match following pregame visits to a house of ill repute. There was a scandal involving former prime minister Benyamin Netanyahu and his wife, Sarah, accused of accepting bribes and stealing valuable state gifts. And there was yeshiva scandal a plenty. So much muck was being raked that the newspaper Yediot Ahronot even ran a full-page scandal guide on Friday, with boxes for every major affair, its suspects, its allegations and the status of its investigation.” [SONTAG, D., 11-28-99, p. 17]

In 2000, nothing had changed. The Jewish Week headlined an article “Israel Sinking in Scandal Swamp: ‘Light Unto Nations’ Seen Losing Moral Bearing Amid Corruption, Fraud Probes.” New scandals included those surrounding Israel’s president, Ezer Weizman, who had taken hundreds of thousands of dollars in a secret fund from French Jewish millionaire Edouard Sarousi, and Prime Minister Ehud Barak “who was questioned by state Comptroller Eliezer Goldberg last week about allegations that fictitious associations illegally pumped foreign contributions into his 1999 election campaign.” [AIN, S., 1-28-2000, p. 1]

In 2002, Israeli MK (Member of Knesset/Parliament) Michael Kleiner complained that “World Jewish organizations are set to ‘rake into their coffers’ some $1 billion in unclaimed funds allocated by Swiss banks to compensate for assets from dormant Holocaust-era accounts … Kleiner accused the [Israeli] government, along with Jewish organizations, of compliance in allowing the Swiss to avoid publishing the lists of bank account and insurance policyholders. The Jewish organizations have a conflict of interests, he said, since they cut a deal under which all unclaimed monies would go to them.” [GILBERT, N., 1-15-02]

Scandals in Israel are an old theme. Looking back to the 1970s, notes Richard Rubenstein, “there was a serious loss of public confidence in the Labor government [the then-empowered political party] as a result of revelations of economic corruption and greed among some government leaders, heads of state-owned banks, corporations, and the Histadrut labor federation.” [RUBENSTEIN, R., p. 229] And as World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann noted about Israel’s first prime minister, David Ben Gurion:
“A promise to him was quite worthless. He did not hesitate to promise one thing and do the opposite. He was absolutely unscrupulous. He never pursued any objective other than realizing the Zionist ideal and satiating his immense ambition.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 94]

In 2001, a London Guardian reporter noted with outrage that Israel has blatantly “cheated and lied and abused the trust” it had in trade agreements with European nations. “No sooner had the ink dried on [Israeli minister] Shimon Peres’s signature [to a Euro-Israeli trade pact],” notes Brian Whitaker,

“than Israel began to cheat. To imagine that this was due to a few bent officials in the customs department would be a mistake: cheating was built into the system and it was carried out with the blessing of the Israeli government … In 1997, as a result of complaints, the European commission sent a delegation to Israel to find out why Brazilian orange juice arriving in Europe had been certified as Israeli in order to qualify for preferential rates. The problem, the delegation concluded, went way beyond orange juice: Israeli customs officials simply could not be trusted. The problem was so serious, their report said, that ‘the validity of ALL preferential certificates issued by Israel, for ALL products,’ was in doubt.” [WHITAKER, B., 4-3-01]

An Israeli journalist noted the moral tenor of its citizens in 2001, a worldview intrinsic to Jewish identity throughout the history of the Jewish diaspora and its traditional circumvention of surrounding Gentile law:

“The Israeli temperament does not accept rules of behavior and rejects natural obedience to the law. The average Israeli is afraid to feel like a sucker, so scorns the rules and regulations and regards the law as an area of ever-expandable space in which to maneuver, outwit, bypass, and bribe, if necessary, in order to achieve more.” [BENZIMAN, U., 5-27-01]

This theme was repeated again a week later by a Jewish ethnic magazine, The Forward, which wondered if Israel’s national “personality trait” of subversion of civil law had roots in Jewish ethics in earlier times in other countries:

“[There is] universal awareness that something is definitely rotten in the state of Israel. This is, after all, a country in which bending the rules is said to be a national pastime, cutting corners a way of life and cheating the authorities the proof of merit … Sticklers for the law are ridiculed and abused, where anyone who works by the book is branded a sap, a ‘freier,’ the worst insult in modern Israeli lexicon … Many people believe Israeli laxity, which borders on anarchy, is a national personality trait that cannot be eradicated by laws alone. Some trace the trait all the way back to the historical Jewish Diaspora, where Jews often found solace in bending the rules imposed by the often anti-Semitic authorities.” [SHALEV, C., 6-1-01]

The same year, Michael Finkel had this to say, about another criminal subject, in the New York Times:

“Moshe lives in Israel, which happens to be one of the more active nations in the international organ-trafficking market. The market, which is
completely illegal, is so complex and well organized that a single transaction often crosses three continents … Yet in Israel and a handful of other nations, including India, Turkey, China, Russia and Iraq, organ sales are conducted with only a scant nod toward secrecy. In Israel, there is even tacit government acceptance of the practice – the national health-insurance program covers part, and sometimes all, of the cost of brokered transplants. Insurance companies are happy to pay, since the cost of kidney surgery, even in the relatively short run, is less than the cost of dialysis. According to the coordinator of kidney transplantation at Hadassah University Hospital in Jerusalem, 60 of the 244 patients currently receiving post-transplant care purchased their new kidney from a stranger – just short of 25 percent of the patients at one of Israel’s largest medical centers participating in the organ business. Relatively few transplant operations, illegal or legal, take place in Israel. Every proposed kidney transplant in the country between two unrelated people is carefully screened for evidence of impropriety by a national committee. Therefore, almost all of these illegal surgeries are performed elsewhere, in nations where the laws are easier to duck, including the United States. Israel also does not contribute much to the supply side of the equation. Organ donation is extremely low; an estimated 3 percent of Israelis have signed donor cards … Paying for an organ has become so routine in Israel that there have been instances in which a patient has elected not to accept the offer of a kidney donation from a well-matched relative. ‘Why risk harm to a family member?’ one patient told me. Instead, these patients have decided that purchasing a kidney from someone they’ve never met – in almost all cases someone who is impoverished and living in a foreign land – is a far more palatable option … A few Americans do go abroad for transplants. A man named Jim Cohan, who lives in Los Angeles, helps organize such trips … Cohan’s price for a kidney, he says, is $125,000 … Only a small portion of the money actually goes to the person selling the organ – as little as $800 … [There is a physician] who has repeatedly been accused by the Israeli media, including one of the nation’s leading daily papers, Ha’aretz, of participating in hundreds of overseas transplants, many of them in Turkey. The [Israeli] surgeon’s name is Zaki Shapira.” [FINKEL, M., 5-26-01]

In 2001, an Israeli newspaper, Ha’aretz, announced that

“Romanian authorities are looking into the possible links between Israeli adoption agencies and an illegal global conspiracy to sell organs for transplants. The Romanian embassy in Israel has asked for, and received from the Labor and Social Affairs Ministry, a list of all children born in Romania who have been brought to Israel for adoption in recent years. The Romanian officials are trying to ascertain if all such children arrived in Israel with all their organs in their bodies.” [REZNICK, R., 12-13-01]

In the midst of the growing 1980s Wall Street scandal, the American Jewish Committee held a panel discussion on Jewish ethics at a conference luncheon. The Palm Beach Jewish Journal quoted Rabbi David Gordis as worrying that
with all the negative publicity some might see Jews in America broadly “as exploiters of the economy, parasites, profiteers.” [EHRLICH, p. 342] Judith Ehrlich and Barry Rehfeld note that

“[Pointing] to the dangers to Jews from the prominence of Jewish names in current scandals and the imagery that emerged from the visibility, Rabbi Gordis urged that ‘as a people we must look more deeply into the recesses of our traditions, our experiences, our values.’” [EHRLICH, p. 345]

The “crisis in Jewish ethics” in America, epitomized in the Wall Street scandals, was of course nothing new to the 1980s. Well-publicized scandals involving prominent and powerful Jews surface fairly regularly. Gerald Krefetz, for instance, noted a particularly nasty Jewish-based scandal in the 1970s:

“Bathed in the merciless lights of Congressional hearings, the witnesses exposed to a national audience the morbid, pathetic, and sordid conditions of senior citizens in nursing and old-age homes. It was as if they had found that a Jew was in charge of a concentration camp. The whole proceedings were a shanda (shame) of the first order, [with] illegal practices of a rabbi and other prominent Jews on a captive population unable to protect itself … [Rabbi Bernard] Bergman was more than a symbolic figure of evil in the nursing home industry – he was the industry … [KREFETZ, p. 128] … It became clear that Bergman had almost oligopolic powers, with interests in close to a hundred different homes across the nation. It also became clear that perhaps more than any other industry or service area, Jews dominated the field, that many of the operators were Jewish, including Bergman, Eugene Hollander, and Albert Schwartzberg … Insensitivity, greed, and human degradation were the hallmark of a majority of the private facilities. And that the chief perpetrator of this terminal inhumanity should be an orthodox rabbi and a prominent Zionist was a mind-boggling reversal of values … [KREFETZ, p. 129]…. One illustration is perhaps typical of Bergman’s operations, his persistence, his political connections, and his unabashed use of his ‘Jewishness’ that he paraded as if he were its victim … [KREFETZ, p. 131] … The hypocritical Bergman was using the lethal and explosive charge of anti-Semitism as a foil for his commercial maneuvers.” [KREFETZ, p. 132]

Bergman was prominent a number of Jewish Orthodox institutions. “Reputed to be worth $100 million,” notes Alan Dershowitz, “he had held the presidency of numerous Jewish philanthropic, religious, and educational institutions.” [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, p. 126] He was “one of the richest and most powerful orthodox Jews in the world,” notes Robert Friedman, “with close ties to Israel’s National Religious Party. He made a fortune from a national conglomerate of Medicaid nursing homes, where infirm patients were left unattended to soak in their own urine … No doubt Bergman learned his business ethics from his parents who were not only bootleggers, but also were convicted in 1941 of smuggling eight kilos of heroin from France in the bindings of Hebrew prayer books.”
“In my lifetime in this city,” declared another Jewish critic in the *Village Voice*, “I have never encountered anyone as rotten as Bernard Bergman.” Within three months, 62 articles about Bergman were published in the *New York Times* alone. [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, p. 119]

Sensationally, the judge in the Bergman case, Marvin Frankel, sentenced the rabbi to a term of only four months, a decision that elicited outrage from all corners. A Jewish Congressman, notes Alan Dershowitz, “warned that ‘there will be anti-Semitism flowing from the fact’ that the judge and defendant were both Jewish.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 120] Special State Nursing Home Prosecutor Charles Hynes declared the punishment “insubstantial” and that it was “special justice for the privileged.” [DERSHOWITZ, p. 120] A second judge, Aloysius Melia, reviewed the case and added a year to Bergman’s sentence.

In 1993, when prominent non-Jewish American lawyer Michael Tigar took up the U.S. citizenship case of John Demjanjuk – after his new client had been exonerated in Israel of being the Nazi operative Ivan the Terrible – a Jewish faculty member at the Hofstra Law School, Monroe Freedman, publicly rebuked Demjanjuk’s new lawyer in a well-known law journal: “Is John Demjanjuk the kind of client to whom you want to dedicate your training, your knowledge, your extraordinary skills?” [MARGOLICK, p. B18] Tigar’s response to Freedman’s pained moral query was an emphatic yes. Demjanjuk, after all, had never been proven to be guilty of any crime, and he had been cleared of the charge of being Ivan the Terrible. And Monroe Freedman? Freedman had been one of the lawyers for the aforementioned Rabbi Bergman who was found guilty of particularly heinous crimes against the helpless elderly, a client who was widely known as “the meanest man in New York.” [MARGOLICK, p. B18]

Other scandals in the 1970s included that which caused non-Jewish actor Cliff Robertson to be blacklisted for four years [MCCLINTICK, p. 518] by the largely Jewish Hollywood crowd [see forthcoming media section p. 1141] for reporting a forgery by the president of *Columbia Pictures*, David Begelman. The investigation of Begelman ultimately led to an embezzlement scandal and press investigations into the whole unethical base of the film business itself. Robertson attracted animosity also because of his public demands for further police investigation into something that he believed to be merely the tip of an iceberg, especially after Begelman was tentatively removed from his post at Columbia, but reinstated. “The entire entertainment community had been shaken [by the scandal],” noted David McClintick in 1982, “Four of the seven major studios – Columbia, Fox, MGM, and United Artists – had changed drastically.” [MCCLINTICK, p. 518] As the scandal attracted increased media attention, the *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*’s entertainment columnist noted the essence of the situation: “The *Washington Post* apparently is incensed because the Hollywood trade press never used the word ‘embezzlement’ [in referring to the Begelman scandal]. There’s a reason for that. Embezzlement is not a sin in Hollywood. It’s a way of life.” [MCCLINTICK, p. 354] (Begelman had once been an agent for Judy Garland who believed that he had stolen $200,000 from her). [SHIPMAN, 1993, p. 448]
In 1977, Jewish author Michael Hellerman had his autobiography published. It was entitled “Wall Street Swindler.” Criminal associates noted that he was “the master [swindler] of them all” and “when it comes to the big swindle, Hellerman is a genius. He makes us all look like pikers.” [HELLERMAN/RENNER, 1977, p. viii] Hellerman grew up “in the bosom of a deeply religious affluent family in the heart of suburban Long Island” but was “driven by an almost insatiable desire for riches and luxury.” [HELLERMAN/RENNER, 1977, p. ix] “As a thief,” says Thomas Renner,

“Hellerman was the very personification of the white-collar criminal. … Like the men of the Mafia he often dealt with and cheated, Hellerman could and did leave his victims stripped of their dignity, financially destitute, and psychologically traumatized.” [HELLERMAN/RENNER, 1977, p. ix]

In the political realm, in 1977 the Jewish governor of Maryland, Marvin Mandel, and four others were “convicted of conspiracy to have the Governor influence race track legislation in return for $380,000 in bribes.” [AYRES, B.D., p. A1] Mandel served 19 months of a four year prison sentence. One of those convicted with him, Irwin Kovens, “was a major sponsor of Mr. Mandel’s political career. He helped raise millions of dollars for Mr. Mandel’s campaign for governor in 1970 and 1974.” [NYT, 11-2-89, p. B21] [BALTIMORE JEWISH TIMES, 1-23-98, p. 8]

Shortly thereafter, in 1982, another Maryland Jewish politician was sentenced to prison. Baltimore City Council President Walter Orlinsky pleaded guilty to “one count of extortion … [He also] conceded that the Government could prove other charges against him.” [NYT, 9-23-82, p. A24] [BALTIMORE JEWISH TIMES, 1-23-98, p. 8] He was originally indicted on 12 counts of extortion and mail fraud.

In 1999, Donald Warshaw, also Jewish, and Miami’s powerful city manager, was fired after nearly two years in the position. He faced a “federal indictment charging he misspent public pension and charity funds on luxurious items.” He was accused of “spending $86,563 in pension and charity funds on trips, designer clothes, $21,276 in hockey tickets and other things from 1993 to 1995 while serving as police commissioner … Warshaw’s friend, accountant Ronald Stern, as named as an unindicted co-conspirator. He killed himself in July 1999 after allegations surfaced that he embezzled $500,000 from the pension fund while serving as its auditor and investment adviser. He was also the charity’s accountant.” [WILSON, C., 10-11-2000] In 1993, Dade County Commissioner (Miami, Florida) Joe Gersten, also Jewish, was accused of smoking cocaine with a prostitute in a Miami drug den and subsequently fled to Australia. [DE FEDE, J., 3-16-94]

In 1995, Joe Waldholtz, the Jewish husband of non-Jewish Utah Congresswoman Enid Greene was exposed in a scandal that sent him to prison for 21 months and effectively destroyed his wife’s political career. Waldholtz, noted Salt Lake City’s Deseret News, “lied and bullied his way to notoriety … during a scandal that involved Waldholtz’s ex-wife, then Congresswoman Enid Greene, check kiting, illegal money transfers, federal election law violations, drug abuse
and bizarre behavior … [He was] convicted of embezzling nearly $4 million from his former father-in-law and illegally funneling most of it into Greene’s 1994 election campaign [which she won].” [DILLON, L., 5-29-99, p. A1] Greene, pleading complete innocence, divorced him soon after the scandal.

In Florida, in 1999, State Senator Al Gutman was sentenced to two years in prison for “conspiracy in a Medicare fraud case.” Gutman and his wife Marci "secretly owned companies that billed Medicare for health care services that were not performed.” He “collected at least $2 million from fraudulent billings while he served in the Legislature.” [FIELDS, T., 10-20-99; FIELDS, T., 10-26-99] In 2000, Paul Adler, a “key” Hillary Clinton political adviser (particularly to the Jewish community) and head of the Democratic Party in New York’s Rockland County, was arrested on charges of “public corruption, fraud, extortion, and other charges linked to his real estate transactions.” [FORWARD, 9-15-00, p. 15] In 2002, Edward Mezvinsky, a former (Jewish) Congressman from Iowa, “was indicted on 66 counts of fraud and related charges for allegedly bilking more than $10 million.” Those signing letters trying to get him off easy were Edward Shils (a University of Pennsylvania professor, Jonathan Yarowsky, a former general counsel to the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, and Rabbi Gerald Wolpe. [MOORE, T., 1-9-02]

In the 1960s, a former Jewish socialist activist turned rich playboy, Bernie Cornfeld, was probably that decade’s best known financial swindler, defrauding 250,000 investors in his Investors Overseas Service (IOS) mutual funds company. [NYT, 3-1-95, p. A10] With a million customers in 26 countries around the world, and employing 20,000 employees, Cornfeld, amassing a personal fortune of over $100 million. He promised millions to Israeli causes and started a mutual fund system at the Tel Aviv stock exchange. “Stories of shady dealings, mismanagement, plain stupidity, what some lawyers were calling outright fraud, were filling the financial pages of newspapers and magazines all over the world,” noted one of his former associates, Bert Cantor. [CANTOR, p. 8] Cantor also had this to say about who ran the corrupt IOS business:

“A minor IOS executive in evaluating the company’s personnel practices remarked that status in the hierarchy could be measured in four categories: 1) Nice Jewish boys from Brooklyn who belonged to Bernie’s Boy Scout troop, 2) Nice Jewish boys from Brooklyn, 3) Nice Jewish boys, 4) Everyone else.” [CANTOR, p. 7-8]

In 1975 Cornfeld was convicted for telephone fraud. In 1990, Forbes magazine reported that the IRS claimed Cornfeld still owed $15 million in taxes going back thirty years. [NYT, 3-1-95]

Another (extremely) noteworthy Jewish fraud of the Cornfeld era was that of Stanley Goldblum. In the 1970s he was sentenced to prison for the ‘biggest corporate fraud in United States history,” “one of history’s greatest hoaxes.” His Equity Funding Corporation of America sold $2 billion worth of fake insurance policies –64,000 of them – to other insurers. In later years he surfaced as a criminal again, arrested in 1999 “in a scheme to operate a number of medical
clinics that allegedly bilked the workers’ compensation system.” [NY TIMES, 3-26-75; GAW, p. C1] [DIRKS/GROSS, p. 3-4]

Also in the 1960s, Australia had a memorable Jewish scandal. Stanley Korman, notes Jewish commentator Leon Gettler,

“shocked and angered the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant pillars of the establishment back in the 60’s. Sure, Korman was a crook. They hated him and sent him and sent him to jail for fleecing his shareholders. But they hated him even more because he was Jewish.” [GETTLER, L, 2000, p. 27]

More recently, much-publicized Jewish crime figures include the sensation-ally ostentatious penny-pincher and tax evader, Leona Helmsley (Ms. Helmsley, noted the Economist, “had long been labeled one of the villains of modern America. A witness at her trial testified that she had once said ‘only the little people pay taxes’ and the little people remembered.” [ECONOMIST, 4-25-92, p. 28] “Helmsley,” noted Reuters, “was found guilty … of writing off a wide va-riety of personal items as business expenses, including bras, shoes and dresses, a million dollar pool cover that doubled as a dance floor, and a $130,000 stereo system.” [APPELSON])


Fleiss was eventually sentenced to prison in 1993 for attempted pandering, tax evasion, and money laundering. She was once quoted as saying that the aforementioned Bernie Cornfeld “was the only real boyfriend in my life.” [WASH POST, 3-2-95, p. B4] Fleiss’ father, noted the Los Angeles Times, “a well-known Los Feliz pediatrician who recently examined the newborn daughter of pop star Madonna, was previously sentenced to three years’ probation, 625 hours of community service and fined $50,000 for conspiring to hide profits from his daughter’s call girl ring.” [MCDONNELL, p. B1, B3]

A kindred soul in professional ethics to Dr. Heiss in the late 1960s and early 1970s was Dr. Max Jacobson. Nicknamed “Dr. Feelgood,” his license to practice was eventually suspended for routinely giving amphetamine injections into a large number of celebrities. [SEAMAN, p. 386-388] Jacobson and another Jewish doctor, Lee Siegel, are cited by one author as famous “drug pushers” for
Hollywood studios. There were “stories,” notes Dennis McDougal, “about physicians on the TV or movie set who injected stars with ‘vitamins’ to keep them performing … It became clear after a while that [movie star] agents did not interfere with the addictions that were killing Allen Ladd, Montgomery Cliff, and Judy Garland.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 259] Dr. Robert Feder, another Hollywood physician, “gave amphetamines, or uppers, to some of his patients if they needed to be ‘on’ for a particular performance or day.” In the case of drug-addicted actor John Belushi, Feder fed him uppers through Belushi’s agent, Bernie Brillstein [WOODWARD, 1984, p. 244-245] (Among the great medical fraudsters of the early 20th century was Albert Abrams. Arthur Cramp of the American Medical Association once said that Abrams “easily ranked as the dean of twentieth century [medical] charlatans.” Abrams used a variety of invented machines, often based on the radio, that were supposed to diagnose, and even cure, disease.) [YOUNG, J., 1967, p. 138-139]

Doctor Melvyn Rosenstein is also a noteworthy surgeon. Self-described as the “world’s leading authority on penile surgery,” he spent $250,000 a month in advertising across the country in an effort to entice men to have surgical penis elongation. He reportedly netted $30 million in this practice between 1991 and 1995. By then, however, dozens of men (over 40 in southern California alone) had surmounted their embarrassment to come forward to sue him for malpractice, for misinformation, and for deforming their sexual organs. A California Medical Board spokesman declared that those who had come forward to sue Rosenstein were “the tip of the iceberg.” In 1996 Rosenstein was forbidden to further practice his lucrative trade. [HOLDING, R., 4-24-95, p. A9; SHUIT, D., 3-5-96, p. B1] (In the women’s world of cosmetic surgery, socialite Joyce Wildenstein – one of the heirs to the opulent Jewish Wildenstein art gallery dynasty – has become the much lambasted symbol in the New York media for those who have had face lifts too many times).

Moving along in the generic fraud department, up north, in Ontario, Canada, in 1991 Jewish lawyer Herman Melnitzer parked his Jaguar XJS coupe and “pleaded guilty to one of Canada’s biggest cases of fraud.” [TYLER, p. A1] He was charged with 43 cases of “forgery, fraud and attempted fraud relating to $1 billion worth of phony stock certificates he used to trick banks into giving him $43 million in lines of credit, $12.3 million which was spent.” [TYLER, p. A1]

Also in the 1990s, certainly a rival to the claim of “Canada’s biggest fraud,” the Bre-X gold mining scam swept the world’s imagination in what the Ottawa Citizen eventually called a “monumental swindle.” It began when a small company (co-owned by David Walsh, Michael de Guzman, and John Felderhof) in Calgary, Canada, claimed to have discovered a huge new source of gold in Indonesia. Soon enough, the head (Peter Munk; also Jewish) of Canada’s largest gold producer (Barrick Gold Corporation) was a player in the story. “In the heat of negotiations between [Munk’s company] and Bre-X,” notes the Citizen, “one of Munk’s executives was reluctant to talk business with his boss on Yom Kippur, an important Jewish holiday when Munk would be observing the Day of Atonement. Munk dismissed his vice-president’s
concerns. ‘This is more important to me than anything. I know it. God knows it. And there’s no point in trying to fool anyone about it.”’ [SHER, p. E4]

While investors clamored to join the group that promised enough gold to rival the gross national product of the nearby Philippines, nothing substantial was ever found.

Steven Gaines notes the case of Jewish mogul Barry Trupin and his Rothschild Reserve International company:

“What made Trupin really rich was his 1976 discovery of a tax loophole from which he could spin a personal fortune of $300 million, a ‘money-making machine,’ he called it. Trupin found that a company could earn huge tax deductions by leasing computers instead of buying them. Almost every aspect of the transaction was deductible … Although perfectly legal, the dodge was a little cloudy. He began to proclaim himself the ‘master of corporate veil.”’ [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 230]

In 1997 Trupin “was indicted by the U. S. government as a tax cheat for the avoidance of $6.6 million in taxes.” He was also “convicted in federal district court of receiving, possessing, and selling a stolen painting [by Marc Chagall].” Also, “thirty-nine investors in Trupin’s various companies were suing him” and the FBI “launched an investigation into Trupin’s interest in a Tustin, California, bank in which he had bought a 62 percent controlling interest and had introduced a number of loans that had to be written off as bad.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 270]

In 1997, Arnie Zaler was arrested in Arizona for fraud totaling millions of dollars, swindling as many as 60 people. Earlier, he had been so well-established in the Phoenix community that he was considered a strong Democratic candidate for Congress. The Arizona Republic notes that, when financial troubles began to hit him in 1994,

“Zaler dropped out of sight. Private investigators hired by investors discovered that he had been laying low in Phoenix and Denver, and occasionally slipping out of the country to spend time in Israel. Zaler had dual citizenship in the United States and Israel. They even learned that Zaler made a large donation to a new temple outside Tel Aviv that was named after him.” [MILLER, E., p. A1]


“was embroiled in a Federal tax-evasion scandal, and rumors flew that Mr. Douglas had his own tax problems. He took a plane to Israel and didn’t come back until the cases had been dropped.” [TOY, Sec1, p. 27]

As noted above, if threatened with exposure and arrest in America, an emergency bailout for Israeli, American-Jewish, or any other international Jewish criminals throughout the world is Israel’s Law of Return, in which Jews can essentially rush to Israel for sanctuary. Israeli law officially forbids the extradition
of any Israeli citizen for crimes committed in another country, and any Jew on earth may acquire – by simple birthright, and an application – Israeli citizenship. Many American Jews do indeed hold both American and Israeli citizenships. This curious convenience garnered considerable outrage and publicity in the 1997 case of American-born Samuel Sheinbein – the son of (technically) an Israeli citizen – who was accused of murder. The teenager fled to Israel and sought refuge under the “law of return” for worldwide Jewry.

Sheinbein’s accused crime was particularly heinous: he and another Jewish youth (old friends from the Charles E. Smith Jewish Day School) were charged with murder, including sawing off the Hispanic victim’s arms and legs with a chainsaw, and attempting to burn the body. The other teenager accused in the case, Adam Needle, was arrested and jailed; he subsequently committed suicide. Sheinbein, meanwhile, had hurried off to Israel, a place he was visiting for the first time in his life.

Sheinbein’s plan of escape rested on his father, Shlomo, who had immigrated to America from Israel with his family in 1950, at the age of 6. This entitled him to perpetual Israeli citizenship. He eventually became a lawyer and was so “American” that he was even employed by the Pentagon. [BALTIMORE SUN, 10-11-97, p. 23] Ironically, Shlomo’s own father had been murdered in Tel Aviv in 1982. The London Guardian notes that “He was shot in the head at close range in his office, from where he was suspected of organizing illegal money transfers between Israel and the United States. He left property valued at pounds 44 million.” [BORGER, p. 16]

The American government formally requested from Israel the extradition of Samuel Sheinbein to be tried for murder. As far the Jewish state was concerned, however, if Sheinbein’s father was indeed an Israeli citizen, his son must also be considered a citizen – no matter that he had never been to Israel – and therefore immune from extradition to America.

In October 1997, the Israeli government formally refused the American extradition request. “He cannot be extradited,” declared an Israeli Justice Ministry spokesperson, “He was an Israeli citizen when the crime was committed.” [ASSOC. PRESS, p. 62] This decision elicited an extremely unusual storm of outrage and indignation within the U.S. Congress. Shortly thereafter, members of that legislative body announced that it was postponing a scheduled transfer of $180 million in U.S. aid to Israel. Newly attentive, Israel later suggested a Sheinbein trial in Israel, and eventually a further compromise: Sheinbein could be tried in America, but would serve his prison term in Israel.

In May 1998, U.S. prosecutors rejected such compromise proposals. As Agence France Presse noted:

“Justice officials in Maryland had expressed concern that Sheinbein would be released early if he served a term in Israel.” [AFP, 5-3-98, ONLINE]

Meanwhile, all the bad press and economic Congressional action forced some major American Jewish agencies to take extremely unusual positions on
the case, that is to say, to publicly criticize Israel. “Noting the victim was a Hispanic youth,” noted the *Jerusalem Post*, “the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith has warned that failure [to extradite Sheinbein] will have ‘consequences which transcend this case alone.’” [J.P., 10-9-97, p. 8] Even the Executive Director of the American Jewish Congress, Phil Baum, announced that “Sheinbein’s connection to Israel is so patently tenuous as to verge on the fraudulent.” [PR NEWSWIRE, 10-9-97, ONLINE] “Regardless of how it may be presented,” the *Jerusalem Post* editorialized, “a failure to expedite will be interpreted by many as Israel’s willingness to shield people accused of committing heinous crimes.” [J.P., 10-9-97, p. 8] “[The] extradition law is part of Israeli law, end of story,” noted Stuart Schoffman in the *Washington Post*, “But alongside this flat formulation runs an age-old protective instinct: You don’t surrender a Jew to the gentiles.” [SCHOFFMAN, p. B1]

Israel eventually decided that Samuel Sheinbein was not a citizen after all, because of a small technicality: Israel’s Law of Return was suddenly noted to have been created two years after Sheinbein’s father left Israel, and therefore not applicable to him and his son. Nonetheless, by a 3-2 vote, in February 1999 the Israeli Supreme Court ruled finally that Sheinbein could claim Israeli citizenship and could not be extradited. “I am disappointed in Israel,” said the Maryland lawyer, Douglas Ganser (who is also Jewish), set to prosecute the case in America, “because the [Israeli] ruling didn’t make sense. It’s not even a close call. It looks bad for the Jewish people.” [BESSER, J., 3-5-99, p. 10]

At the same time as the Sheinbein fiasco, the United States government was also trying to extradite Chaim Berger from Israel to stand trial in America too. While the Jewish state was deciding what to do with this case, in May 1999, “despite objections by United States law-enforcement officials, an Israeli court … approved an unusual $3 million bail agreement” for this founder of a Hasidic community in New York. Under the “personal bond” of two Israeli rabbis and the governments housing minister, Berger was allowed complete freedom from jail in mornings and evenings. “U.S. officials warned Israel against freeing Berger, contending that he fled New York 18 months ago knowing he would be indicted for his part in stealing $20 million in federal and state education and housing grants and subsidies. Four other co-defendants were also indicted in the U.S. – two of them were yet in hiding. A rabbi in Berger’s community complained that “the [Hasidic] community’s sense is the government’s pound of flesh has been exacted and there’s no need to drag a 73-year old Holocaust survivor into this.” [GREENBERG, J.J., 3-12-99, p. 12]

In the 1980s, France had its own major run-in with Israel’s shielding of international Jewish criminals when Israel’s Ministry of Justice delayed for years the extradition of a French Jew, William Nakash. Nakash had been convicted there for murder. “French officials,” noted Reuters, “insist that [Nakash was involved in] a gangland killing between rival pimps.” [TAYLOR, ONLINE] The *Jewish Week* noted the mood in Israel, however, about France’s extradition request:
“Nakash, who claims to be newly Orthodox, has been passionately defended by Orthodox Jews and right-wing nationalists. They have depicted him a hero who killed an Arab in self-defense, a ‘nationalistic’ act forced upon him by unbearable harassment by Jew-hating Arabs, abetted by a climate of rampant anti-Semitism in [the French town of] Besancon.” [EYTAN, p. 3, 34]

A former Deputy Mayor of Besancon, a Jewish lawyer named Jacques Lorach, responded by saying that “Never in my life, and certainly not in my political career, have I heard or been told an anti-Semitic remark.” The town even has “one of the largest and most impressive memorials to the Holocaust outside Yad Vashem in Jerusalem and it was financed exclusively by the city and regional authorities.” [EYTAN, p. 3, 34]

Nakash was finally only considered eligible for extradition when he proved to be a criminal problem in his new home. As the Chicago Tribune noted,

“In 1985, Nakash, by then an Israeli citizen, was arrested near Jerusalem for plotting to rob a senior Christian prelate of 60 bars of gold and $2 million in cash. When Israeli police realized Nakash was the same man sentenced for the Besancon murder, two courts, including Israel’s Supreme Court, ruled that he was extraditable to France … [But] mindful of the political damage [in Israel] that Nakash’s extradition could cause, Justice Minister Avraham Sharir, an astute Likud politician, ignored the opinion of the Courts and last week barred Nakash’s extradition.” [BRODER, p. C1]

In 2000, 124 people from the Paris Sentier district were put on trial, accused of embezzling $77 million from French banks. “The Sentier area of Paris [is the] center of the Jewish-run garment industry.” [WEBSTER, 12-7-89] “The Sentier garment district in Paris … is majority-owned by French Jews.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 7-16-99] The Sentier district “is renowned as the center for the rag-trade and a base for petty criminals.” [GRAHAM, R., 2-20-01] “Thirteen of the accused, Israeli nationals or holders of dual Franco-Israeli nationality,” noted the Jerusalem Post, “have fled to Israel.” Struggling to get the Jewish state to extradite the accused criminals for trial, French prosecutor Francois Franchi complained that “Israel has put itself beyond the pale of the international community. Its banking system encourages actions which explain what happened in this case.” [LEVEQUE, 2-25-01, p. 4]

“Investigators [into the Sentier affair],” noted Agence France Presse, “also uncovered money laundering networks with Austria, Belgium, and Israel … most of the defendants are accused of being part of a criminal network.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 2-20-01] And the implications of the Sentier scandal to the Jewish community at-large? “Leaders of France’s 750,000-strong Jewish community,” noted the Jerusalem Post, “have privately fretted for months about possible effects on public opinion of the trial, which opened in a courtroom built specially to accommodate the mass of defendants and lawyers.” [LEVEQUE, 2-25-01, p. 4]
Meanwhile, France was also trying to extradite Arkadi Gaydamak (Gai-
damek), “a billionaire industrialist,” from Israel for trial on charges of illegal
arms trading. Gaydamak has Israeli, Canadian, French, and Angola passports.
Newspaper reports noted that this mogul “had close ties with Danny Yatom, the
security adviser to caretaker Israeli prime minister Ehud Barak.” Gaydamak
“called attacks on his character as ‘aimed at a Jew and a Russian who succeeded
in business.’” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 12-29-00]

Also in France, in 2002 “three of Israel’s five leading banks [were] under in-
vestigation by French authorities as part of a larger, ongoing probe of a money-
laundering network between France and Israel. The network used Jewish char-
itable institutions and cultural institutions based in France to process illegally-
acquired money … In November French officials said there were some 80 sus-
perts in the case, including six rabbis. Six people are reportedly already in jail.”
[BERGER/STUB, 12-30-01]

Elsewhere, in 1993 Poland requested the extradition of two Polish Jews, Bo-
guslaw Bagsik and Andrzej Gasiorowski, owners of the Art-B Trading Compa-
ny (which owned 200 other companies), who had fled to Israel in 1991. They
were accused, noted Reuters, “of stealing … $310 million in the country’s big-
gest financial scandal.” [REUTERS, 5-20-92] Bagsik was known to have Polish,
German, and Israeli citizenship. [REUTERS, 8-16-91, p. 16] Israeli authorities
conceded that at least $85 million had been transferred by Bagsik to the Jewish
state. An Israeli newspaper reported that Gasiorowski complained of discrimi-
nation in Poland by “people feeling anti-Semitic sentiments.” [POLISH NEWS
BULLETIN, 8-91, p. 1] Bagsik was captured in Switzerland the next year and
faced 15 years in a Polish jail. Israel refused the extradition of Gasiorowski.
[PAP NEWSWIRE, 1-31-97]

In 1994, another newsworthy Polish Jew, Solomon Morel, fled to Israel
when Polish authorities sought to question him about his role in “possible post-
war crimes against German civilians.” [NEWSWEEK, 1-3-94, p. 6] Israel re-
fused to return him to Poland. Likewise, in 2000, the Israeli government refused
to extradite Nahman Dushanski back to Lithuania where he is wanted for tak-
ing “part in the murder of Lithuanian prisoners during Soviet occupation in
1941.” Lithuania also requested the extradition of Simion Borkov from Israel on
similar charges. [MELMAN, 2-10-2999]

In 1992, yet another Jewish predator of the embryonic Polish capitalist state,
David Bogatin, made international news for his corrupt bank (with 14 offices)
in Poland. “Last month,” noted the Montreal Gazette,

“a muckraking journalist discovered Bogatin’s First Commercial
Bank was founded on fraud. Bogatin was unmasked as a con man – al-
leged to have connections with United States and Russian criminal syn-
dicats – who fled the United States after conviction on a tax evasion

Bogatin, originally from the Soviet Union, had emigrated to the United
States in 1977. Starting out as cab driver, by 1985 he was involved in shady busi-
ness dealings, the Mafia, and major tax evasion. By 1987, he was arrested in Vi-
enn for “carrying counterfeit securities.” Bogatin, also noted as “one of America’s biggest gasoline bootleggers,” was eventually extradited to the United States and sentenced to prison for tax evasion. [LEGAL INTELLIGENCE, 5-15-92, p. 5]

From the Ukraine, in 1994 the Jewish acting head of the Ukrainian cabinet, Yefim Zvyagilsky, “was faced with charges of embezzlement of state property [worth $25 million].” [STETSYURA] After fleeing to Israel, the Jewish state denied the Ukrainian request for his extradition. “Ukrainian officials,” noted Reuters, “say Zvyagilsky, a Jew by origin, acquired an Israeli passport during his two and a half years in Israel but he denies this … Some top [Ukrainian] government officials, including Foreign Minister Hennady Vdovenko have suggested that Ukrainian authorities might have to think twice before appointing Jews to senior jobs in the future.” [REUTERS, 2-12-97]

In April 1997 the Jewish Telegraphic Agency reported an intriguing banking story from Russia:

“The head of a large Russian bank who is also a prominent member of the country’s Jewish community has been detained in Moscow on suspicion of embezzling more than $120 million … Arkady Angelevich, who heads Moscow’s Montazhspetsbank and is a member of the presidium of the Russian Jewish Congress, has been in prison since last week … Angelevich was arrested on the way to the airport, where he was planning to leave for Israel, according to news reports.” [KRICHEVSKY, 4-25-97, p. 6]

In 2001, Agence France Presse reported that

“Spain’s top criminal court on Monday turned down a request by Russian media magnate and Israeli-passport holder Vladimir Gusinsky to travel to Israel to cast his vote in elections … [Gusinsky faces] extradition to Russia to face fraud charges.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 2-5-01]

Gusinsky is the head of the Russian Jewish Congress. Within two weeks, another prominent Russian Jew made the criminal news:

“The arrest of the well-known St. Petersburg businessman and vice-president of the Russian Jewish Congress [Mikhail Mirilashvili] has caused outrage in some political circles in Israel.” [ST. PETERSBURG TIMES, 2-16-01]

Mirilashvili also has both Russian and Israeli citizenship.

(Another Eastern European Jewish mogul, Vadim Rabinovich, is founder and president of the All-Ukrainian Jewish Congress. He too has known “ties to Russian organized crime.”) [BONNER, R., 6-12-01]

Even in war-torn Serbia, in 1994 the (Jewish) Forward noted that there were fears of an anti-Semitic backlash when Jews locally masterminded

“a billion dollar embezzlement racket. The scandal, a classic pyramid scheme, involved two banks, Yugoskandic and Dafiment … Both banks claimed close links to Israel, and thousands queued over their money.
Then the banks collapsed. The owner of Yugoskandic absconded to Israel with his investment money…” [RUBIN, E, p. 1]

This owner, Jezda Yasiljevic, notes the London Sunday Times, “fled to Israel, where he threatened to fund hit squads against politicians who turned against him.” [BRANSON] In 1992, Vasiljevic had purchased an island off the Montenegrin coast, “once the playground of Richard Burton and Sophia Loren,” for hundreds of millions of dollars. [BRANSON] The next year, notes the Christian Science Monitor,

“tens of thousands of panicked Belgraders besieged a soccer stadium yesterday where numbered tickets were being given to withdraw money from a private bank. The rush followed the collapse last week of another bank whose owner fled to Israel, leaving a tangle that threatened to bring down the whole economy of the remaining Yugoslavia.” [BRANSON, p. 3]

“Vasiljevic’s bank,” said Time, “ran a classic Ponzi scheme, using new deposits to pay the interest on old ones.” [GREENWALD, p. 58]

A sampling of other newsworthy items about Jews committing crimes throughout the world and then hurrying to Israel for refuge include:

- **Members of the Jewish Defense League.** Between 1981 and 1987, the FBI blamed Jewish groups for 24 terrorist acts in the U.S. – 17 of them were believed to be perpetrated by the JDL. [THORNTON, p. A19] The Washington Post reported that “the Israeli government has failed to cooperate with a U.S. investigation of Jewish Defense League (JDL) members and associates suspected in a series of bombings and terrorist incidents in this country, according to an internal Federal Bureau of Investigations memo. The memo … said several key suspects in the investigation have fled to Israel.” [THORNTON, p. A19] In 1992, seven years after the murder by bombing of Arab-American Alex Odeh, the president of the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Organization Albert Mokhiber, complained that “the American government is asking to interrogate American citizens [in Israel] on a crime that occurred in America and the Israeli government is preventing it.” [HEDGES, p. A3] Among others, William Ross, an important philanthropist to the Meir Kahane and his Kach Party, carried out a mail bomb murder “not for politics but for his own profit.” [TUGEND, 8-19-88, p. 8]

- **Gordon Wolfson.** In 1985 he was convicted of 34 counts of mail fraud after cheating investors out of $50 million in a real estate scam. Five days before Wolfson’s sentencing, he paid the Israeli vice-consul in Miami, David Mordechai, $125,000 to arrange to get him on an El Al flight to Israel. Mordechai was sentenced two years later to six years in U.S. prison for aiding the criminal. “[Mordechai] did something that every Jew hopes to do once in his lifetime,” explained his lawyer, “that is help a Jew go to Israel.” [UPI, 1-10-87]
- **Eddie Antar.** Head of a chain of electronics stores called Crazy Eddie, Antar escaped to Israel and lived under the name of “David Cohen” after a $63 million securities fraud judgment against him by the Securities Exchange Commission. [UPI, 6-24-92, ONLINE]

- **Dov and Ayala Engel.** The two fled to Israel from Brooklyn in 1998 after swindling American banks out of $100 million through their company Kent International. (Although eventually brought to justice in the U.S., in 2001 the *New York Post* noted that Dov “plans to cut his 11-year [prison] sentence to less than half by serving time in the Jewish state … Under a 1999 extradition-treaty amendment, he can serve his sentence in that country [Israel], where fraud charges carry a maximum of five years’ imprisonment.” [SMITH, K., 12-4-01]

- **Michael Vishedsky and Shlomo Wishedsky.** These two owners of a Brooklyn shoe store fled to Israel after committing “the largest Medicaid fraud ever uncovered in New York state, possibly the country.” [UPI, 4-16-96]

- **Michael Schiff.** In 1995, known by Chicago-area police authorities to have both American and Israeli citizenship, he raped and sodomized a woman he was interviewing for a (non-existent) job as a nanny. He then fled to Israel. “Under terms of a U.S.-Israeli agreement,” noted the *Chicago Tribune*, “the Tel Aviv government will not extradite one of its own citizens.” [HILKEVITCH, p. 3, N]

- **Richard Minns –** Minns, is “the former jet-setting health club owner who was implicated but never charged in connection with the shooting of his former lover, in October 1980.” She sued him for the injuries suffered and won $42.6 million in 1991. Minns by now was in Israel: [He] never showed up in court for depositions [in Texas] in connection with the suit … [He] lived in Israel at the time of the trial … [His lawyer son] says his father disinherit him … because he married a woman who was not Jewish…” [SAPINO, B., 4-6-92]

- **Ezra Murad.** A diamond dealer, in 1989 he was accused of defrauding Norway’s second largest bank of $3 million. [HOROVITZ]

- **Samuel Dagan.** An Israeli, he swindled two American banks out of $6 million. (Israel relented in this case and extradited him to the U.S. – probably because of the problems he caused to Israel itself. Dagan had 21 earlier convictions in the Jewish state for fraud and extortion). [UPI, 8-15-90]

- **Yosef Lisch.** A Hasidic Jew, in 1998 he fled to Israel after the car he was driving in a motorcade for a prominent Orthodox rabbi hit and killed a seven year old Black child in the Crown Heights area of New York, resulting in local riots and increased Black-Jewish tensions. [NOEL, p. 27]

- **Ronald Carmon.** An Israeli-born lawyer, he worked for a New York City program that offered legal services to the poor. He fled to Israel after being caught defrauding the city out of $7,000. [UPI, 12-22-88]
- **Nahum Vaskevitch.** In 1994, this former head of the international merg-
ers and acquisitions for Merrill Lynch in London absconded to Israel af-
ter an illegal “insider trader” scheme netted him $4 million. Fellow
conspirator David Sofer was also Israeli. [APPELSON]

- **Ilan Mayan.** In 1987, Mayan murdered a man in Los Angeles and fled to
Israel, but was later arrested in Switzerland. [LA TIMES, 6-25-87]

- **Daniel Weiz.** Weiz fled to Israel from Toronto after being charged with
second-degree murder. “Police have described the case as a random ass-
sault by a group wearing ski masks.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 12-15-99]

- **Natchum Gal.** “In Alberta [Canada] in 1982,” noted the *Toronto Star*,
“Dr. Natchum Gal turned off the respirator sustaining a brain- dam-
aged newborn girl and authorized a nurse to administer 15 milligrams of
morphine. The child died 40 minutes later. Gal denied any wrong doing,
but he fled to Israel before facing a murder charge.” [TORONTO STAR,

- **“Billy” King.** In 1998 the *New York Law Journal* noted that he “fraudu-
antly transferred to himself valuable estate properties consisting of com-
mercial buildings in Manhattan. Subsequently, he remains a fugitive.”
[NY LAW, p. 31]

- **Dror Haim Goldberg,** an Israeli. Indicted in 1999 for murdering Man-
uela Silverio in a Houston wig shop, “[police] strongly suspect he has fled
to Israel, which prohibits the extradition of its citizens for prosecution.”
[HOUStON CHRONICLE, p. A30] “It was vicious,” said Houston po-
lice sergeant George Aldreta, “We don’t know the exact reason for it, but
we suspect he may have done it for the pure pleasure of killing some-
body.” [AP, 2-12-99]

- **Jeffrey Ashkenazi.** Ashkenazi was a doctor in the small town of Green-
ville, Michigan. He was arrested in 1998, initially on a mail-fraud charge.
Ashkenazi, noted the *Associated Press*, “had his medical license suspend-
ed after improperly treating 10 patients, one of whom died … [He] re-
served one-way plane tickets to Israel for himself and family.”
[ASSOCIATED PRESS, 8-11-98]

- **Paul Stern.** Stern was indicted in 1971 for his part in a scam to defraud
insurance companies, including fake care accidents and medical bills. He
was not arrested until 1997, when he tried to enter the U.S. from over-
seas. Stern, noted the *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin*, “was believed to have
been in Israel the whole time.” [STEPHENS, B., 4-9, 97]

- **Kenyon Schulman.** “Where is Kenyon Schulman?” asked the *Houston
Chronicle* in 1992, “Harris County prosecutors … learned through
Schulman’s lawyer … that he’s somewhere in Israel, probably Tel Aviv.”
Schulman was wanted for questioning when 400 hits of the drug Ecstasy
were found in the trunk of his BMW. He had been arrested earlier, in
1988, for computer hacking. [MAKEIG, 10-21-92, p. A23]
Sholam Weiss. He was the kingpin of the “nation’s largest-ever insurance fraud” and, along with three of his four co-defendants (Jan Schneiderman, Jan Starr, and Keith Pound), was convicted of “racketeering, fraud, money laundering and other charges.” Weiss was the brains behind criminal looting the National Heritage Life Insurance Company and was sentenced to “what is believed to be the largest Federal prison term ever imposed” – 845 years. “Many of the company’s 35,000-40,000 policy holders lost most of their life savings.” Most were elderly, living in Florida. The criminal investigation against Weiss “followed a five year criminal investigation across nine states and led to dozens of indictments.” On October 18, 1999, Weiss skipped his $500,000 bail bond and a New York court sentencing, thereby making the FBI’s Most-Wanted list. A reward of $125,000 was also offered for information leading to his capture. Weiss was alleged to be in Israel, Austria, Brazil, or Belgium. Some suspected he was hiding in America. The presiding judge in his case also fined Weiss over $123 million, the criminal was also ordered to pay back another $125 million in restitution to insurance policyholders, and another judgment against him demanded $339 more for his crimes. Weiss was raised in the Borough Park section of metropolitan New York City in a cloistered ultra-Orthodox community. He was “educated in a yeshiva [Jewish religious school], where he spoke Yiddish … he did not learn to speak English until he was in his late teens.” This criminal also “claimed that he was a victim of company executives who lured him unknowingly into the conspiracy and took advantage of his ties to the Jewish community.” Weiss was earlier indicted in 1994 for mail fraud. He was also a co-owner of the famous Studio 54 nightclub and the Scores striptease joint. He “testified that he was involved in several business ventures with lawyer Michael Blutrich and Lyle Pfeffer, who owned Scores in secret partnership with the mob.” Pfeffer and Blutrich were sentenced to 25 years in prison for their roles in the National Heritage insurance fraud. [RASHBAUM, W., 3-9-2000; RASHBAUM, W., 11-22-99; ASSOCIATED PRESS, 11-2-99]

For some reason, Jewish American scamsters Harold and Alan Lieberman chose Chile, and not Israel, as their refuge from the arm of American law. The two fled the U.S. in 1992 to escape prison for fraud. “Their sudden departure,” noted the St. Louis Post Dispatch, “came three years after the collapse of Lieberman Corporation, once one of the nation’s top home builders.” The brothers “left debts of $15 million and a 37-page Federal indictment accusing them of defrauding lenders, customers and contractors. They took with them a reported $6 million.” [MIHAOPOULOS, D., 3-1-98]

Living in luxury in Santiago, “the Liebermans enjoyed a daily routine of Spanish lessons and every-Saturday visits to the Jewish temple.” In 1997, Alan’s wife and another man were caught trying to smuggle $750,000 back into the United State. Ms. Lieberman also had cocaine in her purse. Alan soon returned to America and was sentenced to prison. Brother Harold continued to resist expulsion from Chile, eventually committing suicide. [MIHALOPOULOS, D., 3-1-98]
Fugitive (since 1983) Jewish American financier **Marc Rich** [who merits further discussion later in this chapter] chose Switzerland to escape the arm of American law. Nonetheless, he became an Israeli citizen in 1994 and “has donated about $200 million over the last 20 years to Israel and worldwide Jewish charities.” [DOBBS, M., 2001, 2-21-01]

“Maryland con man” Martin Bramson (“the mastermind of one of America’s largest insurance fraud schemes”) chose Europe to hide. Tracked by Interpol for three years, Bramson was finally arrested in the tiny country of Liechtenstein where he fought extradition back to America to face charges of “money laundering, wire fraud and mail fraud.” Bramson had swindled thousands of doctors and laundered money through 588 banks in countries throughout the world, including $43 million in a two-year period in Anguilla alone. Others in his business scams included his father Norman (an optometrist who went to prison in 1980) and his brother Leonard (a lawyer who went to prison in 1990). [JAMES, M., 5-17-95, p. A1; JAMES, M., 12-13-97, p. A1]

In 1997, Ira Einhorn was arrested in France for the 1981 murder of a woman in Philadelphia. He had “vanished” just before his trial was to begin. Einhorn was a “former peace activist,” Philadelphia’s “most recognized activist, a wildly dressed advocate of psychedelic drugs, communal living, Eastern mysticism and environmental consciousness,” and “a friend and guru to prominent Philadelphians in another era.” “Peace and love was what he stood for,” said one acquaintance. [NEW YORK TIMES, 6-18-97, p. A14]

Yet another Jewish renegade, from Texas, is Alexander Ross (alias Alexander Cohen, or William Cohen), a man who was not a licensed dentist but practiced anyway, eventually a fugitive in 1999 for both sexually molesting young patients and Medicaid fraud. “FBI and police,” noted the *Houston Chronicle*, “have begun an international hunt for Ross. Investigators think he has spent at least several months in Panama.” [SMITH, M., 6-27-99, p. A1]

Perhaps Ross knows Jeffrey Gottlieb, wanted by Alaska’s State Medical Fraud Unit for over billing Medicaid, stealing drugs from doctors, and selling drugs to drug dealers. “Gottleib told the State licensing board that he attended a medical school in Guadalajara, Mexico, from 1974-77, then went to study religion in Israel, then returned to receive a medical degree in 1986 from American University of the Caribbean on the Island of Monserat … One of Gottlieb’s patients [later arrested] alone received 2 percent of all the controlled drugs prescribed to Medicaid patients in Alaska.” [TOOMEY, S., 5-2-2000, p. 1A]

Among other Jewish fraudsters who didn’t head for Israel is Hal Kaplan, a con man-connector who has used “eight known aliases and been convicted of fraud, theft, forgery, and bigamy.” Married eight times, his favorite ploy, noted the *Los Angeles Times* in 1993, is to marry rich women to “loot their bank accounts.” [GABRIEL, p. 18] Yet another kindred soul is Charles Ray Lonberger, arrested in 1990, who ran a series of charity frauds, often under the pretense of raising money for the Jewish Federation Council. [MEYER, J., p. J1] Another, from the early 1980s, was Eduardo Rabiea, son of Iraqi Jews who immigrated to the United States from Israel. Rabiea was described by a New York prosecutor
as “a master of deceit and deception who is wanted for fraud all over the world,” absconding with over $60 million in swindles. [RAAB, S., p. B1] A fellow soul is also Britain’s Jonathan Kern, also Jewish, who was arrested while entertaining two prostitutes in 1999. Also wanted for fraud and various scams all over the globe, Kern “has previously impersonated members of the Rolling Stones, and fooled a Park Lane garage into lending him a pounds 44,000 BMW by posing as a record producer.” Among other ploys, he has pretended he was a well known British auto race commentator, Jonathan Palmer, creating bills in Palmer’s name all over Europe. “You are a persistent criminal and a man who deceives as a way of life,” a sentencing judge told Kern. [PRYER, N., 1999]

In a 1994 *Toronto Life* article entitled “Con Man,” the criminal life of Patrick White was explored, stemming from his defrauding of a local newspaper of $20,000. “Charmed by White’s affable manner, by his habit of smiling when he spoke,” and “by the Torah he displayed on his night table,” David Mackin allowed alleged investor Mr. White to take over as Managing Editor of his small newspaper. “White,” notes *Toronto Life*, “was regularly attending Kensington market synagogue and by all appearances was a devoutly religious man.” [TORONTO LIFE, 11-94] Once White absconded, it was learned that he was a master fraudster. He had served jail time in Canada in 1978 for “indecent assault,” and in 1982 for “a pair of fraud convictions.” And there were outstanding arrest warrants for him across North America: Ontario – theft, Virginia – sexual assault against a boy, New York – larceny, Mississippi – sodomy and sexual assault against a boy, Ontario – theft, Nova Scotia – theft and fraud, Virginia – sexual assault, and Alberta – sexual assault. In New Brunswick, he then hired 35 people for nonexistent jobs for a nonexistent night club, charging them each $100 for “uniforms.” While in Toronto, White once hired three boys to shovel snow from his sidewalk. Inviting them inside, he showed them pornography. “When police searched the house,” notes *Toronto Life*, “they found a cache of pornography along with religious texts White had borrowed from a local rabbi. It was entitled *The Sexual Morality of Young People.*” [TORONTO LIFE, 11-94]

Another noteworthy con man of Jewish heritage is Stanley Cherry (alias “Stefanos Coreey”). In 1999 a Canadian woman fell in love with him but was the “victim … of a fraud artist so diabolical that he left her almost destitute: without savings, without access to credit and in danger of losing her home.” Total losses were about $75,000. It was eventually revealed, notes the Montreal Gazette, that “the man had been in and out of jail throughout his adult life. Crime was his profession. It was, you might say, his vocation.” Three outstanding warrants for his arrest existed for other crimes. Among the frauds earlier perpetuated by Cherry was that upon another infatuated woman with him. [ABLEY, M., 4-12-99, p. A1]

In 1997, David Missman and his wife Karen were sentenced to prison for ten years and probation, respectively, for swindling investors – primarily Los Angeles schoolteachers – out of between $8 and $18 million. Their two “salesmen” were Hank Springer, a former United Teachers-Los Angeles president, and Nate Glazer. The two testified against the Missmans in return for immunity from prosecution. [CARDENAS, p. B5]
In 1997, John Perry, the Jewish editor of an Indian weekly newspaper, *The New India-Times*, was charged in New York City for eleven counts of conspiracy and mail fraud. Perry called the charges “a witch hunt” and sounded out a possible defense of anti-Semitism from Israel and Jewish American newspapers, and the Anti-Defamation League. [FORWARD, 5-23-97, p. 8]

In 1995 the former Executive Director, Lester Kaplan, of the Jewish Community Center of Greater Washington DC, was imprisoned for embezzling a million dollars from the organization. Three others, including the Chief Financial Officer at the organization, Jay Manchester, were also implicated. Kaplan could have gotten up to 95 years in jail, but was only sentenced to seven years; he was freed after eight months. [RIVAS, p. D5] The State Attorney General’s office investigated and prosecuted the crime despite the Jewish organization’s decision to avoid publicity and not report the situation to police. [ZOROYA, p. B1] Despite his record, in 1997 Kaplan was hired as a Montgomery County public housing agency supervisor. “Kaplan,” noted the *Washington Post*, “approached HOC [Housing Opportunity Commission] chairwoman Barbara Goldberg-Golden – a board member at the Jewish Community Center – and asked her for help [in getting a job].” [PEREZ-RIVAS, p. D5]

In 2001, “Montgomery County prosecutors … opened up an investigation into the handling of a charity fund at one of the Washington area’s largest synagogues [Congregation Beth El in Bethesda, Maryland], after its senior rabbi reimbursed $300,000 to the fund because of questions about how he had used the account.” The rabbi, Jonathan Maltzman, “transferred more than $220,000 from the charity fund to his brokerage account at Fidelity; used $7,950 from the fund for his child’s b’nai mitzvah parties; and used about $11,500 to pay his self-employment taxes. An additional $62,000 was withdrawn in cash at ATMS … About $700,000 had passed through the fund during the 11 years Maltzman administered it, [but] only about $20,000 could be identified as having gone to charities.” [MURPHY, C., 5-10-01, p. B2]

In 1999, a Cincinnati rabbi, Jacob Lustig of congregation Kneseth Israel, was found guilty of skimming hundreds of thousands of dollars of profits from a series of synagogue bingo games spread across three counties in 19 storefronts. “The instant bingo,” noted the *Associated Press*, “took in more than $1 million in 1996 and 1997, but his congregation received only $250,000 of that. Lustig and his associates (Gerel Payne, Ralph Lipsky, and Sam Semet) avoided prison time, although Lustig was ordered to surrender $920,000. The *Cincinnati Enquirer* noted that “Judge Cartolano said the lack of cooperation from the congregation, which still supports the rabbi, was a problem for prosecutors.” [HORN, D., 6-9-99, p. B5]

In 2000, the Temple Sinai synagogue in Dresher, Pennsylvania, sued its fired Executive Director, Barry Wilf; his wife Barbara who was an assistant bookkeeper at the synagogue; bookkeeper Betty Shusterman; and Shusterman’s husband, son, and son’s wife. They were accused of embezzling $700,000 over the years through a bank that was also named in the suit. [FELDMAN, S., 5-4-2000, p. 9]
In 1999 too, the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* reported that “the Jewish community in Poland is being wracked by a scandal that has forced the country’s umbrella Jewish organization to fire its treasurer and downgrade the status of the Jewish communities of Gdansk and Poznan … Jewish organizations tried to keep the affair quiet.” [GRUBER, R., p. 9] That same year, Wolfgang Schnur, founder of the “Democratic Awakening” political party and “a leader of the democracy movement that toppled communism in East Germany 10 years ago,” was “detained on fraud charges after trying to cash phony securities at a Berlin bank.” An Israeli accomplice escaped. [AP, Former]

In 1997, the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* noted a common theme in Germany:

“Jewish community elections in Germany are rarely covered in the German media. But the upcoming election in Berlin on June 1 has catapulted the city’s Jewish community into the national media spotlight. The stories center on real estate scandals, alleged financial mismanagement of community funds and embittered personal rivalries among community officials. The reports … cast a shadow on the integrity of some leading members of Germany’s largest Jewish community … Jewish leaders worry that if the negative publicity continues, it could weaken community structures and damage the political influence of Berlin’s Jewish community in the German capital.” [BERGER, D., 6-30-97]

Also in 1999, Reform Rabbi Fred Neulander, of Congregation M’Kor Shalom, the largest synagogue in southeastern New Jersey, was indicted for the 1994 contract murder of his wife. “The subsequent investigation into her murder,” noted the *Jewish Exponent*, “brought to light her husband’s involvement in several extramarital affairs.” [SILVERSTEIN, p. 15] Later stepped forward an embittered man, Myron Lewin, who also claimed that Rabbi Neulander had also “cheated me” in Levin’s purchase of a $16,000 Torah. [AP, 12-19-98] Somewhat similarly, in 1993, a Jewish author, Michele Samit, wrote an entire book (subtitled *The True Story a Rabi’s Deadly Affair*) about a major sordid scandal in her own synagogue congregation in metropolitan Los Angeles. The husband (Mel Green) of the president (Anita Green) of Reform temple *Shir Chadash* arranged for her to be murdered when she had an affair with center’s rabbi, Steven Jacobs, and left her husband. This case, writes Samit, “was the stuff of tabloids and miniseries: a shooting, rumors of sex between two spiritual leaders in the temple setting, accusations, criminal charges, and people lying on the witness stand to save their reputations … The Los Angeles Jewish community prides itself on its high values, moral superiority and insularity. My temple leaders and members seemed to worry more about this reputation than about what had happened.” [SAMIT, M., 1993, p. xxi, xxiii] The victim’s mother was outraged that the rabbi seemed to care more about his reputation than his ex-lover: “When the detective told us how to handle the press, and that the police would make all the statements, the rabbi went crazy. He said, ‘There can’t be any statements. I want to keep a low profile. This can’t get out to the press. I’m a rabbi.’ All he cared about was himself. He didn’t want there to be an arrest or a trial if his name would come up. It made me sick.” [SAMIT, M., 1993, p. 210]
In 1992, another rabbi, Austin Yoncy Feld, and his brother were held in a San Francisco-area jail on charges that they planned to murder a Palo Alto child psychiatrist, Saul Wasserman, and his wife. Recently arrived from Jerusalem, police found in the rabbi’s car “six plastic handcuffs, two knives, ski masks, detailed floor plans of the house, photographs of the Wassermans, a key to every door in the house, a bouquet of flowers and the location of a shotgun in the house.” Police suspected the plan was motivated by the Wasserman’s daughter, a student in Israel, who accused her parents of sexually molesting her when she was a child. [MCCABE, M., p. A25]

Looking more deeply into the American Jewish Committee’s Jewish self-described “tradition, experience, and values,” we can find some very prominent Jewish organizations seemingly going out of their way to try to affirm the classical stereotype that Jews are addicted to money at any moral cost. We have seen already the likes of Ivan Boesky as the chairman of the New York City United Jewish Appeal for two years during his illegal hoarding of tens of millions, and World Jewish Congress President Edgar Bronfman whose family fortune (Seagram’s) was built upon illegal alcohol smuggling from Canada (including a deal with major Jewish mobster Meyer Lansky) to the United States during Prohibition. “Though the Bronfmans,” says Dennis McDougal, “denied any complicity in the transport of their wares across the U.S. border during the Prohibition, notable gangsters like Abner ‘Longie’ Zwillman and New York Mafia ‘Prime Minister’ Frank Costello admitted to the Kefauver Committee that a steady stream of whisky flowed out of Bronfman distilleries and into millions of dry American mouths.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 144] (Among many other charitable donations to Jewish organizations, the Bronfman family donated a million dollars for a new wing of the Israel Museum in 1962).

Of course there is also the prominent philanthropist Annenberg family fortune, at least partially based in underworld links decades earlier, and (the later to be discussed) common connections between Jewish-dominated Hollywood and the criminal underworld there. “U.S. smugglers, conmen, and thieves couldn’t seem to get enough of the movies and the stars during the first half of the century.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 145-146] Then there is Robert Maxwell, the corrupt Jewish/British businessman who manipulated what later became known as “colossal swindles of a particularly nasty kind” [GROSS, p. 380-381, see earlier, p. 803, p. 924] who in 1991 went to Israel’s Holocaust memorial center to be bestowed Yad Vashem’s “Remembrance Award” for his “dedication to Yad Vashem and all it stands for.” [AXELROD, T., p. 41] Seven months after Maxwell’s death, his two sons and an American associate, Larry Trachtenberg, formerly a lecturer at the London School of Economics, were arrested in England on charges of fraud and theft of $250 million. A Washington Post article did not mention their ethnicity, but patriarch Robert Maxwell was described as a “Czech [who] arrived in Britain after World War II almost penniless and made himself one of Britain’s biggest media tycoons.” [MACASKILL, p. A31]

Elsewhere, in 1995, the largest non-Orthodox Jewish high school in America (located in Los Angeles) raised eyebrows when it renamed itself “Milken
High” after a $5 million donation from the Milken Family Foundation. The high school is part of a new multi-million dollar “cultural and artistic showplace” complex which includes the Skirball Museum. Principal Bruce Powell qualified the new high school name, insisting that it was technically named after the “Milken Family Foundation,” and not the convicted felon. Powell also told the Los Angeles Times that, besides, he believed Michael Milken was “tried and convicted in the press by innuendo and a politically ambitious prosecutor.” [DART, p. B9] “We feel [the Milken High School name] is a non-issue,” Shoshana Hirsh, planning director of the San Fernando Jewish Alliance, told the Times. After all, another Jewish complex – the West Valley Jewish Center in West Hills, California – already opened in 1987 – in the midst of Michael Milken’s financial scams – as the Bernard Milken campus, named after Michael’s father.

In 1991, Thomas and Joseph Gambino, sons of deceased Mafia leader Carlo Gambino, and recognized organized crime figures in their own right, donated $2.3 million to the Long Island Jewish Medical Center. Tom was at the time under federal investigation for racketeering, extortion, loan-sharking, and murder charges. Joe was indicted a few months earlier for extortion and restraint of trade. Hospital officials announced a new facility to be named the Gambino Medical and Science Foundation Bone Marrow Transplantation Unit. “No amount of money these men give,” complained one disgusted hospital trustee, “can offset the damage this incident is doing to the hospital’s reputation.” [BRUNING, p. 15]

In 1958 media mogul Walter Annenberg proposed to fund what he called the “M.L. Annenberg School of Communications” at the University of Pennsylvania, named in honor of his father, Moses, a man who built the Annenberg fortune in association with a variety of criminal underground figures, including mobster Meyer Lansky. John Cooney writes that:

“There had been a loud opposition from faculty members who objected to Penn’s honoring a man of Moses’ past. Moreover, many faculty members believed that Annenberg wanted to retain control over the school by appointing faculty members himself, a situation they considered intolerable.” [COONEY, p. 282]

In 1985 Myron Goodman and his brother-in-law Mordechai Weissman merited an entire volume about the moral fiascos in their company called OPM (The OPM Scandal and the Seduction of the Establishment). Founded in 1971, OPM became the largest purchaser of IBM equipment for their computer leasing company. Clients included AT&T, American Express, Rockwell, Occidental Petroleum, and many others.

In 1980 Goodman and Weissman were found guilty and sentenced to 10-12 years in prison for check kiting, conspiracy, and mail and wire fraud. The company fraudulently obtained nearly $200 million from lenders. Other OPM officials found guilty of criminal actions in the case included Allen Ganz, Manny Friedman, Stephen Lichtman, and Jeffrey Resnick. Kickbacks also went to Jewish executives at Montefiore Hospital (Harry Weiss) and American Express
WALL STREET, JEWISH / ISRAELI ETHICS, AND THE WORLD OF FUND RAISING


“Both Goodman and Weissman were Orthodox Jews,” notes Robert Gandossy, “who practiced Jewish dietary laws and refrained from work and travel on the Sabbath. A mezuza [a Jewish religious artifact] hung on every office door at OPM … Weissman’s faith was so strong that he left OPM in 1973 to fight in the Israeli war in the Middle East.” [GANDOSSY, p. 20] Not surprisingly, Goodman also “gave away millions to charitable organizations, particularly those with Jewish affiliations.” [GANDOSSY, p. 20] This included $1 million to Yeshiva University, where he was elected to be a board member.

In 1996, officials at Beth Israel Hospital and the Hebrew Rehabilitation Center for the Aged wrote testimonial letters on behalf of Jewish philanthropist Simon Fireman to help keep him out of jail. Fireman, Hebrew Rehab’s Man of the Year in 1996, (he funded their “Fireman Pavilion” a year earlier) faced a federal court and 74 counts of conspiracy to hide $120,000 in illegal political campaign contributions. [GELBWASSER, p. 5]

In 1999 Garth Drabinsky and Myron Gottleib, co-founders of the giant theatre producer Livent, Inc. (the organization behind popular musicals like Showboat, Ragtime, and Kiss of the Spider Woman) were arraigned for 16 charges of conspiracy and securities fraud in Manhattan. “Some individuals and groups in the non-profit sector,” noted the Ottawa Citizen, “particularly in Toronto’s Jewish community, are evaluating the impact on past and future funding received from [them].” [MAROTTE, B., p. E3]

In 1997, Roy Rosenbaum, the vice president of development for the Jewish Theological Seminary, defended the practice of accepting money from anyone, no questions asked:

“Should a charity accept money from someone who may have earned it by illegal means of any kind? … I believe that it is appropriate to do so.” [KORDOVA, p. 27]

“There’s a difference,” insisted Rabbi Stephanie Dickstein in the Jewish Theological Seminary’s magazine, “between accepting money of a questionable background and the directors of the organization engaging in such behavior themselves.” [KORDOVA, p. 27] This disturbing worldview from a preeminent Jewish American theology center essentially sanctions any immoral, unethical practice and any crime if, in the end, the Jewish charity recipients themselves didn’t themselves pull the trigger.

Over the years, notes Robert Rockaway in the journal American Jewish History, “Jewish organizations and charities did accept gangster contributions, rarely inquiring as to the source of the money given to them, neither did they discriminate among donors. [Prominent Jewish mobster] Meyer Lansky donated large sums of money to his synagogue, Temple Sinai in Hollywood, Florida, to [the Jewish-founded] Brandeis University, and to causes related to Israel.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 237] “Over the years,” adds Stephen Birmingham, “[Jewish mobster Meyer Lansky] has been very generous to Israel – not only
with personal contributions, but also by regularly turning over his Las Vegas hotels and casinos for Bonds for Israel rallies.” [BIRMINGHAM, p. 358]

In 1970 Moe Dalitz, “a leading member of the Cleveland crime syndicate,” and controller of the Stardust and Desert Inn Las Vegas casinos, was awarded the City of Peace Award of the State of Israel “in recognition of distinguished service to the people and state of Israel.” [ROCKAWAY, p. 227] In 1985 the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith bestowed their “Torch of Liberty” award upon him for his cash support of that group. [ROCKAWAY, p. 227] A gangster associate revealed to a 1947 organized crime commission that Dalitz was in fact the chairman of the Nevada United Jewish Appeal. [ROCKAWAY, p. 227] In 1982, Dalitz was listed by Forbes magazine as one of the 400 wealthiest people in America. [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 37] In terms of the criminal underworld, he was also known as “the godfather of Las Vegas.” [ROEMER, p. 52] In 1949, Murray Greenfield was a hero to Israel; he was activist in guiding immigrants to the Jewish state. He connected in Baltimore with the Jewish criminal underworld through a contact at a local United Jewish Appeal function. [ROCKAWAY, p. 231]

Also in Las Vegas, Ze’ev Chafets notes the story of “a local Jewish madam [who] had given a talk to a B’nai B’rith meeting. Prostitution is legal in Nevada, and the madam, a Jewish lady named Beverly Hurel, is a highly regarded businesswoman.” [CHAFETS, p. 101] Other prominent local Jewish activists included Jack Entratter, who was concurrently the president of both the Sands Hotel casino and the Temple Beth Sholom synagogue.

In 1973 Morris (Moishe) Levy, head of the musical recording label Roulette Records, was honored by the UJA music division as its man of the year. [DANNEN, p. 51] “One of the most aboveground institutionalized mob involvements in the [music industry],” noted Steve Chapple and Reebee Garofalo in 1977, “was suggested at Senate hearings in 1973, during the testimony of Gerland Zelmanowitz, a Mafia financier turned informer who said Angelo ‘Gyp’ DeCarlo, a New Jersey Mafioso, and Tommy Eboli…, another top-level mobster shot and killed in New York, were partners in Roulette Records. The label’s president, Morris Levy, says the mob, was never in Roulette, but acknowledged Mafia money in Promo Records, which he used to share with Eboli.” [CHAPPLE, p. 230]

In roasting Levy at the UJA dinner in his honor, Joe Smith, the head of Elektra records, told the crowd, “The thought of coming up to honor Morris Levy and to introduce him and say something complimentary about this crowd here tonight, is the most difficult assignment I’ve ever faced…. [There are] two things all these ladies and gentlemen on the dais have in common: They cheated everybody every time they could. And they are the biggest pain in the ass to be around.” [DANNEN, p. 51] Turning to address a friend of Levy’s in the audience, Hy Weiss, the founder of the Old Town record label, Smith said, “Hymie was assigned not to the table, but to room 328 where he’s gonna line up the hookers for a party afterwards.” [DANNEN, p. 51-52] “There was laughter and applause to these remarks,” says Fred Dannen. “I was the payola [bribe] king of New York,” said Weiss later, “Payola was the greatest thing in the world. You
didn’t have to go out to dinner with someone and kiss their ass. Just pay them, here’s the money, play the record, fuck you.” [DANNEN, p. 51-52] In 1988 Morris Levy was convicted of two counts of conspiracy to commit extortion.

In 1982 Roy Cohn (who rose to fame as the right-hand man of Senator Joe McCarthy’s anti-communist witch hunt purges in the 1950s) was honored at a State of Israel Bond “testimonial dinner” sponsored by the B’nai B’rith Banking and Finance Lodge. Cohn was awarded the City of Peace Award “for his ongoing advocacy of American economic and political support of Israel.” [JEWISH WEEK, 4-15-83, p. 44] Cohn had earlier been honored by the Jewish National Fund and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Cohn was once disbarred from the practice of law for a year and a half for stealing from a client (this client, Lewis Rosentiel, head of the giant Schenley alcohol fortune and a prominent philanthropist for Jewish-founded Brandeis University, was also known to have been involved with the mob); [SUMMERS, A., 1993, p. 248] over a ten year period Cohn was also acquitted in three separate trials involving obstruction of justice, perjury, a stock-swindle scheme, bribery, conspiracy, and filing false documents. “At these trials,” notes Thomas Maier, “the testimony revealed some of Cohn’s friends and associates included such underworld figures as Moe Dalitz, … a man described by authorities as an ‘under boss’ to Mafia chieftain Vito Genovese; and Meyer Lansky, the Miami gangster.” [MAIER, p. 98] (Cohn’s uncle, Bernie Marcus, head of the Bank of the United States, even spent time in prison. Why? “The WASP establishment,” says Cohn, “went after the Bank of the United States with a vengeance that was pure in its anti-Semitism.”) [ZION, S., 1988, p. 24]

In Miami also, noted Robert Friedman in 2000, “until recently the ringleader of the Russian mob in South Florida,” Ludwig Fainberg has held “numerous fundraisers … for Jewish charities at a restaurant and nightclub he owns called Babushka.” [FRIEDMAN, R., 4-10-00]

A lot of Jewish World War II lackeys to Nazis ended up working as officials in American Jewish community organizations. As noted Jewish Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal notes:

“I made a [postwar] rule that was approved by the American military government authorities and became known as Lex Wiesenthal: Latin for Wiesenthal’s Law. It was very simple: WHOEVER HAD A FUNCTION OF AUTHORITY IN THE NAZI PERIOD COULD NOT HAVE A FUNCTION IN POSTWAR JEWISH LIFE. [Wiesenthal’s emphasis] I wasn’t saying such a man was a criminal. I wasn’t even looking into whether he was good or bad. But I needed to protect our Jewish society from more bad surprises’ … Wisenthal noted that ‘in many cases, such people after the war found jobs with Jewish organizations. Maybe they were trying to atone; maybe they thought this was the best place to hide. Once, I was going special to Paris to see the director for Europe of the [Jewish] Joint Distribution Committee, because working for him was a man – a Jew! - who had been in a concentration camp the head of the transports to the death camps. According to Wisenthal, the JDC direc-
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tor, an American, responded, ‘So what? This was a time when everyone had to serve.’” [LEVY, A., 1993, p. 85]

In 2001, President Bill Clinton found himself in another scandal when he pardoned Jewish American fugitive Marc Rich, wanted since 1983 on “51 counts of tax evasion, racketeering and violating sanctions against trade with Iran.” New York mayer Rudolph Giuliani notes that Rich’s crimes included “the biggest tax evasion case in United States history.” Rich was also charged with a complex oil scam that exploited America’s energy crisis in the early ‘80s. The 65-count indictment claimed he had secretly bought up millions of barrels of Texas crude oil then under strict price controls and relabeled the oil as decontrolled supplies, ultimately selling it on the open market for huge profits – reportedly $100 million. And while 52 Americans were held hostage in Iran, Rich’s company allegedly made another fortune by trading with the Ayatollah Khomeini’s regime in violation of a strict American trade embargo.” [DAWSON, P., 2-12-01]

As a fugitive, Rich the wanted criminal had given over $70 million to Israeli causes. Hence, as the Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted about massive international Jewish lobbying efforts to get the pardon:

“The Rich case puts an uncomfortable spotlight on the many Jewish and Israeli causes, like Birthright Israel [which sends young Jewish Americans to Israel], that Rich supported. Indeed, a New York Times article noted that the list of people who wrote letters [to Clinton] supporting Rich’s pardon is ‘a virtual Who’s Who of Israeli society and Jewish philanthropy.’” [WIENER, J., 2-9-01]

These included Rabbi Irving Greenberg, head of the U. S. Holocaust Memorial Council, who asked Clinton, on Rich’s behalf, to do “one of the most God-like actions that anyone can ever do.” “Rich has given to a variety of major institutions in Israel,” noted the JTA. [WIENER, J., 2-9-01]

As Jewish commentator Ben Stein lamented:

“The really embarrassing moral disgrace attaches itself to, first, the chairman of the U. S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Rabbi Irwin Greenberg, who wrote Clinton urging a pardon for Rich, and to Ehud Barak, who while prime minister of Israel likewise solicited Clinton … It’s part of the thinking about the Holocaust that whatever is thought bad by Holocaust experts – such as Greenberg – is bad, and whatever is thought good is good. To spend such moral capital to get a pardon for Rich is disgusting. To think that the pity Americans feel for the Holocaust dead and survivors should be manipulated to aid a man accused of trading with America’s enemies for profit is revolting.” [STEIN, B., 2-14-01, p. 15A]

Israeli commentator Ze’ev Chafets was also shamed to comment about the international Jewish lack of morals in the effort to secure pardoning of such a corrupt man:

“The effort of Rich’s strategists to turn their client into a modern day Alfred Dreyfus [a famous French Jew who was falsely tried for disloyalty] with the active connivance of some of the world’s most prominent Jewish personalities and institutions – is a scandal in its own right … [Abra-
ham] Foxman is the national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, America’s most prestigious Jewish group. He wrote an official ADL letter to Clinton, asking him to pardon Rich. I called the ADL to ask why its director had intervened with the President of the United States on behalf of a master swindler and member in good standing of the FBI’s most wanted list.

‘Humanitarian reasons,’ a spokeswoman told me.

What possible humanitarian reason, I wondered, could there be to pardon a billionaire who lives in a Swiss castle and flies around the world in his own jet? And what did a crook like Rich have to do with the ADL? … As for Foxman, Greenberg and other so-called American Jewish leaders, they prostituted themselves and their organizations for a rich criminal … Foxman’s not alone. Led by a Tel Aviv-based former Mossad agent named Avner Azulay, the Rich team put together a Jewish who’s who of supporters. They got their client character references from famous rabbis like Shlomo Riskin; from Rabbi Irving Greenberg, chairman of U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council; from the chief rabbi of France; from the directors of a half-dozen Israeli hospitals, and from Marlene Post, former head of Hadassah [the women’s Zionist organization]. Rich also received active support from former Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres; Knesset Speaker Avraham Burg; Israeli Foreign Minister Shlomo Ben-Ami; ex-Ambassador to Washington Itamar Rabinovich; former Jerusalem mayor Teddy Kollek; the current mayor, Ehud Olmert, and dozens of other Israeli politicians … By participating in what appears to be an international conspiracy, they have given life to a classic anti-Semitic fantasy and earned themselves a place on the Anti-Defamation League’s list of enemies of the Jewish people.” [CHAFETS, Z., 2-15-01, p. 51]

It was even eventually revealed that Abraham Foxman, director of perhaps the best-known Jewish organization, the Anti-Defamation League, a powerful enforcer of self-defined public morals (particularly against what it defines as “anti-Semitism”) and ardent defender of Israel, had accepted a $100,000 donation to ADL from Marc Rich shortly before Foxman wrote his letter to Clinton in behalf of the criminal. “The ADL,” noted the New York Post, “that Foxman and Rich’s Israeli representative, former Mossad agent Avner Azulay, met in Paris last February to discuss ways to resolve Rich’s legal problems.” ADL spokesperson Myra Shinbaum declared that the ADL (“which annually budgets $50 million to fight anti-Semitism”) wouldn’t be returning the money. [BLOMQVIST, B., 3-24-01]

In 1994, in the (Jewish) Forward’s list of the most important Jewish American leaders, Shoshana Cardin was noted as “chief of staff of American Jewry” and “past chairman of almost everything,” from the United Jewish Appeal to the National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership. The Forward also noted that she “stood by her husband [Jerome Cardin] with dignity when he went to prison for his role in a Maryland savings-and-loan scandal.” [FORWARD,
Cardin was released from prison early for medical reasons, but an associate – Jeffrey Levitt – spent seven years behind bars.

Levitt, who was active in Jewish charities which fueled his “concurrent rise in Baltimore’s Jewish community,” was well known in the 1970s “as one of Baltimore’s most audacious slumlords.” [BAKER, p. A1] As president of the Old Court Savings and Loan Association, he was involved in what one prosecutor termed as possibly “the largest fraud in the history of the state of Maryland.” [BAKER, p. A1] Likewise, in Boston, as elsewhere, the Realty Lodge of the local chapter of the B’nai B’rith Jewish fraternal organization (which is the parent of the Anti-Defamation League) “represented many of the city’s Jewish slumlords.” [HILLEL/HARMON, p. 185]

In 1982, Earl Shorris recalled his childhood memories of the kinds of men who headed his synagogue:

“We arrived at the synagogue as a family, three generations led by my grandfather ... My grandfather spoke to his friend Eddie – Big Eddie, he called him. They spoke as members of the board of directors of the synagogue, important men, big donors. My grandfather earned his money from the labor of Italian and Polish women who sewed clothing in his factories. Big Eddie sold cheap wine and whiskey to the poor of the town. We did not approve of Big Eddie. His diamond ring and his fat cigar offended us ... [H]is business offended us. There were fights in front of his store, stabbings, more than one killing. There were rumors about him. Some people said he dealt with criminals. It as said that he gave so much to the synagogue to atone for the way he made his money ... He traded donations for a position as a director of the synagogue. My grandfather said Eddie wanted to be president, that he was willing to donate a community center if the directors would elect him president .... [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 3-4] [When Big Eddie finally strode up at the synagogue to be so honored, “the man our community commended to God” (p.7)] the color of his flesh was as rich and vulgar as his suit. [Grandfather,] you were so small, so pale beside him. Jerusalem was conquered, the Temple was destroyed, and there was no prophet in all of Israel. After the service I asked my father why it had happened. Money, was all he said. Sometimes you have to do these things, my grandfather added. A building doesn’t come cheap.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 7]

Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway notes the notoriously ruthless all-Jewish Detroit Purple Gang of the prohibition era:

“[Purple Gang members] were what we would call ‘traditional’ Jews; they observed certain religious rituals and traditions such as lighting the Sabbath candles, eating kohser food at home (and often outside the home), attending synagogue on Jewish holidays and hosting or attending a Passover seder. Some of the fathers [of gang members] were active members and even officers of synagogues ... [O]n one particular Day of Atonement, the FBI sent two agents to Congregation B’nai David in hopes that some of the wanted Purple gangsters would show up for ser-
vices. At the time, the uncle of a leading Purple gangster was president of the congregation.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 2001, p. 113-]

In 2001, Ronald Lauder, heir to the Estee Lauder cosmetics fortune, stepped down as the chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Americans, the umbrella organization for this country’s most prominent Jewish groups. Lauder was known jokingly as the “King of the Jews.” That same year the New York Times reported that Lauder’s overseas company, Central European Media Enterprises, was “under investigation over allegations that it paid at least $1 million in bribes to Ukrainian officials for a valuable television license, according to lawyers and [U.S.] Justice Department documents.” Lauder owned Ukraine’s best-known TV station, Studio 1+1, with Jewish crime lords Vadim Rabinovich and Boris Fuchsmann, who, although “known around Kiev for their influence and wealth,” were “less well known [for] their ties to Russian organized crime, according to reports by the F.B.I. and European law enforcement agencies.” [BONNER, R., 6-12-01]

In 1995, Jeanette Nelson and her husband Victor Incenty (honorary co-chairpersons of an American Jewish Committee tribute to the conductor of the Florida Symphony Orchestra) were arrested for an “alleged scam to cheat thousands of investors out of $170 million.” [DOUGLAS, R., 5-26-95, p. B6] Vincenty’s company, Cascade International, had made Fortune magazine’s 1989 list of “companies to watch.” Also in Florida, in 1998, Phillip Scott Plotka was noted to have

“the resume of a prominent insurance agent … In 1996 he received the Quality of Life Winner award by the Million Dollar Roundtable Foundation. He serves on the board of Jewish Vocational Services and on a professional advisory committee for the insurance industry … But Wednesday, Plotka gained a different sort of notoriety. He became the first agent arrested in Miami-Dade county on charges of insurance fraud solicited through the Internet … The Florida Department of Insurance said he solicited clients with the AIDS virus and instructed them to falsify insurance applications so they would be accepted … ‘This is a particularly onerous case because the individual is a highly regarded individual in his field,’ [Dade Assistant State Attorney Mark] Shapiro said. ‘He sits on an ethics committee.” [ACLE, A., 5-7-98]

In Canada, in 1989, Patricia Starr

“was facing revelations in the Toronto media that she had channeled more than $82,000 of charitable funds from the local branch of the National Council of Jewish Women, of which she was president, to Liberal and Conservative politicians and to Liberal activists. The Federal Income Tax Act prohibited charities from making such contributions, and Ontario legislation limits the size of individual donations that a politician can accept.” [KAIHLA, p. 12]

Starr also pleaded guilty to lying to receive an unwarranted $357,000 from the local government for her Jewish organization, of which she personally stole $33,000. [BRENT, p. A1] The National Council of Jewish Women itself faced 22
court charges for various legal infractions; they were dropped, however, because – in the words of the government prosecutor: “It would have been like having the same trial [as Starr’s] all over again. I don’t think that would serve the public interest.” [DEVERELL, p. A3]

In 1998, the National Jewish Council of Jewish Women made the news again, this time in Denver, where its treasurer of 14 years, Ellen Bloch, was found to have embezzled over $150,000. [SORAGHAN, p. B12] In England, that same year, the (London) Independent headlined a story “Chief Rabbi Rocked by Fraud Scandal.” Rabbi Jonathan Sacks is “seen by many Jews and non-Jews as the spiritual center of British Jewry … is technically the Chief Rabbi only of the United Synagogue, the main Orthodox movement with 70 congregations in the United Kingdom.” Suddenly he was “embroiled in deepening turmoil.” Police were investigating “allegations of fraud at Jewish cemeteries in east London” and “the disappearance of highly valuable texts from a religious library.” [KOSSOFF, p. 6]

In 2001, the Jewish Chronicle noted another Jewish cemetery escapade: “an ugly real estate battle between a New Jersey synagogue and its former cantor [that] has begun to focus on a larger question of whether congregants benefited from unethical business relationships they formed as synagogue benefactors.” Harvey Waldman filed suit alleging that the temple’s rabbi and other congregants took kickbacks “on a profit of more than $20 million” in a cemetery land scheme. [CATTAN, N., 3-27-01, p. 9]

In 2000, Jean Thorbourn, a bookkeeper and financial consultant for the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Los Angeles was charged with “embezzling more than $1 million from the institution – some of which was apparently used to finance the production of independent films.” [WESTPHAL, S., 3-11-2000, p. B1] In 2001, rabbis Jacob Bronner and Efroim Stein “pleaded guilty to defrauding the US government of part of a $2.5 million federal grant intended to aid Holocaust survivors.” The two men embezzled hundreds of thousands of dollars. [HENRY, M., 2-16-01, p. 4]

In Canada, scrap metal millionaire Morris Lax was the victim of an unsolved murder in 1993. Guy Crittenden notes “the closed-shop nature of the scrap business” and that

“Even Lax supporters don’t deny he was crooked (though perhaps not more so than some others in the business). He pled guilty to criminal charges in the early 1960’s after being caught with stolen brass. On February 16, 1977 he was fined $34,000 after pleading guilty to three counts of falsifying company records … Another time police found a portion of four tons of stolen copper at Lax’s property … People remembered him as an oddball who was physically filthy and would inadvertently spit upon listeners when he became animated in conversation. (This was normally Yiddish; Lax avoided speaking English throughout most of his life in Canada) … Money allowed Morris Lax one luxury. He was a prominent supporter of Israel and, in stunning contrast to his usual crudeness, moved easily in the highest circles of Israeli political life,
counting among his friends Mr. [Menachem] Begin [Israel’s prime minister] (with whom he’d fled Russia) and Yitzhak Shamir.” [CRITTENDEN, G., 2001]

Chester and Morris Waxman, business associates of Lax, built to power “one of the top three scrap-recycling enterprises in Canada.” Chester, the Jewish community’s Man of the Year in 1979, eventually was involved in a 14-year lawsuit with his brother (who initiated charges) which provided “a veritable parade of witnesses who have leveled accusations of fraud, conspiracy, diversion of funds, racehorse-breeding schemes, evidence tampering and betrayals of deathbed promises.” [CRITTENDON, G., 2000]

“What a bunch of shiksas in here!” proclaimed Bess Myerson, the only Jewish Miss America in history, in 1995 at the sight of a number of blondes in attendance at a gathering of the Women’s Division of Israel Bonds of Maryland. Myerson, speaking as a member of the Israel Bonds national board and the board of the Anti-Defamation League, noted that “my greatest source of renewal comes from walking into a room filled of Jews.” The Baltimore Jewish Times also observed that

“she did not allude to her well publicized legal troubles over the years, which have included indictments in the mid-1980s on charges of conspiracy, fraud and obstruction of justice for allegedly bribing a judge to reduce support payments to her then-boyfriend’s former wife. Ms. Myerson eventually was acquitted of the charges. She was also arrested for shoplifting in Pennsylvania seven years ago.” [SHAPIRO, D. p. 36]

Myerson, a millionaire, was in fact arrested twice for shoplifting. The first time was in London. Luckily for her, this fact was not reported. At the time she was the New York City Consumer Affairs Commissioner. [PRESTON, J., p. 85]

Myerson’s non-Jewish boyfriend, Carl Capasso, was already married and was twenty-one years younger than her. Capasso’s wife, Nancy, was also Jewish. [PRESTON, p. 147] His “best friend and neighbor was Mafia boss Matthew (Matty the Horse) Ianniello.” “Capasso,” notes Jack Newfield and Wayne Barrett, “was probably the only cheating husband in history who claimed to be spending his nights with a Mafia boss (Ianniello) when he was really having an affair with Miss America.” [NEWFIELD/BARRETT, p. 8] (In 1998, Myerson donated money to the Anti-Defamation League to institute the “Bess Myerson Campus Journalism Awards,” conceived by her as “an important tool in reaching students far and wide in the fight against hatred,” encouraging “student journalists to think critically about interracial, interethnic, intercultural and interreligious relations.” [STRONGWATER, 1998, p. 4])

In 2001, a Jewish journal, the Forward, featured an article about shoplifting, using actress Winona Ryder, real estate heir Robert Durst, and Bess Myerson as examples of the Jewish wealthy who steal for psychological reasons. In one man’s case, his “Holocaust” background is allowed to excuse his thieving behavior. “Sometimes,” noted the article,

“the stressor [shoplifter under stress] can be very old. For example, Mr. [William] Chupchik – who holds intervention seminars for what he
calls ‘atypical theft offenders’ – had a wealthy patient, a Holocaust sur-
vivor, who was arrested for stealing a $15 pair of Dr. Scholl’s insoles
from a drug store. ‘He had no reason, no excuse for the theft behavior,’
he recalled. Still, as Mr. Cupchik spoke to the man about his past, he
learned that the day of the theft was the 50th anniversary of his libera-
tion from a concentration camp, when ‘inmates were awakened at 3
a.m. and were forced to march, most of them without shoes, along a
rock-laden rail line.’ ‘It was an anniversary reaction, manifested in atyp-
ical theft behavior,’ Mr. Cupchik said.” [KEYS, L., 12-28-01]

In 1997 the UJA-Federation of New Y ork found itself in an in-house ethical
controversy when James S. Tisch, whose family controls the Lorillard Tobacco
corporation, was nominated to head the Jewish organization. “Morality, ethics,
Jewish law against self-destruction and common sense,” said fellow UJA board
member Henry Everett,” mandate that it would be repugnant for a tobacco ex-
ecutive to be cast as the president and role model of any Jewish federation.”“On
an ethical level,” Alfred Munzer, a lung specialist and president of the American
Lung Association told the New York Times, “a smoking executive is not fit to be
the head of a social welfare agency.” [MILLER, NYT, p. B3] In 1994, James
Tisch’s brother, Andrew, who was then the CEO of Lorillard, stated in Congres-
sional hearings that the widespread scientific information about the relation-
ship between smoking and cancer “has not convinced me that smoking causes
deaths.” [MILLER, NYT p. B3] “Several Jewish leaders,” noted the Times, “who
opposed Mr. Tisch’s nomination asked not to be quoted, saying they were afraid
that the Tisch family or the UJA-Federation might cut off their [economic] sup-
port to their groups … Most of those who protested said they were concerned
about the impact of the appointment [of Tisch] might have on the group’s abil-
ity to raise money.” [MILLER, NYT, B3]

Tisch was formally approved as the Jewish “role model” the next week.

In another ethical area, in the wake of the much-publicized Anita Hill sexual
harassment charges in 1991, the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California ran a
story written by the Associate Executive Vice President of the National Jewish
Community Relations Advisory Council, Diana Aviv, and the Director of Na-
tional Affairs for the American Jewish Committee, Gary Rubin. They com-
plained that

“sexual harassment is also rife within Jewish communal organiza-
tions. Since the [Hill] scandal broke, we have been inundated with sto-
ries from women who work within Jewish agencies, anxious to share
their experiences of sexual harassment by lay and professional men …
These stories could be multiplied almost without end. All the women we
spoke with believed that sexual harassment is endemic and deeply en-
grained in the Jewish community.” [AVIV, D., p. 15]

An echo of this has long been a problem in the psychotherapy and psychia-
try worlds: the sexual exploitation of vulnerable patients by predatory ther-
pists. Such fields, as evidenced earlier, are enormously overpopulated with
Jewish men. [“That vast apparative of putative concern, psychiatry, is largely a

Rapes and other similar incidents are only sometimes reported by patients who have the courage to complain to authorities. A 1994 Boston Globe article noted the great scope of the problem, mentioning the cases against therapists Martin Teicher, Arthur Reider, Lionel Schwartz, Joel Feigon, Jacob Goldberg, Leonard Friedman, and others, including, in 1992, “several accused multiple offenders – Sheldon D. Zigelbaum, Edward M. Daniels, and Stanley S. Kanter [who] either lost or gave up their licenses [to practice therapy] under pressure … Though polls have shown that about 8 to 10 percent of psychiatrists admit to having sex with patients, many experts believe the actual frequency is higher, up to 25 percent. Many psychiatrists, they say, are not about to admit to such a clear violation [of therapists’ ethical codes], even anonymously.” [LEHR, 10-4-94] Worse, as the Citizens’ Commission on Human Rights noted:

“Although only ten percent of psychiatrists admit to sexually abusing patients, interestingly, 65 percent say new patients tell them of being abused sexually by their former psychiatrist. In other words, the 10 percent figure can be considered very, very low. In fact, in an article from the March 12, 1990 edition of U.S. News and World Report, experts put the figure at more like 25 percent, or one out of every four psychiatrists. And a 1973 study in California puts the figure at an astronomical 51 percent!” [CITIZENS’ COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, 2001]

This organization estimates that there are 150,000 women “sexually abused by psychiatrists in the USA.” 21,000 try to kill themselves, 1,500 DO kill themselves, and 16,000 end up hospitalized because of the harm caused to them.” [CITIZENS’ COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, 2001]

The innate difficulty of determining how widespread sexual abuse is in psychotherapy is noted by Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson: “Imagine attempting to find out how many men had raped by asking nonconvicted rapists whether they were guilty of rape.” [MASSON, p. 181]

In 1993, another Jewish sexual predator, this one especially prominent, Dr. Jules Masserman, began making the news. Masserman has been called “the most prominent psychiatrist in the world.” He had a resume of 432 articles and 16 books of his authorship. He was the past president of both the American Psychiatric Association and the American Academy of Psychoanalysts. He was also a vicious sexual predator, one who “admitted that he, over his 50-year career, drugged and sexually molested female patients in his office.” [ROZNAFSZKY, p. 10F] Four women eventually accepted out-of-court settlements of claims against him. Eventually, a dozen women came forward to note similar sexual predations against them by Masserman. Former patient Barbara Noel even authored an entire volume about her experiences with the therapist, underscoring
his control over her and the difficulties in getting anyone to initially believe her stories against such a powerful man.

For years, therapist sexual abuse of patients was kept hush in the secretive psychoanalytic community. As Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson noted in 1988:

“[The sexual exploitation of patients by therapists was] for many years … almost never mentioned, except in private. I remember that one of the first seminars I attended when I was a candidate for psychoanalytic training was given by an elderly psychoanalyst from Montreal, who immediately informed us that a major part of his clinical practice consisted of analysts who had had sexual involvement with patients. He told us ten students that many of us, before our careers were finished, would become sexually involved with a patient. Before the [1970s] decade was over, an increasing body of literature addressed the subject. One reason, obviously, was that there were a number of landmark cases in which large awards were made to individuals who sued therapists. There is no sense in pretending to the general public that something never happened which is in the newspaper.” [MASSON, p. 168]

By the 1970s, for example, the psychoanalytic practice of John N. Rosen began making the news. Rosen was not obscure; articles about his therapy theories had appeared in various scholarly realms by himself and others. In 1983, he gave up his medical license rather than face trial on 67 counts of violations of the Pennsylvania Medical Practices Act. As part of “therapy,” for example, patient Sally Zinman faced the following outrages:

“Without a word of explanation, [Rosen] and his main aide, an ex-Marine, tore off all of her clothes except her underpants and began beating her on the face and breasts (the aide held her down while Rosen beat her). She was then tied to her bed, still with no clothes on, and kept her that way for 24 hours under close guard … [Therapy also included Rosen] suggesting various ‘delusions’ to her and fondling her breasts when they were alone (often the sessions were in groups), and once even her vagina.” [MASSON, p. 136-137]

In the case of another patient, Janet Katkow, Rosen “took off his pants and boxer shorts down over his penis and commanded the plaintiff to suck on his penis.” [MASSON, p. 138] This Katkow was required to do “hundreds of times” over a seven year period. “This is what it is all about, this is when a baby is at peace,” he told her. [MASSON, p. 141] This patient was also forced to lick his anus “and orally take in as much of his feces as she could, which she did.” Katkow was also directed to have cunnilingus with another woman and have sex with an impotent judge. [MASSON, p. 144]

Rosen also had “numerous sexual relations” with patient Julia Blythe. Three other women eventually came forward with similar stories of abuse. [MASSON, p. 145]

Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, a former psychoanalyst, became profoundly disillusioned with the field and notes, in his volume entitled Against Therapy, the disturbing undercurrent of such stories, that such abuses are part of a per-
versely authoritarian doctor-patient relationship that is the foundation of the psychoanalytic world itself:

“Is Rosen an exception or is there something about psychotherapy, something in the very nature of psychotherapy, that tends toward abuses? A prison warden, a slaveholder, and a psychotherapist have in common the desire to control another person.” [MASSON, p. 147]

In late 2000, the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles noted with concern a number of newsworthy cases of sexual abuse by rabbis:

“For those who look up to the American Jewish clergy, it has not been a good year. Last week, one of the Reform movement’s most prominent rabbis was suspended from the rabbinical movement for past sexual misconduct …Rabbi Sheldon Zimmerman, widely respected as a Jewish thinker and teacher, resigned as president of the movement’s Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion … The wave of incidents is refocusing on an issue that has come into public view only in recent years. In the past, rabbinical misconduct – particularly sexual misconduct – was rarely discussed publicly. Many advocates for victims complained that rabbinical associations were more interested in protecting their members than the people they hurt.” [WIESNER, J., 12-15-2000]

Also noted in the article is the sexual harassment “by the late charismatic Orthodox leader, Rabbi Shlomo Carlebach,” a Reform rabbi in New Jersey who “allegedly hired people to murder his wife,” a “Conservative Cantor in the Chicago area [who] was arrested … for alleged involvement in a prostitution ring,” and a “New York rabbi working for [the Orthodox Union’s] national youth group [who allegedly] sexually harassed and molested teens.” [WIESNER, J., 12-15-00]

In 1996, a Los Angeles Jewish showpiece, the Skirball Cultural Center and Museum (a $65 million cultural center created by Israeli architect Moshe Safdie and founded by Israeli-born president and CEO Uri Herscher), named Robert Kirschner as its Program Director despite his past as the former rabbi of one of northern California’s pre-eminent synagogues, Temple Emanu-El in San Francisco. Kirschner resigned his rabbinical post there in 1992 after four women (eventually a total of twelve) came forward with complaints of the rabbi’s sexual misconduct, “involving,” he publicly apologized, “sexual relations outside my marriage.” At least three of the women reportedly “reached settlements with the temple’s insurance policy.” [LA TIMES, 11-2-96, p. B4]

In 2000, the Miami-Dade Public Schools district paid a million dollar settlement to five women, four of them teachers, who charged that Michael Exelbart, the principal of a school for the handicapped, had sexually harassed them. Two had been “coerced” into sex, including at the site of “a conservative Jewish temple in Kendall where Exelbart was an officer.” Exelbart wasn’t fired, and continued to make $80,000 a year at another position. [KISSELL, T., 4-20-2000]

In April 2001, Jerrold M. Levy, a rabbi at Temple Beth El in Florida, was arrested for “online solicitation of a juvenile” over the Internet. The synagogue
had hired him as an associate rabbi in 1992, even though it was known by those hiring him that he had been arrested on a past sex-related charge:

“Levi mentioned a prior arrest when interviewing in 1992 for associate rabbi at Temple Beth El in Boca Raton … [He had pleaded no-contest to] a sex-related case involving an undercover police officer in St. Louis-area public restroom … Temple leaders decided to give Levy the job anyway, based on his record as a rabbi, lawyer and member of their synagogue community.”

“He’s a wonderful person,” said David Beale (the synagogue’s vice-president for education and youth) after the rabbi’s arrest, “and he conveys love and Judaism to all who come in contact with him.” During the yearly Purim celebration, noted the South Florida Sun-Sentinel, “Levy helped lead the service dressed as the cookie monster.” [KRAUSE, K., 4-6-01; HAHN, B., 4-9-01]

Two weeks later, in the Boston area, also in April 2001, Eric Hindin was charged with “two counts of rape of a child, two counts of indecent assault and battery, and two counts of statutory rape.” Hindin had sexually assaulted and videotaped the crimes with two boys, one of whom “he was matched with through a Jewish Big Brother organization.” [ELLEMONT/TWAROG, 4-12-00]

In 1981, the four-term (1968-81) Brooklyn District Attorney, Eugene Gold, “announced he would not seek re-election and planned to devote himself to Jewish charitable causes.” In 1983, he was charged with “unlawful sexual conduct” in a hotel with a 10-year old girl. In return for probation, Gold pleaded guilty and would seek “psychiatric treatment in Israel, where he had a home.” [NY TIMES, 10-21-83] In 1992, Sol Wachtler, “chief judge of New York state’s Court of Appeals, one of the most prestigious courts in the United States, resigned … [He was] the central figure in a scandal involving sex, blackmail and kidnapping threats … Before his arrest, he was frequently mentioned as a possible candidate for the governor of New York state.” The object of Wachtler’s sexual attentions and threats was Joy Silverman (a former lover), whose personal friend at the FBI put 80 agents on the case to nab him. [CHISHOLM, P., 1992, p. 56]

In 1995, Frederick Werbell, a rabbi who co-wrote “a best-selling Holocaust book” (Lost Hero: The Mystery of Raul Wallenberg), pleaded guilty to “second-degree sexual abuse” of his cleaning lady. “He sprang naked from the bathroom of his Eastside apartment, grabbed his 39-year old housekeeper and fondled her.” He had earlier been sentenced to 17 months in jail for grabbing a woman he was interviewing in his apartment for a job as a receptionist.” [BREEN, 7-18-95] In 2001, Rabbi Pinchas Lew, a Chasidic Lubavitcher (ultra-Orthodox),

“was arrested on misdemeanor assault charges … after a woman accused him of repeatedly touching his genitals in front of her. The woman, a housekeeper in Lew’s home, reportedly said Lew had bolted all the doors and that she feared he planned to assault her. She managed to escape through a back door … Lew, married with five children, led religious study and frequently held services in his home for college students … Members of the community had just learned of Lew’s conviction for his part in an Iowa armed robbery 10 years ago … After the local com-
munity learned about [this] incident, more than 100 members of the local Jewish community attended a meeting to hear Lew talk about his criminal past. Coincidentally, that meeting occurred on the same day he allegedly assaulted the woman in his home.” [FLEISHMAN, D., 7-3-01]

Lew is a member of a prominent Chabad family – “his father was second in command of Chabad in London, a key post in worldwide Lubavitch.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 265] The national Chabad community stunned the judge in providing the required $200,000 bond for the arrested and jailed man. This, notes Stephen Bloom, was based on the Jewish tradition that “observant Jews are compelled to post bail that will allow a fellow Jew ‘imprisoned unjustly’ to be released. Called in Hebrew *pidyon shevuyim*, the ‘ransom of captives’ is a particular obligation of the Hasidic community.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 253]

Lew’s criminal accomplice was fellow Chabad member Philip Stillman who robbed a small town popcorn vendor and shot a grandmother at point-blank range after taking her money. Stillman reportedly accepted an offer from two rabbis to accept a bribe to accept full blame for the crimes. Lev, despite an original sentencing of ten years in prison, was merely put on probation. The judge told a journalist that he was influenced and “impressed by many of the Jews who came [to the Lew trial]. The courtroom had a significant number of rabbis. They were very intellectual individuals. “If the crime had stunned the locals [of Iowa],” says Stephen Bloom, “the double standard of punishment for Stillman and Lev took their breath away.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 255-256] Marion Bakken, the woman who was shot, survived and was awarded $1.6 million as settlement for her injuries. She has never been paid. [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 274]

Secular Jewish journalist Stephen Bloom believes that ultra-Orthodox disdain for Gentiles contributed to the robberies and attempted murder:

“The attitude shared by many Postville Hasidim toward the locals nourished a destructive environment of contempt and scorn providing a setting for Stillman and Lew. While the Hasids would not encourage unprovoked violence against gentiles, their everyday us-against-them mentality helped set the stage for two cocky fellows to fantasy into reality. For more than a year, the Hasidic Jews’ imperious attitude toward the Postville locals had stuck in my craw. As a Jew, I was embarrassed by their take-it-or-leave-it mentality.” [BLOOM, S., 2001, p. 273]

In 1995, a rabbi’s assistant, Yehuda Friedlander, pleaded guilty to the charge of sexually molesting a 15-year-old girl sitting beside him, alone, on an international plane flight. He had also had an earlier arrest for a sexual crime in 1991. A rabbi with him, Israel Grunwald, the leader of New York’s Pupa ultra-Orthodox community, was also accused of sexually harassing the girl. He remained under investigation as Friedlander accepted blame. According to the affidavit filed against both men, substantiated by another passenger who witnessed the incident, Grunwald first fondled the girl’s breast, then exchanged seats with Friedlander, who violated her further as she protested and resisted under a blanket, trying to sleep. The two men were returning from Australia where Grunwald had lectured about the Talmud. Later, “about 15 supporters from
New York and Los Angeles,” noted the *Los Angeles Times*, “attended the court hearings chanting from prayer books as they waited for the proceedings to begin.” [BOXALL/KENNEDY, p. B1; and LOS ANGELES TIMES, 11-1-95, p. B4]

In 1999, Ze’ev Kopolovitch, a rabbi and the principal of Netiv Meir, an all-male yeshiva high school in Israel, was accused of sexually abusing 19 students from 1991-1997. The most disturbing part of the case, noted the *Jerusalem Post*, was that “investigators say Kopolovitch’s alleged behavior was known within the school for several years and tolerated by the governing hierarchy of the religious Zionist movement.” [GROSS, N., 1999, p. 28] In 2001, a “part-time synagogue sexton” in Jerusalem was convicted “for sexually assaulting children who went to synagogue to pray with him … At least three children were involved, with one, the 13-year-old, being the son of another synagogue official. That boy was so disturbed by the sexual abuse that he took up drugs, and the sexton then exploited that knowledge to blackmail the youth into more sexual intercourse. The other two children were subject to his fondling, often on the back porch of the synagogue during prayers, in exchange for sweets.” [REINFELD, M., 6-22-01]

In 2001, Chabad rabbi Mordechai Yomtov, a teacher at Cheder Menachem grade school in Los Angeles, was jailed on $500,000 bail for “ten felony counts of committing lews acts with children … Yomtov was keeping [three boys] alone in the classroom and molesting them while the other children were at recess.” [FAX, J., 12-14-01]

In 2000, John Douglas Wynn was arrested for molesting a 12-year old boy in the spa at California’s Palo Alto Jewish Community Center. [SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, 5-18-2000, p. A18] In 2000 an unnamed young Jewish woman came forward to press criminal charges against Rabbi Baruch Lanner, the religious director of the National Conference of Synagogue Youth (NCSY), an Orthodox youth group. She claimed she was molested by Lanner on a daily basis for eight months beginning in 1995. [ROSENBLATT, G., 7-10-2000, p. 9] Lanner, noted the *Jewish Week,*

“is widely regarded as one of the most brilliant, dynamic and charismatic educators in Jewish life today … Reports have continued to circulate that he has harassed, if not abused, many scores of teens sexually, physically and/or emotionally, from the early 1970s to the present … Those who have elected to tell their stories say they are motivated by anger and frustration over the refusal of the OU, the national central body of Orthodox synagogues, to act decisively on repeated complaints about Rabbi Lanner’s behavior.” [ROSENBLATT, G., 6-23-2000]

In 2001, two U.S. Congressmen, Tom Lantos and Edolphus Towns were “snookered” into defending an Argentine yoga school against alleged “anti-Semitic” elements (about “50 percent of those involved were of the Jewish faith”). Towns introduced a formal resolution condemning “discrimination against yoga enthusiasts by the Argentine government. In the resolution he linked bombing of a Jewish center in Buenos Aires six years ago to a long pattern of Argentine anti-Semitism.” As *Insight on the News* notes, however,
“The Congressmen may have been snookered by those accusations of anti-Semitism. Their lofty resolution failed to mention some of the other ‘practices’ of the Escuela de Yoga. According to reports, the learning center, run by a certain Juan Percowicz, teaches lessons that are *sui generis*, in that they involve practices that most people would call ‘sexual freedom.’ There have even been some allegations of child exploitation, which local police were compelled to investigate. Since its founding in the 1980s, the school has been raided by the police more than 300 times. Other charges brought against it include assault and petty larceny.” [NICHOLS/SPUN, 12-7-01]

From Israel, in 1998, 19-year old model Linor Abargil was named “Miss World.” Seven weeks earlier she had been raped at knife-point by an Israeli travel agent, Shlomo Nour. [USA TODAY, 1-20-99] “The 51st year of the Jewish state,” noted the *Jewish Advocate*, “seems to be shaping up as the Year of the Sexual Assault. Or perhaps, more properly, the year when sexual assault is coming out of the closet. Coming out with a vengeance. In the first six months of 1998, rape was up 22% over the previous year … Teen rape, child rape, homosexual rape, rape in the military, intra-family rape, we run the gamut.” [MOTRO, H., p. 10] In 1999, an “expanding” sexual harassment scandal broke out in the Israeli Ministry for Religious Affairs, centering on the division’s comptroller, Yehiya Paruz. [SINAIA, 1999] That same year, the *Los Angeles Times* noted that “Long a taboo topic, or dismissed as something women simply had to put up with, sexual harassment in the [Israeli] military is now openly discussed in Israel, thanks to high-profile cases, new rules and a handful of crusading activists. More and more women are coming forward to denounce abuse.” [WILKINSON, T., 12-1-99, p. A1]

In 2000, the head of the Defense Ministry’s publishing unit, Amnon Tzabar, was charged with sexual harassment for “performing lewd acts on four female workers in his office.” This followed disciplinary actions against “long-time ministry spokesman” Dan Weinrich and, in a separate case, the head of the Defense Ministry’s media section, Shachar Halevi. “The situation became so bad,” noted the *Jerusalem Post*, “that ministry Director-General Arno Yam gathered all senior officials and warned he was going to uproot the phenomenon.” [O’SULLIVAN, A., 9-8-2000] In 2001, a parliamentary aide to Israeli MK (member of Knesset/Parliament) Ayoub Kara publicly accused him or raping her. Ayoub is Prime Minister Sharon’s “liaison to Israeli Arabs.” [JERUSALEM POST, 2-28-01] In 2000, Israel’s Transport Minister, Yitzhak Mordechai, “who deputizes for [Israeli Prime Minister] * Ehud* Barak in his absence, suspended himself pending an investigation into accusations that he sexually assaulted a female civil servant.” [REEVES, P., 3-8-00] In 2001, the director general of the Israel Journalists’ Union, Tuveya Sa’ar, was “arrested on suspicion of having intercourse with a minor and coercing her for sexual favors … In one instance … he is suspected of promising the girl an appearance on the TV channel for children because of his connections there.” Sa’ar is the former director of Israel TV. [ARBELI, A., 8-15-01] Along these general themes, see also historical Jewish pre-eminence in the international prostitution trade (http://jewishtribalreview.org/10whsla.htm) and Jewish dominance of the pornography business (in the Mass Media chapter, p. 1235).
Another ethical in-house controversy in the Jewish organizational community – in this case, involving environmental morality – arose in Houston when Charles Hurwitz, a UJA-Federation official, was noted for his role as a majority stockholder in Maxxam, the company that owns Pacific Lumber which environmentalists were fighting for its plans to cut down some of the last remaining old growth Redwood trees on private land in California. As Benjamin Stein notes, “Charles Hurwitz’s catastrophic takeover of Pacific Lumber…. resulted in some of the worst environmental atrocities of all time against first-growth redwood trees.” [STEIN, B., p. 114]


In 1999, environmentalists created an activist alliance against Maxxam with a steelworker union which had begun a strike against Kaiser. “I don’t think there’s a corporation anywhere else in the U.S. that’s at the epicenter of so many social issues as Maxxam,” said steelworker union official David Foster. [BORRESON, S., 1-3-2000]

Then there is David Koch. Koch heads Koch Industries, “a conglomerate with major oil and gas holdings, [which] is the second-largest privately-held company in the United States. It is also the recipient of the largest civil fine ever imposed on a corporation for violating federal environmental laws. During the 1990s, the company’s leaky pipelines were responsible for more than 300 oil spills in five states … Last fall, Koch Industries and four employees were indicted on 97 counts of violating federal clean air and hazardous waste laws. Government prosecutors accuse the company of intentionally releasing fumes from benzene – a suspected carcinogen – into the atmosphere and then lying about it to state regulators in Texas. If convicted, the company could be fined up to $352 million.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

Samuel Heyman owns 98% of the giant manufacturing firm GAF. As Mother Jones magazine noted about the company:

“Last year, if the Asbestos Compensation Act had passed Congress, Heyman would have profited handsomely from his anonymity. The bill – drafted by a Harvard law professor hired by GAF – would have denied or delayed compensation to thousands of victims of asbestos-related diseases, cost tax-payers as much as $150 million a year, and provided ‘unwarranted benefits to asbestos companies,’ according to the U. S. Justice Department. As a former manufacturer of asbestos-laden building products, GAF found itself in a crushing legal avalanche.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]
Likewise, in the pantheon of prominent Jewish organization leaders, there was the case of (the Jewish) *Moment* magazine’s “donor of the month,” Bernie Marcus, for his donation of $15 million to the Atlanta UJA fund-raising campaign. Marcus, the CEO of *Home Depot*, only weeks earlier lost an Oakland jury verdict of $1.6 million in damages against his company for “sexual discrimination and retaliation.” A class action lawsuit for $65 million also was settled against Home Depot for sex discrimination. [ARON, M.] “A trustee-for-life of the Atlanta Jewish Federation,” notes *Mother Jones* magazine,

“Marcus says he has integrated Judaic principles into what he likes to call the ‘Home Depot family.’ For him, helping people understand Judaism is a matter of marketing. ‘I think a lot of it has to do with selling,’ he says, ‘You’ve got to sell the beauties of Judaism.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

In March 1998, the head of the World Jewish Congress, Edgar Bronfman, also president and CEO of the family-controlled Seagram and Universal Studios, was awarded a conspicuously dubious honor (the Seagram fortune was built to power by the Bronfmans during prohibition, with considerable collusion with Detroit’s criminal Jewish Purple Gang who smuggled alcohol over to Windsor). “A bipartisan political group,” noted the *Financial Times* of London,

“launched a new campaign aimed at embarrassing one of the leading lights of the entertainment business. The first ever “Silver Sewer” award, in recognition of its ‘outrageous contribution to the degradation and coarsening of our culture and its unswerving dedication to the pursuit of profit above principle’ [was awarded *in absentia* to Bronfman].” [BAKER, G., 3-21-98, p. 2]

Of particular note to the judges was the Bronfman ownership and promotion of the decadent *The Jerry Springer* [who is Jewish] Show on television and *Marilyn Manson*, “perhaps the most shocking of the ‘shock rock’ groups.” William Bennett, a former cabinet member in the Reagan and Bush White Houses, decried Seagrams as “the leading perpetrators of cultural rot” in America. [BAKER, G., 3-21-98, p. 2] Seagrams is noteworthy for many dubious honors, including the fact that in 1997 it “started airing TV commercials for its Crown Royal Whiskey in scattered markets across the United States. The commercials broke a voluntary ban on television advertising that the liquor companies had imposed on themselves in 1948.” [FINANCIAL TIMES, 4-7-97] [More about the Bronfmans and Springer later]

In 2001, Irv Rubin, head of the Jewish Defense League, and an associate, Earl Krugel, were arrested by the FBI for plotting to bomb the Los Angeles King Fahd Mosque and the office of Arab-American Congressmen Darrell Issa. [DEUTSCH, L., 12-12-01]

In 1997, the United Jewish Appeal went out of its way to shame the Jewish community by awarding its “Humanitarian of the Year” award to (non-Jewish) media mogul Rupert Murdoch at a fund-raising dinner that raised $2.3 million for the organization. *Mother Jones* magazine wondered about the surreal moral reasoning behind the award: “The media baron is better known to labor and
human rights groups for his union-busting and for catering to the Chinese government (in 1994 he yanked the BBC off his Asian satellite network because officials in Beijing were angered by its reporting on Chinese human rights violations).” [MJ, 9/10-97, p. 18]

“By what criteria has the UJA chosen the worldwide robber baron for this years’ award over, say, Radovan Karadzic [accused of war crimes in Bosnia], or perhaps Larry Flynt [the pornographer]?” wondered Eric Alterman in the Nation, “… Murdoch was chosen, the UJA says, for his ‘longtime support of the security of the state of Israel, his friendship for the Jewish people, and his support of UJA.’” [ALTERMAN, p. 6-7] The Australian-born Murdoch had earlier been honored in 1982 as the “Communications Man of the Year” by the American Jewish Congress. He was presented that award by AJC president Howard Squadron, who was also Murdoch’s American lawyer, his guide to visit right-wing politician Ariel Sharon in Israel, and an opinion page writer for Murdoch’s New York Post. [GOLDSTEIN, T, p. 69; KIERNAN, T., 1986, p. 262] “The Jewish national cause is one that is extremely important to me, to my family, and to my company,” Murdoch told the UJA audience, “… We’re also in Israel [Murdoch has investments there] because of my faith in the integrity and worthiness of the Zionist undertaking. I have been accused of being pro-Israel, pro-Zionist, pro-Jewish – charges to which I plead guilty.” [LEON, M., 7-4-97, p. 16]

Matti Golan, a former Israeli government official, calls the massive American Jewish organizational ring to raise money for itself and Israel the “Money Machine.” American Jews, notes Golan, have

“created a ruthless, well-oiled machine whose only aim is to collect money and … will do anything to do so. Every year [American Jewish leaders get] a higher quota to meet and … stop at nothing to meet it. If you can’t meet your quota, you’re out. The only gauge of success, the one bottom line, is how many dollars you’ve brought in.” [GOLAN, p. 65]

In 1999, Jewish billionaire Henry Samueli was presented an award by a prominent Jewish American organization. As the Los Angeles Times noted this honor,

“The Orange County chapter of the American Jewish Committee will present him with its National Human Relations Award … He’s happy to be honored, Samueli said, but he was surprised to find out that a donation to the Committee was part of the package.” [CONWAY, A., 4-13-99, p. E1]

Even Alan Dershowitz concedes that “Jewish organizations sometimes honor the wealthy without inquiry into the sources of their wealth. We sometimes do not make the effort to see what is plainly before our eyes. We are blinded by the facade of money …” [DERSHOWITZ, Chutzpah, p. 307]

This worldview, so common in the Jewish community, was heralded as an emulative value for Americans at-large in 1995 by a Jewish professor at the University of Chicago, Daniel Fischel, who espoused it – not surprisingly – in his book, Payback: The Conspiracy to Destroy Michael Milken and His Financial Revolution, published prominently by Harper Collins. Fischel’s introductory para-
graph to begin his defense of Milken’s vast corruption machine deserves to be quoted in full, as sum of both his book and a widespread moral vacuousness so much at stake here:

“Why have the 1980s been so uniformly condemned as the ‘decade of greed?’ For that matter, what does this disparaging characteristic even mean? The decade’s many critics who pontificate against evils of greed have seen no need to define the term. Dictionary definitions of greed – ‘inordinate desire for wealth’ or ‘wanting more than one’s proper share’ – provide no help but merely restate the question. What is ‘inordinate desire for wealth, or the dividing line between one’s ‘proper’ or ‘improper’ share? With no answers to these questions, how can we possibly know when an individual, let alone a whole country, is guilty of ‘greed?’ And even if we could somehow identify ‘greedy’ behavior, why should we care?” [FISCHEL, p. 1]

[See also Chapter 23 p. 1087 for much more evidence on the theme of the expression of Jewish ethics]
“Top Russian Mafiosi from Russia, Europe, and the United States, convened in Israel three times between 1993 and 1994 to decide upon their investment policies and to settle disputes.”

– Alan Block, 1996, p. 33]

“The element of trust is vital in the diamond trade, and religious orthodoxy, curiously enough, is often regarded as the ultimate guarantee of a Jew’s honesty.”

– Howard Sachar, 1985, p. 47]

“I can’t believe it. A rabbi stole my money. A rabbi stole my money.” – comments of prominent Jewish American mobster Joseph “Doc” Stacher, arrested over the years for “atrocious assault and battery, robbery, burglary, larceny, bootlegging, hijacking and murder,” then an Israeli citizen after being deported from America in 1965. These comments were made upon winning a lawsuit after being swindled by Rabbi Menachem Porush of the ultra-Orthodox Agudat Israel Party. [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 116-117]

Jews in America have been prominent in the narcotics underworld since the early twentieth century. As Rich Cohen notes:

“The first major American drug dealer was probably Arnold Rothstein … [COHEN, R., 1999, p. 131] … In the mid-nineteenth century, when the government started to ban certain narcotics, drugs were smuggled in from Europe and the Far East. But it was a slapdash affair – not a business. Rothstein changed all that. He saw Repeal coming and knew drugs could fill the void left by alcohol … So in the late [19] twenties Rothstein retooled a mechanism he had built to carry booze. It would now carry, among other things, heroin and cocaine … [It became] a blueprint for smuggling drugs into America.” [COHEN, R., p. 132]
“By 1926,” notes Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway, “[Rothstein] was allegedly the overlord of the foreign narcotics trade in America. Beginning with Rothstein, American Jewish underworld figures became prominently involved in smuggling and distributing opium and opiates in the United States. During the 1920s and 1930s Jews competed with Italians for dominance of the trade. The Italian-American’s racketeering predominated during World War II. This was because of the Nazis. When the Germans began to exterminate European Jewry, they also destroyed the Jewish criminals who supplied American distributors.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 8]

Rothstein’s right-hand man was Louis Lepke, who took over the drug empire when his boss died in 1928. In the 1930s associate Yasha Katzenberg journeyed to Shanghai, China, contacted underworld figures there, and “taught them how to make heroin.” “In the last thirties,” says Cohen, “when officials at last figured out what Katzenberg was up to, the League of Nations declared him an international menace. A few years later Yasha was indicted, along with Lepke and twenty-eight others, for violation of narcotics laws.” [COHEN, R., p. 133-134] In the late 1940s, there were still “dozens of Jewish drug dealers roaming New York City, the remnants of Rothstein’s machine.” [COHEN, p. 139] Particularly noteworthy were Solly Gelb, Solly Gordon, Tudi Schoenfeld, Artie West, Niggy Rutkin, Harry Koch, Sam Haas, Moe Taubman and Harry Hechinger. Tolly Greenberg even invented a machine to turn liquid heroin into pill form. [COHEN, p. 139-140] Harry Strauss, “Philadelphia’s gambling czar,” later became involved in smuggling “heroin into the United States from France. He reportedly earned $20 million a year from the trade.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 33-34]

An important foundation of the old opium trade was the Jewish Sassoon family (of which famous hair mogul Vidal Sassoon is an heir):

“The legend of the Jewish clan can be traced back to David Sassoon (1792-1864). Born into a Sephardic Jewish family in Baghdad, Iraq, David Sassoon set up the Sassoon company in Bombay, India, in 1833. In 1844, he set up a branch in Hong Kong, and a year later, he set up his Shanghai branch on the Bund to cash in on the opium trade. At that time, about one-fifth of all opium brought into China was shipped on the Sassoon fleet. They brought China opium and British textiles and took away silk, tea and silver.” [SHANGHAI STAR, 5-10-01]

Today’s drug dealing is probably the world’s most profitable crime; profit margins can range from 200% for cocaine to 1,200% for heroin. The Colombian international drug cartel, “Kali,” which monopolizes the trade in Los Angeles and Miami, is estimated to distribute over 80% of the world’s cocaine and a third of its heroin. Illegal drug syndicates are estimated to take in about $25 billion a year in the United States alone. In 1998, 59 tons of cocaine and 770 pounds of heroin were confiscated by American police authorities.

Little known – and little publicized – in America, in recent years the Jewish “Russian mafia,” and Orthodox religious and Israeli business networks with
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deep links to drug cartels, have been instrumental in maintaining the United States drug problem. Many of these criminals are particularly pious Jews, and a number of Orthodox Jewish religious institutions have been used for the laundering of literally hundreds of millions of dollars in drug money in (particularly) New York City. (Money laundering here refers to the task of getting huge sums of money that were paid for drugs, originally in small bills, into a form of assets that has the appearance of legality.) In 1994 Israeli journalist Ben Kapit exposed this story of Jewish culpability and corruption in America’s growing drug problem; he wrote in Hebrew, to an Israeli audience, in the newspaper Ma’ariv.

American Jews and Israelis dominate the jewelry and precious stones and metals trade in Manhattan, mostly located in the 47th Street area. “75-80% of the active traders on the street are Jews,” said Kapit, “A large part of them are very pious Orthodox Jews, mainly Hassids. There is also a respectable representation of Jews from Iran and Syria, usually also very pious … the place is also the biggest launderer for drug money in the United States.” [KAPIT, p. 2]

Daily transactions of huge sums of money – including interstate and international – is part of the diamond business (as is backroom secrecy, based on “personal acquaintance and trust,” [KAPIT, p. 2]; boxes, large packages, and armored trucks come and go regularly under heavy security. All this provides a convenient front for the laundering of massive amounts of drug money, most of it in $10 and $20 bills. “One of the most popularly successful ways to launder money,” notes Kapit, “is through Jewish religious institutions, such as yeshivas and synagogues. Since the majority of the 47th Street gold and diamond merchants are religious Jews, the process is made easier.” [KAPIT, p. 4]

“Today,” noted Newsweek in 1977, “the Japanese give diamond engagement rings nearly as often as American, and wealthy Arabs who once eschewed diamonds for the more colorful stones, have become insatiable diamond buyers … Little wonder, then, that tampering robberies and even murders have come to haunt the business, not only along West 47th Street in New York – where the mostly Jewish dealers see an ‘Israeli mafia’ behind the murder last month of one of their numbers – but the world’s other diamond centers as well.” [ATLAS, p. 95] “The robberies that plague the diamond districts of New York and Tel Aviv,” notes David Koskoff, “are almost always perpetrated by people from within the diamond community.” [KOSKOFF, p. 191] In 1990, the Jerusalem Post, paraphrasing the Los Angeles County Sheriff, Sherman Block (also Jewish), noted that “Los Angeles’ small but potent ‘Israeli mafia’ has spread across America, graduating in the last two decades from extorting poor Jews – often concentration camp survivors – to major drug-dealing and fraud schemes against the rich … Cocaine is the favored product of the mafia’s drug dealing, and their clients tend to be affluent people who demand the highest quality.” [DERFNER, 9-9-90, ONLINE]

U.S. Federal agents have identified, says Kapit, what it calls “the Cocaine Triangle. Its sides are: Colombian drug barons, Israeli-Jewish money launderers, and Jewish-Russian mafiosos … You need only look at the list of arrests and in-
dictments of the past three years in order to grasp the enormous scope of Israeli involvement in the field.” [KAPIT, p. 3] There are numerous murky criminal interfaces between these Israeli drug dealers, the so-called “Russian” mafia, and some of the most pious Jewish Orthodox religious circles. The link between Israeli weapons dealing and South American underworld organizations is also deep. In 1988, for example, an Israeli paramilitary training company called “Spearhead,” directed by a former senior army officer, Yair Klein, was hired to train members of a drug cartel in Colombia. Klein was eventually fined all of $13,000 by Israeli authorities for “exporting defense know-how not covered in his permit.” [HIRSCHBERG, p. 13] In 1990 the Jewish Week reported that “three United States officials were in Israel … investigating possible Israeli connections to the Colombian drug cartel” and that earlier NBC had reported that “Israeli reserve officers…. [were providing] military training to drug-cartel gunmen.” [GOLBERG, A, p. 51]

An associate of Klein, Israeli Arik Afek, known publicly as a “flower importer,” was found dead in the trunk of a car at the Miami airport in 1990. The Washington Post noted that

“Afek’s name first surfaced last summer when NBC News broadcast film allegedly showing foreign mercenaries training Medellin cartel gunmen in ambush assassinations and other paramilitary activities.” [ISIKOFF, p. A14]

Still, in May 2000, Colombian authorities busted four Israelis and one Colombian citizen in an “arms trafficking ring” that sought to funnel weapons into the country. [XINHUA GENERAL NEWS SERVICE, 5-27-2000] Itzik Richter, Ofer Birnbaum and Yaron Cohen with known links to the Cali drug cartel, were arrested, also on charges of a scheme to counterfeit dollars. A few weeks earlier another Israeli, Amos Shimoni, had been arrested in Panama on similar charges. [KRAU, 5-29-2000]

“Among the recent items of news that failed to make more than passing mention,” noted R. T. Naylor in 1989, “…is the scandal over the chummy relations senior members of Israel’s military maintain with both the Colombian cocaine barons and their Panamanian affiliate, General Manual Noriega.” [TAYLOR, p. 136] Noriega’s alleged “right hand man” was a Mossad agent, Mikhail Harari. In 1988 the Jewish Week reported that “[U.S.] Senate investigations have turned up information linking Panama’s recently indicted military strongman, General Manuel Antonio Noriega, to the Mossad, Israel’s external intelligence agency.” [WAGMAN, p. 5] Jose I. Blandon, a former influential Noriega adviser and Panamanian counsel in New York, told Congress that Michael Harrari, “described as a former Israeli army general who later worked for Mossad,” lived in close contact with Noriega for 5-7 years and trained “Noriega’s private guard – a unit separate from the Panamanian army. Guard officers report to Noriega through Harari.” [WAGMAN, p. 5] Brandon also noted that “Harrari often acts as a middleman in weapons purchases that Noriega makes in Europe,” and that “when Noriega travels in Europe, Harari arranges for his protection by Israeli military intelligence and Mossad personnel.” “In-
vestigators believe Panama,” reported the Jewish Week, “a kind of Switzerland of the Caribbean, has become a center of Israeli financial dealings and for so-called front companies – corporate shells operating for secret owners, in this case the Israeli government. Investigators believe another of Harari’s functions is to oversee bank accounts and shell companies … Panama [functions] … as a haven for shadowy financial transactions.” [WAGMAN, p. 5] Secret reports were also in Noriega’s possession of various United States politicians, from Senators Edward Kennedy to Jesse Helms; “Some [Senate investigators] speculate,” said the Jewish Week, “the files may have come to Noriega through Harari.” [WAGMAN, p. 5]

In 1985, Israeli Shmuel Targan, who used a fake shoe store in New York City as the front for his drug operation, was arrested for cocaine and heroin smuggling. Rudolph Giuliani, then the U.S. District Attorney for Southern New York, noted that Targan’s store “was one of a 100 Israeli-operated legitimate businesses in the city that disguised illegal operations.” [FISHER, A.] In 1986 five Israelis were arrested in New York for a million-dollar-a-week heroin and cocaine operation. In 1988 five more Israelis were busted in Boston for drug running by the FBI. Also in 1988, in Los Angeles, Israelis Abraham Zarchia and Yitzhak Edvi received ten year prison sentences for drug trafficking – $22 million over a five month period. [HUNTER, LINK, p. 4, 6, 7]

In 1985, Max Mermelstein, described by his lawyer as “just a nice Jewish guy who got into the wrong industry,” [MURPHY, pt. 1, p. 3] became a government witness against a number of former accomplices in Colombia’s international Medellin drug cartel. Over seven years, Mermelstein was himself responsible for the smuggling of 55 tons of cocaine, worth $360 million, into the United States. (Curiously, the town of Medellin was actually founded by Spanish Jews in 1616).

Elsewhere, a pioneer in the laundering of Colombian drug money (particularly that from marijuana and cocaine) was Isaac Kattan-Kassin, son of a Sephardic Jewish family that had fled Hitler’s Germany in the 1930s. In the late 1970s, over $100 million a year of the tainted bills passed through his family’s currency exchange business in Cali, Colombia, although Kattan established business offices in New York and Miami, where he spent most of his time. In 1977, he “went to work full time for several cocaine organizations” [POWIS, p. 34] and he eventually became known as “the most famous of the money launderers of this period.” [POWIS, p. 32] Another prominent drug money launderer in this era was Beno G hitis, who also headed a Colombian currency exchange business founded by his father, Alter. Victor Eisenstein was also a crucial partner in the drug money ring, and Abel Holtz, president of Capital Bank in Miami, was a participant as the American depository. [POWIS, p. 74]

In 1993 an FBI sting operation arrested an Israeli in New York City, Zion Ya’akov Eveheim, who had both Israeli and Colombian citizenship. In less than a year he and his associates laundered $22.5 million in drug money through a fake corporation called Prism. Other Israelis arrested with him were Raymond Shoshanna, Daniella Levi, Binyamin Hazon, Meir Ochayan, and Alex Ajami.
“Many other suspects,” says Kapit, “escaped to Israel.” [KAPIT, p. 3] One of the interviewees in Hebrew for the FBI was a Jewish New Jersey resident, Neil Elefant. He was disturbed to discover an Israeli friend in trouble. He went to his rabbi, Elazar Teitz, who recommended “that it was his religious duty to warn [Elefant’s Jewish friend].” Elefant did so, and upon his own exposure for aiding a drug criminal to escape, Elefant claimed he did it because of “the zealousness, almost approaching anti-Semitism, which he found among the FBI agents trying to involve Israel in drug affairs.” [KAPIT, p. 3] Among those Israelis who escaped, thanks to Elefant’s warning, were Adi Tal, David Va’anunu, Yishai Ya’anunu, and Ya’akov Cohen. “Most of them,” says Kapit, “came out of the affair with a lot of money they took to Israel. The Americans know that the chances of any of them being extradited to the United States are close to nil.” [KAPIT, p. 4]

In another drug laundering case, in 1990 Aharon Sharir, “undoubtedly the major Israeli launderer,” in America [KAPIT, p. 5] was busted; he subsequently confessed to laundering $200 million. Sharir’s testimony led to 35 other Jewish launderers, including American Stephan Scorkin, “the biggest laundering shark in the history of the United States.” Scorkin was accused of laundering $300 million. Sharir’s partner, Lihu Ichilov, fled back to Israel. [KAPIT, p. 6] “Even with automatic money counting machines,” testified Sharir, “it was difficult to count the money. It arrived in bills of five, ten, and twenty dollars. The bills, most of which had been to sniff cocaine, had a strong odor of coke. A real stink. My employees could not stand it. Every 2-3 hours they had to take a break, go out for some fresh air, so as not to get high.” [KAPIT, p. 5]

Another Israeli drug laundering ring, led by Adi Tal, a former El-Al airline security guard, was broken up by American authorities in 1988. Eleven members were arrested. “An important member of Tal’s laundering ring,” notes Kapit, “was Rabbi Shalom Levitin, a Lubavitch Hassid, head of the Chabad branch in Seattle. It is assumed that all the considerable political power of these Hassids were exerted in favor of that laundering ring.” [KAPIT, p. 4] “I was motivated by my desire to help my brethren in need,” explained Rabbi Levitin, “with funds being transferred to Israel.” “People in the community know that he is only concerned about helping Jewish people,” said Mark Goldberg, President of Congregation Shareiev Telfilah-Lubavitch.” [Degginger, C., p. 12] Levitin got off easy with a $10,000 fine and a 30-day sentence in a half-way house.

In 1984 the oldest yeshiva [Jewish Orthodox religious studies center] in New York City, Tifereth Yerushalayim, was also busted for drug laundering. “The yeshiva’s representative,” says Kapit, “was a very pious Hassid, Mendel Goldenberger, who daily received cash … and deposited the money in the yeshiva’s account … Nine persons were convicted in the affair, including Rabbi Israel Eidelman, Vice President of the yeshiva, and some of its dignitaries.” [KAPIT, p. 4] “Laundering money is extremely beneficial to the yeshivas and other Jewish institutions,” Kapit was told, “… The attitude of the pious Jewish community … is drugs are sold anyway. As long as it does not harm our com-
DRUGS AND DRUG MONEY LAUNDERING WITHIN JEWISH NETWORKS: THE ‘RUSSIAN MAFIA,’ ‘ULTRA-ORTHODOX’

Community and only does good for it, it doesn’t matter if we benefit from drug trade.” [KAPIT, p. 5]

In 1990 another rabbi, Yosef Crozer, was arrested by FBI agents; he had in his possession prayer books, five passports, and $280,000 in cash in the trunk of his car.” [KAPIT, p. 1] In another 1990 case, a group of Hassids in the Orthodox community of Williamsburg, New York, was investigated for drug laundering operations. The accused included Naftali, Miklosh, Yitzhak, and Ya’akov Shlesinger, and Milton Jacoby. Money was laundered “on checks drawn from the account of Camp Yereim (Camp of the Pious) – a Hassidic summer camp in the Catskills.” [KAPIT, p. 5] The next year, in an unrelated case, a 38 year old Israeli – Uri Mizraci – was murdered in Manhattan; investigators suspected he was smuggling hashish and heroin into the United States. He was also suspected of being a “hired executioner” from an Israeli organized crime group. [JAMES, p. B4] Earlier, in 1986, Daniel Whitman and “cocaine dealer Robert Cohen were arrested for conspiring to murder Raymond Cohen, no relation to Robert, allegedly to keep him from testifying in [a National Football League] ticket scalping investigation.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 396] In 2001, Israel drug dealer Alen Amor, living in the U.S. on a tourist visa, was arrested in Los Angeles. Police found 30 pounds of marijuana at his home, as well as cocaine and heroin. [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 10-17-01, p. B5]

And, as Alan Block notes,

“In the late 1980s and early 1990s, [Jewish] Russian-émigré Vladimir Beigelman, of Brooklyn, N.Y., was known to be involved in cocaine trafficking with the Cali cartel. On December 2, 1993, Beigelman was fatally shot in the face while exiting a van in Queens, N.Y. Witnesses described the assailants as two Hispanics. Evidence indicates Beigelman was murdered in a dispute over a large quantity of missing cocaine.” [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 193]


In 1994 still another Hasidic rabbi, an especially prominent one, Abraham Low, of the Mogen Abraham synagogue in Los Angeles, was arrested with a Jewish businessman, Alan Weston, and an African-American woman, Charlessa Brown, on charges of a drug laundering project worth about $2 million. It involved elements of the usual scenario: Hasidic diamond dealers in New York City and the bank accounts for Orthodox Jewish religious charities. [DE LA MA, 1, 10] “The cash would be delivered to Hasidic diamond dealers known to the rabbi.” [MALNIC, A16] Brown also offered to sell an undercover FBI agent “assault rifles, pistols, bullet proof vests, and knives – “any quantity … on a regular basis.” [MALNIC, A16] When the FBI received the tip about Rabbi Low’s drug laundering activities, he was already under investigation in a $189 million
“check kiting” scheme and a “promissory note scheme in which the Bank of America might lose $70 million.” [WEINSTEIN, B9]

A request was made by Low’s lawyers to the court to dismiss the charges because of alleged “outrageous government misconduct” by an FBI investigator and “anti-Semitism.” Efforts to have the case dismissed against Low included the accusation that an FBI agent cursed at one of the rabbi’s associates and that an FBI informer had spoken an “anti-Semitic slur” to Low and “declared that the Torah was a piece of toilet paper.” [WEINSTEIN, B9] The prosecutor in the case argued that the claim that Rabbi Low “had been singled out because he is Jewish is a smokescreen to divert attention from his lawbreaking.” [WEINSTEIN, B11]

The rabbi was subsequently convicted of a felony: good for five years in prison. “Low,” noted Israeli journalist Kapit, “is married to the niece of the Satmar [Hasidic sect] Rabbi, Moshe Teitelbaum, who wields enormous political power in New York state.” [KAPIT, p. 5] (Three years earlier, another pious Hasidic Teitelbaum – Hanoch – was sentenced in Rockland County, New York, to 20-months to five years in prison for stealing $1 million in mortgages, loans, and welfare payments). [NYT, 12-6-91] From prison, Low later filed a law suit, demanding special privileges, including housing with other Jews. Rabbi Low “also wanted the prison to buy him a $30,000 Torah, about 200 religious texts, and to build a separate prayer room with a special sink.” [HOUSTON] Incredibly, the government agreed to a settlement in which it paid $270,000 in Low attorney fees, as well as to let him leave prison for ten days on Passover, and to spend further time in a half-way house for the “High Holy Days.” [HOUSTON] No wonder that in 1997 the London Observer ran an article about American prison consultants who offer “advice to nervous white-collar criminals on how to survive a spell in the slammer.” Among the advice for better prison treatment is “pretend to be Jewish.” [HELMORE, p. 17]

Another example of this kind of special treatment was the newsworthy 1996 case of Sholam Weiss, an ultra-Orthodox Jew, who was serving a seven-month prison term. He “conned his jailers into giving him permission to spend Passover with his family, then took off for a high-rolling trip to an Atlantic City casino.” [SMITH, G., 5-22-96, p. 24] In 1998 Neil Lederman (sentenced to prison for 11 months for writing a bad $60,000 check) made Washington DC-area news for the results of his request for kosher food from his jailers. To save the hassle of providing it, Lederman was released from jail and allowed “detention” in his home. Earlier, jail officials had even “allowed him to go to work during the day. At night, he returned to the jail.” [JACKMAN, T., 10-8-98, p. B12]

In 1994, New York state began offering Jews “hot kosher meals” at a cost 30% higher than all other inmate meals. In 1997 the Seattle Post-Intelligencer also noted that “Oregon authorities are expecting rampant conversion to Judaism in the state prison system, thanks to a judge’s ruling that a convicted murderer [Daniel Lee Holtermann] must be served kosher meals.” These meals would cost the prison $4-6 apiece, whereas regular inmate meals cost $1. In Colorado, in 2000 Jewish prisoners Charles Beerheide, Sheldon Pearlman, and Allen Isaac Fistell won their lawsuit “for kosher meals to Jewish prisoners at no
In 2001, a convicted murderer and convert to Orthodox Judaism, Hbrandon Lee Flagner, won the right to sue the state of Ohio. His grievance was that the prison had forced him to conform to its rules and cut his beard and sidelocks. “Ohio leaders argued that the case could provoke thousands of lawsuits … Attorneys for [20] states said if exemptions are allowed ‘the ability of prison officials to maintain security will inevitably falter, thereby placing the safety and welfare of prison staff, inmates, and the general public at risk.’” [HOLLAND, G., 12-10-01]

In June 2000, in Las Vegas, after numerous complaints from a car-packed neighborhood, city officials made nine trips over a three-month period to a private residence used by Orthodox Jews for Saturday religious services. Orthodox rabbi Moshe Omer (an Israeli with an “English name” of Michael Essence) was handcuffed and arrested after refusing to sign a zoning violation citation. The rabbi explained that, under Jewish Orthodox law, he couldn’t work on Saturday – and this included signing a piece of paper. Nor could he ride in a car, but he was driven by an officer to jail anyway. The Jewish mayor of Las Vegas, Oscar Goodman, later offered a formal apology for the incident. The rabbi in turn declared that “the way he was treated brought images of Nazis and the Holocaust to mind.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 6-22-2000]

Charged with the lead role in an alleged scheme that skimmed $1 million from a synagogue bingo series, Stanley Aronson described the view of his rabbi being led by police back to the (Akron, Ohio-area) synagogue “reminiscent of Europe in 1938.” Ten people were indicted on a total of 21 counts, but a bungled investigation left “six defendants plead[ing] to a string of minor misdemeanors.” Aronson and his wife then sued the city of Akron for $30 million. [EWINGER, J., 2-20-94, p. 1B; EWINGER, J., 2-26-94, p. 4B]

In 2002, Robert Noel made the news when he complained that San Francisco police “chose a time when we were out of town to come over and kick down the doors of a Jewish home. My relatives went through this in Germany.” [ESKENAZI, J., 1-16-02] Noel and his fellow-lawyer wife Marjorie Knoller, also Jewish, were charged with a crime when their dog mauled to death a neighbor. As the case dragged on, “a judge opened the door to testimony on allegations they were involved in everything from animal sex to racist prison gangs.” [QUINN, A.] “Several [Holocaust] survivor advocates questioned Noel’s rationale for raising accusations of anti-Semitism considering he and his wife recently adopted a 38-year-old inmate at Pelican State Prison, who prison officials believe is one of the leaders of a white-supremacist prison gang called the Aryan Brotherhood.” [ESKENAZI, J., 1-16-02]

It is also not bad to be a Jewish, particularly a “pious” one, if one is a criminal seeking to avoid getting caught. In January 2000, the Village Voice noted the difficulties local police faced in penetrating an ultra-Orthodox community to bring a murderer to justice. Jacob Blum, son of a local rabbi, was being sought for bludgeoning to death his grandmother’s 61-year old part-time (non-Jewish immigrant Polish) cleaning lady. As a doctor noted, “The victim was missing a large
part of her brain.” “[Police] precinct sources,” reported the Voice, “say it is rare for cases [against ultra-Orthodox hasids] to end in arrests. One cop bitterly recalled an incident in which a young hasidic driver who had accidentally run over an elderly black woman was not even cited for leaving the scene of an accident. ‘He did not summon an ambulance or police and left the scene because he wanted to get home in time for Sabbath,’ the source alleged.” [NOEL, P., 1-18-2000, p. 45]

In yet another drug case, an Orthodox Jew (a mashgiah: “a religious officer who sees that kosher restaurants maintain their Jewish dietary codes”), David Bright, was arrested at New York’s La Guardia airport in 1996 with a briefcase containing $200,000 in cash. He was arrested and accused of laundering $2 million for drug cartels. Upon release, he “disappeared.” [GROSSMAN, p. 1] At the same time, Bright’s brother, another Orthodox rabbi – Alan Bright – also disappeared. This second Bright, notes the Chicago Tribune, “was a rabbi in Medellin, Colombia – a South American city that is home to the notorious Medellin drug cartel.” [GROSSMAN, p. 18]

In 1994, in Montreal, Canada, Rabbi Meyer Krentzman, a former director of the Canadian Zionist Federation, a former director of the Jewish National Fund of Montreal, and a former director of the Jewish Educational Council, was arrested for selling heroin and cocaine to an undercover police officer. An associate, Andor Galandauer, a voluntary official at the Beth Zion Congregation synagogue, was also arrested; Galandauer’s past included activism with the Jewish Defense League. [FISHKOFF, p. 1] “As recently as the fall of 1992, Krentzman was hired to preside over the synagogue’s auxiliary service during the High Holidays, Rosh Hoshannah and Yom Kippur. Galandauer acts in a voluntary capacity as the synagogue’s gabbai – the person who chooses people for honors during services.” [BLOCK, I., p. A3]

In 1999, another rabbi, Eli Gottesman, this one in Montreal, was charged with smuggling cocaine and marijuana into a federal prison where he served Jewish inmates. In 1988 he was named “chaplain of the year” by the New York Board of Rabbis. He has dual citizenship and is the author of Who’s Who in Canadian Jewry. Rabbi Gottesman “had been under investigation for several months by prison officials, as well as the Justice Department, the FBI, and state police.” [THE GAZETTE, MONTREAL, p. A4] He eventually got off easy, pleading guilty only to a fraud charge and getting less than a year of prison time. [AP, 4-7-99]

In Michigan, in 1998 Mindy Brass, described by an Oakland County prosecutor as “a manipulator and a major drug dealer” was trying to get out of prison with claims of a bad heart. She had been arrested in 1992 with more than a pound of cocaine. [MCCCLEAR, J., 7-2-98, p. C4] And in 1995, Jewish drug addict Alan
Hurwitz, described by the *Detroit News* as a once “respectable Michigan proponent of social justice and educational reform,” and formerly the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps in Kenya, was arrested as “the notorious Zombie Bandit,” a man who had robbed 18 Midwestern banks. [MARTELLE, S., 8-1-95]

In 1989 Jack Myers (a former son-in-law of Lew Wasserman, the mogul of major Hollywood agency/studio MCA) was convicted of being a courier in a drug money laundering network. As Dennis McDougual notes:

“...In exchange for three years probation, Myers testified against [California] Governor Jerry Brown’s Chief of Staff Richard Silberman [also Jewish], the millionaire husband of San Diego County Susan Golding. Silberman was sentenced to forty-six months in federal prison and fined $50,000 for directing a scheme to launder $300,000 that an undercover FBI agent identified as the profits of Colombian cocaine dealing.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 523]

In 1996 the Canadian ambassador to Israel, David Berger, was presented evidence that a Canadian embassy official in Tel Aviv, Douglas Wardle, was using diplomatic mail to smuggle Colombian cocaine. Two Israelis – Meir Hazor and Ya’acov Sternheim – were also arrested in the case. [CANADIAN JEWISH NEWS]

A news item in October 1999 noted the breakup of an international ring specializing in the illegal drug “ecstasy.” Israeli police announced that 49 suspects around the world had been detained; 24 were Israelis, most of the others were ultra-Orthodox Jewish Americans. [KLEYE, S.] The *Detroit Free Press* noted that “ultra-Orthodox Jews served as couriers for a major international drug ring that operated in the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Israel, and the United States ... The syndicate, led by two Israelis living in Europe, was one of the world’s largest producers of the synthetic drug ecstasy.” [DET FR PRESS, 10-13-99, p. 59] The ring circulated tons of drugs, including cocaine and heroin. [DUDKEVITCH, M., p. 1] A few months earlier, “seven men were indicted in Brooklyn for allegedly operating an international drug ring that relied on Hasidic couriers dressed in black hats, dark suits, and side curls.” [HAYS, T., 7-23-99, p. A8] The key six Israelis arrested in this Ecstasy ring included Igal Malka, Yariv Azulay, Oshri Ganchrski, Eyal Levy, Robert Levy, and Oshri Amar. They were caught with 300,000 tablets on-hand, worth an estimated $7.5 million; 100,000 pills a week were funneled by the gang into the New York metropolitan area. [HENRY, M., 2-25-2000, p. A1]

As a Miami newspaper noted:

“In its June 1999 Drug Intelligence brief about Ecstasy, the DEA [Drug Enforcement Administration] states that Israeli organized crime syndicates (some composed of Russian-Jewish immigrants to Israel who maintain ties to Russian mobsters) are the ‘primary’ source of Ecstasy for distribution in the United States.” [KISSELL, T., 9-30-99]

The next year, in 2000, 25 people (including Las Vegas strippers and cocktail waitresses) were arrested in another Ecstasy drug ring, which smuggled the drugs from Paris into the United States. This group was headed by Jacob Orgad,
an Israeli living in Los Angeles. “His people seemed to have a presence in every major city where Ecstasy is the rage,” noted U.S. Customs investigating agent Fred Walsh. [JERUSALEM POST, 6-15-2000, p. 5] “Prosecutors,” noted the New York Post, “charge Jacob Orgad, 45, sold hundreds of thousands of pills to Israeli national Ilan Zarger.” [FRANCESCANI, C., 6-28-01] The same year the Associated Press noted the results of a survey by Partnership for a Drug-free America which found, the “use of ecstasy… has doubled among [American] teens since 1995 … One in 10 teens had experimented with the drug.” [MCS-HANE, L., 11-27-2000, p. 3A]

In 2001, it was reported that

“an Israeli [Oded Tuito] described as a major international smuggler of the drug Ecstasy is in custody in Spain awaiting a court decision on an American request for his extradition … Spanish newspapers reported that Tuito ran a massive smuggling operation in Europe, Israel, and the United States … Israeli crime syndicates with links to Russian mobs are the primary source of Ecstasy smuggled into the United States, according to the DEA.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS/HAARETZ, 5-23-01]

The New York Post noted that Tuito hired strippers to ferry drugs to America from Europe:

“Scores of nude dancers from across the country were recruited as couriers in Tuito’s ecstasy-smuggling army … An Israeli national named Sean Erez, allegedly tutored by Tuito in ecstasy smuggling, had risen through the ranks of Tuito’s drug mob … [Erez] hired Hasidic high school boys … These are kids who spend hours a day in the synagogue … Federal Judge Leo Glasser … sentenced nearly a dozen local Hasidic men … In March, Miami authorities busted a 71-year-old retired Queens tailor [also Jewish: Machloof Ben-Chitrit] allegedly ferrying more than 36 pounds of pills from Paris in his luggage.”  
[FRANCESCANI, C., 5-5-01]

In July, 20001, yet two more Israeli ecstasy kingpins were busted in America. David Roash and Israel Ashkenazi were arrested “in Manhattan on drug possession charges after police seized more than a million Ecstasy tablets, the largest drug bust in New York City history.” [Emphasis added] The pills weighed 450 pounds and had a street value of $40 million. [RADLER, M., 7-20-2001] In November 2001, German police “arrested two Israelis [Uzi Gutman and Yosef Raphaelovitz] unloading a truck that contained 1.5 million Ecstasy pills, capping a long drug investigation by German, Dutch, Australian, and Israeli police into international Ecstasy trafficking by Israelis.” [SOMMER, A., 1-22-01]

Marijuana? In the 1990s Howard Marks (NOTE: a Jewish identity here is very speculative. Marks, from a Welsh mining town, has a daughter, Myfanwy, who lives in Israel) [CAMPBELL, D., 4-26-95, p. 12] was released from an Indiana prison after only serving seven years of a 25-sentence for his role as a major international drug provider. “At the height of his smuggling operation,” noted a British newspaper, “Mr. Marks was reputedly responsible for the majority of the marijuana smoked in the western world in the 1970s and early 1980s.” [HULL
The head of the United States Drug Enforcement Agency in Miami once called Marks “the Marco Polo of drug trafficking.” He is believed to have successfully shipped about $2 billion-worth of cannabis into the United States in Britain from a variety of countries, including Lebanon, Afghanistan, Columbia, Pakistan, Thailand, and Vietnam. [DENING, P., 9-7-96, p. suppl. 1] Marks once had “43 aliases and 25 companies worldwide as a cover for his drug empire.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 5-4-99]

In 2000, after jumping a $1 million bail in 1988, Steven Wolosky and Mark Gayer were captured and arrested. Both men were on the Justice Department’s 15 Most Wanted Men list. “The Marshal’s office considered these two men to be two of the most wanted people in the country,” said the government investigator and Supervisory Inspector Andre LaBier, “They were major international maritime narcotics traffickers.” The two fugitives were responsible for the importation of over 400,000 pounds of marijuana and hashish into America. Upon bail, the Wolosky and Gayer tried to fake their deaths with a fabricated boating accident. “When the government questioned why Wolosky’s mother had never held funeral services for her son,” noted one newspaper, “the woman’s attorney submitted a declaration from her rabbi suggesting it would be contrary to Jewish faith to hold services without a body.” [MINTZ, H., 3-9-93, p. 3; HAYWARD, M., 6-10-2000, p. A4; WALLACE, B., 6-22-2000, p. A1]


“had started selling grass in the sixties at his high school in Bellaire, Texas, a Houston suburb. By 1983 he had a Ferrari, a BMW, a Chevy Blazer and more money than he could handle. That summer he and his partners had arranged the largest marijuana-smuggling operation of their careers. An oceangoing tug named the Bulldog pushed a refrigerated barge loaded with 280,000 pounds of marijuana from Colombia on a circuitous route that ended in Louisiana … Kalish was in charge of the logistics of the operation, which involved more than one hundred people. That operation netted $15 million to $20 million; other smaller deals that summer brought in another $15 million. The money had stacking up in Kalish’s lakeside house on St. Charlotte Drive in Tampa.” [DINGES, J., 1990, p. 156]

Kadish even became involved in Panama’s politics, economically supporting a presidential candidate he expected would be helpful to Kadish’s drug networking. [DINGES, J., 1990, p. 170]

In 1987, a New Zealand citizen, Lorraine Cohen, was sentenced to death in Malaysia for “trafficking in 140.76 grams of heroin.” Her son, Aaron was sentenced to life imprisonment for 34.14 grams. International human rights groups protested the harsh sentences and after a few years in prison, they were both released. [SHUIB, S., 9-2-87] In 2001, in England, Philip Lyons was sentenced for “laundering the proceeds of numerous heroin and ecstasy deals and
then send[ing] the money to Spain.” Just between February and March 6, 2001, Lyons laundered two million pounds. [KAYE, J., 11-26-01]

In 1997, *Agence France Presse* noted a now common pattern of Jews, diamonds, and drugs in Belgium:

“The Flemish city of Antwerp has lost some of its sparkle as the world’s diamond capital after a series of financial scandals linked the trade here with the murky underworld of drugs and mafia. The scandal came to light after one of the diamond merchants’ most reputed banks, the Max Fischer, went bust last January … amid allegations of fraud and laundering of drug money.” [PINON]

Others caught in the scams included three executives at *United Diamonds*, four directors of a company called *EetH*, and a “Lebanese” diamond dealer. “The spate of scandals,” noted the *Presse*, “fueled persistent rumors that the Russian mafia had infiltrated Antwerp.” [PINON] “The rumors are mixing up unrelated events in a way that could be damaging to the diamond sector,” insisted an Antwerp lawyer (who requested anonymity), “… If this climate persists [diamond dealers] could be tempted by the advantage offered by the Tel Aviv market [and leave Belgium].” [PINON]

As Guy Dunn, a scholar on organized crime, notes:

“Antwerp’s port has a reputation for being a major smuggling base. The city’s diamond dealers, many of them Russian Jews, have links to many Russian gangs and are allegedly among the world’s most experienced in the art of laundering money and dodging taxes. Several Russian groups have been uncovered recently, among them a group head by Boris N. [Nayfield?], a leading mafia boss, who was charged with racketeering, drug trafficking, conspiracy to murder, and association with Russian Jewish criminal groups. In 1989-93 N’s group was centered on companies owned by Antwerp Russians, as well as affiliates in Moscow, Berlin, Odessa, and Warsaw. He was heavily involved in laundering money illegally obtained through drugs and arms smuggling.” [DUNN, G., 1996, p. 81]

In 1998, the (London) *Independent*, noting that the year before “police made a series of raids on diamond businesses suspected of tax evasion and money laundering,” announced that

“the Orthodox Jewish community [in London] has been shocked by a series of arrests of its members for alleged heroin smuggling. Police and customs inquiries are centering on a drugs link between Israel, Antwerp, and London … Evidence of the new drugs link follows the professional execution on an Antwerp street last week of a Jewish jeweler and leading figure in the Russian mafia. A Talmudic scholar was also accused in Tel Aviv this month of laundering drug money.” [LASHMAR, p. 3]

Dror Hazenfratz – carrying both an Israeli passport and a Belgian identity card – was arrested with 15 kilograms of heroin worth well over a million dollars. He appeared in British court “wearing traditional dress and carrying the Talmud … The ultimate destination of the drugs was reputedly David Santini,
a Glaswegian who, at the time, was Scotland’s leading heroin dealer.” [LASHMAR, p. 3] Santini was arrested earlier. Other Jews arrested included

“a young man from Antwerp with 10 kg of heroin allegedly concealed in his hire-car. He is awaiting trial. Shortly before, an older man had been arrested at Coquelles at the French entrance to the Channel Tunnel. British customs allegedly found quantities of heroin and cocaine. The man was an American Orthodox Jew living in Stamford Hill. British drug officers suspect they are seeing the beginning of a new drug operation involving Antwerp Orthodox Jews and the Russian mafia.” [LASHMAR, p. 3]

The man who was murdered in Antwerp was Rachmeil Brandwain, “a Jewish trader in precious metals” and “also reputed to be a leading figure in the Russian mafia.” [LASHMAR, p. 3] Brandwain was noted by a British newspaper as “Antwerp’s gangland boss” and “the Antwerp connection to the mobsters of Moscow.” Born in the Ukraine, he was raised in Israel. He was also a philanthropist to the ultra-Orthodox Chabad organization. [HELM, S., 4-21-96] Brandwain ran a company called M&S International and, noted George Weisse, the Commissioner of the U.S. Customs Service,

“was a close associate of Boris Nayfeld, a well-known [Russian-born] criminal who operated out of Brighton Beach in Brooklyn, New York … In the late 1980s, Brandwain was the middleman who helped corrupt Soviet Army officials stationed in East Germany, siphoning more than a billion dollars in illegal deals … Boris Nayfeld and a number of people associated with Brandwain and his companies were arrested smuggling heroin into the United States.” [WEISSE]

In 1999, a newspaper in Scotland noted that a giant earthworks machine had been stolen from a construction site in Glasgow and found in Israel:

“Detectives believe the JCB digger was stolen to order as part of an illegal multi-million pound international trade in which drug dealers use the profits to fund major purchases of hard drugs like heroin and cocaine. Around 30 pieces of heavy machinery have disappeared from British sites during the past two years and the National Crime Squad was called in to lead an inquiry which traced the centre of operation to Israel.” [HERALD, 2-1-99]

From Australia, we have the noteworthy case of Nachum Goldberg, an Orthodox Jew in the Addas Israel congregation, who was busted and sent to prison in 1997. (A Jewish associate, also charged with tax fraud, died before sentencing). Member of an international ring that included diamond merchants in Israel, Belgium, and Sydney, Australia, Goldberg laundered “dirty money” to Israel: an estimated $90 million over 13 years through a bank account set up for a fake organization called United Charity. “Nachum Goldberg,” noted the Sydney Morning Herald, “was a master money launderer, who was helping some of Sydney’s and Melbourne’s ultra-Orthodox Jewish businessmen evade taxes … Most of the money that he laundered came from the sale of diamonds that had been imported illegally into Australia.” Tens of millions of dollars were sent to
his brother, who managed a Bank Leumi branch in Jerusalem. “The strict religious faith of the defendants,” noted the Herald, “was one of the main elements of the plea that the sentences should be lenient and it was one of the main reasons why the judge went easy on the Goldberg family.” Goldberg was given a reduced prison sentence, and his wife and two sons, active players in the scam, were given suspended sentences. [BARRY, P., 10-14-2000]

Joseph Gutnik, a Chabad rabbi and one of the richest men in Australia, even filed

“a libel suit against the magazine Barons and its mother company, Dow Jones. The magazine published an article linking Gutnik’s name with that of Nahum Goldberg, a businessman accused of using an Israeli charity fund to launder money. The article claimed that $24 million had been laundered – Goldberg was found guilty and sentenced to five years in prison. In October 2000 The Age reported that the judge in the Goldberg case had criticized the Israeli government for not being more cooperative with the Australian investigators who were trying to follow the trail of funds through the local banks.” [HANDWERKER, H., 5-15-01]

Elsewhere, in 1997, in Miami, Ludwig Fainberg was accused of especially noteworthy drug-related crimes. A dentist in Russia, he immigrated to Israel, served in its army, and then moved to the United States where he owned Porky’s strip-tease joint. He was arrested for underworld drug activities with suspected middlemen for a Colombia drug cartel. Plans even included a $5 million purchase of a Soviet submarine to smuggle drugs to the United States. A New York Times article did not identify Fainberg as a Jew, nor as an Israeli, but as a “Russian.” “A new element has been added to the [Miami] region’s celebrated mix of two-bit con-artists and Colombian drug lords,” wrote Times reporter Mireya Navarro, “law-enforcement officials say: Russian mobsters are engaged in nationwide illegal activity running from extortion to financial fraud.” Twenty-six such Russian crime organizations have been identified in America by Federal officials, mainly located in New York, Los Angeles, and Miami. Fainberg was believed to head one of them, a man “who was a typical member of the Russian criminal element that in recent years has spread … form its cradle in New York City.” “The Russian criminal mobsters,” one U.S. drug-enforcement official told the Times, “are eager for ‘every way to make a dishonest dollar.” Another said, “They’re good at networking.” [NAVARRO, p, A22]

The international scope of the “Russian mafia” is reflected in recent headlines about the problem: Russian Mafia Making Austria Its Haven (San Francisco Chronicle, 1996), Swedes Face a Russian Invasion (New York Times, 1993), and Russia’s Notorious Mafia Spreads Tentacles of Crime Around the Globe (Christian Science Monitor, 1995). A large number of these Russian crime groups are Jewish in control. In the United States one of their bases is located in the Brighton Beach area of Brooklyn. [ROSNER, p, xi, xii] A 1986 Presidential Commission on Organized Crime report, noted the New York Times, “warned that the Jews from the Soviet Union were among several ethnic-organized crime groups to have emerged recently in this country.” [RAAB] “Some [Russian immigrants
to America] find the free enterprise system difficult to understand,” wrote Newsweek in 1985, “Others end up in the ‘Russian mafia.’” [NEWSWEEK, Ag 19, 85] “In the 1990s,” says Rita J. Simon, “there are reports of extensive organized criminal activities within the Soviet Jewish community, especially in the Los Angeles and Brighton Beach areas of Brooklyn … [SIMON, p. 137] … Terms such as ‘Soviet Jewish Mafia’ are widely used in print and electronic media [This is not true. This author’s extensive research has yet to run across any such term that highlights Jewish involvement. The common nomer is ‘Russian Mafia’ which disguises any Jewish dimension] to describe the activities of these recent immigrants to the United States (especially New York and Los Angeles), parts of Western Europe, and Israel, and of criminals in post-communist Russia. They are believed to be involved in drugs, prostitution (especially in Israel), racketeering, and various forms of illegal activities.” [SIMON, p. 145] “Russian” control of prostitution even exists in Romania. [TANNER]

“It may be too soon,” cautiously wrote Joseph Bensman back in 1986,” to tell whether the … crime [Russian immigrants to the United States] engage in is a means towards gaining the wherewithal to become respectable citizens and white collar criminals, or whether it is to become the base for a new, permanent underclass in American society.” [ROSNER, p. xvii] One informant told a researcher that “more than 50% of the people who live in Brighton are involved in criminal things.” [ROSNER, p. 106] The worst end of criminal activity includes “protection rackets, gambling, confidence schemes, counterfeiting, forgery and sales of license and travel documents, smuggling, burglary, armed robbery, drug and weapon sales, and murder.” [ROSNER, p. 119] “ Brighton Beach,” noted Agence France Presse in 1997, “… has long been home to … the Russian mafia … The Russian mafia has been putting roots down in Brighton since the early 1970s, when then-Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev decided to allow Jewish emigration, said Raymond Kerr, who specializes in Russian organized crime for the FBI.” [BICHON, ONLINE] “A high level of communication” also exists between “criminals in Brighton Beach, Brooklyn, and northeast Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.” [NEW YORK STATE ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE, 1996, p. 180]

In 1986 UPI noted the case of Boris Davidov, who was arrested with $3 million in stolen property. “He had been in this country for seven years,” noted FBI agent Joseph Koletar, “If you come to this country and don’t know many people and don’t know the language and culture and manage to set up a fencing operation of that size, it suggests that he hit the ground running and had some experience before he got to these shores.” [UPI, p. c2]

The reason so many Russian Jews are able to quickly get established in crime in America is that they were experts in this field in the Soviet Union. As scholar Louise Shelley notes:

“In many countries, where organized crime is dominated by different ethnic groups that are precluded from legitimate social mobility, the Jews and Asian groups were significant figures in the shadow economy.” [SHELLEY, L., 1999, p. 85]
This “shadow economy” was the clandestine and illegal goings-on in the Soviet communist world. Shelley’s apologetic myth, that Jews were somehow forced into this realm because of a marginalized existence in Soviet communism, is an expression of the usual Jewish victimhood myth. Jews, as this volume amply evidences, have been omnipresent in the upper echelons of power throughout the Soviet communist hierarchy. And as a 1996 (New York and New Jersey) state investigation into the growing “Russian” crime problem in America noted about “Russian” immigrants to America,”

“Russian émigrés tend to be highly educated. Those who engage in crime are very resourceful and sophisticated in their methods of operation … Unlike the farmers and unskilled laborers who comprised the majority of earlier immigrations to this country, Russian émigrés are generally urban in origin, well-educated, and industrially and technologically skilled. Despite a language barrier, they have marketable skills and have not been closed off from the legitimate ladders of upward mobility. … [Yet] they engage in a variety of frauds, scams and swindles because those are the kinds of crimes that most closely build upon their previous experience in the former Soviet Union. Unlike their ethnic predecessors in crime, Russian émigrés do not have to go through any developmental or learning process to break into the criminal world in this country. They are able to begin operating almost immediately upon their arrival.” [NEW YORK STATE ORGANIZED CRIME FORCE, 1996, p. 180, 184-185]

The above description of an urbanized, educated, entrepreneurial group, prone to unethical economical activity towards self-advancement, is a classical explication of the historical Jewish strata.

Among the various “ethnic” groups that are members of the “Russian” mafia are those from the former Soviet area called Georgia. Jews are well-represented among this group too, and, with a long tradition of criminal underworld behavior, were primed to continue this in other countries. Menachem Amir notes what happened when these Jews from Georgia moved to Israel:

“These new immigrants arrived by the thousands in the mid-1970s. In 1980-82 there were repeated reports in the [Israeli] media and in police statements that among the Georgian Jews were ‘special’ types of criminals, engaged in ‘big and serious’ crimes, which they had previously practiced in Georgia … What became a hallmark or specialty of Georgian criminal organizations, however, was their control, by the use of violence, of carting and hauling services at air and sea ports. They used this position for large-scale theft of passengers’ luggage, as well as theft from cargo planes and anchored ships. In addition, there were reports of grand scale thefts from warehouses, sophisticated frauds of religious objects and diamonds, counterfeiting of money and documents (drivers’ licenses and professional diplomats), and large-scale fencing.” [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 28]
Amir further notes formal Israeli anthropological studies into the Georgian Jewish crime community. These investigations concluded that the Georgians’ “original normative system” of crime “favored their immediate entrance and persistence into organized criminality and organized crime.” The results of fifteen years of Israeli efforts to dissuade Jewish Georgians from crime were a “success” only to the degree that they left Israel and had “continued their criminal activities in their new ‘places’ while maintaining criminal relations with their brethren who remain in Israel (e.g., contraband goods, drugs, laundering money or distributing counterfeit money, produced in Israel [and] in Europe.” [AMIR, M., 1996, p. 29-30]

In explaining to the United States Senate the workings of the “Russian Mafia,” two of the top three crime groups cited by an undercover police agent were expressly noted to have links to Israel:

1) Izmailovskaya organization. This is based in Moscow and is several thousand members strong. Its leaders reside in Russia and Israel. The group uses quasi-military ranks and is very strict in disciplining its members. It is involved extensively in murder-for-hire, extortions, and infiltration of legitimate businesses.

2) Solntsevskaya organization. This is based in Moscow. Its leaders reside in Russia, Central Europe, and Israel. The group is active in extortion, infiltration of legitimate businesses, counterfeiting, and the trafficking in illegal drugs.” [US, COMM, PERM, p. 201] This crime gang is “the largest mafia organization in Russia.” [DUNN, G., 1996, p. 81] It is headed by Jewish mogul Sergei Mikhailov. [BONNER, B., 11-16-00]

In 1997 Agence France Presse reported that in Geneva “suspected Mafia godfather, Sergei Mikhailov, had been questioned for four hours by a Russian police officer, prosecutors said here Friday … Before the interrogation, Mikhailov was questioned for 11 hours by two Israeli police officers about illegal immigration to the Jewish state … ‘Mikhas’ was carrying an Israeli passport when he was arrested in Switzerland. He is said to be linked to the Solntsevskaya, an organization named after a Moscow neighborhood.” [AGENCE FRANCE, 1997]

It may be that the aforementioned Senate testifier merely neglected Jewish/Israeli pre-eminence in the third Russian crime family. As the New York Review of Books noted in November 2000 in a review of the book The Russian Mafiya:

“Of all the nations where the Russian mob has established a presence, none has been more deeply compromised than the State of Israel,” [author Robert] Friedman writes, adding that the Russian mafia has ‘become a grave threat to the stability of Israel.’ Although this may be a bit hyperbolic, the Russian mafia does have a strong, safe base in Israel – a story that American and Israeli journalists have largely overlooked. One FBI report observes, for example, that most members of [Jewish crime boss Semion] Mogilevich’s criminal organization have Israeli passports. And Jonathan Winer told Friedman (when Winer was still the State Department’s crime expert), ‘There is not a major Russian organized crime
figure whom we are tracking who does not also carry an Israeli passport.” [BONNER, R., 11-16-01]

Another testifier before the Senate subcommittee, an Italian “Colombia family” Mafioso figure, described his crime contacts with the Russian Mafia, represented to him by Michael Markowitz, David Bogatin, and Lev Persits, men “in a position of leadership [who] had about 200 other Russians working under them in various capacities. They were also continuously assisting other Russians in immigrating to the United States.” [US, COMM, _Perm_, p. 39] Another, a representative of the Italian Mafia Lucchese family, noted that “I know of Russian criminals in this country who ship guns and cocaine back to Russia. These men have beautiful offices in Rockefeller Center and Beverly Hills and look like legitimate businessmen. They run import-export businesses funded by the mafia over in Moscow.” [US, COMM, _Perm_, p. 51] Two New York City police detectives, Daniel Mackey and Ralph Cefarrello, testified that “Brighton Beach is also a hub for Russian-born criminals with a well-deserved reputation for extreme violence. Their criminal activities include vicious murders and assaults, extortion of Russian-owned businesses, prostitution, illegal gambling, and a vast collection of frauds and schemes that ravage the economy, causing government, businesses, and consumers millions of dollars.” [US, COMM, _Perm_, p. 54]

The aforementioned Markowitz, Bogatin and Persits were partners in a range of criminal activities, particularly a noteworthy enterprise in fuel racketeering (collectively, a scam that costs the U.S. government about $1 billion a year). [NEW YORK STATE ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE, 1996, p. 185] Markowitz, originally from Rumania, eventually immigrated to Israel and later to the United States. Bogatin came from Russia. Persits “was one of the important ‘Russian’ gangsters from the now notorious Brighton Beach section of Brooklyn.” “The most important broker” that bonded the Bogatin-Markowitz relationship was also Jewish, lawyer Marvin Kramer, “a Brooklyn attorney with a reputation for gritty personal injury litigation.” An associate of Kramer’s, Phil Moskowitz, had about a dozen arrests going back to 1947. An accountant for Moskowitz, Shelly Fishman, “created false financial assessments.” Joe Skolnik also became an associate in the ring. “Corrupt banker” David Goldberg was also on Persits’ payroll. [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 161-162, 164]

Persits, notes Alan Block,

“primarily worked with Marat Balagula, once called the Russian ‘Godfather’ … [He] sprinted to the top of the émigré underworld in Brighton Beach … He formed a fuel distributorship called Mallard with Lev Naum, originally from Kiev, Efrem Nezhinski, and Carlos Orsini. [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 165]

Other Jewish associates in this criminal netherworld include Boris (a “fairly typical heroin dealer”) [BONNER, R., 11-16-01] and Benjamin Nayfield, Evsei Agron (“the most notorious Russian organized crime figure in New York until he was gunned down”), Ilia Zeltzer, Michael Vax, and Efim Laskin. [Block, A., 1996, p. 166] Jewish lawyer Robert Eisenberg became a “sort of ‘consigliere’” for Marat Balagula. Another player, also Jewish, in this network was Brooklyn Sur-
rogate Court Judge Bernard Bloom, “who was both corrupt and close to [New York governor] Cuomo.” For $50,000 Bloom’s office helped mob boss Balagula untangle from some restrictive legalities. [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 172]

Then there is Shabtai Kalmanovich, who, in Russia, “has a reputation as a major mobster.” [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 167] Kalmanovich, continues Jewish scholar Alan Block, is a “mysterious Russian/Israeli gangster and KGB spy, who was … wanted in the United States for a bank fraud in North Carolina … He took over [the African country of] Sierra Leone, which had a fairly large Russian Jewish community since the days when the country had aligned itself with the Soviet Union … All that was really left [in Sierra Leone] were diamonds, Sierra Leone’s most profitable natural resource. And Kalmanovitch and his cronies looted them with abandon. Kalmanovich’s relationship with [fellow Jewish Russian gangster] Balagula was leavened through his association to some other strange bedfellows who were close to the Hasidic community in New York’s Rockland County, the heart of [Jewish senator Benjamin] Gilman’s district. Rabbi Ron Greenwald was one, Bill Davidson another. Davidson’s wife was Balagula’s secretary.” (Greenwald was also an agent for worldwide Jewish American criminal Marc Rich). [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 166-167]

In 2000, the Jerusalem Post noted another Russian Jewish criminal kingpin: “recently, there were reports that the FBI had identified commodities trader Semyon (Sam) Kislin, a generous donor to Jewish and Israeli causes and to the campaign of [New York] mayor Rudolf Giuliani, as a member of a Brooklyn-based Russian crime syndicate.” [HENRY, M., 1-13-00, p. 3]

In 1995, the Official Kremlin International News Broadcast reported on a press briefing by the Interior Ministry about the Russian Mafia. Vladimir Ovichitsky, identified as a Russian “expert on organized crime busting” noted that, in terms of the ethnic dimensions of the problem,

“when mention is made of the Russian mafia in the United States, reference actually is made to the Jewish community on Brighton Beach.” [OKINB]

In 1983 Mike Mallowe described the growing American problem in the Philadelphia Inquirer. He calls the Russian criminal elements “a new mafia,” and “Malina”:

“It is an international conspiracy that will engage in any crime for the right price … In the early 1960s, according to one top secret FBI analysis, members of the Malina began to emigrate from Russia to Israel, where they re-established their criminal networks. Over the years these Israeli hoods branched out from Tel Aviv to other cities, including London, Paris, Antwerp, Vienna, Rome, New York, and Los Angeles. Some members of the Malina brotherhood really are Russian Jews. Others have merely purchased false identities of Russian Jews … Most … are first class international criminals.” [ROSNER, p. 120]
“The Organizatsiya,” the Commissioner of U.S. Customs told Congress in 1996, “has been in operation in the United States since the middle 1970s with the first influx of Jewish émigrés from the FSU. The true structure, size, and operational components of the Organizatsiya are not entirely known since there is limited available intelligence, investigative and source information.” [WEISSE] In 1986 Daniel Burstein wrote in *New York magazine* about the home of the “Russian” mafia in America, Brighton Beach:

“Over 100,000 Soviets have come to the United States. The overwhelming majority were Jews … By and large, the Russians … favor … white-collar crimes like credit card fraud, counterfeiting, and gas bootlegging.” [BURSTEIN, p. 40]

“One of the foundations on which the Russians are believed to have built their foreign operations,” noted London’s *Independent* in 1996, “are the old criminal structures run by mostly Jewish émigrés from the Soviet Union living among Russian communities in cities like Antwerp, New York and Tel Aviv.” [REEVES, p. 11]

Veiling the Jewish crime element, in 1982, *United Press International* reported that “spies and criminals” were flooding into the United States “disguised as Jewish immigrants.” [BARABAK] The *New York Times* noted that Jewish organizations were “angered by a police report speculating that the Kremlin was sending hardened criminals to the United States through abuse of the Soviet Jewish refugee quotas.” [NY TIMES, p. A14] This is one way to spare the Jewish community unwanted (but very merited) attention for their very serious share of this “Russian” Mafia problem (i.e., asserting that leading criminals living in the tightly-knit Russian Jewish community are somehow not Jewish). A 1996 investigation (co-sponsored by the New York State Organized Crime Task Force, the New York State Commission of Investigation, and the New Jersey Commission of Investigation) dismissed popular myths that Russian officials had intentionally implanted criminals into the Jewish immigration rush to America, that the KGB had interests in sowing Jewish migration with non-Jewish Soviet criminals, or that “members of organized crime groups in Odessa, Ukraine, had smuggled themselves out of the country by assuming the identities of Soviet-Jews who were either dead or in jail.” As the report noted:

“For several reasons, all of these explanations proved inadequate … The actual number of known Russian-emigre criminals who entered the United States in the 1970s and 1980s, either with or without the consent of Soviet officials, was relatively small and, in general, their crimes have been very localized…. History has shown that the growth of organized crime in any community is invariably linked to the recent migration into that community by ethnic groups having weak ties to the dominant political culture.” [NEW YORK ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE, 1996, p. 183]

Another way to spare the Jewish community attention for its contribution to a new form of American crime network is to vaguely and generically call Brighton Beach, as one reporter did, simply an “ethnic neighborhood.” [GIB-
SON, p. A1] The old reliable standby too, is the American mass media’s blanket injunction against naming Jewish criminals who largely function within Jewish networks as Jewish criminals. Another way to guide public attention away from Jewish criminality was the way it was attempted in March 1997 when “Russian American leaders” in Los Angeles called a press conference to argue that there is no such thing as a “Russian mafia” and that it only reinforces negative stereotypes. Principal complainants included Si Frumkin, chairman of the Southern California Council for Soviet Jews, and Eugene Levin, President of the Association of Soviet Jewish Emigres. [GOLD, B13]

Meanwhile, also in 1997, the “Russian mafia” that doesn’t exist was creating such criminal havoc in Israel that an Israel Radio poll found that a third of the Israelis surveyed were “frightened” by Russian immigrants to Israel; 60% of those questioned even believed that further immigration from Russia should be discouraged. Natan Sharansky, former poster boy for American Jewish demands upon the Russian government to allow Jews to move to the Jewish state, called the poll “the saddest thing that’s happened to me in the ten years I’ve been in Israel.” [COHEN, A.] In 1996, the Israeli government “identified a list of 35 major crime bosses from Russia and Ukraine who had established a presence in Israel and were laundering the proceeds of their European operations.” [TRENDS IN ORGANIZED CRIME, SUMMER 1999]

Incessant Jewish strangleholds used to veil the profound Jewish significance in the “Russian” mafia and other organized crime in the western world may be discerned in an obscure 1986 news item when the President’s Commission on Organized Crime issued a 250 page document supposedly detailing “the full scope of organized crime in America.” [SANTOS] Both the UPI and Reuters wire services took note of an extraordinary crack in the Jewish lobby’s seams by half of the document’s creators, after the formal report was issued:

“In a departure, nine of the 18 commissioners issued a critical statement charging the commission’s history ‘is a saga of missed opportunity.’ It criticized the commission for poor management of time, money, and staff and said it ignored many areas, including the roles of American blacks and Jewish organizations in organized crime.” [SANTOS]

A defender of this final report was the commission’s Jewish chairman: Irving Kaufman. [MOLDEA, p. 348]

As always, Jews – even here – are afforded a hiding place, at least partially, in the underclass Black man’s shadow. Why – and how – such an important issue as international Jewish crime (widespread crime even networked through distinctly Jewish religious institutions) was forcibly “ignored,” we can well understand. But it is amazing that the censorship was so great and meaningful that half the commissioners felt the moral need for this public complaint, however muffled, and little passed on.

One of the dissenters on the commission cited a nine-hour meeting held before releasing the final report, and said: “Leaving [Jewish Hollywood-based lawyer connected to the criminal underworld Sidney] Korshak out of the final report was no accident. A conscious decision was made to leave out any reference to him,
This veiling of Jewish crime comes in various guises. In 1995 a Jewish author, Stephen Handelman, wrote a book about the Russian mafia. He concedes that “a number of prominent black marketers and businessmen were Jewish and police found evidence tying international gem swindlers to joint ventures owned by Russians who had immigrated to Israel. A former Russian who became an Israeli citizen had signed the shipment of Colombian cocaine that was discovered at Vyborg in 1993 and, according to police, the ikon-smuggling trade was dominated by Russian Jewish émigrés in Vienna and Frankfurt.” [HANDELMAN, p. 301] But Handelman argues that most of the Russian mafia are Slavs, never addressing the Jewish prominence in the upper echelons of the Mafia and the fact of its enormous Jewish overrepresentation (Jews make up merely one percent of the Russian population). Handelman routinely dismisses the comments he garnered in an interview with former KGB official Aleksander Sterligov, an expert on the subject of Russian crime, one of the “senior experts in counterintelligence,” and chief investigator of “corruption in the Ministry of Internal Affairs,” as merely expressions of anti-Semitism:

“General Sterligov told me that Jews were responsible for the corruption of local governments. ‘They are always trying to push out the Russians and seeking the dominant positions … Even an ancient Russian city like Nizhni Novogorod has been completely destroyed because it is run by a Jewish administration.’” [HANDELMAN, p. 301]

“As corruption and crime spread through post-communist society,” decides Handelman, “it became easier to blame the nation’s problems on the traditional scapegoats of Russian nationalism – Jews and other ethnic minorities.” [HANDELMAN, p. 301]

This is a curious accusation, given the fact that Handelman himself feels comfortable in addressing an introductory senior mafia figure in the book by the criminal’s supposed nickname: “the Armenian,” hence slurring an entire community. (Might we imagine such a parallel character to introduce a book on world crime addressed as “the Jew?” On a much lesser level, a rare fluke: in 1998 “one of five mob figures” in Youngstown, Ohio, was noted by the Associated Press with his nickname: “Bernard ‘Bernie the Jew’ Altshuler.”) [WELSH-HUGGINS, 11-29-98] The essence of Handelman’s worldview, however, like virtually any Jewish author on such a subject, may be understood by glancing at his volume’s index for a moment. There we find that all pages (p. 300-303, 310, and 311) under the heading “Jew” exactly correspond to those under the heading “Anti-Semitism.” In other words, one way or another, the subject of the Jewish relationship to the Russia mafia, no matter what the evidence, is never discussed without the standard contextual qualifier to diffuse Jewish responsibility: anti-Semitism, i.e., virtually anything anyone said to the author about
Jews involved in the Russian crime world must be ultimately framed as baseless, prejudicial, irrational, and wrong. And the notion of some kind of “conspiracy,” which is of course central to organized crime, is categorically dismissed.

In 2000, the Houston Chronicle published a frank appraisal of an unusually honest new book, the Red Mafiya, by author Robert Friedman. As the Chronicle noted,

“An American of Russian Jewish descent, Friedman is remarkably well positioned to report on the [Russian] Mafiya, since most Mafiya members are themselves Russian Jews. This curious fact owes its origin to the efforts, during the Nixon administration, of Democratic Senator Henry ‘Scoop’ Jackson to link trade concessions with Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union … While the Italian Mafia has a singular link between Italy and America, the Russian Mafiya is more international. Ironically, in a Jewish transit camp near Rome, many Russian-Jewish career criminals met, exchanged information and departed … The Russians seem crazier in their violence than do the Italians. While the Mafia uses violence to punish enemies surgically, the Mafiya will kill the enemy, his wife, his children, and his friends, both as a theatrical warning to competitors and for the sheer joy of bloody, tyrannical violence … Now 30 Russian crime syndicates are operating in at least 17 U.S. cities.” [ALFORD, S., 5-14-2000, p. 15]

And public examination of this very criminal core through expressly Jewish networks? It is systematically hidden by Jewish lobbying pressure and media influence, carefully defaming “Russians” at-large as corrupt. As Robert Friedman notes, “Because the Russian mob is mostly Jewish, it was a political hot potato, especially in the New York area.” [ALFORD, S., 5-14-2000, p. 15]

“Is there a Russian mafia?” asked Lt. Robert Cook, commander of the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department’s organized crime unit, in the article about Jewish complaints about Russian Jewish stereotypes in Los Angeles, “I think that’s been well documented.” [GOLD, B13] So well documented that eight months later the Los Angeles Times noted that

“the Colombians are finding their most reliable drug partner in Europe is the Russian mafia … ‘The Russian mafia has set itself up on the Caribbean islands so as to be able to contact the Colombians,’ said General Rosso Serrano, commander of the Colombian police … More than two dozen Russian banks have offices on the island of Antigua, raising questions about why so many faraway financial institutions would have so much interest in such a small island.” [DARLING, p.14]

The Jerusalem Post had this observation about Antigua in 1991:

“Take a small Caribbean island, add an unscrupulous Israeli adventurer with a melon farm, and sprinkle it with Israeli ex-army types, including a brigadier general. Have them take over the place by bribery and corruption, then use the island to sell small arms to Colombian drug dealers. These are the embarrassing findings of the recently published Official Re-
port of the Commission of Inquiry by the Governor General of Antigua and Barbuda, Sir Wilfred Jacobs.” [MORGENSTERN]

In 1989, a Colombian presidential candidate, Luis Carlos Gallin, was assassinated by members of the Medellin drug ring. Only months earlier the Colombian government had lodged protests to the Israeli government about Israeli Yair Klein, who had been found to be training the drug cartel in paramilitary techniques. The Colombian government, notes the Jerusalem Post, “could not have imagined that, as they were making the complaints, a plot was being hatched to supply 100 Uzis, 400 Galil rifles, and 200,000 rounds of ammunition to the drug cartels [by the Israeli Military Industries (IMG) company – the commercial wing of Israel’s Defense Ministry].” [MORGENSTERN] An August 1989 Reuters report noted that

“Colombian drug traffickers … declared ‘total’ war on the Bogota government Thursday and blew up the offices of the country’s two main political parties in the drug capital, Medellin. As the group known as the ‘Extraditables’ also threatened journalists, judges, business and trade union leaders, Israel Thursday dissociated itself from its citizens, reported to be working for the Medellin drug cartel.” [KARP]

The president of the Russian Jewish Congress, Vladimir Gusinksy, also owner of another prominent Russian bank called Most, is widely reported (even in Israel) [COHEN, A.] to have likely Russian crime connections. [Gusinsky is also a major Russian media tycoon and will be further discussed in a later section]. The chairman of the board of Gusinsky’s bank is Boris Hait, who is also a vice-president of the Russian Jewish Congress. (In 2001, another deputy of the Russian Jewish Congress, Mikhail Mirlashvili, was “arrested in St. Petersburg and charged with kidnapping two people.”) [COCKBURN, P., 1-25-01] Mikhail Friedman, chairman of Russia’s Alpha Bank and Vitali Malkin, president of the Rossiiski Kredit Bank, are Russian Jewish Congress vice-presidents. Andrei Rappoport, chairman of Alpha Bank, is also an RJC board member. Of these RJC officials, Gusinsky, Hait, Friedman, and Malkin were listed in 1995 by a Moscow newspaper as among the twenty richest men in Russia. [KRICHESKGY, Around, p. 1] Other Jewish bankers and financiers at the very top of Russian society include Mikhail Khodorovsky and Pyotr Aven, among others. With the fall of communism and the resultant struggles for power, the nature of the banking business in Russia is extremely precarious, deeply embedded in organized crime. Over a four year period in the 1990s there were assassination attempts upon 116 bankers; 79 were killed and 36 wounded. [HOFFMAN, D., Russian, p. A1] Gusinsky alone has a 1,000-man “private security force,” directed by a former general in the KGB. [COHLER-ESSES, p. 13]

As Phil Williams notes about the scope of the “Russian” mafia:

“In August 1995 the MVD All-Russian Scientific Research Institute estimated that criminal groups control over 400 banks and 47 exchanges. An even more pessimistic assessment was made by professor Lydia Krasfavina, head of the Institute for Banking and Finance Managers,
who estimated that 70 to 80 percent of private banks in Russia are controlled by organized crime.” [WILLIAMS, P., 1996, p. 1-27]

In 1999, Edmond Safra, fabulously wealthy and secretive Jewish banker/financier and owner of the international Republic Bank, died in a fire of suspicious circumstances. Although the cause of the blaze was determined to have been an employee, the London Daily Telegraph noted that there had been “reports that the Russian mafia had issued a contract for his murder.” [GRAVES/NUNDY, p. 13]

In testimony during hearings before a subcommittee of the United States Congress in 1996, one expert on Russian crime said

“I would reiterate that Russian organized crime is more involved in the banking sector than most other organized crime groups. Research within Russia reveals a very high presence of organized crime in either the organization of [the] banking sector, the management, or in influencing the banking sector.” [US, COMM, INT’L, p. 35]

“Organized crime groups in Russia,” another expert told Congress, “have more control over the banking sector than their compatriots in other countries. Hundreds of banks are controlled by organized crime facilitating money laundering abroad for Russian groups and providing a service for foreign crime groups. Organized crime’s domination of the banking industry is the biggest impediment to economic growth…” [US, COMM, INT’L, p. 77]

Banking throughout the world, and throughout history, has always had a high Jewish involvement. Among the most sinister Russian Jewish thugs today is Semion Mogilevich, who the Village Voice headlined in 1998 as the “world’s most dangerous gangster.” Mogilevich, with a base in Brighton Beach, has also acquired Israeli citizenship and reportedly runs international “torture,” prostitution, and drug rings. He heads a criminal group called the Red Mafia, of which “many of the organization’s 250 members are his relatives.” [FRIEDMAN, THE WORLD’S, p. 43] They also trade in illegal nuclear materials and legally purchased “the entire Hungarian armaments industry.” [FRIEDMAN, THE WORLD’S, p. 43] He also “bought a string of nightclubs in Prague, Riga, and Kiev known as the ‘black and white clubs’ which became notorious centers of prostitution ... After the breakup of the Soviet Union [he] is reputed to control almost everything that passes in and out of Sheremetyevo Airport, Moscow’s principal international terminal.” [BINYON]

In 1999 Mogilevech turned up again in the news. The International Monetary Fund was embroiled in controversy when it was discovered that billions of dollars lent to the Russian government had been laundered into private hands. The Wall Street Journal called it “one of the biggest money-laundering schemes to be uncovered in the United States.” [WSJ, 8-30-99, p. 8] The Jewish-centered scandal (never publicly named as such) broke at the Bank of New York where Lucy Edwards (originally named Ludmilla Pritzker; married to Jewish Russian banker Peter Berlin, a reputed Mogilevech lieutenant” [GOLDBERG, JJ, 9-3-99]) and Natasha Garfinkel Kagalovsky were placed “on unpaid leave while in-
vestigations continued. Both women are beloved to work in the bank’s Eastern Europe department and are married to Russians. The central character in the investigation [is] Mogilevch.” [GARTH, A.]

“The IMF,” notes Jonathan Steele, “found itself pouring millions into Russia simply to protect the value of the ruble and western banks … Konstantin Kagalovsky [also Jewish] served from 1992 to 1995 as the link man [for the Russian government] to the IMF. Now vice-president of Yukos oil, he has been in the news this month because it was through the accounts which his wife managed at the Bank of New York that millions of dollars from Russia flowed.” [STEELE, p. 8] Kagalovsky was a former executive at Bank Menatep, “one of Russia’s largest banks.” This bank was controlled by Mikhail Khodorkovsky, also Jewish (whose “internet bank” based in Antigua was called by some regulators “a scam”). [O’BRIEN/BONNER, 8-18-96, p. 32]

Mogilevich, noted the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles, is “the central suspect in an international bank-fraud that investigators term the biggest in money-laundering history. … Mogilevich’s mob is said to be the largest and most dangerous criminal organization to emerge from the backdrop of the Soviet Union … Most of its members are Jewish … Cash movements began just before the August 1998 ruble devaluation that led to Russian financial crisis … Others whose names have surfaced in the mushrooming probe include several so-called ‘oligarchs,’ the business tycoons, many of them Jewish, who control much of post-communist Russia’s privatized industry.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, 9-3-99] (Those noted by the Journal were Jewish tycoons Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Boris Berezovsky, and Vladimir Goussinsky. More about them, their links to the “Russian mafia,” and their influence in the Russian mass media, in the Mass Media chapter, p. 1333. In 1998, Berezovsky’s daughter Yelizaveta was arrested for cocaine possession in St. Petersburg). [BADKHEN, A., 5-15-98] (In 2002, Catya Sassoon, daughter of famous Jewish hair mogul Vidal Sassoon, “died of a suspected drug overdose after a New Year’s Eve party.”) [AKBAR, A., 1-5-02]

“All told, Mogilevich’s mob may have looted as much as $15 billion from the Russian economy in the last few years.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, 9-3-99]

Another Jewish link in the gigantic economic bleeding of Russia is Israeli-born Bruce Rappaport. As the New York Times noted,

“At the intersection of illicit Russian money and the Bank of New York is Bruce Rappaport, a Swiss banker who has had brushes with governmental investigators in the past … Most recently, Mr. Rappaport’s bank [Bank of New York-Inter Maritime] was sued by the Justice Department in 1997, to recover proceeds that the Government asserted was from drug sales that had been deposited in the Bank of New York-Maritime in the Caribbean Island of Antigua by a known money-launderer … Rappaport … was recently appointed Antigua’s Ambassador to Russia. Antigua … has been a major center of Russian money-laundering for years.” [O’BRIEN/BONNER, 8-22-99]
In the late 1980s, Rappaport’s wife, Ruth, was head of the Geneva chapter of the Women’s International Zionist organization. [GREENHOUSE, S., 2-4-1988, p. 16]

Central involvement in the spectacular theft of vast sums of Russia government money was not a first for Jewish swindlers, even in the 1990s. The Jerusalem Report, in 1993, noted that “A Jewish businessman, an alleged spy [for Israel], is in the middle of a scandal that is shaking Moscow’s fragile regime.” The man in question was Boris Yosefovich Birshtein, head of the Seabeko Group. As the Israeli journal noted:

“Seabeko, according to a KGB report obtained by the Jerusalem Report, was used by leaders of the former Soviet Union as a conduit to steal millions.” [LESSER, A., 9-23-93]

Stolen money was deposited in Switzerland accounts. Past Birshtein business partners included Jewish Americans David Katz and David Tzebel. Among Birshtein’s more recent associates was Dmitry Yakubovsky, also Jewish, who lives today in a $5.2 million home in suburban Toronto. Israeli Binyamin Keret, the head of a company called Trade Links, was also a Birshtein partner. “Birsh-tein, according to the KGB report, is a Mossad [Israeli spy] agent, as was Keret … Diplomatic sources quote government officials as saying he was being run on the Russian side by Mikhail Potoranin, one of [Russian prime minister Boris] Yeltsin’s closest aides.” [LESSER, A., 9-23-93]

Moving along, in 1987, Israelis Moshe Shtrowise, Ishack Ferman, and Asher Sivan were arrested for smuggling drugs into England. [HUNTER, LINK, p. 6] In 1995, Barry Rider, a Jew, the dean of England’s Jesus College at Cambridge University, and “an academic who has been involved for the last ten years in crime research,” presented a controversial “anti-Semitic” paper to Great Britain’s Houses of Parliament. The (Jewish) Forward noted that the report “highlighted a rising tide of organized crime among Britain’s Jewish community – much of it connected with Israelis living in Britain. According to the report, English Jews are helping to launder Mafia money. It also claims that some Jews are involved in racketeering and protection rackets and that they are ready to resort to criminal violence. Many observers are coming to accept that there is a growing class of Jewish criminals in Britain, particularly among the 27,000 Israelis now settled in the country … Israeli drug gangs … have carved out a large slice of the narcotics trade … in recent years.” [SHAMASH, p. 2]

An unnamed senior government prosecutor told the Forward that “some of the biggest drug dealers in Britain are Israelis based at London’s most prestigious addresses” and are involved “in importing millions of pounds of heroin and cocaine.” [SHAMASH, p. 2] In 2001, on another front, Philip Lyons and Abraham Israel were charged in London with “money-laundering charges, including the handling of proceeds from drug trafficking.” [ROCKER, S., 3-9-01]

In 1997, the French Montreal La Presse newspaper, attracted Canadian Jewish Congress and B’nai B’rith Canada condemnation, cries of anti-Semitism, and a demand for an apology when the paper ran a headline stating “RC-
MP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] strike a Deadly Blow to a Jewish Criminal Organization.” The Jewish lobbying organizations argued that it was inappropriate to note criminals by ethnicity (although the common nomer, “Russian mafia,” garners little complaint from anyone), and that only seven of 31 arrested members of the gang smuggling drugs were Jewish. Claude Masson, the assistant publisher of *La Presse*, noted in response to the Jewish attack that all the leaders of the criminal group had been identified by police as Jews, and added: “I think we’re playing with words a bit. I think we should be careful about being so politically correct that we can no longer say what is happening in our society.” [EISENTHAL, p. 4] (In 2001, Jacob Cohen-Shiri was arrested in Montreal for a drug-related murder. A year earlier he had pleaded guilty to a case of armed-robbery). [CHERRY, P., 5-8-01]

Antonio Nicaso and Lee Lamothe, in their 1995 book *Global Mafia. The New World Order of Organized Crime*, noted that

“In Toronto, Soviet gangs practiced extortion, gambling, loan-sharking, and drug trafficking, much of it in conjunction with the Paul Volpe group of the Buffalo La Costra Nostra crime family. During the 1970s and 1980s, various police investigations turned up Soviets, many of whom said they were Jews who had immigrated from Israel. The men were treated as run-of-the-mill bandits and the cases never got beyond the basic investigations. In retrospect, police believe the Russian mob was behind many of the crimes. The same held true in New York City, where Russian gangs conducted ongoing crimes within the ethnic community, and expanded beyond its borders into partnerships with the New York La Cosa Nostra to whom they paid ‘an operating tax.’ It wasn’t until the breakup of the USSR that thousands of gangsters flooded into North America, many of them turning to the criminals living there who already knew the ropes, the law, and the language. The immigrants connected with the local former Soviet mobs and were quickly absorbed into the underworld. They often formed their own more violent networks, demanding a larger piece of the criminal pie.” [NICASO/LAMOTHE, 1995, p. 45-46]

In 2001, the *Jewish Chronicle* noted a similar story in Australia:

“Sydney’s Jewish community has been embarrassed about publicity in the city’s two major newspapers about gang warfare to control the drug trade in the Eastern Suburbs, where the majority of Sydney’s Jewish population live. In a dawn raid last week, 40 police swooped on homes across the city, taking in for questioning youths who were later charged with kidnapping, extortion and robbery. The victims were described in the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Daily Telegraph* as being members of wealthy Jewish families. The leader of one of the gangs is also Jewish … Stephen Rothman, president of Sydney’s Board of Deputies, told the JC: ‘We’ve told both papers that we are totally against ethnic labelling of any kind. The *Herald* removed the Jewish tag in later editions, but the Telegraph persisted and we will be taking this up with the paper.” [BENJAMIN, H., 4-20-01]
In Vilnius, Lithuania, in 1995 Boris Dekanidze was arrested for the murder of a journalist who consistently exposed a local arms smuggling, drug dealing, and money laundering ring called the Vilnius Brigade. “It was a political trial,” Dekanidze told the state television network about his eventual death sentence, “It’s a clear attack on the Jewish businessman.” [KAMINSKI, p. IV] “The government,” noted the London Financial Times, “… although sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism, … says Boris Dekanidze has a criminal past and proven contacts with shadowy figures among the émigré community in the U.S., Europe, and Israel … But a recent terrorist threat against the world’s largest nuclear power plant in Ignalina, in the east corner of Lithuania – German intelligence received a tip that the plant might be bombed if Boris Dekanidze was not released – casts doubt on who truly governs the country.” [KAMINSKI, p. IV]

In 1998 and 1999, Ukraine reversed the usual “Jews flee to Israel” scenario by kicking two prominent Jewish businessmen/racketeers out of the country. First, Leonid Vulf, a Ukrainian with Israeli citizenship, was banned from entry into the former Russian republic because he is “an alleged leader of a gang suspected of contract killings in Ukraine.” [KRICHENSKY, L., 6-30-99, p. 11] A few months later, yet another Ukrainian Jew, Vadim Rabinovich, also possessing Israeli citizenship and also with known ties to the Russian mafia, was banned too from Ukraine for five years for causing “considerable damage to Ukraine’s economy.” Given the fact that one of Rabinovich’s harshest critics is the Chief Rabbi of the Ukraine, Ya’akov Bleich, it was difficult to completely dismiss his case as one of irrational anti-Semitism. Rabinovich, noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, with “assets of $1 billion, makes him one of the wealthiest men in the former Soviet Republic,” and a member of Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma’s “inner circle.” [KRICHENSKY, L., 6-30-99, p. 11]

In 1995, another Jewish Mafioso, Monya Elson, was arrested in Italy. The Associated Press noted that “law enforcement officials long ago identified Elson as a boss in the Russian mafia, a national network of criminal enterprises based in the Brighton Beach section of Brooklyn. He had been described as the highest ranking member not behind bars.” [AP, 3-8-95]

In 1996, the California State Attorney General, Don Lundgren, announced that there were “approximately 300 former Soviet Union crime figures and associates in the San Francisco Bay Area” involved in extortion, money laundering, loan sharking, auto theft rings, and gas tax fraud schemes. The Jewish Bulletin of Northern California interviewed Rabbi Ben Pil, an immigrant from Uzbekistan, identified as likely the only Russian-speaking rabbi in the San Francisco area. Pil told the paper that Jews are “the brains of the mafia” in the Soviet Union and “here, it could be the same.” [STRASSER, p. 96] For Rabbi Pil’s part, the state of California investigated his Jewish charity organization for fraud the next year and a San Francisco judge ordered the rabbi’s prominent local Jewish “charity” organization, the Jewish Educational Center, and two subsidiary businesses run by Pil and his wife, to be shut down. Ostensibly created to aid new immigrant Jews from Russia and sick children, the organization was charged with fraud, false advertising and tax violations. In widespread appeals for donations of used cars, the
Jewish Educational Center had become one of the largest used car dealerships in America. [SF CHRON, 7-2-97, p. A13; 6-14-97, p. A1]

In the insurance fraud world, in 1997 the Keystone Medical ring was busted by police authorities, indicting over 30 people in four states and “13 different sham medical clinics.” Approximately 120 accidents were faked and 600 bogus insurance claims filed. “Peter Rivelis, who helped run Keystone Medical,” noted the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, “had extensive contacts among Russian Jewish émigrés because of his own Jewish background and recruited from that group of acquaintances, according to documents.” [PITZ, p. A1] In 1995, a scam “orchestrated by Alexander Zaverukha” cheated insurance companies out of over a $1 million. Indicted were Zaverukha, Victor Tsan, and six others. [NEW YORK ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE, 1996, p. 188]

In 1993, two Jewish Russian immigrants, David and Michael Smushkevich, were “accused of orchestrating the biggest health care fraud in United States history,” worth a stunning $1 billion dollars. Earlier, in 1987, David had been convicted of Medicare fraud. Both brothers lost a $17 million lawsuit accusing fraud filed by an insurance company in 1988. [MOFFAT, S., 3-16-93, p. B1] In 1995, Russian Jews Bella Jakubovicz and Asya Drubich were indicted in Brooklyn for stealing $35 million from a Manhattan jewelry company. In 1996, Lev Breskin, Alexander Korogodsky, Yakov Portnov, and George Yosifian were indicted for stealing $5.7 million from a charity set up to help victims of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor disaster. [NEW YORK STATE ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE, 1996, p. 189, 190]

In 2001, “two executives from a World Trade Center brokerage have been charged with plotting to steal $100 million from investors – a theft discovered days after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks.” Indicted were Andre Koudachev (Jewish?), owner of First Equity Enterprises, and Gary Farberov (Jewish), former First Equity president. [GUARDIAN, 11-20-01]

In 2000, reporter Mike Tobin found himself under attack by Jews for an article he had written for Cleveland Scene magazine about local Russian immigrants involved in crime, particularly those in computer sales. “The story also makes clear,” complained the Cleveland Jewish News, “that in addition to being Russian, most of the immigrants to Cleveland it is highlighting, are also Jewish.” [OSTER, M., 11-5-2000, p. 3] Tobin’s article, said the News in a follow-up piece,

“singled out Russian operations, identified them as Jewish-owned, and implied that these were just a few of many Russian Jewish computer companies engaging in scams and illegal business practices … Tobin, who is Catholic, said he ‘thought long what to do with the information’ when he realized that the computer companies were all owned by Russian Jews. ‘I’m not saying that Jewish people sell bad computers. But what do the companies have in common? The same geographic area, the same ethic and religious background’ … Contacted after the television show taping [on local Russian TV, where he defended his article], Tobin said since the article appeared, he has received 40 e-mail messages from former employ-
ees of computer companies and law enforcement officials who told him, ‘You have just scratched the surface.’” [KARFELD, M., 11-19-2000, p. 22]

In 1996, the Cleveland Plain Dealer named Martin Goldfarb and William Sawchyn, co-owners of Allstate Vending, as “two of the principal figures in [a car insurance] conspiracy” involving 130 vehicles. A network of 38 people were eventually indicted in the ring. In one case, noted the Plain Dealer,

“Goldfarb leased a retagged 1990 van to the Jewish Family Services Home, a home in Woodmere for retarded children, and then had Sawchyn steal it. Goldfarb then filed a false insurance claim for the van he had leased to the Jewish Family Services Home for a nominal fee.” [ROLLENHAGEN, M., 9-20-96, p. B1]

With the cooperation of Russian police agencies in 1997, another Jewish fraudster, Vladimir Levin, was imprisoned in New York for a spectacular innovation in white collar crime. He was charged with having

“masterminded [from St. Petersburg, in Russia] the first bank raid ever carried out on the Internet, withdrawing more than $10 million from bank accounts in a country he had never set foot in… Levin was allegedly able to arrange the transfer of large sums from Citybank customers to accounts in countries as far apart as Israel and Finland, Colombia and the Netherlands … The assumption was [by police] that the Russian mafia had muscled in on the scam.” [JACOBSON, 1997, p. 28]

(In 2000, the giant Microsoft computer software computer notified the FBI that a computer hacker had gained entrance into its system and downloaded material at “an email account in St. Petersburg, Russia.” The perpetrator was unknown.) [BRIDIS/BUCKMAN, 10-27-2000]

In another computer case, also in 2000, an Israeli woman, Sandra Elazar, and an Italian national, Giuseppe Russo, were “accused of using thousands of American credit-card numbers snagged off computer lists to place $750,000 worth of on-line lotto bets.” They also went on an “on-line buying spree.” [JERUSALEM POST, 3-5-2000] In 2001, four Israeli high school students confessed to unleashing the “Goner” computer worm. [COPANS, L., 12-8-01]

There is even an entire book (subtitled “America’s Most-Wanted Computer Outlaw”) written about notorious Jewish computer hacker Kevin Mitnick. Mitnick was hunted down after a multi-year search by the F.B.I. He was jailed for nearly five years. [BLANGGER, T., 12-26-96, p. D1; BRIDIS, T., 3-3-2000, p. B1]

Ever wonder where the computer phenomenon of “spamming” came from?:

“One of the earliest examples of [Internet] spamming was actually done by lawyers. Laurence Canter and Martha Siegel, former practitioners in Florida, in 1994 invented ‘spamming.’ They advertised that they would prepare the documents for the INS lottery, which permitted non-residents of the U.S. to enter a lottery for a green card. Their advertisement was posted across the Internet. And the Internet was outraged. To understand the outrage of the Internet community, you need to understand the origins of the Internet. In 1994, roughly one year after the World Wide
Web came into use, the Internet was primarily populated by academics, scientists and students. Commercialism was frowned upon and violated the terms of service for most of the Internet service providers then in existence (including the terms of service of the provider used by Canter and Siegel to spam the Internet). Many Usenet groups, inundated with the spammed message, crashed or were forced offline… Notwithstanding the furor caused by their spamming, in 1995 Laurence Canter and Martha Siegel published How to Make a Fortune on the Information Super Highway, a book that became the ‘spamming bible’ to the next generation of spammers. Inevitably, given the low cost and ease of mass mailings online, spamming caught on.” [CYBERANGELS]

In 1987, Israeli Zvi Gafnis was arrested in Hong Kong. Gafni was involved in international arms dealing, cocaine smuggling into Mexico and the U.S., counterfeit U.S. dollars, and illegally transporting computers into the Soviet Union. [HUNTER, LINK, p. 5] In 1997, in an article entitled Specter of Russian Mafia Scares Dutch After Latest Killing, Vadim Rosensaum – a Jewish importer-exporter – made news as a murder victim in the Netherlands. Agence France Presse suggested that he had been slain for informing authorities about local “Russian” Mafia activities.

In 1978, New York City’s famous Studio 54 disco nightclub was raided by the Organized Crime Strike Force for tax evasion and drug dealing. Owners Steve Rubell and Ian Shrager were both Jewish. Shrager’s father, nicknamed “Max the Jew,” was a former associate of gangster Meyer Lansky. Among the objects confiscated were lists of famous visitors who were provided complimentary drugs by the proprietorship. [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 276-277]

In 1999, Thailand authorities asked Israel for help in capturing Israeli Peres Esat who murdered another Israeli, Shimon Benhamo, in Bangkok. Another arrested Israeli, Shimon Ofer Skriki, also confessed to the killing over an argument about the price on a cocaine shipment from Brazil. [DEUTSCHE PRESSE] That same year, the Jerusalem Report noted the cases of four Jews serving life sentences in Thailand’s Bangkwang prison for smuggling heroin. With money provided by friends and relatives, they have approached prison employees and “bought themselves into the same cell, then bribed the guards to have only 10 other inmates in their 215-square-foot quarters, not the standard 20, and allow them sleeping mats, bottled water, and a diet of meat, fruit and vegetables. Two years ago, the four ‘leased’ a $500-a-year cell for their ‘Jewish House.’ It’s an exclusive club equipped with tables and chairs, bookshelves and a color TV.”

Among those Jews imprisoned is Stephen Roye, once an Emmy-winning TV producer “who had several anti-drug documentaries in the 1980s” but was caught when he “volunteered to run heroin from Bangkok to his native Los Angeles.” [KRAUSZ, T., 12-20-99]

In 1996 the (London) Times noted the case of Iosif Kobzon, who “from humble Jewish roots” had attained
“fame in the 1960s as [Russia’s] favorite singer … Over the past five years, Mr. Kobzon has become one of Moscow’s leading entrepreneurs with interests from sportswear outlets to hotels. Last year, however, his small empire looked vulnerable after his controversial underworld ties threatened his reputation and ability to operate … The FBI cited his close links with Vyacheslav (Yaponchik) Ivankov, the alleged godfather of Russian organized crime being held in America on racketeering charges.” [BEESTON]

In 1990, Israeli Amiram Nir was killed in a mysterious plane crash in the Mexican state of Michoacan. Ostensibly, he was visiting a large avocado plantation – Nucal – owned by fellow Israeli Avraham Cohen and Swiss-Jewish millionaire Nessim Gaon. “A week after Nir’s death,” noted the Jerusalem Post,

“Newsday reported that U.S. intelligence sources in Mexico believed he was the middleman for a large arms deal of Israeli weapons via a port in Vera Cruz on the eastern coast of Mexico. It quoted American Drug Enforcement Agency officials as saying that there had been a steep rise in the efforts of cocaine smugglers to transport drugs from Michoacan to the U.S. and that three days prior to Nir’s visit a captain in the Mexican army confirmed that a ‘large shipment’ of Israeli-made weapons arrived at the Vera Cruz port and was transported to Mexico City.” [BAINERMAN]

In 1994 a bomb exploded on a Panamanian commuter plane, killing 21 people. 12 of them were Jews (included four Israelis). Suspicions grew that the target of the attack was Saul Schwartz, a passenger on the plane who was under investigation by Italian police and known to have links to the Medellin Columbia drug cartel. Robert Eisenmann, the Jewish publisher of La Prensa, noted that “Saul Schwartz was definitely in the hanky panky business … Most of the Jewish community would prefer to call [the bombing] an anti-Semitic act than to accept that one of their own was involved in drug trafficking.” [LUXNER, p. 2]

In 1997 an alleged “Russian mafia kingpin,” and immigrant to Israel, Grigori Lerner (a.k.a. Zvi Ben-Ari) was put on trial for bank fraud and bribery in the Jewish state. In Russia he was wanted for “murders … of a banker and a popular Moscow TV broadcaster, the attempted murder of several other bankers, and the embezzlement of $85 million from three Russian banks” [GROSS, N., 1997, p. 22] but Israeli law forbids extradition of its citizens. Born of “highbrow Jewish parents,” as early as 1981 Lerner was convicted of stealing large sums of money from a government agency. The Jewish Week noted that there were those in Israel who “insisted that anti-Semitism was a primary Russian motive in the Lerner affair.” [DERNFNER, p. 24] Lerner’s wife, Olga Zolovenskaya (who became Ilena Rubinstein in Israel), was formerly married to Sergei Timofayev, “a major mafia don.” [GROSS, N., 1997, p. 22]

Regarding Lerner’s case, the Christian Science Monitor noted that:

“Crime experts say there is a more general problem of Russian expatriates using Israel as a base for international money laundering and trying to infiltrate or influence Israeli economic, political, and security
establishments. And their reach does not stop at the [Israeli] border … Reformers say that it is relatively easy to buy influence in Israel because there are few restrictions on contributions to individual candidates … But magnifying the international aspect of organized crime in Israel are its even more liberal banking laws – which police and other critics say make money laundering easy … Police say $2.5 billion to $4 billion in criminal money has been brought into Israel since the collapse of the Soviet Union … ‘Now you can bring money here, deposit it, whenever you like, no questions asked,’ says a Jerusalem-based police ministry special investigator of international crime … Attempts to infiltrate Israel’s political and economic system represents a ‘strategic threat’ because Mafia figures have been hiring former security or police officers to learn how Israeli investigators operate.” [PRUSHNER, p. 18]

“Many countries in the West,” noted the Jerusalem Post in 1996, “have regulations forcing disclosure of sources of investment to both banks and private developers. No such rules, however, exist in [Israel]. The most commonly stated for this situation is the authorities’ desire to make it easy for Jewish immigrants to transfer their money here with ‘no questions asked.’ But there is another reason. By looking the other way when money from even questionable sources is transferred into this country, the authorities encourage the flow of much-needed foreign currency.” [HUTMAN, p. 10]

In 1994, Russian government officials advised Israeli police on 34 known “Mafia chiefs” who had immigrated to Israel. [INTELLIGENCE NEWSLETTER, 5-29-97] Among them was Anton Malevsky, who received his Israeli passport in 1994. Malevsky, noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “reportedly heads one of Moscow’s most notorious organized crime groups.” [KRICHEVSKY, 1-26-98] Hebrew University criminologist Menachem Amir estimates that there are 5,000-6,000 Russian-born criminals in Israel and that “90% of the prostitutes here are Russian – many of them brought over by organized prostitution rings – and most of the money brought here from Russia was criminally tainted.” [PRUSHNER, p. 18] By 1987 the tiny country of Israel had an existent narcotics-dealing business of $1 billion and 15,000-20,000 of its own home grown addicts, not including another 30,000 or so less addictive drug users. In 1995 Israeli news highlighted two horrific murders in which the victims had been decapitated and their heads carried away. “The most brutal system of cutting off the head,” said police commander David Cohen, “is practiced by a very particular sector of organized crime in Russia.” [ REUTERS NA]

Menachem Amir notes that it was not the Israeli government that alerted the public to the presence of the “Russian” mafia in that country, but the Israeli press. [AMIR, M., 1996, p. 21] And it wasn’t until 1978 that an Israeli government commission (the Shimron Commission) noted the “corruption [that] existed in the form of ‘social relations’ and ‘mutual help’ between prominent businessmen, national political leaders and high-ranking military officers.” [AMIR, M., 1996, p. 25]
In 1994, 23 people were arrested in a drug laundering gang that included Borough Park (New York) rabbis Alexander Schwartz and Menashe Leifer, lawyers Harvey Weinig and Robert Hirsch, policeman Michael Kalanz, retired fireman Richard Spence, a Swiss banker, and the Honorary Consul in New York for Bulgaria. “The key destination for the cocaine money was Zurich,” noted the (London) *Daily Telegraph*, “where it was allegedly fed into Swiss accounts by husband and wife bankers Leon and Rachel Weinmann.” [LAURENCE, p. 19] The *New York Times* noted that the ring was “one of the biggest drug-money laundering operations the authorities had ever uncovered in New York.” Rabbi Schwartz was captured with $267,830 in cash stuffed inside a money vest in San Juan, Puerto Rico. [TREASTER, J., 12-1-94, p. B1]

Two years earlier, the *Village Voice* had highlighted yet another Jewish gangster, this one American-born: Murray Wilson. Wilson, said the *Voice*, is “perhaps the only man to be identified by law enforcement officials as a high-level associate of both the Russian Organizatsiya and the Italian *La Cosa Nostra* … Wilson has been the focus of at least eight criminal probes and has surrounded himself with Mafia bosses, Russian killers, captains of industry, corrupt lawyers and, for good measure, an international art thief and one KGB agent … While not particularly religious, Wilson has dabbled in Jewish causes, including the Jewish Defense League and Soviet Jewry.” [BASTONE, p. 34]

In still another recent major drug laundering case in America, in 1997 two more New York City-area Orthodox rabbis, Bernard Grunfeld (an “administrator” at a yeshiva) and Mahir Reiss, both of the Bobover Hasidic sect, were indicted with ten other men on charges of laundering $1.75 million in drug money; they even helped buy the Colombian drug cartel an airplane. Rabbi Reiss, a frequent visitor to Israel, was described by the *New York Times* as the “most senior player in the case.” His brother Abraham (who “collected cash from a stash house operated by the drug dealers in Manhattan” [GOLDMAN, A16] was also arrested as was Israel Knoblach, a yeshiva “associate.” Abraham Reiss the philanthropist also sat on the Board of Directors of the Orthodox girls school Manhattan High, rubbing elbows with fellow Board member Malcolm Hoenlein, executive vice president of the Conference of Presidents of American Jewish Organizations. [KAHN, G, p. 2] Jack Pinski, “from one of Colombia’s wealthiest Jewish families,” [KAHN, G, p. 2] remained a fugitive. [GREENBERG, p. 9] Between August 1995 and May 1996 $19 million was deposited in bank accounts using the address of a yeshiva, Mesivta Eitz Chaim.

And as the London *Observer* observed about U.S. governmental favoritism towards Jews in this case:

“In a bizarre twist, the judge put … defendant Abraham Reiss under house arrest when it emerged that his brother was serving a prison sentence for the same offenses, and that to have a both sons in jail would be ‘a double hardship’ for the parent.” [OBSERVER, 9-5-99, p. 26]

“Money launderers are the indispensable partners of major drug traffickers,” Zachary W. Carter, a federal prosecutor, told the press regarding the Grun-
feld-Reiss case, “The cynical act of using religious institutions to conceal drug proceeds is particularly reprehensible.” [GOLDMAN, A16] “These cases don’t seem to be dramatically different from those involving other ethnic groups,” noted Assistant U. S. Attorney Lee Dunst, chief prosecutor in the case, “Except, that is, for allegations that the bank accounts of religious institutions are used for money laundering. That seems to be unique.” [GOLDBERG, Thou, p. 41]

But there were other noteworthy peculiarities. The Jewish Week, for instance, noted an Israeli newspaper report that “the Reiss brothers recently bought land in Israel’s West Bank for tens of millions of shekels … The paper reported there is suspicion that some of the money for the land deals came from Columbian drug profits … The attorney representing the two settlements [where the rabbis bought land] was Shlomo Deri, brother of Arye Deri, the head of the [Israeli] Shas Party who is under indictment for a corruption scandal that touched Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.” [GREENBERG, E, p. 9]

The 20,000 Bobover Hasids, of which Grunfeld and the Reiss brothers were leaders, is the largest Hasidic community in Borough Park, Brooklyn, which is known for its Orthodox populations. The arrests of the rabbis was particularly bewildering, said the New York Times, because “in the pious Bobov community drug addiction is virtually unheard of.” “Everybody in this community is a rabbi,” Dov Hiskin (the Democratic Assemblyman who represents the largely Hasidic district that includes Borough Park) sarcastically told reporters, “If you have a beard, they call you a rabbi.” [NYT, JUNE 17, 18] Hiskind – a former member of Rabbi Meir Kahane’s Jewish Defense League – is a well-known personality in New York City, described by the Times as “one the most ardent and visible advocates of Jewish causes on New York City’s political scene.” FRIED, B1 “[The Bobov Hasids] are completely shocked by the terrible allegations,” Hikind announced the next day, “and hope and pray they are not true.” [GOLDMAN]

It is doubtful if Hiskind’s own prayers will help. Two months later Hiskind himself was facing serious legal problems of his own, eventually being charged with crimes by a Federal Grand Jury in Brooklyn, facing up to ten years in prison for taking at least $40,000 in payoffs from officials of the government-funded Council of Jewish Organizations of Borough Park. The Assemblyman was charged with misappropriation of funds, criminal conspiracy, fraud, and corrupt solicitation and acceptance of funds. Hikind was charged with using the money to pay for his children’s tuition, for supporting illegal fund-raising activities, as well as financing trips to France and Israel. Officials of the Jewish Organizations of Borough Park, Rabbi Elimelech Naiman, Director of Employment and Training, and Paul Chernick, Director of Operations, were earlier charged with stealing up to $600,000 from federal grant monies. (Yet another rabbi, Elliot Amsel, a “key fund raiser for Assemblyman Hikind,” and president of Syrit College, was also charged by federal agents with putting $419,000 intended for the college into his personal bank account. [COHLER-ESSES, ORTHODOX, p. 9] Federal investigators charged Hikind with taking payoffs from them in exchange for funneling state grants – up to five million dollars a year – their way. In a press conference about the charges against him,
Hikind asserted “that the Federal charges were part of an attempt to silence him. He declined to identify who was trying to silence him, but made reference to ‘self-hatred, jealousy, and self-interest among Jews.’” [SULLIVAN, B3 FRIED, 9-27-97, SULLIVAN, B3, FRIED, 8-8-97, FRIED, 3-28-97]

Related to the Hikind case, in 1998 a Brooklyn rabbi, Elliot Amsel, who heads the Syrit College in Brooklyn, was charged with stealing over $700,000 from government funds intended for education. He was also accused of money laundering, filing false income tax returns, and lying to investigators. The money he stole, noted the New York Daily News, “was diverted to private bank accounts in New York and Israel.” [PETERTSON, p. 61]

Such wheelings and dealings in the Jewish Orthodox religious community go on and on:

In 1990, the editor of a Hebrew-language weekly newspaper in Brooklyn was arrested on charges of extortion from an official of the Satmar Orthodox community. Chaim Shaulson, the son of a Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem, was accused of accepting $50,000 to avoid writing critical articles about the Satmar group in his paper. [BIRNBAUM, p. 26]

In 1996 the “largest case of voter fraud in the history of New York state” was discovered in the Satmar hasidic communities of Brooklyn and Kiryas Joel. In a check of 1,134 voting records of names linked to an address at the local United Talmudic Academy, the Times Herald-Record of Middleton, New York, found 121 cases of voter fraud, double-voting in two New York localities, a state felony. [GREENBERG, E. CITY, p. 1] In 2001, in England, two Hassids were “convicted of the biggest vote-rigging conspiracy ever brought before a British court.” Isaac Leibowitz and Zev Lieberman, “two local government politicians in north London,” represented both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties. [DAVIS, D., 3-11-01] They were sentenced to only six and four months in jail, respectively, causing six members of the British Parliament to protest that the sentences were “absurdly lenient.” [ROCKER, S., 4-27-01, p. 1]

In 1989 Rabbi Abraham Friedlander was found drowned in Brooklyn's Gowanus Bay. The Jewish Week noted the cloud of suspicion around his death: “There were some speculating that Friedlander … was being hounded by people from whom he had borrowed money, including Satmar Jews, some of whom have been implicated in other loan-sharking cases that have ended violently.” [MARK, J, RABBI, p. 5]

In 1991 another hassidic rabbi, Nochum Sternberg, and his wife Esther, were jailed for contempt of court for refusing to testify, on religious grounds, against fellow Jews in a tax-fraud scheme involving $20 million. The Jewish Week noted that their attorney, Nathan Lewis, argued that “Jewish law has a strong religious prohibition against informers who testify against other Jews in a secular court.” Both Sternbergs had already served prison terms themselves years earlier in another tax fraud. [JW, 8-2,8-91, p. 8]

In 1999 Rabbi Bernard Freilich, “who holds a $76,000–a-year political patronage in the [New York governor] Pataki administration” was charged with “witness tampering in a case of an alleged incest victim, raped by her (un-
Howard Jacobson noted in 1993 the first conversation he had with British lawyer Martin Braum (both men are Jewish), who was active in fighting London’s Jewish Orthodox community:

“The molesting of a child and the community’s ring of secrecy around the molester are merely the surface of the problem. Things are deeply wrong within Orthodox Judaism, and have been going wrong for a century. Chief among the problems are the [Jewish] Germans. Although a minority in Stamford Hill, the German Orthodox are assertive and assured, and are easily able to sway the less sophisticated. They have brought over from Germany methods they acquired from the Nazis – crowd control, propaganda, hatred.” [JACOBSON, H., 1993/1995, p. 19, 23]

“They – the ultra-Orthodox ones,” said Braum,

“contaminate our religion. They have no honour, no generosity, no prettiness. They come to the court – yeah, yeah, to the trial – in those plant-pot wigs, to put off people with open minds. They’re there first thing, so they can take all the seats, staring with hostility at whoever isn’t one of them … Child-molesting doesn’t bother these people, it isn’t seen to be an enormous sin, it can’t be grasped by them as such, because they cannot conceive of any innocence to be molested, and because the very idea of molesting a young person is so close to what they do anyway in their educational methods.” [JACOBSON, H., 1993/1995, p. 23]

In 1993, 21 New York-area Orthodox institutions were being investigated for fraudulently obtaining $300 million in education grants. Two Brooklyn-based Orthodox schools, Bais Fruma, a hasidic academy, and Yeshiva Toldos Yaakoor Yosef, were indicted, including senior officials of the Village of New Square, an Orthodox township north of North York City. [GOLDBERG, THOU, p. 40] (A group of prominent Jewish leaders met with the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York, seeking to get the New Square defendants off lightly. Lobbyists included Abraham Biederman, a former official under former New York City mayor Ed Koch; Israel Singer, Secretary General of the World Jewish Congress; Richard Stone, Chairman of the Orthodox Union’s Institute of Public Affairs; and George Klein, a wealthy real estate baron. [FORWARD, 6-6-97, p. 3]) Four men from New Square were sentenced to prison terms. “When I visited New Square shortly after the indictments,” says Jewish author Joseph Berger, “there was universal support for those charged.” [BERGER, J., 2-28-2000]

Later, in 1999, “the New York city schools chancellor removed three Chasidic school board members in Williamsburg, Brooklyn, [because of] a $6 million scam that involved Rabbi Hertz Frankel, the principal of perhaps the largest girl’s yeshiva in the nation. Frankel pleaded guilty to conspiracy to defraud the federal government and the New York City school system of millions of dollars in remedial education aid for his school’s children.” [GREENBERG, E., It’s,
p. 8] Rabbi Frankel got off with three years unsupervised probation. The school had to pay a fine of $1 million. “If you had a secular organization that bilked a public school out of $6 million,” professor Marci Hamilton of Yeshiva Benjamin Cardorzo Law School told the Jewish Week, “you would see [the responsible perpetrator] either going to prison or paying a hefty fine … [This is] a light slap on the hand [that] could be attributed to the government favoring an influential religious group.” [COHLER-ESSEL, 4-23-99, p. 24]

“Publicly most [Orthodox religious leaders] contend that corruption scandals are isolated incidents,” noted the Jewish Week, “… But privately, some Agudah officials make other determinations. ‘Yes, there is a problem. We know it,’ whispered one.” [GREENBERG, E. It’s]

In 1998 Zelman Manela, the “son of Holocaust survivors,” and the head of Chevra Kadisha, an Orthodox mortuary in Los Angeles, was sent to prison for two years for forgery and grand theft. The Jewish Journal of Los Angeles noted that

“Manela’s mortuary was one of only a few in town run by Orthodox Jews strictly according to Jewish law … At the sentence hearing … about sixty observant Jews appeared to support Manela and his family. They cried and prayed, reading psalms while two rabbis urged Judge Michael Hoff to grant probation…” [PFEFFERMAN, p. 10]

In 1998 the New York Daily News named Abraham Gabbay, an Orthodox Jew, as “the new King of deadbeat dads,” who – as a multi-millionaire – preferred months in jail than pay $45,000 owed to his ex-wife in child support. In jail, Gabbay spent $2,500 on telephone calls to maintain his businesses. Meanwhile, noted the News, “he also devoted time to prayer. A religious Jew, he meets twice weekly with a prison chaplain, a rabbi who recently wrote the court on Gabbay’s behalf.” [ARENA, p. 6]

From London, in 1990, property developer Michael Zebner absconded to America with a girlfriend, leaving his Land Development Corporation in ruins. The secretary of the company, Nathan Dony, said that

“The man was a pillar of society and very highly thought of in the Orthodox Jewish community in London. There was no warning that anything was wrong. He has left behind a beautiful wife and four lovely children, who are totally devastated. He left us, and a lot of other people, in a financial mess.” [MANCHESTER]

In 1993 the New York Times noted that in a “campaign sullied by charges of mischief and wrongdoing” two rabbis in Israel were selected as Chief Rabbis for the Ashkenazic and Sephardic divisions. The new Ashkenazic Chief Rabbi, Meir Lau, was accused by “several women … of trying to seduce them. He sued one for libel.” The Sephardic rabbi, Eliahu Bakshi-Doron, faced “affidavits charging he once tried to bribe a Haifa city council member to drop out of the race.” “The atmosphere was so thick with accusations” against the two rabbis, noted the New York Times, “that at one point the incumbent Chief Rabbis publicly deplored the quality of the campaign.” [NYT, 2-22-93, p. A7]
In 1997, a rabbi associated with Israel’s Ministry of Religious Affairs, Mikhail Dushinsky, was caught in a scandal when he was secretly filmed telling a young couple (two news reporters posing as a Jewish man and his non-Jewish pregnant girlfriend) that he would do a quick under-the-table conversion to Judaism for her (which would expedite access to social services in Israel) for $15,000. [GUARDIAN, 2-22-97] “Don’t tell her what’s going on,” Rabbi Dushinsky told the undercover reporter, “She shouldn’t think Judaism is something you buy with money.” [SCHOFFMAN, p. 23] After the tape was broadcast on Israeli TV, “dozens of other converts and aspiring converts” came forward with stories of “being subjected to the same sort of extortion.” [DERFNER, HIDDEN, p. 10] Rabbi Alan Lew notes a similar tale in America:

“When [a dying Jewish man’s] wife realized that she couldn’t be buried next to him because she wasn’t Jewish, she decided she wanted to convert, but only on her terms. She wasn’t willing to go to the mikvah, she wasn’t willing to study, she wasn’t willing to be interrogated by rabbis. ‘I’ve been married to a Jewish man for forty years,’ she said. ‘That ought to be enough.’ I said I couldn’t convert her under those circumstances, so she found a rabbi who would, an Orthodox rabbi who agreed to convert her for a large sum of money and no other requirements.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 234]

Such “Judaism for sale” stories echo that of the Israeli consular official – Eliezer Yitzhaki – in Ethiopia who was recalled to the Jewish state for allegedly selling Israeli tourist visas to Ethiopians for over $4,000 apiece. Many Ethiopians, Jewish or not, seek a better economic prospects out of the African Third World country. [MELMAN, Y., 6-222-01]

The same year, Agence France Presse announced that “Israeli authorities are investigating Chief Rabbi Israel Lau in the latest corruption scandal to tarnish the country’s Orthodox Jewish community.” [Renaudie] Lau was accused of demanding $500-$2500 to officiate weddings on about a hundred occasions, a service that was supposed to be free. An Orthodox community near Tel Aviv, Bnei Brak, was also raided by police – an area “where tax fraud has risen 30 percent.” [RENAUDIE, ONLINE] In 1998, another Israeli rabbi was photographed in a nude bar. Claiming that he went to the bar “to see if any of his students frequented it,” he could not explain why he was dressed in a Stetson hat and cowboy boots. [DAILY TELEGRAPH, p. 16]

Zev Chafets also notes the case of a rabbi revered in Israel’s Moroccan Jewish community. This man, son of a particularly respected rabbi, is “a crook, whose activities landed him in jail for fraud, bribe taking, counterfeiting court documents, attempting to influence witnesses,” and other crimes. “Out of prison,” says Chafets, “the son, Baruch Abu Hatzira, became ‘Baba Baruch,’ the new holy man of the town of Netviot.” [CHAFETS, p. 155-156]

In 1991, a prominent American rabbi, Levi Yitzhak Horowitz, was sued by the Empire Blue Cross and Blue Shield for “having set up a network of sham companies that provided health coverage for hundreds of Israelis.” This man, “the Botoner rebbe,” noted the Jerusalem Post, “who divides his time between
Jerusalem and Boston, is a member of Agudat Yisrael’s Council of Torah Sages.” [KEINON] In 1994, Schloime Dachowitz, who “told police he was a rabbi,” was charged in a scheme to get $1.3 million in life insurance from a fictitious brother and defraud a bank of a million dollars.” [GEARTY, p. 4]

In 1999, one Rabbi Schenkelowski of Lakewood, New Jersey, was accused of “accepting a $500,000 donation to a school he runs in exchange for using his political clout to help the donor get a co-generation plant built. The prosecutor at the trial admitted he “botched” the case and the rabbi went free. [CASSIDY, p. 1] The same year, an Israeli, Yaron Tishby, the president of the Florida-based All American Van Lines, “pleaded guilty to charges of wire fraud, mail fraud, hiring illegal aliens, conspiracy, and violation of federal transportation laws.” [MZ PRESSWIRE] Also, in an old intra-Jewish theme, one recent news report (1998) noted that in that year alone there were 82 investigations of kosher fraud in the New Jersey area – 30 resulted in fines. [KENT, B., p. 4]

In 1993 Jewish lawyer, Erwin Sobel, sued the State Farm insurance company in Los Angeles about an internal company memo that listed lawyers who were to be treated in insurance claims with special attention, because they were suspected of being more likely to commit fraud. Claims from the lawyers on the list were to be funneled for review by a new fraud unit. According to Sobel, 123 of 161 names on the list were Jewish. [MULLIGAN, p. D3] Confronted with an implication of irrational “anti-Semitism,” State Farm argued that the list merely represented lawyers with large numbers of claims.

Protection from unwanted attention and responsibility, thanks to claims of “anti-Semitism,” is a common Jewish tool. Also in 1993, the Los Angeles Times noted the case of a particularly nasty Jewish Iranian immigrant, Emanuel Sabet, who defrauded “dozens” of investors, including his own relatives, out of millions of dollars. He was the defendant in at least 29 lawsuits, primarily preying on people of his own – Jewish, and Iranian – community. But the Times also noted that

“Sabet’s complex trail of deals and transactions extends beyond the Iranian-American community. Before it went out of business, Sabet’s Edmani Financial bought the outstanding loans of another company, Cable Busters Inc., which sold satellite dishes to residents in South Central Los Angeles [the African-American ghetto] and other sections of the city who were unable to receive cable television during the 1980s. Lured by a promise of one year of free viewing, residents bought dishes by the hundreds – often, according to county investigators, without realizing that they were simultaneously taking out a second mortgage to pay for them. In effect, those who failed to make their monthly payments ran the risk of losing their homes.” [KRAMER, p. J1]

The Times was thereupon visited by a letter of complaint from Barbara Bergen, a lawyer for the Anti-Defamation League, complaining that on two occasions in the article Sabet was identified as a Jew. Bergen argued that it was appropriate to merely identify Sabet to be Iranian. This is the same strategy by which Jews (despite a common Jewish nationalist self-identity wherever they
are as minorities in cultures throughout the world) are routinely afforded a free hand in defaming others – for example, the many, many Jewish criminals from Russia who, largely rooted in Jewish networks, are cloaked in the veiled nomer: “Russian Mafia.” And largely direct it. In this case, the ADL feels comfortable in defaming Iranians at-large, and thereby Islam – the only Iranian religion/identity known to most Americans. “Nothing in the article,” demands Bergen, “appears to justify the reference to the religion of the Iranian-Americans involved. Although reference is made to “affinity fraud” aspects of the alleged scams, the affinity described appears to be based on the victims’ Iranian origins and still does not explain the references to their religion. We would not expect a reference to the religion of the perpetrators or victims of a crime to be highlighted unless the religion played some part in the story. In this case the reference appears gratuitous and inappropriate.” [BERGEN, p. J6]

Meanwhile, in a New York Times article about the notorious serial killer David Berkowitz (“Son of Sam”), it is apparently no problem to anyone when the Times identifies him as a “born-again Christian,” however incongruous this is, given the fact that Berkowitz was raised Jewish. Likewise, the Times diffuses his past identity as a Jew beneath the generic racial nomer of “white” people, stating that in 1977 “the police seemed powerless to stop [this] mysterious white man from killing.” [HARDEN, p. 22]

On October 4, 1999, the New York Observer had a pair of articles about the way that advertising mogul and art collector Charles Saatchi scammed the New York art community to drive up the art prices of works he owns. Charles and his brother Maurice are noted in one piece as “a couple of Iraqis,’ which is true only in the dissimulative sense that they are fabulously wealthy Jews from Iraq who live in Great Britain. [HOGREFE/KRAMER, 10-4-99] (This is the result of decades-long Jewish lobbying. In the 1950s, for instance, “one of the [American Jewish] Committee’s staff members secured agreements from Time and Life and several New York newspapers not to publish letters from readers commenting on the Jewishness of accused Communists [despite the fact that Jews have always been pre-eminent in that movement, and networks of Soviet espionage were largely Jewish]. He also claimed to have prevented the summoning of ‘at least three prominent American Jews … who shall be nameless’ by the American Un-American Activities Committee.”) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 95]

In 1999, with no looming multi-millionaire dollar Armenian “defense agencies” to face, the Los Angeles Times even felt secure enough to write a front-page article declaring that “A giant rip-off of the California Medi-Cal system, centered in Armenian immigrant neighborhoods of Los Angeles, may total more than $1 billion when it is finally unraveled, making it one of the largest frauds against a state in American history.” [ELLIS/MAZINGO, 11-29-99, p. A1]

Double standard? Can we imagine any such front page highlight in the American mass media centering on an expressly Jewish culpability? Or how
about Jewish journalist Maura Lerner’s article in a Minneapolis newspaper in 1995 that stirred protest from some readers for naming a group of college students involved in an insurance fraud as Pakistanis, which they, of course, were. [GELFAND, L., 4-9-95, p. A21]

Take yet another example of this double standard. Given the widespread evidence of Jewish corruption, money-laundering, drug-dealing, et al throughout the world, within expressly Jewish networks, there has never been an article in the West that investigates this phenomenon as a unified theme. It is institutionally forbidden to criticize the Jewish community in such a manner. Yet, on the other hand, Fortune magazine can freely impugn the heart of Catholicism with an “exclusive” feature story, screaming in bold type across its cover, Scandal in the Vatican. In reading the article, however, one discovers that the story’s essence is really a Jewish swindler named Martin Frankel, who remained a fugitive at the time of the article. “In short,” says Fortune, “Frankel … appear[ed] to be requesting that the Vatican front for him as a money launderer in return for 10% of the funds (looted from his U.S. insurance companies).” [BEHAR, p. 31] Why, one must wonder, does the “scandal at the Vatican” merit a cover story and lurid attention, when not only was the central criminal in the story Jewish, preying on the Catholic hierarchy, but “money-laundering fronts” are a cottage industry throughout Orthodox Jewish religious institutions and are occasioned – as a Jewish issue – as little publicity as possible. Let alone the widespread activities of hardcore Israeli drug dealers, couriers, and launderers, poisoning a variety of countries.

“Though [Frankel] was raised Jewish and expressed fervently pro-Israel political views to friends,” noted the New York Times, “Mr. Frankel aggressively courted the Catholic Church and the Vatican religious hierarchy beginning last summer.” [KAHN, J., 6-25-99, p. A1]

The International Herald Tribune also ran a headline about the Frankel case, declaring “2 Priests at Center of Insurance Scam.” Again, reading the article, we find the central culprit is Frankel, known to the Christian clergymen as “David Rosse, a middle-aged tycoon who claimed descent from the Jewish King David and said he was eager to give at least $50 million to the Roman Catholic Church. They supported the St. Francis of Assisi Foundation, a charity Mr. Frankel set up and then attempted to use to buy several insurance companies in the United States.” [Stanley, A., p. 13] “Together,” said journalist Alessandra Stanley, the two priests “provided a clerical cloak of respectability for a Greenwich, Connecticut, money manager who authorities suspect embezzled more than $300 million from a web of insurance companies across the United States.” [STANLEY, p. 13] Priest Peter Jacobs, whose father was Jewish, noted the Fortune piece, “was Frankel’s confidant (and, it seems, his unwilling tool) for the past year.” [BEHAR, p. 29] Fortune also noted Frankel’s scandal to possibly “be the biggest – it is certainly the strangest – scandal in the history of the insurance agency … News stories are revealing details about Frankel’s complex scam – and the sordid life that went with it.” [BEHAR, p. 29] As the New York Times noted,

“Pornography and sexual fetishes were prominent features of the [Frankel] house. According to police reports, during a search of the
house following the death of Ms. [Frances] Buge [whose death in 1997 by hanging was ruled a suicide despite neighbors’ testimony that they heard screams], the authorities discovered a leather riding crop, ropes and sadomasochistic literature and videos.” [KAHN, J., 6-25-99, p. A1]

In May 1999, Frankel’s $3.5 million house burned down. “The firefighters,” noted the Baltimore Sun,

“doused the flames and called the police, who found strange notations on some of the charred documents. The top line on a handwritten ‘to-do’ list poked from the fire read, ‘Launder money.’ The next line: ‘Get $ to Israel get it back in.’” [SCHNEIDER, G., 7-1-99, p. 1A]

(Are there financial swindles in the religious Christian world actually instigated by Christians? Of course. One “Rabbi Rudin,” National Interreligious Affairs Director for the American Jewish Congress, provided the public with his article in 1996 about the “embezzlement epidemic” that “plagues U.S. Religion.” Rudin cited four instances of such corruption in Christian affairs that he found [one each from the Evangelical Lutherans, Episcopals, Roman Catholics and United Methodists] – he didn’t bother to note any examples of criminality in the Jewish community. [RUDIN, 9-28-96, p. D6])

Another Jewish predator upon Christian churches has been Marcel Harpin (known to the Church of Christ in Delaware, as evidence by a stolen passport, as “Felix Schuster” of Switzerland). Harpin was a “con man” who “roamed the country scamming churches” noted the Providence Journal-Bulletin in 1994. He got in touch with the Church of Christ, claimed that he was a medical student who had just been robbed of the last of his money, said he was raised as an Orthodox Jew but was interested in converting to Christianity, and was taken home by a church family. He eventually absconded with $1,750 from them but was caught in Nashville, Tennessee, trying the same scam at a church there. It was discovered that he was also “wanted on similar charges in Washington and Atlanta.” [RAY, E., 6-23-94, p. D13]

The mere accusation of anti-Semitism in the hands of a Jewish swindler, of course, has immense potential. Apparently, decorating one’s property with swastikas and burning it down for the insurance is a mini-cottage industry. In 1990 a Maryland accountant, Joel Davis, was convicted of arson and insurance fraud in arranging for a Jewish summer resort to be burned down and covered with anti-Semitic slogans and signs to disguise his own involvement. [VALENTINE, p. B1] In 1995, in Portland, Oregon, Dan Davenport, a Jewish co-owner of an apartment building, was charged with two business associates for “painting swastikas on their apartment building and later setting it on fire in an insurance scam … The FBI began a civil rights investigation after the swastikas appeared last year on the building and anti-Semitic phrases were scratched on Davenport’s car.” [ORLANDO, p. A18] In 1996, in the Miami area, Al Rubin was sentenced to prison for three years and his son, Steve, for eight, for covering the Hillel County Day School with Nazi-like graffiti and destroying school buses. It was merely a scam to get the school’s repair orders. [GARCIA, M., 8-13-96, p. B1] In 1998, a 15-year-old Jewish boy in affluent Huntington Beach, Cal-
DRUGS AND DRUG MONEY LAUNDERING WITHIN JEWISH NETWORKS: THE ‘RUSSIAN MAFIA,’ ‘ULTRA-ORTHODOX’

ifornia, was one of four people arrested for putting a burning cross on his parents’ lawn “because his parents wouldn’t let him stay at a beach bonfire party two hours beyond his usual 10 P.M. curfew … The Jewish boy also admitted to using chemicals to burn a swastika into his home’s lawn because his mother wouldn’t give him $3 for a pack of cigarettes.” [JEWISH BULLETIN, 6-5-98]

The accusation of anti-Semitism has even been used to effect very lucrative criminal dividends. In a Canadian scam in 1998, a fraudulent group calling itself “The North American Jewish News” began sending out invoices to major corporations, billing them for ads they never ordered in a non-existent newspaper. The bills were followed up with phone callers demanding payment, threats of legal action, and accusations of anti-Semitism. An executive at Media Health Pharmaceutical Services was told that “the reason he didn’t want to pay, the reason he didn’t want to advertise, was probably because he was anti-Semitic.” [LAWTON, p. C1] “This is a very powerful threat,” said Annie Lalonde, director of communications at the firm, “Most companies, just to keep quiet and not be accused of being racist, they’ll pay up.” [LAWTON, p. C1]

In a twist of using the accusation of anti-Semitism for criminal profit, in 1990 an Israeli court convicted a messianic Jew of spraying anti-Semitic graffiti on 300 Jewish tombstones in a cemetery in Haifa, calling for the extermination of the Jews. David Goldner did it, he said, “to enlighten the Jewish nation and to unite it against its enemies.” [LA TIMES, 5-28-99, p. A4] In February 2000, for whatever strange reason, Alan Jay Lorenz, a Jew, dumped medical waste decorated with swastikas at two Connecticut synagogues with a message that it was “a wake-up call to America to kill the Jews.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 2-11-2000]

In 1999, Sylvia Wygoda, the Executive Director of Georgia’s Commission on the Holocaust, wrote a hostile letter to state legislators. The letter became local news. In it she compared meticulous state auditors (of the Commission’s yearly budgetary records – of which $250,000 was provided by the state) to Nazis. [MANTINI, P., 12-10-99, p. 1E] Wygoda had been criticized for “budget and allocation” vagueness. She “earns more than any other Holocaust commission director in the country” and was “unable to produce substantial minutes and records of commission meetings where money was allocated and spent.” [ATLANTA JEWISH TIMES, 6-18-99]

In March 2000, the Omaha World-Herald reported that “a Canadian businessman [Jewish executive Larry Weltman] who once accused gambling regulators in Nebraska and Washington state of being anti-Semitic and anti-Canadian was indicted Friday in New York City on charges that he and another man [Jack Banks] defrauded a bank of $32 million.” During Weltman’s accusations of anti-Semitism, he was the Chief Financial Officer of the Gambling Lottery Co. Gambling regulators had insisted that they were merely enforcing laws, and, as the Omaha paper explained, “Gaming Lottery’s chairman and other directors were Jewish.” [TAYLOR, J., 4-2-2000, p. 52]

In 1999, a former chiropractor, David Becker, self-described as an Orthodox Jew, was convicted in the San Francisco area of “three counts of statutory rape, four counts of child pornography, two counts of furnishing marijuana to
youngsters and two counts of showing lewd material to minors.” The next year he charged a Contra Costa Deputy Probation Officer, Betty Maloney, with anti-Semitism because she resisted his efforts to move to Florida. Becker had failed two drug tests which were conditions of his current probation after only five months in jail. Becker formally complained to the court that Mahoney “implied that because I am Jewish I got special treatment.” (Both the prosecutor and judge in his case were also Jewish). [HALLISSY, E., 1-12-00,p. A15]

Also in 1999, some in the Argentine Jewish community accused the head of Argentina’s central bank, Pedro Pou, of anti-Semitism. Three Argentine banks – all, as the (Jewish) Forward notes, “controlled by Jews” – were facing economic crisis and imminent closure. The president (Ruben Beraja) of the largest of them (Banco Mayo), was also president of the DAIA, the major Jewish organization in Argentina. Beraja was soon, notes Joseph Goldman, being “investigated for fraud and tax offences … At least $160 million is accounted for. Some of that money may have been diverted to pet Beraja projects – like Israel’s Bar-Ilan University, the [Jewish] cable station Alef Network, and Fundacion Banco Mayo, which supports cultural activities in the Jewish community.” [GOLDMAN, J., 1998, p. 34] Repercussions of the banks’ collapse effected the whole philanthropic structure of the Argentine Jewish community and Beraja looked for a bail-out, filing a complaint of “religious discrimination” against the Central Bank. Central Bank President Pou responded by saying that his organization had “propped up Banco Mayo more generously than any other bank, with $350 million in rediscounts,” and that Catholic- and Arab-owned banks had also went under. The (Jewish) Forward quoted a Jewish reporter at Pagina 12 newspaper who said that “the allegation of anti-Semitism may be a smoke screen for real problems at Banco Mayo.” “There is an attitude,” said Horacio Verbitsky, “of some Jewish community people [who] tend to disguise their mistakes behind the anti-Semitic attitudes of other people.” [STOLL, I., p. 1]

In March 2000, “con man” Robert Friedland, facing a prison term “for writing [$200,000 worth of] bad checks in connection with a scam to develop a marina restaurant,” embarked upon an especially innovative use of the accusation of anti-Semitism. The judge in his case was Edward Turnbach. Friedland eventually “filed a lawsuit against Turnbach, saying the judge’s German ancestry interfered with his ability to be fair to Friedland, who said in the court document that he is Jewish.” Friedland also “sued his victims in the scam,” as well as the judge, the prosecutor, and local reporters who covered the case. [WILLIAMS, C., 3-10-2000, p. B3]

One of the ways the Holocaust can be exploited by Jewish criminals as a manipulative tool – both as a convenient shield from justice and magnet for sympathy – is described by David Klinghoffer:

“The [New York] Times reported that some Hasidim up in Rockland County had been indicted on the charge that they had defrauded the federal and state governments in a multi-million dollar scheme involving student loans and housing subsidies. Subpoenas had been served at 6 AM to ensure that the subpoenaed individuals would be on hand to
receive the documents personally. Getting woken up at such an early hour scared the children, the Jews claimed, and was ‘remindful of the Holocaust that many in this community endured decades ago.’” [KLINGHOFFER, p. 10-13]

In 2001, Jewish Los Angeles real estate mogul Sam Menlo (worth $154 million) faced a court far a variety of slum lord offenses (112 building-code violations and 34 criminal counts of violating city codes: mushrooms coming out of the mildew in ceilings, etc.) Twenty years earlier, at his nursing homes, “investigators found patients lying in beds full of excrement and urine and one patient with bedsores infested by maggots.” Menlo’s lawyer for the more recent offenses argued that, since Menlo was a Holocaust survivor, “I can only imagine what lies in a concentration camp versus someone who has a leaky faucet or someone who has a little bit of mold or mildew building up on a bathroom wall. His minimum standard is lower than mine.” [YOSHINO, K., 12-30-01]

Then there are the likes of lawyer Alan Mirman, who eventually received a two year prison sentenced for swindling an elderly client out of $92,000 (she died broke). Mirman’s lawyer, in an appeal for court mercy, “hinted that Mirman, who is Jewish, may have been tortured by the Nazis.” [DAVIS, M., 8-21-99, p. B1]

Moving along in our criminal overview, in February 1998, Rabbi Peter Hoffman and his associates (Abraham Woldiger, Abraham Taub, David Abrahamson, Bella Schon, and Joseph Sochaczewsky) were arrested on charges that “they pocketed millions of dollars in government funds that were supposed to be used to maintain” eight federally subsidized low-income housing projects that they owned in five states. [See earlier section on Jewish slumlords p. 734, p. 889, p. 889] Over seven years, the owners had received $52 million in Housing and Urban Development funds. “Much of the money that allegedly was skimmed,” noted the New York Daily News,

“reportedly was spent on cars, homes and vacation trips, but hefty amounts also were allegedly contributed to Jewish charitable organizations and schools, including the United Institution of Israel, Chafetz Chaim Heritage Foundation, Meesifta Sanz of Hudson County and the Children’s Torah Foundation. Court papers show than additional $30,000 was deposited into the Chaim Shel Shulem Gemilas Chesed Fund in Borough Park, Brooklyn, which is under investigation in the laundering of Colombian drug money.” [PETERSON, p. 38]

In 2001, in Toronto, Canada, Rabbi Leon Edery “was sentenced to a year of house arrest and must pay a fine of $32,229, in a tax evasion scheme that issued false receipts in the names of three registered charities … Rabbi Edery had been charged with 48 violations of the Income Tax Act, but convicted on one that encompassed all the major accusations … Court heard that under the scheme, which ran from 1992 to 1997, donors to three charities, two of which are synagogues, were issued tax receipts by Rabbi Edery. However, the receipts were for much higher amounts than the actual donations … Edery’s age and poor health saved him from prison.” [CSILLAG, R., 6-5-01]
Fraud upon others to benefit the ultra-Orthodox Jewish community was perfected to a science by yet another rabbi, the so-called “Robin Hood rabbi,” Joseph Prushinowski. This man, an ordained rabbi, and described as “an international economic menace” and “one of the world’s most wanted con men,” was sought for ten years by the FBI, Canada’s Royal Mounted Police, Scotland Yard, the New York Police Department, and the Dutch police. His media nickname stemmed from the fact that he kept little of the money he scammed for himself; most went to projects in his ultra-Orthodox community – the Hasidic Tash sect. He was arrested most recently, in Israel, in 1998. He was the principal player in a series of frauds that caused “banks, building societies and insurance companies” to lose over $200 million; other fraudulent schemes stripped the world’s banks of another $200 million. Originally born in Israel, Prushinowski emigrated to America but first fled the arm of the law in 1977 (because of a $1.5 million bank scam early in his crime career), rushing back to Israel. He eventually returned to the U.S., however, and in 1981 began a three year sentence in prison. He later settled in Canada, “running frauds around the globe by telephone, fax and Telex.” [GILLARD, M., 1-3-93, p. A2] Prushinowski’s main partner, Selig Waldman, also Jewish, in his most recent frauds, “jumped bail [in 1990] and is now thought to be in South America.” [GILLARD, M., 11-8-98]

In 2000, Allen Wolfson, a Salt Lake City business man and founder of a 50-person Orthodox Chabad Lubavitch community (Bais Menachem) there, was arrested and charged with “five counts of securities fraud, two counts of wire fraud and one count of conspiracy to commit fraud.” He had earlier served time in prison in the 1980s for fraud and illegal political contributions. Originally from Brooklyn, in Salt Lake City Wolfson had a one-hour business radio show and he “promoted building a city, modeled after Jerusalem, and a religious theme park dubbed ‘City of Peace’ in remote northwest Utah.” [CEKOLA/MIMS, 6-14-2000]

Convicted Jewish American/Israeli terrorist Era Rapaport (who bombed and maimed Palestinian mayors) recalls the sympathy he had from the Hasidic community when he was a fugitive: “When I was in New York, I found that a lot of Jews were sympathetic to me. Satmarer hasidim offered to hide me out if the police came looking for you. Ditto for Lubavitch [the Chabad organization]. I had friends who said: ‘Come hide in our basement till it’s safe. No one will find you there.’ Et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. For many people it was sort of a thrill to hide out a bandit type who they thought was a good guy.” [RAPAPORT, E., 1996, p. 269]

Then there is the ultra-Orthodox Tasher hassidism community in Canada. “In 1999,” notes William Shaffir,

“the [Tasher] community was the target of a federal revenue department raid by 25 agents and a Royal Canadian police officer. Revenue Canada alleged that the Collège Rabbinique de Montréal, Yeshiva Oir Hachaim D’Tash, was involved in fiscal fraud, mainly through the community’s charitable organization …” [SHAFFIR, W., 2000, p. 77]
In March 2001, 14 members of the ultra-Orthodox Hasidic enclave of Kiryas Joel, 40 miles north of New York City, were indicted “for cheating individuals, banks, and insurance companies out of millions of dollars ... The indictment alleges the group carried out ‘a myriad’ of financial frauds since 1996, including soliciting individuals for bogus lotteries, defrauding banks with counterfeit checks, submitting false death claims to insurance companies and using false information to get tax refunds.” A key member of the racketeer ring was Mordechai Sarret. [HA’ARETZ, 3-29-01]

In 1997 the Israeli-based Jerusalem Report featured an article on widespread financial corruption and crime among religious leaders and institutions of Ultra-Orthodox Jewish groups in America. “The Jerusalem Report has learned of at least a dozen current or pending civil allegations of financial misconduct against leaders and institutions in the Ultra-Orthodox community in America,” wrote J. J. Goldberg, “Allegations of hasidic and non-hasidic groups included drug-money laundering, banking and currency code violations, embezzlement of federal and state funds, insurance investment and charity fraud, and misuse of federal student aid, housing assistance and small business loans ... And more charges may be coming.” [GOLDBERG, Thou, p. 40]

The Jewish Week also noted in 1997 that

“The term Orthodox and all it stands for has been so besmirched and sullied lately that when most people hear the word Orthodox, what comes to mind is not ‘pious,’ or ‘God-fearing,’ but ‘crooked,’ ‘violent,’ ‘intolerant,’ and ‘coercive.’ Hardly a day goes by without the media noting another moral scandal involving Orthodox Jews ... The New Times recently featured a story about an Israeli politician who spends the entire morning, six days a week, absorbed in prayer and Talmud study, and for the rest of the day is busy with activities that have led to a series of indictments against him.” [LOOKSTEIN, p. 21]

With little changing by the year 2000, the (Jewish) Moment magazine also addressed the by now recurring theme of ultra-Orthodox corruption:

“Imagine then the embarrassment that has regularly been rippling through the American Jewish community as it reads headline after headline about Hasidim and other strictly Orthodox persons being hauled off to court, or jail, for sordid crimes from laundering drug money, sexually abusing children, and kidnapping to bribery, theft of government money, and even attempted murder. While some crimes were the work of aberrant individuals or idiosyncratic family disputes, others entangled distinguished rabbis and bedrock community institutions in schemes that involved dozens of accomplices.” [BERGER, J., 2-28-2000, p. 50]

This Jewish magazine also had the rare courage to list a number of possible reasons for the avalanche of corruption in ultra-Orthodox circles, including this one: “[Some critics] note fine distinctions in the Talmud: Jews behave one way with Jews and another with non-Jews and secular governments.” [BERGER, J., 2-28-2000, p. 50] “One scholar,” noted the article’s author, Joseph Berger,
“notes that a Jew is under no halachic obligation to return a lost possession of a gentile but must do so for a Jews. ‘They have one moral standard within the tribe and one moral standard outside the tribe,’ says an Orthodox rabbi who requested anonymity … Sometimes the talmudic reasoning can be stretched so far it amounts to casuistry to justify an obvious wrong.” [BERGER, J., 2-28-2000, p. 50]

In 1997 too, the (Jewish) Forward noted that “chasidism [ultra-Orthodox], though commonly drawing upon their rights and prerogatives as American citizens, have commonly been taught that they inhabit a culture and world that is answerable to another, higher authority. They see the world often divided between ‘us’ and ‘them.’ For insiders, everything; for outsiders, contempt … Chasidism therefore do all they can to insulate themselves from America and its influence, which has led both to a contempt for American culture and its normative rules as well as an attitude that encourages chasidim to take themselves and vouchsafe their world and values.” [HEILMAN, S, p. 1]

In the wake of President Bill Clinton’s controversial pardons of four Chasidic criminals, the Jewish Forward noted the case of Assistant U. S. Attorney Deborah Landis of New York who protested such leniency and had come under attack for smearing “all Jews as potential criminals.” As the paper noted:

“[Landis] reportedly urged the White House in a January 16 letter not to commute the sentences of four chasidic men convicted of stealing government student-aid and other funds, claiming clemency would ‘send a message to that worldwide community that its pursuit of its own religious customs justifies fraud against the government.’ The letter, obtained by the Associated Press but not released, prompted angry retorts from two groups that seldom agree with one another: the Jewish Council on Public Affairs, a liberal-leaning coalition of national agencies, and Agudath Israel of America, an Orthodox advocacy group. Both accused Ms. Landis of stereotyping a group because of the actions of a few … In a possible reflection of the sensitive nature of the dispute, however, no other Jewish organizations were willing to comment on the Landis letter, including such normally outspoken agencies as the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Congress. The ADL had objected once before to a federal investigation of student-aid fraud by Orthodox groups, arguing that a 1993 probe risked creating an image that such fraud was characteristic of a particular community, only to be told by federal officials that it was … [A 1993 congressional hearing on its investigations] prompted a letter of protest to the subcommittee’s chairman, then-Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia, from ADL national director Abraham Foxman, who charged that the largely Orthodox Jewish roster of institutions under investigation might create the impression that Orthodox seminaries were particularly prone to these student-loan frauds. Mr. Nunn replied in a letter to Mr. Foxman that the investigation had found just such a pattern.” [KLEIN, A., 2001]
The avalanche of financial fraud and corruption in Orthodox Jewish circles also pushed the *Jewish Observer*, a periodical of the Agudath Israel Orthodox organization, to devote some space to the subject in its Summer 1997 issue. “What might the sin of our day be?” wondered Rabbi Aaron Brafman of Yeshiva Derech Ayson in Queens (which had itself come under investigation for embezzlement a few years earlier), “… I submit that the new sins to be concerned about are those of geeiva and gezeila (thievery and robbery) – dishonesty in money dealing.” [GOLDBERG, Thou, p. 40] Ironically, one of Agudath Israel’s featured speakers at a yearly gathering two years before was David Schick, an Orthodox investment counselor, who lectured about ethics in business. He also chaired that Agudath Israel of America national convention. A year later he himself, notes the *Jewish Week*,

“was accused of swindling at least $150 million from hundreds of Orthodox Jewish investors … in a massive real estate investment scam… [His] potential cooperation with law enforcement authorities is sending shivers throughout the frum [Orthodox] world because of potential involvement by the Internal Revenue Service into investors who used unreported cash in the investment scam.” [GREENBERG, E., Schick, p. 6]
“There is a new age of commercialism in American media, with its concentration of power and its widening breach between the public interest and the interests of the very few. In the coming century, the questions about the integrity of America’s information and media ownership are likely to be as fundamental to society as the purity of the water we drink or the air we breathe.”

– Thomas Maier, p. 13

“So here I am again in purse and wallet country … briefcases, holdalls, canvas football-bags – the swag that’s forever associated in my mind with being Jewish. Cheap and ugly objects, made for others’ tastes, never one’s own; Jews always second-guessing the gentiles, making little Hollywoods, little Broadways, returning gentile ideas to the gentiles, giving a Jew’s idea of what is gentile back to gentiles, wherever they go … If that is a Jewish tune to which the Lauren Bacall and Faye Dunaway look-alikes are dancing in Beverly Hills, then I wish someone other than Jews had written it.”

Howard Jacobson, Jewish author, 1995, p. 26, 208

“I wonder if any of our immigrant grandparents could have imagined that on the eve of the 21st century, Jews would comprise 11 percent of the United States Senate, dominate the entertainment industry as never before, while at the same time boasting the most popular professional wrestler as well as the most notorious spy in the country?”

Jonathan Tobin, Jewish author, 1-4-99, p. 5

“Non-Jewish participants [in a Los Angeles-area survey sponsored by the Zionist women’s organization Hadassah], most of whom did not grow up with Jews or know them personally, had vivid resentments toward Jews for their economic success, seeing them as ‘insular,’ superior and rich. They repeated the canards that Jews own the media, run the studios, own the Wilshire/Fairfax district. Jews were praised for their work ethic and strong family solidarity, but were regarded with suspicion, as being important behind-the-scenes players, lawyers who took advantage of their clients and media manipulators who slanted the press in the O. J. Simpson case.”

Marlene Adler Marks, New Jersey Jewish News, 4-23-98, p. 5]
“It just seems the whole world is Jewish… The Jewish Connection can be found in so many people, places and even animals.”

M. H. Goldberg, Jewish author, 1976, p. 105

“Given their skills and experiences, Jews today have excellent employment opportunities… Jews are represented among those men most active in promoting reform in top-level positions in banking, government, and the media.”

Michael Paul Sacks, 1998, p. 265, Jewish author commenting about Jews in Russia

“The main complaint heard [in Israel] is that for some reason Jews are the imaginative leaders in this field [movies] almost everywhere except Israel, and guess why. The real ‘why,’ the truly stinging insinuation, is that in Israel there are too many Jews who have to deal with each other.”

Jay Gonen, Israeli author, 1975, p. 274

“Only the blind cannot see that whoever controls the cultural apparatus… also controls the destiny of the United States and everything in it.”

Harold Cruse, Black intellectual, The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual (in Kostelanetz, p. 107)

“Two-thirds of Americans,” notes Bill McKibben, “tell researchers they get ‘most of their information’ about the world from television… [Most] American homes have TVs… on an average of seven hours a day… As many as 12 percent of adults (that is, one in eight) feel they are physically addicted to the set, watching an average fifty-six hours a week.” [MCKIBBEN, p. 18] “Twenty years ago,” noted Neil Postman in 1985, “the question, Does television shape culture or merely reflect it? held considerable interest for many scholars and social critics. The question has largely disappeared as television has gradually become our culture.” [POWERS/ROTHMAN/ROTHMAN, p. 41]

“Most Americans are basically,” noted Jewish author Herbert Schiller in 1973,

“though unconsciously, trapped in what amounts to a no-choice informational bind. Variety of opinions on foreign and domestic news or, for that matter, local community business, hardly exists in the media. This results essentially from the inherent identity of interests, material and ideological, of property-holders (in this case the private owners of the communications media), and from the monopolistic character of the communications industry in general.” [SCHILLER, H., p. 19]

The ABC, CBS, and NBC television and radio networks were all controlled and developed to power by Jews: David Sarnoff at NBC, William Paley at CBS, and Leonard Goldenson at ABC. As late as 1985, “Leonard Goldenson, ABC’s founder, was still very much in charge, and his network… was still the Number One in America.” [WILLIAMS, p 5]
Paley, the second mogul, achieved control of CBS in 1928 and headed it for nearly the next sixty years. Early investors in the company included other Jews of Paley’s original Philadelphia home, including Ike Levy and Jerome Louchheim. One of Paley’s biographers noted that he “had an insatiable appetite for power [SMITH, S., p. 15] ... CBS shaped and reflected American society to a greater degree than its rivals ... The flickering images on CBS represented the soul and sensibility of Bill Paley.” [SMITH, S., p. 16]

“Officially, [Sarnoff, the third mogul] did not head RCA until thirteen years after its founding,” notes Carl Drehr, “actually, as commercial manager, for all practical purposes he ran it almost from the beginning.” [DREHR, C. p. 52] By 1936 David Sarnoff was both president of RCA (later CEO) and chairman of the board of NBC (he founded NBC in 1926 as a radio company). [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 162] His son Robert became the CEO of NBC in 1955. In 1956, says a biographer, Sarnoff “brought the issue of nepotism [about the appointment of his son to head NBC] in the open.” “When a man stands in the way of his son’s progress,” Sarnoff told an NBC staff convention, “he is not thinking of his son, he is thinking of himself.” [LYONS, p. 312-313] “David Sarnoff,” notes Edwin Emery, “retired in 1970 to the honorary chairmanship of the Radio Corporation of America, which he had built. RCA was a two-billion dollar business and the largest communication organization in the world. His son Robert became both President and Board Chairman of RCA and father and son sat on the NBC board [a subsidiary of RCA].” [EMERY, p. 606]

“Both Paley and Sarnoff,” notes Chaim Bermant, “have shown a consistent interest in Jewish affairs. The latter was for many years on the board of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, and both he and Paley have been generous supporters of the Weizmann Institute of Science [in Israel].” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 105]

(The pattern of television ownership in England has been the same. As Bermant observes: “In Britain, until 1955, radio and television were a state monopoly ... In 1955, however, commercial television was launched and in time comprised three networks and several smaller regional companies. The networks, Associated-Rediffusion, Associated Television and Granada were headed by Emil Littler, Lew Grade, and Sidney Bernstein respectively, all of whom had spent a lifetime in show-business ... and all three were Jewish.”) [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 105]

Despite corporate buyouts and the labyrinthian nature of business takeovers, restructuring, et al, Jewish management and control over the decades has remained dominant; in 1993, for instance, the Chief Executive Officers for the three major American television networks and the four largest film studios were all Jews. [MACDONALD, p. 129] (In 1998, in a survey, the Anti-Defamation League solicited opinion about the fact that “the presidents of the three national television networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC, are Jewish.” [ADL, NOV 1998] In the film world, noted J. J. Goldberg in 1996, “virtually all the senior executives at the major studios are Jews.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 288]
While Jews make up merely 2.5% of the American population, in a 1990 issue of *Premiere* magazine, the first thirteen individuals identified “as the most powerful people in Hollywood,” were Jewish. [WHITFIELD, p. 83] In the same year, as noted by *American Film* magazine, the chairmen of eight of the top ten movie and television companies were Jewish. [STAUTH, p. 44] In an October 1994 issue of *Vanity Fair*, ten of eighteen deemed important faces in the changing world of “media megacorporations” were Jews. [HALBERSTAM, p. 12]

In 1999, the *Los Angeles Jewish Times* ran an article entitled “Yes, Virginia, Jews Do Control the Media.” “Four of the largest five entertainment giants,” it announced, “are now run or owned by Jews. Murdoch’s News Corp (at number four) is the only gentile holdout – however Rupert is as pro-Israel as any Jew, probably more so.” [LOS ANGELES JEWISH TIMES, p. 14] (And who is the Executive Vice President at the News Corporation? Gary Ginsberg.) [WEINTRAUB, B., 3-4-01] “Time-W arner, Disney, Viacom-CBS, News Corporation and Universal rule the entertainment world in a way that the old Hollywood studio chiefs only dreamed of,” noted the *Jewish Week* in 1999, “And, after all the deals and buyouts, four of the five are run by Jews. We’re back to where we started, bigger than ever.” [GOLDBERG, J.J., 9-17-99, 12]

Since Australian-born Rupert Murdoch is the lone non-Jew in the aforementioned pantheon of elite media moguls, it is appropriate to examine his relationship to the Jewish community. As one of his biographers, Thomas Kiernan, notes:

“The most important impact of 1962 on Murdoch, though, was his trip to the United States to buy television programs ... The chief executive who impressed Murdoch more than any was New York’s Leonard Goldenson, the head of the American Broadcasting Company ... At the time, Goldenson was turning the small, feisty ABC television network into a legitimate rival of the twin Goliaths, CBS and NBC. His method was to pursue ‘down-market’ programming, a combination of entertainment and news shows designed to appeal to the coarser tastes of the American public. ABC became known as the ‘schlock network during the 1950s ... Goldenson’s approach to television in America was similar to Murdoch’s newspapers in Australia [p. 75-76] ... [Murdoch] and Goldenson became fast friends ... In time, Goldenson became Murdoch’s newest mentor ... Goldenson’s Jewishness also had a significant impact on Murdoch ... As for the stereotype of Jews being financially aggressive, brash, devious, cutthroat, pushy, and concerned only with making money – well, he certainly possessed many of those traits too ...[p. 76-77] ... Goldenson, like many of his ambitious New York counterparts, made no effort to disguise his Jewishness. If anything, they wore it on their sleeves, mostly out of their pride in Israel. In a place like New York, it was almost fashionable to be a Jew in the 1950s, especially if one’s ambitions were focused on achieving a niche in the city’s establishment ... [p. 77] It was easy for him to identify with these New York Jewish counterparts. When the time came for him to make his perma-
nent move into the United States fifteen years later, it was to them that he would turn largely for support. And they would respond eagerly, but not just because Murdoch represented a source of business. They felt they could ‘trust’ him on Israel. Leonard Goldenson had not let a meeting with Murdoch go by during his trips to New York without giving him a dissertation about Israel and its imporance in the global scheme of things.” [KIERNAN, T., 1986, p. 78]

“What binds [the Hollywood elite] is a sense of interlocking ventures and relationships,” said a Jewish observer, William Isaacson, Time Inc.’s media editor, in 1994, “The old establishment was a club. The New Establishment is a network.” [CASH, p. 15] In a 1980s study, 59% of the directors, writers, and producers of the fifty most economically successful movies produced between 1965 and 1982 were also found to be Jewish. [LIPSET, p. 4] (See Martin Greenberg’s The Jewish Lists for a sampling of such people). As early as 1936, one study found that “of 85 names engaged in [movie] production, 53 are Jews. And the Jewish advantage holds in prestige as well as numbers.” [GABLER, p. 2]

In 1980, film scholar Patricia Erens noted that “the list [of Jewish screenwriters in Hollywood] is long. A recent survey indicated that seventy to eighty per cent of the Screen Writers Guild was composed of Jews, a trend dating back to the 1930s.” [ERENS, P., 1980, p. 116] (Prominent among them were Julius and Phil Epstein, Carl Foreman, William Goldman, Ben Hecht, Garson Kanin, Howard Koch, Abraham Polansky, Herman Mankiewicz, Morris Riskin and Budd Schulberg). “Composing [music for movies],” adds Erens, “has been another area of high concentration for Jewish artists.” In this genre, Erens notes Burt Bacharach, Irving Berlin, Elmer Bernstein, Bernard Herrman, Marvin Hamlisch, Jerome Kern, Alfred Newman, Andre Previn, Miklos Rozsa, and Max Steiner. [ERENS, P., 1980, p. 116]

“Hollywood,” notes film critic Lester Friedman, “was a town dominated by Jews from its earliest days down to the present time.” [FRIEDMAN, L., 1982, p. vii] As early as 1925, Samuel “Roxy” Rothafel “was the leading movie theatre impresario in America.” [GABLER, N., 1988, p. PHOTO SECTION CAPTION] He was also known for his movie theatre “palaces.” Grauman’s Chinese Theatre, the iconic site where Hollywood stars dipped their hands and feet into fresh cement, was owned by Sid Grauman, also Jewish.

Early Jewish film directors are many, including Billy Wilder, Eric Von Stroheim, Josef Von Sternberg, Ernst Lubitsch, William Wyler, Hal Wallis, William Wanger, Robert Wise, Rouben Mamoulian, Robert Rossen, George Cukor, Sidney Lumet, and Cecil B. DeMille (who had a Jewish mother). In later years came Peter Bogdanovich (half-Jewish), William Friedkin, Stanley Kubrick, Arthur Penn, and many others. More recent Jewish academy award-winning directors include Sydney Pollack, Stephen Spielberg and Barry Levinson. Jewish influence in movie-making also has a strong international complexion: Polish-born Roman Polanski (Chinatown; and Czech-born Milos Forman (Amadeus) are among the many prominent movie directors who are also Jewish. Jews were also prominent, even dominant, in the pre-World War II years in the German film
world (from which many Jewish filmmakers – the likes of Fritz Lang and Otto Preminger – moved to America). In Russia, “Mikhail Romm,” notes Jewish scholar Barnet Litvinoff, “[was] considered the greatest Soviet filmmaker since his fellow-Jew, [Serguei] Eisenstein.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 86]

As Louis Rapoport notes:

“[Joseph Stalin] was not pleased by the fact that there was a highly disproportionate number of Jews in the Soviet film industry, as in the other arts: for example, directors Sergei Eisenstein, Mikhail Romm, Mark Donsky, Leonid Lukov, and Yuli Reissman; actors and actresses Faina Raneskaya, Mark Berness, Daniel Segal, Solomon Mikhoels, and Benjamin Zuskin; scriptwriters Vasily Grossman (the novelist-journalist) and Yevgency Gabrilovich; and cinematographer Boris Volchok.” [RAPOPORT, L., 1990, p. 82]

“The motion picture industry,” notes Charles Silberman, “was largely a Jewish invention.” [SILBERMAN, p. 147] “All the large Hollywood companies, with the exception of United Artists (a distribution company established by Hollywood actors who feared the big producers would restrict their artistic freedom) were founded and controlled by Jews,” notes the Encyclopedia Judaica, [United Artists, however, was controlled by Jews later] ... An even more important influence in the film industry ... were the independent producers, among whom Jews were in the majority.” [ENCY JUD, p. 445, 449]

In the earliest years of the movie and entertainment industry, Jewish filmmakers often popularized negative images of the Jewish community. “Some of the worst offenders,” says Nathan Belth, “were themselves Jews.” [BELTH, p. 46] The “so-called ‘Jew movies’ were produced at the rate of one every two week.” [BELTH, p. 50] These centered on highly unflattering Jewish characters – smugglers, robbers, lustful “Yiddish sports,” and miserly swindlers. In 1916, the Anti-Defamation League convinced Carl Laemmle (the Jewish head of Universal film studios) to avoid making any movie that “held Jews up to ridicule or contempt ... By 1920 the policy enunciated by Laemmle became the general practice among movie makers.” [BELTH, p. 50] (Even Jewish comedian Jack Benny’s “tightwad” persona was a “Jewish character.”) [FAINBOLD, N., 6-5-98]

“Despite the powerful Jewish role in [early] motion pictures,” says Milton Plesur,

“that industry also had its anti-Semitic features. Whenever a producer wished to depict a betrayer of public trust, a hard-boiled, usurious money lender, a crooked gambler, a grafter, a deprived firebug, a white slaver, or other villains of one kind or another, the character was often represented as a Jew ... When one of the many theatres owned by Jews boycotted a movie with the usual stereotypes, Rebecca’s Wedding Day (Chicago, 1916), Hollywood got the message and agreed to cease producing anti-Semitic films.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 34]

Jews have long been active in establishing themselves and networking throughout the American theatrical and entertainment worlds. “The Broadway musical,” says Charles Silberman, “generally considered the most characteristi-
cally American theatrical form, has been largely an American-Jewish creation … Composers and lyricists who have given the Broadway musical its distinctive shape have almost all been Jews – people such as Jerome Kern, Oscar Hammerstein, Ira Gershwin, Richard Rogers and Lorenz Hart, Rogers and Hammerstein, and more recently Frederick Loewe, Marvin Hamlisch, and Stephen Sondheim. [SILBERMAN, p. 147] The team of Alan Jay Lerner and Fritz Loewe produced Brigadoon, My Fair Lady, Camelot, Paint Your Wagon, Gigi, and other major musical plays. “The wellspring of the American musical,” says Gene Lees, “is to be found in the opéra-bouffe of Jacques Offenbach, a German Jew by birth though he lived and worked in Paris and his shows were in French.” [LEES, G., 1990, p. 12] “With the exception of Cole Porter,” notes the London Guardian, “almost every writer of musicals in the pre-rock [music] era was Jewish, even if their names sometimes suggested otherwise.” [ARNOT, C., 10-4-2000, p. 6]

“At the turn of the century,” Jewish performers Lewis Fields and Joe Weber “were the most beloved and ambitious of comedy teams.” [FIELDS/FIELDS, p. xiii] Vaudeville star Sophie Tucker “raised several million dollars for Jewish causes.” [ANTLER, J., 199,7, p. 140(d)] Unknown to most Americans, an estimated 80% of America’s professional comedians in recent history were/are Jewish, [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 170; SLAVIN, p. 18] from Milton Berle (Bergling), Jack Benny (Benjamin Kubelsky), Woody Allen (Alan Konigsberg), Eddie Cantor (Isidore Iskowitz), Fanny Brice (Fania Borach), Pee Wee Herman (Paul Rubenfeld), Soupy Sales (Milton Hines), Joey Bishop (Joseph Abraham Gottleib), Buddy Hackett (Leonard Hacker), Alan King (Irwin Kniberg), Gene Wilder (Eugene Silverstein), Gilda Radner, Don Rickles, Joan Rivers (Molinsky), Jerry Lewis (Joseph Levitch), Mel Brooks, Pinky Lee, Billy Crystal, Totie Fields, Red Buttons (Aaron Chwatt), Allen Sherman, Henny Youngman, Shelly Green, Zero Mostel, David Steinberg, Shelly Berman, Jack Carter, Mort Sahil, Myron Cohen, and Rodney Dangerfield (Jack Cohen) to the Marx Brothers and Three Stooges (Moe and Curly Howard/Hurwitz, and Larry Fineman). “Nearly all the American comedians and comedienne whose names have lingered,” says Chaim Bermant, “from Fanny Brice to the Marx Brothers, and from Jack Benny to Lenny Bruce, have been Jews. If Hollywood was a Jewish industry, no part of it was so exclusively Jewish as laughter.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 101]

“When I started doing stand-up comedy in New York in 1978,” says Mark Schiff, “we created our own little shtetl. All I saw every night, either walking the streets or in a comedy club, was mostly other Jewish comedians. About 80 percent of the comics I worked with were Jewish. I personally knew a therapist that was treating 10 different Jewish comics at the same time.” [SCHIFF, M., 11-16-01]

Lenny (Leonard Schneider) Bruce’s humor, says Barry Rubin, portrays “almost everyone [as] really Jewish, meaning different, oppressed, alienated. Gentiles were hypocrites, secret anti-Semites.” [RUBIN, p. 110] John Stewart (Leibowitz) “is Generation X’s Mort Sahil and Lenny Bruce – a comedian who
unapologetically filters his political satire through a Jewish sensibility … he sometimes refers to Christians as ‘you people’ …” [FORWARD, 1-5-01]

Comedian Jackie Mason is even an ordained rabbi. He was an early supporter of political racist Meir Kahane. “Democratic principles shouldn’t apply to Israel like they do to America,” he told a Jewish journalist. [FRIEDMAN, R., 1990, p. 222] Early in her media career, talk-show host Sally Jessy Raphael interviewed Mason on a live radio broadcast:

“I was just beginning to feel that the interview was going pretty well when all of a sudden he reached under my sweater, unhooked my bra, and cupped my breasts in his hands. I was repelled. I was shocked. I was scared. I was dumbfounded. But there was absolutely nothing I could do about it but try to get the interview over as fast as I could. I was on live radio, after all.” [RAPHAEL, S., 1990, p. 21]

George Burns recalls the political activism of fellow Jewish comedians Georgie Jessel, Eddie Cantor and Jack Benny:

“George had just come back after raising something like $25,000,000 in bonds for the new nation of Israel. ‘That’s a lot of money, Georgie,’ I said, ‘How’d you raise so much? ’It wasn’t that difficult, Natty,” he explained, “I just left no Cohen unturned … [BURNS, G., 1989, p. 178] One night, I remember, [Jack Benny] had dinner at Cantor’s house and Eddie started telling him about Israeli Bonds. Jack made out a check right there for $25,000.” [BURNS, G., 1989, p. 203]

During the 1950s and 1960s, notes Irv Saposnik, “Sid Caesar, Alan King, Morey Amsterdam, Jack Carter, Buddy Hackett, Sam Levenson, Jackie Mason, Jan Murray, and Joey Bishop (among others) became household fixtures. Suddenly, Jewish comedians were everywhere: Milton Berle on the Texaco Star Theatre, Eddie Cantor on the Colgate Comedy Hour, Sid Caesar and company on Your Show of Shows, and a whole comic avalanche on the Ed Sullivan Show … Psychoanalysis and stand-up comedy offer a distinct way of looking at the world. Both present the abnormal as normal, the neurotic as necessary, the outsider as the true insider. No wonder Jews invented both.” [SAPOSNIK, 1998]

Joan Rivers explains the psychology of what she believes to be the successful comic who “makes it to the top”:

“The conventional diagnosis of comics holds that they are hypersensitive, angry, paranoid people who feel somehow cheated of life’s goodies and are laughing to keep from crying. I agree, but I think comedy is more aggressive than that. It is a medium for revenge. We can deflate and punish the pomposity and the rejection which hurt us. Comedy is power. We can be in control… People want to be around somebody who entertains them – but simultaneously they fear us. The only weapon more formidable than humor is a gun … [RIVERS, p. 24] … If you have reached the top in comedy, you are, in your own way, a killer – but every killer is bandidged. And the anger is never out of you.” [RIVERS, p. 150]
Mel Brooks is more explicit about this. As one news report noted:

“There’s a very serious reason Mel Brooks makes so many jokes about being Jewish. The writer-director of such classic films as ‘Blazing Saddles’ and ‘History of the World: Part I’ says his humor stems from a deep-seated anger about anti-Semitism. ‘Yes, I am a Jew. I AM a Jew,’ he says on ‘60 Minutes,’ which airs at 7 p.m. EDT Sunday on CBS. ‘What about it? What’s so wrong? What’s the matter with being a Jew? I think there’s a lot of that way deep down beneath all the quick Jewish jokes that I do.’”

ASSOCIATED PRESS, 4-12-01; updated 4-16-01

Jewish comic Bobby Slayton, self-described as the “Pit bull of Comedy,” noted a Phoenix newspaper in 1998, “despises conservative white Christians, and doesn’t fear their warnings of hell ‘because the Jews’ll cater, the blacks’Il entertain, the homos’ll decorate, and it’ll be one big fuckin’ party.”

Another Jewish comedian, Robert Schimmel, was noted in 2000 as “America’s newest comedy star, fresh off his first HBO special and his third major-label release.” “Schimmel,” declared one reviewer, “is one of those men who leaves audiences breathless with his potty-mouth talk about fucking his daughter’s boyfriend and jacking off to porn.” Schimmel once talked about the death of his 11-year old son to cancer on the Howard Stern radio show, joking that “well, the Make-a-Wish Foundation came to us. Derek was really sick, and they wanted to make his wish come true. So I told them his wish was to watch Dolly Parton blow me.”

Jerry Sadowitz, a Jewish comedian from Great Britain, was “beaten up by members of his audience on stage in Canada for being so rude about the Francophone population.” Sadowitz is also a British TV star. As the Times [of London] reported:

“It’s very childish and very offensive,’ explained Sadowitz, when asked to describe his new X-rated late-night sketch show, Bib and Bob.”

Another Jewish British comedian, Ian Stone, has a stand-up routine guaranteed to offend fellow Jews, entitled “A Little Piece of Kike.” “I knew that using the word [kike] would get peoples’ noses up,” he says, “because they’re Jewish noses, what noses!”

As Rabbi Daniel Lapin complains, “Some of the most notoriously foul-mouthed and obscene-minded entertainers are Jewish and earn no reproof for their public aggrandizement of filth.” “From the first,” adds Jewish author Ellen Schiff, “Jewish comedians and comediennes have provoked laughter by breaking the rules. They are loud and vulgar; they shamelessly call attention to their physicality … The caricatured comic Jew who pokes fun at himself (and everything else) as one ethnic among others is essentially an American Jewish creation. Responding both to opportunity (theatres by the turn of the present century were largely controlled by Jews) and to cultural conditioning … Jewish performers scored conspicuous success in vaudeville and burlesque as well as in drama.”
Jewish author Arthur Asa Berger (author of “The Genius of the Jewish Joke”) and the Jewish impact on American humor:

“While assimilation is a big concern in the Jewish community, Berger contends that conversely, Jewish culture has ‘Yiddishized American humor.’ ‘When Jews disappear,’ he joked, ‘the Jewish humor will be written by non-Jews because they’ve been Yiddishized and they’ll be able to carry it on.’” [FAINGOLD, N., 6-5-98]

Long time Tonight Show host Johnny Carson, noted biographer Laurence Leamer, “had something else going for him. He was a WASP in a profession full of Jewish comedians. The television executives knew that much of their audience was in Topeka and Peoria and other stations in the heartland, where the borscht belt was considered an item of apparel.” [LEAMER, L., 1989, p. 135]

Even the people writing the jokes for comedians have usually been Jewish. “A lot of great comedy writers started in radio,” noted comedian George Burns. “For some reason, a lot of them were Jewish.” [BURNS, G., 1989, p. 138]

(The among Burns’ own “top writers” was fellow Jew Sid Dorfman). [RANDALL, T., 1989, p. 123]

“The storefront theatres of the late teens were transformed into the movie palaces of the twenties by Jewish exhibitors,” says Neal Gabler about the early twentieth century, “And when the sound movies commandeered the industry, Hollywood was invaded by a battalion of Jewish writers, mostly from the East. The most powerful talent agencies were run by Jews.” “Jews,” notes Joel Kotkin, “also accounted for a large portion of the agents and, often working under Anglicized names, many of the actors as well.” [KOTKIN, p. 60] The most pre-eminent “talent agency,” the William Morris Agency was founded by Zelman Moses – who renamed himself William Morris. Its major modern day rival, Creative Artists Agency, was founded in 1975 by another Jewish entrepreneur, Michael Ovitz, and other defectors from the parent firm. Yet another who got his start at William Morris was David Geffen, who has risen to become one of the biggest record company, and mass media, executives in Hollywood. At powerful William Morris, “it was no accident,” says Frank Rose, “that a mostly Jewish agency handling mostly Jewish performers in a business that smacked of the underworld should employ an Episcopalian … to sell its acts to Madison Avenue.” [ROSE, p. 70] (This strategy closely parallels that of Sigmund Freud’s early psychoanalytic movement when it was almost all Jewish. Freud appealed to his Jewish followers, explaining the reason he selected non-Jew Karl Jung to head the International Psychoanalytic Association: “Most of you are Jews, and therefore you are incompetent to win friends for the new teaching … It is absolutely essential that I should form ties in the world of general science.” [GROLLMAN, E., 1965, p. 101] This strategy of hiding the Jewish hand has also been true in the Jewish-dominated world of socialism and communism. As Jewish scholars Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note: “The same pattern characterized the Socialist Party of America. Until 1918 SPA drew its greatest relative strength from non-Jewish areas of the country. Nonetheless, Jews already dominated the party’s organization, aside from the very top leadership (i.e., Eugene
Debs and his immediate followers). By 1920 Jews constituted the main prop of both the party leadership and cadres, a position they maintained through the 1960s. They tended to avoid the very top leadership positions, however, lest attempts to develop a broader base be weakened … The American Communist party would soon follow the same pattern … Indeed, when instructed to change their names for party purposes, most American Jewish communists chose non-Jewish pseudonyms.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 99, 100])

Indeed, a Jewish criminal underworld, as well as (to a lesser degree) the Italian mafia, has long held influence in Hollywood [see, for example, Dan Moldea’s Dark Victory, focusing on MCA, about the subject] and its Nevada playground, Las Vegas. In a battle for Columbia Pictures between brothers Harry and Jack Cohn in the late 1930s, for instance, Harry received economic help from Jewish “crime boss” Abner Zwillman. [MOLDEA, p. 88] Mobster Joseph Stacher was also a “silent partner” in the firm. [MCDOUGAL, p. 420] Joseph Schenck, also Jewish, the head of 20th Century Fox, was “convicted of perjury during government investigations into bribes he and other studio bosses had paid to … union racketeers connected with the mafia.” [WOLFE, D., p. 197]

“Behind the case was union business,” says Mary Ellin Barrett (Schenck’s “god daughter”), “the paying off of racketeers to grease the wheels of Hollywood productions, something all the big studios, including 20th-Century Fox, were suspected of doing. ‘Joe took the rap for a lot of guys,’ my father [Irving Berlin] would say later, and try to explain how it was that Uncle Joe, though engaged in questionable dealings, had been a form of Hollywood hero; that the other studio chiefs, also dealing in illegal payoffs, had families; Joe, the only one without children, had volunteered to stand for the rest.” [BARRETT, M. 1994, p. 196]

William Fox, of 20th Century Fox, spent five months in prison for tax evasion in 1943. [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 419] And when Jewish “labor lawyer Sidney Korshak … arrived in Hollywood [in the 1940s],” says Dan Moldea, “a new, more ambitious and sophisticated era of the Mafia’s penetration of the film industry had begun.” [MOLDEA, p. 86] Korshak had connections and friends throughout the Hollywood world. “To scores of federal, state, and local law enforcement officials,” wrote Seymour Hersh, “Korshak is the most important link between organized crime and legitimate business.” [MOLDEA, p. 278] In 1978 a California Attorney General report listed Korshak as one of the “Mob figures” in the state. [MCDOUGAL, p. 420]

Among those many in Hollywood who worked with Korshak was Charles Bluhdorn, who had gained control of Gulf + Western (of which Paramount studios became a subsidiary) in 1966. “Bluhdorn seemed to have few qualms about turning to gray money,” says Peter Biskind, “He was under investigated by the SEC through the ‘70s, and he was close to Korshak, the real Godfather of Hollywood … [BISKIND, p. 144] … Everyone who worked for him was certain [Bluhdorn] was Jewish, but he took great pains to conceal it. Mob lawyer Sidney Korshak told [producer Robert] Evans that his sister went to synagogue with Bluhdorn in Chicago, but the Gulf + Western chief always professed ignorance of Jewish holidays.” [BISKIND, p. 143] Film director Don Simpson called Blu-
hdorn a “mean, despicable, unethical, evil man … He had no problem breaking the law. He was a criminal.” [BISKIND, p. 144]

(Bluhdorn’s Gulf + Western corporation was a many-tentacled monster. “There is hardly a major issue in the news that does not affect Gulf + Western,” noted investigative journalist Ben Bagdikian in 1983, “Almost every American buys the company’s goods.” [BAGDIKIAN, p. 31] The company controlled over 100 other firms, including TV production center Desilu Productions, clothing lines Kayser-Roth, Catalina, Cole of California, Jonathan Logan, Oscar de la Renta; nuclear power and mining interests; racetracks, professional sports teams, insurance companies, farm supplies, and missile parts. “It once owned 50 percent of UPITN, which provided television news for networks in eighty countries … and it owns 8 percent of the arable land of the Dominican Republic.” [BAGDIKIAN, p. 30-31])

Eventually Paramount’s (Jewish) head of production, Robert Evans, decided to do a film version of the popular book about the Italian mafia, The Godfather. But when he and the number two man at Paramount, Peter Bart (also Jewish), “screened [old] mob movies, [they] realized they had all been written and directed by Jews. Evans concluded he needed an Italian if he was going to ‘smell the spaghetti.”’ [BISKIND, p. 142] Enter Francis Ford Coppola.

Noting the importance of being Jewish in Hollywood, in 1994 William Cash noted (in a British journal, The Spectator) that:

“In Hollywood, the most obvious Jewish Club are in the sideshows, the lawyers, talent agencies, and management and production offices. Birgit Cunningham … told me that when she worked as a personal assistant to Vic Sutton, the Jewish head of the fast track LA commercial talent agency, Sutton, Barth and Vennari, her boss would often – if signing a deal – bluntly ask if they were Jewish. ‘I was surprised,’ she said, ‘I mean, in England, you’d never hear someone ask, ‘Are you Anglican?’”’ [CASH, p. 15]

Throughout the history of Hollywood, note David Desser and Lester Friedman, “the Jewish film producers, known not entirely affectionately as movie moguls, employed a veritable army of talent both in front of and behind the camera, many of whom were Jewish. The number of Jewish writers and actors, in particular, is amazing, as are the number of [Jewish] émigré directors who started in the 1920s.” [DESSER, p. 27]

Among Hollywood’s many public promotions is Sigmund Freud’s theories of psychoanalysis. [See earlier chapter on its use in Jewish theories of anti-Semitism] The New York Times notes that “since the 1920s Hollywood has been fascinated – off and on screen – by psychiatry … Despite the erratic matter in which it was practiced, psychoanalysis struck a chord with the Hollywood elite. Writers were particularly enthralled by the new science.” [FARBER, p. 22] “As they evangelized psychoanalysis,” note Stephen Farber and Marc Green, “the Hollywood elite led the way in making the Freudian science – with all its contemporary offshoots – an integral part of American life.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 7] “Suddenly,” says Dr. Louis Jolyon West, “psychoanalysis was no longer seen as a quaint and
slightly perverted Jewish conspiracy to subvert the world’s morals. After World War II, psychiatry became respectable.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 70]

How entwined this secular Jewish world view of guilt, sexuality, and neurosis has been in the heart of Hollywood may be measured in the flurry of 1990s books about the subject, including titles like Farber and Green’s *Hollywood on the Couch*; Lebeau’s *Lost Angels: Psychoanalysis and Cinema*; Bergstrom’s *Endless Nights: Cinema and Psychoanalysis*; and Kaplan’s *Psychoanalysis and Cinema*. Among the most obvious of the self-conscious psychoanalysis promoters is director/actor Woody Allen, whose stereotypical on-screen neurotic Jewish persona centers on psychotherapists to explain the world to him. In real life, notes Allen’s former lover, Mia Farrow, “that Woody had been in psychoanalysis two or three times a week for about thirty years was astonishing to me.” [FARROW, p. 223-224]

Among the prominent Jewish psychoanalysts who have set up shop in Tinseltown over the years included Otto Fenichel and Ernst Simmel (see earlier chapter, p. 592 and p. 594, about their thoughts on anti-Semitism), Karl Menni nger, Margaret Hohnehberg, Lawrence Kubie, Philip Solomon, Joshua Hoffs, Leo Rangell, Rudolph Loewenstein, Mildred Newman, Bernard Berkowitz, and David Rubenfine. May Rom (originally: Minyetta Belyoshi Ichi Minya M’Aike) set up her practice in Hollywood in 1946.

Jewish therapist Frederick Hacker set up a clinic in Beverly Hills and was “the first analyst to become a millionaire” in Hollywood. [FARBER/GREEN, p. 118] Analyst Milton Wexler was struggling for years to hustle one of his own screenplays; he finally found a taker in one of his own patients, director Blake Edwards. [FARBER/GREEN, p. 215] Another Jewish therapist, Gregory Zilboorg, exploited one vulnerable patient so much that he “was making himself the manager of his patient’s business.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 63] When O.J. Simpson was jailed after accusations that he murdered his wife, therapist Saul Faerstein outraged Simpson’s lawyers with a bill for $25,000 for his first month of part-time work with the notorious patient. [SCHILLER/WILLWERTH, p. 165] Jewish director/screenwriter Norah Ephron even married her psychiatrist. [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 63] (She was also once the wife of famous Washington investigative journalist Carl Bernstein). [GROSSVOGEL, D., 2000, p. 184] Actress Esther Williams (and Cary Grant) first took LSD in 1959 as experiments at the Psychiatric Institute of Beverly Hills, headed by Mortimer Hartman and Arthur Chandler. [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 12]

Another therapist, Eugene Landy, raised eyebrows by claiming 25 percent of royalties on some of his patient’s songs: Brian Wilson of the Beach Boys. [FARBER/GREEN, p. 216] Landy’s therapy fee was $5 a minute ($300 an hour). [WILSON, p. 276] Between 1983 and 1986 he was paid $35,000 a month ($420,000 a year). Landy also became a half partner with Wilson in a “creative partnership” to share profits in “recordings, films, soundtracks, or books.” In addition, he was also paid $150,000 a year from 1987-1991 from a special Beach Boys fund. In sum, he made nearly $3 million as Wilson’s psychoanalyst. [HILBURN, p. 63]
Wilson, burned out on drugs in the 1980s, had ceded complete control of his life to his therapist. Landy’s accountant’s son, Scott Steinberg, even moved in with Wilson to oversee his personal world. Therapist Landy became Wilson’s “executive producer, co-producer, business manager, co-songwriter, and business adviser.” [WILSON, p. 351] Pushed by fellow Beach Boys and Wilson’s wife, the Board of Medical Quality Assurance, a California medical ethics organization, eventually charged Landy with unethical conduct. Landy surrendered his license to practice therapy for two years. [WILSON, p. 352] Other Jewish therapists, at various times, for the famous Beach Boy included Harold Bloomfield, Solon Samuels, and Lee Baumel.

(The economic exploitation of vulnerable patients by their psychoanalysts is apparently an ethical norm of the psychoanalytic community. At a meeting of the International Psychoanalytic Association, Jewish psychoanalyst Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson notes his initial introduction to the “political realities of psychoanalysis. I ought not to have been shocked, but I was. As I’ve indicated earlier, I knew of the practice of soliciting money from patients, but this was the first time I was directly involved. About twenty analysts, most of them holding some official position or other, had gathered together to discuss the funding of the new chair of psychoanalysis at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. A million-dollar endowment was needed. How to get it? The solution, said one prominent analyst from Chicago, was easy, and had been used several times. ‘I would ask each of you to compose a list of your wealthiest patients, with their names, addresses and phone numbers. We will then circulate this list within this group. The next stage is for some of us to contact these people, without, of course, telling them how we have their names, and asking them if they wish to donate money for the chair.’ This was, by any standard I knew, unethical behavior, but nobody in the room voiced any objection.” [MASSON, J. M., 1990, p. 187-188])

Such a profiteer of the therapist-patient bond was George Pollock (president of both the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis and the American Psychiatric Association), who was eventually sued by the son of one of his deceased patients (Anne Lederer) who claimed that the “doctor” brainwashed his mother into leaving him her fortune. Jewish therapists Martin Wasserman and Melvin Heller also entered lucrative careers as “media consultants.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 242] Another, analyst Carol Liebeman, started out as a cabaret singer. She remained a member of the Writers’ Guild of America and ran ads in its house organ, noting her psychological services to improve screenplays. Therapist Evelyn Silvers even started out as a fashion model, and was a pretty backdrop for TV’s “The $64,000 Question.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 290] New York therapist Louise Kaplan’s book, entitled Female Perversions, was translated into a movie in 1997. Directed and co-screen written by Susan Streitfeld, the film features “a sexy, high-powered attorney who sleeps with both men and women.” [SKALR, R., 1997, p. 9]

Dr. Martin Grotjahn counted Warren Beatty, Vivian Leigh, Danny Kaye, David Geffen, and many others as patients. Phil Cohen had Sterling Hayden, Lloyd Bridges, John Garfield, among others. Judy Garland’s Jewish psychoanalysts included Ernst Simmel (“five days a week on her way to work”) and Her-
bert Kupper. She first went to one at the encouragement of her lover, Joseph Mankiewicz, also Jewish. [SHIPMAN, 1993, p. 142] Another therapist, Frederick Hacker, used “to accompany Garland to [her movie] rushes, where she judged her work.” [SHIPMAN, 1993, p. 201]

**Marilyn Monroe** is another who fell under the dominance of a string of Jewish analysts, and a Jewish world, including, most famously, Ralph Greenson (born: Romeo Greenschpoon) who was her therapist when she (allegedly) committed suicide. “Like many of his colleagues at the time,” notes a *Good Housekeeping* review of a book by Donald Spoto about Marilyn,

> “Greenson relied heavily on drug therapy for his patients, routinely prescribing barbiturates and tranquilizers or having patients’ other doctors do so. He referred Marilyn to internist Hyman Engelberg [also Jewish], who prescribed many of the medications Greenson ordered for her. Greenson would also regularly meet with Marilyn at his home and even asked his daughter to befriend her, disastrously unprofessional tactics that increased Marilyn’s dependency on him … Her friends noticed that the more Marilyn saw Greenson, the more miserable she became … Greenson encouraged Marilyn’s deep dependency on him (he was seeing her twice daily).” [GOOD HOUSEKEEPING, 1993, p. 212, 214]

The incestuous nature of Hollywood life may be noted in Greenson’s case: his sister Elizabeth “was married to Milton ‘Mickey’ Rudin, an entertainment attorney who was one of the town’s major power brokers.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 93] Rudin was Jewish and also Monroe’s lawyer. He was also an attorney and publicist for Frank Sinatra, who, early in his career, was also a patient of Ralph Greenson. [KELLEY, K., p. 208, 305]

**Marilyn Monroe**’s publicist, Arthur Jacobs, was also Jewish. So were her agents at MCA, Jay Kanter and Mort Viner. Many of the directors of her films were also Jews (for example, Billy Wilder of *Some Like It Hot* and George Cukor of *Let’s Make Love*). Natasha Lytess, her personal manager, and a woman she lived with at one time in Hollywood, was the subject of talk about Monroe’s rumored lesbianism. Lytess was also Jewish, from Austria. [LEAMING, p. 31] In the quest for Monroe’s career, says Barbara Leaming, “Marilyn’s relationship with Nathasa was … mutually exploitive.” [LEAMING, p. 31] Milton Greene, also Jewish, a fashion photographer “with whom she’d reportedly had a fling during the late forties,” was another early personal manager. [MCDOUGAL, p. 216] Charles Feldman was also once her agent.

**Monroe**, early in life, had resolved to sleep with anyone who could help her attain fame and fortune in Hollywood. Close friend Ted Jordan notes that she had “sex with anybody she thought might be able to advance her career.” [JORDAN, p. 121] “It is clear,” notes Anthony Summers in his biography of her,

> “that Marilyn made judicious use of her favors. A key beneficiary, reportedly, was the man who got Marilyn that vital first contract at Fox – Ben Lyon. According to writer Sheila Graham, Lyon had been sleeping with Marilyn and promising to further her career… Lyon called the casting director for Sol Wurtzel, a B-movie producer of the time [and
Monroe was awarded a small part in the 1947 film *Dangerous Years*.” [SUMMERS, A., 1985, p. 35]

Garment millionaire Henry Rosenfeld was another Jewish sex partner on the road to fame. “She would join Rosenfeld at his home in Atlantic City for trips in his speedboat and for quiet evenings of talk and laughter.” [SUMMERS, A., p. 45] Jewish mobster, and Hollywood powerbroker, Bugsy Siegel also had sex with Marilyn. [JORDAN, p. 84, 87] Ted Jordan (born Edward Friedman) even wrote a book about his early sexual experiences with Monroe – they began on his fourth date with her when she was 17. Then known by her real name, Norma Jean, Monroe was soon sleeping with Friedman’s uncle, Ted Lewis (original name also Friedman), who, “with his clarinet and distinctive style of old favorites, was among the hottest acts in show business.” [JORDAN, p. 73]

“I learned,” says Jordan,

“that at one point in their little backstage meeting, Ted had slipped Norma Jean a piece of paper with his telephone number on it. Soon they were meeting in hotel rooms whenever Ted was in town … Soon he was pulling strings for Norma Jean, trying to hook her up with an agent who would do her the most good … As Norma Jean had vowed to me, whoever she had to fuck, she was prepared to do it. And, for good measure, she did the same with [prominent, and Jewish, gossip columnist] Walter Winchell.” [JORDAN, p. 75]

Lewis, notes Jordan, “began an affair with the then-unknown model and introduced her to narcotics.” [JORDAN, photo section] A key agent in accelerating Monroe’s early career was Johnny Hyde (like many Hollywood Jews, born in Russia, and a veteran of vaudeville.) She was also his mistress – he soon fell in love with her, and wanted to leave his wife for the actress. (He was 53, she was 23). Hyde, notes Ted Jordan, “not so coincidentally … was Ted Lewis’ personal manager.” [JORDAN, p. 85] “In making Marilyn known,” says Fred Guiles, “[Hyde] flexed a lot of muscle. The simple fact is that Johnny Hyde was the chief architect of her fame and her eventual legend.” [GUILES, p. 147]

“By 1953,” says Jordan,

“… [Monroe] could be virulently anti-Semitic (a prejudice that grew as she got older). To my discomfort she would sometimes refer to Joe Schenck, the mogul [and another sexual stepping stone], as ‘that Jew shit’ and to other Hollywood personalities as ‘Jew’ this or that. Occasionally I would have to remind her that I was half Jewish.” [JORDAN, p. 188]

The Hollywood world and its pressures of being a sex goddess of course destroyed her. Monroe’s physician Hyman Engelberg and her therapist Romeo Greenson were the first to her death scene, reported to be a drug overdose, but they didn’t call police for four hours. One investigative author, Donald Spoto, in a 1993 work, even burdens Greenson with the responsibility for killing her, directing that a female employee “administer [to Monroe] … a fatal barbiturate-laced enema.” (In this scenario, Greenson’s motivation was that Monroe was trying to free herself from Greenson’s influence and control, and had fired
him.) [WOLFE, D., p. 99] In this scenario too, Monroe did not realize that this enema was abnormal. [SPOTO, D., 1993, p. 218] A friend of Monroe’s recalls that she was beginning to feel that Greenson was “trying to substitute himself for everything she’d built up those past years. She decided he was anti-everything she wanted. She was radically turning on Greenson and Mrs. Murray, the woman he’d put with her, she felt, to spy on her.” [STRASBERG, p. 250-251])

The famous movie star’s alleged suicide has always been controversial, and there are various conspiracy notions about who would want her dead. Greenson’s secret life is much clouded. As well as being a therapist, he was, like a number of Hollywood people, an activist Communist Party member; he was also part of its international Comintern. Whatever Greenson’s role as a listener of movie star’s confessions, his communist ties have profound implications because Monroe had romantic affairs with President John F. Kennedy and knew a great deal about behind-the-scenes politicking, perhaps including plans against communist Cuba and Fidel Castro. Everything Monroe knew, per “opening up” in therapy, she undoubtedly told her psychotherapist. As Donald Wolfe notes:

“Once Marilyn Monroe became Greenson’s patient, he became one of the most important Comintern operatives in America; he had access to the mind of a woman who often shared the bed with the president of the United States and was an intimate of the attorney general [Kennedy’s brother, Robert] … As Greenson has correctly stated, Marilyn Monroe had a tendency to ‘get involved with very destructive people, who will engage in some sort of sado-masochistic relationship with her.’ Ironically, among these people was her psychiatrist [Greenson], her physician [Engelberg], and her housekeeper, Eunice Murray [who was appointed by Greenson to live with Ms. Monroe and report back to him], who joined in a conspiracy to survey Marilyn Monroe within a sphere of influence designed to gather intelligence from her relationship with the president of the United States and the attorney general.” [WOLFE, D., p. 386]

Greenson, once noted his sister, Elizabeth, also had “strong ties to Israel.” [KELLEY, K., p. 305]

Marilyn Monroe’s road to psychoanalysis was directed upon her by the influential Jewish acting teacher, Lee Strasberg, who is usually credited with spawning the “method acting” genre, made famous by the likes of Marlon Brando and James Dean. Brando’s first Jewish analyst, says the famous actor, early in his career, was Bela Mittelman, “the coldest man I’ve ever known … [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 124] … Acting afforded me the luxury of being able to spend thousands of dollars on psychoanalysts, most of whom did nothing but convince me that most New York and Beverly Hills psychoanalysts are a little crazy themselves, as well as highly motivated to separate patients from their money while making their emotional problems worse.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 243] Brando was not much endeared to Lee Strasberg either, calling him “an ambitious, selfish man who exploited the people who attended the Actors Studio, and
he tried to project himself as an acting oracle and guru. Some people worshiped him, but I never knew why.”) [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 85]

Strasberg’s daughter, Susan, notes that her father “sent numerous actors to psychiatrists, and many doctors sent their patients to class because they felt his work helped theirs in analysis.” [STRASBERG, S., 31] Susan Strasberg herself used to argue with Marilyn Monroe about whether she or the famous sex goddess “needed therapy more.” [STRASBERG, p. 138] As Barbara Leaming observes:

“It was said that the master teacher Lee Strasberg could open inner doors that one scarcely knew existed. Some admirers called him the Rabbi. Some compared him to a psychiatrist or a highly judgmental Jewish father … Strasberg focused on psychology. He ran his workshop as though they were group therapy sessions… Strasberg often advised actors to enter psychoanalysis in order to put them in touch with emotionally-charged material they could use in their work.” [LEAMING, p. 156-157]

“Under [Lee] Strasberg’s influence,” note Stephen Farber and Marc Green, “Marilyn became an earnest devotee not just of method acting, but of Freudian analysis as well.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 83] Monroe’s one-time husband, Jewish playwright Arthur Miller, also had his own Jewish psychoanalyst: Rudolph Loewenstein. [WOLFE, D., p. 307] Monroe even had sessions with Sigmund’s Freud daughter, Anna, also a therapist, in London. [WOLFE, D., p. 300] “The significance of [Monroe’s reliance on psychoanalysts] for psychoanalysis,” notes Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, “was that Monroe left a substantial part of her estate to further the work of Anna Freud, whom she had seen briefly for analytic help in 1956 (Anna Freud wrote about her that she was paranoid with schizophrenic traits), and this bequest was undoubtedly achieved through her analysts, who were intimately connected to Anna Freud.” [MASSON, J. M., 1990, p. 129]

As Masson, a former official at the Sigmund Freud Archives, further notes about the ethical undercurrent of such funding:

“It is not, in fact, uncommon for analysts to solicit, usually through roundabout methods, former patients for money to support analytic projects. Chairs of psychoanalysis in medical schools at various universities have been partially endowed through former patients. There was also the case of the Centenary Fund, named for the centenary, in 1956, of Freud’s birth. [Marilyn Monroe’s therapist] Romi Greenson had organized this fund for psychoanalytic research in Los Angeles … I felt then, and still do now, that it is an exploitation of the emotional relationship with a patient to solicit money, in whatever form, directly or indirectly. It seems to me that the patient, or ex-patient, is in no position, emotionally speaking, to refuse … I find it wrong and morally distasteful.” [MASSON, J. M., 1990, p. 130]

Another Jewish Hollywood therapist, Judd Marmor (born Judah Marmorstein), candidly wrote an article in 1953 about the trap vulnerable patients would inevitably find themselves in under the control of a psychoanalyst. Its theme we have run across before, as being quintessentially “Jewish.” Marmor’s
piece was entitled “The Feeling of Superiority: An Occupational Hazard in the Practice of Psychotherapy.” “Marmor,” note Stephen Farber and Marc Green, “pointed out the neurotic needs that may drive a person to become a psychiatrist – a hunger for prestige as well as a desire to solve one’s own internal conflicts.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 135] “[The] ego-seductive aspects [of the field of psychoanalysis],” noted Marmor, “tend to foster such defensive arrogance to a greater extent, perhaps, than do many other professions.” [FARBER/GREEN, p. 135] A Monroe friend once stated that “I felt [Ralph Greenson] had a big ego, like a lot of doctors he wanted to be God, and of all the analysts in L.A. she found him. Inger Stevens was his patient too. She killed herself later.” [STRASBERG, p. 250] As Greenson, Monroe’s analyst, once claimed, “I can count Marilyn to do anything I want her to do.” [WOLFE, D., p. 422]

“I was a patient of five different psychiatrists,” says Marlon Brando, “Based on my experience, most psychiatrists are people who feel comfortable trying to control other people because they can’t handle themselves. Their experiences have overwhelmed them and they believe they will be able to cope only if they are in a controlling position over others. I’ve known a lot of them, and some of them have been among the nuttiest people I’ve ever met … [One of them] spent a lot of our sessions asking for money.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 366]

Yet another tragic Hollywood movie star “goddess” driven to a psychological abyss was Frances Farmer, one of the most famous film faces of the late 1930s and early 1940s. Farmer’s demise is particularly disturbing. Ardent rebel and idealist, she was attracted to the largely Jewish New York communist world before she became a movie celebrity, even visiting Moscow in 1935. Attracted to serious theatre, in New York she was “escorted around the city by a delegation of local communist leaders and – through an introduction written by [Jewish friend] Sophie Rosenstein – [Farmer] got herself invited to a party given by members of her cherished left-wing Group Theatre” where she first met famous Jewish playwright Clifford Odets. [ARNOLD, W., p. 50] (Supposedly anti-capitalist and anti-materialist, the Group Theatre grew out of meetings at Harold Clurman’s home. Eventually he, fellow Jew Lee Strasberg and “WASP shiksa” Cheryl Crawford were the Group’s early directors. [SMITH, W., p. 213, ] Clurman was also the aforementioned Stella Adler’s husband.) William Arnold notes the illusory idealism of the famous (largely Jewish) Group Theatre: “The Group actors, far from being the artistic purists [Farmer] had always believed them to be, all seemed to want to go to Hollywood and make piles of money (which, eventually, most of them did).” [ARNOLD, W., p. 90]

Both Farmer’s mother and sister Edith believed that such “communists” destroyed her. [ARNOLD, W., p. 94] (For her part, Frances despised her mother and placed enormous blame for her troubles upon her. In the third page of her biography she even quotes a “Jewish saying” about mothers, and bemoans her lack of a good one). [FARMER, p. 12] William Arnold, who interviewed sister Edith, notes that she believed “the Communists drove Frances crazy. [Edith] seemed particularly bitter towards the Group Theatre and its left-wing mem-
bers who, she said, took criminal advantage of France’s kind nature and then harassed her into insanity.” [ARNOLD, W., p. 94] During the McCarthy-era communist probes, eight Group Theatre members were identified as members of a communist cell – Joe Bromberg and Lewis Leverett were its “co-leaders.” [SMITH, W., p. 157] (Generally speaking, Jewish left-wing radical Saul Alinsky once noted that “few of us survived the Joe McCarthy holocaust of the early 1950s.”) [ALINSKY, S., 1971, p. xiii]

Farmer’s rise to acting stardom was meteoric. Within two weeks of moving to New York City to live, and within weeks of returning from Moscow, she was signed by agent Shepard Traube who managed to get her hired by Paramount Pictures top talent scout in New York, Oscar Serlin. Although Farmer reached Hollywood stardom by age 21 (with the film “Come and Get It” in 1936), she returned to New York – because of personal conviction to the legitimate theatre, and for little pay – to star in Odet’s play entitled Golden Boy. The largely Jewish cast, some with changed names, included Luther Adler, Morris Carnovsky, Phoebe Brand, Lee J. Cobb (born Lee Jacob), John Garfield (Garfinkel), Martin Ritt, Howard Da Silva, Robert Lewis, Michael Gordon, and Roman Bohmen. By now too, Farmer had begun a troubling affair with Odets, a married man – a relationship that was to hasten her road to psychological destruction and a mental institution. In her autobiography, Farmer wrote that:

“Odets was a strange, almost ugly man, but he was everything I could ever imagine, at the time, admirable in a man. He was a fiery, fascinating intellect with strange sexual drives, and I reacted like a smitten schoolgirl. I believed in him passionately … I drowned myself in his doctrines and political theories, and had he not severed the affair, I probably would have followed him to his far-left politics… Odets maneuvered me as he would a character in one of his plays. He toyed with my attitudes and reactions. He was a psychological button-pusher … One moment he would marvel at my brilliance and minutes later he would curse me for my stupidity. Sometimes, locked with me in his apartment, he would plead like a schoolboy for love and favors, and then, suddenly and with insulting accusations, he would assault me as if I was a streetwalker … He would insult me in front of everyone, belittling my performance [in Golden Boy], and he was satisfied only when he had reduced me to tears and set me sobbing to my dressing room.

There were times after such incidents when he would not speak to me for two or three days. At other times, he would force his way into my dressing room and make a great point of not only locking the door behind him, but further securing the room by propping a chair under the doorknob, and then he would tear off his clothes and scream his love and need for me with all the fire and passion of a Rococo Thespian. He would threaten to take his life and mine, unless I loved him… His sexual appetite was a complicated maze of weird manipulations. He would deftly maneuver me to a point of fulfillment, then withdraw and mock what he termed my base and disgusting desires. After searing my feminine spirit in this bed of humiliation and degrading me in every possible manner, he would be-
gin again with the shyness of an innocent lad and explore me with tender
fascination.
This was no ordinary man. He was a creature who pried open the psyche
with the intention of sticking it with pins. I cannot say that I loved him;
a more apt description would be a passionate hatred coupled with a
physical fascination. Whatever it was, it did much to destroy me. Where-
as I had once lived secure within myself, after Odets I became a bundle
of raw hesitant nerves, confused and almost without purpose.” [FARM-
ER, p. 193-194]

“Looking back,” notes Margaret Brenman-Gibson, “Group members, all of
whom had watched the [Farmer-Odets] affair with unusual concern, agreed
that this seemed to be the trigger for her life’s descent, during which she became
addicted to alcohol and to drugs, was jailed, reviled, beaten, and for seven years,
institutionalized by her mother as a lunatic.” [BRENMAN- GIBSON, p. 579] As
one Group member recalled, Odets was “so kind and tender a man who obvi-
ously revered his dead mother and whose empathy with women could be so
delicate, could nevertheless be so exploitively cruel with some women.” [BREN-
MAN-GIBSON, p. 579] A Farmer wrote herself, “My artistic id was clobbered
to shreds and the emotional trauma with Odets finished the job.” [FARMER,
p. 578] Institutionalized against her will, Farmer endured electroshock therapy,
various drugs, and possibly a lobotomy.

She died in 1970. A decade later, Farmer’s horrifying story was afforded re-
newed interest in Hollywood. Jewish producer/comedian Mel Brooks em-
barked on a movie project (Frances, starring Jessica Lange). Brooks’ film
featured a character named Harry York who “appears repeatedly to bed and be-
friend the doomed actress Frances Farmer in her downroad spiral through al-
cohol, despair and a Dickensian insane asylum.” [HAMMER/PILCHER, p. 38] Will-
iam Arnold, author of a biography of Farmer (Shadowlands) eventually
sued Brooks and his partners (Jonathan Sanger and Marie Yates), charging that
the York character was an invention in order to avoid linking the film’s screen-
the business practices of Mel Brooks, whose company produced Frances – and
about the veracity of the film itself.” [HAMMER/PILCHER, p. 38] The Harry
York character was eventually declared by the Brooks team to be a real-life char-
acter, Stewart Jacobson, an ex-convict and convicted pimp who claimed to
know Farmer as far back as high school. The outlandish assertions made by Ja-
cobson (highlighted in his claim to have set up a Farmer affair with Supreme
Court Justice William O. Douglas), charged Arnold, was merely a contrivance
for “stealing my book.” “Mel Brooks is a crook and an incredible cheat,” agreed
producer Noel Marshall, who was scheduled to originally produce the film.

The Jewish business network that built Hollywood, observes Claire Pajacz-
kowska, “provided an opportunity for a relatively small managerial elite to for-
mulate American culture as it should or could be. It has been said that ‘Hollywood’ – the American Dream – is a Jewish idea in a sense; it’s a Jewish revenge on America. The genius of future moguls was a complex one, partly sheer business ingenuity, partly ruthless risk taking, and a kind of competitive solidarity…. They were also closely associated with the meretricious, ostentation of the industry, with poor morals, bad taste, and the industrialization of art.” [PAJACZKOWSKA, p. 238] As Marlon Brando once noted, “I’ve never had any respect for Hollywood. It stands for avarice, phoniness, greed, crassness and bad taste.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 153-154]

Or as film critic Kenneth Turan noted in an introduction to David Freeman’s book *A Hollywood Education*:

> “Freeman knows that the movie business is more than any old con-man’s paradise, it is one where the grail is a whole new persona. Because stakes are so high, because ‘in Hollywood, what you succeed with and what you fail with are virtually the same,’ everything, even your most personal life, is a viable tool to get ahead. Mind games, hidden agendas, backstabblings, and all around venality, they all pass without so much as a second glance. Everything is excused in pursuit of the dream.” [FREE-MAN, D., 1992, p. 7]

> “[A]s I heard about Hollywood,” wrote prominent science fiction writer Isaac Asimov, in a reflection on his career, “I liked it even less. Walter Bradbury of Doubleday would travel to Hollywood once a year on business. When I had lunch with him after such a visit, he would be drawn and strained. He hated the people he had to deal with there, phonies, one and all, he said, and not to be trusted an inch.” [ASIMOV, I., 1994, p. 365]

> The literary critic Edmund Wilson wrote

> “Perelman; Hollywood. Jewish girl, very nice and intelligent. Not fancy, who had lost her husband out there after three years – her theory [is] that Jewish men thought themselves ugly, so they had to keep proving to themselves what they could do in the way of getting Gentile girls.” [GOULD, p. 305]

> The literary critic Edmund Wilson wrote

> “Perelman; Hollywood. Jewish girl, very nice and intelligent. Not fancy, who had lost her husband out there after three years – her theory [is] that Jewish men thought themselves ugly, so they had to keep proving to themselves what they could do in the way of getting Gentile girls.” [GOULD, p. 305]

> “In olden times,” said the great journalist and muckraker, Upton Sinclair, “Jewish traders sold Christian girls into concubinage and into prostitution, and even today they display the same activity in the same field in southern California where I live.” [GOULD, p. 305] The Hollywood rulers, noted Hollywood Rabbi Edgar Magnin, “were men who made all that money and realized they were still a bunch of Goddamned Jews. Sleeping with a pretty gentile girl made them feel, if only for a few minutes, ‘I’m half gentile.’ No wonder they made idols out of shiksa goddesses.” [RUBIN, p. 78] This kind of sexual predation, if
we are to believe what some Jewish scholars have to say about it, has root in the psychological insecurities of Jewish identity. The (Jewish) *Forward*, reviewing a biography of (Jewish) writer Arthur Koestler by (Jewish) scholar David Cesarani, notes that

“Koestler’s life was marked throughout by ‘non-stop womanizing,’ Mr. Cesarani writes. As a journalist in the 1930s, for instance, he ‘was sleeping his way through Berlin at the rate of one girlfriend every four to six weeks.’ The chronic philandering was in part a function of Koestler’s Jewishness, Mr. Cesarani explained in a telephone interview, because, for Koestler, to be seen with tall, blond shiksa was a sign of the fullness of his assimilation and acceptance around gentiles.” [BRAHMS, p. 11]

(This kind of predator is apparently evidenced in the case of Evan (Meshulam) Frankel, a real estate mogul in East Hampton, New York, “An otherwise suave and gallant companion, Frankel might easily reach out in conversation and caress the breast of a woman he hardly knew or run his fingers over her buttocks … In one famous incident, he gave a large party at which three generations of women he had bedded from the same family were his guests, unaware that each one of them had been a Frankel conquest.”) [GAINES, F., 1998, p. 176]

Jewish men rushing in veritable herds to bed non-Jewish women is much remarked upon in the Jewish world. As an old Yiddish folk saying notes saying:

“Why does a Jew need legs? To school he must be forced, to marriage he must be led, to burial he is brought, to synagogue he won’t go, and after Gentile girls he crawls. So why does he need legs?” [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 142]

This long tradition of Jewish male interest in the non-Jewish female has created profound resentment by Jewish women in modern Hollywood. In 1998, “a group of 30 high-level Hollywood women in television, film, art and academia” (called the Morning Star Commission) released a study, headed by Jewish “superagent” Joan Hyler, and sponsored by the Zionist women’s group Hadassah, about the portrayal of Jewish women onscreen in Hollywood. As the *New Jersey News* noted about the Jewish psychological undercurrent in the survey findings:

“Among the most devastating findings of the Morning Star Commission is the way that Jews, both men and women, still regard non-Jews as competitors and even adversaries … Jewish women, though proud of their professional achievements … project a surprising degree of ambivalence toward themselves within American society and a shocking degree of rivalry and hostility toward non-Jewish women … Jewish women, in their envy of non-Jews, often project hostility onto non-Jews, often project hostility onto non-Jewish women, calling them ‘air heads’ and perceiving them as ‘irresponsible’ and ‘unambitious.’” [MARKS, M. A., 4-23-98, p. 5]

“I have not fingers and toes enough,” notes Jewish novelist Ann Roiphe, “to count the [Jewish] men I know who can only love the shiksa.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 199] “Jewish men’s attraction to non-Jewish women,” philosophizes Joel Streiker, “[is] an important theme of Jewish American literature in the 1950s
and 1960s, the attraction that has to do with Jewish men’s desire to be accepted by the larger society. Bedding or wedding a beautiful non-Jewish woman was a symbol of a Jewish man’s having made it in America.” [STREIKER, J., JULY-AUG, 1999, p. 36]

A Jewish Ms. editor, Susan Braudy, noted a story she published in a 1975 “Special Issue on Men” issue:

“The story was about a Jewish scholarship student at Harvard who thought he was very ugly, and his obsession with this gorgeous, upper-class, Radcliffe gentile person, and with bringing her to her first orgasm orally. I think it was about him and his first wife, actually.” [THOM, p. 81]

See http://jewishtribalreview.org/shiksa2.htm for more citations about the “shiksa cult.”]

Conversely, non-Jewish womanizer Marlon Brando credits Jewish women early in his acting career in New York with opening him to the sexual world:

“It was common in those days for girls from wealthy New York Jewish families to rent an apartment in the city and have a little fling before striking out on a career or marriage after they had graduated from college … They were fascinated by me and I by them. Many were more experienced sexually than I was, and I was a willing and happy pupil. I especially remember Carole Burke.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 74]

Jews dominated the vaudeville world, precursor to radio, television and the other mass media worlds. George Burns remembers the first time he met fellow Jewish comedian Georgie Jessel:

“I remember the first time I met Jessel. Actually, it was the first time I met him alone. He was starring on Broadway in the dramatic version of The Jazz Singer. It was a big hit, and Georgie was brilliant. The Jazz Singer is the story of a cantor who wants his son to become a cantor, while the son wants to go into show business. At the end the father dies and the son quits show business and becomes a cantor. The show ended with Jessel singing ‘Kol Nidre,’ a sacred, very emotional song…. [After the show] I was stopped outside the door [to his dressing room] by his cousin, Bob Milford. ‘You can’t go in right now,’ Bob told me, ‘he’s got his clothes off.’ The tears were still dripping from my eyes, that’s how wonderful Jessel had been. ‘That won’t bother me,’ I said. ‘I’ve seen a naked Jew before. I just want to tell him how much I enjoyed his performance.’ ‘I’m sorry,’ Bob said, shaking his head, ‘you really can’t go in.’ He dropped his voice to a whisper. ‘He’s got a girl in there.’ I was shocked. Until that moment I’d believed that there was nothing that could follow ‘Kol Nidre.’” [BURNS, G., 1989, p. 77-78]

The Hollywood “casting couch” is an infamous icon. Actress/writer Joan Collins (half-Jewish) notes an early introduction to the world of Hollywood as a young aspiring actress:
“[When] Buddy Adler, who was head of 20th Century-Fox, to whom I was under contract, asked me in his own home if I would like to be the biggest star on the lot, I said, ‘Yes, of course.’ ‘All you have to do’ – and he smiled suavely as he maneuvered me across the lacquered dance floor of his Beverly Hills mansion – ‘is to be nice to me, and the best parts at the studio are yours.’ ‘What do you mean exactly by ‘be nice,’ Mr. Adler?’ a worldly and sophisticated twenty-two-year-old Joan asked warily. ‘Listen, honey’ – he held me closer in the dance and whispered in my ear – ‘you’re a beautiful girl and I’m not exactly an ugly old man… We’ll see each other a couple of times a week, you can still have your own life, and I’ll have mine, of course.” [COLLINS, J., p. 25]

Marilyn Monroe, as noted earlier, was a willing mistress to many to help her career. Aside from those mentioned earlier, she was also regularly invited to the home of Joseph Schenck (early head of 20th Century-Fox) where, she once said, “I liked sitting by the fireplace with Mr. Schenck and hearing him talk about love and sex. He was full of wisdom on the subjects.” [WOLFE, D., p. 198] Schenck was once married to early film star Norma Talmadge. [WHITFIELD, E., 1997, p. 239] Monroe, says Ted Jordan, “bitterly complained about Schenck, who made it clear what her primary function was: sex.” [JORDAN, p. 100] Schenck, says film historian Neal Gabler, “embodied just about every cliché of Hollywood decadence and debauchery.” [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 259]

Early in Monroe’s career as a struggling actress, the head of Columbia, Harry Cohn, also once invited her, “and no one else,” to an overnight cruise on his yacht. According to close friend Ted Jordan, Monroe was required to strip naked for Cohn in his office. As she bent over, at his direction, he approached her, penis in hand. When she declined his advances, said Monroe, “I had never seen a man so angry.” [JORDAN, p. 91; WOLFE, D., p. 211-212] Cohn then “banned her from the [Columbia] lot after she refused to accompany him on a yacht to Catalina Island.” [LEAMING, p. 8] “You know,” Monroe once said, “that when a producer calls an actress into his office to discuss a script that isn’t all he has in mind … I’ve slept with producers. I’d be a liar if I said I didn’t.” [SUMMERS, p. 34-35] In 1955, 20th Century Fox awarded Monroe the richest per-film contract of any actress. “It means,” remarked Monroe, “I’ll never have to suck another cock again!” [MCDOUGAL, p. 217]

Cohn also, notes Barbara Leaming,

“developed an obsession with getting [his contracted actress] Rita [Hayworth] into bed that was more than just sexually motivated… As time went by he would become preoccupied with keeping other men out of her life, including her own husband and any other man who might come between Rita and the studio … [Cohn] went so far as to sport hidden microphones in her dressing room to listen in on her private conversations.” [LEAMING, B., 1989, p. 60]

Louis B. Mayer (head of MGM) had “a private life [that] was not always so praiseworthy,” notes Norman Zierold, “… Although married, he had a keen eye for feminine beauty and courted women at a clip in keeping with his extrava-
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“[Mayer] was naturally careful and decorous, but none the less vigorous in pursuit of those he lusted after, frequently in vain … He once said to Luise Rainer, ‘Why don’t you sit on my lap when we’re discussing your contract the way the other girls do?’ A little adroit lap-sitting would go a long way, they found. He was hardy and persistent, however. Tirelessly he laid siege to some of the more formidable actresses, rewarding them with richer roles or disciplining them with poor assignments, in maneuvering to accomplish his private aims.” [CROWTHER, 1960, p. 263]

Mayer was alleged to have “once insisted that ‘the Talmud says a man is not responsible for a sin committed by any part of the body below the waist.’” [GABEL, N., 1988, p. 389]

Legendary actress Lana Turner remembers what it was like for her as a teenager at MGM:

“Often in those early years at MGM I’d see a young actress with more experience than I had, and I’d think, ‘Oh boy, there’s competition for me.’ Six months later she would have fallen by the wayside. When I asked, people would say, ‘You’re so dumb!’ It had to be spelled out for me that those six-month option girls would never go on to a movie career – they were there for the benefit of management. That was what Zeppo Marx [Turner’s first agent and one of the famous Marx Brothers] had meant when he told me to say I was eighteen [she was fifteen when signed]. If I got one of those six-month-option deals, I’d better lie about my age – for their protection.” [TURNER, L., 1988, p. 34-35]

Shirley Temple (Black) recalled her experience as an 11-year old movie star the FIRST time she went to the MGM offices with her mother:

“Eight months had elapsed since leaving Fox in May 1940, and on this first executive visit under my new Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer contract, Mother and I were split up, she ushered away by general manager Louis B. Mayer and I left alone with producer Arthur Freed. Best known as producer of the blockbusting The Wizard of Oz, Freed was rumored in some adult circles to have an adventurous casting couch. At the time I knew none of this, nor would I have recognized such furniture even when sitting on one. To visit an executive of such stature was enough to send my spirits soaring. ‘I have something made just for you,’ he continued, fumbling in his lap. ‘You’ll be my new star!’ That phrase had last been used when I was three years old in Kid in Hollywood. Obviously, Freed did not believe in preliminaries. With his face gaped in a smile, he stood up and abruptly and executed a bizarre flourish of clothing. Having thought of him as a producer rather than exhibitor, I sat bolt upright. Guarded personal exposure by both brothers and Father had maintained me in relatively pristine innocence. Not twelve years old, I still had little appreciation for masculine versatility and so dramatic was the leap between schoolgirl speculation and Freed’s dazzling exposure...
that I reacted with nervous laughter. Disdain or terror he might have ex-
pected, but not the insult of humor. ‘Get out!’ he shouted, unmindful of
his disarray, imperiously pointing to the closed door. ‘Go on, get out!’
[BLACK, S., 1988, p. 319-320]

Telling her mother about the incident as she drove home, her mother told
her that she too had similar troubles, fending off a sexual advance from Louis
Mayer in his office at the same time. [BLACK, S., 1988, p. 320] “Usually sol-
lemn,’ writes Temple,

“[Mayer’s] eyes glinted. Surely [Temple’s mother] could recognize
real sincerity when she saw it. Never forget, he continued, at MGM we
are a family. We take care of our own. Slipping down off his chair, he
approached the sofa and sank down beside her, uttering a contented
sigh. Surely she was the most unique mother in the world, he said.
Someone who should be a star in her own right. He grasped her hand,
pulling her toward him. Mayer’s opinion of his personal prowess was
rumored to be overblown, but not the power of his office. Reluctant to
test either, Mother picked up her purse and retreated out the door,
walking backwards. Unlike my reaction of hilarity to Freed, hers was to
be grievously affronted. Not for nothing was the MGM lot known as the
‘factory,’ a studio perfumed with sultry, busty creatures with long legs
and tight haunches, and more than its quota of lecherous older men.”
[BLACK, S., 1988, p. 320]

And what of movie mogul Samuel Goldwyn, also married, partner in Para-
amount, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, and United Artists? As his biographer notes,

“[An assistant director] stumbled into Goldwyn’s office during the
making of Whoopee! and discovered the producer in a compromising
position with a girl who did not even get into the picture. Most of the
girls on the lot had heard about Sam Goldwyn’s ‘casting couch.’”

Actress Joan Crawford, early in her career, allegedly starred in a porno
movie. “When she was trying to break into the studios,” says Ted Jordan

“she got nowhere until several studio executives were given a private
screening of her stag film ... In short order Miss Crawford won a studio
contract.” [Jordan, p. 122; also Considine, S., 1989, p. 12-13]

Crawford was brought to Hollywood in 1924 by Jewish MGM mogul Harry
Rapf. Agent in the early MGM years? Michael E. Levee. [Considine, S., 1989,
p. 16, 61] “Over a sixteen month period,” says Shaun Considine, “Joan Craw-
ford appeared in thirteen pictures at MGM. She also acquired the reputation
of being a quid-pro-quo girl. Years later, when asked if she ever had to sacrifice
her virtue for roles via the proverbial casting couch, Crawford replied, ‘Well, it sure
as hell beat the hard cold floor.’” [Considine, S., 1989, p. 17]

“While their wives were meant to be decorous and refined and sexless,”
notes Neal Gabler,
“many of the Hollywood Jews found sexual release elsewhere – sometimes flagrantly ... Sex, like family, power, wealth, and culture, was meant to be conspicuous in Hollywood. It was a symbol of power, which may be why so many of the Hollywood Jews behaved with such little discretion. **Jack Warner** [one of the heads of **Warner Brothers**] bragged about his conquests as if they were trophies. Bess Lasky knew that when her husband [the head of **Universal**] sneaked away to make a quick business call he was not talking to Adolph Zucker ... David Selznick [was] a bearish hedonist with the appetites and discipline of a child.”

[GABLER, N., 1988, p. 246, 258]

Charles Feldman, founder of the important **Famous Artists** film artist agency, represented the likes of **Greta Garbo**, **Marlena Dietrich**, and **John Wayne**. “Feldman,” also, notes **Peter Biskind**, “was known for casting his girlfriends in his movies.” [BISKIND, p. 25] He was once banned from **MGM** for his love interest in actress **Jean Howard**, a woman MGM head **Louis B. Meyer** had his eye on too. [CROWTHER, p. 193] Feldman was once romantically involved with sex queen actress **Jean Harlow**. [RUBIN, p. xii] So were others. **Columbia Pictures’** head Harry Cohn introduced Harlow to Jewish mobster Abner Zillman (an investor in Columbia). “For years after Harlow’s death, [Zwillman] was boasting nostalgically about the various ways he’d banged the actress.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 146] Zwillman also “reportedly gave some gangster friends gold lockets, each containing a strand of Jean’s blonde pubic hair.” [MARX, S., 1990, p. 121] Blonde bombshell movie star **Carroll Baker**’s Jewish husband was theatre and film director Jack Garfein: their son is named Herschel David Garfein. **Mae West** made a career centered upon flaunting sexuality – in a long list of intimates, her “first steady beau, Joe Schenck,” a pianist and singer, [LEIDER, E.M., p. 51] was also Jewish. Blonde sexpot **Jayne Mansfield**’s boyfriend at the time of her death in a 1967 car accident was also Jewish: Hollywood lawyer Sam Brody. The crash killed both of them. Among **Marilyn Monroe**’s long list of Jewish (and other) partners, one of her husbands was playwright **Arthur Miller**. She even formally converted to Judaism for him. [WOLFE, D., p. 285]

Clara Bow, renowned for her promiscuity, was the sex goddess (the “It girl”) of the late silent screen era. Like many who have the burden of being “sex” stars, she repeatedly collapsed with nervous breakdowns. She was built to fame by Benjamin Schulberg, head of a film company called **Preferred Pictures**. “To launch her,” note **Joe Morella** and **Edward Epstein**:

“Schulberg instructed his photographer [in 1923] to take a series of provocative pictures of Clara. In the photographs she was gracefully posed and draped only in a sheet, Greek goddess-style. Her breasts and ample derrière were outlined, and it was obvious that she wore nothing under the sheet ... Clara was in effect a pin-up girl, though the term had not yet been coined. This manner of selling her would set the tone for her entire career ... One of the unpublicized advantages of being under contract to a studio, even a small one like Ben Schulberg’s, was the ready availability of
reliable medical attention for ‘unspeakable’ problems certain to arise among Hollywood’s high-living set. Abortions were easily arranged. Venereal diseases could be treated without undue embarrassment. To put it bluntly, and in the words of an actor of the era, ‘Anyone as promiscuous as Clara was sure to catch the clap.’” [MORELLA/EPSTEIN, 1976, p. 58]

Eventually, in 1925, Schulberg and his company moved under the wing of larger Jewish film moguls Adolph Zukor and Jesse Lasky at Paramount Pictures, at the time the largest movie studio in Hollywood. [MORELLA/EPSTEIN, 1976, p. 69-70] Bow’s paramours were numerous, but perhaps the most publicized was her affair with “showman Harry Richman,” “Mr. Broadway,” “a Cincinnati-born Jewish boy ... By his own admission he often wined, dined, and bedded down as many as four showgirls in one night. And Harry was generous. He shared his conquests with his pals ... For a time one of Harry’s closest buddies was fellow womanizer and enormously wealthy film mogul Joseph Schenck ... head of United Artists ... At the time of his friendship with Harry Richman, Schenck was married to top star Norma Talmadge [who later married Jewish comedian George Jessel].” [MORELLA/EPSTEIN, 1976, p. 69, 70, 169, 170] Schenck arranged the initial sexual tryst with Bow for Richman. [p. 172-175] (Richman also owned Club Richman, “a speakeasy which became a big success.” [MORELLA/EPSTEIN, 1976, p. 70]) “Richman’s name was romantically linked with the most glamorous women of his day, including the tragic, gorgeous silent-screen star Barbara La Marr. There was mystery and scandal too. Ziegfield girl Helen Walsh burned to death in a fire on one of Richman’s yachts.” [MORELLA/EPSTEIN, 1976, p. 70] Per Clara Bow, “Harry Richman had finally found his match for sexual adventure. In his own words: ‘One of the greatest things about Clara was that she had an appetite for lovemaking that was at least the equal of mine. Every time I was ready, she was, and believe me, there was hardly an hour when I was not ready.” [MORELLA/EPSTEIN, 1976, p. 179]

“Not all Bow suitors retained fond memories of her,” write Morella and Epstein,

“Abel Baer, a sexy young songwriter from New York, was in Hollywood writing the score for an upcoming Clara Bow picture. Baer had attracted the attention of Mae West back in New York, and in Hollywood he caught Clara’s eye. ‘I went to bed with her,’ Baer says, ‘but I’ll tell you this – there were no repeat performances. Once was enough for me.’” [MORELLA/EPSTEIN, 1976, p. 209-210]

Jewish comedian and early television star Milton Berle hosted “the most successful show in television history.” [BURNS, G., 1989, p. 269] His “reputation with the girls was pretty big,” notes George Burns,

“He went out with everybody from silent movie star Pola Negri to evangelist Aimee Semple McPherson to Marilyn Monroe. You’ll notice I use the phrase ‘went out,’ but that’s not exactly what I mean. I can’t tell you exactly what I mean, because I do a clean act. I don’t even drop cigar ashes on the page. But if you want to know what Milton did with these women, think of a train going into a tunnel. And based on Milton’s rep-
utation, this train was so popular with the passengers that he couldn’t keep it in the station.” [BURNS, G., 1989, p. 253]


Jewish singer Eddie Fisher, (“I prefer seduction to singing”) for years a cocaine addict, divorced Debbie Reynolds, “America’s sweetheart,” to marry Elizabeth Taylor in 1958. To the mores of the 50s it was a scandal of monumental attention. “Even a partial list of his claimed [sexual] conquests,” adds London’s Daily Telegraph,

“include Mia Farrow, Marlene Dietrich, Bette Davis, Kim Novak, Stefanie Powers, Angie Dickinson, Dinah Shore and Judith Exner, the mistress also shared by President Kennedy and Sam Giancano, the boss the Chicago mafia.... Fisher is of the generation that still uses a good sprinkling of Yiddish words, and prominent among them is shiksa.”

“I think I slept with only one Jewish girl in my whole life,” Fisher told the London paper, “Peggy Lipton, and then I didn’t know she was Jewish ... Boy, did I have a libido.” [LAURENCE, C., 10-14-99, p. 23]

Doris Day was stunned when her agent, Al Levy, “followed me into my room, closed the door, turned off the lights, and pulled me onto the bed. He desperately thrust himself on top of me as if he was some unknown rapist and I were an anonymous victim.” [HOTCHNER, 1976, p. 102] Jewish bandleader Artie Shaw’s romantic flings included those with Judy Garland, Betty Grable, and Lana Turner. [SHIPMAN, D. 1993, p. 104-107] Hollywood lawyer Gregory Bautzer “had a reputation not unlike Artie Shaw of having ‘squired’ many of Hollywood’s most famous stars; he had preceded Shaw in Turner’s life, and he was publicly associated with Joan Crawford for several years.” [SHIPMAN, p. 464] Among [MGM screenwriter-producer] “Joe Mankiewicz’s former lovers were Joan Crawford, Gene Tierney, and Linda Darnell. He had a habit,’ said his son Chris Mankiewicz, ‘of bedding down with leading ladies.”’ [HEYMANN, C.D., 1995, p. 203] Screenwriter/playwright George S. Kaufman (best known for the Marx Brothers movies), who was married, “had a cleanliness compulsion, abhorred outward displays of affection, and hated physical contact except, presumably, with his many sexual conquests (the Broadway producer Max Gordon called him a ‘male nymphomaniac’).” [WINOKUR, 1987, p. 109] Even Jewish Hollywood hairdresser Sydney Guilaroff “had a long affair with [Greta] Garbo and then moved on to Ava Gardner.” [MCDOWELL, p. 15]

When swimmer Esther Williams first got started in show business, “famous New York showman” Mike Rose lured her into “a seduction scene – pure and simple. I saw that look in his eyes ... Couldn’t he look in the mirror? He was already in his fifties, married, and five feet two inches. I was seventeen, not even the legal age for such antics.” [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 45] Williams’ first marriage, that same year, was to a Jewish pre-med student, Leonard Kovner, whom she soon divorced. Her lawyer in her golden years was also Jewish, Lew Goldman. [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 302] As a budding actress, a particularly pesky
Hollywood sexual predator was Sam Katz, head of MGM’s musical productions. Williams recounts an early encounter with him:

“Sam, aren’t you married?
‘Yes, I am. I have two beautiful daughters.’
‘And so am I,’ I said. ‘Don’t you think it would be embarrassing if you and I were seen in public having dinner together?’
‘Well ... I have little places.’
‘I bet you do.’” [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 92]

“Katz’s philandering was common knowledge,” writes Williams, “so I decided to deal with this head-on.
‘You’ve done this before, Sam. Did the other girls become big stars?’
Astonishingly enough, he tried to answer the question. He began ticking off his other conquests.
‘Well, let’s see. Kate Groom? No. Ilona Massey? Not really...’
I stopped him before he got too deep. I didn’t want to be another 8 X 10 glossy on his wall of conquests, and I didn’t want to know the names of the rest of them.” [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 92]

Williams’ most bizarre love affair was with Jeff Chandler (also Jewish, born Ira Grossel, his most famous role was that of Cochise in Broken Arrow). Williams fell in love and had an affair with him until she discovered his fetish for wearing women’s clothing. “Jeff,” notes Williams, who quickly abandoned him,

“was dead serious about this dress-up game and obviously had been at it for a long time ... [He] had a compulsion to don Aunt Sophie’s underpants, which gave him his first orgasm, growing up and feeling happy and secure only in women’s clothing.” [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 309]

As Rachel Abramowitz notes the oppressive undercurrent for women trying to make it in Hollywood:

“Go to CAA [a rival talent agency],” [top Jewish agent Sue Mengers at the William Morris agency] derisively told the starlet Valeria Golino, who was vacillating about William Morris, “Ronnie Meyers [a Jewish executive at CAA] just wants to fuck you.” [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 331]

Jewish novelist Judith Krantz notes the stir actress Loretta Young created at the funeral of Jewish film director Mervyn Le Roy:

“At the funeral of Mervyn Le Roy ... I heard Loretta Young give a eulogy that won the bad-taste prize of all time. She slithered exquisitely down the aisle of the Forest Lawn chapel, clad in a startlingly sexy, body-hugging black dress and the largest black garden-party hat I’d ever seen. ‘Mervyn Le Roy discovered me,’ she announced slowly. Pause. ‘No, we didn’t have an affair.’ Long pause. ‘I was only thirteen,’ she added thoughtfully, as if in explanation for the omission.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 209]

In 1977 director Roman Polanski, also Jewish, fled America rather than face sentencing for raping a 13-year old model. He had drugged her (with
Quaaludes and alcohol) as he photographed the child at an actor’s home. Arrested, he was allowed to work on his current film. As Barbara Leaming notes:

“Since the probation report would affect his fate, Polanski worked on his [Jewish] probation officer, Irwin Gold, for whom he painted a picture of a tragic past [Polanski was a Jewish survivor of Nazi-occupied Poland] a compliant girl, and remorse for anything he had done wrong ... He managed to win Gold’s sympathy ... This was a victimizer as victim – a role Polanski had played to the hilt.” [LEAMING, 1981, p. 181, 184]

Also, “at age fifteen, Natassia [Kinski], star of Polanski’s film Tess] became Polanski’s lover. Polanski gave her books to read and suggested ways for developing her acting abilities.” [LEAMING, 1981, p. 192] Polanski once married actress Sharon Tate, star of his film Fearless Vampire Killers. “During the shooting, Polanski had become Sharon’s lover.” [LEAMING, 1981, p. 79] She had been introduced to him by Jewish producer Martin Ransohoff of Filmyways, who had her under contract. After Tate and others were sensationally murdered by the Charles Manson “family,” one week later Polanski charged Life magazine $5,000 to pose at the door of the house she was slain. [KIERNAN, T., 1980, photo section]

Bob Rafelson and Bert Schneider were Jewish partners who produced a number of influential 1970s “counterculture” movies (Easy Rider, Five Easy Pieces, et al). “Bert was so relentless,” noted one acquaintance, “that he came on to almost every pretty woman who came his way ... Sex was a publicly traded commodity among the Raybert guys, sexual exploits, a variety of who could piss farther.” Actor Jack Nicholson (no innocent himself) reportedly admonished a friend, “Never bring a woman that you’re serious about around Bert or Bob.” [BISKIND, p. 58-59] Among Schneider’s love affairs was one with actress Candice Bergen. [MCGILLIGAN, 1994, p. 181] At BBS (the Rafelson/Schneider company), notes Patrick McGilligan,

“All of the important players were men; the atmosphere was familial; but really it was a fraternity of insiders, a boy’s club. Bert was capable of unzipping his pants during an argument and flourishing his cock; his brother, Harold, was also known to bring his penis out and lay it on the table. The BBS men circulated throughout the building, calling each other “babe,” and “doll,” and hitting on the women. ‘The important players took a macho pride in fucking the same women at different times,’ said one former BBS staff member, ‘from the starlets right down to the typists.’” [MCGILLIGAN, p. 201]

“This [Hollywood],” complained novelist Theodore Dreiser in its big studio glory days, “is a selfish, self-concentrated, mean, loafing town. The business and political world is hard-boiled and cruel. The movies are solidly Jewish. They’re dug in, employ only Jews with American names and buy only what they cannot abstract and disguise. And the dollar sign is the guide – mentally and physically. That America should be led – the mass – by their direction is beyond all believing. In addition, they are arrogant, insolent, and contemptuous.” [GOULD, p. 298] “There’s enough sincerity in Hollywood,” wrote H. L. Mencken, “to fill
a peanut shell and still leave room for an agent’s heart.” [GITLIN, p. 145] The novelist F. Scott Fitzgerald summed up the Hollywood scene as “a Jewish holiday, a gentile tragedy.” [GABLER, p. 2]

“The entire [movie] industry,” notes Chaim Bermant, “was dominated by the big five: MGM, Paramount, Warner Brothers, RKO, and Twentieth Century Fox, all of which were owned and controlled by Jews. And of the not-so-little three – Universal, Columbia, and United Artists – two were in Jewish hands.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 91-92] The major motion picture studios of the Hollywood golden age of the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, and their Jewish founders and most important chiefs over the years include:

**Universal** – Carl Laemmle, Jesse Lasky

**Paramount** - Adolph Zukor, Marcus Loew, Barney Balaban; much later, in the 1970s, Robert Evans. Bought by Charles Bluhdorn in 1960s

**Twentieth Century Fox** - William Fox (originally Fuchs), Sol Brill, Joseph Schenck, (and non-Jew Daryll F. Zanuck). Bought by Marvin Davis in 1970s

**Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM, part of Loew’s Inc.)** Louis B. Mayer, Samuel Goldwyn (originally: Shmuel Goldfisz), Nicholas Schenck, Irving Thalberg, Dore Schary; earlier, Marcus Loew; 1970s: Frank Rosenfelt

**Warner Brothers** - Harry, Sam, Albert, and Jack; Norman Katz

**Columbia** - Harry and Jack Cohn (At Harry’s death, Columbia merged with Screen Gems, headed by Leo Jaffe, Abe and Stanley Schneider, and Mike Francovich); Daniel Melnick

**RKO** - in early years, financially controlled by the Lehman Brothers, Jewish bankers. Later headed by Arnold Grant (Goldstein), one time head of Board of Directors. (Also chairman of the Anti-Defamation League and the Joint Defense Appeal of the American Jewish Committee). Later controlled by non-Jew Howard Hughes


As an example of almost complete Jewish domination of the studios’ executive hierarchy, one recent author listed the members of Columbia’s 1957
Board of Directors, as part of a section entitled “the Columbia Empire on the eve of Harry Cohn’s death.” (Is there more than one non-Jewish name here?):

- President: Harry Cohn
- First Vice President and Treasurer: Abe Schneider
- Vice President for Production: B. B. Kahane
- Vice President for Domestic Sales: Abraham Montague
- Vice President for Foreign Distribution: J. A. McConville
- Vice President for Advertising and Publishing: P. N. Lazarus, Jr.
- Vice President for Public Relations: N. B. Spingold
- Vice President for Finance: L. J. Barbano
- Vice President and Assistant Treasurer: Leo Jaffe Secretary: Charles Schwartz
- Assistant Secretary (Legal): D. G. Cassell
- Assistant Secretary: Bernard Birnbaum
- Assistant Treasurer: Mortimer Wormser
- Controller: Arthur Levy
- Director (Hemphill Noyes): L. M. Blanke
- Director (City National Bank): Alfred Hart
- Director (Sonnebend): A. M. Sonnebend
- Director: (Hallgarten): D. S. Stralem
- Director: Ralph M. Cohn

A listing of Columbia’s “Corporate Management, Divisions and Subsidiaries” executives contains almost all the same names, and the “Hollywood Studios” hierarchy is the same pattern. [DICK, B., 1993, p. 196-198] And as Chaim Bermant observes, to understand the nature of this firm: “Harry Cohn, or King Kohn, as he was sometimes called, head of Columbia, directed his company with the arbitrariness of a Caliph. So many legends have accumulated round his barbarity that one almost suspects that he consciously set out to play a part.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 94] (More generally, note here one investigator’s overview research into the gender and ethnicity of many past studio executives at MGM, Columbia, Warner Brothers, 20th Century Fox, Paramount, Disney, and MCA/Universal).

Famous swimmer/actress Esther Williams notes what it was like when she first strode down the long and intimidating executive office carpet as a teenager to meet her new (Jewish) MGM employers (who were considering her for a contract):

“As I walked the sixty-foot-long walk on this white carpet, [MGM head Louis] Mayer scrutinized me through his thick glasses as if I were a piece of merchandise. Sitting in back of [Mayer] was a phalanx of executives – L. K. Sidney, Sam Katz, Eddie Mannix, and Benny Thau – all the top man-
agement ... Although I didn’t know it then, they were the men who ran MGM. Like Mayer, they were all short ... I felt like Snow White with the dwarfs. When I reached the desk, I put out my hand and said, ‘Hello Mr. Mayer.’ No one stood up.” [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 62-63]

Mayer’s assistant, Ida Koverman, adds Williams, was “a power behind the throne.” [WILLIAMS, E., 1999, p. 79]

At Warner Brothers, brother Harry was an “ardent Zionist.” Brother Jack even forced his Jewish employees to donate part of their salary to the United Jewish Welfare Fund. [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 289-290] “If a thing worked,” Jack Warner, Jr. once remarked about his father, “it was moral. That’s a terribly cynical thing to say, but I think that’s how he felt.” [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 293]

Other prominent Jewish executives at various smaller studios over the years have included Victor Carter (chairman of Republic Pictures), William Chaikin (president of Avco Embassy Pictures), Bernard Donnenfeld (president of the Filmmakers Group), and Paul Heller and Fred Weintraub (heads of Sequoia Pictures), among others.

Dan Moldea notes that:

“As early as 1938, the Justice Department’s Antitrust Division had filed suit against the eight big motion picture companies – Paramount, Loews, RKO, Warner Brothers, Twentieth Century Fox, Columbia, Universal and United Artists for ‘combining and conspiring to restrain trade in the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures,’ in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act ... Thurman Arnold, the head of the Antitrust Division charged that the motion picture business had become ‘an industrial dictatorship and strictly unAmerican ... The danger in this country is the private seizure of power ... it is subject to no criticism and no attack because no one even knows about it.’” [MOLDEA, p. 46]

A settlement was reached in 1940. A second trial commenced in 1944 with some changes being forced upon the studios.

In 1941, there was even a public investigation in the U.S. Congress about Jewish domination of Hollywood and its alleged activist positon in support of American involvement in the looming world war:

“In August 1941 [Senators Gerald P. Nye and Bennett Champ Clark] called for a congressional investigation into warmongering and propaganda in the film industry .. [Because it did not receive enough votes in support] ... the Interstate Commerce Committee ... established a subcommittee to investigate Nye’s and Clarks’ allegations ... The subcommittee hearings raised exactly the charges which Jewish organizations and industry leaders had long feared anti-Nazi films would bring about: that Jews in Hollywood were warmongers and propagandists and that Jewish organizations abetted their coreligionists in Hollywood. The hearings added new and powerful rhetoric to the long-time charge that Jews controlled Hollywood and were using it for nefarious purposes, and they gave these ideas an airing on the very public floor of the U.S. Con-
gress ... Yet ... despite Jewish fears, the American press treated the sub-
committee hearings with criticism and even derision.” [HERMAN, F., MARCH 2001, p. 86-88]

“All the great moguls,” notes Frank Rose, “belonged to the Hillcrest [Country Club] – Louis B. Mayer, and the Warner Brothers and Harry Cohn of Columbia and Adolph Zukor of Paramount. Most of the top comics belonged – George Burns, Danny Thomas, Georgie Jessel, Milton Berle, the Marx Brothers ... Benny Siegel, the mobster who invented Las Vegas, was admitted, but Joseph P. Kennedy was turned down: Jews only. (Danny Thomas was an exception).” [ROSE, p. 1]

“Within the studios and on the screen,” says Neal Gabler,

“the Jews could create a new country – an empire of their own so to speak ... They would create its values and myths, its traditions and archetypes ... This was their America and its creation may be their enduring legacy.... They lived in large, palatial homes that imitated (some would say “vulgarized”) the estates of Eastern establishment. They became members of a lavish new country club called Hillcrest that mim-icked the Gentile clubs and barred them ... For their social life, they organized a system of estates, a rigid hierarchy, that could easily have been modeled after the court of Louis XIV ... The Hollywood Jews would cope through ‘a sustained attempt to live a fiction, and to cast its spell on the minds of others.’ ... The Hollywood Jews created a powerful cluster of images and ideas – so powerful that, in a sense, they colonized the American imagination ... Ultimately, American values came to be defined largely by the movies the Jews made.” [GABLER, p. 6-7]

In 1979, a Jewish screenwriter, Ben Stein, wrote a book about Hollywood, based upon his own experience in the city and interviews with nearly forty TV producers and writers. Such people, he concluded,

“with a small number of exceptions ... are all white males. They are almost never younger than 35. They are almost never second-generation Californians. A distinct majority, especially the writing of situation comedies, is Jewish ... [STEIN, p. 10] ... The super-medium of television is spewing out messages of a few writers and producers (literally in the low hundreds) ... Television is not necessarily a mirror of anything but what those few people think. The whole entertainment component of television is dominated by men and women who have a unified, idiosyn-
cratic view of life.” [STEIN, p. xiii]

“Hollywood is largely liberal and Jewish,’ Jewish agent Barry Mendel (of the United Talent Agency in Beverly Hills) told Jewish journalist Steve Berg in 1995, “We live in an insular world. We don’t understand fully people’s common concerns.” [BERG, S., p 1A] “The Hollywood elite,” note one Jewish research team, “shares a set of political and cultural assumptions that it views as natural
(as all of us view our own assumptions) and that it seeks, as do others, to put into action. These Hollywood leaders do not do this in a concerted or conspiratorial way; yet because there is a general agreement on core issues ... the totality of their world suggests a more or less coherent ideology. That ideology is generally left-leaning and highly critical of traditional features of American society.” [POWERS/ROTHMAN/ROTHMAN, p. 5]

“I’ve always believed that film,” observed Jewish film critic Lester Friedman, “like all art forms, is inherently propagandistic. Even seemingly innocuous pictures carry messages that either support or attack the prevailing status quo.” [FRIEDMAN, L., p. vii] In this vein, psychology professor Kevin MacDonald suggests sometimes deeper dimensions and themes to Jewish-dominated Hollywood movies. He cites the example of the film *Addam’s Family Values* (1993), produced by Scott Rudin, directed by Barry Sonnenfeld, and written by Paul Rudnick – all Jewish. “The bad guys in the movie are virtually anyone with blond hair,” says MacDonald, “... and the good guys include two Jewish children wearing yarmulkes.” [MACDONALD, 1998, p. 18]

As Jewish comedian Lenny Bruce once noted in his stand-up routine:

“Now the Jew gets into show business. And he writes motion pictures, he’s making the images – he has the film industry knocked up – he controls it! And the Jew naturally writes what he thinks is pretty, what he thinks is ugly – and it’s amazing, but you never see one Jewish bad guy in the movies. Not ever a Jewish villain, man. Gregory Peck, Paul Muni – haha! It’s wonderful! Who’s the bad guy? The goyim! The Irish!” [COHEN, J., p. 37-38] [Apparently even Bruce, like virtually all movie-goers, didn’t realize that Muni was Jewish.]

In 1983, a book, *Inside Prime Time*, by Jewish sociologist Todd Gitlin, was published about the entertainment divisions of American television. (Among the pioneers in the field was Ira Phillips, who was Jewish. “In 1941”, notes Anthony Heilbut, “the most popular [radio] soap operas were the creations of Ira Phillips ... By 1949 [he] had become the doyenne of television serials.” [Heilbut, p. 125]) Noting that his field work evidenced “the large number of Jews who hold top positions in the networks and production companies,” [GITLIN, p. 184] Gitlin interviewed a range of people in the TV business. Among them was Ethel Winant, vice-president in charge of mini-series at NBC, who told him

“There’s a kind of joke that you hear often in this business. The same people move in kind of a circle. It’s a family. If I were fired tomorrow, I would get a job the day after ... I’m part of that group. Which has very little to do with whether I’m good or bad.” [GITLIN, p. 116]

“A few score producer’s names come up over and over again,” noted Gitlin, “a few major production companies dominate the airwaves ... [GITLIN, p. 118] ... The old-boy networks binding executives, agents, and top producers amount to a curious kind of solidarity. Outsiders charge corruption ... [GITLIN, p. 155] ... Cronyism, mutual back scratching, behind-the-scenes favors, revolving doors, musical chairs, careers made by failing upward, the ‘amazing largesse’ given to favored members of the ‘creative community’ ... The same names may
stay in circulation for years, or decades ... Old-boy networks bind this savage business together.” [GITLIN, p. 156]

“Nepotism,” says Jewish critic Michael Medved, “... plays a limited role in preserving Jewish prominence in the entertainment industry. Power often seems to pass from generation to generation. Just look at famous acting [Jewish] families like the Douglases (Kirk and Michael). Among producers and top executives, this pattern is even clearer. One of the major independent studios, Samuel Goldwyn Pictures, is run by the son of founding father Samuel Goldwyn ... A third-generation Goldwyn (Tony) is a successful and talented young actor ... It’s possible that industry leaders feel more comfortable working with people who share their own outlook, values, and background.” [MEDVED, p. 39] In the heyday of MGM, studio chief “Louis B. Mayer placed so many of his relatives on the payroll that the initials M-G-M were said to stand for ‘Mayer’s ganze mishpoches’ [Mayer’s whole family].” [WHITFIELD, p. 156]

“Back in the heyday of the self-made Jewish movie moguls,” notes the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles,

“the studios were, to a certain degree, family businesses. For Louis B. Mayer, Jack and Harry Warner [at Warner Brothers], and others, nepotism was standard operating procedure ... Nepotism reached unprecedented heights at Universal Pictures, which was founded in 1915 by Carl Laemmle, an affable and unpretentious German-Jewish immigrant.” [ZAGA,

Universal, notes Chaim Bermant, “during [Laemmle’s] heyday, was full of relatives, a fact which gave rise to Ogden Nash’s famous couplet: ‘Uncle Carl Laemmle has a large famlee.’” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 93-94]

“Perhaps the most unique aspect of Jewish participation [in Hollywood],” says Jewish scholar Patricia Erens,

“that which sets them apart from any other ethnic group – has been the virtual monopoly on film producing ... As Jews gained a foothold in the industry, they hired friends and relatives, and so their numbers, and influence, grew.” [ERENS, P., 1980, p. 115]


Richard Shepherd, for example, who had “a brilliant producing career,” became a partner at talent agency Creative Management Associates, and eventually production chief at (post-Mayer) MGM. A key factor in getting the ball rolling was that his wife “was a grand daughter of the fabled Louis B. Mayer. Judy’s father, William Goetz, had married Mayer’s daughter, Edith, and had gone on to become a powerful producer in his own right during Hollywood’s golden era.” [BART, p. 127] Goetz was once a producer at 20th Century Fox.

One time head of the Paramount film studio? Stanley Jaffe. One time chief at Columbia? Jaffe’s father, Leo, whose brother-in-law, Abe Schneider, was Chairman of the Board. One time chairman of MGM? Nick Schenck. At the same time his brother, Joseph, headed United Artists.

And as Peter Hay notes about Warner Brothers studio:

“In 1950 stockholders brought suit against Warner Brothers and United States Pictures, which was run by Milton Sperling, the son-in-law of Harry Warner. Warner Brothers financed and distributed the films made by United States Pictures. This was not the first nepotism suit, which prompted producer Jerry Wald to remark: ‘If this sort of thing keeps up, the son-in-law business in Hollywood will be set back at least ten years.’” [HAY, P., 1990, p. 262-263]

Note the case of Joan Micklin Silver, a “housewife turned director.” Silver’s husband Raphael, says Rachel Abramowitz, “had grown so distressed by watching his wife’s frustrated ambition that he personally raised the money to finance her 1975 directorial debut, Hester Street, about a neglected Jewish housewife at the turn of the century.” [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 139] “At a party,” notes the Jewish Press,

“Silver met Joan Ganz Cooney, a founder of the Children’s Television network, who put her in touch with Linda Gotlieb, then an executive with an educational film company. Gotlieb fed her freelance script writing work and when Micklin Silver told the company head she wanted to direct as well, she got her wish.” [BIGA, L., 4-14-2000, p. 34]

David Begelman “was in the insurance business when he met and married Esther Feldman, sister of the agent Charles Feldman.” Feldman was one of the most powerful agents in Hollywood. Begelman soon worked at the MCA agency till he formed his own company with Freddie Fields, Creative Management Associates (CMA). [SHIPMAN, D., 1993, p. 447] By the 1970s, Begelman was head of Columbia studios. MCA executive Jay Kanter was Paramount president Barney Balaban’s son-in-law. [MCDOUGAL, p. 231] Famed Universal director William Wyler’s cousin, Carl Laemmle, was the head of that movie company. [BERG, A., 1989, p. 263] Paul Weinstein, vice president of production at Warner Brothers has a sister, Lisa, who is a “D-girl for the powerful production team of Leonard Goldberg and Jerry Weintraub at Universal.” [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 170]

Famous agent Mort Janklow’s wife Linda is the daughter of prominent Jewish film director Mervyn Le Roy and granddaughter of Harry Warner, of Warner Brothers. Jeremy Zimmer, who rose to head the motion picture packaging department at talent agency giant ICM, (and later became a partner in the “prestigious Baver/Benedek Agency” is the grandson of former MGM president Dore Schary. [BROUWER/WRIGHT, 1990, p. 45] Howard Kaminsky, president of Warner Books, is Jewish director/comedian Mel Brook’s first cousin. [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 209, 288] Ray Stark was the “producer of such films

And on and on.

**Sidney Ganis** was named president of the motion picture group for Paramount Pictures in 1988. Here’s how he got his start in Hollywood:

“As a teenager, he responded to a *New York Times* want ad for an office boy needed in a show business publicity office. When the rejection note came, he left it on the kitchen table, where his uncle Phil, a restaurateur with acquaintances in the entertainment industry, happened to read it. One call from Uncle Phil, and Sid had the job. Within three years he was introduced to the publicity chief at Twentieth-Century-Fox who brought him on board.” [BROUWER/WRIGT, 1990, p. 515-516]

“Hollywood is a make-work town where nepotism is a way of life,” observed (Jewish) comedian Roseanne Barr’s sister (and longtime manager), Geraldine, in 1994. [BARR, G., 1994] “In Hollywood,” once joked British character actor Arthur Treacher, “success is relative. The closer the relative, the greater the success.” [HAY, P., 1990, p. 262] “I became a director,” says Jay Sandrich (director of TV’s *The Cosby Show*, among others), “by being in the right place at the right time, plus the wonderful thing that helps so many people in this business, nepotism.... My father was a feature film director ... I really had no interest in the business. I’ve always felt that if my father had worked in the automobile business, I’d be in the automobile business.” [LEVINSON, p. 118-119] (Cosby’s Jewish agent, Jerry Katzman, originally arranged the deal for his show with NBC’s Jewish head, Brandon Tartikoff. One of the two co-writers for the program was also Jewish, Ed Weinberger. [TARTIKOFF, p. 10, 13] Thomas Werner, the head of Carsey-Werner, produced “The Cosby Show” and “Roseanne” for television. In earlier years, as Bill Cosby made the transition from stand-up comic to television with the *I Spy* series, his managers were Fred Weintraub and Roy Silver. The producer of another popular Black-oriented program, Sanford and Son? Bernard Orenstein).

“Now that Jews govern the New [mass media] Establishment, (their official mouthpiece is the *New York Times*),” complained William Cash, a reporter for Britain’s *Daily Telegraph*, “does any sort of reverse form of class or racial discrimination operate against outsiders trying to get access to the entertainment highway – wasps, blacks, Brits (there is only one Brit of any level of executive significance in all the major studios, and he is Jewish) and others not so favoured?” [CASH, p. 15]

“Recently I had a meeting with a young executive,” wrote Jewish screenwriter Adam Kulakow in a Jewish journal, “to discuss a possible script assignment. Our conversation began with a discussion of the Eastern European origins of my surname and segued from their to talk of my grandparent’s arrival in America ... It wasn’t long before we were playing ‘Jewish geography.’ By the
time we got around to the business of the meeting, we had achieved a comfort level based on our common ground.” [KULAKOW, A., p. 43] Kulakow ends his story that dismisses Jewish nepotism by declaring that Jewish solidarity meant nothing because he didn’t get the job. What he neglects to mention, of course, is how many other candidates were interviewed for the job, and whether or not the person who did get the position had the same “comfort level.” After all, even the most ethnocentric Jewish executive can’t hire all fellow Jews for one open position. “Relationships at studios,” says television comedy writer Stuart Gibbs, “often begin with whether they are comfortable with you. If you share a bond you might have a slight edge [in getting a job.]” [KULAKOW, p. 43]

Meanwhile, Kulakow quotes a non-Jewish television writer who dutifully says that being a non-Jew hasn’t hurt his career. However, the Gentile notes to Kulakow that “in a nice way every now and then and then I feel like a shabbes goy.” Short of those married to Jews, how many non-Jews know what a shabbes goy is, except those who have the term directed to them, jokingly or otherwise? A shabbes goy is (whatever its formal dissimulative explanations) essentially a non-Jewish servant who traditionally does all the work for Jews on Saturdays while they sit home lounging around, religiously forbidden to even light candles. One dictionary of Yiddish slang defines shabbes goy as “Someone who does the dirty work for others (Lit., gentile doing work for a Jew on Sabbath).” [KOGOS, p. 69] In what context would such a Yiddish term come up between Jew and non-Jew, unless there was, however veiled in humor, a latent undercurrent of reality? In Black parlance, shabbes goy is the rough equivalent to “house nigger.”

(While we’re on Yiddish terms, the double moral/linguistic standard in today’s Jewish-dominated mass media can be staggering to behold. The free use of the word shiksa (the defamatory slur against non-Jewish women) can still be found today, common in major publications. The New York Post calls Hilary Clinton’s grandmother a shiksa [PEYSER, 8-6-99], the Los Angeles Times notes a film with an “unattainable shiksa princess,” [HORNDADY, p. 90], and Richard Siegel, the executive director of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture has a letter printed in the New York Times quoting another commentator about a “shiksa-chasing Jewish prince.” [SIEGEL, R. 11-30-96] Can we imagine this day and age the same Jewish (or any other) organization discussing “nigger-chasers,” “Pollock-chasers,” or any other comparable defamation in a reputable national newspaper? One writer, Ellen Jaffe-Gill, (who is Jewish; how many non-Jews have even heard the shiksa term, let alone know the way that the Jewish community still widely uses the word?) had the integrity to complain to the Times about the paper’s use of the term. Shiksa, she noted, “is about as affectionate as the N-word, and if the Times’ style sheet lists racial pejoratives ... as no-nos, shiksa ... should go on the list.” [JAFFE-GILL, p. 95] Elsewhere, in a Jewish journal, Gabrielle Glaser notes that when she reviewed Jewish literature for information about intermarriage with non-Jews, “a lot of it was judgmental and didactic. The attitude was, ‘Well, if she’s not Jewish, she’s a stupid shiksa.’” [COLEMAN, S., p. 41]) (A review of expressly Jewish periodicals in the Ethnic Newswatch computer databank, from 1994 through 1999, notes the use of the word shiksa in over 70 different articles).
Being Jewish means nothing in Hollywood? In 1992, struggling Jewish actress Fran Drescher ended up sitting on a plane next to a Jewish broadcasting mogul, Jeff Sagansky, then president of CBS Entertainment. “To her captive audience she pitched an idea: a sitcom about a Jewish babe who become a nanny for the children of a dashing British millionaire. By the time Drescher deplaned, she’d convinced the network honcho to give her a weekly show [The Nanny] – which is now in its fourth season.” [HANSON, p. 160]

In another such case, Jewish journalist Philip Weiss “conspired to get himself seated next to [book publisher] Farrar, Strauss’ formidable [Jewish] boss, Roger Straus, at a dinner party. After three drinks, an emboldened Weiss asked Straus if he would take a look at his novel. Straus agreed to look, and later agreed to publish [Weiss’ novel entitled Cock-a-doodle-do].” [CRYER, p. 34]

“The social and professional scope I have as an American Jew is largely unlimited,” says Weiss, “... I have been included just about everywhere I have wanted to be. My (largely Jewish) professional network is well connected and powerful.” [original author’s parenthesis: WEISS, p. 26]

Jewish NBC head Brandon Tartikoff notes that at his grandmother’s death bed she was still asking him to do a TV mini-series based on the book Evergreen, by Belva Plain. “Grandma,” Tartikoff explained to her, “It’s a Jewish story. There are only six million Jews. We’re into large audiences ... After she died, I felt badly that I’d never done it and – largely for sentimental reasons, I admit – I commissioned a script of the book.” [TARTIKOFF, p. 29] Evergreen eventually became a regular television program.

In 2001, the New York Times started an article about Jewish/Israeli Hollywood mogul Haim Saban like this:

“Haim Saban picked up the phone in his office. Leslie Moonves [also Jewish], president of CBS Television, was returning his call. ‘Bobbie,’ said Mr. Saban, the children’s television mogul and top Democratic fund-raiser, ‘Don’t worry, don’t worry, I’m not asking for money.’ Instead Mr. Saban asked Mr. Moonves to help a singer, who was a family friend, in finding a TV gig.” [WEINRAUB, B., 3-4-01, p. 2]

In this vein, Jewish Hollywood mogul David Geffen “helped [Jewish fashion mogul] Calvin Klein’s daughter, Marci, land a job at Saturday Night Live.” [KING, T., 2000, p. 480] (Geffen had helped the head of Saturday Night Live, Lorne Michaels, get a job earlier in his career as a writer at a Phyllis Diller TV show). [KING, T., 2000, p. 61]

“Soon after the success of Daisy,” says Jewish novelist Judith Krantz, about one of her early novels,

“Nat Wartels sold Crown to Random House, which was owned by Si Newhouse, one of the richest men in America. On my next trip to New York, this unknown billionaire gave a dinner party to welcome me, inviting only executives from Crown and Random House. He and Bob Bernstein, who was his second-in-command at the time, quizzed me, a total stranger, trying to get a grip exactly who this strange Californian was besides being a successful novelist.
'So where did you go to high school?' Bob began.  
'Birch Warthen.'  
'My God, did you know my cousin, Alice Bernstein?'  
'Well, of course I did, we graduated in the same class,' I answered.  
'What did you do after college?' Si wanted to know.  
'I worked for Herb Mayes at Good House [Keeping].'  
'Herb? I’ve known him all my life. A great man’ was Si’s response.  
'My father was one of his best friends,' I said modestly, 'and Alex is one of my oldest and dearest friends,' I added, knowing full well that Si had dated their daughter, Alex, at one point her life, and that Mitzi Newhouse, his mother, and Grace Mayes were friends. Both men’s faces beamed with relief. An absolutely perfect game of Jewish Geography had just been beautifully played and I had been squarely identified as a highly creden-tialed, super-nice New York Jewish girl, no potentially oddball California exotic.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 303]

In 2000, Tom King’s The Operator. David Geffen Builds, Buys, and Sells the New Hollywood outlined Hollywood mogul David Geffen’s rise to fabulous power via his largely Judeo-centric networking:

First Geffen got a job in the mailroom at the William Morris (Jewish-founder) agency. He told the Jewish man who hired him, Howard Portnoy, that he was (Jewish music producer) Phil Spectre’s cousin. He also lied and said he had graduated from UCLA. [p. 46-47] Expecting a letter from UCLA to evidence that Geffen was not a graduate, Geffen came in early to the mail room to intercept it. He had his brother, a lawyer, write a bogus UCLA confirmation from his law office instead. [p. 47] Geffen was much like the Hollywood hustler in [Jewish author] Budd Schulberg’s novel What Makes Sammy Run, “a backstabbing [Jewish] huckster who employed appalling tricks to run to the top in Hollywood.” [p. 48] In the mail room, Geffen met “Barry Diller, a Jewish kid from Beverly Hills who years later became one of Geffen’s best friends, when the two were among the most powerful moguls in all of Hollywood.” [p. 50] At a night club, he “struck up a conversation with Herb Gart, a manager who had recently come to New York with comedian Bill Cosby.” [p. 50] “He next set his sights on romancing Nat Letkowitz, the celebrated head of Morris’s New York office.” [p. 51] “Enlisting Letkowitz’s support was a brilliant move. Geffen had realized the value of having a ‘rabbi’ in life, someone powerful to help him get what he wanted.” [p. 52] Geffen worked in the mail-room for six months until “he was stopped by Scott Shukat [also Jewish], who offered him a job as secretary to Ben Griefer [also Jewish], one of the office’s most respected television agents ... Brooklyn born and raised in Queens, Shukat ... too, had lied on his employment application at the Morris office, listing his stage name, Scott Logan, Jr. But when he arrived at the office on the first day and saw the executives’ names on the company directory in the lobby – Letkowitz, Kalcheim, Griefer, Weiss, and so on – he hustled back to the personnel office and told them his given Jewish name.” [p. 52-53] [KING, T., 2000]
“To cover some of the long-distance calls, Geffen called the local switchboard at CBS and claimed to be Jerry Rubin, a CBS executive he had met.” [p. 53] “Geffen began to mentor other secretaries and trainees. Jeff Wald [also Jewish], who supported his petty salary by peddling marijuana in the mailroom, immediately latched onto Geffen.” [p. 54] “But by far the most important alliance Geffen made was with Elliot Roberts [also Jewish], a dope smoking clown who had grown up across the street from Wald. In the years to come, Roberts hitched his star to Geffen’s and played a critically important role in David’s life ... Born Elliot Rabinowitz ... he was not as swift as Geffen, [but] he was nevertheless a hustler.” [p. 54] “Nat Lefkowitz placated Ben Griefer [also Jewish] by giving him a new secretary and then promoting Geffen to assistant to a crusty agent named Harry Kalcheim [also Jewish].” [p. 59] “With Marty Litke [also Jewish], also now a pal, Geffen signed Carmen Matthews ... Nat Lefkowitz soon promoted [Geffen] to agent.” [p. 60] “At the meetings, Geffen often prattled on about a fellow he had met at the University of Texas named Ronny Pearlman [also Jewish], who he claimed would be the hottest writer the TV business had ever seen. He also talked up a hippie named Lorne Michaels [also Jewish, and later head of Saturday Night Live] and soon got him a gig writing for a situation comedy.” [p. 61] “Geffen first turned to Herb Gart [also Jewish] .. who was now handling a group called the Youngbloods.” [p. 66] Geffen got a hot stock tip “at a lawyer’s office” about “Allen Klein [also Jewish], the manager of the Rolling Stones who was going to take over Cameo-Parkway Records.” [p. 67] “Meanwhile, in Los Angeles, Barry Diller [also Jewish] had quit the Morris office to become assistant to Leonard Goldberg, the head of West Coast programming at ABC ... Before long, Diller was running the department by himself.” [p. 68] “Laura Nigro [Nyro] was born in the Bronx in 1947, the daughter of a Jewish mother and an Italian-Catholic father ... [She was managed by] Artie Mogul [also Jewish], a hustler who had once signed Bob Dylan [of course also Jewish] to an early publishing deal. [p. 73] “He did not interfere with her songs, but he did insist that she change her name, fearing people might pronounce it ‘Negro.’” [p. 73] “Geffen next plotted to make a new label deal for his client. He went to see Jerry Schoenbaum [also Jewish], the head of Verve-Folkways.” [p. 80] “CBS Records head Clive Davis [also Jewish] was one of the slickest and most intimidating figures in the business ... Geffen, meanwhile, had gotten all the use he could squeeze out of Nat Lefkowitz and was searching for a more powerful rabbi.” [p. 81] “Clive Davis, meanwhile, had developed an extraordinary affection for David Geffen.” [p. 86] In 1968, the “rivals of William Morris began to court [Geffen]. The Ashley Famous Agency [also Jewish-founded] ... now badly wanted him.” [p. 87] “[Nat] Lefkowitz also may not have wanted to get in a bidding war with Ashley Famous in part because Ted Ashley was his nephew.” [p. 88] “In late 1967, Ashley sold his agency for thirteen million dollars to Kinney Service ... Kinney was run by the owner’s son-in-law” Steve Ross [also Jewish], “later ... chairman of Warner Communications. Ross was the man directly responsible for the transactions that were to make Geffen a billionaire.” [p. 88] “Once again displaying indomitable guts, Geffen set his sights on Albert Grossman [also Jewish], the biggest gun in the
management business.” [p. 89] Geffen “got on the phone, found [Todd] Schiffman [also Jewish] at home in Los Angeles, and began selling him on the notion that he ought to quit APA and join Ashley Famous.” [p. 90] “But the real clincher for Schiffman was that he, like Geffen, had a shady artist-management operation on the side.” [p. 91] “Geffen met the man with home he would develop a decades-long friendship, bonded in a love that many would term brotherly” – Sandy Gallin [also Jewish]. [p. 92] Gallin shot to stardom after booking the Beatles for their legendary 1964 debut on The Ed Sullivan Show.” [p. 93] “The only person Geffen knew at Atlantic Records was Jerry Wexler [also Jewish], Atlantic’s president.” [p. 106] “The next day, Geffen visited his friend Lous Adler [also Jewish].” [p. 120] Freddie Fields [also Jewish] “was the most powerful motion-picture agent in the business. Geffen thought that he might be able to use a connection to fields as a springboard to establishing himself as a power in movies as well as music.” [p. 127] “At CMA, Geffen was in Field’s office every day, ushered in by Field’s assistant, a young man named Jeff Berg [also Jewish], who years later became the chairman of the agency (known then as ICM).” [p. 129] When Geffen first met David Begelman [also Jewish], who a few years later became known as one of Hollywood’s most notorious felons, he looked him in the eye and said, "You know, what I admire most about you is your ability to lie with such grace.” “Geffen “finangled relationships with Robert Evans [also Jewish], the president of production at Paramount Pictures, and David Picker [also Jewish] the head of United Artists.” [p. 129]

“It has long been a standing joke in LA,” says English journalist William Cash, “that the way to get on is to convert to Judaism. Simon Kelton, an Eton-and Oxford-educated screenwriter friend with whom I used to share a house, and who was shortlisted for the Samuel Goldwyn film-writing award, always stressed his Jewish ‘ancestry’ whenever he gets a chance in LA; something few had heard about before.” [CASH, p. 29]

Non-Jew Jon Peters, a seventh grade dropout, [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 95] eventually rose from co-ownership of a hairdresser shop to become co-head of a Columbia division. It didn’t hurt his possibilities that when he started out, he shared the hair business with a Jewish friend, Paul Cantor. Nor did it hurt his Hollywood career that he eventually was doing Barbara Streisand’s hair, and that he later became her live-in lover. [GRIFFIN/MASTERS, p. 23, 102, et al] Jewish film producer Julia Phillips, early in her Hollywood career, notes the first time she met Streisand at her home: “She stares at me a lot. I make sure to let her know I’m Jewish like the time I met [my husband] Michael’s grandmother, and that pleases her.” [PHILLIPS, J., p. 90]

Russian-born French film director Roger Vadim (Jewish?) – famed for romances with Brigitte Bardot, Catherine Deneuve, and Jane Fonda – notes the beginning of his movie career: “All I needed was opportunity and luck. Opportunity came in the form of Raoul Lévy.... a Belgian of Russian origin.” [VADIM, p. 78] Lévy, notes actor Tony Randall, “made many of Brigitte Bardot’s films, starting with her first, And God Created Woman.” [RANDALL, T., 1989, p. 89]
Famed French film director François Truffaut? “His father had disappeared in 1931 after impregnating his mother.” A hired detective discovered that Truffaut’s father was “the Bayonne-born Jew, Roland Lévy.” And as the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California notes:

“According to the authors of a new biography on the filmmaker, Truffaut was relieved [that his father was Jewish] ‘because it confirmed he was not like everyone else. He was different. He was not a child like anyone else and perhaps that was because he was Jewish child... [Truffaut] kept his Jewish origins a secret from all but his ex-wife Madeleine Morgenstern; Helen Scott, the head of the public relations for the French Film Office in New York; and film producers Pierre Braumberger and Ilya Lopert – just a few of the Jews he surrounded himself with.”

Truffaut’s “long time Jewish assistant” was Suzanne Schiffman. He was also a member of Fonds de Solidarité avec Israël (the Israel Solidarity Fund).

How prominent are Jews in Hollywood? Superstar Judy Garland’s road to Hollywood stardom was like many others. Although not Jewish, her big break in Hollywood was provided by a Jewish friend of her parents, Marc Rabwin. He contacted a Jewish acquaintance, Joseph Mankiewicz, a prominent screenwriter, who personally asked an audition for her from Louis B. Mayer of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM). Garland’s agent at the time, Al Rosen, also Jewish, “claimed credit” for setting up a second audition for his client at the powerful studio where the man she “decided to see was Sam Katz, a new arrival to the studio.” [SHIPMAN, D., 1993, p. 42-44, 51] Like many Hollywood stars, Garland’s eventual agent was the prominent Charles Feldman, also Jewish. So was her doctor, Lee Siegel. Garland’s first husband was also Jewish – bandleader Artie Shaw. Her second husband was a Jewish musician, David Rose. (Garland’s sister, Suzi, also married a Jewish musician, Lee Cahn. [SHIPMAN, D., 1993, p. 104, 108]) Judy Garland’s fourth husband was her business manager, Sid Luft, also Jewish. A man he hired, Harry Rubin, “a former hoodlum from Brooklyn,” [SHIPMAN, p. 304, 352] also had a series of affairs with the famous actress/singer. One of Garland’s many Jewish psychotherapists, Leonard Krauss, called Rubin “her one island of [emotional] safety.” [SHIPMAN, D., p. 353] When Garland divorced Luft, her divorce lawyer, Jerry Geisler, was also Jewish. Garland also had a variety of other marriages and other affairs. Included among them was romantic engagements with her lawyer Gregory Bautzer. (Another of her lawyers was Irving Erdheim). Bautzer was “the unofficial California law partner” of mob lawyer Sidney Korschak, also Jewish. [MCDOUGAL, p. 327] The man Garland declared in later life to have been “the only one she ever loved,” was also the aforementioned Joe Mankiewicz. [SHIPMAN, D., 1993, p. ix]

Late in her career, Garland also believed that she had been swindled by as much as $300,000 by a Jewish agent, David Begelman. Both Begelman’s wife and Garland’s husband believed he too had a secret affair with the famous actress. [SHIPMAN, D. p. 448] Aside from numerous Jewish producers and directors in her life, others in Garland’s business world included Arthur Freed,
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MGM lyricist, described by one chronicler as “a vulgar, ambitious, sentimental, reactionary, ruthless, insensitive, and ill-educated man.” [SHIPMAN, D., 1993, p. 53] Garland’s daughter Liza (Minelli) was even named after a song by Jewish songwriters Ira Gershwin and Gus Kahn. [SHIPMAN, D. p. 190] Daughter Lorna Moon was named after a character created by Jewish playwright Clifford Odets, [SHIPMAN, D., p. 299] the character played by Odet’s real-life tragic paramour, Frances Farmer, in Golden Boy.

Lana Turner? The legend that she was “discovered” by Hollywood at Schwab’s pharmacy was created by a Jewish columnist, Sidney Skolsky. [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 23] Her first agent, when she was 15, was Zeppo Marx, who had dropped out of the Marx Brothers comedy group to concentrate on business ends of Hollywood. In later years her agent was Stan Kamen. [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 28-29, 283] As a teenage actress, the first man Turner ever had sex with was Jewish Hollywood lawyer Greg Bautzer. “I wasn’t surprised at all,” she wrote in 1982, “when I recently read that he is now the power behind the throne at MGM.” [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 43] Turner’s next lover was Jewish bandleader Artie Shaw (Arshawasky), who married in Las Vegas at age 19. [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 50] (This was the first of seven marriages). After having sex with Shaw after the marriage, Turner writes that “I experienced nothing but a question – what am I doing underneath this man? I don’t even know him.” Others actresses at the same time with emotional investments in Shaw included Judy Garland and Betty Grable. [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 53] “By the third day of our marriage,” notes Turner, “I knew I was in trouble, but how could I get out of it?” [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 55] Within the year she had divorced him and had an abortion of his child. Turner’s last husband (for six months) was scam artist and nightclub hypnotist Ronald Dante (Peller). Dante skipped out of the marriage after six months, trying to swindle Turner out of $35,000. [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 291] (Dante surfaced publicly again in 2000, heading a fraudulent business system called the Permanetics Institute, and became a fugitive when sentenced to 67 months in prison).

Non-Jewish actress Betty Davis? “Her role in [Jewish film director William] Wyler’s movie,” notes Reuters,

“was one of Davis’ many trademark performances. She always maintained that ‘Jezebel’ made her a box-office star. She also had an affair with Wyler. Though Davis would have many Hollywood affairs, some with her other directors, Davis later maintained that Wyler was the love of her life.” [REUTERS, 4-6-01]

TV star Mary Tyler Moore became famous on the Dick Van Dyke Show (produced by Carl Reiner and Sheldon Leonard). The heads of her production company, MTM Enterprises, were Arthur Price and Mel Blumenthal. In recent years she moved in with Robert Levine, also Jewish, a cardiologist she met in a Los Angeles hospital. Soon thereafter they took a vacation to Israel, where he had nearly 100 relatives. [MOORE, M., p. 258] Touring the Jewish state, she says,
“Nothing compared to the effect I felt at visiting The [Jewish Wailing] Wall, with its millions of prayers and wishes written on small pieces of paper that were tucked into crevices and cracks by all who had come there throughout the ages. It was an Orthodox tradition that men and women visit separately, so I was alone and without a prayer, but I did put my forehead against the Wall and embraced with outstretched arms all the pleas hidden there. When Robert and I were reunited some distance from it, we both had tears in our eyes.” [MOORE, M., p. 258- 260]

This emotional scene, she states, soon led to a Jewish marriage. “My [Christian] family,” she writes,

“was more accepting of the impending marriage than Robert’s was at first. Marion [Robert’s mother], who was about to become my mother-in-law, was only five years older than I. She confided to Robert that as the director of a family mental-health agency, it might appear that she had failed personally as a parental counselor. Irving [the groom’s father, who was Director of the Institute on American Pluralism of the American Jewish Committee] was obliged to be a little more receptive because of his long involvement with and knowledge of cultural pluralism.” [MOORE, M., p. 261]

Moore first heard the Yiddish word shiksa with her new husband at a party. It “is taken,” she says, “almost always, as an affectionate term for a non-Jewish woman.” [MOORE, M., p. 255]

“Suicide blonde” starlet Gloria Grahame attained fame in the early 1950s. Her initial screen test as MGM was conducted by Harry Rapf and J. Robert Rubin. She was romantically involved with film producer Stanley Rubin, later marrying Cy Howard (originally Seymour Horowitz). “Cy’s Jewishness,” notes Vincent Curcio, “was a very important issue to him, and as time went on it was to weigh very heavily on Gloria.” [CURCIO, 1989, p. 186]

“Platinum Blonde” superstar Jean Harlow was, early in her acting career, involved with Jewish mobster Abner “Longie” Zwillman. Harlow’s mother, notes David Stenn, “knew [Zwillman] could help her daughter’s career, which he proved by securing a two-picture deal for Harlow with Harry Cohn of Columbia Pictures.” [STENN, D., 1993, p. 61] Harlow eventually married MGM executive Paul Bern (born Paul Levy), a close friend of top Jewish MGM executive Irving Thalberg. “Paul Bern fell in love with Jean Harlow,” says Samuel Marx, “and got her the part that made her a star [a film called Red-Headed Woman],” [MARX, S., 1990, caption; photo section] Bern, while marrying America’s silver screen sex symbol, was alleged to have been impotent. He was also, says Harlow biographer David Stenn, “interested in abnormalities and complexes, inhibitions, perversions, suicide and death.” [STENN, D., 1993, p. 92] Bern was found dead at home, naked, with a gun at hand. His death, ruled a suicide, has always been controversial. Harlow later married Hal Rosson. Another Jewish beau late in Harlow’s short life was Donald Friede, one of the owners of the Boni & Liveright publishing firm. [STENN, D., 1993, p. 105-134, 160, 216]
Jewish bandleader Barney Rapp (Rappaport) “gave Doris [Day] her start as a singer.” [HOTCHNER, 1976, p. photo] Al Levy was Day’s agent. She married her Jewish manager, Marty Melcher. When Melcher died in 1968, “he left his widow nearly half a million dollars in debt. His business partner, lawyer Jerry Rosenthal, mismanaged Day’s assets – estimated at $20 million – down to nothing.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 251] (Among others Rosenthal hastened towards financial ruin was actor Van Johnson, “especially [via] a shelter that was supposed to decrease his tax bill. It was completely bogus.”) [WYNN, N., 1990, p. 187] Sam Weiss, the head of Warners music, noted that “the fact was that the only thing Marty loved was money. He loved Patty’s money [Melcher was first married to Patty Andrews of the popular singing trio, the Andrews Sisters] until Doris’s money came along and then, because there was more of it, he loved Doris’s money more.” [HOTCHNER, 1976, p. 126] Day successfully sued Rosenthal; the presiding judge noted Rosenthal’s “pattern of kickbacks and rebates disguised as attorney fees, and the implication of his clients thereby in tax fraud.” [HOTCHNER, 1976, p. 281]

Actress Debbie Reynolds married Harry Karl – they were introduced by omnipresent Jewish mob lawyer Sidney Korshak. [MCDOUGAL, p. 326] Reynolds once was also married to Jewish singer Eddie Fisher. Fisher left Reynolds to court superstar actress Elizabeth Taylor – eventually Fisher became Taylor’s fourth husband. Taylor converted to Judaism during this marriage, in 1959. (Her Hebrew name was Elisheba Rachel). Although she was never known by her husband to have attended a Jewish religious service, she promised to invest $100,000 in Israel Bonds. [HEYMANN, C.D., 1995, p. 195] Taylor’s prior husband, Mike Todd, was a Hollywood film producer and was also Jewish. He, in turn, was formerly married to actress Joan Blondell. Todd’s other “conquests,” says C. David Heymann, “included Marlene Dietrich, Gypsy Rose Lee, and Marilyn Monroe ... Lawsuits, civil litigations, and bankruptcy court peppered Todd’s career. The consummate con man, he survived (even thrived) by skirting the edge ... [HEYMANN, C.D., p. 151] ... Unbeknownst to Elizabeth, Todd made an entire set of tape recordings of their lovemaking sessions and frequently presented the tapes as mementos to friends and business associates ... [HEYMANN, C.D., p. 153]

Taylor’s uncle Howard, says C. David Heymann, “couldn’t understand why Elizabeth would become involved with so many Jewish men.” [HEYMANN, C.D. p. 195] These also included, during her marriage with Eddie Fisher, and “on-again off-again romance with another man” – Max Lerner, a professor at Brandeis University who was decades older than her. Patricia Seaton, the widow of Peter Lawford, recalls that “I knew Max when he would hang out at the Playboy mansion in Los Angeles. He had his own room there and would lure the young Playboy bunnies into his web by promising to read poetry to them. He pulled the same routine on me, and to my amazement it worked.” [HEYMANN, C.D., p. 228]

The Jewish presence in Elizabeth Taylor’s life, like so many in the Hollywood world in the rise to stardom, was important. “Taylor’s emergence as a
child star ... was largely the result of one man’s intention.” [HEYMANN, 1995, p. 36-37] This man was Samuel Marx, a producer at MGM, also Jewish. The director of the film that catapulted her to fame, National Velvet, was also Jewish: Fred Zinnemann. Taylor’s agent in her glory years was Jules Goldstone. Her partner in the Elizabeth Taylor Theatre Company was also Jewish, Zev Bufman.

Marlon Brando? Agent: Jay Kantor. When the future movie star moved to New York to begin an acting career, he began taking courses at the Jewish-dominated New York School for Social Research and was subsumed by a Jewish environment. “I was largely raised by these Jews,” he says, “I lived in a world of Jews. They were my teachers; they were my employers. They were my friends ... As well as [Jewish] academics and scholars from Eastern Europe, Jewish girls, most of whom were more educated, sophisticated and experienced in the ways of the world than I was, were my teachers in those early days in New York.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 72, 74] Brando’s profoundly influential “method acting” acting teacher was Jewish, Stella Adler, who he credits with having enormous influence in his personal life; he even had a “relationship ... off and on, for many years” with Adler’s daughter Ellen. [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 98-99] Adler also secured Brando his first important part in a play. [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 101]

Early in his career, Brando also took an important role in a play called A Flag Is Born, written by avid Zionist Ben Hecht and directed by Stella Adler’s brother, Luther: both Jewish. As Brando notes, “it was essentially a piece of political propaganda advocating the creation of the state of Israel ... Everyone in A Flag Is Born was Jewish except me ... I did not know then that Jewish terrorists were indiscriminately killing Arabs and making refugees out of them in order to take their land ... The play, as well as my friendship with the Adlers, helped make me a zealous advocate for Israel and later a kind of traveling salesman for it.” Brando was then further exploited by his Jewish cohorts; he began giving propaganda speeches for a Zionist organization, The American League for a Free Palestine. Influenced by Hitler’s mass murder of Jews and the world view of the many Jews around him, Brando even contributed money himself to the Zionist Irgun organization, a terrorist group. Noting his avidly pro-Israel political activities, the movie star wrote to his parents, saying, “I’m really stimulated more than I’ve ever been.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 107-111]

Eventually Brando learned more about Zionism and his politics changed. “Now,” he said in 1994, “I understand much more about the complexity of the situation than I did then ...” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 111] ... I sided with Jewish terrorists without acknowledging that they were killing innocent Palestinians in their effort to create the state of Israel ... [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 231] ... One of the strangest government policies is that largely because of the political influence of Jewish interests, our country has invested billions of dollars and many American lives to help Israel reclaim land that they say their ancestors occupied three thousand years ago.” [BRANDO/LINDSEY, 1994, p. 388]

This kind of devotion by non-Jews in the entertainment world to Jewish causes was echoed by silent screen star Mary Pickford, who was catapulted to
fame by Jewish mogul Adolph Zukor. Originally, Pickford held contempt for a number of the Jews she knew and was highly critical of them. “Behind his back,” says Eileen Whitfield,

“Pickford called Goldwyn ‘Shylock.’ And to [her husband Douglas] Fairbanks, whose grandfather had been Jewish, Mary sometimes said, ‘That’s the Jew in you.’ But she topped these comments in the presence of actress Carol Myers, to whom she explained that the Jews had invited Hitler’s persecution. Forgetting that Myers was a rabbi’s daughter..., Pickford chirped that avaricious Jews had snapped up German property at bargain prices after World War I. She added that a syndicate of Jews would repeat the conspiracy after World War II.” [WHITFIELD, E., 1997, p. 333]

Later, however, leaning on her universalistic Christian religious values, and troubled by increased reports of Nazi attacks against Jews, Pickford repented. Henceforth, “for years she tried to compensate [for her earlier feelings] by giving till it hurt to Jewish causes. Her greatest triumph was the Mary Pickford Building at L.A.’s Jewish Home for the Aged, to which she became a devoted patron.” [WHITFIELD, E., 1997, p. 333] (Another example of such well-meaning non-Jewish Hollywood support for Jewish causes is the case of Jon Voigt and his activism for the Orthodox Chabad Lubavitch movement. As Howard Jacobson notes about the actor: “Jon Voigt would seem to have a special relationship with Chabad Lubavitch. He speaks of ‘whirlwinds of knowledge’ ..., ‘I’m a firm believer,’ Jon Voigt goes on, ‘in this source of energy that keeps the just justly.’” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 100] One presumes that, like so many, the well-meaning non-Jewish Voigt has not done his homework about the racist teachings of this Orthodox organization. Click these three links for earlier discussions about Chabad: First (http://jewishtribalreview.org/chabad2.htm), Second (http://jewishtribalreview.org/micsam.htm), Third (http://jewishtribalreview.org/bush.htm). (Meanwhile, people like former NBC producer Molly Resnick, raised in Israel, has returned to her Jewish roots via allegiance to Chabad. She eventually became a “proud Jew, instead of the kind of Jew who wanted to be a WASP,” and founded Mothers Against Teaching Children to Kill and Hate, an organization against the content of Palestinian school textbooks). [ESKENAZI, J., 5-11-01]

Comedian John Belushi’s Hollywood world included the usual swirl of Jewish lawyers, agents, and film and TV people: Lorne Michaels, head of Saturday Night Live; Belushi's personal manager Bernie Brillstein, his assistant Joel Briskin; movie producer Robert Weiss; “physician and psychiatrist” Bennett Braun, musician and cocaine supplier Richard Gerstein, [WOODWARD, p. 344] filmmaker and drug addict Gary Weis, among others. The public relations firm of Solters, Roskin and Friedman was hired, “as with many of their clients, ... to keep [Belushi’s] name out of the news, not in it.” [WOODWARD, 1984, p. 377] Belushi degenerated into a hopeless drug addict and developed a reputation for unreliability, eventually dying of a heroin overdose.
TV talk show host **Jay Leno**? His manager is Helen Kushnik, later the Executive Producer of *Leno’s TV show*. She and her husband Jerrold Kushnik (a Hollywood lawyer) have been members of Temple Emmanuel in Beverly Hills. Leno’s lawyer? Ron Berg. [CARTER, B., 1994, p. 79, 104-106, 62]

Tough-guy **John Wayne** started out in Hollywood at Harry Cohn’s Columbia Studios, moved to Nat Levine’s Mascot Pictures, and then was under contract to Sidney Rogell and Leon Schlesinger. [ROBERTS/OLSON, 1995, p. 99, 102, 112] Likewise, **Gene Autry** got his start at Levine’s film company. [TUSKA, J., 1982, p. 156] Director **Orson Welles**? “A curious member of Welles’ entourage,” says Barbara Leaming, “[was] his mentor and surrogate father, Dr. Maurice ‘Dadda’ Bernstein.” [LEAMING, B., 1989, p. 92] “Bernstein,” notes Charles Higham, Welles’ biographer, “was greedy and unscrupulous; he used, married, and discarded Mina Elman, sister of the violin virtuoso Mischa Elman, and later equally misused the Chicago opera star Edith Mason, drawing her into a ménage à trois with her former husband. Later Dr. Bernstein tried to milk Welles of every possible cent when Welles achieved fame.” The index in Higham’s volume lists ten pages under the heading: “Bernstein—money grubbing antics of.” Bernstein also had an affair with Welles’ mother. [HIGHAM, C., 1985, p. 6, 350, 38-39] Welle’s first acting role was as a “brutally anti-Semitic, bullying nobleman” in the Irish play *Jew Suss*. [HIGHAM, C., 1985, p. 57]

Jackie Gleason’s Jewish circle? His agents were “superagent” Sam Cohn [HENRY, W., 1992, p. 10, 66] and Herb Siegel [p. 225] Meeting CBS chief Joseph Cates in 1952, his “agents and managers” included “Herb Rosenthal and Herb’s assistant Jerry Katz.” The writers for his smash 1950s TV series *The Honeymooners* were Marvin Marx (“Gleason’s leading writer for a couple of decades”), Walter Stone, Leonard Stern, and Sid Zelinka. [p. 169] Coleman Jacoby was the “creator of most of the characters Gleason played for two decades of network television.” [p. 10]

Of particular note too was a “tall, fat, big-nosed, craggy-faced, homely Jewish man called Toots Shor ...” [p. 67] For at least a decade and a half, from the early forties through the late fifties, [Gleason] was to center his life on a ceaseless effort to tease, amuse, trick, top and otherwise entertain Toots Shor. He spent more cumulative time with Toots than any of his wives or mistresses.” [p. 68] As Gleason’s biographer William Henry III notes about Shor:

“No social history of Manhattan would be complete without mention of Shor, the barkeep-turned-celebrity who was described by The New Yorker in a November 1950 profile (adulatory at such length that it ran in three installments) as ‘the burly, impudent, hard-working, high-spirited, sentimental proprietor of the restaurant at 51 West 51st Street that bears his name’ ... Shor’s was not for the literati, the left-leaning or, naturally, the ill-to-do. It was not for the cafe of society of tuxedoed gentlemen and gilded debutantes. Rather, Shor’s was for saloon society, the self-confident men of attainment in sports and journalism and entertainment, plus their hangers-on, admirers, and gawkers ... Toot’s was a world of celebrities, commingling with all sorts of people whose common bond was being fa-
mous ... Just as being ‘mentioned in [Jewish columnist Walter] Winchell’ was a vital hallmark of this status, so was being moved to the front of the inevitable waiting line at Shor’s ... Just as important to Shor’s reputation were the newspaper columnists, most of them locally based but many of them nationally syndicated ... These journalistic power brokers worked the tables at Shor’s to get glittering celebrity items for their columns, often accumulating a whole day’s worth of material in the course of lunch. The celebrities, in turn, worked the tables at Shor’s to promote their careers ... Toots was regarded as a crude but accurate barometer of how one’s career was going ... The warmer his greeting, the faster one was rising; the more perfunctory the handshake, the quicker one’s impending fall.” [HENRY, W., 1992, p. 68]

Danny Thomas, the Arab/Lebanese-born comedian famous for the long-running TV series Make Room for Daddy, was – like most – inundated by Jewish Hollywood. He started his career at Harry Eagle’s nightclub in Chicago. His first agent was Leo Salkin, who passed him up to super-agent Abe Lastfogel (Thomas called him “Uncle Abe” all his life), [THOMAS, D., 1991, p. 111] the head of the William Morris Agency. Thomas describes his first performance for Lastfogel:

“When I finished, I joined the William Morris group at their table. Mr. Lastfogel was deep in thought. Everybody was waiting for him to speak. Finally, his wife, Frances, broke the ice. She said, ‘You’ve sure got a lot of talent for a Lebanese from Toledo. Are you sure you’re not a Jew from New York?” Everyone laughed.” [THOMAS, D., 1991, p. 110]

Thomas (who was often mistaken for being Jewish) notes his first stand-up comedy gig in Chicago:

“When sensing the makeup of the audience, I told a lot of my Yiddish stories, starting with my classics about Mrs. Feldman. I didn’t know it at the time, but in the audience there was a wealthy diamond appraiser, Max Finkelmen, who was staying at the nearby Edgewater Beach Hotel and had stopped by with his wife for a cold beer on that warm night. This man became my biggest booster. There were two big Jewish private clubs in Chicago, the Covenant and the Standard. The diamond appraiser spread the word around these two clubs, and people soon came flocking to see ‘this great new Yiddish comic.’” I never said I was or wasn’t Jewish.” [THOMAS, D., 1991, p. 86-87]

Jewish comedian Fanny Brice gave him his first radio break. Three prominent Jewish movie moguls (Louis Mayer, Harry Cohn, and Jack Warner) offered him a future in the movies if he had his large nose changed with plastic surgery. [p. 153-157] He declined each time, but MGM’s first film offer cast him as a Jewish cantor. [p. 155] At Warner Brothers, his first movie role was to star in a screen biography of Jewish songwriter Gus Kahn (producer: Lou Edelman). [p. 158] He next starred in a remake of the classic Jewish-themed movie The Jazz Singer. [p. 159] Thomas is known for building the St. Jude Catholic hospital. The only people Thomas mentions in his biography on the St. Jude Foundation of California were Lastfogel as president, fellow-Jew Morris Stoller
(another executive at William Morris) as treasurer, and Democratic Party activist Paul Ziffen (also Jewish) “the attorney who got us our tax exemption.” [p. 171] The script writer who wrote the pilot for Make Room for Daddy was Mel Shavelson. [p. 186] Other writers for the series included Danny Simon, Bob Schiller, Bob Weiskopf, Frank Tarloff, and Mac Benoff. [p. 210-211] The director was first Bill Asher, and later Sheldon Leonard, who became Thomas’s co-partner on many future projects. These projects included successful TV series like the Dick Van Dyke Show, The Real McCoys, The Andy Griffith Show, and others. “The man who deserves most of the credit,” writes Thomas, “for running the Empire (we frequently had three shows in the Top Ten) was the indefatigable Sheldon Leonard.” [THOMAS, D., p. 218]

Moving along in the show business world, there is Joseph E. Levine. “I built a helluva lot of people – made them stars,” he declared,

“Sophia Loren – I won her the Academy Award for Two Women, promoted the shit out of her within the industry, and she didn’t even mention me in her book. And don’t forget [Jewish actor] Dustin Hoffman in The Graduate. I made a helluva lot of directors too. I hired [Jewish director] Mike Nichols the first one – won him an Oscar for best director, The Graduate. I hired [Jewish director] Mel Brooks the first one – on The Producers. Yeah, it was his first picture.” ARONSON, S., 1983, p. 194

Among actress Gloria Swanson’s marriages was one to Herbert Somborn, a Jewish film executive. [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 279] After Desi Arnaz, Lucille Ball married Gary Morton (born Morton Goldaper) in 1961, a comic and film producer. Husband of the famous redhead for the rest of her life, Morton became head of Lucille Ball Productions. [AUSTIN AMERICAN-STATESMAN, 4-1-99, p. B3] Late in her life, actress Rita Hayworth developed Alzheimer’s disease. Yet “even at this point there was a man in Rita’s life, Kim Novak’s former beau, Mac Krim, who regularly squired her about town and to certain of her public appearances.” [LEAMING, B., 1989, p. 356]

In once-prominent Hollywood actress June Allyson’s autobiography, she dedicates the book to her husband, two children, and her manager Jerry Cohn. [ALLYSON, J., 1982, DEDICATION PAGE] (Allyson, who was once thinking about giving up her Hollywood ambitions, credits MGM producer Joe Pasternak with launching/saving her movie career, interceding with MGM head Louis B. Mayer on her behalf). [ALLYSON, J., 1982, p. 36].

Even “top supermodel” Cindy Crawford has a Jewish husband. When she was honored with an award by a women’s division of Yehisva University, a number of rabbis began complaining that, “as a gentile married to a Jew, Ms. Crawford sends an inappropriate message to a Jewish community that is beleaguered by intermarriage.” [FORWARD, 5-5-2000, p. 1]

The incestuous Jewish world of power in Hollywood may also be noted in the Jewish team of Bert Schneider and Bob Rafelson, who have been influential in a variety of Hollywood projects since the late 1960s. Schneider got his start in his father’s Screen Gems company, the television wing of Columbia pictures, rising to become treasurer of the company. The two men later formed a
firm called **BBS** which was influential in the creation a number of hit “counter-culture” films like the aforementioned *Easy Rider* and *Five Easy Pieces*, among others. Independent filmmaker **Jim McBride** noted that at BBS, “the truth is, they were very schizophrenic. We used to call them ‘the Hollywood Sperm,’ because they were all children of successful Hollywood people. They had beards, but in other ways, they didn’t seem at all that different.” [BISKIND, p. 77] Another who knew them, **Harry Gittes** (also Jewish), noted that the BBS “people were the meanest people I ever met in my life, brutal, inhumane inflicted. Respect and loyalty, that was the way BBS operated. They had a gangster mentality. This was the Jewish, Bugsy Siegel-type of hipness ... These were the coldest, toughest Jews I’d ever met in my life to another Jew!” [BISKIND, p. 117]

Famed television talk show host **Larry** (Zeiger) **King**’s first “benefactor” was Lou Wolfson, “a great philanthropist in the Jewish community” who once “controlled a $400 million industrial empire and was known as ‘the great raider’ because of his penchant for taking over corporations.” [KING, p. 11] “Now, one may wonder,” wrote King, “as I did not, why this virtual stranger suddenly wanted to become my benefactor and career advisor. To this day I don’t know.” [KING, p. 13] (Wolfson eventually went to prison for stock crimes. Jewish Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas was also hit by Wolfson’s wake, resigning “from the Court in disgrace” when it was learned he was a $20,000 a year advisor for the “Wolfson Foundation.” [KING, p. 197] King himself was sued by Wolfson in 1972, accused of stealing $5,000; the charge against him was eventually dismissed because “the statute of limitations had run out.” [KING, p. 29] A later wealthy benefactor for King’s career was Ed Gordon.

Being Jewish means nothing in the behind-the-scenes world of Hollywood? The chummy network is so strong that lead defense lawyer, **Robert Shapiro**, in *O.J. Simpson*’s trial for murder, seriously entertained the idea that he could influence potential jurors by requesting a favor from some Hollywood friends. The idea was to warm the local public up to the idea that O.J. Simpson had been set up by racist policemen. “I know people in the TV industry,” he remarked to his staff, “I’ll talk to them about playing movies that show people being framed by the police. Perhaps *Twelve Angry Men.*” [SCHILLER/WILLWERTH, p. 161]

The eventual president of production at **Columbia Studios**, **Dawn Steel** (she replaced another Jewish executive, David Puttnam, the CEO of **Columbia Pictures Entertainment**), wrote about her path towards becoming the second woman to head a major Hollywood studio. ([Paula Weinstein had a similar post at about the same time at **United Artists**. Sherry Lansing, another Jew, was the first woman to get such a high position. Lansing started out as a math teacher in Watts while she looked for acting jobs. Within ten years of getting a $5 an hour script reviewing job, in 1980 she was named – at the age of 35 – to be the head of **Twentieth Century Fox.** “Quite honestly,” she says, “I think I’ve been accused of sleeping with every man I’ve ever worked for. Every single man: married, unmarried, gay, whatever.” One verifiable such connection, early in her career, was Jewish executive Dan Melnick. [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 90-91] Lansing
eventually married Jewish movie director William Friedkin, of *The Exorcist* fame. [Earlier husband: Michael Brownstein]. After her first big hit, *Fatal Attraction*, she turned to do *The Accused*, a film about a woman who gets gang raped in a bar. Members of the Portuguese-American community protested that the story defamed their community).

Dawn Steel’s own road to power is illustrative. “Steel’s defining characteristic was unapologetic and ambitious,” says Rachel Abramowitz, “a consuming desire to make it.” Steel “drank with the best of them [male Hollywood executives]. She fucked with the best of them. She told the same bawdy stories,” says her “close friend” Howard Rosenman. [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 187, 195] In Steel’s autobiography, she notes that she got her start in the media as the head of merchandizing at *Penthouse*. Her first personal entrepreneurial venture was a mail order business selling amaryllis plants as “penis plants.” She ran a simple ad in men’s magazines across the country, announcing “Grow Your Own Penis. All It Takes Is $6.98 and a Lot of Love.” Costing her thirty cents apiece, Steel sold 100,000 of them. [STEEL, p. 68] Her next money-making venture was to mass produce and sell toilet paper with the Gucci imprint. Eventually she was dating actor Richard Gere, highlighted by a visit with him to *Plato’s Retreat*, a nude swinger club in Manhattan where her brother worked as a lifeguard.

Steel’s move up the movie world was expedited by a self-described “connection” to Jewish media mogul Jeffrey Katzenburg. “He was one of the best friends of Sid Davidoff,” she notes, “my lawyer in the Gucci [toilet paper] affair.” [STEEL, p. 106] Jewish mogul Michael Eisner [later head of Disney, where Steel landed later producing work] hired her virtually off the street to be a major movie executive:

> “You’re vice president of production in Features. Congratulations.”
> [Eisner said] “I don’t know anything about movies,” I told him. “Neither does anybody else. Goodbye, good luck, and break a leg.” [STEEL, p. 110]

As *Los Angeles Times* columnist Jack Matthews later wrote: “Marketing designer toilet paper seems as good a background for success in Hollywood as anything else.” [SLOMAN, p. 14] Steel quickly built a reputation as “Hell on Hells” and the “Queen of Mean”; *California* magazine put her on one of its covers in 1984 as one of the state’s worst bosses to work under.

When Steel [whose father was a professional bodybuilder who changed his last name from Spielberg] married a fellow movie industry Jew, Chuck Roven, “the main obstacle was Chuck’s mother, Blanca ... Somehow she got it into her head that, of all things, I was not Jewish. She was convinced I was pretending, to catch her son. I was enraged ... Blanca tracked down my family.” [STEEL, p. 191] (An earlier Steel husband was Ronald Rothstein). [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 190]

Opportunities have been obviously improving for Jewish women in Hollywood in more recent times. Paula Hyman and Deborah Moore noted that:

> “Since the 1990s there seems to be a deluge of Jewish women behind the [Hollywood] scenes. The following list, which is by no means com-
complete, attests to the immense energy and talent of Jewish women who are now working in [film] production: Susan Arnold, Bonnie Bruckheimer, Laurie Schuler Donner, Connie Field, Wendy Fineman, Ellen Geiger, Litz Glotzer, Lynn Harris, Susan Hoffman, Gale Ann Hurt, Donna Isaacson, Gail Katz, Nana Levin, Rachel Lyon, Nancy Myer, Linda Obst, Polly Platt, Mimi Polk, Jane Rosenthal, Midge Sanford, Deborah Schindler, Sandra Schulberg, Arlene Sellers, Shelby Sherr, Sandy Stern, Shelby Stone, Roselle Swid, Anthea Sylbert, Paula Wagner, Paula Weinstein, and Laura Ziskin ... The real change in the past few decades has been in the number of Jewish women in positions of power and influence. Jewish women have always worked behind the scenes, most often as writers. More recently, and especially in the exponential leap of the early 1990s, they have moved into directing and producing, both independently, and as studio executives. For many, there is no question that Jewish women have gained higher access because of their connection to Jewish men in the industry.” [HYMAN, p. 447-448]

“There was hellish competition among the women,” says executive Paula Weinstein about those around her in corporate Hollywood, “Roz Heller [at Columbia] and Marcia Nasatir and Nessa Hyams [at Warner Brothers] always argued about who was the first woman vice president [at a Hollywood studio], but one of the three of them was. We all tended to compete with each other.” [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 131] All these women are Jewish. In the talent agency world,” notes Rachel Abramowitz, “by the late eighties, a number of young women had begun to make their mark – Elaine Goldsmith and Risa Shapiro ... and the lanky JJ Harris.” Others included Joan Hyler and Toni Howard. [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 329-331] (See Abramowitz’s volume – Is That a Gun In Your Pocket? about women, almost all Jewish, in the business side of recent Hollywood).

Want to take your production crew to film in Philadelphia? You’ll be talking to the Commissioner of Greater Philadelphia Film Office, Sheila Pinkenson, who is also Jewish. [SALISBURY, G., 3-30-99]

“Even those who might not like Jews,” says Barry Rubin, “[have] to accept their power and win their favor. In June 1991, the Simon Wiesenthal Center held a fifty-thousand-dollar-a-table dinner to honor movie star Arnold Schwarzenegger, who reportedly contributed five million dollars to build its Museum of Tolerance. Present were Jewish executives heading virtually every movie studio including Disney, whose late founder refused even to hire Jews. The Austrian-born actor’s father may have been a Nazi Party member and the actor himself was a friend of Kurt Waldheim, Austria’s ex-Nazi President, but Schwarzenegger also needed the favor of these powerful men.” [RUBIN, p. 88]

Among those who sociologist Todd Gitlin sampled in the early 1980s by interview or research in his television entertainment project included Sy Amlen, vice-president of ABC Entertainment in New York; Paul Klein, program chief at NBC; Gerald Jaffe, NBC vice president for research development Stu Sheslow, vice president for dramatic development at NBC; Jonathan Axelrod, vice presi-
dent at ABC “before he moved through the industry revolving door to Columbia Picture’s television division;” [GITLIN, p. 24] Arnold Becker, CBS vice president for television research; Fred Silverman, the research head at NBC; Peter Roth, an ABC development executive; Lee Rich, Lorimar president; Ann Daniel, an ABC executive in drama development; Richard Reisberg, former president of United Artists; Esther Shapiro, an ABC executive (she and her husband wrote the founding script for the Dynasty TV series); Lew Wasserman, head of MCA; Herman Keld, vice president of CBS; Jane Rosenthal, at CBS and “probably the youngest high-ranking woman in network entertainment”; Brandon Tartikoff, for ten years the president of NBC Entertainment and later head of Paramount Pictures and New World Entertainment; Alfred Schneider, head of ABC’s Standards and Practices department; Stu Samuels, vice president for TV movies at ABC, writer-producer Richard Levinson, producers Norman Lear, Aaron Spelling, Barney Rosenzweig (whose father-in-law – Arnold Rosenberg – was a producer at Twentieth Century Fox), Mace Neufeld, David Wolper (the most prominent producer of documentary films in recent decades), Herb Brodkin (whose projects include the TV program “The Holocaust”), Leonard Goldberg, David Gerber, Michael Zinburg, Tony Ganz, Marvin Kupfer; former president of the Writers’ Guild of America, David Rintels; William Morris agent Jerry Katzmann, and writers Garry Goldberg and Michael Elias.

Among the many prominent Jewish television directors over the years was Alan Rafkin. Rafkin directed over 80 TV shows from the 1960s into the 1980s, including Danny Thomas in Make Room for Daddy, Love, American Style, Mash, and The Mary Tyler Moore Show. Rafkin’s autobiography is subtitled “Tales from TV’s Most Prolific Sit-Com Director.” [KROTKI, A., 2-2699, p. 49]

Another Jewish director, Jess Oppenheimer, subtitled his own autobiography “How I Came to Create the Most Popular Sitcom of All Time.” This was the I Love Lucy show, starring Lucille Ball and Desi Arnaz. Oppenheimer founded the show, produced it, directed it, and was one of its three screenwriters. The show’s film editor, Dann Cahn, and cinematographer, Karl Freund, were also Jewish. The key man who actually sold the I Love Lucy show to Philip Morris cigarette company sponsorship was also Jewish, Milton Biow, “head of the ad agency that bore his name.” An early influence upon, and connection for, Oppenheimer was Ralph Freud, director of a theatre group at San Francisco’s Jewish Community Center. (Freud later founded UCLA’s theatre arts department). A former Oppenheimer roommate, Bob Weiskopf, joined the I Love Lucy staff as a screenwriter in the show’s fifth year. And Oppenheimer’s high school friend, Mort Weiner, “would later become programming chief at NBC-TV.” [OPPENHEIMER, J., 1996, p. 18, 56-58, 141, 145, 158, 185]

Ralph Levy directed the original pilot program for I Love Lucy. He also directed The George Burns and Gracy Allen Show, The Jack Benny Show, and, in later years, The Beverly Hillbillies, Petticoat Junction, Green Acres, and Hawaii Five-0. [OLIVER, M., 10-20-01, p. B15

Jews have long shaped the essence of American popular culture through the medium of television: David Dotort, for instance, created and produced Bonanza
(actors Michael Landon and Lorne Greene were also Jewish), Aaron Ruben produced The Andy Griffith Show, Chuck Barris created The Dating Game, The Gong Show, and The Newlywed Game. [JEWHO0, 2000] Rod Serling, host of The Twilight Zone, was Jewish. David Levy created The Addams Family. Gil Fates was the Executive Producer of pioneer TV game shows To Tell the Truth and What’s my Line? [KIRSCHNER, S., 9-14-00, p. 11] Lou Cowan produced the infamous $64,000 Question, and other early TV quiz shows like The Quiz Kids. He was also once the president of CBS-TV. [COWAN, P., 1982, p. 4] (Cowan “met with Israeli officials to suggest ways of explaining their policies to the American public. Sometimes he would be among the most hard-line, uncompromising American Jews in the room, insisting that Israel emphasize its own self-interest, its own point of view, instead of concocting the bland, half-true justifications for controversial policies that Americans might not want to hear ... [COWAN, P. 1982, p. 91] [Cowan’s wife Polly’s] feelings about Israel as a vital, precarious symbol of Jewish survival were deeper than I imagined [wrote her son Paul], even when I thought about her lifelong obsession with the Holocaust.” [COWAN, P. 1982, p. 93] Ms. Cowan was also a television producer.)

“In a study completed in the 1960s, Muriel Cantor found that almost half of the Hollywood producers of prime time television shows were of Jewish background.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 97] And as Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note elsewhere:

“The role of Americans of Jewish background in television dramas was equally pronounced. Michael Robinson and Ben Stein have pointed to the negative portrayals of businessmen, the military, and other ‘establishment’ groups that characterized dramatic series and soap operas during the 1960s, as well as the counter-cultural themes that were openly introduced in such dramas. Although Stein does not make the point directly, his interviews with television writers and producers suggest the importance of Jews in formulating the social imagery of television entertainment.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 107]

In the 1950s, Jules Stein’s and Lew Wasserman’s MCA subsidiary, Revue Productions, was the world’s largest producer and distributor of television series. Popular Revue shows included most of the major TV shows of the era, including Ozzie and Harriet, Leave It to Beaver, The Ed Sullivan Show, Wagon Train, The Jackie Gleason Show, General Electric Theatre, Alfred Hitchcock Presents, et al. Dennis McDougal lists in his volume about MCA over 60 such programs). [MCDOUGAL, p. 230] (Danny Thomas’ popular show, Make Room for Daddy, was run by independent Jewish producer Lou Edelman). MCA’s influence at NBC was great – it is credited with getting Robert Kintner his job as NBC president, as well as that of NBC vice president Mannie Sacks. [MCDOU- GAL, p. 239]

In later years, Norman Lear was the producer of TV programs like All in the Family (lead character Archie Bunker, the “loveable bigot,” was based upon Lear’s father, Herman), [COWAN, G., p. 24] Maude, Mary Hartman, Soap, and the Jeffersons. Lear is also the “king of a multimillion dollar media empire that ultimate-
ly embraced publishing, broadcasting stations, theatres, and TV and film production.” The man who founded the righteous-minded “liberal” political action group People for the American Way has a brand of “American Way,” however, which is remote from most Americans. As the San Francisco Chronicle notes: “The Lears’ new 12,300-square home is off Mandeville Canyon on a nearly 10-acre site, which Lear says is costing $15 million to buy and remodel. The property will have a facility for 30 cars built cantilevered under a tennis court that is being built on a hilltop ... In 1986, Lear was listed by Forbes magazine as one of the 400 richest Americans in the United States, with an estimated worth of $225 million – only to be deleted in 1987 after his $112 divorce settlement from his second wife, Frances, with whom he had a 29-year marriage and two daughters. She has since become founder and editor-in-chief of the women’s magazine Lear’s. [MICHAELSON, p. 43] Frances Lear’s monthly, with a circulation of 350,000, claims a readership whose “average yearly household income [is] a startling $95,000.” [SMILGIS, p. 70]

(A similar kind of magazine, Lifestyles, founded by Gabriel Erem, is expressly geared to rich Jews – or, as Mediaweek calls it, “a super-glossy lifestyle magazine for upscale Jewish people.” [LIEBMAN, H., p. 16] Its circulation by 1993 was 118,336, of which 81,659 was paid subscriptions. “Readers,” notes Mediaweek, “have high incomes and education levels, as well as a propensity for purchasing art objects and collectibles. They also give a lot to charities – the main [Lifestyles subscription] list is culled from donations of more than $10,000 to major Jewish groups.” [LIEBMAN, H., p. 16])

Aaron Spelling, described by some as the “Cotton Candy King” of TV, or the “King of Schlock,” “boasts of being the most successful TV producer in the world.” [CRITTENDON, p. C12] Starting out in the business with partner Leonard Goldberg, Spelling’s string of eventual TV hits included Dynasty, Melrose Place, Charlie’s Angels, The Love Boat, Beverly Hills 90210, and The Mod Squad, among others. He has “often been criticized,” notes the (London) Guardian, “for perpetuating inane shows,” [JOHNSON, p. 14] of which his own daughter was installed as an actress in one of them. Locally, in Los Angeles, Spelling is also known for his spectacularly ostentatious home, called by some “the tackiest in Hollywood,” a 123-room mansion costing $60 million dollars.

In 1990, Peter Bart noted another Jewish agent/producer/executive of this genre, Jerry Weintraub:

“His mannerisms and life-style seemed to spill from the pages of The Great Gatsby. The vast parties at his Malibu estate, called Blue Heaven (San Simeon South, others dubbed it) were Gatsby-like in their opulence. Clad proudly in his two-thousand-dollar custom-made Brioni suits, a valet always at his elbow, poised to light his Havana, Weintraub presided over the swarms of strangers – some of them important strangers – who always seemed to overflow the grounds. And while not everyone would necessarily get to shake hands with the host, all would, at the very least, confront the life-sized portrait of Weintraub and his wife in
stained glass that adorned the house. (In Weintraub’s portrait, he is
talking on the phone).” [BART, p. 240]

(At a ceremony in Los Angeles in 2002, Weintraub was awarded the “Golan
Fund’s Humanitarian Award” http://www.jewishjournal.com/home/pre-
view.php?id=7991 by former right-wing Israeli prime minister Benjamin Net-
is a Zionist organization, described at one Internet web site as “a non-profit or-
ganization in the U.S. Its objective is to support developing Jewish life in the
Golan [Heights – part of the Occupied Territories of Israel] by strengthening
the 32 [Jewish] communities and the city of Qatzrin.”)

**Dennis McDougal** notes the self-conscious image of **MCA** mogul Jules Stein
in his early years in Chicago:

“[Stein] took great glee in dressing like a million bucks, crashing the
highest society that money would permit, and tossing a leopard- skin
blanket across the back seat of his Rolls Royce and tooling down Mich-
igan Avenue like a peacock.” [MCDOUGAL, D., p. 2]

Then there is Joel Silver, producer of **Lethal Weapon, Die Hard, 48 Hours**, and
other “action” movies. He is “known for his flamboyant personal style,
which includes shouting matches and public feuds. Silver is said to be the model
for the ruthless Steve Martin character in the film **Grand Canyon.**” [A DAY IN
THE LIFE, 1992, p. 124] In 1984, one author noted that “the three largest pro-
ducers of documentary films for television are **NBC, CBS, and [Jewish inde-
died in 1997) was the “producer of the **Superman** films and one of the first mov-
ie moguls to put together large, internationally financed films.” [DALLAS, M,
p. 33A] Samuel Arkoff headed for years the “exploitation film” production center
**American International Pictures** (“How to Stuff a Wild Bikini,” et al).

A small sampling of other recent faces for the 1990s include Jeffrey Sagan-
sky, the president of **CBS Entertainment**; Mel Harris, president of **Sony Pic-
tures**; Jon Feltheimer of **Sony TV Entertainment; MCA** president and CEO
Ron Meyer; Fred Bernstein, president of **Columbia Tri-Star; Warner** president
Terry Semel; David Goodman, president of **WarnerVision TV**, John Goldwyn,
the production head at Paramount; Barry Diller, formerly of **20th Century Fox**
and now head of **USA Network**, Inc. which controls the USA Network (Ames-
trica’s “most watched” cable channel), **Studios USA**, the **QVC Home Shopping
Network** (host: Kathy Levine), and other firms. In 1999 he joined with comput-
er Internet giant **Lycos** to create a new entity called **USA-Lycos Interactive Net-
work** that expected $1.5 billion in annual sales. [SUROWIECKI, p. 54]

In 1995, the **London Sunday Times** called Barry Isaacson, the vice president
of production at **Universal Pictures**, “probably the single most powerful En-
glishman in the film business.” [YOUNG, ONLINE] In 1996 the president of
the **Academy of Motion Pictures and Sciences**, Arthur Hiller, was also a mem-
famous TV series like **Gunsmoke, Alfred Hitchcock Presents, Naked City**, and
many others, was awarded the first annual Jewish Image Awards in 2001 “which
recognizes outstanding work reflecting the Jewish heritage through film and television.” [NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE, 10-31-01] Gilbert Gates, also Jewish, was the “former president of the Screen Actors Guild, long time producer of the Academy Awards telecast, producing director of the Geffen playhouse and former dean of UCLA’s School of Theatre, Film and Television.” [WELKOS, R., 7-22-2000, p. F1] Andy Vajna, a Jewish immigrant to America and head of the independent Cinergi company, “is considered one of the most respected and richest filmmakers in Hollywood.” [TUGEND, Arts, p. 2] His $60 million Rambo III was the largest film ever produced in Israel.

In 1992, Arnon Milchan, an Israeli, was described by the Jerusalem Post as being “among the handful of Hollywood moguls with the muscle and money to single-handedly give the go-ahead for a new movie project. [Among his big movie hits was his movie about a prostitute, Pretty Woman.]” [TUGEND, MOGUL p, ARTS] Milchan “has admitted laundering some of the more than $100 million spent by the South Africans during the 1970s in an attempt to improve the white government’s image abroad.” [MARSHALL/SCOTT/HUNTER, 1987, p. 123] A citizen of both Israel and Monaco, he controls 30 companies in 17 countries, profiting in everything from film production to the weapons trade. Milchan has been investigated for “possible links to a pro-apartheid propaganda campaign [in South Africa] and ... a shipment of nuclear triggering devices to Israel.” [TUGEND, MOGUL, p. ARTS] “I’ve heard the rumors [about Milchan],” said controversial film director Oliver Stone who signed a long-term deal with the Israeli producer, “but, then, I’ve always had a penchant for larger-than-life figures. If Arnon comes from an arms background, well, so did Rhett Butler [in Gone With the Wind]. If those stories are true, I’m sure Arnon sees himself as a [n Israeli] patriot.” [TUGEND, MOGUL, p. ARTS] Curiously, Stone – defender of Israeli patriotism – is the well-known director of a number of anti-military (American) establishment films, including JFK, Born on the Fourth of July, and Platoon. (Oliver Stone is “half-Jewish.” This kind of referral is often used by Jewish observers who seek to claim the famous and accomplished – whatever the subjects’ own opinion about themselves – to the tribal fold. Other famous “half-Jews” include actors Paul Newman, and Harrison Ford. Whatever the subjects’ own sense of identity, being at least “half-Jewish” is a definite plus in Hollywood. And with popular American celebration of Jewish identity as being a lineage of noble hero/victims, many are pulled into the fold. Take, for example, the children of Jewish actor Kirk Douglas, twice married to non-Jews. Although the famous actor didn’t assert a Jewish identity until recent years, his “half-Jewish” sons Peter, Joel, Eric, and Michael Douglas all made connections to a Jewish identity on their own). [DOUGLAS, K., 1997, p. 147-151]

Oliver Stone is especially famed for his film “Natural Born Killers,” a movie (in which two teenagers murder dozens of people) that has spawned a number of real life “copycat” killers who cited the movie as an influence in their crimes. “Already the target of outrage and a pending lawsuit over viewers who took ‘Natural Born Killers’ as a how-to-manual,” noted the San Francisco Chronicle, “... two [more] serial-murder movies will be released under Oliver Stone’s imprint.” [WHITING, S., 8-18-96, p. 32] Even in the wake of controversy, Stone
released an “unedited” “director’s cut” version of “Natural Born Killers” to the video market, including even more carnage, including a chainsaw attack upon twin bodybuilders.

Stone was also the producer, and Milos Forman (also of Jewish heritage) the director, of The People Versus Larry Flynt, a film that heroizes the non-Jewish pornographer (of Hustler magazine fame) under the auspices of a noble struggle for free speech. (The film was released under the auspices of Phoenix Pictures, headed by Gerald Schwartz, also Jewish). Flynt, who once wrote of his copulation with a chicken, has even been accused of child molestation by his own daughter. And as so very often (even in the movie itself), a “baby-faced Jewish lawyer,” notes reviewer Adina Hoffman, “... takes up Flynt’s cause because he believes the publisher’s constitutional rights have been violated.” [HOFFMAN, A., 3-28-97, p. 5; STEYN, M., 3-2-97, p. 29]

Another Israeli media mogul now based in Hollywood, Haim Saban, created and produced the “Mighty Morphin Power Rangers” film and fad. His Saban Entertainment company (president: Stan Golden), and offshoot Libra Pictures, produces about twenty-five feature length films a year, mostly for television. The Mighty Morphin Power Rangers TV show was banned in some countries for excessive violence, including Canada, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. In 1996, he merged Saban Entertainment with Rupert Murdoch’s Fox Children’s Network and he remained head of this company. The Children’s Network in turn owns the Christian-founded International Family Channel. Bought from Pat Robertson, this channel reaches 69 million American households. [TUGEND, T., 3-28-99]

Jerry Bruckheimer is “probably the most financially successful film producer in movie history with film, video and soundtrack revenues topping $11 billion.” Among his many credits are Pearl Harbor, Top Gun, Beverly Hills Cop, Con Air, Armageddon, and Flashdance. “He is returning to his roots,” noted a Jewish ethnic newspaper in 2001, “by developing his first Jewish-themed film, ‘Operation Moses,’ based on the mass airlift of Ethiopian Jews to Israel in 1985.” “Even if [the critics] don’t like my movies,” he says, “the public does. That’s why I make my pictures. I’ve gotta take the bright side.” [PFEFFERMAN, N., 5-25-01]

In 1997, Michael Nathanson, the head of Milchon’s New Regency Productions, became the CEO of MGM Pictures, replacing yet another Jewish mogul, Mike Marcus. In 1999, Hollywood director Mike Nichols (original name: Michael Igor Peschkowsky) was awarded the Film Society of Lincoln Center’s Lifetime Achievement Award. The New York Times noted that in 1980s he had “a prolonged reaction to the drug Halcion, prescribed for sleep after minor heart surgery, left him delusional, convinced that he had lost all his money and was being subjected to some form of retribution for having escaped the Holocaust.” [APPLEBORNE, p. 24]

Sociologist Gitlin noted (in 1983) that few on-screen personalities actually on network television call attention to the fact that they are Jewish, in part because the Jewish TV executives have a “self-protectiveness against any real or conceivable anti-Semitic charge that Jews are too powerful in the media.” [GITLIN,
p. 184] “In the 1930s,” adds Edward Shapiro, “the operative principle in Jewish life was shah (low profile). Jews were advised to be as inconspicuous as possible for fear of provoking anti-Semitism.” [SHAPIRO, Jewish-Americans, p. 166] Or, as James Jaffe noted in 1968: “‘Don’t make yourself conspicuous’—this is one of the earliest pieces of advice that the Jewish mother gives to her child.” [JAFFE, J., 1968, p. 61] “To ‘make rishis,’ says Paul Jacobs, in describing traditional Jewish thinking, “was to stir up a fuss of some kind, and it was a cardinal sin, for it supposedly made Jews vulnerable to the potential wrath of the Christian world. This world was conceived of as something like a potential sleeping giant who, if awakened by a loud noise, might, and probably would, turn on the disturber of his peace and do him harm.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 40-41]

For decades, throughout the entertainment world most Jews assumed WASP-sounding names to disguise their identities (a process that was eventually dictated by Hollywood moguls upon virtually all actors). Jewish actress Lauren Bacall was really Betty Joan Perske (she’s a cousin of current Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres), Jewish dancer Arthur Murray was Arthur Teichman, actor Danny Kaye was Daniel Kaminsky, and Tony Martin was Alvin Morris. Among many, many other Jewish name-changers were Fanny Brice (Fanny Borach, whose husband Nick Arnstein spent two years in prison for heading a $5 million Wall Street bond theft), [BURNS, G., 1989, p. 248] Mel Brooks (Melvin Kaminsky), George Burns (Nathan Birnbaum), Dyan Cannon (Samile Draen Friesen), Kitty Carlisle (Catherine Holzman), Jack Gilford (Jack Gellman), Lee Grant (Lyova Rosenthal), magician Harry Houdini (Ehrich Weiss), Peter Lorre (Lazlo Loewenstein), Paul Muni (Muni Weisenfreund), conductor Billy Rose (William Rosenberg), Jill St. John (Jill Oppenheim), Dinah Shore (Francis Rose Shore), opera singer Beverly Sills (Belle Silverman), Walter Matthau (Walter Matuschanskavasky), Ethel Merman (Ethel Zimmerman), Shelley Winters (Shirley Schrift), Bert Lahr (Irving Lahrheim), Ed Wynn (Isaiah Edwin Leopold), and on and on. [SIEGEL/RHEINS, p. 13-16] “The first western star who played a lead in the first motion picture that had a story line (“The Great Train Robbery,” 1903) was Max Aronson, better known as ‘Bronco Billy’ Anderson.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 72-73]

This on-screen dimension, of course, is drastically changing. “Any Martian monitoring America’s television,” said Jewish media writer Michael Medved in 1996, “... would view Seinfeld, Friends, the Nanny, Northern Exposure, Mad About You, and other shows [Rhoda, Welcome Back Cotter, Barney Miller, et al] and be surprised to learn that fewer than one in forty Americans are Jewish.” [MEDVED, p. 39] The same year, the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California noted that

“On a recent episode of the TV sitcom ‘Third Rock from the Sun,’ a young man who happens to hail from an alien planet bemoans the fact that while all his schoolmates can claim an ethnicity, he cannot. His landlady solved the dilemma explaining that the youth must be Jewish because his surname is Solomon. Later, when his sister returns from a date, the alien father immediately demands: ‘Is he Jewish?’ Watching
this show with his young daughter, the National Foundation for Jewish Culture’s executive director Richard Siegel was thrilled to see yet another example of Jewish identity popping up in mainstream culture ... Pointing out that filmmaker Mel Brooks recently joked on CNN’s ‘Larry King Live’ that his next movie will straighten out all the kinks in the Talmud, Siegel said Jewish culture is becoming more and more part of mainstream media. ‘It’s everywhere,’ he said.” [WEINSTEIN, N, p. 28]

Michael Elkin notes that:

“Alex Rieger, Judd Hirsh’s character on TV’s ‘Taxi,’ was Jewish ‘because I made him Jewish,’ says the actor. ‘Barney Miller’ was never defined as a Jewish cop. But, according to Hal Linden, the actor who played him, there was a Talmudic wisdom about his decisions ‘that reflected my own Jewish upbringing.’” [ELKIN, God, p. 1x]

By the mid 1990s, Jewish Internet web sites were appearing which traced the rising numbers of Jewish actors and actresses in films and television and their Jewish pedigrees (“half-Jewish,” full-Jewish, practicing Jew, non-practicing Jew). Here we learn that the TV series Love Boat has a regular Jewish actor (Bernie Kopell), as does Friends (David Schwimmer), Knots Landing (Michele Lee), Cheers (Rhea Pearlman), Starsky and Hutch (Paul Michael Glaser), Hill Street Blues (Bruce Weitz), Anything But Love (Richard Lewis), and on and on. Alicia Silverstone was chosen by (also Jewish) film producer Joel Schulmacher to be “Batgirl”; Steven Bochoco created NYPD Blues, Hill Street Blues, and Brooklyn South. Douglas Schwartz was the Executive Producer of Baywatch. Janis Hirsch was the writer/producer of Frasier. Marshall Herkovitz and Edward Zwick created thirtysomething. Michael Gelman is the Executive Producer of Live with Regis (Philbin). Jeff Melvoir is Executive Producer of Northern Exposure. Al Franken, actor/writer/producer for Saturday Night Live moved on to be the Executive Producer of the satiric Lateline. Actress Ellen Barkin is Jewish, as is Barbara Hershey (Herzstein), Robert Downey Jr., Richard Dreyfuss, Kevin Costner, Winona Ryder and so on. Paula Abdul’s mother was Jewish; her father an Arab.

In 1996 a reporter for the (Jewish) Forward, Susan Kaplan, wrote an article about the lack of Jewish women in positive role models onscreen. But this is how she framed it:

“Although it’s not a theme of the show ‘Friends,’ it’s clear that both ... Ross Geller ... as well as his father ... are Jewish ... After ‘Friends’ comes ‘The Single Guy’ with Jonathan Silverman as novelist Jonathan Elliot ... Then there’s ‘Seinfeld’ ... Next on Thursday night comes ‘ER.’ Oops, no readily identifiable Jewish characters here although on CBS’s ‘Chicago Hope,’ Adam Arkin and Ron Stone ... are oozing Jewishness from every pore ... On other days of the week, ‘Mad About You’ gives us non-Jewish Jamie and her hyper-Jewish husband Paul ... ‘Relativity,’ a new show this season ... focused on – surprise! – a Jewish guy...

Many television writers are Jewish men.” [KAPLAN, S., 11-29-96, p. 16]

As Jewish author Alina Sivorinovsky noted in 1995:
“In the 1990s, it seems that the mother of every fictional female on television is advising her daughter to find a nice Jewish boy. And the daughters are listening. From hour-long dramas, ‘Sisters,’ ‘Chicago Hope,’ and ‘Murder One,’ to 30-minute comedies, ‘Mad About You,’ ‘Cybill,’ ‘Partners,’ ‘Bless This House,’ ‘The Single Guy,’ ‘The Larry Sanders Show,’ ‘Friends,’ ‘Love and War,’ ‘Seinfeld,’ and ‘Murphy Brown,’ Jewish men are dating and marrying Gentile women in numbers far exceeding any other interethnic relationship currently on television ... All [of these Jewish men] are either resident New Yorkers, as in ‘Seinfeld,’ ‘Mad About You,’ ‘Love and War,’ ‘The Critic,’ ‘The Single Guy,’ ‘Friends,’ and ‘Dream On,’ or transplanted New Yorkers, as in ‘Northern Exposure,’ ‘Murphy Brown,’ ‘Anything But Love,’ ‘Homefront,’ and ‘LA Law’ ... The question is, why should an ethnic group that makes up only two percent of the US population be so disproportionately, albeit stereotypically, represented on television? And why is that representation nearly exclusively male?” [quoted by O’BRIEN, P., 12-23-97]

Scholar Patrick Gerald O’Brien noted in 1997 what he found on television during the Christmas season:

“Let’s return to TV. At 7:25 I surfed to Channel 11, the Christian channel, and Pat Robertson was talking about a court ruling ... he specifically mentioned efforts of the ADL [Anti-Defamation League] to enforce this ... Then I turned to NBC and caught the end of ‘Suddenly Susan’ (or something like that). The set was a living room or small cafe all done up in Christmas decor, but huge Stars of David were prominently posted pasted all over ... Now that I was on a roll, I watched the next NBC show, ‘Jenny,’ ...[where George] Hamilton now sits in front of his mantelpiece, on which is strung a large ‘Happy Hanukkah’ decoration, and in a thick accent, he belts out a Yiddish greeting ... At 8:00 came ‘Caroline in the City’ (I think it’s called) in which another Christmas scene took place [in which O’Brien senses a Jewish undercurrent] ... At 8:30 came ‘Georgie and Leo,’ with Bob Newhart attempting a comeback, and Judd Hirsch playing a Jewish guy (which he mentioned during the show). So, given that about 2% of Americans are Jewish, I’d say that Jewish identities and concerns crop up fairly often. Autobiographical of the producers, writers, and actors? It would seem so. Though the 9:00 show was not about Christmas, it did deal with a Jewish topic for an hour ... tensions between Hasidic Jews and African Americans in parts of Brooklyn. The following night, Tuesday, I only once scanned the network sitcoms, but on the first show I turned to, ‘Hiller and Diller,’ they were singing

We wish you a Merry Christmas
We wish you a Merry Christmas
We wish you a Merry Christmas
And a Happy Hanukkah.” [O’BRIEN, P., 12-23-97]
Jews are so omnipresent in entertainment television that in 1999, when the Anti-Defamation League took offense at some jokes at the expense of Jews on Saturday Night Live, ADL’s director, Abraham Foxman, found himself protesting to NBC’s head of programming, Rosalyn Weinman, and Saturday Night Live’s executive producer, Lorne Michaels. [TUGEND, 12-19-99] Both of them, too, are Jewish. Saturday Night Live was also criticized for anti-Semitism years earlier for a satire sketch: a “Jew-Not a Jew” game show. The head of NBC at the time, Brandon Tartikoff, fielded a flood of negative phone calls, noting that:

“Tom Hanks played the host. A slide of a famous personality would appear on the screen, and the panelists had to decide whether the person was Jewish ... It was funny, I thought – but was it anti-Semitic? All week long, I agonized over that question, not just with Broadcast Standards but with myself. Since I’m Jewish, I wondered if I was being too sensitive or maybe too blasé.” [TARTIKOFF, p. 192]

(In 1998 the Anti-Defamation League even attacked a series of Superman comic books in which Superman flies back in time to fight the Nazis. The complaint, wrote ADL director Abraham Foxman, was that Superman “never names the victims. The intent was to send a universal message. The result provided offensive to Holocaust victims.” Although the word “Jew” was never used in the comics, “the victims were shown wearing yarmulkes and prayer shawls, had Jewish names like Mordechai and Baruch, and referred to each other using Yiddish terms such as 'bubeh' and ‘zyde.’” The CEO of DC Comics, Jenette Kahn, which produced the Superman series, was even Jewish. She responded with a formal apology for not using the word “Jew” in the comic series). [GOLDBERG, D., TIKKUN]

Some in the Jewish community even suggested anti-Semitic undertones in a new Jewish-like Star Wars movie character, Ferengi, despite the fact that the film’s executive producer, Rick Berman, was also Jewish. [WALZ, 6-8-1999] Original Star Trek stars William Shatner (Captain Kirk) and Leonard Nimoy (Dr. Spock) were also, in real life, Jewish, as was William Koenig (Chekov). (Nimoy’s Jewish activism includes an integral role in getting Mel Mermelstein’s story made as a film. Nimoy also starred in the film as the main character. Mermelstein is a man who figured out a way to sue a “Holocaust denial” organization that offered $50,000 to anyone who could prove that the Holocaust really happened). [NIMOY, p. 307-308])

Jews in the mass media apparently even have subtextual dialogues with themselves about Jewish identity in film reviews. References (anti-Semitic?) to Jews in an Entertainment Weekly review of director Barry Levinson’s science fiction movie, Sphere, drove him to anger, culminating in a furiously written script (in three weeks) for his next film (Liberty Heights). This new movie expressly embraced his Jewish heritage. The offending review, entitled “Abysmal,” trashed, like most reviews, his earlier science fiction effort. But Levinson zeroed in on these words by the EW reviewer:

“... Norman the emphatic Jewish psychologist [played by Jewish actor Dustin Hoffman]. Okay, so he’s not officially Jewish [in the film]; he’s
only Hoffman, who arrives at the floating habitat and immediately announces, noodgey and menschlike, ‘I’d like to call my family’ ... This *Sphere* isn’t science fiction, or even psychological fiction ... It’s a matzo ball. Norman’s mother knows what I mean.” [Even Jewish actor Liev Schrieber, notes the reviewer, plays “the neurotically competitive astrophysicist.”] [SCHWARTZBAUM]

Levinson was “enraged” and “furious” by such commentary. “The movie has nothing to do with religion!” he exclaimed to the *Los Angeles Times*, “... I mean, you wouldn’t say that Mel Gibson [in the film “Ransom”] is a Catholic businessman whose son is kidnapped.” [HORNADY, p. 90] This fixation on the *subliminal* Jewish nature of Levinson’s film as preface to his *overtly* Jewish one, the one that *champions* “being Jewish,” the one where he goes back to his roots in Baltimore, is certainly curious. But more strange is the *Los Angeles Times* report on Levinson’s motivation to make *Liberty Heights* – it never notes the fact that the *Entertainment Weekly* culprit/author of the slights to Jewry is not a malevolent Gentile. On the contrary, the critical reviewer, Lisa Schwartzbaum, on the contrary, the critical reviewer, Lisa Schwartzbaum, who cannot see Levinson’s science fiction from his Jewish “religion,” is also Jewish. To carry on such a “film review” (and thrust to Levinson’s heart) in actual Yiddish jargon, she has to be.

One negative review of *Liberty Heights*, by Jewish author Jeff Salamon, notes the usual Jewish stereotypes about the non-Jewish Other (repeatedly evidenced throughout Jewish history):

“The WASP elite [that a Jewish protagonist] is trying to infiltrate turns out to be full of drunks with sexual hangups.” [SALAMON, J., 12-23-99]

Reflecting the trend of more and more overtly Jewish themes in Hollywood, “many more films,” notes Barry Rubin, “dealt openly with Jews in the 1980s and 1990s than ever before, and Jews not only remained numerous on stage, screen, and television, but also became far more visible.” [RUBIN, p. 99] David Desser and Lester Friedman suggest that “ethnic consciousness in American cinema is a fairly recent trend. ... The notion of a ‘great melting pot’ ... held little interest to people ... Directors turned to Jewish themes and characters...” [DESSER, p. 2-3] By the 1990s, even Gentile actor Robin Williams was playing the role of a Jew in Holocaust-era Poland (“Jacob the Liar”); non-Jew Demi Moore converted to Orthodox Judaism in a Woody Allen film. Even a TV game-show called “Win Ben Stein’s money” has recently made the airwaves, sounding like a stereotypical joke by an anti-Semite. (Stein, among other things, is a former speech writer for Richard Nixon).

As Larry Mark noted in an ethnic Jewish newspaper in 2001:

“Over the past five years, as Holocaust survivors pass away and filmmakers struggle with the lessons of World War II, it has become even-money that a film touching upon the Nazi atrocities will be an Oscar nomination. Since 1995, these nominees and winners have included *One Survivor Remembers, Ann Frank Remembers, Shine, Life is Beautiful, The Long Way Home, The Last Days*, and even *One Day in September.* ... Three very
strong and poignant nominees drank out of the well of the Holocaust for this year’s stories: *Divided We Fall, One Day Crossing*, and *Into the Arms of Strangers* ... Three other actors portraying Jewish characters received Oscar nominations [in the films *Requiem for a Dream*, *Pollock*, and *Almost Famous*].” [MARK, L., 3-1-01]

Jewish actor **Jerry Seinfeld** (of the popular *Seinfeld* TV series) was named to have the highest yearly income ($225 million) in a 1998 “Top Entertainer” list by *Forbes* magazine. A Jewish co-creator of the *Seinfeld* show, Larry David, was ranked number two, at $200 million.” To some degree,” suggests **Adam Levitin**, “the reason for Seinfeld’s success is that America has absorbed so much Jewish culture that ‘being Jewish’ has become mainstream America ... What Jews have long considered ‘Jewish’ has evidently become so incorporated into America at-large that non-Jews assume them to be American ... A significant manifestation of this New-York Jewish milieu is the ineffable neurosis that pervades the outlandish, manic drama of each episode [of Seinfeld].” [LEVITIN, p. 52-54]

Among the many Jewish power mongers in Hollywood is film producer/director **Stephen Spielberg**, “perceived by many to be the formative representative of American popular culture.” [LOSHITZSKY, p. 12] Like many supposed “non-Jewish Jews” of Tinseltown, Spielberg had followed the pattern of being a non-committed, non-didactic Jewish public figure throughout his early years, but inevitably experienced a “rebirth” as a Jew.

This return to Jewish particularism has many adherents, dramatically exemplified in Jewish actor **Kirk Douglas’** renewed interest in Jewish Orthodoxy. (Douglas’ original name was Issur Danilovich Demsky). In 1997 he was even honored at a dinner held by a “controversial Orthodox outreach organization,” Aish Ha Torah. [TROUNSON, p. B1] “I’d have to say [Aish Ha Torah] techniques bother me,” a Conservative rabbi told the *Los Angeles Times*, “It’s the Jewish equivalent of fundamentalist Christian groups.” [TROUNSON, p. B1] “As part of its executive learning program,” noted the *Times* in an earlier article, “Aish, which is based in Jerusalem and has offices around the U. S., sends rabbis to the homes and offices of executives, free of charge.” [HEIMAN, p. B4] Co-chairs of the *Ha Torah* occasion – held at the home of Merv Adelson, the founder of Lori-mar Pictures – included other Jewish media moguls **Jeffrey Katzenburg**, **Michael Ovitz**, **Lew Wasserman**, and talk show host **Larry King**. Right-wing Israeli prime minister **Benjamin Netanyahu** even managed to attend the dinner for the famous actor. “I see that no matter how far I run away from my Jewishness,” Douglas has written, “it was always there. Like my shadow, I could not lose it.” [TROUNSON, p. B1] Echoing similar communal loyalties, in 1996 the Israel Film Festival in New York City featured not only a former Israeli prime minister as guest of honor, but also mostly Jewish Hollywood powerbrokers as co-chairs for the event: Michael Ovitz, Sherry Lansing, and **David Geffen**.

Even when not so overtly visible, the Jewish producer/writers’ dominance in the media world is still felt. In 1968, NBC featured a weekly sit-com starring an African-American (Diahann Carroll), the first since the 1950s (Amos and
The new show was created by Jewish writer/producer Hal Kanter. The program, “Julia,” is still examined by scholars today, particularly in the way it featured Carroll as a “white Negro” living an upper-class lifestyle familiar to very few African-Americans. “While large numbers of blacks lived in exploding ghettos,” notes Aniko Bodroghkozy, “Julia and Corey Baker [the main character and her son] lived a luxury lifestyle impossible on a nurse’s salary [her occupation].” [BODROGHKOZY, p. 143] (This depiction of African-American life is similar to that of the aforementioned Bill Cosby show, where the Cosby resides in a “lavish townhouse decorated with African-American art works.” [BODROGHKOZY, p. 150])

In 1993, USA Today noted that Black actor Paul Winfield was “not happy with the state of Black sitcoms these days.” “They are mostly Jewish jokes,” he complained, “being mouthed by Black actors.” [KING, L, p. 2D] Jewish dominance caused troubles in the Black community in 1999 with a remake of the classic Black-oriented movie, “Shaft.” Director John Singleton locked horns with Jewish producer Scott Rudin over the fact of 125 positions filled to make the movie, only six were Black employees. [FINK, M. 8-23-99]

A front page New York Times article in June 2000 highlighted the same theme, although the Jewish dimensions of the problem were muted. In the piece entitled “Who Gets to Tell a Black Story?,” the usual tensions between “white journalist” (and eventual writer-film producer for HBO) David Simon and African-American director Charles Dutton (during the shooting of “The Corner”) were rendered purely as a Black-White problem. Not surprisingly, Simon is Jewish; his father was even a public relations director and speech writer for B’nai B’rith. When Dutton found so few African-Americans on staff to film a story about drug addicts in a Black ghetto, he was outraged. The Times, (owned and mostly edited by Jews, as we shall soon see) evaded the theme of Jewish dominance and nepotism in Hollywood, but did criticize other ethnic ethnocentrism (however minor in Hollywood) instead, saying:

“It was always the same, Mr. Dutton said later. The business was ‘full of nepotism and cliquism.’ Italians hired Italians, Asians hired Asians. ‘So why is it a problem when it’s a black project? Every black project that I’ve worked on, with the exception of the Spike Lee movies, you’ve got to go through this every time. You’ve got to say, Why can’t we have some more black folks on the crew?’” [SCOTT, J., 6-11, 2000, p. 22]

[Note that the Italians and Asians reference is an insert by the paper between quotes by Dutton. Did the reporter write this? Did the editor? What, one wonders, was Dutton’s direct quote on the subject of nepotism, when his foremost nemesis on the film he was directing, and all of Hollywood, was/is Jewish?]

In 1990 the Los Angeles Times reported that

“In comments sure to trigger controversy in the entertainment industry, members of a panel at the NAACP convention in Los Angeles complained today that the influence of Jewish executives over films and music distribution has held back black entertainers and producers.” [FOX, D., 6-11-90, p. B1]
“If Jewish leaders can complain of black anti-Semitism,” said LeGrand Clegg, city attorney of the city of Compton and chairman of the Coalition Against Black Exploitation, “our leaders should certainly raise the issue of the century-old problem of Jewish racism in Hollywood.” Marla Gibbs, a film producer and actress on the NBC series “227,” added that “criminal behavior is being imitated by our children because it is being glorified on the screen ... The Jewish system in Hollywood was not set up for us.” [FOX, D., 6-11-90, p. B1]

In 2000, the African-American newspaper The Los Angeles Sentinel noted the following story:

“Jerome Metcalf, a black writer and entrepreneur has filed [a lawsuit] recently against [Jewish] CBS television producer Steven Bochco for allegedly stealing the story idea that led to the creation of ‘City of Angels’ ... The material was submitted to Bochco and CBS and according to Metcalf, both passed on the project. However, after viewing the pilot episode of the ‘City of Angels’ Metcalf said he and his wife were ‘shocked and devastated to see their works, dramatic expressions, literary expressions, ideas, treatment, scripts and property had been stolen’ ... The most interesting if not revealing truth surrounding the lawsuit is the fact that Bochco’s attorney, Edward A. Rottenberg, contacted [Metcalf’s attorney Michael] Lotta recently with a settlement offer. Lotta deemed the settlement inadequate and turned it down ... A hypocritical truth, would the court find Metcalf’s allegations valid, is that Bochco and the president of CBS Entertainment Leslie Moonves [also Jewish] hosted a screening of the ‘City of Angels’ at the Magic Johnson Theater Complex in South Los Angeles prior to the series debut. Metcalf said he was particularly insulted that Moonves, in front of invited guests, many of them black community leaders, praised Bochco as the creator of the first black medical drama for prime television.” [WILLIAMS, S., 12-27-00, p. A3]
In 1985 Laurence Tisch, Chairman of the Board of New York University, former President of the Greater New York United Jewish Appeal, an active supporter of Israel, and a man of many other roles, started buying stock in the CBS television network through his company, the Loews Corporation. The Tisch family, worth an estimated 4 billion dollars, has major interests in hotels, an insurance company, Bulova, movie theatres, and Loliards, the nation’s fourth largest tobacco company (Kent, Newport, True cigarettes). Brother Andrew Tisch has served as a Vice-President for the UJA-Federation, and as a member of the United Jewish Appeal national youth leadership cabinet, the American Jewish Committee, and the American Israel Political Action Committee, among other Jewish organizations. By September of 1986 Tisch’s company owned 25% of the stock of CBS and he became the company’s president. And Tisch – now the most powerful man at CBS – had strong feelings about television, Jews, and Israel. The CBS news department began to live in fear of being compromised by their boss – overtly, or, more likely, by intimidation towards self-censorship – concerning these issues. “There have been rumors in New York for years,” says J. J. Goldberg, “that Tisch took over CBS in 1986 at least partly out of a desire to do something about media bias against Israel.” [GOLDBERG, p. 297]

The powerful President of a major American television network dare not publicize his own active bias in favor of another country, of course. That would look bad, going against the grain of the democratic traditions, free speech, and a presumed “fair” mass media. And if it ever became clear that the CBS news department was in danger of turning into an ad agency for Israel, the resulting controversy would probably defeat Tisch’s purpose in helping them. But word leaked out, that CBS news under Laurence Tisch lived in fear of being ethically compromised.

During the Palestinian Intifada (the stone-throwing revolt by Palestinian Arabs against Israeli military rule), a birthday party was held by Jewish TV personality Barbara Walters and her husband Merv Adelson for Jewish Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan. Other invited Jewish guests included former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and U.S. News and World Report publisher, Mortimer Zuckerman.

According to Roone Arledge, the President of ABC News, who was also a guest at the party, a long and heated debate arose about television’s depiction of the Israeli military’s attempts to crush Arab rioting. CBS President Tisch argued that TV should effectively censor reports on what was happening, that “televi-
sion ought to be banned in the occupied territories “because it portrayed Israeli soldiers in a bad light. Kissinger had argued the same a few weeks earlier, publicly concerned that “TV cameras incited riots and tarnished Israel’s reputation.” Arledge vehemently argued that the media’s ethical stand should be to be present and report whatever was happening, when and wherever possible.

Barbara Walters and Mortimer Zuckerman covered for Tisch and they all denied that he took such an irresponsibly biased, and disturbing, position. According to (Jewish) reporter Ken Auletta, however, eight other people at the party testified – five to him personally – that Tisch did. Jewish guests at the party, led by Tisch, also attacked Arledge’s ABC anchorman (who was not present) Peter Jennings, for being – as they saw it – too “anti-Israel. “Several guests,” writes Auletta, “came away deeply distressed by Tisch’s behavior. What disturbed them was that the President of CBS seemed to say that the perceived interests of Israel took precedence over the interests of CBS News. Tisch’s reflex, they felt, was to defend Israel, not his network; he was blaming Jennings and the press for reporting Israel’s excesses, not Israel committing them.” [AULETTA p. 488-490]

Tisch’s strong emotions about Israel were exhibited in other ways. After CBS’s popular news program, 60 Minutes, did a story about the Jewish lobbying group AIPAC (the American Israel Public Affairs Committee), Tisch was furious with his employees because the program made Jews, to his eyes, look too powerful. (Curiously, long-time CBS reporter, David Schoenburn, notes that both 60 Minutes producer Don Hewitt, and 60 Minutes reporter, Mike Wallace (both Jewish), “were personal friends of Larry Tisch.” [SCHOENBURN, p. 6]) Tisch reportedly even called the reporter of the AIPAC story, Wallace, a self-hating Jew. Tom Wyman, the non-Jewish CEO of CBS, joined in the fray, at another party. He was reported by Newsweek to have complained “that Tisch’s enthusiasm for ‘pro-Israel’ causes and charities might compromise the independent reporting of CBS news.” [AULETTA, p. 164]

This attitude by powerful Jewish media figures reflects a certain tradition, and recalls the case in the late 1940s of Adolph Schwimmer who “became the Jewish state’s prime [arms] smuggler in America.” Among his close contacts was Herman “Hank” Greenspun, the publisher of the Las Vegas Sun. Greenspun once noted that he was a Zionist “before I could even identify a picture of George Washington.” [RAVIV, p. 40] During Israel’s “War of Independence” in 1948, Greenspun traveled to “Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, and Panama, where he organized false documents, bank guarantees, and arms shipments to Israel.” [RAVIV, p. 41] “Hank Greenspun,” notes Alex Pelle,

“embarked on an incredible odyssey, plundering a naval depot in Hawaii, seizing a private yacht at gunpoint near Wilmington, California, and posing in Mexico as a confidential agent of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek’s government. A single driving purpose generated over the span of seven months all those seemingly unrelated events: to fill the holds of a ship … with six thousand tons of contraband rifles, machine guns, howitzers, cannons, and ammunition, destined for the port of
Haifa and Israel’s beleaguered Jews. In so doing, Hank Greenspun had violated the United States’ Neutrality Act, the Export Control Law, and Presidential Proclamation 2776.” Thanks to Jewish lobbying pressure, Greenspun was pardoned by President John F. Kennedy in 1961. [GREENSPUN, H., 1966, p. ix]

In 1989 the Time Inc. corporate media giant merged with Warner Communications to become Time-Warner Communications, the largest media organization at the time in the world. (Sigmund Warburg, an internationally renowned Jewish banker who represented the London Daily Mirror Group, then the largest newspaper company on earth, had years earlier tried to buy Time, Inc., to no avail). [CLURMAN, p. 31] When the dust had settled this time, Steve Ross, a Jewish entrepreneur who started out working for a funeral home, sat astride the monstrous merger, the highest paid corporate executive in America. His $39.1 million in 1990 as co-CEO, sole chairman and chief decision-maker, was 1,363 per cent above the corporate average. [CLURMAN p. 304] The merger, notes Richard Clurman, “was the creation of the biggest media empire, the corporate interfaith marriage of the sixty-seven-year-old Time Inc., a WASPy blue-chip American institution, for years the largest combined magazine and book publisher on earth, to Steven J. Ross’s poker-chip Warner Communications, Inc., the pop entertainment conglomerate whose movies and sounds of music ricochet around the world.” The Time Inc. stable included such venerable publishing mainstays as Time, Life, Fortune, Sports Illustrated, People, Money, Time-Life Books, the Little-Brown publishing house, HBO (long time chief: Michael Fuchs), the Book of the Month Club, and television stations. It even held a 20.5% share in the ownership of Turner Broadcasting (of CNN fame) and 10.5% voting power in it. Warner contributed the likes of Lorimar Television, Atco-East/West Records, Atlantic Recording, Quincy Jones Entertainment, Elektra Communications, DC Comics, as well as the Batman movie, Rod Stewart, Madonna, Bugs Bunny, and the rest of its vast movie-music empire. (By 1997 Time-Warner even owned the rights to the photographs, other images, and words of Martin Luther King, Jr.) In his earlier years, Ross had revitalized Warner-Seven Arts by buying cable-TV monopolies, as well as major interests in the Pittsburgh Pirates baseball team, Ralph Lauren perfume and cosmetics, and other investments. A month after the Time-Warner merger, federal bank regulators instituted new restrictions to hinder such “highly leveraged transactions.” [CLURMAN, p. 33]

Steve Ross (whose father changed his surname from Rechnitz, and whose former stepfather, William Paley, for decades controlled CBS) was widely known as a man of dubious ethics and caused consternation among many journalists at Time that such a man was about to take them all over. He has been an “unindicted co-conspirator” in a 1979 United States Justice Department case investing underworld money laundering operation in suburban New York City. His “top lieutenant” at Warners took the fall and admitted guilt; likewise,
Warners’ assistant treasurer (who handled Ross’s personal accounts) was also convicted of fraud and perjury. [CLURMAN, p. 29] In earlier years Ross had merged his funeral home operation with a parking lot company, Kinney National Service, which had its own “unsavory reputation.” “There were rumors that Kinney was mobbed up [i.e., tainted by organized crime],” notes Fred Goodman, “Caesar Kinney, Kinney’s executive vice president and original owner of Kinney’s parking lot business, was the son of Emmanuel Kinney, a well-known New Jersey gambler.” [GOODMAN, p. 137-138] (In 1969 Ross and the Kinney company bought Warner-Seven Arts from Elliott Hyman for $400 million. [Sam Kinney had been head of production; Benny Kalmensan was the number two man.] For his part, Hyman’s earlier company was Associated Artists Productions, which had purchased the entire pre-1948 Warners film library in 1956. Associated Artists’ chairman was Louis Chesler, who, notes Andrew Yule, was a man “with established ties to Mafia boss Meyer Lansky. Nor was this AA’s only shady connection. Its vice-president, Morris ‘Mac’ Schwebel, would later be convicted of criminal activity.” [YULE, p. 176])

The 1989 merger of the two super companies, Time and Warner, also raised issues of conflict of interest. How could Time, Fortune, and other magazines now be expected to give honest reviews and evaluations of Warners movies, records, and other enterprises? Richard Clurman notes the fact, for instance, that an August 1991 Fortune article called “The Deal Decade: Verdict of the 80s” … “sharply criticized leveraged excesses deal by deal, with the names and numbers of the dealmakers but it skipped one of the highest profiles of them all, the Time-Warners merger.” [CLURMAN, p. 305]

Among the central negotiators in the mega-merger was the Jewish Vice-President of Time, Inc., Jerry Levin, “chief tactician for Time’s merger with Warner,” and Ed Aboodi, an Israeli-born “financial consultant” for Warners. Aboodi’s reputation, says Clurman is that of a “shadowy mystery man … [He] was an invisible mystery man to the world outside Warners until the Time-Warner deal.” Investigative reporter Richard Clurman found no listing in any telephone directory for his Alpine Capital Company, which is housed in the Time-Warner building. “Aboodi says he has no telephone listing for Alpine because ‘people know me and they know how to find me. I’ve never thought about it.” [CLURMAN, p. 165] “Levin and Aboodi,” says Clurman, “a Delphic-like oracle and a Talmudic-like exegetist, [are] quite a combination for an intricate modern business deal. Levin even spoke of the ‘thaumaturgic (i.e., mystical) significance’ of some of their meetings.” [CLURMAN, p. 166] “While his peers have been unabashedly striving to scale the corporate ladder to attain the personal perquisite of power and wealth,” notes Connie Bruck, “Levin has long maintained that he has been compelled by something far less mundane, almost mystical: a sense of obligation to bring to fruition the ‘manifest destiny’ of Time, Inc. and, now, Time Warner.” [BRUCK, p. 55] Ultimately, the Chief Financial Officer, the General Counsel, and Secretary of the Board for the new company were all to come from Warners. [CLURMAN, p. 197-198] The new company committed up to $150 million to a fund managed by Aboodi’s Alpine Capital company, as well as providing him his $8 million advisory fee.
By 1991 Time-Warner announced a deal with the largest of Japanese venture capital trading firms, C. Itoh, and Toshiba; this translated into a Japanese investment of another billion dollars. The massive mega-company then hired former Federal Communications Commission chairman Dennis R. Patrick and “two corporate ‘image makers’ who had worked at the White House” to help maneuver governmental regulatory policies. Time-Warner “also had on retain-er an elegant pack of the most connected Washington lobbyists.” [CLURMAN, p. 338] The new Time-Warner soon also acquired Sunset magazine, Lane Publishing, and 50% interest in Six Flags Amusement Parks.

“Time-Warner,” wrote Richard Clurman in his book about the subject in 1992, “is a combination whose creations (magazines, books, movies, music, cable TV, and programming) are now exposed to the minds and emotions of more people than those of any other commercial enterprise on earth …” [CLURMAN, p. 33] [Time-Warner executives] frequently predicted that one day ‘5 or 6 media companies would dominate the world.”’ [CLURMAN, p. 338]

After the big merger, ruefully notes Clurman, for twenty years a journalist and executive at Time, Inc., “in a bicoastal, cross-cultural anointing, Time’s house organ [had a column on new executive titles] under the heading ‘Honorable Menschen’ [a Yiddish pun]. Within the same two weeks, Nick Nicholas [the co-chairman of Time-Warner, eventually dumped from that position], was given a American-Jewish Committee Human Relations Award in Los Angeles and Steve Ross was named Man of the Year by the Entertainment Division of the UJA [United Jewish Appeal] in New York.” [CLURMAN, p. 314] (Steve Ross was “one of the role models” for Oskar Schindler in Stephen Spielberg’s film Schindler’s List. “To prepare [actor Liam Neeson] for the part, the director reportedly showed pictures of Ross … a wheeler-dealer of legendary proficien-cy.” [KELLMAN, p. 10] Schindler was also likened to another Jewish media mogul, Michael Ovitz, “on top of the mountain pulling strings in every fiefdom down below.” [KELLMAN, p. 10]

When Steve Ross subsequently died of cancer, Gerald Levin replaced him as head of Time-Warner after a struggle for power, successfully firing presumed heir, Nick Nicholas. (Levin’s son, Lee, is studying to be a rabbi at the Jewish Theological Seminary. [BOXER, T., 5-26-01] Soon Norman Pearlstine, formerly the head of the Wall Street Journal and Jewish, was installed as editor of Time magazine.

More recently, in 1995, Disney’s Jewish chairman Michael Eisner announced the $19 billion acquisition of Capital Cities-ABC to create an even larger corporate media monolith, relegating massive Time-Warner to second size. Disney-ABC controls, aside from the obvious, everything from the Anaheim Angels baseball team and the Mighty Ducks hockey team to Miramax Films (co-chaired by the Jewish Weinstein brothers, Harvey and Bob) and the ESPN sports network (Jewish president and CEO, Steven Bornstein). Disney also owned Fairchild Publications which included fashion magazine Jane, W, Supermarket News, Women’s Wear Daily, Chilton Books, Los Angeles Magazine, and numerous newspapers and TV stations. Not to be out-fattened, Gerald

And this is how a Jewish ethnic online magazine described Brad Turrell, number 12 in its 2001 “Fifty Most Influential Jews in America”:

“While Turrell was the head of communications for the WB television network, he began a religious odyssey that transformed he and his family into observant Jews. Well, the Lord works in mysterious ways. In April, he was promoted to the top communication slot for all of Turner Broadcasting which includes TNT, TBS Superstation, the WB Network, Cartoon Network, Turner Classic Movies, Turner South and Boomerang, the CNN News Group Networks, which includes CNN/ U.S., CNN Headline News, CNNfn, Accent Health, CNN Airport Network, College Television Network (CTN), CNN Radio Network, CNN.com, CNNfn.com, CNNfai.com and MyCNN.com and Nascar.com. With all the recent claims [by Jewish lobbying organizations] of CNN’s alleged media bias against Israel, it will be interesting to see how Turrell handles the position.” [JEWSWEEK, 2001]

The aforementioned Weinstein brothers “run a company [Miramax] that released more movies than any other in the U.S. in the year 2000 and had the eighth-largest box-office receipts.” “After Disney paid $60 million for Miramax in 1993,” notes New York Magazine, “[Harvey] Weinstein spent his time buying his way to the Oscar platform and getting in touch with his inner thug by screwing over far more delicate artistic sorts … But all the legendary bad behavior [by him] cannot obscure an objective fact: Harvey Weinstein is a cultural good. Pulp Fiction, Sex, Lies, and Videotape, and Shakespeare in Love have all become a part of the national narrative, framing the way people dance, talk, and fight … [Weinstein] is a pushcart peddler who is more than happy to put his thumb on the scale when the old woman is buying meat,’ says [fellow Jewish] producer Saul Zaentz. ‘He has not quams about it … ‘People say, ‘Are you tough?’ I say: ‘Facing [Jewish Hollywood moguls] Barry Diller, Michael Eisner, Jeffrey Katzenberg, David Geffen, you know, Stephen Spielberg … Why the hell wouldn you have to be tough in this industry to survive? Those guys are just a walk in the park?’” [CARR, D., 12-03-01]

(Among Weinstein’s most recent projects – like so many Jewish moguls – is one with a Holocaust theme (this one based on a piece of fiction by Jewish novelist Leon Uris, Mita 18.) “I’m preparing to direct a movie about the Warsaw Ghetto. About Jews killing fucking Germans in great numbers,’ he says with enthusiasm.”) [CARR, D., 12-03-01]

“It makes no sense at all to try to deny the reality of Jewish power and prominence in popular culture,” wrote Jewish author, film critic, and talk show host Michael Medved in 1996,
“Any list of the most influential production executives at each of the major movie studios will produce a heavy majority of recognizable Jewish names.” [MEDVED, p. 1] … Consider the well-publicized reshuffling that recently rocked the Walt Disney Company, involving some of the mightiest and most highly paid media moguls. In this game of corporate musical chairs, Disney C.E.O. and Chairman of the Board, Michael Eisner lost the services of his movie production chief, Jeffrey Katzenberg, who became part of the much-heralded new “dream team” (formally incorporated as DreamWorks SKG) with Steven Spielberg and David Geffen. [In 1990 Forbes magazine called Geffen – a former agent and record producer – the richest man in Hollywood.” [KOTKIN, p. 62] The first project out of DreamWorks was also by a Jewish producer, Gary Goldberg, whose earlier “gentle, semi-autobiographical look at a middle-class Jewish family” lasted 35 episodes in 1991-92 on CBS [CEROWE, p. F1]] Meanwhile, Eisner created a new position at Disney for his omnipotent super agent Michael Ovitz and gave broader responsibilities to his fair-haired boy, Joe Roth, former head of 20th Century Fox … These headlines underscored the ironic fact that the famous Disney organization, founded by a gentile Midwestern who allegedly harbored anti-Semitic attitudes now features Jewish personnel in nearly all its most powerful positions.” [MEDVED, p. 37]

Among these personnel is also Michael Lynton, appointed to be the head of Disney’s movie division in 1994. At the very start of Eisner’s tenure at Disney, Katzenberg headed the Disney studios, fellow Jew Richard Frank headed television, and David Hoberman was the chief at the film division. [SCHWEIZER/SCHWEIZER, p. 5] Joseph Shapiro became a Disney Senior Vice President in the 1990s. Steven Bornstein is (2001) chairman of Walt Disney Internet Group, heading Disney’s commercial explorations of the world wide web. Even the president of the Disney-founded California Institute of the Arts is Jewish, Steven Lavine. In earlier years, during Saul Steinberg’s attempt to lead a hostile takeover of the famous WASP firm, some observers were concerned that the “take over battle might be regarded as an attempt by Jews to topple one of the temples of Protestant America.” [TAYLOR, J., p. ix] At that time, when Walt Disney’s nephew, Roy E. Disney, held the largest individual stake in the company, his lawyer was also Jewish: Stanley Gold. [TAYLOR, J., p. 3] Gold eventually became “a financial power through Roy Disney’s Shamrock Holdings and one of the largest foreign investors in Israel.” [TUGEND 10-22-99])

As Carl Hiaasen wrote, in his 1998 volume Team Rodent – How Disney Devours the World:

“In December 1997 Disney chairman Michael D. Eisner exercised company stock options that brought him $565 million in a single swoop. The notion of attaching such a sum to one man’s job is both obscene and hilarious on its face, yet it’s pointless to debate whether or not Eisner deserves it. He got the dough. It happened in the same month that Business Week chose Disney’s board of directors as the worst in
America. The reason: Many seemed to have been handpicked not so much for their business expertise as for their loyalty to the autocratic Eisner. Among the company’s directors are his personal architect, his personal attorney, the principal of his children’s elementary school, and seven current and former Disney executives ‘Fantastic’ is how Eisner has described his choices for the board. But critics say it’s a meek and malleable group. That’s precisely what was needed to sit still for the ludicrous $75 million platinum parachute given to Michael Ovitz [also Jewish] as compensation for fourteen whole months as president of the Walt Disney Company.” [Hiaasen, C., 1998, p. 38-39]

In 1997, when Lilian Disney (Walt’s widow) donated $50 million towards building a Los Angeles cultural center called Disney Hall (named in honor of her husband), Variety noted lingering (Jewish) animosity towards him:

“So far [her donation is] the only notable sign of financial support from the film industry or its players for the new concert hall in downtown Los Angeles … The fact that the hall bears the name of Disney [is] possibly a turnoff to other studios.” [JOHNSON, p. 11]

“Not everyone was happy with the ‘inevitable’ changes [resulting from the arrival of Eisner and his new management at Disney in the 1980s],” notes Joe Flower, “Letters to the Los Angeles Times, homeland newspaper to the company and the entertainment industry, ran heavily negative, complaining of the compromise in quality in Disney’s Saturday morning cartoons, the ‘commercialism’ of the new management’s projects and the dilution of the Disney name.” [FLOWER, p. 192] In 1985 Disney announced that pop star Madonna would star in one of its films (she eventually didn’t) and affiliates of the great bastion of “family entertainment” began to produce R-rated films. The movie Pulp Fiction (produced by a Disney affiliate, Miramax) was decried by some for its graphic and celebratory violence. By 1987, when Disney had a quarterly profit increase of 159%, Chairman Eisner got a $2.6 million year-end bonus while rank-and-file Disney employees found their health insurance deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses doubled. [FLOWER, p. 257]

As Disney profits soared and its “family values” reputation corroded, in 1997 the Southern Christian Baptist Convention initiated a boycott of all Disney products, in part because of Disney-ABC’s homosexual sit-com, “Ellen.” In 1997 too the Catholic League for Religion and Civil Rights, already protesting a Disney-sponsored feature film called “Priest,” successfully lobbied at least seven corporations to pull their ads from a new Disney-ABC series called “Nothing Sacred,” which featured, as some expressed it, “an inner city priest’s struggles with his religious beliefs.” The offended Catholic organization decried the TV program for containing “slanderous assaults” against the Church. (Similarly, in 1992, a few Catholic newspapers refused to accept advertising for a novel by Jewish author Erich Segal, Acts of Faith, the story of a love affair between a Catholic seminarian and an Orthodox Jewish woman.) The conservative Focus on the Family organization also instituted its own boycott against any product with a Disney label. In 1995 the well known Disney “family entertainment”
company was scandalized when it was revealed that the director, Victor Salvo, of a new Disney movie called “Powder,” was a convicted child molester. In 1999 Disney invited controversy with its film about the life of New York mass murderer David Berkowitz, the “Son of Sam.” Even the killer himself was outraged by the movie. “Let me tell you something,” said Berkowitz from prison, “Walt Disney must be turning over in his grave.” [HARDEN, p. 22]

As Rabbi Daniel Lapin notes about the aforementioned Disney movie Priest,

“When it came to Priest, there were few courageous Jewish leaders out there who stepped to the defense of Catholics … It was appropriate for Jews to join in the denunciation of Priest. After all, the head of Disney as well as the heads of its distribution subsidiary, Miramax, are Jewish. We may feel that making such an observation is in bad taste. If non-Jews make the same observation we no doubt will immediately recognize them as anti-Semites. However, this kind of intimidation will not stop many Americans from making that observation. Neither will it stop them from seeing as insulting that the companies just happened to choose Good Friday as the date for this film’s national release.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 311]

In 1994 Disney faced claims that its Lion King character was pilfered from a 40-year old Japanese story by Tezauka Osamu. In 1990 advocates for the homeless managed to get Disney to stop selling a tramp toy. In 1996 the World Development Movement protested Disney’s exploitation of toy-makers in Third World countries. In 1997 nearly forty organizations joined the National Hispanic Media Coalition protests against Disney and its ABC network for alleged discrimination in hiring. In 1997, after media embarrassment, Disneyland reinstated a discount program for the disabled it had tried to quietly rescind. In 1997, too, Disney CEO Michael Eisner (already since 1984 the highest paid executive in the United States at $660 million over 11 years), succeeded in getting a ten-year future “compensation package” for himself that could be worth close to $800 million, a sum attacked at a Disney shareholders meeting by about twenty investor organizations, including the California Public Employees Retirement System. After a failed 14-month hiring of Eisner’s (Jewish) friend Michael Ovitz to be groomed as the next Disney heir to power, Ovitz was awarded a controversial $128 million severance package. [GRELLEY, Persp, p. B9; FISHER, M, BAPTISTS, p. A1; MATZER, p. D8; HORN, p. 3; BURRESS, p. A1; CHICTRIB, 12-20-90, p1, 8; GUARDIAN, 12-4-96, 1, 19; BURRESS, p. E1; BRAXTON, p. F2; MILLER, p. A1; LIEBERMAN, D, USA, p. B3; FARHI, p. D1, SLATER p. 298, 327; SEGAL, N, p. 5]

(In the 1990s the Disney-ABC conglomerate began buying up and gentrifying Manhattan’s Times Square area. All the low-life adult bookstores and other such merchants were shifted, en masse, to another area. And who was positioned to sell the real estate in the newly designatedporno site? “Just about the whole neighborhood,” noted London’s Daily Telegraph, “it turned out, was owned by half-a-dozen old Jewish families.”) [LAURENCE, C., 10-30-95, p. 17]
In 1992, the Disney film “Aladdin” came under attack from outraged Arab and Muslim groups. Condemnation starts with its opening song: “Oh, I come from a land / a far away place / where the caravan camels roam. / Where they cut off your ear if they don’t like your face / it’s barbaric, but, hey, it’s home.” [SHAHEEN, J. 12-21-92, p. F3] Professor Jack Shaheen complained again about Disney four years later:

“Nearly one year after Disney bashed Arabs in ‘Aladdin,’ … [its] studio executives promised they would in the future consult with Arab Americans so as not to repeat the mistakes. Soon after, in ‘The Return of Jafar’ (1996), they displayed gobs of hook-nosed Arabs referred to in the film as ‘desert skunks.’ That same year, Disney continued trouncing Arabs in … ‘In the Army Now’ … In 1995, Disney’s Christmas feel-good family film ‘Father of the Bride, Part II,’ writers inserted a foul, rich, Arab-American couple, the Habibs… Collectively, Disney’s relentlessly ruthless images advance suspicion and hatred. Although other studios perpetuate injurious clichés … only Disney violates Americans of Middle East heritage.” SHAHEEN, J., 8-12-96, p. F31

This anti-Arab, anti-Islam tenor, of course, is a recurring theme from Hollywood. In 1998, for instance, a non-Disney film, The Siege, by director Edward Zwick, came under especially heated attack by Arabs and Muslims. From the apologetic side, “Zwick and [Siege producer Lynda] Obst, both Jewish, have said that they intended the 20th Century Fox film to combat racism.” [PFEFFERMAN, N., 9-4-98] The American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee strongly felt it did something else, calling it “insidious, incendiary, and dangerous” for Arabs and Muslims. “There is no doubt,” agreed Montreal Gazette reviewer Bill Brownstein, “… that The Siege does incite racial hatred toward Arabs … The image that will linger long after the lights come back on is that of U.S. soldiers herding up every Arab in New York and shunting them off to mini-concentration camps.” [BROWNSTEIN, B., p. A3]

In 2000, London’s daily newspaper The Independent noted the new movie Rules of Engagement, directed by William Friedkin and produced by Paramount, whose head of the film division is Sherry Lansing. Friedkin and Lansing are husband and wife – and they are both Jewish:

“The Arab nations – and the Islamic world in general – have become the new stock enemy, a powerful and unreasoning force in True Lies (1994), Executive Decision (1995), GI Jane (1997) and The Siege (1998) – in which Bruce Willis rounded up Arab Americans in an attempt to stop a Hezbollah-type terrorist group blowing up New York. Even The Insider (1999) – a film about corruption in the tobacco industry, for heaven’s sake – tacked on a Syrian prologue in which Al Pacino took on a pack of mad-ish mullahs. And Rules of Engagement? This film is absolutely off the scale,’ says Hussein Ibish, communications director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, a Washington-based pressure group. ‘I’ve never seen anything quite so vile. I felt like I was being physically beaten, which is a reaction I’ve never had encountering
a work of art. It was mind-bogglingly vicious. I’m amazed that a major American entertainment company would actually release such a thing.” [SWEET, M., 7-30-00]

In 1999, the Disney company found itself embroiled in yet another controversy, this one political. It had allowed the state of Israel to have an exhibit – the largest – “on display at the new Millennium Village at [Disney World] Complex’s Epcot Center in Florida.” [LOS ANGELES JEWISH TIMES, Aug 27-Sept 2, 99] Muslim and Arab organizations were concerned that Israel would portray Jerusalem as the capital of the Jewish state, an assertion at odds with the Muslim and Arab view.

Rarely publicly expressed, there may be an angry undercurrent in popular perception about the reshaping of Disney’s public image: a perceived negative Jewish influence in the mass media’s shaping of modern American values, a theme which is not new. “During Hollywood’s pre-second World War Golden Age,” notes J. J. Goldberg,” it was commonly argued that Jews were insensitive and hostile to Christian values and were shaping an American culture that offended the American Christian majority.” [GOLDBERG, p. 284] In later years even Jewish authors could be found who complained about a noticeable shift in media-defined American values. “A distinct majority of [producers and writers in Hollywood] are Jewish,” wrote Jewish critic Ben Stein, “They do not hold criminals responsible for crime but rather place the blame on society.” [PRAGER, p. 63]

“There may be something more serious behind these boycotts [against Disney], Lehrer [an Anti-Defamation League official] and others suspect,” says Joel Kotkin, “a revival of the traditional concerns among various groups about ‘Jewish control’ of the means of mass communications. Disney [‘s] … leadership comprises some of the most visible and powerful Jewish figures in the industry.” [KOTKIN, DISNEY, p. 12]

In protesting the Disney-ABC TV series “Nothing Sacred’ (which has extremely low ratings, yet was renewed for a second season anyway), the president of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, William Donohue, noted in 1997 that

“Perhaps the most aggravating aspect of ‘Nothing Sacred’ is the audacity of executive producers David Manson and Richard Kramer, to admit that their purpose is to create ‘dialogue among Catholics’ about the teachings of the Church. Who ever asked – or appointed – these two men, both of whom are Jewish, and both who believe in nothing, to foment dialogue in my Church? … ‘Nothing Sacred’ is political propaganda against the Magisterium being waged by producers who are outsiders.” [DONOHUE]

In 1999, a Disney affiliate, Miramax Films, produced yet another Catholic-bashing movie, Dogma, “Kevin Smith’s controversial satire of Roman Catholicism.” [GEIER, T., 11-13-99] The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights claimed to have garnered 300,000 signatures in protest of the film. The Miramax Jewish co-chairmen, Bob and Harvey Weinstein, eventually “person-
ally bought back” the movie from its parent company and forwarded distribution rights to another firm, Lion’s Gate (co-presidents also Jewish: Mark Urman and Tom Ortenberg).

In 1992 the Jewish film critic and talk show host, Michael Medved, was taken aside by an unnamed “best-selling author” and “popular television commentator” at a “media accountability” conference for a heart to heart talk. “What I don’t get,” the unnamed Gentile said, “when I look at Hollywood, is why is it that so many of the people who are responsible for the worst garbage turn out to be Jews? It’s sort of become an obvious question, but nobody likes to talk about it, because nobody wants to sound like a bigot … How come they’re so set on trashing everything that the rest of us care about? I’m afraid we’ve got more and more people out there who are wondering about the same thing.” [MEDVED, p. 315]

“To hear this sophisticated and dynamic public figure draw a connection between Jewish involvement in Hollywood and the current degradation in Hollywood,” says Medved, “hit me with the force of a blow to the chest. No one could ever accuse him of anti-Semitism; for many years he had compiled an admirable record of service to Jewish causes and he’d made several trips to Israel.” [MEDVED, p. 315, p. 70] (Jewish assault on non-Jewish and Christian values is an old theme. In 1927, Bishop Joseph Schrembs of Cleveland, remarking on the pornography, prostitution, and general mass media trades, noted the “large and influential group of Jews who are attempting to break down Christian morality. Let us go to the decent Jews – and thanks be to God there are decent Jews and lots of them – and ask them to join hands with us to solve the common problem of commercialized vice.” [FRIEDMAN, A., 2000, p. 142]

Hollywood movies and television at-large have been increasingly attacked in recent years for propagating a range of decadent values. 82% of Americans polled in a 1989 Associated Press/Media General survey felt that today’s movies had too much violence, 80% felt there was too much profanity, and 72% too much nudity. 72% of a Parents magazine survey supported prohibition “against making fun of religion” in the mass media. A 1991 Gallup poll showed that 58% of Americans were “offended frequently or occasionally” by prime-time programming. A 1989 Time/CNN survey documented that 67% of the American public believes the violence in movies was “mainly to blame” for rising teenage violence; 70% supported “greater restraints on the showing of sex and violence” in the movies. [MEDVED, Hollywood, p. 4] In the 1992 Presidential election both Bill Clinton and Robert Dole criticized Hollywood for glorifying drugs. In 1999 the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of National Drug Control Policy released the results of a joint report that studied the content of the top movie rentals and 1,000 most popular songs of 1996-99. 98% of the films and 27% of the songs “contained reference to either alcohol or drugs, 26% of movies portrayed illicit drug use in a humorous context.” [OLDENBERG, p. 8B] And in a 2000 report, the Federal Trade Commission “accused the entire [entertainment industry] of aggressively selling violent and sexually explicit films, video games and music to kids.” [MSNBC, 4-24-01]
“That this [film and TV] industry,” says Michael Medved, “more firmly associated with Jews than any other business in the world, is almost universally viewed as a destructive force in our society should be viewed with concern.” [MEDVED, p. 42] Not even focusing on the Hollywood world, in 1999, Rabbi Daniel Lapin wrote an extraordinarily unusual, and stunning, appraisal of the collective negative effects of the modern Jewish community upon the values of America:

“My firm conviction is that we must engage in an honest exploration of the problems and shortcomings of the Jewish community and Jewish communal leadership. Instead of focusing on imagined enemies, we should ask whether dogmatic commitment to a secular-liberal vision is encouraging dislike for the Jewish community. Without such honest self-appraisal, Jews will become more and more disliked – not by crazed individuals but by decent Americans distressed over their rapidly deteriorating culture and the role of Jews in that agenda. It cannot escape the notice of ordinary Americans coping with the challenge of raising responsible children in a hostile world that many Jewish names and groups lead the fight for policies these Americans see as causing the country’s decline.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 42]

Jewish-dominated Hollywood and its movie and music world has always been a hotbed for all sorts of vices, including drugs. All sorts of people partake in these realms, and there can be created long lists of Tinseltown drug addicts and dealers, of course, but Jews are to be found – as in so many fields – profoundly disproportionate in them (Jewish mobster Arnold Rothstein, in the early 20th century, is even credited by some with beginning the syndicated drug trade in America). As early as the 1930s, actress Lana Turner notes her surprise at the drug interest of her Jewish husband, famous band leader Artie Shaw:

“When I came back Artie and Phil [Silvers, a well-known Jewish comedian] were smoking what they called ‘reefers.’ I’d heard of marijuana, of course, but I’d never seen it before. It was associated mainly with jazz musicians. Artie and Phil offered me some, and I said no.” [TURNER, L., 1982, p. 58]

In more recent years cocaine has become an especially popular Hollywood drug. In 1974 Paramount Pictures’ head of production Robert Evans was replaced, largely because of his continuous problem with cocaine. In 1980 he was convicted for cocaine possession. [MCDOUGAL, p. 393, WICK, S., 87] In 1982 Jewish actor Richard Dreyfus “was arrested and charged with possession of cocaine and 31 tablets of Percodan.” [WOODWARD, 1984, p. 418] Likewise, in the 1990s actor Robert Downey, Jr. spent a year in prison for drug abuse. In an extreme case, in 1983 Hollywood agent Roy Radin, also Jewish, was found murdered, a result of his involvement in a drug ring. [WICK, p. 144] Radin, “a six-foot, three-inch, 300-pound cocaine addict … made a fortune producing traveling vaudeville shows for Police Benevolent Associations across the country. ‘The Roy Radin Review,’ as it was called, headlined the likes of Georgie Jessel and Tiny Tim … [Radin] sometimes took 75 percent of the proceeds.”
[GAINES, S., 1998, p. 246] Radin, notes singer Eddie Fisher, “was the sleaziest person I’d ever known. He was guzzling cocaine.” [FISHER, E., 1999, p. 312] Bert Schneider’s and Bob Rafelson’s film BBS company “ethic was the raucous parties, with bags of dope and bowls of coke openly displayed on coffee tables.” [MCGILLIGAN, 1994, p. 202]

Rachel Abramowitz notes the post-1960s elite that has come to rule Hollywood:

“[Executives Paula] Weinstein and [Mark] Rosenberg and their radical friends typified the leftists with the cause manquée who poured into Hollywood from the [political] battlefields of Columbia and Stanford, ready to take on life on the studio expense account. Unlike their forebears, they weren’t self-made scrappers but tended to be well-tended progeny of the upper-middle class with down-home hippie roles … They drank Perrier, did coke and grass [cocaine and marijuana] … Paula Weinstein was one of the new breed of Hollywood executives … [Their] intoxicants were cocaine and work.” [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 79, 134]

In 1991, Jewish academy award-winning film producer Julia Phillips (among her products: The Sting, Taxi Driver, Close Encounters of the Third Kind) wrote an autobiographical book about her life in the upper echelons of Hollywood movie making. Here are some snippets from her expose about her experiences in the behind-the-scenes real-life world of Tinseltown that makes America’s movies and molds popular culture, helping towards an answer, perhaps, to the question ‘Where does Hollywood’s on-screen interest in drugs come from?’:

- “[Backstage at a Rolling Stones concert at Madison Square Garden] there is a smelly Israeli named Freddie who seems to be very important to everybody. He carries two medium sized bottles filled with rock cocaine. He offers some to Goldie [Hawn] and some to me. Fuck you, Mr. Under-Assistant West Coast Promo Man. We turn him down; I’ve got my own.” [PHILLIPS, p. 197]

- “Our little baby [is] asleep innocently in another room while we, two smart New York Jews, are imbibing in [heavy drugs].” [PHILLIPS, p.235]

- “Jack Spratlin is a middle-echelon Hollywood drug dealer … [He] is an acid casualty. He was meant to be one thing – an upwardly mobile street Jew from New York who came to Hollywood to be an agent and a luminary – but he became another because of drugs.” [PHILLIPS, p. 235]

- “I let Spratlin fuck me from behind in the closet in front of the mirror just before I leave for the morning.” [PHILLIPS, p. 327]

- “The seductive thing about freebase, for me anyway, is that at first I have the illusion that I am doing substantially less cocaine than if I toot it … I learn a rough [drug] recipe from a nice Jewish dealer in the Valley.” [PHILLIPS, p. 358]
• “One morning Rottweiler wakes up in bed in a bad mood. We’ve run out of blow the night before and he’s down downed himself out with Quaaludes. Like all male junkies, he uses dope as a reason not to bathe. Like all Jewish girls, there is nothing in the world to keep me from a daily shower and shampoo. Not even freebase.” [PHILLIPS, p. 358]

• “I actually smoke freebase in the hospital, right up to the abortion.” [PHILLIPS, p. 376]

• “I sleep with Michael Brandon, but I do a taste of this and that as sexual aids. Basically, I mix Quaaludes and Atvion and pot … Upon awakening the next morning, I look at him and he is cute, but I surprise both of us by bursting into terrible heaving sob/tears. Being Jewish and funny, Michael defends himself with some pretty good jokes.” [PHILLIPS, p. 453]

Ned Wynn (of partial Jewish heritage: actor, screenwriter, and son of comedian Keenan Wynn), recalls his first encounter with cocaine in the Hollywood world, thanks to singer Cass Elliot (born Ellen Naomi Cohen):

“I had been introduced to cocaine by Cass Elliot, the lead female singer with the Mamas and the Papas. An enormous woman of appetites yet unfathomed, Cass had literally chased me around at a party John had taken me to one night. She had cornered me and actually spooned coke into my nose. Caught like a rabbit in the glare of Cass’s eyeballs, I wrinkled and twitched and snorted and lit up like a little light bulb. Cass, you dog. I was in.” [WYNN, N., 1990, p. 199]

In 1995, Marvin Shick wrote an article in the Jewish Week, saying that:

“Much has been made of the abundance of high-profile Jews in the lower-depths of the entertainment industry. While it won’t do to simply say it ain’t so, for it is, … I do not feel especially guilty because of the wrongful behavior of certain Jews, whether they are secular sleaze merchants or chasidim … But I am embarrassed, even hurt, when wrongdoers are honored, which happens too often in our fervid world of organizations and fund raising. It is my understanding that in Hollywood ‘humanitarian’ awards are handed out promiscuously, with Jewish organizations well in the lead … It’s … a mistake for our community to have so little to say about the cultural depravity all around us … It is insufficient for us to act like a community of amateur constitutional lawyers whenever someone shouts ‘First Amendment’ to protect the cesspool of moral corruption.” [SCHICK, p. 5]

Jewish film critic Steve Walz noted with concern the rise of violently and morally reckless “teenager films” in the late 1990s. “The most controversial teen flick [Cruel Intentions],” he observes, has “several Jewish and half-Jewish stars, writers, producers, etc. involved in this flick, which basically depicts wicked teenagers trying to bed each other based on vicious dares … Teenage crime figures are on the rise and anyone who tells you that there ISN’T a direct correlation between what teens see on the big screen or small screen and their anti-
social relations is a flat out liar.” [WALZ, 3-1-98] _The plot of Cruel Intentions_, noted the _Los Angeles Times_, “revolves around a rich New York City high school girl who snorts cocaine from her crucifix and bets her stepbrother he can’t de-flower a certain virgin. She offers him sexual relations with her as the prize, if he wins.” [JENSEN, E., p. F1]

Jews in fact have a long history of testing the limits of popular morality and exploring sexuality’s potential for profitability. They dominated the early 1900s vaudeville scene and were prominent in the development of the striptease as entertainment, as part as the package known as burlesque (“the most sexually suggestive and sexually explicit of all of New York’s popular media”). [FREIDMAN, A., 2000, p. 62] After all, as an earlier chapter evidences, and as Yale professor Donald Davis phrases it, “the Jewish pimps and vice lords … dominated the white slave trade traffic and its ‘sex industry’ in the early twentieth century.” [DAVIS, D., p. 29] “Jewish male comics,” also notes Andrea Most, “regularly appeared in drag on the Broadway and vaudeville stage.” [MOST, A., 1999, p. 322]

In the early to mid-20th century, a number of anti-vice organizations sought to curtail some trends in the New York entertainment industry, which was largely Jewish. (Sometimes underscoring ethnic/religious undercurrents, these included expressly Catholic organizations like the Legion of Decency and the National Organization for Decent Literature). “New York’s position as the nation’s cultural mecca,” notes Andrea Friedman, “and the important role played by entertainment industries in the city’s economy, made the conflicts over obscenity that occurred there unique in their importance to municipal life … The substantial role played by Jews in New York’s entertainment industries made debates about obscenity especially important to many Jewish leaders.” [FRIEDMAN, A., 2000, p. 10] In 1942, New York City refused to renew city burlesque theatre licenses, shutting them all down. [FRIEDMAN, A., 2000, p. 62] “Jews,” notes Jewish scholar Friedman,

“were also well represented among New York’s theatrical producers, and burlesque in particular was notable for the presence of Jews among producers, managers, and entertainers … The visibility of Jews in these industries nourished Christian fears that commercial culture in the metropolis would become even more corrupt and corrupting than it already was. Their association with an entertainment world built around the commodification of sexuality seemed to sustain a preexisting paradigm of antisemitism that fused prejudices regarding Jewish greed and sexual immorality in the conviction, as historian Edward Bristow had phrased it, that Jews ‘organized widespread conspiracies to corrupt and pollute the Christian world.’ In the United States, as in Europe, many Christians subscribed to the view that Jews were so avaricious that they would permit neither legalities nor morals to stand in their way of their accumulation of wealth.” [FRIEDMAN, A., 2000, p. 141]

Friedman also notes the main reason for eventual Jewish religious activism in some anti-obscenity groups – fears of anti-Semitism:
“Some of New York’s Jewish religious leaders also became more vocal in debates about obscenity during the 1920s and 1930s. To a greater degree than Protestants and Catholics, however, their participation came in response as much to the existence of anti-obscenity campaigns as to the existence of obscenity. Rabbis entered into anti-obscenity activism in the attempt to counter Christians’ perceptions of Jews as a different, alien, and more primitive people, by demonstrating that they shared the ‘Christian’ morals of their Protestant and Catholic brethren and by trying to control the behavior of other Jews. Prompted by the concern that Christian condemnations of obscenity might fuel antisemitism (and vice versa), they sometimes joined in such condemnations in self-defense. For Jews, anti-obscenity activism became a strategy for protecting the Jewish community by policing it.” [FRIEDMAN, A., 2000, p. 140-141]

The most famous stripper of all time, Gypsy Rose Lee (real name: Rose Louise Hovick) was Jewish, as was her early forum – Minsky’s Theatre (of “The Night They Raided Minsky’s” fame). The theatre founders were Abe and Billy Minsky, grandsons of the chief rabbi of the Russian city of Minsk. Another Minsky, Herbert, was the “maestro of burlesque.” [COOPER, p. 42] (The Minsky’s New Gotham Burlesque House was raided on April 8, 1937, and its Jewish manager, Sam Kraus, jailed. Other Minsky venues included the Republic and Oriental Burlesque sites. As Jay Maeder observes, “New Gotham operator Abe Minsky was one of numerous Minsky brothers who had largely cornered the stripper business in New York.” Jewish “civil rights” lawyer Morris Ernst declared that the raid was a “step in the direction of fascism.”) [MAEDER, J., 6-26-2000] Elsewhere in New York City, among many other Jewish madams, was “Polly Adler, the Polish-born madam of New York’s most famous bordello of the 1920s and 1930s.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 92] A little earlier, “the most famous madam in turn-of-the-century New York was Rosie Hertz. Saving enough from her own prostitution, she and her husband, Jacob, opened several brothels on the Lower East Side during the 1880s … The epitome of the ‘white slaver,’ Hertz was called by one judge the ‘godmother for prostitutes.’ Another critic considered her ‘as much a public feature of the lower East Side … as the Brooklyn Bridge.” [GILFOYLE, T., 1992, p. 295]

Dallas, Texas? When Jack Ruby (Rubenstein) murdered Lee Harvey Oswald in 1963, he owned the Carousel, a local strip tease joint. As Gerald Posner notes, “Ruby’s main competition was from the Theatre and Colony Clubs, owned by two brothers, Abe and Barney Weinstein. In 1961, they had introduced amateur strip-tease dancing.” [POSNER, p. 362] Atlanta, Georgia? By 1999, owner Steve Kaplan’s Gold Club “nude dancing” business had been “indicted on federal racketeering charges that included prostitution, credit card fraud, money laundering, police corruption and ties to the Gambino organized crime family.” His lawyer, Alan Begner, was also Jewish. “Since 1982,” noted the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, “Begner has carved a lucrative niche as a lawyer of adult entertainment establishments,” representing about half of the 45 in metropolitan Atlanta. “I knock out laws,” he explained to the newspaper. Begner’s interest in strip joints
began when another Jewish owner (Emmanual Isaacs of the “She Club”) asked him to represent him. [RANKIN, B., 12-5-99, p. 2D]

The Associated Press further noted in 2001 that Gold Club owner Steven Kaplan (club manager: Norbert Calder) was “accused of building a $50 million fortune in part by providing prostitutes for celebrities. Atlanta’s Gold Club is one of the most profitable nude clubs in the country, popular among convention-goers and visiting celebrities. Federal investigators say it is also a high-priced brothel that pumps cash into the Gambino crime family … [The Federal indictment against Kaplan] says Kaplan ordered more than 20 beatings of people who did not repay loans at high rates of interest.” [COURT TV, 4-2001]

The most famous “sex club” in history (prospering in the 1970s and 1980s before the AIDS epidemic) is probably Plato’s Retreat, based in New York City. Its owner was also Jewish: Larry Levenson. As Jewish scholar David Allyn describes it:

“First of all, you have to picture the Ansonia Hotel, which is a late 19th century wedding-cake of a building in the heart of the upper west side in New York. In the basement of the Ansonia was Plato’s Retreat, then the world’s most famous sex club. Men and women would stroll about the Ansonia lobby in nothing but towels. In the club, they would have sex with possibly a dozen or so people in a single night. Plato’s Retreat represented the commercial version of what was happening in people’s apartments and living rooms across the country.” [BOOKMARK, 2000]

In the early movie world, seminal Jewish “vamp” film actress Theda Bara “scandalized the mores of the middle-classes … Local boards issued edicts condemning her films.” [HYMAN, p. 118-119] “The first sex symbol [Bara] in movie history,” says M. H. Goldberg, “was Jewish. (It is interesting to note that two other sex symbols in movie history – Marilyn Monroe and Elizabeth Taylor – converted to Judaism.)” [GOLDBERG, H. M., 1976, p. 166] A little earlier, Anna Held, of Polish Jewish descent, celebrated a “naughty French persona” in the Ziegfield Follies and “was an early icon” of “America’s burgeoning cult of celebrity at the turn of the century.” [LAVITT, P., 2000, p. 263, 268] Vienna-born Jewish actress Hedy Lamarr (Hedwig Kiesler) pushed mores in the movie world with the European film Ecstasy (1933), featuring partial nudity and daringly new degrees of eroticism. The film was banned in the U.S. till 1940.

In the early years of the 20th century, Sholom Asch’s play “God of Vengeance” was performed in New Y ork in Yiddish and then in English off-Broadway without incident. “Asch’s tale centers on Yankel, a Jew who runs a shady downstairs brothel with his ex-whore wife, yet is obsessed with protecting the chastity and piety of his young daughter.” When the play was finally performed to a broader public on Broadway, it was “shut down by New Y ork police, a landmark censorship case … The actors, producer, and owner of the Apollo Theatre” were all arrested and their court trial became “the first jury conviction of American entertainers charged with presenting ‘immoral’ fare.” Variety maga
zine called the play “the most disgusting play ever presented on Broadway.” [BERSON, M., 4-2-2000]

Cartoon character Betty Boop? The Fleischer brothers, Max and Dave, notes Amelia Holberg,

“created and controlled one of the great 30s sex symbols, animated Betty Boop. Betty’s cartoons, remembered vividly for their overt sexuality and often grotesque imagery, are even more provocative when viewed in relation to the lives of her working-class Eastern European immigrant, Jewish creators … Betty’s initial disappearance can be traced to the Hays Production Code Office, which determined Betty Boop to be too racy for general audiences in 1934.” [HOLBERG, A., 1999, p. 290-291]

[Chaim Bermant notes a little more about Will Hays and the tearing down of popular mores: “The Jewish dominance of Hollywood did not, of course, pass without comment. By the end of World War I it became clear that the cinema was becoming, if it had not already become, the supreme influence in the cultural life of America, affecting its tastes, its habits, its outlook. There was a growing clamour – to quote the words of one influential pressure group – ‘to rescue the motion pictures from the hands of the Devil and five hundred un-Christian Jews.’ To defend themselves against such criticism, Mayer, Laemmle, Goldwyn and the other un-Christian Jews grouped themselves into the Motion Pictures Producers and Distributors of America Inc., and invited Will H. Hayes to preside over them. In doing so they were not merely attempting to buy-off criticism, they were buying respectability.”] [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 102]

The Fleischer brothers also created Popeye, and many other characters in the 1930s. In fact, “Jews represent 80 percent of the pioneers and leaders of the comic book industry.” [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1979, p. 118] In the molding of popular American culture, Mad magazine (publisher: William Gaines. Editors Al Feldstein and Harvey Kurtzman. All Jewish. Kurtzman formerly worked for the communist paper the Daily Worker.) [HEILBRUNN J., 6-01] Mad’s “most popular artists” were also Jewish: Mort Drucker and Al Jaffee. [GOODWIN, G., 2001, p. 159] Mad magazine was influential in creating a new kind of adolescent. “Americans of Jewish background,” note Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter,

“developed a direct and important influence on adolescents and even pre-adolescents in other ways. Starting in the 1950s, Mad Magazine developed wide popularity among this group, and, as Marie Winn had pointed out, it played a significant role in ‘the move toward free expression among children; its relentless exposure of parental dishonesty caused shock waves and reaction among its young readers.’ From the beginning Mad’s editors have been Jewish and, as they themselves would agree, hostile to the American civic myth.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 108]

Joe Shuster and Jerome Siegel created Superman. Bob Kane created Batman; Stan Lee created Spiderman and The Hulk. Jewish all. [ETKES/STADT-
MAUER, 1995, p. 128] Stan “the Man” Lee “revived Marvel Comics. He invented the superhero as anti-hero … A 1965 college poll conducted by Esquire … revealed that student radicals ranked Spider-Man and the Hilk alongside the likes of Bob Dylan [also Jewish] and Che Guevara as their favorite revolutionary icons … The outsider hero had arrived as the most celebrated figure in youth culture, and Marvel had him.” [HEILBRUNN, J., 6-01] Head of DC comics (Superman, et al)? Also Jewish: Jenette Kahn (1998).

The Jewish Forward noted the Jewish dimension to the comics world and the blockbuster movie Spiderman in 2002:

“Sure, Spiderman’s great. He’s a nebbish who happens to have superhuman powers. He’s got radioactive blood, he detects trouble with his Spider sense, he catches thieves just like flies, all while smashing box-office records by taking in $114 million his first weekend as a movie star. According to Dan Raviv, however, the real heroes of Marvel Comics are the two Israeli men at the company’s helm, Isaac (Ike) Perlmutter and Avi Arad. In this real-life drama, they’re the two little guys who wrestled Marvel away from sparring billionaires, transforming a bankrupt company into a highly profitable one. Exactly how two underdogs beat seasoned tycoons at their own game is the kind of fairy tale that movies are made of, and it makes for interesting reading in Raviv’s latest book, Comic Wars: How Two Tycoons Battled Over the Marvel Comics Empire and Both Lost (Broadway Books). The good guys are the immigrant owners of a small toy company albeit one with exclusive rights to license Marvel toys. And the bad guys are two titans of finance: Ronald Perelman, the Revlon chief and takeover artist who ran Marvel into bankruptcy, and corporate predator Carl Icahn [both Perelman and Icahn are also Jewish] a model for Michael Douglas’s character in Wall Street who attempted a hostile takeover. In the end the Israelis, predicting the Marvel superheroes’ ability to jump from comic book pages to the silver screen, unexpectedly seized control of the company … The story of Marvel is a Jewish one indeed. Founded in 1939 by Martin Goodman, Marvel was a part of the so-called “golden age” of comics, when hordes of young Jewish writers and artists, most of them struggling immigrants’ sons, created armies of imaginary superheroes like Superman and Captain America, whose mission was to wage war against Nazis and their ilk. At Marvel in particular, the key players throughout the decades, including Jacob Kurtzberg and Stanley Lieber better known as Jack Kirby and Stan Lee, the creators of the Fantastic Four and Spider-Man in the early 1960s have been almost exclusively Jewish.” [KEYS, L., 5-10-2002]

Cartoonists Jules Feiffer, Al Capp (the author of L’il Abner; Capp’s original name was Alfred Gerald Caplin), Herblock (Herb Bloch), Ralph Bakshi, Rube Goldberg, illustrator Maurice Sendak, Shel Silverstein, Nicole Hollander, and many others are also Jewish. Isador (Fritz)Freleng was the “creator of Bugs Bunny, Daffy Duck, Porky Pig, Tweety Pie, Speedy Gonzalez, and the Pink Panther.” [ETKES/STADTMAUER, 1995, p. 128] “To my mind,” says Stan Sulkes,
echoing legend about Jewish history, “no one is more Jewish than Bugs Bunny. Or more resourceful. Surrounded by enemies, he survived by his wits, thwarting all the Elmer Fudds of this world unwilling to let him live in peace. Happily, I’m not alone in that view. Another transplanted New Yorker recognizes Bugs’ ethnicity too. ‘It was no accident,’ observes David Gilner, director of Libraries for Hebrew Union College, ‘that his animator was Fritz Feleng, and his voice supplied by Mel Blanc – both of whom were Jewish.” [SULKES, S., 4-21-97]

A former major in the Israeli army reserves, Ranan Lurie (now living in the United States) is the “world’s most syndicated political cartoonist;” he is featured in 106 countries and 1,100 newspapers. [LIEBENSON, p. 13CN, 21] Betty Cohen even is president today of the Cartoon Network, the cable TV channel that has 60 million subscribers in 144 countries throughout the world. [POLLAK, S., 1-7-00]

Cartoonist Albert Hirschfeld (who once worked for the communist magazine The Masses) has appeared, for over seven decades, “frequently and prominently on the pages of the New York Times. He has published several coffee-table volumes, and a Manhattan gallery, Margo Feiden, deals exclusively with his drawings and limited edition prints … Twice during the 1990s he received commissions for postage stamps.” Will Eisner “made an important name for himself both as the father of his own comic strip and as developer of ‘instructional’ comics.” His company, American Visuals, has contracted for organizations as diverse as the Girl Scouts and the American Dental Association. [GOODWIN, G., 2001, p. 151, 154]

In the 1950s, the Jewish-dominated comic book industry raised familiar issues – public concern that they were influential in the degradation of popular morals and values. In 1955-56 the U.S. Senate held investigations into the matter, releasing a report entitled “Comic Books and Juvenile Delinquency.” The Senate document noted that

“on first impression, the present comic book industry would seem to comprise many different publishing firms with no apparent relationship to one another … On closer scrutiny, however it is found that the picture is entirely different … The 676 comic book titles [that were examined] are published by 111 companies owned by only 121 persons or families in addition to 1 corporation … The majority of the publishers maintain editorial offices in New York City.” [U.S. Senate, 1955-56]

Subsections of the report included “Techniques of Crime Taught by Crime and Horror Comics,” “Criminal Careers as Glamorous in Crime and Horror Comic Books, and “Defenders of Law and Order [Are] Frequently Represented as All Powerful Beings Who Kill and Commit Other Crimes to Defend ‘Justice.” Jewish comic book entrepreneurs who are singled out by the report include direct-mail advertiser Samuel Roth “who has for many years been engaged in using the mail to advertise lewd and lascivious material,” and Alex Segal who “testified that ‘by mistake’ one of his trays of addressograph plates bearing the names of 400 children was routed to the publisher of sex literature.” In the listings of owners and distributors of comic book businesses, among the best
known are Marvel Comic group (owners: Martin and Jean Goodman) and Archie Comic Group (owners: Maurice Coyne, John Goldwater, and Lewis H. Silberkleit). [U.S. SENATE, 1955-56] 

Mad magazine’s William Gaines also produced “the greatest of the under-the-covers-with-a-flashlight genre.” These comics, featuring new explorations of gore, include Tales from the Crypt, Weird Science, Shock Suspensestories, Frontline Combat,

“and a few other titles [that] made the struggling company profitable and Gaines a fully employed pop culture mentor of the first magnitude. But this upstart Jewish kid was soon put out of business by a crusading psychiatrist from the old country, a nasty bunch of Senators, and a coalition of PTA and American Legion, sheriffs and bishops, editors and aldermen. The Comics Code that was created to deflect the heat couldn’t help Gaines. The slander was so thorough that his books were returned unopened by retailers even after the Code seal was applied. By the end of 1954, after just a four year run, the EC [Gaines’ company] comics were all gone, except for the satirical Mad.” [TEBBEL, J., 1999]

As Jacob Heilbrunn notes, in a review of a book about comic books by scholar Bradford W. Wright,

“EC comics offered something of a precursor to the upheaval of the 1960s, questioning authority before it became fashionable to question anything. In perhaps the most notorious panel printed by EC comics, a murderous baseball team plays a midnight game with the limbs and entrails of a victim. Little was left to the imagination … Another issue depicted a man holding a bloody ax in one hand and a woman’s severed head in the other. ‘Corpses in various states of decay and reanimation,’ Wright says, ‘regularly adorned the covers.’ ‘A commercial expression of cultural defiance,’ he writes, ‘EC brilliantly perceived the alienated generation among young people and recognized youth dissatisfaction as a marketable commodity.’ The reaction came quickly. By 1948, Catholic schools were conducting bonfires of comic books … Soon enough, William M. Gaines, the publisher of EC, found himself facing off against a Senate investigative committee headed by Estes Kefauver. It was a rout. Kefauver declared that a panel in the July issue ‘seems to be a man with a woman in a boat and he is choking her to death with a crowbar. Is that in good taste?’ ‘I think so,’ was all Gaines could answer.” [HEIBRUNN, J., 6-01]

Moving along in the Jewish influence world, even the nightclub business, says Kenneth Kanter, “was invented by a Jew, Jack Levy.” [KANTER, p. 38] Billy Rose, another Jewish entrepreneur, was “a pioneer of nightclub entertainment. He opened in 1924 with a small club for people of modest means, and he remained only modestly successful till he built up the Diamond Horseshoe, which became the largest, plussiest and most celebrated establishment of its type and which was decidedly for people of immodest means and even less modest taste. Here too the accent was on glamour, with successive arrays of splendid women splendidly semi-attired.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 90] [See
elsewhere in this volume discussions of Jewish ownership of everything from Club Med to the Cotton Club). Glasgow, Scotland? Stefan King (“half-Jewish and half-Catholic”) “opened Glasgow’s first gay nightclub.” [MULFORD, S., 2000, p 35] “By 1920,” adds Stephen Birmingham, “much of the Prohibition liquor trade was in Jewish hands, and a good number of the speakeasies and nightclubs where would-be stars could do their turns was also Jewish owned.” [BIRMINGHAM, p. 190]

In 1999, the Village Voice interviewed Luke Ford, author of A History of X: 100 Years of Sex in Films and a convert, of all things, to Judaism. “Publishers Weekly” Ford said, “took me to task for that ‘offensive generalization’ about Jews but it’s true. The big machers [in the pornography] industry are Jewish – Steve Hirsch, Paul Fishbein (who runs and publishes Adult Video News), and David Sturman, who owns [production company] Sin City.” [BUNN, March 3-9, 99] Fishbein, notes the Los Angeles Times, is the “editor and publisher of the Van Nuys-based trade magazine Adult Video News, generally considered the authoritative guide to the $9 billion U.S. sex business … Fishbein became a [porn] industry spokesman and advocate, a role he has retained to this day.” [COLLINS, S., 7-8-99, p. C1]

As Jewish scholar Jay Gertzman notes: “David Hebditch and Nick Anning, researching the pornography business in the mid-1980s, report that ‘some industry insiders claim that porn in the United States is essentially a Jewish business.’ “If this is so,” adds Gertzman, with a little spin control for Jewish economic endeavors, “it is because Jews have for a very long time cultivated the temperament and talents of the middlemen, and they are proud of these abilities.” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 289]

In his book, Ford goes further, pointing to a strong Jewish influence across American culture that helped swing open the doors to increased sexual permissiveness, an overhaul of traditional moralities, and, ultimately, increased popular tolerance of pornography, noting that

“Those who pushed America to a more liberal view of sex were mainly male non-Jewish Jews (Jews alienated from Judaism and Jewish life as well as the Christian culture embraced by a majority of Americans) including Samuel Roth of the 1957 Supreme Court case [that tested laws concerning the depiction of sexuality]; Grove Press publisher Barney Rossett; the owner of Olympia Press, Maurice Girodias, and his father, Jack Kahane, a Paris publisher and author of sexually explicit novels; comedian Lenny Bruce; filmmakers Russ Meyer, David Friedman, and Randy Metzger; Austrian psychiatrist Wilhelm Reich; Screw publisher Al Goldstein; Eros publisher Ralph Ginzburg [Ginzburg served time in prison on obscenity charges for his magazine Eros; he later became editor and publisher of Moneysworth]; [GREENBERG, M., p. 54; his publications Blue Ball and Intercourse were mailed from the conservative Pennsylvania Dutch area: GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 287]; publisher Edward Mishkin; Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America; defense lawyer Stanley Fleishman; Playboy playmate and
Hugh Hefner’s ex-lover Barbara Klein (aka Barbie Benton); Hefner’s personal secretary, Bobbie Arnstein; philosopher Herbert Marcuse; psychologist Albert Ellis; authors Philip Roth, William Styron, and Norman Mailer; and Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas. They carried on a hundred-year history of radical Jews challenging the reigning order.” [FORD, p. 21]

(Ford’s above list, however, is wrong on at least one count: William Styron isn’t Jewish. It’s not hard to understand, however, where the error came from. As Truman Capote once noted about Styron’s presence in the Jewish literary establishment, “if ever there was a goy Yid, it’s Bill Styron.”) [VOLKMAN, p. 96]

Among those in Ford’s tally, after a “watershed” court case over obscenity, Barney Rosset’s Grove Press published, in 1959, D. H. Lawrence’s then-scandalous Lady Chatterly’s Lover; Rosset also “precipitated another censorship brouhaha in 1968 when Grove’s Evergreen Films imported the sexually explicit I am Curious Yellow from Sweden.” [BLACKWELL, E., 1973, p. 417] Among works published by Kahane and Girodias that have become standards of literature were controversial works by Henry Miller, and Lolita.

Samuel Roth is noteworthy in the pornography trade for many reasons. Although some might portray him as a free speech hero, he pirated editions of both James Joyce’s Ulysses and D. H. Lawrence’s Lady Chatterly’s Lover, to the protest of both the Joyce and Lawrence estates. Imprisoned twice, 1937-1939 and 1957-61, Roth was labeled “the dirtiest pig in the world” and “the louse of Lewisburg [prison]” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 219] Roth in 1936 “received the most severe prison sentence possible under the law for brazenly using the Postal Service to distribute flagrantly obscene books … Roth was the most often incarcerated, the most feckless, and quite likely the most resourceful booklegger of his time, challenging moral and legal authorities with a quixotic bravado.” [GERTZMAN, J., 1999, p. 22] Other “chief mail-order erotica dealers were Esar Levine and Benjamin Rebhuhn.” [GERTZMAN, J., p. 26] Both served prison terms on obscenity charges. “Great ‘art erotica’ suppliers” included Jake Zeitlin, Harry F. Marks, Ben Abramson, and David Moss. [GERTZMAN, J., 1999, p. 61] Alleged Jewish porn pushers at a Congressional investigation of the New York pornography system included Irving Klaw (“self-styled King of the Pin-ups”), Edward Mishkin, and Abraham Rubin. [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 278] Martin Kamin was a “supplier of borderline erotica.” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 177] Other “offenders” in the erotica trade included Earl Marks, Solomon Malkin, Alex Field, Henry Klein, Raymond Thomson, Al Picker, Joseph Seiffer, Max Gottschalk, and David Moss. [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 31] Jewish erotica book publishers included William Faro, Panurge, Falstaff (“Falstaff gave special prominence to the work of Iwan Bloch,” also Jewish, “the father of sexology”) [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 193], Robin Hood House, the American Anthropological Society, American Ethnological Press, Jul-Mar, Julian, Risus, Biblion Balzac, Pickwick, Parnassus Book Shops, Abbey, Allied Book, Emerson, Pioneer and Franklin. [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 192-193]
Jewish scholar Jay Gertzman, whose own uncle’s bookshop was once raided in Philadelphia, [GERTZMAN, J., p. 287] notes that Jews built the “erotica” book business in New York (the heart of American publishing) and that there was an

“absence of any single ethnic group of erotica dealers in New York City prior to the Jewish presence … In several cases, the erotica dealer’s relatives were business partners. One could trust uncles and brothers, and possibly no one else … The underground printing of many banned erotic classics … was the work of two brothers, Adolph and Rudolph Loewinger; another pair, David and Jacob Brotman, was responsible for a large part of the lubricious under-the-counter pamphlets and paper-bound books [moral watchdog groups] decried as flagitious. Jack Brussel, Sam Roth’s partner at the start of the latter’s career, enlisted the aid of his first wife … Benjamin Rebluhn’s office manager was his nephew, and his wife was listed as director of the Falstaff Press Inc. Esar Levine and his brother Benjamin, close friends of the Rebhuhns, were editor and business manager, respectively, of the Panurge Press.” [GERTZMAN, J., p. 29, p. 30]

By 1939, according to a major anti-smut organization, the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, 28 of 32 people arrested that year in New York City for obscenity-related law-breaking were Jewish (the number may have been even higher: two of the 32 did not have their religion/ethnicity listed. [These figures are cited by Gertzman, who accepts them as credible: GETZMAN, J., 2000, p. 29]

As Gertzman notes, in classical Jewish outsider-insider terms,

“Erotica dealers formed a tight-knit, and therefore persistent, resourceful, and resolutely successful entity. They were easy to stigmatize as a group [by non-Jews] set apart from the majority, even if they had the same goals and methods of doing business as general book dealers. In New York at least, during the period from 1880 to 1940, many were members of Jewish immigrant families. Jewish erotica dealers seem to have become prominent in the field soon after the eastern European immigrants began arriving in record numbers in 1880.” [GERTZMAN, J., p. 28]

The Jerusalem Post concluded a review of Gertzman’s book about the Jewish dominated smut-trade like this:

“Gertzman himself acknowledges towards the end of his book that his uncle once ran the most notorious ‘dirty bookshop’ in Philadelphia. For that matter, Sam Roth’s grandson is none other than Prof. James Kugel, the eminent Bible scholar at Harvard University. If there’s a more complicated and surprising tribe on earth, I’ve yet to hear about it.” [NESSVISKY, M., 3-9-00]

There are many other Jewish public figures, in various fields, that might merit addition to a Luke Ford-like list of Jewish assault upon dominant culture morality. In literature, homosexual Allen Ginsberg’s 1950s-era obscenity trial in
San Francisco about his poem “Howl” (another landmark in popular culture) escalated him thereafter to fame. As Ginsberg’s Jewish ideological nemesis, “neo-Conservative” Norman Podhoretz, notes:

“As the 60’s wore on, I came more and more to see all this [hippie era] as a new kind of plague … I ended with a lament for the victims it had claimed among the ‘especially vulnerable’ young … [There were] shades of antinomian propaganda Ginsberg had done as much as anyone else in America to spread … Ginsberg was also fulsomely praised as a pioneer of the gay-rights movement, which indeed he was. Yet so far as I have been able to determine, no one thought to draw a connection between the emergence of AIDS and the rampant homosexual promiscuity promoted by Ginsberg (with buggery as an especially ‘joyful’ feature that is described in loving detail in poem after pornographic – yes, pornographic – poem. And I could find only one mention (in the Weekly Standard) of Ginsberg’s active sponsorship of the abominable North American Man Boy Alliance (NAMBLA), an organization devoted to the legalization of homosexual pedophilia. (‘I don’t know exactly how to define what’s underage,’ he once explained, quickly adding that he himself had ‘never made it with anyone under fifteen.’)” [PODHORETZ, N., 2000]

In the early years of the twentieth century, warring against Victorian era morality, Jewish “anarchist Emma Goldman also fostered a new permissiveness; she toured the country, lecturing on subjects as ‘The Limitation of Offspring’ and “Is Man a Varietiest or a Monogamist?” She challenged feminists who advanced chastity, insisting that liberated women faced more danger from too little sexual experience than they did from too much.” [LEIDER, E.M., p. 49] In the early 1890s, Goldman “became the lover of [Alexander] Berkman and after a while, of his artist friend, Fedya, as well. The three lived communally… Even certain radicals found Emma’s honesty on matters of sex hard to tolerate.” [SHULMAN, A., 1970, p. 10, 11] Goldman even once attempted to work as a prostitute to raise the money to buy a gun for an assassination. [SHULMAN, A., 1970, p. 10]

Speaking of prostitutes, perhaps the most influential as the most “famous prostitute in the world” is Xaviera Hollander, whose 1971 book The Happy Hooker was a best-seller. (Hollander’s “first fiance’s name was Frank Apfelbaum … he transformed himself into Frank Allen.”) [HOLLANDER, X., 2000, p. 39] A daughter of a Holocaust survivor/Dutch psychiatrist, it was her father “who instilled in her a love of Yiddishkeit and a passion for Jewish culture.” “She began running a high-end brothel out of a brownstone on the Upper East Side,” notes the Jewish ethnic magazine, Moment,

“where her clients included a man who asked a lot of questions, soon arousing Hollander’s suspicion. The man turned out to be Eric Kohn, a Jewish journalist researching a book. The two decided to collaborate on an autobiographical account of Hollander’s life, and one year later The Happy Hooker exploded onto the scene – eventually selling 16 million copies … Addicted to diet pills and unable to control her kleptomania
(‘I got orgasms from stealing,’ she says), she was arrested for stealing a $40 nightgown. That theft, coupled with the fact that she was a confessed criminal in the States, led her to eventual deportation and divorce … Businessman Arnold Blitz, a friend of Hollander’s, has this to say: ‘Xaviera is not an ambassador for Jewish culture – but for Jewishness.” [LIPKIN, L., FEB 2001]

In 1924, two eighteen-year-old men from very affluent families in Chicago, Nathan Leopold and “his friend and lover Richard Loeb,” made international news for what was then popularized by its sensationalism as the “crime of the century.” Psychiatrist David Abrahamsen notes that the men

“kidnapped fourteen-year old Bobby Franks, and Loeb beat him to death. They stripped the body from the waist down, and although the evidence is inconclusive, one or both of them probably performed a sexual act on it … In the perspective of all that has happened since the 1920s, the murder of Bobby Franks hardly qualifies as the crime of the century, as it was seen then. But at that time the brutality and senselessness of the act exploded like a bomb in the public consciousness. People began to realize that society was changing in some frightening way. The youth of the two murderers (this was the beginning of the tidal wave that came to be called juvenile delinquency), the sexual undercurrent of their crime and the fact that theirs was the first major trial to use the testimony of psychiatrists on the background and state of mind of a defendant made an indelible impression on the millions who followed the sensational case in the newspapers.” [ABRAHAMSEN, D., 1983, p. 41-42]

In 1997, the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California even featured an article about the early 20th-century German Jewish medical doctor, Magnus Hirshfeld, an

“ openly gay sexologist, who founded a famed Berlin institute that studied sexual behavior and sold sex aids in its gift shop, [and] embodied the Nazi’s most-despised attributes … [The] founding of Hirshfeld’s Scientific-Humanitarian Committee [is] believed to be the first organization devoted to the legal rights of homosexuals and other sexual minorities … ‘In a sense, he was the founder of gay liberation as a kind of political, legal movement,’ [says Jewish scholar David] Biale, ‘He’s a very important figure in gay history’ …In 1919 … Hirschfeld established his Institute and Museum of Sexology. A former mansion was divided into consulting offices, study rooms, laboratories and a large museum devoted to every aspect of human sexuality, especially the ‘Derangements of the Sexual Instinct’ … [Some visitors] left accounts of the strange exhibits and vast array of erotic artifacts and aphrodisiacs found in one of Berlin’s most curious attractions. The institute was one of the first cultural organizations liquidated by the Nazis, who destroyed the building and its contents.” [KATZ, L., 6-6-97]

Rabbi Daniel Lapin notes fashion designer Rudi Gernreich’s influence in America in the 1960s:
“When Rudi Gernreich, a Jewish socialist from Vienna, settled in Los Angeles and foisted the topless bathing suit on a shocked America, it seemed titillating and daring. Many will recall the newspaper photographs of grim-faced policemen clutching towels around the shapely torsos of giddy young women while escorting them off public beaches … A few hailed the flagrantly homosexual Gernreich as the hero of the avant-garde.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 2]

Such Jewish influence is common in popular culture. In 1995 Jewish fashion media mogul Calvin Klein came under fire by critics who compared his clothing “ads to child pornography” [GROUX, p. 16-17] The Israeli Nakash brother, who own the Jordache jeans company, pushed daring new levels of “lewd” imagery in their own ad campaign. [BYRON, p. 34-35] The Jewish Bulletin had a feature on famous Jewish homosexual fashion mogul Isaac Mizrahi in 1998:

“Viewers saw little-known sides of Mizrahi in ‘Unzipped,’ the 1995 documentary about him. Filmmaker Douglas Keeve was, at the time, in a relationship with the designer. In one scene, Mizrahi put a sheer scrim behind the catwalk and had models change their outfits in full view of the audience. That kind of chutzpah gave viewers insight into his bold personality … ‘To this day the designer remains active in Jewish charities. ‘I do what I can,’ he says. ‘I’m a zealot, a real lover of the Jewish faith.” [SCHLEIER, C., 1-2-98]

Then there is Jewish fashion photographer Helmut Newton. “It is impossible to deny the impact he has made,” noted England’s The Independent in 2001,

“on fashion photography in particular … To radical feminists, Newton is the antichrist. This is the man who photographed a woman on all fours with a saddle on her back, and another sitting on her underwear or an unmade bed, with a gun in her mouth … Newton’s vision is fuelled by sex, status, power and, above all, voyeurism … Small wonder, then, that much of the photographer’s most successful imagery has become far more famous than the garments he has chosen to photograph … Newton’s influence is everywhere … In the Sixties and Seventies, Newton’s decadent vision may have been labelled ‘porno chic,’ but today the rest of the world has finally caught up with him and it’s just plain chic. There is barely a stylist, photographer or designer working in fashion today who can fail to acknowledge Newton as an influence … Helmut Newton was born to middle-class Jewish parents in Weimar Berlin in 1920, and the decadent spirit of that place at that time is imprinted on his work … Accusations of misogyny are still constantly made against Newton’s work.” [FRANKEL, S., 5-9-01]

In 2001 Rabbi Ira Korff complained that “the suggestiveness in the media these days is increasingly irresponsible – it’s really pornography – and its been bothering me more and more.” Korff should know what he’s talking about. He is the former president of National Amusements Inc., which owns Viacom, the second-largest media conglomerate on earth (controlled by Jewish mogul Sumner Redstone). “Korff,” notes the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz, “says the
worst purveyor of violence and profanity on TV is Music Television (MTV,) which is owned by Viacom. But he adds, ‘I have no interest in attacking Viacom, and MTV is an ethically run business.’ After all, much of his own wealth was made while serving as president and later consultant to National Amusements Inc.” [HAUSMAN, T., 6-22-01]

Arnold Shaw notes some 1960s-era New York Jewish influence in the rock music world:

“The Fugs, a New York city group led by Tuli Kuperberg and Ed Sanders, are generally regarded as the first underground group. Political and pornographic … they worked at shocking and repelling … They received virtually no airplay, since disk jockeys worried that the pronunciation of their name would be offensive. Although appearances frequently prompted people to walk out on them, they did secure a recording contract … [including Golden Filth] … With a name taken from a pornographic paperback, the Velvet Underground helped make underground Rock largely a New York phenomenon. Led by Lou Reed [also Jewish] (b. early 1940), the group became part of Andy Warhol’s Exploding Plastic Inevitable, a multimedia show, in 1966. The subject of Reed’s songs eliminated airplay for the records they made: heroin, in ‘I'm Waiting for the Man’; cocaine, in ‘Run, Run, Run’; sado-masochism, in ‘Venus in Furs’; and transvestitism, lesbianism, and homosexuality in other songs.” [SHAW, A., 1982, p. 396]

From France, singer Serge Gainsbourg [born Lucien Ginzburg] “is still most famous in Britain for his number one ‘Je t’aime moi non plus’: the scandalous anthem which was in the British charts 30 years ago. He and [actress Jane] Birkin simulated their lovemaking so effectively that the single was banned by the BBC and formally condemned by the Vatican …Yet Gainsbourg is the greatest popular musician France has ever produced … Echoes of his favourite technique, of murmuring profanities against a delicate and beautiful harmony, can be heard in many contemporary records, not least the later work of Leonard Cohen … Towards the end of his life, the singer’s media appearances became ritual provocations: in one television broadcast, he subjected a veteran paratrooper – horrified by Gainsbourg’s dub version of the Marseillaise – to a torrent of obscenities, pausing only occasionally, to inflate condoms. On another notorious live show, sharing a platform with a young Whitney Houston, Gainsbourg, then 58, turned to the presenter Michel Drucker and declared, in English, ‘I want to fuck her.”’ [CHALMERS, R., 1-4-00]

like to watch pornos backwards? So that they can watch the prostitute give back the money.” [FORWARD, 10-23-98, p. 1]

“...I’m such a sex machine...” begins controversial radio talk show host Howard Stern’s autobiography, “...I could take a piece of wood and turn it into something erotic, something sensual, something perverse.” [STERN, H., 1995, p. 3]

Despite Jewish pre-eminence in the porno world, it’s not kosher to face this issue squarely. So how did feminist Susan Griffin examine – like so many - the issue of Jews and pornography, in her 1981 book Pornography and Silence? She didn’t mention them at all, except as a forum for railing at length about Jews as victims of “anti-Semitic” stereotypes, and forcing a link between sexual pornography and anti-Jewish hostility (both from the same reservoirs of sick minds). “And yet it is precisely because of the madness of the anti-Semitic or pornographic idea,” she declares,

“...and precisely because it is a delusion, that it must assault reality and try to change it. A man ‘believes’ in anti-Semitic propaganda, or the pornographic ideology, because the illness of his mind REQUIRES that he believe these ideas to be true. Yet illness is of its very nature resistant. Thus, when a madman is told that he does not see the world correctly, and when he is given evidence against his prejudices, he will refuse to see the truth, and he will even distort this evidence to support his own delusion. But most significantly, he will even change reality so it supports his mad idea of the world. This is what anti-Semitism and pornography requires of their believers. THE DELUDED MIND MUST TRY TO RE-MAKE THE WORLD AFTER AN ILLUSION.” [author’s emphasis] [GRIFFIN, S., 1981, p. 121]

Griffin has more to say about this subject, using the innocence of Jews as an attack upon the pornographic (anti-Semitic) mind:

“The same mind [of Adolf Hitler] that dreamed of itself as the bearer of culture conceived that its nemesis, the destroyer of culture, was the Jew. As a shadow to the fantasy of Aryan dominance, the anti-Semite invented an enemy of awesome proportions. In the fabricated document known as ‘The Protocols of the Elders of Zion,’ the anti-Semite imagined a congregation of Jews who meet in a cemetery to plan the death of Aryan culture. Of course, a pornographic image lies at the center of this imagined plan. Thus the imagined Jews in the imagined cemetery contrive a lurid plot to ‘demand marriage between Jews and Christians.’ Together they enjoy the idea of defiling Gentile women. And as the meeting adjourns, a huge and shapeless golden calf emerges from the tomb to symbolize the materiality of the Jew, just as the fear of matter and mortality have emerged from the mind the anti-Semite in this fantasy of evil power.” [GRIFFIN, S., 1981, p. 175]

Even Judy Blume, a well-known Jewish writer of children’s books, is “routinely” listed among America’s “most censored U.S. authors” for testing moral boundaries. Outraged parents continually raise complaint. In 1997 alone, there were nine efforts to take her books for children off library shelves, particularly
for undercurrent sexual themes. Blume’s juvenile book *Deenie*, for example, addresses masturbation, and *Forever* includes a penis named Ralph. [WOULFE, M., 7-20-98; JENKINS, E., 4-13-99, p. 134] Famous Jewish novelist *Judith Krantz* notes that “My most famous piece [while a writer for *Cosmopolitan*], about which I’m still asked, was called ‘The Myth of Multiple the Orgasm,’ inspired by a book by a general practitioner Dr. Rubin, who insisted that any woman who settled for less than fifty orgasms during a single sexual session was being cheated.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 236]

How about Willie Hammerstein’s influence upon popular culture? As *Marybeth Hamilton* notes, by 1913, his Victoria Theatre “became New York’s top-grossing vaudeville playhouse, renowned (or notorious) for its garish attractions – in Hammerstein’s phrase, for its ‘freak acts’ … [Siamese twins, etc.] … But more compelling than these physical and geographical oddities were the freaks of publicity, the city’s most notorious inhabitants, men and more frequently women who had made names for themselves through their links to New York’s criminal and sexual underworld, in headline-grabbing vice raids, ‘Love Nest,’ scandals, and murders … The emphasis was on sexual scandals, especially those featuring young, attractive women.” [HAMILTON, M., 1995, p. 3]

Exploiting their notoriety, Hammerstein hired such people from real-life, sensational news items to appear at his forum as *performers*.

What about Anton LeVay’s influence upon modern morals, particularly in attracting alienated youth? LeVay, born Howard Stanton Levey, and known as the “Black Pope,” founded the *Church of Satan* in San Francisco in 1966 and was bathed with media attention. Creating a web of lies about himself, “he has constructed,” noted one reporter, “a personal history untruthful in every fact that can be verified.” [GRACE, K., 7-28-97] ‘His Satanist’s Bible’ (1967) proposed a sub-Nietzschean philosophy wherein might equals right, and immediate self-gratification constitutes the chief duty of man. ‘Be simply animal man,’ the Satanist’s Bible instructs, ‘hate your enemies, and if someone smites you, smash him … Susie Atkins, one of [Charles] Manson’s knife-wielding groupies, blames La Vey for her descent into depravity and murder.” [DAILY TELEGRAPH, 11-11-97, p. 25] More than a million copies of Levey’s books have been printed. [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 11-8-97, p. 8]

Levey, who died in 1997, notes the *Church of Satan*’s web site, was “a self-loathing man of Jewish descent who embraced fascism toward the end of his life.” [CHURCH OF SATAN/1] His own daughter, Zeena, notes that he “routinely beat and abused those of his female disciples with whom he had sex, forcing them into prostitution as part of his ‘Satanic counseling’ and collected their earnings. In 1986 [Levey] was a passive witness to the sexual molestation of his own grandson by a long time friend.” [CHURCH OF SATAN/2]

The traditional Jewish animosity towards Christianity is reflected by Levey in almost cartoon form. Levey’s Church of Satan teachings are of course antithetical to those of Christianity. “Behold the crucifix,” wrote Levey, “what does
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it symbolize? Pallid incompetence hanging on a tree … [Levey's book] advocates ritual masturbation, rites ‘to summon one for lustful purposes or establish a sexually gratifying situation,’ as well as rites ‘to cause the destruction of an enemy’” [HARPUR, T., 3-5-97, p. A7] “For more than a decade,” notes the , in evaluating Levey’s influence,

“scholars have noted a growing interest in Christianity’s archenemy of goodness. The Reverend Richard Woods, a Dominican who relates theology to popular culture, traces the upward curve [of interest in Satanism] from 1966, the year that Anton LaVey’s Church of Satan made its debut in San Francisco. The same year brought the release of Rosemary’s Baby, Ira Levine’s movie about a woman who gave birth to the devil’s child. In the early 1970s, the book and movie ‘The Exorcist’ titillated millions.” [The film The Exorcist was directed by William Friedkin, also Jewish]. “[SCHJAEFFER, P., 2-5-89]

Seminal too, of course, to Luke Ford’s overview of those that have shaped modern sexual mores in western society is Sigmund Freud, from which so many sexual populists stem. Feminist Kate Millet, in Sexual Politics, noted Freudianism’s “penis envy” and its other oppressive theories as profoundly detrimental to women:

“Although generally accepted as a prototype of the liberal urge toward sexual freedom, and a signal contributor toward softening traditional puritanical inhibitions upon sexuality, the effect of Freud’s work, that of his followers, and still more that of his populizers, was to rationalize the invidious relationship between the sexes … And as regards the sexual revolution’s goal of liberating female humanity from its traditional subordination, the Freudian position came to be pressed into the service of a strong counterrevolutionary attitude.” [MILLET, p. 178]

As Earl Grollman has observed:

“Although [Sigmund] Freud was considered a non-believer [of Judaism] and even stated his disavowals of the rituals and rites, he did feel that he retained the best attributes of the faith. Numerous biographers noted that his home life was warm and loving, that learning occupied and extremely high priority and that he had a strong feeling of identification with other Jews. Even his doctrine concerning the powerful drive of sexual urges grew out of Freud’s interpretation of the basic ingredients of Jewishness.” [Grollman, E., 1965, p. xxv]

In 2001, the Jewish Bulletin noted the case of Rabbi Leslie Alexander who

“has made it her mission to turn Jews on … ‘Judaism is about giving pleasure to one another and having no qualms or inhibitions about it … When a Jew goes before God, they are going to have to answer for every pleasure they didn’t take. We, as American Jews, are saddled with a Christian sexual perspective which doesn’t at all reflect Jewish ideas. We have all this moral baggage about who we are sexually; none of that is Jewish … We spend so much time as a society trying to free ourselves from sexual mores. If we had just learned from our own tradition, we
wouldn’t have to try … The Jewish texts are very blunt and direct [about sex] … Teaching it is lots of fun. My students usually say, ‘Whoa! They really said that?’ [GOLDSMITH, A., 11-23-01]

“Alexander,” notes the Bulletin,

“remembered once reading a text in which a rabbi is telling a group of other rabbis about the various things he would consider sexual perversions. ‘And then, at the end of his speech the rest of the rabbis told him he was wrong’ … In addition to loving the ‘racy’ nature of the subject, Alexander enjoyed teaching about Jewish sexuality because it’s a way to pique people’s interest in Judaism.” [GOLDSMITH, A., 11-23-01

Profoundly influential, of course, in shaping popular morality is the behind-the-scenes world of mainstream Hollywood: “Show people had always been careless about morals, and in a town, in an industry, dedicated to peddling glamour and romance, it would be surprising if the passions enacted before the cameras did not sometimes carry over into real life … Youngsters pouring into Los Angeles, desperate for a movie career, were prepared to risk the perils of the casting couch.” [SHIPMAN, D. 1993, p. 136] As noted earlier, the “casting couch” has long been an institution in Hollywood. In crudest form, the results of such sexual expansion inevitably include the likes of famed Jewish Hollywood “madam” Heidi Fleiss and her much-publicized Hollywood drug and prostitution ring in the early 1990s. The ring reportedly included Columbia executives Michael Nathanson and Barry Josephson as important players.[See earlier discussion] William Stadiem notes the Hollywood Jewish prostitute contingent within the general stable of non-Jewish madam “Alex Adams”:

“Robin was part of an entire group of young privileged hookers Alex had dubbed ‘the JAP [Jewish American Princess] Pack.’ They loved nightclubs, Porsches, Versace, and coke, mostly went to UCLA on and off, hated the idea of working at a real job, and could only soak their parents for so much.” [ADAMS, A., 1993, p. 55]

Hollywood’s “Sin City” entertainment playground, Las Vegas, especially renowned for gambling, prostitution and other vices, must also be added to the list of great questionable Jewish influences upon popular culture. (In Hollywood, Al and Lew Wertheimer founded an illegal gambling den in Hollywood called the Clover Club. The Jewish Hollywood crowd later set up such a resort near Tijuana, Mexico, called Agua Caliente.) [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 261] Las Vegas, as an institution, has been profoundly influential in its efforts to sanitize, normalize, and popularize some of the most troubling expressions of human nature as acceptable recreation in western society. As professor Alan Balboni observes, “The Jews and Italians who made up ‘the Boys’ [the Mafia] were able to develop the burgeoning gaming industry to the point where it eventually became a significant influence on the American scene.” [BALBONI, p. ix] Jewish entrepreneurship was not alone in this, but it was central. [See earlier information about the huge Jewish influence in the formation of Las Vegas] For purposes here, we may wonder about the observations of Jewish commentator James Yaffe: “If Jews can be said to have a characteristic vice, that vice is gambling.
Even back in the shtetl they were gamblers. Many psychiatrists have mentioned this phenomena to me, yet nobody has been able to explain it exactly.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 268] We may also note the case of Mike Rose, the Jewish CEO of *Holiday Corporation* (Holiday Inn, et al), who “steered [the company] into gambling when it bought into Harrah’s in 1980, causing Holiday’s president and two directors to resign. Rose later sold the namesake motel chain to create a gambling concern called the *Promus Corporation.*” The company’s president, L. M. Clyde, retired “because he could not reconcile his Presbyterian religious beliefs with gambling … Clyman did not go quietly, and two Holiday directors joined him in resigning on moral grounds.” [JOHNSTON, D., 1992, p. 49, photo section]

Across the earth, in 1998 conservative Israeli commentator Jonathan Rosenblum lamented the dubious moral status and reputation of the modern Jewish state:

> “Once again anti-Semites portrayed us as a sexual libertines and perverts to undermine our moral authority. Today we cheerfully admit the charges and imagine ourselves beloved by the world for it. Are we and our culture similarly honored when a CNN documentary claims that we have the highest rate of prostitution in the world?” [ROSENBLUM, J., 5-15-98, p. 9]

Rosenbaum probably could not have imagined the grotesque defamation of the holiest of Jewish holies by young Israelis the next year. In 1999, a group of 40 Israeli teenagers visiting Auschwitz and other sites of Jewish mass extermination in Poland under the Nazis, garnered international outrage from Jewish communities when it was discovered that they had “ended a tour of Poland’s death camps with a strip show … only hours after visiting Treblinka, where 900,000 Jews were murdered … On a previous occasion, Israelis were shocked after a group of [Israeli] army officers went to a casino after visiting Auschwitz.” [GROSS, T., 11-28-99]

In 2001, a Jewish community in England made the news when a “stag night with three strippers performing ‘sexually explicit acts’” was held at a synagogue (Finchley Synagogue’s Kinloss Suite) … Some of the funds raised was supposed to be for a Jewish charity. [ZERDIN, J., 2-9-01]

Jewish American feminist Andrea Dworkin notes her disillusionment with her liberation myths about Israel when she first visited the Jewish state:

> “In 1988 I went to Israel … I was distressed by what I found, including Holocaust-themed pornography and battered and raped women. Why would I expect it to be different? … In Israel there is a genre of pornography defined by the theme of the Holocaust: women’s bodies in pieces run down by trains or skeletal standing by open ovens.” [DWORKIN, A., 2000, p. xi, 168]

Jewish American Paul Cowan noted this anecdote about looking for his Jewish identity in Israel in 1982:

> “I had an enemy in Beersheba, a man named Itzhak, the city’s leading stud. He’d been a gigolo on the French Riviera, had run drugs from Is-
rael to Syria, and now owned his own bar, a place called the Barsheba, where you could often find the sort of brawls that seemed so exciting in American Westerns. He was always stealing women. I had a particular grudge against him because he had seduced Pam, an Englishwoman I was dating, made her a hostess at his bar, and had then become her part-time pimp.” [COWAN, P., 1982, p. 108] [See also “White Slavery” chapter, p. 251]

In 2001, Israel’s state-run television station elicited outrage from women’s groups when it broadcast “a video clip of an attacker beating a naked woman whom he had allegedly raped … The president of the Na’amat women’s organization … said in a letter … that she hoped [the station would not] compete for ratings through the use of violence and pornography.” [HAAS, D., 2-16-01, p. 2] In 2000, the Egyptian newspaper *Al-Arabi* claimed that “film producers [in Israel] are tracking down actors who look like current Egyptian stars, and using them to shoot porn flicks in Israel. The films are then imported to Egypt and screened for paying customers … [Film actress] Yusra Alawi told reporters she is asking her attorney to obtain copies of the films and to pursue legal action against those responsible.” [BOULWARE, J., 6-7-00]

The Jewish state was also severely embarrassed by a July 2000 incident in South America that engendered “huge play in the Brazilian media.” Israeli diplomat Arie Scher was implicated in the production of child pornography when Brazilian police discovered videos and photographs in Hebrew teacher George Steinberg’s home. [NIGRI, S., 7-5-2000] Scher fled to Israel before he could be arrested by Brazilian police. (In 2000, the *Sydney Morning Herald* reported that South Africa was “one of the world’s worst centers for child abuse and child sex slavery … International crime syndicates based in Nigeria, China, Israel, and Russia have become involved in the South African trade.”) [O’LOUGHLIN, 9-9-2000]

(On the continued theme of child pornography, in 1996, David Webber, former director of the Calgary Jewish Community Council and Youth Director of Beth Israel Synagogue, was sentenced to six years in prison “for possessing child pornography and molesting seven boys over the past eight years.” Police found in his possession 3,635 photos of young boys, 16 pornography videos, 224 books and articles about “man-boy love,” and other indicting materials. The provincial prosecutor called Webber an “unrepentant pedophile.” [SLADE, D., 10-26-96, p. B5] In 1997, across Canada in Nova Scotia, Stuart Friedman, the cantor at Halifax’s Orthodox Beth Israel synagogue was “convicted and sent back to the United States [to his native Baltimore] for possessing and distributing child pornography … one of the biggest [news] stories to hit Halifax in a long time.” [CANADIAN JEWISH NEWS, 2-6-97, p. 10] Police found a range of pornographic materials, including sets of handcuffs. In yet another child pornography case in Canada, in 1994 Corey Jones, a professional sex offender rehabilitation counselor,” wrote that “My head hangs in despair … when I read of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association coming to the defense of Eli Langer, an artist charged under the new law against child pornography because of an
exhibition of paintings which depict children in various sex acts with other children and adults.” Langer, arrested at the Mercer Union Gallery, is also Jewish; “his father is an amateur Holocaust historian.”) [JONES, C., 1-20, 1994, p. A21; TORONTO LIFE, 7/1994]

In the world of American pornography, particularly the film-making side, Luke Ford observes that

“Though only 2 percent of the American population, Jews dominate porn. Most of the leading male performers through the 1980s had Jewish parents. Leading Jewish pornographers include Wesley Emerson, Paul Fishbein, Lenny Friedlander, Paul Norman, Bobby Hollander, Rubin Gottesman, Hank Weinstein, Fred Hirsch and his children Steve and Marjorie, Steve Orenstein, Theodore Rothstein, and Reuben Sturman.” [FORD, p. 21]

At his Internet web site, Ford elaborates in a section entitled Jews. “Secular Jews,” he writes,

“play a disproportionate role throughout the sex industry … Leading modern Jewish pornographers include Ron Braverman, John Bone, Wesley Emerson, Paul Fishbein, Herbert Feinberg AKA Mickey Fine, Hank Weinstein, Lenny Friedlander, Bobby Hollander, Rubin Gottesman, Fred Hirsch and his children Steve and Marc, Paul ‘Norman’ Apstein, Steve Orenstein, Jack Richmond (Legend CEO), Theodore Rothstein, Reuben and David Sturman, Ron Sullivan, Jerome Tanner, Armand Weston, Sam and Mitch (Spinelli). Jews accounted for most of the leading male performers of 1970s and ‘80s. Hebrew studs include Buck Adams, Bobby Astyr (Bobby Charles), R. Bolla (Robert Kerman), Jerry Butler (Paul Siderman), Seymore Butts (Adam Glasser), Roger Caine (Al Levitsky), David Christopher (Bernie Cohen), Steve Drake, Jesse Eastern, Jamie Gillis (Jamie Gurman), Ron Jeremy (Hyatt), Michael Knight, William Margold, Ashley Moore (Steve Tucker), David Morris, George Payne, Ed Powers (Mark Arnold aka Mark Krinski), Harry Reems (Herbertg Streicher), David Ruby, Herschel Savage (Harvey Cowen), Carter Stevens (Mal Warub), Marc Stevens, Paul Thomas (Phil Tobias), Marc Wallice (Marc Goldberg) Randy West (Andy Abrams) and Jack Wrangler … Jewish female performers include Avalon, Jenny Baxter (Jenny Wexler), Busty Belle (Tracy Praeger), Chelsea Blake, Tiffany Blake, Bunny Bleu (Kim Warner), J. R. Carrington, Lee Carroll (Leslie Barris), Blair Castle/Brookle Fields (Allison Shandibal), Courtney/Natasha/Eden (Natasha Zimmerman), Daphne (Daphne Franks), Barbara Dare (Stacy Mitnick), April Diamond, Jeana Fine, Alexis Gold, Terri Hall, Heather Hart, Nina Hartley (Hartman), C. J. Laing (Wendy Miller), Frankie Leigh (Cynthia Hope Geller), Gloria Leonard, Traci Lords (Nora Louise Kuzma), Amber Lynn, Tonisha Mills, Melissa Monette, Susan Nero, Scarlett O. (Catherine Goldberg), Tawny Pearl (Susan Pearlman), Nine Preta, Tracey Prince, Raylene, Janey Robbins (Robin Lieberman), Mila Shegol, Alexandra Silk, Susan Sloan, Annie Sprinkle
(Ellen Steinberg), Karen Summer (Dana Alper), Cindy West, Zara Whites (Amy Koolman), and Ona Zee (Ona Simms) ... Why do Jews dominate porn?” [lukeford.com]

“[Jewish] pornographer Seymour Butts,” says Ford,

“attributes the large number of Jews in porn to the desire for profits. Jews gravitate towards money ... If four people compete for a job, and three of them are goyim [non-Jews], the Jew, all things being equal, will get the job. That’s the way I work. If I’ve got three actors going for a part, and one of them is Jewish, and they’re all in the same ball park ... sue me.” [http://www.lukeford.com]

(Note: As the parameters of what constitutes “morality’ shifts wider decade by decade, any definition of pornography constitutes a controversial subject. On today’s terms, pornography, to this author’s sensibilities, is not the public depiction of sexuality itself, but rather the exploitation, debasement, robbing of dignity, devaluation and even ruthless dehumanization of the most intimate of human connections: frail emotions, human weakness, vulnerability, and the act of love and intimate human tenderness despoiled for public entrepreneurial profit).

Among the most important Jewish porn performers of all, is Harry Reems (real name: Harry Streicher). Reems, notes omnipresent lawyer Alan Dershowitz, was “a nice Jewish boy making his living by doing what lots of people would pay to do ... [He was] the undisputed king of the porno actors.” [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, p. 156, 155] Dershowitz knows Reems’ story well because he successfully defended the actor against obscenity-related charges in Memphis. “If Herb Streicher had not become an actor,” notes the lawyer, “he would have been a first-rate press agent. Every time a story [supportive of his case] appeared, he placed it in his press kit and sent copies to other journalists. This had a snowball effect ... It was impossible to pick up a newspaper or magazine or turn on a TV or radio talk show without coming across some reference to the Reems case. Reems had become an overnight celebrity.” [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, p. 171] Dershowitz even attracted the ire of feminist and other outraged groups when he went to court to argue for a student showing at Harvard University of Reem’s best known movie, *Deep Throat*, (an early 1970s porno movie which grossed $60 million worldwide). [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, 184]

By the late 1980s, freedom fighter Dershowitz had a growing track record in such matters. Well before Harry Reems, he notes with pride that he “successfully defended the film *I am Curious (Yellow)* ... [which was] made in Sweden. [It] had been [the] first commercially distributed motion picture to show explicit sex.” [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, p. 163] He next was the lawyer for Terry Levene’s movie, *Belinda*. Levene was convicted of obscenity-related charges by a jury trial; Dershowitz won an appeal for him. [DERSHOWITZ, 1987, p. 176]

In 1995, Nadine Strosse, a professor of law at New York University, even wrote a book entitled *Defending Pornography*. She defends herself as a champion of free speech with the usual “Jew as oppressed victim” credentialing:

“My father was a Holocaust survivor. I am a Jew. I know from logic and from observation and from experience that the more powerless you
are as a group, gender or ideology, the more you should defend your freedom of speech.” [GERRARD, N., 1-28-96, p. 15]

Indeed, the very paradigm of the marginalized and popularly despised pornographer rests comfortably upon the Jewish “outsider/victim” model. Both Jew and pornographer commonly ascribe to themselves attributes of moral nobility against a perceived repressive society: in both cases the enemy is Christian culture/values where sexual expression has been traditionally devalued. In the porno context the enemy is configured as prudishness. The struggle of the Jew and pornographer is, in this world view, a struggle against oppression; both Jew and pornographer are declared to be innocent of moral wrongdoing. Their common goal is conceived merely as the struggle for freedom. This, and recent efforts in the (traditionally despised) pornographic world to reinvent itself as heroic is noted by Carina Chocano:

“If sex in our culture were not so ‘steeped in shame and guilt’ they argue, and if the sex and pornography industry were not marginalized, then pornography would cease to reflect harmful attitudes, rear its had out of the gutter, and provide, as one of the panelists [at the First Annual World Pornography Conference] put it, ‘masturbatory catharsis for the masses.’ ‘That stuff is bullshit,’ retorted Glasgow Phillips, an author and critic [of pornography], ‘To make money in this business you have to exploit,’ he says, ‘and it’s so easy to do. I mean, you are aware of how many dumb sluts there are in this town [Los Angeles]? You just cast them.” [CHOCANO, C., 1998]

Feminist Diana Russell angrily assailed Strossen’s Defending Pornography, saying:

“Nadine Strossen’s objective in Defending Pornography is to destroy the reputation and achievements of the feminist movement against pornography. To this end, she dishes up the same tired old caricature of us as anti-sex prudes, pro-censorship, and in collusion with the right wing … Strossen’s book was enthusiastically feted by the media not because it’s so brilliant but because she’s president of the American Civil Liberties Union (an organization that has increasingly become a watchdog for the interests of pornographers). The fact that Strossen professes to be a feminist gives her a lot more clout than man would have doing the same dirty work for a dirty industry.” [RUSSELL, D., SUMMER 1995]

There are apparently no limits to the reshaping of sexual morals. In 2001, Princeton professor Peter Singer (“son of Viennese Jews who escaped to Australia in 1938, shortly after Hitler’s invasion”) [NASAR, S., 4-10-00, p. A1] made national news, and national ridicule, for a book review he authored at an online magazine, Nerve. The title of the piece was Heavy Petting, where he endorsed bestiality, including lines like this: “Who has not been at a social occasion disrupted by the household dog gripping the legs of a visitor and vigorously rubbing his penis against them … In private, not everyone objects to being used by his dog in this way, and occasionally mutually satisfying activities may develop.” [BILLUP, A., 4-2-01] The Arkansas Democrat-Gazette featured a poignant edi-
torial about Singer, an expert on “bioethics,” and the broad implications of such thoughts from the Ivy League college:

“[Peter Singer is] a Princeton professor of bioethics who wants to know when the sexual revolution is gonna start revolting again. He’s ready to get it on with the animal kingdom … He was brought to Princeton with much fanfare by that university’s president, Harvey Shapiro, who also happens to head up the President’s National Bioethics Advisory Committee. Yep, these guys are shaping national policy. Ethical policy.” [ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT-GAZETTE, 4-8-01, p. J4]

In 1999, Hope Weissman, another Jewish professor, this one at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, was attracting controversy for her class, “Pornography: Writing of Prostitutes.” The class featured readings from everything from the Marquis de Sade to Larry Flynt’s Hustler magazine, as well as a guest striptease performance by well-known Jewish pornographer—“performance artist” Annie Sprinkle, who gained notoriety for inviting art audiences to inspect her cervix. “Create your own work of pornography,” Weissman instructed her class. [PINKERTON, J., 5-20-99, p. B9] In 2001, after public protest Peter Lehman’s class “Sexuality in Media” was cancelled. The year before he had “required the students to sign a waiver before screening X-rated movies.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, PORN, 11-9-01]

Annie Sprinkle, born Ellen Steinberg, is “the Jewish porn star/performance artist,” [EPSTEIN, R., 10-15-99, p. 18] who is the veteran of so much sexual variety that she “stopped counting her own personal sexual encounters at 3,500.” [HELBER, A., 8-19-99] “When I went to [visit the former Nazi concentration camp] Dachau,” she once said, “I could see how tied in that was to sex.” “How so?” wondered her interviewer. “Well,” she continued,

“I’m not clear enough at the moment to really say, but the quest was for power and the visceral quality, the bodies, the blood … I don’t know. It’s just too big to even try to explain, but it was just a sense I had of how truly tied in that was with a misdirected sexual energy … [There is] my Jewish tit print. I kind of like the idea of the heart and breast and the nurturing to the feeling and the nipple and the sensuality being used to create a religious symbol: a Jewish star. And it’s not that I’m poking fun or anything. I’m honoring both the breast and the Jewish star in my mind.” [FRIEDLANDER, M., 2000]

(In similar terms, Jewish scholar Michael Govrin describes the holiest of Jewish places: “Jerusalem, God’s bride, His place of desire, is always an erotic place of masculine desire. Jerusalem is the biggest harlot of all places, the world’s cunt exposed on all the television screens, in an ongoing peep show, day and night. And yet, in the classical paradox of desire, everyone has his Jerusalem virginal and pure, defiled only by the others’ abusive and defamatory biographies of her.”) [GOVRIN, M., 200]

In 1998, a conference on sexuality was held at the State University of New York at New Paltz; it was sponsored by the college’s women’s studies program.
“What apparently must be called the highlight of the conference,” noted the Clarion,

“was the performance of [Jewish lesbian performer] Shelly Mars, a stripper from a bisexual bathhouse. During her performance, ‘Whiplash: Tales of a Tomboy,’ which featured her simulating sex and screaming obscenities, Mars collided with the crotch of audience member Peter Shipley, chairman of a private educational group called the National Catholic Forum. Shipley’s pen went into her nostril, and Mars fell back shouting that she was bleeding. Then she removed her pants and blouse and exposed herself.”[CLARION, FEB 1998]

Other prominent Jewish porno performers include Randy Becker (“steamy nude pinup boy for the gay community”) [GERSTEL, J., 5-22-97, p. B10] and Ron Jeremy. As one Canadian newspaper noted in 1999, “With 1,500 films to his credit over a 22-year career, Ron Jeremy is one of the most prolific and famous porn stars in the history of the business.” Jeremy describes himself as a “good Jewish boy” who started out as a schoolteacher with a Master’s degree in special education. [GRIWKOWSKY, F., 12-8-99, p. 38] (On a more modest scale, in 1994, a New York policewoman, Carol Shaya, “born in Israel to a Jewish father and Catholic mother,” made the news for posing nude in Playboy.) [HALL, A., 7-11-94, p. 2, 21]

In 1998, Rabbi Shmuel Boteach, although underscoring that he distances himself from pornography, even clocked in when an excerpt from his book, Kosher Sex, in Playboy magazine. [DAILY TELEGRAPH, 10-26-98, p. A9] In 2001, Boteach sued an Internet dating service, MatchNet.com, a firm he was commissioned to represent. Joe Shapiro and Alon Carmel, founders of MatchNet.com, are Israelis, as is Ami Shafrir, another developmental partner in the Internet firm. However, “the heart of Shafrir’s business empire was another company with headquarters in the Wilshire Boulevard Building: Amtec Audiotext, an operator of telephone sex lines that he says generated revenue of $60 million in its best year, 1995.” Shafrir is also the landlord for MatchNet, in Beverly Hills. Matchnet divisions include Americansingles.com and Jdate, the latter of which “one of every 10 Jewish singles in the United States uses it and … the site has been responsible for 300 marriages in its four years of operation.” Rabbi Boteach was eventually approached by another Israeli, Daniel Nicherie, himself once convicted of bank fraud, “who told the rabbi that Mr. Carmel and Mr. Shapiro were pornographers who had been sued nearly 40 times.” “The intrigue [surrounding MatchNet.com],” noted the New York Times, “stretches from Beverly Hills to Israel to the German stock market. The characters include a phone sex entrepreneur, the former convict who took control of his business and a disbarred lawyer obsessed with exposing the underbelly of the online dating industry.” [ELLIN, A., 2001]

Then there is Gloria Leonard, also Jewish, past pornography actress, former president of the Adult Film and Video Association of America and president of the “Free Speech Coalition.” She notes that she “was at the cutting edge of a phenomenon known as ‘phone sex’ during my tenure as publisher of High Society
magazine, which ultimately resulted in a landmark case fought in the United State Supreme Court, which we won.” [WASHINGTON TIMES, 10-12-99, p. A2] Ms. Leonard, promoted as “a name synonymous with quality adult entertainment of all kinds,” was once a “convertible bond specialist from Wall Street.” [LAFEE, S., 4-29-89, p. D2] In 2001, when she stepped down as president of the “Free Speech Coalition” (a largely porn activist group), she was replaced by “her long time friend and fellow Free Speech board member Mara Epstein. A veteran of the adult entertainment business, Epstein previously ran icandy Entertainment, a DVD producer, and was employed by Laserdisc Entertainment, the exclusive producer of XXX laserdiscs in the early 1990s.” [ADULT VIDEO NEWS, JUNE 2001]

Elsewhere, Sandy Kane has, notes Jay Weissberg, “the raunchiest, most Jewish show on cable … Sandy bills herself as the world’s only stripper comic.” [WEISSBERG, J., 2000] Other noteworthy Jews in the porn field include Steve Greenberg, co-chair of the Committee on Male Sex Work at the 1997 International Prostitution Conference; Karlyn Lotney, producer of the “San Francisco-based erotic cabaret ‘In Bed with Fairy Butch’”; and Carol Leigh (“Scarlet Harlot”), head of the Prostitution Education Network, and founding member of the homosexual advocacy group, Act Up! “Being stigmatized for the way you’re earning money,” says Ms. Leigh, “is a way to persecute Jews, right?” [COHEN, B., 2000] Other prominent Jewish pornography performers/producers include Nina Hartley, Jerry Butler, Hershel Savage (Harvey Savage), Sam Weinstein (alias Armand Weston or Anthony Spinelli), and Paul Thomas. [JEWHOO, 2000]

Then there is Abby Ehmann who “pledges to meet the tastes of fetishist and spectators who come to her regular Saturday night party, Click + Drag at Club Mother” in New York City. She edits Extreme Fetish magazine, “dubbed the best alternative sex publication in New York by TimeOut magazine. She is on the board of directors of Feminists for Free Expression, an organization that fights restrictions on free speech, and she is a writer and a performer.” [KAKOULAS, M., 6-26-00]

Elsewhere, CNN notes the Gold family’s British-based Ann Summers sex shop chain “offers customers the opportunity to shop of lingerie and sex aids in their home homes [via meetings like Tupperware parties] … Chief Executive Jacqueline Gold may be responsible for Britain’s sexual revolution. The Ann Summers concept of targeting women was her brainchild … ‘We certainly have contributed to changing people’s attitudes to sex, certainly the women’s attitudes,’ she said.” [CNN, 9-10-98]

In his list of Jewish film pornographers, Luke Ford ascribes to Reuben Sturman the nomer “godfather of porn,” noting that “although not as well known as Playboy’s Hugh Hefner, Hustler’s Larry Flynt, and Penthouse’s Bob Guccione, Sturman exerted far greater influence. One competitor complained that Sturman did not control the adult entertainment industry; he was the industry.” [FORD, p. 22] Sturman himself told the Los Angeles Times that “No one was anywhere near me [in the pornography business].” [JOHNSON, J., 5-31-95, p. B1] “To expand his hold on the [pornography] industry,” noted the Times, “he produced
films with one company, sex paraphernalia with another and then sold everything through his own stores.” By 1977 an FBI report declared that Sturman had accomplished “an almost total takeover” of the “peep-show industry.” [JOHNSON, J. p. B1] The San Diego Union-Tribune noted in 1991 that

“in its 1986 report, the [U.S. government] Meese Commission on Pornography singled out Sturman as the administration’s top porn target. It identified him as the number one worldwide distributor of pornography, with financial control of nearly 200 businesses in 19 states, one Canadian province, and six foreign countries.” [LAVELLE, P., 1991, p. B1]

(Ford cites figures of 800 Sturman adult bookstores in all American states and forty other countries). [FORD, p. 129]

Sturman was eventually worth an estimated $100 million. His main company, Sovereign News, noted the Los Angeles Times, was “based in a sprawling Cleveland warehouse which is cynically referred to by some lawmen as the Ft. Knox of pornography.” [HOUSTON, P., 1987, p. 20]

Sturman, son of Jewish Russian immigrants, depicted himself as a free speech crusader and evaded the law for most of his life. (Omnipresent Alan Dershowitz once defended his deeds, declaring that “the worst thing [Sturman] did was to turn feminists into censors.” [JOHNSON, J., 1995, p. B1]) The “Godfather of Porn” was finally sent to prison in 1992 for income tax evasion and interstate transportation of films that depicted “humans eating excrement, women having sex with horses, pigs, chickens and other animals, and acts of sadomasochism.” [LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, 10-29-97, p. B1] Ralph Levine, a former Sturman partner in a Las Vegas porno bookshop called Talk of the Town, (described by one newspaper as “a gaudy smut emporium on the eastern fringes of downtown Las Vegas”) [LAVELLE, P., 1991, p. B1] became a key government witness against him. Another Jewish co-defendant in the case, Stanley Loeb, “pleaded guilty to interstate transportation of obscene materials.” [LAVELLE, P., p. B1] Sturman was convicted in 1992 but escaped from a minimal security prison in the California desert that same year, was captured, and later convicted of further charges, including extortion. Another Jewish associate, Herbert Fineberg, was also convicted for the attempted murder of another porn shop owner. [FORD, p. 121-132] Another member of the porno chain, Allan Goelman, was convicted of income tax evasion of $270,000 in personal profits as head of Sturman’s “U.S. retail operations.” [HOUSTON, P., 1987, p. 20]

“I was a businessman,” said Sturman once imprisoned, blandly explaining his activities, “I didn’t see [pornography] as good. I didn’t see it as bad. It was a product to be sold.” [JOHNSON, J., 1995, p. B1]

More recently, in 1999 the Los Angeles Times called 26-year old Seth Warshavsky the “Bill Gates of Smut” and “the most infamous pornographer of the Internet Age.” [EHRMAN, M., 6-13-99, p. 26] He founded and heads Internet Entertainment Group (partner: Mark Cohn; Director of Sales and Marketing: Jonathan Silverman). Divisions include Club Love, Manhole, Sex Fantasy, Girls Girls Girls, and many others. “Depending on who’s talking about him,” noted the Seattle Weekly,
“[Warshavsky’s] either a genius, a misogynist, a respected global businessman, an exploiter of children, the Bill Gates of Porn, or the Larry Flynt of Cyberspace.” [ANDERSON, R., 2-11-99, p. 22]

The Seattle-based Warshavsky started out at age 17 with a phone sex business. By 1999 IEG had grossed $75 million in its first three years. Warshavsky had to park his Jaguar after his driving license was taken away – over 20 moving violations in five years. Warshavsky has been accused of choking a girlfriend in a limousine, “stalking” her, and threatening her former boyfriend. [ANDERSON, R., 2-11-99, p. 22]

In 1999 IEG garnered Catholic outrage and a subsequent lawsuit from the Archdiocese of St. Louis. “IEG recently linked its sites to others that carries news of Pope John Paul II’s visit a couple of weeks ago to St. Louis,” noted the Seattle Weekly, “To make sure Catholics were properly horrified, IEG included an account of papal sex scandals and dirty religious jokes.” [Anderson, R., 2-11-99, p. 22] The Archdiocese won a court injunction against IEG’s use of the term “papal visit” as a name for one of its websites, a strategy intended to lure the religious to porno that also defamed and ridiculed the Catholic faith. “This was an absurd ruling,” declared Warshavsky about the court’s decision, “This is a prime example of how the Church has been able to use the legal system to suppress free speech.” [SALTER, J., 1-21-99] (Similarly, in 2001, computer hackers commandeered the militant Muslim Palestinian group Hamas’s web site. Visitors to the Hamas home page were subjected to hard-core pornography images that could not be quickly clicked away. Outraged Hamas officials blamed Israelis for the violation.) [FREE REPUBLIC/REUTERS, 3-26-01]

In August 2000, NBC’s online news site featured an article entitled “The Sultans of Smut.” The aforementioned Seth Warshawsky and Jonathan Silverstein (by now president of Cybererotica, whose founder and chief is Ron Levi) made a list of ten of “the influential players in the business [pornography] that built the Internet.” Another “player” was Bill Asher, “president of Vivid Entertainment Group, the “world’s leading producer of adult films and videos.” VEG was founded by Steven Hirsch and David James. VEG also owns Hot Network, “considered the largest hardcore adult television network in the country.” [BLANKSTEIN, A., 7-1-2000, p. C1] Other Jewish surnames on the list of ten “Sultans” included (Danni) Ashe, who founded “one of the best known adult sites on the web,” (Eric) Langen, and (David) Marshlack whose company gained fame by charging a fee for computer users to ask O.J. Simpson a question on the Internet, and setting up cameras that followed a group of co-eds at all moments throughout their private lives (“Voyeur Dorm”). [BRUNKER, M., 10-9-2000]

If Mark Kreloff of Colorado-based New Frontier Media is Jewish too (his Executive Vice President, in any case, is Michael Weiner) [ACCOLA, J., 5-21-2000, p. 1G] as many as seven of the NBC’s ten star Internet pornographers may be Jewish. (Mark Bruder, president of Santa Monica, California-based Cable Entertainment Distributors is also a porn supplier to New Frontier Media.) [ACCOLA, J. 5-21-2000, p. 1G] Per the 2.5% Jewish percentage of the Ameri-
can population, all things being equal, 7 of 225, not 7 of 10, prominent pornographers should be expected to be Jewish.

Another young Jewish Internet pornography mogul is Great Britain’s Benjamin Cohen, the 18-year old founder of JewishNet (sold for 300,000 pounds) and CEO of cyberbritain (“its subsidiaries include the pornography portal, huntforporn.co.uk, and the adult search engine, dotadults.com.”) [LEVITT, L., 1-19-01, p. 9] dotadults.com was “the UK’s first adult search engine.” Cyberbritain Executive Directors include the Jewish enclave of Gerry Defries, Benjamin Cohen, Alex Defries and Daniel Ickowitz-Seidler. Non-Executive Directors include Gary Sterns (CEO of London Jewish News Ltd), Steve Masters, David Green, and Richard Cohen. [M2 PRESSWIRE, 1-2-01]

Still another major Internet pornographic Cohen – not to be confused with Benjamin – is Stephen. This second Cohen was successfully sued for stealing the Internet URL “sex.com” from a man named Gary Kremen. Kremen had never envisioned the domain name to be a pornographic home. Cohen, after forging papers to seize the site, and developing an elaborate take over scheme, built sex.com into the premiere Internet smut base, grossing $100 million a year. As the online journal “wired.com” notes about Cohen’s history and character:

“Cohen was convicted in 1991 for posing as a lawyer in a bankruptcy court in a scheme to bilk an elderly woman’s creditors out of $200,000. According to court records, Cohen assumed the identity of several attorneys, forged phony deeds and cashiers checks, and attempted to hide the woman’s assets … Cohen was sentenced to 46 months. It was his second conviction. In 1975, he was found guilty of grand theft and check kiting … Within eight months of his prison release, Cohen controlled [by fraud] the Sex.com domain name …

By the late ‘80s, Cohen had set up a real-world meeting place for French Connection swingers at a home in Orange County, California. Hundreds of couples met at ‘The Club’ on Friday and Saturday nights to swap partners. After neighbors complained, police arrested Cohen in 1990 on charges of operating a sex club in a residential zone … In January 1996, [Cohen’s group] unveiled its bid to buy a Nevada brothel called Sheri’s Ranch and transform it into a $100 million ‘adult fantasy resort.’ Named Wanaleiya, the Polynesian-themed resort would feature 500 exotic women who ‘would not hesitate to see to your comfort and pleasure.’” [BICKNELL, C., 4-13-99]

Then there is Steve Hirsch, who owns Vivid Video. “Of all its achievements,” notes Los Angeles magazine,

“Vivid is most famous for refurbishing the appearance of the video box, wrapping it in the glossy-art look of a fashion advertisement that masks its raunchy contents. Single, Ferrari-driving Hirsch, who has built up the biggest-selling adult-film business in the Valley based on the idea of the old Hollywood studio system, seems equally ‘packaged.’ Talking to him is like interacting with a TelePrompter—his well-rehearsed CEO lines (“It is important for us to make quality product, work with the best models, get our message out”) seem scripted by
drones in next room. ‘He’s very intelligent,’ says every competitor of Hirsch’s, yet after asking him for his thoughts, you can’t help wondering what Hirsch is really thinking. Unlike [non-Jewish pornographer Russ] Hampshire, Hirsch did not start out in fast food. In the late ’70s, his father quit a job as a stockbroker to create one of the first X-rated video-distribution companies in the [San Fernando] Valley [today, the premiere pornography production center on earth]. Hirsch worked in his dad’s warehouse after high school and founded Vivid with a partner in 1984. He was 23 years old. Today, Hirsch’s father works in Vivid’s sales division, his sister Marci heads production, and Hirsch—who is known for aggressively entering and dominating new markets–sits poised to conquer the new DVD technology that could eventually replace the video format, as well as mainstream the adult-film industry once and for all.” [GARDETTA, D., 12-98]

Then there is Steven Orenstein, head of a major porno production firm called Wicked, like many, based in Los Angeles’ San Fernando Valley (the premiere pornography production zone on the planet):

“Like [fellow Jewish pornographer Steve] Hirsch, Orenstein was introduced to the business by a parent. In his case, it was his mother, a bookkeeper, who took a job in accounting at an adult-magazine business and then later helped her son secure work at the same company. (Today, she does the books at Wicked.) Also like Hirsch, Orenstein came up through the industry, working a series of jobs until he struck out on his own, forming Wicked in 1993.” [GARDETTA, D., 12-98]

And we dare not omit Susan Block from the long list of Jewish sex entrepreneurs. Block, a self-described “sex expert,” has an online porno site where she revels in a furious sex hustling and narcissism, herself modeling scanty outfits and apparently living out her porno portrait fantasies (caption to one photo: “Here Dr. Block is in her ‘Cyberstars’ push-up bra, thong panties and sheer robe ensemble”). And here, at this Internet version of her Dr. Susan Block Institute for the Erotic Arts and Sciences, Block lists media commentary that describes her as “America’s hottest sex therapist,” an “X-rated alternative to Leno, Letterman, and Nightline” (she has a cable TV show), and “a happily-married, religiously aware Jewish woman.” [http://www.drsusanblock.com]

In 1998, reporter Carol Lloyd described the public opening of Ms. Block’s “Sex Institute”:

“There must be an explanation for the scene taking place just five feet away. A blond, large-breasted woman and a massive black man are fornicating with methodical, casual self-consciousness, like two bodybuilders pumping iron after an injury. He is on top, banging away unhurriedly, holding himself away from her with two knuckled fists planted on either side of her hips. She doesn’t touch him but fidgets with a silver vibrator while preening at the small live audience and the roving, carnivorous camera. The peanut gallery continues with its kibitzing, trying to make sense of how such an explicitly sexual spectacle – the climax
to an evening of broken taboos – can be so deeply, utterly unsexy. The event seemed too good to pass up. Dr. Susan Block, a sex celebrity who is, among other items on a groaning résumé, an advice columnist, a maker of videos bearing such titles as ‘The Fine Art of Fellatio,’ the author of ‘The 10 Commandments of Pleasure,’ the holder of a doctorate in philosophy, a radio and cable access talk-show host and the cleavage-friendly poster child for all things sex-enlightening and self-promoting, was throwing a Valentine’s Day party to celebrate the opening of her new sexual institute, located in an old 1920s speakeasy in the heart of downtown L.A.’s art, fashion, financial and convention district … Max, Susan Block’s self-declared publicist, footman, butler, husband and sex slave, offers to show me the art … ‘We’ve got everything,’ he says proudly, then segues into interview mode. ‘I’m the most prosecuted publisher in America. I’ve been prosecuted 20 times and I’ve spent 18 months in jail.’ He ticks off the charges on his fingers. ‘Industrial espionage, rack ordinances (I put the first pair of tits on the streets of L.A.), conspiracy to publish.’” [LLOYD, C., 2-18-98]

Yet another Jewish pornography entrepreneur of considerable notoriety, David Friedman, owned the Pussycat Theatre adult film movie house chain; in California alone there were 47 of them. [FORD, p. 26] Friedman was also a pioneer in the production of “soft-core” porn. Called the “Sultan of Sleaze” and “America’s Most Notorious Carpetbagger of Cinemadom,” between 1958 and 1984 he made 58 full-length films including the likes of Blood Feast, Ten Thousand Maniacs, and Scum of the Earth. [FRIEDMAN, D., p. 8, 10] Scum of the Earth, notes Friedman, was “about a gang of pornographers … who lure young college girls into posing for ‘feethyl pictures.’” [FRIEDMAN, D., p. 325] “Herschell [Lewis] and I,” says Friedman, “had a reputation in the burgeoning exploitation film business of the early sixties. It was widely known and agreed upon that Friedman-Lewis Productions could generate more films per dollar than any other source.” [FRIEDMAN, D., p. 325] (Other associates in his genre of film world included Howard Golden, S. S. Millard, Louis Sonnery, and Irwin Joseph. Sam Katzman also had production companies for quickly created movies, 4 Leaf and Victory. So did Maurice Conn of Ambassador-Conn.)

The following is what Mikita Brottman notes (complete with psychoanalytic analysis in her scholarly volume Offensive Films: Towards an Anthropology of Cinema Vomitif) about Herschell Lewis’ contribution to film. He is responsible for the introduction to popular culture of the grotesque gore movie:

“Made for a mere $24,000 in 1963, Herschell Gordon Lewis’ infamous Blood Feast is regarded – when it is regarded at all – as the absolute nadir of exploitation cinema. Original publicity posters, declaring the film ‘more grisly than ever, in blood color,’ promised its audience they would ‘Recoil and Shudder’ when witnessing ‘the Slaughter and Mutilation of Nubile Young Girls – in a weird and horrendous Ancient Rite! … Even Herschell Gordon Lewis has talked about the limitations of the actors’ abilities and the fact that the script stresses gore at the expense of
plausibility and coherence there is something to be said for the film’s transgression of classical cinema’s barriers and limitations … The film opens with an attack on a young girl in the bath. Ramses [the villain] pokes out her eye with a sword, then hacks off her legs and wraps them in newspaper. His second victim, Marcie (Ashlyn Maretin, Playboy Playmate of April 1964), is making love to her boyfriend on the beach when she is attacked and murdered; her brain is removed, still quivering. A third girl (Astrid Olsen) is stalked to a motel where Ramses pulls her tongue out of her mouth with his bare hands … At the time of its first release, Blood Feast was reviewed extensively in Time, Newsweek and Variety, to almost universal distaste. Ever since, it has attained the status of a cult classic as ‘the infamous first gore film’ and ‘the original splatter film’ … As for the less respectable face of horror – the slasher movie – the narrative foundation for this highly ritualized and formulaic tale are laid bare for the first time in 1963, in the story of Fuad Ramses and his Blood Feast … [which] stands as the ur-test for a long tradition of slasher and stalker film. To pick up once again on the psychoanalytic metaphor, Blood Feast is the ‘primal scene’ of the slasher film genre … Put in its simplest narrative terms, Blood Feast is the story of a blood-thirsty fiend, who sets about killing and mutilating a series of sexually attractive, pubescent females one-by-one until only a single girl in the chain remains alive.” [BROTTMAN, M., 1997, p. 79-80]

And what of the personal ethical life of Mr. Lewis? He was “an ex-college professor with a Ph.D in English and the self-styled ‘Wizard of Gore,’ [who] lost most of his capital in the courts when he was arrested for his part in a fraudulent car rental agency, along with a series of other mail fraud convictions, including a fake abortion referral agency and a phony gas-saving device. The arrest brought his filmmaking career to an abrupt end.” [BROTTMAN, M., 1997, p. 180]

More recently, Zalman King, “the soft-core impresario,” has produced, among other films, Female Perversions (directed by Susan Streitfield) and Strip-tease (directed by Andrew Bergman). [MILLAX, J., 5-23-97, p. 5] He also created the “popular erotic drama series, ‘The Red Shoe Diaries,’ for Showtime cable television. “I don’t consider this soft porn,” he told a reporter, “I would just call it erotic filmmaking.” [MENDOZA, N., 6-27-93, p. 75]

In the “B” movie genre, among the best known is Roger Corman, whose father was Jewish. Film critic Roger Ebert also notes three more Jews of prominence:

“AIP’s [American International Pictures] Samuel Arkoff and James Nicholson and the early Joe Levine are the major 1960s figures in the exploitation field, but by the end of the decade … [there was also] Joe Solomon.” [EBERT, p. 137]

Solomon’s works include Hell’s Angels on Wheels. His “top director” was also Jewish – Bruce Kessler. [EBERT, p. 138] Legendary Hollywood hustler Joseph E. Levine? He, says Steven Aronson,

The creator of *Fritz the Cat*, “the world’s first X-rated cartoon?” [DIAMOND, J., 7-6-92] Also Jewish: Ralph Bakshi, born in Palestine before it became Israel. And as Jewish commentator Barbara Amiel notes about filmmaker David Cronenberg:

“[His] new film *Crash* has hit London like an unexploded bomb … The story of a group of young people who get their kicks out of watching stunt men re-enacting car crashes or videos of famous car accidents (*Jayne Mansfield, James Dean*) has horrified the public … Britain is in the middle of a wave of self-righteous Puritanism and the notion that car crashes could sexually excite people is something ‘beyond depravity.’” [AMIEL, B., 11-16-96, p. B6]

Then there is British filmmaker Mike Leigh (changed from Lieberman), “dubbed Europe’s best filmmaker by an American distributor.” Leigh, who has “12 full-length films to his name, together with dozens of theatre and television plays, plus lucrative television commercials for McDonalds,” is

“the master of the grungy, the squalid, the sexually menacing and the sexually dissolute … Young Mike himself joined a Jewish youth movement, went to Israel and worked on a kibbutz … Leigh presents his audience with lavatories, excrement and urine, farting, vomiting, abortions, nudity, graffiti-infested lifts, cannibalism, and, in his play *Babies Grow Old* … your actual kitchen sink.” [KAUFMAN, G., 2-11 96]

In 1988 prominent Italian film director Franco Zeffirelli made Jewish news for allegedly calling the Jewish producers of the film *The Last Temptation of Christ* (the film, directed by a non-Jew, Martin Scorsese, attracted widespread condemnation from conservative Christian groups) “Jewish cultural scum in Los Angeles.” Zeffirelli later denied those exact words, but still attacked the film’s producer, Lew Wasserman, Chairman of *MCA*, as “a merchant on the lookout for dollars, and not, certainly, of quality films that respect precise universalist values … I ask Lew Wasserman, with irony: What would he say if one day an Italian decided to make a film about Abraham sodomizing Isaac?” [GRUBER, p. 7]

Hollywood-based Christian activists Tim Penland and Larry Poland were hired by the Jewish head of *Universal*, Tom Pollock, (Universal was MCA’s subsidiary that released the movie) and they later co-authored a book about the company’s exploitation of them. Hired (without seeing the completed film) to mollify Christian lobbyist groups that were uncomfortable with *The Last Temptation*, Penland and Poland felt deceived and manipulated by Universal and soon joined the protest against the film. Careful not to enflame anti-Jewish sentiment, Poland nonetheless notes that “My observation is that the higher you go in the power structure of film and television, the more Jewish the industry becomes. If you don’t believe me, checkout the corporate directors of the ten biggest movie studios sometime.” [POLAND, L., 1988, p. 141]
The Jewish community, in so many ways influential in defining public morality (through activism in enforcing a separation between “church and state,” dominance in the upper echelons of the mass media, pre-eminence in pornography, as well as mainstream publishing, modern art, etc., as we will soon see) were the subject of a national survey in 2000. According to the *Jews and the Public Square Project*, researchers discovered the following percentages of support of those surveyed for the following assertions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Jews</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Jewish “leaders”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality is Wrong:</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support “abortion rights?”</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the displaying of the <em>Ten Commandments</em> in public schools?</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Jews take a less critical view,” noted the surveys’ researchers, “of homosexuality, abortion, birth control and pornography than do Gentiles.” [PAULSON, M., 7-15-2000, p. B2] (Not surprisingly, the producers of herisque, “push the boundaries” gay sitcom for Showtime in 2000 were Daniel Lipman and Ron Cowen). According to another (1994) survey by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, Jews are also the most sexually promiscuous ethnic group in America. According to their responses, 34% of American Jews have had sex with more than 11 partners by age 18! [HALBERSTAM, p. 141] (As non-Jewish journalist Ross Wetzsteon notes: “I’ve always been attracted to Jewish women – in fact, every long relationship I’ve ever had, including my marriage, was with a Jewish woman … With WASPs, the code seemed unbreakable – first date kiss at the door, second date clumsy feel in the car, etc. etc., so you sensed your sexuality was rigidly sculpted; with Jews, on the other hand, it wasn’t a matter of ‘an easy lay’ – it was the feeling that whatever was going to happen sexually between you would happen, clumsily, perhaps, but at least spontaneously.”) [WETZSTEON, R. SEPT 6-10, 1998]

**Chaim Bermant** explains traditional Jewish views about sex like this:

“One could also discern in some of the anti-Jewish agitation [in early 20th century Christian Europe] more than a passing undertone of sexual jealousy. The Jew, as we have seen, was thought to be in league with the devil and prone to every variety of dark practice, and what could be darker or more devilish than sex? (The Jew, in ancient times at least, also had an extravagant idea of the sexual tastes and aptitudes of the gentile: The Talmud, for example, decreed that one shouldn’t stable one’s ass with a non-Jew in case it should be buggered). That the Jew had and has a robust sexual appetite is well attested from even the most cursory readings of the Bible, the Talmud, and more recent, if less sacred, texts. ‘Be fruitful and multiply’ is the first commandment in the Torah and what was traditionally regarded amongst Christians as a sordid if necessary act was raised by the Rabbis to the level of a holy sacrament. But as the Rabbis themselves were to lament, it was carried to unholy lengths.” [BERMAN, C., 1977, p. 29]
A survey of Jewish Americans in 1989 also noted that “nearly one in five respondents” elicited “skeptical responses” about the existence of God, while “in the general American population, over nine out of ten affirm a belief in God.” [WERTHEIMER, J., 1993, p. 63]

The results of an earlier 1980s study about the mores of the entertainment television elite, the molders of popular culture, was published by three Jewish researchers in 1983. 104 prominent members of the Hollywood television world were formally interviewed, randomly selected from a list by Hollywood “insiders” of “key” people in the business, i.e., “Hollywood’s most influential television writers, producers and executives.” 93% of those interviewed were found to have had a “religious upbringing.” Of these, 59% were raised “in the Jewish faith.” (7% of the total survey were not raised in a religious milieu. In the context of Jewish pre-eminence in communist movements in the early and mid-20th century, [see discussions earlier] it is safe to assume that a very high percentage of these religiously unaffiliated were also Jewish). [LICHTER/LICHTER/ROTHMAN, 1983, p. 54-61]

75%, of the Hollywood elite categorized themselves to be to the left of center politically; only 14% to the right. 97% agreed with a statement that women “have a right to abortion,” and only 20% agreed that “homosexuality is wrong.” 51% disagreed with the statement that “adultery is wrong.” Only 17% of the Hollywood elite “strongly agreed that extramarital affairs are wrong.” 70% disagreed with the statement that “There is too much sex on television.” 72% disagreed with the statement that “TV is too critical of traditional values.”

Meanwhile, at the same time, in a 1982 nationwide poll, only 27% of the American public called themselves “liberal,” 32% classified themselves as “conservative.” As the three Jewish researchers noted,

“The television elite’s social liberalism is also evidenced by their views on sex and morality … On such issues as abortion, homosexual rights, and extramarital sex, their views diverge sharply from traditional values … Television creators emerge as upholders of the ‘new liberalism’ that surfaced among upper status cosmopolitan groups in the 1960s.” [LICHTER/LICHTER/ROTHMAN, 1983, p. 54-61]

Rothman and Lichter noted Jewish influence in shaping popular culture, against the grain of dominant mores:

“Within the intellectual and artistic communities, Jews were also far to the left of their non-Jewish colleagues in the 1930s and 1950s, and far more active in supporting communist or ‘progressive’ causes. As Jews moved into the professions, government service, the media, and academia, they served as a radical leaven for these groups and for the ever larger number of Americans coming into contact with them.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 331]

Jews have also been prominent in Hollywood as communist activists, a tradition decidedly against American popular opinion. As Neal Gabler noted in 1988:
“One leading communist estimated that 50 per cent of the party’s members were Jews during its heyday in the thirties and forties, and a large minority – and sometimes a majority – of the party leadership was Jewish. What was true of the national party was even truer in Hollywood, where Jews already formed a large part of the left-leaning artistic community.” [Ring Lardner, Jr., for example, himself a CP member, estimated that two-thirds of the communists in Los Angeles were Jewish] [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 331]

Dore Schary, prominent Hollywood mogul and national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League from 1963-69, was among those with FBI files as a “strong communist sympathizer.” As Laird Wilcox notes:

“John Sanford, a Communist Party member and Hollywood writer who taught with Schary at the Progressive Educational Center in Hollywood, CA, sees Schary as somewhat less principled. When Sanford’s wife, Maggie, refused to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Schary went after her: ‘Mention a few names. What does it hurt? Mention the names of people who’ve been named already.’ Sanford observed that Schary was ‘one of the biggest pricks in the business.”’ [WILCOX, L., 199, p.. 63]

As Milton Plesur notes about the Senator Joe McCarthy communist “witchhunt” era:

“In 1952, before the Senate censured McCarthy, a Gallup Poll demonstrated that 56 percent of Catholics and 45 percent of Protestants approved of McCarthy and his tactics, but that 98 percent of the Jews considered him a menace to the country.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 135]

Noting the predominance of a “small” group of Jews in the corrosion of America’s traditional moral order and American Jewish “leadership” in this role, in 1999 politically conservative Rabbi Daniel Lapin lamented that “decent, ordinary Americans are forced to begin to question whether Jews are bad for this country. I realize how inflammatory this statement is… I do know that I am not alone in this concern…” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 41] The spokesmen for groups like the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Veterans of America and Lesbian Task Force are all too often Jewish. Many of the member organizations of the Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice are Jewish. The membership of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), a champion of ultra-liberal causes, is disproportionately high in Jews. The ACLU’s leadership is almost reminiscent of a temple board meeting…” [LAPIN, D., p. 279]… So many of the enthusiasts for the radical homosexual agenda, increased immorality, and expanded abortion rights are Jewish.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 293]

In 1999, the Gay Financial Network announced its list of the “most influential Gay and Lesbian Corporate Executives.” At least four of the top six ranked were Jewish, and they were all influential media moguls:

1) Kathy Levinson, president and COO of E*Trade
2) David Geffen, the CEO of Dreamworks
3) Barry Diller, the CEO of USA Networks
5) Hilary Rosen, president and CEO of the Recording Industry Association of America

(Lower on the list was Stephen Friedman [vice-president of public affairs for MTV]; Seth Radwell, CEO of Doubleday Interactive; David Kuhn, senior VP and editorial director of Brill Media, and Steve Fuchs, president of Hampton Industries) [BAIM, T., 12-9-99]

In 2001, Publisher’s Weekly reviewed William Mann’s Behind the Screen: How Gays and Lesbians Shaped Hollywood, 1910-1968, saying:

“Mann also covers a wide range of ancillary topics, e.g., the history and aesthetics of set design; the rise of Los Angeles’s ‘pansy clubs,’ and the special role of Jews (who were more likely than gentiles to be open about their sexuality).” [PUBLISHERS WEEKLY/amazon.com, 2001]

Chairman and CEO of Canada’s first and only (2002) gay television network, PrideVision? John Levy, formerly President and CEO of Cableworks, “one of the first cable systems in Canada to launch high-speed internet access over cable.” Levy also heads The Score, a TV sports network, and “he is the majority shareholder in Headline Media Group, Inc., the company that owns PrideVision TV.” [http://pridevisiontv.com/aboutPV/decision.htm]

Reviewing a recent biography about Jewish homosexual Hollywood mogul David Geffen, journalist Taki lashed out at the huge influence on public morals exerted by the largely Jewish “Velvet Mafia,”:

“I’m not surprised to read that Hollywood is dominated by a Velvet Mafia of rich homosexuals who demand sexual favors in return for work in the movies. In fact I would have been surprised if it were the other way around. Those old Mittel-Europa Jews who ran Tinseltown in its heyday established the casting-couch practice long ago; but, as they say, at least they did it with style and with the opposite sex. The Operator: David Geffen Builds, Buys, and Sells the New Hollywood is the title of an upcoming book by Tom King, a respected Wall Street Journal reporter who it seems has hit pay dirt – and it’s dirt, all right – with his expose of the unspeakable Geffen. Geffen invited King to write a book about his amazing rise to the top, and allegedly named dozens of former boyfriends, many of them now famous stars. Indiscretion aside, Geffen is a lowlife sans pareil… But what bothers me is not the bestiality and arrogance of the Velvet Mafiosi. It is the message they send out through their movies… Geffen, of course, denies there is such a thing as a homosexual cabal, and, typically, charges anti-Semitism. According to King’s book, [Jewish] friends like Barry Diller, Sandy Gallin and Calvin Klein, among many others, keep a low profile but apparently indulge in the sexual bacchanals that go with the territory. Alleged weekend-long orgies fueled by drugs at which Geffen and his powerful buddies run a ‘meat market’ selecting young men for sex are apparently described in detail in King’s opus… Hollywood has never been a moral place, far from it, but until the 1960s and 70s it preached a hell of a moral lesson. God, the family, patriotism, even Mom were sacrosanct. Now it’s the exact oppo-
site. Criminals are sympathetically portrayed, cops always negatively; people who think same-gender sex is wrong are fascists.” [TAKE, v.13, no. 10]

In Russia, Olga Zhuk (“I’m Jewish and I’m a dyke”) has led the recent Soviet out-of-the-closet homosexual movement. As London’s The Guardian noted in 1992:

“Olga Zhuk can claim the dubious distinction of being the only woman in the Soviet Union ever to have been charged under Article 121 of the Penal Code - the law that criminalises sodomy between men. It happened in November 1990, after Zhuk and a handful of other lesbians and gay men from Leningrad took a very deep breath and attempted to register Russia’s first ever lesbian and gay organisation - the Tchaikovsky Foundation - with the city authorities... As president and perceived ‘ringleader’ behind the Tchaikovsky Foundation, Zhuk was publicly denounced in the Lensoviet and charged with sodomy. But the case never came to court, the charges dropped after radical lawyers succeeded in convincing the chief prosecutor that lesbians were biologically incapable of sodomizing each other.” [MCKENNA, N., 3-31-92, p. 21]

Moving along in the religious sphere, in 1999, the aforementioned Rabbi Daniel Lapin, representing a very rare Jewish perspective, addressed the systematic defamation of the Christian community by major Jewish organizations, declaring that

“I am appalled by the great injustice being perpetrated by those Jewish organizations [the Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Congress, World Jewish Congress, etc.] that engage in anti-Christian bigotry. Although many of them were founded explicitly to fight bigotry, and for many years did just that, today the shrill rhetoric and hate-filled propaganda found in their direct mail is discriminatory and divisive. The very same Jewish organizations would be the loudest protesters were anything remotely similar being said by non-Jews about Jews.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 2]

As Yechei Eckstein, also a rabbi, further noted in 1997:

“Hollywood’s impact on our popular culture is profound and undeniable... More often than not, filmmakers seem to go out of their way to depict people of faith in the worst possible light. And while Jews and Judaism are, by and large, portrayed favorably and reverently, Christians, particularly Evangelical Protestants and devout Catholics, do not fare so well. One is left with the distinct impression that Hollywood has a very real and pervasive anti-Christian bias. How else do we explain the fact that Christian clergy – when they are portrayed at all – are usually shown engaging in morally reprehensible behavior? Or the fact that Christian symbols are associated with characters who prey upon society? Or that the crimes of various antagonists are shown to be religiously motivated? In Primal Fear, for example, the local archbishop is murdered by one of the waifs he exploited in his self-made porn films. The lead charac-
ter in Priest is shown in a homosexual tryst with a The sadistic nurse in Misery wears a cross; the rapist in Eye for an Eye sports one as well. A killer played by Harry Connick Jr. in Copycat repeatedly invokes the names of Jesus. Christian beliefs and symbols are often belittled by Hollywood producers and writers. The cherished symbols of faith are put to blasphemous uses. Indeed, if there is a Christian character in a film, he is usually depicted as a fool, a liar, a cheater, a diabolical murderer or a crazy person… Could Hollywood producers ridicule and malign Christians with impunity if the Christian community organized its own equivalent of the Anti-Defamation League?" [ECKSTEIN, Y. 2-14-97, p. 4] (Executive Producer of Primal Fear? Also Jewish. Howard Koch, Jr.).


Mainstream Hollywood’s drastically different portrayals of Christianity and Judaism today is noted by Jewish film critic Michael Medved:

“I can’t think of any film that has portrayed the Chasidic community [of Satmar, Bobov, and other ‘fraud and corruption’ fame we have met earlier] that portrayal has been anything but affectionate… If you compare the treatment of the Jewish religion to the way Catholics and Protestants are shown… well, Jews are not treated as savagely… The only place where religion is treated reverentially is where it’s considered exotic, and that is the case with the hasids.” [EIKIN, p. 29]

“One strain of Judaism,” concur Jonathan and Judith Pearl, “has been most prominent and visible [on television]… The appeal of Hasidic Judaism to television undoubtedly lies in its exoticism.” [PEARL/PEARL p. 94]

This loving treatment of Jewish Orthodoxy (“Fiddler on the Roof,” et al) is evident in modern Jewish fiction as well. “Orthodox Jewish characters and settings,” noted Paula Hyman and Deborah Moore in 1997, “now enjoy an unprecedented and variegated focus in new American Jewish fiction… The fascination with Orthodox settings extended to the mystery novels and to popular fiction as well.” [HYMAN, p. 422] “In the fall of 1985,” noted Edward Sha-
piro, “the New York magazine even published a lengthy three-part essay titled ‘Holy Days,’ which described in favorable terms a Hassidic sect in Brooklyn.” [SHAPIRO, Jewish, p. 167] “Orthodoxy,” noted Jack Wertheimer in 1993, “has been the beneficiary of much media coverage and has learned to exploit such coverage. Unlike earlier coverage of some Hasidic sects in the general American press, which focused on their exoticism, more recent reports have emphasized the warm communal spirit and decent values promoted by the Orthodox world.” [WERTHEIMER, J., 1993, p. 122] [See chapter 2, p. 11, for an analysis of the spirit and values of this Orthodox world]

Robert Avrech is believed to have become Hollywood’s “first Orthodox screenwriter” in the late 1970s. By 1999, noted the Baltimore Jewish Times, “more than 30 Orthodox writers now work in the industry, particularly in television.” (David Sacks, for example, also an Orthodox Jew, is also the Executive Producer of the TV series 3rd Rock From the Sun, Michael Glouberman is the co-Executive Producer of Fox’s Malcolm in the Middle, and Etan Cohen has even written scripts for the risque MTV cartoon series Beavis and Butt-head.) [UMANSKY, El, 2-18-2000, p. 21] Real Hasidim often appear in Robert Avrech’s movies. “Although movies are taboo in the Haredi community,” noted the Times, “large Chasidic families appeared [in Avrech’s last film] as extras for the $200 per day, per person fee. [The families] promised each other they would keep their secret.” An earlier Avrech film was Body Double, which he described as “extremely wild, sexy, very violent – a cult classic.” [HIRSCH, R. 6-4-99, p. 18]

Even influential horror movies exploring a powerful Satan in a Christian context (particularly, Rosemary’s Baby [1968; directed by Roman Polanski, novel by Ira Levin], where the Devil inseminates the lead character, and William Freidkin’s The Exorcist (1974), where the lead character, possessed by the devil, stabs herself in the crotch with a crucifix) were Jewish creations. The National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures condemned Rosemary’s Baby, noting “the perverted use which the film made of fundamental Christian beliefs, especially surrounding the birth of Christ, and its mockery of religious persons and practices.” [LEAMING, 1981, p. 88]

Defamation of, and attack upon, the Christian world view is evidenced throughout the Jewish entertainment community. Gordon Davidson, also Jewish, has been the first and only artistic director (for 33 years) of the Center Theatre Group at the Mark Taper Forum in Los Angeles. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency notes Davidson’s very first directorial effort:

“For the inaugural drama of the new theatrical venture, the young Davidson decided to stage, and direct himself, ‘The Devils,’ John Whitting’s tale of a libertine priest, a nun and their sexual fantasies. The Los Angeles Catholic Archdiocese and Davidson’s bosses at the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors were suitably outraged.” [TUGEND, T., 3-6-2000, p. 11]

(This quote, by the way, is from an article about Davidson by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency entitled “Award-Winning Theatre Director Likens His Role to That of a Rabbi”).
Peter Novick notes a similar story in 1964: a play (The Deputy) about Pope Pius XII and his alleged silence about the Holocaust:

“Almost all Jewish organizations, particularly the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee, were heavily involved in interreligious dialogue, whose agenda was ‘make nice’ and ‘can’t we all just get along?’ The Deputy was definitely not nice, not a contribution to getting along. Catholic spokesmen publicly and privately called on their Jewish dialogue partners to put pressure on the Jewish producer and director to cancel the play, or at least to join them in denouncing it. Implicitly they were saying that if the shoe was on the other foot – if what was at issue was a play sullying the reputation of the world’s most venerated Jewish leader – Jews wouldn’t hesitate to call on them.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 143]

Conversely, Jewish themes in the largely Jewish entertainment world are portrayed in loving and respectful terms. In 1999, for example, rabbi Jonathan Pearl (who holds a PhD in Judaic Studies) and his wife published a volume about Hollywood’s treatment of Jewish themes and characters on television. The Pearls note that

“While Jews have been known for millions as the People of the Book, they could also well have been called, for the past fifty years, the People of Television… Contrary to the commonly held inaccurate belief that serious Jewish issues and truly Jewish characters rarely find their way into popular TV shows, our intense research – over the course of fifteen years and many thousands of hours of viewing shows – has revealed that literally hundreds of television dramas and comedies have featured Jewish themes over the past half century…[PEARL/PEARL, p. 1]… By the end of his twelve years on television, Archie Bunker, America’s best-known bigot, had come to raise a Jewish child in his home, befriend a black Jew, go into business with a Jewish patron, enroll as a member of Temple Beth Shalom, eulogize his close friend at a Jewish funeral, hosted a Sabbath dinner, participate in a bar mitzvah ceremony, and join a group to fight synagogue vandalism… [This show] was far from unusual. Since the inception of network television half a century ago, hundreds of popular TV shows have portrayed Jewish themes… In nearly every instance, the Jewish issues have been portrayed with respect, relative depth, affection, and good intentions… [PEARL/PEARL p. 5]… It follows, then, that most American television viewers, especially those who have little personal contact with Jews, gain a large portion of their ideas about Jews and Judaism from the small screen.” [PEARL/PEARL p. 6]

In 1999, an HBO feature-length movie was aired about the life of famous Jewish mobster Meyer Lansky. (Lansky’s murderous associate-gangster, Bugsy Siegel, was immortalized in not one, but three Hollywood feature films about him in 1991 alone: The Marrying Man, Mobsters, and Bugsy). Echoing the times, when Jewish martyrological legend has become history, even this vicious Jewish thug, Lansky, who headed the greatest criminal empire in Ameri-
can history, is portrayed as first and foremost a victim, the innocent butt of horrible Gentile anti-Semitism and ever entwined, and loyal, to the noble Jewish people. As the Jewish Telegraphic Agency notes, “The two opening scenes set the tone. The first shows the seventy-year old Lansky amid the cluttered tombstones of Jerusalem’s Mount of Olives, trying to buy a space for himself next to his grandparents’ graves. In a flashback, the seven-year old Meyer Suchowljansky [Lansky] watches in frozen horror as a pious, old Jew is butchered by Polish peasants during a pogrom in his native Grodno.” Later, the film shows Lansky’s “muscular pal Bugsy [Siegel] defend him from Irish bullies.” [TUGEND, T. 2-22-99] Such material begins, and frames for apologetic context, the mobster’s life of crime.

As explanation for this special treatment, we may look to Lester Friedman who observes that “writers of films featuring Jewish characters have, from the story idea to the final cut, historically faced a gauntlet of highly placed Jewish executives.” [FRIEDMAN, L., p. 3] Or as Jewish film scholar Patricia Erens frames it:

“Despite their small numbers in the United States, Jews have enjoyed an advantage unequalled by any other ethnic group in America – a virtual control over their own self-image on the screen.” [ERENS, P., 1980, p. 114]

As the Jewish Bulletin noted about Jewish executive Jerry Offsay, president of programming at Showtime Networks in 2002,

“Two or three times he has passed on a script that has portrayed Jews negatively. ‘I can’t stop it from being made, but I’m not going to be the person who brings it forth,’ he says. In a simiar vein, he mentions a Showtime film – he doesn’t want the name printed – in which the director was planning to cast an ‘idenifiably Jewish character’ in the patently villainous role. ‘I didn’t want a Jewish guy playing such a virulently hateful character,’ Offsay admits.” [SCHLEIER, C., 5-29-98, p. 34]

Samples of Jewish-themed programs from Offsay include a play “about the way in which a Jewish family copes with the possibility of a gay child being born,” a 1943-era Warsaw uprising story, and ‘Rescuers: Stories of Courage’ “about non-Jews who risked their lives rescuing victims of the Holocaust.” [SCHLEIER, C., 5-29-98, p. 34]

“Jewish theatre and film producers,” noted Jewish author James Jaffe in 1968, “have created the wholly mythological figure of the gentle, inoffensive, philosophical, shoulder-shrugging Jew, ready to give the hero the benefit of his wise warm-hearted advice. [Jewish film critic] Pauline Kael detects him in the kindly old pharmacist in West Side Story, and points out that his chief function is to convince the gentile world how harmless the Jew is.” [JAFFE, J., 1968, p. 62]

During World War II, despite the fact that Jews were a tiny American minority, they were amply represented as soldiers in movies: “There was the all-but-obligatory inclusion of Jews in Hollywood platoon rosters: a Feingold in Bataan, a Weinberg in Air Force, A Diamond in Pride of the Marines, a Jacobs in
Objective! Burma, an Abraham in Action in the North Atlantic, and a Greenbaum in The Purple Heart.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 33]

Hyper-sensitivity to Jewish themes has a long history in Hollywood, particularly since the World War II (Holocaust) era. Even aside from Jewish insider domination in the shaping of movies, Jews have been so protective of their portrayals in the mass media that in 1948 an umbrella group for Jewish American organizations, the National Community Relations Advisory Council, instituted, in collaboration with the major Hollywood studios, the “Motion Picture Project.” “It functioned,” notes Neal Gabler,

“to give each of the major Jewish organizations a piece of Hollywood… [Its activities involved] reviewing scripts, cajoling producers, keeping the big Jewish organizations informed of any movie that might help or hurt the Jews… Some charged that an accusation could be made that a ‘Jewish group was trying to censor the industry,’ which, in fact, was exactly what it was trying to do.” [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 303-304]

But even before this self-censoring organization was created, in 1947, Hollywood carefully policed its depiction of Jews for the public. Frederic Wakeman’s novel The Huckster, for example, (based largely upon the life of MCA mogul Jules Stein) was made into a movie by MGM. Dennis McDougal notes that

“In Wakeman’s novel, the newly respectable Dave Lash [the Stein character] was a poor Jew who clawed his way to the top by playing footsie with the Mob, then made up for it by giving generously to charities that fought anti-Semitism… In the film version, there is no hint that Lash, played by grandfatherly character actor Edward Arnold, is Jewish or that his right-hand man is the conniving, deceitful agent of the novel. The MGM script transformed Lash’s odious [Jewish] chief lieutenant into an eager Irish string bean named Freddie Callahan… The movie gives not hint that Arnold’s character is Jewish or that his early criminal conniving had anything to do with being Jewish.” [MCDOUGAL, 1998, p. 127-128]

In another such case, in 1945, Jewish screenwriter Barney Glazer struggled with Warners Brothers executive Jeff Wald (also Jewish) about a film to made called Rhapsody in Blue. Originally a play written by Jewish playwright Clifford Odets, Glazer formally objected to his superiors that the lead character (Jewish in the original version) was now Italian-American. The plan to delete the Jewishness of the character, noted Glazer, was that Warners wanted to do “a study of young genius; that for the greater part of it our hero must be portrayed as an out-and-out little sonofabitch; that the same color and sympathy can be had from say an Italian-American family portrait.” [BEHLMER, p. 266] Glazer’s complaint was to no avail: the lead character in the film appeared as Italian-American.

In 1994, Newsweek noted another such Hollywood ethnic switching:

“When the play ‘Other People’s Money’ was made into a movie, the character of a Jewish corporate raider who takes over a family business was changed into a generic ‘ethnic’ played by Danny De Vito [of Italian heritage].” [SOLOMON, J., 5-23, 94, p. 50]
One of the comedians in the British group Monty Python, Terry Gilliam, noted what happened to one character in their movie The Life of Brian:

“We cut Otto out...[Monty Python member] Eric was very keen to cut it and I think it was because he was living in Hollywood and worried about offending ‘Jews who run Hollywood’ or because he works in Hollywood and half his friends are Jewish. I don’t know. I thought, ‘This is crazy. We made a film to offend everybody! If we’re going to offend the Christians, come on! We ended up cutting it out...’” [HEARST NEWS MEDIA]

Although Jews played a dominant role in Hollywood (and American) communism, including Soviet espionage [see earlier citations; Hollywood Jewish communist screenwriter Ring Lardner, Jr., estimated, for example, that two-thirds of the Communist Party members in Los Angeles were Jewish] [GABLER, N., 1988, p. 331], Jewish organizations were active in lobbying the largely Jewish film community to keep that depiction off the movie screens. As Peter Novick writes,

“Jewish organizations, throughout the fifties and well into the sixties, worked on a variety of fronts to prevent, or at least limit, the association of Jews with Communism in the public mind. Their principal co-operative venture was the ‘Hollywood Project,’ in which they jointly employed a West Coast representative who lobbied movie producers to avoid any unsympathetic representations of Jews. A good deal of this lobbying dealt with the Jew-Communist issue. The producer of I Married a Communist promised to see that no Communist character had a ‘name that can even remotely be construed as Jewish.’” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 95]

Fearing the spread of anti-Jewish hostility (especially in the context of a Hitler-style fascism), Jewish organizations were also influential in policing Hollywood film content in the 1930s. Rabbi William H. Fineshriber, for example, “who became active in film industry affairs in the early 1930s on behalf of the Reform Central Conference of American Rabbis,” took personal credit for convincing MGM to abandon a proposed film called It Can’t Happen Here. [HERMAN, F., MARCH 2001, p. 66] As Felicia Herman notes about this era:

“Although the ADL [Anti-Defamation League] and AJC [American Jewish Committee] occasionally corresponded on their own with film industry figures, by far the closest relationship between a Jewish organization and the Jews in the film industry existed through the LAJCC [Los Angeles Jewish Community Committee]. Leon Lewis, the former national secretary of the ADL, had created the LAJCC in 1934 as an autonomous, self-appointed umbrella organization of local representatives of all of the major national Jewish organizations as well as local Jewish social and communal leaders. Many of the LAJCC’s members enjoyed personal and professional links to Jews in the film industry, and a week after the LAJCC’s founding, the organization created a Motion Picture Committee comprised of prominent Jewish studio executives like Irving Thalberg, Jack Warner, Joseph Schenck, and Harry Cohn. These men regularly met with Lewis to discuss film issues relevant to the Jewish
A planned film about Hitler, entitled Mad Dog of Europe, was eventually shelved after Jewish concern about Jewish predominance in Hollywood and how such a movie could backlash Jewish interests. “The film’s would-be producers were all Jewish,” says Herman,

“and the film made particular reference to Nazi antisemitism. Upon investigating the project, Jewish leaders concluded that the script was ‘so fanatical’ that ‘there may be a very unhappy kickback from it. They therefore utilized many of the tools at their disposal to prevent the film from being produced. The Jewish efforts to stop Mad Dog of Europe received little public attention, just as Jewish leaders desired: as much as they could, they kept their dealings with the motion picture industry a quiet affair, attempting to stave off the charge that the Jews were ’controlling’ Hollywood.” [HERMAN, F., 2001, p. 69]

The Judeocentric, ardently pro-Israel Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles also plays today a significant role in censoring prospective movies with Jewish themes or characters. As Josh Spector notes:

“Rabbi Abraham Cooper is not your typical Hollywood power broker. But a thumbs down from Cooper and his colleagues at the Simon Wiesenthal Center recently proved enough to convince Paramount Classics to back away from a potential distribution deal with this year’s Sundance grand jury prize winner, The Believer [about a real-life Jew who became a neo-Nazi leader], proving just how influential special interest groups have become in the Hollywood machine… Paramount’s decision to consult the rabbi and his colleagues at the Wiesenthal Center is not unprecedented. The Los Angeles- based organization has been active in the entertainment industry for a number of years, often reviewing scripts and consulting with filmmakers and studios on Jewish-related productions… ‘This is a nightmare,’ [The Believer’s director/writer, Henry Bean, who is Jewish] said, ‘The fear of political correctness is encroaching on every aspect of the artistic process.’” [SPECTOR, J., 2001]

Curiously, even the old Hayes Office, the censorial organization that for decades oversaw Hollywood films, apparently maintained a double standard in its policing of ethnic defamations. As Gerald Gardner notes about the (Jewish) Marx Brothers: “The Marx Brothers seem to have been immune to charges of ethnic humor. The same censors who made Walt Disney change the feigned Jewish accent of the Wolf in The Three Little Pigs, raised no objection to Chico’s improbable Italian accent, his absurd, tight-fitting jacket and pointed hat.” [GARDNER, G., 1987, p. 115]
Apparently Italian-Americans have often served as Jewish-dominated Hollywood’s dumping grounds. Aside from the considerable film/television maligning of Christianity, Islam, Arabs, and other religious and ethnic genres, a 1982 report by the Commission for Social Justice noted that “television is lacking in portrayals of positive Italian American role models.” (Likewise, a 1983 TV commentator complained that “never have so many Blacks appeared on television, yet never has their image been so stereotyped.” [PEARL/PEARL p. 9-10]) In 1999, an Italian-American, Bill Dalcone, wrote an editorial in the Los Angeles Times about the HBO-produced TV program “The Sopranos.” This series, complained Dalcone, “not only revels in negative, cartoonish images of a specific community – Italian Americans – but was congratulated for doing so last week by a flurry of Emmy nominations from the television industry. How can this be?” [DELCERRO, B., 7-26-99, p. F3] Perhaps, one wonders, because both the show’s creator/executive producer, David Chase, and its producer, Todd Kessler, are Jewish, as well as a majority of important figures in the television industry.

In 1980, Daniel Golden noted that:

“The dominant portrayal of Italians in American film is within the gangster genre, a cinematic heritage that stretches from Little Caesar (1931) to its apotheosis in both parts of The Godfather…. Indeed, much early anti-Italianism is merely a continuation of anti-Catholicism.” [GOLDEN, D., 1980, p. 77-78]

Golden, a Jewish author, blames such bias on “WASP America’s obsession and prejudices against ‘foreign influence.”’ [GOLDEN, D., 1980, p. 75]

Hollywood Jewry’s stereotypes of the Irish? As Dennis Clark and William Lynch note:

“For the millions, the revelations and fantasies produced by the motion picture industry during the twentieth century were powerful formative influences… The fact that Jews played such a vital and extensive role in the film industry had both positive and negative effects upon Irish participation… The Irish in the movies often were the Irish as seen by Jews, with the disparity and distortion that always attends one group’s portrayal of another. For example, Jewish families were seen as close and peaceful, though tense, but Irish families were usually seen as rude and violent.” [CLARK/LYNCH, 1980, p. 98, 103]

Generic Slavs? As Caroline Golab observed in 1980,

“The Slavs were not, until recently, popular victims of Hollywood’s fascinating propensity to stereotype. Of the thousands of movies produced in the past sixty years, probably less than two dozen contain Slavic-Americans as major or minor characters. What is missing in quantity, however, is more than made up in quality. American film not only helped perfect the Slavic stereotype, but was largely responsible for nationalizing it… In its heyday, vaudeville made frequent use of the caricatured Jew, Italian, or Irishman. The Slav made infrequent appearances, if he made any at all. Only in the Yiddish theatre did he reappear again and
again, usually as the poor, dumb, easily duped peasant… Slavs have such low social standing that, more often than not, they are portrayed as being one thin line above the blacks in the American social hierarchy.” [GOLAB, C., 1980, p. 135, 140]

An angry professor of Ukrainian descent, Lubomyr Prytulak, was motivated to create his own Internet website (Ukraine Archives: http://www.ukar.org) after watching an October 1994 CBS 60 Minutes report that unjustly defamed Ukraine and Ukrainians with a one-sided emphasis on that country’s alleged anti-Semitism. The program was entitled “The Ugly Face of Freedom” and Prytulak began an online project to refute 60 Minutes’ biased view of Ukrainian history. At the time of the show’s airing, complains Prytulak, all the principals in the CBS hierarchy were Jewish, including Laurence Tisch, chairman and CEO; Eric Ober, president of CBS; Dan Hewitt, Executive Producer of 60 Minutes; Jeffrey Fagar, Producer of the “Ugly Faces of Freedom”; and Morley Safar, the host of the report. Two people interviewed in the program, defaming the Ukrainian people, Simon Wiesenthal and Yaakov Bleich, were also Jewish. [PRYTULAK, UKRAINE ARCHIVE at http://www.ukar.org]

Andrew Gregorovich, also of Ukrainian descent, for thirty years the head of the Toronto library system, responded with his own outrage.” The program about Ukraine, he wrote, “is an amazing program because after Morley Safar’s first two sentences it becomes a textbook example of distortion and propaganda about the relationship of Ukrainians with Jews.” The program, the author notes, was apparently timed to coincide with “the first official visit to North America by the President of Ukraine.” Among the many outrageous inaccuracies in the CBS program, the Ukrainian word “Zhyd” (which is not pejorative and means “Jew”) is translated as “kike.” Likewise, at one point in the program Safar declares that “Thousands of Ukrainians joined the [Nazi] SS and marched off to fight for Nazism.” “This is said simultaneously,” notes Gregorovich,

“with marching men who four times in the program shout ‘Slava natsiyi! (Glory to the nation!) To the viewer this sounds as if it is a cheer for Nazism but all it reflects is the phonetical similarity of the sound of the Ukrainian word for nation to Nazi. The Ukrainians did not join the Galicia Division No. 14 (Waffen-Grenadierdivision der SS) to fight ‘for Hitler’ as Safer said. They were fighting against the USSR and the Russians in order to win independence for Ukraine.” [GREGOROVICH, 1994]

Even one of the men interviewed on 60 Minutes, Rabbi Yaakov Bleich, an American Jew, later stated that “I feel that the broadcast did not convey the true state of affairs in Ukraine. I also would like to state unequivocally that my words were quoted out of the context that they were said.” [GREGOROVICH, 1994] Even the Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee, David Harris, felt moved to note that the 60 Minutes program about the Ukraine was “a simplistic and stereotypical image.” [KUROPAS, M., 1995] Another individual interviewed on the program, Cardinal Lubachivsky, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, complained that “I must also add that my office was misled as to the actual thrust of the report… Mr. Fagar [the producer] presented the piece as one
about ‘post-Communist Ukraine’… I can only deduce that the goal of the report was to present all Ukrainians as rabid anti-Semites.” A few hundred people of Ukrainian heritage demonstrated for a retraction of the program (to no avail) at CBS studios in Washington and New York. [KUROPAS, M., 1995]

(In 2000, there even arose a controversial Internet web site posted by people of Serbian descent, calling themselves the Serbian Defense League (http://compuserb.com/sdl/index.htm#10wanted). This site, especially shrill in its anti-Jewish polemic, holds the Jewish community guilty of injustices against, and defamations of, the Serbian community). [ONLINE: COMPUSERB.com]

In 2000 too, an angry author of Native American descent, Olin Tezcatlipoca, noted the hypocrisy of Steven Spielberg’s loving and sacred treatment of Jewry in his films and the defamatory historical inaccuracies concerning another person in his firm’s film “Road to El Dorado”:

“Steven Spielberg’s DreamWorks (the producer), and Universal Studios (the distributor) [owned by the Jewish Bronfman family] present the story of two Spaniards who stow away to the New World in the 16th century and wind up saving the village of El Dorado from a powerful priest intent on carrying out human sacrifices. This is an outrage, given the reality that the Spanish conquerors were responsible for the genocide of 23 million of our people – killing 95% of our population.” [TEZCATLIPOCA, O., 4-10-2000, p. F3] [One may also wonder here, of course, about the Jewish subtext of a priest who celebrates ritual murder].

As Gretchen Bataille and Charles Silet observed in 1980:

“Hollywood has presented an extremely distorted picture of American Indian peoples. From our childhood on, Hollywood has bombarded us with cartoons and movies which show the Indian as the ‘bad guy’ or, at best, a tragic anachronism from out of the past.” [BATAILLE/SILET, 1980, p. 36]

In a surprising corner, Hollywood’s popular depictions of Jewish women has even engendered outrage from Jewish females who feel defamed. One 1998 study by the Zionist women’s Hadassah organization complained that in Hollywood Jewish women are commonly portrayed in the mass media as “pushy, controlling, selfish, unattractive, materialistic, high maintenance, shallow, domineering, who nag their husbands and spend all their time cooking and shopping.” [MARKS, M., 4-23-98, p. 5] Rarely publicly spoken, the essence of this Jewish women’s outrage is merely an in-house, intra-Jewish psychological war: Jewish males versus Jewish females. The “Jewish American Princess” and nagging Jewish mother stereotypes are, after all, Jewish creations, perpetuated by Hollywood’s Jewish male elite who should recognize either the truths or inaccuracies of the subject.

Ironically, despite sensitizing America to the singular righteousness of Judaism, the rampant graphic violence celebrated as entertainment by today’s television and motion picture producers has begun to pay disturbing dividends for Jewish efforts to sensitize people to the Nazi atrocities during the Holocaust. In 1994, for example, a group of 69 inner-city Oakland, California, high school
students on a field trip to see *Schinder’s List* were evicted from the theatre for rowdy – and celebratory – behavior during the most gruesome Nazi murder scenes. [BARTOV, p. 49-50]

In July 1991, there was a “grand opening” of *Time-Warner*’s Comedy Central cable channel, a joint venture with *Viacom* (also Jewish-owned – see later. Warner is also notorious for its distribution of some of the most anti-social and vicious “rap” songs in history, including a song called “Cop Killa” which evoked widespread condemnation and public protest towards the mega-corporation). The show aired at 5:45 PM, a prime time for children. **Richard Clurman** describes the program with disgust

“[The] narrator-host on the roof of an office building screamed: ‘The smell of urine is wafting up from the streets, and the urge to spit here 25 stories above the city is almost unbearable.’ Then he introduced the pièce de résistance: ‘the Love Goddess,’ a bimbo decked out in a gold lame evening gown, squealing “Hello pigs,” as she slipped into a ‘Love Harness much like the one she has next to the bed at home.’ then she wrapped her legs around a greased flagpole atop the building. Burly riggers hoisted her inch by inch up the pole, declaring her safe because, said one of them, ‘I always packed a safe rigging. I have a condemn on right now.’ For safety, the riggers, the host assures us, are all “wearing condoms.” As the Love Goddess slowly slithers up the pole she trilled, ‘Oh, honey, this feels good, baby. I’m glad you greased up this pole. This makes me hot, makes my hormones dance. This is more satisfying than being serviced by Big Foot. Oh, look, I see a woman breast-feeding her baby. Oh no, that’s Cher with her new boyfriend. I’m ready to go husband hunting. I like my men hot, packed and unloading everything,” she screamed. ‘If you want to get off, I had multiples.’ Narrator: ‘We can see up your dress and that’s pretty frightening too.’ Cut to promo for another feature: A wild-eyed comic, after some talk about diarrhea, describes what this show is, opening the stalls of public restrooms,’ and surprising people.” [CLURMAN, p. 323-324]

In 1995, **Delores Tucker** of the National Political Congress of Black Women attended a *Time-Warner* stockholders meeting to read to executives, face to face, the misogynist lyrics of one of the company’s bands (Nine Inch Nails). In 1997 a 14 year-old boy in Kentucky murdered three classmates “after a prayer meeting. He told police that “he had seen it done before in a movie [The Basketball Diaries] that featured a teenager dreaming about gunning down students at a Catholic high school.” The *Associated Press* called the company (New Line Cinema, owned by Jewish mogul Ronald Perlman) that made the movie, but Steve Elzer, vice president of publicity for the firm, refused comment. [BRIDIS, 12-5-97]

In 1999, Dylan Klebold (whose mother is Jewish) soared to notorious fame when he was involved in the murder of 12 fellow students and a teacher at Columbine High School in Colorado. There were mixed reports about his background, but he participated in a Passover *seder* the month before the atrocity. “Some people in the Jewish community,” said a Jewish official at Klebold’s
mother’s home town, “have a sense of disquiet because of the news media playing up the irony of somebody who has a Jewish heritage in their family being involved in an incident of such tragic overtones on Hitler’s birthday.” [DICK-TER, A., 4-30-99, p. 18]

In the publishing world, by 1977 this is the ethic that Michael Korda, a popular author of Jewish heritage, and for thirty years the editor-in-chief at Simon and Schuster, heralded as a growing trend for popular American culture in his own book, Success!, reflecting both the worst of Old World Talmudic ethics and the absolute stereotype of a Jewish Shylock:

“Before you read any further, stop and tell yourself:
* It’s O.K. to be greedy.
* It’s O.K. to be ambitious.
* It’s O.K. to look out for Number One.
* It’s O.K. to have a good time.
* It’s O.K. to be Machiavellian (if you can get away with it).
* It’s O.K. to recognize that honesty is not always the best policy (provided you don’t go around saying it).
* It’s O.K. to be a winner.
* It’s always O.K. to be rich.”

[original author’s emphasis; KORDA, p. 4]

(Korda is from a very wealthy mass media family. His uncle, Alexander Korda, was “one of the most legendary and flamboyant of all film tycoons” who “brought to stardom” Sir Laurence Olivier, Charles Laughton, Marlene Dietrich, and Vivien Leigh, among others. [KORDA, M., 1979, dustjacket]

By 1998, Studios USA (chairman: Greg Meidel), a division of the USA Network (chairman: Barry Diller), both Jewish-directed and both Jewish-owned by MCA and the Bronfman family, bowed to public demands to morally civilize its Jerry Springer “talk show,” a program that regularly featured “chair-throwing brawls” and which was “a target for politicians, religious groups, and television executives offended by its fights, coarse language, and nudity.” [BRAXTON, G, p. F2] The Dallas Morning News described Springer (the son of German-Jewish Jews who escaped the Holocaust) as “a bottom feeder whose syndicated talk show epitomizes the worst television has to offer... He once apologized for writing checks to prostitutes while serving as the married mayor [1977-81] of Cincinnati.” [BARK, p. 41A] In 1998 Springer, the “Sultan of Sleaze,” reportedly paid $600,000 to ensure that a secret film of him “romping with a 21-year-old porn star while her stepmother looked on” wouldn’t publicly surface. [COREY/WITHERIDGE, 11-2-98] (Bruce Dubrow, also of Jewish heritage, the Springer show’s Executive Producer, “created and launched both the Sally Jessy Raphael Show and The Jerry Springer Show.” [STARR, M., 1-4-99, p. 74] He later became Executive producer of the Joy Browne show. Talk show host Rikki Lake is Jewish too. Sally Jessy Raphael’s father was also Jewish.) [JEWHOO, 2000]

A kindred spirit is TV personality Geraldo Rivera (son of a Puerto Rican father and Jewish mother). The Washington Post noted that Rivera was “the man who... spent much of the 80s and 90s getting rich off his trashy daytime talk
show, to which he lured teen satanists and mother-daughter prostitutes, while he brawled with skinheads who broke his nose and had fat from his buttocks implanted surgically in his forehead.” [GROVE, p. C1]

Yet another Jewish TV talk show host was blasted in the *Washington Post*. “The most vulgar show I’ve seen,” wrote *Patricia Priest*, “was a recent ‘Maury Povich’ episode. The program featured an unbelievably crude discussion of women’s breasts.” [PRIEST, p. C1] Executive Producer of the Maury Povich show? Amy Rosenblum, a former producer at the Sally Jesse Raphael Show. Earlier in his career, Povich did television news; moving from Chicago to CBS in Los Angeles, Dick Goldberg was his news show’s producer. *Alfred Geller* is Povich’s agent. [POVICH, M. 1991, p. 131, 207] And Povich’s father, he notes, “was the respected, not to mention all-powerful, sports editor and columnist for the Washington Post.” [POVICH, M., 1991, p. 46]

Executive Producer of the Howie Mandel show? Diane Rappaport. And further behind many of such shows is “one of television’s foremost specialists on syndication launches,” Bonnie Kaplan, who has promoted a variety of talk show formats, including the Geraldo Rivera, Jenny Jones, Ophra Winfrey, and Joan Rivers shows, among others. [FEDER, p. 49]

A 2001 column by *Michael Kelly* in the *Washington Post* noted the influence of Jeff Zucker upon popular culture:

> “Mr. Zucker is the very role model for us. He is the president of NBC Entertainment. As such, he is responsible for ‘Fear Factor,’ NBC’s ‘reality show’ in which people who are desperate enough for money are induced to risk bodily harm and endure national humiliation. Contestants on ‘Fear Factor’ have allowed hundreds of rats to swarm over their bodies and have been chased, in protective clothing, by attack dogs. Mr. Zucker mocks those who find something wrong with this. ‘We’re having fun, we’re having a great summer,’ he told reporters this week. ‘Get a life.’” [KELLY, M., 7-25-01]

Yet neither the likes of Singer or Rivera or Zucker can compare to the level of decadence reached on a television talk show in Israel. In 1995 *Haim Kreissel* wrote with alarm in the *Jerusalem Post*:

> “On January 9, the TV talk show *Popoliticia* featured a discussion on snuff movies [films that depict people actually tortured and killed for later viewing pleasure]…The tragic result of all the publicity will be an increased demand for such movies. Far worse, some Israelis may feel the need to produce them themselves… Two well known Israeli philosophers, Adi Tzemah and Yosef Agrassi, were invited to the program… To summarize the philosophers’ positions, morality and esthetics are two disparate areas, and never the twain shall meet. While both philosophers condemned those who made snuff movies, both saw a possible esthetic value in these movies. They appeared to be recommending that we judge them on aesthetic grounds, much as people used to watch gladia-
tor shows. Woe to the society whose wise men think along such lines.”  
[KREISSEL, p. 6]

Two of America’s most influential newspapers, The New York Times and the Washington Post (which, in turn, owns Newsweek), are owned by families of Jewish heritage – the Ochs/Sulzbers and Grahams, respectively. Chairwoman Martha Graham’s father, Eugene Meyer, bought the Post in 1933. At the Times, Sulzberger-related executives in recent years have included Arthur Sulzberger, Steve and Michael Golden, and Daniel Cohen. Other influential Jewish positions at the Times by the early 1980s included the Executive Editor, Managing Editor, Associate Editor, and Editorial Page Editor. (Another Jew, Fred Michael Hechinger, was president of the New York Times Company Foundation).

As New York Times Executive Editor Max Frankel (who was with the Times from the early 50s to 1994) confessed in his 1999 autobiography:

“Instead of idols and passions, I worshiped words and argument, becoming part of an unashamedly Jewish verbal invasion of American culture. It was especially satisfying to realize the wildest fantasy of the world’s anti-Semites: Inspired by our heritage as keepers of the book, creators of law, and storytellers supreme, Jews in America did finally achieve a disproportionate influence in universities and in all media of communication. Punch Sulzberger [owner of the New York Times] unconsciously abetted this movement. He felt born to the publisher’s chair and had none of his father’s hang-ups about being Jewish. Israel’s ambassadors to the United Nations lived just a few floors below his Fifth Avenue apartment and always enjoyed easy access to him and to his table at The Times. Within a few years of Punch’s ascendancy, there came a time when not only the executive editor – A. M. Rosenthal – and I but ALL the top editors listed on the paper’s masthead were Jews. Over vodka in the publisher’s back room, this was occasionally mentioned an any impolitic condition, but it was altered only gradually, without any affirmative action on behalf of Christians.” [author’s emphasis: FRANKEL, M., 1999, p. 400-401]

Joseph Goulden notes the editorial bent at the influential New York paper: “Having reported from Cairo, [Rick] Smith understood the Arabs’ side of the endless Middle East conflict; while not anti-Israel by any means, he came under constant criticism from [Executive Editor A.M.] Rosenthal for supposedly ‘slanting’ bureau stories towards the Arabs.” [GOULDING, p. 303]

The Times acquired the Boston Globe in the 1993; it also owns 21 other newspapers throughout America, 10 magazines – including Family Circle, Golf Digest, and Tennis, and eight TV and two radio stations. In 1999, the Boston Globe noted that “in a surprise move that ended 126 years of leadership of the Boston Globe by the Taylor family, the New York Times yesterday replaced pub-

Arthur Ochs Sulzberger and the Washington Post’s Katherine Graham are also “co-chairmen” of the International Herald Tribune, the best known international English daily newspaper. The Time’s daily rival in Manhattan, the New York Post, has also been owned – off and on over the years – by Jewish entrepreneurs (at one time owned by heiress Dorothy Schiff. Peter Kalikow bought it in 1988).

In 1976, Schiff’s biographer noted that “the owner, publisher and editor in chief of the [New York Post] is Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, who has been called ‘the most powerful woman in New York,’ an accolade she rejects.” [POTTER, J., 1976, p. 9] Her managing editor for the paper? Byron Greenberg. [POTTER, J., 1976, p. 16] Earlier, “J. David Stern, whose papers included the Philadelphia Record, bought the Post in the early 1930s and dropped the word ‘Evening’ from its masthead.” [POTTER, J., 1976, p. 161]

The New York Post during Schiff’s tenure (1950s to 1970s) became not only a mouthpiece for Zionism, but for the terrorist Irgun organization. As Jeffrey Potter notes:

“‘I don’t think Dolly [owner Dorothy Schiff] was nearly as aware as I was of the political direction of the paper,” Paul [Sann, then Executive Editor of the New York Post] says.”[Her husband] Thackery was very close to the Irgunists and Menachem Begin. They were a must – conferences, interviews – but we were pushing their cause instead of covering it. I was against those bastards – I don’t knock them now they got a stake – but they were very, very suspect to me. I knew some of them; they were creepy. They had an inordinate access to our columns.’

“Dorothy,” continues Potter in his biography of her,

“it is clear, was not wholly unaware of the way her paper’s columns were being used: ‘These terrorists [Schiff said] and other pressure groups would come to [my non-Jewish husband] Ted in the office. I think it was a psychological thing; he was jealous, he wanted his own thing, and walked right into their hands. I didn’t know they were terrorists until I found out from one of our reporters, Fern Eckman, but of course the Haganah [the early Israeli army] were more moderate. Ted was apolitical originally, and in becoming far left, he may not have understood he was in the hands of fellow travelers ... Henrietta Szold, who was of German Jewish descent and started Hadassah [the Zionist women’s organization], was the first of the early Zionist leaders I met. I was in my teens and told her that I wanted to dedicate myself to Palestine [today known as Israel]. She asked me what I could do and I said I could sew. She didn’t seem to think that would be useful.”’ [POTTER, J., 1976, p. 201-202]

By 1979, one survey identified 25-30% of the employees of the elite and influential media organizations as Jews. (No further study has been done to chart this trajectory in recent years, nor explore the details of their percentages in the highest echelons of power. “When one looks at the key decision-making posi-
tions,” noted Jewish scholar Charles Silberman about the 25-30% figure, “the Jewish role appears to be even larger.” [SILBERMAN, p. 153]). These “elite” media corporations of the most weighty influence in the study included the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Los Angeles Times, Time, Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report, and the ABC, CBS, and NBC television networks, as well as PBS (Public Broadcasting System).

Also by the 1980s, at least three senior editors at the Washington Post were also Jewish, as was the former editor of the Wall Street Journal and its then-current Managing Editor. A Jew could also be found as the Editor of Newsweek, the Managing Editor of Time, the Editor of the U.S. News and World Report, as well as the Presidents of CBS and ABC News Divisions, and company presidents of both PBS and National Public Radio. [WHITFIELD, American, p. 134-35, SILBERMAN, Certain, p. 153-154] Maurice (“Reese”) Schonfeld was also president at Ted Turner’s CNN, and a member of its Board of Directors, at the company’s emergence in 1980. In earlier years, Burt Reinhardt was a Schonfeld partner in a venture with a UPI news service. “As his ITNA service grew, Schonfeld became known in the business as the Electronic News Godfather.” Reinhardt later became executive vice-president at CNN. Sam Zelman started out as vice-president and executive producer. [WHITTEMORE, H., 1990, p. 12, 28, 57, 69] (CNN President Schonfeld later became Chairman of International Network News and head of the TV Food Network). By the 1990s, Bradley Siegel was president of TNT (Turner Network Television).

As American-born Israeli Ze’ev Chafets noted in 1985:


By 1987 the President of Times-Mirror (Los Angeles Times) was Jewish (David Laventhol, honored by the Anti-Defamation League in 1990), as was the editor of Fortune magazine. [CHRISTOPHER, p. 151-152] Richard Schlossberg III was also CEO of the Los Angeles Times in the 1990s. Although by 1998 the New York Post was owned by Rupert Murdoch – a non-Jewish media baron with close ties to Jewish organizations – the paper’s president and publisher was Martin Singerman. (Murdoch’s Fox Broadcasting has also been headed by a steady series of Jewish directors including Barry Diller, Joe Roth, and Peter Chernin. The CEO of Murdoch’s Fox Kids Worldwide? Haim Saban. Murdoch’s public relations agent? One Howard Rubenstein. (Rubenstein, noted the New York Daily News, “is one of the city’s most influential and respected powerbrokers.” [PIENCIAK, p. 20] Murdoch has also “contributed to the favourite Jewish charity,” noted London’s Daily Telegraph, “a smart move in a Jewish-run industry.” [ROBERTS, G., p. 1])

One of Murdoch’s former Jewish executives, Michael Clinger, at another media holding, “until recently… lived in the plush Swiss ski resort of St. Mortiz
before recently seeking refuge in Israel.” There was, in fact, an outstanding arrest warrant for Clinger and he was formally sought by Interpol for “conspiracy, fraud, and insider dealing… He remained a fugitive from justice. The last attempt at extradition, through Interpol in February [1996] remains unanswered by Israel.” [FARRELLY, p. B3] In 2000, yet another former executive of a Murdoch company found himself in serious trouble. Once a former manager of the New York Post and also a millionaire real estate developer, Abraham Hirschkfeld was convicted of hiring a hit man to murder former business partner Stanley Stahl. [WONG, E., 6-17-2000, p. B2]

One of Murdoch’s biographers (Thomas Kiernan) notes that

“Murdoch… as publisher and editor-in-chief of the New York Post, had a large Jewish constituency, as he did to a lesser degree with New York magazine and The Village Voice. Not only had the pre-Murdoch Post readership been heavily Jewish, so too, were the present Post advertisers. Moreover, most of Murdoch’s closest friends business advisers were wealthy, influential New York Jews intensely active in pro-Israel causes… There was no way, then, that Murdoch could allow the Post to relax its traditional advocacy of Israel as he turned it into New York’s main organ of Reaganite orthodoxy. His first solution to the problem was to expand and banner the paper’s stable of politically conservative columnists who happened to be Jewish. Norman Podhoretz and Dorothy Rabinowitz were just two of the Post’s right-wing voices… His second solution, which was to use the paper’s news pages to glorify Israel more intensively than ever while regularly deriding the actions of its Arab enemies, was not so subtle… Much of the Post’s reportage of events in the region was shamelessly slanted, distorted, and on more than one occasion, fabricated from the bare, dry, factual bones of wire service copy.” [KIERNAN, T., 1986, p. 262]

Another non-Jewish mogul who spent some time in the Hollywood limelight was Kirk Kerkorian, of Armenian heritage. He bought control of MGM in its dying years in the 1970s, and later United Artists. And, like anyone who expects to survive in the mass media world, he too surrounded himself with Jewish partners, executives, agents, lawyers and others of the standard movie-making and news world parade. His first choice to run the studio was his “tennis-playing friend” Herb Jaffe, who turned his offer down. [BART, p. 32] Others at Kerkorian’s MGM included president and CEO Frank Rosenfelt; Frank Rothman (later CEO of MGM/UA); and Frank Yablans (another head of MGM at a different time). When Gentile Alan Ladd Jr. was picked to be share power as president and CEO with Yablans, “the nucleus of his own team” was all Jewish: Jay Kanter, Richard Berger, and John Goldwyn. [BART, p. 231] Other prominent Kerkorian-era chiefs included Chief Financial Officer Sidney Sapowitz; production heads David Begelman, Daniel Melnick, Freddie Fields and Paula Weinstein; Herbert Solow; Peter Bart; lawyer Gregory Bautzer (“Kerkorian’s eyes and ears in the filmmaking community”); [BART, p. 17] Roger Birnbaum, Ileen Maisel, and Lee Rich, among others. Kerkorian had earlier built his
fortune in Las Vegas, where he had many Jewish business associates, including mobsters Meyer Lansky and Moe Dalitz. [BART, p. 47-51] Kerkorian was also beholden to Jewish criminal financier Michael Milken who helped sell MGM “junk bonds” to finance some Kerkorian enterprises. [BART, p. 129-130]

Perhaps as summary to all this, former MGM Jewish executive Peter Bart notes that when Kerkorian eventually began negotiating over a year’s time to sell MGM off, the then-head of the company, Alan Ladd, “became a sort of Wandering Jew of executives, which was ironic since he was one of the few non-Jews to ever become a head of production.” [BART, p. 255] There was apparently a Jew in the shadows here though. “The strongest influence on Laddie’s [Ladd’s] career was probably [his father’s] second wife a former starlet and agent named Sue Carol.” (She was also Jewish; her original name was Evelyn Lederer). [FABER, STEPHEN/GREEN, MARC; cited at FIRM, 2001]

In the news world, by the late 1980s, six of the top seven editorial positions at the New York Times were held by Jews (their correspondent to Israel was also a Jewish-American, Thomas Friedman), and three of the four most influential positions at the Wall Street Journal. As noted Joshua Halberstam in 1997, “The Wall Street Journal… has been under the editorial control of Jews for years (Warren Phillips was the CEO of Dow-Jones, the company that owns the paper, and the paper’s former editor-in-chief is Norman Pearlstine, who is now the editor of Time).” [HALBERSTAM, p. 19] (Warren Phillips was succeeded as head of Dow-Jones by another Jewish executive, Peter Kann. Dow-Jones also controls the economic journal, Barron’s).

A note here about Pearlstine, former editor of the Wall Street Journal and now chief at Time magazine, and the interconnectedness not only within the upper echelons of the mass media, but crossing into the financial world of Wall Street too. Pearlstine – with a presumed responsibility to the credo of “objective” journalism – has been accused of being far too friendly with some of Wall Street’s most prominent (Jewish) financial predators. “As Pearlstine began to settle into his new job [at the Wall Street Journal],” notes Francis Dealy, a fellow executive at Dow-Jones, “he began to relish the relationships formed with Wall Street celebrity deal makers the likes of Ronald Perelman, who acquired Revlon in a hostile takeover, Henry Kravits, of RJR-Nabisco fame, and Joe Flom… perhaps the biggest mergers-and-acquisitions attorney on Wall Street.” [DEALY, p. 239]

In March 1991 reporter Laurie Cohen submitted a formerly approved story at the Journal to her superior, Dan Hertzberg, about the looming default of $400 million by corporate raider Eli Jacobs. The story in its original form never made print. “We can’t run that,” Hertzberg eventually told Cohen, “Jacobs is a good friend of Norm’s.” [DEALY, p. 247] When the story did finally make the Journal, it was rewritten and appeared in the back of the stock section; the word “fraud” had been excised. [DEALY, p. 251]

Pearlstine admitted in an interview that “I’m a friend of Ronnie’s [Perelman] and Nancy [Pearlstine’s wife] is on his payroll. [Dow Jones executives] Peter [Kann] and Warren [Phillips] know all that… Yes, I’ve been to seder [a Jewish religious gathering] at Ronnie’s, and so have a lot of other people like Joe
Flom, Eli [Jacobs], and others… Ronnie and I come from the same suburban Philadelphia background… Besides, I like to know the people I write about…” [DEALY, p. 307] In the wake of the many criminal accusations against Michael Milken, when the junk-bond king decided upon a massive public relations campaign to counter his negative image, he hired Norman Pearlstine’s old girlfriend, Linda Robinson, to lead the task. [DEALY, p. 308]

(In 1999, *Time* magazine designed a publicity stunt, soliciting votes by Internet from people around the world for a “Person of the Century” for their year 2000 issue. Initial balloting placed Jesus Christ in the lead, but he was ruled by *Time* management to be ineligible because he wasn’t born in the past century. With Christ’s rejection, by existing vote tally, that left Adolf Hitler as the tentative new #1. This choice is also offensive to Jewish sensibilities. Whether “Person of the Century” has anything to do with “good” or not, this prospect of Hitler in the lead didn’t sit well with Jewish groups so, not surprisingly, they banded together in a crusade to stuff votes for their own man, assassinated Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin, who soon led the “Person of the Century” pack.) [KURTZ, p. A12])

There is often an incestuous nature between members of the mass media and its newsworthy subjects. Jewish newscaster Ted Koppel and former Jewish Secretary of State Henry Kissinger “are old friends.” [HERTSGAARD, 1991, p. 53] In 1982, a *60 Minutes* producer, Bill Willson, tried to get reporter Mike Wallace to do an expose on Katherine Graham, head of the *Washington Post*. “I don’t think I want to do that story,” Wallace told Willson, “Kay Graham is a friend of mine, and I play tennis with her in the summers of Martha’s Vineyard. Why don’t you get someone else to do it?” [HERTSGAARD, M., 1991, p. 53] For what it’s worth, both Wallace and Graham are of Jewish heritage, as is *60 Minutes* Executive Producer Don Hewitt who finally vetoed the Graham story. For Hewitt’s part, his “two closest friends on the West Coast were Lew and Edie Wasserman.” (To Hewitt’s credit, a program entitled “Hollywood and the Mob,” that included Wasserman, destroyed that friendship). [HERTSGAARD, M., p. 53]

In a 1991 story about the newsroom at *60 Minutes*, reporter Mark Hertsgaard singled out Hewitt and Wallace as chronic sexist offenders, for years sexually harassing their female employees:

“Mike Wallace’s abuse of underlings is legendary. Again and again, colleagues chose the word bully to describe his lacerating treatment of subordinates… Wallace is accused of repeatedly making lewd comments about women’s physiques and bedroom abilities, pinching their bottoms and both snapping and unhooking their bra straps.”

For Hewitt’s part, former *60 Minutes* reporter Sally Quinn wrote that “Everybody knows that Hewitt makes passes at women with aspirations. But nobody talks about it. If you’re smart, you’ll keep your mouth shut.” Another female employee told Hertsgaard about Hewitt’s physical attack upon her:

“Before she knew it, he grabbed her and started to kiss her. With great strength, he grasped both her forearms right below her elbows and ‘rammed me up against the wall… I was shaking. I remember he had
stuck tongue down my throat’… The women who say they experienced the harassment emphasize that they refrained from protest for fear that, in a community as small as network TV, making public accusations against men as powerful as Wallace and Hewitt would mean they would never get hired or promoted again.” [HERTSGAARD, M., 1991, p. 82]

Reporter Hertsgaard later had the opportunity to expand about workroom conditions at 60 Minutes in a feminist Internet journal, Mothers Who Think. His original article had appeared in Rolling Stone magazine (whose editor is also Jewish, Jann Wenner). As Hertsgaard later noted:

“The entire piece almost never ran because Don Hewitt tried to kill it and (Rolling Stone editor and publisher) Jann Wenner almost went along with him. They did emasculate the piece by taking out a lot of the damaging material. You’ll see in there that there is one basic episode involving Don. There were four that I had reported… Don tried to kill it by talking to Jann Wenner privately, asking, ‘What is this story you’ve got on me?’” [LLOYD, C., ONLINE]

“Of the three leading papers,” wrote Charles Silberman in 1985, “only the Washington Post has a non-Jew… as an editorial chief; but there is no shortage of Jews in top ranks of the Post.” [SILBERMAN, p. 153] (Washington Post Jewish newcomers in top editorial posts for the 1990s included Meg Greenfield and Stephen Rosenfeld). Jews had become “equally influential” in the management of TV news and many Jewish network correspondents were “household names,” including CBS’s Mike Wallace [Myron Wallach], whose son, Chris Wallace, became the White House correspondent for NBC News), Morley Safer, Bernard Goldberg, Daniel Schorr [Early in his career in 1955, “Schorr arrived in Moscow soon after NBC had placed its own [Jewish] correspondent, Irving R. Levine, there.”] [SLATER, R., 1988, p. 181], Leslie Stahl, and Morton Dean of CBS; Marvin Kalb (whose broadcasting brother Bernard eventually became President Ronald Reagan’s press secretary; Marvin is currently the executive director of Harvard’s Shorenstein Media Center) and Irving R. Levine of NBC; and Herbert Kaplow, Barbara Walters, and Ted Koppel of ABC.

Matt Lauer is co-host of the Today Show on NBC. Famed Internet independent journalist Matt Drudge is also Jewish. [JEWHO, 2000] Giselle Fernandez, anchor of NBC’s Sunday night news, has a Jewish mother. Bill Maher, of Politically Incorrect? “His father was Irish Catholic, but he identifies more with his mother’s Jewish heritage. (‘My mother and I really get along because she’s like me. It’s hard to explain, but my father and my sister acted more Irish. You just have to know what that means.’)” [RUSOFF, J., 2001] Charlie Rose has his own program on PBS. He also co-hosts 60 Minutes II. He is a former Executive Producer of the Bill Moyers Journal and anchorman at CBS News programs Face the Nation, CBS Morning News, and other programs. Other prominent Jewish newscasters have included Jeff Greenfield and Martin Agronsky. Agronsky’s career spanned all
three commercial networks and PBS. “When Agronsky retired in 1987, ‘Agronsky and Company’ was still television’s highest rated political talk show... Agronsky’s interest in Israel sustained itself throughout his life; even in his retirement, Agronsky gave many lectures on Middle East affairs, donating his fees to the United Jewish Appeal.” [WALLACE-WELLS, B., 1999, p. 6] (Prominent Jewish executives at PBS for the late 1990s have included the Director of Corporate Communications, Stu Kantor. And, earlier, Jewish mogul Walter Annenberg’s philanthropy of $150 million to public TV we may safely presume to have been influential in policy: “He that pays the piper calls the tune.” Director of the University of Southern California’s Annenberg School for Communications and its Norman Lear Center? Also Jewish, like the two philanthropists, is Marty Kaplan).

Joan Lunden was a regular on ABC’s Good Morning America. Famous (Jewish) news anchorwoman Jessica Savitch died in a 1983 car accident with Martin Fischbein, a vice president at the New York Post. Wolf Blitzer is CNN’s White House correspondent; he formerly edited a journal published by the formal Israeli lobbying arm in Washington, AIPAC, moving then to the Jewish Chronicle and Jerusalem Post. Likewise, Charles Fenyvesi practiced his journalism skills at AIPAC’s Near East Report before moving on to the Washington Post. [KENEN, I., p. 112] Reporter Bob Simon of the 60 Minutes II show has a residence in Israel. [WALZ, 1-5-98] John Donovan, ABC Nightline correspondent and occasional anchor, is married to Israeli Ranit Mishori.

“Objective” news? Take the case of behind-the-scenes world of famous Jewish newswoman/interviewer Barbara Walters. Her father Louis was a “nightclub entrepreneur and original owner of the Latin Quarter”) [BLACK-WELL, E., 1973, p. 509] Carli Laklan (in a book written for adolescents about famously successful career women) notes that the Walters family once lived “on an offshore island in what was practically a castle and staffed with servants. [Barbara’s father] showered the family with luxuries. After the years of near poverty it was all quite overwhelming. Barbara was enrolled in a private school. Every day the chauffeur drove her to the club where she kissed her parents good morning.” [LAKLIN, C., 1983, p. 155] Walters’ husband also merits some attention here, particularly the influence of her husband, Merv Adelson. He has headed Hollywood powerhouse Lorimar-Pictures Telepictures Corporation, which has a long line of television hits (Eight is Enough, Dallas, The Waltons, Knott’s Landing, Falcon Crest, among others). More intriguingly, notes Dan Moldea, Adelson was a “longtime business associate and friend of [Jewish mobster] Moe Dalitz and other underworld figures.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 413] He was also once co-owner with Dalitz and others of the La Costa Country Club in Carlsbad, California, described by some as “the playground for the mob.” [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 413] An activist in Israeli and other Jewish causes (he co-chaired, for example, Israel’s fiftieth anniversary celebration aired on CBS), Adelson also has long been involved in Las Vegas circles as well, including co-ownership with Irwin Molasky in the Colonial House casino.

News anchor Peter Jennings had a Jewish wife, Kati Marton (Chairwoman of the Committee to Protect Journalists), and CBS anchorwoman Connie
Chung’s husband (talk-show host Maury Povich) is also Jewish. Newswoman Diane Sawyer’s husband is Jewish film director Mike Nichols. NBC’s chief foreign affairs correspondent, Andrea Mitchell, also Jewish, is married to Alan Greenspan, one of the most powerful men in the country; he’s the (Jewish) Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. When (Catholic-raised) Cokie Roberts (today a prominent ABC news commentator) married Steve Roberts, (today a CNN/Late Edition panelist) it was “an enormous problem” for his Jewish family who preferred a Jewish spouse for him. [MCELWAINE, 1/2-98] CNN foreign news correspondent Christianne Amanpour is married to State Department spokesman Jamie Rubin.

Earlier pioneer Jewish television personalities have included the influential likes of David Susskind, Laurence Spivak (host of seminal news show Meet the Press), Irving Kupcinet, Stuart Schulberg, Edwin Newman, and many others.

“The greatest concentration of Jews, however,” says Charles Silberman,

“is at the producer level – and it is the producers who decide which stories will go on the air, and how long, and in what order, they will run. In 1982, before a shift in assignments, the executive producers of all three evening newscasts were Jewish, as were the executive producers of CBS’s 60 Minutes and ABC’s 20/20. And Jews are almost equally prominent at the ‘senior producer’ and ‘broadcast producer’ levels as well as in senior management. When Reuven Frank stepped down as President of NBC News in 1984, for example, he was replaced by Laurence Grossman, who left the Presidency of PBS to take the position.” [SILBERMAN, p. 154]

Frank’s term noted above as head of NBC News was his second: his first term at the helm was from 1968-73. The Jewish string of news chiefs at rival CBS was also long – Jews headed the news division for the first thirty years of the company. Sig Mickelson was the president of CBS News from the position’s inception, from 1949 to 1961. Richard Salant then followed from 1961-1964. Then came Fred Friendly, (born Ferdinand Wachenheimer), also Jewish. [SCHOENBURN, p. 58] (Friendly “never graduated from college but ended up a professor at Columbia University.”) [JARVICK, 1997, p. xvi] Salant returned to the CBS News presidential position in 1966, serving to 1979. [HAMMOND, p. 36, 100] In a book about television documentaries from 1965-1975, at least 11 – possibly 13 – of 21 prominent network producers/directors highlighted in photographs are Jewish: NBC’s Fred Freed, Reuven Frank, CBS’s Don Hewitt, Richard Salant, John Sarnik, Irv Drasnin, Perry Wolff, Morley Safar, Stephen Fleischman; ABC’s Avram Westin; and Martin Carr who worked at various times for all three major networks). [HAMMOND, 1981]

Israeli Ze’ev Chafets notes that:

“In his famous study of television news in 1973, Daniel Jay Epstein interviewed thirty-six network news producers and editors – twenty-one of whom turned out to be Jews.” [CHAFETS, 1985, p. 277]

(As Epstein stated it, “A majority [of the 36] came from middle or upper class families, in which a father usually was a businessman. Twenty-one were of
Jewish descent; none were black or came from lower-class backgrounds.” [EPSTEIN, EJ, 1973, p. 223])

Likewise, when the head of the entire company of ABC, Leonard Goldenson stepped down in the 1980s, Fred Silverman took his place. In the same era, as further example, at one point both CBS Morning News’ “managers of news planning,” Jon Katz and Steve Isaacs, were both Jewish. And who negotiated their salaries? A Jewish talent agent, Richard Liebner, who represented over 100 CBS News employees from anchor stars to field producers. [BOYER, p. 45, 217]

In 1989, a media watch group, Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR), meticulously examined 865 of ABC News’ influential Nightline programs, finding that “working, middle-class and poor people and their representatives are provided no opportunity to speak out.” 89% of the U.S. guests on the program were found to be men, and 92% white. (No mention was made of what percentage of those “white” guests were Jewish, although of the top four people to have most repeatedly visited Nightline, two government officials – Henry Kissinger and Elliott Abrams – were Jewish). And not only was Ted Koppel, the on-air host of Nightline, and its Executive Producer, Daniel Kaplan, Jewish, but so was the director of FAIR, the investigating organization: Jeff Cohen. [LEE/SLOMON, 1990, p. 26-30]

In 1987, Steve Friedman, “the man often credited with making the ‘Today’ show No. 1 in the morning ratings” left the program. [BELKIN, L. 6-6-87] He was both Jewish and the show’s Executive Producer. In the 1990s, Jewish television producer dominance has endured. In 1999, Friedman became the Executive Producer of This Morning at CBS. Don Hewitt continued to be the Executive Producer of CBS’s 60 Minutes (its core team of [Jewish] reporters has long been Morley Safar, Leslie Stahl, and Mike Wallace; its “chief investigative producer” was Lowell Bergman), [HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 192] In the 1990s, Victor Neufeld held the Executive Producer position at ABC’s 20-20, Jeff Zucker was the new Executive Producer at NBC’s Today show, Jeff Gralnick headed the NBC Nightly News, Neal Shapiro was top man at NBC’s Dateline and Bob Reichbloom was in charge at Good Morning America. (By 2000, this show’s Executive Producer was Shelley Ross). Susan Zirinsky has been the executive producer of CBS’s 48 Hours since 1996. The president of NBC News was Andrew Lack (replaced by Neal Shapiro in 2001), the president of CBS News was Eric Ober, and the president of ABC News was David Westin. The head of the CNN news division is Rick Kaplan.

And a common Jewish perspective of their roles throughout the field of American journalism? This from a Jewish scholar, Charles Silberman:

“As Richard Cohen, columnist for the Washington Post puts it, ‘Jews are foreign correspondents in their own country.’” [SILBERMAN, p. 154]

Ze’ev Chafets was born and raised in Pontiac, Michigan, but emigrated to Israel and became an official at the government mass media office there. “During my years at the Press Office,” he notes,
“I made it a rule not to raise the question of the religious or ethnic identity of visiting journalists [from other countries] but often Jewish correspondents did so themselves. Sometimes it was done in a transparent attempt to get trust and cooperation, sometimes in an off-hand way in which an American reporter of Italian ancestry might mention his grandparents’ origins to a government official in Rome; but usually it signaled that the journalist felt personally connected to the country.” [CHAFETS, p.282]

“Journalists such as Anthony Lewis and Thomas Friedman of the New York Times [Friedman worked as a summer intern for the CIA in 1975 after college graduation] [TWERSKY, p. 80], and Mike Wallace of CBS,” says J. J. Goldberg, “make little secret of the fact that they feel an attachment to Israel, and that this attachment might make them focus more closely on Israel, warts and all…[GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 282]… Columnists most often figured as defenders of Israel and Jewish interests [include]: William Safire and A.M. Rosenthal of the New York Times, Richard Cohen of the Washington Post, Charles Krauthammer of the Washington Post, Frank Rich of the New York Times, and New Republic editor Martin Peretz and literary editor, Leon Wieseltier.” [GOLDBERG, JJ,] As longtime 60 Minutes reporter Mike Wallace once wrote, “In a variety of private ways, I had contributed my efforts to raising money and support for Israeli causes.” [WALLACE/GATES, 1984, p. 298-299]

As Ze’ev Chafets noted in 1985:


How does one get to such prominence? Perhaps Anthony Lewis is an example. His father was a co-partner in Crown Fabrics, one of New York’s “leading firms in the garment center.” As Roy Cohn notes:

“[Jewish Supreme Court Justice] Felix Frankfurter got Arthur Hays Sulzberger [also Jewish], publisher of The New York Times, to hire Tony from the Washington News and assign him to cover the Supreme Court.” [ZION, S., 1988, p. 31]

Moving along in the media ownership world, the Village Voice, New York’s “alternative voice” to the mainstream media, was bought by Leonard Stern in 1985 (editor: Richard Goldstein; publisher: David Schneiderman). Stern’s Hartz Mountain Pet Company settled two anti-trust suits in 1979 for $100 million and he “was
forced to pay $640,000 in back pay to workers as part of a settlement of a 1974 union-organizing fight.” [BRENNER, p. 347] Mr. Stern personally pledged $5 million to the United Jewish Appeal in 1974, part of a campaign that year that “unabashedly raised money in staggering amounts to send to Israel.” [ISAACS, p. 266]

The Voice’s weekly counterpart in Los Angeles, the LA Weekly, is also Jewish-owned and edited. Its creator and first editor was Jay Levin. He and three others, including Joie Davidow, were co-founders of the paper; Davidow later founded LA Style and “the Latino-culture magazine - Si.” Stuart Goldman was the first music editor and Susan Mogul the photography editor, later replaced by Howard Rosenberg. Michael Sigman was the general manager, later publisher. A later Executive Editor was Harold Meyerson. In 1995, the aforementioned Leonard Stern’s Stern Publishing company bought the LA Weekly. [BURK, G., 11-28-98, p. 10] Stern eventually sold his newspaper holdings in 2000 to the president and publisher of the Village Voice, David Schneiderman, who headed an investment group. This new conglomerate, Village Voice Media (CEO: Schneiderman; president: Arthur Howe), now had collected a growing stable of “alternative” newspapers across the country including the Village Voice and LA Weekly, the Nashville Scene, the Cleveland Free Times, City Pages (Minneapolis-St. Paul), Ace Magazine (Lexington, Kentucky), and the Long Island Voice. [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 1-6-2000, p. C4; BERGER, K., 1-13-2000]

In Chicago, Jane Levine is the publisher of the Chicago Reader, yet another ideologically “alternative” paper. Levine’s investors “also own Washington City Paper and half of the East Bay Express in Berkeley, California). [COLFORD, P., 6-11-98, p. E4] Stephen Mindich, also Jewish, owns the Phoenix Media communications Group which includes the “alternative” weeklies the Boston Phoenix (the largest weekly newspaper in New England), the Worcester [Mass.] Phoenix, the Providence [Rhode Island] Phoenix, and another in Portland, Maine. He also owns Boston radio station WFNX and Phoenix Ventures (publishers of the official yearbook for local professional sports teams, etc.). [http://www.yahoohodi.com and Phoenix Media Communications Group web site] Even in Santa Fe, New Mexico, the free weekly Santa Fe Reporter is edited by Julia Goldberg.

Another alternative weekly newspaper chain, in several cities, is New Times. The executive editor for them all is Michael Lacey (2001). Its Dallas paper, the Dallas Observer, is edited by Julie Lyons. (2001)

Rolling Stone, the influential music industry journal, was founded, and has since been controlled and edited, by Jann Wenner. He is also Jewish. By 1989 Rolling Stone was worth $250 million. Once considered the “voice of the counterculture,” Associate Publisher Les Zeifman referred to it as “the Wall Street Journal of rock and roll.” [DRAPER, p. 15] In 1986 an advertising newsletter called Marketing Through Magazines was instituted by Rolling Stone to forge tobacco, beer, and other corporate sponsors of musical acts and the appropriation of famous songs for commercials. The driving force behind the “counter-culture” Rolling Stone, Jann Wenner, eventually developed an “ostentatious lifestyle of private jets, country villas, and choice social connections.” [DRAPER, p. 21] Robert Draper notes that in the early years of the paper Wenner
“cut a multitude of ethical corners: stealing initial subscription lists from another magazine, awarding himself shares of company stock so as to secure minority control, lying to advertisers about Rolling Stone’s readership, and pocketing the magazines subscription dues while the rest of the staff worked for little or nothing… From the outset, Wenner proved his finest talent to be exploiting the talents of others.” [DRAPER, p. 9]

Wenner also became chief editor of *Look* magazine in 1979, not long before it folded, and attained a controlling interest in *US* magazine. Another Wenner-initiated periodical was *Men’s World* in 1992. When *Rolling Stone* moved to New York in 1977, the paper’s new focus seemed to be that “famous New York writers… wrote about famous New Yorkers.” [DRAPER, p. 15] (From England, Maurice Kinn, also Jewish, who died in 2000, “published the *New Musical Express*, one of the world’s foremost music newspapers.”) [KIRSCHNER, S., 9-14-2000]

The *New Yorker*, the *American Mercury*, and *Esquire* were also founded by Jews. (The current editor of the Jewish Journal of Los Angeles, Gene Lichtenstein, is the former fiction editor at *Esquire*). *Ms* magazine was largely founded by Jewish feminists. Its most famous personage is Gloria Steinem, born of partial Jewish background, who has asserted a Jewish identity. She was also the co-founder of *New York* magazine. The original managing editor of *Ms.* was Suzanne Levine. An early prominent financial supporter was the *Washington Post*’s Katherine Graham. By 1977 *Warner Communications* owned a quarter of *Ms.* and the media giant’s Jewish director of its publishing division, William Sarnoff, was the only male on the *Ms.* board of directors. (Even Al Feldstein’s zany *Mad* magazine was part of the Warner stable. Feldstein of course is also Jewish).

**Joseph Pulitzer** (of “Pulitzer Prize” fame) was a Jewish immigrant from Hungary; he bought the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* in 1878. In 1887 he launched the *New York World*, one of the pioneers of what’s known today as “yellow journalism,” focusing on crime, disasters, and other kinds of sensationalism. In 1996 the Pulitzer family purchased control of 16 daily and 30 non-daily publications. They also have two radio stations, nine TV stations, and are part owner of the St. Louis Cardinals baseball team. By 1989, the Pulitzer Prize Board of Directors included 6 Jews, 7 WASPs, 2 Blacks, and a Polish-American. [CHRISTOPHER, p. 151] The (Jewish) administrator of the Pulitzer prizes from 1953 to 1975 was Paul Hohenberg. [KIRSCHNER, S., 9-14-00, p. 11] Elsewhere, based in St. Louis, Barry Baker (originally Barry Bakelman) is the CEO of *River City Broadcasting* with television stations in St. Louis, San Antonio, Indianapolis, and Des Moines.

From San Francisco, the *Hellman and Freedman* investment company (18 offices in the United States, England, China, and Brazil) owns *Advanstar Communications* (chairman and CEO: Robert Krakoff; Vice Chairman: Ira Siegel) among other holdings. Advanstar publishes over 100 “specialty magazines” (the likes of *Video Store News, Managed Healthcare, Physician’s Management, Travel Agent*, et al) and produces 100 trade shows and exhibitions a year, including “the largest apparel trade shows in the nation and abroad.” [ABRAMS, S. p. 12]
Ian Levine and Herman Bruggnik are co-chairmen of Reed Elsevier PLC. This company “publishes more than 1,200 scientific journals, as well as business, consumer, and professional magazines primarily in the US and Europe, including Variety and Publishers’ Weekly. (Variety was founded in 1905 by Sime Silverman). Reed Elsevier also owns Lexis Nexis, “the world’s largest provider of full-text information.” [HOOVER, p. 148] A division of Reed Elsevier is Cahners, founded in 1946 by Saul Goldweitz and Norman Cahners. Norman Goldweitz was the company’s CEO until he retired in 1989. “During his 40-year career,” notes the Boston Herald, “Mr. Goldweitz succeeded in expanding a single-publication business into one of the largest business-to-business publishing and trade exposition companies in the world.” [BOSTON HERALD, p. 69]

(In 1995, Elsevier, publisher of the scholarly journal Human Behavior and Evolution Society, sought to censor the comments of contributor John Hartung, who frankly addressed Jewish religious racism in a book review. Hartung was accused by some Jews of anti-Semitism, and Elsevier refused to publish in the journal Hartung’s response to this accusation. The editor of the periodical, Michael McGuire, a neuroscientist at the University of California, notes that “[Elsevier] wouldn’t let me talk to the decision-maker.” “Elsevier,” added Science magazine reporter Constance Holden, “kept shifting ground, at different times offering different rationales for the action, says McGuire… Elsevier staff did not respond to phone calls from Science.”) [HOLDEN, C., 7-96, p. 177]

As Hartung wrote in his censored piece: “As to the charge of anti-Semitism that has been leveled against me, if anti-Semitism is defined as prejudice against people who are Jewish, I am not anti-Semitic by any stretch of the imagination. One can have respect for people of a religious persuasion while questioning the persuasions of their religion. However, if one’s definition of anti-Semitism applies to those who make critical inquiry into the fundamental tenets of Judaism, I could be labeled anti-Semitic.” [HARTUNG, 1995?, Online]

Another Jewish entrepreneur, Moses Koenigsberg, founded the omnipresent King Features Syndicate. Michael and Roger King founded King World Productions, “one of the most powerful firms in television syndication… Today the company boasts annual revenues of $584 million through hits such as ‘Jeopardy,’ ‘Wheel of Fortune,’ ‘Inside Edition,’ ‘Hollywood Squares,’ and ‘The Oprah Winfrey Show.’ Although CBS bought the company for $2.5 billion in 1999, the Kings still run it. [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] In another large media chain, Daniel Gold became the president/CEO of the TV station group of the Knight-Ridder Broadcasting Company. He had formerly been the CEO/president of Comcast Cable Corporation and eventually became the CEO of ASCAP (the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, which licenses musical compositions to the tune of nearly $400 million per year). [ELKINS, D., p. 10X] (1996 CEO of ASCAP? Marilyn Bergman).

In the midwest, Jeff Smulyan’s mini-media empire – Emmis Broadcasting – today employs 1,000 people Emmis owns eight radio stations and many city/state magazines – Indianapolis Monthly, Los Angeles Magazine, Texas Monthly, Cincinnati Monthly, and Atlanta. In Greenwich, Connecticut, Marty Edelston’s
Boardroom Inc. is a yearly $100 million business, publishing newsletters and books. From Michigan, David Hermelin (noted as one of Detroit’s top 400 “movers and shakers”) is a partner since 1986 in WMCA-AM in New York, “one of that city’s top talk show stations... His wife, Doreen, is heavily into Jewish causes.” [KISKA, T., p. 99] In Miami, Ed Ansin’s Sunbeam Television owns TV station WSUN, “one of the largest independent owned Fox stations in the country.” Ansin, a “strong supporter of the Anti-Defamation League,” added Boston’s WHDH TV station to his stable in 1992. [KIMMEL, D., 2-17-2000, p. 15] From San Diego, the Dan Devlin Design group, “known throughout the television industry for state-of-the-art news sets,” in the late 1990s joined forces with the Israeli company Orad to build computer-generated “virtual reality” environments for newscasters. [GREEN, F., 11-14-97] Philip Levine, one of the major individual philanthropists to the Democratic Party, heads Onboard Media which provides “customized media programs for luxury cruise lines, leading hotels, and other businesses.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

Elsewhere, “info-mogul” Michael Bloomberg (elected in 2001 as the Mayor of New York City) heads a computer-database-media company worth $2 billion. The Baltimore Jewish Times notes that

“Today millions of people hear and see the Bloomberg name through a multi-tentacled news organization that includes a 56-bureau international wire service; a nationwide syndicate of radio stations; commercial and public television station; a glossy monthly magazine; and a personal finance journal inserted into 21 major newspapers that reach 7 million homes each week. If you visit New York, you’ll be hard-pressed to miss Mr. Bloomberg’s billboards.” [CONN, p. 48]

Bloomberg Business News also employs 350 reporters in 61 bureaus throughout the globe. Bloomberg Information Radio appears on 57 American stations. It’s business and news reports also air on 500 National Public Radio stations, as well as on Voice of America and Armed Services Radio. [CONN, p. 48] In 1999, Bloomberg and his sister gave $1 million to a scholarship fund sponsored by Hadassah, the international women’s Zionist organization, in honor of their mother who had been a lifelong member of that organization. [KAHN, E., 3-23-01]

Another business news network, Business Wire, is owned by San Francisco-based Lorry Lokey, also Jewish. Business Wire claims to be “the leading source of news on major U.S. corporations,” and was the first to use PhotoWire, an Internet transmission of news photographs. [BUSINESS WIRE, 11-9-99]

Elsewhere, in 1995, Steve Greenberg and Brian Bedol founded the Classic Sports Network, a cable TV enterprise. [See earlier chapter addressing Jews in sports journalism]. Earlier, Mitchell Rubinstein and Laurie Silvers founded the Sci Fi Channel, as well as Big Entertainment, Inc. Another of their media ventures, Big Entertainment, signed a deal with former basketball star Magic Johnson in 1997 for “Magic Johnson books and textbooks.” The company’s Tekno Books division is headed by Martin Greenberg.

Advance Publications, little recognized by the general public, was by the mid-1980s “one of the largest, most prosperous, most intensely private compa-
nies in America” and ranked as the fifth largest media company in the country, only behind ABC, CBS, Time Inc., and RCA. It was founded by a Eastern European Jewish immigrant, S. I. Newhouse, “a merciless union buster,” and is currently owned by his descendants. The Newhouse patriarch “was one the most nepotistic of American employers; at one point, some 64 Newhouse sons, brothers, cousins, and in-laws were on the Newhouse payroll.” [BIRMINGHAM, p. xi] By 1996 the Newhouse family was worth about 9 billion dollars.

Advance, through its subsidiary, Conde Nast Publications, by 1988 owned, among other holdings, the New Yorker, House and Garden (HG), Mademoiselle (the Jewish publisher of this magazine, Julie Lewit-Nirenberg, also founded Savvy, New York Woman, and Mirabella), Glamour, Bride’s, Vanity Fair, Gentlemen’s Quarterly (GQ), Self, Conde Nast Traveler, Gourmet, Bon Appetit, Allure, Architectural Digest, Wired, and Details. Vogue magazine was bought by Newhouse as a gift for his wife, Mitzi. Versions of some of these magazines appear in French, Italian, Australian, German, British, Mexican and Brazilian editions.

In England Conde Nast also owns Tatler and World of Interiors. Advance also owns a Sunday newspaper supplement, Parade, which by the 1980s was appearing in 314 newspapers with an audience of 64.8 million people. (A former editor of Parade, Lloyd Shearer, was a strident activist in the Anti-Defamation League and the notorious Jewish Defense League.) [LILENTHAL, p. 220]

Advance also owns twenty-nine newspapers, including Newsday (originally founded by Harry Guggenheim), the Newark Star Ledger, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and the New Orleans Times-Picayune. It also owns a stable of major New York publishing houses, including Random House, Alfred A. Knopf, Pantheon, (New York) Times Books, Ballantine, Fawcett, Schocken, Bonanza, and Villard. In 1988 the fifth largest publishing conglomerate, Crown Publishing Group, was absorbed by Random House. [Random House was sold for $1.2 billion in 1998. Why? To open up possibilities, said Si Newhouse, for more “acquisitions, certainly.” [KELLY, p. 68] Other possessions have included television and radio stations and the country’s largest cable TV system. [MAHON, p. 231] It also controls the Discovery Channel which reaches 63 million homes and another 80 million in 65 countries across the world, as well as Lifetime and The Learning Channel. [MOMENT, p. 36]

Newhouse cousin, Robert Miron, became chairman of the National Cable Television Association in 1990. [MAIER, p. 353] And in April 1999 the president of Advance, Donald Newhouse, was “reelected Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Associated Press.” [INTL HERALD TRIB, 4-28-99, p. 3] In 1994 the S.I. Newhouse Foundation donated nearly one million dollars to the United Jewish Appeal, and other large sums to a synagogue in New York City and the Anti-Defamation League. [MOMENT, p. 36] In 1996 the Anti-Defamation League created the “Norman H. Newhouse Human Relations Award” in honor of a family member who had been an ADL national commissioner. In 1995 a Newhouse publication, US West, became partners in a cable TV deal with Time-Warner Entertainment. [BRUCK, p. 56]
In an entire volume about the secretive Newhouse media empire, Thomas Maier reported in 1994 that

“Some Newhouse publications rank among the most celebrated in the world; others boast virtual monopolies of the daily press in several American cities… With few remaining independent voices – and an oligarchy of media power held by a handful of conglomerates like Newhouse’s – it is hard not to come under his sway… Most Americans know little about Si Newhouse – the most influential media baron of our time… The full extent of the Newhouse family’s ethical lapses in handling so important a public institution as a major daily newspaper, however, remains virtually unknown even among today’s media cognoscenti. There are repeated examples of Newhouse’s papers’ union busting, political malleability, and their willingness to allow advertisers to influence improperly their editorial judgment.” [MAIER, p. 2, 6]

In the magazine end of the business, noted Maier, “Si Newhouse…. celebrated the acquisitiveness of the eighties… [Vanity Fair, for instance] seemed to capture the trappings of every nuance of the decade’s greed, avarice, and power… [MEIR, p. 8]… By the early 1990s, with a nationwide recession and an ever-widening gap between rich and poor, Newhouse’s critics saw a more sinister motive in this redefinition of the media. To many the Conde Nast stylization of celebrity and gossip over the previous decade became a permanent part of the American cultural diet.” [MAIER, p. 11]

Commenting on a 1994 Vanity Fair article about the new Hollywood mogul clique, William Cash noted that “there is something very obvious… that does bind most of the leading members of the so-called ‘New Establishment’ – or the Titans of Tripe, as Auberon Waugh recently called them – only no magazine in America (especially a Conde Nast publication owned by Si Newhouse) would point it out: they are predominantly Jewish.” [CASH, p. 15]

Over the years, the Newhouses have been involved in essentially “hostile takeovers” of a number of firms, including the New Yorker and Random House. A news story appearing on the cover of the Cleveland Plain Dealer about a local Teamster union boss, rewritten under pressure from the Newhouses to accommodate Mafia influence, created outrage among editors, reporters and other staffs at the paper, resulting in the amazing spectacle of about fifty Plain Dealer employees picketing their own offices.

(Among Si Newhouse’s close friends, since childhood, was Roy Cohn – the prominent Jewish prosecutor for senator Joe McCarthy during the 1950s witch hunt investigations for “unAmerican activities.” In later trials for bribery, conspiracy, and other charges against Cohn, it was revealed that the old McCarthyite’s associates have included Jewish gangsters Moe Dalitz and Meyer Lansky, as well as Mafiosos like Vito Genovese and Tony (Fats) Salerno. Cohn’s role for the Newhouses, says Thomas Maier, was “as a go-between with the mob and Newhouse officials.” [MAIER, p. 118] A Cohn law firm partner, Stanley Friedman, who was also head of the Bronx Democratic Party, was imprisoned for corruption; another business partner, Sam Garfield, was a “stock swindler.” Comedian
Joey Bishop, a performer at many of Cohn’s parties, noted that “my opening line – this is a typical Roy Cohn dinner – [was] ‘If you’re indicted you’re invited.’” [VON HOFFMAN, p. 272] Cohn’s connections were diverse; he also had a “long lasting friendship” with Jewish media personality Barbara Walters, as well as with Walter Winchell. [MAIER, p. 89, 98, 103] He claimed to have come close to marrying Walters in his younger years. [VON HOFFMAN, p. 23])

Thomas Maier noted the disturbing implications of the Cleveland Plain Dealer Mafia-influenced episode:

“What happened to the Plain Dealer was a… powerful warning to Americans concerned about the integrity of their news media and how it can be improperly tainted and professionally compromised. In an era in which many of America’s major cities are increasingly serviced by only one daily newspaper – acting in each city like private utilities with almost complete control on the printed word – the lessons were indeed profound. The actions in Cleveland would forever mark Si Newhouse and his company as unworthy stewards of a public trust, a flawed vessel for so important a task as the free flow of information in a democratic society. And with so much at stake, it raises the question of what an informed public would do about it if only they knew the full extent of the story.” [MAIER, p. 118-119]

In their expanding empire, the Newhouses have come close to establishing virtual news monopolies in at least five American cities – St. Louis, Portland (Oregon), Birmingham, Syracuse, and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania – “where Newhouse owned not only the [only] daily newspaper but also a television and radio station or a cable-television franchise, as well.” [MAIER, p. 26] As early as 1960 Oregon Congressman Wayne Morse, responding to the situation in Portland (where the Newhouses purchased the two competing newspapers and merged them together) declared on the Senate floor that “The American people need to be warned before it is too late about the threat which is arising as a result of the monopolistic practices of the Newhouse interests.” [MAIER, p. 25] The Newhouse family was also involved in one of the most famous tax court cases in history when the IRS decided the value of Advance Publications, in its earlier years, to be worth $2.1 billion. The family claimed its holdings were worth $182 million. “By claiming that every business decision had been made by the family as a group,” says Moment magazine, “not solely by their father, the Newhouses won the case – a victory that gladdened the hearts of tycoons everywhere and is now common practice.” [MOMENT, p. 36]

Sam Newhouse also was involved in helping a Jewish friend in founding a publishing empire in the distribution field. “A near monopoly [by the 1980s],” noted Alfred Lilienthal, “in the news distribution field in New York lies in the hands of Henry Garfinkel’s corporation, National Services, which owns the Union News Company.” [LILIENTHAL, p. 220] “Let’s face it,” Garfinkel once said about Sam Newhouse, “we were best friends. Anything I could do to help the man, I’d do.” [MAIER, p. 96] McCarthyite lawyer Roy Cohn eventually worked for Garfinkel and helped engineer the takeover of the American News
Company. Renamed **AnCorp National Services**, Garfinkel “gained a near stranglehold on the distribution of newspapers and magazines in the Northeast.” [MAIER, p. 96] At one point in time, Garfinkel’s companies controlled 50% of the newsstands in America. [MAIER, p. 96] In the 1960s the **Wall Street Journal** turned up links between Garfinkel’s business and the criminal underworld; in 1971 the Federal Trade Commission filed suit against AnCorp for “improper payments” involving the **New York Times** and **New York Daily News**. [MAIER, p. 97]

By 2000, another media conglomerate, the New York-based **Primedia**, owned 250 magazines, 232 business and consumer information forums, it owned 47 trade shows, and had sales of $1.7 billion. Jewish mogul Henry Kravis controlled over 80% of the company through his Kohlberg Kravis Roberts investment monster [described earlier, p. 1025]. [FOLIO, FIRST DAY, 9-23-99] Kravis and Jewish KKR partners George Roberts and Michael Tokarz sit on Primedia’s Board of Directors. Meyer Feldberg is another Jew on the Board. (The chairman of company, Tom Rogers, and Vice-Chairman, Beverly Chell, may both be Jewish too, Rogers and Chell are sometimes Jewish surnames). Primedia owns magazines and journals across the spectrum of America, including **American Baby**, **Chicago**, **New York**, **Modern Bride**, **Soap Opera Digest**, **Tiger Beat**, **16 Magazine**, **Canoe and Kayak**, **Surfing**, **Off Road**, **Truckin’**, **Crafts Magazine**, **Arabian Horse World**, **American History**, **Civil War Times**, **Fly Fisherman**, **Dog World**, **Quiltmaker**, **Pro Football Weekly**, and on and on. Divisions include **HPC Publishing** (113 publications in 38 states) and Internec. “Primedia publishes the largest number of magazine ad pages of any media company in the country… eighty-four percent of the company’s products are ranked #1 or #2 in their respective markets.” [PRIMEDIA ONLINE HOME PAGE at http://www.primediabusiness.com/magazines/magweb.asp?page=Magazines; and http://www.intertec.com/about.news; 9-27-99, ONLINE]

By the 1980s another Jewish family, the Annenbergs, owned **Triangle Publications**, which owned the largest read periodical in America: **TV Guide**, as well as **Seventeen**, (once edited by Enid [Annenberg] Haupt), the **Philadelphia Daily News** (and, for a time its rival, the **Philadelphia Inquirer**), the **Miami Tribune**, and the **Daily Racing form**, among other media holdings, including six television and nine radio stations, plus 27 cable TV franchises. [BIRMINGHAM, p. xii] (President Ronald Reagan was often a vacation guest at Walter Annenberg’s resort home in Palm Springs). The Annenbergs also are major shareholders in the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Campbell Soup Company. [MOMENT, p. 39] They have also owned a range of movie fan magazines, including **True**, **Screen Guide**, and **Detective**. The founder of all this, Moses Annenberg, was convicted of income tax evasion, fined eight million dollars, and spent three years in prison. [BIRMINGHAM, p. xii] His “national monopoly on the dissemination of horse race results back in the 1920s was allegedly facilitated by underworld figures.” [CHRISTOPHER, p. 103] “It has been said,” notes Robert Rockaway, “that Moe [Annenberg] was to the bookie of America what Arnold Rothstein was to the bootleggers and narcotics peddlers. He put the racket on a business-like basis.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 200] The Chica-
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go district attorney once called Annenberg “a murderer and a thief.” [ROCK-AWAY, R., 1993, p. 201]

The Annenburg Foundation has given 15 million dollars to the United Jewish Appeal for the resettlement of Soviet refugees in Israel, another million a year to the UJA, as well as a million to Technion-Israel Institute of Technology. Donations to non-Jewish organizations include 150 million dollars to PBS. Walter Annenberg also founded the University of Southern California’s Annenberg School of Communications.

In 1962 Walter Annenberg personally censored an ABC program about friend Richard Nixon that was scheduled to appear on the ABC-affiliates he owns, including WFIL-TV in Philadelphia and WNHC-TV in New Haven. As John Cooney notes, “Annenberg believed himself the judge of what was good for the public, and… his media complex enabled him to arbitrarily censor a news program on television and then explain in print [his Philadelphia newspaper] why he had done so.” [COONEY, p. 280] (Annenberg was appointed by Nixon to be the U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain in 1969).

Real estate investor Mortimer Zuckerman (who became an American citizen in 1977) by 1995 owned the U.S. News and World Report, (where he had earlier installed himself as editor-in-chief of America’s third largest news weekly magazine), the Atlantic Monthly, and the New York Daily News. He is also the founder of an organization called the Zionist Forum, and in 2001 became the head of the President’s Conference of Major Jewish Organizations. “Zuckerman has used the Atlantic Monthly,” says J. J. Goldberg, “to publish… occasional pieces that manage, ever so slightly, to shift debate toward what might be called a Jewish way of seeing the world.” [GOLDBERG, p.299] On one occasion, Zuckerman (a former boyfriend of Jewish feminist Gloria Steinem) addressed an American Friends of the Israeli Museum of the Diaspora fundraising dinner with a “35 minute jeremiad on the continuing dangers of anti-Jewish hostility all over the world and in America. He cited Arab threats to Israel, anti-Semites among American Blacks, and an anti-Israeli bias in the American news media.” [GOLDBERG, p. 70] Zuckerman, notes the (Jewish) Forward, has foregrounded his “advocacy of Israel in discussions with Secretary [of State] Albright… His column in U.S. News and World Report [is] evidence of his pro-Israeli tilt. He penned a dissent in defense of Israel in a Council on Foreign Relations report on the Middle East and has helped to rejuvenate the America-Israeli Friendship League, of which he is president.” [FORWARD, 11-14-97, p. 14] Zuckerman, the real estate developer (“one of the largest owners and developers of office buildings in the country”) [MATUSOW, p. 55], even sought to ruin a major icon of American intellectual and naturalist history – Walden Pond, Henry David Thoreau’s famous woody refuge site of personal contemplation and reflection against the noise of rat race barons like Zuckerman. “[Zuckerman] gave new meaning to the term ‘rapacious developer,’” noted Regardie’s Magazine, “by sticking to his plan to put up an office park next to Thoreau’s Walden Pond.” [REGARDIE’S, p. 64]

Regarding Zuckerman’s avid Zionism, Bill Kovach, curator of the Nieman Foundation in Boston, notes that:
“Each step that an owner of a news organization takes deeper into partisian activities of any kind makes a difference. It raises fundamental questions about the purpose for which that person chooses to own news outlets.” [MATUSOW, p. 55]

Even when his billionaire chum Michael Milken was making news for his various financial scandals, Zuckerman instructed his Atlantic Monthly staff not to use the popular “junk-bond king” label to describe him, but, rather, “besieged financial genius.” [MATUSOW, p. 55] Conversely, when the New York Times ran a critical story called “Mortimer Zuckerman: a Developer Who Thrives on High-Stakes Dealing,” the Jewish executive editor at the Times, A. M. Rosenthal, responded by calling underling editors into his office. Chummy with Zuckerman, only two days earlier Rosenthal had dined with him and his then-girlfriend, Gloria Steinem. As Joseph Goulden notes, Rosenthal assailed the editors and condemned the Zuckerman piece in an in-house memo for allegedly “opinionated phrases and unattributed characterizations. The article established a tone that cast its subject in an unfavorable light. Describing Mr. Zuckerman’s real estate acquisitions, the article uses the phrase ‘more than five years of plotting.’ It said he had befriended people ‘in an effort to win a place in their world.’ His latest major purchase… ‘does not sate him.’…. [etc.]” [GOULDEN, p. 288]

(Gordon Thomas, British author of a 1999 volume about Israel’s Mossad, fingers Rosenthal an Israeli sayan, an undercover American “helper” of the foreign spy network). [HOWE, R., 6-99, p. 47]

The Jewish Ziff family (worth $3 billion), until it started selling off many of its media holdings in the mid-1990s, owned half a dozen TV stations and over 35 periodicals including Popular Photography, Popular Electronics, Car and Driver, Stereo Review, PC (Personal Computer) Magazine, and PC Week. Before modern Israel was founded, patriarch William Ziff wrote a book called The Rape of Palestine, notes Lenni Brenner, “which favored a Zionist alliance with Mussolini.” [BRENNER, p. 78]

The Pritzker family (worth $6 billion) has owned the 140 Hyatt hotels, Royal Caribbean cruise ships, Braniff and Continental Airlines, McCall’s magazine, Ticketmaster (the ticket outlet that some rock and roll groups have assailed for its high prices and monopolistic practices – in 1998 Jewish mogul Barry Diller’s USA Networks acquired it; its CEO and president remains Frederic Rosen), and Coast-to-Coast Savings and Loan. They also own the Mormon Group, which controls companies making everything from gloves to missile parts.

Sumner Redstone (formerly Murray Rothstein, worth $3.4 billion) began as a liquor wholesaler, and graduated from a 12-chain theatre operation to 855 of them. He is currently the chairman of National Amusements, Inc. In 1987 he acquired the media giant Viacom, Inc. Redstone’s other subsidiaries include the Blockbuster Video chain; the Simon and Schuster, Charles Scribners Sons, Twayne, MacMillan, Pocket Books, Fireside Books, the Free Press, Jossey-Bass, and Prentice-Hall publishing houses; Spelling Television (Aaron
Spelling: chairman of the board); and Paramount studios. Paramount in turn owns the New York Knicks basketball team and the New York Rangers Hockey team. Viacom also owns the MTV and Nickelodeon cable TV companies, as well as Showtime. It also shares ownership of the USA and SciFi channels. “Redstone’s donations to Jewish charities have won him honors from the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the B’nai B’rith and Jewish philanthropies of Greater Boston.” [MOMENT]

The former president of National Amusements and publisher of The Jewish Advocate (as well as the ex-husband of Redstone’s daughter) is Ira Korff, a direct descendant of the Baal Shem Tov – the founder of Hasidism in the 18th century. Korff eventually decided to accept the Hasidic hereditary mantle of the Hasidic “Grand Rabbi.” As the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz notes:

“Korff says that the worst purveyor of violence and profanity on TV is Music Television (MTV), which is owned by Viacom. But, he adds, ‘I have no interest in attacking Viacom, and MTV is an ethically run business.’ After all, much of his own wealth was made while serving as president and later consultant to National Amusements Inc., a large movie-theatre chain which holds the majority of shares in Viacom, the world’s second-largest media company (to AOL Time Warner Inc.) Furthermore, his first wife, Shari Restone, is the daughter of Sumner Redstone, chairman and CEO of Viacom, and Korff’s three children from that marriage will likely profit from their grandfather’s fortune. Forbes recently estimated Restone’s personal worth at $14 billion.” [HAUSMAN, T, 6-22-01]

(Viacom’s Paramount TV network, United Paramount Network (UPN), is actually a joint venture with BHC Communications, which is a subsidiary of Chris-Craft Industries. Jewish entrepreneur Herbert Siegel has controlled Chris-Craft since the late 1960s. UPN reaches over 91% of American homes through 150 television affiliates. [HOOVER, p. 225])

“At mighty Paramount,” noted Jewish screenwriter Ben Stein in 1996, “the controlling stockholder is Sumner Redstone. Head of the Studio is Jon Dolgren. [Dolgren, formerly president of Sony Pictures and Columbia Pictures, was awarded the Wiesenthal Center’s 1997 “Humanitarian Award.”] Head of Production is Sherry Lansing – all members of my tribe… At newly energized ICM [International Creative Management], the top dogs are Jeff Berg and Jim Wiatt. At still overwhelming CAA [Creative Artist Management], Jack Rapke and other members of my faith predominate. At William Morris John Burnham and other Jews are, by and large, in the power positions [1997 president: Jerry Katzman]. This has always been true in Hollywood.” [STEIN, E! LINE]

Stein here refers to the three major Hollywood “talent agencies,” all predominantly Jewish. These firms are so influential in Hollywood that for years in the 1990s, Michael Ovitz, the Jewish head of CAA, was rated by Premiere magazine as the most powerful person in Hollywood. As early as 1986, the Wall Street Journal wrote that “it seemed that Michael Ovitz really was Hollywood’s most powerful power broker.” [SLATER, p. 176] In 1989 Time noted that “nearly everyone agrees that Ovitz, 42, president of Creative Artists Agency, is possi-
bly the most powerful figure in Hollywood.” [SLATER, p. 200-201] Ovitz even personally arranged for his martial arts instructor, Steven Seagal, to become a movie star. [SLATER, p. 181]

Ovitz formed **CAA** in 1975 with fellow **William Morris** defectors Michael Rosenfeld, Ron Meyer, Bill Haber, and Rowland Perkins. Martin Baum joined as a sixth partner later. When CAA was formed, one of the first things the five founders did was to each buy a Jaguar automobile, to create a proper “image.” [SLATER, p. 69-70] The first two hires at **CAA** were Amy Grossman and Laurie Perlman, both later elevated to agent status.


Major agents at **William Morris** included the legendary Abe Lastfogel, as well as Phil Weltman, Sam Weisbrot, Lew Weiss, Barry Diller, Robert Shapiro, and many others. Until he died of AIDS, Stan Kamen was “the most prominent talent agent of the day [1980s].” [SLATER, p. 93] Another prominent agent/lawyer was Mickey Rudin. His sister, **Elizabeth Greenson**, noted that she “watched Mickey create an atmosphere of demand for **Frank Sinatra**, that he was desirable.” [KELLEY, K., p. 305] Freddie Fields, “the chairman of [Creative Management Associates], was the most powerful motion-picture agent in the business… He was married to actress Polly Bergen, and [with] his partner, David Begelman, oversaw the most envied client list of Hollywood’s stars, including **Henry Fonda, Judy Garland, Natalie Wood, Steve McQueen, Paul Newman, and Barbara Streisand**.” [KING, T., 2000, p. 127]

Irving “Swifty” Lazar was also for decades one of Hollywood’s most powerful agents; an invitation to his post-Academy Awards party was a measure of high Hollywood status. Sandy Gallin, “by the time he was thirty… was the mastermind of an elite coven of entertainment superstars that included **Dolly Parton, Cher, and Michael Jackson**.” He was also a member a group of Jewish homosexual moguls known in the elite party world as the “Velvet Mafia”; it included clothes designer **Calvin Klein**, movie/TV mogul Barry Diller, record mogul **David Geffen**, and Steve Rubell, among others. [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 206, 209-210] Steve Rubell headed New York’s **Studio 54** nightclub, “the greatest nightclub of all time.” Steven Gaines and Sharon Churcher note that Studio 54’s reputation was that of “a destructive, malevolent place, a septic tank that glorified drug use and promiscuity.” [GAINES/CHURCHER, p. 206, 209-210]

“through Jack La Vien [a common form of Levine], a friend of [Krantz’s husband Steven, also Jewish] we became members of an exclusive club that dominated the chic New York disco scene. It was called Le Club, and everyone wanted to get all done up in pretty clothes, go there, and dance. This was a decade before the Studio 54 scene and pretty clothes were still desirable. Jack was one of those socially gifted men who seemed to know absolutely everybody in London and New York.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 221]

In her autobiography, Jewish comedian Joan Rivers notes the many agents and managers she had (which of them, one wonders, is not Jewish?) who “had once carried my hopes” in her long, torturous road to media stardom:

“Irwin Arthur, Freddie Weintraub, Jack Segal, Marty Erlichman, Charlie Joffe, Bob Shanks, Jack Rollins, Paul Keyes, Roy Silver, Tony Rivers. [And] every agent or secretary or manager, large and small, that I had ever phoned or waved to or used their ladies’room. Julius Monk, Irving Haber, Lenny Jacobson. This is your life, Joan Rivers.” [RIVERS, p. 337]

Earlier Rivers agents also included Hamilton Katz. Another she ran across, Ira Ring, was one of the clique of agents who controlled bookings at hotels in New York’s Catskill mountain resorts. “Most of them,” notes Rivers, “were sleazy and liars.” [RIVERS, p. 170] Another Jewish agent, Bernie Sohn, helped her get a position in Chicago’s Second City improvisation comedy team. Second City’s producer was also Jewish, Bernie Sahlin. The director was Paul Sills, later replaced by Alan Meyerson. [RIVERS, p. 263-264, 278] Rivers later worked for a miserable time at Candid Camera as a writer for Allen Funt (also Jewish). Much-hated by employees, Rivers describes Funt as the “Hitler” [RIVERS, p. 363] of the popular program.

ICM’s most powerful agent in the 70’s and 80’s was probably “Holocaust survivor” Sue Mengers. “Mengers,” notes Rachel Abramowitz, “ruled Hollywood as the outrageous, mouthy, impudent, muumuu-swaddled agent to the stars.” Fellow Jewish agent Martin Baum, Mengers says, taught her “total aggression.” Clients included Burt Reynolds, Gene Hackman, Candice Bergen, Barbara Streisand and many other prominent movie stars. “When Mengers finally became rich, she used to luxuriate in breakfast in bed, served by a Portugese maid.” [ABRAMOWITZ, R., 2000, p. 39, 41] (In April 1998, ICM chairman Marvin Josephson and Merv Adelson, the former CEO and chairman of Lorimar, co-chaired the “jubilee committee” that ran the “Hollywood extravaganza” program on CBS that commemorated Israel’s 50th anniversary, “Israel at 50.” Both men, noted the Jewish Journal of Los Angeles, “were appointed to serve as international co-chairmen of the 50th celebration at the behest of Israel’s prime minister, Benyamin Netanyahu.” Josephson has even served as treasurer for a pro-Israel lobbying group, the National Political Action Committee.)

In earlier years, Jules Stein’s and Lew Wasserman’s MCA (Music Corporation of America) was so prominent in the talent agency business that it was known as “the Octopus.” [BROWNSTEIN, p. 182] “By 1936 [MCA] con-
trolled every band of any consequence in America.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 43] Ever expanding, “through the 1950s MCA became the dominant force in television production.” [BROWNSTEIN, p. 183]

By 1960, notes Michael Pye, Jules Stein “was the ultimate power in more than half of American show business, agents to the stars in theatre, cinema, television, and he kept it bland. He became the power that dominated the schedules of NBC… Almost a third of prime television in the 1950s came from the corporate machine he fashioned. When finally the Justice Department put his business in a courtroom and challenged its scale and power, he had already decided to abandon his agency… [PYE, p. 18-19]… It is hard to overestimate the power and ambition of the empire Jules Stein built. It dominated the agency business, with perhaps 60 per cent of the star business worth having in music, movies, and television. It dominated prime-time television… Lew Wasserman, as the operating head of the agency, was regarded by consensus as the most powerful man in Hollywood.” [PYE, p. 60]

MCA has long been alleged to have been built with ties to organized crime. An advisor to President Lyndon Johnson, notes the Washington Post, “recalls that the White House only considered Wasserman but never offered the job [of Secretary of Commerce] to him because of worries that confirmation hearings would turn up embarrassing details about his ties to Hollywood’s shadowy side.” [FARHI, p. G1]

Another MCA mogul, Sonny Werbler, head of MCA-TV and later president and CEO of the New York Jets professional football team, was described by a Variety reporter in 1965:

“In more than three decades, Werblin wielded more influence, made more money, made and broke more careers, than any other show biz impresario in New York.” [MOLDEA, p. 237]

Jews are of course predominant in the literary agency world (which blends into the entertainment milieu) as well. Albert Zuckerman, for example, is “one of New York’s most successful millionaire literary agents,” with a stable of writers including Ken Follett and Zuckerman’s own wife, Ellen Goudge. [LORA, p. 15] Dallas-based Evan Fogelman is “the prince of the romance novel… He has built the Fogelman Literary Agency into a force in the industry, one that includes among its authors some of the biggest names in romance: Kathleen Sutcliffe, Julie Beard, Anne Eames, and Peggy Webb, among others.” [BIEDERMAN, C., 10-23-97] At agent Joan Daves’ death in 1997 she “was regarded as one of the world’s foremost agents for serious and intellectual fiction and non-fiction.” Her clients included six Nobel Prize winners. [GEIDER, L., 6-27-97]

An early CAA merger deal with the Adams, Ray, and Rosenberg Literary Agency fell through, but CAA head Michael Ovitz eventually worked out cooperative, mutual development deals with another agency, headed by Mort Jankow. (There was “no literary agent more important than Mort Jankow,” notes Robert Slater. [SLATER, p. 66]) Jankow’s literary clients still include best-sell-
ing authors Judith Krantz, Danielle Steel, Jackie Collins, and Sidney Sheldon. (Janklow’s wife, Linda, was the granddaughter of Harry Warner, one of the founders of Warner Brothers). [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 209] Later Ovitz lured literary agent Steve Roth away from the Ziegler-Roth literary agency. When, under increasing media scrutiny, Ovitz hired a public relations company in 1988 to deal with the media for CAA, it was Howard J. Rubenstein Associates. [SLATER, p. 200]

**Dennis McDougal** notes the case of MCA in the literary world:

“MCA began buying up New York literary agencies, including the Jay Sanford Agency and the Liebling-Wood Agency, which gave MCA control of the nation’s three best-known playwrights: Tennessee Williams, William Inge, and Arthur Miller.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 151]

Another example of the talent agency network system is the case of Jane Sindell, described in 1997 by the Los Angeles Times as “one of the top literary agents in the business,” a veteran of all three of the most powerful talent agencies – CAA, ICM, and the William Morris Agency. Married to TV writer David Hurwitz, her mother worked for prominent Hollywood screenwriter Herman Mankiewicz. Her uncle (Sam Jaffe) founded his own talent agency, as did her father (the Sindell Agency), her uncle (the Gersh Agency), and her brother Richard. [ELLER, Top, p. D9] Uncle Sam Jaffe was “the pre-eminent Hollywood agent for the 1930s through the 1950s [who] managed the careers of stars, notably Humphrey Bogart, Richard Burton, and David Niven.” [KIRSCHNER, S., 4-27-00, p. 13] Nat Letfowitz was another top agent at the William Morris Agency. His cousin Ted Ashley headed the Ashley Famous agency (which represented the likes of John Wayne, William Holden, and Tennessee Williams). [KING, T., 2000, p. 88]

Prominent author Scott Berg’s family includes a father who was an MGM screenwriter, a brother who heads powerhouse Hollywood talent agency ICM, another who is a record producer at (Jewish-owned) Geffen Records, and a third who is a literary agent. [SCHLEIER, 1-29-99, p. 31] Until his death in 2000, Arthur Pine (born Pincus) owned “one of the most dynamic literary agencies.” He started out in the entertainment agency business, representing “Jack Benny, Bob Hope, Milton Berle, George Burns, Sammy Cahn, Phil Silvers, and the rest of Tinseltown’s Jewish mafia.” [NOLAN, F., 11-1-00, p. 6]

From her experience managing her famous sister Roseanne, Geraldine Barr (also Jewish) notes the way that Hollywood networking (agents, and other wheelers and dealers) works for those who hope to rise as “stars” there: “The power situation is one where you are buying access to the system that is Hollywood. In the early stages of your career, there is no free lunch. A rising star will ultimately pay as much as 75 percent of earnings just to enter the world where real fame and fortune can be achieved. If the star were a box of cereal, she would be buying shelf space in supermarkets and advertising in newspapers. In Hollywood, you buy the people who can put you in the position you need for success.” [BARR, p. 159-160]
Jews are of course also predominant in radio. Norman Pattiz, for instance, has been for years the chairman of Westwood One, which “is America’s largest producer and distributor of radio programming” and the parent company of Mutual Broadcasting System, the NBC Radio Network, CBS News Radio, Fox News Radio, CNN Radio, the Source, NBC Talknet, and the Westwood One Radio Network.” Its programs are featured on over 7,500 radio stations around the world. By 1988, it was even producing 200 rock and roll concerts a year. The “single biggest stockholder of Westwood One, the nation’s largest radio network” is also Jewish: David Saperstein. [PR NEWSWIRE; MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

In 1991 Bruce Kanter was named Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the Westwood One company. Another Jewish executive, Martin Rubenstein, was the CEO of Mutual Broadcasting until 1984; in 1986 he became the CEO of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Among the many Jewish reporters in commercial radio is Ellen Ratner, “White House correspondent and bureau chief for Talk Radio News Service.” She was formerly the co-host of the widely syndicated Good Day USA. [SPEVACK, V., 5-5-2000, p. 48]

In the government realm, Marc Nathanson was appointed twice by President Bill Clinton to be “chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, which oversees Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and other federal broadcasting services… Nathanson founded Falcon Communications. In 1999, he sold the company to Charter Communications for $3.5 million, creating the nation’s fourth-largest cable operator. Nathanson remains one of the largest individual stockholders and vice chairman of Charter’s board. He is also a director of the Digital Entertainment Network and the National Cable Television Association… He recently ventured into online entertainment, making an undisclosed investment in iFilm.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]


NPR’s White House correspondent? Also Jewish: Mara Liasson. NPR reporter Lina Gradstein is an Orthodox Jew. (Can we remotely imagine a comparable Christian fundamentalist as a reporter at the liberal public radio network?) In 2000, yet another Jew, Jeffrey Dvorkin, was named to the new post as National Public Radio’s ombudsman. He formerly worked as the Vice Pres-
ident for News at NPR; before that, he was in the same position at the Canadian Broadcast Corporation. Why not a Jewish ombudsman? As the Cleveland Jewish News notes,

"[Dvorkin] notes that Jewish listeners comprise more than 20 percent of NPR's audience. A significant number of Jews, like himself, also work at the radio network." [KARFIELD, M., 6-23-2000, p. 27]

Other prominent Jewish NPR figures include Ira Glass (host and producer of This American Life, Robert Siegel (co-host of All Things Considered), and David Isay and his Associate Producer Stacy Abramson – contributors to All Things Considered). Rabbi Lawrence Kushner is a “regular commentator” to the same program. [PROVIDENCE JOURNAL-BULLETIN, 5-1-99] Senior editor for the All Things Considered weekend edition is Jonathan Broder, also a writer for Israel’s Jerusalem Report. Scott Simon (whose father was Jewish), now hosts Weekend Edition and has “one of the most familiar voices on radio.” (In 1997 Catholic groups protested Weekend Edition’s satirical song of Catholic ritual called ‘The Vatican Rag. ‘ “NPR is taking great delight in offending Catholics,” objected William Donahue, of a Catholic defense organization, “They would not be disparaging of blacks, Jews, and gays. This rank hypocrisy and double standard is what gets our ire up.”) [MCCORD, J., 6-12-97, p. 57]

Ketzel Lavine is the “funny gardener” on the Weekend program. Charles Mayer is “one of the new members of NPR, a young producer.” [JULIAN, S., 6-6-2000] Michael Feldman hosts Whad’ya Know? Terry Gross is host of NPR's Fresh Air (co-producer: Naomi Person). Even Ray Suarez, of Puerto Rican heritage, has a Jewish mother. For six and a half years he hosted NPR's Talk of the Town program until he recently moved to PBS television as a “senior correspondent” for the News Hour with Jim Lehrer. [DIAZ, K., 10-28-99] (The director of the Lehrer news hour is David Deutch.) Likewise, David Brancaccio, host of NPR's Marketplace, is of Jewish/Italian descent.

For many years too, the head of the most important NPR radio station in the second largest American radio market (Los Angeles), has been Ruth (Hirschman) Seymour. Seymour, notes the Los Angeles Times, “shaped the public radio station KCRW in her own image… Hawkish on behalf of Israel, Seymour and KCRW often seem to fixate on the Middle East and Europe and, until recently, hardly seemed to acknowledge the existence of Los Angeles.” [RUSSELL, p. A1] Among her pet projects was a 13-week 32-story collaboration between KCRW and the National Yiddish Book Center [which opened its new Amherst, Massachusetts $8 million building in 1997] to air Eastern European Jewish short stories to a nationwide audience. [MARGOLICK, p. 3] (Another nationally “acclaimed National Public Radio series” was Great Jewish Stories from Eastern Europe and Beyond). [BIGA, L., 4-14-2000, p. 34]

Meanwhile, in the commercial radio world, Mel Karmazin, was described by the New York Daily News in 1997 as “one of the most powerful and richest men in the media business.” His personal fortune is estimated at over $200 million. He headed “the CBS broadcasting giant’s most precious properties: it's string of 14 TV stations and 77 radio stations and is poised to take over the en-
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tire network.” [FURMAN, p. 31] The CBS radio group was by 1998 America’s largest radio company in terms of revenues, at $1.5 billion. In 1998 Karmazin became the chairman and CEO of the resurrected Infinity Broadcasting division, which he had sold to CBS two years earlier for $3.9 billion. CBS has also acquired the then fifth largest radio company – American Radio Systems – during Karmazin’s tenure. Among other accomplishments, Karmazin resurrected the career of decadent Jewish radio talk show host Howard Stern when he was fired by WNBC in 1985. “At the time,” notes the Daily News, “Stern was under siege. Parents and religious groups regularly protested his provocative broadcasts and boycotted his advertisers… No matter what Stein did on the air, whether it was lesbian dial-a-date or celebrating his own flatulence, Karmazin stuck with him,” eventually even paying a “$1.7 million settlement to the Federal Trade Commission to settle indecency charges against Stern.” [FURMAN, p. 31] “During is career in radio,” noted the Washington Post, “Mr. Karmazin championed the notion of favoring good ratings over just about everything else, including taste.” [SCHWARTZ, p. 13]

Karmazin, head of the CBS Station Group (radio and television) in May 1997 became Chief Operating Officer of the CBS corporation. By January 1998, notes the New York Times, “he muscled aside the CBS Chief Executive Officer, Michael Jordan… for the top job,” finally reigning over all of the firm. [ELLIOIT, S., p. 16] Following the pattern of more and more centralized media monopolies, in September 1999 CBS merged into the aforementioned Viacom, headed by another Jewish mogul, Sumner Redstone. Karmazin was now the president and Chief Operating Officer of the new Viacom, number 2 man behind Redstone, but all divisions reported to him. “Mr. Redstone,” noted the New York Times, “predicted that when his position finally became vacant, Mr. Karmazin would get the job.” [ELLIOIT, p. 16] Viacom now ruled CBS, MTV, the Nashville Network, Nickelodeon, Paramount, Simon and Schuster, VH1, the Blockbuster video chain, and on and on. And who is chairman of CBS Television? Leslie Moonves, is also Jewish [ELKIN, M., 7-13-2000], and reputed to be a distant relative of David Ben-Gurion, the first prime minister of Israel. Only a month after the World Trade Center terrorist attack, he was under fire by some for his consideration of a new sitcom show based on the atrocity. [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 10-20-01, p. F4]

In 1996 President Bill Clinton responded to lobbying pressures from the entertainment media and signed a bill deregulating American radio; companies had formerly been limited to the ownership of two radio stations in any given geographical market and 40 stations (20 on AM, 20 on FM) overall. The new law allowed the ownership of up to eight stations in a given area, and the total number that a company could own was now unlimited. In the next two and a half years, 4,000 of America’s 11,000 radio stations changed ownership [FINANCIAL TIMES, 6-10-98, p. 24] as the richest companies rushed to expand into giant media conglomerates, increasingly monopolizing and homogenizing the airwaves, and creating what one professor called the “McDonaldization” of radio. “More and more regulators, academics, and advertisers,” noted the Dal-
las Morning News, “worry that radio’s merger-mania concentrates too much
power in too few hands.” [DWORKIN, p. 1H]

Quickly, two radio companies stood out as especially active in bloating
themselves immediately after Clinton’s deregulation bill to gigantic status:
Chancellor Media, and Jacor Communications.

After a series of massive buyouts of other companies, in late 1998 the Chancellor Media corporation became America’s largest radio broadcast company
with over 456 stations in 105 markets across America (it also owns or manages
12 TV stations). Its AMFM Radio Network was also created to provide pro-
gram syndication. It even owns the Primedia Broadcast Group in Puerto Rico
and 50% of Latin America’s largest Latin American radio company (in Mexico). Chancellor also owns 37,000 outdoor advertising display boards in 37 states.

In 1998, the president and CEO of Chancellor, Scott Ginsburg, resigned
and took with him a “severance” package worth $59 million. He was replaced
by another Jewish executive, Jeffery Marcus, the founder of Marcus Cable, “the
largest closely held U.S. cable TV company.” [LA TIMES, p 4-30-98, p. 7] In
1997 another Jewish chief, David Kanter, left the presidency of Disney’s ABC
Radio Network to run Chancellor’s AMFM Radio Network. He was also
named senior vice president of Chancellor.

The parent company (Hicks Muse Tate and Furst) that owns Chancellor Media is not Jewish-owned, but in 1998 it joined forces with the America’s larg-
est private equity company, Kohlberg Kravis Roberts (which is Jewish) to cre-
ate the largest chain of movie theatres in America – Regal Cinema. Plans were
to own 20% of the total cinema screens in the nation by 1999. [LEWIS, W, p. 2]

The Jacor Communications rise to gigantic status is even more dramatic,
zooming from obscurity to become the third largest American radio broadcasting
corporation (after CBS and Chancellor). Starting in early 1996 with 20 ra-
dio stations, by late 1998 it owned 205 in 56 cities. In 1997 alone Jacor paid $1.2
billion for 77 new stations. “Jacor,” noted the Associated Press, “has gone on a
cost-to-coast buying spree that has raised eyebrows even in an era when loos-
ened controls on the broadcast industry have led us to widespread purchase and
consolidation of radio groups.” [NOLAN] The company was particularly in-
terested in “clustering,” i.e., buying the maximum number (eight) of radio sta-
tions in a given market including Denver, San Diego, and Cincinnati. By 1997,
Jacor had eighteen such clusters throughout America. Aside from flirting with
local information monopolies (it is not impossible that the eight most domi-
nant radio stations in any given area could be owned by the same controller),
the economic effect of this is significant. Early in Jacor’s buying spree, for ex-
ample, its Cincinnati stations cornered 44.3 percent of the radio advertising
dollar in that area.

Among Jacor’s other buys was also EFM Media Entertainment, the syndi-
cation company that holds the rights to the number one rated radio talk show
in America – that of conservative political news commentator Rush Limbaugh.
The next year Jacor bought the rights to (Jewish) Laura Schlessinger’s number
two rated talk show for $71.5 million. Jacor even bought a Christian radio station in St. Louis, WCBW-FM.

For Limbaugh’s part, Susan Rosenbluth, editor of the Jewish Voice and Opinion, noted that “as one who knows Limbaugh and has personally followed his career for many years, I can assert categorically that his philo-Semitism and pro-Israel stances are sincere and heartfelt.” [ROSENBLUTH, S., 10-9-94] In 1995, the New York Times featured an article on Limbaugh’s “legman” Joel Rosenberg, director of research for Limbaugh’s Limbaugh Newsletter. Posted in Washington DC, says the Times, Rosenberg

“is the eyes and ears – and, on occasion, the muscle – of Mr. Limbaugh in the capital… Mr. Rosenberg considers himself something of an expert on Israel, where he has travelled extensively and spent a year as a student at Tel Aviv University. The summer before his graduation from Syracuse, he worked at the State Department, helping produce a videotape that introduces Israel to Foreign Service Officers newly stationed in Tel Aviv… [Rosenberg] describes himself to acquaintances as an evangelical Christian… [He regards] himself as a rather committed Zionist.” [BERKE, p. 1]

The economic piston behind the Jacor feeding frenzy was Sam Zell, a Jewish billionaire who is also the chairman and major stockholder in the company. Zell was listed in the mid-1990s as the 96th wealthiest American by Forbes magazine. The president of Jacor is also Jewish, Steve Lehman, as is the CEO, Randy Michaels (real name: Benjamin Homel). (Sheila Rosenberg was Chairperson and Robert Lawrence the co-CEO in 1996).

Michaels has long cultivated a distinct reputation in the radio business. In the early 1990s at a Radio & Records convention he ripped the shirt off a woman he planted in the audience during his talk about the “importance of being outrageous.” [STARK, p. 63] Michaels, wrote the Dallas Morning News, also “has earned publicity for promoting his stations with billboards that featured naked women and disgraced celebrities.” [DWORKIN, p. 1H] In 1992 ABC’s 20/20 TV program featured a story about a sexual harassment suit by a former talk show host. Broadcasting magazine noted that

“In the report, 20/20 quoted [former Jacor employees] who said that ‘Jacor’s emphasis on sexually oriented programming continues off the air, creating a raunchy workplace atmosphere that [was]… intolerable for some female employees’…. The report detailed incidents in which Michaels, then vice president of programming and an on-air personality at WFLA, allegedly accosted women with a flexible rubber penis and twice mooned a female employee.” [VILES, p. 33]

In 1996, as a recorded radio stunt, local employees at a Jacor affiliate in Denver went to a mosque and “played the national anthem on a bugle and taunted worshippers.” The Denver Post responded by condemning the station attitude created by Jacor’s top executives:

“The management of radio station KPI would have us believe that the buck stops with disc jockeys, in the outrageous invasion of Muslim
mosque in Denver. Wrong. The buck should stop at Jacor, the corporate owner of the station… Jacor has demonstrated it has the financial clout and the influence to dominate the Denver radio market with eight stations. But this latest incident proves that Jacor is a lousy, money-grubbing corporate citizen. It obviously couldn’t care less about the irresponsible, bigoted trash it’s spewing out over the public airwaves. [AMOLE, p. F5A]

In 1998 Jacor made Denver’s news again when a citizens’ group – Citizens Opposing the Stadium Cost – charged that Jacor’s eight local stations were “openly engaged in a campaign to shape public opinion and influence an election that would result in substantial profits for itself as well as its political and business allies.” [LOWE, p. A10]

(Ever in flux, in 1999, with continuing corporate mergers and reshufflings, Jacor merged with Clear Channel Communications [non-Jewish (?) CEO Lowry Mays] to become the second largest radio group in America in terms of stations (458). Randy Michaels was named president of Clear Channel).

In the cable world, based in Philadelphia, the Comcast Corporation is America’s third largest cable company (only behind Time-Warner and TCI). Comcast was founded by three Jewish entrepreneurs in the 1960s – Ralph Roberts, Daniel Aaron, and Julian Brodsky. By the 1990s the company’s chairman, Roberts, was worth $400 million and owned 78% of the company’s voting stock. In 1997 he ceded voting control to his son, Brian, who had been earlier named, at age 30, as the Comcast president. By 1996, Brian was also Chairman of the National Cable Television Association and on the Boards of Turner Broadcasting System, QVC, Inc., and Viewer’s Choice. [ALMANAC, 4-23-96]

In 1991, another Jewish executive, Ann Wexler, was named as Director of the Comcast company (she had once served as a public liaison assistant to President Jimmy Carter. Wexler’s husband is the president of American University in Washington DC). In 1998 Howard Fischer & Associates took credit for bringing Steve Burke (formerly president of Disney’s ABC Broadcasting) to the presidency of Comcast as Brian Roberts moved upwards. Comcast has been active in Jewish and Israeli causes, including a film about the Holocaust that was introduced to local school systems. In 1993 the company even defrayed expenses for a Jewish National Fund “gala” featuring the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell. “Having someone of Colin Powell’s stature gives us the edge,” said JNF president David Neving, “and means we’ll sell more tickets to raise money for Israel.” [FEILER, p. 17]

(Brian Roberts won silver medals in squash in 1981, 1985, and 1997 at Israel’s Maccabiah Games. “The Maccabi,” once noted Israeli prime minister David Ben-Gurion about the Games, “is without a doubt one of the most important offshoots of the Zionist movement.” [http://www.maccabicanada.com/about/history/history.html] According to the organization’s web site, the Maccabiah Games’ “Goals and Objectives” are “1. To re-enforce Jewish Zionist Education, both for the youth and adults to enable the Jews to receive and explore their roots. 2. To fight Assimilation 3. To get the Jewish youth of the Diaspora more
acquainted with the Jewish heritage and tradition. 4. To foster the relationship between the Jewish communities inter-globally and with Israel.”) [http://www.maccabiworld.org/aboutus.html]

In 2001, Comcast took over AT&T’s cable business to become the “giant of the industry… with 22.3 million cable subscribers in 41 states. The company will have more than 30 percent of the cable market… The Roberts [family] will have only a 1 percent equity stake in the combined company. But they will control one-third of the voting stock, far more than any other single block of voting shareholders.” [DABNEY, M., 12-20-01]

Further along in the mega-mogul category, the Bronfman family (worth $2.7 billion) acquired a fortune by supplying United States bootleggers with alcohol from Canada during the prohibition years. Deals were made with Jewish gangster Meyer Lansky for the illegal distribution of Bronfman’s liquor into the United States. The Bronfman’s own Seagram’s, and market Chivas Regal scotch, Absolut vodka, Mumm champagne, Martell cognac, and Tropicana fruit juices. At the age of 16 a young heir, Edgar Bronfman, Jr. (whose father is the Chairman of the World Jewish Congress) spent $500,000 on making his first movie. Later, he bought 15% of the shares of Time Warner (the parent firm of Warner Brothers, HBO, and Time magazine.) In 1995 Edgar gained 80% of MCA, Inc. the parent company of Universal pictures, Universal City and other theme parks in Los Angeles and Orlando, Florida, and Geffen Records. MO-MENT, p. (By the early 1980s MCA – run by Lew Wasserman and Sidney Scheinberg – had evolved from a talent agency to a television production and music firm.) The Bronfman dynasty, as noted earlier, also owns the PolyGram media empire. (Ever changing, Seagram recently merged with the French Vivendi media conglomerate. In 2001, Jewish Hollywood mogul Barry Diller took the helm of Vivendi Universal, “one of Hollywood’s hottest studios.”) [VERRIER/BROWN, 12-16-01]

Some apologists have argued that, with large investments in Hollywood by powerful Japanese corporations in recent years, that Jewish power there is being diluted. Not so says Michael Medved:

“It’s… foolish to use foreign ownership of leading entertainment conglomerates as a rebuttal to those who blame Jews for what they dislike about Hollywood. Sure, companies like Sony [and] Matsushita [are] not recognizable Jewish name[s]. Nevertheless, these offshore enterprises have functioned in Hollywood like absentee landlords, employing long-time industry insiders in all the most powerful positions rather than importing their own personnel from Tokyo or Sidney. When Matsushita took over MCA-Universal, for instance, the home company did nothing to undermine the unquestioned authority of Universal’s legendary – and all Jewish – management triad of Lew Wasserman, Sid Scheinberg, and Tom Pollack. Now, of course, the Japanese conglomerate has abandoned its high-flying Hollywood adventure and turned over its entertainment division to Seagram – a business that’s owned by one of the most visible and active Jewish families on the globe, the Bronf-
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man,
whose patriarch heads the World Jewish Congress. Young Edgar Bronfman Jr. has now arrived in California to take personal control of the operation and has installed Ron Meyer (former associate of Mike Ovitz at the Creative Artists Agency) as his second-in-command.” [Medved, p. 37]

Before Edgar Bronfman (chairman of the World Jewish Congress) and his family’s Seagrams corporation took over MCA-Universal, there was a lingering “Jewish problem” to Matsushita ownership. “A sensitive matter that remains unresolved from the Matsushita-MCA deal,” noted the Los Angeles Times in 1991, “is Matsushita’s relationship with Israel. Matsushita was listed late last year among the companies that comply with an Arab-led business boycott of Israel. The disclosure did not threaten the deal but did express all sides, because Wasserman is a leading supporter of Israel.” [CITRON, Matsushita, p. D1]

For Ovitz’s part, when Sony bought Columbia Pictures in 1988, he bagged an $8 million “consultant” fee. When Matsushita bought out MCA, Ovitz’s consultancy brought him $40 million. [SLATER, p. 219, 227] In 1994 an unnamed Sony executive in Tokyo told the Japanese business weekly Keizaikai, “The United States film business is almost completely controlled by Jews. This is true of what we are doing as well and our job is to use them in an efficient manner.” The magazine then noted, “What this person is saying is that you cannot ignore the Jews if you do business in the United States.” [MAGIDA, British, p. 42] (These conditions were apparently noted by Berry Gordy, founder and head of the African-American Motown musical recording label. A Jewish employee, Rob Cohen, was installed as a prominent official in the company’s film division). [TARABORRELLI, p. 299]

The Japanese-owned media giant Sony has maintained a prominent Jewish executive presence in its American operations. In 1994, Michael Raskin, the 33-year-old chief American counsel for the Sony Corporation, fell and died on Mt. Fuji. In a 1997 job purge because of weak profits, Sony Corporation of America chief Michael Schulhoff and Sony movie president Fred Bernstein lost their positions. (Alan Levine, chairman of Sony Pictures Entertainment, had been fired the year before). Schulhoff had earlier hired Jeff Sagansky in 1994 as his second in command. By 1998 Sagansky was – of all things – the CEO of Paxson Communications, a “conservative Christian” station. Illustrating the necessity even here for a negotiating Jewish presence in order to reasonably function in the Jewish entertainment and broadcast industry, the network under his command would not be solely slanted from a Christian point of view. As Sagansky told the Hollywood Reporter, “I’m Jewish so if that were true [the owner of this station] certainly wouldn’t have gotten me to do this job.” [DAVIES, J.] In 1999, still head of Paxson, Sagansky was honored with the Jewish Television Network’s “Vision Award.” Sagansky was also a member of JTN’s Board of Directors. [PR NEWSWIRE, 9-9-99]

By 1996 Marvin Schick complained that

“There may be someone adept in cyberspace who can roam across the Internet and ascertain how often Michael Schulhoff and Mel Iberman have been enshrined as outstanding Jews. They’re the top American of-
ficials of Sony, the company that has just released Michael Jackson’s album which contains words so vile and anti-Semitic that it is impossible to figure out what was on anyone’s mind.” [SCHICK, p. 5]

Jewish mass media influence, internationally, in a variety of countries, is also profound. Jews, for instance, have been prominent in defining the world throughout Latin America from the media helms. In Brazil, Jewish media mogul Silvio Santos (original name: Senor Abranavel) controls 98% of the group shares of that country’s second largest TV network – Sistema Brasileiro de Televisao (SBT), a conglomerate of 33 companies employing 15,000 people. Santos long ago installed himself as an on-air entertainer, and is a well-known TV personality. The (London) Daily Telegraph notes that Santos is “best known as the beaming millionaire host of Brazil’s most popular television variety show… [which features] half-naked Samba dancing girls, celebrity guests, and [a] Treasure Chest of Happiness lottery [that is] part of very working-class Brazilian’s traditional Sunday.” [HARGREAVES, p. 21]

By 1991, Santos was also the on-air host of the popular “They’ll Do Anything for Money” show. The Associated Press described the show:

“How about it, Christianne?’ Santos coaxed. ‘I’ll give you 10,000 cruzeiros (about $10) if you let me mash this egg on your head.’ Maciel, 18, an unemployed maid, refused. ‘How about 20,000?’ said Santos. ‘No? How about 40,000!’ She studied the audience, then nodded, embarrassed… The program, which pays audience members money to be the butt of pranks, has touched off a ratings battle that has all Brazilian networks thinking up new ways to ridicule contestants. The new crop of shows has also sparked a debate over what’s funny and what’s simply cruel.” [LEWAN, AP, INTERNET]

Another SBT show was “Get It Right or Get Splattered, in which contestants who give wrong answers to trivia questions get a pie in the face. Now, other networks have joined in the trend.” [LEWAN, AP] In 1989, Santos even sought to run for the presidency of Brazil. It was no joke; as the (London) Daily Telegraph noted in a headline: “Game-show Host Could Win Brazil’s Presidency.” [HARGREAVES, p. 21]


In Peru, preeminent media mogul Baruch Ivcher is an immigrant from Israel and owns the country’s largest television station. In 1997, during political troubles with the government for a series of television exposes, Ivcher lived in Miami and Israel. His minority partners in the station, also Jewish, ran the
company in his stead. [FORWARD, 11-7-97, p. 3] In Panama, the largest newspaper, *La Prensa*, is owned by Jewish mogul Robert Eisenmann. Even in Jamaica, that country’s most prominent newspaper – the *Gleaner* – is most publicly associated with the Ashenheim family. [HOLZBERG, p. 146] In Bolivia, a country that had less than 500 Jews in the whole country in 1987, “publisher and book dealer Werner Guttentag [is] a major presence on the national cultural scene.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 127]

In Mexico, the principal news anchorman for *Televisa* (which in recent years has held a monopolistic 95 per cent of the television audience) was Jacobo Zabludovsky. [OPPENHEIMER, A., p. 128, 131] He retired in 1998 after 27 years. Zabludovsky is often referred to as the “Walter Cronkite of Mexico.” He was “the nation’s most influential journalist who was also director of the network’s news division for many years.” [BUCKLEY, T.] Zabludovsky’s son, Abraham, is also a prominent reporter at the TV network.

In 2001 Jewish author Elissa Rashkin wrote a book entitled *Women Filmmakers in Mexico*. Of the five filmmakers she features, at least two are Jewish (despite the fact that there are merely 86,000 Jews in all of Mexico). Such filmmakers reflect typical Jewish themes. For *Guita Schyfter*,

> “with government backing, she was able to make a film which directly addressed her own experience of outsidersness and exclusion, as well as the history of Mexican Jews as a whole. That Schyfter’s reexamination of *mexicanidad* through Jewish eyes came to the screen in the 1990s has everything to do with larger changes taking place during this period: the collapse of myths of national unity in the wake of successive economic and political crises and the emergence of contestatory discourses such as feminism, gay activism, and *campesino* and indigenous resistance to centralized state power… Schyfter was refused permission by the president of the Ashkenazi community to film at the old synagogue and the Jewish cemetery, on the grounds that the film included an intermarriage.” [RASHIN, E., 2001, p. 143, 153]


Then there was Jacques and Natasha Gelman, Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, who settled in Mexico. They were

> “major players in the glamorous Mexico City film scene of the 1940s… Aristocratically educated in St. Petersburg, Russia, Jacques Gelman had been sent packing to Europe by his land-owning parents following the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, his pockets stuffed with several Faberge eggs he luckily was never forced to sell. Much of his fortune… came from discovering and producing the films of Mexican comedian Cantiflas.” [VANESIAN, K., 6-7-01]
Elsewhere in Latin America, Jaime Yankelevich “pioneered both radio and television and broadcasting in Argentina, becoming a nationally known figure in the country’s culture and politics… [ELKIN, 1998, p. 157] … Max Glucksman (1875-1946) was producing, distributing, and exhibiting films in the early years of this century. Albeito Soifer… wrote tangos and other music for more than eighty movies. Leon Klimovsky… directed movies, and Luis Saslavsky wrote screenplays for Argentine and foreign films. Numerous Jewish actors and actresses, such as the Singerman sisters and Iza Kremer, gained fame.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 101]

“Many Jewish immigrants [to Argentina],” notes Judith Elkin,

“turned to journalism as a profession, and a considerable number of them founded their own journals of opinion. The total number of periodicals emanating from identifiable Jewish sources that have circulated in Buenos Aires at one time or another probably comes to as many as 250. With the acculturation of the second generation and attrition of the communal press, journalists who are Jewish emerged into the wider, multimedia, Spanish-and-Portuguese world. Bernardo Verbitsky of El Mundo, Antonio Portnoy of La Gaceta and others introduced a substantial presence of journalists into the Argentine press… The current president of Argentine PEN is a Jew, and so is the first Latin American to be elected president of the Federation of International Association of Journalists… Jews were among the pioneers of Argentine films… and a host of other entertainers achieved fame on the Argentine radio and stage despite their ‘exotic’ origins… Actors occupy several pages in recent books about Jewish Argentina and Mexico.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 276]

The most famous Jewish Argentinean media figure in the West was probably Jacobo Timerman, founder of Primera Plana (“a kind of Argentina Time”), [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 305] and founder, publisher, and editor of the newspaper La Opinion. [SIMPSON/BENNETT, 1985, p. 245] “Broadly speaking, La Opinion supported [in the 1970s] much of the military government’s disastrous economic policy,” note John Simpson and Jana Bennett, “and it rarely spoke in unambiguous terms about the government’s total disregard of human rights, or the continuing practice of torture and murder. What it did was to highlight some of the cases that came to light, and that was itself dangerous enough.” [SIMPSON/BENNETT, p. 247] In 1977 Timerman was arrested, initially during an investigation into Timerman’s partner at La Opinion (a 45% shareholder in the paper), banker David Gravier. Gravier had recently died in a plane crash, and soon thereafter his banking interests in Belgium, Switzerland and the United States crashed, causing a scandal. It was also discovered that Gravier, also Jewish, “had been handling $17 million, mainly raised through robberies and ransom demands by the Montonero guerillas.” [SIMPSON/BENNETT, p. 252] As for Timerman, note Simpson and Bennett, “[he] had a reputation as a kingmaker and wheeler-dealer which made the human rights side of his case [in Argentina] more difficult to get across.” [SIMPSON/BENNETT, p. 259]
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Timerman was imprisoned, interrogated and tortured by interrogators of the ruling military junta, not uncommon in an era when over 11,000 people in Argentina “disappeared,” presumed murdered by the oppressive dictatorship.

Timerman, in his best-selling book, *Prisoner without a Name, Cell without a Number*, recalls an early interrogation he was forced to undergo with his captors:

“*Question*: Are you Jewish?
*Answer*: Yes.

*Question*: Are you a Zionist?
*Answer*: Yes.

*Question*: Is La Opinion Zionist?
*Answer*: La Opinion supports Zionism since it is the liberation movement of the Jewish people. It considers Zionism to be a movement of high positive values, the study of which can shed light on many problems related to building national Argentine unity.

*Question*: Then it is a Zionist newspaper?
*Answer*: If you wish to put it in those terms, yes.

*Question*: Do you travel to Israel often?
*Answer*: Yes.

*Question*: Do you know the Israeli ambassador?
*Answer*: Yes.”


Timerman survived a two and a half-year imprisonment and, due to international pressure upon the Argentine government in his behalf, was released. He was expelled from Argentina and subsequently emigrated to Israel.

Also in Argentina, Alef, “the world’s first Jewish TV channel outside of Israel,” was initiated in 1995. Vice president Horacio Lutzky, said *Television Business International* “will have a Jewish perspective, but is looking for a universal audience.” Transmitting 24 hours a day, the network was founded and funded by “15 Argentine investors and local and Israeli media professionals.” Two-thirds of the programming was to come from Israel. “Also under way are negotiations with cable operators in other Latin American countries.” [TEL. BUS. INT’L, p. 16]

Along the same lines, in Great Britain, the (London) *Independent* wrote in 1998 that:

“Britain’s Jews are being urged to seize the unique opportunity presented by the digital revolution to create their own television channel. The call came yesterday from the Institute for Jewish Policy Research (JPR), a leading international think-tank, and is being backed by prominent Jews who hold some of the most powerful posts in British broadcasting, including David Elstein, chief executive of Channel 5, Michael Green, chairman of Carleton Communications, and Sir Jeremy Isaacs, founding chief executive of Channel 4. His successor Michael Grade was also Jewish. Indeed, until he quit television last year, all of Britain’s five terrestrial channels had Jews in prominent positions.” [BROWN, p. 11]
One of the forces behind the new Jewish channel, professor Roger Silverstone, said that “it is high time that Jews participate in electronic media space to recover their heritage, to redefine their identity, and their social and cultural contribution, and to make their presence felt in the wider public sphere.” [BROWN, p. 11] “Professor Silverstone,” noted the Independent, “acknowledged the risk of creating an ‘electronic ghetto’ through such a narrow casting initiative. But he envisaged that the proposed channel would avoid the danger by appealing from day one to non-Jews.” [BROWN, p.11]

Also in England, in the 1980s, the head of Channel 4 in London, Jeremy Isaacs, was Jewish. [LILENTHAL, p. 143] A former chairman of the BBC, Stuart Young, was also chair of the Institute for Jewish Affairs. By the late 1970s, another British Jew, Sir James Goldsmith, owned the weekly French newspaper L’Express as well as a significant interest in London’s Daily Express. [MCCLINTICK, p. 303] David Montagu was director of London Weekend Television for 21 years, as well as the chairman and CEO of Orion Bank. Sidney Samuelson has been “head of the British Film Commission since 1991.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 267] “At least three British television stations and a radio station are headed by [Jews],” noted (London) Independent journalist Mark Lawson in 1994, “as, in the past, were three of the great ITV companies: ATV, Granada, and the Thames.” [LAWSON, p. 16] Alex Bernstein, for example, is the former chairman of Granada Television till he retired in 1979; his father, Sidney, founded the company by first building a chain of cinemas, opening one a week in 1935. “Raised in an Orthodox Jewish home,” noted the Associated Press, “Bernstein was not particularly religious. But he was a lifelong supporter of many Israeli charities.” [AP, 2-6-93] Another Jewish mogul, David Goldman, is the former chairman of Britain’s Sage computer software group.

In the mid-1990s, the Internet website of European-based Radio Islam at http://abbc.com/ (considered to be extremely anti-Semitic by Jewish organizations) documented over 250 names of prominent Jews on staff in England’s mass media system, ranging from Alan Yentob (Director of BBC programming) to Judee Goffee (Director of the Independent Television Commission) to David Elstein (the CEO of Channel 5) to Duncan Lewis (the CEO of the Granada Media Group) to Julian Aston (the Managing Director of Channel 1), and on and on and on.

In 1999, Granada Media announced an agreement with the New York Times to “jointly produce international television programming. Granada, one of Europe’s largest commercial television production companies, and a unit of London based Granada Group PLC, said it will have access to the New York Times’ newsroom and other departments, in order to create documentary programming, including science, history, and current affairs shows.” [WALL STREET JOURNAL, p. 3]

In 1998, Scotland’s The Scotsman wondered:

“Vanni who? TV-land was desperately seeking the answer to that question this week after it was announced that Vanni Treves (“of Jewish
stock”), a 57-year old lawyer, had been named as the new chairman of Channel 4 television.” [DIDCOCK, p. 31]

In 1991, the (London) Sunday Telegraph noted the path to power of Jewish media mogul Michael Green:

“In his own quest to own a television franchise, Green has immersed himself in the industry, becoming close friends with men such as [Jewish media moguls] Michael Grade of Channel 4 and Alan Yentob of BBC2… The jewel of the ITV [television network was] added to his crown… Green attended Great Portland Street synagogue where he met Isaac (later Lord) Wolfson, the founder of Great Universal Stores and one of the most influential businessmen of his generation…. Helped mainly by [Jewish] city advisor Michael Sorkin of Hambros Bank, Green built [his] company… into a near $2 billion communications giant… [Green] is great friends with [Jewish moguls] Lord Rothschild, Charles Saatchi, Gerald Ratner, and media bigwigs Grade and Yentob… Green cherishes a collection of cars including a 14-year old Rolls-Royce convertible, a Bentley Turbo, and an Austin Martin Virage.” [SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, p. 23]

In 1995, seven of the ten most popular television drama shows in Great Britain were produced by Green’s Carleton UK Television. [LAING, p. 15] The Daily Telegraph called him “the most powerful figure in British commercial television.” [VALLELY, p. 21] (In 1998 the Carlton Communications division was fined $3.2 million by a British TV commission “for faking an award-winning documentary about Colombian drug smuggling.” [USA TODAY, 12-22-98]) In 1998, British Jewish media mogul Stephen Grabiner (whose brother Mike runs Energis, a telecommunications company) was “the front man for the biggest media launch this country has ever seen” [LYNN, INTERNET] – British Digital Broadcasting (BDB), a joint venture between Michael Green’s Carlton company and Granada. These two corporations, note the Wall Street Journal, “are the two largest players in ITV, “which is Britain’s leading commercial terrestrial [i.e., non-digital/satellite] channel.” [PYLAS, p. 14] Grabiner also headed the newspaper and magazine division of United News and Media. By 1998 too, BBC’s studios were, quite literally, rented out to a Jewish bar mitzvah ceremony. “More normally home to A Question of Sport and the Mrs. Merton Show,” noted the London Independent, “Studio A will now be made kosher so that food can be served to a party of several hundred.” [MCCANN, p. 10]

By the late 1990s, more and more British observers were expressing concern about the increased decadence on British broadcasting airwaves. “The tidal wave of sex and nudity,” complained journalist Leo McKinsty, “demonstrates that the BBC and other broadcasters have lost all sense of morality… A friend of mine was recently trying to make a programme for the supposedly religious Everyman slot on BBC 1 about Edith Stein, the Jew who converted to Christianity, died in a concentration camp and has recently been canonized. He was told the subject was ‘not sexy enough.’” [MCKINSTY, L., 11-23-98] Government Culture Secretary Chris Smith even told the House of Commons that “We have
noted in recent days a very considerable concern about some of the content on television, particularly in relation to Channel 5.” [LEY, G., 6-22-2000, p. 19]

**Channel 5** is of course headed by Jewish mogul David Elstein, and he increasingly has come under attack for the station’s fare. “Can this really be the same man,” wondered the *Daily Mail*,

“who today runs a channel that seeps tat into our living rooms with offerings such as *Stark Naked*, a naturism programme screened at 8:30 PM; *Pleasure Zone*, the theme of which is sex, debauched films masquerading as drama; *The Naughty, Naughty Hypno Show*, in which members of the audience are hypnotised to engage in lewd acts such as simulating oral sex and wearing a rubber phallus; and, of course, the gruesome show *Naked Jungle* in which all the contestants appear in the nude.” [BROWN, A., 11-2-97]

“Much of this [television decadence],” noted the *London Daily Mail* in another article the next year, “can be traced back to the zeal with which [Jewish media mogul] Michael ‘Pornographer-in-Chief’ Grade introduced a whole new approach when in charge of Channel 4, filling its outposts with sex-oriented programs.” [MCKINSTY, L., 11-23-98] Other Jewish moguls include David and Ralph Gold,

“[who are] most famous for owning the Ann Summers chain of sex shops, run by David’s daughter Jacqueline. The Gold brothers have interests in top shelf publishing as well as owning independent magazine distributor Portman. The brothers also jointly own Sport Newspapers and Birmingham City football club with David Sullivan.” [TMF NEWS]

Elsewhere in Britain, the avidly pro-Israel Hollinger Group (“described by one author in 1997 as “the world’s fastest growing press empire” [NESIVSKY, p. 1]) is the owner of London’s *Daily Telegraph*, the *Jerusalem Post* and is the owner – or has an interest in – nearly 500 newspapers throughout the world. It controls half of all the daily newspapers in Canada and even owns 24% of Australia’s second-largest newspaper chain, **Fairfax Holdings**. The man who runs all this from England, **Conrad Black**, is not Jewish, but, noted the (London) **Sunday Times**, “he thought nothing of turning the whole traditional editorial policy of the *Jerusalem Post* on its head once he acquired it, transforming it from a dovish into a hawkish [militantly pro-Israel, anti-Arab] paper overnight.” [HOWARD, INTERNET]

The *Jerusalem Post* itself noted that:

“For the record, Black has long had Jews on his company boards, including such figures as **Chaim Herzog** [a former president of Israel], **Henry Kissinger**, the Canadian real-estate tycoon **Paul Reichmann**, former Canadian ambassador to the U.S. Allan Gottlieb, U.S. security advisor **Richard Perle, Peter Bronfman**, Sir Zelman Cowen, and others. Black’s current wife, the one-time *Sunday Times* of London columnist **Barbara Amiel**, is Jewish, and Black’s longtime Jewish partner David Radler became the Post’s chairman.” [NESIVSKY, p. 22]
The (London) **Sunday Times** noted that Black’s “wife, chief operating officer, and other key members of staff, including the Fairfax chairman [in Australia], are Jewish.” [BERNOTH] Black’s wife, Barbara Amiel, is also a director of the *Spectator*, the *Jerusalem Post*, and **Sunday Night Magazines**. For years she has been the senior political columnist for the *Sunday Times* (London). “Those of us who care about Israel,” wrote Amiel in 1999, “can’t come up with any pragmatic reason for our unrequited love… I’d support Israel even if I were not a Jew, simply because any country that is subject to such malevolent distortion fits my notion of a worthy underdog.” [AMIEL, 1999, p. 17] In 1995, Conrad Black and his wife were guests of honor at the Jerusalem Foundation of Canada. “Black and his wife, Barbara Amiel, a columnist for *MacLean’s* and the *Daily Telegraph*,” observed *MacLean’s* itself in 1997, “are known for their hawkish positions on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.” [NOLEN, p. 36]

Black’s Jewish partner, David Radler, is also the CEO of **Hollinger** (Blacks’ Canadian holding company) and he is the chairman of the *Chicago Sun-Times*. He is also on the board of the *UK Telegraph* newspaper and *Southam* (Canada’s biggest newspaper chain). [SIMON, p. 16] Radler was described by the *Financial Times* (London) as “Black’s closest business confidant, his chief deal maker, and when necessary, his hatchet man.” [SIMON, p. 16] [Also note earlier references to Jewish domination of the nineteenth century British newspaper world]

In 2001, Black announced plans to within the year launch a new daily newspaper called the *New York Sun*. Jewish hedge-fund mogul Michael Steinhardt was a major co-investor. The chief editors at the new paper were announced as Seth Lipsky, former editor of the Jewish ethnic weekly newspaper, *Forward*, and his ‘protege,’ Ira Stoll. [New York Observer, 11-29-01]

Earlier, in 1991, at the death of corrupt [see earlier] British tycoon Robert Maxwell (born Ludvik Hoch), his media empire included Britain’s **Mirror Group** of newspapers, including the *Daily Mirror* and *Sunday Mirror*. Other media holdings included *People, Syndication International*, the *Scottish Daily Record*, the *New York Daily News*, 50% of Germany’s *Berliner Zeitung*, 50.1% of Hungary’s *Magyar Hirlap*, 45% of the *Kenya News*, the *European* newspaper, percentages of Canadian media companies, *Metromode* cable TV, *MacMillan*, MacMillan-McGraw Hill Educational Books, *Pergamon, Que* (computer books), *Collier, Panini, Berlitz*, the *Official Airlines Guide*, and Europe’s biggest printing company. Maxwell also owned a major share of *Ma’ariv*, one of Israel’s two major newspapers. *The Jewish Advocate* noted that Maxwell “has been called the ‘crook of the century’ following revelations that he looted $900 million from his workers’ pension funds and his complicated web of companies. Hour by hour, new and lurid details surface of Maxwell’s chicanery, deceit, and international intrigue.” Yet, said the *Advocate*, in its article entitled *Robert Maxwell: An Appreciation*, “Maxwell was an ardent Zionist devoted to Israel and the Jewish people… Despite all the *National Equirer* glamour and clamor, beneath the swashbuckling image of ‘Cap’n Bob,’ beat the heart of a real mensch, a decent, sensitive man, a Holocaust survivor.” [PORTER, p. 9]
In 1986 Ari Ben-Menashe, a controversial figure who asserted an identity as an Israeli undercover agent and arms dealer, claimed that he had dealt directly with Maxwell as a “saian” (Jewish “assistant” for the Mossad) in soliciting his help for an Israeli coverup, to impugn actual photographs taken inside Israel’s nuclear weapons plant by defector Mordechai Vanunu as fraudulent. As Seymour Hersh tells it:

“Maxwell made it clear at the brief session, Ben-Menashe recalled, that he understood what had to be done about the Vanunu story. ‘I know what has to happen,’ Maxwell told Ben-Menashe. ‘I have already spoken to your bosses.’” [HERSH, p. 312]

Whether this interchange was true or not (some have challenged Ben-Menashe’s credibility), Maxwell’s Daily Mirror printed Vanunu’s true story as “a hoax or something even more sinister – a plot to discredit Israel.” [BOWER, p. 462] Maxwell, a British citizen, notes Seymour Hersh, “was well known for his closeness to Israel’s top leadership,” and even ordered that the Vanunu photographs be delivered to the Israeli embassy. [HERSH, p. 312] Maxwell’s funeral in Jerusalem was attended by the most powerful Israeli government officials, including prime minister Yitzhak Shamir, and cabinet ministers Ariel Sharon, Moshe Arens, Ehud Olmert, and Shimon Peres. President Chaim Herzog was among Maxwell’s eulogizers, noting his rise as a media mogul, thus “influencing a large sector of mankind in many countries.” [LYNFIELD, p. 7] “Regaled at his graveside by the Israeli government as a hero,” notes Tom Bower, “he was condemned in London as a fraud.” [BOWER, p. xiv] Maxwell’s lawyer in Israel, Yaacov Ne’eman, eventually became the Israeli Finance Minister under Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. [MACHLIS, p. 30] In 1995 Maxwell’s widow was selected by the American Zionist Youth Federation to be the Grand Marshall for New York’s Salute to Israel parade.

Maxwell’s intrigues were diverse. Nicholas Davies, the former Foreign Editor at Maxwell’s Daily Mirror, notes that “for decades Maxwell had been involved with the KGB, not, as far as is known, as an active agent or in spying activities, but according to KGB sources in Moscow, he acted as a conduit, a banker, ‘laundering’ the KGB’s money outside the Soviet Union.” [DAVIES, N., p. 7]

Another Jewish entertainment/media mogul in Britain over the last few decades has been Lew Grade (born Louis Winogradsky). Grade founded the Associated Television Corporation (ATV) and was the Managing Director of ACC (Associated Communications Corporation), which owned ATV. Grade built the largest chain of theatres in the world. His brother, Bernard Delfont (born Boris Winogradsky), became the CEO of EMI’s entertainment division and a nephew, Michael Grade, became Director of Programming for the BBC as well as the CEO of Channel 4 and the director of First Leisure. By the 1960s, notes Michael Pye, “the Grades were the most powerful force in British show business, the three brothers [Lew, Leslie, and Bernard Delfont at their company called the Grade Organization] had television in the Midlands, a string of London theatres, and a vast agency business.” [PYE, p. 234] In 1980, music critic
David Harker noted the omnipresence of the powerful Winogradsky brothers in British music, media, and entertainment worlds:

“The Royal Variety show takes place in a theatre owned by Associated Television (ATV), which is run by Lew Grade – who, just happens, to be Bernard Delfont’s brother. The proceeds from the shows go to a charity – presided over by Bernard Delfont. Delfont is also a director of EMI, the largest record manufacturer in the world. Recently, EMI absorbed one of England’s two big cinema circuits – Associated British Pictures – of which Delfont is also a director. Bernard Delfont is also deputy chairman and joint managing director of the Grade Organization, which is owned by EMI (of which Mr. Delfont is a director). Bernard Delfont thus owns himself – twice. So, if you read the TV Times, buy Pye, Marble Arch, Regal, Columbia, Parlophone, HMV, Pathé, Music for Pleasure, or Odeon Records; if you watch ATV or Thames Television, go to the Talk of the Town, the London Palladium, Victoria Palace, Hippodrome, Her Majesty’s Globe, Lyric, Apollo, or Prince of Wales Theatres; if you go to one of ABC’s 270 cinemas or twelve bowling alleys or one of Ambassador’s ten bowling alleys, then Bernard Delfont has an interest in what you’re doing.” [WICKE, p. 120]

Delfont and London music publisher Cyril Share were particularly active in support of Israel during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. [COLEMAN, p. 345]

Jewish commentator Barnet Litvinoff once observed

“that Jewish power expressed unconsciously is Jewish power nevertheless. Few films emanating from Hollywood have put a Jew in an unfavourable light, possibly because of the special character the industry assumed through the Jewish pioneers who controlled it for so long. Britain may well be undergoing a similar experience through the ubiquity of the organization headed by Lew Grade and his brothers (the erstwhile Winogradskys of Whitechapel). It is impregnable in entertainment for its hold upon the theatre, the variety scene, commercial television, a significantly large cinema circuit, and its contractual ties with many leading actors, writers, and popular musicians.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 168]

Lew Grade, note Peter Brown and Steven Gaines,

“owned the huge Associated Television Corporation, Britain’s largest independent producer of TV programs. Lew Grade also personally produced the United Kingdom’s most popular TV variety show, ‘Sunday Night at the Palladium,’ on which an appearance was crucial for an act to gain national attention. Brother Leslie Grade headed the largest show business agency in the country… The third brother, Bernard, owned several prestigious theatres, was a major force behind the West End Theatre business, and by appointment to the Queen booked the most prestigious of all live shows, the Royal Command Performance.” [BROWN/GAINES, 1983, p. 98]

(Among Grade’s many Jewish partners in various reams was Leo Greenfield, “nearly legendary in the field of motion picture distribution,” who co-founded
with the British mogul the film distribution firm Associated Film Distribution.) [BROUWER/WRIGHT, 1990, p. 508-509]

Another British Jewish entertainment mogul, Louis Benjamin, was the managing director of the Moss Empire, a theatre chain later running the Pye and Golden Guinea record labels. Benjamin “pioneered cut-price records…, signed many of the musical giants of the day, and was credited with the introduction of Rhythm and Blues to the [British] public.” [DAILY TELEGRAPH, p. 21] Arnold Goodman, who died in 1999, was chairman of British Lion Films and the London Observer newspaper. [FINANCIAL TIMES, 10-16-99, p. 4] Jack Shulman “started one of London’s early silent movie picture houses despite being a staunch member of the communist party.” [BEVAN, J., 10-2-94, p. 24]

Echoing the situation in America, many of Great Britain’s popular comics have been Jewish. These include Peter Sellers, Marty Feldman, Bennett Aron, David Baddiel, Jerry Sadowitz, Paul Kaye, David Schneider, Sid James, Ivor Dembina, Arnold Brown, Alexei Sayle, Ben Elton, Peter Rosengard, Maureen Lipman, and Mark Maier. Television writers Laurence Marks and Maurice Green are recent history’s “Kings of British Sitcom.” [WINNER, D., p. 45] Then there is Esther Rantzen, also Jewish. As London’s Independent reported in 1991:

“Her colleagues and the Press delight in castigating her. She has been called vulgar, mawkish, exploitative, smug and self-serving; ruthless, spiteful, ambitious, aggressive, power-mad. In the Eighties she was frequently likened to Mrs. Thatcher, a comparison she claimed she was proud to accept, adding however that Mrs T. identified with success and she with victims. After winning this week’s libel case against a newspaper that claimed she had protected a known pedophile because he provided inside information for her programme, she said her critics had the right to call her old, ugly and untalented, ‘but if you tell me that I put children in danger, then I have to go to court.’ Few would dispute that Esther Rantzen is the most powerful woman on television. That alone explains why her survival and the 18-year reign of her programme, That’s Life, should arouse strong passions. How did she reach and maintain that eminence?” [INDEPENDENT, 12-21-91, p. 14]

In France, notes Howard Sachar, “by the mid-1950s… as in other Western nations, Jews were prominent in theatre and cinema.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 99] The CEO (1996) of Lagardère Group is Raymond Levy. Its Hachette Filipacchi division publishes over 100 newspapers and magazines (including Women’s Day, Family Life, Video, and Car and Driver) in 15 languages throughout the world. In 1995, Lagardère bought Premiere magazine, in association with Jewish American mogul Ronald Perelman. Its Matra division even produces missile parts, satellite technology, and builds cars with Renault. [HOOVER, p. 110] Also in France, Europe’s largest pay-TV organization is Canal Plus; its CEO is Marc André Feffer. Also, in the 1980s and 90s, for thirteen years, Anne Sinclair, the Jewish wife of French Finance and Industry Minister Dominique Strauss-Kahn, “hosted France’s most popular political chit-chat
show on prime television, being voted ‘television’s personality of the year.’” [ECONOMIST, 9-13-97]

Going to France’s Cannes Film Festival? It is monopolized by yet another Jewish entrepreneur, Gilles Jacob. Newsweek noted him in 1999 as a “career maker,” a “former film critic who has been running the Festival for the past 21 years. Not only does Jacob choose and schedule all the films, he also picks the jury president and its members.” [THAMES, D., p. 56] Want to speak freely about the Jewish influence in radio and television in France? In 2000, a French publisher, Éditions Fayard, called back its volume “Journal,” by Renaud Camus, for fear of public backlash for Camus’ negative comments about Jews in the French mass media. The book criticized the “large presence of Jews in a radio and television program, France Culture.” Camus wrote that Jews were “over represented as an ethnic and religious group” and there was too much emphasis on “Jewish culture, Jewish religion, Jewish writers, the state of Israel and its policy, the life of Jews in France, and in the world today or through the centuries.” Among those threatening to sue both the author and publisher was the Jewish director of the France Culture program, Laure Adler. [XINHUA GENERAL NEWS SERVICES, 4-20-2000]

In southern Europe, Jewish mogul Carlo De Benedetti is “one of the richest men in Italy,” and is “ranked third among Italy’s economic barons.” He built to power Olivetti, “one of Europe’s premier computer and telecommunications companies.” A De Benedetti holding company, CIR, owns La Repubblica, “one of the country’s top newspapers,” and the Editrice Periodici Culturali magazine group, which includes L’Espresso, a well-known weekly magazine. In 1992, De Benedetti was sentenced to six years for fraud in a bank scandal. He was also arrested for spending $6 million in a kickback scheme with government officials. [MONTALBANO, p. A13; VULLIAMY, p. 9] Also in Italy, Ever Haggiag, is “a leading Italian motion picture producer and distributor.” [PERRY, V., 6-10-99] In 1996, Fiamma Nirenstein, a “well-known journalist and former director of the Italian Culture Center in Israel,” won Italy’s Premiolini Journalism Award. [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 328] In 1999, “Clemente J. Mimun, director of TV news at the state-run RAI-2 channel, received the Golden Quill award honoring outstanding personalities in the field of ‘Culture in Journalism.’” [GRUBER, R., 1999, p. 333]

In 2000, Gad Lerner, also Jewish, resigned his position as director of news on Italian state television RAI 1. “He resigned,” noted the Irish Times, “because he had been caught up in a major political row prompted by the fact that his channel (as well as RAI’s channel 3) had last week broadcast disturbing images of pedophile pornography. The controversial images had been broadcast within the ambit of a report on an investigation by state prosecutors in Torre Annunziata, near Naples, which uncovered an Italo-Russian racket that produced and sold child pornography on the Internet. The images in question were deeply disturbing since, among other things, they showed the apparent rape of a young boy by an adult man. Clearly, this was hardly family viewing for the
main evening news bulletin on the nation’s longest-established television service, a bulletin that last Wednesday night was watched by seven million people. Within minutes, the RAI switchboard was receiving hundreds of protest calls... Given Mr Lerner’s swashbuckling, campaigning style of journalism on previous news and current affairs programmes, it was hardly surprising to discover that he had made enemies. Nor did it help his popularity on the right that he is a former member of the extreme left-wing group, Lotta Continua.” [AGNEW, P., 10-4-00, p. 14]

The Associated Press noted that “Aldo Grasso, one of Italy’s most respected television critics, said the RAI broadcasts were ‘symptomatic of what has been happening in Italian TV, both state and private, over the last couple of years.’ ‘Editors are driven not by quality or responsibility toward viewers but only the ratings,’ he told the Associated Press. ‘Disturbing and violent images intrude in all kinds of programs, throughout the day.’ The UNICEF head in Italy, Giovanni Micali, also complained bitterly about rising violence. ‘It was an extreme case, but not the first and not the only one,’ he said of the RAI newscasts.” [HUGHES, C., 9-28-00]

In 1994, in Germany, the head of CCC Film Studio, Arthur Brauner, won the German Federal Cross of Merit. [SINGER/SELDIN, 1995, p. 323] Leo Katcher noted in 1968 that

“The German motion-picture industry, which Hitler and Goebbels had converted into a propaganda machine was a shambles when the war ended... For a short time there was no industry at all and then Arthur Brauner emerged as the new titan in the field.” [KATCHER, L., 1968, p. 176]

Brauner, who is from Poland, rose to power in post-war West Germany, where Jews were one-twentieth of one percent of the total population. And as he once noted:

“I made up my mind that some day I would tell the world what it was like to be a Jew. It was then that I decided that I would make motion pictures... I wanted revenge against the Germans. I wanted to show that they had not destroyed all Jews [KATCHER, L. 1968, p. 177]... No Jews can be Germans. If we have a home, it is Israel. That is where our duty lies. That is where our love must go. It is our obligation to defend and aid Israel.” [KATCHER, p. 175]

In 1997, Brauner premiered his eighteenth film about the Holocaust (From Hell to Hell) at the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles. The film’s depiction of Poles and Poland garnered protests from the Polish-American community. A month later Brauner’s German studios burned down in what police called an arson attack. [TUGEND, T., 2-7-97]

In 1995, another Jewish mogul, Ron Sommer, took over as CEO of Deutsche Telekom, formerly a massive state bureaucracy. Subdivisions of this firm include T-Online, “Europe’s largest internet service company.” [BENOIT, B., 9-22-2000, p. 32] Sommer was born in Haifa, Israel.
In Sweden, notes Rochelle Wright, “Between 1989 and 1993... there were five Swedish feature films and one co-production— a significant number, given the relatively small annual output of the Swedish film industry— that focused on the Jewish experience. Beginning in 1997, several television dramas of varying lengths also incorporated a discussion of Jewish identity or of Swedish anti-Semitism.” [WRIGHT, R., p. 8]

What about the mass media situation in Canada (aside from the already mentioned Hollinger dynasty)? “Jews,” notes Morton Weinfeld, “have been statistically over represented in both the financial and the creative aspects of the entertainment business. It is a short step from that observation to the vicious canard that the Jews, in some collective, conspiratorial sense, control Hollywood. One could also possibly construct a similar argument for the Canadian scene. People such as Izzy Asper, Garth Drabinsky, Harold Greenberg, Robert Lantos, Ed Mirvish, and Moses Znaimer are just a few of the Canadian Jews who have played innovative roles in the popular entertainment industry in Canada.” [WEINFELD, p. 10]

In that country, Israel “Izzy” Asper controls CanWest Global. He is the chief officer of the company that by the mid-1990s was “already the largest private sector television broadcaster in the country.” [CHISHOLM, p. 36] CanWest is also the country’s “most profitable broadcaster” and has media outlets in every Canadian major markets except Montreal and Alberta. [TELEVISION BUS. INT’L] Asper also controls TV 3 in New Zealand (68% of its stock) and founded TV 4, as well as FM radio network MORE, in the same country. In Australia, CanWest has a 76% stake in Network Ten, the second-most profitable TV station in that country. In Ireland, Asper is the largest investor in TV 3, and his firms also have a financial stake in Ulster TV. [SCOTLAND, Business, p. 4]

A TV colleague calls Asper “the most aggressive businessman I know. The guy is a Machiavellian genius.” [CHISHOLM, p. 36] MacLean’s notes that:

“Asper’s lock on [CanWorld’s] multiple voting shares— he holds all 26 million— has also made him one of the country’s richest corporate players. By the time he is through, he wants to carve a global broadcasting force. He does not say that he will build a dynasty, but his three offspring [including Leonard, CanWorld’s vice president for corporate development; David, the vice president for programming; and Gail, another executive] have taken on key corporate roles, and they will accede to ownership, so there is that too.” [WELLS, p. 40]

Asper blatantly uses his ownership powers to melodramatically propagandize on behalf of the state of Israel, as he did in the National Post (a newspaper he controls) in 2001:

“Israel, after 53 years of statehood, remains the only isolated island of democracy, human rights and rule of law—a lonely outpost of Western civilization and its values in a sea of terrorism, corruption, dictatorship and human enslavement. Countries like Canada should therefore be in the vanguard of its support, for mutual economic, military and ethical
reasons… It is therefore a dismaying sight for knowledgeable Canadians to watch our Foreign Affairs minister, John Manley, either a prisoner of naïveté, or political opportunism, embracing this war criminal, [Yassar] Arafat, on Mr. Manley’s recent visit to the Middle East.” [ASPER, I. H., 6-19-01] [See chapter on Israel, p. 1725 for the details of Israel’s “democracy.”]

Other important Jewish executives at CanWorld have recently included president Steve Gross, and David Mintz, the head of programming.

Also in Canada, the wealthy Greenberg family began moving into the mass media in the 1990s, controlling Astral, Canada’s largest pay-per-view and specialty TV company. The chairman of Astral, Andre Bureau, is also the former chairman of the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission. Astral Home Entertainment is the largest wholesaler of video cassettes in Canada. Harold Greenberg’s original co-partners in his ventures were Phyllis Switzer, Ed Cowan, and Jerry Grafstein. Barbara Frum host Canada’s prominent TV news program, The Journal.


In 1998 a Canadian magazine called Robert Lantos, head of Alliance Communications, and later Serendipity Point Films, “one of the original architects of what we have now [in the Canadian mass media].” [GROSS, P., 9-21-98] The Toronto Star noted Lantos and Garth Drabinsky (eventually caught in a financing scandal) as “Canadian’s two most emblematic, brash, creative and – according to some – egocentric entertainment figures.” [ADILMAN, 8-29-98, p. M4] Drabinsky founded (with Myron Gottlieb) Livent, America’s largest theatre production company, and Cineplex Odeon, by the 1980s one of North America’s largest movie theatre chains. Until recent scandals, Livent owned the $43 million Ford Center for the Performing Arts in New York City, the Pantages Theatre in Chicago, and the Center for Performing Arts in Chicago, among other holdings.

In his autobiography, Drabinsky notes the influence upon him of Canadian Jewish mogul Nat Taylor:

“He was big, the biggest, a legend in the movie business in Canada, the nearest thing Canada had to a Hollywood mogul. He had been an exhib-
itor, a distributor, a producer, and a TV-station shareholder. He was partners with Famous Players, the dominant exhibition chain in Canada. He owned the country’s largest movie-production studio, Toronto International Studios, in Kleinberg, Ontario. He was the man who opened the first Canadian movie-house for foreign and art films. He was the guy who came up with the idea of multiple theatres.” [DRABINSKY, G., 1995, p. 56]

Taylor also owned the influential trade journal, *Canadian Film Digest*, and hired Drabinsky – in his early years – to edit it. [DRABINSKY, G., 1995, p. 58]

Another noteworthy Jewish cinema/theatre mogul in the early years was Nathan Nathanson who “built the Panteges [theatre] in 1920... Even more significantly, Nathanson started not only the Famous Players theatre circuit in Canada but also Canadian Odeon... He was single-handedly responsible for the two chains that formed the duopoly that dominated Canadian exhibition for so long.” [DRABINSKY, G. 1995, p. 64] Then there is Allen Karp, “chairman and chief executive of the Toronto-based Cineplex Odeon Corporation, Canada’s largest film exhibitor.” [KIRSHNER, S., 1-7-99]

Also in Canada, Jewish mogul Paul Godfrey is the 1990s chairman of the Toronto Sun Publishing Company/Sun Media Group and was the 1998 winner of the B’nai B’rith Award of Merit. Five families own TorStar, the parent company of the Toronto Star, the largest newspaper in Canada. One of the families is Jewish: the Thalls. “Their original name was Rosenthal. [Burnett] Thall says he lopped off the first two syllables to overcome the anti-Semitism of 1940s Toronto and improve his job prospects.” [REGULY, E., 10-26-01] In 1992, a baptized Jew, Peter Herrnsdorf, became the CEO and chairman of TV Ontario, replacing Bernard Ostry. (For a decade Herrnsdorf had been the publisher of Toronto Life magazine. “Among those who championed Herrnsdorf’s installation at TVO,” notes Toronto Life, “was Howard Bernstein, a senior producer who had worked for Herrnsdorf at CBC,” where Herrnsdorf had also been an executive). [CANADIAN BUSINESS AND CURRENT AFFAIRS, JULY 1996, p. 56-6; DINOFF, D., 7-26-99, p. 4]

Yet another Jewish media head, Jacques Bensimon, member of the “self-help Sephardic Network,” stepped down in 2000 as the Managing Director of TFO, the French language division of TV Ontario. “He is widely considered,” notes the Canadian Jewish News, “to be the father of TFO... By Bensimon’s estimation, his Jewish sensibility helped enormously, sensitizing him to the perspectives and needs of his French minority audience.” Bensimon left TFO to become an executive at the Banff Television Festival. Bensimon had earlier served as a director at the Film Board of Canada. [KIRSHNER, S., 7-13-2000]

Sandra Kolber, also Jewish, became a member of the board of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) in 1991. [SINGER/SELDIN, 1992, p. 34] The very powerful president and CEO of CBC at the turn of the millennium is Richard Rabinovitch. (He “spent more than a decade as chief operating officer of Claridge Inc., [Jewish alcohol and media mogul] Charles Bronfman’s private
holding company in Montreal, and was chairman of the executive committee of the Canadian Jewish Congress’s Quebec region). [GORDON, S., 11-30-01]

Also in Canada, Garry Schwartz heads Phoenix Pictures and Phyllis Yaffe is the president and CEO of Showcase Television. Both, too, are Jewish. (The chairman of the Canadian Television Fund, a private/public partnership that helped fund 330 TV programs and 17 feature films in 1997-98 alone is Richard Stursberg and Tim Kotchoff was sequentially vice-president of news programming for both CBC and CTV television networks. Are these two men Jewish as well?) At the lower media tiers, a panel discussion at a Canadian Jewish Congress luncheon in 1999 included CBC TV “senior reporter” Joe Schlesinger, “broadcaster” Evan Solomon, “editorial writer for the National Post” Ezra Levant, and “associate editor of Now magazine” Susan Cole. [ROSE, B., 12-9-99, p. 3, 5] Himie Koshevoy died in 2000. He had been the “managing editor of the Vancouver Sun and subsequently the Toronto Star.” [KIRSCHNER, S., 9-14-2000, p. 11]

“Humble Howard” Glassman is a prominent radio show radio host in Toronto, as is Marsha Lederman. As one Jewish ethnic paper noted about the usual Jewish subtext in their commentaries:

“Glassman has been under fire from Christian groups for a few years now, culminating in last month’s 26-page complaint to the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission by the Catholic Civil Rights League and the Canadian Family Action Coalition. (They sent copies to the B’nai B’rith and the Toronto Police Hate Crimes Squad). Particularly at issue was a series of bits done by Glassman and sidekick Fred Patterson regarding Jesus (including the song ‘Jesus Was a Fetus’) and Easter (a giveaway of chocolate Jesus candles, promising to mail their producer to a cross and holding a Jesus-lookalike contest… While [Lederman] has sufficient respect for her background to not try to subvert Judaism, she is constantly at odds with how much her perspective is shaped by religion. She’s been accused of being anti-Catholic after addressing issues, which she finds odd, since she currently cohabitates with a Catholic.” [WEISBLOT, M., 9-2001]

In 1997, the Alberta Report reported about those who oversee moral issues for the Canadian television audience (the article was subtitled “Naked Lesbian Kissing Is Deemed Acceptable for Suppertime TV”):

“A recent decision by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council suggests that if Ellen [the American lesbian-oriented TV series] were produced here, the only controversy would be whether she would be shown naked in bed with her lesbian lover… Nudity is not yet common on Canadian sitcoms, but the diaphanously-clad models featured on such haute couture ‘news’ programs as CBC Newsworld’s Fashion File and the syndicated Fashion Television often resemble Salome stripped to her last veil… Two weeks ago the industry-funded CBSC (which had earlier dismissed two previous claims against Fashion Television) dismissed this complaint as well. The CBSC cited a response from series producer
CITY-TV—owned by [Jewish mogul] Moses Znaimer, who also co-owns Alberta’s ACCESS-TV—‘We do not equate nudity with pornography. Fashion and photography to our mind are art’… The unnamed complainant had argued in a January 1995 letter, ‘These are prime time family viewing hours and it is highly inappropriate for such sexually explicit material to be shown on television.’ Ron Cohen, CBSC national chairman, rejects this argument as irrelevant, contending that the specialized nature of the program appeals to adults only… Jay Levine, Fashion Television’s producer, adds that nudity is to be expected from a show covering an industry where ‘being sexy is to be provocative.’ He adds, ‘We’re doing something that obviously a lot of people don’t have a problem with… a few years ago it would have been inconceivable that producer-writer Ken Finkleman could utter ‘the f-word’ on his hit CBC sitcom The Newsroom.’” [SILLARS, L., 4-28-97]

In Australia, the pattern continues. Jewish mogul Theodore Fink (1855-1942) “owned the Herald newspapers, the largest chain in Australia and the largest publishing enterprise south of the equator.” [GREENBERG, M., p. 53] In South Africa, Jonathan Wacks returned to his homeland as a major Jewish movie figure after 20 years in the United States. There, he was a film director, vice-president of production at the Samuel Goldwyn Company, president of Michael Ne smith’s Pacific Arts Pictures, and head of the Moving Image Arts Department at the College of Santa Fe in New Mexico. [MORRIS, M., 10-23-01]

From America, the Lauder family fortune, worth $4.2 billion, is rooted in perhaps the richest woman in the United States, Estee Lauder, the “queen of cosmetics.” An heir, Ronald Lauder, gained a footing in Europe in the mid-1980s while a Reagan-appointed ambassador to Austria, which was “largely in return for his work as finance chairman for the New York Republican Party.” Lauder, noted the Jewish Week, has been “active in a wide variety of causes which aid Israel and world Jewry. [He] is closely associated with the Israel Bond program… [Lauder] made a significant contribution to Vienna’s Jewish community by dedicating and opening up for Jewish immigrants the [Orthodox] Chabad center.” [JW, 2-26-88] He also heads the Jewish National Fund of America.

With the collapse of the Soviet-controlled Eastern European bloc, Lauder was well-positioned to embark upon investing in a business empire in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly in television and telecommunications. A former executive (Itzik Fisher) at Israel’s national telephone company, Bezeq, was installed as head of Lauder’s RSL Communications. Mr. Lauder (also current Chairman of the Board of the Museum of Modern Art) was not alone among those most prominently searching for profit, control, and cultural influence in the collapsed communist area. A 1990 New York Times article highlighted five American investors in Hungary; at least four of them were Jewish, including Lauder. Another, Albert Reichmann, one of three brothers controlling a company that Business Week calls “the richest and most powerful real estate developer in the world,” told the magazine: “The Jewish population is the reason I’m interested in Hungary and the Soviet Union.” [NYT, 1-26-90]
In 1990 Lauder gained principal ownership of the Hungarian Credit Bank Ltd, and in 1992 he had 50% share in an eastern German engineering firm. By 1997 a Lauder-controlled company – Central European Media Enterprises – held television stations in seven European countries, including Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and the Czech Republic, and operated eleven TV stations in Poland alone, ironically called “Independent Polish Television.” [BRZEZINSKI, p. A41] CME became the largest private television broadcasting organization in Europe. [MCELVOGUE] The publisher/editor-in-chief of the English-language general information newspaper in Poland, the Warsaw Voice is also Jewish – Andrzej Jonas. One of the paper’s crusades has been against a cluster of Christian crosses near Auschwitz. [See, for example, 6-6-99] He also publishes the English-language Okecie Airport magazine, the other newspaper visiting Americans are likely to read in English in Poland. The publisher of Gazeta Wyborcza, one of Poland’s most widely circulated newspapers, is Adam Michnik. He is also Jewish.

By 1989, Poland’s first cable TV system, Polska Telewizja Kablowa, was 70% controlled by Jewish entrepreneur David Chase’s Chase Enterprises). [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 12-8-89, p. D4] In 1996, with the continued de-monopolization of Poland’s communist-era RP Telekom telecommunications company, the Jerusalem Post noted the “position” of Israeli Shmuel Dankner in the Eastern European country’s telecommunications field:

“Dankner is well positioned to become a key player in the country’s transition to market economics. Yet he doesn’t appear intent to do that. In fact, it seems as if Dankner is careful to keep his own and his partner’s foreign profiles low.” [ASA-EL, A., 7-17-96, p. 6]

Dankner partners include fellow Israelis Meir Srebernik and Sharon Waizer “who runs an RP Telekom joint venture with Motorola.” “If anything,” Waizer said about Poland, “my stay here so far has made of me a prouder Zionist.” [ASA-EL, A, 7-17-96, p. 6] By 1997, Dankner’s Dankner Investments, its subsidiary Matar, and General Electric held “majority shares” in RP Telekom. [MIDDLE EAST NEWS, 3-24-97] By 1998, a telecommunications firm called Netia had “emerged as the largest provider of local fixed line telephone services in Poland… It holds the concessions for five of the ten biggest cities… and has licensing covering a third of the population [of Poland].” Owned by a consortium of companies (Telia from Switzerland, Dankner Investments, Shamrock Holdings, Trefoil Capital Investments, and Goldman Sachs Capital), the CEO was Israeli Meir Srebernik. [FINANCIAL TIMES, 3-25-98, p. 8]

In 1999, Ronald Lauder’s CME merged with the Swedish-based SBS Broadcasting. The new company (retaining the SBS name) now owned 18 TV and 12 radio companies in 13 countries (TV stations included those in the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Norway, Finland, Italy, Hungary, Slovenia, Romania, Ukraine, Switzerland, and Poland). Ronald Lauder now shared the Co-Chairmanship of the new firm with Harry Evans Sloan. Sloan is also from America – originally a lawyer in Hollywood. Sloan once headed New
_World Entertainment_ and built his early media empire with Lawrence Kuppin via junk bond financing.

Another Jewish businessman, Michael Finkelstein, formerly the Vice-Chairman of _SBS_, became Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board of the new entity. "_CME_ stations [in Central and Eastern Europe]," noted the _Central European Business Weekly_, "are ranked number one in both audience and revenues in all markets except Hungary where the _SBS_ station, _TV 2_, is number one." [ANTHONY, M., p. 1]

In 1997, in the Czech Republic, one of Ronald Lauder's stations, _TV Nova_ – one that reaches 70% of the Czech broadcasting audience and was originally founded by five Czech intellectuals in Prague, was embroiled in controversy. The control of _Nova_ by Lauder, noted the _Wall Street Journal_, "is raising fears about foreign ownership in broadcasting throughout the region... [Some Czechs] were worried that the country’s liberalized media laws have created a huge foreign force in the market. Czech regulators are investigating _Nova_ for alleged license breaches and have threatened to pull the plug on the station... Adding to the pressure, one of the founders of the station is suing _Nova_ over control and labeled it 'an American propaganda machine.'" [FRANK, p. A1]

"Newspaper editorials attack the influence of 'Nova sleaze' on Czech culture," noted the _Journal_, "Government ministers privately suggest _Nova_'s gory prime-time features are to blame for the recent rise in crime." [FRANK, p. A1] In Poland in the same year, arsonists set fire to a Warsaw synagogue located next door to the offices of the Ronald S. Lauder Foundation, an organization attempting to reassert an international organizational Jewish presence in Poland.

Maneuvering around Czech ownership and licensing laws that addressed foreign ownership, the control of _TV Nova_ was technically deeded, in association with Lauder, to a Czech national, Vladimir Zelezny. Zelezny, not surprisingly, is also Jewish ("Zelezny and Lauder have much in common, including a passion for collecting art collecting and Jewish philanthropy.") [MORTKOWITZ/ERNSBERGER, 1-17-00] He is also "one of the wealthiest men in the Czech Republic." [MEILS, C., 3-5-01] By the year 2000 the two Jewish moguls had a falling out in a struggle for full control of the station. Lauder eventually sued Zelezny for 140 counts of alleged fraud. Lauder also sued the Czech government. However, noted _Newsweek_, "Lauder has said he’d drop the case against the Czech government if _CME_ is allowed to purchase _Prima_ [the second largest TV station in the Czech Republic]." [MARTKOWICZ/ERNSBERGER, 1-17-00, p. 46] "It is widely believed, noted _Variety_, that Zelezny also covertly manages _Prima TV_, Nova’s main commercial rival." [DAWTREY, A., 1-22-01]

And what was the effect of this Jewish-controlled _TV Nova_ upon Czech culture? Local professor Jan Culik noted that "educated people have been horrified by what this station has been to doing to Czech society, especially the violence and its effects on kids." The _Jewish Week_ described the station’s fare:

"There, on the TV screen each night, on Lauder’s flagship European station, a buxom, frontally naked weather lady would coyly tell viewers how to dress for the next day’s weather. The erotic weather forecast, as
it was called, was part of a newscast that media industry observers describe as among the most gory and sensationalist anywhere, with graphic depictions of beheadings, burnt bodies and other mayhem. Later, after 11 each evening, the station, **TV Nova**, would follow up with soft core pornography. And on another program, ‘Taboo,’ sexual deviants such as molesters, sado-masochists and rapists who would frankly discuss their sexual activities.” [COHLER-ESSES, L., 1-21-2000, p. 16]

Jewish influence in the mass media of Czechoslovakia has a long history. Prior to the rise of the Nazis, in the 1930s “the largest [motion picture] producer was the **Elekta Film** concern, with its imaginative chairman, Josef Auerbach.” [PICK, J., 1968, p. 422] And as **Avigdor Dagan** notes about the Czech popular press in this era:

“As in all other countries in Central Europe, so in the Czech lands, Jews played an outstanding role in journalism. The editor-in-chief of the **Prager Press**, the German- language organ of the Government, Arne Laurin, was Jewish. Another Jew, Paul Eisner, was editor of its **Cultural Supplement**, and many Jews served on the editorial staff. Among the Czech-language papers, there was hardly one without Jews on its editorial and literary staff. Jewish journalists could be found in papers of all parties from the right to the left… Even the Catholic organ **Lidove Listy** had a partly Jewish editor in the person of Alfred Fuchs, a Jewish convert.” [DAGAN, A., 1968, p. 523]

In 1997, in the process of expanding his Eastern European media empire into the Ukraine, **Ronald Lauder** also gained unwelcome publicity when it was revealed that a Jewish Russian partner in the deal, **Vadim Rabinovich** (who owns “one of the country’s most popular television channels”), had ties to the Russian mafia. Rabinovich is also the founder and president of the All-Ukrainian Jewish Congress. It’s chairman is Grigory Surkis who also owns a TV station, the country’s most popular soccer team, oil-related firms, and a law company. [KRICHEVSKY, Around, p. 6] One of Rabinovich’s partners, Grigory Lutchansky, in another project, owned a Vienna-based trading company that the Director of the CIA had once called “an organization associated with Russian crime activity.” Lutchansky (spelled various ways, also Grigori Loutchansky) was noted in the **New York Review of Book**’s review of **The Red Mafiya**:

“Along with [Russian Jewish crime boss Semion] Mogilevich, American officials put high on their list of suspects two of his lieutenants, **Gregori Lutchansky** and **Vadim Rabinovitch**. Lutchansky ran a trading company called **Nordex**, which American and European officials say has links to Russian organized crime and once acted as a broker in the sale of Scud missiles from North Korea to Iraq. Rabinovitch ran the Nordex office in Kiev. In Israel, the Russian mob leaders have bought protection from senior government officials, and have poured so much money into political campaigns that they have been able to name candidates for local and national office. The admired former Soviet dissident **Natan Sharansky**, who has become active in Israeli poli-
tics, has admitted taking campaign contributions from Nordex, in spite of pleas from American officials to cut his links with Loutchansky. Loutchansky invited a list of prominent Russian mobsters to his birthday party in Israel in 1996.” [BONNER, 11-16-00]

Vadim Rabinovich himself (Lauder’s direct partner) had spent eight years in a Russian prison but the New York Times noted that he claimed that “he had committed no real crime and had been persecuted for being Jewish.” The (Jewish) Forward noted in August 1997 that Rabinovich “holds 25% stake in the company that runs Ukraine’s only private television station. Cosmetics heir Ronald Lauder owns half the station.” [FORWARD, p. 8-29-97, p. 3] Within months a rival Ukrainian TV station – Perekhid Media Enterprises – filed a lawsuit charging that Lauder’s company and its Ukrainian partners used “criminal connections and corrupt methods” to get a broadcast license. [FRANTZ A4, BRZINSKI A18, FRANKEL A1; MURPHY A6; McElvogue D4; BRZINSKI A41; AUERBACH, S., F4]

In August 1997, Rabinovich’s All Ukrainian Jewish Congress bought a full page ad in the New York Times to call attention to anti-Semitism, and investment potential, in the Ukraine. “The Jewish issue will never get the attention it deserves without your active help,” said the ad, “After all, if American Jews don’t care about their Ukrainian brothers and sisters, why should anyone else?” [FORWARD, 8-29-97, p. 3] A month earlier Rabinovich met for unity talks with Michael Schneider, the vice-president of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. “Mr. Rabinovich’s ad,” noted the (Jewish) Forward, “comes as American-Jewish groups, such as the Jewish Committee and the World Jewish Congress, are increasing their role in Europe.” [FORWARD, p 8-29-97, p. 3]

In June 2001, the New York Times noted that Lauder’s Central European Enterprises company was

“under an investigation over allegations that it paid at least $1 million in bribes to Ukrainian officials for a valuable television license, according to lawyers and [U.S.] Justice Department documents… In Ukraine, Central European Media controls the most popular station through its majority-owned subsidiary Studio 1+1… The principal owners [of Studio 1+1] were [Jewish moguls] Vadim Rabinovich and Boris Fuchsmann, well known around Kiev for their influential wealth. Less well known were their ties to Russian organized crime, according to reports by the F.B.I. and European law enforcement agencies… A 1994 F.B.I report on Russian organized crime in the United States described Mr. Fuchsmann as a gold smuggler and embezzler, whose company in Germany was part of an international crime network. He is barred from entering the United States… Besides Mr. Fuchsmann and Mr. Rabinovich, there were other, silent owners of Studio 1+1. In one internal fax, in April 1996, Ms. Jensen [a CME employee] described the Studio 1+1 shareholders as ‘extremely powerful’ people whom, she added, ‘I will not mention on this fax.’ Central European Media now owns at least 60
percent of Studio 1+1, and Mr. Fuchsmann owns at least 30 percent, according to public statements.” [BONNER, R., 6-12-01]

And what are some of Ronald Lauder’s prior track records in television? What are his interests? What perspectives might he bring to Central and Eastern Europe? Aside from creating the Ronald S. Lauder Foundation to revive Jewish culture in Eastern Europe, he has expressed considerable interest in pressing attention upon the Jewish Holocaust. He is founder of a right-wing think tank in Jerusalem, the Shalem Institute. In his 1989 bid to become the mayor of New York City, he attacked his opponent, Rudolph Giuliani, in a TV ad, saying: “he handcuffed innocent stockbrokers in front of co-workers and ignored the torment of a Holocaust survivor.” [MAY, p. A27] In 1988 he financed a documentary shown on PBS about the 1938 Nazi attack upon Jewish synagogues in Austria and Germany. [SMITH, C, p. 32] And in 1994 his media company in Europe “kicked off the first commercial broadcast in Eastern Europe with the film ‘Sophie’s Choice’ [a Nazi concentration camp story].” [FRANK, R, p. A1] In the political realm, in 1997 the Jewish Week noted that Jewish American Lauder is “reportedly among Netanyahu’s biggest financial backers.” [Netanyahu, of course, is the former right-wing prime minister of Israel]. [COHLLER-ESSES, Dissensions, p. 1] “With money and campaign contacts,” notes the (Jewish) Forward, “Mr. Lauder has helped engineer one of the biggest upsets in the history of Israel’s democracy.” [FORWARD, 11-14-97, p. 14]

In 1999 Ronald Lauder became what the Jewish Week called the “King of the Jews” – the head of the Presidents’ Conference of Major Jewish Organizations. “Some [Jewish] leaders,” noted the Week, “are expressing concern about what they see as the continuing lack of democracy [in that organization]... Several left-wing groups complained that Lauder is perceived as being too close to [right-wing Israeli prime minister Benyamin] Netanyahu, both as a personal friend and a major political contributor.” [GREENBERG, 1-15-99, p. 20]

With the fall of communism in the Soviet bloc, yet another Jewish media “tycoon,” this one in Hungary, rose to power in recent years. This one, Janos Fenyo, was murdered in 1998, apparently by criminal underworld elements. At the time, as founder and head of Vico Distributing and Publishing (“currently the biggest print media-owner in Hungary”), [MARYNIAK, I., 4-1-98] he controlled Hungarian 13 newspapers (including the former trade union journal Nepszava and a women’s journal, Nok Lapja) and Nap TV. “Fenyo had excellent contacts to leading Hungarian politicians and he skillfully exploited the confusing legal situation after the collapse of communism to boost his empire.” At the time of his death, he also had 30 lawsuits filed against him. [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 5-21-98]

Turning to the nearby new capitalist nation of Russia, in 1997 the Washington Post noted that

“In last year’s presidential campaign, two of the most powerful media tycoons, Vladimir Gusinsky and Boris Berezovsky, played a key role in reelecting President Boris Yeltsin, demonstrating the might of television in the young democracy.” [HOFFMAN, p. 12]
The *Wall Street Journal* noted that Gusinsky (also spelled Goussinsky) “is sometimes billed as the richest man in Russia.” [WALLST, 4-13-95] For his part, Berezovsky was listed by *Forbes* in 1997 as one of the “ten top” billionaires in the world. Both Gusinsky and Berezovsky (originally Abramovitch) are Jewish. Gusinsky is also the president of the Russian Jewish Congress and his circle of international Jewish connections includes the aforementioned Ronald Lauder and Edgar Bronfman of the World Jewish Congress. A source told the *Jewish Week* that Gusinsky founded the Russian Jewish Congress so his “physical well-being will no longer be just [his] personal concern; it will be of international [Jewish] interest,” i.e., whatever he does, he can tap into the powerful international Jewish defense mother lode against “anti-Semitism.” [COHLLER-ESSES, p. 13] The *Jerusalem Post* notes that in Israel “media reports [were] hinting” that Gusinsky “had ties to the Russian mafia.” [COHEN, A.] Gusinsky built his business empire from his Most Bank; the Chairman of the Board of the Most Bank is Boris Hait who is also one of the vice-presidents of the Russian Jewish Congress. Other vice-presidents of the Jewish organization include Mikhail Friedman, Chairman of the board of the Alpha Bank, and Vitali Malkin, President of the Rossiiski Kredit Bank.

Gusinsky’s media empire includes NTV television – the largest commercial television station in Russia with an audience of 120 million. It also broadcasts to Israel, and “recently [December 1997] unveiled plans to expand its Russian-language broadcasts to Western Europe and other parts of the Middle East.” [KRICHEVSKY, p. 10] (Even in the New York area, the Russian-language Russian Television Network is run by a rabbi, president Mark Golub. Alexander Polovets, the editor and publisher of Panorama, “the most influential Russian-language newspaper in the United States,” is also Jewish. [TUGEND, 10-22-99]). Gusinsky also controls the Echo of Moscow radio station; a weekly magazine called Itogi (published in partnership with Newsweek/The Washington Post); the newspaper Segodnya; and NTV-Plus, a pay-per-view satellite network. In 1997, the Russian Orthodox patriarch, Alexei II, charging blasphemy, declared that “God would punish those responsible” for screening Martin Scorsese’s film *The Last Temptation of Christ* on Mr. Gusinsky’s television channel. The program had been postponed twice “because of Orthodox Christian fury.” [MEEK, p. 1] With mind-boggling chutzpah, NTV had originally planned to show the film “in April, on Russian Easter.” [KRICHEVSKY, Jewish-Owned, p. 9] Meanwhile, “at Gusinsky’s influence,” noted the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* in 1998, “a synagogue and Holocaust museum are now being built at the World War II Memorial site in Moscow.” [MILNER]

In 2001, the deputy head of the Russian Jewish Congress, Mikhail Miralashvili was arrested in Russia and charged with kidnapping. “Mr. Miralashvili,” noted London’s *Independent*,

“who holds joint Israeli and Russian citizenship, was due to leave Russia this week with the Israeli President, Moshe Katzav, who is on a state visit. Mr. Miralashvili is a director of the St. Petersburg company Russian Video, which was bought by Media-Most, controlled by Mr. Gusinsky,
in 1997. Mr. Gusinsky was later accused of defrauding the state by buying the company for $10 million – well below its real value.” [COCK-BURN, P., 1-25-01]

In July 1997, the Jewish Week reported that

“the Russian Jewish Congress, a powerful new group headed by one of Russia’s most prominent and controversial millionaires, has signed a landmark agreement with American Jewry’s top umbrella organization [the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations], pledging joint cooperation and consultation… The National Conference on Soviet Jewry, another U.S. umbrella group that encompasses many of the same Jewish organizational members as the Presidents Conference, was also a signatory…. Some, including a top Russian Jewish Congress official, says it marks a milestone in the emergence of the Russian group as an influential diaspora player on the international stage… In a separate initiative, the Russian Jewish Congress signed an agreement at about the same time with the World Jewish Congress…” [COHLER-ESSES, Lawyer, p. 9]

(A note about the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations: It represents, notes Jewish journalist Wolf Blitzer, “more than thirty of the most important national Jewish organizations; it has come to be viewed as the authoritative voice of the mainstream Jewish leadership… Because the Presidents’ Conference, like AIPAC [the leading American Jewish Israel lobbying organization], can almost always be found in support of the official Israeli position, U.S. officials in all recent administrations have to view it as a de facto arm of the Israeli government.” [BLITZER, p. 141-142])

Gusinsky also met with a number of Jewish American Congressmen, including Carl Lewin, Frank Lautenberg, Joseph Lieberman, and Arlen Specter. “The Middle East and ‘rising anti-Semitism’ were among the topics discussed,” noted Don Bonker (“a former Congressman who handles public relations for Goussinsky in Washington”). [COHLER-ESSES, US RUSSIAN, p. 1] The Jewish Week further noted that “according to a Jewish official who spoke on the condition of anonymity, Goussinsky’s efforts to meet with top State Department officials were rebuffed due to what one State official ; as his ‘checkered past.’” [COHLER-ESSES, US-RUSSIAN, p. 1] In 2000, Gusinsky, who, like other Russian Jewish media moguls, has dual Russian-Israeli citizenship, fled Russia after accusations of fraud. In October, related to the Gusinsky criminal investigation, Russian police raided the central Moscow synagogue, searching “practically everything,” but particularly looking for “in what way was the Jewish community… laundering money it was receiving from its sponsors.” Alexander Osovtsov, Executive Vice President of the Russian Jewish Congress, complained: “What gives special cynicism to it is the fact that the action was undertaken on the single day when the leaders of the Congress and the Jewish community were absent from Moscow because they were on a one-day visit of peace and solidarity to Israel.” [INTERFAX RUSSIAN NEWS, 10-20-00]
Boris Berezovsky’s riches began with Logovaz, a car dealership. He has since rapidly gained control of the Russian Public Television network, known as ORT; the newspaper Nezavisimaya Gazeta; the weekly magazine Ogonyok; Transero, a Russian airline; and 80% of Russia’s seventh largest oil company, which merged in 1998 with another Jewish-owned oil firm (together called Yuksi), to create “the world’s largest oil company in terms of reserves.” [MC-MAHON, p. 3] “Berezovsky,” says the Wall Street Journal, “has a reputation for labyrinthine political and business intrigues and has in the past exercised influence over Russian companies, including the national airline Aeroflot, without taking over formal ownership.” [HIGGINS, p. 2]

“Like many of the people in Russia who became rich very fast,” notes the New York Times, “Mr. Berezovsky has been the subject of numerous press reports that suggest he relied on organized crime to build his business empire.” [STANLEY, p. A3] Berezovsky, notes the Washington Post, “is part of a tight circle of financiers and business moguls who, by his own estimate, control half of Russia’s economy… [HOFFMAN, Russia]…. They all attained wealth in the violent, corruption-ridden, high-stakes competition that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union five years ago…. The scramble for wealth and power was carried out with brutal means, often including car bombs and assassinations… Russian tycoons are not public heroes. Popular resentments run deep over the vast sell-off of state property, which made many of them rich and left millions of Russians in poverty.” [HOFFMAN, p. A26] Berezovsky, notes the (Jewish) Forward, is one of the “robber barons accused of milking Russians dry.” [BLUSTAIN, p. 1]

In 1999 Berezovsky gained control of Moscow’s popular TV-6 television station. That same year he claimed control of “Russia’s premiere daily newspaper, Kommersant,” and fired its editor, Raf Shakirov, who said that “his ouster [is] an attempt to curb often critical coverage of the tycoon’s business and political activities.” [HIGGINS, p. 2]

In December 1996, Forbes magazine published a scathing article about Berezovsky (making sure such reports will be few and far between, the multi-billionaire responded by punishing the magazine with a suit for libel, as did the other Jewish tycoon giant, Vladimir Gusinsky, against the Wall Street Journal for an unflattering report about him). [WALL ST JRNL, 4-13-95] The Forbes article, entitled “The Godfather of the Kremlin,” was printed with no byline for fear of violent retribution to its authors. “Berezovsky,” noted the magazine’s editor, James Michaels, “stands tall as one of the most powerful men in Russia. Behind him lies a trail of corpses, uncollected debts and competitors terrified for their lives.” [MICHEALS, p. 10]

The anonymously written article in Forbes notes that

“Assassination is a tool of business competition. Scores of business leaders and media personalities have been killed… Berezovsky controls Russia’s biggest national TV network. His control was solidified shortly after the first chairman of the network was assassinated gangland style. Berezovsky was immediately fingered by the police as a key suspect, but
the murder remains unsolved two years later… Such is the Russian business environment today that the men at the top have use for the shadowy army of killers and thugs who work further down in the scale of corruption, running prostitute and protection rackets.” [FORBES, p. 91, 92]

In 1995 Vladislav Listiev, one of Russia’s most popular television talk show hosts, was named head of the Russian Public Television network (ORT). One of his major efforts was to rid the station of the corrupt, monopolistic advertising empire of a man named Sergei Lisovsky. The Forbes article suggests that Berezovsky was involved in Listiev’s eventual assassination, and when Berezovsky ended up with a controlling interest in ORT (36%), he retained Livosky as the only agent for the company’s advertising.

Incredibly, in 1996 Berezovsky vast wealth and power afforded him the opportunity to become a member of the Kremlin Security Council, a position that meant access to some of the Russian government’s most sensitive national secrets. He was soon embroiled in a scandal over his national allegiance when the liberal newspaper Izvestia publicized the fact that Berezovsky had secured Israeli citizenship in 1994. Berezovsky threatened to sue the newspaper, charging anti-Semitism. [SHALAPENTOKH, p. 19] (Meanwhile, the ruthless baron publicly declares he is a convert to Christianity). [KRICHEVSKY, L., 5-23-99]

A year later Fortune magazine ran an article entitled “Russia’s Robber Barons,” profiling ten of the most important Russian business tycoons who have catapulted to economic dominance in Russia with the collapse of communism; these included Gusinsky, Berezovsky, Boris Hait, Mikhail Friedman, Vladimir Vinogradov, Vladimir Potanin, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Alexander Smolensky, and Pyotr Aven.

Along with Gusinsky and Berezovsky, not only are Hait and Friedman Jewish, they are, as noted earlier, vice-presidents under Gusinsky in the Russian Jewish Congress. Khodorovsky, the President of Bank Menatep (and, curiously, the former Deputy Secretary of the Moscow Branch of the Communist Party youth branch) is also Jewish. (Khodorovsky’s ability to make ideological U-turns on a dime somewhat echoes the latent wheeling and dealing of Leonid Roitman, whose “meteoric rise to power was fueled by the chaos of post-pereestroika Russia.” In his earlier years, under the communist regime, says the Jerusalem Post, Roitman set up “an organization called Hativya, which taught summer camps for Jewish youth. In a brilliant move, he registered Hativya as part of Komsol, the Communist Youth movement, and it rapidly became ‘one of the largest and strongest organizations in Russia.’” [HECHT, p. 12]

Continuing the Fortune list, Pyotr Aren, of the Alpha financial group, is also Jewish. Smolensky, president of Stolichny Bank and Vinogradov, head of Inkombank, are also – according to a B’nai B’rith publication – “believed to be Jews.” [BERNSTEIN, RUSSIA’S, p. 12] (Many Jews in Eastern Europe publicly hide this fact of their identity). Of this group of economic dominators, that leaves only Potanin who is not Jewish (in a country where today less than half of 1% of the Russian population is Jewish [BERNSTEIN, p. 12]), but he has had American Jewish billionaire George Soros as a major backer in some of his
deals, including the takeover of Russia’s Svyazinvest telecommunications giant. (Soros has “invested around $2.5 billion in Russia, more than anyone or any institution.” [BROWNING, p. F2]

“Soros’s extraordinary role,” noted the (London) Guardian in 1994, “not only as the world’s most successful investor but now possibly, fantastically, as the single most powerful foreign influence in the whole of the former Soviet empire, attracts more suspicion than curiosity.” [LEWIS, M., p. 14] “I have been a prime target for the current version of anti-Semitic conspiracy theory,” notes Soros himself, “If there was ever a man who fit the stereotype of the Judeo-plutocratic Bolshevik Zionist world conspirator, it is me. And that is, in fact, how I am increasingly depicted in Eastern Europe and also to some extent in Western Europe, but not so much in America.” [SOROS, p. 239])

The above ten Russians, notes the Fortune piece, “dominate the country’s trade in arms and precious metals, as well as its production of copper, nickel, and a quarter of its oil. They control the No. 1 and No. 3 television networks, the Visa bankcard network, a big chunk of the pulp and paper industry, and an increasing portion of the food processing industry… Princeton professor Steven Cohen, writing in the Nation, dubbed [most of today’s Russian business elite] a ‘semi-criminalized oligarchy’ that has made ordinary Russians ‘suffer unduly and unjustly.’” [MELLOW, p. 120] Berezovsky has publicly bragged that he, Gusinsky, Khodorovsky, Aren, Friedman, Smolensky, and Potanin control half of Russia’s wealth. [BERSTEIN, p. 12]

As Jewish scholar Betsy Gidwitz noted in 1999:

“That Jews control a disproportionately large share of the Russian economy and Russian media certainly has some basis in fact. Between 50 and 80 percent of the Russian economy is said to be in Jewish hands, with the influence of the five Jews among the eight individuals commonly referred to as “oligarchs” particularly conspicuous. (An oligarch is understood to be a member of a small group that exercises control in a government. The five oligarchs of Jewish descent are Boris Berezovsky, Mikhail Friedman, Vladimir Gusinsky, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, and Alexander Smolensky. The other oligarchs are Vagit Alekperov, Vladimir Potanin, and Rem Vyakhirev.) Perhaps the most famous (and simultaneously the most infamous) of the oligarchs is Boris Berezovsky. In common with most of the other Jewish oligarchs, Berezovsky controls industries in three critical areas: the extraction and sale of a major natural resource, such as oil, as a source of great wealth; a large bank (useful in influencing industry and transferring assets abroad); and several major media outlets (useful for exerting influence and attacking rivals). He also controls a significant share of the Aeroflot airline and the Moscow automobile industry.” [GIDWITZ, B., 9-15-99]

A 1999 Wall Street Journal editorial notes that disturbing situation in today’s Russia:

“Russia’s oligarchs – many of them apparatchiks from the communist days – have stripped the country’s best assets and transferred their win-
nings to off-shore companies they control... For every dollar a Russian has laundered abroad there had to be a counterparty at the other end. London, Geneva, and New York are preferred destinations, as well as off-shore havens such as Cyprus and New Jersey. Estimates of $10 billion capital flight from Russia each year are probably conservative.” [WSJ, 8-30-99, p. 8]

By 1998, the foreign minister of Russia was Yevgeni Primakov. His real last name – Finkelstein – was dropped when he worked for the KGB. Also that year, Sergio Kiriyenko became the prime minister of Russia. He too is Jewish. [SAFIRE, p. 6] Primatov later succeeded him as Prime Minister. “Two of the main political leaders in Parliament,” adds the Times of London, “Grigori Yavlinsky, the leader of the liberal Yabloko Party, and Vladimir Zhirinovsky, the head of the ultra-nationalist LDPR, also have Jewish parents.” [BEESTON] A Los Angeles Times reporter notes that “at least half of the powerful ‘oligarchs’ who control a significant percentage of the [Russian] economy are Jewish. The reviled architect of Yeltsin’s failed reform policies, Anatoly Chubais, [later head of the national electrical power monopoly], is rumored to be Jewish, along with Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov, ousted Deputy Minister Boris Nemtsov and Yeltsin’s wife, Naina.” [REYNOLDS, p. 7A] The Jewish Telegraph Agency noted that “Chubais is not… open about his Jewish roots.” [KRICHEVSKY, L., 5-23-99] Alexander Livshitz also served a spell as Russia’s finance minister in the 1990s. [KRICHEVSKY, L., 5-23-99]

In 1999, the Jewish Exponent noted that “all but one of the eight leading [Russian] bankers are Jewish,” and four of them – Goussinsky, Boris Hait, Mikhail Friedman, and Vitaly Malkin – occupy the top positions at the RJC [Russian Jewish Congress]... In addition to these business titans, often referred to here in the [Russian] media and on the street as the ‘oligarchs,’ many of the leading political figures in Russia are also Jewish or partly Jewish. These include former prime Minister Sergei Kiriyenko and top Kremlin aides Yegor Gaidar and Boris Nemtsov. Grigori Yavlinsky, the leader of the Yabloko, the largest democratic party in the Duma today, has one Jewish parent... In the new Russia, the most important fields... to which Jews [have] gravitated [are] banking, trade, the media, and show business.” [RUBY, W., p. 37]

In late 1998, Viktor Ilyukin, the head of the Russian Parliament’s Security Affairs Committee, said this about the Yeltsin government: “The large-scale genocide [i.e., Russian social and economic collapse] wouldn’t have been possible if Yeltsin’s inner circle had consisted of the main ethnicity groups, and not exclusively of one group, the Jews.” [NEW YORK TIMES, Communist, p. 12] That same year, Nikolai Kandratenko, the governor of a southern Russian province, called the government of the area’s largest city “a Zionist nest” exemplifying a “Judeo-Masonic mafia.” [KRICHEVSKY, L., Russian, p. 7]

Meanwhile, also in the same year, the Jerusalem Post noted a more commonly enforced stereotypes about the situation of Jews in Russia:
“[A Christian woman in Dallas] heard about some young Jews in the former Soviet Union getting help via a soup kitchen. She decided to become the adoptive grandmother, sending in a monthly contribution for their welfare.” [COHEN, A., p. 11]

As Jewish scholar Michael Paul Sacks noted in 1998 about the almost secretive nature of the economic situation of Jews in modern Russia:

“Published census data on Jews [in Russia] have been very scarce, but this [from the 1989 Russian census] and other sources leave no doubt that in comparison with other groups Soviet Jews were very distinctive in terms of their urban concentration and their educational and professional achievement… With the recent release of new data from the 1989 census, a more precise understanding of the opportunities available to Jews in ‘Soviet’ Russia is now possible. These data show the number of men and women by major ethnic groups (including Jews) in 257 job categories. Surprisingly, this new information is not referred to even in the most recent Russian scholarship on Jews, and it received no mention in western sources… Jews showed a very early path of upward mobility in the modernizing sectors of the labor force… [SACKS, 1998, p. 247]… Occupations that were largest for Jews were primarily top-level positions and all were white collar: physicians, scientists, chief managerial personnel, artists and producers, literary and press personnel. The [job] categories that were largest only for Russians were entirely manual labor and other low-skills; tractor drivers, cleaners, weighers, nursemaids, lathe operators, tailors and seamstresses, carpenters and dairy work.” [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 257]

A 1995 study in Russia found that 84% of employed Jews had “professional or managerial positions.” Another 4% were “owners of firms or entrepreneurs.” [SACKS, M., 1998, p. 265]

With the likes of Gusinsky, Berezovsky, and other powerful Jewish business tycoons wielding extraordinary influence and blatantly buying (and allegedly even killing) their broad way into the Russian media, business, and government, (as well as centrally placed Jews in the Russian government like Finance Minister Alexander Livshits and First Deputy Minister in Charge of Economic Reform, Boris Nemtsov), the Christian Science Monitor noted in 1997 that

“A loose coalition of nationalistic communists and out-and-out [Russian] nationalists has begun to characterize President Boris Yeltsin’s regime as ‘Jewish.’ It is the Jewishness of Mr. Yeltsin’s regime, its essential foreignness to Russia, that [in this view] explains the plummeting economy, the brazen corruption and enrichment of the few… and Russia’s subservient position to the West.” [SHLAPENTOKH, p. 19; WALL ST, 4-13-95, p. A14; HOFFMAN, D., 1-10-97, p. A1; STANLEY, 6-14-97, p. A3]

Still another angle on Jewish economic dominance at the upper tiers of capitalist Russia was a 1998 article in the Israeli daily, Ha’reetz, which noted

“The most successful venture capitalists in the world in 1996 and 1997 operated out of Moscow and was started by an Israeli. The Hermitage 1
and **Hermitage 2** funds specialize in investments in Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union, although they invest throughout the world. They were set up in 1995 by Israeli businessman Benny Stein-matz and the Safra brothers [and are] managed by American Bill Brod-er… Hermitage is considered the most senior player on the Moscow Stock Exchange, and it is the second-largest of the fund managers active in Russia, with some $600 million to invest.” [LIPSON]

Then there is Boris Jordan, also Jewish, from New York’s Long Island, eventual head – after **Vladimir Gusinsky** fled to Israel to escape criminal prosecu- tion – of Russian television station NTV,

“who almost single-handedly established the Russian stock market, who in one year earned half the global profits for his employers at Credit Suisse First Boston, who walked away from a reported $4 million bonus because it was insultingly small and instead founded Russia’s first full-ser-vice investment bank, which he optimistically called **Renaissance Capital**. Brash, bright and above all ambitious, Jordan more than any other individual put Russia on the financial map in the 90’s. ‘Czar Boris,’ as he was dubbed by admiring business reporters, held court high atop Mos-cow’s most expensive new skyscraper, while Renaissance’s 800 pin-striped bankers and brokers handled billions of dollars from blue-chip investors like **George Soros** and the Harvard endowment. The darling of Davos, the Swiss summit for the well heeled and influential, Jordan was, in his own words, on top of the world.” [BRZENSKI, M., 7-22-01, p. 40]

Yet another Jewish Russian money mogul is **Roman Abramovich**. The **Warsaw Voice** (headed by Jewish publisher and editor Andrzej Jonas) noted in 1999 that he is “the CEO of the powerful **Sibneft** oil group. A popular joke in Mos-cow says that one must count one’s fingers after shaking hands with Abramovich, who has for years been associated with Berezovsky’s financial group.” [ZYGULSKI, p. 8] Oil magnate Leonid Nevzlin became head of the Russian Jewish Congress in 2001. He and the aforementioned Mihail Khodorkovsky “formed one of the first successful private banks in Russia in 1989. The two then went into the oil business together, and now run the **YUKOS** firm – Khodorkovsky is in charge, and Nevzlin is his deputy.” The secular Jewish Nevzlin, like so many, has returned to his Jewish roots. “For all my life,” he says, “I have never felt any substantial anti-Semitism, and was rather indifferent to the Jewish community. Then something clicked, and I thought, Well, I’m over 40, I have made a successful career, I have made a fortune. But what will I tell my children when I am 70.” [GORODETSKY, L., 5-23-01]

Then there is **Mikhail Mirilashvili** (a.k.a., Misha Kutaisskey), who “is one of the biggest shareholders of the local branch of **LUK oil**. He is also president of **Channel 11** and president and deputy chairman of the St. Petersburg branch of the Russian chapter of the World Jewish Congress.” A brother, Konstantin, is the “co-owner of **Gosting Dvor**, [St. Petersburg’s] major shopping center.” [KORA-LYEV, VLADIMIR, 10-11-2000] Then there is Anatoly Karachinsky, “head of In-formation Business Systems, Russia’s largest IT group.” Karachinsky, also Jewish,
“is regarded in Russia as the country’s answer to Bill Gates – and who is about to become the country’s first high-technology dollar millionaire.” Karachinsky “set up NewspaperDirect, a system that allows newspapers from anywhere in the world to be printed on a desktop.” [FINANCIAL TIMES, 10-2-00]

Then there is New York-based Stuart Subotnick, also Jewish, who is the CEO and president of Metromedia International Group. (In 1999, Subotnick was ranked by Forbes magazine among the richest 400 Americans). This company’s specialty is cable, telephone, and digital media – largely in Eastern Europe. Holdings include complete – or major – shares in Russia’s PLD Telekom, Kosmos TV (“one of Russia’s largest wireless cable operators”), 50% of Comstar (“a large Moscow digital communications carrier”), Romsat (“one of the largest cable operators in Romania”), 70% of “a leading Bucharest-based ISP (Internet Service Provider) called FX Internet. Metromedia even has holdings in places like Belarus and Kazakhstan. In Russia it also owns “several TV and radio stations in St. Petersburg and Nizhii Novgorod.” [CAPITAL MARKET RUSSIA, 5-20-99; AFX EUROPEAN FOCUS, 1-12-01; CABLE EUROPE, 7-4-00; TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES MARKET, 6-26-00]

Howard Jacobson rode with a taxi driver in recent years in New York City. The driver was a fellow Jew, a recent immigrant from Russia. “He speaks Yiddish,” noted Jacobson in 1993,

“His family kept it alive so that they could talk among themselves and not be understood. ‘A secret language,’ he explains. The secret language of the Jews. A light kept burning underground all during those years of atheism. I’d be touched if I wasn’t alarmed. For where people speak a secret language, how can suspicion and fear of them not multiply?” [JACOBSON, H., 1993/1995, p. 80-81]

“Our people are not blind,” proclaimed the head of the Russian Communist Party, Gennady Zyuganov, in 1998, “They cannot fail to see that the spread of Zionism in the government is one of the reasons for the current catastrophe in the country, the mass impoverishment and the process of extinction of its people.” [ENSEL, M., p. 3]

The blustering of an anti-Semitic fanatic? In the same year, a Jewish Russian immigrant in New York of considerable renown, novelist Edward Topol (whose work was once banned in Russia), stirred controversy and deep concern in the world Jewish community because of a published letter he wrote to a Russian weekly newspaper. In it Topol called prominent Jewish Russian bankers “puppeteers” who manipulated Russian politics and its economy. The puppeteers, he concluded, has “a very long Jewish last name – Berezovsko-Goussinsko-Smolensko-Khodrokovsko, etc…. How come all or almost all the money in this country ended up in Jewish hands?” Topol also called the economic crisis in Russia today a “Jewish tragedy.” “Mr. Topol’s main premise,” noted the (Jewish) Forward, “is that for the first time in a millennium, Jews have gained real political power and financial control over Russia and can pretty much decide whether to ‘cast the country into a chaos of wars and poverty or raise it from the mud.” [KRICHEVSKY, Emigre’s, p. 5; KAZAKINA, p. 5]
In 1997 the (Jewish) *Forward* reported that “with the [Russian] economy in shambles, opposition parties held nationwide strikes at the end of last month. [Even] Jews are grumbling that too many Jews stand close to the reigns of power and too many Jewish names fill the headlines.” [BLUSTAIN, R, p. 1] “All the Jews, I don’t understand their motivation, to show they are rich… [to say] ‘I am an owner and you are a slave,’” complained Alexander Lieberman, the Jewish director of the Union Council’s Russian-American Bureau of Human Rights. “If I were a single Russian and I saw and heard only Jews in the government… [I would think] ‘we are all without money because the Jews have all the Russian money.’” [BLUSTAIN, p. 1] “People have quite bitter memories of Jews in the [communist] revolution,” noted Michael Chlenov, the president of the Jewish Va’ad of Russia.

In this regard, transnationally, in 1996, Boris Berezovsky hosted a party in honor of the earlier mentioned Ronald Lauder (American Jewish owner of a number of TV stations in Europe), attended by Russian President Boris Yeltsin and United States Ambassador Thomas Pickering. Speaking to a reporter, Lauder (already ensnared in partnership media dealings in the Ukraine with Russian mafia-clouded Vadim Rabinovich) publicly distanced himself from Berezovsky, saying, “The invitations went out in President Yeltsin’s name.” [FORBES, p. 91]
In 1986 Ze’ev Chafets, an American Jew who had moved to Israel, returned for a while to the states to do a book about the American Jewish community; he entitled the resultant volume, *Members of the Tribe*. Following an AIPAC (the powerful Israel lobbying agency based in Washington DC) organizer who was “hunting Jews” across America, he noted an interesting incident at a Jewish gathering at the Stardust Motel in Moline, Illinois. Chafets writes that a fellow Jew sitting next to him in the audience poked the American-Israeli in the ribs, and then “tapped my copy of the *Quad-City Times* (‘The Midwest’s Most Exciting Newspaper’) and whispered, ‘This is a Jewish newspaper’ … The man was referring to ownership, not content … Determined to make an impression, the man poked me again. ‘See this motel?’ he asked. ‘It’s a Jewish motel.’” [CHAFETS, p. 39]

In 1999, the chairman of the *Newspaper Association of America* was Richard Gottlieb. He is also the chairman of *Lee Enterprises*, based in Davenport, Iowa, which owns 21 newspapers and 16 TV stations across the United States – from Billings, Montana, to Madison, Wisconsin, to Lincoln, Nebraska. Lloyd Schermer retired as CEO of the company in 1999. A corporate subsidiary, *NAPP Systems*, constructs printing plates for about 350 newspapers in 30 countries. In Nebraska too, John Gottschalk is the chairman and president of the *Omaha World-Herald* company. He is also publisher of the *Omaha World-Herald*. [BATT, J., 3-24-2000]

In northern California, in the heart of the internationally important high-tech area of Silicon Valley, David Cohen controls an area-wide empire as the Publisher/CEO of the *Silicon Valley Community Newspapers* (SVCN Inc.). Cohen founded *Metro*, “Silicon Valley’s weekly alternative newspaper.” A SVCN subdivision is *Metro Newspapers*. *Metro*, in turn, “purchased the *Los Gatos Weekly* and the more than 100-year old *Los Gatos Times-Observer*, which were combined as the *Los Gatos Weekly Times*. In 1991, the company acquired the weekly *Saratoga News* and the *Willow Glen Resident* … In 1993, Metro Newspapers began publishing a newspaper in Cupertino, and acquired its competitor the *Cupertino Courier*, in 1995. The company founded *The Sun* in 1993. The most recent addition to the community family was *The Campbell Reporter*, which began publishing in March, 1999.” [CUPERTINO COURIER, 4-11-01]

In Colorado, Edward Lehman publishes a few small town newspapers, including the *Longmont Daily Times-Call*, the *Loveland Daily Reporter-Herald*, and *Superior* in Lafayette. The executive roster for all these papers includes Ed-
ward Lehman at the top, Dean Lehman as president, and Lauren Lehman as vice-president. (Ruth Lehman is the Associate Editor at the *Longmont journal*).

In 1975, in New Hampshire, journalist Kevin Cash wrote an entire volume criticizing the concentrated media and political power of newspaperman William Loeb. Loeb owned New Hampshire’s two major newspapers – the *Manchester Union Leader* and the *New Hampshire Sunday News*, as well as the *Vermont Sunday News*, and a few smaller New England area papers. Loeb was also in the habit of writing regular editorials in his newspapers. “The truth is,” wrote Cash, a former reporter at the Union Leader, “is that [Loeb’s papers] are to a large extent monopolistic in nature within the limits of New Hampshire.” [CASH, K., p. 3] Loeb was of Jewish heritage (both parents were Jewish); he once published in one of his papers, however, his father’s 1906 Episcopal baptismal document, signed by American President Theodore Roosevelt (his father was Roosevelt’s executive secretary).

In Pittsburgh, Paul Block (1877-1941) owned the *Pittsburgh Evening Sun*, the *Pittsburgh Morning Post*, and the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, as well as the *Toledo Times* and *Toledo Blade*. [GREENBERG, M., p. 53] His sons, William and Paul, also later added television and cable stations to their mini-empire. Elsewhere, “in 1978, the Samuel Horvitz Trust [run by three sons and an employee] owned five monopoly newspapers in Ohio and New York, cable systems in Ohio and Virginia, and construction firms in Ohio, and was a major landowner in Florida.” [BAGDIKIAN, p. 42]

In a review of Jewish book publishing in the United States to 1976, Jewish author Charles Madison noted the following Jewish-founded, or purchased, firms (some still exist, some are now defunct, some are absorbed by others):

- **Simon and Schuster** (Richard L. Simon; Max L. Schuster)
- **Knopf** (Alfred A. Knopf)
- **Random House** (Bennett Cerf and Donald Klopfer)
- **Pantheon** (founded by Kurt and Helen Wolf)
- **Viking** (Harold Guinzburg)
- **Dover** (founded in 1943)
- **Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux** - (The father of Roger Strauss – president of the publishing company – was in turn chairman of the Board of the American Smelting and Refining Company. From 1955-65 Roger was also chairman of the board of *American Judaism* magazine).
- **Grove Press** (1947) - which controlled **Evergreen Books** and the **Evergreen Review**.
- **Praeger** (1950)
- **Basic Books** (1952) - Its founder, Arthur Rosenthal, later became Director of *Harvard University Press*.
- The **Free Press** (1947) - Its founder, Jeremiah Kaplan, joined Crowell-Collier, which had acquired **MacMillan**, as a Vice-President.
- **Atheneum** (1959)

Academic Press

International Universities Press

Twayne Publishers (1948)

World Publishing Company (1905)

Frederick Ungar (1941)

Harry Abrams (1950) - mostly art books.

George Braziller (1955)

Tudor - mostly music books.

[MADISON, CHARLE:, 1976]

“One year,’ says famous Jewish novelist Judith Krantz in her autobiography,

“when I cam back from Paris, I foolishly risked a certain jail sentence by bringing for, buttoned into my blouse, a copy of the utterly pornographic Rosy Crucifixion by Henry Miller, an erotic masterpiece that Jeremy rented out to his friends as twenty-five cents a day. I’m not taking all the credit, but eventually he [Jeremy Tarcher] became the first and best publisher of New Age books in the United States.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 147] [Krantz notes that her novel Mistral “was quickly bought for France by Edition Stock, whose publisher, Jean Rosenthal, as it happened had translated my other novels into French.”] [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 313]

In a continuing trajectory of percentage of ownership, by 1968 Roger Kahn noted that “Jews own perhaps half the major book publishing houses: Random House, Simon & Schuster, New American Library, Alfred Knopf, and Atheneum are a few that thrive under the leadership of Jews.” [KAHN, R., p. 5] “Owners of new [early to mid-20th century publishing] concerns, “notes Jay Gertzman, “most of them young Jewish men (Horace Liveright, Thomas Seltzer, Ben Huebsch, Max Schuster, Alfred Knopf) had begun to specialize in presenting European writers to an American audience curious about their sexual frankness and Marxist ideas. Established houses, such as Doran, Houghton, Appleton, and Doubleday, did not do so, and some of their executives resented their parvenu colleagues. Modernist writers especially owed their exposure to Jewish firms.” [GERTZMAN, J., 2000, p. 114]

In the 1980s, Crown Books, headed by Robert Haft (who also founded the Trak Auto supply chain), rose to become the third largest bookstore chain with nearly 250 outlets throughout America. At its peak the firm was a national giant with nearly 10,000 employees and valued between $500 million to $1 billion (the company drastically weakened with in-house, intra-family legal feuds between Robert and his father Herbert, a Jewish immigrant from Russia). The Brentano’s bookstore chain was also founded by Jewish entrepreneur August Brentano in the late 19th century. Abraham Rosenbach and his brother Philip were used book sellers from 1903 until the 1950s. In 1928, the New Yorker called Abraham “the most famous dealer in rare books.” “If Gutenberg [Bible] sales are taken as the
measure of a dealer,” says Guy Lesser, “Rosenbach would have to be reckoned history’s most successful [book dealer], judging by his transactions over … four decades.” [LESSER, G., JAN 2002, p. 48, 46] “Whiskey, cigars, deep-sea fishing, and women (to put the last politely),” adds Lesser, “in roughly that order, after books, seem to have been his passions.” [LESSER, G., JAN 2002, p. 48]

Jewish publishers also brought out the inexpensive series for mass appeal, including the Little Leather Library, the Little Blue Books, and the Modern Library (Horace Liveright); Jewish entrepreneurs also initiated the “Book-of-the-Month Club.” “As an author and editor, [Mortimer] Adler built a publishing empire on an unlikely foundation: the philosophic system of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas. That system influenced his work as compiler of the Great Books of the Western World and as editor of Encyclopedia Brittanica.” [D’Alessio, F., 6-29-01] In 2001, Michael Ross, the publisher of the World Book Dictionary, removed the verb “jew” (traditionally meaning “beat down in price”) from the volume. [LEVINE, S., JUNE/JULY 2001]

Other Jewish book publishers include Westview, Stein and Day, Holmes and Meier, Price Stern Sloan, Lyle Stuart (the founder, Lyle Stuart, was born Lionel Simon), Ottenheimer (a Baltimore publisher with 200 titles a year), and Schocken. In England, Lord George Weidenfeld not only controls a well-known namesake publishing house, he is also chairman of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain. From England, Andre Deutsch’s namesake company published Norman Mailer, V.S. Naipaul, Arthur Schlessinger, and other prominent authors. In Canada, Avie Bennett is president of McClelland & Stewart (1992).

By the late 1990s, Golden Books Family Entertainment, “the nation’s largest producer of children’s books,” was headed by Jewish publisher Richard Snyder (who replaced Richard Bernstein). The next four top executives at the firm were also Jewish: Steven Grossman, James Cohen, Ira Gomberg, and Ian Reich. [HOOVER, p. 255]

Alfred Lilienthal, a Jew and lifelong crusader against Zionism and Jewish chauvinism, wrote in 1982 that

“All the leading magazines, ranging from Commentary, Esquire, Ladies Home Journal, New York Review of Books, New Yorker, and U.S. News and World Report have Jews in key positions as publishers, editors, or managing editors. No one is able to criticize Jews – or even take Israel to task – for fear of being out of line with the boss … There is [also] the constant overriding concern of the media about losing advertising … at times making a mockery of ‘freedom’ of the press … [LILIENTHAL, p. 219] … It would be futile to list the number of top Jewish editors and writers across the country. Many of the largest book publishers, including Knopf, Random House, Holt, Liverwright, Viking Press, Simon and Schuster, Van Nostrand Reinhold, and Lyle Stuart are Jewish-owned, directly or by Jewish-controlled interests (including CBS, RCA, Music Corporation of America [MCA], Litton’s, and Gulf and Western.
In other firms such as Macmillan and Grosset and Dunlap, one will find editors-in-chief or presidents who are Jewish.” [LILIENTHAL, p. 220]

In the same year, Jewish literary agent Bill Adler (formerly the Executive Editor at Playboy when Mike Cohn was Director of Playboy’s book division) wrote a volume entitled Inside Publishing. Some of the (Jewish) power people in his New York publishing world included

- Richard Snyder: CEO, president and Chairman of the Board of Simon & Schuster
- Joni Evans: (Snyder’s wife), president of Simon & Schuster subsidiary, The Linden Press
- Robert Gottlieb: President and Editor-in-Chief of Alfred A. Knopf
- Louis Wolfe: President and CEO of Bantam Books
- Marc Jaffe: Editor-in-Chief of Bantam Books
- Hillel Black: Editor-in-Chief at William Morrow
- Nat Wartels: Chairman of Crown Publishers
- Jonathan Segal: Editor-in-Chief of Times Books
- Helen Meyer: President of Dell Publishing
- Phyllis Grann: Publisher of G.P. Putnam’s Sons
- Jim Silberman: President of Summit Books
- Howard Kaminsky: President and Publisher of Warner Books

[ADLER, B., 1982]

Adler’s favored choice for assignment as writing “collaborator” with celebrities was Mickey Herskowitz. Herskowitz wrote books for Bette Davis, Dan Rather, Gene Autry, Jimmy the Greek, and others. In the “book packaging” field (where literary agents produce anthology-type volumes commissioned by publishers) Lyle Kenyon Engel was “one of the most prolific book packagers over the years.” [ADLER, B., 1982, p. 89]

Jewish actor Kirk Douglas has written some books about his life; he notes his surprise when he discovered that

“my editor Ushi was becoming fascinated with Judaism [she eventually converted to it]. Out of the blue, in the fall of 1993, she announced that she was going to Israel. A whole month in Israel would cost her a mere $950 plane fare, food and lodging included. Could that be true? Oh yes, but she was doing it through an organization called Volunteers for Israel, which basically meant she was going into the Israeli Army for three weeks.” [DOUGLAS, K., 1997, p. 125]

“Any roll call of the most respected and/or powerful figures in the publishing world,” wrote Robert C. Christopher in 1989 in a book about the decline of WASP institutions,” whether in editorial or executive positions, has to include a sizeable number of Jews; among those who automatically come to mind are Robert Bernstein, Jason Epstein, and Joni Evans at Random House, Richard Snyder and Michael Korda [also author of Power: How to Get It and Success!] at Simon and Schuster, Simon Michael Bessie at Harper and Row, Howard Kaminsky at Hearst and Marc Jaffe at Houghton Mifflin.” [CHRISTOPHER, p. 222] “I don’t
want to sound chauvinistic;” said Jason Epstein in 2001, “but [Jewish publishers] were smarter than their gentile colleagues.” [GREEN, D., 5-31-01]

Others Jews in positions of power in earlier years (as noted by Martin Greenberg in 1979) included the publisher of Collier’s and the Women’s Home Companion, founder and editor of the National Guardian, the editor and founder of AB Bookman’s Weekly, the editor of the Saturday Review, senior editors at Time, Forbes and Newsweek, the editor of Variety, a member of the Board of Editors for Fortune, the editor-in-chief of Redbook and on and on. [GREENBERG, 1979]

More recently, take, for example, a 1996 report in Advertising Age that noted that Ellen Levine, the editor-in-chief of Good Housekeeping, was having a spat with her publisher, Alan Waxenberg, and that Jerry Kaplan was one of those being considered to replace him. [KELLY, p. 47] In 1994, Barbara Grossman left Simon and Shuster to become the publisher at Viking where Peter Mayer was the Viking Penguin CEO. In the same era, Joni Evans (born Joni Goldfinger) became the head of the Turtle Bay imprint at Random House. Tina Brown, also Jewish, was described by one London newspaper as “the most famous woman editor in the world … [She is] the worst social climber since Kong lumbered to the top of the Empire State Building.” [LANGTON, J.]

In England, in 1998 the (London) Daily Telegraph noted Gail Reubuck, “daughter of affluent Baltic Jewish immigrants,” as “the most powerful figure in British publishing,” and “recently voted Publisher of the Year.” [CAMPBELL, p. D4] Another example is Richard Malina who started out as a lawyer for Grosset and Dunlap. By 1985 he was the President of the publishing division of Doubleday; in 1987 he became the Executive Director and Publisher of the Jewish Publication Society. [GODFREY, p. 2]

A mere random look at a few 1998 issues of Publishers Weekly evidenced the following items: Al Silverman retired as “Editor-at-large” at Penguin. He was also the former publisher and editor-at-large at Viking, and chairman and CEO of the Book of the Month Club. Mark Lieberman was the Executive Vice President of Cahner’s Publishing Company, which publishes Publishers Weekly where Sybil Steinberg was the Senior Editor for Fiction. Jane Friedman was the CEO and president of HarperCollins. Martha Levin was named the new Vice President and editor-in-chief at Hyperion (moving over from a position as Senior Vice President at Doubleday. Lucianne Goldberg was noted as the literary agent for Linda Tripp (who exposed the President Clinton-Monica Lewinsky sex scandal. Goldberg – formerly Steinberger – is the wife of Sid Goldberg, former editor of the North American Newspaper Alliance, and later vice president of United Media, a syndicator of news stories. One of Lucianne’s own novels is Madame Cleo’s Girls, a “frothy tale about three high-class prostitutes.’ [HUBBARD, p. 111]) The Bantam Doubleday Dell International CEO in 1998 was Stephen Rubin. The president and editor-in-chief of Summit Books was still Jim Silberman. Marc Jaffe was publisher of his own imprint at Houghton Mifflin. Others afforded news making mention in the Publishers Weekly issues were Jonathan Karp, an editor at Random House, Esther Newberg, an agent at ICM; and agents
Daniel Greenberg and Al Zuckerman of James Levine Communications. The Horowitz-Rae book manufacturing company was also noted as sold.

Such Jewish prominence today is all over the map. Michael Hoffman is the Executive Director of Aperture, probably the most influential “art” photography journal and book publisher. Michael Hirschorn is editor of Spin, “the bible of alternative music.” Alan Light is Editor-in-Chief of Vibe magazine. George Hirsch is the vice-president and publisher of Runner’s World. Nat Lehman was the publisher of Playboy. (Richard Rosenzweig was Playboy founder Hugh Hefner’s personal Executive Assistant, Bobbi Arnstein his personal secretary, and Howard Shapiro his chief legal counsel. By the 1990s, Shapiro was third in command of the Playboy empire, behind only Hefner and his daughter). Peter Bart is Editor-in-Chief at Variety. Michael Solomon was named editor of Premiere in 2000. Lesley Seymour is the editor of Redbook. Merle Ginsberg is the Entertainment Editor for Women’s Wear Daily. David Bauer is one of the Executive Editors at Sports Illustrated. David Fine is SI’s photography editor. Todd Gold recently left the editorship of People magazine to found a company with fellow Jew Adam Werbach, recently stepped down as the president of the Sierra Club.

Milton Esterow is the publisher and editor of both ArtNews and Antiques World. He is also co-editor and founder of the American Art Journal. Jonathan Steinberg – son of notorious corporate raider Saul Steinberg – publishes Individual Investor magazine. Steven Brill founded American Lawyer and a media watchdog journal called Brill’s Content (editor-in-chief: David Kuhn, formerly executive editor of Talk magazine), and the Court TV program on television. (A rival, Peoples’ Court, features presiding Jewish judge Jerry Sheindlin and commentating attorney Harry Levin. Another court TV program, Judge Judy, features Jerry Sheindlin’s wife, Judy, at the helm.) For years Jerry Finkelstein published the New York Law Journal. Janice Kaplan is the Executive Producer of Television. Jane Goldman is the Executive Editor of California Lawyer. Rae Anne Marsh is the managing editor of Arizona Corridors Magazine. Steven Cohn edits the Media Industry Newsletter. Rachel Newman edits Country Living. David Klinghoffer is the literary editor of the National Review. Debbie Rosenberg is the Managing Editor of Biography. Robert Epstein is the Editor-in-Chief of Psychology Today. Adam Garfinkle is the Executive Editor of the National Interest. Michael Berman co-founded George magazine. Baltimore’s Style magazine is owned by the Baltimore Jewish Times. Michael Gewanda became the editor of Time (Australia) in 1993. Peter Newman edited Canada’s prominent weekly magazine, Maclean’s. Peter Eisenman was “the father of two architectural publications of note, Oppositions and Skyline.” [ARONSON, S., 1983, p. 303] And on and on and on.

“White and Jewish,” Ben Burns (originally Bernstein) even “made a career in black journalism, editing the Chicago Defender and helping found Ebony magazine.” [GROSSMAN, p. C1] He also edited Sepia, “a white-owned magazine for blacks.” [ZALLER, p. 30] A more recent black-based magazine is the musical “hip-hop” The Source; by the mid-1990s it boasted a newsstand circulation larger than Rolling Stone. The Source “speaks to young black males,” not-
ed USA Today, “in a language they can understand. More than 60% of its readers are African-Americans. Over 80% are under age 25.” Featuring “shock covers” and articles like the one about bulletproof vest clothing fashions to ward off a 44 magnum at close range,” the publisher of The Source, Peter Mays, is also Jewish. [HOROVITZ, p. 1B] In 1998, Elinor Ruth Tatum became the publisher of her father’s newspaper, the Amsterdam News, New York City’s oldest and largest African-American newspaper. Ms. Tatum’s father is Black; her mother is Jewish. [JET, p. 32]

The Detroit News is both published and edited by Marc Silverman. Howard Kleinberg was, until recently, the editor of the Miami News. Martin Baron edits the Boston Globe. Phil Bronstein is the executive editor of the San Francisco Examiner and the second Jewish husband of non-Jewish actress Sharon Stone (his father was a former director of the Los Angeles Jewish Federation). (Michael de Young, also Jewish, founded the rival San Francisco Chronicle). Tom Rosenstiel is the director of the Project for Excellence in Journalism. ABC’s Peggy Wehmeier, a self-described Protestant, born of a Jewish mother, is “the only network correspondent specializing in religious and spiritual issues.” [SHISTER, G., 9-11-99, p. G2] At least half of the ten members (Jonathan Alter, Howard Fineman, Michael Isikoff, Debra Rosenberg, and Ron Haviv) of Newsweek’s “political team” covering the 2000 American presidential campaign were of Jewish heritage. [NEWSWEEK, 11-20-2000, p. 4] And if you want to write regularly for editor Steve Wasserman’s Los Angeles Times Book Review, and you’re not Jewish, the odds are heavily against you. His stable of “Contributing Writers” is Anthony Day, Michael Frank, Jonathan Kirsch, Jonathan Levi, Suzie Linfield, Suzanne Mantell, and Benjamin Schwarz. Politically conservative commentator David Horowitz would argue that you’d have to be left-wing too, noting that:

“I knew Wasserman as a former Berkeley radical and protégé, in the 1960s, of a Times contributing editor, Bob Scheer … After the 1960s, Scheer had ingratiated himself with Hollywood’s bolsheviks, married a top editor at the Los Angeles Times, and become a figure of influence in the paper’s hierarchy, which enabled him to secure Wasserman his job.” [HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 189]

Longtime media critic for the Los Angeles Times has been Howard Rosenberg. In a 1991 column he wrote that

“The mail is coming in about my column endorsing KCET’s recent presentation of the controversial film ‘Stop the Church,’ and nearly all of it is critical and angry. Most writers accused me of being rather a fence sitter and biased against Catholicism. Some note that I am Jewish.” [ROSENBERG, H., 9-16-91, p. F1]

The Washington Post media reporter is another Jewish Howard, this one Kurtz. Until his death in 1997, across the continent, Herb Caen was for fifty years a “legendary San Francisco columnist” and the city’s “most beloved institution.” [SCHEER, R., 2-4-97, p. B7; DOUGAN, M., 2-7-97, p. A1] Looking back into earlier years, Dennis McDougal singles out (Jewish columnists) Joyce Haber (of the Los Angeles Times) and Irv Kupcinet (of the Chicago Sun-Times)
as prominent media loyal public supporters/defenders of Hollywood lawyer/mobster Sidney Korshak. [MCDougAL, p. 396]

In 2000, journalist Katherine Ross wrote about the case of fellow journalist Lynn Hirschberg:

“She is the premier chronicler of the entertainment elite for the New York Times Magazine … On the beat for almost 20 years, Hirschberg stands at the nexus of the Los Angeles entertainment and New York publishing worlds … Hirschberg’s pieces almost always deify or demonize. ‘She can make your career,’ says publicist Bumble Ward.” [ROSMAN, K., 5-2000]

Hirschberg started out with help from David Rosenthal, “then the assistant manager at Rolling Stone and now the publisher of Simon and Schuster’s adult-trade division.” “Hirschberg,” adds reporter Ross,

“doesn’t just profile and befriend the powerful. Like most other successful operators, she is savvy at facilitating business deals for friends that will leave those friends in her debt. In 1993, for example, Hirschberg brokered a Time magazine cover story about her then close friend, the producer Scott Rudin, written by her friend Philip Weiss … [Also] consider her close alliance with Peter Kaplan, the editor of the New York Observer, a weekly newspaper popular in New York’s media circles. Kaplan and Hirschberg have never worked together, but their friendship has benefited both.” [ROSMAN, K., 5-2000]

All these people are Jewish.

Does all this massive Jewish predominance in the mass media, internationally, and their collective sense of destiny in history; upper echelon cliques; widespread allegiance to Israel; intense sense of collective community; concerted economic and ideological pressures to encourage pro-Israel/Jewish views; the systematic political pressures and omnipresent lobbying maneuvers of the Anti-Defamation League, the American Israel Political Action Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee; and many other multi-million dollar lobbying groups whose fundamental purpose is to control information about Jews and Israel, mean nothing, as so many Jews insist? Let us take but one aspect of the systematic censorship throughout American culture by the Jewish community: the state of Israel.

Paul Findley, for twenty-three years a United States Congressman from Illinois had to say about his book that described the Jewish-American lobby for Israel in America, They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel’s Lobby (the book was eventually published by a small publisher, Lawrence Hill, and made the Washington Post’s ten top books list for nine weeks):

“My quest for a publisher began in March 1983 and was predictably long and frustrating. Declining to represent me, New York literary agent Alexander Wylie forecast with prophetic vision that no major United States publisher would accept my book. He wrote, ‘It’s a sad state of affairs.’ Bruce Lee of William Morrow and Company called my manuscript ‘outstanding,’ but his company concluded that publishing it
would cause trouble in the house and outside’ and decided against ‘taking the heat.’ Robert Loomis of Random House called it an ‘important book’ but reported that the firm’s leadership decided the theme was ‘too sensitive.’ Twenty other publishers said no.” [FINDLEY, THEY, p. viii]

When in 1986 Israeli defector Mordechai Vanunu had his photographic evidence of the inside of Israel’s nuclear weapons plant published in England, it should have been a major news story. Jerry Oplinger, a former White House aide, was amazed at how little attention the mass media gave it, saying: “I couldn’t believe those guys. There was nothing [significant] in the [New York] Times, [Washington] Post, and Wall Street Journal. Everybody in the arms control business was amazed that there was nothing. To me and my close friends, it was really discouraging.” [HERSH, p. 308]

In the London Independent, in 1998 Robert Fisk wrote an entire article about the mass media’s systematic bias and censorship of stories relating to Israel. Among the Fisk’s list of outrages, is the fact that

“the New York Times … ran a syndicated account from an Israeli paper of an Israeli soldier’s life in Qana before the massacre [when Israeli troops fired a missile into an Arab ambulance in Lebanon]; but the New York Times deleted a paragraph about how the Israeli troops had stolen cars from their Lebanese owners and looted houses – thus even censoring the Israeli press … History continues to be short-changed in the American media … Academics may one day decide how deeply the American public has been misled by the persistent bias of the US media, and the degree to which this has led them to support US policies which may destroy America’s prestige in the Middle East.” [FISK, p. 14]

Norman Finkelstein, a well-known Jewish critic of Israel, tabulated the articles about torture in the Middle East in the New York Times between 1981 and 1991. He found over 80 articles – 26 articles about torture in Iran, 15 in Turkey, 14 in Iraq and 8 in Egypt. “Consider how the case of Israel was treated,” he wrote,

“Except for a brief period under [Israeli] Prime Minister Begin, torture was practiced continuously from the early 1970s against Palestinian detainees … [The Times] has probably devoted as much space to coverage of Israel [on other matters] as the entire Arab world combined. Yet for the full decade under consideration (1981-91), the Times found space for only five items on Israeli torture of Palestinian detainees … Not once did the Times even hint at the not trivial fact that Israel’s torture of Palestinian detainees in the Occupied Territories is ‘virtually institutionalized’ (Amnesty International) and ‘systematic and routine’ (B’Tselem).” [an Israeli human rights organization] [FINKELSTEIN, 1996, p. 67]

In 1982 the Times’ Foreign Correspondent to Israel, Thomas Friedman (also Jewish) ran into trouble with his Jewish superiors for telling the truth about the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Friedman filed a report with his employers about the “indiscriminate” bombing of the Arab community there. New York
*Times* editors censored the adjective. Friedman “then sat down and wrote one of the most indicting messages the *Times* ever received from a correspondent, that his editors were ‘afraid to tell our readers’ about Israel’s ‘apparent aim of terrorizing its [Beirut] civilian population … I am filled with profound sadness by what I have learned in the past afternoon about my newspaper.’” [GOULDEN, p. 323] Friedman was immediately called back to the states and warned that “if you ever pull a stunt like that again, you are fired. Understand?” [GOULDEN, p. 323]

In 1994, the *Jerusalem Post* noted another case of Jewish lobbying-censorship of the American mass media, this time of the work of *Time* magazine reporter Murray Gart:

> *Time* was planning to publish a list of Israeli agents in Washington submitted by the Mossad to the CIA. [Howard] Teicher’s name [a Jewish National Security Agency adviser] was purportedly on the list. *Time* never ran the story, the editors pulled it out of the magazine virtually at the last minute.” [RODAN, S., 1994, p. 18]

Thomas Kiernan notes the case of non-Jewish mogul Rupert Murdoch, so beholding to the Jews who helped him get a foothold in the world of international mass media:

> “[ABC head Leonard] Goldenson’s personality and lectures thus had the effect of sharpening Murdoch’s sympathy toward Israel. As a result, his Australian papers took a decidedly pro-Israel tone during the early 1960s – a fact that didn’t please his surrogates in the top editorial chairs. The eventual resignation of Douglas Brass as editor for the *Sydney Mirror*, for instance, is said by some in Murdoch’s organization to have come about over that issue …” [KIERNAN, T., 1986, p. 78]

In a discussion of the reportage at Murdoch’s *New York Post*, Kiernan observes

> “I was witness to some of the Post’s coverage of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in the summer of 1982 and of the subsequent siege of Beirut. Throughout that period, the paper was without a single reporter on the scene, yet its stories were laced with unattributed ‘eye-witness’ descriptions of Arab atrocities and Israeli heroics, many of them invented in its New York newsroom.” [KIERNAN, T., 1986, p. 262]

In May 2001, during the latest Palestinian intifada (uprising) against Israeli rule, the Anti-Defamation League announced that their recent survey showed that “56 percent of major newspaper editorials took a strong pro-Israel stance.” [TEITELBAUM, S., 5-25-01] This was despite the fact that representatives of organizations as diverse as *Amnesty International*, the *European Union*, the *Red Cross*, and *YMCA* were criticizing, and often condemning, the brutal policies of the Israeli state. Incredibly, even as most of those who headed press organizations were emphatically pro-Israel, Howard Goller, chairman of the Foreign Press Association, publicly complained that “twenty foreign correspondents in the West Bank and Gaza have been shot at and hit [by Israeli troops] with live ammunition or rubber coated-bullets since the start of the intifada …
Worse still, he says, the Israeli government is refusing to deal with the matter.” [HAUSMAN, T., 5-25-01]

Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman note the case of British author David Irving, who faced the destruction of his decades-old writing career when he started addressing the Jewish community critically:

“After Irving testified for the defense in [“Holocaust denier” Ernest] Zundel’s 1988 ‘free speech’ trial in Canada, various governments filed notices of entry denial and deportation against him. As he recounts on his Web page, his publishing firm, Focal Point, has received notices from the bookstores in England canceling distribution of [his book] *Hitler’s Wars* and other titles. ‘Following complaints from valued customers we no longer feel able to stock this title,’ read one notice from a Sheffield bookstore in July 1992. Also in the same year, the director of Media House Publications in Johannesburg, South Africa, informed Irving that with regard to *Hitler’s War*, “I don’t want any copies on our premises. We have had some incidents already. Many of our book buyers are Jewish. It is much easier for [my staff] now to say, ‘We don’t stock the book.’” [SHERMER/ GROBMAN, 2000, p. 50]

Filmmaker Tom Hayes calls the mass media’s wall of censorship surrounding the state of Israel “the Information Blockade.” This systematic censorship is important in keeping Americans ignorant about the truths concerning Israel, including the details of the staggering sums of money – approximately $78 billion – American taxpayers have funneled to that other country (instead of to themselves) since the creation of the Jewish state in 1948, [APAS, p. 106] let alone the myriad of moral injustices perpetrated upon others by the Jewish nation. [See later chapter] Arthur Hays-Sulzberger, the publisher of the *New York Times*, noted the behind-the-scenes economic intrigues and mass media power of pro-Israel Jews as early as 1946:

“I dislike the coercive methods of Zionists in this country who have not hesitated to use economic means to silence persons who have different views.” [LILIENTHAL, p. 124]

Those who would like to criticize Israel, notes Jewish French scholar Maxime Rodinson, “remain silent, either because they are not in a position to write or speak publicly, or because they fear the reactions of their immediate environment or the broader public. I understand them very well. Moreover, publishers, newspaper editors, and radio and television producers, also tend to be afraid to let them speak; they suffer constant blackmail from Judeo-centrists.” [RODINSON, p. 15]

Ze’ev Chafets notes a 1979 article that got past the censors in *Newsweek*; it read:

“With the help of American Jews in and out of government, Mossad [Israel’s intelligence agency] looks for any softening in U.S. support and tries to get technical intelligence the Administration is unwilling to give to Israel.”
The normal chorus of Jewish complaint and pressure to censor any similar future statement was soon to follow. As Chafets observes, “the editor of Newsweek later admitted that Newsweek’s insinuation that American Jews are disloyal to the United States ‘reflects an anti-Semitic stereotype’ and informed the Anti-Defamation League that ‘we have engaged in some consciousness raising on this subject and I do not expect a recurrence.’ The letter to the ADL was signed by the magazine’s editor-in-chief: Lester Bernstein [also Jewish].” [CHAFETS, p. 281]

Also in the 1970s, CBS news commentator Jeffrey St. John made a similar mistake about speaking openly of Jewish dual loyalty on the radio program “Spectrum.” He had the courage to observe that

“American public opinion is shaped largely by a pro-Israeli viewpoint. And when someone suggests we should begin changing our policy, as an American oil executive did recently, the pro-Israel propaganda machine is America crucifies him in public … Emotions, not reason, govern our policy towards Israel … The issue is whether you are an American first and a Jew second and if forced to choose, which commands your loyalty first.” [LILIENTHAL, 1983, p. 450]

St. John was gone from CBS soon afterwards. Likewise, CBS newscaster Eric Severeid took heavy Jewish lobbying heat in 1975 for daring to say that “A growing number of American Jews are … torn in a soul-searching internal debate as to just where their loyalties should lie and how far they should go in honoring them.” [LILIENTHAL, 1983, p. 449]

In 1994 after rejections from numerous publishers, John Sack, a respected Jewish journalist for Esquire and other magazines for nearly 40 years, managed to get his manuscript (An Eye for an Eye, about the “vengeful” Jewish heads of post-World War II concentration camps for Germans and Poles) published by Basic Books. (The book was originally commissioned with a $25,000 advance by the Henry Holt publishing company. When Sack’s final manuscript was completed, it was abandoned by the firm). “Major U.S. newspapers and publishers,” noted the Associated Press, “shied away from the manuscript before Basic Books finally put out the English edition in 1993.” [BAJACK, INTERNET] The editor for the volume at Basic Books, Steve Fraser, noted that

“We concluded it ought not to be suppressed – which is what was happening. I take my vocation as a publisher seriously enough to feel that it is my responsibility to publish something that’s important even if the rest of the industry is afraid to do that.” [WIENER, p. 24]

Terry McDonnell, one of Sack’s editors at Esquire, was one of those refusing to publish any of the investigators articles about the Jewish commandants of concentration camps. “[Other publishers are] scared,” he told Sack. “And I’m scared too.” [LOMBARDI, p. 18]

Sack had researched the facts of the volume for seven years. “Although Sack’s facts were not disputed,” notes the Associated Press, “the book was slammed as sadistic sensationalism in a review by powerful German [Jewish] critic Elke Geisel, whose seething polemic called it ‘vile docudrama’ and ‘a gift to neo-Nazis.’”
“[Sack’s book] is the greatest filth,” added Ralph Giordano, a German Jewish writer who never read the book in question, “… [it is a] vulgar artistic fetish.” [AP, INTERNET] (Press censorship about Jewish history even occurs in Poland, presumably because the new capitalist state must seek so much western/Jewish economic aid in rebuilding their nation. In 1994 the Gazeta Wyborcza, one of Poland’s most-widely read newspapers, covered an investigation of fifteen former officers of the Office of State Security [Poland’s communist secret police]. “The paper is avoiding any mention of Jews,” notes Jewish journalist Carol Oppenheim. “I think there is widespread opinion of the dominance of Jews in the Communist Party,” said Michael Cichy, the cultural editor of the paper, “but mention of this in the Polish press is taboo.” [OPPENHEIM, p. 39]

In response to Jewish outrage that such truthful information be published, the new head (Viktor Niemann) of the publishing house that printed Sack’s book in German, R. Piper, decided to destroy all 6,000 copies in its warehouses. “It was the fourth time,” notes the Associated Press, “that Sack’s story … had been bought by a publisher who subsequently decided against printing.” [BAJACK, INTERNET] “It is tragic,” wrote Sack in response to his German publisher’s actions, “that An Eye for an Eye is not being published in Germany now and that Germans have nowhere to learn the truth.” [SACK, p. A18]

When the TV news show 60 Minutes investigated one of the Jewish subjects of Sack’s book, Shlomo Morel, Sack’s broader story “looked as if it might take off,” said Carol Oppenheim, “and it sent shock waves through the Jewish community.” “A feature by 60 Minutes that backed up Sack seemed to promise major attention and at least minor bestsellerdom,” noted the Washington Post, “but the rest of the media either attacked or ignored the book. The general tenor was summoned up in Miami Jewish Week: “Do me a favor – don’t read this book.” [STREITFIELD, p. D4]

In 1994, John Lombardi wrote a disturbing article for New York magazine about the Sack story and the massive censorship surrounding it. Lombardi called his piece “The Book They Dare Not Review: An Inconvenient Holocaust Story.” Lombardi formerly worked at Advance Publication’s GQ magazine, the periodical that had initially paid Sack $20,000 to research and write about the Jewish concentration camp overseers, only – after the article had been typeset – to quietly kill it.

The most venomous attack on Sack’s book came from the New Republic (owned by avidly pro-Israel publisher Martin Peretz). Sack wrote a point by point rebuttal to their review, but the magazine refused to publish any of it in their Letters to the Editor section. “But,” noted the Nation, “the magazine made the remarkable decision to sell him ad space to run it ($525 for five column inches). The ad was typeset, but the magazine then chose to reject it.” [WIENER, p. 287] Leon Wieseltier, the Jewish literary editor of the New Republic, was even quoted as saying, “I’m not embarrassed to say that as part of my job of policing the culture, I felt that the sooner we stopped this book, the better…. It’s one of the stupidest books I ever read, and I frankly resolved to do as much damage as I could.” [LOMBARDI, p 18] Elan Steinberg, spokeswoman for the
World Jewish Congress impugned the veracity of Sack’s dozens of interviews with Jewish (and other) eyewitnesses to Jewish-created atrocities, saying: “You cannot rely on witnesses … [because] you’re insulting the memory of 6 million [Jewish Holocaust] martyrs.” [LOMBARD, p. 18]

In 1997, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC suddenly cancelled a lecture by Sack about his book and his findings therein. “The invitation to give your lecture was issued without my knowledge,” wrote Director Walter Reich to the *Eye for an Eye* author, “Having had the opportunity to examine the matter, I have determined that holding the presentation would not be compatible with the Museum’s programs.” [STREITFIELD, p. D1] In turn, Sack decided to rent (for $301) a room at the nearby National Press Club to discuss his book and the censorship around it. There is no record in the major national computer research database of America’s newspapers that Sack’s press conference was ever reported upon.

“It would be tempting to simply dismiss this painful book as the work of an anti-Semitic crackpot, as many have,” wrote Jewish author Carol Oppenheim, “The *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and *Time* have ignored *An Eye for An Eye* [i.e., not reviewed it]. But John Sack is a noted journalist with some forty years experience. His work on the Vietnam War is studied in college classes. And he is also a Jew.” [OPPENHEIM, p. 39]

And what are we to make of the case of Victor Ostrovsky, former Mossad agent and author of 1990’s *By Way of Deception*, an expose of the international workings of the Israeli Mossad organization? Although Israel managed to briefly, and literally, ban his book in America through the American courts, the censorship was soon lifted. [See earlier discussion] “We will get to him by other means, we will break him economically,” the head of the Mossad, Israel’s CIA, then told the Israeli media. “I’m now convinced,” wrote Ostrovsky in 1997, “that I am the target of a broad collusion between elements of the Israel government and their gofers, mostly in the American Jewish community … My second book was ignored … A speaker’s bureau in Toronto, which seldom had trouble arranging speaking engagements with student and other groups eager to have me as a speaker, found that the engagements were cancelled before I could appear.” [OSTROVSKY, 1997]

When Ostrovsky appeared on Canadian national television, Yosef Lapid, the former chief of Israeli television, declared on the same show, via satellite from the Jewish state, that Ostrovsky’s assassination by the Mossad could cause diplomatic problems now that he lived in Canada, but “I hope that there would be a decent Jew in Canada who would do the job for us.”

Ostrovsky was later stunned that no North American media outcry rose against this call for his assassination on live public television. (Recall, in contradistinction, the mass media outcry against Iran’s death sentence on author *Salmon Rushdie*. Iran, of course, is a declared arch-enemy of Zionism. And what, one wonders, would happen to a former president of *CBS* who called for murder?) But Lapid? Nothing. A reporter from *USA Today* interviewed Ostrovsky about Lapid’s public threat and planned to write a story about it, but,
“while I was still in his office,” laments Ostrovsky, “his editor told him by telephone to kill the article.” “The same people,” wrote the former Mossad agent, “who presumably would praise someone from the CIA or the U.S. armed forces who exposed serious wrongdoing in those institutions were now hard at work to smother my criticisms of an intelligence agency for a foreign country that, to put it as charitably as possible, does not have America’s best interests at heart.”

Eventually he sought to sue the man who called for the call to kill him, but Ostrovsky’s lawyer soon bailed out, explaining “that the safety of his staff would clearly be jeopardized if he proceeded.” Soon thereafter, Ostrovsky had financial problems with both his publishers, HarperCollins and, in Canada, Stoddart. His agent suddenly refused to return his calls and in due time his “house burned to the ground. The fire marshal’s report declared it arson.” In 1997, Washington publisher Regnery backed out of a plan to publish his next book, already listed in its upcoming books catalogue. “It suddenly occurred to me,” Ostrovsky wrote,

“for the first time, that the forces of racism, bigotry and apartheid may win, even here in North America. In calling out, finally, for help, I suddenly fear that I man only be shouting into the wind. To all who believe that ‘it can’t happen here,’ I say beware. It is immensely satisfying to take a stand and speak out against coercion and tyranny. But … although your friends cherish you, they may choose to do it from a distance.” [OSTROVSKY, V., 1997, p. 37, 84-85]

In another case of covert censorship, in 1996 the London Sunday Telegraph took note of an unusual article by American Jewish journalist Philip Weiss:

“A studied silence has greeted the cover story in the normally scrupulously liberal New York magazine which claims that Jews in America wield so much power and influence that they need no longer fear the shadow of anti-Semitism. The magazine refuses to discuss the article, as apparently does the author, Philip Weiss … The weekly must have known it was inviting trouble. Even the cover seemed a calculated risk: a photograph of the American flag with some of its stars replaced by the Star of David. American magazines rarely confront the issue of Jewish influence so directly…. Richard Goldstein, a columnist for the Village Voice, has already remarked that the fact Jews have achieved so much influence despite the anti-Semitic views of many Americans is ‘less a paradox than a time-bomb.’ The irony, of course, is that the issue is one that has been privately discussed among Jews for decades.” [LANGTON, p. 24]

In another censorial case, 1989 BBC reporter Alan Hart complained that United States publishers were afraid to publish his less-than-condemning book about PLO leader Yassar Arafat because they “privately feared a backlash from supporters of Israel.” The volume, Arafat: A Political Biography, had already appeared in three editions in Great Britain – first published five years earlier. Over 40 American publishers had passed on publishing Hart’s work until Indiana University Press decided to do it. In a formal statement, the university publisher remarked that it was “not unaware that some form of self-censorship might
have been the cause” for the lack of American publisher interest. [ABRAMS, G., 6-19-89, p. 5, 1]

In 1996 the Christian Science Monitor noted the attack upon a famous Catholic cleric in France, headlining its article: “Cleric’s Comments Ignite the Fury of French media.” The origin of this controversy stems from a book by Roger Garaudy: The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics. Garaudy, as noted earlier, wrote this volume that criticized Israel, Zionism, and the Holocaust as Judeo-centric propaganda; it has been effectively banned in France. The author, an 82-year old former Resistance fighter against the Nazis, was also once a Communist member of the French parliament (expelled from the party in 1970 for criticizing the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia) and later a convert to Islam. He was fined $20,000 by a French court for writing his book, which, declared the court, “questions all Jews, not only Israelis … Far from merely criticizing Zionism … Roger Garaudy embarked on a virulent and systematic questioning of crimes against humanity against the Jewish community.” [ROSENBERG, C., 2-27-98]

The Christian Science Monitor noted that Garaudy’s book was available in only one bookstore in Paris, and it was not possible to even order the work in many of the others. The Monitor also noted that most of the critics of the book have not read it and that “Garaudy’s book does not deny that millions of Jews were murdered by the Nazis.” “A “prominent jurist,” Francois Terre, called the 1990 Gayssot Law (that “makes it a criminal offense to challenge the facts of the Holocaust”) totalitarian: It was “a law that kills historical research and dishonors France … Even politicians who oppose the law have been reluctant to speak out against it.” [CHADDOCK, G., 7-25-96, p. 5]

The Catholic cleric Abbé Pierre fell into the controversy surrounding the book soon after. Pierre, noted the Washington Post, was “France’s most admired man … For five decades [he] ranked consistently at the top of the popularity polls in France for his defense of the downtrodden. As a champion of street people and a former activist in the anti-Nazi resistance, Abbe Pierre commanded universal respect and unrivaled media coverage.” [RANDALL, J., p. 7-3-96, p. A27] Pierre’s activities in the French underground also included smuggling Jews to safety. He is the founder the Emmaus foundation, 350 centers around the world for the homeless and poor.

The cleric’s problems began when he publicly came out in support of Garaudy. Knowing the author for fifty years, Pierre attested to his integrity. “I think the average Frenchman,” said Pierre, “will say with relief the taboo [about how the Holocaust may be examined] is over. You will no longer be called anti-Jewish or anti-Semitic for saying a Jew sings out of tune.” [RANDALL, J., 7-3-96, p. A27] Unfortunately for Abbé Pierre, however, not understanding the power of such forces against such an open comment, this was a gross miscalculation.

The 83-year old cleric was barraged with critical attack from all sides – from the French media, civil rights groups, and eventually – seeking to assuage vociferous Jewish complaint – the Church itself. France’s chief rabbi called Pierre’s words those of an anti-Semite. The president of the Jewish Consistory of France declared that: “[Abbe’s] continuous support of Roger Garaudy is unacceptable.”
Under an avalanche of criticism, Pierre took refuge in a monastery in Italy. For a while the old cleric continued to defend his position, digging himself deeper into controversy, noting that Jewish suffering was only part of the calamity of World War II. He also “said that according to the Bible, the Jews committed a genocide comparable with the Shoah when they entered Palestine 12 or 11 centuries before Christ.” Addressing Zionism, he called it “a world conspiracy,” that it was “based in the United States with world ramifications,” and he implored people to have “the honesty to look at the truth.” Zionism, said the cleric, “want[s] the empire promised to Abraham. And this movement is plotting worldwide for that.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 6-17-96] [See later chapters for discussions of Zionism]

The attacks upon France’s national “saint,” suddenly fallen, continued. Months later a British newspaper noted that “it is clear that the debate left him traumatized. His conversation [now] is scattered with references to his friendship, help towards, and empathy, with the Jews.” [FINANCIAL TIMES, 6-21-97] The Washington Post’s reporter Jonathan Randall ended his report on Pierre with a suggestion of senility in the old man. Quoting Charles De Gaulle, Randall concluded his piece, saying: “Old age is a shipwreck.” [RANDALL, J., p. 7-3-96, p. A27]

Overwhelmed by the attacks against him, Pierre finally publicly surrendered. “The attacks of which I have been targeted have been beyond all measure,” he said. “I have greatly suffered.” [PHILLIPS, I., 5-30-96, p. 13] He announced that “I have decided to retract my statement, and to bow entirely to the sole opinion of the experts of the Church,” also adding that his comments had been “exploited by elements who dangerously toy with the anti-Semitic, neo-fascist, and neo-Nazi currents that I have fought and will always fight against.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 7-23-96]

A controversy of a somewhat related vein occurred in Montreal, Canada, a year before the Abbé Pierre story. A prominent Canadian Jewish lawyer, Julius Grey, faced an avalanche of Jewish condemnation and outrage when he freely noted in a lecture at John Abbott College that “I think the Holocaust and anti-Semitism is being used by some elements and Israel and the Jewish community to keep people in the fold. What is happening is a fake alarmist mentality, because there is effectively no anti-Semitism in North America … [Modern teaching about the Holocaust] is turning it into a political incident. Each ethnic group creates its own martyrology, that we’re good and kind and we’ve been mistreated.” [CHERNEY, 4-25-95]

Response to Grey’s comments was overwhelming in the Jewish community. Mike Cohn of the Canadian Jewish Congress told a reporter that “in the many years I’ve been at the congress, I don’t remember getting this many phone calls from irate members of the community.” [CHERNEY, 4-26-95] In the flurry of subsequent editorials about the controversy, one non-Jewish commentator noted that “the effect of the reaction to Grey’s remarks could be to intimidate, to stifle open debate, to chill free expression. For after seeing what happened to Grey, others may think twice about expressing unconventional opinions and
ideas.” [MACPHERSON, D. p. B3] The original (Montreal) Gazette reporter who reported the Grey story later wondered in a later article about “the rush to discredit and silence Julius Grey … [Does] a writer need … a special license to deal with the Holocaust, or a lawyer need to get permission from the community’s institutions to talk about it … Could that … silence dissent?” [CHERRY, E., 4-29-95, p. B6]

Elsewhere, in the more personal realm, when Tom Bower sought to publish his unauthorized and highly critical biography of Robert Maxwell, the British Jewish media baron invoked litigation involving at least twelve lawyers, a number of accountants, and two private detectives in researching Bower’s background. Failing in the courts to stop the book, Maxwell’s army of censors intimidated – by economic threats and intimidating legal innuendoes – much of England’s publishing world. Wholesale book distributors and most British bookshops knuckled under to Maxwell’s power, and didn’t carry the book. The mogul even bought a paperback company that held the rights to Bower’s pending volume in order to effectively censor it. [BOWER, p. ix-x]

In 1997, in a story about Jewish South African mogul Sol Kerzner, the New York Times noted that:

“In an early test of press freedom under South Africa’s new constitution, a well-known international casino magnate has delayed the publication of a book about him and is trying to ban it. The book, Kerzner Unauthorized… profiles Sol Kerzner [who] made his fortune operating [casinos] under apartheid in south Africa’s black ‘homeland’…. [He] has threatened to sue local newspapers if they excerpted it. As a result, a major Sunday newspaper withheld publication of an excerpt from the book.” [MCNEIL, p. A3]

The author of the Kerzner volume, Allan Greenblo, is credible; he is himself the CEO of two major South African publications – the Business Day and the Financial Mail. (Perhaps he himself is Jewish?)

Jewish author Steven Weinberg (author of Armand Hammer: The Untold Story) was even sued by corrupt Jewish mogul Armand Hammer. “After The Untold Story was published in English, Armand filed the most expensive libel action in British history, suing Weinberg on 157 counts of defamation.” [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 449]

In 1988, yet another Jewish business mogul family (Canada’s Reichmanns, at the time owners of the largest real estate empire on earth) sought to censor the truth about their past. The (Montreal) Gazette notes that:

“These are dangerous waters for any journalist. In 1988, Toronto Life magazine was hit with a $102 million libel suit for publishing an article by freelance writer Elaine Dewar which investigates [patriarch] Samuel Reichmann’s murky past as an egg dealer in pre-war Austria and then as a currency speculator in wartime Tangiers. Toronto Life’s eventual apology and out-of-court settlement suggested that ‘libel chill’ can be an effective deterrent for any wealthy family seeking to keep a curtain of privacy around itself.” [HADEKEL, p. I]
In the same realm, as microcosm for the whole problem of censorship and self-censorship in the mass media world, in reviewing Jewish Hollywood mogul Michael Ovitz at the peak of his power, Robert Slater noted that “As the most powerful person in [Hollywood], Ovitz had the power, if he chose, to use it in order to punish any critic who went public by denying him or her all access to his stable of stars. The mere possibility that he exact such punishment was enough to silence his critics … No Ovitz critic was willing to speak out either on or off the record.” [SLATER, p. 202]

In August 1992, John H. Richardson, a senior writer at Premiere magazine in Los Angeles, finished a story about Jewish madam Heidi Fleiss and her drug and prostitution ring in the Hollywood community. The entertainment magazine, dependent upon cooperation with the movie world for its very existence, decided against publishing the piece. The Entertainment Weekly also developed an article about the story, but threats of legal action from attorneys for Columbia executive Michael Nathanson killed the story. The Hollywood Reporter also had an article about Fleiss too; this too was aborted when Nathanson threatened to “destroy [each reporter’s] reputation” if the story was published. [KENNEDY, D., 8-20-93]

Reporter Dan Moldea experienced a similar situation when he dared to write an expose (published in 1986) about mogul Lew Wasserman at MCA. Moldea who has written about crime for over twenty years (including books about the murder of Bobby Kennedy, the Teamsters Union, and corruption in professional sports), noted that “Writing Dark Victory [about Wasserman] was the only time I ever really feared for my career. I felt raw power coming at me like a rifle shot.” [MCDOUGAL, p. x] “Moldea,” notes Dennis McDougal, “maintains that he was followed and his phone lines tapped during the year he worked on the book. He is certain that Lew Wasserman targeted him for harassment.” [MCDOUGAL, p. x]

Los Angeles Times reporter Bill Knoedelseder also faced blatant censorship when he tried to write about the Wasserman-MCA-Mafia world, which extended to powerful influences in the Reagan White House (Wasserman was Reagan’s Hollywood agent). The reporter, notes Dennis McDougal, “changed his mind about his newspaper’s independence…. Somewhere in plusher, upper reaches of the Times, beyond the hard scrabble cubicles of the newsroom, Lew was enjoying lunch with the newspaper’s executives … Knoedelseder’s stories about MCA and the derailed Mob probe [at Los Angeles City Hall] began to get rejected regularly by his editors. He was instructed to switch interests and write about something other than MCA for a change. Before the year was out, stories about MCA and the Mob ceased to appear in the paper at all, and Bill Knoedelseder quit his job at the Times.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 468]

In 2000, Los Angeles Times reporter, Kim Murphy, a 17-year veteran newswoman, wrote some articles about the community of “Holocaust Deniers” and alleged right wing political groups that led to many Jews “accusing the Times of legitimizing the views of anti-Semites.” The first article addressed controversial
British historian David Irving who had attempted to, in effect, sue the international Jewish lobby that had destroyed his writing career. Murphy’s attempts at objectivity rankled a lot of Jews and the reporter soon found herself under fire. “The story outraged members of the Los Angeles Jewish community,” notes Eric Umansky, “The controversy even found its way into the Times newsroom.” At close quarters, fellow Los Angeles Times reporter Alan Abramson, of course Jewish, decried Murphy’s work, as did another Jewish newsman, David Lauter, the Times religion reporter, who said, “Kim is a very good reporter. But I think she screwed up on this particular subject.” The Times’ executive editor, Leo Wolinsky, also Jewish, “signed off on Murphy’s second story after asking her to quote more sources critical of Irving.” Murphy publicly defended herself, insisting that

“The Holocaust was horrible, “[but] it’s my profound belief that there are no questions that can’t be asked. This is an issue of political correctness. There are just certain things you are not allowed to say, even in this country.” [UMANSKY, E., 9-2000]

During the era of the 1980s Savings and Loan scandals across America, Wall Street Journal reporter Charles McCoy was set to run an article about the Federal Home Loan Bank Board’s questionable decision to allow J. Livingston Kossberg’s First Texas Savings and Loan (fourth largest in Texas) to acquire Gibraltar Savings (the state’s largest S&L whose principal investor was Saul Steinberg). Connected to the deal was yet another influential Jewish entrepreneur, Robert Strauss, former chairman of the Democratic National Party and head of the Jimmy Carter campaign against Ronald Reagan. Reporter Martin Meyer notes that

“In my presence [Strauss] chewed reporter McCoy out on the telephone for a quarter of an hour, informing him that he (Strauss) was close to Warren Phillips [also Jewish], CEO of Dow Jones, and thus McCoy’s employer, and Strauss would have his ass if there was stuff in the story of which Strauss disapproved … [So] McCoy wrote carefully, and you had to know what the numbers [in his story] implied to know what the story said.” [MEYER, M., p. 14]

“The deal shouldn’t have been approved at all…,” remarks Meyer, “First Texas was a sinking ship, losing money on its lending operations … [But] with Strauss on one side and [Jewish junk bond manipulator Michael] Milken on the other, the Bank Board was completely surrounded by political influence … First Gibraltar’s star board member was [also] Strauss’ son, Richard (who was further blessed in Dallas by his aunt, the mayor).” [MEYER, M., p. 13-14]

In 1992, director/actor Woody Allen faced public embarrassment when actress Mia Farrow (who had a common law relationship with him for many years; she was also once married to Jewish conductor Andre Previn) accused Allen of having an affair with one of their teenage adopted daughters, and that he had repeatedly sexually molested another daughter, a young child. Criminal charges, however, were another story. Allen conceded, and defended, his sexual relationship with the older daughter but denied any other incidents with others. Paul Williams, the New York Child Welfare worker on the case, noted that
“based [on the child’s] demeanor and her responses to my questions, and my conversations with the caseworker in Connecticut, and my experiences from interviewing hundreds of children who have been abused, I concluded that abuse did occur and that there was a prima facie cause to commence family-court proceedings against Woody Allen. Then the barriers came down. There came a litany of reasons why we should not go forward. My superior said that Woody Allen is ‘an influential person,’ she talked about his films, and his ‘position.’ As more evidence came through interviews, I insisted that the case should have been filed. Managers at the Child Welfare Agency responded that ‘pressure [to drop the case] is coming all the way from the mayor’s office [Jewish mayor: Ed Koch].’” [FARROW, p. 311]

The case was dropped. A child custody trial featured Allen represented by six different law firms. [FARROW, p. 316] Later, the Connecticut state attorney, Frank Maco, announced that “probable cause” for Allen’s arrest existed, but that by then Farrow had decided a public trial would be extremely detrimental to the abused child. [FARROW, p. 329]

In 1997 Peter Watson’s sensational expose of the systemic corruption within the Sotheby art auction house (headed by Jewish real estate mogul Alfred Taubman) “sparked scandalous headlines on both sides of the Atlantic when it was released in Britain.” [NY POST, 2-2-98] “Now that [the book] has finally arrived [in America],” noted the New York Post, “the press doesn’t seem to be showing much interest. So far, only the weekly New York Observer has reviewed it – and even that is going Sotheby’s way.” [NY POST, 2-2-98] The American publisher of the book, Random House (owned by Jewish mogul Si Newhouse) backed its publication up three times and revised part of the European version. The Post suggested that “Sotheby is getting kid glove treatment thanks to Alfred Taubman getting a favor from Random House owner Si Newhouse – an avid collector known to spend millions at auctions.” [NEW YORK POST, 2-2-98, p. 12]

In 1999, independent journalist and art critic Hector Feliciano found himself facing a $1.8 million lawsuit at the hands of the (Jewish) Wildenstein family (Daniel, Alec, and Guy). Feliciano had dared to write about the family’s clandestine art dealings with the Nazis during Hitler’s looting of Jewish-owned art treasures. “They’re suing me,” said Feliciano, “so that other journalists will think twice about writing about them.” [GOLDBERG, J. J., 6-18-99, p. 14]

Dissident (“self-hating”) Jews too are not immune from enforced censorship about public criticism of their community. British reporters Christopher Reed and Eleanor Mills note a well known case in Hollywood:

“An example of Tinseltown shyness about criticism of Jews is Budd Schulberg’s book What Makes Sammy Run? Now 82, he wrote the classic about a ruthlessly ambitious Hollywood type called Sammy Glick, in 1941. Five attempts to film it have failed. After reading the book, MGM studio chief Louis Mayer said Schulberg should be deported. It was pointed out that the author was not only born in America, he was the son of the head of Paramount.” [He was also Jewish] [REED, p. 2]
“The charge of anti-Semitism was laid on the book,” notes the *Los Angeles Times*, “although Schulberg pointed out that all of Sammy’s victims were Jewish too … These days, Schulberg fears that *What Makes Sammy Run?* has become what he calls ‘a handbook for yuppies.’ ‘It’s a new handle on Sammy,’ Schulberg says, “Sammy’s credo of success at all costs and it doesn’t matter how you get there makes the book seem not truly merely entertaining but a Bible of sorts.” [CHAMPLIN, p. F1] (Along the same censorial lines, in 1963, Jewish cinema verité documentary filmmaker Albert Maysles’ unforgiving film about Hollywood producer Joe Levine evoked such anger in the Hollywood community that “members of the Oscar screening society reportedly found ‘Showman’ so anti-Semitic that they watched only five minutes before walking out.” [JEW JR LA, 1-16-98, p. 26] (Levine, notes Thomas Hoving, “earned his millions by buying nonentities such as the Italian Hercules films starring Steve Reeves and Godzilla, the Japanese monster movie, and hyping them shamelessly.” [HOV-ING, T., 1993, p. 396]

Jewish singer Eddie Fisher recalls wanting to play the lead acting role in *What Makes Sammy Run?* “I had several meetings with Lew Wasserman, then the president of MCA,” Fisher says,

“the talent agency that represented me. I wanted to play the lead, an aggressive producer named Sammy Glick, maybe the ultimate Jewish hustler. I knew a lot of real Sammy Glicks and I felt confident that was a character I could play. Wasserman decided Sammy Glick was ‘too Jewish, too negative.’ He hated the concept and did not want the picture made. I think he decided it was bad for the Jews.” [FISHER, E., 1999, p. 90]

Angry reaction by the Jewish community to members of their own depicting such Jewish “success stories” is not uncommon. The (Montreal) *Gazette* noted Mordechai Richler as one of Canada’s best known writers, but

“caustic, controversial, and often crude … [Richler’s novel] Dudley Kravitz remains the best-selling of Richler’s works. A comic extravaganza of a coming-of-age novel, it tells the story of a ‘scheming little bastard,’ a coarse, driven, young Jew determined to make something of himself at any cost. A critical success both in Canada and beyond, the book inspired a raging controversy and denunciation by the Jewish community that Richler [who is Jewish] was an anti-Semite.” NAVES, p. 12

In the movie making world, in 1996 actor Arnold Schwarzenegger learned a bit about Jewish censorial power when he dared to consider to make a film about a real life character, a Nazi captain named Osterman who refused to kill a group of British prisoners during World War II. His interest came in the wake of Jewish director Steven Spielberg’s colossal hit *Schindler’s List*, where a Nazi saves Jews. Scheduled to begin shooting in ten weeks, the director of Schwarzenegger’s project backed out of the film. “Other directors,” noted the *London Sunday Times*, “have privately admitted they are avoiding a film that might offend the powerful Jewish lobby in Hollywood … According to Hollywood reports, Joel Schumacher, who is directing the latest *Batman* film, offered Schwarzenegger a short word of advice about making the film, ‘Don’t.’” [HARLOW]
In 1999, in an overtly censorial and revisionist move, the British **ITV** television company announced that it was sweetening the unpleasant Jewish “Fagin” character in their new filming of Charles Dickens’ classic novel *Oliver Twist*. In the new version too, he would not be Jewish. “We don’t want a Fagin that is a Shylock character,” said the **ITV** Director of Programming, David Liddiment. “This decision,” noted critic Rhoda Koenig, “exemplifies not only a lack of understanding of our literary heritage, but a contempt for the past itself. It is also an example of the sentimentality, arrogance, and cowardice that are now passed off as ‘sensitivity’ and ‘responsibility’ … Why have we become so illiterate, so phony, and so craven?” [KOENIG, 7-7-99, pl. 13] Dr. David Parker, curator of the Dickens House Museum in London, responded, saying: “This softening of Fagin is done to political correctness. Literary stereotypes, however objectionable, should not be lightly cast aside.” [HELLEN, 1-17-99]

In 1997 the mainstream Jewish Thought Police struggled to censor (and failing that, at least marginalize) a book by a Jewish author, Norman Finkelstein. Finkelstein, described in the (Jewish) *Forward* as “a notorious ideological opponent of the state of Israel,” a man who characterized a more favored – and best-selling – Jewish author as a “Zionist propagandist who distorted evidence in order to legitimate the existence of the state of Israel.” [MAHLER, p. C1] Hearing that Finkelstein’s book, *A Nation on Trial*, was set to be published by the **Henry Holt** publishing firm, “the literary editor of the *New Republic*, Leon Wieseltier, was so startled by the news that he put in a call to Michael Naumann [also Jewish], an old friend and the publisher of Holt, assured that [Naumann] could not be familiar with Mr. Finkelstein’s work.” [MAHLER, p. C1] The Anti-Defamation League was among those who publicly rallied against the publication of the “anti-Zionist and anti-Israel” work. “There seems no question,” noted the *Forward*, “that the book is something of a hot potato. An esteemed historian who initially agreed to write the prologue to the book, Istvan Deak, a professor of Central European history at Columbia University, suddenly changed his mind.” [MAHLER, p. C1]

In the violent criminal underworld, vengeful censorship actions can be more draconian. Jewish journalist Robert Friedman was forced to go into hiding in 1998 when authorities informed him that Russian Jewish mobster Seimon Mogilevich (described by the *Village Voice* as “the World’s Most Dangerous Gangster”) was overheard contracting for Friedman’s murder because of the journalist’s expose about him.

Various forms of censorship by the powerful – usually by economic blackmail and intimidation – is not uncommon in the mass media world, creating an environment of people worried about their careers and fear of their bosses, thereby becoming overly protective of Jews/Israel from criticism. Even leaving aside, for example, the issues at stake in the simple fact that the vast Newhouse media empire – like so many others – is Jewish-owned (a subject whose political implications publishers are certainly forbidden to address), any criticism of the Newhouse organization is smothered because of its omnipresent economic clout, media interconnectedness, and long arm of vengeance. Even in the aca-
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demic world. Take the case of the Columbia Journalism Review and its Jewish editor, Suzanne Levine, who in 1992 wanted to find a writer willing to address the many negative changes affecting the New Yorker magazine after the Newhouses took it over. Thomas Maier notes that:

“Levine went through numerous contacts until she found an out-of-state editor willing to accept the assignment. ‘Why me?’ asked the editor, Eric Utne, who runs his own alternative magazine. ‘You’re the perfect person to do it,’ the Columbia Journalism Review told him. When Utne pressed for the real reason, he was told flatly, ‘Because no one else will touch it.’” [MAIER, p. 347]

In 1998, a small publisher, Seven Stories Press, published an “unauthorized biography” of the Newhouse family. A reviewer in the New York Times Book Review noted that “Citizen Newhouse was initially signed with Viking, but new management there took the unusual step of canceling the book when it was done – a decision itself that was the subject of news articles and gossip columns. [Author] Felsenthal said that once she turned in the manuscript, Phyllis Grann, president of Penguin Putnam, Inc., parent of Viking, told her she couldn’t publish it because too many people mentioned in it were friends.” [GOLDSTEIN, T., p. 17]

And what – away from the mass-produced popular press – of Jewish dominance of the more “high-brow” reading? The most widely-read American “intellectual periodicals,” remarks W. D. Rubenstein, “are either Jewish or contain a disproportionately Jewish input.” [RUBENSTEIN, p. 64] His list is five journals long: Commentary, The Public Interest, the New York Review of Books, the Partisan Review, and the New Republic.

Commentary is a house-organ publication of the American Jewish Committee (Jewish editors Elliot Cohen and then Norman Podhoretz), “Commentary,” wrote Richard Curtiss in 1998, “… has been around so long that probably few Americans even recognize it as the Israel lobby’s principal national publication.” [CURTISS, p. 9] In a 1990s survey of “3,000 prominent Americans” Commentary was ranked third behind the New England Journal of Medicine and Foreign Affairs among “most influential” print and electronic media. It was ahead of the New York Times, Washington Post, and Wall Street Journal. [TWERSKY, p. 40] “Many Commentary authors,” says David Twersky, “have gone on to serve in government as a result, in large measure, of being read by the right people at the right time.” [TWERSKY, p. 41] Such Gentile authors have included Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Daniel Moynihan (Commentary is well known for its “neoconservative” flavor).

“[Editor Norman] Podhoretz’s struggle with his Jewishness,” notes Twersky, “is central to the evolution of Commentary … [It] came to be defined by the desire of Jewish intellectuals to create a space for modernism without discarding their Jewishness.” [TWERSKY, p. 43] Yet, according to editor Murray Polner of a second American Jewish Committee-published journal, Present Tense, (1973-1990), this second publication was founded “because Commentary wasn’t Jewish enough.” [TWERSKY, p. 58] Former non-Jewish journalist Scott McCo-
nnell notes the unpleasant experience he had when (years after his employment at Commentary) he bumped into Podhoretz at a dinner party:

“Norman was standing across a round table from me, looking older and frailer (and thus in a way sweeter). When I approached him, hand extended, his distaste in putting forth his own was palpable. ‘I always liked you Scott. But you wrote an anti-Israel piece, and I’m very ideological on that subject’ … To be charged with writing an ‘anti-Israel’ column is no small thing – it has been known to get people fired … The U.S. gains nothing for its own reputation or interests by backing Israeli policies that are unjust to the Palestinians, reviled throughout the Arab world and opposed by most of the world’s governments. In political Washington (as at some Hamptons dinner parties), life may go more smoothly if one doesn’t do or say anything that irritates right-wing Zionists. As my encounter with Norman reminded me, the consequences of speaking out sincerely can be quite unsettling. But it is still the right thing to do.” [MCCONNELL, S., v.14, ISSUE 30]

The “New York Intellectuals [a group of influential social and political critics and theorists, whom Podhoretz calls “The Family”],” says David Twersky, were “a group made up largely (though not exclusively) of Jews … writing in Partisan Review, and later Commentary and Dissent…. [they] helped fashion post-war American attitudes toward literature, culture, art and politics.” [TWERSKY, p. 40] The Jewish author Irving Howe (himself benighted as one of “The Family”) wrote in 1968 that

“they have a fondness for ideological speculation; they write literary criticism with a strong social emphasis; they revel in polemic; they strive self-consciously to be ‘brilliant;’ and by birth – or osmosis – they are Jews.” [TWERSKY, p. 40-41]

In a symposium in Commentary magazine in 1966, notes Arnold Eisen, “all the participants except the Reconstructionists and Rabbi Jacob Agus affirmed that Jews were God’s Chosen People, and did so in the traditional terms of revelation, covenant, messiah, and exile, rather than by citing the Jewish contribution to civilization or explaining that, in fact, it was Jews who had chosen God … Significantly, Commentary did not ask respondents whether the Jews were the Chosen People but in what sense they had been chosen.” [EISEN, p. 149]

The second of Rubinstein’s “most widely read” intellectual journals is Public Interest, founded by Jewish conservatives Irving Kristol and Daniel Bell in 1973. The third, The New York Review of Books, wrote Dennis Prager in 1980, “is still edited by Robert B. Silvers and Barbara Epstein … most of its political writers were Jews, and its tone, in the words of Irving Howe … was a ‘snappish crude anti-Americanism.’” Within a decade it was the “most influential magazine” among America’s 275,000 academics. [KOSTELANETZ, p. 69]

Jewish authors William Phillips and Philip Rahv (born Ivan Greenberg) were the founding editors of the reinstitution of the fourth of Rubinstein’s noteworthy magazines, Partisan Review, in 1937. “The main difference between Par-
tisan Review and Commentary,” said Elliot Cohen, Commentary’s first editor, “is that we admit to being a Jewish magazine and they don’t.” [PODHORETZ, p. 99-100] Even today, Partisan Review remains Jewish-dominated. The Editor-in-Chief remains William Phillips, the Editor is Edith Kurzweil, and Number three in the hierarchy is Associate Editor Steve Marcus. Joanna Rose is also Chairman of the Publications and Advisory Board.

Lastly, of Rubinstein’s five seminal “high-brow journals,” The New Republic is still owned and edited by Martin Peretz, “one of the most militant defenders of Israel.” [GOLDBERG, p. 299] Peretz, once a bankroller of the left-wing Ram-parts magazine, was described by a New Republic foreign editor as “a very emotional guy. He has certain passions in life, one of which is Israel. I hate to keep bringing in the Israeli thing, because I consider myself just as pro-Israeli, but it colored his whole view of the world.” [CURTISS, p. 325] (Among other things, Peretz has served on the Board of Directors of Channel 7 TV in Boston. A Jewish friend, Robert Kraft, owner of the largest privately owned packaging company in America, also sat on the Board and was the station’s number two shareholder). [WEINGARTEN, p. 4]

In 1992, a 25-year old Jewish author, Ruth Shalit, “began interning at the New Republic. Practically overnight she became a star—a TNR Associate Editor writing cover stories for the political weekly as well as for the New York Times Sunday Magazine with a $45,000-a-year contract to do pieces for GQ.” [SHEPARD, p. 34] She was also accused, notes the American Journalism Review, of “plagiarism, factual errors” and – in one specific article – racism, when she charged that the Washington Post “had lowered high standards in an attempt to diversify its newsroom and had softened news coverage of black politicians so as not to offend African-American readers.” [SHEPARD, p. 34]

In 1998, a (Jewish) Associate Editor at the New Republic, Stephen Glass, was even fired for fabricating the news stories he authored. Glass, noted the New York Times about the scandal, “had made up part or all of 27 articles he wrote.” [NEW YORK TIMES, 4-18-00, p. C2] (A former editor of the New Republic, Michael Kinsley, also Jewish, today is the editor of Microsoft’s Internet magazine called Slate. Michael Hirshorn edits rival Internet magazine Inside, and Scott Rosenberg is the vice president and “technology editor” of another of the major Internet magazines, Salon.)

Other important intellectual journals over the years with links to the mostly Jewish “intellectual” clique include [d] Dissent, run by Irving Howe, Meyer Schapiro and Michael Walzer; Sol Levitas’ New Leader; the New Criterion (publisher: Samuel Lipman); and the Menorah Journal; a periodical of entirely Jewish content. Hilton Kramer (for nearly twenty years a news editor and art critic for the New York Times) founded and edited the New Criterion; Peter Grose was managing editor of Foreign Affairs. Laurence Goldstein edits the Michigan Quarterly Review. Irving Horowitz founded the social-science periodical Transaction, now called Society, and Transaction Publishers. “Horowitz,” writes fellow Jewish intellectual Nathan Glazer,
“once an advocate of the generally undifferentiated poor and powerless and down trodden, has become over time much more concerned with one group in all its specificity: Jews … Horowitz is much concerned with anti-Zionism, which he sees as extending to what he considers anti-Semitism – even in sociology, with the large numbers of Jews working in it.” [GLAZER, Deomp., p. 127]

Theodore Solotaroff was the founding editor of the New American Review, as well as an Associate Editor at Commentary. Daniel Pipes is the founder and editor of Middle East Quarterly. At one point in time, “roughly half of all the articles of the American medical journals were authored by Jews.” [KRAFETZ, p. 176] Daniel Koshland, Jr., a descendant of the Levi-Strauss blue jean dynasty, is the former editor of Science magazine. In 1999, he donated $8 million to an Israeli university. [LUM, R., 11-19-99, p. 1A] And, as one Jewish observer noted in 1968, “For the last ten years 70 percent of the editors of the Yale Law Journal have been Jewish.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 224] Sam Bercholz, also Jewish, even founded Shambhala Books, “the first major publisher of Tibetan Buddhist works in this country.” [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 9]

Billed as a left wing alternative to Commentary, and just as bluntly Jewish in concern, is Tikkun, the brainchild of editor Michael Lerner. In 1997 Lerner – always heralding the beauties of Jewish values and ethics for the problems of modern society – was exposed to be regularly (over a period of years) publishing “letters to the editor” written by himself under fake names. [KATZ, L, p. 3] Lerner is publicly “known as Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton’s favorite philosopher.” [COLLINS, L., 1994, p. 302] In 1997, Danny Goldberg, the CEO of Mercury Records, became the publisher of Tikkun.


“Who, I ask, are the liberals? The Nation Associates Freda Kirchway, Henry Wallace, Clark Eichelberger, Albert Barkley, William O’Dwyer, Ludwig Lewisohn, Abba Hillel Silver, all of whom have intolerantly and ardently supported Zionism? [LILIENTHAL, p. 145]

In 1967, I. F. Stone (Isadore Feinstein) felt it necessary to write: “As a Jew, closely bound emotionally to the birth of Israel, [I feel] honor bound to report the Arab side, especially since the U.S. press is so overwhelmingly pro-Zionist.” [LAGUEVIR/RUBIN, p. 327]

“The leading exemplars of this genre [of radical journalism],” note Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, “such as the *East Village Other*, the *Los Angeles Free Press*, the *Berkeley Barb*, and Detroit’s the *Fifth Estate*, as well as ‘alternative’ papers like the *Village Voice*, the key personnel were invariably of Jewish background.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 107] Today’s versions of this include David Barsamian (founder and director of *Alternative Radio*), Michael Albert (editor of *Z* magazine), and Robert Weissman (editor of *Multinational Monitor*). Abby Goodman has for years been the news director at “progressive” Pacifica station WBAI in New York; she also hosts its national *Democracy Now!* program.

*Mother Jones*, the well-known left-wing “social conscience” magazine, was largely founded in 1974 by the philanthropy of Adam Hochschild, heir to a fortune; he thereby became the magazine’s original managing editor, as well as Board Chairman. Judging by his autobiography, Hochschild’s commitment to create *Mother Jones* in behalf of the socially and politically dispossessed appears to have been, in major part, in atonement for the sins of his father. This man, Harold Hochschild, was the wealthy Jewish co-founder (and chairman) of an international mining syndicate that sent entire communities of Africans into holes in the ground for a miniscule wage, and engendered local wrath for its strip-mining in Appalachia, pollution of Indian fishing areas in British Columbia, and destroying Aboriginal lands in Australia. The younger Hochschild was even embarrassed to discover, while working on a series of exposes about the CIA as a staff member at an earlier left-wing journal, *Ramparts*, that for a decade his father was Chairman of the Board of the African-American Institute, a front for the CIA. [HOCHSCHILD, 1986, p. 130] Adam Hochschild, noted the *San Francisco Examiner* in 1998, is “historically [Mother Jones’] largest funder and the wielder of very substantial clout within the foundation [that runs Mother Jones] … Hochschild has placed an unspecified sum in a 13-year account which … provides money year by year in diminishing amounts.” [ARM-STRONG, D., 9-13-98, p. D1] As editor-in-chief Jeffrey Klein resigned in 1998, “creative director” Rhonda Rubenstein designed a new format for the magazine. Today’s editor-in-chief at *Mother Jones* is Roger Cohn.

Matthew Rothschild edits the left-wing *Progressive* (for years published by Erwin Knoll). James Weinstein is the founding editor and publisher of another
influential leftist journal, *In These Times*. (Today’s editor: Joel Bleifuss). Naomi Klein is a former editor of a Canadian leftist journal, *This*. As mentioned earlier, Jews have dominated *Nation* for decades. Louis Weisberg edits Chicago’s gay newspaper, *The Chicago Free Press*. And as Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note about the world of American journalistic communism:

> “From the 1930s through the 1950s, Jews were quite active in the [Communist] party leadership. Almost half the Communist leaders tried for violations of the Smith Act in 1947 were Jewish. In the 1940s, the editor of the *Daily Worker*, the managing editor, and the labor editor were all of Jewish background. The publicly visible top leadership, however, was non-Jewish.” [ROTHMAN LICHTER, 1982, p. 100]

To the American political right, by 1997 Adam Meyerson edits the *Heritage Foundation’s Policy Review* and Bill Kristol, also Jewish, former Chief of Staff for former Vice President Dan Quayle, publishes, and edits, the *Weekly Standard*, a journal he founded with fellow Jew John Podhoretz. Even William F. Buckley’s well-known politically conservative (and supposedly Catholic) magazine, the *National Review*, founded in 1953, had a strong Jewish foundation. As George Nash notes:

> “The fact remains that a striking number of *National Review*’s original luminaries were Jews. [Nash cites seven] Indeed, without them the magazine might have never gotten off the ground, for if Buckley was the founding father of the journal, its unlikely godfather was an Austrian Jewish émigré journalist named William S. Schlamm … [And] it was Morrie Ryskind (1895-1985), a prize-winning playwright and Hollywood screenwriter, who organized a series of crucial fund-raising receptions for the project at his home in Beverly Hills. As a result, Buckley achieved more financial success with Ryskind’s California friends than with anyone else except his own father.” [NASH, G., 2000, p. 124]

Other influential Jews associated with the *National Review* were Eugene Lyons, Frank Meyer, Frank Chodorov, and Ralph Toledano (an editor at *Newsweek* who was offered the Managing Editor job. He turned it down but later became the *National Review*’s music editor). Marvin Liebman also “emerged as the outstanding fund-raiser, organizer and coordinator of ‘agitation-propaganda’ for a vast apparatus of conservative causes associated with *National Review*.” Will Herberg, also Jewish, became the journal’s first religion columnist. [NASH, G., 2000, p. 124-126, 156]

Other prominent politically conservative Jewish journalists these days include Charles Krauthammer, David Brooks, David Frum, John Podhoretz, and Dan Feder. [FRIEDMAN, M., 1999, p. 110] Even the Christian evangelical *World* newsweekly (which has over 100,000 subscribers, reasonably comparable in size to the “premier magazine for evangelical Christians,” Billy Graham’s *Christianity Today*, which has a circulation of 150,000) is edited by Marvin Olasky. Olasky is a “Jew turned Marxist turned born-again Christian … [He] oversees the magazine from his custom-built home in the posh hills of Austin, Texas … He declared
himself an atheist at 14, and became a committed Marxist at Yale – even joining the Communist Party and touring the Soviet Union.” [PERINA, K., JUNE 2000]

And how about “radical” (i.e., anti-establishment, anti-Hollywood) documentary filmmakers? For two years (Jewish) film critic and historian Alan Rosenthal was “supported” by an Israeli university to do a book about international documentary filmmaking. (In 1980, the book was published by the University of California Press). Although it was not a publicly stated interest of Rosenthal’s, this side too of movie-making has also been largely Jewish. Rosenthal’s list of the most important “radical” filmmakers of the 1960s includes the Maysles brothers, Ricky Leacock, Don Pennebaker, Bill Jersey, Fred Wiseman, and Alan King. For the 1970s, he singles out Barbara Kopple, Jill Godmilow, Julia Reichert and James Klein. [ROSENTHAL, p. 9] Of 14 people cited, at least 8 are Jewish.

Moving back towards mainstream documentary media, Rosenthal elsewhere observes that “one appreciates Barbara Kopple, Julia Reichert, James Klein, and Richard Cohen but it was directors like Al Wasserman and Douglas Leiterman who have helped enlarge the boundaries of broadcast documentary.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 23] Jewish documentary filmmakers or producers afforded chapter-length interviews in his book included Robert Vas, Abe Osheroff, Amalie Rothschild, Richard Cohen, Jerry Blumenthal (with a group), Julia Reichert and James Klein, Morton Silverstein, David Elstein, and Albert Wasserman.

Wasserman, notes Rosenthal, had a career that covers the best years of ‘CBS Reports,’ the CBS ‘Twentieth Century’ series, and NBC’s ‘White Paper’ series, which he helped originate. At present [1980] he works as producer on CBS’s Sixty Minutes.’ [ROSENTHAL, p. 91] “I was at CBS until 1960,” says Wasserman, “Then I went to NBC with Irving Gitlin, who was a very important figure in the evolution of the television documentary.” [ROSENTHAL, p. 93] Another Jewish writer, director, and producer, Fred Freed, merited an entire volume about his contributions to documentary television. [YELLIN 1973]

For all the international muckraking of all these Jewish documentarians, none of them is noted in Rosenthal’s volume to have turned their critical eyes to Israel, from which the volume’s university support stems. And the only one who mentions Jews in any way is Robert Vas, who frames himself in the context of the Holocaust. By 1995, with the mass media increasingly celebrating Jewish themes, the world could look to more overt mass media Judeo-centrism when Stephen Spielberg funded the New York-based “Fund for Jewish Documentaries,” an off-shoot of his National Foundation for Jewish Culture.

———

Like the film, television, and publishing industries, the musical recording business and general musical world is, and has been, in virtually all its important facets, dominated by Jews.

Classical music? In 1968 Roger Kahn noted that “the four pre-eminent American orchestras are conducted by Jews: Erich Leinsdorf at Boston, George
Szell at Cleveland, Eugene Ormandy at Philadelphia and Leonard Bernstein, who is about to retire from the New York Philharmonic. A look at the rosters of these orchestras reveals string sections all but solidly Jewish clear back to the rear desk in the furthest corner of the second violins … [KAHN, p. 6]…. A Jewish armada has conquered musical performance. Jewish names comprise the aristocracy of performers: Heifetz and Horowitz; Elman and Rubinstein; Piatigorsky and Koussevitzky; Bernstein and Stern; Fleisher, Glazer, Gomberg, Graffman, Roisman, Rosen, Schneider … Jews dominate serious musical performance in America.” [KAHN, p. 63-64] Arnold Schoenberg is arguably “this century’s most influential composer.” [HEILBUT, p. 493]” In the 1920s he wrote (a still unpublished) Zionist drama and began with the preparations for his opera Moses and Aron.” [GRUNFELD, F., p. xix] Philip Glass and Steve Reich are well-know composers in the “pushing the boundaries” avant-garde genre. “In the 1920s [Aaron] Copland was a primary influence in American music through the League of Composers.” [PEYSER, J., 1987, p. 33]

Joan Peyser, a biographer of Leonard Bernstein, notes the following about her subject:

“The more one knows about Bernstein, the more complicated the portrait is of him as a Jew. Capable of working productively with anti-Semites, he still holds a soft spot in his heart for fellow Jews, whom he says he finds superior to all others. ‘He is so adamant about music being Jewish,’ [conductor and composer Gunther] Schuller says, ‘It is important to him that a composer is a Jew, that a performer is a Jew. He told me that Triplum, my composition, has a Jewish soul. That is meant as a compliment. I am not a Jew. When Lenny says, ‘You can almost be Jewish,’ that is considered by him to be one of the most supreme of compliments.’” [PEYSER, J., 1987, p. 409]


In southern California, there exists the Los Angeles Jewish Symphony, which “is an established and growing ensemble that aims to fill a cultural niche
by exploring new or seldom heard music by or about Jews.” Founder Noreen Green “is most proud of an original oration and concert, ‘Women of Valor,’ sponsored by Hadassah Southern California [the international Jewish women’s Zionist group] which premiered at UCLA.” [SMITH, L., 6-11-2000, p. E1]

Harlan Robinson notes who dominated the musician (especially violinist) realm of the American classical music realm in the 1940s:

“Further down the 1942-43 [Jewish impresario Sol] Hurok list was a recent addition to the stable: violinist Isaac Stern. Though at the time a newcomer, he, too, would eventually turn into a steady source of income. Stern would also become one of his manager’s [Hurok] most trusted advisers and the patriarch of a group of Jewish musicians (especially violinists) whose imposing artistic and booking influence would come to earn them the ironic nickname the ‘Kosher Nostra … [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 287] … [Itzhak] Perlman turned into a very popular and profitable addition to his list. So did another Stern recommendation, Pinchas Zuckerman. Together, they became the backbone of the Manhattan-based Jewish musical clique jokingly labeled the ‘Kosher Nosta.’” [ROBINSON, H. 1994, p. 427]

Famed pianist Arthur Rubinstein was an ardent devotee of Israel:

“Another matter that frequently enraged Rubinstein was the world’s attitude – or his interpretation of it – toward Israel. In his last years, he was not merely benevolent toward Israel: he was a right-winger, certain that Israel could do no wrong. The territories that Israel had occupied in 1967 were Israel’s by right, he believed, and he said that the Palestinians were nomads in whom Lawrence of Arabia had unfortunately implanted the notion of being a people – after which they had done nothing but procreate ... Since the Soviet Union had become the major supporter of Israel’s opponents, Rubinstein even suggested that the United States bomb the Kremlin.” [SACHS, H., 1995, p. 393]

Rubinstein once donated $100,000 to Israel’s Weizman Institute, he gave $50,000 to the Israel-American Cultural Foundation “in honor of Isaac Stern, on the violinist’s sixtieth birthday,” and he left $500,000 in his will to the city of Jerusalem. [SACHS, D., 1995, p. 394]

In 2000, famous Jewish opera singer Beverly Sills (also chairwoman of New York City’s Lincoln Center performing arts center) was in Seattle to speak to the northwestern chapter of Hadassah. This was special news, noted the local newspaper, because Sills “limits appearances to a dozen a year, often speaking to members of Hadassah, a Jewish women’s organization. She says, ‘They’re people trying to make the world a better place.’” [GODDEN, J., 5-2000, p. B1]

In 1933, a researcher discovered consistent Jewish overrepresentation in the classical music world, including “51% of the first violins of twelve orchestras,” 23.8% of the works “performed by symphony orchestras,” and so forth. Why was this so? Comparing Jewish and non-Jewish children, Kenneth Sward found no intelligence differences, but speculated that “the Jewish child may be a superior all-around organism by ‘nature.’” [WEYL, N., 1968, p. 188]
Singer Jan Peerce (born Jacob Pincus Perelmuth) from the late 1930s to early 1950s “was a regular on the most popular classical music [radio] broadcast in American history ... In a story worthy of Hollywood, he was finally noticed [i.e., ‘discovered’] by showman Samuel L. ‘Roxy’ Rothafel while performing as a singing violinist.” [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 253-254] (Peerce “was so deeply religious that he had even disowned his son Larry, a film director, for marrying a gentile woman with two children). [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 459]

Jewish influence in more popular music has been profound. During the rise of rock and roll, notes Jory Farr, “in many ways, the pop business was run as the film business in its heyday. It was a club, mostly Jewish, filled with wily impresarios, maverick street fighters, and out-and-out operators.” [FARR, p. 126] In earlier years, the musical agent – and later executive – John Hammond, notes Frederic Dannen, “was the ultimate WASP in a preponderantly Jewish profession.” [DANNEN, p. 62] A network of Jewish executives, agents, managers, and other entrepreneurs have reigned supreme in the musical network for decades. (“One writer in 1927,” note Claire Pagackowska and Barry Curtis, “referred to jazz as reaching ‘from the black South to the black North, but in between it had been touched by the commercial wand of the Jew.’”) [PAGACKOWSKA, p. 242]

Kenneth Kanter notes that:

“Both as a business and as an expression of talent and creative artistry, American popular music was in large part shaped and formed by Jews, many of them immigrant newcomers to the American scene ... Virtually all the great names that come to mind when one considers popular music – Rogers and Hammerstein, Irving Berlin, Lorenz Hart, Jerome Kern, George and Ida Gershwin, Irving Caesar, and Charles Harris, for instance, are Jewish names. Jews wrote the songs, Jews sang the songs, and Jews made sure that the songs were circulated to every corner of the country, for they founded and built America’s publishing industry. Among the vanguard publishers were M. Witmark, Charles K. Harris, Joseph Stern, Shapiro and Bernstein, Harry von Tilzer, Leo Feist, T. B. Harms, and Irving Berlin [born Israel Baline]. Collectively their publishing firms came to be known as ‘Tin Pan Alley’ ... It was the Tin Pan Alley ethos, combining the commercial with the aesthetic, that gave our popular music its distinctive character.” [KANTER, p. ix]

The Jewish Tin Pan Alley monopoly of the music business was solid for decades. As H. F. Mooney notes:

“By 1941, the virtual monopoly of the ASCAP (American Society of Composers Authors, and Publishers, organized in 1914), which had practically protected New York’s ascendancy in the music market, was broken by legal judgment. The consequent opening of broadcasting and recording channels to non-ASCAP composers and publishers, many of them unknowns outside the conventional musical establishment of Tin Pan Alley ... marked the end of an era of increasingly urbane New York composers. These had been heavily Jewish ... Such New York Jews as Harold Arlen, George and Ira Gershwin, Jerome Kern, Vernon Duke
(né Dukelsky), Herman Hupfeld and Vincent Youmans had produced a pensive music of finesse and polish, often using minor strains in the cantorial tradition. Their melodic concepts influenced ‘white’ jazz instrumentalists – themselves frequently Jewish – flowing with increasing facility through plaintive but delicately restrained saxophones from Benny Kreuger in the early 1920s through Frank Trumbauer to Stan Getz; and through the arabesque clarinets of Benny Goodman and Artie Shaw.” [MOONEY, H. F., 1972, p p. 258-259]

(Per current Jazz, in 1998 the Cleveland Jewish News announced that “the world’s No. 1 jazz group [is] Spyro Gyra. Meet the man who started it all – Jay Beckenstein. The world-renowned musician and music producer and his jazz crew (Bekenstein and two other members are Jewish) have been legends since 1970.”) [ALPEN, J., 5-1-1998, p. 46]

Jewish domination of the music world did not, of course, end with the demise of Tin Pan Alley. As we shall soon see, Jewish influence merely broadened.

Tin Pan Alley (a term invented by song writer/journalist Monroe Rosenfeld) [SHAW, A., 1982, p. 386] Jews were also instrumental in maintaining popular negative views about themselves. “The image of the Jews in the songs of the day,” says Kanter, “was not terribly flattering. Jews were presented as money-grubbing, hand-rubbing old men who wore crepe hair and ran pawn shops. The Jews of Tin Pan Alley helped perpetuate this stereotype.” [KANTER, p. 57]

The Jews who dominated Tin Pan Alley and the turn-of-the-century vaudeville world were also central in the popularization and propagation of profoundly demeaning African-American stereotypes. Pamela Brown Lavitt notes Tin Pan Alley and the many onstage Jewish “coon callers”:

“Jewish women vaudevillians at the turn of the century popularized what is now a little-discussed and misunderstood performance venue, known as “coon shouting” … Trying to break into the entertainment business, [‘Tin Pan Alley entrepreneurs’] aesthetics were circumscribed in a vehemently antiblack and xenophobic milieu. By the mid-1880-s they had formed a tight-knit Tin Pan Alley industry that came to dominate vaudeville and early black musicals … Intended as comedy, coon song ranged from jocular and dismissive to cruel and sadistic … Coon song sheet music and illustrated covers proliferated defamatory images of blacks in barely coded slanderous lyrics. For example, the ‘N’ word and associated inferences were dispatched in words like ‘mammy,’ ‘honey boy,’ ‘pickininniy,’ ‘chocolate,’ ‘watermelon,’ ‘possum,’ and the most prevalent ‘coon.’” [LAVITT, P., 2000, p. 253-258]

Especially well known Jewish “coon callers” included Sophie Tucker, Stella Mayhew, Fanny Brice, Anna Held, Eddie Cantor, and Al Jolson.

Jews have long gravitated to an entrepreneurial exploitation of the Black cultural scene and jazz music. As Burton Peretti notes:

“Aside from the hazards of the mob [organized crime] environment, the exploitation faced by jazz players was rather typical for this era [1930s and 1940s]. Jazz, like minstrels and ragtime before it, came under
the control of professional promoters who sought to make music profitable. [They adapted] the technique of advertising, song plugging, and vaudeville … Some promoters, like Joe Glaser (who managed Louis Armstrong in the thirties) were associates of organized crime who left the underworld when prohibition was repealed. Glaser apparently had overseen Al Capone’s profits from the Sunset Cafe and a prostitution ring before he became Armstrong’s manager in 1935. Many more promoters, however, were veterans of Tin Pan Alley, Manhattan’s song-publishing industry, including Irving Mills, a former singer and songwriter who managed Duke Ellington’s and other black bands in the thirties.” [PERETTI, p. 147]

Glaser ran the Associated Booking Corporation, often “the exclusive agent for many of the top Black performers. He became a close associate of many of the top underworld figures in Chicago and New York, whom he met through his band-booking agency.” [MOLDEA, p. 14] Glaser had been an early partner in the company with eventual MCA chief Jules Stein. In 1962, mob-linked attorney Sidney Korshak, also Jewish, gained control of the ABC company. [MC-DOUGAL, p. 141]

Mills and Paddy Harmon, owner of Chicago’s Dreamland Cafe, “sought and gained spurious renown, as Mills took partial credit for many Ellington compositions and Harmon patented and gave his name to a trumpet mute that had long been popular among Joe Oliver and other black players.” [PERETTI, p. 148] The rip-off of Black artists was a norm for the era. As Al Silverman notes in the case of Fats Waller:

“In his time Fats wrote the melodies to over 360 songs. Not that many bear his name today, unfortunately, because when money was needed he’d write the music and sell all rights to unscrupulous Tin Pan Alley characters.” [SILVERMAN, p. 129-130]

“That practice of show business share-cropping … in the 1920s and 1930s,” notes the director of Harlem’s Apollo Amateur Night, Ralph Cooper, “existed right on through the fifties and sixties. Its bitterness still exists among many performers to this day – a bitterness from the theft of their songs, their sound, their talent.” [COOPER, p. 199] Jewish singers “Sophie Tucker, Eddie Cantor and Al Jolson,” notes Donald Fischer,

“performed in blackface at the beginning of their careers, singing black songs. They later built on their successes in this medium to develop national statures and professional successes with other music. However, their early songs were for the most part borrowed or plagiarized from African-American sources, with little or no public recognition – or monetary reward – for the creative talents that produced them.” [FISCHER, D., 6-30-2000, p. 21A]

Jews were also prominent in the overseeing of the Black community’s jazz life, including the control of musical clubs in Black neighborhoods in a variety of American cities. “The invasion of the Black community by organized crime lords with connections to downtown money,” notes Ted Vincent, “was certainly
the most sensational contribution to the loss of Black oversight of neighborhood dance halls and theatres.” [VINCENT, p. 176] “Slumming resorts” served a largely non-Black audience and “were noted for their riverboat decor, fake magnolia plants, and nearly nude dancers … Perhaps the nationwide pioneer in the resorts was Isadore Shor’s Entertainment Cafe.” [VINCENT, p. 78] In Harlem, such clubs included Connie’s Inn (owned by Connie Innerman) and the famed Apollo Theatre. “From the opening of the [Apollo] building in 1912 until 1934,” notes Vincent, “the theatre was a showcase for white [i.e., largely Jewish] vaudeville burlesque shows, with white strippers coming to be the main attraction.” [VINCENT, p. 189] The Apollo was eventually sold by “Burlesque Kings Hurtig and Seaman” to Sid Cohen and Morris Sussman, and then to Frank Schiffman and Leo Brecher. Brecher also owned the Douglas, the Roosevelt, the Lafayette Theatre (“the prime showcase for black talent in America”) [COOPER, p. 44], and the Harlem Opera House located a block from the Apollo. [VINCENT, p. 189-192] Jay Fagan, and Moses and Charles Gale (Galewski), founded the popular Savoy Ballroom in 1926.

Mel Watkins notes the reputation in the Black community of dominant mogul Frank Schiffman:

“Schiffman was a controversial figure in black entertainment. Admired and respected by some, scorned and excoriated by others, he was rarely viewed neutrally. His Machiavellian approach to business is a matter of record, and most would admit that he was an unrepentant shark in business matters. He quickly eliminated his competitors and for decades eradicated all serious competition, which earned him the grudging esteem of other showmen. Among performers, however, the estimate was not glowing. Of his knowledge of black acts, John Bubbles [an African-American performer of the era] said, ‘Only thing he knew was how to get people cheap as he could, and work them as long as he could.’ And John Hammond, a record producer and friend, flatly declared ‘Frank had no artistic taste at all.’” [WATKINS, M., 1994, p. 386]

Samuel Charters and Leonard Kunstad note the situation of another famous nightclub:

“The Cotton Club had opened at 142nd St. and Lexington Ave. in 1922 with a strict policy of white only. The owner, Bernard Levy, had pressed his policy, despite loud protests from the Harlem community. He used Negro orchestras and a Negro revue and ran it as a tourist attraction for society people who wanted to see a little of ‘Harlem life’ … The club was forced to admit colored patrons during the next winter, but the prices he kept high and it remained predominantly a tourist attraction until the Depression.” [CHARTERS, p. 217]

New York’s Latin Quarter club (with eventual branches in other cities) was also owned by a Jew, Lou Walters, father of famous newscaster Barbara Walters; Monte Kay was the founder of the famous Birdland jazz club. He too was Jewish. Mobster Morris Levy later controlled the place. The Panama was one of the top two cabarets in Chicago. It was owned by Isadore Levine. [BRICKTOP, 1983,
JEWISH INFLUENCE IN THE MASS MEDIA (PT. 3)

p. 53] Bricktop, a famous international African-American nightclub manager from the 1920s-1950s, wrote about her time spent in Mexico:

“The most prominent of the wheeler-dealers in Mexico City’s American colony was a strange, tiny little man called Blumey. He was A. C. Blumenthal, a financier who had his fingers in many pies. He was once married to Peggy Fears, a Ziegfeld showgirl. Blumey went to Mexico City to dodge Uncle Sam’s tax collectors, and he was just one of many rich Americans who had gone to Mexico City for that reason. The others lived quietly and inconspicuously, but Blumey loved the limelight ... He had a stable of tall, beautiful girls who towered over him, and he could be found holding court every day in the Reforma Hotel, where he was the manager.” [BRICKTOP, 1983, p. 223]

As Israeli scholar Robert Rockaway notes about a common undercurrent in such night life:

“Jewish Gangsters frequented nightclubs ... In fact, Jewish underworld figures owned many nightspots and speakeasies. In New York, Dutch Schultz owned the Embassy Club. Charley ‘King’ Solomon owned Boston’s Coconut Grove. In Newark, Longy Zwillman owned the Blue Mirror and the Casablanca Club. Boo Boo Hoff owned the Picadilly Cafe in Philadelphia. Detroit’s [Jewish] Purple Gang owned Luigi’s Cafe, one of the city’s more opulent clubs. Jewish singers and comedians, such as Al Jolson, Eddie Cantor, Fanny Brice and Sophie Tucker played in the mob clubs.” [ROCKAWAY, R., 1993, p. 205]

Upset with outsider exploitation and degradation of the Black community (where many night clubs were located), there was an effort by the Marcus Garvey African-American movement as early as the 1920s to institute Black-owned Liberty Halls “where the musical offerings would be part of an overall effort at community uplift and not just a profit-oriented business.” [VINCENT, p. 114]

(From France, even the international jet-set luxury playground/resort of “Club Med” was founded by Gerard Blitz, and built to power by Gilbert Trigano. Both are also Jewish. By 1999 the firm had 116 sites in 36 countries, now headed by Gilbert’s son Serge. [REGULY, E., 4-25-88, pl. 24; MCDONELL, E., 5-1-99, p. D10] Hollywood’s Roxy nightclub was founded by the Jewish managerial trio of David Geffen, Loud Adler, and Bill Graham. [KING, T., 2000, p. 187]

Jews have of course been prominent over the years as musical performers. These included three of the most influential band leaders of the 1930s – Benny Goodman (“the King of Swing”), Harry James, and Artie Shaw (Arthur Arshansky). More recent popular names include Leonard Bernstein, Andre Previn, Arthur Fiedler, Stephen Sondheim, and many others. As noted earlier too, by the 1930s MCA (Music Corporation of America) was a powerful talent agency, founded by Jules Stein and built later to power by Sidney Sheinbein and Lew Wasserman, who ultimately became one of the most powerful men in Hollywood. Ronald Brownstein observes that:
“By the mid-1930s, MCA controlled many of the country’s most popular bands, from Tommy Dorsey to Artie Shaw.” [BROWNSTEIN, p. 181]

For years, MCA’s Jules Stein, adds Michale Pye, “ran the music business so toughly that no dance hall would stand against him.” [PYE, p. 18-19] In a 1946 antitrust trial that MCA lost, a Los Angeles federal judge “declared that MCA held a virtual monopoly over the entertainment business.” The presiding judge also stated that MCA was “the Octopus … with tentacles reaching out into all phases and grasping everything in show business.” [MOLDEA, p. 2, 3] “The one man,” notes non-Jewish band leader Guy Lombardo, “who probably more than any other solidified the business and hastened the era of the Big Bands was Jules Stein. He had started his Music Corporation of America in Chicago and to that city gravitated bands from all over the country, seeking the buildup and engagements they would get if MCA took them in the fold.” Lombardo was also under contract to Stein. [LOMBARDO, G., 1975, p. 153] Stein even wrote an introduction to Lombardo’s autobiography.

For years MCA increasingly interfaced with Chicago’s Mafia and other underworld personalities. Seemingly omnipresent in Hollywood was lawyer Sidney Korshak. “A close friend of Stein’s and Wasserman’s,” says Dan Moldea, “Korshak quickly became one of the most powerful influences in the entertainment industry and in California politics … [MOLDEA, p. 5] … Korshak … has been described by federal investigators as the principle link between the [Hollywood] legitimate business world and organized crime.” [MOLDEA, p. 2]

And rock and roll? The Jewish foundation continued. “The most famous and important [rhythm and blues disc jockey],” note Steve Chapple and Reebee Garofalo, “was … Alan Freed, the father of Rock ‘n’ Roll … Freed was credited with co-writing fifteen rock and rock hits including Chuck Berry’s ‘Maybelline,’ but he did little more than promote any of them.” [CHAPPLE, p. 56-57] A biography of Freed notes that “by 1956, there was no bigger name in rock and roll than Freed, except Elvis Presley.” [JACKSON, p. ix] (Another of America’s best known early disc jockeys was also Jewish, Murray the K, aka Murray Kaufman). In 1960, Freed was indicted for accepting $30,000 in bribes to play songs at his radio station. “[Freed] grabbed the kids and led them to the great rock candy mountain,” says Albert Goldman, “He named their music, coined its us-against-them rhetoric, created rock show biz, including the package tour … Alan Freed is really one of the principal exhibits in the Rock ‘n’ Roll Hall of Ill Fame … [He] was not only a crook but a self-righteous hypocrite. Even [Freed’s manager] Morris Levy [with deep ties to the criminal underworld, particular the Mafioso Gigante family] had to concede that the ‘Father of Rock ‘n’ Roll’ was not a nice man. Speaking as one Jew to another Jew about a third Jew, Levy said simply: ‘He could have been another Hitler.’” [GOLDMAN, p. 519-520]

In a book about the Atlantic Records empire (later swallowed by Warners), Dorothy Wade and Justine Picardie noted Morris Levy and the kinds of people that populated the rock and roll industry: “The truth is, with or without mob
connections, Morris Levy was much more typical of the new music moguls than either [non-Jewish] Ahmet Ertegun or [Jewish] Jerry Wexler … The world in which Atlantic had to survive was populated largely by hoodlums and hustlers.” [WADE, p. 57] As Syd Nathan, the owner of King Records, once said, “You want to be in the record business? The first thing you learn is that everyone is a liar.” [WADE, p. 60] “The early rhythm and blues companies were run by a fraternity of Jews … They were tough and they were shrewd – some say unscrupulous – and they were alternately loved, despised, respected, and feared. The deep bond of these cultural outsiders prompted one gentle, mild rebuke in his voice, to comment that ‘Yiddish was the second language of the record business.” [COHODAS, N., p. 3-4, 2000]

“To the general public,” notes Steve Chapple and Reebee Garofalo, “the music business seems to have a tremendous amount of corruption.” [CHAPPLE, p. 226] “I think in Hollywood,” media psychologist Stuart Fischel of California State University at Los Angeles told the Los Angeles Times in 1993, “people get into a kind of mind meld. You can come in as a relatively moral and ethical person, but eventually [Hollywood] produces a re-socializing of a subculture with different norms and ethics based on hedonism and materialism. It’s hard to know what’s going to breach the bounds of acceptable criminality in Hollywood.” [ELLER, p. B8, B11] Aside from drugs, prostitution, and all the other extracurricular norms of the interrelated music, film, and television worlds of Hollywood, just at the most basic business level, “payola [bribery] has been a key factor in the establishment of major artists,” says Roger Karshner, “the evolution of publishing dynasties and the creation of recording empires. Payola, layola, and taking care of business are the ABC’s of the music industry past and present. It has taken many forms, and many publishers, artists, managers, and record people at all levels have participated in payola practices.” [KARSHNER, p. 39]

Probably the most important early rhythm and blues recording company was Chess Records, founded by Leonard and Phillip Chess, Jewish immigrants from Poland. They started out with a scrap metal business in the ghetto, then moved into the liquor business, eventually owning several bars in the Black neighborhoods of South Chicago, including the large Macamba Club, which was “reputedly a prime center for prostitution and heavy drug dealing.” [DIXON, p. 78] The Chess brothers soon recognized a profitable opportunity open to them with the many Black musical acts that played at their nightclubs; the entrepreneurs soon embarked upon a recording business, eventually producing blues, gospel, and rock and roll music. Seminal Black artists who signed on to the Chess label included Bo Diddley, Howlin’ Wolf, Muddy Waters, John Lee Hooker, Etta James, Chuck Berry, and many others. Berry’s songs were among the most influential in rock and roll history. “Some people have called Leonard and Phillip Chess visionaries who recognized the potential in the visceral blues of post-World War II Chicago,” says Don Snowden, who co-wrote the auto-biography of bluesman Willie Dixon, “A far greater number have branded the Chess brothers as exploiters who systematically took advantage of the artists who created that music.” [DIXON, p. 78] The Rolling Stones even found seminal bluesman Muddy Waters still painting the Chess’s home when they came to record in Chicago. [WADE, p. 71]
Frank Schiffman, owner of a number of musical venues in New York’s Harlem area, “was a ruthless competitor who would do anything, including take advantage of his black employees and exploit the great black artists who worked for him, in order to increase his profits and beat down the opposition.” [COOPER, p. 44] “Remember [Black singer] Little Eva Boyd?” asks Ralph Cooper, “She worked as a babysitter for two Tin Pan Alley [Jewish] rock and roll writers, Carole King and Gerry Goffen. They wrote a song called ‘Loco-Motion’ and they asked her to sing it … Now [1990] she lives in North Carolina, where her people are from. She’s a working mother on welfare. She works in a barbecue kitchen as a cook.” [COOPER, p. 196]

In 1997, Black singer Darlene Love won a lawsuit for back royalties against famous Jewish musical producer Phil Spector. (Originally awarded $263,000, it was later dropped down to $130,000.) Love was the anonymous lead singer on a number of 1960s-era Spector productions, including He’s a Rebel, Da Do Ron Ron, He’s Sure the Boy I Love, and other hits. In the early 1980s Ms. Love found herself cleaning toilets for a living, but her singing career later flourished anew. [WILLMAN, C., 10-15-88, CALENDAR, p. 10; WARRICK, P., 11-2-98]

“I didn’t know anything about the record business,” said early rock and roll sensation Little Richard (of “Tutti Frutti” fame) about his rock and roll career. “I was very dumb … I was just like a sheep among a bunch of wolves that would devour me at any moment. I think I was taken advantage of because I was uneducated. I think I was treated inhumane … I think I was treated wrong and many people got rich out of the style of music I created. They are all millionaires, writ many times, and nobody offered me nothing.” [WADE, p. 74] Dorothy Wade and Justine Picardie note Little Richard’s lamentation, then add: “To which many, if not most, of his black musical contemporaries would add: Amen.” [WADE, p. 74] Among others, Richard had in mind the Jewish owner of Specialty Records, Art Rupe, who many years ago bought the rights to his songs for a paltry $10,000.

Chuck Berry remembers being cheated by the Chess brothers:

“[Phil Chess finally acknowledged] in writing that no songwriter royalties had been paid for three years on my Chess Records product … [And in a review of Chess documents] I was surprised to learn that I had been paid the same songwriter royalties for an LP as I was receiving for a single record. Chess claimed to be unaware of this ‘mistake,’ as if they had never noticed that LPs had between eight and ten songs on them.” [BERRY, C., p. 246-247]

“In 1974 Howlin’ Wolf filed a lawsuit against Arc Music [the publishing wing of Chess Records, it was co-owned by the Chess brothers and two brothers of Jewish band leader Benny Goodman] [COHODAS, N., 2000, p. 37] asking for $2.5 million for unpaid royalties from his songs … In 1976 Muddy Waters and Willie Dixon filed identical lawsuits against the publishing company, alleging fraud and conspiracy and asking to paid money damages and to have their publishing contracts voided.” [COHODAS, N., 2000, p. 308]
In 1972, Martin Otelsberg became the manager of African-American musician Bo Diddley. Suspecting in later years that he had been swindled, Diddley filed suit against Otelsberg’s estate in 1994 and recovered $400,000. As Diddley’s lawyer (also Jewish) John Rosenberg noted, “This is a typical story that’s happened time and again to musicians like Bo.” [MORSE, S., 6-18-94, p. 28] Diddley complained of being cheated by the Chess brothers as well. “To me every nationality has a reason for bein’ here,” said Diddley, “an’ mostly all the Jewish people own everything. They got all the money. Give him a thousand dollars, he’ll turn it into ten million. How the heck they do it, I don’t know.” [COHODAS, N., 2000, p. 110]

The Jewish community, of course, isn’t comfortable with this history. As Jewish author Neal Karlen describes one African-American depiction of the Jewish music hustler: “In the 1990 film Mo’ Better Blues, Spike Lee crafted an artful if blazingly anti-Semitic portrait of the fictional Moe Flatbush, an avaricious Jewish club owner intent on swindling black jazzmen. The ferretlike, Yiddish-spouting Moe, played by John Turturro, was seemingly lifted straight from the pages of the anti-Semitic screed The Protocols of Zion.” [KARLEN, N., 1994, p. 145]

The Jewish agent-producer exploitation of Black recording artists in the early rhythm and blues era of the 1940s and 1950s (and later) was predominant and widespread, entrenching a Black hostility among many to their Jewish financial controllers to the present day. The following Jewish entrepreneurs were among those who founded record labels featuring mainly Black talent: Herman Lubinsky (Savoy Records); the Braun family (Deluxe Records); Hy Siegal, Sam Schneider and Ike Berman (Apollo Records); Saul, Joe, and Jules Bihari (Modern Records); Art Rupe (Specialty Records—its biggest hits were those of Little Richard); Lev, Edward, and Ida Messner (Philo/Aladdin Records); Al Silver and Fred Mendelsohn (Herald/Ember Records); Paul and Lilian Rainer (Black and White Records); Sam and Hy Weiss (Old Towne Records); Sol Rabinowitz (Baton Records—Rabinowitz eventually became vice president of CBS International); and Danny Kessler (head of OKeh Records, a “cheap” branch of Columbia Records). Sydney Nathan controlled both the King and Federal record labels and Florence Greenberg owned the Mafia-influenced Scepter Records (featuring the Shirelles and Dionne Warwick).

“Those illiterates,” Hy Weiss of Olde Towne once said about his recording artists, “they would have ended up eating from pails in Delancey Street if it weren’t for us.” [WADE, p. 70] “The record producers were white,” says Nadine Cohodas in her book about the Chess brothers, “their talent for the most part black, many from impoverished backgrounds and few with much formal education, living in a society that regarded them as second-class citizens. The deals between the two parties were not the negotiations of peers. The relationship could be paternalistic, even condescending. At Chess it sometimes looked as though Leonard and Phil gave their musicians an allowance rather than a salary.” [COHODAS, N., 2000, p. 4] The history of rock and roll is, of course,” notes Rich Cohen, “riddled with pioneering white record men who built careers recording, and sometimes,
exploiting black artists: Morris Levy, that burly, cigar-smoking product of the Brill Building, allegedly stealing writing credits from Frankie Lyman; Herman Lubinsky, the founder of Savoy Records in Newark, New Jersey, throwing around nickels as if they were manhole covers.” [COHEN, R., 6-21-01]

In Philadelphia, in 1984 lawsuits were swirling around WMOT, a company that “developed a reputation as an aggressive independent record producer specializing in the ‘Philly sound.’” Formerly owned by Steve Bernstein, Alan Rubens, and David Chacker, it was acquired by Michael Goldberg, Allen Cohen, and Jeff and Mark Salvarian. Lawsuits even named Israel’s Bank Leumi among defendants in a scheme to use the record company to launder drug money. The central player in this accusation was Larry Lavin, who was indicted as the “kingpin of a 13-member [drug] ring that allegedly sold $5 million of cocaine a month.” [DAUGHEN, 1984]

By 1978 president Oscar Cohen of the Associate Booking Corporation presided over “the country’s biggest black talent booking agency.” [SHAW, A, p. 419, p. 133] Recurrent, “mobbed-up” Morris Levy even eventually owned Birdland in its heyday, the famous jazz club. [WEXLER, p. 130] Levy also controlled the Roulette Record label. Nat “the Rat” Tarnopol headed the Brunswick label (Jackie Wilson was one of its most prominent African-American stars). Tarnopol was indicted twice in the 1970s “for using payola, drugola, and strong-arm goons to get radio airplay for Brunswick recording artists.” [MC-DOUGAL, p. 366]

An early and important supporter of disc jockey Alan Freed and his own empire was Leo Mintz, who owned a large record store near Cleveland’s Black ghetto. Even earlier, Eli Oberstein founded Varsity records in the 1930s, Joe Davis launched Beach records in 1942, and “Jake Friedman had Southland, one of the biggest distributing outfits in the South.” [SHAW, A., Honkers, p. 236]

“The whole history of rock ‘n’ roll,” noted the London Guardian in a review of Jewish author Michael Billig’s book about the subject, “has been portrayed as white artists ‘ripping off’ black music. Only now [with Billig’s volume] has the major Jewish contribution been acknowledged.” [ARNOT, C., 10-4-2000, p. 6] Atlanta-based Mark Shimmel, for instance, is the CEO of LaFace Records, which headlines TLC, Usher, Tonik Braxton, GoodiMob, “and a raft of hot hip-hop artists … He built his own company, managing talents as varied as John Denver and Broadway composer Frank Wildhorn … He doesn’t worry much about what he calls ‘the white guy in the black music business.’” He has also worked with Huey Lewis, Harry Belafonte, Ray Charles, and former Eagle Don Henley. [POLLAK, S., 1-7-00]

Looking to the Hispanic record market, George Goldner founded the Tico, Rama, and Vee record companies; he also owned a number of Latino-oriented dance halls. Goldner later founded the Mafia-influenced Red Bird label. (Goldner once hired a team of whores to service a deejay convention. He “had the girls arrive a day early, to sit down and go over his new releases with them. The idea was for the girls to whisper the names of those records in the jock’s ear while they were making love.” [ELIOT, M., p. 49] By the 1970s, Joseph, Stanley,
and Kenneth Cayre (of New York’s Jewish Sephardic community) owned the Salsoul record label. It was worth $49 million in sales and held a 70% share of the Latino record market. [UPBIN, 11-10-99]

In the folk music genre, Albert Grossman managed the career of Peter Paul and Mary. “This established his reputation as a star maker,” notes Anthony Scaduto, “as some kind of genius manager, even as he was being criticized for commercializing folk and for being an excessively sharp operator.” [SCADUTO, p. 106] Israel Young ran the Folklore Center in New York’s Greenwich Village in the 1960s. Fred Weintraub owned the well-known Bitter End nightclub. Manny Roth ran Cafe Wha? Among the prominent Jewish folksingers of the era were Bob Dylan, Phil Ochs, Jack Elliott, Peter Yarrow (of Peter, Paul, and Mary), David Blue (Cohen), and two (Fred Hellerman and Ronnie Gilbert) of the four Weavers. Ballad singer Leonard Cohen had a grandfather who was the first president of the Canadian Jewish Congress.

Moe Asch (whose father, Sholem, was “the most widely read Yiddish writer of the twentieth century”) [GOLDSMITH, P., p. 1] headed Folkway Records, the label that released recordings by Woody Guthrie, Pete Seeger (manager: Harold Levanthal), Doc Watson, Black blues artist Leadbelly, Josh White, Black poet Langston Hughes, and ethnic performers from around the world. (Woody Guthrie’s wife, Marjorie Gleenblatt Mazia, was Jewish, and their child, Cathy Ann, was “raised as a Jew.” [POLLAK, O, p. 12]) Guthrie even lived with Marjorie in a Jewish neighborhood in Coney Island.

Asch got into the recording business with a connection to David Sarnoff, the eventual head of NBC-RCA. [GOLDSMITH, P., p. 60] A later version of Folkways was Verve/Folkways, which featured Tim Hardin, Richard Havens, and Jewish artists Laura Nyro and Janis Ian. (Nyro’s original name was Nigro, and her name was changed for fear that people might call her “Negro.”) [KING, T., 2000, p. 73] Another Jewish entrepreneur, Maynard Solomon, headed another prominent folk-oriented record label, Vanguard, which featured Joan Baez, Buffy St. Marie, Eric Anderson, among others. Another folk label in Chicago, Flying Fish, was founded by Bruce Kaplan.

Jewish popular musical performers are many and varied, including the Beastie Boys (“widely castigated for glorifying sex and violence”) [ANDERSON, 1991, p. 173], Bette Midler, Billy Joel, Barry Manilow, Randy Newman, Carly Simon (one of the heirs to the Simon-Schuster publishing house fortune), Helen Reddy, Lesley Gore, David Lee Roth of Van Halen, Lou (“Take a Walk on the Wild Side”) Reed, [BELL, I., 6-1-93, p. 12] and Mountain’s Leslie [Weinstein] West. Donald Fagen co-founded Steely Dan. Marty Friedman of Megadeth is Jewish, as is Peter Green of Fleetwood Mac, Marty Balin of Jefferson Airplane, Marc Knopfler of Dire Straits, Paul Stanley (Stanley Eisen) and Gene Simmons (born Chaim Whitz in Haifa, Israel) of Kiss, Perry Farrel (Perry Bernstein; son of a diamond dealer) of Jane’s Addiction, Kevin Dubrow (lead singer of Quiet Riot), Slash of Guns ’n Roses, Geddy Lee (of Rush – born Gar Lee Weinrib), Eric Bloom (lead singer of Blue Oyster Cult), Robbie Robertson, Warren Zevon, Jeff Beck, Mick Jones (of the Clash), Gavin Rossdale (head of
Bush), Jay (Blatt) and the Americans, Marc Bolan of T-Rex, Manfred Mann (Lubowitz), Norman Greenbaum, Phranc (a Jewish lesbian folksinger), and Howard Kaylan and Mark Volman of the Turtles. And on and on. Jewish interest in the subject notes that ukelele-rooted Tiny Tim’s mother was Jewish, Donovan’s mother was Jewish, Cyndi Lauper’s father is Jewish, Country Joe MacDonald’s mother is Jewish, Twisted Sister’s Dee Snider’s father was Jewish and on and on. [JEWWHO, 2000; BOUCHER, G., 4-17-01, p. 62; TAYLOR, L., 12-27-00, p. F5] Even the 1998 “Eurovision Song Contest winner” – featuring an event watched by 100 million people in 33 countries – was Israeli transsexual Dana International, born Yaran Cohen.

Not Jewish? Want to make it in the music business? Enhance your chances by learning Yiddish:

> “Even gentiles learned to salt their language with pinches of Yiddish, the industry’s vernacular. Courtney Love, not long before her own major label debut at Geffen Records, began boning up with the help of Leo Rosten’s The Joys of Yiddish. ‘I’m going to blow the minds of all those shemedricks at the record company,’ Courtney said. She would even sometimes refer to her dispute with Kat [of the all-female band Babes in Toyland] over who was the first to wear a baby-doll dress onstage as ‘that shmatte’ controversy.’” [KARLEN, N., 1994, p. 146]

From France, singer Serge Gainsbourg [born Lucien Ginzburg] “is still most famous in Britain for his number one Je t’aime moi non plus: the scandalous anthem which was in the British charts 30 years ago. He and [actress Jane] Birkin simulated their lovemaking so effectively that the single was banned by the BBC and formally condemned by the Vatican …Yet Gainsbourg is the greatest popular musician France has ever produced … Echoes of his favourite technique, of murmuring profanities against a delicate and beautiful harmony, can be heard in many contemporary records, not least the later work of Leonard Cohen … Towards the end of his life, the singer’s media appearances became ritual provocations: in one television broadcast, he subjected a veteran paratrooper – horrified by Gainsbourg’s dub version of the Marseillaise – to a torrent of obscenities, pausing only occasionally, to inflate condoms. On another notorious live show, sharing a platform with a young Whitney Houston, Gainsbourg, then 58, turned to the presenter Michel Drucker and declared, in English, ‘I want to fuck her.’” [CHALMERS, R., 1-4-00]

The magazine “Bible” of rock and roll music, Rolling Stone, was also founded by Jewish entrepreneur Jann Wenner [see elsewhere, Mass Media chapters]. Wenner also is “the single most important person behind” Cleveland’s Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum. [HINCKLEY, D., p. 9] Joel Siegel, later prominent as a film critic, was also “TV’s first rock and roll reporter.” [SLEWINSKI, C., 3-23-99, p. 102]

Jerry Wexler, the Jewish co-director of Atlantic Records – remembers with fondness the early rhythm and blues and rock and roll industry years with a curious perspective:
“How well I remember those labels and the grizzled infighters who owned them. Exclusive (Leon and Otis Rene), Modern (the Biharis), Imperial (Lew Chudd), Specialty (Are Rupe), Old Towne (Hymie Weiss), Herald/Ember (Al Silver), Chess (the brothers Chess), and on and on into the night – memorable logos, all. I am reminded of the tribes of the Sinai desert – the Hittites, the Moabites, the Midianites, the Amorites. Gone, perished, vanished from the face of the earth. Only one survived – the Hebrews.” [WEXLER, p. 183]

Wexler’s written memories also include stories about other fellow Jews in the later music world, including the music editor of Billboard, Paul Ackerman; his early Jewish bosses at MGM Records – Abe Olman and Mitch Miller, and A&R men Harry Myerson at RCA and Morty Palitz at Decca; and Nat Shapiro, the promotion man at Atlantic. “What [Wexler] achieved at Atlantic makes him a key figure in the history of post-war black masterworks.” [HOSKYNS, p. 10] Among Wexler’s most famous Black talents was Aretha Franklin. Also, “throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Jerry Wexler worked with several of the most influential R&B singers ever to hit the charts: Wilson Pickett, Otis Redding, Clyde McPhatter, the Drifters, Joe Tex, Ray Charles, Ruth Brown, the Clovers, Joe Turner, and La Vern Baker, to name a few. Rolling Stone has gone so far as to christen him ‘the Godfather of Rhythm and Blues.’” [BEGO, M., 1989, p. 90] In the building of Atlantic Records to power, non-Jewish co-founder Ahmet Ertegun feared collusion between Wexler and two Jewish songwriters, Jerry Lieber and Mike Stoller, to oust him. [HOSKYNS, p. 10] (Jerry Greenberg was also “one of Ertegun’s top lieutenants at Atlantic.” [KING, T., p. 166] Jewish mogul David Geffen once tried to create a rumor that Ertegun was anti-Semitic which “could hurt Ertegun’s business.” [KING, T., 2000, p. 292]

In 1992, Bill McKibben noted an interesting piece of music trivia that he had heard about on television:

“Neil Sedaka went to the same high school as Neil Diamond and Barbara Streisand, and while he was there he wrote a song about a girl called Carole Klein who went on to become Carole King and of course had several number one records.” [MCKIBBEN, p. 20]

The author doesn’t mention it, but, rather curiously, aside from the fact that they all became famous pop singers, they were also all Jewish. In fact, in the early 1960s, Don Kirshner and partner Al Nevins had a company called Aldon Music as a kind of last outpost of the seminal Tin Pan Alley complex at the so-called “Brill Building” in New York City. Their hires (mainly song writers at that time) were virtually all Jewish, including Carole King, Gerry Goffin, Barry Mann, Cynthia Weill, Neil Diamond, Neil Sedaka, and Howard Greenflens. Later came Phil Spector, Jeff Barry, Ellie Greenwich, Doc Pomus, Mort Shuman, Burt Bacharach, Hal David, Jerry Leiber, and Mike Stoller. [SCHEURER, T., p. 90] Ellie Greenwich and Jeff Barry, notes Rich Wiseman, were “one of the hottest songwriter teams in pop.” [WISEMAN, p. 31]

“To my surprise,” writes Jewish author Michael Billig,
“song after well-known pop song, revealed itself to ‘Jewish music,’ from [Elvis] Presley to the soft sounds of the drifters to [producer] Phil Spector. So much of the rebellion-music which I had loved in my youth and which seemed to be a window to a foreign, dangerous world, turned out to be a product of familiar surroundings. Surprise was mixed with delight.” [ARNOT, C., 10-4-2000, p. 6]

In the 1960s era, the Beatles’ agent/manager, Brian Epstein, was Jewish, as was the promoter, Sid Bernstein (“New York’s leading promoter in the mid-sixties,” [GLATT, p. 87] of their early Carnegie Hall and Shea Stadium concerts. The head of Bernstein’s employer – the General Artist Corporation – was Norman Weiss, also Jewish. A Jewish entrepreneur in America, Irwin Pincus, “secured foreign rights on six original Beatles recordings.” [ELIOT, M, p. 127] These seminal tunes appeared on the Vee Jay label (which also recorded the popular Four Seasons) in the early months of “Beatlemania” in America. (Meanwhile, the state of Israel banned the Beatles from performing there in 1965 “for fear of the decadent affect it would have on Israel’s youth).” [FRANKEL, G., p. 273] Sandy Gallin (also Jewish and, like Epstein, gay) “shot to stardom after booking the Beatles for their legendary 1964 American debut on The Ed Sullivan Show.” [KING, T., 2000, p. 93]

“The daughter of prosperous furniture manufacturers in Sheffield,” says Albert Goldman, “[Brian Epstein’s mother] had been educated in a school dominated by Roman Catholics, an experience that led to her to attribute all her subsequent misfortunes in life to anti-Semitism, another trait Brian adopted.” [GOLDMAN] “At age ten,” adds Chet Flippo, “[Brian] was expelled from Liverpool College for scrawling dirty pictures. He and his mother attributed the expulsion to anti-Semitism.” [FLIPPO, C., 1988, p. 143] Both Epstein’s parents “were from prominent Jewish families in Liverpool” and he was an heir to his family’s NEMS company: the North End Music Store chain, which was purchased in the 1930s. [FLIPPO, C., 1988, p. 143] “Brian didn’t care that much about the Beatles’ music,” writes Flippo, “They knew that early on and he always acknowledged it. He had absolutely no experience in managing a group and the Beatles knew that. His contacts, such as they were, were with the business side of record companies.” [FLIPPO, C., 1988, p. 142]

Epstein, notes the Jewish Forward, was a “gay, Jewish record-department manager – of the Liverpool store owned by his parents – who met the Beatles and in little more than a year turned them into the most successful musical act in the world. The life of the Beatles’ first manager has been familiar to Beatles fans for decades, though always as one of the sideshows to the record-shattering main attraction. With the focus reversed, some arresting tidbits emerge, such as when Paul McCartney explains his father’s immediate approval of Epstein. ‘He thought Jewish people were very good with money,’ Mr. McCartney says. ‘That was the common wisdom. He thought Brian would be very good for us … And he was right … If anyone was the fifth Beatle, it was Brian.’ MANDELL, B., 2001]
A biography of Epstein is entitled *The Man Who Made the Beatles*. “While none of his performing artists were Jews,” notes author Roy Coleman, “Brian veered towards the company of Jews in the music business, and some of his senior colleagues were Jews: Nat Weiss, Dick James [originally Richard Leon Vapnick], Dan Black, Vic Lewis, Bernard Lee.” [COLEMAN, p. 345] Weiss became partners with Epstein in a company called Nemperor Artists. Another Beatle-based company (called Stramsact in London and Seltaeb in America) was formed, in conjunction with Epstein’s lawyer, David Jacobs, to merchandise everything from Beatles chewing gum to wallpaper. Jacobs funneled considerable Beatles business in America to famous Los Angeles Jewish lawyer Marvin Mitchelson. [JENKINS, p. 85]

David Jacobs, note Peter Brown and Steven Gaines,

“adored the young Brian Epstein and took him under his wing. The two men were similar in many coincidental ways. Their families were both in the furniture business, both were born and bred of money, and both had doting Jewish mothers. Both were homosexual. David Jacobs became Brian’s chief solicitor. From then on, all legal decisions and contracts would be made with David Jacobs’ advice.” [BROWN/GAINES, 1983, p. 122]

Victor Lewis, also Jewish, was the Managing Director of yet another Epstein company, NEMS Enterprises. The Beatles had a 10% interest in this company that was based on their profitability; Epstein and his brother held the other 90%. [COLEMAN, p. 305] As Decca writer Tony Barrow once noted, “As for hiring of staff, what John Lennon said to me upon our introduction – ‘if you’re not queer and you’re not Jewish, why are you joining NEMS?’ – proved to be pretty accurate. They weren’t all Jewish, but that was the ideal combination of the two things that were most close to [Epstein] or his family’s heart.” [COLEMAN, p. 178] Nemperor Holdings (formerly NEMS) was eventually sold to Jewish businessman Leonard Richenberg of Triumph Trust. “Trust became a 90 percent holder of Nemperor … The Beatles were stunned that they had lost Nemperor.” After various legal threats, they managed to reacquire it). [BROWN/GAINES, 1983, p. 322]

The aforementioned Jewish businessman, Dick James, controlled the Beatles’ publishing licenses and was their publisher at Northern Songs. James, note Peter Brown and Steven Gaines,

“became the for the Beatles a symbol of the music business. He was a balding Jewish ‘uncle’ to the boys, a man with a big cigar and a sly smile, who taught John and Paul one of the biggest lessons of their lives … John and Paul would form a songwriting partnership called Northern Songs … Dick James, in return for his responsibilities as a music publisher, would get 50 percent of the earnings. In literal terms Brian [Epstein] signed over to Dick James 50 percent of Lennon and McCartney’s publishing fees for nothing. It made him wealthy beyond imagination in eighteen months.” [BROWN/GAINES, 1983, p. 186]
Chet Flippo notes the context of Epstein’s death (an overdose of sleeping pills):

“There were immediate rumors then, just as there are rumors now, that Brian Epstein was murdered as the end result of one or another of the many business deals that he had cut regarding the Beatles. There were so many murky deals, involving so many people and so much money, that it could even have been a deal that he failed to do that might have resulted in such rumors of vendetta and revenge. Subsequent court hearings over the years have showed that the Beatles were probably – there is no information for this kind of data – the most underpaid superstar performers ever. Given their worldwide acclaim and the millions of records they sold, one would have imagined that they were millionaires many times over. That was hardly the case … As Paul [McCartney] especially had started to try to dig into the Beatles business books, which they had never even thought to do during the Fab Beatlemania years, suspicions of Brian had started bubbling to the surface.” [FLIPPO, C., 1988, pl. 244]

Also after Epstein’s death, in 1969 James sold the rights to the Beatles songs from under them. “It was the single most contentious deal arising from the Epstein-James era,” says Coleman. “The Beatles were angry at what they regarded as betrayal.” [COLEMAN, p. 306] Marc Elliot notes that James sold “his interest in Northern Songs to the notorious [British Jewish media mogul] Lew Grade, known in the film industry as Low Grade.” [ELLIOT, p. 158] Epstein also had “good communication” with Grade’s brother, Bernard Delfont, “one of the czars of London show business.” [COLEMAN, p. 245-246]

Epstein also managed the career of singer Cilia Black. “After Cilia’s performance [in New York City],” notes Brown and Gaines,

“Brian threw a party for her in a hotel suite upstairs. The party was crowded with press and New York show business personalities when some woman within Brian’s earshot remarked that the lobby of the Plaza Hotel looked ‘Jewish.’ Brian flew into a wild rage. The party came to a halt around him as he screamed, ‘Madame, I happen to be Jewish!’… It was a small miracle the incident didn’t find its way into the press.” [BROWN/GAINES, 1983, p. 183]

Moving in the circles of rich and powerful, notes Coleman, “Brian had struck up a particularly warm rapport in London with Bernice Kinn, wife of the owner of the New Musical Express. An ebullient, intuitive Jew, she and her husband Maurice formed part of the core of London’s 1960s show business hosts and party goers.” [COLEMAN, p. 245-246] Another of Epstein’s “close friends” was Lionel Bart (Beglieter), the Jewish song writer for many of pop star Cliff Richard’s songs, and originator of the musical score for the musical play, Oliver! [PRESS ASSOCIATION NEWSFILE, 4-3-99]

The Beatles’ “official photographer” during their peak years (1962-67) was Jewish – Dezo Hoffman. Paul McCartney’s wife Linda (Eastman – originally Epstein) was also Jewish. [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 77, 172] Eastman’s father also
became active in legal squabbles between the Beatles, especially between McCartney and Lennon. McCartney’s lawyer in this contentious era, Charles Corman, was an Orthodox Jew. [BROWN/GAINES, 1983, p. 333] The producers of the Beatles first movie, *A Hard Day’s Night*, were Walter Shenson and Bud Orenstein. Richard Lester directed the movie. Famous Jewish singer Bob Dylan (Robert Zimmerman) introduced the Beatles to marijuana the first time he met them, a gathering arranged by music writer Al Aronowitz. [BROWN/GAINES, 1983, p. 150]

After John Lennon’s death, another Jewish agent, Elliot Mintz, has been for years Yoko Ono’s publicist (he has also worked as a public relations man for Bob Dylan, and other capacities with pop singers throughout the years). Immediately after Lennon’s assassination, an employee, Fred Seaman, and his “old college roommate,” “psychiatrist and New York diamond dealer” Bob Rosen, set up a network (termed “Project Walrus”) to market Lennon’s stolen journals and other memorabilia. [MINTZ, 1991]

One of the most famous popular music producers of the 1960s – Phil Spector – was also Jewish. Spector was renowned for his strange temperament and a music style described as a “wall of sound.” “Philip was a very strange person,” remarked pop singer Sonny Bono, “He always had a tough time staying rational, a real tough time.” [WADE, p. 100] Spector also founded Phillips Records with partner Lester Sil. “The most famous pop producer [Spector] of them all,” noted the *Los Angeles Times* in 1988,

“was a bigger superstar than any singers among his bullpen he kept on hand to belt out wonderfully disposable ditty after ditty – and he kept it that way by issuing most of the singles under the name of some generic group, not the actual lead singer.” [WILLMAN, C., 10-11-88, CALENDAR, p. 10]

Another top Jewish manager, Allen Klein – starting out with clients like Steve Lawrence and Eydie Gorme (both Jewish), Bobby Darin, and Sam Cooke – eventually owned the Cameo Parkway company, managing many of the biggest British musical acts of the 1960s, including the Rolling Stones (whose early agent was Sandy Lieberson), the Yardbirds, the Kinks, the Animals, and Donovan. Eventually, upon Brian Epstein’s death, Klein even managed the Beatles’ Apple company. “Klein was a New York accountant,” notes Mark Hertsgaard, “whose foulmouthed personality and street-fighter instincts masked a razor-sharp financial mind but helped explain his propensity for attracting lawsuits and tax fraud accusations.” [HERTSGAARD, p. 287] “At the peak of his career,” says Phillip Norman, “his company was involved in fifty lawsuits,” [NORMAN, p. 184] including one with the Beatles. The Rolling Stones once sued Klein for $29 million. [SANDFORD, p. 164]

Christopher Sandford notes that

“By midsummer [Rolling Stones singer Mick] Jagger was unable to mention his manager’s name [Klein] calmly. Later he gave an interview in which he stated, ‘Half the money I’ve made has been stolen. Most artists in show business suffer the same kind of thing… It’s all the hangers-
on and parasites. There are very few honest people in the profession.”
[SANDFORD, p. 139]

Klein had this interchange with a *Playboy* interviewer in 1971:
“Q: Would you lie?
A: Oh, sure.
Q: Would you steal?
A: Probably. Look. You have to survive. Whatever it takes … It’s a game
for Chrissakes and winning is everything.” [GARFIELD, p. 257]

Another legendary Jewish manager, Albert Grossman, was “probably the
best-known, most successful, and aggressive artist’s manager in the music busi-
ness.” [SCADUTO, p. 105] He ran the careers of Bob Dylan, Janis Joplin, Jimi
Hendrix, and many other top musical artists. (When Grossman’s business
manager, Dick Asher, signed Joplin to a contract, he never forgot what she said
to him: “I hope you didn’t fuck us too much.” [DANNEN, p. 76] The early
booking agent for Joplin’s Big Brother and the Holding Company band was
Todd Schiffman; its manager was Julius Karpen.

Bob Dylan was also signed to a song-licensing deal by Lou Levy, and later
Early in songwriter’s career, “when a girlfriend’s mother challenged his lies and
said she thought Zimmerman was his real name, he called her an anti-Semite,
as if a mere description of the truth was bigotry.” [RUBIN, p. 94] Dylan, who
early in his career hid his Jewish past and made up various lies (he was from
Oklahoma, etc.) about his background, nonetheless joined the Jewish fraternity
house at the University of Minnesota in 1959, Sigma Alpha Mu. [SCADUTO,
p. 26] After becoming rich and famous singing about social justice, in the
1980s, “Dylantologist” A. J. Weberman declared that the famous singer “is an
ultra-Zionist. He is doing the tour to raise money for Israel. He has given large
sums of money to Israel in the name of Abraham Zimmerman.” [SPITZ, p. 430]
*Newsweek* and *Time* each reported that Dylan had indeed donated sums to the
Jewish state, and even the far right-wing Jewish Defense League. [SPITZ,
p. 407] A biographer, Anthony Scaduto, noted earlier, in 1971,

“At this writing, Dylan’s search for personal salvation seems to be
coming around full circle, back to the religion of his fathers. Bob has
started to study Judaism, and Hebrew. Dylan, who gets so Gemini-en-
thused about everything, has made several trips to Israel in the last year
to ‘sniff the breeze’ as his friends put it. He has reportedly donated some
of his funds to help support at least one kibbutz there. Folksinger Theo
Bikel [also Jewish, and a Zionist activist] adds: ‘Dylan has told me that
Israel appears to be one of the few places left in the world where life has
any meaning.’ He has even attended several meetings of the militant
Jewish Defense League. The JDL’s head, Meir Kahane, [charged by
many, including Jews, as a racist and fascist] will say only that Dylan has
‘come around a couple times to see what we’re all about’ and has prom-
ised to donate money to the organization. Dylan refuses to discuss it.”
[SCADTO, p. 274]
By 1977, the biggest rock concert promoters were San Francisco-based Bill Graham (a Jewish Holocaust survivor originally named Wolfgang Wolodia Granjanka, the owner of the famous hippie Fillmore Ballroom who had named his own northern California estate after the mythic Israelite fortress, Masada), Concerts West, Concert Associates, Chicago’s Frank Fried, and in New York, Ron Delsener and Howard Stein. [CHAPPLE, p. 152] In 1976, Howard Stein (whose “father, Jack ‘Ruby’ Stein, had been a loan shark, … ended up floating down the Hudson, sans head”) [HADEN-GUEST., 1997, p. 66] noted that the field of his endeavors in musical concert production had a “territorial overtone”:

“It’s hard for a major concert producer to get started in New York City and do battle with Delsener and myself. It’s equally difficult for a major concert producer to establish himself against Frank Fried and myself in Chicago. In Miami, I virtually don’t consider myself as having any real competition. In Atlanta, minor competition. In Texas, some competition. In New York there are three: Delsener, myself, and Jerry Weintraub. Bill Graham on the West coast … The power of an impresario or a concert producer is through associations. It’s very political. It’s very personal. It’s building reciprocal relationships.” [LEVINE, F. p. 262]

Jon Fischel at Billboard magazine named Jerry Weintraub and Bill Graham (sometimes described as the “Godfather of Rock and Roll”) as the “most powerful men in the [rock concert] business” in their era. [LEVINE, p. 275] “As Bill Graham became increasingly successful and achieved celebrity status in San Francisco,” says John Glatt, “he faced a growing hostility from many people who saw him as a capitalist pig growing rich on the backs of the Love Generation.” [GLATT, p. 61]

By the 1970s, lawyer Allan Grubman (whose partner was Arthur Indursky) became “the biggest music attorney in the history of rock and roll.” [DANNEN, p. 144] Irving Azoff, “one of the most loathed men in the movie business,” eventually headed the Front Line management firm, “the top management firm in rock and roll.” [DANNEN, p. 134] Top man at Front Line after Azoff? Howard Kaufman. [KING, T., 2000, p. 436] Azoff, short in stature, is known by enemies in the Hollywood world as the “Poison Dwarf.” Azoff’s acts included the Eagles, Boz Scaggs, Dan Fogelberg, Steely Dan, REO Speedwagon, Joe Walsh, and many others. Azoff eventually headed MCA, and later Giant Records. When he was president of MCA, three of four vice-presidents were also Jewish: Myron Roth, Zach Horowitz, and Larry Solters. [KNOEDELSED-ER, p. 26] The Leber-Krebs agency became “one of the biggest management companies in rock”; their acts included Aerosmith and Ted Nugent. Dan Wein- er founded the rock talent agency, Monterey Peninsula Associates. John and David Handleman (the Handleman Company) eventually became the largest rock and roll “jobbers” (distributors) in the United States; in 1991 they bought out their largest rival, also Jewish-founded – Lieberman Enterprises. [HULL, p. 181] “Almost every time you buy an LP, cassette, compact disc or book at K mart,” says Tim Kiska, “you’re putting a few dimes in the Handleman family fortune.” [KISKA, p. 91]
Lou Adler (formerly teamed with fellow-Jewish mogul Herb Alpert) was the backbone producer of the influential Monterey Pop Festival and head of the Ode record label. (Alpert and another Jewish partner, Jerry Moss, also founded A&M Records). The Monterey festival was originally conceived by Benny Shapiro and Alan Pariser who sold the project to Adler and Michelle Phillips. [HOSKYNS, 1996, p. 142] Ray Manarek remembers when he and the rest of the Doors rock group went (before they became famous) to Adler’s office, hoping he would sign them to a recording contract:

“He rejected the whole demo. Ten seconds on each song … and we were dismissed out of hand. Just like that. He took the demo off the turntable and handed it back to me with an obsequious smile and said, ‘Nothing here I can use.’ We were shocked. We stood up, the three of us, and [lead singer] Jim [Morrison], with a wry and knowing smile on his lips, cuttingly and coolly shot back at him, ‘That’s okay, man. We don’t want to be used, anyway.’” [MANZAREK, R., 1998, p. 153]

The landmark 1969 Woodstock Musical Festival was the entrepreneurial investment of four young Jews: Joel Rosenman, John Roberts (heir to a pharmaceutical fortune), Artie Kornfeld, and Michael Lang. The person hired to pull the whole project together was Stanley Goldstein. Mel Laurence (born Melvin Bernard Lachs) was also the Director of Operations for the festival creators, Woodstock Ventures. Bert Cohen, of Concert Hall Publications, soon joined the production team for various tasks. [SPITZ, 1979] The first employee of Woodstock ventures was Rene Levine, a bookkeeper and another Jew, Alex Jaffee, was the company’s accountant. In a book chapter called “Buying Off the Underground,” Joel Rosenman recalls when he and others of the Woodstock Ventures investment team went to Greenwich Village’s East Village Other “counterculture” newspaper to buy them off, guaranteeing that prominent members of that anti-capitalist community wouldn’t cause problems with the economic exploitation of the supposedly anti-materialist Love Generation. Famed radical (and Jewish) agitator Abbie Hoffman demanded $10,000 from Woodstock Ventures, “or else that fucking festival you guys are planning is gonna end up around your ass.” [ROSENMAN/ROBERTS/PILPEL, p. 102]

Others involved in the Woodstock project included Judi Bernstein (business manager for the sound company that handled the festival; she later became executive director of Boston’s Zionist Hadassah Organization) and her husband Harold Cohen; Lee Blumer (Assistant to the Director of Security); Steve Cohen (who was “largely responsible for designing and building the Woodstock stage”); Len Kaufman (who “headed the ‘elite black shirt’ security force”); and Rona Elliot (who worked in Woodstock Ventures public relations and later became the music correspondent for NBC’s Today show). Many of the Woodstock musical artists were even boarded at the famous Jewish resort hotel in the Catskill Mountains, Grossinger’s. Even Max Yasgur, the dairy farmer whose land was used for the festival, was Jewish. [JEWHŌO]
One of the four Woodstock festival entrepreneurs, Artie Kornfeld, was vice president of **Capitol Records** (1967-68). He “wrote and produced all the Cow-sills’ stuff.” In later Kornfeld recalled how Woodstock was started:

“My secretary said, ‘There’s a Michael Lang here to see you.’ And I said, ‘Who’s Michael Lang?’ And she said, ‘He says he’s from your old neighborhood.’ And I said, ‘Well, if he’s from the neighborhood, tell him to come in.’ Bensonhurst. It’s a section of Brooklyn that’s all Jewish and Italian. That’s how he got to see me; by saying he was from the neighborhood.” [MAKOWER, p. 25]

The two men shared some marijuana in Kornfeld’s office. Later, discussing the grand idea of a gigantic music festival, Kornfeld notes that much “was basically talked out that night, that first night, probably behind some Colombian blond, which had something to do with it. Overachieving, pseudo-intellectual Jewish kids with an idea that came from outside of us, I believe. It was the culture.” [MAKOWER, p. 27] The two men later paid a visit to join forces with Rosenman and Roberts (later partners in a venture capitalist firm called **J.R. Capital** and Woodstock was born.

The disastrous 1999 Woodstock Festival was also headed by Michael Lang, and John Scher. It ended in rioting, vandalism, injuries, arrests, and sexual crimes. [MORSE, S., 7-27-99] Also in the rock-and-roll entrepreneurial world, “the first Lollapalooza,” notes Neal Karlen, “was held in 1991 as the brainchild of Perry Farrell [born Perry Bernstein], former leader of the defunct Jane’s Addiction. That summer’s eight band line-up drew 430,000 fans, grossed $10 million, and was the surprise smash of the entire [music] industry.” [KARLEN, N., 1994, p. 160]

Another Jewish entrepreneur, Harold Leventhal, promoted folk acts like the Weavers and Woody Guthrie. “Jefferson Airplane was the creation of [their manager] Matthew Katz.” [GLATT, p. 57] Danny Rifkind managed the Grateful Dead. Paul Rothchild produced the Doors (and many other groups); Jac Holzman, head of Elektra, signed them to his record label. [DENSMORE, J., 1990, p. 79] (Todd Schifferman signed them to a talent agency). [KING, T., 2000, pl. 97] Rothchild was so integral to the **Doors** that band member Ray Manzarek calls him “the fifth Door.” [Manzarek, R., 1998, p. 203] Manzarek recalls Elektra owner Jac Holzman’s attitude towards his best-selling group:

“We were all excited at the prospects of breaking the cherry of a brand-new, state-of-the-art [Elektra] recording studio. And we thought it was going to be for free. Hell, Jac Holzman built the damned place with profits from the Doors’ record sales. Everybody called the new Elektra facility on La Cienga ‘the house the Doors built,’ so why shouldn’t we record for free? Besides, it was an in-house studio. It would be for all Elektra artists. Outsiders could hire the studio at the going rates, but Elektra’s own people could record there anytime they wanted and for free. Right? We were excited. Wouldn’t you be? Bullshit! No free time. No freebee recording sessions. Everybody paid. Strangers or family … everybody paid. However, Jac did say … ‘Boys, I’ll tell you what I’m go-
ing to do. For you …’ And you could see the calculator in his head whirling. You could see that he wanted to be generous to us, he was on the West Coast now, he wore love beads, he had grown his hair long, he was not a crass materialist, he was new man who believed in peace and love for all races, religions, creeds, nationalities. But he was also from New York. ‘For you … a ten percent discount!’ I almost snorted in his face. [Lead singer] Jim [Morrison] just spun around on his heels, unable to face Jac.” [MANZAREK, R., 1998, p. 302]

Early in their career the Doors practiced at home of Stu and Marilyn Kreiger in wealthy Pacific Palisades. [MANZAREK, R., 1998, p. 149] This was the home of the parents of Doors guitarist Robby Kreiger, also Jewish. Heiress Naomi Hirshorn literally bought the Byrds their first musical instruments. [CROSBY/GOTTLEIB, p. 86] Terry Melcher (whose father was Jewish) managed both the Byrds and Paul Revere and the Raiders. [WYNN, N., 1990, p. 197] Herb Gart “handled” the Youngbloods. [KING, T., 2000, p. 66] David Kapralik managed Sly and the Family Stone and Barbara Streisand. [SCADUTO, p. 105] Nik Cohn, a music critic for the Manchester Guardian, and later the New York Times, provided Peter Townsend of The Who important criticism in the development of his rock opera “Tommy.” Townsend, notes Larry Smith, had a “willingness to compromise his work for a favorable review from [this] respected journalist/friend.” [SMITH, L., 1999, p. 3] The Beach Boys story eventually centered around key member Brian Wilson’s destructive drug habit and his controlling psychotherapist, Eugene Landy [see elsewhere for the story of Landy’s exploitation of his famous patient, p. 1153]. The band’s road manager was also Jewish, Arnie Geller. At the peak of his success, Wilson also married a 16-year old Jewish girl, Marilyn Rovell. His autobiography was also written by Todd Gold, who was hired by Wilson and his psychotherapist Landy, to create the book (portraying the controversial Landy in an extremely favorable light) from tape-recorded interviews.

Top rock act Creedence Clearwater Revival was effectively destroyed largely by its Jewish overseers. The group signed with Fantasy Records in 1964. In 1967 the company was bought by Jewish entrepreneur Saul Zaentz (he also produced the films One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest and Amadeus). When CCR soon began a string of hit records, the group demanded a royalty increase, per a clause in their contract. Zaentz refused, but led the group to an acquaintance, an unscrupulous (and mob-linked) Jewish lawyer named Bruce Kanter, who developed a complicated scheme to secure the rock group’s earnings in a much lower tax bracket. Kanter shifted much of Creedance’s money into tax dodge companies created in the Bahamas; one such Kanter company was called King David Distributors, and later Sholom (Hebrew for peace) LTD. [BLOCK, A., p. 268-269]

As Alan Block notes:

“Over the years the Creedance Clearwater Revival repatriated much of their Castle [another Kanter-related firm] money by borrowing it from companies they actually owned, or thought they controlled, under Kanter’s plan. Nevertheless, when Castle went bust it took $4 million of
the group’s and [leader singer/writer] John Fogerty’s money. Before that happened John Fogerty desperately tried to extricate himself from Castle and the Kanter grasp … Fogerty was particularly angry with Saul Zaentz because he held him responsible for bringing the group into the Kanter scheme.” [BLOCK, p. 271]

In the mess, Fogerty also lost the rights to every song he wrote with the band. [BLOCK, A., p. 271] In 1983, the group won a lawsuit of $1.5 million against Kanter for his part in the Creedance problems. The next year, recording again, Fogerty lyrics in his Centerfield album included obvious references to Zaentz that could certainly infer anti-Semitic overtones. He was described as a “little pig” who is “silent and quick / just like Oliver Twist.” [BLOCK, A., p. 272-273]

African-American singing superstar Diana Ross, originally of the Supremes, married a Jewish Hollywood public relations agent, Robert Silberstein, in 1971. J. Randy Taraborrelli, in his biography of Ross, suggests careerist dimensions to the marriage:

“Why Diana Ross decided to marry Bob Silberstein remains a mystery today. If the two of them were in love, it was the best kept secret in Hollywood … Bob Silberstein was both white and Jewish. Diana’s appearance and singing style were meant to appeal to Caucasians, so a white husband would certainly not hurt her image – in fact, it would enhance it – and Jewish men were perceived to be shrewd and intelligent.” [TARABORRELLI, p. 249]

(African-American singer-actress star Diahann Carroll’s first two husbands were also Jewish: Monte Kay (owner of the Birdland jazz nightclub), and Freddie Glusman, head of a Las Vegas dress shop. The second marriage collapsed after Glusman beat her).

Harvey Goldsmith is the manager of rock star Elton John, among others. He is recognized as “the best known rock promoter in England.” [GRAHAM/GREENFIELD, p. 551] Doug Goldstein manages Guns ‘n Roses. (Jerry Heller and Samuel Frankel manage Guns ‘n Roses guitarist Slash. [SNYDER, N., 2-19-01] Steven Levine produced Culture Club. Jerry Meyer “became one of the top independent record promoters in the country. He was part of an informal group of about 10 promoters known at the Network, which dominated airplay on Top 40 radio during the ‘70s and ‘80s. The Network had the power to make or break records … [Meyer] loves music, which next to his Jewish faith, has been the constant of his life.” [VIOLANTI, p. 8M]

Rock superstar Bruce Springsteen fell under the control of two agents of Jewish heritage, first

“the tutelage of sharpie Mark Appel, who simultaneously managed him, ran the production company through which his contracts were signed, and owned his publishing…. [Springsteen] managed to escape … Appel through a series of lawsuits prompted by rock critic/social climber Jon Landau. Landau ran Rolling Stone’s record review section even as he worked as a producer for major record labels … Landau came
out the other end Springsteen’s manager, producer, and best friend and confidant.” [DOHERTY, p. 54]

Reviewer Brian Doherty noted Landau’s portrayal in a rock and roll history book as “an unethical, anti-art, money-grubbing climber.” [DOHERTY, p. 54]

Elsewhere, Dick Friedberg was a partner at the Premier rock and roll management service. Gil Freisen became the president of A&M Records (Janet Jackson, Sting, *et al*). Herb Abrahamson was a cofounder of Atlantic Records. Norman Granz owned Verve. Jac Holzman founded Elektra Records with “$600 of bar *mitzvah* money.” (President of Elektra? Mel Posner. [KING, T., 2000, p. 245] Simon Waronker and cousin Herb Newman founded Liberty Records in 1955 (*Ricky Nelson*, Jan and Dean, Bobby Vee, Fats Domino, Johnny Rivers, the Ventures, *et al*). Newman also founded another label, Era. Ted Wallerstein headed RCA records in its formative years. Art Kass, Phil Steinberg, Hy Mizrahi, and Artie Ripp founded the Kama Sutra recording label (financed in part by a known mobster, [WADE, p. 118] and later Buddah. Buddah producers Jerry Kasentz and Jeff Katz helped develop the trivial genre of “bubblegum music,” including the 1910 Fruitgum Company and Ohio Express. Both groups had the same lead singer, Joey Levine. [DANNEN, p. 164] Don Kirshner is credited with the supervision of the quintessential media-illusory artificial band, the Monkees; three of the four band members didn’t even know how to play an instrument. Jewish film moguls Burt Schneider and Bob Rafelson were their creators. Bob Ezrin’s Migration Records features acts like Peter Gabriel, Aerosmith, Lou Reed, Robert Flack, Kiss, *et al*. Trauma Records (owned by Rob Kahane and Paul Palmer) has featured acts like No Doubt, Bush, and basketball star Shaquille O’Neal. Israeli arms dealer and Hollywood mogul Arnon Milchan sought to purchase Trauma in the late 1990s and merge it into his own Restless Records company.

Eventually most of the small record labels were bought out or rendered extinct by large mega-media corporations. “The term ‘oligopoly’ is an apt one to describe today’s record business,” wrote Frederic Dannen in 1990, “Most Americans get nearly all their wares from six suppliers – CBS, Warners [including the labels: Warners, Atlantic, Atco, Elektra, Asylum, Reprise], BMG [the initials of the Bertelsmann Music Group, which includes RCA], Capitol-EMI, PolyGram [including Mercury, Polydor, London, Vertigo, Verve, Wing, A&M, Island, Motown], and MCA [including Decca, ABC-Dunhill, MCA, Geffen, DGC, GRP] … Far out in front there are the big two … A whopping one-third [of the record business] belongs to CBS and Warners … Today CBS and Warners can be viewed as the record industry’s equivalent of the world’s two superpowers.” [DANNEN, p. 112]

For years CBS Records was headed by Walter Yetnikoff. “The heart of Yetnikoff’s persona,” notes Dannen, “was his Brooklyn Jewishness … An outsized number of [record] label bosses were Jews from Brooklyn, but Walter wore his ethnicity like a gabardine … [He] fit well with the record business which was culturally Jewish … The *goyim*. With Walter it was always Us versus Them. When CBS Records had its annual convention in London, Walter forbade his
people to stay at the Dorchester Hotel because it was Arab-owned ... One of Walter’s inconsistencies was that he dated only gentile women, preferring well-endowed blondes. Before his twenty-five marriage broke up in the early eighties, he had already begun to amass a stable of such girlfriends – his ‘shiksa farm.’” [DANNEN, p. 23] Yentnikoff was a “close friend” of record industry mobster Morris Levy, as was Sheldon Levy, another president of CBS Records. “Walter grew fond of Morris,” says Frederic Dannen, “and spent time at [Morris] Levy’s farm.” [DANNEN, p. 34]

(To rock star Sting’s credit, in 2001 he resisted unspecified “media” pressures to censor an Arab out of one of his songs. As the Associated Press noted, “Sting told the [Arab American Institute Foundation] that some people in the media had advised him not to put out his duet with Algerian vocalist Cheb Mami as a singer, ‘because of the Arab guy singing at the front. ‘They said, ‘If you take him out, we’ll play it on the radio.’ I said, ‘No can do. It’s an integral part of the song.’ His remarks drew cheers from Arab Americans across the ballroom.”) [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 5-2-01]

Bertelsmann Music Group (BMG) is a giant German-based entertainment conglomerate. The president and CEO of BMG Entertainment North America, since 1994, has been the Jewish executive Strauss Zelnick, formerly the president of Twentieth Century Fox. From this position he oversees “the operations of all North American divisions of Bertelsmann Music Group as well as Music Publishing and Interactive Entertainment operations worldwide.” [BUSINESS WIRE, 9-13-94] The division Zelnick heads accounts for over $4 billion in yearly sales. In 2001 another Jewish executive, Joel Klein, was named chairman and CEO of the U.S. operations of Bertelsmann AG. For years, another Jewish head, Clive Davis, has overseen the important Arista record division in BMG’s stable. In 1998, another executive at BMG (both a German convert to Judaism, and a rabbi) quit to become the director of Germany’s chapter of the environmental Greenpeace organization.

In 1997, Frank Woessner, the non-Jewish CEO of Bertelsmann’s giant book division, was awarded the (Jewish fraternal organization) B’nai B’rith of Continental Europe’s “Gold Medal for Humanitarian Work.” “Woessner,” noted the Jewish Week, “was lauded for supporting liberal Jewish causes in speeches by prominent members of the local Jewish community.” [AXELROD, p. 41] Among the most important of his “humanitarian work” was the publication of Jewish American author Daniel Goldhagen’s controversial work that affixed blame upon all Germans for the Holocaust (not just Nazis).

In 1998, the Jewish Bronfman family’s Seagrams firm (which already owned MCA) bought PolyGram NV – “the world’s largest music company” – for $10.5 billion. The International Herald Tribune noted that:

“The transaction would be the biggest in the history of the entertainment industry, eclipsed only by Walt Disney’s $18.9 billion purchase of Capital Cities/ABC Inc. and the $11 billion merger of Time and Warner Communications that created Time Warner Inc.” [INTERNATIONAL HERALD, p. 15]
The Polygram-MCA amalgamation now under the combined rule of Edgar Bronfman made him, at age 43, “the most powerful mogul in music land,” with a quarter of all world record sales on earth,” including the largest output of classics and jazz. [LEBRECHT, p. 25] Polygram alone, in the Bronfman empire, also owns over 320,000 song copyrights. Among its labels are A&M, Mercury, Decca/London, Phillips Classics, and Island. [HOOVER, p. 138] Worldwide, Polygram-MCA holdings include the Finnish Sonet Media AB company, Japan’s Nippon Phonogram, Polydor KK, and Rodven Records, “the leading independent record company in Latin America.” [HOOVER, p. 138] Prominent musical acts in the Polygram stable have included U2, Sting, Lionel Richie, Soundgarden, Kiss, the Village People, Janet Jackson and numerous others. MTV-like TV station projects include Atomic TV in Warsaw, Poland and (in association with MTV) 2 MTV in Asia.

Charles Koppelman was founder of the SBK record label, which recorded “white rapper” Vanilla Ice, and Wilson Phillips among others. Through the mid-1990s he was chairman of EMI Group North America, later founding a company called CAK Univeral Credits, geared to music stars looking for loans. In 2000, Monte Lipman, co-founder of Republic Records, was named president of Universal Records (part of the Bronfman empire), which had bought out the former company. And, in the same year, as the Cleveland Jewish News noted,

“Instead of forming on their own, megapop bands like Backstreet Boys and ‘N Sync are the manufactured creations of Transcontinental Records mogul Lou Pearlman, where inspired grooming and marketing has shepherded a number of record boy-groups to stardom.” [HOROWITZ, G., 3-24-2000, p. 37]

(In 2000, ‘N Sync played at young Rachel Colburn’s private Bat Mitzvah party. She is the daughter of American Online’s President of Business Affairs, David Colburn. “AOL spokeswoman Wendy Goldberg said the band has a relationship with Colburn, and they did the gig as a favor.” Such a performance by the singing group normally costs between $250,000 and a million dollars.) [DESERET NEWS, 6-8-2000, p. A2]

In the music executive scene, at Warners, for example, for years Mo Ostin headed the music company. “Warners,” notes Neal Karlen, in his book about the all-female band Babes in Toyland, “was run by Mo Ostin and Lenny Waronker; the company’s entire A&R department was headed by Mo’s son Michael. If [A&R man Tim] Carr could get his way, the Babes’ campaign would be largely orchestrated from Warner Records’ Burbank headquarters by a half-dozen Jewish music men ... Traveling the spectrum of popular music, one could still occasionally hear the word Jew used as an epithet. If one listened, one could catch bands talking of being ‘Jewed down’ by a record company executive or having to hire a ‘Jew lawyer’ to fix a thorny legal hassle. The attitude was no different in the shrunken universe of alternative music. True, three of punk rock’s spiritual godfathers were Jewish: Bob Dylan, né Robert Zimmerman, Lou Reed, né Louis Firbank; and Joey Ramone, né Jeffrey Hyman. Yet signing with
a major label, one drunk English guitarist could be heard saying late one night in 1992 at the historic New York punk club CBGB, meant turning oneself into ‘Jew-bait.’” [KARLEN, N., 1994, p. 145].

At Sire Records, an affiliate of Warners, Seymour Stein’s artist stable has included Madonna, Talking Heads, the Ramones, and many other premiere talents. “Before long,” says Christopher Anderson, “[producer Mark] Kamins and Madonna became lovers … After a few days together, Madonna felt comfortable enough to spring her tape on Kamins … He had become friendly with an up-and-coming artist and repertoire man at Warner’s Sire label named Michael Rosenblatt … Rosenblatt took the tape to the mercurial [Seymour] Stein.” Madonna also got her start in movies in Susan Seidelman’s Desperately Seeking Susan. [ANDERSON, 1991, p. 96-98, 121] Guy Oseary, born in Jerusalem, is “a partner in Madonna’s Maverick Records” and he wrote a book called Jews Who Rock, about Jewish performers in the rock and roll world. “I keep getting calls,” he says, “And they say, ‘Why wasn’t I in your book? I rock. And I’m Jewish.’” [BOUCHER, G., 4-17-01, p. 62; TAYLOR, L., 12-27-00, p. F5] Oseary “as Maverick’s chief talent finder has become one of Madonna’s most trusted confidants.” [FURMAN, P., 6-17-98, p. 12]

When Bob Krasnow became the head of Elektra, “it was, he says, his ethnic credentials more than anything else, that got him the job.” [WADE, p. 58] “I could work for a big company like Warner Brothers [which swallowed Elektra],” said Krasnow, “because I had all the ethnic qualities – I was white, I was Jewish, they could invite me over to their home for dinner, and I could talk to Black people.” [WADE, p. 58]

Jerry Wexler was the co-founder of Atlantic. When the head of CBS Records, Clive Davis, was fired for embezzling $94,000 (including $18,000 for his son’s bar mitzvah) [DANNEN, p. 86], he was replaced by Irwin Segelstein. Dick Asher, also Jewish “was the number two man at Columbia Records” under Clive Davis.” [KING, T., 2000, p. 143] (“Since the days of Abraham,” notes the Jewish Forward, “machers in the entertainment business have used their sons’ and daughters’ special day to power-schmooze fellow moguls. In 1973, Clive Davis, then president of CBS Records, threw one of the most famous bar mitzvahs in show business history (that he was fired for it only adds to its mystique.”) [DORFMAN, J., 6-16-2000, p. 2] Davis later ended up as the head of Bell Records under Columbia Pictures president Alan Hirschfield. (Davis later had a successful career heading Arista Records, whose artists included Whitney Houston and the Grateful Dead. Davis’ business manager at CBS was Michael Levy; Goddard Lieberman was CBS Records’ second in command; Lieberman’s assistant was Norman Adler. Al Shulman was head of the CBS Special Products Division and Dick Asher was CBS Records’ Executive Vice President. Ron Alexenburg was a vice president for promotion at Columbia. Elliott Goldman was the number two man at Arista Records; Mitch Miller was a prominent producer and musical celebrity at CBS.

By 1998 Jay Boborg – co-founder of IRS Records in 1979 which began the careers of the Go-Gos, R.E.M., and others – was the president of MCA Records.
Jerry Greenberg, former head of Atlantic Records, “is now [in 1998, superstar] Michael Jackson’s right hand man and president of MJJ Records.” [VIOLANTI, p. 8M] (Jackson was the best man for Israeli psychic Uri Geller’s wedding. Geller’s drawing – minus a Star of David – graces a recent Jackson album). [REUTERS, 11-1-01] Alain Levy is chairman (1998) of PolyGram. In 1997 Danny Goldberg, chairman of Mercury Records, was described by the Jewish Week as being “among the most powerful executives in the entertainment industry.” [GREENBERG, E., MUST, p. 49] Among the divisions he directs is Motown Records and PolyGram Classics and Jazz in the United States. Goldberg was also formerly the president of Atlantic Records where he controlled, among other groups, Nirvana. By 1995 he was the chairman and CEO of Warner Records, but lost the position during the controversy over Warners’ support of particularly abrasive “gangsta rap” recordings. Goldberg is also a former chairman of the executive committee of the American Jewish Congress.

In 1987 Goldberg (then manager of Bonnie Raitt, Belinda Carlyle of the Go-Go’s, Don Johnson, and others) organized a record industry-wide propaganda effort for the state of Israel. As the Los Angeles Times described it:

“Israel’s Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, in an unprecedented appearance before a group of recording industry executives, personal managers, agents and lawyers, told them that rock music was ‘like praying’ to some Israeli youth and exhorted them to ‘come ‘pray’ with our young people so they will celebrate our [Israeli] 40th anniversary’ in 1988. The reception/brunch at the Beverly Hills Hotel on Sunday was organized by rock entrepreneur Danny Goldberg, the president [then] of Gold Mountain Records … The 100-plus guests represented a cross-section of the music industry, with strong ties to musical talents. Among them: Irving Azoff, president of MCA’s Entertainment Group; A&M Records vice-president Jeff Gold; and personal managers Fred DeMann (Madonna, Lionel Richie), Mike Gormley (The Bangles, Oingo Bonggo), and Michael Lippman (George Michael).” [CAULFIELD, D., 9-29-87, p. 6]

Goldberg told the Times that

“We talked about the fact that Israel needs to establish an identity with younger people. They’re currently only aware of the country as an item on the nightly news. In the 1950s, an alliance was formed between Israel and what used to be the heart of show business. I mean, Frank Sinatra and Elizabeth Taylor were associated with Israel, but that leaves out the people who grew up after them.” [CAULFIELD, D., 9-29-87, p. 6]

The brunch was sponsored by the CRB Foundation, founded by Jewish mogul Charles Bronfman “to create a mutual exchange between Israel and the rest of the world.” The Israeli Foreign Minister, Peres, noted the Times, received “a standing ovation when he arrived.” [CAULFIELD, D., 9-29-87, p. 6]

In England, Michael Levy headed Magnet Records, built to power with help in 1972 from the then head of (British) Columbia Records, Maurice Oberstein. Levy, known for “chasing people around the office and throwing ashtrays,” is also
chairman of Britain’s Jewish Care organization. [BRIGHT, p. T2] Levy “made his personal fortune propelling pop acts – Alvin Stardust, Chris Rea, Darts and Bad Manners – to stardom.” [DAVIS, D., 2-10-2000, p. 5] “At one point [he] was selling 8% of all records in the UK.” [RED STAR RESEARCH] In 1991 British producer Ian Levine began recording old Black Motown record label acts for his new Motorcity label. Levine gathered over 100 former stars to Detroit. “I was in control of the entire Motown family,” he chortled, “[I brought] it back together again, and the press and the fans were standing there in awe.” [BULL, p. 14]

Perhaps the most famous agent/manager/record executive is David Geffen (also Jewish), former manager of Crosby Stills Nash and Young, and many others, who founded Asylum, and later, Geffen Records (the artist stable included Jackson Browne, the Eagles, Joni Mitchell, Linda Ronstadt, and many others). (Alan Cohen “structured the Asylum Records joint venture buyout [with Warner and] left Warner to become head of Madison Square Garden”). [KING, T., 2000, p. 287] Dennis McDougal notes that Geffen “spotted Aerosmith, XTC, Nirvana, and dozens of other pop acts in their infancy and nurtured them to monied maturity and more than fifty gold record albums … In 1989 alone, Geffen worldwide record sales came to over $225 million.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 474] A key Geffen partner was Elliot Roberts (Rabinowitz) – he was the “pre-eminent manager of L.A.-based folk rock in the seventies,” including, even later, Neil Young and Tracy Chapman. [GRAHAM/GREENFIELD, p. 553] The president of Geffen Records was Eddie Rosenblatt. Geffen’s business manager was Jerry Rubenstein. Gil Segel helped to get him into real estate. [KING, T., 2000, p. 160, 184] “The funny thing,” says Geffen, “is that I had to forge a letter that I graduated from UCLA [to get an early job], and today I’m on the Board of Regents of UCLA.” [SMITH, p. 303] (“He used his friendship with [his client] Linda Ronstadt, who was then dating California governor Jerry Brown, to obtain a seat on the University board of regents.”) [KING, T., 2000, p. 316]

Jews even came to prominence behind the scenes in the world of country music. The first important Jewish figure in Nashville was Paul Cohen, the A&R man for Decca in 1945-58 (the Decca company in the United States was founded in Chicago by Jack Kapp in 1934). Cohen, who lived in New York and visited Nashville for a few weeks at a time, was “called by some ‘the King of Nashville.’” [JONES, M., p. 73] Margaret Jones notes that

“As head of A&R for Decca’s country division, Cohen was responsible for a blue chip roster of talent that included the top acts of the time: Ernest Tubb, Red Foley and Webb Pierce … In 1952, Cohen signed the one and only female star of country to Decca, Kitty Wells, and by 1954 he had two other solo girl performers under contract: Goldie Hill and Wanda Jackson … After Cohen signed Webb Pierce, Pierce became the hottest artist in country … [JONES, M., p. 74] … Nashville was Cohen’s ‘fishing hole,’ and he galvanized the town, convincing Ernest Tubb to record there; soon all the other acts fell into line.” [JONES, M., p. 73]

“Paul was one of the first Jewish guys who actually came in to Nashville, once they saw country music was getting to doing something,” recalled singer
Faron Young. “Before that, most of the country people wouldn’t accept Jewish people. They were too clannish about that. He more or less broke the ice, then the rest of them came in and more or less took over this business. Hell, they own all the labels and everything else now. Them and the Japs.” [JONES, M. p. 73]

Cohen also signed Brenda Lee and eventual country superstar Patsy Cline, among others, to his stable. “Cohen was a wheeler-dealer in many respects,” notes Margaret Jones, “He started a dozen or more publishing companies of his own – all named after brands of whisky. Then he had the chutzpah to open his office two blocks away from Decca, so he would be operating right under their noses.” [JONES, M., p. 71] When Cohen’s career was finished in Nashville, another Jewish Decca agent, Milton Gabler, “took over for him.” [JONES, M., p. 73]

Among his finds, Gabler signed Bill Haley and His Comets in 1954. (Irvin Feld is also credited with “discovering” Bill Haley, as well as Paul Anka, the Everly Brothers, and Fats Domino, among others). [BLACKWELL, E., 1973, p. 164] In this same genre, years later, country star Waylon Jennings recalled that his big break in Hollywood came through Jewish producer and musician Herb Alpert.

The Atlanta Jewish Times notes the story of the birth of another country star, Willie Nelson:

“[Jewish agent Joel Katz] received a phone call from a man with a distinct Texas drawl. The man said he had read about the contract Katz had negotiated for [Black pop star] James Brown. He didn’t have money, but he wanted Katz to make him a star. Katz hopped on a plane for Austin, Texas, walked into a room at the Ramada Inn, and stared into the eyes of Willie Nelson.” [POLLAK, S., 1-7-00]

Katz has represented a wide range of singers: from country stars Tammy Wynette, Waylon Jennings, and George Straight to African-American artists The Temptations, B. B. King, Stevie Ray Vaughn, Jimmy Buffet, and the rappers Rone Thugs and Harmony.

Finding a niche wherever it is available, by the late 1990s Madeline Stone was even a “leading writer of Christian music,” working with top Christian acts CeCe Wilnan, and the group Anointed. “I see myself,” she explained, “as being a Jewish girl who writes inspirational songs, not a Christian writer.” [DREYFUSS, I., p. Y4] A Reform Jew, Steve Kaufman, is also “the only three-time winner of the National Flatpicking Championship held in Winfield, Kansas.” As the Jerusalem Post notes,

“His 50 books and videos include A Smokey Mountain Christmas for Guitar and Flatpickin’ the Gospels. ‘My mother said ‘Oy,’” he recounted. “I said, “mom, it’s going to sell.” In this business you fill the void. There weren’t many bluegrass gospel videos.’” [ROBINSON, R., 7-24, 2000]

In the “heavy metal” musical world, Jewish entrepreneur Jon Zazula of Crazed Management-Megaforce Records has a stable of acts that includes Method of Destruction (M.O.D.), Anthrax, Ministry, Metallica, and others. Cliff Burstein and Peter Mensch have managed AC/DC, Metallica, Def Leppard, Bruce Hornsby, Queensryche, Tesla, and others. Their Q Prime company also
owns three radio stations in California. Howie Klein founded the “punk” rock label 415.

The “godfather of punk,” manager and “mastermind” of the seminal “punk” band – the Sex Pistols, was Great Britain’s Malcolm McLaren. He was also the manager of the New York Dolls, Adam Ant, and Boy George. According to Sex Pistol lead singer Johnny Rotten, his manager was “the most evil man alive.” [HARRIS, M., 8-19-94, p. 11; SHAW, D., 12-16-99, p. 5] McLaren “was brought up by his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Corre, a formidable woman from a very rich Sephardic Jewish family.” [BARBER, L., 12-22-91, p. 8] The anarchistic Sex Pistols, notes the London Independent, were “brought into being quite cynically by Malcolm McLaren as an advertising gimmick to promote sales of the fetishistic clothes and other devices designed and sold by himself and Vivienne Westwood.” [GRAHAM-DIXON, 8-19-95, p. 2] (The Ramones are also a candidate for the most influential punk band. The head of the Ramones, Joey Ramone – born Jeffrey Hyman – is also Jewish.) [TAYLOR, L., 12-27-00, p. F5]

Joseph Heller, formerly of Heller-Fischel, booked acts like Styx, the Electric Light Orchestra, Boz Scaggs, and a variety of others. “He represented top-drawer rock talent like Van Morrison, the Guess Who, Marvin Gaye, War, Elton John and Pink Floyd.” [SNYDER, N., 2-19-01] Stretching out as dangerously as possible to make a buck, Heller eventually gravitated towards a relative goldmine in the Black ghetto-based “gangsta rap.” He cofounded Ruthless Records and managed the pioneer rap group NWA (Niggaz With Attitude) from early in their careers. The musical genre of gangsta rap, notes Jory Farr, “thrives on misogyny, as well as homophobic and race-baiting rage … [It] was the perfect music for [a] lifestyle loaded down … with warnings of betrayal, murder, revenge, and a short life.” [FARR, p. 70] “I believed that rap would become the most important music of the nineties,” said Heller, “… [But] you can’t sell two million rap records to kids in the inner city. That’s a way to sell 200,000. You have to market it to the white kids.” [FARR, p. 68, 71]

Heller hired Ira Selsky as his corporate attorney and an Israeli-born security chief named Michael Klein to ward off angry, exploited Blacks who quite literally walked into his office threatening to kill him. Rap star Ice Cube even threatened Heller in one of his recorded songs, prompting the Anti-Defamation League to flag it as anti-Semitic. Ruthless Records released a Jewish rap duo called Blood of Abraham. As Chuck D, the lead vocalist for the Black rap group Public Enemy, noted, “There’s no way to get trained on the seamiest elements of the music business being on the street – that element is reserved for boardrooms.” [D, CHUCK, p. 85] Those in Chuck D’s reminiscences about “boardroom” behavior include Lyor Cohen (manager of Rush Productions, and an Israeli); Al Teller, an executive at MCA whose parents died in the Holocaust; Steve Ralbovsky of CBS; Bill Adler (a publicist); and Rick Rubin of Def Jam Records. (Jewish diamond dealer Jacob Arabo has made the news as a favored jewelry merchant to the Black rap crowd that seeks to symbolize wealth and power, or, as the New York Times put it, “the jeweler who gives most of today’s leading rappers their shine.” [CENTURY, p. 1]
In 2001, Heller was named the “Godfather of Latin Rap” by the *Los Angeles Business Journal*; he was joining in attempting to build a rap movement in the Latino market via *Hit a Lick* records. As the *Journal* noted:

“If Heller is convinced that Latin rap will emerge as the next big thing, it probably will be, said other music industry veterans … Indeed, Heller is widely acknowledged as one of the key forces behind gangsta rap’s crossover into the music mainstream … While Heller has the second-tier title of chief operating officer, he acknowledges that the other partners ‘generally run everything by me because of my experience and expertise.’” [Snyder, N., 2-19-01]

By 2001 too, the aforementioned Lyor Cohen had catapulted to power in the Rap world. *Rolling Stone* even magazine featured an article about him, sub-titled *How Lyor Cohen – the White, Jewish Israeli-Raised President of Island Def Jam Records – Became One of the Most Important Men in Hip-Hop, and Why He May Now Become One of the Most Important Men in Rock & Roll.* Cohen started out promoting punk rock acts like the Circle Jerks, Social Distortion, and the Red Hot Chili Peppers. He then became president of the rap music label Def Jam in 1988 and soon had become “perhaps the most powerful white executive in an African-American business.” (Def Jam was bought out by the Jewish-owned Polygram company in 1999). Irv Gott, a Black record producer, notes that Cohen is “a white Jewish guy, but I think everybody respects him like he’s black. He knows how to carry it too. He knows how to get gangster, how to fall back, when to shut the fuck up, when to say something. That’s why other white executives are scared of him. He knows how to deal with the hoods, the criminal element.” Cohen, continued *Rolling Stone*, has broadened his musical base and “oversees an empire that includes hundreds of artists performing in dozens of genres, a roster that features PJ Harvey, American Hi-Fi, Shelby Lynne, Lionel Richie, Bon Jovi, Melissa Etheridge, Saliva, Ludacris, Kelly Price and Sisqó.” Cohen’s nickname is “Little Lansky” (after famed Jewish mobster Meyer Lansky). He was born in New York City “where his father, an Israeli, worked in the consulate.” He was later raised on an avocado farm near Tel Aviv. [Cohen, R., 6-21-01]

Cohen has also been active in trying to readjust Black consciousness of Jewish exploitation of the African-American community. “In the late Eighties,” notes reporter Rich Cohen,

when [Public Enemy’s] album *It Takes a Nation of Millions to Hold Us Back* was topping the charts, the group’s minister of information, Professor Griff, made several anti-Semitic statements. As a Jewish exec working with the band, Cohen found himself in the middle of a rough, formative experience. ‘When Professor Griff from Public Enemy said what he said, and it caused this whirlwind, the whole industry asked me, ‘What the fuck are you doing?’ says Cohen. ‘Every president of every record company called and said, ‘Drop them: But I believe part of being Jewish is education. And I believe I was instrumental in changing Public Enemy’s views. I said, “Your voice is being muted because you say Jews are this or that. You can’t make blanket statements. If you want your
message out there” – and it was profound, I think – “stop generalizing.” And I was the only Jew in their lives. What if I resigned? They would only be more alienated. I hadn’t quite being a Jew. I can’t quit being a Jew. Instead, I tried to have an impact. I felt like I was doing the right thing. Not just as a Jew, as a person. They had a big voice da nation of millions, to quote their album. I had the Holocaust Museum [the Simon Wiesenthal Center] shut down, and we had a private tour. The first thing you see is a Jewish skull plus a black person’s skull equals a baboon. The last thing is a monkey with enormous lips dressed with a Star of David holding a trumpet and a sign saying, ‘It’s these Jews that are bringing in this music call jazz.’” [COHEN, R., 6-21-01]

Then there is former tax attorney Joe Weinberger who drives a Jaguar S-200, wears a diamond-studded Rolex watch and “fat gold rings,” and carries a “9mm automatic pistol tucked in his pocket.” As the Miami New Times notes about his rise to power in the African-American rap music world,

“In the early Nineties, Miami’s reigning booty-rapper, Luther Campbell, hired Weinberger away from the carpeted hallways of a swash Brickell Key law firm to help manage a growing musical empire and its attendant lawsuits. Within five years Campbell was bankrupt and Weinberger had purchased the rights to his music. Rather than return to the comfortable confines of his former life, the 42-year old lawyer, who is single and childless, opted to launch his own label, Lil’ Joe … In a post bankruptcy fire sale overseen by Richard Wolfe [Weinberger’s lawyer/partner, also Jewish], Weinberger bought the rights to 2 Live Crew music for about $800,000, plus the outstanding money he claims Campbell owed him.” [KORTEN, T., 8-10-2000]

Weinberger has even been accused of ordering a car bombing and directing death threats against an employee.

Then there is Canada-born Bryan Turner, who founded Priority Records in 1985; he is also Jewish. [JEWHOO, 2000] By 1998, Priority had yearly sales of $250 million. As the Los Angeles Times notes:

“When the pioneering gangster rap group N.W.A. was looking for its first record deal, it found a distributor in Priority Records, which released an album so obscene it prompted a letter of complaint from the F.B.I. When Ice-T left Warner Brothers Records after police groups and the company’s shareholders objected to his song ‘Cop Killer,’ he found a new home at Priority. When Suge Knight, the imprisoned head of Death Row Records, who is known for his pugnacious business tactics, was looking for his first deal, Priority gave it to him. Through all the violence and controversy of hardcore rap music – from its roots in N.W.A to its current resurrection with Master P – the Los Angeles label Priority Records has been a major player.” [STRAUSS, N., 9-3-98, sec. E, p. 1]

And as the Times noted on another occasion:

“When Time Warner first parted ways with rapper Ice-T after the ‘Cop Killer’ flap and then with rapper Paris over a song that portrayed an assas-
sination fantasy of President Bush, Turner wasted little time signing deals with both artists.” [HOCHMAN, S., 7-30-95, CALENDAR, p. 82]

Jewish entrepreneur Steve Rifkind has also become very successful in the rap music field. In 1993, Rifkind founded and still heads Loud Records (its president is Rich Isaacson). Earlier, Rifkind began the Steven Rifkind Company, “a consulting firm specializing in Rap and R&B.” Loud acts include Wu-Tang Clan, Mobb Deep, Yvette Michelle, Funkmaster Flex, Alkaholics, Raekwon, and Xzibit. The company’s value is estimated at about $100 million. [collegemusic.com/1-11-00] “Rifkind,” notes the online magazine Entrepreneur, “who trademarked the term ‘Street Teams,’ takes marketing to the street literally – by hiring youths to tell their communities about his artists’ music. ‘My philosophy has always been ‘You can’t stop word-of-mouth, explains Rifkind, who has street teams across cities, distributing free singles to teenagers at housing projects and schools, and scrawling the names of his albums in the dust on parked trucks, which then serve as mobile billboards.” [entrepreneur.com]

Yet another major Jewish rap entrepreneur is the aforementioned Rick Rubin, who, says Jory Farr, found his “biggest stars were former gangsters who used beats and rhymes to glamorize wealth, dope, and violence. Deciding who to sign could be a moral quagmire … but Rubin wasn’t one to be bothered by the trivia of social responsibility.” [FARR, p. 126] “I could do anything I wanted,” Rubin once said about his own family life in New York, “We were always upper middle class. We were wealthy for the community we lived in. In a sense I was spoiled.” [FARR, p. 119]

Rubin’s record company Def American is now called American Recording; at one time Geffen Records distributed Rubin’s material. Earlier in his career he had signed bands like Slayer (whose lyrics exhorted “everything from virgin sacrifice and satanism to sadistic mutilations and the atrocities of Auschwitz” [FARR, p. 109]) and the Geto Boys, who “pushed misogyny and sadism to new depths.” [FARR, p. 108]

Rubin’s own star rose so high that he eventually produced albums for Mick Jagger and the Red Hot Chili Peppers. Troubles, however, came from a lawsuit against him by Adam Horowitz of the Beastie Boys and threats from the Meir Kahane-founded Jewish Defense League. Outraged by Rubin’s promotion of violently anti-Jewish lyrics by Black ghetto groups, the Jewish group reportedly came looking to beat him up. Rubin couldn’t understand their anger. He told an interviewer that “They should’ve talked to me and found out what I felt before coming to attack me, because I was a JDO [Jewish Defense Organization] supporter. When I was at NYU I saw [right wing rabbi] Meir Kahane speak and he blew me away – he was amazing … After hearing him speak, I wanted to pack my bags and go to Israel … I called the JDO several times, wanted to join, but they never returned my calls.” [FARR, p. 123]

Among the most controversial “gangsta rap” labels was Death Row Records (including Tupac Shakur, Dr. Dre, and Snoopy Doggy Dog). A noted earlier,
Death Row products were distributed by the Jewish-dominated Time-Warner company until “pressure from stockholders after an outcry over the flagrantly violent and misogynist lyrics” of its stars. Time-Warner dropped the label, but eighteen months later it was picked up (for $200 million) by the Universal Music Group, a subsidiary of the Jewish Bronfman family’s Seagram company. Universal too eventually abandoned the controversial label, only after “pressure from stockholders and regulators.” [HELMORE, E., 8-29-97, p. 10]

Still another Jewish push – more recently – into the rap world is Koch Entertainment’s In The Paint record label. Koch, one of the largest “independent music distribution companies,” is headed by founder and CEO Michael Koch and President Bob Frank. [http://www.kochentertainment.com]

Jewish author Nearl Karlen doesn’t like latent Black perceptions of Jewish exploitation surfacing in the rap world, writing: “I want everybody to try and find this book!” rapper Ice Cube said at a 1991 press conference where he held up a copy of The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews, a bogus piece of Nation of Islam scholarship.” [KARLEN, N., 1994, p. 146] Karlen later applauds one rappers stand against “antisemitism,” saying: “Easy-E, former leader of the gangsta rap group N.W.A., made a courageous stand, going so far as to appear on a Jewish rap group’s single entitled ‘Niggaz and Jews (Some Say Kikes).’ Easy-E was not long after lectured by Omar Bradley, the mayor of his hometown of Compton, California, with ‘I won’t name the specific racial group that’s using you, brother, but they are destroying us and having lunch and a bar mitzvah at the same time.” [KARLEN, N., 1994, p. 146]

And lastly for the music scene, the president and CEO of the Recording Industry Association of America — a lobbying group (with a staff of 72) for the big record companies – is also Jewish, Hilary Rosen, who was described in 1997 by the Washington Post as “a powerful woman in an industry dominated by men. One of the most influential yet least known players in the U.S. entertainment behemoth.” [WEEKS, p. C1] Rosen became the CEO when another Jewish executive, Jason Berman, stepped down from the position.

C. Delores Tucker, the founder of the National Political Congress of Black Women, has singled out Rosen’s organization for special condemnation:

“In terms of children, the RIAA is the most destructive lobbying force in America. It is incomprehensible that anyone with an ounce of concern for children would be demanding the promotion, distribution, and sale of gangsta/porno rap to children.” [WEEKS, p. C1]

Another organization often under public fire for negatively influencing children and adolescents is the Interactive Digital Software Association, which represents nearly fifty video game companies. Doug Lowenstein, also Jewish, [who was once the Legislative Director for Ohio Senator Howard Metzenbaum], became the first president of the organization in 1994, and he remains in power. Lowenstein is often called upon to defend the excessive violence and decadence found in many of the games. “Video games,” he insisted in 1998, “are not the source of violence in society.” “The producer of Flesh Feast,
Eric Wahlberg,” noted one media report, “agreed.” [MEDIA AWARENESS NETWORK, 5-29-98; BLOOM, D., 9-23-99, p. L8]

The most controversial video game for the early 1990s was *Mortal Kombat*, produced by **Acclaim Entertainment**. In an appeal to video firms, asking for restraint from excessive violence, California Attorney General Dan Lundgren noted that “*Mortal Kombat* depicts bloody decapitations as well as scenes where a still-beating heart is pulled from a body.” [SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, 9-9-94, p. C7] Acclaim Entertainment is headed by Gregory Fischbach, once hired by Elliot Goldman (the president and CEO of **RCA/ARIOLA**) to head RCA/ARIOLA Record International. (Fischbach represented musical acts Crosby Stills and Nash, Emmylou Harris, Boz Scaggs, among others.) In 1998, Lawrence Kassanoff, CEO of **Threshold Entertainment**, was making a weekly TV series based on *Mortal Kombat.*) [KNOEDELSEDER, W., 6-18-86, pt. 4, p. 3; O’HARE, K., 12-27-98, p. 45]

———

For all the Jewish complaints that they are “marginalized” in American society and subject to Gentile-inspired self-hate, Jews have for decades been afforded mass media dominance in literally telling everyone else how to run their lives. “Dear Abby” (Pauline Esther Friedman Philips) and “Ann Landers” (Esther Pauline Friedman Lederer) – the twin Friedman sisters from Sioux City, Iowa – have been mentioned before. One or both of them have been listed in polls as among “the most admired women in the United States,” “the most important women,” and “the most influential women in America.” By the late 1980s both women were in demand in the national lecture circuit, commanding $10,000 for a half hour talk. [POTTKER/SPEZIALE, p. viii, 4]

The sisters’ father, Abraham, began a successful theatre business as co-owner of a burlesque house in a seedy part of Sioux City. [POTTKER/SPEZIALE, p. 15, 312] Ann (Esther) once admitted that she “learned the facts of life from the girls in the chorus line.” [P/S, p. 16] Both women are remembered by locals in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, where they later lived, for their ostentation: “their flare for making an entrance.” [P/S, p. 65] Both women took separate routes to advice column stardom, although “neither twin has had formal training in social service work or journalism.” [P/S, p. 4-5] A non-speaking, competitive feud between them lasted eight years.

Sister “Abigail Von Buren” eventually married Morton Phillips, Jewish heir to a Midwestern liquor fortune. In Eau Claire, the Phillips family also owned a factory, **Presto Industry**, (which gained national fame as a maker of pressure cookers) which alienated some in the town. “Many of the town’s blue-collar workers, resentful of their dependence on the Jewish-owned Presto Industry, openly made anti-Semitic remarks … [P/S, p. 65] … Despite the profits Presto reported in 1953, including an astounding 48 percent return on net worth the year before, Presto managers shocked union employees with a proposal for wage cuts.” [P/S, p.89]
“Dear Abby” sits on her husband’s $70 million philanthropic foundation. A millionaire many, many times over, she has also done advertising commercials for English muffins and a milk lobbying organization. Telling the world with assurance how to solve its problems, her own daughter spent five years in therapy with (the aforementioned) Judd Marmor. [P/S, p. 178-179]

Sister “Ann Landers” was married to Jules Lederer, founder of the Budget-Rent-a-Car company. In her columns she was “ever mindful of maintaining the facade of a happy marriage, … presenting her readers with the image of a devoted wife and loving husband.” [P/S, p. 216] In 1975, her husband of 36 years dumped her for a younger woman. “Gossip about the affair,” note her biographers, “had an extra zing to it. Jules was cheating on the woman who had set herself up as America’s moral conscience …” [P/S, p. 222] … Perhaps her public statements, years before her divorce, reflected her fears and insecurities over an empty marriage.” [P/S, p. 216] A friend of the Lederer family, therapist Abe Franzblau, who knew Ann Landers well, noted that “All it took was a short time in the Lederer company to realize that [Ann] exhibited the classic, textbook traits of a cold, rejecting woman.” [P/S, p. 217]

Landers also lives a life of extreme ostentation:

“The ornate showplace at 209 East Lake Shore Drive is still [Ann’s] home. Wall panels and sconces imported from a British castle complemented the mullioned windows and intricately sculpted ceilings. Re-casts of fifteenth-century statuary in the living room, including a covey of kneeling angels…, provide a stunning counterpoint to Louis XV sofas and mother-of-pearl inlaid chairs. Works by Picasso, Renoir, and Dali cover the walls … [Her husband] was offended by the extraordinary amount of money [she] was lavishing on their apartment.” [P/S, p. 219]

In 1995, Landers got into hot water with some comments she made in New Yorker magazine about the Pope and the Polish people. “He has a sweet sense of humor,” she said, “Of course, he’s a Polack. They’re very anti-women.” Polish-Americans responded with outrage to the slur, wondering how and why she had singled them out as being “anti-women.” Landers issued a formal apology but refused to comment further. [O’CROWLEY, P., 12-1-95, p. A1]

The woman who tells the little people of the world how to handle their lives, also had a chauffeur and housekeeper. [P/S, p. 229] The values she champions also reflect her behind-the-scenes “facelift” and “extensive body surgery.” Her sister, Abby, has also had cosmetic surgery. [P/S, p. 255] Both women, but especially Ann Landers, survived scandal in the 1980s when it was discovered that the two millionaires were sometimes doing nothing for their pay – merely recycling advice columns (not identified as reprints) from two decades earlier. [P/S, p. 277-283]

Concerning Jewish identity, notes Landers’ daughter Margo, “[My mother] made the rule when I went to college that I could only date Jewish boys … Mother was simply ethnocentric. She made it a point to tell everyone she was Jewish and often mentioned it in her column.” [HOWARD, p. 142-143]
(In 1987 there was a much publicized search to create a new “Ann Landers” when Esther Lederer left the Chicago Sun-Times to work at the Chicago Tribune. 12,000 people applied to become the new syndicated advice columnist. Jeffrey Zaslow, male, and also Jewish, was selected as one of two people to replace Landers. Zaslow’s column was called “All That Zazz”; his wife is also in the media business, a “TV news anchor.”) [ZASLOW, J., 1990; MOMENT, 12-31-96]

Another syndicated troubles columnist, Judith Miller (“Miss Manners”) is Jewish as is the popular media sex therapist “Dr. Ruth” (Westheimer) whose shows include her “Sexually Speaking” radio show, “Good Sex!” cable TV program, and “Ask Dr. Ruth” TV program. She has also lent her name to a “Good Sex” board game, a “Terrific Sex” videotape, and ads for condoms, bras, and typewriters. She has been afforded acting spots in movies and was a panelist on the TV game show “Hollywood Squares.” “I raised my children with an emphasis on Zionism and idealism,” writes Westheimer, “… They both went to Zionist summer camps … [When my daughter graduated from college] she announced that she was going to Israel to live. I knew it was coming – I had encouraged it.” [italics in original: WESTHEIMER, p. 180-181] (In 1996, the Cleveland Plain Dealer noted another Jewish sex therapist, Sherry Levine, who was making appearances throughout the national media. Levine, headlined the paper, “is the Dr. Ruth of Northwest Ohio.”) [YERAK, p. 8] Dr. Joy Kuriansky is another prominent Jewish media sex-therapist.

Elsewhere, the second-most listened-to radio talk show host in America is “Dr. Laura” (Schlessinger), who has been known to have her rabbi as a guest in her studio during her show. (Schlessinger’s favorite therapist? Rhoda Markovich “is the best therapist I know of.”) [SCHLESSINGER, L., 9-1-2000] “Geoff Rich [the president of Radio Today, was] one of the key people in marketing Laura.” [BANE, V., 1999, p. 165] Schlessinger, whose father was Jewish and who asserts an activist Jewish identity, has even incorporated herself as Dr. Laura Inc. She also has a syndicated newspaper column and two books that have together sold over two million copies — How Could You Say That? and Ten Stupid Things Women Do to Mess Up Their Lives. By 1997, 60,000 people were calling her program per day, seeking her advice on how to solve their problems; that same year she sold the rights to her radio show for $71.5 million. [MYERS, p. B6]

In 1999, an unauthorized expose of Schlessinger’s life was published by Vickie Bane, which portrayed the talk show host as an extremely unpleasant personality behind the scenes and a steady hypocrite in both her past and present, rarely following in her personal life the moral dictates she demanded for others on her talk radio show. In 1998, the news world also noted that “her conservative message had been sullied by the publication of 12 color photographs of her, either topless or nude, on the Club Love web site.” [BONES, p. A21] The photos were taken over 20 years earlier by her former boss, Bill Bal lance, who gave Schlessinger her start in radio; the photos were taken when she was separated from her first husband. Schlessinger unsuccessfully sued both her former lover and an Internet company.
“Schlessinger,” notes Yvonne Crittenden, “hasn’t spoken to her mother for fourteen years, and is equally estranged from her younger sister and family – more fodder for critics who claim she’s a hypocrite for espousing strong family values … She fell in love with a married Zoology professor – Lew Bishop (who was married with children at the time they met) … Schlessinger converted to Judaism after watching a show on the Holocaust with her son … [An article written by Leslie Bennetts of] Vanity Fair found her to be “cold and condescending, defensive, evasive and spiteful about those she’d worked with and hated by many formers friends and colleagues, all long before she became successful.” [CRITTENDEN, 10-10-99]

Schlessinger, notes Evelyn Theiss, is “particularly tough on callers who have been divorced, but she herself is a divorcee … By the sheer numbers of documented episodes of such outrageous behaviors, [author Vickie] Bane persuades us that this is a woman with some serious problems … There is plenty more of such behavior – an almost stultifying amount.” In 1998, “Schlessinger received Israel’s 50th Anniversary Tribute Award for her contributions to humanity.” [THEISS, 10-10-99] The Jewish Forward notes the brand of Judaism she practices:

“Ms. Schlessinger was born to a Jewish father and an Italian Catholic mother, but was raised without religion, she has said in interviews. Prompted by questions from her son, Derek, while they watched a Holocaust documentary, Ms. Schlessinger began to research her Jewish roots and ended up converting under the auspices of Conservative Judaism. She later joined Chabad-Lubavitch of Conejo in the Los Angeles area and underwent an Orthodox conversion two years ago. The Chabad congregation’s rabbi, Moshe Bryski, said Ms. Schlessinger regularly attends.” [EDEN, A., 2001]

The author, David Reuben, of the popular volume, Everything You Wanted to Know About Sex But Were Afraid to Ask, was also Jewish. And for decades, the prim know-it-all Jewish psychologist, Dr. Joyce Brothers, (real surname: Bauer) was omnipresent in the mass media (her ride to fame began on a TV game show when she won “top prize on the first leg of the $64,000 Question, telling twenty million TV viewers that ‘cestus’ was the name of the leather glove worn by ancient Roman boxers.”) Brothers was “the only member of the American Psychology Association who was ‘repped’ by General Artists Corporation, which said [in its handout to journalists] for background: she looks like Loretta Lynn, walks like Marilyn Monroe, and talks like Dr. Freud.”) [KRIM, p. 139-140] “She’s obviously a fraud,” wrote journalist Seymour Krim, “but I can’t undress her in public. It’s too goddamn cruel.” [KRIM, p. 140] Brothers has a syndicated column in 350 newspapers, a daily program on NBC Radio/Westwood One and “is a long-standing member of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.” [HYMAN, p. 191]

Another Jewish psychiatrist in the talk show business was David Viscott. “At his peak in the early ’90s,” noted the Los Angeles Times, “he advised millions on both radio and television programs.” [ZAMICHOw, p. 10] Viscott had his own greeting card line, therapy audio tapes, and he had written two autobiogra-
phies. His personal therapy sessions cost $1,500 for two hours, which helped finance his ostentatious lifestyle including a Jaguar automobile and a Hancock Park mansion. Consummate hypocrite, police were often called to his home to break up family fights. “Abrasively confident on the air,” says the Times, “megalomaniacal off it, Viscott was never in doubt about what other people should do with their lives. But when his own life began to crumble, he turned out to be clueless.” [ZAMICHOW, p. 10]

Other prominent Jewish American radio “shrink” talk-show hosts in the last decade have included Elyse Goldstein, Harvey Ruben, Harry Sobel, and Sonya Friedman (her show was entitled, “Telling Secrets with Sonya Friedman”). The pioneer (in the early 1980s) of this radio genre, however, was Toni Grant, “the first in the growing ranks of ‘media therapists’ who give free advice on the airwaves.” [BOSWORTH, p. 112] “While Grant is a nationally recognized advisor on love,” noted the Los Angeles Times, “she almost gave up finding it for herself.” “I’ve been single eight years,” she admitted. “And I confess openly that I was starting to wonder if all I knew how to do was talk about it.” [FINKE, p. VIEW, 5] It is difficult to locate any ethnic information about Grant, born and raised on Long Island. She may or may not be Jewish, but, judging by Al Goldstein, publisher of the free love, semi-porno magazine, Screw, she has travelled in some intimate Jewish circles. Goldstein told People magazine that, “she was the hottest sexual partner I ever had. But basically it was a dishonest relationship. I loved her fame. She loved my excitement.” [CHAMBERS, p. 70]

In 1987, Los Angeles Times journalist Al Martinez – intrigued by the avalanche of local telephone call-in therapy programs – decided to randomly select one of the therapists advertising in the Hollywood Reporter. The psychologist-entrepreneur turned out to be a Jewish woman named Audrey Levy. Her ad was for call-in psychological help, offering “telephone counseling out of Beverly Hills by calling 2-RELATE, credit cards accepted.” [MARTINEZ, pt. 9, p. 2]

In 1991, Larry King introduced his (Jewish) guest and “inspirational speaker” Marianne Williamson, like this:

“Who is that petit brunette standing behind the pulpit and why are some of Hollywood’s hottest stars listening? … Her detractors say she is a New Age guru more interested in self-promotion than teaching others about self help.” [KING, L., 9-26-91]

Jewish mass media psychology profiteers also dominate the scene in England. “Few people,” noted the London Sunday Telegraph in 1997, “have been so influential in British life in recent years as the four famous agony aunts [i.e., mass media personal problem advisers] – Marjorie Proops, Irma Kurtz, Anna Raeburn, and Claire Rayner. They have been empresses of pelvic epics and laureates of female personal pleasure.” They are also all Jewish. [MYERS, p. 26] “The role of the agony aunt is up for examination,” noted the Telegraph in another piece, “What makes a good one? There is a joke among top practitioners that the key qualification is to be a Jewish mamma.” “Maybe Jews have been so good at it because we have such an intense curiosity,” suggested Claire Rayner. [GRICE, p. 17] “Have you noticed,” Irma Kurtz once asked an interviewer,
“that three-quarters of the agony aunts in the world are Jewish? We have carried common sense with us. Why are Jews violinists? You can pick it up and run.” [SCOTLAND ON SUNDAY, 2-13-94]

And what of the personal background of such people who have given advice to the emotionally needy for decades? What are their qualifications – other than mass media connections and great drive – towards counseling millions about etiquette, ethics, and healthy emotional lives? Late in their careers, there were startling revelations about each of the famous four in Great Britain, underscoring a profound audacity and hypocrisy at base in their professional careers.

In 1995 Claire Rayner, agony aunt for the London Sun, publicly confessed that “I’ve been a depressive all my life … I’m ashamed to admit that I’m still ashamed … In America you show off if you need psychiatric help, and in this country you’d rather die than get it.” [(SCOTTISH) DAILY RECORD & SUNDAY MAIL, 8-14-95, p.16] In turn, her husband “has been suffering from severe depression for ten years which at time have left him feeling suicidal. Despite his wife’s career as an agony aunt, he says she hasn’t been able to help.” [MIDDLEHOUSE, 7-26-99, p. 41] “I was beaten to hell and back as a child, “ she says, “… I hardly knew my mother so I couldn’t love or respect her. I did not have any self-esteem to speak of…” At the age of 15, she spent 14 months in a psychiatric hospital because of a “misdiagnosed thyroid problem.” The kind of woman qualified to give advice to the psychologically and ethically troubled?

Irma Kurtz? In 1999 the London Daily Mail noted that Kurtz, for over 20 years Cosmopolitan’s “personal problem solver … has given advice on everything from promiscuity and its consequences to abortion and the advisability of getting married too young. There would be those who argue that her own flawed emotional life is hardly conducive to dispensing considered, unbiased advice to women … Irma admits she was a recklessly promiscuous young woman who stopped counting the number of her lovers when they exceeded 38. At the age of 30, she had an abortion when her married lover got her pregnant. And she chose a man to father her child, with no intention of ever marrying him.” Kurtz notes that “when [my son] was eight or nine, I can remember getting very low and sometimes I would drink too much. There were a lot of nights in a row when I didn’t go to bed sober.” [MIDDLEHOUSE, 2-27-97, p. 46-47]

Marjorie Proops? In 1992 the London Daily Mirror noted that “In her Mirror column … she has often referred lovingly to her husband, giving the impression that she was writing from the experience and security of a happy marriage.” [BROOKE, 12-24-92, p. 2-3] In her biography of that same year, however, she admitted that it was a disastrous marriage. “Britain’s best known agony aunt had a largely sexless marriage accompanied by a secret 30-year affair” with the Daily Mirror’s chief lawyer, Philip Levy. (For his part, it was later revealed that he always met Proops at a hotel and never told her that he lived with another woman, Meli Meitner). Proops also had three abortions, a divorce, an alcoholic mother, and “chronic depression.” “Every agony aunt has a
murky past,” she once said. “Most use the problems that they’ve had in the past to share with their readers.” [GRANT, p.23]

**Anna Raeburn**? She built her reputation on Capital Radio with a call-in advice show, the first of its kind in England. In 1998 the *London Evening Standard* noted that “she’s the agony aunt who has suffered more than her fair share of anguish: rape, two abortions, three suicide attempts, four periods of therapy. What next?” She once told an interviewer: “I’m not a nice woman. I have never been a nice woman. I did try it once and it didn’t suit awfully well.” Pregnant by her husband, she told him that he couldn’t “cope” with a child and secured an abortion. [BILLEN, 7-22-98, p. 23]

In 1994, **Ann De Courcy**, a critic in the London *Daily Mail*, lambasted the profound hypocrisy of this genre of “agony aunt”:

“What makes these women believe that they are specially gifted to offer moral guidance? … They have no hesitation in telling their readers how to be happy, nor in laying down moral guidelines that often smack of pure hypocrisy … Most people seeking made a success of their emotional life, rather than one traumatized by it.” [De Courcy, 2-1-94]

Other prominent Jewish agony aunts in Great Britain include:

- **Vanessa Feltz**. In 1999, she signed a $4 million deal with the BBC. Her qualifications for this career included the fact that “she was known as ‘Vanessa the Undresser’ and her interest in sex was such that her mother would ring up hostesses at teenage parties and tell them: ‘Don’t let her go upstairs [with any boys].’” Feltz wrote a book called *What Are These Strawberries Doing on My Nipples? I Need Them for Fruit Salad* and was a columnist for the *Jewish Chronicle*; she also presented “Jewish London” on Greater London Radio. Her comedy routines she described as “nice smut … [like] ‘Is sperm kosher?’” Her TV program’s formula, noted one critic, “is not only moronic, but can be deeply wounding [to those participants on the program].” The *London Sunday Times* also noted that “Vanessa lives in some grandeur with her husband and two daughters in a Hampstead mansion with a marble hall, a ballroom, and a swimming pool. She plays the much-loved part of the Jewish princess to perfection, clothes with jewelry like a medieval knight togged out for a tournament … She says she cannot understand the ‘non-Jewish way of dressing.’” [SUNDAY TIMES, 8-23-98]

- **Miriam Stoppard**. Her 25th book was *The Magic of Sex* and she was by 1991 an anchor woman at BBC’s morning program *People Today*. “Hailed … as the vixen of permissive parenting,” one critic said that “some are born to controversy, some achieve it, and some have controversy thrust upon them. She luxuriates in all three, and her latest book, *Sex-Ed – Growing Up, Relationships and Sex*, has nothing to diminish that status.” [GLOVER, 9-219-97, p. 7] Stoppard, noted another media observer, “married playwright Tom Stoppard when he divorced his first wife because Miriam was expecting his child.” [DE COURCY, 2-1-94]
Suzie Hayman, mass media “sex counselor” and author of *The Good Sex Guide*. “The only thing my mother ever said about my father was that he was not Jewish,” she says. “And yet when Dad was with my mother, he threw himself into the Israeli War of Independence … Why had he been prepared to put himself at such risks, if he wasn’t Jewish?” Hayman’s husband’s father was “violently anti-Semitic”; later she discovered that he was Jewish too. “And so,” she resolved, “as I have found time and time again with counseling others, the subconscious drives towards ‘martial fit,’ keys to common ground that we are not even told is there.” [HAYMAN, 12-24-97, p. 11]

In America, decadent radio commentator Howard Stern (with the third-ranked talk show radio in America), sensationaely obnoxious “shock” radio agitator Michael Savage (Weiner), sports commentator Howard Cosell (William Howard Cohen), talk show host Larry King, radio personality Dennis Prager, popular Los Angeles talk show host Michael Jackson (from South Africa), talk show physician Dean Edell, woman-beating sportscaster Merv Albert, Jerry Seinfeld, Ed Asner, and Roseanne Barr were/are Jewish. (“I remember [my mother] taking us down to the basement [at their home in Salt Lake City] if someone just came and knocked on the door,” says Barr, “I really truly believed that if anyone found out we were Jewish they would kill us.” [LAHR, p. 126]

Gossip queen Rona Barrett (Burstein) was Jewish, as was/gossip columnist Sheila Graham (Lily Shiel), gossip columnist Louella Parsons (whose father was Jewish), “Let’s Make a Deal” game show host Monty Hall, 50s-era television puppeteer Shari Lewis, popular media astronomer Carl Sagan, Henry Winkler (the Fonz), Gilda Radner, Carl Sagan, and Israeli psychic Uri Geller. Prominent Jewish film critics include Pauline Kael, John Simon, Stanley Kaufmann, Judith Crist (born Klein), Gene Shalit, Leonard Maltin, Gene Siskel (of Siskel and Ebert), and Joel Siegel of “Good Morning America” (among numerous other Jewish movie commentators). Assassinated Denver talk show host Allen Berg was Jewish, as is financial columnist Sylvia Porter, and many, many others are familiar Jewish mass media “personalities” to the public.

In earlier years, prominent Jewish sports voice personalities included Marty Glickman, Bill Stern (Sterngold) – “one of the best known voices on the airwaves,” [LEVINE, p., p. 232] and Mel Allen (formerly Mel Israel). Even the ex-wife, Claudia Cohen, of billionaire financier and corporate raider, Ronald Perelman, was a gossip columnist for the *New York Post* and later a TV reporter. [BRUCK, p. 218] Not surprisingly, her father is Robert Cohen, “the wealthy book and magazine distributor.” [SPORKIN, p. 150]

Profoundly influential in shaping American popular culture, it is estimated that seminal gossip columnist Walter Winchell (original family name: Weinschel) had an audience (for his weekly radio program or his daily newspaper column) of two-thirds of all American adults. [GABLER, Winchell, p. xi] His focus was brash and sleazy. Like most who are driven towards power, he was, notes Neal Gabler, “vindictive, cruel, egocentric, paranoid, selfish, cheap and
thoroughly reprehensible [GABLER, p. xiv] … What made him a national phenomenon was gossip … Winchell introduced a revolutionary column that reported who was romancing whom, who was cavorting with gangsters, who was ill or dying, who was suffering financial difficulties, which spouses were having affairs, which couples were about to divorce, and dozens of other secrets, peccadilloes and imbroglios that had previously been concealed from public view … He suddenly and single-handedly expanded the purview of American journalism [GABLER, p. xii] … Few lives are more instructive of the forces that shaped mass culture in America than Walter Winchell’s.” [GABLER, p. xv]

In 2001, Jews gathered for a “special program for student journalists sponsored by the Jewish Agency for Israel and the World Zionist Organization at the General Assembly of the United Jewish Communities.” “Do Jewish journalists have more obligations than others?” asked the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California, “Are they responsible first to their communities, and do they need to represent Israel in their newspapers?” [RAGOLSKY, H., 11-23-01] “On campus there is already so much anti-Israel sentiment that we have to be careful about any additional criticism against Israel,” Marita Gringaus told a reporter,

“This is our responsibility as Jews, which obviously contradicts our responsibilities as journalists.” [RAGOLSKY, H., 11-23-01]

“I’m a Jew before I’m a journalist,” added Uzi Safanov, a reporter for Long Island University’s school newspaper,

“before someone pays me to write. If I find a negative thing about Israel, I will not print it and I will sink into why did it happen and what can I do to change it.” (“If he eventually wrote about negative incidents that happen to Israel,” added the Jewish Bulletin, “he would try to find the way ‘to shift the blame.’”) [RAGOLSKY, H., 11-23-01]

What of the case of the New York Times’ Tom Friedman, “a Jew who was raised on all the stories, all the folk songs, and all the myths of Israel.” [DIAMOND, E., 1993, p. 44] Edwin Diamond notes the personal “crisis” Friedman faced when he was confronted with reporting honestly (which he eventually did) about Israel’s involvement in the notorious Shatila-Sabra massacre of civilian Palestinians in Lebanon:

“Shatila-Sabra became a ‘personal crisis’ for Friedman, convinced as he was of Israeli knowledge – and probably, approval – of what happened inside the camp. Sitting at his typewriter, trying to reconstruct the massacre, he felt driven by ‘two conflicting impulses,’ the truth-telling role of a Times journalist and his private Jewish sympathies. ‘One part of me wanted to nail [Israeli Prime Minister Menachem] Begin and [Defense Minister Ariel] Sharon … Yet another part of me was looking for alibis – something that would prove Begin and Sharon innocent, something that would prove that the Israelis couldn’t have known what was happening.” [DIAMOND, E., 1993, p. 45]
In a much more practical expression of this censorial world view, in 2001, the Canadian CanWest media conglomerate (headed by ardent Zionist Israel Asper) announced that “We do not run in our newspaper Op Ed pieces that express criticism of Israel.” CanWorld, with media holdings in Ireland, New Zealand, and other countries, had earlier announced that it had acquired “all of the major Canadian newspaper and Internet assets of Hollinger Inc., including the metropolitan daily newspapers in nearly every large city across Canada and a 50% partnership interest in the National Post.” [ELECTRONIC INTIFADA, DECEMBER 11, 2001] CanWest also has major television interests in Canada and other countries.

In 1993, a former reporter for the Washington Post, Jeffrey Goldberg, addressed the issue of the “disproportionate” Jewish presence in the mass media and its implications:

“[There is a] particular perception about the Jews and the press, namely, that Jews own the presses, and not only the ones off Times Square … There certainly is a disproportionate Jewish presence in the newsrooms of major media organizations; anyone who knows what the suffixes ‘berg’ and ‘stein’ generally indicate would agree. But there is, of course, no Jewish conspiracy to control the press, and when I am asked how I know there isn’t (as I was long ago by an official of the [Lyndon] La Rouche organization), I offered two forms of proof: 1) No one has ever asked me to join such a conspiracy, even though my credentials for membership are impeccable; 2) If ‘the Jews’ really did control the media, coverage of the Jewish community and the issues that interest it would be far superior to what we see today.” [GOLDBERG, JEFFREY, 1993]

Are Goldberg’s “proofs” convincing? Are there any legitimate signs of a “conspiracy” (whatever the semantic nuances of that word) in the American mass media about expressly Jewish and Israeli themes? By what reasoning should we ignore, in the mass media context, incessant in-house ethnocentric Jewish discourse about their collective superiority, international solidarity with other Jews, the sacredness of the Holocaust, and special attention to Jewish welfare? Need pan-Jewish activism express itself today in “conspiratorial” form, in the sense of a secret spy ring? How can the everywhere celebrated and distinct Jewish world view – religious or secular – be completely discarded in any reasoned analysis of Jewish dominance in the mass media? (Many Jews declare this in their in-house writings. As Eric Kahler observes, for example, about highly assimilated Jews of Europe, “Such distinguished personalities as [Heinrich] Heine, who was a skeptic, an intellectual adventurer, as [Baruch] Spinoza, as [Franz] Kafka, whose devotion was entirely unorthodox, unfixed, exploratory, a Bernard Lazare who was a freethinker, and as Werfel, who was almost a Catholic – all of them show attitudes and proclivities, clearly deriving from the Jewish religion.”) [KAHLER, E., 1967, p. 7] And is not transnational Jewish solidarity (so much highlighted and heralded by modern Jewish observers) manifest in a purely “naturalized” manner the virtual norm in today’s media workplace?
And what of Goldberg’s own case? Here’s an American-born reporter who, as we learn in his own writings about the lack of a “conspiracy” among Jews in the media, volunteered for service in the Israeli army. Is this of no consequence in speculating upon this man’s objective journalism as a former *Washington Post* reporter? Perhaps Goldberg will run across fellow journalist Bruno Schlumberger in Israel. Schlumberger is a staff photographer for the *Ottawa Citizen* who was sent on assignment to the Jewish state in 1998 to cover its fiftieth anniversary celebration. “I couldn’t sleep, so thrilled was I to be in Israel,” wrote Schlumberger in the paper, “… When I was in high school I joined Habonim, the Labour-Zionist youth movement.” [SCHLUMBERGER] (Although soured on religious Orthodoxy in Israel, former *Cleveland Plain Dealer* editor Stephen Esrati was once even a member of the Zionist terrorist Irgun Zvai Leumi organization. [GUTH, D., 12-8-00] Hank Greenspun, publisher of the *Las Vegas Sun*, as noted earlier, even broke American laws in delivering weapons to Israel.)

And what of the following observations by Israeli Ze’ev Chafets?

“In a study undertaken in the winter of 1979-80, Professor S. Robert Lichter found that fully ninety-one percent of the Jewish journalists he surveyed agreed with the statement “The United States has a moral obligation to prevent the destruction of Israel … [CHAFETS, 1985, p. 279]

Can we expect that these Jewish journalists have the same noble “moral” obligations about El Salvador, Argentina, Afghanistan, Poland, Russia, Kenya, France, Iran, the Philippines, or anywhere else? How about the “destruction” of the Palestinians by Israel?

Here’s Max Frankel (for years the Executive Editor of the *New York Times*) and his thoughts about Israel in his work:

“I was much more deeply devoted to Israel than I dared to assert. I had yearned for a Jewish homeland ever since learning as child in Germany that in Palestine even the policemen were Jews! Like most American Jews, however, I settled on a remote brand of Zionism, which rejected all importuning to move to Israel to share its hardships and dangers … I did indeed have many close Israeli friends, not only relatives and journalists but high officials, ranging from Yitzhak Rabin to Lova Eliav. That is why I well understood the full range of Israeli opinion on all of the country’s vital security concerns … Fortified by my knowledge of Israel and my friendships there, I myself wrote most of our Middle East commentaries. As more Arab than Jewish readers recognized, I wrote them from a pro-Israel perspective. And I wrote in confidence that The Times no longer suffered from| any secret desire to deny or overcome its ethnic roots.” [FRANKEL, M., 1999, p. 401, 402, 403]

When push comes to shove in the world of patriotic allegiance, or merely objective journalism, where do such men (particularly a Jeffrey Goldberg or Bruno Schlumberger) stand? And what about an American-born Israeli soldier who scoffs at the “conspiratorial” view of Jewry, asserting that no fellow Jews came around in the newsrooms of America, asking him to join a special under-
ground organization? As Goldberg well knows, no one needs to ask him to join anything: by religious or secular perspective, the “organization” is a birthright. The modern state of Israel codifies this fact: any Jew can emigrate to Israel by virtue of his genetic identity. And pan-Jewish solidarity and its collectivist perspective is so widely enshrined in the American mass media (and American culture as a whole) that there is in fact nothing at all “conspiratorial” about it whatsoever, since it is, after all, the prevalent, naturalized norm of operation for all. And yet few recognize – and no one dares risk a challenge to – it.

And the charge of Jewish “conspiracy?” What does that mean? What are the word’s nuances? Do the “behind the scenes” unified wheelings and dealings of hundreds of Jewish organizations that seek to maintain the unpopular “separation of Church and state” fit the bill? Is a lack of public honesty and candor about Jewish belief, purpose, and identity part of the same paradigm? As Jewish sociologist Arnold Eisen notes about a veritable Jewish American cultural trait:

“Many [Jewish] informants [in one academic study] demanded assurance of the interviewer’s Jewish background before volunteering certain responses (especially those reflecting their less public attitudes about dominant [Gentile] groups) … [EISEN, p. 144] … [The Jew in public] represents his people before another, and knows that if his behavior is found wanting, his people as a whole will suffer. He must manipulate the opinion which others have of him and, as the sociologists observe, such manipulation is acceptable in secondary relations but not in friendships requiring candor and trust.” [EISEN, p. 144]

In this regard of Jewish protective self-censorship, Lesley Hazleton notes the case of an Israeli journalist:

“One of Israel’s top journalists had been asked by an American magazine to write an article called ‘Has Israel Lost Its Soul?’ He turned down the assignment. ‘Why?’ someone asked. ‘You’ve been saying it often enough in the Hebrew press.’ He gave a despairing shrug: ‘I can’t. It’s read differently in the States. Knowing that, I’d only end up writing an apologia.’” [HAZELETON, L., 1984, p. 26]

In other words, the man felt that he couldn’t write the truth about Israel in English (perhaps in part because American Jews/media powers were biased towards apologia), but, more importantly, his critical thoughts would be revealed in a language that could also be read by a non-Jewish audience. As Peter Novick notes about journalists in the ethnic Jewish press: “They are ‘less Jewish’ in that their public role, the fact that they know what they say is being listened to by a gentile audience, may make their utterances less frank, less expressive of spontaneous feelings, more ‘correct,’ than conversation around the kitchen table.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 38]

And the formal, institutionalized Jewish apologia for the subject of Jewish dominance in the mass media? After conceding the obvious in the year 2000 (that even a Jewish scholar, Steven G. Kellman, noted that “most” of the “100 most powerful people” in Hollywood were Jewish, and that “boosters and anti-Semites agree: Jews have been prominent and predominant in all phases of the [motion
picture] business: production, distribution and exhibition”), the Anti-Defamation League was still taking the only apologetic spin on these facts available to it:

“Though individual Jews control Hollywood, Jewishness does not … The ADL believes that the recitation of numbers and percentages is not the answer to the false charges of Jewish ‘control’ of the motion picture industry, or, indeed, of similar accusations involving the media, banking, finance and other businesses. Reliance on statistics alone plays into the hands of anti-Semites.” [ADL ONLINE, SEPT 1999]

Indeed it does. This is a profound concession in formally admitting the obvious. What else can the ADL say, lest it be caught as a public liar in refuting the notion of Jewish “predominance” in the mass media? Yet the key, however untenable, to the ADL’s Jews dominate the media, so what? argument, is that Jews don’t “in any field act in concert with other Jews similarly situated simply because they happen to be Jewish.” [ADL ONLINE, SEPT 1999]

Maybe not in whether they root for the Los Angeles Dodgers or New York Yankees, but what reasoned analysis of Jewish identity and politics can possibly assert that they have no collective agenda in the mass media? [See also, for example, later discussed Jewish collective efforts in American government towards molding American foreign policy in support of Israel]. A recurrent subject on entertainment television, for example, as noted by Jewish researchers Jonathan and Judith Pearl, is anti-Semitism, a subject that – as we have earlier seen – is virtually non-existent in modern America. But it is a crucial antithetical foundation (against non-Jews) of Jewish identity and socio-economic advantage/advancement. As the Pearls note about their fifteen years of television research:

“The various manifestations of anti-Semitism that popular television has portrayed have been almost unlimited … The continued existence of modern anti-Semitism is reflected in the numerous programs that dramatize its many manifestations … [TV] invariably depicts anti-Semitism as an ugly, abhorrent trait that must be fought at every turn … Non-Jews often have a strong and prominent role in the battle against anti-Semitism … For the vast majority of Americans who are not Jewish, watching their favorite TV character do battle with religious bigots can be an important influence. And often, non-Jewish characters can make inroads against anti-Semitism on their own turf in ways that Jews cannot … [PEARL/PEARL p. 103-104] … Anti-Semitism is clearly presented in the television dramatic programs as an injustice that should be constantly fought. In virtually no program is the derogation of Jews or Judaism left unchallenged either by inference, word, or action … This kind of portrayal projects the important message that fighting anti-Semitism is not solely a Jewish concern but the responsibility of all people.” [PEARL/PEARL p. 130]

In 1980, Patricia Erens, noted Jewish dominance throughout the mass media and its self-protection:

“Although anti-Semitic literature [in America] has appeared in every decade, anti-Semitism has not been a dominant or even prevalent aspect
of the mass media (newspapers, radio, film, television) or the fine arts (painting, literature, drama). Therefore, it is not surprising to discover that although negative portrayals of Jews exist in film, little overt anti-Semitism occurs. The large number of Jews who hold the reins of Hollywood’s power prevented this.” [ERENS, P., 1980, p. 117]

And what about the ceaseless avalanche of Holocaust-related material throughout the mass media, (as noted in detail elsewhere) including, for example, the front page 1999 article in a Los Angeles Times by Jewish author Josh Geitlin? Again and again, special sympathy is demanded by the public for “Jewish survivors” (and Jews in general), now in their old age. In this case, readers are informed that “as they get older, a lot of these people feel like they’re facing extinction for a second time.” [GEITLIN, p. 1] This “extinction,” as the article notes, is death itself, something – apparently lost to the author of the piece – no Jewish suffering, of “survivor” quality or not, has a corner on.

As Jewish scholar Peter Novick notes why Jewish victimology themes – especially the Holocaust – of the Jewish power elite is so omnipresent in popular culture:

“There are many reasons why concern with the Holocaust among the 2 or 3 percent of the American population that is Jewish came to pervade American society. I will mention one important reason here, if only because it is often nervously avoided. We are not just ‘the people of the book,’ but the people of the Hollywood film and television mini-series, of the magazine article and the newspaper column, of the comic book and academic symposium. When a high level of concern with the Holocaust became widespread in American Jewry, it was, given the important role that Jews play in American media and opinion-making elites, not only natural, but virtually inevitable that it would spread throughout the culture at large.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 12]

Let us also turn to other specific Jewish/Israeli issues in the mass media and widespread Jewish-enforced censorship against addressing, let alone scrutinizing, the dominant Jewish presence at the upper echelons of the mass media and its influence in shaping American popular culture. The taboo against this subject is itself institutionalized, usually by dismissing any queries about the subject as both groundless and nakedly anti-Semitic. At a New York Times-sponsored question-and-answer session for the foreign press in 1987, for example, Mato Sato, a press officer at the Japanese mission to the United Nations, made waves for daring to ask Jewish New York Times Foreign Editor (later Executive Editor) Joseph Lelyveld why the Times covers “so many Jewish stories” and “how many Jewish editors are employed at the New York Times?” Sato apparently did not realize that asking such questions are forbidden and considered “bizarre” (to use Lelyveld’s description of them) in American society. Lelyveld responded, said the Jewish Week, by saying “that he was unaware of employees’ religious backgrounds.” (This is a curious response for someone whose own father is a rabbi). [ATLAS, J., 6-7-2000] (Lelyveld was appointed to be Executive Editor by the Times ‘Jewish owner Arthur Ochs Sulzberger in 1994, fol-
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Jewish scholar David Grossman (who coauthored a book with a Japanese scholar about Japanese “cultural stereotypes” about Jews) noted the Sato incident, saying that the inquirer’s “questions were tactless and displayed astonishing naïveté, but they were probably not malicious and the intense reaction he received bewildered Japanese observers, who failed to understand what he had done wrong.” [GOODMAN, p. 10] (Meanwhile, while Jews and Israel are institutionally protected from examination of their collective power in the mass media, economic, social, and political worlds, it is apparently no problem for anyone that Marvin Wolf wrote a book in recent years entitled The Japanese Conspiracy, that Daniel Burstein wrote Yen! Japan’s New Financial Empire and Its Threat to America, or that Pat Choate called his own work Agents of Influence: How Japan Manipulates the American Political and Economic System. At least two of these three authors are Jewish: all three surnames can be found in Jewish surname databases. In Burstein’s case, he links Japanese self-identity to Hitler’s Master Race concept and even mentions the Japanese reporter’s inquiry [about how many Jews work at the New York Times and why there were so many articles about Jews] to be an example of Japanese anti-Semitism). [BURSTEIN, D., 1988, p. 72-73]

Sato might well have asked the same questions about the Jewish stories in the Washington Post. A Jewish scholar, Barry Rubin, notes that

“Three of four main articles in the July 22, 1990 Washington Post features section were about assimilating Jews who had made widely different choices – Andrew Dice Clay [Silverman], Sandra Bernhard, and Allen Ginsberg. That newspaper’s October 18, 1992 reviews section is full of books by or about Jews: on sports and the American Jewish experience; a biography of Bill Graham, a Holocaust survivor and leading rock and roll impresario; the story of a upper-class New York family infected by anti-Semitism; a South African woman’s group portrait of her set of Jewish friends; a Jewish couple’s volume on foreign investments in America, analyzing problems of multiple loyalties and foreign influence paralleling issues in assimilation; and a Jewish author’s book on politics in higher education, discussing multiculturalism in terms drawn from the integration of Jews into American society.” [RUBIN, p. xiii]

Earlier, Rubin (whose specific interest is declared to be Jewish assimilation into American society), notes that

“An author knows a subject is compelling when it seems omnipresent. For example, the April 1991 Vanity Fair contains four relevant articles concerning Alfred Stieglitz, scion of a rich German Jewish family who
founded art photography in America and wed Georgia O’Keeffe; Lady Mary Fairfax, whose family migrated from Poland in the 1920s and who became a powerful press lord and doyenne of Australian society; Charles Feldman, head of Famous Artists Agency and the great love of Jean Harlow; and the actress Ali McGraw, whose Hungarian mother would never admit to being Jewish.” [RUBIN, p. xii]

Of course the American mass media is regularly flooded with stories about Israel. As Doug Bloomfield, “former chief lobbyist for AIPAC, the pro-Israel lobby on Capitol Hill”, remarked:

“If E.T. had stayed in the U.S. and read the New York Times, the Washington Post, or the Christian Science Monitor, or had watched the network news instead of riding around in bicycle baskets, when he finally returned home and they asked him, ‘What is it like on earth?’ – the first thing he would have said is, “There are three superpowers. There is Israel and two others.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 33]

The Judeo-centric world view of film director Mel Brooks suggests, increasingly, a useful paradigm in analyzing the Jewish entertainment world. As Andrea Most observes,

“The humor in Brooks’ movies originate in the idea that everything and everyone is Jewish – and it is his job to reveal it as such. So the oldest man in the world is Jewish (The Two Thousand Year Old Man), the Indians are Jewish (Blazing Saddles), Sherwood Forest’s Merry Band is Jewish (Robin Hood: Men in Tights), the past is Jewish (History of the World), and the future is Jewish (Spaceballs).” [MOST, A., 1999, p. 337]

In the Arab-Jewish political field, in 1985 American media reports were swamped with stories about the horrible death of wheelchair-bound Leon Klinghoffer, an American Jew murdered by Palestinian ship hijackers of the Achillo Lauro. Yet, notes Israeli Amnon Rubenstein, “In the aftermath of the hijacking, the United States media covered his death in great detail … The same week, Alex Odeh, a United States citizen of Palestinian descent who was the West Coast Director of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, was murdered by a bomb explosion [later attributed by the FBI to an act of terrorism by the Jewish Defense League]… Odeh’s death was virtually ignored by the national media.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 157]

“The truth of the matter,” said novelist Truman Capote on the Johnny Carson Show in 1973, “… is the entire cultural press, publishing … television … theatre … film industry … is almost 90% Jewish-oriented. I mean, I can’t even count on one hand five people of any importance – of real importance – in the media who aren’t Jewish. Here’s this God-damned Jewish mafia working tooth and tong on the New York Review of Books, the New York Times, whether they’re doing it consciously or not. And mostly they’re doing it consciously.” [FORSTER, p. 108-109] Needless to say, Capote’s public comments are mainstays in Jewish-written books about Anti-Semitism.
In 1988 John Hohrn, a Black official at the Mississippi film commission, was assailed by the Anti-Defamation League and other Jewish groups for the following comment:

“You hear people say, ‘Well, that’s civil rights – that story’s been told already.’ But no one has questioned the right of the Jewish community, which controls the media, to retell the story of the Holocaust.” [JEWISH WEEK, 1-15-88]

ADL attorney Betsy Ross denounced Hohrn’s clause about Jews to be “obnoxious ... This person needs an education. His comments about Jews controlling the media is completely inaccurate. It’s an age-old anti-Semitic canard.” [JEWISH WEEK, 1-15-88, p. 33]

This “anti-Semitic canard” of Jewish media dominance has held credence, albeit discretely, in some pretty high places. According to the memoirs of H. R. Haldeman, President Richard Nixon’s Chief of Staff, during one closed door session with his boss, “there was a considerable discussion of the terrible problem arising from the total Jewish domination of the media and agreement that this is something that would have to be dealt with.” [NEW YORK TIMES, 5-18-94, p. A19] Nixon’s vice-president, Spiro Agnew, even spoke publicly about Jews and the mass media, complaining that the American media “was unduly influenced by Zionist opinion ... All you have to do is look around and see who owns the networks, who owns the Washington Post ... the New York Times ... As you look around in ... the big news business you see a heavy concentration of Jewish people.” [VOLKMAN, p. 104] Even when Richard Nixon signed with Warners to write his memoirs, the people (including his press secretary) who arranged the deal were all Jewish:

“The price, according to the agent, Irving ‘Swifty’ Lazar, would be $2 million. Lazar met with William Sarnoff and Howard Kaminsky of Warners Communications and Nixon’s former press secretary, Ron Ziegler, and sealed the deal with handshakes.” [BAGDIKIAN, p. 34]

In the entertainment world, country singer Dolly Parton was forced to apologize to the Jewish community for telling Vogue magazine that “everybody’s afraid to touch anything that’s religious because most of the people out here [in Hollywood] are Jewish and it’s a frightening thing for them to promote Christianity.” TV personality Kathy Lee Gifford (whose own father – Epstein – was Jewish) also publicly apologized for complaining that “they’re changing who crucified Jesus,” during a TV show that discussed recent New Testament changes. [ROSENFELD, p. 61] “When the NRA [National Rifle Association] exercises political power,” noted Jewish journalist Philip Weiss, “it’s a hot-button issue. When Jewish money plays a part [in politics], discussing it is anti-Semitic. If you say anything about [Jewish power in] Hollywood, you are shouted down.” [WEISS, p. 32]

In 1990, Giancarlo Parretti, an Italian financier (with alleged links to the criminal underworld) complained to an Italian newspaper that “the Jews have ganged up on me ... The fact is that the Jews don’t like the idea that I represent
the first Catholic communications network … There isn’t a single [media] holding company in the world that isn’t in the hands of the Jews.” [TUGEND, T, p. 37]

Parretti was widely attacked for anti-Semitism for this statement. The Los Angeles Times quoted a “veteran Hollywood leader” as saying that “it’s one thing to note that many prominent figures in all aspects of Hollywood are Jewish and always have been. It’s quite another, however, to make hostile statements on that fact.” “As an anti-Semite,” said another movie executive, “I don’t see how he could ever function in this town.” Rushing to Parretti’s defense was Yoram Globus, a Jewish co-President of Paretti’s Pathe Communications Corporation (which had earlier taken over the Canon Group, owned by the Israeli-born Globus and his cousin Menahem Golan). “There is not even an inch,” proclaimed Globus, “of anti-Semitism in him.” [TUGEND, T, Hollywood, p. 37]

In 1994, William Cash’s aforementioned comments in Great Britain’s the Spectator about Jews controlling Hollywood drew widespread attack and publicity. Both the New York Times and Chicago Tribune featured prominent articles about Cash’s speaking the unspeakable in a distant overseas publication. The Toronto Star even joined in with a headline proclaiming, “Anti-Semitic Article Shakes Hollywood.” [TORONTO, p. C4] A group of Hollywood actors wrote a letter (see http://jewishtribalreview.org/cash.htm) to the Spectator accusing Cash’s piece of “racist cant” and “anti-Semitic stereotypes.” Jewish author Neal Gabler, in condemning Cash’s ideas of excessive Jewish power in Hollywood, told a Jewish newspaper that Cash was “only contrite to the extent that he feels he has damaged his career – which of course he has. [Cash was a Hollywood-based reporter for London’s Daily Telegraph.] I can’t imagine anyone [in Hollywood] wanting to meet with him after that article.” [CENTURY, p. 1] This danger of Cash losing his entire journalistic career, of course, is the paradigm for the reason that those who know well Jewish dominance in the mass media cannot give public voice to the fact.

Among those formally complaining directly to Cash’s regular employer – the aforementioned Conrad Black, owner of the Daily Telegraph – was Britain’s powerful Jewish Board of Deputies lobbying body. Not only does Black own the Telegraph, he also owns the Spectator, the journal in which Cash’s offending article appeared. Jewish omnipresence in the mass media is so great that even the editor of the Spectator itself, Dominic Lawson, was Jewish – the son of former British chancellor Nigel Lawson. [WOOLF, p. 1] For Cash’s simple telling of the truth, Rabbis Marvin Hier and Abraham Cooper of the Los Angeles Simon Wiesenthal Center charged the sensationally absurd libel that the British author “has actually plagiarized a page from the playbook of [Nazi theorists] Julius Streicher and Joseph Goebbels … fanning the flames of bigotry and genocide.” [RICHLER, p. 32]

Referring to the Vanity Fair article addressing 16 Hollywood media moguls that Cash used as reference in his own piece, apologist Gabler – author of a book on (in his own words) the “Jewish invention of Hollywood” – complained that those 16 “are not predominantly Jewish at all. Only nine of the 16 are Jewish.” When the (Jewish) Forward pointed out that Gabler’s own books focused pre-
dominantly on Jews, he responded, “What I’m interested in are the figures who shaped popular culture in the 20th century, and because such a disproportionate number are Jewish, the subject inevitably arises.” [CENTURY, p. 1]

Richard Neuhaus in the National Review pointed out the craziness, and even sinister intent, of the Jewish Cash crucifixion:

“Some Jews have ratcheted up to an almost painful degree their antennae for the detection of anti-Semitism. A few months ago, the New York Times went ballistic when the London Spectator ran a little article on the self-described dominance of Jews in Hollywood. The somewhat naive Spectator author thought he was doing nothing more than reporting on interesting circumstances; as it turned out, he was in large part relying on what Jewish writers had said about Jews in Hollywood. The young man did not understand that non-Jews are not supposed to notice when Jews publicly celebrate Jewish influence and success. As anyone familiar with the large role of Jews in American history knows, the large role of Jews in American popular entertainment goes back to the nineteenth century and, far from being a secret, has been frequently extolled in film and song. With weeks of letters and commentary in the Spectator, our British cousins had great fun with this little squall, chalking it up as yet another instance of American hypocrisy about our professed devotion to free speech.” [NEUHAUS, p. 52]

British journalist Charles Cummings noted that

“It’s a delicate subject. Mention the relationship between Hollywood and Jews and you can land in some very hot water. Journalist William Cash discovered this in 1991 when he wrote an article for the Spectator about the increasing influence of Jews in the American entertainment industry. More than a dozen movie luminaries – including Charlton Heston, Barbara Streisand, and Steven Spielberg – sent an impassioned letter of complaint to the magazine, chastising Cash as a latter-day Nazi and complaining about the trite and vulgar stereotypes in which he had couched his argument. Yet the thrust of the piece was accurate.” [CUMMINGS, p., 15]

As James Atlas noted in 2000:

“The Jewish dominance in the media, in newspapers and magazines and Hollywood and the publishing industry, is an old story (not that its implications have been very arduously explored); I continue to find myself baffled – and not a little amazed – by the popularity of an insipid narcissist like Jerry Seinfeld, but he has certainly achieved market penetration as a representative Jew.” [ATLAS, J., 6-2000]

In 1997, British author John Le Carre (David Cornwell) also found himself in hot water with the Jewish Thought Police. In the best interests of his writing career, he had to grovel before England’s Anglo-Israel Association “to lecture them on his reasons for detesting anti-Semitism, and to defend himself against charges which had been made against him on another continent.” Years earlier, his third novel, The Spy Who Came In from the Cold, had stirred “Jewish Amer-
ican organizations,” noted the *London Sunday Telegraph*, “to know whether he equated Jew with communist.” Le Carre recounted worse charges against his last novel, *The Tailor of Panama*:

“We sat head in hand in my American editor’s office, the *New York Times* review of *The Tailor of Panama* before us, telling us that consciously or not I had been listening to the internal voices of my English anti-Semitism as I wrote my novel. What could I possibly say in reply? … I wanted to tell the *New York Times* that to publish a smear of anti-Semitism on such arbitrary grounds was a serious act of editorial irresponsibility. But a tumult of alarm broke out among my well wishers. 'If you write that, your career in the United States will be ruined.’” [WAUGH, A., p. 39]

In a rare case of justice against Jewish-directed persecution, in 2000 William Quigley was awarded $10.5 million in a suit against the Denver, Colorado, regional Anti-Defamation League. A jury trial found the ADL to be itself guilty of defamation for publicly accusing Quigley and his wife of anti-Semitism. As the *Cleveland Jewish News* observed:

“William Quigley, an executive in the film industry, claimed that as a result of the public anti-Semitism charged against him, his career was severely damaged. After the charges he was shunned by colleagues, most of whom were Jewish, he said.” [KARFELD, M., 5-19-2000, p. 24]

This man, surrounded by Jews in the film industry, lives in Denver, not Los Angeles or New York.

Jewish censorship of free speech about them in the mass media has taken an even more sinister form in Canada. In 1994, *Doug Collins*, a veteran journalist for *Vancouver’s North Shore News*, (with a circulation of only 60,000) wrote a review of *Stephen Spielberg*’s Holocaust movie, *Schindler’s List*, thereby launching into a critique of the Jewish Holocaust mythology as a political and economic weapon, and a lambaste of Jewish power in Hollywood. His article was entitled “Hollywood Propaganda.”

“I think [Collins] made some valid points,” said his editor, Tim Renshaw. “I wouldn’t have approved the column if it was over the top.” [BROOK p. 58] “I’ve published Doug Collins for fifteen years,” added Peter Speck, the publisher of the *North Shore News*. “He has written 1,500 columns for me, and he’s a fine man, a fine journalist, he’s a pro, he’s the recipient of a military medal, he served with distinction in the Second World War, and he was captured by the Germans and he escaped ten times. Ten times!” [BROOK, p. 58]

In response to Collins’ article, the Canadian Jewish Congress solicited a handful of other organizations to join it in pressing criminal charges against Collins under a 1993 British Columbia “anti-hate” law which the B.C. Press Council and B.C. Civil Liberties Union decried as a suppression of free speech in a democratic society. The law, for the first time tested, prohibited the publication of material “that is likely to expose a person or group or class of persons to hatred or contempt because of race, color, ancestry, place of origin, religion, martial status…” etc., etc. etc. [BROOK, p. 58]

In 1997 Collins went to trial.
The lawyer for the Canadian Jewish Congress, Gregory Walsh, “argued [that] the column exposed Jewish people to hatred.” [TODD, JEWS, p. A4] Collins’ crime, declared Walsh, was saying that “Jews are responsible for false Holocaust propaganda, which is itself hateful; they are master manipulators who use their extensive ownership of the media to widely disseminate Holocaust ‘nonsense’ for profit, to the great harm of innocent people and society generally.” [TODD, JEWS, p. A4]

A University of Toronto professor, Bart Testa, noted the Ottawa Citizen, testified that Collins’ article “portrayed Jewish people as powerful, manipulative and dedicated to keeping alternative views of the Nazi Holocaust of Jews, the subject of Schindler’s List, out of public view.” [TODD, p. F11] Another Jewish professor, Leonidas Hill, “a specialist in the history of anti-Semitism,” testified that Collins’ column infers that “Jews are deceitful and conspire to swindle the non-Jewish world for their own gains … Mr. Collins poses as a dauntless civil libertarian and a champion of free speech. This pose made it possible for him to continue publishing his anti-Semitic diatribes.” [TODD, p. F11]

In reply, the British Columbia Press Council lawyer, Roger McConchie, denounced the B.C. Human Rights Code under which Collins was tried, calling it “the most significant legislative infringement of press freedom in the history of British Columbia.” [TODD, JEWS, p. A4]

In 1997, the B.C. Human Rights Commission decreed that Collins’ Schindler’s List column was “likely to make it more acceptable for others to express hatred or contempt against Jewish people,” but that it did not have enough “calumny, detestation or vilification” to punish him. [BOLAN, p. A1] Nonetheless, a Jewish Victorian businessman, Harry Abrams, filed another complaint against Collins. (Abrams’ tact was to file as an individual, although he is the British Columbia’s representative for B’nai B’rith Canada. The earlier complaint was filed by another Jewish organization, the Canadian Jewish Congress). This complaint focused on the cumulative impact of four Collins columns that had critical commentary about Jews. This time, Collins lost. “The columns,” decided the Commission’s next tribunal report, “repeatedly reinforced some of the most virulent forms of anti-Semitism, and perpetuate the most damaging stereotypes of Jews: that they are selfish, greedy, and manipulative.” [MOORE, D., p. A8] … “Mr. Collins perpetuates the stereotype against Jews, especially those which allege widespread power and influence … The ideas and statements in these four articles reflect and, in fact, reinforce common anti-Semitic stereotypes. Mr. Collins not only expresses discriminating attitudes, but also exposes Jewish people to hatred and contempt.” [VANCOUVER SUN, p. A19]

The Commission’s final report was even ordered to be published in the North Shore News. Managing editor Tim Renshaw responded with amazement that his paper would be forced to publish “government-dictated content.” “Basically,” said Renshaw, “we have been tried on the same thing [and] they got the desired result the second time around. I guess if it wasn’t the second time, then there would have been a third time.” The B.C. Press Council declared that the
tribunal dictate was “an unjustified violation of the principle of the freedom of the press.” [MOORE, D., p. A8]

Author Doug Collins (whose trial costs were $200,000) was ordered by the Commission to apologize and pay Abrams $2000 “as compensation for the injury [Collins’ words] have caused to his dignity and … self-respect.” [VANCOUVER SUN, p. A19] The North Shore News was also ordered not to publish anything more “contemptuous” of Jews. The Commission “ordered Collins and the paper to stop publishing statements that expose or are likely to expose Jewish persons to hatred or contempt in violation of section 7 (1) (b) of the human rights code.” [BOLAN, K., 12-3-99, p. 5]

“What is particularly odious in its ruling,” noted journalist Claire Hoy, “is that although the tribunal found Collins had not explicitly violated hate laws (and one could argue hate laws themselves are an outrageous violation of free speech, incidentally), the collective wisdom of his columns is enough to give the impression of hate-mongering.” [HOY, p. 5]

After the decision in his favor, Mr. Abrams said that the Collins columns “soften the ground” for another Holocaust. “They want to complete the job Hitler didn’t finish,” he said. In response to this wild charge, the 78-year old Collins – a prisoner of war at the May 31, 1940 battle of Dunkirk – asserted that “I was fighting Hitler when that louse bag was in diapers.” [DE CLOET, p. 27; Sinoski, p. B3]

Collins sought to appeal the Commission’s ruling. But the North Shore News could not join in the appeal. By 1999 the paper was itself owned by Hollinger International, the ardently pro-Israel media giant discussed earlier. Its Jewish CEO, David Radler, noted the reason why Hollinger’s North Shore News was abandoning its fight for free speech: “We support Collins’ right to write whatever he wants. Where we break with Collins is I don’t want Collins’ view in our newspaper. Basically, I find them inaccurate and offensive.” [TORRANCE, K., p. 24-25]

In the midst of the Doug Collins episodes, in 1998 Jewish journalist Paula Brook of the Vancouver Sun wrote an editorial about yet another successful Jewish censorial effort in the Vancouver area. After complaints by the Canadian Jewish Congress, journalist Greg Felton at the Vancouver Courier was forbidden by the paper’s owner, Sam Grippo, to write about Israel again. “I have received a directive not to publish any anti-Israel commentary in the newspaper,” Felton said in an interview. Noting this case, editor Tim Renshaw of the North Shore News (of Doug Collins notoriety), wrote that “the forces of censorship headed by the Canadian Jewish Congress continue to steamroll over any criticism of Israel or other things Jewish.” [BROOK, p. A17]

The title of Paul Brook’s article in reply to accusations of repeated Jewish censorship was “Business Rights Versus Free Speech.” She concluded her editorial, saying: “If those offended people [to articles like Felton’s] have the numbers behind them, and are represented by an advocacy group, more power to them. And if the owner [of the paper] responds by saying, you’re right – reprehensible speech is no longer free around here – then decisions are taken and life carries
on, and as long as the government stays out of it we do not call this censorship. We call it business.” [BROOK, p. A17]

In response, Rafeh Hulays, Director of External Affairs for the Arab Community of British Colombia, wrote that “the bottom line of Ms. Brook’s argument is that instead of entering a debate, a special interest group with powerful friends has the right to silence the views of journalists with whom it disagrees, no matter how legitimate these views are.” [HULAYS, p. A15]

By 2001, the aforementioned Doug Collins, in his own independent Internet column, noted the state of Canadian “freedom of the press.” Jewish media mogul Izzy Asper had bought out “Hollinger/Southam’s 13 daily newspapers, 126 community newspapers, Canadian Internet operations, and fifty per cent of National Post.” The North Shore News was now an Asper paper, and both its publisher, Peter Speck, and Executive Editor, Tim Renshaw – supporters of Collins right to free speech about Jews and Israel – were fired. Likewise, the aforementioned Greg Felton, critic of Israel, was dumped from the Vancouver Courier (even before that paper became part of the Asper chain). [COLLINS, D., 2001] to read Collins’ explanation of the matter see http://jewishtribalreview.org/collins.htm

Jewish censorial efforts to squelch free speech, as noted in an earlier chapter, are manifest in many ways across the world. Even in western democracies, citizens can face criminal conviction merely for expressing negative opinions about Jews. Take the case of Robert Holzach, the honorary chairman of Switzerland’s largest bank, who the made the mistake of speaking too freely to a reporter from New Yorker magazine. In 1997 Holzach faced prosecution by Swiss courts for remarks he made to Jane Kramer that there was “a Jewish conspiracy” to take over the world’s most important banks. Formal, legal charges against Holzach for this comment was made by Marcel Hess, a Jewish politician in Basel. Holzach denied he ever made the remarks.

Conservative syndicated columnist Joseph Sobran, (charged often to be an anti-Semite), formerly of the National Review, notes in overview the problem at stake in all these cases:

“Not only persecution of Jews but any critical mention of Jewish power in the media and politics is roundly condemned as ‘anti-Semitism’… It’s permissible to discuss the power of every other group, from the Black Muslims to the Christian Right, but the much greater power of the Jewish Establishment is off-limits. That, in fact, is the chief measure of its power: its ability to impose its own taboos while tearing down the taboos of others … Power openly acquired, openly exercised, is one thing. You may think organized labor or the Social Security lobby abuses power, but you don’t jeopardize your career by saying so. But a kind of power that forbids its own public mention, like the Holy Name in the Old Testament, is another matter entirely … Journalists are as afraid of Jewish power as politicians are. This means that public discussion is cramped and warped by unspoken fear – a fear journalists won’t ac-
knowledge, because it embarrasses their premises of being fearless critics of power.” [SOBRAN]

Another conservative critical commentator, Wilmot Robertson, noted the same thing in 1973:

“Any critical discussion of Jewish wealth – or for that matter any critical discussion of any aspect of Jewish power – immediately exposes the author or speaker to charges of anti-Semitism … [ROBERTSON, p. 179] … Instead of submitting anti-Semitism to the free play of ideas, instead of making it a topic for debate in which all can join, Jews and their liberal supporters have managed to organize an inquisition in which all acts, writings, and even thoughts critical of Jewry are treated as threats to the moral order of mankind.” [ROBERTSON, W., p. 180]

One has to look long and far to find any observer willing to stick his (or her) neck out in the mass media to raise the Jewish issue. A rare example occurred way back in the 1970s, when the directors of the Anti-Defamation League noted (as a severe example of irrational anti-Semitism) an article that appeared in a little Gentile-owned newspaper in Vermont:

“In May 1972, the Bennington Banner of Vermont, a liberal newspaper, carried a column headlined ‘Decline and Fall’ by Samuel Ogden who wrote about ‘WASP’ decline resulting from the fact that ‘the news media, the recent books, the books reviewed, all speak the viewpoints of the Jews,’ that the doctorates and professorships are principally held by Jews, that as a result ‘the American culture is rapidly becoming Jewish in character,’ which may be its ‘manifest destiny’ but which has contributed to a society that is ‘taking on the aspects of a dreadful nightmare.’” [FORSTER/EPSTEIN, p. 111]

All in all, the mass media itself and Jewish lobbying efforts have been astonishingly successful in cloaking Jewish mass media dominance, and framing Jews in America as relatively meek, oppressed, disenfranchised, and invisible. And victims. No mainstream media venue dares to address the dominating Jewish mass media presence. But generic “whites,” however unjustly, and incorrectly, are fair game. In 2001, for example, the Los Angeles Times, in an article about the lack of minorities in Hollywood, blamed “whites” for this discrepancy, condemning the Hollywood power structure, specifically that “90% of each major [Hollywood] guild (Screen Actors, Directors, Writers and Producers) is white, the majority of them male.” [MUNOZ, L, 3-24-01]

In 1945 a national poll found that 67% of the American population felt that Jews “had too much power” in America. As Jewish power actually grew dramatically over the following decades, it was veiled, and the perception of it was socialized away. By 1962, the perception of “too much Jewish power” was down to 17%. [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 117] In 1945, according to one survey, 19% of Americans believed that Jews were a “threat to America.” By 1950, this percentage was only 5 percent. “This short term shift,” noted Jewish psychoanalysts Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, “may well have been influenced by the exposure of Nazi genocidal practices.” [BETTELHEIM/JANOWITZ, p. 6-7]
These authors were especially troubled, however, by the results of a 1952 survey question that found that college-educated people were more nearly twice as likely (17 to 10 percent) than grammar school-educated Americans to believe that “Jews were more likely to be Communists than others.” [BETTELHEIM/JANOWITZ, p. 19] [See evidence elsewhere in this volume that points to this as an obvious fact]

Always monitoring their fellow citizens, in a 1986 Anti-Defamation League national survey of 1,000 Christian conservatives, “Jews ranked far down the list of those thought to have too much power [in America]. Big business was too powerful for 67% of the group, organized labor for 55%, Arabs for 38%, Catholics for 23%, and 11% for blacks, compared to only 7% who thought Jews were too powerful.” [LIPSET, p. 157]

Such beliefs bear repeating, that we might ponder their implications: In 1945 67% of Americans felt that Jews had “too much power” in the United States and by 1986 only 7% of a religious section of them felt that way. In the more recent survey, five and a half times as many people thought that Arabs have more power in America than Jews. Over 50% more of these people understand the “power” of the largely impoverished Black community to be more than that of Jews. What evidence, one must wonder, has been disseminated to (or been withheld from) such people, and through what channels, to create, maintain, and enforce such preposterously skewed opinions? (“Jewish defense agencies,” notes Ronald Bayor, “helped create a climate in which Jew-baiting was no longer respectable. The assault upon anti-Semitism found in movies, the press, and general and politically oriented magazines by 1947 all contributed to its decline as a reputable movement.” [BAYOR, 1986, p. 187])

Such recent perceptions about Jews from the likes of “Christian conservatives” are not unusual to Americans in general. A 1986 Roper Poll of the American public at-large revealed that only 8% thought that Jews had “too much power” in the United States. [PENKOWER, p. 321] In 1998, the Anti-Defamation League conducted a survey of Americans about the fact that the “presidents of the three national television networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC, are Jewish” (not mentioning the far deeper cultural hegemony of Jews in the Hollywood world). 80% of respondents didn’t think Jewish executives “tend to allow more sex and violence programming than non-Jewish executives” and 80% opined that there was “no connection between the amount of Christian-oriented programming on TV and the fact that the executives of the major networks are Jewish.” [ADL, NOV 1998]

But we are still very far from finished with the story of Jewish influence, and “power,” in popular culture.

One last word here, however, about polls and public opinions of “Jewish power” within America. While American awareness of Jewish economic and mass media influence in America is miniscule and considered – when it is rarely evidenced – as an “anti-Semitic” view, across the world, in 1983, the Hanoch Smith Research Center conducted a national poll of the Jews of Israel. Colin Shindler notes that
“When Hanoch Smith asked his Israeli respondents whether the Jews of America have control of important branches of the American economy, 73 per cent replied in the affirmative … In a non-Jewish society, this would have aroused suspicion of anti-Semitism, but emanating from a Jewish society, it seemed both a matter of pride and bewilderment.” [SHINDLER, p. 94-95]
Likewise, a 2001 survey of Israelis by the World Jewish Congress found that “the most admired characteristic of U.S. Jews is ‘their cultural and political influence’ – 34 percent – followed by ‘Jewish pride’ – 22 percent – and their ‘sense of unity and community’ – 21 percent.” [AXELROD, T., 10-29-01]
“By the early 1960s … Jews were even more heavily represented in the knowledge professions than they had been a decade earlier. They clearly dominated the political culture of New York, where their style and views had been adopted by relatively large numbers of non-Jewish intellectuals. They also became increasingly influential in other cosmopolitan centers such as Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Berkeley. In all these cities, they played an important role in educating non-Jews to a more cosmopolitan perspective.”

Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, 1982, p. 103

“It is ironic that many of the literary figures who shied from Jewish themes embodied in their writing more alleged Jewish traits than more consciously Jewish writers. There remains in their innermost self unsuspected residues of their inherited culture which no amount of rejection or denial could wholly eradicate. In both the self-hater and the detached, the affinity of supposed Jewish characteristics has been observed by both critics and laymen alike.”

Lothar Kahn, Jewish author, 1961, p. 31

“If the literary output of 1999 reveals anything, it reveals that Jewish writers are among the privileged citizens of the global village … Given the unprecedented international reach of their imaginations, their absorption in Jewish history and theology, and the staggering diversity of emergent American voices, it just may be that these young Jewish American writers find that they share more in common artistically with their Jewish contemporaries writing in Israel, Europe, Asia, and the rest of the Americas than they share in common with their non-Jewish contemporaries writing in the United States.”

Andrew Furman, one of the judges for the National Jewish Book award, MAY/JUNE 2000, p. 30]

In a 1974 book, The American Intellectual Elite, Charles Kadushin produced the results of his studies. He had tabulated lists of contributors to leading American “intellectual” publications, narrowed the names down to 200, and in a series of queries or interviews asked his subjects who were the most influential
intellectuals around. Of the top 21 most highly rated (by others in this publish-
ing circle), 15 were Jewish, including Hannah Arendt, Daniel Bell, Saul Bellow, Noam Chomsky, Paul Goodman, Richard Hofstadter, Irving Howe, Irving Kristol, Norman Mailer, Herbert Marcuse, Norman Podhoretz, David Ries-
man, Robert Silvers, Susan Sontag, and Lionel Trilling. [KADUSHIN, p. 30] Half of the total 200 were also reputed to be Jewish. As Kadushin notes,

“Jews are indeed much more strongly represented among leading in-
tellectuals than the population at large. They compose about half of the American intellectual elite. Catholics are vastly underrepresented, but Protestants, who are one-third of the group, are also relatively under-
represented … [KADUSHIN, p. 23] … Even in comparison with elite American professors (those who published more than 20 articles in ac-
ademic journals and who teach in high-quality colleges and universities) of the same age and in the same fields, there are between two and five times as many Jews in the intellectual elite.” [KADUSHIN, p. 24]

In the world of academia (professorships) at-large, 60% of the “intellectual elite” were found to be Jewish. [KADUSHIN, p. 24] The “intellectual elite” also had a geographical flavor – half of the academic elite held positions at four East Coast universities – Columbia, New York University, Harvard, and Yale. [KA-
DUSHIN, p. 23]

Another (Jewish) professor echoes this study in claiming that by the late 1970s 50% of the “top intellectuals” in America were Jewish, the percentage rising to 51% of all “elite” academics in the social sciences and 61% in the human-
ities. [RUBENSTEIN, p. 64] Stephen Whitfield cites evidence that as many as 30% of the professors at “major universities” by the 1980s were also Jewish. [WHITFIELD, American, p. 9] Yet another Jewish professor used such figures to declare that 76% “of the most influential intellectuals had at least one Jewish parent.” [DAVIS, D., p. 29]

To begin to understand the implications of all this, (other than the popular Jewish explanations that Jews are “just smart,” or socially positioned as margin-
ialized “others” to recognize greater philosophical insights) one must examine how someone gets on such a list of prominent people. Kadushin’s study sample was selected from those published in “twenty or so leading intellectual jour-
nals.” These included the New York Review of Books, the New York Times Book Review, the New Republic, Commentary, Partisan Review, Daedalus, Ramparts, Dissent, the Village Voice and other such periodicals. All of these were founded, controlled, or edited by Jews, as were many of the others on the list. “As might be expected,” noted Kadushin, “the persons most often named as having the power to make or break reputations were the editors of the key journals – Robert Silvers, Jason Epstein [and his wife Barbara], and Norman Podhoretz. [All are Jewish] A few persons [of the intellectuals surveyed in Kadushin’s study] commented on the alliance between journals and book publishers represented by Silvers and Jason Epstein.” [KADUSHIN, p. 53]

Kadushin’s definition of a “leading intellectual” underscores its incestuous current; a “leading intellectual” is “simply any person who writes regularly for
leading intellectual journals and/or has his books reviewed in them.” [KADUSHIN, p. 8] Kadushin himself confronts the inbred dimensions of the “intellectual elite”: “I have the impression from reading autobiographical accounts of intellectual life that young intellectuals tend to be sponsored by older intellectuals and into intellectual prominence through a combination of journals, circles, and political parties controlled by the older intellectuals.” [KADUSHIN, p. 25]

In order to fully understand this scenario, one must begin with the 1930s and a group of mostly Jewish individuals that have sequentially risen en masse in New York City as part of an interconnected literary, publishing, and “intellectual” network, often self-referred to as “The New York Intellectuals” or “The Family.” The Family, wrote Philip Nobile, is “an elite array of critics, editors, novelists, and poets that manage the country’s high culture.” [NOBILE, p. 13] “The New York literary world,” says Family member Gregory Podhoretz, “began to acquire a recognizable identity …. [one could] think of it as a Jewish family.” [PODHORETZ, Making, p. 109] To those outside the Family circle in the literary world, they – and their heirs today – are the Jewish (literary) Mafia. Homogeneous only in that they are almost all Jews (not uncommonly warring among themselves), they inevitably linked with the many webs of the expanding Jewish-predominated mass media; a few “intellectuals” even became household names. As a group, they are credited with profound influence in the shaping of the twentieth century American cultural, social, and even the political scene.

“During the last few years,” wrote Family member Irving Howe in 1969, “the talk about the New York Establishment has taken an unpleasant turn. Whoever does a bit of lecturing about the country is likely to encounter, after a few drinks, literary academics who inquire enviously, sometimes spitefully, about ‘what’s new in New York.’ … As polite needling questions are asked about the cultural life of New York, a rise of sweat comes to one’s brow, for everyone knows what no one says: New York means Jews.” [HOWE, p. 267]

Of course the New York Intellectuals were – and their descendants are – not a formal organization, but rather an informal clique, a communally self-promotive camaraderie of writers, critics, editors, and publishers. Alexander Bloom suggests that the following individuals may be considered to be part of the Family’s inner ring:


Other candidates for connective inclusion include Henry Roth, Michael Blankfort, Leon Uris, Meyer Levin, Arthur Cohen, Louis Utermeyer, Herman Wouk, Arthur Miller, Muriel Rukyeser, Louis Zara,
Paul Goodman, Barbara Epstein, Steven Marcus, John Simon, and many others.

Rings radiating outward include I. F. Stone, Herman Kahn, Hans Morgenthau, Sidney Hertzberg, Ronald Steel, David T. Bazelon, Nat Hentoff, Oscar Handlin, Daniel Boorstin, and others.

In 1980, Daniel Bell, a prominent Family member, broke down his version of the Jewish contingent of the New York Intellectuals and their “fields of interest” into the following categories:

- **Art:** Meyer Schapiro, Clement Greenberg, Harold Rosenberg
- **Philosophy:** Sidney Hooks, Hannah Arendt (Ernest Nagel)
- **Literary Criticism:** Lionel Trilling, Philip Rahv, Alfred Kazin, Irving Howe, Leslie Fiedler, Paul Goodman, Lionel Abel, Steven Marcus, Robert Warshow, Robert Brustein, Susan Sontag, Diana Trilling
- **Intellectual journalism:** Elliot Cohen, William Phillips, Irving Kristol, Robert Silvers, Norman Podhoretz, Jason Epstein, Theodore Solotaroff, Midge Decter
- **Theology:** (Will Herberg) (Emil Fackenheim) (Jacob Taubes) (Arthur Cohen)
- **Sociology:** Daniel Bell, Nathan Glazer, S. M. Lipset, (Philip Selznick) (Edward Shils) (Lewis Coser)
- **History:** Richard Hofstadter, Gertrude Himmelfarb
- **Economics:** (Robert Heilbroner) (Robert Lekachman)

Bell further lists eight Jews as the “Elders of the Family” (1920-1930), with six Gentile afforded “cousins” status. Bell adds ten more Jews as the Family’s “Younger Brothers” (1930-40) and seven more Gentiles as “cousins.” In the “Second Generation” of the Family (his own group), Bell lists ten new Jews and, rather noteworthy, the Gentile “cousin” group has dropped to two. The 1940-1950 new “Younger Brothers” category lists ten more Jews and, alas, we are down to one non-Jewish cousin. [BELL, *Intelligentsia*, p. 126-127] “These political intellectuals,” says Stephen Isaacs, “include a number of people who have known one another well for many years and who have been tagged the “College of Irvings” after Irving Kristol (a professor at New York University and co-editor of the *Public Interest* and Irving Howe (a professor at the City College of New York and editor of *Dissent*). [ISAACS, p. 53]

However one portrays the best known American “intellectuals,” New York-oriented or not, a huge proportion invariably came up Jewish. In the 1970s one commentator, Michael Novak, framed his own *Most Important American Intellectuals List* like this:

- **Ivy league pragmatists and humanists:** Henry Steele Commager, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.
- **Literary modernists:** Lionel Trilling, Louis Kampf, Irving Howe, Leslie Fiedler
- **Pluralists:** Nathan Glazer, Daniel Moynihan, David Reisam, Talcott Parsons, Will Herberg
– **New radicals**: Noam Chomsky, and “the New York Review of Book” gang
– **Conservative liberals**: Sidney Hooks, Norman Podhoretz, Irving Kristol
– **Europe-oriented humanities**: Hannah Arendt, Philip Rahv, George Lichtheim, Saul Bellow

**Jack Porter** responded to Novak’s Intellectuals List with his own about the subject, specifically focusing on a compilation of Jewish intellectual “insiders” who “despite their political differences, agree on two essential points: the survival and integrity of the Jewish people and the survival and integrity of the state of Israel. If any intellectual opposes either one of these, he or she stands outside the Jewish people.” [PORTER, p. 38 -39] Porter’s group includes David Brudnoy, Milton Friedman, Meir Kahane, Norman Podhoretz, Irving Kristol, Milton Himmelfarb, Nathan Glazer, Leonard Fein, I. L. Horowitz, Irving Howe, Arthur Waiskow, Morris U. Schappes, and Paul Jacobs.

The most notable factor in these last two lists is that Noam Chomsky, a Jewish professor of linguistics, is mentioned on the first, and is “left standing outside the Jewish people” on the second. Chomsky has in fact long since been ostracized and marginalized by the Jewish “Family” for his attacks against Jewish chauvinism and Israel. “What sets Chomsky … apart,” notes David Herman, “is his fierce attack on his fellow intellectuals as a class … Instead of producing truth, he argues, they often betray their vocation and produce amnesia about the past and distortion of the present … Intellectuals in the universities, think tanks, and media create a consensus of public opinion. All criticism is then marginalized by placing it beyond the pale of informed debate.” [HERMAN, p. 39] Not unusually, an American-born professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Barry Rubin, cited Chomsky as someone who was “intellectually unbalanced or psychologically disturbed.” [RUBIN, p. 217]

The New York Intellectuals, says **Alexander Bloom**, “held out for their personal independence but maintained their connections … They moved across the political landscape together … occupying the same large area at the same time … There is no question that these individuals embodied many of the most important political and social forces of recent years, that they helped shape what America thought – in its universities, its leading journals, and its political debate.” [BLOOM, p. 7] “Once journals have attained positions of eminence,” notes **Charles Kadushin**, “they have independent power to make or break the prestige of individual intellectuals. This power is exercised through the clique and star system, the ability to publish some people and not others, and the ability to select some ideas and not others. And as will be evident, the power to support one idea while ignoring or denigrating another gives one the key to the kingdom of the intellectuals.” [KADUSHIN, p. 51]

By the time [Jewish mogul] Punch Sulzberger [inheritor of the *New York Times*] occupied his father’s chair in 1963,” says former *Times* Executive Editor Max Frankel,

“American society had shed many of its anti-Semitic prejudices and permitted the rapid advancement of Jews in professional life and corporate suites. The general revulsion against fascism turned into a revulsion
against bigotry itself, as demonstrated by the election of the first Catholic president, John F. Kennedy. Exploiting this atmosphere, and Gentile guilt about the Holocaust, American Jews of my generation were emboldened to make them themselves culturally conspicuous, to flaunt their ethnicity, to find literary inspiration in their roots, and to bask in the resurrection of Israel.” [FRANKEL, M., 1999, p. 400]

“Jews play a markedly disproportionate role in political intellectualism in the United States,” wrote Stephen Isaacs in 1974, “Jewish intellectuals tend to stand out because many of them have been heavily advertised and, having a touch of the tummler, they themselves are often experts at self-promotion. They thrive not on mass awareness of their concepts but on the quality of their audience. The Jewish intellectuals predominate among the editors of the small but influential intellectual journals…” [ISAACS, p. 53] “Careers like those of [non-Jew] Margaret Mead, David Riesman, and Daniel Bell,” notes David Hollinger, “indicate the extent to which social scientists replaced the clergy as the most authoritative public moralists for educated Americans.” [HOLLINGER, p. 23]

“These people are the Diores and Shiaperillis of intellectual fashion,” the novelist George P. Eliot observed about the Family, “What they think today, you’re apt to find yourself, in a Sears-Roebuck-ish sort of way, thinking tomorrow.” [BLOOM, p. 313] “The literary field in which Jews are without qualification in the highest rank is that of the essay,” wrote Jewish author Marie Syrkin in 1964,

“be it column or book-length exposition. As social analyst, political commentator or literary critic, the American Jewish writer occupies a major role. In journalism every shade of political opinion has Jews among its ablest exponents. The gamut runs from the conservative Arthur Krock through the less predictable Walter Lippman to the liberal Max Lerner on to extreme radical pundits. In literary criticism the same variety and excellence are present.” [SYRKin, M., 1964, p. 231]

The Family took shape around the journal Partisan Review in the 1930s; they initially expressed a radical, confrontational and communist posture towards mainstream non-Jewish American society. The central theme of their communal identity – not yet overtly expressed as being Jewish – was that they were all outsiders, “alienated,” struggling in the margins of mass culture. Eventually, distinctly as Jews, notes Alexander Bloom, “they claimed … an expertise in marginality based on hundreds of years of experience.” [BLOOM, p. 169] “[The Family],” notes Norman Podhoretz, “did not feel that they belonged to America or that America belonged to them.’ [PODHERETZ, p. 117] “There was something decidedly Jewish about the intellectuals who began to cohere as a group around the Partisan Review in the later 30s,” notes Family member Irving Howe, “and one of the things that was ‘decidedly Jewish’ was that most were of Jewish birth!” [HOWE, p. 240] (What was/is a common situation for a non-Jew who sought/seeks to crack the Jewish-dominated publishing world? Take the case of British novelist George Orwell, of Animal Farm and 1984 fame. “His
first publisher, Victor Gollanz,” says Milton Goldin, “was a Communist who described himself as a Christian socialist and had been born into an Orthodox Jewish family. Orwell’s second publisher, Frederic Warburg [also Jewish, was] a descendant of the Swedish branch of the Warburg banking family … Jewish editors of the Partisan Review (then located in New York) acquainted a readership across the Atlantic with Orwell’s views. And when Jewish editors at the Book-of-the-Month Club chose Animal Farm as a club selection, the breakthrough at last provided him with a decent living.”) [GOLDIN, M., 11-29-2000]

“The chic word among the best Jewish writers today is ‘alienation,’” wrote Arthur Hertzberg in 1964, “which is a way of recognizing the truth that a Jew is irretrievably different. Writers like Norman Mailer and Leslie Fiedler, and a host of others, have the merit of seeing this fact continues to exist even where Jewish learning or active commitment have evaporated. They may not know why, and they may deny those reasons that they do know, yet these writers proclaim that the Jew in his very existence is alien to the world … the Jew is not becoming like everyone else they say; it is that everyone worth mentioning is really becoming just like the Jew. There is some superficial truth to this assertion at a moment in American life when so much of its literature is being written by Jews.” [HERTZBERG, p. 294] Jewish poet Delmore Schwartz once noted this “alienation which only a Jew can suffer, and use, as a cripple uses his weakness in order to beg.” [ATLAS, J., 1977, p. 166]

Among the literature promoted and disseminated by many Family members was the secular Jewish “religion” of Freudianism. One Partisan Review staffer noted that, “We were all more or less saturated with psychoanalytic jargon. Psychoanalysis was at that time very much in the air, and everybody seemed to be in it or contemplating it.” [TORREY] Partisan Review editor William Phillips edited two books on psychoanalysis as a basis for socio-cultural perception, Art and Psychoanalysis (1957) and Literature and Psychoanalysis (1983). Lionel Trilling’s influential volume, The Liberal Imagination, had chapters on “Art and Neurosis” and “Freud and Literature.” Louis Fraiberg wrote in his own Psychoanalysis and American Literary Criticism that “No other critic (than Trilling) has shown a comparable grasp of the significance of psychoanalysis; no other critic has so well incorporated it into his criticism.” [TORREY] “Many Jewish intellectuals,” suggests E. Fuller Torrey, “sought expiation of their guilt and remorse (about the Holocaust) in psychoanalysis.” [TORREY] In 1990 a random survey of New York psychiatrists, 50 to 80% of local book and literary journal editors were believed to be veterans of psychoanalysis. [TORREY]

Norman Podhoretz even described the Family’s bitter arguments among themselves in psychoanalytic – and Jewish – terms:

“To be adopted into the Family was a mark of great distinction … But once adopted, you could expect to be spoken of by many (not all) of your relatives in the most terrifyingly cruel terms … Transposed into a different key, it was the Jewish self-hatred that has always been the other side of the coin of Jewish self-love.” [PODHORETZ, p. 152]
While most of these Great Thinkers, in the beginning, distanced themselves from issues of their “Jewishness” (although, notes Irving Howe, “this severance from Jewish immigrant sources would later come to be a little suspect” [HOWE, p. 241], their collective path to money, status, and power is manifest in a most distinctly Jewish way: they were an influential clique, a clan, initially homogeneous only in that they were all part of the same mutually promotive network. Over the following decades their radicalism softened into an assertion of “anti-communist liberalism”; ultimately individuals spread from there across the political map. Increasingly however, after World War II, their most pressing common link was a strong reaffirmation of their Jewish identities, allegiance to Jewish parochialism, and emphatic support for the state of Israel.

Ironically, history has proven the Jewish Mafia’s essential self-image of being “alienated” and “marginalized” (later understood by them to be an ancestral reservoir of special Jewish insights) to become ridiculous. The Family has proven to be exactly the opposite of what they proclaimed themselves at first to be. History has revealed them as a group of literary hustlers and self-promoters who were profoundly influential and centrally located in deconstructing the institutions of the surrounding non-Jewish culture they so much despised until they gained entre to prestigious empowerment, at which time they vigorously struggled to affirm the status quo of which they had become so much a part, save overt adjustments to their new-found “Jewishness,” and a reconstruction of the world in that image.

Family member Harold Rosenberg explained the way modern Jewry seeks to rationalize Jewish particularism as being beneficial to American universalism like this:

“Since modern life is so complex that no man can possess it in its entirety, the outsider often finds himself the perfect insider.” [BLOOM, p. 153]

“In addition to their notions of group marginality,” observes Alexander Bloom, “which differs from individual feelings of aloneness, [the Family] also attempted to carry their alienation with them to the central position they felt they should occupy [in American society].” “What began in the 30s,” says Richard Kostelanetz, “as a collection of ambitious young writers became, by the 60s, the most powerful establishment ever seen in literary America, and they dominated the scene as it had never been dominated before.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 39] “Upwardly mobile Jews,” notes Alan Wald, “comprised a disproportionate number of intellectuals in all radical movements in New York in the 1930s. The veterans of the [Jewish-founded left-wing magazines] New Masses and New Leader were not qualitatively different in their Jewish composition from those of the Partisan Review.” [WALD, p. 9]

In historical retrospect, it is obvious that noble intellectual endeavors and enlightenment really were not the only – and probably not the fundamental – driving forces behind most of the New York Intellectuals. “A strong desire of class was also buried in the whole dynamic,” notes Alexander Bloom, “Only subsequently did some of the young men come to see how clearly their own
progress was tied to a desire to rise.” [BLOOM, p. 27] Norman Podhoretz called the Jewish Mafia’s deepest motivation in their struggles “a dirty little secret,” and he wrote an entire book, *Making It*, about his own – and others – obsessions with self-promotive hustling and status-seeking within the Family. “The lust for success,” he wrote, “… had replaced sexual lust … especially for writers, artists, and intellectuals, among whom I lived and worked.” [BLOOM, p. 360] “After all,” noted Irving Howe, “it had never been dignity that we could claim as our strong point.” [HOWE, p. 265]

(It was also, as noted earlier, a parallel situation in the largely Jewish left-wing Group Theatre world in New York City – many actors, directors, and producers abandoned their proclaimed purist principles to migrate to Hollywood for wealth and fame. Even in the folk music world, singer Dave Von Ronk recalls the climate of some of the socially-minded, anti-materialist, left-wing folk singers of the 1960s, naming Jewish singers **Bob Dylan**, Phil Ochs, **David Cohen**, and Gentile Eric Anderson: “They wanted to get rich. They were hungry, scuffling cats looking to grab the brass ring. I felt it, I saw how hungry they were. They wanted to be honest, but they suddenly realized they could say what they wanted to say and make a million dollars. Dylan was a terrible influence … Bobby always wanted to be a superstar. When he discovered the reality of being a superstar he freaked out.” [SCADUTO, p. 227]

“Among aggressive young intellectuals, ghetto-bred and seeking big reputations,” said Alfred Kazin, [Saul] Bellow was making the world’s powers resist him … he was ambitious and dedicated in a style I had never seen in an urban Jewish intellectual; he expected the world to come to him. He had pledged himself a great destiny.” [BLOOM, p. 292]

Concerning **Norman Mailer**, Kazin once noted that

“I’ve never known anyone whose career was always in public and who constantly put himself forward the way movie people do so much as Mailer.” [MANSO, p. 274]

“[Jason] Epstein’s literary **chutzpah** is indeed legendary,” says Philip Nobile, “He is possibly the only editor in the history of publishing who reviewed a book he himself edited … and who even edited a book he himself had written.” [NOBILE, p. 91]

“Most of my friends and I were Jewish,” wrote Seymour Krim of his experiences around the Family, “we were also literary; the combination of the Jewish intellectual tradition and sensibility needing to be a writer created in my circle the most potent and incredible intellectual-literary ambition I have ever seen.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 12]

In 1963, Richard Hofstadter, another member of the Jewish intellectual Family, decided that “intellectuals” were an elite class in modern society:

“It is rare for an American intellectual to confront candidly the irresolvable conflict between the elite character of his own class and his democratic aspiration. The extreme manifestation of the general reluctance to face this conflict is the writer who constantly assault class barriers and yet constantly hunger for special deference.” [HOFSTADTER, p. 408]
The underlying paradoxical paradigm here, of course, which Hofstadter does not acknowledge, is the standard Jewish universalist-particularist tension: to dominate the inner machinations of American culture and society, but be alienated from it; to be democratic in abstract philosophy in public life, but a self-anointed elitist in one’s personal and confidential worlds; to be a universalistic American on the outside, and a particularist Jew within. Hofstadter never mentions Jews in his entire volume about American “anti-intellectualism”; instead, he sublimates the Jewish dimension to all this, as exemplified by a quote he selects from Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.: “Anti-intellectualism has long been the anti-Semitism of the businessman.” [HOFTSTADTER, p. 4]

The great ambitions that encompassed the Family at-large were ultimately accomplished, causing members to reflect from time to time upon their phenomenal success and influence in American society. Citing examples like fellow Family members Clement Greenberg, Harold Rosenberg, Lionel Trilling, and Alfred Kazin, “there emerged,” wrote Daniel Bell, “a ‘cultural elite,’ and this was primarily a ‘university culture’ … [but] the notion of elites extended beyond campus boundaries. Many of the new cultural arbiters have affected not only serious painters and novelists, but the standards of the larger public as well.” [BLOOM, p. 200] As Irving Horowitz notes, “The Jew at the start of the century was identified as the pure marginal, the outsider, the immigrant incapable of integration. As this century draws to a close the Jew is now identified as the very apotheosis of American dominant values and culture.” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 90]

“The growing complexity of our society,” Lionel Trilling observed about himself and his Family, “had helped create a new intellectual class, which stood in a new relation with power. In addition, intellectual life itself took on a new character, providing the means of social mobility and social ascent … [BLOOM, p. 206] … The needs of society have brought to the top of the social hierarchy a large class of people of considerable force and complexity of mind. Intellect has associated itself with power as perhaps never before in history, and is now conceded to be itself a kind of power.” [BLOOM, p. 200]

“The most pervasive event in American letters over the last ten years,” joined in Clement Greenberg in the Partisan Review, “is the stabilization of the avant-garde, accompanied by its growing acceptance by official and commercial culture.” [BLOOM, p. 297] Among those disturbed with this trend of largely Jewish intellectual status and reward seeking was sociologist C. Wright Mills, a non-Jew, and author of critical attacks of American society called The Power Elite and White Collar. Despite his proximity, as a professor at Columbia University, to the New York Family, he was not part of it. Russell Jacoby notes that

“where Trilling celebrated cultural progress, Mills bemoaned decline, the degeneration of political discourse into slogans and toothpaste commercials … [Mills argued in 1955 that] when a stringent opposition [to social and governmental norms] had disappeared, intellectuals embrace a ‘new conservative gentility.’ Instead of criticizing the mediocrity and mindlessness, they savor their new status, instead of acting as ‘the moral conscience of society,’ they confound prosperity with advancing culture. Mills named
Trilling as one of the intellectuals succumbing to this confusion … From the end of the war until his death, he railed against intellectuals who traded ethics and vision for salaries and status.” [JACOBY, p. 79]

“[As] radical intellectuals,” says Alexander Bloom, “the New Yorkers had once felt that their best hope of access to intellectual prominence and authority lay with a reconstruing of society. In the postwar years, they found the very society which they once scorned, and which had once scorned them, much more hospitable. They discovered a ‘place’ and a ‘role’ for themselves in it.” [BLOOM] “We are witnessing a process that might well be described as the embourgeoisement of the American intelligentsia,” Philip Rahv observed, “This change, coupled with the new liberal policies, accounts for the fact that the idea of socialism … has virtually ceased to figure in current intellectual discussion.” [BLOOM, p. 201] “Instead of standing in opposition to the prevailing cultural flow– mass, popular, middle-brow,” notes Bloom, “highbrow thought and an avant-garde orientation now molded society.” [BLOOM, p. 298]

Indeed, in their earlier years, many of the Family were communist activists, their later worldview adjusted to success and the comforts of capitalism. “In light of the neo-conservative self-portrait being created by many of the New York intellectuals,” noted Alan Wald in 1987, “one is tempted to conclude that they have a stake in perpetuating an amnesia that avoids a forthright disclosure of their previous political history as revolutionary but anti-Stalinist Marxists.” [WALD, p. 8–9]

The much-published ideas and arguments of the New York Intellectuals and their rise to status and power took them into university classrooms everywhere and even the very seat of government power in Washington DC. “Intellecutals established intimate connections with government as never before,” says Bloom, “Some took jobs in Washington … While most did not take employment, they nonetheless felt the connection.” “President Kennedy began to flatter the intellectual,” Midge Decter recalled, “which is to say he invited them to his house for supper.” [BLOOM, p. 324] “We became a touch of minor royalty,” says Norman Mailer. [BLOOM, p. 324] “All of us in the family,” says Norman Podhoretz, “were even friendly with members of the White House staff; they read our magazines and the pieces and books we ourselves wrote, and they cared – it is even said that the President [Kennedy] himself cared – about what we thought.” [PODHORETZ, 1967, p. 312]

Alan Wald notes that:

“The skills and experience [the New York intellectuals] had acquired as polemicsists and ideologists during their radical years, and especially as authorities on communism with an insider’s knowledge, enabled them to move rapidly into seats of cultural power in the 1950s. In more recent decades, some even came to have access to national power. Irving Kristol, for example, became an intellectual consultant to the Nixon administration, Nathan Glazer’s work was much admired by the Reagan administration, and neoconservative articles in Commentary magazine influenced White House policy in the 1980s.” [WALD, p. 8]
As Jewish commentator **Earl Shorris** noted in 1982 about these once-Leftist, now influential “neoconservative,” individuals:

“The neoconservative Jews [Shorris notes, as examples, Norman Podhoretz, Daniel Bell, Irving Kristol, Nathan Glazer, Midge Decter, and Sidney Hook] have not codified their views. They are still best identified by the half dozen middle-aged former leftists who led the garrulous conversions [to the political right] ... [T]hey enjoy money as Norman Podhoretz has so loudly said. They are unashamedly ambitious, almost greedy. They do not know or wish to know the risks of daily life in the world of business; they are more comfortable in the role of consultant, advising others on which risks to take.” [SHORRIS, E., 1982, p. 10]

Even those intellectuals without university degrees sooner or later gravitated to teaching positions at universities. Irving Howe, Alfred Kazin, and William Phillips found positions without PhDs; Philip Rahv even became a professor without a Bachelor’s degree. At Columbia, Nathan Glazer and Daniel Bell (who also became an editor at *Fortune*) were deeded PhDs for “research already published.” [BLOOM, p. 311]

“Once intellectuals had come in from the cold and established connections with power,” says **Alexander Bloom**, “it became clear that their intellectual endeavors no longer represented opposition to the prevailing ethos. They were ‘chic’ because they were ‘in’ – they had achieved what they had long ago set out to achieve.” [BLOOM, p. 325] “Where young writers once faced the world together,” wrote Irving Howe, “they now sink into suburbs, country homes and college towns … They not only lose their traditional rebelliousness but to one extent or another they cease to function as intellectuals.” [original author’s emphasis: JACOBY, p. 82]

The Family – most of them former communists of various brands – became so entrenched in the mainstream corridors of power and influence that a number of them even ended up having the covert backing of the CIA. During the height of the post-World War II anti-communist hysteria in America, many Family members joined an organization called the American Committee of Cultural Freedom. “Anticommunism became its only prerequisite,” says Alexander Bloom, “.....New York Intellectuals … provided the solid center of the organization and filled many positions.” [BLOOM, p. 264]

**Diana Trilling** remembers that

“Even before I came onto the Executive Board of the American Committee, I was aware, and it was clear impression that everybody else on the Board was also in some measure aware, that the institutional body with which we were associated was probably funded by the government … We strongly suspected that the Fairfield Foundation, which we were told supported the Congress, was a filter for the State Department or CIA money.” [BLOOM, p. 264]

The ACCF’s parent organization even funded a British-based “intellectual” journal, *Encounter*, edited by Irving Kristol and Stephen Spender. A later editor,
Melvin Lasky, is generally presumed to have been the CIA agent-editor publicly alluded to by a former CIA-employee. [BLOOM, p. 267]

Throughout the rise to prominence, status, and power, the incestuous, connections-laden, interlocking of the New York Intellectual clique ran deep in mutual self-promotion. “What might seem the result of a ‘conspiracy,’” notes Richard Kostelanetz, “[is] actually caused by a confluence of attitudes, historical precedents, and initially independent discriminations, all of which combine to function with a conspiratorial effectiveness … It is de facto censorship [of non-Family writers]. [KOSTELANETZ, p. xvii]

“Intellectuals and publishers,” notes E. Fuller Torrey, “… are often related or familiar with each other through marriage or shared consorts, recommend and review each others work and pass promising manuscripts around for publication … The New York intellectual community and the publishing industry are essentially two parts of a single whole.” [TORREY]

Midge Decter, for example, the secretary of the first editor of Commentary (Elliot Cohen), became the wife of the second editor of that journal, Norman Podhoretz. She also worked for the Saturday Review and eventually rose to become an executive editor at Harper’s where Norman Mailer became a featured contributor and Irving Howe a regular contributor. [KOSTELANETZ, p. 101] John Podhoretz, son of Norman, attained jobs at the Washington Times and George Bush’s White House before settling in as a television critic for the New York Post. By 1998 he was the paper’s Editorial Page Editor. Podhoretz’s daughter, Ruthie Bloom, moved to Israel and became a regular columnist for the Jerusalem Post. Podhoretz’s wife – the aforementioned Midge Decter – has a daughter by another marriage who married Elliot Abrams, an adviser on Latin America in Ronald Reagan’s State Department. [TWERSKY, p. 45]

“Family” members Lionel and Diana Trilling were married. Alfred Kazin remarked in 1976 that he didn’t like fellow Family member Daniel Bell (co-editor of Public Interest), “even though he is my brother-in-law.” Irving Kristol, another co-editor of Public Interest (and the editor-in-chief at Basic Books) was the brother-in-law of Milton Himmelfarb, a Contributing Editor for Commentary and also co-editor of the Jewish Yearbook.” [BLOOM, p. 278] Lionel Trilling’s former students included Jason Epstein, who at Doubleday published Trilling’s The Liberal Imagination. Trilling also selected the book titles for the Reader’s Subscription and the Mid-Century Book Society, each organization managed by former Trilling students, Gilman Kraft and Sol Stein, respectively. [KRUPNICK, p. 102] Likewise, “the writers from Partisan Review now came to dominate the New Yorker,” Daniel Bell once asserted to Midge Decter, Partisan Review was getting to be like a farm team for the New Yorker.” [BLOOM, p. 311]

The self-promotion and clannishness are clearly reflected elsewhere in the interconnectedness of those selected in Family journals for publication. Elliot Cohen, the first editor of Commentary, brought on board Clement Greenberg and Nathan Glazer as editorial assistants and Sidney Hooks as a contributing editor. Irving Kristol and Robert Warshow later joined the staff. By the end of the first year, Harold Rosenberg, Paul Goodman, Alfred Kazin, Hannah Arendt,
Saul Bellow, Robert Warshow, Sidney Hooks, Isaac Rosenfeld, Daniel Bell, Diana Trilling, Irving Howe, Philip Rahv, and Clement Greenberg had articles or reviews in *Commentary*. [BLOOM, p. 160]

“Just as Willie Morris [a rare non-Jewish member of the Family],” says Richard Kostelanetz, “assuming the chief editorship of Harper’s, prepublished sections of Norman Podhoretz’s *Making It*, so did Podhoretz feature sections of Morris’ *North Towards Home* in (Podhoretz’s) *Commentary*.”

The kind of interrelated media circles Norman Mailer traveled in, for example, include – aside from the central New York Intellectual luminaries – the following people who were solicited for stories for a book of oral histories about his life (Mailer himself was a co-founder of the *Village Voice* with Jerry Talmer, Ed Fancher, and Dan Wolf):

– Bernard Farber, fiction editor at the *Saturday Evening Post*, later senior editor at *Trident Press, Simon and Schuster*, and then *CBS Legacy Books*. He also served as Vice-President of Mailer’s film company, *Supreme Mix*.

– Benjamin DeMott, columnist for Harper’s and The Atlantic, a contributing editor to the *Saturday Review*.

– Judy Feiffer, Senior Editor at *William Morrow*, Vice-President of East Coast Productions, *Orion Pictures*.

– Jules Feiffer, cartoonist at the *Village Voice*.

– Henry Geldzahler, former curator of twentieth century art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

– Allen Ginsberg, Beat Poet.

– Lionel Hellman, screenwriter, playwright.

– Lionel Abel, “longtime contributor to *Commentary, Dissent, Partisan Review*.

– Leo Lerman, features editor at *Mademoiselle, Vogue*, editor in chief at *Vanity Fair*.

– Max Lerner, an editor at the *Nation*, columnist for the *New York Post* and *Los Angeles Times* syndicate.

– Max Linenthal, Director of the Poetry Center at San Francisco State University.

– Adeline Naiman, Editor at Little, Brown.

– Sol Stein, one of ten founding members of the *Playwright Group* of the Actors Studio.

– Al Wasserman, producer, director, and writer for *NBC News*. Married to Mailer’s sister.

In 1996 a *Mailer* quote was used on the back cover of friend Lawrence Schiller’s book about the O.J. Simpson trial. “I couldn’t stop reading *American Tragedy*,” he said. “My old friend and colleague Larry Schiller has come up with a book that is impossible to put down.” [SCHILLER, 1996] Mailer had good reason to be so engrossed in the accusation that Simpson murdered his wife with a knife. Mailer had once stabbed his own wife, Adele, in the upper abdomen and back, sending her to the hospital. “One of the wounds was near the
heart,” notes biographer Carl Rollyson, “and the cardiac sac had been punctured.” Within a week of the assault, “Mailer appeared on the Mike Wallace television show. He announced his intention to run for the mayor of New York City.” [ROLLYSON, p. 137, 138] In an obvious reflection upon the violent incident, one of his 1962 published poems, entitled “Rainy Afternoon with the Wife” (in a volume he called Deaths for the Ladies) stated that

“So long/as/you/use/a/knife/there’s/some/love/left.” [ROLLYSON, p. 141]

Some of Mailer’s other associations were – in view of his public image as a “liberal” – peculiar. Roy Cohn – a driving force behind right-wing McCarthy anti-communist witch hunts in the 1950s – helped negotiate a lucrative writing deal between Mailer and the continually morally dubious Newhouse (Advance) media empire; Mailer was initially commissioned on projects for Parade magazine and Random House. Mailer even rented a cottage to Cohn next to Mailer’s own summer home. “Newhouse’s overtures to Norman Mailer, made through Roy Cohn,” says Thomas Maier, “would pay [Mailer] sizeable fees and commissions, throughout the decade of the 1980s and well into the 1990s, with some of the most lucrative deals ever seen by an American novelist ... By the early 1990s, Mailer was listed on [Newhouse’s] Vanity Fair masthead as writer-at-large.” [MAIER, p. 108-109]

Seizing the opportunity of the New York city newspaper strike in 1963, Jason Epstein, a Vice President at Random House, and editor of Viking Books, was instrumental in setting up the New York Review of Books (which extended its own mini-empire by purchasing the Kirkus Reviews book reviewing periodical from Maurice Friedman in 1971). Robert Silvers (formerly at Harper’s and the Paris Review) and Epstein’s wife, Barbara, were installed as editors. [BLOOM, p. 326] “In the second year of the Review,” says Alexander Bloom, “Harold Rosenberrg, Diana Trilling, and Midge Decter contributed; Daniel Bell and Norman Podhoretz did so in the third. The degree to which the New York Review swept the field of contemporary writers and critics led Richard Hoftstadter to refer to it jokingly as “the New York Review of Each Others Books.” [BLOOM, p. 329] Philip Noble, who chronicled the Review’s early history, characterized the era as prey to ‘nepotism, fratricide, and incest, and even a dose of narcissism. Establishment liberals were reviewing one another wholesale.” [NOBILE, p. 29]

As Jewish scholars Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter noted:

“The New York Review of Books was edited by Robert Silvers and Barbara Epstein, and the bulk of its political contributions (especially articles on American politics) in the mid-1960s was written by Jews. By and large then, as Tom Wolfe has pointed out, ‘radical chic’ in New York was a heavily Jewish phenomenon, and the influence of such people spread well beyond their own circle.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 105]

“In the course of the New York Review’s rise,” notes Bloom, “two of its prime movers joined the upper ranks of the New York Intellectual world. Robert Silvers ... climbed slowly up the intellectual social ladder. Jason Epstein sprang to the top ... Epstein had helped created the paperback revolution at Doubleday...
… Epstein wore his ambition … openly.” “Jason has the mind of a scholar but the instincts of a pushcart peddler,” recalled a former colleague at Doubleday. Dwight MacDonald called him “a caricature of a New York intellectual; a nineteenth century entrepreneur, a robber baron, only his market is not copper, but intellectuals.” [BLOOM, p. 327]

“There is no such thing as a New York Intellectual establishment,” Epstein said to those not part of the Family, “it just looks that way.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 61] “It is fashionable,” wrote Victor Navasky, editor of Nation (of whom Diana Trilling once worked as a literary editor), “for the New York Intellectuals to not only deny its existence but, as a corollary, to deny its influence.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 79]

As the New York Jewish Mafia built a foundation of interconnectedness and self-promotive power, “the Upper West Side, Wellfleet, and Martha’s Vineyard now replaced City College and the Village as centers of their social whirl,” says Alexander Bloom, “They all still attended each others parties, still gossiped to one another …” [BLOOM, p. 277] … They remained vitally aware of one another, even as they expressed their criticism [of each other] in extremely harsh terms. Like prizefighters in a traveling carnival, they might be combatants but they remained part of the same show.” [BLOOM, p. 279]

Allen Ginsberg, the famous Jewish-born Beat poet, remembers Norman Podhoretz coming up to him at a party and offering him entre into the Jewish Mafia:

“Ginsberg, [said Podhoretz] you really have some talent and I realize that you’re an intelligent writer and really gifted. You could have a career in New York, be part of the larger scene with us if you’d only get rid of those friends of yours like [non-Jews William] Burroughs and [Jack] Kerouac. You have much better taste than they. Why aren’t you working with us instead of those people that are so nowhere? …. I remember the incident as an ephiphanous moment in my relation with Podhoretz and what he was part of – a large right-wing proto-police surveillance movement …. The Beat group was more or less based on Vachel Lindsay, Whitman, populism, and individualism.” [MANSO, p. 314]

Upon a visit to New York City, the novelist George P. Eliot observed that

“What strikes me, as a visitor, ever more strangely than the intensity with which these Jews attack and praise each other, is the attention they pay to each other.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 25]

Whether hugging or warring, says Norman Podhoretz, the Family was “preoccupied with each other to the point of obsession.” [PODHORETZ, p. 110]

The novelist Theodore Dreiser (1871-1945) believed a Jewish-inspired plot was amuck to suppress his work for his crime of writing critically about the Jewish community. “He suspected,” writes A. A. Swanberg, “that Arthur Pell, head of the Liveright firm, and Simon and Schuster, were parties to the plot … [To a friend] he wrote: Get me the names of a number of fairly recently organized non-Jewish publishers … Can you tell me whether W. W. Norton or any-
one connected with his organization in a financial control sense is Jewish?” [GOULD]

Alas, Dreiser was securely marginalized by the American literary-cultural establishment by the early 1960s. “The decline of Dreiser’s reputation,” notes Irving Howe, “has not been an isolated event. It has occurred in the context, and is surely a consequence, of the counterrevolution in American culture during the forties and fifties … Dreiser became a symbol of everything a superior intelligence was supposed to avoid … He represented the boorishness of the populist mentality, as it declined into anti-Semitism.” [HOWE, p. 168]

Likewise, notes Ann Douglas, prominent Beat author Jack Kerouac eventually became “ever more paranoid,” thinking that “the New York Jewish critics were plotting against him; he joked bitterly about titling Big Sur (1962), ‘Another idea for the Jews to Steal.’” [DOUGLAS, A., 19-99] In 2001, Jim Irsay (whose father’s original name was Robert Israel), owner of a professional football team, bought Kerouac’s original manuscript for On the Road, at auction, for $2.2 million dollars. (Jewish author Franz Kafka’s The Trial had “held the previous record for an original manuscript sold at auction.”) [HERMAN, J., 5-22-01]

“[There is] a Jewish Mafia in American letters …, “said popular writer Truman Capote, risking censure and the inevitable charge of anti-Semitism in 1973, “There is a clique of New York-oriented writers and critics who control much of the literary scene through the influence of the quarterlys and intellectual magazines … All these publications are Jewish-dominated and this particular coterie employs them to make or break writers by advancing or withholding attention … Bernard Malamud, Saul Bellow, and Philip Roth, and Isaac Bashevis Singer are all fine writers, but they are not the only writers in the country as the Jewish Mafia would have us believe.” [FORSTER, p. 109]

The Partisan Review crowd, for instance, is generally acknowledged to have “made” Saul Bellow. “From the first,” says Alexander Bloom, “Bellow established a recognizable and, ultimately, uneasy relationship with the New York Intellectuals, as friends and patrons. Yet he has resisted any notion that they made him famous.” But, says Leslie Fiedler, “[Bellow] really owed a big debt to them, because they did help introduce him to the world. Rahv thought of him as one of their boys.” [BLOOM, p. 291]

Early in his career, from 1941-1951, Bellow published six short stories and two novels; five of the short stories first appeared in Partisan Review. [BLOOM, p. 291] His second novel, was reviewed in Partisan Review by Family member Delmore Schwartz and favorably compared with Mark Twain’s Huckleberry Finn, Henry James, and Walt Whitman. “Bellow’s success,” says Alexander Bloom, “was more than just personal. whether or not he was ‘made’ by the Partisan writers is less significant than the degree to which his success and the history of the achievement of the New York Intellectuals in general intertwined … Lionel Trilling … made it clear that a Jew could be a great literary critic; Meyer Schapiro, a great art historian; and Saul Bellow a great American novelist.” [BLOOM, p. 293]
“Bellow,” said Norman Podhoretz, “was the Family’s White Hope, as it were, in fiction.” [BLOOM, p. 291] “Bellow was their novelist,” observes Alexander Bloom, “because he wrote about them, sometimes literally, but more often socially and culturally.” [BLOOM, p. 293]

“What makes Bellow’s work so unusual,” decided Alfred Kazin in 1959, “is the fact that his characters are all burdened by a speculative quest, a need to understand their particular destiny.” [BLOOM, p. 295] In the 1960s, Leslie Fiedler proclaimed Bellow to be “America’s most important living novelist.” [BLOOM, p. 292] Earlier he had declared that of all the contemporary novelists, Bellow “was the one we need most to understand, if we are to understand what we are doing at the present moment.” [BLOOM, p. 292]

“It is said,” wrote Edgar Siskind in 1978, “that more PhD dissertations have been and are being written on Bellow than any other contemporary writer. No aspect of his work has been more fiercely analyzed than the question of its Jewish component.” [SISKIN, p. 90]

“Complementing Bellow’s individual success,” notes Alexander Bloom, “was his preeminence in what has been called the emergence of Jewish-American literature in postwar years … What is striking about the writers included in this literary category is the degree to which they all had close connections with the New York Intellectuals.” [BLOOM, p. 295] Such authors include a vast field, including most of the Jewish names in this chapter. Many of Bernard Malmsud’s stories, for example, first appeared in the Partisan Review and Commentary. Norman Mailer often had pieces published in Dissent in the 1950s. [BLOOM, p. 296-297] Paul Goodman’s book, Growing Up Absurd, turned down by nineteen publishers, was promoted by Norman Podhoretz, and serialized in his Commentary. Podhoretz also persuaded Jason Epstein at Random House to publish it, even though his firm had already rejected the manuscript. [BLOOM, p. 322] Commentary also serialized the Diary of Ann Frank, as we have seen earlier, one of the first popular books about the later so-called Holocaust, bringing the subject to public eye.

“I cannot prove a connection,” wrote Irving Howe, “between the Holocaust and the turn to Jewish themes in American fiction, at first urgent and quizzical, later fashionable and manipulative … but it would be foolish to scant the possibility.” [HOWE, p. 265]

“The larger questions of Jewish existence,” notes Alexander Bloom, “as well as the narrower ones of Jewish intellectuals – the themes mined by Saul Bellow – became the material for a growing literary œuvre.” [BLOOM, p. 297]

By 1975, this “literary œuvre” had sparked Jewish critic George Steiner to proclaim

“It is commonplace that recent American fiction and criticism have to a drastic extent been the product of Jewish tone and explosion of talent.” [MADISON, C., p. 271]

Russell Jacoby had another take on this Jewish “explosion of talent”:
“By quality alone, it is simply not possible to distinguish the œuvre of New York intellectuals from that of non-New Yorkers. Essay by essay, book by book, the collective work of New York intellectuals is neither so brilliant nor so scintillating that all else pales. It is almost more feasible to reverse the common opinion: the significant books of the fifties were authored by non-New Yorkers … New York intellectuals received the lion’s share of attention less by reason of genius than by … their New York location and their personal and physical proximity to the publishing industry. In addition, their tireless monitoring of themselves lays the groundwork for further studies (and myths). For those padded cultural histories with reports on what writer X said to editor Y at Z’s party, the New York scene is a mother lode … [JACOBY, p. 102]

… New York intellectuals specialize in the self; theirs is the home of psychoanalysis, the personal essay, the letter to the editor.” [JACOBY, p. 103]

As one unnamed “intellectual” responded to Charles Kadushin’s study of American intellectuals, “Power is in the circles around Commentary, Dissent, the New York Review of Books, and Partisan. Ninety-nine percent of what goes on in these circles is bullshit.” [KADUSHIN, p. 52]

Norman Podhoretz noted the crucial importance of hustling and politicking to further one’s career in the Literary In-Crowd, and the desperate Status Chase of it all:

“Did so-and-so have dinner at Jacqueline Kennedy’s last night? Up five points. Was so-and-so not invited to the Lowell’s to meet the latest visiting poet? Down one-eighth. Did so-and-so’s book get nominated for the National Book Award? Up two and five-eighths. Did Partisan Review neglect to ask so-and-so to participate in a symposium? Down two.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 129]

This “explosion of talent” within the Jewish Mafia’s self-promotive web has been profoundly successful. As example, of all the thousands of talented writers in America, “for several years in succession,” wrote Charles Angoff and Meyer Levin in 1970, “Jewish authors won the National Book award with works about Jews. Jewish novels headed the bestseller list.” [ANGOFF/LEVIN, p. 13] “[The New York] mob writers,” complained Richard Kostelanetz in 1974, “usually sit on the selection juries of the National Book Award … and win these awards regularly (Bellow getting an unparalleled three).” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 124] Among the National Book Award winners, twelve years later Family member Irving Howe even took the prize with his nostalgic look at early Jewish America, World of Our Fathers. National Book Award winner for fiction in 2000? Jewish author Susan Sontag.

Likewise, in the Nobel Prize for Literature world, Jewish author Elias Canetti won the award in 1981, notes the (Jewish) Forward, “shortly after Saul Bellow and Isaac Bashevis Singer, in a sequence that some anti-Semites in the Hispanic world shamelessly called ‘Stockholm’s Jewish triumvirate.’” [STAVANS, 1999, p. 1] In 1987, Jewish writer Joseph Brodsky also took the Nobel prize.
In 1994, Jewish author Lois Lowry won for the second time the American Library Association’s Newberry Medal for books for young adults. She had won the award in 1990 for *Number the Stars*, “the stirring tale of the Danish people's heroic efforts to protect their Jewish population from the fate that befell their brothers and sisters in the rest of Europe.” [HOFFMAN, M., 4-10-94, p. 23]

“We live in a moment where everywhere in the realm of prose Jewish writers have discovered their Jewishness to be eminently a marketable commodity,” wrote Jewish author Charles Madison in 1976, “the much vaunted alienation to be their passport into the heart of Gentile American culture.” [MADISON, C., p. 272] “Everyone is by now aware,” noted Robert Alter in 1965, “of the fact that literary Jewishness has become a distinct commercial asset.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 13] “The new atmosphere has created a phenomenon which is especially evident in intellectual circles and on college campuses,” noted James Jaffe in 1968, “Jewishness is now acceptable, sometimes even fashionable. At the opera and other important cultural battlegrounds in New York, socially prestigious women are constantly seen with Jewish escorts … Yiddish words pepper the speech of television personalities from Jerry Lewis, who is Jewish, to Johnny Carson, who isn’t.” [JAFFE, J., 1968, p. 45]

Pop singer Linda Ronstadt read Herman Wouk’s *Marjorie Morningstar* (first published in 1955) as a teenager: “It screwed me up about love and romance and everything. But I loved it then, and it made me wish I was Jewish.” [WHITFIELD, AMERICAN, p. 12] Marilyn Monroe once expressed an affinity for the Jewish world that surrounded her in Hollywood, saying, “It’s like the Jews are the orphans of the world. Maybe that’s why I feel so close to them.” [STRASBERG, S., p. 56] Upon marrying Jewish playwright Arthur Miller, she declared that “if I have kids, I think they should be Jewish. Anyway, I can identify with the Jews. Everybody’s always out to get them, no matter what they do, like me.” [STRASBERG, p. 112] As Susan Strasberg notes, “Over the next year she’d pepper her conversations with Jewish expressions as if reaffirming her conversion to Judaism. ‘Hi Bubuleh, oy vay, what tsures.’” [STRASBERG, p. 112]

A Jewish friend of Elvis Presley, Larry Geller, even “introduced Elvis to new ways of thinking about Judaism … Both he and Marty [Lacker, another Jewish friend] claimed credit for encouraging Elvis’ decision that Christmas to have a new headstone placed on [Elvis’ mother’s] grave – with a Jewish star on one side, a cross on the other.” [GURALNICK, p. 190] (Elvis’ world of Jews included music agents, movie directors, his Beverly Hills dentist Max Shapiro, and the South African doctor (later exposed as a fraud) Laurenz Johannes Griessel Landau who, while treating Elvis for acne, made a homosexual pass at him. [GURALNCK, p. 47, 620]

“The mostly Jewish New York intellectuals and their magazines – *Partisan Review, Commentary, Dissent, New York Review of Books, Public Interest* – have assumed an almost mythic position among American intellectuals,” says Edward Shapiro, “Thus, Elizabeth Hardwick once noted that she had left Kentucky to become a New York Jewish intellectual (her conversion took place in the office of the *New York Review of Books*). Hardwick was not alone in assum-
ing mistakenly that to be a New York intellectual (or any intellectual) one had to be Jewish. Victor Navasky [also Jewish] editor of the Nation, jested in 1966 that ‘rumors to the contrary notwithstanding, you don’t have to be Jewish to be an intellectual.’” [SHAPIRO, Sidney, p. 153]

The commercial pluses to being Jewish (and its attendant homage as eternal victims) in a Jewish-controlled environment were obvious. Even Gentile writers like Robert Lowell and Mary McCarthy stretched back to claim distant Jewish blood in their family trees. [KOSTELANETZ, p. 28] “The exotic appeal that ethnicity offered to the participants in mass culture,” says Stephen Whitfield, “has sometimes even seemed to put the dominant group on the defensive. Nelson Rockefeller found it advantageous to ventilate hints of his admittedly distant Jewish ancestry. Caroline Kennedy marched down the aisle of a church [with a Jew]; a character in the film Pete ‘n Tillie (1972) emphasized his one-fourth Jewish ancestry because, ‘I’m a social climber.’” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 11]

African-American radio personality Howard Lester, once emphatically decried as an anti-Semite by New York Jews (even threatened and physically assailed by Jewish protest rallies), eventually decided that, considering the fact that he had a great-grandfather who was Jewish, he would convert to Judaism. A key influence in his decision was all the information he was hearing about Jews in the Holocaust; it is the key entre to empathy for Jews for many: the Jewish victim paradigm. “The more I read [about the Holocaust],” Lester wrote, “the greater my numbness at the horror, the greater my numbness as I read of Jews affirming God even in the midst of their own negation.” [LESTER, H., p. 122] One day Lester wakes up “and my lips are moving. I listen. I am trying to say ‘Sh’ma Yisrael Adonai Eloheenu Adonat Ehad’ [Hear O Israel. The Lord our God the Lord is One]. At night those words resound in me and when I awake, they are the first words I hear from my lips” [LESTER, H., p. 123] … I have lived these past nine months amidst the ashes of the crypt in heaven. Auschwitz and Treblinka are part of my daily pain. The spirits of murdered Jewish children shoot marbles with me in the dirt of a parsonage yard.” [LESTER, H., p. 133]

In 1998, Ross Wetzsteon, a Montana-born WASP (who made the pilgrimage to New York City), wrote an extraordinarily definitive explication of WASP-self hate, and his cravings to be a Jew, in a Village Voice (Jewish-owned and edited) article. The strange product of Freud’s Judeocentric psychotherapy, a journalism career dominated by Jews, alienation from the norms of American popular culture, long-term romantic relationships with ONLY Jewish women, and estrangement from his own family lead him to the rescuing life jacket of Jews. Wetzsteon embraces all Jewish-enforced stereotypes of the Jew: Jewish moral superiority, Jews as eternal victims, Jewish powerlessness, Jewish blunt- ness and vulgarity as a form of liberation, and Jews as being more intellectually interesting. What one begins to recognize at core here is a kind of ideological indoctrination process, in Wetzsteon’s case deeply rooted in his psychotherapy sessions. Wetzsteon below maps his metamorphosis into his configuration as an ‘honorary’ Jew:
“Everyone always assumes I’m Jewish … So why do people think I’m Jewish? My name? My profession? But more interesting than why I pass for Jewish is why it pleases me so … I was immediately drawn to the Jews because they seemed so attractive and because the WASPs seemed so repellent. It was at this time, in one of the most painful choices of my life, that I decided to become a scholar rather than play centerfield for the Yankees … It became clear … that the Jews represented … an acceptable rebellion, in that they embodied both a rejection of unfulfilling values and a repository of honorable new ones … Jews were both homeless and universal, which appeals to a mind enamored of ‘disengaged’ sensibilities. And, since most of the Jews I knew were leftists … [there was] radicalism as the Jewish version of juvenile delinquency … What Jews seemed to be saying was, ‘In our powerlessness, we have a superior moral heritage’ – an appealing conceit for a teenage intellectual who faced the dilemma of being at the center of his culture while feeling both socially ill at ease and psychologically estranged … I came to see WASP life as a rigid, deceitful facade that had to be penetrated if one cared at all about what was real. Self-control, self-restraint, self-effacement were the pious names given to what were really decorous lies … [I had] a yearning affection for what I perceived as ‘Jewish openness’ … So-called Jewish vulgarity, in short, became a kind of intellectual and moral critique of WASP mentality … I’ll never forget how much my therapy had to do with my pleasure. For me, therapy was primarily a means of liberating inner vulgarity, of releasing a kind of pushiness and ostentation in my psychic life – it was a way of discovering that the things I valued most were radically opposed to the WASP ideals that I internalized … The important point is that it was quite clear to me that the Jew and the psychotherapist joined forces in the abolition of WASP hypocrisy, WASP decorum, and WASP censorship. I even came to see a parallel – while obviously aware of the disparities – between Jewish social liberation and my own psychological liberation. My ghetto was my head, my assimilation was through therapy … I’ve always been attracted to Jewish women – in fact, every long relationship I’ve ever had, including my marriage, was with a Jewish woman … I regard myself as an ‘honorary Jew … [But] I realized … that by seeking my identity in Jews … I was denying their identity to themselves.” [WETZSTEON, R., 9/6-12-98]

Chaim Bermant notes the necessary pro-Jewish metamorphosis that often takes place among non-Jews in Jewish-dominated environments – in this case Hollywood:

“One met the occasional gentile [in Hollywood], like the Skouras brothers, who were Greek, or Winfield Sheehan, who was Irish, but the whole ambience was Jewish and even the gentiles acquired Jewish mannerisms, expressions, and habits of speech. As the Scottish director, John Grierson, observed after a stay in Hollywood, ‘After a few years in the place, your foreskin falls away.’” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 92]
Indeed, this kind of anti-WASP deconstructionist world view needed strong ideological encouragement to prosper. After World War II, and militantly after 1967, the Family and its various satellites began to pay more and more attention to their Jewish identities. “New questions arose,” says Alexander Bloom, “… and an essential component of [the Family’s] character – their Jewishness – re-emerged to demand attention.” [BLOOM, p. 125] Largely children of immigrants (or immigrants themselves), “we knew,” wrote Irving Howe, “that but for an accident of geography we might also be bars of soap.” [BLOOM, p. 137]

Unable to talk about the Holocaust itself,” says Bloom, “[the Family] began in postwar years to talk about themselves as Jews, something they had rarely done before … By the 1950s … many had become ‘enthusiasts of Martin Buber, while the whole of the New York literary world was ringing with praise of the Yiddish storytellers, the Hassidim, Maimonides, medieval Hebrew poetry, and even Rabbis of the Talmud.” [BLOOM, p. 142] “To ‘write Jewish,’” noted Charles Angoff and Meyer Levin in 1970, “is in fashion, but recently the Jewishness in much of our fiction has been one of bland nostalgia … or else it is a Jewishness of mystification cum mysticism, in which the ancient wisdom-image of the Jew is invoked through Hasidic themes or the idea of Buber … or it is a Jewishness treated satirically – basically an attack on the complacent middle class.” [ANGOFF/LEVIN, p. 15]

The move away from Jewish allegiance to the American melting pot, universalism, and left-wing causes to rationales for Jewish parochialism within American universities and public life had begun. Some members of the family – Irving Kristol, Daniel Bell, and Nathan Glazer – even joined Milton Himmelfarb, an official of the American Jewish Committee, for group study of Maimonides’ texts and other Jewish religious literature. “One after another,” notes Alexander Bloom, “under the influence of political pressure, social analysis, and personal awareness, the intellectual began to reassess and reconsider their Jewish past.” [BLOOM, p. 143]

Susan Sontag found overwhelming connection to photographs of concentration camp victims:

“Nothing I have seen – in photography or real life – ever cut me as sharply, deeply, instantaneously. Indeed it seemed plausible to divide my life into two parts … Some limit had been reached, and not only that of horror; I felt irrecoverably grieved, wounded, but a part of my feeling started to tighten; something went dead; something is still crying.” [TORREY]

The classic irreconcilable dialectic of divisive Jewish values in an all-inclusive, universalistic society began to be addressed by the Jewish Mafia and explained away:

“Insistence upon being ‘one-hundred-per-cent something,” wrote Harold Rosenberg, makes us “uncomfortable when they debate whether one can be an American and a Jew.” [BLOOM, p. 145] “I was born in galut and I accept, now gladly,” wrote Daniel Bell, one time editor of the New Leader, and editor at Fortune, and a co-editor of the Public Interest, “though once in pain, the double
burden of my self-consciousness, the outward life of an American and the inward secret life of a Jew.” [BELL, Reflections, p. 322]

Leslie Fiedler found it useful to tie the particulars of “being Jewish” into its traditional messianic subsuming of all humanity under the dominion of ennobled Jewish suffering:

“In this apocalyptic period of atomization and uprooting, of a catholic terror and a universal alienation, the image of the Jew tends to become the image of everyone; and we are approaching the day when the Jew will come to seem the central symbol, the essential myth of the whole western world.” [BLOOM, p. 150]

“Some, like [Gentile] social critic Dwight MacDonald,” says Steven Zipperstein, “felt sickened by much of what he read in Commentary, where, as he saw it, his friends engaged in self-indulgent trivia. Why, he asked, were such bright people devoting so much time to ‘uninteresting exercises in Jewish culture?’” [ZIPPERSTEIN, p. 20]

But the first steps of the “Holocaust is Unique” formula, and the “humankind should look to the Jews for guidance” enforcement had begun in earnest, and the maze of Jewish guilt and self-obsession was spread like a tablecloth over the American scene. “The Jews’ life and wanderings, “ decided Daniel Bell, “are, in a sense, the image of the world’s destiny. His heightened sense of his own alienation is a prescient tremor of the quake to come.” [BLOOM, p. 153] (This “alienation” from the American power structure has been, of course, at key points a complete delusion. Chaim Bermant, for example, notes the Jewish “outsider” status in Hollywood, the most profound influence upon popular culture: “An essential part of Jewishness is the feeling that one is an outsider, not part of the crowd. In Hollywood the entire crowd was so Jewish that non-Jews felt outside. Nor did they have to feel strange whenever they moved east to confer with the New York end of the business, for that too was Jewish.”) [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 99]

“Whereas [the Family] had earlier argued for a role as the modern ‘cleric’ and arbiter of modern culture because of their intellectual calling,” says Alexander Bloom, “they now claimed to offer a uniquely appropriate view of modern society, thanks to their ethnic background.” [BLOOM, p. 151] “One cannot … simply discount the possibility that some essentially Jewish qualities may adhere to the writing of the most thoroughly acculturated Jews,” wrote Robert Alter in the 1960s, “Most readers have sensed in at least some of the ‘post-traditional’ or ‘transitional’ Jewish writers certain modes of imagination or general orientation towards art and experience that seems characteristically Jewish, even though the writer scrupulously avoids all reference to his ethnic origins.” [ALTER, p. 54] “A Jewish book,” declared Ludwig Lewisohn years earlier, “is one written by someone who is well aware that he or she is Jewish. Jewish literature, therefore, consists of all the works – written in every age and language – whose creators knew they were Jewish.” [SHAKED, p. 169]

Clement Greenberg (who was for a while the editor of the Contemporary Jewish Record), says Bloom, “asserted that [the Jewish author Franz] Kafka held a steady belief in halakhic order, the belief that Jewish history stopped with the
extinction of Palestine and will begin again when the Messiah comes. Until then, Jewish life is to be kept ‘humdrum, thoroughly prosaic and historically immobile within the fence of the law. Such history as persists in Gentile history.’” [BLOOM, p. 154]

Whereas in earlier years Harold Rosenberg was “bothered by the chauvinism of certain Jewish zealots in Commentary,” [BLOOM, p. 160] and William Phillips “complained throughout the 80s that intellectuals were now asking whether or not policies were good for Jews, [TWERSKY, p. 40] the New York Intellectuals had come, says Alexander Bloom, “to accept and, largely, to proclaim their Jewishness. Their ethnic identity overcame their former universalism … Now self-defined Jewish intellectuals, they laid claim to a special appropriateness for their personal viewpoint and to a high value for their insight.” [BLOOM, p. 153]

“The Alfred Kazin who proclaimed his revolt from Jewish sentimental chauvinism,” notes Edward Shapiro, “was the same person who wrote in an autobiography titled New York Jew how the Holocaust became the consuming event of his life.” [SHAPIRO, p. 156] Irving Howe had come to believe that “the only subject truly worthy of a serious writer … [is] the problem of collective destiny, the fate of a people.” [KOSTELANETZ] At Philip Rahv’s death, it was found that he had donated his estate to Israel. [SHAPIRO, p. 287] “I remember,” notes Mary McCarthy, “Philip Rahv saying that all Gentiles, without exception, are anti-Semitic.” [MCCARTHY, p. 98] Midge Decter’s views of Israel? “What I do know,” she says, “is that Zionism was bred in my bones … As for me, the unswerving Zionist, there was the miracle of the establishment of the state of Israel.” [DECTER, M., 1999, p. 185, 187] Susan Sontag? She was awarded Israel’s Jerusalem Prize for 2001. As Alexander Cockburn notes:

“[Israeli minister Shimon] Peres has been quoted as admiring Sontag’s definition of herself. ‘First she’s Jewish, then she’s a writer, then she’s American. She loves Israel with emotion and the world with obligation’ … Sontag has always been appreciative of irony. Does she see no irony in the fact that she, relentless critic of Slobodan Milosevic (upon whose extradition to face trial in its Hague Court as a ‘war criminal’ the US is now conditioning all aid to Yugoslavia) is now planning to travel to get a prize in Israel, currently led by a man, Ariel Sharon, whose credentials as a war criminal are robust and indeed undisputed by all people of balanced and independent judgement … Does Sontag sense no irony is getting a prize premised on the author’s sensitivity to issues of human freedom, in a society where the freedom of Palestinians is unrelentingly repressed?” [COCKBURN, A., 3-20-01]

Hannah Arendt, a German-Jewish refugee, accelerated this interest in Jewishness and, especially, the Holocaust, with her controversial 1963 volume, Eichmann in Jerusalem (first serialized in the New Yorker). Her evidence for Jewish complicity in their own demise in Europe (and her critique that the Israelis’ focus upon only crimes against Jews by the captured Nazi was a disservice to wider justice) provoked a firestorm of Jewish outrage. “It is this tension be-
tween the parochial and the universal,” wrote Daniel Bell, “that explains the fur-
rious emotions over Miss Arendt’s book. For she writes from the standpoint of
a universal principle which denies any parochial [Jewish] identity.” [BELL, AL-
PHABET, p. 312] Irving Howe wrote that, in Jewish reaction to her book, “the
long-suppressed grief evoked by the Holocaust burst out. It was as if her views,
which roused many of us to fury, enabled us to finally speak the unspeakable.”
[BLOOM, p. 329]

What, wondered Howe, would the goyim say to this Jewish dirty laundry?

“Hundreds of thousands of good-middle class Americans will have
learned from those articles that the Jewish leadership in Europe was
cowardly, inept, and even collaborationist, and that if Jews had not ‘co-
operated’ with the Nazis, fewer than 5 to 6 million would have been
killed. No small matter: and you will forgive some of us if we react
strongly to this charge.” [BLOOM, p. 330]

Dissent, of which Howe was editor, organized a public discussion about
Arendt’s book. Mary McCarthy, a non-Jewish member of the Family, thought
the book “splendid.” “Apparently,” she noted, “this is so because I am a Gentile
… I don’t ‘understand’ … It is as if Eichmann in Jerusalem had required a special
pair of Jewish spectacles to make its ‘true purport’ visible.” [BLOOM, p. 330]

“The emotions tapped,” says Alexander Bloom, “demonstrated the degree
to which Jewishness remained a sensitive issue. Having worked out their own
personal sense of Jewishness in the first postwar years, after the decade of cos-
mopolitan universalism, the New York Intellectuals had not fully resolved the
more general questions of Jews in society. Did Jews constitute a particular social
grouping with unique collective attributes?” [BLOOM, p. 331]

Disbanding allegiance to universalistic values, says J. J. Goldberg, through-
out the Jewish community “a new set of basic values came to replace them: loy-
talty to the Jewish people, commitment to its survival, and hostility to its
enemies.” [GOLDBERG, p. 162] Norman Mailer set sights on one of them:

“In their immaculate cleanliness, in the somewhat antiseptic odor of their
stringent toilet water and perfume, in abnegation of their walks, in the
heavy sturdy moves so many demonstrated of bodies in life’s harness,
there was the muted tragedy of the WASP.” [SCHRAG, p. 187]

Mailer points the way to what Jewish observer James Yaffe outlined in 1968
as the nature of the generic “Jewish intellectual”:

“The Jewish intellectual, whatever else he may do, seldom stretches
under a tree and just thinks. And then, the intellect can’t be just a tool
for him; it has to be a weapon too. He doesn’t use it simply to discover
what the world is like, or to create something beautiful, or to communi-
cate his ideas. He must use it to beat down his competitors, to prove his
superiority. From him controversy is inseparable from intellectual ac-
tivity. Watch him at a party: note the vicious delight with which he backs
lesser intellects into a corner. He’s implacable; neither social decorum
nor human compassion can soften his attack … Above all he is very con-
cerned about his ‘significance.’ He must always have something profound to say, even if he has nothing profound to say. There is nobody like a Jewish intellectual for making Important Statements.” [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 235]

“Intellectuals,” wrote Jack Porter, “are far from ineffectual, although they may be snobs. On the contrary, they exert enormous power, more than any of the 17th century Hof-Juden ever dreamed of. At the same time, in the aftermath of the Holocaust and the establishment of the Jewish state – there has been a definite shift in their allegiance to Jewish causes.” [PORTER, p. 35]

“These intellectuals,” says Alexander Bloom, “posited that Jews had a central place because of their Jewishness. They now felt that Jewishness, once a source of scorn among some writers, offered a special insight, useful in the analysis of the modern condition.” [BLOOM, p. 150] “The Jews,” proclaimed Jewish author Isiah Berlin,

“like the strangers seeking to lose themselves in the strange tribe, find themselves compelled to devote all their energies and talents to the task of understanding and adaptation upon which their lives depend at every step. Hence the fantastic over-development of their faculties for detecting trends, and discriminating the shades and hues of changing individual and social situations, often before they have been noticed anywhere else. Hence too, their celebrated critical acumen, their astonishingly sharp eye for the analysis of the past, the present, and sometimes the future also – in short their well-known genius for observation and classification – above all for reportage in its sharpest and finest forms.” [ISAACS, p. 55]

“Through their Jewish writers,” declared Leslie Fiedler, “Americans, after the second World War, were able to establish a new kind of link with Europe in place of the old pale-face connection – a link not with the Europe of decaying castles and Archbishop of Canterbury, nor with that of the French symbolists, and the deeply polite Action Française – for those are all Christian Europe; but with the post-Christian Europe of Marx and Freud, which is to say, of secularized Judaism, as well as the Europe of surrealism and existentialism, Kafka, neo-Chassidism …” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 14]

“By the 1960s,” notes Robert Christopher, “Jewish writers had undeniably supplanted white southern ones as the nation’s leading school of novelists; they had, in fact, come to dominate American fiction to such an extent that, as Norman Podhoretz recalls in Making It, that wayward WASP Gore Vidal was moved to complain that there was no longer room on any list of important contemporary American writers for more than one ‘OK guy’.” [CHRISTOPHER, p. 228] (Symbolic to all this, in 2002 the new Jewish president of Brooklyn, Marty Markowitz, made the news when he called an old portrait of George Washington that hung in his office “an old man” and announced that “he will probably hang a portrait of a black or a woman in his office in place of the country’s first president.”) [SOCKWELL-MASON/SEIFMAN, 1-16-02]
“Jewishness has become fashionable,” wrote Jewish author Peter Schrag in 1971, “In New York, which is where most of the soapboxes are kept, it is the goy and not the Jew (or the Negro) who feels defensive. Half the major book publishers are Jewish and probably more than half of the art dealers, the music managers (booking agents, publishers, Tin Pan Alley flacks) and the senior brass of network television.” [SCHRAG, p. 108]

Gentile writer Chandler Brossard noted (in the American Jewish Committee’s Commentary magazine) the trend of Jewish dominance in American “intellectual” life, and the way Jewish culture subsumed all others, as early as 1950. Brossard recognized the strong influence upon him to submit to Jewish intellectual landlords in order to succeed:

“There is a new alienated man around. He is the Gentile intellectual in New York City. Hopelessly outnumbered by his Jewish colleagues on the New York intellectual scene, of late he has begun to feel that his back his against the wall … Partly consciously, partly unconsciously, [the Gentile] starts assuming some of the wise style of the Jewish intellectual, to overcome what he thinks is his own naivete, in order to become part of the group surrounding him. The implications of this are almost infinite. Strange things happen. His vocabulary becomes spiced with Jewish inflections and expressions (his friends teach him the correct pronunciations: he has an increasingly strong tendency to say [the Yiddish term] ‘nu?’ instead of ‘so?’ His gestures become sensual, curvilinear, and an elaborate and necessary part of his communication. His humor becomes less mirthful – so long, Mark Twain! – and more ironic, twisted, oblique, and gaggy. (If he is a writer this gag quality finally gags him insofar as his originality is concerned). He cannot remember the last time he told a joke that did not involved a Jew or the Jewish point of view … He feels, in effect, a kind of clown. His confusion is not helped by the fact that for the first time in his life he is now a member of a minority. It almost seems that he is a kind of extravagance of his Jewish circle … He wonders whether he is ever really being accepted; he feels that his Jewish friends do certain things for each other that they do not do for him. Is he at the center or the periphery? … He often winds up playing straight man to his friends at a nearly all-Jewish party … He has the choice now of recognizing his background and origins, his difference, and living accordingly, or of denying them and reshaping himself with the help, or proximity, of his Jewish friends. The temptation to submit to reshaping is strong; it is hard to be different in these surroundings.” [BROSSARD, C., in ROGOW, A., 1961, p. 349-353]

“It is not just that Jewishness was chic in mainstream circles,” says Karen Brodkin, “It also became mainstream. Observing that J.D. Salinger, Saul Bellow, Bernard Malamud, and Philip Roth were the great American – not great Jewish – writers of the period, Peter Rose notes that ‘for perhaps the first time in American literary history, the Jew became everyman and, through a curious transposition, everyman became the
Jew … Most American Jews are part of the big wide – and white – Establishment.’ Indeed, as Neil Gabler has argued for Hollywood up to World War II, Jews helped create white Americanness.” [BRODKIN, p. 142]

In the world of academe, Irving Horowitz centers on Jewish preeminence:

“An intellectual immigration took place that changed the landscape of American sociology no less than that of American sociology itself … The coming to American shores of [immigrant Jewish scholars] Theodore Abel, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Theodor Adorno, Franz Neumann, Marie Jahoda, to name just a few, changed the emphasis in sociology from civilizational issues to psychological issues … [HOROWITZ, I., p. 75] Can one seriously imagine the study of sexuality without references to [Jews like] Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, and [non-Jewish adherent to psychoanalytic theory] Carl G. Jung? … Without them, there would be no Helene Deutsch, or Anna Freud, or Marie Bonaparte; that is, particular inquiry into the nature of female sexuality … The same holds true for subdisciplines like political theory. One presumes that a literate person has a working knowledge of the works of Hannah Arendt, Harold Lasswell, and Leo Strauss, among others … It is conceivable, perhaps imperative, if the focus is international law versus national power, that one world substitute Hans Morgenthau, Hans Kohn, and Hans Kahn for the aforementioned trio.” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 125]

Karen Brodkin cites another commentator about the Jewish molding of American values in broader, popular culture:

“In the century of Calvin Klein, Ralph Lauren, and Dinah Shore, need we ask who but a Jew is best a packaging unwhining blonde fantasy figures? I don’t know about you, darlings, but ever since I found out that Kathie Lee Gifford was née Epstein, I don’t assume anything. Why be surprised then, that Barbie, the ultimate shiksa goddess, was invented by a nice Jewish lady, Ruth Handler (with her husband Eliot, co-founder of Mattel?) Indeed, the famous snub-nosed plastic ideal with the slim hips of a drag queen is in fact named after a real Jewish princess from L.A., Handler’s daughter, Barbara (who must have been hell to know in high school!) Her brother’s name was Ken.” [BRODKIN, p. 143]

A Jewish author, Irving Berlin, penned the famous Christian-based songs “White Christmas” and “Easter Parade.” Even the 1990s president of the board of directors of the WASP world’s hallowed Miss America pageant is David Frisch. Ed McClanahan notes the Jewish dimensions to the Gidget surfing icon:

“No no, not Sandra Dee or Sally Fields, nor Deborah Walley or Cindy Carroll or any of the legions of Gidget impersonators of the big screen or the small screen or even, yes, the stage. We’re talking the Real Deal here, the original Gidget, the ur-Gidget you might say, Kathy Kohner Zuckerman herself, whose father, a Hollywood screenwriter named Frederick Kohner, wrote the hugely popular little novel … in 1957 … and made his daughter Kathy, who inspired it, a legend in the world of surfing … The book was regarded as mildly scandalous in its day (‘Any parents,’ fulmi-
nated the Nebraska Farmer, ‘who allow their teen-agers to talk as Gidget does should be soundly spanked.’”) Nowadays, in the era of Sex in the City, it seems as innocent as Rebecca at Sunnybrook Farm. Still, the Gidget character is a bit of a potty-mouth (it was she who brought the adjective ‘bitchen’ into the language.)” [MCLANAHAN, E.]

In the sexual realm, in the formation of popular American values, notes Anthony Heilbut, “The two major therapeutic changes of the sixties and seventies were ushered in by [Jewish] émigrés, Fritz Perls of Esalen and Wilhelm Reich … Their positions have become the roots of such American phenomena as ‘est’ or sex therapy … Of all Freud’s disciples, Reich was the most obsessed with sexuality.” [HEILBUT, p. 439] (Reich died in an American prison in 1957, held on charges of “criminal contempt” in a case involving his shipments of “orgone accumulators.”)

Perls was also “the founder and main figure of Gestalt therapy.” [MASSON, p. 209] At every group Gestalt therapy session, he recited the “Gestalt prayer,” famous doggerel that profoundly influenced, and exemplified, 1960s-era ethics:

“I do my thing and you do your thing.
I am not in this world to live up to your expectations.
And you are not in this world to live up to mine.
You are you and I am I.
And if by chance we find each other, it’s beautiful.
If not, it can’t be helped.” [MASSON, p. 209]

In the 1960s, the American Jewish Committee even estimated that 40 percent of the youth who emigrated to the Haight-Ashbury Hippie Mecca in San Francisco were Jewish – a total of about 71,000 of them. The average stay there was 3–4 months. [YAFFE, J., 1968, p. 269] Jewish psychiatrist Oscar Janiger (a cousin of famous poet and counter-culture icon Allen Ginsberg – “administered almost 3,000 doses of LSD to 1,000 volunteers. Among them were [Cary] Grant, fellow actors Jack Nicholson and Rita Moreno, author Aldous Huxley and musician Andre Previn … Although his work predated that of LSD guru Timothy Leary, he never gained widespread recognition for it.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 8-17-01]

James Davison Hunter notes, in an article entitled When Psychotherapy Replaces Religion, one of the occupational fields that has profoundly influenced the moral climate of modern America:

“When it comes to the moral life of children, the vocabulary of the psychologist frames virtually all public discussion. For decades now, contributions from philosophers and theologians have been muted or non-existent … Rather, it is the psychologists, and in particular the developmental and educational psychologists who have owned this field – in theory and in practice. All the major players in the last half century have been psychologists. Eric Erickson, B. F. Skinner, Benjamin Spock, Havighurst, Carl Rodgers, Jean Piaget, Abraham Maslow, Rudolph Dreikurs, William Glasser, Lawrence Kohlberg, Louis Rath, Sidney Simon, Jane Loevinger, Daniel Levinson, Robert Selman, Maurice Elias –
their assumptions, concepts, and paradigms have largely determined how all of us think about the moral lives of children, and, indeed, about moral life generally.” [HUNTER, J.D., 2000, p. 5-22]

Not surprisingly, well over half of these influential figures have been Jewish.

In the field of anthropology, Jewish academic Franz Boas was the most preeminent and influential anthropologist in the early years of the twentieth century. This genre of the field absorbed and incorporated many of the premises of Freudianism. “By 1915,” notes Kevin MacDonald, “the Boasians controlled the American Anthropology Association and held a two-thirds majority on its Executive Board … By 1926 every major department of anthropology was headed by Boas’ students, the majority of whom were Jewish.” [MACDONALD, 1998, p. 25] Jewish students and ideological descendants of Boas, who themselves became influential academics, included Alexander Goldenweiser, Melville Herskovits, Robert Lowie, Paul Radin, Edward Sapir, Leslie Spir, Alexander Lesser, Ruth Bunzel, Gene Weltfish, Esther Schiff Goldfrank, Ruth Landes, and Ashley Montagu [born Israel Ehrenburg].

Sociology? A Jewish historian and social anthropologist even suggested, notes British sociologist W. S. F. Pickering, that “there is something about those characteristic virtues and viewpoints [of the influential Jewish sociologist Emil Durkheim] which cannot be understood by gentile readers … that only a Jew can understand him and his sociology.” [PICKERING, p. 10] (Durkheim started out in early life as a rabbinical student). “By the early 1960s,” says David Hollinger, “the large numbers of Jews in sociology led to a faculty-club banter to the effect that sociology had become a Jewish discipline. In the literary world the triumph of Norman Mailer, Saul Bellow, and J. D. Salinger led Leslie Fiedler to hail the great takeovers by Jewish-American writers of a task ‘inherited from certain Gentile predecessors.’” [HOLLINGER, p. 28]

Even some academics who aren’t publicly reckoned to be Jewish are Jewish. As Hershel Shanks notes,

“I think of a teacher of mine long ago, one of the most eminent sociologists in the country – Robert King Merton. Even when I was studying with him at Columbia University in the 1950s, there were rumors that he was Jewish. Recently – he is nearly 90 – he came out. He was born Meyer Schkolnick.” [SHANKS, H., 2000, p. 16]

“Jews found sociology attractive,” noted Family member Nathan Glazer in 1994, ‘It was particularly attractive to those who were socialists … In time the Jewish newcomers became the dominant figures in sociology. Concurrently, they abandoned their early radicalism.” [GLAZER, DECOMPOSITION, p. 4] After World War II, notes Irving Horowitz, “young scholars came from other walks of life into sociology … The field soon became populated by Jews to such a degree that jokes abounded: one did not need the synagogue, the [the minimum number of Jewish men necessary to hold religious services] was to be found in sociology departments; or one did not need a sociology of Jewish life, since the two had become synonymous.” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 77]
Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter note Jewish radical political dominance in a range of academic subworlds:

“Within academia, Jewish faculty sparked revolts against the ‘establishment’ in their professions, struggling to turn them in directions of direct political action. In the American Political Science Association, for example, the membership of the Caucus for a New Politics, a radical activist group, was initially overwhelmingly Jewish. (Jews were also heavily represented on the ‘liberal’ opposition Ad Hoc Committee, but here they constituted no more than about half of a highly fluctuating and informal membership). The same pattern emerged in the Modern Language Association, where the radical caucus was led by Louis Kampf and Paul Lauter, both of Jewish background. The Union of Radical Political Economists also initially contained a disproportionate number of individuals of Jewish background. While William Appleman Williams, the dean of the group, was not Jewish, a majority of the leading cold war revisionists among historians were (Alperowitz, Kolko, Horowitz, etc.). The largest number of those radical educators and writers on education who argued that American education was linked to capitalism’s need to keep lower classes (including blacks) in their place were also of Jewish background (e.g., Herbert Gintis, Donald and Beatrice Gross, Jonathan Kozol, Edgar Z. Friedenberg, Herbert Kohl, Charles Weingartner, Gerald Weisntein). The same thing was true in sociology …” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 104-105]

In this growing context of Jewish pre-eminence throughout academia, Richard Hofstadter already felt secure enough in 1963 to write that

“Catholic scholars and writers tend to be recognized belatedly by their co-religionists, when they are recognized at all. All this concerns, of course, not so much the anti-intellectualism of American Catholicism as its cultural impoverishment, its non-intellectualism.” [HOFSTADTER, p. 140]

Hofstadter, who obviously basked in his many Jewish cultural treasures, also turned for solace to his own identity chauvinism to attack the then-current beatnik movement for its own “anti-intellectualism.” Looking past the Beat's moralist, populist, non-materialist, and oft-times Zen worldviews, Hofstadter said that “the beatniks have repudiated the path of intellectualism … to [live] lives of inverted sainthood, marked by an acceptance of poverty, and their willingness to do without the usual satisfaction of a career and a regular income … The movement seems unable to rise above its adolescent inspiration.” [HOFSTADTER, p. 421] In 1998, Jewish American professor Jules Chametsky was commissioned to edit a new Norton Anthology of Jewish American Literature. “One could argue,” says Chametsky, “that without African-Americans and Jews, popular culture would be very thin indeed in America.” [CARNEY, p. 22] (With a different set of cultural dominators, one wonders, would it not have been “thin,” but something else?) Noting a 1922 novel by Jewish German author Hugo Bettauer (The City Without Jews), Jewish author Michael Brenner exudes
the same arrogance and elitism about Jewish cultural dominance of pre-Nazi German culture:

“As a city without Jews, Bettauer’s Vienna soon becomes a dull and boring place where rough woolens are declared the latest style of fashion, the state economy is overburdened with debts, the currency loses its value, and intellectual discussion and cultural activities are defined by the low standard of the surrounding peasant population.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. xvii] (By whose criteria are such standards “low?”)

The shoving aside of non-Jewish writers and thinkers, and non-Jewish traditions and history, by empowered Jewish particularists has been for decades vigorously undertaken. “One thing did matter to somebody like me, classified as a WASP writer,” wrote Edward Hoagland in Commentary, “This was being told in print and occasionally in person that I and my heritage lacks vitality, that except perhaps for a residual arrogance the vitality had long since been squeezed dry, if it had ever in fact existed in this thin blood of mine. I was a museum piece, like some state-of-Mainer, because I could field no ancestor who had hawked tin pots in a Polish shtetl [Jewish village].” [HOAGLAND, p. 62]

One of the Jewish characters in prominent Jewish poet Delmore Schwartz’s prose pieces even proclaimed:

“My ancestors, in whom I take pride, but not personal pride, were scholars, poets and students of God when most of Europe worshipped sticks and stones; not that I hold that against any of you, for it is not your fault if your forebears were barbarians groveling and groping about for peat or something.” [ATLAS, J., 1977, p. 166]

One of the many results of all this kind of Jewish-enforced revisionism was a 1970 volume, The New Novel in America, subtitled The Kafkan Mode in Contemporary Fiction, which featured all Jewish writers except mention of some Gentiles in a final chapter addressed to “Minor American Novelists.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 27] An intriguing insight on Kafka comes from Clement Greenberg:

“Kafka’s own awareness of what he intuited about the Jewish condition through his fiction also explains why he became a Zionist … Kafka … presented the Gentile world and Gentile history as a trap for the likes of him and his … [Kafka’s] heroes … could, with very few exceptions, win out only at the last moments and only by destroying completely the fabric of the kind of reality in which they are embedded. For that reality, and that reality alone, is their enemy.” [GREENBERG, p. 270]

(This perspective, of course, is not only Zionist but the absolute paradigm for Orthodox Judaism, that is, at the end of time – in Greenberg’s last “moments” – Gentile society will be destroyed and Jews, who cannot ever be free in galut, will prevail over their historical nemeses).

Even earlier, in the 1950s, says Richard Kostelanetz, “[Jewish authors] Mordechai Richler was the most lauded Canadian writer, Don Jacobson and A. Alvarez as the most touted Englishmen, and Harold Rosenberg as the chief expert on ‘the New.’” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 28] With the publication of Philip Roth’s Portnoy’s Complaint, in 1971 Peter Schrag delighted in noting that “a few months after
it was published an editor in New York rejected a manuscript with a note that ‘no one is interested in reading novels about WASPS.’” [SCHRAG, p. 110]

In due time, there were Jews – heralding the chauvinist core of their mythic past – who were declaring that even the English language wasn’t good enough for them. “I am intrigued,” wrote poet Joel Rosenberg in 1971, “with the possibility of Judaizing the English language.” [ROSENBERG, J., p. 170] “I feel cramped,” decided Cynthia Ozick, “I have come to it with notions it is too parochial to recognize. A language, like a people, has a history of ideas, but not all ideas: only those known to its experience. Not surprisingly, English is a Christian language. When I write in English, I live in Christendom.” [EISEN, p. 167] “One need only call to mind Cynthia Ozick,” says Jewish critic Mark Schechner, “currently the most prominent writer associated with the revolt against secular rationalism, to understand that her eminence in our literature, in our culture, portends something of a fairly large movement. In her own mind, and in ours, she symbolizes a distinct movement toward revival of forms of Jewish consciousness which, if not identical to halakhah [Jewish religious law] are certainly unthinkable without it.” [in SHAPIRO, M., p. 89]

“Having no longer to defend themselves from real or imagined charges of parochialism,” wrote Jewish critic Ruth Wisse in 1976, “the new Jewish writers of the 70s are free to explore the ‘trivial’ and particularist aspects of Judaism, and even, turning the tables, to speculate on the restrictive limits of English as a literary language.” [WALDEN, p. xiii]

By the 1960s and 1970s, notes Harold Wechsler and Paul Ritterband, Jewish scholars and intellectuals were “moved by emotions … particularly deriving from the Holocaust and the establishment of the state of Israel, to … explore the Jewish component in their studies of Persian literature or Gregorian chants or Renaissance art.” [WECHSLER, p. 282] By 1986 there was enough interest in Jewish religious roots for a Jewish scholar to author an entire volume about “Apocalyptic Messianism and Contemporary Jewish-American Poets.” Some of the poets who qualify for this genre, according to Davka, a Jewish ethnic magazine, include:

LITERATURE - “INTELLECTUALS” - “THE FAMILY”


“In a single characteristic year,” wrote Roger Kahn in 1968, “one careful researcher compiled a list of ‘books of Jewish interest in America.’ Marginalia were discarded; the list totaled 258. Where books lead, critics follow. Jewish critics proliferated so freely that one writer has made a most curious charge. He argues that Jewish novelists prosper because of the praise of Jewish critics.” [KAHN, R., p. 6]

James Shapiro is a Jewish professor in the esoteric field of the English Renaissance, “a culture deeply infused with Christianity.” “For years,” he noted in 1996, “I’d look around and see that many of the leading scholars of the early modern period were Jews.” [WINKLER, K., 1996, 2-2-96, p. A15] Shapiro’s narcissistic Jewish ethnocentrism, and exploration of his Jewish roots, eventually led him to decide that “at a time when many writers were trying to reinvent what it means to be English, the English increasingly defined themselves by what they were not. I would argue that the English were obsessed with the Jews.” Shapiro, noted journalist Karen Winkler, “admits freely a deeply personal stake in this argument. It is a way for him to confront his own relationship to Jewish history.” “I realized,” said Shapiro, “that I’m both a professor of English and a Jew, and I wanted to know how my people had shaped the culture I was studying.” [WINKLER, K., 1996, p. A8]

Likewise, Natalie Zeman Davis, a Princeton professor and “one of the leading scholars of early modern Europe,” remarked that

“I’m Jewish, and I see putting the Jews back into the main story of Europe as a way to tikkun, a word that means to repair. I’ve come to feel it as a way to repair the Nazi effort to efface the Jews of Europe.” [WINKLER, K., 2-2-96, p. A15]

Increased Jewish fascination with “Jewishness” and Jewish Orthodoxy, coupled with Jewish dominance in the publishing industry, recently created in the 1990s for novelist Nathan Englander (age 28) a unique opportunity. Englander, raised as an Orthodox Jew, was “discovered” by Lois Rosenthal, the editor of the journal Story. The Knopf publishing firm offered Englander $350,000 for a book of stories about life among Orthodox Jews, “an astonishing sum,” notes the Boston Globe, “for an unknown writer’s first work – for the collection [of stories] and a novel not yet written. Suddenly this spring’s deal catapulted the Jerusalem bachelor into literary stardom.” [ROCHMAN, p. C6]

Along the same theme, in 1994 Publishers Weekly announced the winner of the HarperCollins “get-published” contest, noting that:
“Advertised on the back of Olivia Goldsmith’s novel The Bestseller, the contest attracted an amazing 7,000 entries.” The lucky winner selected was Dalia Rabinovich whose book was a Latin magic-realist tale inspired by her Jewish grandparents immigration to Colombia.” [QUINN, p. 113]

Two years later the same journal noted major publishing interest in – of all things – Holocaust cookbooks:

“For a small press title, In Memory’s Kitchen: A Legacy from the Women of Terezin, edited by Cara De Silva, translated by Bianca Steiner Brown and published in September by Judaica publisher Jason Aronson, has received some incredible publicity: articles in Newsweek and USA Today, a November 17 full-page review in the New York Times Book Review and a People review expected to hit today. And now this unusual piece of Holocaust literature, a collection of recipes written (some on scraps of Nazi material) as legacy and life- affirming defiance by women in the Czech death camp Terezin, has received major trade house recognition: it will become a Delta trade paperback next September.” [QUINN, J., p. 243]

Then there are the likes of recovering heroin addict and famous author Elizabeth Wurtzel. Her first book, Prozac Nation: Young and Depressed in America “immediately became a national best seller when it was published in the United States in 1995 … Overnight she became a poster child for Generation X … She was paid a half-million dollars advance for her second book, Bitch. In Praise of Difficult Women … Her mother frets over her tendency to date shaygetzes (non-Jews), nevertheless insisting her mother has nothing to worry about because ‘I feel so Jewish … I am very proud of being Jewish.” [WENIG, G., 1999, p. 58-61]

By the 1990s, note David Desser and Lester Friedman,

“Critics usually interpret a Jewish author’s direct denial of ethnic influence as a conscious evasion, a personal blind spot, or a psychological problem; more frequently, they ignore denials in favor of analyzing the work, not listening to the author. Scholars even scrutinize these novels, poems, and short stories lacking Jewish characters and having little apparent relationship to Jewish culture for Jewish points of view, attitudes toward characters, and thematic selection … the underlying critical assumption is that the work of a Jewish writer must either overtly or covertly reflect a Jewish sensibility.” [DESSER, p. 4-5]

In 2001, the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles noted the increasing predominance of Jewish authors and Jewish themes in mainstream publishing:

“It’s time to make room for a newer generation of American Jewish writers, many of whom are young women who have not even hit 30. Their debut novels on Jewish themes are earning large advances, garnering stellar reviews and reaching best seller lists … Daisy Maryles, executive publisher of Publishers Weekly, the news magazine of publishing and bookselling, agrees: ‘Writers are a lot less self-conscious of their Judaism,’ she says. ‘They are using their own experiences to illustrate their relationship to the world at large and to their tradition … The interest in Jewish themes may be part of the wave of multiculturalism –from Af-
rican American to Asian American – that has captured public imagination … Three themes predominate in contemporary Jewish fiction, says [Gail] Hochman [an agent with Brandt and Brandt Literary Agents]: the legacy of the Holocaust, survival in Israel or living in the secular world as a practicing Jew … Laura Matthews, senior editor at Putnam, calls it ‘curious but coincidental’ that she has just published two books with Jewish subthemes … The 200-plus Jewish book fairs held during November and December capitalize on the demand for Jewish writers … But, notes [Carolyn Starman] Hessel, [director of the Jewish Book Council], the audience for these books reaches beyond the Jewish market. What Jewish women have to say is of interest to the American public. [Jewish novelist Susan] Isaacs agrees. ‘If we’re willing to read novels about medieval monks a la ‘The Name of the Rose’ or Agatha Christie’s Miss Marple series, about a little Anglican lady in a small town in England, then why shouldn’t we read about American Jews?” [MUSLEAH, R., JUNE 2001] [Specifically noted in the article as illustrations of this increase are Jewish novelists Nomi Eve, Myla Goldberg, Anita Diamant, Cheryl Sucher, Katie Singer, Simone Zelitch, Fran Dorf, Ruth Knafo Setton, and Susan Isaacs].

Many, many Jews are afforded prominence in modern literature and are thereby subject to such scrutiny by fellow Jews. In the best-selling – often sensationalist and sleazy – realm are the names of Danielle Steel, Jacqueline Susann, and Judith Krantz. Danielle Steel married Claude-Eric Lazard, grandson of a famous international French Jewish banking firm. Judith Krantz, who has sold eighty million books in fifty languages, “is the third largest-selling female novelist in history … She writes about fascinating women, beauty, fame, money, and sex … She does try to make some serious points and has woven such images as anti-Semitism and the German occupation in her novels.” [HYMAN] Ms. Krantz was introduced to her future husband – Steven Krantz (eventual director of programming for Columbia Pictures Television) – by Jewish broadcaster Barbara Walters. “Wherever you go,” says Krantz,

“you carry your Jewishness with you, if you want to. I wanted to … [I] would have enjoyed it more if [my sons] married Jewish women. Just to continue. Jews have been around for so many thousands of years, I hate to think of a world without Jews. Jews contribute so much talent to the world, so much spice. What will happen to the talent? Who will play the violin?” [BRAWARSKY, S., 6-26-2000, p. 39]

Krantz’s brother Jeremeny Tarcher “became the first and best publisher of New Age books in the United States.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 147] Krantz’s autobiography (Sex and Shopping. The Confessions of a Nice Jewish Girl) has a firm foundation of Jewish interconnection to fame, fortune, and power:

“My parents were deeply involved in Jewish philanthropies, often spending four nights a week at various meetings [p. 11] … Well-known [Jewish] fashion photographer [Milton Greene] and I became good friends … It was a world of interrelationships. Milton’s ex-wife, Evelyn,
was engaged to [famous Jewish portrait photographer] Dick Avedon … Later, when I became a fashion editor, I was always galvanized when we worked together … [My sister] Mimi became engaged to a man named David Karney, an Israeli whose father was the real-estate ‘Rockefeller’ of Israel … [Later] Mimi and David were living in Los Angeles, where he was beginning a magnificent career as a builder [p. 128-129] … [Jewish friend Andre Sussman changed his name to Surmain and ‘became the owner of Lutece, which instantly became the very best, most famous French restaurant in New York [p. 147] … A friend named Selig Alkon … called and asked if I wanted to go away with a group of other people for the weekend of the Fourth … We were planning to go with Selig’s first cousin, Barbara Walters [Krantz’s husband, Steve, was at one point their boss at ‘NBC’s flagship station, WNBT.’ [p. 160] …. [In New York] we were part of an interesting group of young couples, many of them involved in the art world, such as Aaron Shikler and his wife Pete. Aaron … painted Jackie and Jack Kennedy for their White House portraits … There was David Levine, the now-legendary caricaturist … None of them were as rich as Joanne and Alfred Stern, whose money came from Sears Roebuck via Al’s mother … Many of the others lived in the most magnificent East Side apartments, like Barbara … and Jerry Goldsmith … Among other acquaintances were a lawyer, Mort Jankow, and his wife, Linda, who was a granddaughter of Harry Warner, of Warner Brothers. Mort later became my agent. [p. 208-209] … In New York, through Jack La Vien [a common form of Levine], a friend of [husband] Steve’s, we became members of an exclusive club that dominated the chic New York disco scene [p. 221]” [KRANTZ, J., 2000]

heim, a sculptor who'd lived in Paris most of her life, became our guide into the art world.” [p. 324] “I spent most of my time working on Manhattan on the Salzmann's kitchen table.” [p. 334] [KRANTZ, J., 2000]

“Soon after the success of Daisy [one of her early novels],” Krantz says, in providing a lesson in what she calls “Jewish Geography”:

“Nat Wartels sold Crown to Random House, which was owned by Si Ne-
whouse, one of the richest men in America. On my next trip to New York, this unknown billionaire gave a dinner party to welcome me, inviting only executives from Crown and Random House. He and Bob Bernstein, who was his second-in-command at the time, quizzed me, a total strang-
er, trying to get a grip exactly who this strange Californian was besides being a successful novelist.

'So where did you go to high school?' Bob began.

'Birch Warthen.'

'My God, did you know my cousin, Alice Bernstein?'

'Well, of course I did, we graduated in the same class,' I answered

'What did you do after college?' Si wanted to know.

'I worked for Herb Mayes at Good House [Keeping].”

'Herb? I've known him all my life. A great man’ was Si’s response.

'My father was one of his best friends,' I said modestly, ‘and Alex is one of
my oldest and dearest friends,' I added, knowing full well that Si had dat-
ed their daughter, Alex, at one point her life, and that Mitzi Newhouse,
his mother, and Grace Mayes were friends

Both men's faces beamed with relief. An absolutely perfect game of Jewish Geography had just been beautifully played and I had been squarely iden-
tified as a highly credentialed, super-nice New York Jewish girl, no poten-
tially oddball California exotic.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 303]

Bruce J. Friedman’s novels, says one Jewish critic, usually “center on Jews alienated from Christian America and ignorant of their own roots.” [WALDEN, p. 70] Alvin Toffler (Future Shock) is Jewish as is Studs Terkel. A mere sampling of other Jewish novelists and prose writers includes Ayn Rand (Alisa Rosen-
baum), Nathaniel West (Nathaniel Weinstein), Harold Robbins (Harold Rubin), and science fiction authors Isaac Asimov (“As far as I know, I was the first science fiction writer of note [of Jewish descent] who used his own name.”) [ASIMOV, I., 1974, p. 2], William Tenn, Carol Carr, Robert Silverberg, Horace Gold, Pamela Sargent, Robert Sheckley, and Harlan Ellison.

“Two of the best science fiction writers of the 1930s,” says Isaac Asimov, in re-
flections of his career, “were Stanley G. Weinbaum and Nat Schachmer, both Jewish. (Weinbaum published for only a year and a half, during which he imme-
diately established himself as the most popular science fiction writer in America, before dying tragically of cancer while still in his thirties.” [ASIMOV, I., 1994, p. 16] Martin Greenberg owned Gnome Press (an early publisher of Asimov’s works) Many authors complained of being exploited by this publisher. (ASIMOV, I., 1994, p. 415-416) There was later a second Martin Greenberg (Martin Harry Greenberg). This “Marty,” says Asimov, “has become so famous in science fiction
that the name Martin Greenberg now applies only to him.” [ASIMOV, I., 1994, p. 416] By early 1990s, Martin Harry Greenberg had “published nearly four hundred anthologies, and there is no question that he is far and away the most prolific and, in addition, the best anthologist the world has ever seen.” [ASIMOV, I., 1994, p. 419] Joel Davis also “had two fiction magazines, both mystery – *Ellery Queen’s Mystery Magazine* and *Alfred Hitchcock’s Mystery Magazine*.” He also started *Isaac Asimov’s Science Fiction Magazine* (IASFM). (The main competitors were [Jewish?] Ben Bova’s Analog and Edward Ferman’s F&SF (*Fantasy and Science Fiction*). [ASIMOV, I., 1994, p. 422-423]

The *Cleveland Jewish News* had this to say about the science fiction investigations of Jewish American English professor Batya Weinbaum:

“Existing in two worlds is a also a theme of science fiction written by immigrant Jews in the early part of the 20th century, says Weinbaum. Jews, she explained, dominated the science-fiction field in those days ... Another [Jewish author] Weinbaum is fascinated with is Leslie F. Stone, nee Leslie Rubenstein. Like many Jewish sci-fi writers at the time, Stone used an Anglo-Saxon pseudonym to conceal her Jewish ethnicity ... Many other Jewish writers of the ‘30s, including Nat Schachner, Moses Schere and Bernard Sachs, wrote similar futuristic stories about dictators, political parties and assimilation. Stanley Weinbaum’s ... “The Adaptive Ultimate’ ... is yet another tale drawing from the Jewish immigrant experience of cultural assimilation ... Prof. Weinbaum also credits Stanley Weinbaum and Stone with the creation of the ‘sympathetic alien, a kind, intelligent creature who helped people. This was a far cry from the ‘bug-eyed beasts’ of H.G. Wells, whose only goal was to eradicate humanity. Many of these tales were published in anthologies by another Jew, Hugo Gernsback, whom Weinbaum calls ‘the father of sci-fi.”’ [GUTH, D., 2000, p. 108-]


Edna Ferber, “author of Giant, Show Boat, and the Pulitzer prize-winning novel So Big, attributed her success to having been born a Jew. ‘Being a Jew makes it tougher to get on,’ she commented, ‘and I like that.’” [ANTLER, J., 1997, p. 140(e)] “Modernist” author Gertrude Stein “admired Jews’ ‘clan feeling’ and their high ‘ethical and spiritual nature.’ It is widely believed that she survived World War II with her lover, Alice B. Toklas (another California German Jew), because of her relationship with the [French] Vichy regime.” [ANTLER, J., 1997, p. 140(e)]

When Jewish novelist Anne Michaels’ friend ran across yet another volume about a familiar subject, he complained about “another book on the Holocaust,” not knowing that her own new work focused on the same theme. [Brawarsky, S., 1998, p. 29] Carl Djerassi, a Jewish Stanford University scientist who is considered the “father” of the birth control pill, also writes novels. His most recent, Menachem’s Seed, “ponders how a non-Jewish woman who impregnates herself with an Israeli sperm can ensure her child will be born Jewish.” [PEARL, L., 1997, p. 34]

“Do we need another ex-junkie from New York publishing autobiographical novels about sex, violence, and death?” wondered the [London] Guardian in 1999. The reference was to Joel Rose’s new novel, Kill Kill Faster Faster, described even by the author as a “genre novel – pulp shit.” Rose, of Hungarian Jewish heritage, is a former TV writer for Kojak, Miami Vice, and McMillan and Wife. [GIBB, 1999, p. T18]

Judy Blume is a best-selling author of children’s books. Ever busy socializing children against Christian tradition, Blume notes that “I had letters from angry parents accusing me of ruining Christmas forever because of a chapter in Su-
perfudge called ‘Santa Who?’” [BLUME, p. 65] In 1986 a children’s book called *An American Tail* was published. “A Steven Spielberg Production,” it was originally an animated movie. Lavishly illustrated, the newly invented fairy tale focuses upon the Jewish Mousekewitz family, a group of mice in late 19th century Russia. Both book and film socialize young children to the persecution myths of Jewish identity (depicted here as harmless, innocent mice), while broadly stereotyping the entire non-Jewish community in Eastern Europe as a realm of bloodthirsty monsters. Beneath an image of three cats with Russian style handlebar moustaches, saliva dripping from their teeth, all creeping along next to what appears to be a Nazi (the viewer only sees his black boots and brown pants) the fairy tale reads:

“Suddenly, the houses began to jump and shake. The sound of horses’ hooves clattering through the town and shouts of terrified people made all the mice tremble with fear.

'The Cossacks! The Cossacks!'

In those days, from time to time, Cossacks would gallop through the Jewish villages of Russia, burning homes and temples, destroying everything in their path. In the same kind of way, cat-Cossacks, known as Catsacks, would race through the tiny Russian mouse villages, burning and demolishing the little mouse homes and capturing whole mouse families as they ran from their flaming houses out into the snow.” [KINGSLEY, p. 10]

Other Jewish authors in the children’s market include Paula Danziger, Allen Pace Nilson, Robert Lipsyte, and E. L. Konigsburg, among others.

In 1999, recognizing the market and the times, a coffee-table photography book entitled “The Jewish writer” came out by photographer Jill Krementz. [George Gilbert’s history of Jewish photographers claims her as Jewish; GILBERT, p. 60] Well connected in the literary world, her editorial dilemma, noted the *Jewish Bulletin*, was that there was not enough space in her proposed book for all 78 images of Jewish authors she had collected. [FAINGOLD, 1999, p. 41A]


However restricted, oppressed, marginalized, and unrewarded Jewish women are supposed to be, “in sheer numbers, some 200 titles produced in the twentieth century since the first text was published in 1912 are identifiable as Jewish-
American women's biographies – that is, those in which ethnicity and gender are significant touchstones for the writer’s identification and (self) creation.” [SHOLLAR, B.] Prominent Jews who have held prominence in the feminist field include Bella Abzug, Phyllis Chesler, Gloria Steinem, Vivian Gornick, Robin Morgan, Susan Brownwiller, Shulamith Firestone, Andrea Dworkin, Meredith Tax, Letty Cottin Pogrebin, and Naomi Weisstein, to headline a long list. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese is half-Jewish. Jews have also been extremely prominent in lesbian activism. “[Jews] have been told that they control everything,” noted Jewish lesbian Irene Klepfisz in 1982, “and so when they are in the spotlight, they have been afraid to draw attention to their Jewishness. For these women, the number of Jews active in the movement is not a source of pride, but rather a source of embarrassment, something to be played down, something to be minimized.” [KLEPFISZ, I., 1982, p. 47]

Jewish women, noted Ann Roiphe in 1981, “form a ridiculously high percentage of the women’s movement.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 148] “Carolyn Stoloff concluded in a study of the backgrounds of those active in the woman’s liberation movement among graduate students at the Univeristy of Michigan. She discovered that, of those whose religious background could be ascertained, almost 58 percent were Jewish.” [ROTHMAN/LICHTER, 1982, p. 109] About half of a 1999 issue of Biography magazine’s 25 Most Powerful Women in the business and social world “were either Jewish or had Jewish parents.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 24] “Like [Betty Friedan], many of the leaders and theorists of the 1960s feminists had been Jews, albeit largely secular, unidentified ones.” [ANTLER, p. 260] “Friedan,” notes Joyce Antler, “used the language of the Holocaust [in her texts about women’s liberation] not merely as a metaphor, or as a tactic to shock readers, but because she had already made the connection between the oppression of women and that of Jews.” [ANTLER, p. 261]

David Horowitz adds something else about Friedan (Friedman):

“Her infamous description of America’s suburban family household as a ‘comfortable concentration camp,’ in The Feminine Mystique, probably had more to do with her Marxist hatred for America than for her own experience as a housewife and mother. Her husband, Carl, also a leftist, once complained to a reporter in 1970 that, far from being a homebody, his wife ‘was in the world during the whole marriage, either full time or free lance,’ lived in an eleven-room mansion on the Hudson with a full-time maid, and ‘seldom was a wife and a mother.’” [HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 226]

In 1995, even a non-Jewish Polish-born scholar, Magdalena Zaborowska, teaching at the University of North Carolina, knew which way the intellectual and publishing winds blew. Like many, she too falls prey to the strong force of Judeo-centrism in the American academic community. In her volume about women immigrants to America, subtitled “Gender Through East European Immigrant Narratives,” she focuses on the lives of five women – Mary Antin, Elizabeth Stern, Anzia Yezierska, Maria Kuncewicz, and Eva Hoffman – to illustrate her theses. The title of the book, nor its theses of investigation, have nothing to
do with Jews. Yet, in attempting to exemplify the collective voice of the female immigrant experience, the only one who isn’t Jewish in her five subjects is Kunczewicz. Can this, one wonders, be an accurate overview of the lives, dilemmas, identities, and world views of the millions of Eastern European women who weren’t Jewish?


Part of a much referred-to poem by Muriel Rukeyser in Jewish circles goes:

“To be a Jew in the twentieth century/Is to be offered a gift. If you refuse/Wishing to be invisible, you choose/Death of the spirit, the stone insanity.” [ANTLER, J. p. 174] “Jewish themes,” says Daniel Walden, “pervade much of the poetry of Harvey Shapiro who is probably better known as the editor of the *New York Times* Book Review.” [WALDEN, p. 397] Poet Grace Paley has long been poetry editor of the *Nation*. Poet Joseph Auslander was editor of the *North American Review*.

From 1977 to 1998, fifteen people were awarded Yale University’s prestigious Bollingen Prize (today worth $25,000) for poetry. At least seven of them were Jewish males – David Ignatow, Howard Nemerov, Anthony Hecht, John Hollander, Stanley Kunitz, Mark Strand, and Kenneth Koch. [BRUNNER, 1998, p. 733] Reflecting changes in the power elite of the literature world, of the 26 earlier award winners going back to 1949, only two were Jewish (still an over-representation of Jewry, per their percentage of the American population, by about 250%).

From Philadelphia, the *American Poetry Review* has been described as the “premier poetry journal in the country.” [LEITER, 1999] Editors are Stephen Berg, Arthur Vogelsang, and David Bonanno – at least one, likely two, but very possibly all, are Jewish. In 1998, “local Jewish activist and patron” Lynne Hon-
ickman and her family’s Honickman Foundation instituted a yearly *American Poetry Review* “first book” contest for poets. The 1998 judge, Gerald Stern (winner of the 1998 National Book Award for poetry), was Jewish, (his choice as *APR* winner was Joshua Beckman) as was the next year’s judge, Louise Gluck, who selected another fellow Jew as the best poet, Dana Levin.

**Sanford Pinsker**, a Jewish reviewer, notes with satisfaction the “Jewish dimension” to National Book Award winner Gerald Stern’s poetry. Citing Stern’s poem called “Behaving Like a Jew,” Pinsker’s insights into the poem read like a *Mad* magazine parody:

“In this poem, probably the most anthologized and best known of all Stern’s work, the speaker ruminates about the death of an opossum, refusing to treat the event as yet another instance of the ‘joy in death’ and the ‘philosophical understanding of the carnage’ he associates with the anti-Semitic Charles Lindbergh. Instead, he insists on behaving like a Jew, which means touching the animal’s face, staring into its eyes and pulling it off the road.

And as Stern describes this (Jewish) moment, the opossum in question metamorphoses itself into what looks for all the world like a Hasidic Jew:

‘I am not going to stand in a wet ditch … / and lose myself in the immortal life stream / when my hands are still a little shaky / from his stiffness and his bulk / and my eyes are still weak and misty / from his round belly and his curved fingers / and his black whiskers and his little dancing feet.’

[original author’s parenthesis: PINSKER, 1998, p. 62]

Pinsker isn’t joking about this. Not only does the reviewer declare the poem to be Jewish, **so is the opossum!** So much so that the idea of its “whiskers,” “round belly,” and “little feet” loom as a kind of dead rabbi to him.

“Writers are all secret Jews,” declared Maxime Kumin, two years after winning a Pulitzer Prize for poetry. [HYMAN, p. 766] “All poets are Jews,” echoed Russian Jewish poet Marina Tsvetayeva. [FINKELSTEIN, N., 1998] “To be Jewish means to be a poet,” declared Holocaust hero Elie Wiesel, affirming an apparent in-house Jewish truism. [STORCH, 1998, p. 8] “A woman poet is a hunted Jew,” declares Erica Jong, “eternally the outsider.” [JONG, E., 1994, p. 100] (Delmore Schwartz has his own take on the Jew-poet-sufferer closure, noting his period as a student at Harvard University: “I never thought about anti-Semitism, because everyone was against me as a poet.”) [ATLAS, J., 1977, 166] Helene Flanzbaum suggests the psycho-social forces at play from which such a notion – any poet as a kind of honorary Jew – may come from: “The poet’s sense of alienation had come to signal his superiority to a debased American culture … That poets are seldom appreciated in their own time or nation corresponds to the plight of the Jews, long held to be chosen but nationless.” [FLANZBAUM, p. 267] Hence, being a poet is understood by many in today’s poetry world to be a psychological state of antithesis to the established order, consciously conceived as an echo of the traditional Jewish sense of superiority to the surrounding non-Jewish norms, despite the fact that the elitist cliques that control the avenues towards crowning as a celebrated “poet” in the poetry/
publishing industry has become, like all the rest of popular culture, merely an arm of the established – and increasingly Judaized – order itself. Being Jewish, after all (really or illusorily), is a strong boost towards the gateway of public sympathy, personal accomplishment, and, in all spheres, success.

Flanzbaum notes the case of famous non-Jewish poet John Berryman, and the phenomena of Gentile poets looking for their symbolic selves in the Jewish victimhood paradigm:

“In 1945, John Berryman, a Catholic poet from rural Oklahoma, won the Kenyon Review’s annual contest for best short-fiction. His eight-page story, ‘The Imaginary Jew,’ featured a southern boy in New York City College who is brutally attacked after being taken for ‘a Jew.’ In that same year, Karl Shapiro, a third-generation American Jew won the Pulitzer Prize for a collection of poetry called V-Letter … Berryman is not the only imaginary Jew haunting the pages of modern American poetry. In fact, many appear at this time.” [Flanzbaum, p. 259, 260]

For Shapiro’s part, among his poems is at least one in homage to the new Jewish state of Israel, described in the work as the “liberation of Palestine.” In it he further rhapsodizes that “When I see the name of Israel high in print … I sink deep in a Western chair and rest my soul.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 241] (Shapiro was for a few years the editor of the prestigious journal Poetry.). [SYRKIN, M., 1964, p. 229]

Much-heralded Spanish poet Federico Garcia Lorca, killed in 1936 during the Spanish Civil War, had a “fanciful belief that he possessed the blood of gypsies and Jews.” [NADEL, I., 1996, p. 23]. In Europe, in 1999, a press report noted a requisite homage: “[Britain’s] Poet Laureate Andrew Motion will read his poem about Ann [Frank], entitled Ann Frank Huis,” marking the 70th anniversary of her birth. [PRESS ASSOCIATION NEWSFILE, 6-7-99] Nearly forty years earlier, Soviet Union poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko, “married to a Jewess, leaped to world fame in 1961 as the author of ‘Babi Yar,’ a poem he wrote in protest against the world’s apathy towards the slaughter of millions of Jews.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 97] Another Russian poet and novelist for years elevated to extraordinary attention in the West is Boris Pasternak. He too is Jewish. So is one of Europe’s most celebrated post-war poets, Paul Celan. “Though Celan never spelled out his Jewishness,” says Jewish scholar John Felstiner, “he aligned himself more stringently with the Jews than with the non-Jews in his pantheon.” [GROSS, N., 7-7-95, p. 8]

Prominent French author Nathalie Sarraute (Natacha Tcherniak) was also Jewish. An international Jewish writers conference in San Francisco in 1997 featured prominent authors from Guatemala (Víctor Perera), Brazil (Moacyr Scilar), Mexico (Elan Stavans), Romania (Norman Manae), Great Britain (Dan Jacobson), Poland (Henryk Broder) and Hungary (George Konrad, “who has been discussed as a potential Nobel Prize candidate.”) [SCHIFRIN, D., 1997, p. 1]

As Ilan Stavans notes about the recent upsurge in “Jewish issues” writing in South America:
“Jewish authors, for example, seem to have more presence [than before] in the Southern Hemisphere. From Argentina, there is Ricardo Feierstein, Marcos Aguinis, Jorge Goldenberg, and Fingueret herself; from Mexico, Rosa Nissan; from Uruguay, Mauricio Rosencof. Many of those authors began their careers decades ago, but now the collective impact of their work is beginning to be felt. Some are even achieving popular success. And while few take the genocide in Europe as their central focus, many do offer it as backdrop. *Editorial Mila* and the *Acervo Cultural* in Argentina publish Holocaust survivors’ accounts, like that of Charles Papiernik, originally a French citizen, who endured four years in Auschwitz. And a recent fiction contest, organized by Feierstein, brought a handful of Holocaust-related narratives, including *El ultimo dia*, by Mina Weil, about a Jewish girl growing up in Mussolini’s Italy. I’ve also seen some nonfiction articles, like one about relationships among Holocaust victims by Diana Wang, a psychologist in Buenos Aires, who found out she was Jewish as she was about to take first Communion. Films, too, are part of the trend. I’m acquainted with fewer than half a dozen movies made in Latin America that address the Holocaust directly, but several others deal with the topic at least tangentially.” [STAVANS, I., 5-25-01]

Muriel Spark, an avowed Catholic, born of a Jewish father, has been described as “arguably the most formidable Scottish writer.” [WHITAKER, R., 1-21-96] Jorge Isaacs, of partial Jewish heritage, has long been regarded as Colombia’s “national poet.” [SACHAR, H., p. 267] Australia’s “most widely read and celebrated poet” is Dorothy Porter, whose father, proudly notes a Jewish ethnic magazine, is Jewish. [MANDIE, D., 1999, p. 68-69] The great German writer, Johann Goethe, wasn’t Jewish, but “[Albert] Bielschowsky, like so many Goethe biographers [was] a Jew … German Jews played a leading role in Goethe societies … In the mid-1920s, Jews were almost a majority in the Berlin Goethe society.” [MOSSE, G., 1983, p. 45] Isaac Deutcher noted in 1968 that “quite a few Polish writers have been of Jewish origin, for instance Julian Tuwim and Antoni Slonimski, the most eminent poets of the inter-war period.” [DEUTCHER, I., 1968, p. 54]

And who was America’s official “poet laureate” for the late 1990’s, whose job – for $35,000 a year – is to serve as a poetry “consultant” to the Library of Congress? Jewish poet and Boston University professor Robert Pinsky. “One of his grand works,” notes the *Los Angeles Times*, “An Explanation of America,” (Princeton University Press, 1979) is an epic poem written for his oldest daughter, now a manager at Borders Books in Los Angeles.” [MEHREN, p. E1] Pinsky is the former poetry editor for the avidly pro-Israel *New Republic*. In 1999, Pinsky became the “first poet laureate to be named for a third year by Congress.” [KUSHNER, L., 5-28-99, p. 1]

In 2000, Stanley Kunitz was named to replace Pinsky as America’s poet laureate. Kunitz is also Jewish. Including Kunitz, at least five of the last eight American poet laureates (i.e., since 1988) have been Jewish: Kunitz, Pinsky, Howard Nemerov, Mark Strand, and Joseph Brodsky.
Jewish American playwrights in (the Jewish-dominated) theatre include Arthur Miller, Neil Simon, Lilian Hellman, Elmer Rice, Paddy (Sidney) Cheyefsky, Abe Burrows (Abraham Solomon Borowitz), George S. Kaufman, Wendy Wasserstein, Moss Hart, Elmer Rice, S.N. Behrman, and Clifford Odets. [PLESUR, M. 1982, p. 173] In France, surrealist Eugene Ionesco’s mother was Jewish. In Britain, where Jews are less than one percent of the population, in 1969 “Lord” Goodman, the (Jewish) chairman of the British Arts Council, observed that “in the theatre at this moment the younger school of dramatists is perhaps seventy-five percent Jewish.” Such authors included Harold Pinter, Arnold Wesker, Bernard Kops, Frank Marcus, Peter Shaffer, Lionel Bart, and Wolf Mankowitz, among others. [LITVINOFF, B., p. 168] “Their contention is that they are English writers,” said Barnet Litvinoff, “… [yet] a hidden sentiment was activated among them in 1967, however, and they made a swift if somewhat condescending rediscovery of their Jewishness.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 168]

“What could be prompting the increased visibility of so many Jewish figures on the modern British literary scene?” wondered Merritt Mosely (author of The Dictionary of Literary Biography: British Novelists Since 1960) in 2001. Mosley notes Howard Jacobson (whose “Jewishness consciousness … continues to animate his novels”) as the best of them. “Two other celebrated novels of the year 2000 were about Jewishness,” he adds, including Will Self’s How the Dead Men Live (“Mr. Self has said that [the character] Lily is partly based on his mother, who was also a Jewish anti-Semite”) and Linda Grant’s When I Lived in Modern Times, winner of the Orange Prize for Fiction (it is “a historical novel about a young Jewish woman growing up in London’s Soho during World War II.”) “Two widely noticed 1999 titles were about Jews, assimilation and anti-Semitism in England,” adds Mosely (these are Gillian Freeman’s His Mistress’s Voice and Bernice Ruben’s I, Dreyfus. [MOSELEY, M., 5-25-01]

Germany? “Nathan the Wise,” notes Michael Brenner, “became one of the most popular figures in post-war German theatre. He was soon to be joined on the stage by many other Jewish figures, ranging from the Fiddler on the Roof to Ann Frank. In recent years in Germany there has also been a remarkable revival of German-Jewish authors, such as Else Lasker-Schuler, Kurt Tucholsky, Erich Muhsam, and Alfred Dublin. Such towering names as Franz Kafka and Walter Benjamin are much better known today than during their own lifetimes.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. xxi]

Aside from the many Jewish “Family” critics already mentioned, other prominent Jewish literature/culture critics include Walter Benjamin (Detlev Holz), George Steiner, Louis Untermeyer (whose son, Joseph, was active in Zionist efforts to get weapons to Israel) [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 157] and Clifton Fadiman, among many others.

By 1996, Sylvia Barack-Fishman, a professor at Brandeis University, noted that

“A search for the essence of Jewish identity has become a focal point of contemporary American Jewish literary and intellectual exploration spanning all brow levels, in works from the most complex fiction to the
soap-operatic life-cycle angst of popular films and television programs.”
[BARACK-FISHMAN, p. 58]

She also even notes that these days “Israel figures prominently in fiction by such authors as Saul Bellow, Chaim Potok, Elie Wiesel, Jay Neugeboren, Hugh Nissenson, E.M. Broner, Tova Reich, Mark Helprin, and many others.”
[BARACK-FISHMAN, p. 279] “Even Norman Mailer,” says Desser and Friedman, “who includes few Jewish characters in his books, and actually fights against his Jewish identity, is usually included in anthologies and critical works about Jewish authors.”
[DESSER, p. 4-5]

“Complementing the focus on [the Holocaust] survivor syndrome,” says Lillian Kremer, “is the attention of writers to [a] survivor mission. This is manifest in [Marge] Piercy’s and [National Book award winner] Adrienne Rich’s advocacy of Zionism.”
[DAVIDSON, p. 396] Elsewhere, mystery writer Richard “Kinky” Friedman “is a hawk on the Arab-Israeli conflict.” As a Jewish country western singer, he was once awarded the Jewish Defense League’s “prize for cultural contribution”; among his compositions (often performed) is “a particularly tasteless song about using a picture of Jesus for toilet paper.”
[CHAFETS, MEMOIRS, p. 175, 176] “A number of new books from university presses, Jewish publishers, and mainstream publishers,” noted the Jewish Week in 1999, “are searching out women’s voices in Jewish history and Jewish texts, reclaiming Jewish tradition.”

In the feminist movement, of which Jewish women have been so much a part, publishing and literary heroines began making their inevitable march home to reconnect with Jewish exclusionist/elitist tenets. Abandoning an abstract solidarity with the generalized human community for the narrower, more tangible, glories of Jewish particularism and Holocaust victim/unity, they somehow managed to tiptoe around the massive anti-woman keystones of traditional Jewish teachings. In an article about alleged anti-Semitism in the women’s movement and being a “born-again” Jew, Letty Pogrebin, a founding editor of Ms magazine, announced to her readers that

“During the past few years something has changed, something that makes me no less a woman but more a Jew … [POGREBIN, p. 76, 1987] … Looking back, I suppose my first visit to Israel had something to do with this epiphany … As instructive as the first visit was, it was the MS tour of Israel that grew out of my account of it in this magazine that something clicked for me … [POGREBIN, p. 77, 1987] … Before I had believed in a universalistic ideal, in feminine synthesis, and de-emphasizing differences, but now, secularly as well as spiritually, I was ‘born again’ to my people. The change is subtle but seismic.”
[POGREBIN, p. 77]

“I have never considered myself religious,” wrote Betty Friedan, former President of the National Organization of Women (NOW) and author of one of the most influential feminist tracts, The Feminine Mystique, “For me as for other Jewish feminists, religion perpetuates the patriarchal tradition that denies women access to Judaism’s most sacred ritual and enshrined them within the confines of their biological roles. But when women like me broke through to
our authentic personhood as women, we found the strength to dip deep down into ourselves on other levels … Now with a sense of confidence born of the women’s movement, I and many other feminists found we could embrace our authentic Jewishness in a new way … In some strange and wonderful way my feminism and my Judaism were merging.” [SILBERMAN, p. 264]

“After fifty,” says best-selling author (best known for the novel Fear of Flying) and feminist Erica Jong:

“I began to question my ambivalent relationship to my Jewish identity and the unexamined assimilation I have written about earlier. It seems astonishing to me that a woman born at the height of the Holocaust should not have been trained to a stronger sense of Judaism. And I also began to regret not having raised my [my daughter] more Jewishly, and not having more Jewish children to replace those lost among the six million [Holocaust victims]. Lately I have begun to yearn for solidarity with other Jewish feminists … to celebrate Jewishness without shame.” [TEMPLIN, p. 126]

(How, by the way, did Jong first get published? Her mother sent her to a Jewish family friend, Bessie Golding – Jong’s grandfather’s mistress. Jong presented poems to Golding at her office who read them for twenty minutes, then looked up and decided that “You’re going to be the most famous woman poet of your generation.” Golding passed the poems along to an executive at the Holt publishing company “who passed it on to Aaron Asher [also Jewish],” the Holt publisher. Thus was born Jong’s: Fruits and Vegetables.) [JONG, E., 1994, p. 134-137]

One wonders how prominent author Cynthia Ozick, active in Jewish religious circles, reconciles the virulent anti-female Jewish tradition:

“In the world at large I call myself and am called a Jew. But when on Sabbath I sit among women in my traditional shul and the rabbi speaks the word ‘Jew,’ I can be sure that he is not referring to me. For him ‘Jew’ means male Jew. When my rabbi says ‘A Jew is called to the Torah,’ he never means me or any other living Jewish woman. My own synagogue is the only place in the world where I, a middle-aged adult, am defined exclusively by my being the female child of my parents. My own synagogue is the only place in the world where I am not a Jew.” [ROIPHE, 1981, p. 202]

As Rabbi Frisch’s Marriage Manual, a traditional view of Judaism, says:

“Even though the woman is a man’s partner, she should not think of her husband as a comrade but rather as a master. And the woman should love her husband and he shall rule over her as it is said: ‘And thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.’” [HEILMAN, S., 1992, p. 332]

Rosellen Brown, a fiction editor at the Jewish magazine Tikkun, notes that stories submitted to her tend to be about old Jewish characters, the Holocaust, and old New York City Jewish neighborhoods. “What you can probably see emerging here,” she wrote in 1993, “… [is] nostalgia … [BROWN, p. 79] …
The majority of work we see is thematically hard breathing and anxious. And where its spirit is I have no idea, except that it seems bent on discharging some long-forgotten obligation.” [BROWN, p. 82]

Andrew Furman, a judge for the National Jewish Book award, noted in 2000 the flavor of modern Jewish literature:

“Jews, the world over, continue to write fiction at a fierce clip … The ‘ethnic,’ mid-century wave of Jewish American writing, fueled by the immigrant consciousness, has clearly given way to a new wave of Jewish writing. Concomitantly, the burden of alienation and marginality amid a host culture are no longer the twin occupations of Jewish writers. Rather, the literary grandchildren of Bellow, Roth, and Malamud – at home now amid their environs – look increasingly inward these days as they engage more explicitly Judaic concerns: the toxic legacy of the Holocaust, the retrieval of extinct Jewish worlds (e.g., the European shtetl, New York’s lower East Side), Jewish feminism, the viability of Orthodoxy, and the biblical resonances in the modern world.” [FURMAN, A., MAY/JUNE 2000, p. 29]

In poetry, for instance, Jewish poet Linda Pasten was afforded space in the 1990s in Tikkun for her poem about an almost obligatory theme, concluding:

“and when my mother saw the swastika on an envelope in the kitchen table, she picked up fast, and we returned to the steamy city.” [FIRESTONE, p. 4]

Erica Jong’s first collection of poetry (Near the Black Forest) was “weighed with poems about my discovering my Jewishness in Germany.” [JONG, E., 1994, p. 133]

In a book about Jewish women, Paula Hyman and Deborah Moore note that:

“A significant group of contemporary Jewish writers produced an inward-turning genre of fiction that explores the individual Jew’s connection to other Jewish people, to the Jewish religion, culture, and tradition, and to the chain or Jewish history. Contrary to the expectations of assimilationists and the example of Jewish literature during the first half of the twentieth century, particularist woman’s Jewish fiction became commonplace … Among the themes that emerged is the late twentieth century American Jewish fiction focusing on women, some of the most important include: the role of the Holocaust in the identity of survivors, their children, and the broader Jewish community; Israel as a focal point of American Jewish identity, and a setting for the exploration of Jewish identity.” [HYMAN, p. 422]

“It must be emphasized,” notes Gershon Shaked, “that American Jewish literature today is prouder of its dual identity than any other ‘foreign’ Jewish literature has ever been.” [SHAKED, p. 176]

Also among the major current genres of Jewish fiction is the Jewish “tough guy” story, what Paul Breines calls the “Rambowitz syndrome.” Breines notes that
he is familiar with about fifty novels that celebrate an “idealized representation of Jewish warriors, tough guys, gangsters, Mossad agents, and Jews of all ages and sexes who fight back against their tormentors.” [BARACK-FISHMAN, p. 280]

“A noticeable change has occurred in recent decades,” says Stephen Whitfield, “The fresh appreciation of ethnic differences that began in the mid-1960s has included the celebration of Jewish identity in many best-selling novels, in serious analyses of Yiddishkeit [Jewishness] … in musicals … and in other cultural artifacts too numerous to mention.” [WHITFIELD, Americans, p. 11] “Ours is close to a golden age,” wrote Leonard Fein in 2000, “… Her’s one piece of current evidence: On the ‘new non-fiction’ table in a local (non-chain) general bookstore the other evening, 11 out of 30 titles were on Jewish subjects.” [FEIN, L., 9-8-2000, p. 9]

Thanks to such an avalanche, and Jewish power to empower and enforce it, Jewish chauvinism has become an institutionalized norm and is an increasingly integral – and even dominant – part of the mainstream American landscape. “According to a theory which seems to be tacitly assumed by many critics,” wrote Robert Alter, “the main currents at least of modern culture all derive from subterranean Jewish sources.” [KOESTER, p. 21] “The massive entry of Jewish intellectuals into the academy in the late 1940s through the 1960s,” says David Hollinger, “was a crucial victory for the cosmopolitans. The attendant de-Christianization of American public culture was sometimes openly proclaimed – by Leslie Fiedler, for example – who in 1967 celebrated what he called ‘the great take-over by Jewish-American writers’ of the task of speaking for Americans.” [HOLLINGER, p. 167]

“The acceptance of [Saul] Bellow as the leading novelist of his generation,” wrote Fiedler in evaluating the impact of the Jewish literary Mafia upon America, “must be paired off with the appearance of [Herman Wouk’s] Marjorie Morningstar on the front cover of Time. On all levels, the Jew is in the process of being mythicized into the representative American.” [KOSTELANETZ, p. 1] “Bellow's Humboldt's Gift,” noted Chaim Bermant in 1977, “which is in some ways an odyssey of literary America, or at least literary New York (which nowadays has come to mean the same thing), shows how far the process of assimilation has gone, and it is no longer quite certain what has happened to whom: whether the Jew has become Americanized or the Americans Judaized. It is a world in which a writer like Gore Vidal, who can trace his roots back to an older America, must feel like an outsider, or a Court goy.” [BERMANT, C., 1977, p. 158]

Efforts by highly placed Jews to appropriate all that is great as innately “Jewish” extended to one of the greatest – perhaps the greatest – popular artists in history: Hollywood’s Charlie Chaplin. “Chaplin’s own background and experience,” wrote Hannah Arendt, “taught him the traditional Jewish fear of the ‘cop’ – that seeming incarnation of a hostile world; but on the other hand, it taught him the time-honored Jewish truth that, other things being equal, the human ingenuity of a David can sometimes outreach the animal strength of a Goliath.” [DESSER, p. 10]
“Chaplin was an English Jew,” wrote Albert Goldman, “who was at pains to deny or minimize his Jewish origins … his infatuation with blond-haired, fair-skinned, voluptuously innocent maidens, whom he courted with eyes brimming with Jewish soul and sentiment, were the classic notes and signs of the Jewish comic hero.” [DESSER, p. 10]

The slight problem here, of course, is that Charlie Chaplin was not Jewish. None of his parents were Jewish, nor his grandparents. He was not raised in a Jewish home and he did not know Hebrew or Yiddish; he was not known to have even been in any kind of association with Jews at all, at least until he ended up in Hollywood [DESSER, p. 10] (where one of his wives was a Jewish actress, Paulette Goddard – i.e., Paulette Levy). Jewish insistence to claim him as one of their own, of course, reflects the widespread inability of Jews to understand the universal dimensions of Chaplin’s lovable tragi-comic character, the Tramp, and the universal depth of his follies, misfortunes, and foibles against a world that is hostile to anybody.

If anything, note Desser and Friedman, “Chaplin is an essentially Christian filmmaker. The overarching themes of his finest films involve a redemptive Christian vision revolving around self-sacrifice and charity as the highest form of love.” [DESSER, p. 10] These, as we have amply seen, and as these Jewish film critics aptly note, are not particularly classic elements of the Jewish tradition.

* The issues in this chapter of course have an international flavor. In Russia, during and after the communist revolution, Zvi Gitelman notes Jewish “intellectual” influence in securing the new regime: “The Jewish intelligentsia had neutralized the boycott of the Bolshevik regime by the Russian intelligentsia. In Lenin’s words, they had ‘sabotaged the saboteurs.’ At the same time Lenin suggested this should not be emphasized in the press because ‘in a peasant land one must sometimes also reckon with such hateful phenomena as anti-Semitism.’” [GITELMAN, 1972, p. 115]

Venita Datta has written an entire book entitled the Origins of the Intellectual in France, noting that the 1914 Dreyfus Affair (when a Jewish army officer was unjustly accused of being a traitor) “is often cited as the moment at which the intellectual was born … French intellectuals have served as role models for intellectuals all over the world … [The intellectual] supplanted the traditional priest as a source of moral authority in modern French society.” [DATTA, p. 1]

In recent years, there have been many Jews of influence in the French (and international) intellectual world, including Claude Levi-Strauss, Michel Foucault, Louis Althusser, Roland Barthes, and Jacques Lacan.

In the years around 1900 the 80,000 or so Jews of France represented less than one percent of the French population of 39 million. Yet, “as many anti-Semites noted,” says Datta,

“with the advent of the [French] Third Republic, more Jews than ever were visible in the fields of art, literature, journalism, and academe. Furthermore, noted Jewish intellectuals, in particular Emile Durkheim of the Sorbonne and Henri Bergson of the College de France, were seen as pillars of the republican establishment, as official ‘intellectuals who had
risen to positions of power and fame via the republican university system ... [DATTA, p. 85] ... This new [Third Republic] regime sought to ‘de-Christianize’ public spaces ... In no other country where anti-Semitism was present did it possess such a strong literary character. Anti-Semites in France were more interested in responding to political, social, and cultural developments than in developing racial theories ... [p. 87] ... Many Jews rose to prominent positions in the army, politics, and high civil service, as well as the arts and academe ... [p. 95] ... Jews were particularly prominent as cultural middlemen, that is, as reviewers, critics, and art collectors ... Significant numbers of Jews were at the forefront of avant-garde movements, not only in the literary and artistic avant-garde ... but also in the academic disciplines ... [p. 96] ... [One influential journal] the Revue Blanche, was more than a journal, it as also a milieu and a group of friends linked by school ties and family relations ... Jewish collaborators represented roughly half of the review’s staff and a much higher proportion of its editorial board.” [p. 105]

Aside from Jewish publishing and mass media pre-eminence in pre-Nazi Germany [see other chapters], Frederick Grunfeld notes the situation for Jewish authors in that era:

“Literally dozens of writers afterwards banned as ‘Jewish – though many of them hardly thought of themselves as such – were producing important contributions to German literature. Among the leading dramatists were Carl Sternheim (The Snob), Arthur Schnitzler (La Ronde), Ernst Toller (The Machine-Wreckers), Walter Hasenclever (The Sun), Ferdinand Bruckner (Criminals) and the Hungarian expatriate Ferenc Molnar (Liliom); among the novelists, besides Broch and Kafka, Alfred Doeblin (Berlin Alexanderplatz), Jakob Wasserman (The World’s Illusion), Lion Feuchtwanger (Jew Suss), Franz Werfel (The Forty Days of Musa Dagh), Alfred Neumann (The Deuce), Bruno Frank (Days of the King), Arnold Zweig (The Case of Sergeant Grischa), Ernst Weiss (Nahar), Joseph Roth (Radetzky March), and Vicki Baum (Grand Hotel); among the poets, Ernst Blass, Alfred Mombert, Rudolf Borchardt, Albert Ehrenstein, Martin Gumpert, Walter Mehring, Nelly Sachs, Berthold Viertel, Karl Wolfskehle and Alfrd Wolfenstein; among the essayists and critics, Karl Kraus, Alfred Polgar, Maximilian Harden, Theodor Wolff, Egon Friedell, Theodore Lessing, Kurt Tucholsky, Freidrich Torberg, Walter Benjamin, Ernst Bloch and Felix Salten (who also happend to be the author of Bambi).” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 27]

The non-Jewish German Nobel Laureate Thomas Mann once wrote about the key factor that elevated him to fame and attention:

“Jews ‘discovered’ me, Jews published me and propagated my reputation; they performed my impossible play; it was a Jew, the late S. Lublin-
ski, who wrote of my *Buddenbrooks* (after it had been greeted elsewhere with sour expressions), ‘This book will grow with time, and will still be read generations from now.’ And when I go out into the world, and visit cities, it is almost always Jews, not only in Vienna and Berlin, who welcome, shelter, dine, and pamper me … It is a fact that simply cannot be denied that, in Germany, whatever is enjoyed only by ‘genuine Teutons’ and aboriginal Ur-Germans, but scorned or rejected by the Jews, will never amount to anything culturally.” [GRUNFELD, F., 1996, p. 28]
“American Jews have made tremendous contributions in all aspects of general culture. In the professions, in music, in literature, in painting and sculpture, in the academic world, and in the area of science, Jews are often distinguished and in many instances pre-eminent.”

Milton Plesur, 1982, p. 168-169

Jews are dominant in virtually all controlling facets of the modern art world. In the world of “high-culture” dance, music, and theatre, for decades S. Hurok Productions was the major force in performance promotion. When Sol Hurok (born Solomon Izrailevich Gurkov) died in 1974, notes Harlan Robinson, “he was the last large-scale independent commercial producer of high culture in the United States ... [ROBINSON, p. xv] ... [He] was an important force behind the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts.” [ROBINSON, p. xiv] An early Hurok partner was Jacob Berman. [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 120] An early competitor in the “concert management business” was Daniel Mayer’s and Marks Levine’s National Broadcasting and Concert Bureau, with links to the fledgling NBC broadcast network. [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 133] In 1972 Hurok’s head of publicity, Martin Feinstein, became the Executive Director of Performing Arts for the newly created John F. Kennedy Center in Washington DC. (Hurok’s son-in-law, Barry Hyams, originally hired Feinstein to the Hurok firm. [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 298] In 1975, the president of Hurok Concerts, Sheldon Gold, was replaced by Maynard Goldman. Gold became president later of the major talent agency ICM Artists Ltd., a newly formed classical music and dance division of Marvin Josephson Associates.

In assessment of Hurok’s closest associates, Harlan Robinson notes that “beyond his domestic employees [cook, servant], Hurok had not real close friends, with the possible exception of [Jewish violinist Isaac] Stern. The violinist was also a favorite with Peter Hyams and Peter’s sister Nessa. They also remember their grandfather had a group of ‘cronies,’ including some Russian Jews, whom he had known for years and to whom he remained steadfastly loyal. These included his accountant and his longtime lawyer, Elias Lieberman, an old-time socialist who had helped to found the International Ladies Garment Workers Union” [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 405] At Huro’s death, he “left money to his grandchildren and to a variety of Jewish charitable organizations ... Surprisingly, only one performing arts organization was included in Hurok’s will: the Musicians Emergency Fund, Inc.” [ROBINSON, H. 1994, p. 462]

Hurok was even succesful in getting a Hollywood movie made about his life (screenplay writers: Harry Kurnitz and George Oppenheimer; producer: Geor-
Highest on the list of Hurok’s demands [for the movie] was the removal of any Jewish ethnicity in the character of the impresario hero or his associates ... [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 321] ... Similarly, Hurok strongly objected to the presence of ‘the stock figures of cigar-smoking impresarios’ present in the script’s original opening sequence. Such images would, he feared, detract from the image of refinement and good taste he wanted his fictionalized self to convey ... [He did not want to appear as] some sort of back-room shyster.” [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 322] In the mainstream, the resultant film was not widely acclaimed. The Jewish Ledger declared, however, that “Jews in America will be proud of the film .. Himself a very modest person, Mr. Hurok is very much interested in everything that is Jewish and lends a helping hand in Jeish affairs.” [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 332]

In the world of theatre, notes Lester Friedman, “by the early 1890s a good deal of the theatrical booking business in New York City was in Jewish hands, thanks to the Klaw & Erlanger syndicate, the Shubert brothers, Marcus Loew and Adolph Zukor, the Schenck brothers, and a host of other agents and stage managers.” [FRIEDMAN, L., 1982, p. 9]

Likewise, for decades the most prominent mogul on Broadway was a Jewish producer, David Merrick (born David Margulies). Merrick’s abusive personality saddled him with a widely known nickname: “the abominable showman.” Another Jewish theatre mogul, Joseph Papp (Papirofsky), founded the New York Shakespeare Festival, created the influential Public Theatre for playwrights, and produced such Broadway hits as Hair and A Chorus Line. Papp’s “ego was huge,” says Jewish author Helen Epstein,

“but instead of slickness, he exuded reserve and a sobriety that made me think of Old Testament patriarchs … Papp had influenced a huge number of his contemporaries and younger people in the arts. Hundreds of writers, actors, directors, composers, designers, producers, arts administrators, stage managers, journalists and critics traced the beginnings of their careers to the [Shakespeare] Festival. Thousands more dated their first exposure to Shakespeare to a production in Central Park. Millions of others had seen his productions on television and on Broadway. The name Joseph Papp embodied the history and very best possibilities of New York.” [EPSTEIN, H., 1994, p. 10-11]

Oscar Hammerstein I, also Jewish, by the early years of the 20th century built thirteen theatres/music hall (often for the opera) in New York, Philadelphia, and London. “The name and personality of Oscar Hammerstein,” notes Vincent Sheean, “became as familiar to the nation as if he had been elected its President ... Oscar Hammerstein ... commanded more space in the press than the Vanderbilts, Astors, Morgans, than William Jennings Bryan or indeed any other personage of his day except President Theodore Roosevelt.” [SHEEAN, V., 1956, p. 3-4] Hammerstein (and son Willie) even owned the Victoria Theatre (“the great nut vaudeville house of New York”) which was famed for freak shows, featuring “persons notorious for whatever reason” – “bridge jumpers and stunt flyers, divorcees, channel swimmers, and record-breakers of any kind;
whether they had stage talent was irrelevant.” [SHEEAN, 1956, p. 112] Hammerstein’s greatest rival in the opera world (who eventually bought him out) was also Jewish, Otto Kahn, “banker and connoisseur of the arts [and] principal financial power of the Metropolitan [Opera Company].” [SHEEAN, V., 1956, p. 296]

But the most powerful entrepreneurial network in theatre production and control has long been the Shubert company. Jerry Stagg notes that Samuel, Jacob, and Lee (Levi) Shubert “invaded New York City in 1900, armed with tireless energy, boundless confidence, a lust for money, power, and fame, and $15,000, most of it borrowed. A quarter of a center later, their worth was estimated at half a billion dollars. [The Shuberts] took control of theatre in America.” [STAGG, p. 3] (Shubert CEO in the year 2000? Gerald Schoenfeld). More at ground level, Lee Strasberg and Stella Adler of New York’s Group Theatre were legendary and profoundly influential acting teachers. Lawrence Langner was one of the founders of the Washington Square Players.

As Ellen Schiff notes:

“A few years ago, Tyrone Guthrie speculated that if Jews withdrew from the American theatre, the institution ‘would collapse about next Thursday.’ Guthrie was no doubt assessing Jewish contributions at every level of show business from artistic, to administrators, to ‘angels.’ [i.e, philanthropists].” [SCHIFF, E., 1986, p. 79]

By 1999, Jewish entrepreneur Robert F.X. Sillerman’s SFX company was causing shock waves in the live theatre and music promotion worlds. In one and a half years it had spent $1.5 billion in gobbling up other companies. The Financial Post noted that he was still attempting to “strengthen his domination of live theatre promotion in the United States. SFX also is the single largest player in [music] concert promotion. So large, in fact, that regulators expressed concern last year … SFX is now believed to be close to purchasing its only major rival, Universal Concerts, a division of Montreal firm Seagram Company [controlled by the Jewish Bronfman family].” [LANG, A., 5-28-99, p. C1, C17]

SFX also owns or operates over 80 venues in the United States, mostly concert halls, as well as the rights to many theatrical productions (Phantom of the Opera, et al). It also produces over 13,000 events a year. Its recently purchased Falk Associated Management Enterprises division manages 650 professional athletes and broadcasters – basketball star Michael Jordan among them. “Talent agencies, ticketing companies, and independent promoters,” notes the (New York) Daily News, “have complained that the new live entertainment giant exerts too much control over the industry.” [FURMAN, 6-7-99, p. 57] In August 1999 SFX moved into Great Britain too, purchasing the Apollo Leisure Group (one of the largest theatre and arena operators in that country) for $254 million. The purchase also included Tickets Direct and the Barry Claymore Corporation. [FARMER, N., 8-21-99, p. 13]

In the dance world, Martha Graham was one of the icons of this art form 20th century. She wasn’t Jewish. But in her early seventies her “right hand man”
became Ron Protas, Jewish and in his twenties, who eventually positioned himself to inherit her entire estate at her death. As Ismene Brown notes

“When dance great Martha Graham died at the age of 96, she left him [Protas] everything. It was the greatest legacy to dance this century. Five years later Ron Protas stood as the only inheritor of the Graham works, the Graham company, and the Graham industry. After reading the section on Protas in the huge biography of Graham by her long-term colleague and fellow choreographer Agnes de Mille (Rodeo, Oklahoma!); it’s hard not to expect to meet Svengali, Mephistopholes, and a leech rolled into one. No one could have been more damned in print. He caused a ‘blood-letting,’ ‘policed’ Graham, de Mille says; turned her against old friends, made her into an elderly fool performing into her seventies, and tainted a monumental career with sleazy celebrity games. The object of this scorn (shared by many) is a shock to meet – an amably shambling, hunched-up man of 49, black curly hair, chubby Jewish features, constantly wreathed in smiles, very disarming.” [BROWN, I., 10-16-96, p. 17]

Famed dancer Isadora Duncan’s accompaniest was Max Rabinovitch. [ROBINSON, H., 1994, p. 91] Duncan’s husband, Russian poet Seregei Yesenin, was once publicized as an “anti-Semite.” “Not surprisingly,” notes Harlow Robinson, “and probably with [Jewish impresario Sol] Hurok’s help, the story of Yesenin’s anti-Semitism immediately hit the newspapers, elaborately embroidered.” [ROBINSON, M., 1994, p. 92] As Julia Foulkes declares about the Jewish angle to the modern dance world:

“Although the leaders of modern dance in the 1930s – Martha Graham, Doris Humphrey, Charles Weidman, and Haya Holm – were not Jewish, Jewish women filled modern dance classes, companies, organizations, picket lines, and concert audiences. Teachers, such as Blanche Talmud and Edith Segal, taught performers, such as Lily Mehlman and Lillian Shapero; performances by choreographers such as Anna Sokolow and Sophie Maslow, were reviewed by critics, such as Edna Ocko; while organizers, such as Helen Tamiris and Fanya Geltman, hassled labor unions and the federal government for increased attention to dance. These efforts in substantiating a new art form have been overlooked because our view of the arts tends to focus on a few stars, emphasizing individual genius rather than collective momentum and organizational drive. Jewish women shaped the foundation of modern dance, and in the mid-1930s their impact was well enough known that the eminent social commentator [and Jewish comedian] Fanny Brice could unleash her satire on the subject, playing Martha Graham in a sketch entitled ‘Modernistic Moe,’ in which she cried ‘Rewolt!’ in a Yiddish accent.” [FOULKES, J., JUNE 2000, p. 233-252]

Even the best known mime in history, Marcel Marceau (originally Mangel), is Jewish. To his credit, he once told a Jewish ethnic newspaper: “I find it hard to identify with Jewish issues – humanity is my overriding battle cry.”
Performer Meredith Monk is also Jewish. [TWICE BLESSED, online gay/Jewish website]

Jewish influence in the visual arts is a huge story. “Modern art” (hereafter defined as painting, sculpture, and other visual arts) in capitalist society is a paradox. Its practitioners generally believe that their personal expressions of the human experience through physical objects are secularly sacred. Yet, to survive and prosper as artists, to garner the support to do further work that transcends mere consumerism, this belief itself must be fundamentally prostituted. “Fine art,” notes anthropologist Stuart Plattner, “is similar to religion … as an institution that counteracts the crassly commercial search for advancement in a capitalist art world. At the same time, these objects of supposedly sublime vision are bought and sold as commodities.” [PLATTNER, p. 4]

The elitist “art world” strata – so-called “High Art” – is the milieu of painting provenances, artist pedigrees, and the changing “avant-garde” superstar brand-names. There are, strangely, no objective standards in this strata to discern quality or value in either the artist or his creations. Not only are there no clear standards of evaluation, “in the age of conceptual, minimal, and performance art, it is often unclear what museum quality art is supposed to look like.” [PLATTNER, p. 5] The confirmation of artistic importance (and, hence, quality and value) is merely the decision of the “informed opinion” of High Art insiders, whose dictates are often self-rewarding. Such insiders include an incestuous cabal of professional art curators, critics, and dealers who swim back and forth among these occupational categories of art trade. (There are other entrees to the art community, of course. One of the most prominent art critics of the 1960s and 1970s was Harold Rosenberg who was trained as a lawyer and who became an influential “art critic” after a career in advertising.) [JACOBY, p. 110]

While there is no clearly unifying and objective standard of art evaluation, there is a referential High Art history, the entwined tales of artists and wealthy business patrons who brought them to public attention and acclaim. There is also an art jargon, and meta-language “art talk” for those in the know.

While there is no clearly unifying and objective standard of art evaluation, there is a referential High Art history, the entwined tales of artists and wealthy business patrons who brought them to public attention and acclaim. There is also an art jargon, and meta-language “art talk” for those in the know.

As Duncan Cameron, once-director of the Brooklyn Museum, said in a speech to the United Nations:

“In summary, then, the traditional museum has been administered by a curatorial elite whose members are trained as scholars in disciplines relevant to the museum collections … structured according to specific models of knowledge. These models are generally incomprehensible to other than those trained in a specific discipline and may be said to be encoded in the private languages of scholarship … This situation has persisted through the reluctance of the public to protest it and the willingness of governing bodies to support it. Both have been in awe of the mystique of curatorship, both have been unprepared to admit that
the content of the museum is meaningless and lacks a personal relevance ...
For a few, the upper-middle class with higher education and therefore some key to the secret codes, it becomes a domain with class and status connections.” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 236-237]

“Art has become a commodity,” notes Sophy Burnham, “Collectors bought art as profitable speculation. Museums bought what their trustees (these same collectors) demanded they immortalize. Critics pushed art in which they had financial interest ... The artist had no part in these exchanges. Once his work passed out of his hands ... he received no further royalties. He watched the prices rise and the dealers in art get fat ... Art was whatever would sell.” [BURNHAM, p. 9]

“On the assumption that “he who pays the piper calls the tunes,” says Judith Huggins-Balfe, “critics have accused both individuals and institutional private patrons of altering some presumably ‘natural’ development of art, in their own class and commercial interests.” [BALFE, p. 314] Si Newhouse, for instance, (whom we have met before as chairman of the huge Advance media chain),“ said dealer Leo Castelli, “is one who has put together a perfect choice of artists, starting out with Pollack and de Kooning.” [WATSON, p. 104]

While trained “art professionals” are influential, the foundation of the modern art world is those who buy and sell it (sometimes these very art professionals). Such people decide what has value, and even what art is and is not. Most do not truly care about cutting edge perceptual insights or transcendent visions but, rather, money. Most buying and selling of art today, especially in the realm of High Art, is an economic investment. In 1984 major art journals, including Art-News and Art and Antiques, even began publishing lists of major art collectors. 60% of the list were Americans. The next most populous were Japanese, then Germans. [WATSON, p. 388] (In more recent years, with Japanese economic woes, Japanese influence has correspondingly diminished and a significant percentage of today’s “German” art activity we can safely presume to be Jewish).

The heart of the American (and international) High Art market is New York City. “Although Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, Santa Fe, and other centers have large demands [for art],” says Stuart Plattner, “New York is hegemonic on the national scale, and even the international level, meaning that only elite gallery exposure in New York creates art-historical significance.” [PLATTNER, p. 8] New York City is also home for the most important art magazines and other periodicals whose sphere of reportage is usually its immediate vicinity. By 1973, some estimated that 75-80% of the 2500 core “art market” personnel – art dealers, art curators, art critics, and art collectors – were Jewish. [BURNHAM, p. 25] These people – and their progeny – in New York largely control American artistic tastes and values at the most important tier. (In 2001, according to ARTnews, at least eight of the “Top Ten” art collectors were Jewish: Debbie and Leon Black, Edythe and Eli Broad, Doris and Donald Fisher, Ronnie and Samuel Heyman, Marie-Josée and Henry R. Kravitz, Evelyn and Leonard Lauder, Jo Carole and Ronald S. Lauder, and Stephen Wynn). [ESTEROW, M., SUMMER 2001]
When Alice Bellony-Rewald (an artist, critic, and art model) first moved into the New York art world from France, she noted that:

“I was plunged into a world of highly sophisticated Jewish art collectors, and it took me a long time to reconcile my mental picture of speakeasies and the Wild West with people who spoke five languages fluently and lived surrounded by period furniture, Meissen china, and Old Masters.” [PEPPIATT, p. 16]

Jewish author Howard Jacobson wrote in 1993 about his experiences with prominent New York City art critic Peter Schjeldhal:

“’I came to New York to be Jewish,’ [Schjeldhal] once told me.
’Did you make it?’
’No.’
’What were you before?’
’Porcelain-sink Lutheran.’
’And now? Since you haven’t made it across as one of us?’
He paused. He wasn’t sure he wanted to be that un-Jewish.
’A certain transformation has occurred; but a certain gulf remains.’
It takes me a little while to put it together – the fact that just about every gallery/space/loft we go into is run by a Jew. This isn’t Jewish how I like it. This is slow-drrawl, camp Jewish, retreating, high-toned, not very sense-of-humorish Jewish. The pallid women gallery-owners whose walls and wine we absorb are also Jewish.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 84-85]

Famous Jewish novelist Judith Krantz notes in her biography her avenue into the upper tiers of the art world: “Polly Guggenheim, a sculptor who’d lived in Paris most of her life, became our guide into the art world.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 324]

In 1996, Jewish art historian Eunice Lipton admitted that the main reason she went into a career as an art historian was to be in a field dominated by Jews:

“I wanted to be where Jews were – that is, I wanted a profession that would allow me tacitly to acknowledge my Jewishness through the company I kept.” [RUBIN-DURSKY, p. 289]

Elsewhere, she notes that:

“On the face of it, art history seemed a gentile profession. For one thing, the study of Christian art was its center. In addition, there was an ancient Jewish injunction against making graven images. But the fact is, the field was filled with Jews. One might even say it was shaped by them. Art history is characterized in this century by studies in connoisseurship, formalist analysis, the study of iconography and iconology, and social analyses. Jews have been prominent in all categories.” [LIPTON, p. 285]

“Today,” wrote Gerald Kretetz in 1982, “… Jews enjoy every phase of the art world: as artists, dealers, collectors, critics, curators, consultants, and patrons. In fact, the contemporary art scene has a strong Jewish flavor. In some circles, the wheelers and dealers are referred to as the Jewish mafia since they command power, prestige, and most of all, money.” A few important members of the
Jewish mafia in recent decades included dealers Leo Castelli, Ben Heller, and Larry Rubins (as well as Rubins’ brother, William, a curator at the Museum of Modern Art), free lance art critic Clement Greenberg and Hilton Kramer (long time art critic for the New York Times, Henry Geldzahler (curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art), among many others. “This group is a formidable power,” noted Krafetz, “in forming tastes and promoting some schools of art to the exclusion of others.” [KRAFETZ, p. 161]

The study of iconography and iconology [keys in modern art evaluation] says Eunice Lipton, was “developed by Erwin Panofsky and practiced by [other] Jewish scholars like Leo Steinberg, Irving Lavin, and Linda Seidel.” [LIPTON, p. 286] Still other Jewish art scholars of prominence include Meyer Schapiro, Walter Friedlander, Robert Rosenblum, and Rosland Krauss, to begin a list just among those termed “formalist.” Joseph Hodin was a prominent Jewish art scholar in Britain, as was the Viennese-born E. H. Gombrich, author of the internationally influential textbook in every art student’s locker, The Story of Art. “The notion of Jewish culture,” he curiously claims, “was an invention of Hitler.” [SEARLE, p. T9]

Traditional Judaism has prohibited “graven images” and idolatry, and throughout most of history Jews were usually reluctant to engage in many types of activities western culture describes today as “art.” “It is … forbidden to draw the picture of a man,” declares the Orthodox Code of Jewish Law, “even only the face of a man.” [GANZFRIED, p. 53] “This is when [Jewish] religious law became all powerful,” noted the prominent Jewish religious philosopher Martin Buber, “The human body is despicable. Seeing is a sin. Art is a sin … Everything creative is smothered at its first appearance.” [OLIN, p. 45] “To a non-Jewish reader,” says Margaret Olin, “such judgments appear damning. Buber’s readership, however, was Jewish, since his book appeared under Zionist auspices.” [OLIN, p. 45]

In 1887, two French archaeologists, Georges Perrot and Charles Chipiez, reconstructed models of ancient Jewish temples and decided that Jews were the “least artistic of the greatest people of antiquity.” [OLIN, p. 42] A year later a prominent German art historian, Wilhelm Lubke, declared that “Jews, having no artistic sensibility of their own, borrowed architectural forms on an eclectic principle from the nations dwelling around them.” [OLIN, p. 42]

“[This] remark sounds innocent from a postmodern standpoint,” says Margaret Olin, “but for Lubke to characterize Jews as a people who borrowed from others the art they could not create on their own lent a historical basis to the anti-Semitic stereotypes of Jews as chameleon-like parasites.” [LIN, p. 42]

Even the well-known Jewish turn-of-the-century art historian Bernard Berenson reiterated what Olin calls a recurrent anti-Semitic theme. “The Jews,” said Berenson, “like their Ishmaelite cousins the Arabs, and indeed perhaps like all pure Semites (if such there be), have displayed little talent for the visual, and almost none for the figure arts.” [OLIN, p. 49]

But, although there was “absent a Jewish visual tradition prior to this century,” [FREUDENHEIM, p. 9] there was nothing to prevent them from engag-
ing in the market place of it. Even “in the avant-garde circles of the twenties, thirties, and forties,” notes Nathan Glazer and Patrick Moynihan, “Jews were very often the critics (and entrepreneurs), non-Jews the creators. This was so in literature, painting, music, and the theatre.” [GLAZER/MOYNIHAN, p. 173]

“In the broad spectrum of Judeo-Christianity, one group, often figured as Jewish,” says Marc Shell, “is relatively comfortable with money and uncomfortable with representational art, while one group, frequently reckoned as Christianity, is relatively comfortable with art and uncomfortable with money. It is, according to this stereopticon, the essence of Judaism to reject representational art and the essence of Christians to expel changing coins from the temple.” [SHELL, p. 7]

There is, as we have repeatedly seen, little sacrosanct in Jewish religious tradition that prohibits money-making; certainly the exploitation of objects of human expression would fall within the marketable sphere. The merger of money and art as a single consumer commodity, the whole art world as a field for exploitation, and the profanation of modern art that is regarded as illusorily – yet secularly – “sacred,” has in our own day been profoundly effected by Jewish influence. Norman Cantor, for example, notes that:

“A member of the Warburg banking family single-handedly started up the field of art history … [CANTOR, p. 271] … All the art history departments in the world are direct descendants of Aby Warburg’s Institute (moved from to London in 1932 to escape the Nazis) and his great Jewish disciple, Erwin Panofsky. Is it anomalous that a Jew would have been so creative in the study of art that was so little cultivated in Jewish tradition? All the more that a liberated white Jew should pursue art history. But one can see a Judaizing tendency in Warburg’s method of art historical criticism. The picture is studied for its ‘iconology,’ its pattern of ideas illustrating textual passages. Art is thereby approached in hermeneutic fashion, again recalling Talmudic exegesis, rather than for its aesthetic content. Yet the most significant aspect of Warburg’s development in art history is the demonstration that market capitalism could embrace and fund a purely cultural and academic operation. The distinct equality of capital was not its materialism, but its liquidity, the fungible capacity of capital to transform into any commodity, including art and humanities literature that represents a dynamic power in society. Aby Warburg’s historical and critical mastery of art was structurally the same as his brother’s mastery in their international bank of money and its investment potential. The transformative interaction between art and capital is central to the nature of the market economy.” [CANTOR, p. 271]

(As Jewish scholar George Mosse notes about the Warburg art circle: “Erwin Panofsky, one of the Warburg library’s most famous collaborators [was] like almost all of its early collaborators a Jew … [Ernst Cassirer was] the Warburg library’s most prolific author.”) [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 53]

“Jews may or may not have become more culture conscious,” suggests Gerald Krefetz, “but they certainly were among the first to realize that
modern art is not a bad investment … [Some Jews saw] in modern art one of the most lucrative ways to duplicate money since the invention of compound interest.” [KREFETZ, p. 146] “The linkage of art and commercial gain,” notes Lindemann, “became more important in the United States than in any other country in history.” [LINDEMANN, p. 207] (Coincidence that Jewish administrator Lee Caplin “created and directed the Federal Program ‘The Business of Art and the Artist’ while serving as Special Assistant to the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts?”) [CAPLIN, L., 1989, p. ix] “Some dealers are commodity brokers, not selling pork bellies or soybean futures, but work by recognized artists, mostly dead,” says Krafetz, “They buy and sell their works as they would any other product … They are basically brother traders.” [KRAFETZ, p. 147]

A good example of such attitudes of quite literally “brother traders” can be found in a 1994 article in ARTnews that profiles three Jewish art investors – brothers Joseph, David, and Ezra Nahmad, heirs to a Syrian banking fortune. “Secretive and elusive,” reporter Andrew Decker also observes that the brothers “are among the richest art traders in the world. They are also among the least known … They have one of the largest stockpiles of art in the world … The inventory … consists of about 1,000 paintings that usually sit untouched in a warehouse … [DECKER, p. 116] … According to several sources, Joseph’s greatest interests are money, art, and women, roughly in that order.” [DECKER, p. 119] Joseph has been convicted in France for currency violations; in Italy he was jailed for having 25,000 stolen British pounds in his possession. He was also investigated in Italy for income tax evasion, owing over $13 million. In 1973 the Nahmad brothers were found to be in the possession of Giacometti bronzes that had been stolen eight years earlier.

In Israel, the hundreds of thousands of Jews flooding into Israel in recent years have brought with them art treasures from Russia, particularly old Russian Orthodox Christian icons. They are sold in Israel to dealers, collectors, or tourists for anywhere from $500 to $30,000. Their values can range from $500 to $2.5 million; the best quality pieces are sent from Israel to Europe or America for higher price resale. “Taking them out of the Soviet Union – or its successor independent republics,” notes the Atlanta Journal Constitution, “is illegal. But the immigrants take the risk, often bribing custom officials to look the other way.” [SALOME, p. A6]

In 1995 Dmitri Yakubovsky, once kicked out of Russian military school for what he decried as anti-Semitism, and later owner of a $5.3 mansion in suburban Toronto, had a new home. It was “a decrepit Russian prison cell in St. Petersburg’s Kresty Detention Center. He was arrested in Moscow last December and is charged with complicity in the theft of a historic $130-million collection of rare far Eastern and antique European manuscripts from the Russian National Library.” [GOLD, J., p. 37] The police laid a trap for Yakubovsky, “his arrest followed immediately, and the net expanded to Israel, where a group of Israelis were arrested.” [WARD, p. B6]
A venerable Israeli “Holocaust museum” has even been involved in international art smuggling from the former Soviet Union. In 2001, the Associated Press noted that

“In a secret operation, Jerusalem’s Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial has smuggled out of Ukraine fragments of murals by Polish-Jewish artist Bruno Schulz, sparking an international controversy. Yad Vashem maintains it was merely exercising its right to preserve the works of a prominent Jewish writer, artist and Holocaust victim, but Ukrainian and Polish officials say their removal was a crime.” [SHARGORODKY, S., 6-20-01]

In such an international art sphere, in 1995 ARTnews published a piece about the man who “is spending more freely than any other collector in history,” an Iranian-born Jew, now an American citizen living in Great Britain, Nass-er Khalili. His personal collection of Islamic art alone is insured for $1.5 billion. Khalili spent $7.5 million just to publish a thirty volume catalogue of the Islamic works he owns. Among other genres of his 27,000 art objects is a Japanese art collection worth as much as $100 million, Russian enamels and Fabergé, ancient Mesopotamian pottery figures, 19th-century Spanish metalwork, Swedish bridal tapestries (1750-1850), Indian woven silks (1200-1500), and 16 of 50 pre-16th century silks “all in Tibetan monasteries until the 1980s.” [NORMAN, p. 120] An early Jewish-Iranian adviser to Khalili was Mehdi Mahboubian “who was the most important of the group of Jewish Iranian art dealers in Tehran in the 1970s and acted as a personal adviser to the shah and shahbanu [the shah’s wife].” [NORMAN, p. 120]

Rabbi Alan Lew notes the curiously incongruous expressions of Zen master/art dealer “Rudrananda”:

[There was] a guru named Rudrananda, or, as he was known, Rudi. Rudi’s real name was Albert Rudolph. He was a Jewish guy who grew up in Brooklyn … [LEW, A., 1999, p. 51] [He had] a large store … where all of Rudi’s students lived. The store was lined with tonkas, Tibetan tapestries, and priceless Buddhas. Some of them were very large, over six feet tall, and all of them were exquisite. Rudi had stood at the Indian border when the Tibetans were fleeing the Chinese, buying all their priceless Buddhas and art treasures. Now he was an art dealer, selling his treasures to museums and extremely wealthy people. I had to wait a long time while he obsequiously waited on museum representative and millionaires, periodically going to the back of the store where one or two of his students were meditating on him. He would put his hand on their heads and somehow transmit energy to them, and they would go into convulsions. Other students were coming to see him for consultations. It was as if Rudi was giving off electricity. The more advanced the students were, the more electrified they would become until they were trembling, all in the midst of high-powered transactions over statuary. The millionaires who came to buy art objects seemed totally oblivious to everything that was going on and never got jolted. It was in the midst
of all this that Rudi told me I should drop everything and come study with him, that he would make me rich, and that I would get laid all the time. ‘You should have seen the knockers on the woman I was just with in Boston,’ he said.” [LEW, A., 1999, p. 54-55]

In Switzerland, Werner and Gabrielle Merzbacher own “one of the world’s greatest accumulations of modern art.” [GREEN, D., p. 37] 139 works by 77 artists were exhibited at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem in 1998. In Los Angeles, “in the early 1990s,” notes Tom King,

“with his purchased of David Hockney’s Double Portrait, [Jewish Hollywood mogul David] Geffen began a buying spree that soon made the art world take note. He built a collection of modern masterpieces that, for the artists and periods he favored, was unparalleled, including many of the most valuable works by Jackson Pollock and Jasper Johns. [KING, T., 2000, p. 477]

In England, Jewish advertising mogul Charles Saatchi and his wife “have built a collection of modern art that is regarded today as perhaps the most important of its kind in the world in private hands,” largely concentrating on “American minimalists.” [FALLON, p. 325] By the 1980s Saatchi was spending $1 million a year on new art acquisitions. Among his interests was a “heavy investment in the art of [Jewish painter] Julian Schnabel.” [GLUECK, p. 2, p. 27] Norman Rosenthal of the British Royal Academy suggested that “the Saatchis are probably the most important collectors of modern art in anywhere in the world.” [FALLON, p. 335] Political artist Hans Haacke once held an exhibition (called “Taking Stock”) “which was an attack on the Saatchis, their advertising empire, and on Mrs. Thatcher [the British Prime Minister who was built to power with the help of Saatchi advertising].” [FALLON, p. 334]

Kevin Goldman even suggests that:

“Advertising is an industry in which the amount of money to be made rivals the fortunes made by investment bankers and robber barons. Indeed, one [advertising] man, Charles Saatchi, made so much money in advertising that he was able to control the world’s contemporary art market.” [GOLDMAN, p. 21]

“The Saatchi Collection,” says Alison Fendley, “has been a focus of debate in the world of contemporary art since it opened to the public in 1985. Little is known about the inner workings of the Saatchi Gallery; even today, its finances are mysterious.” [FENDLEY, p. 6]

Looking for an ikat, “a rare textile from Uzbekistan?” Try Guido Goldman, who in the last twenty years has amassed the largest private ikat collection from Central Asia in the world. (Goldman’s father, Nachum, was the “President of the World Jewish Congress and key player in a host of other Jewish organizations.”) [CEMBALEST, HOW, p. 11]

Suits of armor? Medieval artifacts? Judaica? Barry Trupin “owned one of the largest private collections of Judaica in America, as well as a world-renowned collection of medieval artifacts and suits of armor. His pride and joy was a suit of armor from Hever Castle in England that had belonged to Henry II. Trupin
wanted to own the armor so passionately that he paid $3.2 million for it at auction, outbidding both the Tower of London and the Louvre.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 231]

How about the works of French poet, artist, and filmmaker Jean Cocteau? In 1995 Jewish business mogul Severin Wunderman shut down his “Severin Wunderman Museum” in southern California and donated “the world’s largest collection of works” by Cocteau to the University of Texas. Wunderman planned to move to France to live in his restored 15th century castle. [HOWLETT, p. E1] The works of artist Andrew Wyeth? In the 1980s, Hollywood producer Joseph E. Levine sold the world’s largest collection of Wyeth paintings. [ARONSON, S., 1983, p. 187]

Jewish TV personality Allen Funt (of Candid Camera fame) began buying relatively cheap paintings by artist Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836-1912) to “decorate his apartment.” Ruskin had once described Alma-Tadema as “the worse painter of the nineteenth century.” “Funt,” says Karl Meyer, “proceeded to acquire more and more of the artist’s work; soon enough, publicity being what it is, there were newspaper features describing his hobby, and Funt had become the unlikely agent of Alma-Tadema’s rehabilitation.” After the Metropolitan Museum put on a show of Funt’s collection, Funt sold it all (“In all fairness,” says Karl Meyer, “he needed the money since he had recently been defrauded of $1,200,000 in Candid Camera profits by his longtime accountant, who later committed suicide.”) [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 184-185]

Native American art? In 1998 Stanley Marcus, chairman emeritus of the Neiman Marcus luxury store, put his American Indian art collection up for auction at Sotheby’s. In charge of the sale was Ellen Taubman, the head of Sotheby’s Indian art department for 25 years, and the daughter of Sotheby’s board chairman, Jewish real estate mogul Alfred Taubman. Picasso? In 1998, Victor and Sally Ganz put up for auction their art stash, including “the most important privately-held collection of works by Picasso in America.” Expected sales figures ranged from $125 million to half a billion dollars. [HANDWERKER, 11-10-97] In 1999, an auction of art (returned after confiscation by the Nazis decades ago) netted the Rothschild family $90 million.

Art from Germany? Going to auction in 2000, Marvin and Janet Fishman’s properties were worth an estimated $16 million. It was “a collection of some 160 works, one of the most comprehensive groups of early 20th century German art ever to be formed in private hands.” [RONNER, M., 7-30-2000, p. 16]

Anything else? Jewish dealer Ronnie Darvick has, over the years, even sold the gun that killed Lee Harvey Oswald (for $220,000), Marilyn Monroe’s certificate of conversion to Judaism when she married Jewish playwright Arthur Miller in 1956, the writings of mass murderer Charles Manson, and Adolf Hitler’s autograph. “My mother had her whole family wiped out in Poland,” says Darvick, “Her attitude was, he’d be turning over in his grave if he knew a Jew was making money off his autograph.” [THOMAS, p.G8]

In 1981 Charles Hamilton, an art and documents dealer, wrote about his auction world experiences:
“In November, 1975, I put up at auction several unusual Nazi items, one of which instantly captivated the press. It was an ornate, gold-plated license plate used on Hitler’s parade limousine. He’d presented it to his mistress, Eva Braun, because she was intrigued by flashy beauty. The plate was made of heavy brass plated in gleaming gold. There was an embossed swastika in the upper left and a Nazi eagle in the upper right. The plate bore the legend: ‘Reichskanzler – Deutschland.’ Not more than two doors away from the Conrad Suite at the Waldorf-Astoria where I was holding the sale of Hitler’s license plate, there was by chance a meeting of the B’nai B’rith, an assemblage of pensive graybeards wearing yarmulkes. A television reporter perceived the anomaly. ‘May I borrow that license plate for a few minutes?’ he asked. ‘Of course,’ I said. I followed him and his television crew into the B’nai B’rith conference. The reporter selected an old man who looked as though he might have suffered the brutalities of a concentration camp. ‘Sir,’ he said, ‘Mr. Hamilton, the autograph dealer, is auctioning off, just down the hall, this license plate from Hitler’s limousine. May I have your opinion of the sale?’ ‘Disgusting! I cannot believe that anyone would sell or buy such a revolting object.’ The reporter asked the same question of three or four other elderly members of the assemblage. The answers were all vehement denunciations of me and my auction. After the license plate was sold for $3,500 to a Jewish dealer, the reporter asked me what I thought of the sale.” [HAMILTON, C., 1981, p. p. 180-181]

Elsewhere, Hamilton notes another such story:

“In the fall of 1979 a young man, who introduced himself as Aaron Goldberg, brought me for auction a small sheaf of unused stationery imprinted with Hitler’s name and address. ‘I take it your father brought these back from Germany after the war,’ I said, recognizing the paper as that often used by Hitler in writing to lower army echelons. ‘No,’ he explained. ‘My father was too old for the army. He owned a printing shop in Brooklyn. Two or three years before we got into the war, he was asked by the Nazi embassy in New York to print some official stationery for Hitler. It was tough at that time to get any sort of work and although Jewish, my father took the job. I found these sheets in the back of the shop.’” [HAMILTON, C., 1981, p.182]

In England, in 1989 a Jewish entrepreneur, Andrew Benjamin, was evicted by his Jewish landlord when it was discovered that Benjamin’s rented space was a store called “Cutdown,” which was “selling Nazi clothing and medals, as well as racist records, literature, and videos.” [HOROWITZ, D.] (Conversely, in a Jewish censorial action against an Internet provider, France’s International League Against Racism and Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Student Union went to court in Europe to seek to ban an on-line Yahoo Internet auction of Nazi memorabilia. “Is Yahoo expected,” complained the company, “to check who is on-line and comply with the laws of every other country?”) [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 5-16-2000]
Jewish activism to stop the sale of Nazi memorabilia is odd considering the vast experience of art and documents dealer Charles Hamilton in the selling of Nazi items:

“In the past twenty years I’ve sold at auction thousands of Nazi relics and documents. And nearly always such sales have evoked criticism, harrowing experiences, or even threats on my life ... Today the big threat to me is not from bombs [Hamilton once had a bomb threat for having a Hitler photo for sale in his gallery window] but from collectors who are stampeding me and other autograph dealers in their frenzy to stock up on letters and documents of Hitler and his henchmen before the price goes through the roof. A letter of Hitler’s is now worth five of Churchill’s and ten of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s. Who’s in the Third Reich rat race? The Germans are buying. The British are buying. But most of all it’s Jewish collectors in America. They bid with aliases or anagrams, from behind pillars or half-closed doors, or signal the auctioneer furtively. Their names are top secret.”

Is it just the fascination of evil and violence? Maybe. But as one Jewish collector explained to me: ‘It’s like having the head of the hunter on the wall instead of the hunted.” [HAMILTON, C., 1981, p. 172, 174]

Hamilton continues:

“One of the outstanding Nazi collections in America was formed by the late Philip D. Sang, whose collection of Judaica I recently appraised for presentation to Brandeis University. I helped Sang to build his superb assemblage of Jewish letters and documents and I helped him to gather his huge and important Nazi collection. Among the historic items that came from my sales were the Nazi top-secret plan for the invasion of Holland and Belgium and Mussolini’s own copy of Nietzsche’s Man and Superman, annotated with Il Duce’s own ideas for implementing the philosopher's vision.

Another Nazi collector, famed for his physical education courses, once told me

“that his entire family was wiped out in an Austrian concentration camp during the Holocaust. Yet I never met any man so enthralled with the Nazis, especially the more brutal of them. He liked to ensconce his villains in spectacular frames. I once put together for him an ‘ensemble’ of Hitler and Goering, with examples of some of the medals worn by the Fuehrer and his pompous air marshall. As my customer stood admiring the finished product, glittering with medals, he commented on my ‘superb job’ and I couldn’t refrain from asking: ‘What are you going to do with it?’

‘Why,’ he said, ‘I’m going to hang it in my living room.’

And in Miami, among other business projects, Jack Sugarman, “prominent auctioneer” and owner of Jack Sugarman Auctioneers, once organized an auction of paperweights owned by Oscar Schindler (of “Schindler’s List” fame). In 2000, Sugarman went to prison for embezzlement of funds from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 4-18-2000]

Then there is “Chicago collector” Million [Is this the Jewish source magazine’s typographical error?] Kohn, who has amassed 700 Holocaust-related artifacts, including “a list of people scheduled for extermination on July 5, 1943,” “a stuffed pillow with human hair, a bar of soap made from human body fat, and a patch of skin bearing a tattoo.” He has exhibited his collection in 14 countries. [LUM, R., 11-19-99, p. 3A]

The man, Jack Ruby, who killed Lee Harvey Oswald was Jewish. So was Abraham Zapruder, the man who filmed President J.F. Kennedy being shot in Dallas. Zapruder sold the original 8mm film to Time magazine for $150,000. “Concerned that a Jewish man’s profiting from the assassination could touch off a wave of anti-Semitism,” notes Washington Post reporter George Lardner Jr., “his lawyer suggested that he donate the first $25,000 to a fund for a Dallas police officer killed that day, J. D. Tippett. Zapruder readily agreed.” [LARDNER, G., 1998, p. A11] Zapruder died in 1970.

Inexplicably, the film was returned to Zapruder’s heirs in 1975 by Time Inc. Over the years, the Zapruder family (one of Abraham’s sons is a Washington DC lawyer) has been known to charge outlandish fees for the use of the assassination footage. Two independent filmmakers who were told that permission to reproduce the footage in their own movie would cost $30,000, successfully sued the Zapruders to use the historical material. [MARGOLICK, D., 1988, p. B20] In 1997, the U.S. government appropriated the original movie film (it was already in storage, at the Zapruders’ request, at the National Archives.) The Justice Department went to arbitration with the Zapruder family to decide “just compensation” for the 26 seconds of footage. The government offered $3 million; the family asked for $30 million. Three Justice Department judges eventually decided (2-1) to give the family $16 million. (Kenneth Feinberg and Arlin Adams voted yes, and Walter Dellinger no – he suggested $3-5 million as a fair market value). Incredibly, the Zapruders’ also retained copyright – any reproduction of the film would be subject to a fee to the family. [REICHMAN, D., 8-3-99]

As the Quincy Patriot Ledger (Quincy, Massachusetts) editorialized:

“You and I [taxpayers] get the bill and the government gets to keep the original footage. Besides the $16 million, the Zapruder heirs retain the copyright, so they can sell the footage another 16 million times … The family compared its treasure to a Van Gogh painting.” [QUINCY, p. 12]

(Even the man who painted John F. Kennedy and his wife “for their White House portraits” was Aaron Shikler, also Jewish. She also notes in her biography “David Levine, the now-legendary caricaturist.”) [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 208]

Elsewhere, Stanley Slotkin, the Jewish founder of the Abbey Rents company, once bought a pile of rocks dug from a tunnel next to Christianity’s tradi-
tional Jesus nativity site (in Bethlehem) in the 1960s; in more recent years his descendants set the souvenir stones in jewelry frames and are marketing them in TV commercials (featuring actor Ricardo Montalban) as “nativity stones,” selling for as high as $395 apiece. [DART, J., p. B1]

Of course Jews are active in the specifically Jewish art market too. Wilbur Wendell Pierce (originally: Wilbur Persofsky), for instance, even has “an international reputation for his collection of concentration camp currency, which he amassed during the past five years [1991-96].” [BIBERMAN, p. 69]

In the field of archeological swindles, Moses Shapira was the pioneer in the field. “Shapira,” notes Israeli art curator Irit Salmon, “was the first to recognize that archeology could be a profitable business.” Shapira, a Russian Jewish transplant to Jerusalem, sold a variety of fake archaeological artifacts in the late 1800s, including recently manufactured items he misrepresented to major European museums. “His exposure as a fraud in 1884,” notes Shoshana Sappir, “led to his suicide a few months earlier.” [SAPPIR, S., 7-31-2000] In Great Britain, famed Jewish swindler Adam Worth was behind the theft in 1876 of Thomas Gainsborough’s painting of the Duchess of Devonshire, which only a few weeks earlier “had been sold at auction for 10,000 guineas, at that time the highest price ever paid for a work of art, causing a sensation.” [MacIntyre, B., 1997, p. 3]

Stephen Nohlgren notes the illustrious art fraud history of Elmyr de Hory:

“While foraging at one garage sale, I paid a few bucks for a book called FAKE! [full title: FAKE! The Story of Elmyr de Hory, the Greatest Art Forger of Our Times, by Clifford Irving], a biography of Elmyr de Hory, perhaps the greatest art forger of all time. De Hory was a Jewish Hungarian aristocrat and would-be artist who lived in Paris in the 1920s … During World War II, De Hory’s parent’s were killed and the family riches confiscate. He was stranded in Paris with no allowance – but an undiminished taste for high living … [He] launched a 20-year forgery career. Never successful with his own work. De Hory cranked out a prodigious body of fakery. He could mimic almost all of his old acquaintances. To sell his fakes, he’d drop hints that his father had amassed a private collection in the 1930s that was later smuggled out of Hungary. He sold to art dealers and museums. His work started showing up in art books as originals. He forged so many Dufys that an expert once rejected two real Dufy’s as fraudulent because he mistakenly assumed that De Hory’s hand and style were the correct ones. He was finally caught in 1967 and spent a few months in a Spanish jail.” [NOHLGREN, S., 7-16-00]

Auction gallery owner Charles Hamilton notes another Jewish con-man:

“The ability to bilk one’s clients at auction is a fine art, make no mistake about it. To succeed for a lifetime without detection or exposure, the auction- buying crook must have the cunning of a polecat, the ethics of a Gabon viper, and the acquisitive drive of a dung-beetle. All these feral qualities were uniquely fused in the late Lew David Feldman, a rare book and manuscript dealer who operated under a firm name devised

More recently, in 1987, the *Jewish Week* ran an article with a headline declaring “Israeli Art World Stunned By Forgery Allegations.” Ten Israelis were eventually arrested in the scam, including gallery owners and art dealers. “80 high quality fakes” of prominent Israeli artists were discovered in the ring, as well as stolen art from important artist Eliahu Gat. [JW, 4-7-87, 4-10-87]

In the United States, in 1982 the state of New York created a law, sponsored by the Jewish Community Relations Council, which sought to undermine the busy market in stolen Torah scrolls (“150 …. in recent years in New York alone”). Much of the Torah market theft was attributed to a “Brooklyn-based Russian Jewish crime ring.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 58] In the new system, documentation of the previous scroll owner would henceforth be necessary for any sales transaction. [GALLOB] Although a Sefer-Torah “is the holiest object in the Jewish religion,” a Manhattan Judaica dealer, Herbie Stavsky, noted that “as long as people like money, there will always be someone who will steal it. Goes to show you that nothing’s sacred. Anything for the almighty dollar.” [KALMANOFSKY, p. 55]

As evidenced with stolen Torah pages, a growing realm of corruption is the business of buying and selling Jewish antiquities. In 1990 the *Jewish Week* noted recent criminal cases including the $60,000 forgery of a 15th century haggadah by an Italian Jew, an antique Hungarian book of Psalms that “was stolen only to appear at an Israeli auction,” and a Hassidic art dealer, Chaim Schneilbalg, who was murdered in a Jerusalem hotel while meeting an art client. A suspect was an Israeli living in West Germany who was “reportedly involved in counterfeiting, the running of brothels, and a previous insurance claim of dubious validity.” Schneilbalg, reported the *Jewish Week*, “was said to have been jockeying for control of the market in Jewish manuscripts suddenly available in newly capitalist Eastern Europe.” [MARK, J, p. 31]

In an overview of the growing art market for Jewish artifacts, Jonathan Mark in *Jewish Week* noted that

“Ignorance and fraud were creating such havoc that in the last twenty years Judaica buyers and sellers increasingly turned to non-Jewish auction houses to protect themselves from each other … With many American Jews experiencing a rise in their discretionary incomes in the 1970s and 80s, more began buying and selling Judaica as an investment or hobby. It was often used for Jewish fund raising … But even in auction houses … certain dealers were known to work in collusion … The recent fascination with the Holocaust has inflated the market even further. Purchasing an item that was desecrated by the Nazis was considered to be very chic ‘mitzvah.’” [MARK, J, p. 31]

By 2000, not much had changed. “Synagogues across Europe are being robbed of treasures worth hundreds of thousands of dollars,” noted the *Jerusalem Report.* Highly suspect were “two Israeli con artists” who continued to reappear at synagogues, particularly in the Netherlands. [LEVY, R., 2-14-2000] In
2001, Israeli police arrested Yerahmiel Hershler, Aharon Stefansky and Amnon Edri in the Jewish state with stolen religious artifacts from synagogues from "Britain, Gibraltar and a number of European countries" worth "at least $2 million … A fourth suspect was arrested in northern Israel. A police spokesperson said additional arrests were expected." HAAS, D., 3-2-01, p. 2]

Entrepreneurial Jews have been especially active in the European “art scene” since Emancipation in the 1800s. “By the opening of the late 19th century,” says Howard Sachar, “Jewish [art] salons in Berlin were well established as the center of German social life … Writers, artists, intellectuals and viveurs all found good food and even better conversation at the gatherings.” [SACHAR, p. 150] (Much earlier, the wealthy Amsterdam Jewish community often paid for their depiction by the great painter Rembrandt. [37 of his 200 male portraits are of Jews. “When Rembrandt fell on hard times in his later years and became bankrupt,” says M. H. Goldberg, “he was given both spiritual and material help by a rabbi.”) [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 122]

There were also the likes of Jacques-Louis David:

“Realizing the propaganda potential of art and eager to assert France’s primacy in all fields of culture, Napoleon reshaped the academy into a superb machine for the production of art. Jacques-Louis David, a former member of the Royal Academy and an ardent Bonapartist, was one of the governing elite who spurred artists to glorify France in painting classical themes or the battles and heroes of the day.” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 170]

Jews have been particularly preeminent in the economic exploitation of art and the formation of its commercial value since the rise of “modern art” in the 1880s. In that era the center of the art world was Paris. “[There were] two groups of important art dealers in Paris in the first half of the twentieth century,” notes Peter Watson, “… one was made up of [Daniel-Henri] Kahnweiler, Paul Guillaume, Felix Feneon, and the Rosenbergs [Leonce and Paul], dealers in contemporary works …. The other was an equally tight-knit but smaller group of dealers who formed the elite secondary markets dealing with Old Masters … and increasingly in the Impressionists. At the center of this group were [Nathan] Wildenstein, [Rene] Gimpel, and [Jacques] Seligmann. Loosely attached to them were three other dealers in London and New York, [Samson] Wertheimer and [Roland] Knoedler [later run by Charles Henschel until after World War II].” [WATSON, p. 219-220] “[Paul Rosenberg’s strait-forward approach and steep prices shocked Parisian art circles and made him the subject of savage criticism.” He even once said, “As for me, a painting is beautiful when it sells.” [FELICIANO, p. 54] Among those in Rosenberg’s art stable was Picasso, formerly signed to David-Henry Kahnweiler and Rosenberg’s brother Leon. All these people were Jewish.
Further, “one of the oldest art dynasties in France” was founded by Alexandre Bernheim [FELICIANO, p. 75] and David David-Weiss, a prominent art collector, became the President of the Board of Directors of the French National Museum in 1933. Across the border, Max Friedlander, “one of the leading experts on Rembrandt,” directed the Berlin Museum in the same era. [EPSTEIN, 1996, p 290]

Disgruntled with such Jewish control of the art market, in 1915 a lecturer, Tony Tollett, delivered an address to the French Academy of Sciences, Literature, and Arts in Lyon entitled: “On the Influence of the Jewish-German Corporation of Paris Art Dealers on French Art.” [WATSON, p. 190] By 1930, notes Pierre Assouline, “according to dealer Pierre Loeb, during this period four art dealers out of five were Jewish, as were four out of five art collectors … Wilhelm Uhde who had made the same observations, added art critics to the list.” [ASSOULINE, p. 230] After the Nazi’s takeover of France, notes Hector Feliciano, “deploring the lack of experts available to advise German clients, a number of the Nazi information services in Paris explained that this was because most of the premiere art experts had been Jews. Since the 1920s, they had contributed to the development and maintenance of a worldwide network of wealthy art buyers. This network collapsed as soon as they were denied a role in Europe’s largest art market.” [FELICIANO, p. 124]

Nachum Gidal notes that in Germany, James Simon “made a gift of his world famous collection of Italian renaissance paintings, sculptures, medallions, and bronze” to the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin, “on whose governing board he sat.” [GIDAL, p. 348] Other prominent German Jewish collections included those of Marcus Koppel, Franz and Rober von Medelssohn, Alfred Beit, Oscar Huldschinsky, Eduard Arnhold, Leopold Sonnemann, H. H. Meyer, and Philip Rothschild, among others. “The greatest collection of German 19th century painters,” continued Gidal, “belonged to Max Bohm and Rudolf Mosse; the greatest collection of Old Master drawings was assembled by Paul Davidson.” [GIDAL, p. 348] Among the major Jewish German art dealers were Alfred Flechtheim, Herwath Walden, and Paul Cassirer in Berlin, and Bernheim & Heinemann in Munich.

Many Jewish art dealers grew to be extraordinarily successful. In 1909 Jacques Seligman “astounded Paris by acquiring the Palais de Sagan, an even more luxurious house … Seligman was the main [art] supplier for the French Rothschilds as well as [J. D.] Morgan; he was also known for his contacts in Russia …” [WATSON, p. 224] “Possibly the most successful, and certainly, the most secretive [art dealer] was [Nathan] Wildenstein,” says Peter Watson, “ … Another reason for Wildenstein’s success was his close association with Duveen and Gimpel, which made each others businesses truly international.” [WATSON, p. 220-221]

“Georges Wildenstein,” notes Hector Feliciano, “was very well known and actively involved in art circles in a number of countries, including those within the Nazi sphere of influence. Even after the French armistice and the German occupation, Wildenstein seems to have taken advantage of this network to organize a number of deals with the Germans.” [FELICIANO, H., p. 61] Feliciano
was actually sued for such statements about Wildenstein and the Nazis by the art dealer’s heirs in the 1990s. Feliciano counter sued, and with relevant historical evidence, won the case.

“Notoriously dishonest,” [WATSON, p. 166] Joseph Duveen was another prominent Jewish art dealer in the early decades of the 1900s, “the most successful art broker of the twentieth century, this trade – thanks to his undoubted charisma and his gift for salesmanship, laced with lavish doses of corruption.” [SIMPSON, ARTFUL, p. 1] Upon his move from Europe to New York City, Duveen was charged (in a legal “case that attracted enormous publicity”) with evading customs duties of – at today’s values – $102 million. Connections with several United States Senators and other men of influence helped Duveen evade the law. [WATSON, p. 166]

Duveen had a long – and secret – association with the very prominent and influential Jewish art connoisseur, critic, and esthete, Bernard Berenson. Berenson (whose original name was Bernhard Valvrojenski), an expert on Christian art, converted to Protestantism and then Catholicism, but noted in his diary,” At times I seem to myself to be a typical ‘Talmud Jew.’” He also wrote that he longed to drop “the mask of being goyim and return to Yiddish reminiscences …” [RUBIN, p. 75] In 1944, Berenson wrote a piece called, “Open Letter to American Jewry.” In it, notes Barry Rubin, “Berenson warned that envious Christians would persecute them, ‘even if you were innocent as the angels … and you are far from that.’” [RUBIN, p. 76]

For his less than innocent part, Berenson regularly colluded with Duveen over a twenty-five year period in perpetuating continuous fraud and deceit upon unsuspecting art collectors. “Berenson was a genius,” writes Colin Simpson, “who early in life channeled his gifts into the study of that finest flower of Christian art: Italian Renaissance painting. By the age of 35 he had become the world’s leading authority … The curators of many of world’s greatest museum’s were either his former pupils or his disciples … They came to hear his opinions, take his advice, and pay homage to his scholarship and his intellectual integrity. A small minority saw him as a disgustingly rich, opinionated, spiteful tyrant … But only a handful were aware that it was Berenson, not Duveen, who was probably the most successful and unscrupulous art dealer the world has ever seen.” [SIMPSON, ARTFUL, p. 1]

“The raw truth about both men,” notes Peter Watson, “… is… complex and considerably … sordid.” [WATSON, p. 167] For his part, from 1911 to 1937 Berenson’s hidden association with Duveen netted him alone the equivalent – in our day – of $150 million. [SIMPSON, ARTFUL, p. 2] “Berenson,’ notes Eunice Lipton, “shaped the very terrain of Renaissance studies, not to mention the market for what became its masterpieces.” [LIPTON, p. 285]

Another of Berenson’s Jewish contemporaries who had a strong hand in shaping American art history was Paul Sachs. “Though not as widely known as Berenson,” notes George Goodman, “Paul Joseph Sachs, too, had a patriarchal influence in the world of art museums – in America and abroad. Unlike Berenson, however, Sachs was born to privilege.” [GOODMAN, #2, p.2, p. 54] Sachs’
father and uncle founded the prominent Goldman, Sachs New York investment firm. Paul Sachs, an Associate Director of Harvard’s Fogg Museum and chairman of that college’s Fine Arts Department, aided a number of Jewish art scholar protégés, including James Rorimer (eventual Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art). “Two other Jewish protégés,” notes Goodman, “happened to be Sach’s relatives” – Charles Kuhn and James Sachs Plaut (eventual head of the Boston Institute of Contemporary Art). [GOODMAN, #2, p. 57] Yet another Sachs relative, Samuel Sachs II, became head of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts in 1973, then later Director of the Detroit Institute for the Arts and New York’s Frick Collection. Paul Sachs’ grandson, Franklin W. Robinson, also became – in 1979 – the Director of the Museum of Art at the Rhode Island School of Design, and later Director of the Johnson Museum at Cornell University. The patriarch Sachs, says Goodman, “largely invented the notion of curatorial training.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 145]

Jewish pre-World War II influence in the European art world – and Jewish influence in it now – may be appreciated by this observation by John Conklin. While some wealthy German-Jews – like financiers William Weinberg, Georges Lurcy, Siegfried Kramarsky, and Jacob Goldschmidt – were able to get their art out of Europe as capital,

“In 1973 the Austrian government declared that the art in its possession that it had been unable to return to the rightful owners and heirs would become state property, saying that there were no longer many claims being made. Art magazines and Jewish groups challenged that position … From then until 1985, the Austrian government and Jewish organizations worked together to find the owners of the unclaimed pieces. In 1985, the Austrian Parliament passed a law to return to their rightful owners and heirs more than 8,000 works of art that the Nazis had confiscated. Some from museums but most from European Jews … The law established a period until September 1986 for claims to be processed; unclaimed works were then to be auctioned off and the proceeds divided among Austrian [World War II] resistance groups, the Jewish community in Vienna, and Jewish groups in the United States. [CONKLIN, p. 222]

With the rise of German fascism, Jewish art historians began emigrating out of Europe. At New York University alone, Jewish refugee art professors included Richard Ettinghavern, Walter Friedlander, Karl Lehman, Alfred Salmony, Guido Schoenberger, and Martin Weinberger. [GOODMAN, #2, p. 61]

Yet another prominent early twentieth century ring of Jewish art dealers was the Stein family: Gertrude, Leo, Michael, and Sarah. “They claimed,” says Peter Watson, “often and vociferously, to have discovered modern Art.” [WATSON, p. 161] Their famous Parisian salon “was an expression of the Steins’ desire to show off and have others take them as seriously as they took themselves … The Saturday salon made the Steins famous … Leo took [his] Renoirs and half of the Cézannes to the United States. He was keen to get to New York to try Freudian treatment for three complexes from which he was convinced he suffered: an inferiority complex, a castration complex, and a pariah complex.” [WATSON, p. 162]
One of the Stein sisters, Gertrude, became famous as a writer, starting out in America with impressions of Picasso and Matisse which were published in another influential German-Jewish art dealer’s magazine in New York City, Camera Work. This man, Alfred Stieglitz, “editor/dealer/entrepreneur/ impresario/photographer,” would “spawn the spectacular exhibition that introduced modern art to the United States. It was a show that would change American taste for all time, that would eventually cause modern art to rival Impressionism in all the sales-rooms, and that in the long run would leapfrog New York over Paris as the art capital of the world.” [WATSON, p. 163] For Gertrude Stein’s part, “Stein’s apparent pride in her Jewish heritage and frequent assertion of Jewish particularity suggests a strong, continuing identity.” [ANTLER, J., p. 175]

With the shift in the Art world center from Europe to New York City, the development of the “art market,” “art scene,” and “art world” – in all its most important permutations – continued to be Jewish-dominated. Julien Levy, for example, was a major dealer of surrealist art in the 1930s. Salvador Dali was “central to Levy’s stable … Julian Levy and his gallery are central to the history of American art between the wars.” [ALTSHULER, B., MARCH 1999] Maurice Wertheim (father of Zionist historian Barbara Tuchman, who we have met earlier) was a major art collector. Also, “as president of the American Jewish Committee in the early 1940s, he tried unsuccessfully to foster support for Israeli statehood.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 61] Wealthy Jewish patron Peggy Guggenheim sponsored and helped build the career of famous Abstract Expressionist Jackson Pollock whose wife, Lee Krasner (formerly Lena Kreisner) was also Jewish. Ms. Guggenheim had a reputation for “bizarre sexual appetites” and claimed to have slept “with practically every man she ever met,” including Pollock. [NAIFEH/SMITH, 1989, p. 478] Guggenheim sued Pollock’s widow in the 1960s, “charging a failure to hand over at least fifteen works executed by her late husband between 1946 and 1948 when Miss Guggenheim was subsidizing him on the condition that he give her everything he produced.” [BURNHAM, p. 89] For her part, Krasner outlived Pollock by 31 years and amassed a fortune of $26 million, largely from Pollock’s estate. “Lee Krasner spent the rest of her life nurturing the Jackson Pollock legend. Through her crafty manipulations, the price of Pollock’s paintings skyrocketed into the millions.” [GAINES, S., 1998, p. 144]

“After World War II,” remarks Gerald Krefetz, “a new element was added to collecting: investment value. Jews were perhaps the first to appreciate the new art and the new ingredient.” [KREFETZ, p. 147] Sam Kootz opened a gallery in 1945 (he even experimented, in later years, with selling limited edition art at department stores such as Macy’s and Gimbel’s.) He, like some others, came to art with “a training in law” and a background as an advertising executive. Among art dealers, says Marcia Bystryn, “Kootz marks a shift from a concern with establishing a personal bond with the artist to a concern for a marketable product … [BYSTRYN, p. 184] … [He] was to apply the techniques he learned in the advertising business to that of marketing his artists.” [BYSTRYN, p. 185]

Sidney Janis opened his influential gallery in 1948, Leo Castelli (“with his aristocratic manner” [PLATTNER, p. 35] began his own in 1957. “Castelli

Castelli, owner of one of the most influential American art galleries in modern history, is widely credited to have spectacularly maneuvered the art world to his best economic advantage, the consequences which have been profound in art history. In 1964 Robert Rauschenberg, one of the artists in Castelli’s “stable,” won the prestigious Venice Biennale Prize. Sophie Burnham notes that:

“It was said that Castelli first handpicked the American Biennale commissioner, Alan Solomon, Director of the Jewish Museum; then he chose eight American representatives (four of whom were attached to his gallery) and the American judges, then trotted off to Europe to persuade the other [European] judges … of the inevitable thunderous Rauschenberg landslide … The first person invited to be the American judge had turned the job down on the grounds that he felt he would have been unable to exercise his own opinion in the face of American pressure. [BURNHAM, p. 45]

“I was somewhat responsible for the Rauschenberg victory,” Castelli later admitted to the New York Times Sunday Magazine. “After Rauschenberg won the Venice Biennale in 1964,” notes Stuart Plattner, “the value of this [genre of] art was ‘proven,’ and prices for the gallery’s artists rose.” [PLATTNER, p. 35] “Anyone can discover an artist,” Castelli once said, “but to make him what he is, give him importance, that’s really discovery.” [ECONOMIST, p. 98] In this context, Castelli was influential in the “discovery” of Jasper Johns, Robert Rauschenberg, Ray Lichtenstein, Frank Stella, Andy Warhol, James Rosenquist, Richard Serra, Donald Judd, Ellis Kelly, Cy Twombly, and others. [ECONOMIST, p. 99]

One of the most influential art exhibitions in the early years of the 20th century, featuring 1,300 art works, was the International Exhibition of Modern Art, also known as the Armory Show. As Karl Meyer notes:

“In 1912 painters Arthur B. Davies and Walt Kuhn toured Europe to gather the best examples of the most radical modernist works ... By the end of their hegira Davies and Kuhn had assembled the first large assortment of works by masters of European modernism to be shown in America ... The Armory Show has been accurately described by Lloyd Goodman, former director of the Whitney Museum of American Art, as the ‘opening gun in the long, bitter struggle for modern art in this country.’” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 100-101]

(Jewish art mogul Henry Geldzahler, chairman of the Metropolitan Museum museum’s twentieth-century art and later commissioner of New York City’s Cultural Affairs, also mounted a very influential exhibition in 1969: “New York Painting and Sculpture: 1940 to 1970.” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 101-102] In the late 1960s, the Metropolitan Museum “assigned five seats on the Metropolitan
board to ensure borough-wide representation.” Of these five, one was an African-American and three were Jewish: educator Muriel Rosoff Silberstein; Sol Shaviro, a founder of the Bronx Museum of Arts; and Henry Saltzman, former president of the Pratt Institute in Brooklyn.) [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 114]

Another of the most important New York art sales organizations, still strong today, is the Marlborough Gallery, begun in London in 1948 by two German-Jewish refugees, Frank Lloyd and Harry Fischer. By the 1980s it had branches in New York City, Zurich, Toronto, Rome, Tokyo, Montreal, and Liechtenstein, an “art world multinational corporation.” [KREFETZ, p. 160] The Marlborough Gallery’s reputation hit rock bottom in the 1960s – but survived to prosper – after an ugly series of lawsuits over the estate of painter Mark Rothko (a suicide). The gallery seriously undervalued his remaining work and tried – by fraud and conspiracy – to manipulate and skim them for outrageous profits, ultimately losing the case to Rothko’s heirs in court. Rothko’s daughter Kate also successfully sued the executors of her father’s estate – Morton Levine, Theodore Stamos, and Bernard Reiss (“the most celebrated accountant in the art world as far back as the 1940s.” [MYERS, J, p. 236] “The only thing that blocks them [the Jewish mafia] from complete control of the art world,” Marlborough’s Jewish president, Frank Lloyd, proclaimed, “is Marlborough. We’re independent. We are the biggest handicap to that clique.” [KRAFETZ, p. 161] On another occasion he admitted that “I collect money, not art … There is only one measure of success in running a gallery: making money.” [SMITH, R., 4-8-98]

Lawsuits and counter suits are common between artists and their galleries. “The artist sees the dealer as a leech,” observes Sophy Burnham. [BURNHAM, p. 94] Artist William de Kooning sued dealer Sidney Janis, the Marlborough Gallery initiated legal action against Naum Gabo.

Other recent prominent Jewish art dealers include Laurence Rubin, Irving Bloom, Ronald Feldman, Holly Solomon, Ileana Sonnabend (former wife of Leo Castelli), and many others. In 1998 a London newspaper called Jewish dealer Bernard Jacobson “possibly the leading dealer of modern British art.” [COOPER, p. 50] British dealer and art patron Jonathan Silver “established an art gallery for his friend [ultimately art superstar] David Hockney.” [DAILY TELEGRAPH, p. 31] Otto Kallir “dealt in expressionist painters … [He also] became the representative of Grandma Moses and even edited her autobiography.” [HEILBUT, p. 218] Andy Warhol’s world of Jewish art moguls included Ivan Karp, Irving Blum, and Robert Scull. Henry Geldzahler, a homosexual and curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, was “Andy’s painting mentor …. Although they were never lovers, the relationship became intimate. Andy spoke to Henry on the phone every night before he went to sleep and every morning as soon as he woke up.” [BOCKRIS, V., 1989, p. 158, 101]

In 1980, Warhol produced a limited series of pictures entitled “Jewish Geniuses,” featuring portraits of Gertrude Stein, Franz Kafka, Sarah Bernhardt, the Marx Brothers, theologian Martin Buber, Louis Brandeis (the “father” of American Zionism), George Gershwin, Sigmund Freud, Albert Einstein, and former Israeli prime minister Golda Meir. An accompanying exhibition was
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featured at New York’s Jewish Museum and the Judah Magnes Museum in Berkeley, California. Bluma Goldstein notes the “eagerness of major Jewish museums to mount and advertise the exhibit and to sell expensive portfolios of the exhibit’s serigraphs” and Warhol’s shrewdness in targeting Jewish wealth, prominence in the art world, self-infatuation, and vanity:

“Warhol’s preoccupation with money and status is common knowledge and is reflected in his many prints of dollar signs and paper money … New York Times art critic Hilton Kramer, in a review of the exhibit at the New York Jewish Museum, and David Bourdon, in his book on Warhol, both commented on the artist’s crass opportunism in targeting a specific sector of the public. [Carrie] Rickey calls it ‘the synagogue circuit’ – that is middle-class Jews who could be counted on to be attracted to things Jewish and contemporary culture and who also possessed the means to purchase an expensive portfolio in a 200-count limited edition … Not unlike this sector the public, the Jewish museums were drawn to an array of famous Jewish faces artistically displayed by a major artist popular for the previous two decades … Ronald Feldman, owner of a New York art gallery involved in many successful commercial ventures of Warhol’s career, assisted Warhol in selecting Jewish figures, organized the exhibition at the New York Jewish museum, and issued the print portfolio for sale.” [GOLDSTEIN, B., 2000, p. 128]

In 1993 the New York Times Magazine called Arnold Glimcher “the most successful art dealer in New York. With art collector and Hollywood hot-shot Michael Ovitz as one his best friends, Glimcher could personally merge the New York art scene and the Hollywood movie industry.” With Ovitz’s Hollywood connections, art dealer Glimcher even became a film director. In an overview of his career, the Times noted that he lent “himself a WASP-ish touch in his early days as an art dealer by assigning himself the Nordic-looking name Arne, and now, in Hollywood, [he] adopt[s] the more Jewish Arnie.” [SCHWARTZMAN, p. 32]

As art dealer, Glimcher represent “19 of the world’s most demanding artists, from Donald Judd and George Baselitz to Joel Shapiro [Ovitz’s cousin] and Julian Schnabel.” [SCHWARTZMAN, p. 33] Glimcher also represents Jewish artist Jim Dine, with whom he spent two months in Israel. [BOXER, T., 5-26-01] Glimcher’s gallery employs dozens of people, including eight full time archivists. Gallery director, Renato Danese, is a former head of the Visual Arts Program of the National Endowment for the Arts. “One of the amazing things about my father,” said a Glimcher son who headed his dad’s art catalogue division, “is that in this high-powered world, with all the various things that he’s been successful at, he has this innocence.” [SCHWARTZMAN, p. 44]

“So savage was the [art] business (fake forgeries and ruthless competition in an unregulated economy),” wrote Sophy Burnham in the 1970s, “that the Art Dealers’ Association was formed in the early 1960s to help raise the ethics and reputations of dealers.” [BURNHAM, p. 90] But some things never change. In September 1997 ARTnews reported an ongoing Justice Department “probe into the business practices of art dealers and auction houses.” Subpoenaed galleries
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In 1991, the Bernard and S. Dean Levy Gallery in Manhattan was found guilty of collusion and fined $100,000. In 1996, in New Orleans, Federal marshals shut down the Morton M. Goldberg Auction Galleries firm under court order after Morton and David Goldberg were charged with fraud and skimming hundreds of thousands of dollars from a British supplier of art and antiques. [GREG, p. 21] Also in 1996, major Jewish art dealer and best-selling novelist (The Thief of Light, no less) David Ramus was sentenced to 33 months in prison for fraud, bilking art collecting clients out of millions of dollars. “There are no rules [in the art world],” he waxed as he prepared for jail, “only bloated songs of money and ego. It’s a treasure hunt for grown-ups. And it’s like dope; nothing – no profit, no fortune – is ever enough.” [LAURENCE, p. 21]

In 1999, a Los Angeles Police Department media press release noted

“A museum art thief was convicted of thefts of fine art from two Los Angeles museums. Nureet Granott, 50, used a fake driver’s license, a fraudulent credit card, and fictitious rental agreement information to garner control of over $22,000 of art through the art rental galleries of the UCLA/Armand Hammer Museum of Art and the L.A. County Museum of Art in 1995 … [Others were fleeced] for an estimated $100,000 in goods and services – from a luxury car to pet bills. During the museum thefts, Granott assumed the identity of her sister, Hanit Peretz, who is living in Israel. During many of the transactions, Granott was accompanied by her husband, David Yehuda Cohen. Both are also suspected of being involved in questionable real estate transactions.” [LOS ANGELES POLICE, 8-16-99]

In 2001, the New York state attorney general filed an injunction against the Antique and Design Center (owned by Jill and Dave Schuster) for selling fraudulent art work over the Internet on e-Bay. It was “the first case of fraud brought by the State against an online art retailer.” [ART NEWSPAPER, 5-30-01] The same year, in Boston, art dealers Shirley Sack and Arnold Katzen were “charged with conspiring to launder $4.1 million in drug money.” They were arrested “as they attempted to sell paintings, which they claimed were originals by Modigliani and Degas, to a federal agent posing as a drug dealer … Ms. Sack had been attempting to sell a painting by Raphael and was prepared to accept payment in drug money or from organized crime figures.” [MUSEUM SECURITY, 6-3-01]

Also in 2001, Michel Cohen, originally from France, hit the news with his own spectacular art fraud:

“Many are calling it the biggest art fraud ever. When all the figures are in, art dealer Michel Cohen will have taken the art world for at least $50
million … [Art dealing] is a jealous and wary system, where each player guards sources and clients, but it is built on an essential trust. This is the system that has made the art market the largest unregulated money market in the world – a market that Michel Cohen was in a position to loot.” [HADEN-GUEST, A., 2-6-01] … Whether for purpose of convenience, privacy or to avoid paying taxes or the authorities, great sums of money are loaned all the time to purchase art. An inhabitant of the art world’s periphery, Cohen knew this … The art world’s secrecy worked to Cohen’s advantage. Dealers seldom want their peers to know what they are doing.” [HADEN-GUEST, A., 2-12-01]

Always within the art world matrix of incestuous connection and often corruption, the artist has usually championed a rarefied “humanities”-based world perspective that is usually antithetical to the daily economic morass in which he or she is mired. Burnham notes that

“[The artist] appears … at a museum opening or gallery party, for it is politic to circulate in the art crowd. He mingles with the black-tie patrons of the arts and acts his own iconoclast part … all the while hating what he is doing: the terrible dancing with a prospective patron, the posing, while at the back of his mind lurks this terrible doubt about the place of art in society.” [BURNHAM, p. 8]

“The artist who would be known,” wrote the great folklorist Joseph Campbell, “has to go to cocktail parties to win commissions, and those who win them are the ones who are not in their studios but at parties, meeting the right people and appearing in the right places.” [CAMPBELL, p. 49] “Much time,” wrote Jewish artist Julian Schnabel, “is spent nurturing liaisons with creatures of the art world mechanism. At first, there is no time for friendship. Later, there is no capacity for it.” [CAPLIN, L., 1989, p. 168]

For some artists, total cooption and immersion into the most trivial and superficial of values has occurred. “Striking instances of this culture-industry phenomenon,” wrote Anne Bowler and Blaine McBurney in 1993, “may be seen in the cases of painter Kenny Sharf [Jewish and gay] and writer Tama Janowitz [not Jewish]. In both instances, national and sometimes international publicity was directed at these artists in a manner that illustrates the distanced values of the culture industry. In the case of Sharf … a feature-length cover story in the September 1985 issue of ArtNews [Jewish owned and edited] is representative of the culture industry ‘plugging’ and labeling process that produce the art world ‘star system.’ … The ArtNews piece actually spends a great deal of time discussing everything but Sharf’s artwork. Instead, we are treated to a journalistic tableau of downtown parties, clubs, and ‘personalities.’” [BOWLER, p. 172-173]

In Paris, from about 1920 to 1940, Jewish painters “were almost a school unto themselves,” including Chaim Soutine, Jules Pascin, and Marc Chagall. [KREFETZ, p. 143] Other Jewish painters included Pissaro, Amedo Modigliani, and Szyk. Jewish socio-political artists in America in the 1920s and 1930s included Ben Shahn, Moses Soyer, Chaim Gross, Jack Levine, Morris Kanter, Raphael Soyer, Saul Steinberg, Max Weber, and Abraham Walkowitz. A
partial list of other prominent Jewish American artists includes Mark Rothko (Marcus Rothkowitz), Julian Schnabel, Barnett Newman, Joel Shapiro, Roy Lichtenstein, Louise Nevelson, Sam Francis, Judy Chicago (Cohen), Helen Frankenthaler, Jules Olitski, George Segal, Ad Reinhardt, Morris Louis, Adolph Gottlieb, Larry Rivers (Yitzroch Loiza Grossberg), Jim Dine (the Friends of the Tel Aviv Museum’s “Artist of the Year” in 2001), [BOXER, T., 5-26-01] Eleanor Antin, Allen Katz, Jacques Lipschitz, Sol Le Witt, Dennis Oppenheim, Max Ernst, Milton Avery, Leonard Baskin, Eugene Berman, Leonid Berman, Hyman Bloom, Louis Eilshemius, Philip Guston, Hans Hofmann, Philip Pearlstein, Rachel Rosenthal, Carole Schneeman, Susan Weil, Hannah Wilke, Ross Bleckner, among many others. Peter Max has been among the most popularly commercial. “Some critics,” says Gerald Krefetz, “have suggested that the whole field of modern abstract art is especially Jewish.” [KREFETZ, p. 145]

Even Morris Katz

“is listed in The Guinness Book of Records as ‘the most prolific painter in history,’ with over eighteen paintings painted and sold to date … ‘Paint fast, sell cheap’ is his motto.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 62, 63]


Celebrated Jewish architects in recent history include Louis Kahn, Richard Meier, Peter Eisenman, Moshe Safdie, Frank Gehry, Richard Gluckman, Malcolm Holzman, James Polshek, Robert Siegel, and Robert Stern. Louis Kahn was the architect for both Yale University’s art museums; Moshe Safdie designed Ottawa’s National Gallery and Montreal’s Museum of Fine Arts. Emery Roth “became one of the most prolific architects of high-rise apartment buildings in Manhattan.” [SCHACHTMAN, p. 101] Eisenman “founded the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in New York, the intellectual center of architectural activity in the United States and the place where architects from all over the world come to sniff the breeze.” [ARONSON, S., 1983, p. 303] In 2000, “Daniel Libeskind, whose Jewish Museum Berlin has attracted crowds before its exhibits are even in place, was named architect of the Denver Art Museum’s new [$62.5 million] wing.” [CHANDLER, M., 7-14-2000] “In Germany,” notes Cecil Roth, “in the middle of the [nineteenth] century, the most prominent name in [architecture] is that of George Hitzig, president of the Academy of Art, who designed the Bourse (1859-64) and the Reichsbank (1869-77). Many of the local branches of this institution, in the full fortress-like floridity of the close of the last century, were erected by E. Jacobsthal, while in Austria, a new tradition in theatrical architecture was started by Oscar Strnad.” [ROTH, C., 1940, p. 159]

Even Sigmund Freud’s grandson, Lucien Freud, has had phenomenal success as a British painter, selling “small to medium size” pictures for between $200,000-$1 million apiece; occasional individual sales have topped $2 million. Freud’s first wife was Kitty Epstein, daughter of sculptor Jacob Epstein. [FEAVER, p. 138-139] In 1998 a painting of his daughter Bella sold for $5.83 million, the highest price for a living British artist. A “longtime friend” of Freud is
Nathaniel Charles Jacob Rothschild, head of the famous banking firm. Rothschild also heads the National Heritage Monument Trust in Great Britain, an arts agency roughly equivalent to America’s National Endowment for the Arts. (Taking a trip to Australia? Perhaps you might show your art work to Henry Krongeld, the chairman of the National Art Center in Melbourne, and listed in at least one Israeli publication as a committed Zionist).

Even Sigmund Freud himself was afforded art museum attention in 1999 when documents, antiques, and other artifacts from his personal life, including a reproduction of his consultation room, toured the United States, beginning at the Smithsonian museum, and later the Jewish Museum in New York City. [BARUCH, E., 1999, p. 11]

In the late 1990s, millionaire British Jewish advertising king Tony Kaye decided he wanted “to have a bigger impact in the world of communications.” [HILTY, p. 16] So he moved to Hollywood to become a movie director and a gallery artist. Among Kaye’s “art works,” noted the (London) Financial Times, was a project to place a real homeless man “on display at the [British] Tate Gallery with a price tag of 4m. pounds …. [The man] will soon be replaced by … a homeless woman [that] Kaye encountered on Venice Beach [California] and has displayed at the Getty Museum.” [HILTY, p. 16]

“Today,” says Stephen Brook, “… many of the most distinguished [artist] names in Britain are those of Jews … [R.B.] Kitaj … has discovered in middle age an increasing fascination with Judaism … Like many Jews, his rediscovery of Judaism sprang from this study of the Holocaust; he became a mad expert in the whole ‘lugubrious business’ … His obsession with the Holocaust … is adumbrated by the inclusion of a chimney-stack motif with some of his recent work.” [BROOK, p. 329]

Kitaj, who was born in Ohio, coined the term “School of London” to describe the work of himself, Lucien Freud, Frank Auerbach, Leon Kossoff, Michael Andrews, and Francis Bacon. He had a major retrospective exhibition in 1994 that was roundly trashed by critics. Three months later, noted the New York Times, Kitaj’s wife, the painter Sandra Fisher (“who is credited with the largest picture ever made – 300 ft. by 100 ft., for a Heineken advertisement” [BARKER, p. 10], “died unexpectedly of an anevrysm at age 47. And Mr. Kitaj concluded that his critics motivated by anti-Semitism killed her.” [RIDING, p. 13] “I have long since resolved to be a Jew,” once declared Kitaj, “… I regard that as more important than my art.” [STEYN, J., 1999, p. 153] Juliet Steyn notes traditional Jewish self-conception in one of Kitaj’s paintings: “The chimney [in a Kitaj painting] functions as an indictment of Christianity. Hence Jewish identity in Kitajy’s painting is achieved in opposition to Christianity … Innocense and guilt: Jew and Gentile.” [STEYN, J., 1999, p. 168]

The theme of suddenly returning to a lost Jewish identity (and sometimes Judaism) via the decades-old Holocaust is a common one, reflected also in the work of Judy (Cohen) Chicago, a daughter of Marxists and co-founder with Miriam Shapiro of the Feminist Art Program at the California Institute for the Arts. (In New York, Jewish artists Barbara Zucker and Pollie Attie founded the feminist
collective gallery “AIR” – Artists in Residence. Zucker “recalls being ambivalent and embarrassed at being Jewish, yet felt guilty for harboring such emotions. In the late 1980s, she began to explore her Jewish identity.” [HYMAN, p. 73] In a like manner, following her son’s bar mitzvah, a rereading of the book of Genesis, and a trip to Israel [feminist artist] Ann Sperry produced her own version of the biblical story of creation.” [HYMAN, p. 73] Particularly important in Judy Chicago’s Jewish retrieval was her viewing of Claude Lanzmann’s Holocaust movie, Shoah. “The next two years,” says the Cleveland Jewish News,

“were spent reading everything she could find about the Holocaust, visiting museums and exhibitions, viewing films and listening to survivor’s tapes … In 1987, Chicago [and her Jewish husband, Donald Woodman] traveled the ‘landscape of the Holocaust,’ a 6,000-mile journey following Hitler’s pathway of destruction through Germany, France, Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the former Soviet Union … While Woodman took pictures, Chicago wrote, writing her impressions and feelings in her ‘Jewish journal.’” [HELLER, F, p. 14]

Eventually this long escapade became a popular art installation: Holocaust Project: From Darkness into Light, Chicago’s “journey of identity as a Jew.” [HELLER, p. 14]

Art world interest in the Holocaust might be measured by ARTnews’ features in recent years on various aspects of the subject, including an article entitled “Picasso at Auschwitz.” “Picasso embraced me,” recalls Pierre Daix, “and said in a low voice: ‘To think that painters once thought they could paint The Massacre of the Innocents.’” [DAIX, p. 197]

Art Spigelman’s Holocaust comic book, Maus, merited an article, as did Gay Block’s photographic portraits of “Rescuers of the Holocaust.” [DRUCKER, p. 114-118] This series of portraits of people who saved Jews from Nazis was also an exhibition at the prestigious Museum of Modern Art. MOMA also “mounted a show on the making of Maus … which … documented Spigelman’s working methods.” [BERMAN, A, p. 63-64] Yet another ARTnews article in 1995 featured the paintings of Peter Malkin, “a former Mossad agent who helped capture [former Nazi] Adolf Eichmann in Argentina.” [CLEMENTS, F., p. xvii]

Another artist, Anselm Kiefer, “one of the most important artists to emerge in post-war Europe,” started out as an art student in 1969 by having “himself photographed in a paramilitary costume, giving Nazi-style salutes in front of monuments, landscapes, and seascapes around Germany.” Thirty years later he was afforded an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art. “We see railroad tracks anywhere,” he was quoted as saying, “and think about Auschwitz.” [MENDELSOHN, J. 1999, p. 37] 54 of the author’s works “were acquired” in 1995. As two Jewish art critics note about the importance of catering to Jewish concerns in recent art trends, “there are tons of non-Jews – Christian Boltonski, Anselm Kiefer, Christopher Williams, to name a few – who’ve done astonishing work dealing with Jewish culture, persecution [and] the Holocaust.” [AUERBACH/WEISSMAN, 3-21-99, p. 51]
Art world and auction house cynicism for profit knows few limits. “On the very day [in 1979] the Pope preached at Auschwitz,” notes Theodore Ziolkowski, “fifty lots of Nazi memorabilia brought record prices at an auction in New York, including $5,000 for a small diary kept by Heinrich Himmler, Hitler’s mastermind of the ‘Final Solution.’” [ZIOLKOWSKI, p. 685] Adolf Hitler himself was a water color painter and his work today has sold for thousands of dollars. Long before Hitler achieved world wide notoriety as a war monger and mass murderer, notes M. H. Goldberg, “most of the paintings Hitler did sell were bought by Jewish dealers.” [GOLDBERG, M., 1976, p. 37]

As art dealer and memorabilia seller Charles Hamilton notes:

“Contrary to popular belief, Hitler was never a house painter but was, in fact, an artist who actually made a meager living from his watercolors of flowers and buildings and street scenes. Several years ago I had a visit from my good friend, Shea Tennenbaum, a distinguished Hebrew poet, and our conversation fell upon art and artists.

‘A great artist paints from his soul, not from his mind,’ said Shea. ‘It is this flood of deep, inner emotion that makes a great artist.’

‘Don’t you think an artist can counterfeit emotion?’ I asked. And without waiting for a reply, I walked to a file in my gallery and took out a small watercolor of flowers in a vase. ‘What do you think of this?’

Shea studied it. ‘Obviously,’ he said, ‘the artist was a man of great delicacy and profound feelings, a lover of beauty. He has captured the supreme moment in the existence of these flowers and recorded it with taste and skill.’

Shea looked and gasped in horror. The signature was that of Adolf Hitler.

For a moment I feared that Shea might slump to the floor, but he quickly recovered himself and I apologized for the prank.”

After Hitler had twice failed the matriculation test for the Vienna Academy of Arts and Sciences – he had hoped to become an architect – he turned to dabbling in watercolors. His favorite subjects were deserted streets, public buildings, and churches. A friend of Hitler’s, Reihold Hanisch, pretended to be blind so he wouldn’t need a peddler’s license and hawked Hitler’s paintings for him in the bars of Vienna. They sold for a few kronen reach and the two youths split the take, much of which they spent on pastries and whipped cream. At this time Hitler was bearded and wore a derby and a long black coat that gave him a very Semitic appearance. Oddly, most of his regular customers were Jewish, and since Hitler was fond of quoting Jewish proverbs he was often taken for a Jew.” [HAMILTON, C., 1981, p. 182]

Holocaust survivor material also has a price tag. In December 1997, for example, Edith Hahn’s “personal letters documenting her [Holocaust] survival, her love affairs and her escape as a Jew during World War II” went for $169,250 at a Sotheby’s auction. [BROWN, p. 1] Also on the Holocaust theme, in 1995 Rabbi Israel Miller gave the Jewish editor of ARTnews, Milton Esterow, an honorary
shofar, “a ram’s horn blown in synagogues before and during Rosh Hoshanah for the magazine’s role in transferring the ownership of thousands of artworks stolen from victims of the Holocaust by the Nazis to the Jewish community of Vienna.” [ARTnews, 10-96, p. 53] In the late 1980s, a commission to do a Holocaust memorial art work for the New York Appellate Courthouse “triggered [in Harriet] Feigenbaum [an] interest in her Jewish roots.” [HYMAN, p. 73]

All this of course reflects latent Jewish “particularist” exploitation of America’s new “cultural pluralism” paradigm. As Paula Hyman and Deborah Dash note:

“During the last decades, the concept of America as a melting pot was gradually replaced by visions of a multicultural society based on ethnic diversity, and the concept of ‘universal’ art reflecting a master-narrative was challenged by the belief in the necessity of pluralistic art forms.” [HYMAN, p. 69]

Perhaps the most obsessive “art work” about the Holocaust, blending aesthetics, mass murder, and a neurotic Jewish identity, is that of a 23-year Jewish California lesbian, Marina Vainshtein, who sports 25 body piercings and a red Mohawk haircut. As one Jewish art critic appreciatively notes, Vainshtein also has “tattoos of graphic Holocaust images over most of her body. On her upper back, the central image represents a train transport carrying Jewish prisoners in striped uniforms towards waiting ovens … It was … in high school [in Los Angeles] that Vainshtein became obsessed with Holocaust literature … Vainshtein’s tatoos include a violin player … surrounded by hanging corpses, anguished faces and Zyklon B, the killing agent in the gas chambers. The screaming faces of prisoners being gassed are tattooed on one breast.” [APEL, p. 12, 14]

Then there are the likes of Rachel Schreiber, a video artist, and teacher at the Heron School division of Indiana University in Indianapolis, whose recent works include a video expression entitled: “Please Kill Me: I’m a Faggot Nigger Jew.” [SCHRIEBER, R., 2000]

For “superstar” Jewish novelist Judith Krantz, it’s not permissible to even mention some historic art movements. Jewish victimology usurps them. She recounts her outrage when, visiting a German art museum, her companion dared to mention the “Dachau school of landscape painting” [Dachau was also the later site of a Nazi concentration camp where Jews were murdered]:

“Suddenly [Krantz’s German companion] exclaimed, ‘Oh, look here at the masterworks of the Dachau School of landscape painting.’ ‘WHAT DID YOU SAY?’ ‘The Dachau School of landscape painting,’ she replied in all innocence, showing me some charming paintings of rural countryside. ‘It was a well-known artistic movement.’ Only then did I realize that Anna laced the faintest idea of history. My mind whirling, I couldn’t decided where to start her education.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 304]

Invariably, within the “back to Jewish” roots model, surfaces the ages-old Jewish world view, sanctified in the myths of the Jewish Holocaust, that cele-
brates “galut/exile.” And the model is this: constant self-hatred in a world other than Jewish, obsession with physical and/or intellectual markers of Distinction, the incessant Persecution Complex, and the notion that Jews – God’s (or no God’s) eternal outsiders – cannot, and should not, successfully assimilate into the rest of modern American society. In 1997, Jewish art critic Donald Kuspit addressed this theme of modern Jewish identity in an article called “Unconsciously, Always an Alien and Self-Alienated: The Problem of Jewish American Artists.” The Jew, says Kuspit

“may symbolize the ultimate alien in Christian society, the common enemy against which all Christians can unite … In the minds of both [secular and religious] Jews the memory – the threat – of genocide remains ever present. For all their differences, the two [kinds of Jews] are inwardly united; they know Christian society regards them as one and the same.” [KUSPIT, p. 30]

In 1999 Juliet Steyn noted a film entitled Jewish Artists in the East End (of New York City) about David Bomberg, Mark Gertler, and Alfred Wollmark where “Richard Cork argues that a common identity existed between them as Jews: alienation in the condition they share.” [STEYN, J., 1999, p. 17]


In 2001, an Arizona newspaper noted one dimension of the Frida Kahlo craze at an exhibition of Mexican art at the Phoenix Art Museum. The show featured the collection of wealthy Mexican Jewish collectors Jacques and Natasha Gelman, “major players in the glamorous Mexico City film scene of the 1940s”:

“Contemporary acquisitions … [of Jacques and Natasha Gelman] have been expertly guided by longtime [Jewish] Gelman friend Robert Littman, ex-director of Mexico City’s now-defunct Centro Cultural/Arte Cultural). As president of the Vergel Foundation, which is responsible for carrying on the Gelman legacy, Littman seems to possess an infallible eye.” [Vanesian, K., 6-701]

The Gelmans became rich in the motion picture business in Mexico. Artist Kahlo, like others, “often paid the rent by doing portraits of wealthy socialites.” One of Kahlo’s portraits of Natasha Gelman “captures the woman, crowned with sausage curls al modo and draped in a fur stole.”“To anyone familiar with Mexican art history,” writes critic Kathleen Vanesian,

“the Gelman exhibition is not a well-balanced overview of Mexican art mid-century … Rather, it’s a classically status-driven, gotta-be-better-than-the-Gomezes compilation reflecting one type of art collector’s
psychic preoccupation with memorializing himself and notable public figures with which he has socialized. Frankly, it’s one more befitting a newly moneyed, 18th-century Dutch burgher than a discerning, visionary collector seeking emerging and mid-career artists’ best and most enduring works.” [VANESIAN, K., 6-7-01]

Other intriguing Jewish art angles these days include the New York Jewish Museum (which gave Robert Rauschenberg and Jasper Johns their first important exhibitions) where “a high tech highlight of the galleries devoted to the Israelite period [is] the interpretive Talmud – a video that displays Talmudic passages with inset translations and talking heads.” [ROSENBAUM, p. 102] Elsewhere, “last summer,” noted ARTnews in 1994, “Jane Alexander [a Gentile] was starring on Broadway, playing a Jewish banker in The Sisters Rosensweig. No one, least of all the actress herself, imagined that she’d soon take on what may be her most challenging role yet – leader of the embattled National Endowment for the Arts.” [CEMBELAST, p. 71-72] In Eastern Europe, with the collapse of communism, Jewish-American billionaire George Soros has “introduced artists to new systems of patronage, exhibitions, and competition” with the Soros Center for Contemporary Arts in Prague, one of 20 Soros-established organizations throughout former communist countries. [BERNSTEIN, R]

One of the things the Eastern Europeans can learn is that in the relatively narrow art world circle, “there is a constant movement of people around the jobs of the art world, from college professor to museum director to dealer to magazine editor.” [BURNHAM, p. 125] All such occupations tend to overlap. Nepotism and interconnectedness run rampant. Prominent dealer Ivan Karp, for instance, started out as an art critic for the Village Voice. He later worked for art dealer Leo Castelli before starting his own gallery, O.K. Harris. Castelli’s ex-wife Ileana (Sonnabend) started her own eventually important gallery too. Artist Alexander Lieberman started out as a layout editor at Vogue. His stepdaughter became a contributing editor for Art in America and was married to another artist, Cleve Gray, who showed at the same gallery as Lieberman, and was also a contributing editor to Art in America, as well as a sometimes writer for Vogue. “Those who questioned Liberman’s art,” notes Thomas Meir, “invariably mentioned his status as editorial director at Conde Nast,” the firm owned by billionaire media magnate Si Newhouse, of whom Liberman has been a close friend for thirty years. [MAIER, p. 70] “Poverty is not conducive to good art,” Liberman told the New York Times in a feature about his studio, “and I have always believed in living life to the hilt.” [MAIER, p. 70] Prominent art critic Clement Greenberg was both an associate editor of the Jewish magazine Commentary and art critic for the Nation.

Such “cross-pollinating” may be witnessed in the recent case of Tom L. Freudenheim who, at the same time, has been an executive at the National Endowment for the Arts, Assistant Secretary for the Arts and Humanities at the Smithsonian Museum, and Board Vice-Chairman of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture. Henry Geldzahler was “curator of twentieth century art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, program director for the
Visual Arts of the NEA, a close friend of many artists, and a friend and follower of [prominent critic Clement] Greenberg.” [BURNHAM, p. 127]

Artist Jim Rosenquist really got his career started when someone “told Alan Stone [about Rosenquist’s work] who told Ileana Sonnenbend, who told Dick Bellamy and Ivan Karp and Henry Geldzahler and Leo Castelli who came down to the studio in that order to see the picture.” [BURNHAM, p. 106] In the case of prominent artist **William de Kooning**, his wife – Elaine Fried (both Gentiles) – is credited by some for “largely creating and orchestrating the ‘de Kooning myth,’” including having sex with influential art critic Harold Rosenberg and ARTnews editor Thomas Hess [both Jewish]. “When Elaine slept with Hess,” claims an “unnamed elder statesman in the art world,” Bill got publicity in ARTnews. When Elaine had an affair with Harold Rosenberg, he paid Bill off with attention.” [GLUECK, p. 129] She herself eventually wrote art reviews for ARTnews. And the dominant art critic of that era, Clement Greenberg: “Greenberg’s compulsive womanizing … – often inseparable from his promotion of female artists – has long been legendary … In the early 1950s he carried on an affair with artist Helen Frankenthaler.” [LEWIS, MJ, p. 59]

Incestuous collusion, mutual back-scratching, under the table wheeling and dealing, nepotism, and clique allegiance are intrinsic principles of the modern art world. Another case in point was Bill Rubin, chief curator of painting at the Museum of Modern Art in the 1970s. Rubin’s brother was a New York art dealer. In 1970 Rubin set up an exhibition of the work of Frank Stella, a personal friend, and an artist in his brother’s gallery. Rubin even exhibited at MOMA two Stella paintings he owned himself. The show could be expected to automatically raise Stella’s art prices, personally beneficial to both curator Rubin and his brother.

In 1943 Sam Kootz became an adviser to the Museum of Modern Art; the next year he was also a private art dealer, eventually selling works of art by Picasso. When MOMA held a Picasso exhibition in the 1940s, Kootz was holding a simultaneous Picasso exhibition as a private dealer. [BYSTRYN, p. 186]

**Dore Ashton**, an art critic for the New York Times, was once reprimanded by her editor for choosing to write about art shows that included her own husband, Adja Yunkers. She wrote that

“Of this trio, Adja Yunkers, showing heroic and sultry pastels at the Emmerich Gallery, is the most romantic, stoking the fire of color and shape to degree of thrilling intensity. Yunkers, who uses pastels with verve and assurance, organizes restless compositions in a truly symphonic way, summing up a complex infinite of shapes and color for the majestic ‘scoring’ of these beautiful and impressive pictures.” [BURNHAM, p. 342]

During the mid-1960s, says John Conklin, “the price of favorable attention by a prominent critic Clement Greenberg was the gift of one or two major works. Critics have built up reputations of artists whose work they have personally invested, and then profited from the sale of the art. Art historian Bernard Berenson sometimes overpraised artworks in which he had a financial stake,
even vouching for paintings that he knew had undergone significant restorations so as to be made more appealing to buyers. He earned substantial commissions from the sale of paintings by dealer Joseph Duveen, collecting more than $8 million from Duveen in their twenty year partnership … Moreover, Duveen financed much of Berensen’s art criticism, which he then used to justify the prices he charged to wealthy collectors.” [CONKLIN, p. 44]

Critic Clement Greenberg, member of the Jewish mafia “New York Intellectuals,” and probably the most powerful art critic of his era, carried with him a reputation for paybacks for friendly reviews. “No other critic has so openly allied himself to the merchandizing of art,” wrote Sophy Burnham, “…[It is accused that] he turned his influence to personal profit, accepting free paintings, writing and lecturing about contemporary art, and selling the pictures high.” [BURNHAM, p. 149-150] “For three decades,” notes Michael J. Lewis, “art criticism in America was the domain of a rule-giving prophet [Greenberg] … Where his favor came to rest, as it did for a time on the paintings of Jackson Pollack, there followed national celebrity and success.” Other prominent Jewish contemporary art critics “included Meyer Schapiro and Harold Rosenberg. Hilton Kramer arrived on the scene a bit later.” [LEWIS, MJ, 1998] When British/Jewish art critic David Sylvester died in 2001, London’s Daily Telegraph declared him “modern art’s most influential critic.” [DAILY TELEGRAPH, 7-20-01]

“Jewish emigres in flight from the Nazi genocide and Jews of earlier emigrations, such as Meyer Schapiro and Clement Greenberg, for example,” notes Catherine Soussloff,

“had a definitive and formative influence on art and art history in America and England – and by today in the English-speaking world as a whole. The impact of these Jewish art historians, critics, and artists in the interpretation and exhibition of art in America and elsewhere was central for art history.” [SOUSLOFF, C., 2000]

Among his favorites, Greenberg championed “Washington Color School” artists. “By the end of the 1960s,” notes Burnham, “Greenberg’s Color School artists were being shown in four important galleries in New York, Paris, London, and Toronto. They were collected in museums, including the Metropoli- tan, MOMA, and the Smithsonian, and considerable muttering could be heard – not always good-natured – about the Mafia and the Kosher Nostra.” [BURNHAM, p. 107]

“I’ve decided the kind of people attracted to art are often psychopaths,” Greenberg once said, “You can quote me on that. In art and literature both – Do you know the difference between psychopaths and psychoticis? Psychopaths are people with defective consciences. They cannot tell right from wrong.” [BURNHAM, p. 157] For his part, Greenberg is reputed to have walked into artist Barnett Newman’s studio and asked for a painting. “Barney was going to give him something small – a lithograph perhaps,” notes Sophy Burnham, “I don’t want that,’ said Greenberg, ‘I want that big one over there. It’s your best picture.’ And Newman, inwardly raging, capitulated to his own ambitions and handed over the painting. Greenberg takes only the best … If the critic has an
undisclosed stake in the artist’s reputation, it is not for the artist to question.” [BURNHAM, p. 131]

Margaret Olin suggests that widespread Jewish early and mid-twentieth century championing of formalist art (art denuded of social, political, cultural, and religious reference) had – until recent years when celebratory Jewish “particularism” has been unleashed – been rooted in their self-interest in downplaying publicly their Jewish identities. Prominent Jewish art critics Clement Greenberg and Harold Rosenberg, for example, were especially prominent in the encouragement of “Abstract Art.” Occasionally, however, latent counter-attitudes to abstract universalism could indiscreetly surface. Greenberg, for example, once remarked that “it is possible that by ‘world-historical’ standards the European Jew represents a higher type of human being than any yet achieved.” [OLIN, p. 51] This Jewish elitism, lingering just behind a universalistic front, was also manifest in critic Bernard Berenson. Despite his own professed “tendency toward universalism and timelessness” and “the same human quality in every individual,” he further proposed to “erect the same qualities into ultimate standards, and to appraise societies as well as individuals by the extent to which they have possessed these qualities.” “Thus [for Berenson],” notes Margaret Olin, “like George Orwell’s Animal Farm, which found some animals more equal than others, he found some societies more universally human than others.” [OLIN, p. 48]

By the 1980s, art critic Peter Halley found some intriguing historical essences in what he calls a Jewish American artist renaissance:

“Art in the 80’s has been consistently labeled as ostentatious, garish, extravagant, garish, extravagant, vulgar, and over-scaled. These are the epithets of the parvenu or nouveau riche. However, they are also terms that, in earlier decades, were used to characterize Jewish-American taste and style. I want to be very clear that I am not making any claim that anti-Semitism has entered the critical debate. I would suggest instead that the commentators who have thus defined the 1980s have been blind to the meanings that this aesthetic of extravagance may have for Jewish artists of the 80s.” [HALLEY, p. 28]

Halley might have been thinking, among many other candidates, about the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s Jewish curator of contemporary art, as did Lee Seldes, in 1979:

“Trendy Henry Geldzahler [is] the curator of the newly created, hotly debated contemporary arts department. His recent exhibition “New York Painting and Sculpture, 1940-1970,” had set a record for swish ostentation but engaged serious artists and scholars.” [SELDES, p. 5]

“Historically,” notes James Twitchell, “the modern museum has been the site of pitched battles for control, for social territory, for what modern criticism calls privileging.” [TWITCHELL, p. 214] Steadily, in recent decades, traditional
wealthy White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant control of major art institutions has been replaced by Jewish art philanthropy and their own attendant influence and control in shaping – or reshaping – the standards of value and aesthetics in the art world. “Jews significantly support ‘high culture’ in America,” notes Barry Kossim, “Their support of hospitals, museums, symphonies, and universities across the country now appear disproportionate not only to their numbers but also their proportion of the wealthy.” [KOSSIM, p. 26]

Jews have long been prominent in the institutionalized art world, as both formal, public directors and powerful behind-the-scenes “philanthropists”. George Blumental, for example, headed (1933-1941) New York’s influential Metropolitan Museum, as did Thomas Hoving (son of the chairman of Tiffany and Co.) beginning in 1967. Irene and Alice Lewisohn’s Museum of Costume Art merged with the Met in 1946. Michael Friedsam, Jules Bache, and Samuel Lewisohn were other prominent Met philanthropists in that era. “When Henry Geldzahler [the eventual director of the visual arts program of the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the New York City Commissioner on Cultural Affairs] … was brought to the Met as a junior curator of American art, James Rorimer [another Jewish Met director] advised him not to let the trustees know he was Jewish.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 71] “Following the precedents set by Geldzahler,” adds Goodman, “two Jews have since held the prized curatorship of modern art at the Metropolitan. The first was Thomas Hess, well known as an art critic and collector. He was the son-in-law of Edith Stern, a major patron of the New Orleans Art Museum, and daughter of Julius Rosenwald. Stern’s sister, Adele Levy, was a trustee of the Museum of Modern Art.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 72]

In 1969 Robert Lehman, a Vice-President, then the Chairman of the Board, and a Trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art for twenty years, willed to it his $100 million collection of Old Master paintings. “Bobby Lehman,” noted a friend after his death, “wanted his pyramid; with plate glass before the art works. See, Bobby, knew about Macys [Department Store]: the entrance is small, but the display windows are large … when you go to Macys, the pots and pans are in the basement and the Lanvin perfume is at the entrance. Art today is a kind of cultural cosmetic.” [BURNHAM, p. 173] By the mid-1980s one-fifth of the Museum’s Board of Trustees were Jewish, including former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, then CBS-chairman Laurence Tisch, and Mrs. Walter Annenberg. [CHRISTOPHER, p. 217] Wealthy Metropolitan Museum philanthropist Saul Steinberg even held his wedding reception at the museum, as did a member of the wealthy Tisch family. [CANTOR, p. 403]

In 1980, Frederic P. Rose, a real estate developer and former President of the New York United Jewish Appeal-Federation, was appointed to the Board of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. (“There’s more yikus [prestige] in being on the Met Board than in being on our own,” said a UJA-Federation official, “and a lot more clout.” [SILBERMAN, p. 215] Soon after, a friend and fellow Jewish real estate mogul, Harold D. Uris, donated $10 million to the Museum. “As a result,” says Charles Silberman, “the museum decided on a new focus for its fundraising drives. ‘Met Museum Aiming to Tap Real Estate Industry,’ a New York Times

In 1991 communications mogul Walter Annenberg willed his whole art collection – “one of the most valuable and highly sought-after in history” – to New York’s Metropolitan Museum. He also pledged a $10 million gift over a five year period to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. [MOMENT, p. 196] (Annenberg’s wife, Lenore, had been “chief of protocol” for the Reagan administration’s State Department. Renee Crown, wife of the Lester Crown who has controlled the General Dynamics weapons corporation, has served as the chair of the Women’s Board of the Lyric Opera of Chicago. [BAER, p. 210] By the early 1990s, other Jewish mass media barons like S. I. Newhouse of Advance, and Hollywood powerbroker Michael Ovitz, were on the board of trustees of the Met. “On one occasion in the 1990s,” notes Robert Slater, “[Ovitz] scoured [his 2,000 art] books in search of a suitable background for the advertisement that [his company Creative Artists Agency] produced for Coca-Cola. One advertisement, with Coca-Cola bottles falling out of the sky, was meant to be reminiscent of a René Magritte painting.” [SLATER, p. 161]

At the Met, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger (former publisher of the New York Times) eventually became its chairman. He oversaw an institution in which Jews, says George Goodman, “have enriched almost area of the Museum’s collections, including pre-Colombian ceramics (Nathan Cummings), African art (Klaus Perls), ancient Mediterranean and Middle Easter Art (Norbert Schimmel), Old Masters Paintings (Lore and Rudolph Heinemann), French decoration arts (Belle and Sol Linsky) modern European Art (Florence May Schoenborn), modern American art (Muriel Kallis Steinberg Newman; Edith and Milton Lowenthal), Indonesian bronzes (Samuel Eilenberg), and South and Southeast Asian Art (Enid Haupt and Lita Hazen, Walter Annenberg’s sisters).” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 73] Throughout the Met too, galleries, rooms, theatres, and gardens are named after Jewish sponsors including Iris and B. Gerald Cantor, Helene and Michael David-Weill, Lawrence and Barbara Fleishman, Howard Gilman, Leon Levy, Henry R. Kravis, Janice H. Levin, Carroll and Milton Petrie, Arthur, Mortimer, and Raymond Sacker, Laurence Tisch, and Ruth and Harold Uris. (Among the various Jewish curators at the Museum is Barbara Weinberg, head of American Paintings and Sculpture).

By the 1990s, across town, both vice-presidents of New York’s equally prestigious Museum of Modern Art were also Jewish – Ronald S. Lauder and Richard Salomon. (In 2001, another Jewish member of MOMA’s board, media mogul Si Newhouse, resigned after breaking MOMA’s ethical policy when he maneuvered to purchase a Picasso painting that was owned by the museum). [D’ARCY, D., 6-5-01] In 1995 Lauder – cosmetic heir and Eastern European media mogul – became chairman of the board; in 1997 he spent $50 million on a Cézanne painting for his private collection. (In 1988, after a stint as a Reagan-appointed ambassador to Austria, he was the subject of an Austrian parliamentary investigation for his purchase and export from that country 120 art works
worth more than $10 million. Lauder decried the investigation, saying that the “investigation is a politically motivated attempt to discredit him for expressing his views on anti-Semitism in Austria.” [PROTZMAN, p. 42] Aside from being a major donator to the right-wing Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu, and gobbling up a major share of the mass media system in Eastern Europe, this is the kind of man that today heads one of the most important museums in America:


“[Lauder] did a stint at the Pentagon beginning in 1983 and was an ambassador to Austria from 1986 to 1987, a job for which he was widely lambasted as being ineffectual. (ABC’s Ted Koppel once asked him to comment on reports he was considered ‘a laughingstock’ there, to which he tersely replied, ‘Thank you.’) – Wall Street Journal, [JERESKI, p. A10]

After spending $14 million to buy his way into the position of New York City’s mayor (and failing) in 1989, Richard Reeves wrote an Atlanta Journal Constitution editorial, saying:

“To me, Mr. Lauder stands as an advertisement for confiscatory inheritance taxes and another indictment of American campaign financing. His major claim to credibility – other than a declared net worth of $227 million – is a stint as the U.S. ambassador to Austria. He got that after raising money for Ronald Reagan.” [REEVES, p. A15]

In 1994, Ronald Lauder’s brother, Leonard, was named chairman of another New York City cultural monument, the prestigious Whitney Museum of American Art. (David Ross director of that museum since 1991, became head of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art in 1998. Adam Weinberg is the Whitney’s Curator of Permanent Collections.) In the early 1990s the Museum of Modern Art wanted to buy the building next door, the Dorset Hotel. The key to its successful acquisition was MOCA (another Jewish) board member Jerry Speyer who “had known the owner, Sol Goldman, for years, and he know Goldman’s children, who inherited the building on their father’s death.” [TRAUB, p. 67]

Also in New York, the prominent Jewish Guggenheim family founded the Guggenheim Museum (1998 president: Jewish corporate raider Ronald Perelman), as well as the prestigious humanities foundation that bears their name. By the 1980s, four of the ten board members that dole out the MacArthur Foundation “genius awards” were also Jewish; two Jews also sat on the board of the Russell Sage Foundation. [CHRISTOPHER, p. 121] The Kaplan Fund has also had an important impact on the art community in divvying out awards. One of J. M. Kaplan’s daughters was married to a prominent artist, another was the Chairman of the New York State Arts Council. [KREFETZ, p. 153]

Jewish dominance in 1990s New York also continues with Ellen Futter (President of the American Museum of Natural History), Betsy Gotbaum (Di-
rector of the New York Historical Society), Susan Soros (Director of the Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, David Ross (Director of the Whitney Museum of Art), Cornell Capa (until recent retirement, the chief officer at the International Center for Photography), and Mark Rosenthal (Senior Curator at the Guggenheim Museum).

Up the Hudson Valley, a bit out of Manhattan, in smaller communities, the New York Times noted in 1997 that

“At the Performing Arts Center at Purchase College, bar mitzvahs ease the unrelenting financial crunch. In Yonkers, at the Hudson River Museum, there are weddings after the public leaves. And in Katonah at the Caramoor Center for Music and Find Arts, Jewish High Holy Day services pay the way.” [BRENNER, SEC. 14, p. 1]

Two Wall Street Journal reporters noted a “private party” held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in the 1980s:

“Outside the Metropolitan Museum that blustery September evening, there was all the anticipation of a Hollywood opening. Through a phalanx of photographers and reporters the cream of New York society hustled outside, the ladies clutching their hair against the wind, the men dapper in tuxedos, flashing invitations by one account ‘as stiff as sheet-rock.’ In went the Saul Steinbergs, Carol and Punch Sulzberger of the New York Times, Jonathan and Laura Tisch, and a hundred others. Few even in this social stratum had the connections to throw a private party at the museum, but greeting their guests inside the wrought-iron gates of its Medieval Court was a couple who had muscled their way in with a $10 million donation: Henry Kravis and his stunning, fashion-designer wife, Carolyne Roehm.” [BURROUGH/HELYAR, p. 128] [All the men mentioned are Jewish]

At New York University, the art department is called the “Tisch School of the Arts.” The philanthropist it is named after, Laurence Tisch, “does not hide his affection for Israel, even when it costs him money. Thus, for example, when Israeli ministers stay at the Regency Hotel [in New York], owned by the Tisch-controlled Loews Corporation, they receive a significant discount.” [HANDWERKER]

Going to Carnegie Hall? You’ll probably be sitting in the recital hall named after Sanford I. Weill, the Jewish chairman and co-chief of Citigroup. Weill gave a large sum of money to them music center in 1983. He is also the current Chairman of the Board of Carnegie Hall. [NEW YORK TIMES, Weill, p. 10]

In Los Angeles, the most important mover behind the creation of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art was a Jewish industrialist, Norton Simon (among his economic holdings is Hunt Foods). Three separate museum buildings were constructed, two of the three named after a Jewish benefactor: Howard Abrahamson, Armand Hammer, and Leo Bing (funded by his wife Anna in his memory). The first chairman of the LACMA board of trustees was also Jewish, Sidney Brody. Eli Broad, another eventual chairman, was once listed by ArtNews to be (with his wife) the most important art collector in the
world. (He is the chairman and CEO of SunAmerica). Erica Feinblatt was the curator of prints and drawings; Maurice Tuchman became the curator of modern art. An assistant to Tuchman was Stephanie Barron. “As a Jew,” notes George Goodman, “she was also attracted to avant-garde works considered ‘degenerate’ by the Nazis.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 135] In 1984, Barron married a LACMA (Jewish) trustee, Robert Gore Rifkind.

Early Jewish donors of important art or large sums of money to LACMA included Joan Palevsky (who purchased for the museum the 650 objects in the Heermaneck Collection of Islamic Art), B. Gerald and Iris Canter (owners of the largest collection of Rodin sculptures in the world; New York’s Metropolitan Museum has four galleries named after these philanthropists), Philip Berg, Hans Cohn, and Arthur Gilbert, among others. In 1997 Bernard Lewin, a furniture store owner, later art dealer, and “one of the world’s preeminent collectors of modern Mexican artists,” [JOHNSON, R., p. N1] willed his $25 million Mexican art collection to LACMA upon his death. The Los Angeles Times noted an exhibition of Lewin’s collection at a public gallery three years earlier, curated by a Jewish academic in Latin American studies, Shifra Goldman:

“When a museum show consists entirely of works that are for sale at one commercial gallery [as this one is] …. disappointment gives way to disgust … When Lewin … decided to limit the scope of this show to the stuff he’d like to sell, the die was cast … [Nothing] can redeem such a colossal commercial-cum-vanity showcase.” [CURTIS, p. F1]

In 1974 Richard Sherwood (a member of the local American Jewish Committee) became the LACMA president. Further Jewish donators to the museum included David Lowe, Armand Deutsch, Michael and Dorothy Blankfort, Nathan Smooke, Philip and Beatrice Gersh, Stanley and Ellise Gringstein, Max and Ellen Palevsky, Robert Halff, Betty Asher (“formerly an assistant to Maurice Tuchman,” now an art dealer), Felix and Helen Juda, Frederic and Marcia Weisman (sister of Norton Simon), Lucille Ellis (Norton Simon’s first wife), Bernard Levin (a dealer), and Douglas Cramer (a television mogul).

In later years, Micheal Shapiro, a curator at the St. Louis Art Museum was chosen to head LACMA. “It would have been newsworthy for the County Museum to hire a woman, an African-American, an Asian, or a Hispanic, “says Jewish commentator George Goodman, “but few points would be scored [publicly] for hiring a Jewish director [this was, after all, the norm]. Nevertheless, the board members turned to Michael Shapiro. Shapiro’s selection must have been intended to impress Jewish donors of the museum.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 135]

When Shapiro left, he was replaced by Andrea Rich in 1995. Rich had formally been the Executive Vice Chancellor of UCLA. As Goodman noted it in his article in Modern Judaism about what he calls the “Jewish Art Elite”:

“For its first [combined] president and chief executive officer, LACMA’s trustees made a startling decision, hiring Andrea Rich … A specialist in communications and planning, she had never worked for an arts organization and was not even a dues-paying member of the museum. Ms. Rich is Jewish, however.” [GOODMAN, p. 136]
In 1999, Rich also raised eyebrows by becoming – along with her other administrative posts – the **director** of the museum.

Elsewhere in southern California, other Jews were active in a virtual lock on important directorships in the art world. Aby Sher hired architect Frank Gehry (a fellow Jew) to build the **Santa Monica Museum of Art**. Edith Wylie even established the **Craft and Folk Art Museum** across from LACMA. In 1979 a number of prominent Jewish collectors including Marcia Weissman (who also donated $3 million to the now-called **Weissman Art Museum** at the University of Minnesota, as well as other funds to **Minneapolis Walker Art Center**) Eli Broad, Philip and Beatrice Gersh, Lenore Greenberg, Frederick Nichols, and Max Palevsky broke off from the **Los Angeles County Museum of Art** to form the **Museum of Contemporary Art** (MOCA). Today’s president of MOCA [1998] is, of course, Jewish: Audrey Irmas. “Although [Director Richard] Koshalek deserves much of the credit for MOCA’s success,” says George Goodman, “he has several talented associates, among whom were the Jews Sherri Geldin, an administrator, and Paul Schimmel, previously a curator at southern California’s **Newport Harbor Art Museum**.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 139] Note-worthy Jewish philanthropy to MOCA includes that of Barry Lowen, Marcia Weissman, and Taft and Rita Schreiber.

David Leventhal (of the **Los Angeles Times**) also serves as the current Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the **Museum of Contemporary Art** (MOCA). In 1996 MOCA’s “Temporary Contemporary” branch was renamed the “Geffen Contemporary” after a $5 million donation from media mogul David Geffen. Earlier, another $5 million gift had changed the Westwood Playhouse theatre near UCLA to the “**Geffen Playhouse**.” The head of the Geffen Playhouse, Gilbert Cates, is also Jewish. He also “produces the Academy Awards programs and [he] put together the local Israel 50th anniversary celebration.” [TUGEND, 10-22-99]

“Most people, I’d say 90% of donors want recognition of some sort,” remarked Eli Broad, trustee of both the **Los Angeles County Museum of Art** and the **Museum of Contemporary Art**, which has its own “Eli and Edythe Broad Reception Hall.” [MUCHNIC, S, p. F1, 5] “For better or for worse,” says Jewish critic George Goodman, “the museum world is full of – and to a large degree formed by – prima donnas. Collectors such as [early Jewish philanthropists] Blumenthal and Lehman wanted wings and galleries bearing their names. In recent years, however, a growing number of Jewish collectors have let their egos run wild.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 147]

Rich Jewish businessmen with enormous art hoards have also created major museums and named them after themselves in Los Angeles to house their collections: the **Norton Simon Museum** (the Simon’s board of trustees “was led by Jennifer Jones, his second wife, and other relatives”) [GOODMAN, #2, p. 147] and the **Armand Hammer Cultural Center**, respectively. “The boondoggle of the Hammer Cultural Center – within a lifetime of **Armand Hammer’s** fraud and deception,” notes George Goodman, “is … documented in Edward Epstein’s biography of Hammer.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 141] [See also Carl Blu-
“was one of the great frauds of the 20th century … The sordid details of his astonishing life [are those of] myth, fakery, and deceit …. [He was] a ruthless charlatan who bullied and betrayed his way to an imposing reputation as billionaire patron of the arts with a long list of powerful friends … [Epstein] also details the brazen forgery that helped build Hammer’s extensive art collection. One benefit of the tycoon’s Russian connection was an official Faberge stamp, given to him in Moscow, which he used to authenticate fake Imperial jeweled eggs.” [ALLEN-MILLS]

Hammer set up the L’Hermitage Gallery, selling Russian art, in New York City in 1925. Years later he later purchased 75% interest in M. Knoedler and Company, “America’s oldest art gallery.” His partner in the business was also Jewish, Maury Leibovitz. [EPSTEIN, 1996, p. 126, 293] In later years, a freelance writer, Martha Kaufman, became Hammer’s mistress. Wearing wigs to hinder recognition by Hammer’s wife, she also became the curator of Hammer’s art collection and eventually the Director of the Armand Hammer Museum of Art and Cultural Center. [EPSTEIN, photo section]

After Hammer’s death, various family members filed lawsuits against each other for parts of the patriarch’s art collection. Others came to court too: “Occidental Petroleum [Hammer’s company] stockholders were outraged at the squandering of company assets [for Hammer’s personal art collection] which they claimed totaled $95 million.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 141] Hammer also, notes Elliot Horowitz, “identified himself … falsely as a Unitarian Protestant throughout most of his life, even after becoming the CEO of Occidental Petroleum … Later he became a great friend of the state of Israel.” [HOROWITZ, E., Too, p. 196] He was once received the Golda Meir “Man of the Year Award” at an Israeli Bonds banquet. [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 416] (In 1987 he even flew Soviet Jewish dissident/refusenik Ida Nudel on his personal jet to Israel.) [NUDEL, I., 1990, p. 301-302]

Hammer also has a wing named after him and his wife at the Los Angeles County Art Museum. [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 436] At his own museum, the chiseling of his name in marble alone cost $75,000, the “Armand Hammer Fireplace” cost $25,000, and the marble floors cost $1 million. [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 454] In downtown Los Angeles, the Mark Taper Forum in the Los Angeles Music Center is named for wealthy Jewish patron S. Mark Taper. (Gordon Davidson, the current artistic director of the Taper/Ahmanson Theatre, is also Jewish). A few miles north, the Pepperdine University Art Museum in Malibu was renamed the Frederick R. Weissman Museum of Art in 1992 after his gift of $1.5 million. (The University of Minnesota also has an art museum named after Weissman; the San Diego Museum of Art and the New Orleans Museum of Art also contain “gallery complexes” that bear his name). Another southern California Jewish philanthropist, Mandell Weiss, was the main patron behind San Diego’s Mandel Weiss Forum. With city public arts cutbacks, in 1993 Leah Goodwin lost her executive director job at San Diego’s Public Arts Advisory
Council. [TUREGANO, P., 9-30-93, p. E12] Also in San Diego, Mathew Strauss and his wife Iris organized Art Pac, a lobbying group for government funding to the arts. [TUREGANO, P. 2-13-95, p. D1] Phyllis Epstein, former chairman of the San Diego Center for Jewish Culture, was appointed to be a member of the California Council for the Arts in 1999. [JONES, W., 12-14-99, p. E14] State senator Adam Schiff, also Jewish, is chairman of California’s Joint Committee on the Arts. [CITY NEWS SERVICE, 1-6-98]

In 1999 Glorya Kaufman donated $18 million to renovate UCLA’s old Dance Building, now to be called Glorya Kaufman Hall. It was the largest arts-oriented donation in University of California history. Among those proclaiming public thanks was Daniel Neuman, Dean of UCLA’s Art and Architecture School. (In earlier years, MCA’s mafia-linked Hollywood mogul Jules Stein also founded UCLA’s giant ostentatious medical wing, the Jules Stein Eye Institute). In 2000, Jewish businessman Eli Broad topped Kaufman, donating $20 million to UCLA’s art department. The Dickson Art Center was to be renamed the Eli Broad Center.

After donating an undisclosed sum to the Orange County Performing Arts Center in metropolitan Los Angeles, Henry Samueli became a member of its Board of Directors. Samueli and his wife also gave $50 million to the UCLA and University of California at Irvine Engineering departments. “In exchange for the gifts,” noted the Los Angeles Times in 1999, “the highly ranked UCLA School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and UCI’s School of Engineering will bear Samueli’s name.” [CONWAY, A., 4-13-99, p. E1] Earlier, in 1987, another Jewish mogul, Harvey Stearn resigned as the Orange County Performing Arts Chairman of the Board; he remained chairman of the California Arts Council. That same year Leonard Shaine, “philanthropist long active in community and Jewish causes,” was added to Orange County art center’s Board. [JALAN, A., 8-21-87, p. 1] Jewish real estate mogul Walter Shorenstein “founded the Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Policy at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government.” [MOTHER JONES, 3-5-01]

From Texas in 1998, prominent Dallas art collector and real estate mogul Raymond Nasher donated $7.5 million to his alma mater, Duke University. The Duke University Art Museum would be moved to a new building, to be known as the Nasher Museum of Art. [DUKE, 11-98] In Austin, Texas, Mort and Angela Topfer “have pledged millions to the Austin Museum of Art, the Dell Jewish Community Center Campus and other charitable projects.” [BARNES, M., 6-17-99, p. B1] Likewise, Jewish real estate developer John Price donated $7 million to the Museum of Fine Arts at his alma mater, the University of Utah (Price’s JP Realty offices hold “one of the largest collections of Depression era lithographs in the country.”) [KNUDSON, M., 3-23-97] In Omaha, Nebraska, Mort Richards was once president of Performing Arts Omaha. He also served as the top official for other local organizations, including the Downtown Rotary Club. “In 1978, he received the State of Israel’s’ 30th anniversary award.” [1-14-2000, p. 1]

Even the renowned Getty Museum, founded with funds from the non-Jewish oil mogul, J. Paul Getty (and with $4 billion to play with, the richest mu-
seum on earth) has consistently had Jews at the economic helm. In 1998, after 17 years, Harold Williams left the presidency of the J. Paul Getty Trust. Williams, notes George Goodman, was “raised in a Labor Zionist home in East Los Angeles.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 142] Williams had earlier retired as Norton Simon Inc.’s chairman of the board at age 42. He later served as the Dean of UCLA’s Graduate School of Business and Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the President Carter administration.

The new president of the J. Paul Getty Trust is another Jewish administrator, Barry Munitz, formerly the chancellor of both the California State University system and the University of Houston. Munitz’s “current project,” says Goodman, “is the renovation and expansion of the [Getty branch] in Malibu, which will open in 2001 … The collections donated by Lawrence and Barbara Fleishman will be one of the highlights.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 144] The new Getty Center opened in 1998, designed by Jewish architect Richard Meier and built at a cost of $1 billion. Earlier, George Goldner had “launched the Getty’s drawing collection.” He later became the Getty curator of paintings and the curator of prints and drawings at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. He was succeeded at the Getty by David Jaffe, a Jew born in England, and formerly of the National Gallery of Australia. (Even the president and CEO of the Getty Petroleum Corporation is Jewish, Leo Liebowitz; in 1993 he was charged by journalist Robert Friedman with being in cahoots in a tax cheating scam with a chief in the “Russian Mafia.” [NATIONAL PETROLEUM, p. 20])

“In Baltimore, Miami, Atlanta, and a host of other cities,” says Charles Silberman, “cultural institutions are increasingly dependent on Jewish support.” [SILBERMAN, p. 214-215] In Miami, for example, Jews were the “creators of the New World Symphony and the Miami City Ballet.” [HURIASH, L., 2-15-99, p. B3] Joseph Meyeroff donated $10 million to the Baltimore Symphony hall, half its cost. [CHRISTOPHER, p. 214] Also in Baltimore, Robert Bergman became the director of the prominent Walters Art Museum in 1981. In his first decade he oversaw a $6 million museum renovation. Half a dozen wealthy Jews “have been among the Walters’ most generous donors.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 123] “Some eyebrows,” says Jewish author George Goodman,

“may have been raised at the awareness of Baltimore’s Jewish ‘Art Mafia.’ At the time, Arnold Lehman was director of the Baltimore Museum of Art, Sergio Commissiona was music director of the Baltimore Symphony (in Meyerhoff Hall), and Frederick Lazarus IV, an arts administrator, was president of the Maryland Institute College of Art. Also, Herbert Kessler, a medievalist …, chaired the well-regarded art history department at John Hopkins [University].” [GOODMAN, #1, p. 123]

By 1993, Director Bergman, by now the president of the Association of Art Museum Directors, became director of the Cleveland Museum of Fine Arts. Bergman was replaced at the Walters Museum by another Jewish administrator, Gary Vikan.
Across town, at the Baltimore Museum of Art, Florence Levy was the museum’s first director; Gertrude Rosenthal was for decades the chief curator. Goodman notes that:

“When he was appointed the [Baltimore Museum of Art] director in 1971, at thirty-five years of age, Tom L. Freudenheim became one of the nation’s most visible Jewish museum professionals. Though secure in his identity as a Reform Jew and a Zionist, he did not seek recognition as a trailblazer. Indeed, he was somewhat puzzled as to why the Museum’s Board sought a Jewish director, especially one with such obvious Jewish credentials. [GOODMAN, #2, p.129]

Perhaps Freudenheim needed only to look at the Museum’s treasury for a solution to this puzzle. Prominent Jewish donors to his Baltimore museum included Helen and Abraham Eisenberg, Jacob Epstein, Julius Levy, Alan and Janet Wurtzberg, Robert and Ryda Levi, and Sadie May. The Museum’s Etta Claribel Cone collection included over 3,000 pieces of art, including paintings by Renoir, Matisse, Van Gogh, Cézanne, and Gauguin. Freudenheim’s other credentials for his post included internships under prominent Jewish art custodians E. H. Gombrich, Panofsky, Ettinghausen, Alan Solomon of the Jewish Museum in New York, and Peter Selz, a curator at the Museum of Modern Art.

When Freudenheim eventually left the Baltimore Museum, he was replaced by another Jewish director, Arnold Lehman, a grandson of a founder of the Gimbel’s department store. Lehman eventually became director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and later the Brooklyn Museum. Like Bergman, Lehman has also been president of the Association of Art Directors.

When Lehman eventually left the Baltimore Museum, he was predictably replaced by yet another Jewish director, Doreen Bolger, whose credentials include museum directorships in Texas and Rhode Island (the largest gift to the Rhode Island museum she directed was from the Jewish benefactors Leonard and Paul Granoff).

Also in Baltimore is the American Visionary Art Museum, founded and directed by yet another Jewish powerbroker, Rebecca Hoffman (formerly a development officer for the Associated Jewish Charities). AVAM’s largest benefactor, of course, has been Jewish: Zanvyl Krieger. “Hoffberger,” notes George Goodman, “remains active as a volunteer in Jewish organizations, and [is] devoted to Torah study.” [GOODMAN, #2, p. 132]

In nearby Washington DC, by 1998 Jews in the upper ranks of the art world establishment included I. Michael Hegman (Secretary, “or Chief Administrator”) of the Smithsonian Museum, real estate mogul Robert Smith (President of the National Gallery of Art), Allen Shestack (Deputy Director of the National Gallery of Art), Neil Ben Ezra (Chief Curator of the Hirshhorn Museum, where fellow Jew Stephen Weil recently retired as Deputy Director), David Levy (Director of the Corcoran Gallery — his wife is a Vice President at PBS broadcasting), and Stephen Ostrow (Curator of Prints and Drawings at the Library of Congress). Years ago, collector Joseph Hirshhorn’s 6,000 art works were donated towards the creation of the Hirshhorn Museum. (Hirshhorn made most
of his fortune in uranium mining). Jewish mogul Arthur Sackler’s wing at the Smithsonian is the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, featuring Asian and Near Eastern art. Sackler’s collection, noted one curator, is ‘by far the largest and most important collection of ancient Chinese art in the world.’ [GLUECK, G., p. B8]

Years ago, Jewish collector Joseph Hirshhorn’s 6,000 art works were donated towards the creation of the Hirshhorn Museum. (Hirshhorn made most of his fortune in uranium mining).

Karl Meyer notes the context for the building (in 1974) of the Hirshhorn Museum – so prominent on the Washington Mall – as a government institution:

“The federal government was to pay the expenses of building a museum bearing Hirshhorn’s name; the design of the museum was to be subject to Hirshorn’s approval, with the title to the art passing to the government only upon completion of the project; a ten-member governing board was to be established, half of whose members would be nominated by Hirshhorn, who also would nominate the director; and Hirshhorn would not be required to supply an endowment to help meet future operating expenses … These terms aroused considerable disquiet in the museum world, in good part because they were likely to encourage other donors to demand equally one-sided arrangements.” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 49-50]

(Hirshhorn’s choice for the museum director position was Abram Lerner). [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 51]

As Sherman Lee, director of the Cleveland Museum of Art, protested in 1966:

“It is a mistake to accept a collection of contemporary art formed by one man and to use a large sum of money to house and administer such a collection. If at least ten million dollars is available for a building to bear, not the nation’s name, but that of a donor, sufficient funds aught to be available to set about the formation of a truly catholic and articulated national collection housed in a building bearing the collective name of all the people. Such a collection is already begun in the National Collection of Fine Arts, now bypassed by this proposed action.” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 50]

In the midst of the controversy over the Hirshhorn museum, Washington newspaper columnist Jack Anderson “reported that Hirshhorn had been in legal trouble years earlier over alleged currency smuggling and stock manipulation.” [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 50]

A highlight exhibition for 1988 at Washington’s Capital Children’s Museum (founder and director: Ann Lewin) was its Holocaust show. “The visiting children,” noted the Washington Post, “who are held to groups of 30, sit on the floor in an intimate room and are told the story of the Holocaust through a video narrated by a child. A dialogue, led by especially trained docents, some of them Holocaust survivors, follows.” [GAMAREKIAN, p. B7] “[Lewin’s] exhibit about the Holocaust, Remember the Children,,” noted the Post years later, “has
traveled around the country and partly inspired the permanent children’s exhibit at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.” [KASTOR, p. B1]

A highlight exhibition for 1988 at Washington’s Capital Children’s Museum (founder and director: Ann Lewin) was its Holocaust show. “The visiting children,” noted the Washington Post, “who are held to groups of 30, sit on the floor in an intimate room and are told the story of the Holocaust through a video narrated by a child. A dialogue, led by especially trained docents, some of them Holocaust survivors, follows.” [GAMAREKIAN, p. B7] “[Lewin’s] exhibit about the Holocaust, Remember the Children, “ noted the Post years later, “has traveled around the country and partly inspired the permanent children’s exhibit at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.” [KASTOR, p. B1]

By the 1970s Stanley Marcus (of Nieman-Marcus luxury store fame) was the Director of the Dallas Symphony Society, an Advisory Director of the Fort Worth Art Museum, a Trustee for the Public Television Foundation for North Texas, and even a Trustee of Southern Methodist University. Another Marcus, Richard, was on the board of the directors of the Dallas Theatre Center, the Dallas Council of World Affairs, and Assemblage, an organization of the wealthy who are interested in the arts. [COEVER, p. 123]

In 1993, the Director of the Milwaukee Art Center noted in an art catalogue that

“since 1957 … the Jewish community has been central to the development of the [Milwaukee] institution … The list of members of the Jewish community who have been monetary supporters of the museum would be too long to elaborate here, as would the many members of the Museum’s Board of Trustees, presidents and officers of that board’s committee, and support group members, and volunteers.” [BOWMAN, p. 1]

In Detroit, prominent Jewish philanthropist/entrepreneurs include financier Max Fisher, Eugen Appelbaum (founder of Arbor Drugs), Sam Franiel (a real estate baron), and international glass magnate William Davidson. Davidson also owns the Pine Knob Music Theatre and the Palace of Auburn Hills, the two most popular music concert venues in the area. His companies also manage the Meadowbrook Music Festival. In Denver, Colorado, Barry Hirshfeld is “past board chairman of the Denver Art Museum.” [PR NEWSWIRE, 3-21-96]

In Canada, Avie Bennett is (1992) vice president of the National Ballet of Canada; Judith Loeb Cohen became president of that organization in 1988. Louis Applebaum headed the Ontario Arts Council from 1971-1980, and was appointed in 1979 to “co-chair a federal review of Canada’s cultural policy; he also helped raise funds for the National Arts Center Orchestra and served three years as its chairman. [CSILLAG, R., 5-4-2000, p. 6] In 1999 Peter Herrndorf, a baptized Jew, was named as the chairman and CEO of the National Arts Center. Garth Drabinsky (until recent financial scandals) owned the Pantages Theatre and also managed and operated the $50-million North York Performing Arts Center. In 2000, a pair of Jewish brothers “were named to head two of the most important government-owned cultural institutions in the country
[Canada].” Victor Rabinovitch became president of the **Canadian Museum of Civilization Corp.**, “the country’s largest and busiest museum.” (His brother, Robert, became president of the **Canadian Broadcasting Corporation**). Victor has also been on the Board of Directors for the Ottawa Jewish Community Center. [GORDON, S., 11-30-01]

In Australia, Graeme Samuel became Chairman of the **Australian Opera** in 1996. Peter Redlich retired from the chairmanship of the **Victorian Arts Center** in 1994, the same year that Nathan Waks became director of music at **ABC** (Australian Broadcasting Company). [SINGER/SELDIN, 1995, p. 359]

In England, the current director of the **Tate Gallery** (one of that country’s most important museums with 2.2 million visitors a year) is also Jewish: Nicholas Serota. In a 1995 obituary to another prominent Jewish businessman, (Lord) Aby Goodman, the **Times** (of London) noted that, “Not content with being the chairman of the trusts for both the **Observer** and the **Jewish Chronicle**, he was at the same time Chairman of the Newspaper Publishers Association; hardly as he finished his second year term as Chairman of the Art Council than he popped up again as Chairman of the **British Council**.” [HOWARD, A., 1-19-99] In his lifetime he was also Chairman of the **English National Opera**, president of the **National Book League**, Director of the **Royal Opera** at Covent Garden, and a governor of the **Royal Shakespeare Theatre**. [BOGGAM, S., 1018-99, p. 4]

“Glance at the names of board members of major contributors [in Great Britain] to such institutions as the **National Theatre** and **Covent Garden**,” suggests Jewish observer **Stephen Brook**,

“and the large proportion of Jewish individuals and organizations will be apparent. Jonathan Miller … argues that Jews mostly support only the most prestigious institutions … That I think reflects not so much a commitment to the arts as a commitment to getting a place in the British establishment. It’s a short cut. You can buy your way into the centre of the Establishment. I think it’s rather pathetic.” [BROOK, p. 326]

An example of this is England’s Arnold Goodman, a Jewish mogul who died in 1999. Goodman, notes the **Financial Times** of London,

“became successively or concurrently: chairman of **British Lion Films**, the [London] **Observer**, the **Newspaper Proprietors’ Association**, the Committee of Inquiry into Charity Law, the **Arts Council**, the **Committee on London Orchestras**, the **Housing Corporation**, and the **National Building Agency**.” [He was also the Director of the **Royal Opera House** and president of the **Theatrical Advisory Committee**]. [FINANCIAL TIMES, 10-16-99, p. 4]

Corrupt Jewish early 20th century art dealer “Lord” Joseph Duveen also was a philanthropist to British art causes. Duveen

“underwrote the construction costs of entire galleries at the **British Museum**, the Tate Gallery, the National Gallery, and the National Portrait Gallery in London. (His generosity nonetheless piqued Osbert Sitwell to demure: ‘It is an ironical reflection that while Lord Duveen’s magnificent gifts to the nation stand as a memorial to his name, much
of the money that paid for them was earned by the sale to the United States of the flower of eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century English paintings. We have the galleries now, but no pictures to hang in them.”) [MEYER, K., 1979, p. 180-181]

In Cleveland, Richard Bogomolny’s $3 million gift to the Cleveland Orchestra – the largest ever – secured his position as president of the Board of the Musical Arts Association, the group that controls the orchestra. In Seattle, a new symphony venue is called Benaroya Hall, named in honor of the Jewish Benaroya family’s benevolence to the arts. Also in Seattle, “megadonor” Samuel Strom (major philanthropist of the Strom Jewish Community Center, on Mercer Island) “headed the capital campaign” for the Henry Art Gallery. (Strom is also Chairman of the Seattle Symphony Board and a regent at the University of Washington). [BARGREEN, M., 4-27-97, p. N9] In Washington DC, Lessing Rosenwald donated a major collection of graphic art to the National Gallery. In Atlanta, Georgia, Ned Rifkind directed the High Museum until he moved to Houston to head the Menil Collection in 2001. Even in the hinterlands, in San Antonio, Texas, a museum director noted in 1964 that “the vast majority of [art] collectors are Jewish.” [BRENNER, p. 323]

Even in a place like San Luis Obispo, California, Chris Cohan [owner of professional basketball’s Golden State Warriors and Sonic Communications, a TV station conglomeration] “was a central figure in the building of San Luis Obispo’s Performing Arts Center, donating $2.1 million and enduring a rash of bad publicity in a dispute over whether or not it would bear his name.” [LYONS, ONLINE] In Anchorage, Alaska, the “Sydney Laurence Theatre” is part of the Alaska Center for Performing Arts. [ANCHORAGE DAILY NEWS, 3-29-99, p. 2D] In the same genre, in Poland, Zygmunt Nissenbaum planned to provide funds to “renovate the monument to the Warsaw Ghetto uprising and affix a plaque with his name on it” at the site, a narcissistic idea which was “roundly rejected by most Jewish leaders.” [WEINBAUM, L., p. 27]

As James Yaffe noted in 1968:

“Less than 1 percent of all contributors to Jewish charity are anonymous. Donors not only like to have their names known, but immortalized. To satisfy this desire many organizations have adopted the practice of naming things after people. Hospitals give contributors’ names to everything from new wings to new oxygen tents. Brandeis University has a Jewish name attached to nearly every building on campus. The Israelis refer to the United States as Plaquistan.” [YAFFE, J. 1968, p. 175]

Howard Jacobson recounts his amazement about the wealthy Jewish donor name game while visiting the University of Judaism in Los Angeles:

“A list of the university’s founders is done in gold lettering on marble tablets in the hall of what is the SYLVIA AND DAVID WEISZ EDUCATION WING, which is itself, as I understand it, part of the SHIRLEY AND ARTHUR WHIZIN center, (dedicated to the JEWISH FUTURE), which is in turn, as I further understand it, is housed within the WILLIAM AND FRIEDA FINGERHUT ACADEMIC BUILDING, a sub-
branch of NORMAN AND SADIE LEE COLLEGE. To get from SYLVIA AND DAVID’S WING to the BESS AND ALEXANDER L. BERG DINING CENTER (fed, incidentally, by a kitchen dedicated to the memory of CELIA AND MORRIS I. PELLOW BY THEIR CHILDREN JUDITH AND LOUIS), you have to negotiate the ELIE J. AND RACHEL GINDI ENTRY PLAZA AND LOBBY.” [JACOBSON, H., 1995, p. 191-192]

In Boston, like anywhere else, censorship of art works and ideas is usually easily disguised via the rejection of artworks for completely subjective and nebulous “aesthetic reasons.” And, of course, there is self-censorship by those who dare not offend those who economically control – and legislate “philanthropic” power – in the art world. An overt case of Jewish manipulation, however, occurred in 1991 when Steve Grossman, a Jewish board member of Boston's Institute of Contemporary Art, resigned in protest of an ICA curatorial decision to show a series of films by Palestinian filmmakers. The Anti-Defamation League soon became embroiled in the matter, as well as high-profile Jewish lawyer Alan Dershowitz, forcing the Museum to present a concurrent screening of Israeli films, as well as an “educational forum” to address the Palestinian film's “political context, not artistic merit.”

The injustice of the ICA decision to fall to Jewish pressure was not lost even to the curator of the Israeli film show, Ela Chohat, who said: “Can you imagine a program on black cinema where someone resigns if they don’t have a white perspective?” [HARTIGAN, p. 75-76] (Balance me apartheid,” says filmmaker Tom Hayes, about his own experiences with Jewish demands to weld their pro-Israel political opinions into any public expression of the Palestinian point of view, “or the Cheyenne, or the Japanese-Americans’ experience during World War II, the slave’s tales with the slave owners.” [HAYES, p. 6] “At any rate,” noted the Boston Globe, “the upcoming Palestinian series prompted Grossman’s resignation, which raised questions about the role of a board of directors in programming.” [HARTIGAN, p. 75-76]

Likewise in Boston, in 1982, prominent British actress Vanessa Redgrave – known for her sympathy to Palestinian causes – was commissioned to narrate an oratorio for the Boston Symphony Orchestra. She was ultimately fired. As Lenni Brenner notes:

“A key role in the dismissal [of Redgrave] was played by Irving Rabb, a leading figure in Boston’s Jewish establishment, and a member of the Symphony’s board of trustees.” [BRENNER, p. 331]

(Redgrave sued, with the support of a variety of free speech organizations. She won what she would have been paid for the narration, but a federal judge ruled that she wasn't entitled to damages. And she also had to pay court costs).

Blatant censorship and/or information manipulation takes other forms of course. In New York, for example, in 1971 political artist Hans Haacke had his scheduled exhibition cancelled by the Director of the Guggenheim Museum, Thomas Messer. The curator for Haacke’s show was then fired. Haacke’s “art” show was a public revelation of the various slumlords on the Museum’s Board of Directors. The New York Times noted that
“One of the real estate pieces that upset the Guggenheim [was] a deadpan photo documentation of 142 mostly grubby buildings – many in Harlem and on the Lower East side – owned by [Jewish mogul] Harry Shapolsky and associates, a major holder of minor properties in the city.” [GLUECK, #2, p. 27]

The Guggenheim Museum, declared its director, “was not the proper place in which to expose slumlords.” [GLUECK, #2, p. 27]

In Montreal, Canada, in 1972 Jewish pressure “forced the Saidye Bronfman Center to cancel a production [of the play] The Man in the Glass Booth by Robert Shaw, a play about Adolf Eichman that had been performed, without outcry, in Israel itself.” [PARIS, E., p. 99] In Canada, Jewish organizations decided the play was anti-Semitic. Two years later “the same kind of pressure obliged the Saidye Bronfman Center to cancel another event [An Evening with Dudley Kravitz].” [PARIS, E., p. 101] At the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts there’s a performing hall named after Jewish real estate mogul Max Cummings. [EISENTHAL, B., 5-24-01]

Elsewhere in the rolls of Jewish art patrons, in Fort Worth, Texas, prominent philanthropist Rosalyn Rosenthal is on the board of the Forth Worth Opera Association and she is a founder of the Nancy Lee and Perry R. Bass Performance Hall. More curiously, she endowed the E.M. and Rosalyn Rosenthal Chair in Jewish Studies at Texas Christian University’s Brite Divinity School.

Many Jewish art moguls also have some very politically-minded philanthropic interests. In Dallas, Stephen Felder Black was for two terms the president of the Dallas Symphony and a board member of the Dallas Chamber Orchestra. He was also, noted the Dallas Morning News in 1996,

“devoted to disseminating information about Israel … Earlier this year, Mr. Block worked to raise money so the Dallas Symphony Chorus could perform in Israel …. At his funeral Monday, 40 members of the symphony chorus sang the Israeli national anthem … At the time of his death, Mr. Black was chairman of the Israel Commission of the Jewish Community Relations Council and on the organization’s national board.” [SIMNACHER, p. 18A]

Another mogul/philanthropist, Joseph Meyerhoff, until he died in 1995, was extremely active in the art circles of Baltimore. But, notes the Baltimore Sun,

“If you think Meyerhoff is a prominent name in Baltimore, you should go to Israel … Meyerhoff … was an ardent Zionist whose interest in Israel started through his involvement with United Jewish Appeal. He was also one of the first investors in Israel Bonds ... Contributions from him and the foundation that was formed after his death are responsible [in Israel] for the construction of 11 libraries, nine day care centers, several community centers, cultural arts centers, the emergency wing at Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem and several build-
ings at universities throughout the country …. 45 to 50 buildings in Isra-
el bear the Meyeroff name.” [RIVERA, p. 2D]

In addition to all this, as sampling, a scanning of merely a few common, and
easily recognized, Jewish names in an alphabetical list of American art institu-
tion officials (1997–98) revealed the following (selected here are only people at
the pinnacle of their organizations or fields):

– Director of the Detroit Institute of Arts: Samuel Sachs II. (The Treasurer
of this museum is also Jewish: Gilbert Silverman).
– Chairman of the Contemporary Arts Center of Cincinnati: Stanley Ka-
plan.
– Public Affairs Director of the National Museum of African-American Art
in Washington DC: Janice Kaplan.
– President and CEO of Chicago’s Museum of Science and Industry: James
Kahn.
– Executive Director of the Connecticut Historical Society: David Kahn.
– Executive Director of the National Assembly of State Art Agencies in
– President of the Lincoln Center for Performing Arts in New York City: Nathan
Leventhal.
– President of the Society of American Graphic Artists: Martin Levine.
– Director of the American Foundation for the Arts in Miami: May Levine.
– President of the American Foundation for the Arts in Miami: Richard Le-
vine.
– Public Information Director for the International Center of Photography
in New York City: Phyllis Levine.
– President of the American Society for Aesthetics: Ted Cohen.
– Executive Director of the Arizona Commission for the Arts: Shelly
Cohn.
– President of the New York Artists Equity Association: Arnold Gold.
– Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the McMichael Canadian Art Collection in Ontario: Joan Goldfarb.
– Chairman of the Art Academy of Cincinnati: Stewart Goldman.
– President of the Los Angeles Center for Photographic Studies: Adrienne
Goldstone.
– Executive Director of the Farrington Valley Arts Center in Avon, Connect-
icut: Betty Friedman.
– Director and Chief Curator of the Nova Eccles Harrison Museum of Art in
Logan, Utah: Steve Rosen.
– Executive Director of the American Institute for Conservation of Historic
and Artistic Works: Sarah Rosenberg.
– President of the Albuquerque (New Mexico) United Artists: Allan Rosen-
field.
MODERN ART

– Chairman of the Board of Trustees, the Brooklyn Museum: Robert Rubin.
– Commissioner of Chicago’s Department of Cultural Affairs: Lois Weinberg. [BOWKER]

Alan Stein was also Chairman of the Board of the American Conservatory Theatre in San Francisco in the 1990s [WINN, S., 9-24-93, p. C1] and in 1995, also in San Francisco, “a traveling Jewish theatre [was] the lucky winner of a $150,000 challenge grant from the National Endowment for the Arts … [It was] one of only 44 arts organizations in the country (and the only theatre company in California) to receive that kind of NEA grant [that] year.” [JAMISON, L., 3-8-95]

In the actual formation of art tastes and pedigrees, organized Jewry’s influence in art market trends has occasionally been blatant. “[In the 1960s] at first ‘relevance’ meant exhibiting avant-garde art,” says Sophy Burnham, “Some people date ‘relevance’ from the coming of Alan Solomon to the Jewish Museum in 1963. The Jewish Museum had been devoted for years to preserving the historic traditions in its vessels and chalices. Suddenly it turned about face and marched after contemporary art. It was a shock. Everyone was talking about the Jewish Museum and about Alan Solomon, the director. It was showing Rauschenberg, Johns, Larry Rivers, Richard Diebenkorn, Ken Noland, Jean Tinguely, [James Rosenquist] … and later, an exhibit, a social documentary, of life on the [Jewish] Lower East Side… Before the decade was out, the other museums had turned to the chase – the Smithsonian, the Metropolitan, the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, the Pasadena Museum … [BURNHAM, p. 164]

Another seminal turning point in the modern art market was a 1973 auction of Jewish taxi-cab company-owner Robert Scull’s collection of contemporary art. Scull was, says Stuart Plattner, “an early and avid pop collector whom the art world loves to despise for his boorish manners and transparent attempts to use art to increase his social position.” [PLATTNER, p. 35] The auction was a stunning success and launched a flurry of investment interest in collecting this genre of contemporary art.

Art gallery sellings and buyings of important art are usually secret. The most important public gauge for art market prices are the results of art auctions. The most important art auction firm has been Sotheby’s. [The other major auction house, Christie’s, was the subject of movement towards control in December 1997 by a consortium headed by the SBC Warburg company. [CORPORATE MONEY, p. 2-3] (Christie’s chief curator for contemporary art, Neal Meltzer, is also Jewish). In 1966 the Rothschild Investment Trust bought 20% ownership of the Sotheby’s firm, [WATSON, p. 351] but by the early 1980s A. Alfred Taubman, by then “one of the world’s richest men,” a Jewish entrepreneur who made his fortune in shopping malls and real estate, purchased controlling interest in Sotheby’s. (He was also married to a former Miss Israel). [HOGREFE, J., 1986, p. 127]
As a trustee of both the Whitney Museum and the Smithsonian, and now an art dealer, some critics complained, to no avail, that Taubman had a serious conflict of interest in his new buy. “Selling art has much in common with selling root beer,” Taubman told the Wall Street Journal, “People don’t need root beer and they don’t need to buy a painting either. We provide them with a sense that it will give them a happier existence.” [WATSON, p. 385]

In 1998 both Robert Lacey and Peter Watson authored separate books that exposed the scandalous inner workings of the Sotheby’s company. Watson’s expose was supported in part by BBC television; what he discovered, said CBS 60 Minutes reporter Morley Safar, “shook the art world to its foundations.” [MYRPHY, p. 15] “A couple of decades on, Sotheby’s,” noted the Economist, “now controlled by an American property tycoon, Alfred Taubman, has grown beyond recognition. So, too, has its ethical malaise, according to Peter Watson, a British journalist and art-market expert.” [ECONOMIST]

In text and on film, Watson documented Sotheby’s international art smuggling operations, from Old Master paintings in Europe to religious artifacts in the Third World. Watson, noted Newsday

“focuses his story on James Hodges, a disgruntled antiquities administrator in Sotheby’s London office, who amassed thousands of documents that outline the auction house’s various alleged malpractices, including smuggling. Hodges was later convicted of the theft of two artworks from Sotheby’s (which he claims he was “holding” for dealers), but his documents constitute the basis of Watson’s investigations. Most shocking of all of Sotheby’s indiscretions is its alleged collusion in smuggling artworks out of India. With his television crew, Watson visits a tiny Indian village to find the home of a goat-headed stone goddess that was put up for sale on Sotheby’s London auction block. All that’s left of the local shrine, once the home of 20 such goddesses, is a pile of rubble where the villagers still pray.” [LEE, p. B13]

Watson told the New York Times that his investigations led him to believe that such practice at Sotheby’s was “systematic.” [IBRAHIM, p. A9] “Art crime,” notes Richard Myrphy,

“… is far more pervasive than the occasional well-publicized dramas or those crooked dealers’ ploys would suggest. The statistics themselves are sobering. According to a Cambridge University study, 30 to 40 percent of the world’s available antiquities pass through the sale rooms in New York City and London. Roughly 90 per cent of these pieces are of unknown provenance, meaning they were almost certainly stolen, smuggled, or both.” [MYRPHY, p. 15]

Meanwhile, there is an image to be maintained. “Taubman’s most public gambit,” said Watson, in an earlier volume about the art world, “was to flood Sotheby’s board [of trustees] with a raft of rich friends and acquaintances – socialites in many cases – whose job it was to bring in business and create the impression in the minds of prospective sellers, at least in he United States, that Sotheby’s was a sort of club, membership in which conferred social status.”
[WATSON, p. 381] Among this group was Henry Ford II, for a while the vice-chairman at Sotheby’s, who called himself Taubman’s “token Gentile.” [BERMAN, p. C1] (Price-fixing scandals at Sotheby’s forced Alfred Taubman to step down as chairman of Sotheby’s in 2000, although he maintained controlling interest in the company. CEO Donna (Dede) Brooks also resigned with him. That same year, Sotheby’s and Christie’s art auction houses agreed to pay $512 million to satisfy numerous class-action suits brought against them.) [LOS ANGELES TIMES, 9-23-2000, p. C1] In May 2001, Taubman was indicted for price-fixing by a Federal grand jury. [SMITH/HIGGINS, 5-1-01, p. 1]

This elitist, status-laden attitude is not special to Sotheby’s; it has long been the foundation of the modern art world. (In 1993 Sotheby’s even successfully sold the ownership to the abandoned mechanical rover on the moon for $68,000, essentially a conceptual possession, an abstract play thing). High-brow art culture, noted Jewish sociologist Herbert Gans in 1974, serves “a small public that prides itself on exclusiveness.” [DIMAGGIO, p. 142] Sociologists Paul DiMaggio and Michael Useem reiterated the same theme in 1989:

“Our findings clearly indicate that in this country the public for the visual and performing arts is distinctly elite in levels of education, occupation, income, and race. The statistics we were able to summarize from the many studies reviewed show little indication of cultural democracy.” [DIMAGGIO, p. 163]

“Many [art] galleries go out of their way to be rude,” wrote Sophy Burnham, “indeed, one rule of the art world might be that the more ‘important’ the gallery, the more haughty it will be … The gallery of High Art is so discriminating, so refined, deals in such precious artistic sensibility and at such prices, that it affects an ambiance, commensurate with its wares.” [BURNHAM, p. 30]

Among Taubman’s Sotheby’s trustee appointees was the Jewish owner, Max Fisher, of United Brands, a company that was fined for bribing Honduran government officials in exchange for tax breaks. “Still,” notes Watson, “Fisher was chiefly known for his enthusiastic fund-raising for Jewish and Israeli charities … [He also] wrote Op-Ed pieces for the New York Times.” [WATSON, p. 381] Fisher, longtime chairman of the Board of Governors of the Jewish Agency, gives half his multi-million dollar oil and real estate income each year to Israel and other Jewish causes,” notes the (Jewish) Forward. [FORWARD]

The fact that Jews are so dominating in the art world is a reality that is very rarely publicly acknowledged. It is forbidden – as always for anyone, anywhere – to discuss the subject for fear of being branded “anti-Semitic.” Typically, as example, an entire 1989 academic volume on the “Sociology of the Arts” fails to mention Jews as sociological entity in the modern art dynamic. There are analyses of art galleries, “artist groups,” art patrons, and art audiences, broken down into gender, age, income, occupation, and even “racial and ethnic minorities.” We can find that, negligibly, “blacks, Orientals, and persons of Spanish origin constitute about 7% of the art audience,” but there is nothing whatsoever about Jews, even their own percentage of that “art audience,” let alone how many art
galleries they own, museums they direct, and articles they generate about art value. [FOSTER/BLAU, 1989]

This kind of false framing is endemic to modern America. (See, for example, a 1998 scholarly volume entitled *Ethnic Identity and Power. Cultural Contexts of Political Action in School and Society*. The index cites references to Blacks (large case), “white” (small case), “angry white males,” Chicanos, Mexicans, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Latino, Native Americans, Eskimos, Haitians, “Hmong people,” Moroccans, and so on. There is nothing about Jews in the context of power and ethnicity – they are not afforded a heading in the book’s index). It is institutionalized: no one (certainly not a non-Jew) is allowed to single out Jewry for an analysis of their power. Those few who know the story are afraid to speak. Most are merely ignorant of the dimensions of the issue. Take, for example, American journalist Thomas Billitteri’s crusading article for truth, justice, and fairness, never mentioning Jewry in his critical appraisal of the mass media’s systemic reluctance to hire minorities (i.e., Blacks, et al). Instead, Billitteri’s mass media culprits are the standard punching bags – the amorphous “whites,” by which the very particularistic Jewish dominance in the mass media (especially at the highest decision-making strata) [See mass media chapter] is conveniently subsumed, and thereby, as always, hidden: “79% of television new personnel are white, and 88% of radio news workers are white. In management ranks, 92 percent of television and news directors are white. Only 1% of television news directors are black.” [BILLITTERI, p. 19] Or what of the *Los Angeles Times*’ dissimulative assertion in 2001 that “90% of each major [Hollywood] guild (Screen Actors, Directors, Writers and Producers) is white, the majority of them male.” [Munoz, L., 3-24-01]

Art critic Peter Halley (self-identified as half-Jewish) took another angle on the “Forbidden to Be Spoken About” machinations of the modern art world, as represented by the ethnicity of many of today’s most successful artists:

“It is my contention that the art world of the 1980s represented a kind of renaissance for Jewish American artists who came of age in that decade. The list of young Jewish American artists who took center stage in the 80’s is long – early in the decade we might think of Barbara Kruger, Laurie Simmons, Sherrie Levine, R.M. Fischer, Donald Sultan, Julian Schnabel, and David Salle. Later, the work of Ross Bleckner, Terry Winters, Haim Steinbach, and Meyer Vaisman come to the fore … What originally motivated me to explore this subject [of growing Jewish artist prominence] was the strange fact that there has been an inexplicable silence surrounding it. Especially in this era of multicultural awareness, it is surprising, to say the least, that no one has mentioned this phenomena … [HALLEY, p. 26-27] …

One possible reason for this silence about a Jewish artist renaissance in the 80’s is that at the same time a great fluorescence of Jewish influence in the areas of philanthropy, business, finance and the bastions of high society was taking place … By the 1980s … in cities with large Jewish populations, like New York, Jews had largely replaced the older WASP
elite as standard bearers of social power and prestige in the evolving American postwar ethnic meritocracy.”
Thus a new and yet unexamined social paradigm arose. Jews … [who] had championed the marginal culture of Modernism had suddenly become the pillar of the American establishment. At the same time, a new generation of Jewish artists was emerging whose work was collected as often as not by Jews in the cultural elite as part of a continuing tradition of Jewish support for contemporary art.” [HALLEY, p. 28]

By the 1980s, from such artists, notes well-known art critic Robert Hughes, “never before had star artists been so bathed in adulation … The doings of collectors, the gyrations of the market, the increasingly passive promotional role of museums. The whole social circus attached to the art world supplied limitless fodder for breathless journalists. Art magazines devolved into sycophantic praise-bulletins. Since the magazines depended on advertising, revenue from dealers who were not averse to applying pressure, 95 per cent of the writing published in them was the merest puffery, garnished with opaque Derridian and Lacanian jargon [Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan were two French – and Jewish – psychoanalytic philosophers].” [HUGHES, p. 594]

Hughes may have had Milton Esterow in mind when he spoke of the slide into purely money-grubbing, consumerist-spewing “art” magazines. Esterow, the Jewish owner and editor of ArtNews (America’s largest circulation arts publication) and other media interests, was featured in the New York Times in 1995 in his quest “for more consumer, or general, advertising to go along with the substantial art advertising that has traditionally run his magazine.” “Art collectors are passionate about beautiful things,” Esterow said, “This is translatable to beautiful cars, beautiful clothes, exotic vacations. There is no better setting for beautiful things than our magazine.” [SLOANE, p. D9] Esterow noted new ads from Infiniti cars and Rolex watches in his publication. Promotional plans also included an allowance for automobile advertisers to “place a new car in front of a major museum during a particular exhibit,” and an alcohol company “to hold a tasting at an important art fair.” [SLOANE, p. D9]

The Jewish influence in “art photography” – as artists as well as dealers, critics, photographers themselves, and curators– is overwhelmingly dominant. This is certainly in part due to the fact that many photographic artists seep over into the High Art realm from positions of Jewish predominance in hard-to-get advertising, fashion, and photojournalism positions, each deeply part of the business world (Annie Liebowitz at Rolling Stone and Vanity Fair, for instance, or Arthur Penn, Richard Avedon, and Helmut Newton at Vogue and other slick magazines). Even maverick Robert Frank took a vacation to Peru early in his career “because he wanted to escape the commercial success he was beginning to have in New York shooting for fashion magazines.” [WESTERBECK, p. 645] Anthony Heilbut notes that “during the 1930s, American notions of physical
beauty were altered by the [Jewish] émigrés, a neat reversal of the pattern that once led East European Jews to celebrate icons unequivocally gentile and heterosexual. Fashion photographers like Horst and Erwin Blumenthal specialized in tableaus of exotic, androgynous women.” [HEILBUT, p. 492]

In England, in 2001 Gemma Levine had a career retrospective at London’s National Portrait Gallery. She “is one of Britain’s leading portrait photographers…Her career in photography was initiated by a commission from [Jewish publishing mogul] George Weidenfeld to take photographs for two books in Israel in collaboration with [Israeli heroes] Moshe Dayan and Golda Meir.” [http://www.absolutearts.com, 2001] Rock and roll photographer Gered Mankowitz had a retrospective exhibition the same year:

“Best-known for his work as the unofficial photographer for the Rolling Stones in the late 1960s, Mankowitz didn’t just take pictures, he created some of the most enduring images of that era. Working with talents such as Jimy Hendrix and the Stones, he produced the kind of photographs that led nice teenagers astray to worship at the altar of rock…Now 55, the photographer has been creating pop images for so long he has become part of the mythology himself. As integral to swinging London’s music scene as flowing hair and weed, Mankowitz’s studio was in the heart of it all.” [SCOTSMAN, 11-13-01]

Jacques Lowe, son a German father and Jewish mother, was John F. Kennedy’s personal photographer. Lowe “became an assistant to the renowned [Jewish] photographer Arnold Newman, who became his mentor.” Lowe founded the Visual Arts agency (later called Visual Arts Projects). [JFK, 2001]

An émigré from Europe in 1938, for decades Miki Denhof was a “noted mentor of fashion photographers” at Esquire, Vogue, House and Garden and Glamour. Her big break was to be hired at Vogue by (fellow Jewish) art director Alexander Lieberman in 1945. She once donated 900 photographs from her father’s personal collection to an exhibition entitled “Fighting for the Fatherland: The Patriotism of Jews in World War I.” Denhof’s influence in the fashion world was so influential that her death in 2000 merited an article in the New York Times. [HELLER, S., 8-6-2000] (The editor-in-chief for 17 years at Vogue was Grace Mirabella, an Italian-American. Her husband, William Cahan, was a wealthy Jewish doctor and socialite; his cousin, Abraham Cahan, founded and edited the Yiddish language Jewish Daily Forward. [MIRABELLA, 1995, p. 167] At her wedding to Cahan, “the Jewish custom in weddings is to step on a glass and break it. So, after we’d kissed, Nate [Cummings, a Jewish friend] brought out a glass wrapped in a napkin, and Bill had to stomp on it. Nate then picked up the pieces, still wrapped, and had them affixed to a canvas background, which he framed. The collage now hangs in our home, like an abstract painting.” [MIRABELLA, G., 1995, p. 175] She notes that “photographers were becoming big stars too” in her era, particularly noting Jewish Vogue photographers Bert Stern who “could only work with ten assistants in his studio,” Richard Avedon, and Arthur Penn.] [MIRABELLA, G., 1995, p. 121-122]
Jewish novelist Judith Krantz notes the Jewish complexion of her photography connections:

“Well-known [Jewish] fashion photographer” Milton Greene “and I became good friends. It was a world of interrelationships. Milton’s ex-wife Evelyn was engaged to [famous Jewish portrait photographer] Dick Avedon … He already had an aura of a vast future about him, a photographer version of the young [Jewish conductor] Leonard Bernstein … Later, when I became a fashion editor, I was always galvanized when we worked together.” [KRANTZ, J., 2000, p. 128-129]

In the field of photojournalism, three of the original six staff photographers for Life magazine were Jewish (Carl Mydans, Margaret Bourke-White, and Alfred Eisenstadt). “Within a few years Jewish photographers Fritz Goro, Eliot Eliosofon, Dmitri Kessel, and others (Curt Gunther, Hebert Gehr, Yale Joel, Hy Peskin, Paul Schutzen, Mark Kaufmann, Nina Leon, Ida Wyman, Arthur Shay, Lawrence Schiller, Henry Groskinsky, Jill Krementz, and Neil Leifer) became staff or contract photographers.” “From the [19]40s to 70s Philip Stern “was known as Life’s photographer in Hollywood.” Look magazine was founded in 1937. “For most of its years the Director of Photography,” notes George Gilbert, “was Arthur Rothstein.” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 60, 78] The successful “A Day in the Life” series of coffee table photography books (A Day in the Life of – the United States, Russia, Israel, etc.) have been headed by two Jewish photojournalists, Rick Smolan and David Cohen.

An influential documentary photography organization from the late 1930s to the 1950s was the Photo League. “The overwhelming majority of members of the 200-plus group,” notes George Gilbert, “including photographers from Life and from the photo agencies were of Jewish heritage.” Jewish photographers Sid Grossman, Sol Libsohn, and Aaron Siskind founded the group in 1932. [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 230-231] Another influential organization, the American Society of Magazine Photographers (ASMP), was created in 1944. “Starting with 30 paid-up members,” notes Gilbert, “… the group leaped into prominence in the industry, boasting an estimated three of four of all eligible magazine photographers as members. The initial roster, with an exception of two, were all of Jewish heritage.” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 237]

Famous turn-of-the-century social documentarian Lewis Hine wasn’t Jewish. But the man who controlled his estate at his death, Walter Rosenbaum, was. In 2001, the Times of London reported that

“The FBI has begun an investigation into the suspected forgery of hundreds of works by one of America’s most famous photographers. Tests showed that numerous ‘vintage’ prints by Lewis Hine, who is revered for his social realist pictures from the Depression, were printed on paper not available until more than a decade after his death in 1940. The investigation was prompted by a complaint from a dealer in Santa Fe, New Mexico, about Hine’s longtime collaborator, Walter Rosenbaum, an acclaimed war photographer and the former president of the Photo League co-operative where Hine left his archives … This year [Rosen-
baum] was reported to have reached a confidential settlement out of court with six dealers to create a 690,000 pound fund to reimburse buyers of between 300 and 500 Hine prints who were unhappy with their purchases.” [TIMES OF LONDON, 8-17-01]

Prominent Jews in the photographic publishing field have included the founders (William Ziff and Bernard Davis) of Popular Photography magazine, the associate publisher of Modern Photography, the photo page editor of the New York Times, the publisher of Photo Dealer magazine, the publisher of Photo Weekly, and so on. [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 306] Laura Levitt notes the increased interest in the photographic publishing world in Jewish subjects:

“Since 1996 there has been a proliferation of exhibits on Jews and photography across the United States … [There are also] explicit photographic collections about Jews [that] are increasingly being marked as identifactory texts. As I read it, this larger situation of loss [of the Jewish past] helps account for the growing market for picture books about American Jews.” [LEVITT, L., 2000, p. 90, 65]

Critic James Twitchell calls the omnipresent merger of modern art and business advertising these days “adcult,” and the medium of photography plays a central role. The photographic work of Richard Avedon is a case in point, reflecting the interconnected back scratching of the art and corporate elite. Concerning an Avedon exhibition at the Whitney Museum of Art, Twitchell notes that:

“Si Newhouse’s Advance Publications owns the New Yorker, which gave Avedon more-than-usual space in the week of the show’s opening. The co-publisher of the exhibition catalog, with an essay by New Yorker art critic Adam Gopnik, is Random House, which is owned by Newhouse. Among the six speakers at the Whitney symposium connected to the show were Random House’s CEO Harold Evans and writers Brendan Gil [author of a New York Review of Books article accusing the great folklorist Joseph Campbell of anti-Semitism] and Ingrid Sischy who write for … the New Yorker. The curator of the show was Jane Livingston who does not work for the Whitney but for Avedon, who used a grant from Kodak to pay for the show and the catalog. Synergies, anyone?” [TWITCHELL, p. 227]

Elsewhere in the criss-cross into the art world, for years too Cornel Capa (born Karol Friedman) has run the important International Center for Photography in New York City. Capa’s brother, Robert Capa (Andreas Friedman), was a founder of Magnum, the seminal photojournalism agency. Tom Freudenheim notes that “many of the works [of a “Jewish art” exhibition under his review] are by the most significant photographers of the century and indeed, it can probably be demonstrated that this is a medium which, unlike painting and sculpture, was moved primarily by men and women who were Jewish.” [FREUDENHEIM, p. 28] “Photography has been dominated by Jewish photographers from the 1920s through the 1980s,” says Tom Bamberger, himself both a Jewish photographer and adjunct curator of a Milwaukee art museum. [FREUDENHEIM, p. 28] Even the famous photography repository – the Bett-
man Archives – was Jewish-founded, by Otto Bettman, as was Simon Guttman’s London-based international news and photography agency, Report.

Aside from a core of west coast nature photographers like Ansel Adams, Edward Weston, and Wynn Bullock and scattered others across photographic history, there are comparatively few non-Jews who have cracked Jewish dominance of the upper echelon of art-world status in photography. A history of American (and – as many were immigrants – even international) photography reads almost like a history of Jewish photography. A partial list of well-known Jewish photographic artists and/or recurring grant and award winners must always start with the gigantic influence of Alfred Stieglitz. “It was Alfred Stieglitz who was to define the parameters of American ideas about photography’s emotional and expressive potential” [CRICE, p. 661]; his magazine Camera Work and 291 gallery were seminal in moving the “tangible acceptance of photography to the domain of art patrons and other buyers.” [BUNNELL, p. 314] As John Pultz notes: “Stieglitz had been the major force in avant-garde America photography for over forty years. He had exerted his will, and would continue to do so, not only through his own photography but also through the three photography periodicals he had edited between 1893 and 1917 and the three New York galleries he was to run between 1905 and his death in 1946. [PULTZ, p. 484]

“The capitalist concept of the art work [was] a singular rare object,” notes Peter Bunnell, “with a measure of its importance provided by the extent of its economic value … The development of the private gallery, of organized marketing activity replete with regular exhibitions and published criticisms was an American contribution. Largely an urban phenomena, it was orchestrated out of New York by the country’s leading practitioner and spokesman for photography, Alfred Stieglitz … [BUNNELL, p. 314] … [He] applied capitalist economics to the appreciation and acceptance of art. Steiglitz clearly positioned himself at the center of power and he was the major spokesman for Pictorial photography [an early genre of self-conscious “art” photography].” [BUNNELL, p. 315] In 1993, a 1920 “art” photograph by Steiglitz of artist Georgia O’Keefe’s hands and a thimble sold at auction for $398,500, the highest price ever paid for a photograph. Another Steiglitz print went for $107,500. [NYT, 10-9-93, p. A11]

A partial list of celebrated Jewish photographers includes Paul Strand (Stransky), Richard Avedon, painter-photographer Robert Rauschenberg, Herb Ritts (another “photographer of the stars”), Eric Salomon, Alfred Eisenstadt (the “father of photojournalism”), Man Ray (Emmanuel Radnitsky), Robert Capa (Endre Friedman), Cornell Capa, Laslo Moholy-Nagy, Andre Keretsz (“among the most influential photographers in Paris in the 1920s” [WESTBECK, p. 35], Margaret Bourke-White (her father, originally Weiss, was Jewish. She was “surely the twentieth century’s most famous woman photographer” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. ix], William Klein, Helen Levitt, Aaron Siskind, famous ambulance chaser Weegee (Arthur Fellig, whose father was a rabbi), Robert Frank, Lee Friedlander, Gary Winogrand, Diane Arbus (whose major photography influences were Lisette Model [originally Elise Felice Amelie Seybert] and Marvin Israel), Irving Penn, Joel Sternfeld, Joel Meyerowitz, Duane
Michaels, Lewis Baltz, Carl Chiarenza, Michael Bishop, Werner Bischof, Rolof Beny, William Wegman (famed for his in-joke photos of his dog named “Man Ray”), Richard Misrach, Arnold Newman (whose Israeli-born wife was a “one time member of Haganah, the pre-state Israeli underground army” [WALMAN, p. 303], Eve Arnold (originally Cohen: the first woman in the influential Magnum Photo agency), David Seymour (born Szymin, a co-founder of Magnum), Brassai (Gyula Halasz), Susan Meiselas, Cindy Sherman, Walter Rosenblum, Arthur Olman (also the Director of San Diego’s Museum of Photographic Arts), Ruth Orkin, Larry Sultan, Jerry Uelsmann, Judy Dater [Lichtenfeld], Bruce Davidson, Leonard Freed, Elliot Erwitt, Danny Lyon, Larry Fink, Art Kane (Arthur Kanofsky), Jay Meisel, Nan Goldin, Simpson Kalisher, Joe Rosenthal (who took the staged photograph, which has become a patriotic icon, of soldiers planting an American flag at Iwo Jima), Ralph Gibson, Helmut Gernsheim, Phillipe Halsman, Ernest Haas, Annie Leibowitz, Roman Vishniac, John Heartfield (Helmut Herzfelde), Gisele Freund, Sandi Fellenberg, Abigail Heyman, Lauren Greenfield, Arthur Rothstein, Doris Ullman, Rebecca Lepkoff, Sandra Weiner, Andreas Feininger, Lotte Jacobi, Inge Morath, Lynne Cohen, Rosalind Solomon, Milton Resnick, Donald Blumberg, Baron Adolf de Meyer, Ellen Land-Weber, Eva Rubinstein, Dennis Stock (Stockl), Mark Cohen, Paul Diamond, Ray Metzker, Arthur Tress, Peter Simon, Marcia Resnick, Helmut Newton (whose sado-masochistic images for glamour magazines have been seminal to the heroin-addict look in fashion photography criticized by President Clinton in the 1990s), and many others. [See for example, George Gilbert’s compilation of Jewish photographers].

“It is impossible to deny the impact [Helmut Newton] has made, on fashion photography in particular,” noted England’s The Independent in 2001,

“To radical feminists, Newton is the antichrist. This is the man who photographed a woman on all fours with a saddle on her back, and another sitting on her underwear or an unmade bed, with a gun in her mouth … Newton’s vision is fuelled by sex, status, power and, above all, voyeurism … Small wonder, then, that much of the photographer’s most successful imagery has become far more famous than the garments he has chosen to photograph … Newton’s influence is everywhere … In the Sixties and Seventies, Newton’s decadent vision may have been labelled ‘porno chic,’ but today the rest of the world has finally caught up with him and it’s just plain chic. There is barely a stylist, photographer or designer working in fashion today who can fail to acknowledge Newton as an influence … Helmut Newton was born to middle-class Jewish parents in Weimar Berlin in 1920, and the decadent spirit of that place at that time is imprinted on his work … Accusations of misogyny are still constantly made against Newton’s work.” [FRNKEL, S., 5-9-01]

Les Krims’ “taste for the bizarre – deer slayers, dwarfs, murdered women, and naked Jewish mothers making chicken soup – made him one of the most controversial artists of the 1970s.” [RICE, p. 677] Krims’ work “would also be seminal,” notes Shelly Rice, “to the works of Joel Peter Witkin, a young photog-
rapher who is continuing, into the 1990s, to explore the domain of the mysterious. Attracted to the bizarre, like Krims and, before him, Diane Arbus, Witkin photographs transvestites, deformed people, dead fetuses, and other strange phenomena.” [RICE, p. 678] Also Jewish, a Witkins relative, Lee, founded the Witkin Gallery in 1969 which “experienced great success and became the first commercially viable gallery devoted entirely to photography.” [ALEXANDER, p. 697] (Among many influential photography galleries were those run by Stephen White in Los Angeles and Marjorie Neikrug Raskin’s Neikrug Galleries in New York (specializing in antique photography. Charles Traub, also Jewish, was the director of the influential Light Gallery). Vicki Goldberg is one of many prominent Jewish critics of photography.

In 1999, another Jewish photographer, Nan Goldin, was provided a one-person show of her work at Prague’s Galerie Rudolfinum, a spectacular art facility in that beautiful city. Goldin’s show, sponsored by New York’s Whitney Museum of Art, framed her as an ambassador of American art and culture to the Czech Republic. And what was the show like? Large scale color Cibachrome prints of the decadent and violent American underworld decorated the elegant museum walls, including huge confrontational images of drug addicts masturbating.

Another Jewish photographer is Peter Basch. His “photographs for male-oriented publications won him the reputation of having photographed 100,000 nude women.” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 60] Daniel Howard Cohen died of AIDS in 1995. He was “an educator who grew up in Baltimore and went from being an outlaw leftist to running the photography program at one of the nation’s most prestigious journalism schools … [He joined] the leftist Weathermen group in the 1960’s. He went underground for several years while he was wanted by the law.” [Baltimore Sun, 4-17-95]

Europe’s August Sander is also regarded as a seminal influence in the development of documentary photography. Roman Vishniac is another well-known name. Probably the most famous current Polish photographer is expatriate Ryszard Horowitz, a Holocaust survivor, now living in New York City. The best known photographer from Brazil? Sebastian Selgado, also Jewish. Jewish cameraman Yevgeny Khaldei was described by one newspaper as “the greatest Soviet war photographer.” [PIRANI, S., p. 11] W. W. Waglieff Schapiro was the Tsar of Russia’s official “Court Photographer.” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 135]

A Jewish refugee from Germany, Laslo Moholy-Nagy, founded Chicago’s Art Institute of Design. Prominent Jewish graduates have included Aaron Siskind, Nathan Lerner, Arthur Siegel, Ray Metzker, Ken Josephson, Barbara Crane, and Eileen Cowan, among others. [WESTBECK, p. 656] More commercially, Morris Germaine founded “Germaine’s School of Photography,” H. P. Seidel founded the “School of Modern Photography,” and “on the west coast today’s prestigious Brooks School of Photography also had its start early in the twentieth century by a Jewish family.” [GILBERT, G., 1996, p. 79]

“By 1963,” notes Stuart Alexander, “the teaching of photography at the university level had become such a significant force in the United States that, under the instigation of Nathan Lyons [formerly of the George Eastman House] the
Society of Photographic Education was founded to discuss educational issues ... It has its own internal hierarchy and exerts a great influence on American photography.” [ALEXANDER, p. 701] In intellectual cliques, German-born Walter Benjamin is among the best known of “photo-mechanical” theorists. “Benjamin,” notes George Mosse,

“consciously [sought] to define his own brand of Judaism. Benjamin, barely out of school at the age of twenty, rejoiced in his newly discovered Jewish identity. Jewish intellectuals, he wrote in 1912, provide the principal support and dynamic for true culture, which in this case included not only literature and art but also socialism and the women’s emancipation movement. Among Jewish intellectuals, he continued, writers were in the vanguard of change ... [Jews] took a central role in creating alternatives to the existing order ... Benjamin’s preoccupation with Jewish thought, which for a time, under the influence of close friend Gershom Scholem, seemed to shift Benjamin’s early definition of Jewishness toward a sporadic interest in cabala [Jewish mysticism] and Zionism.” [MOSSE, G., 1985, p. 66-67]

In 1997, George Gilbert published a volume that identified over 500 Jews who have been prominent in the field of photography as photographers, critics, scientists, or curators. As Jewish critic A. D. Coleman observed about the volume, “this selection can’t exhaust the list of prospects, indeed it barely scratches the surface (as a parlor game of sorts, I sat with a friend for two evenings and compiled a list of at least one hundred figures Gilbert missed)” ... [These “hundreds and hundreds” of Jews are] so integral to photography’s history as we habitually think of it that a written version of that history excluding these figures is difficult to imagine.” [COLEMAN, A., D., 1998]

Among the most important genres of photography is the so-called “New York School.” It is overwhelmingly Jewish (two-thirds of the important artist selections for one book by curator Jane Livingston on this theme are Jews). “In its art historical usage,” says Coleman,

“the term ‘school’ connotes a connectedness among a group of artists that goes beyond mere friendship and social interaction to deeper levels of bonding and influence: master-apprentice relationships, stylistic kinships, parallel and overlapping trains of thought, and general agreement on what the important questions are in the field – what the philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn would call a shared paradigm.” [author’s emphasis, COLEMAN, A., D., 1998]

This “shared paradigm,” of course, is intellectual doubletalk for a “collective world view” or, more pointedly, ideological collusion.

Why such Jewish dominance of the field, Coleman wonders? Or, as he literally says, “How are we to make sense of this?” What Coleman, as all, fail to willfully address is the obvious: Jewish networking and hustling, Jewish predominance in the mass media, Jewish economic dominance of the art world, Jewish power, Jewish money, and the connective agreement upon what does, and what does not, fall within the realm of artistic “quality.” For the “New York
“He had needed to escape from New York because, as a poor Jewish child in a tough Irish-Italian neighborhood, he had spent his youth being terrorized by street gangs. By the time he went back, in the early 1950s, photography was, for him, he has confessed, a ‘weapon’ with which ‘to get even.’ He wanted his photographs to reveal the harshness of life on the New York streets, and he realized that the way to do so was to cultivate in himself a killer instinct for pictures as ferocious as the primal emotions he wanted to betray in his subjects.” [WESTERBECK, p. 644]

The huge, scholarly volume from which this quote is taken declares itself to be the “new” history of photography. And even this book about photographic image-making devotes an entire obligatory page to the specialness of the Holocaust, a brief article (entitled “The Final Solution”) and four photographs. (No such special attention is provided any world wars or anyone else’s’ collective suffering, genocidal or otherwise). The author of this article, Anne Lilensztein, assets that surviving photographs of the “Final Solution” evidentially prove that the Holocaust occurred: “Testimonies of this madness have been brought to us … above all [by the] photographic … Thus photography is the tangible proof of one of the greatest tragedies of contemporary history.” [LILENSZTEIN, p. 600]

The proof cited for this assertion is four Nazi-era photographs – a pile of naked corpses captioned “Buchenwald, 1946,” and a three-portrait series of a woman entitled “Records of an Inmate at Auschwitz, circa 1943.” There is, as usual, no mention in the text that anyone other than Jews died in Nazi concentration camps, or that millions of other people died at fascist hands in other ways too.

The article’s stated purpose is to declare that photography played an important role in “proving” the atrocities against the Jews. And, as always, the bias against non-Jewish suffering is intrinsic – who can say with absolute certainty that the pile of anonymous corpses depicted are only Jewish? And even if they are, far more indicting to the author’s (and editor’s) ethnocentric premise is that, although non-Jews are never mentioned as victims in the piece, the three
portrait photos of an Auschwitz prisoner illustrating “proof” of the Final Solution against Jews depict a female prisoner who is, incredibly, not Jewish.

The woman in these images [page 600] has a Nazi-created card in the photograph with her prisoner number noted: it is “POL:F 31848.” In the second photo, a patch with her number and a triangle can be clearly seen sewn to her prison uniform. Tadeusz Iwaszko, in an authoritative volume published by the Auschwitz Museum in Poland, notes that: “Besides being tattooed, another element in the registration process for new arrivals [at Auschwitz] was being photographed in three poses. In the first photograph, a profile, the camp number was visible as well as letter symbols for the category and nationality of the prisoner. Jewish prisoners, who had begun to arrive in mass transports in 1942, were not photographed. (There were certain exceptions to this general rule).” [IWASZKO, p. 61] But even if these photographs in question were such exceptions, Nazi concentration camp prisoners were identified by both tattooed numbers and sewn cloth patches (or painted) symbols on their clothing. A red triangle was a political prisoner, a green triangle meant “professional criminal,” a black one were so called “anti-social” prisoners (including prostitutes, gypsies, and others. Violet triangles signified Jehovah’s witnesses; the Catholic clergy had red triangles and homosexuals pink ones. “Jews,” notes Iwaszko, “were identified with a six-sided star, composed of two triangles of different colors … [Later] Jews began to be identified by the same method as the other prisoners, except that a yellow square patch would be positioned above the single triangle.” [IWASZKO, p. 63-64] [See the photographic section before page 33 in Auschwitz: Nazi Death camp, edited by Piper/Zwieback for photographic examples of the different identification symbols and portraits for Jews and Poles].

The Nazis were of course meticulous in their delineation of ethnic/racial backgrounds. The letters “POL” or “POLE,” and then a number series, denoted a Pole. “JUDE,” followed by a series of numbers, denoted a Jew. Hence, three of the four photographs used to “prove” the Final Solution against the Jews in the New History of Photography are those of a non-Jewish Auschwitz inmate. Why belabor this? Because such an error is systemic in western cultures today. In an otherwise meticulous scholarly enterprise of such international scope, this mistake is no mere oversight. The appropriation of the image of an unnoted Gentile concentration camp victim to “prove” the indisputable facts of the Jewish Holocaust is a surrender to the constant historical revision barrage in all realms of life today whereby only Jews count, and even photographic evidence of non-Jews at Auschwitz is appropriated as further, irrefutable evidence for the uniqueness of Jewish martyrology. There is a profound lesson here that subverts the very thesis of the Final Solution article in the History volume. Even as the author heralds the absolute truth of photographic evidence, her illustrations – as any photographs – are always susceptible to contextual manipulation. In this case, as elsewhere, the widespread, monolithic presumption about the specialness of a Holocaust only for Jews precedes all and any facts on the matter. Yet, ironically, the images used in this book in question actually subvert what the author seeks to illustrate, i.e., that it was only Jews who died in a Holocaust-Final Solution at Auschwitz.
The overwhelming Jewish dominance in all realms of art and photography leads us to one place where, in very recent years, some non-Jews have managed to get considerable attention for their photographic work. In the late 1980s American art went through a convulsion of controversy when religious leaders and elected politicians began attacking – and legislating against – what many perceived as decadent modern art values. Seminal among the troublemakers was the work of Andres Serrano, Robert Mapplethorpe (both photographers), and Karen Finley, each in some form rewarded for their efforts by the National Endowment for the Arts. Andres Serrano’s most controversial piece was a photograph of Christ on a crucifix in a container of urine, entitled *Piss Christ*. Mapplethorpe – who has died of AIDS – was celebrated in an NEA-funded retrospective of his works including homosexual sadomasochism, for example, elegant photos of a man peeing into another’s mouth and one in which a fist goes up a rectum.

Karen Finley is a performance artist whose central theme was described in one review as “victimization, especially women as victim, women as underclass, tough stuff … she casually peels off her dress and pours gelatin into her bra … she lathers chocolate over her body … strikes blobs of bean sprouts over body and calls it sperm.” [EVANS, p. 209]

None of these controversial artists are Jewish. However, as Michael Medved pointed out about the largely Jewish-run entertainment media, it should also be of serious concern here that in a field so dominated by Jewish curators, collectors, critics, and dealers, such material is not only heavily supported, but encouraged and glorified. And rewarded.

(A similar kind of incident occurred in 1998 in Great Britain when two Jewish women, Amanda Moss and Marissa Carr [a former stripper], self-described as the Dragon Ladies, “female sexual entertainment,” were awarded nearly $10,000 from the British Arts Council. Joe Ashton, a member of Parliament, complained that “It’s like giving a subsidy to porn. This does enormous damage.”) [BROWN, D., 2-22-98, p. 26]

*Piss Christ*, by any reckoning, is a childish act of sensationalism to engender attention through outrage. It is an assault upon Christian identity, and the response that occurred in reaction to it was predictable. Would the same (largely Jewish) critics, curators, and art financiers who championed this, in the name of free speech and pushing artistic boundaries, feel able to champion a “*Piss Star of David*” or “*Piss Talmud*?” If so, where is it? It does not exist because it is, by “politically correct” dictates, forbidden. Likewise, does the victimization mythology heralded by the gay community (in Jewry’s martyrological shadow) entitle Mapplethorpe to be funded and glorified in dehumanizing and degrading human beings in demeaning sadomasochistic acts? And when Karen Finley howls with sensational rage about her victimhood as a woman, narcissistically covered with chocolate on a stage, where might we look for a model for this kind of demand? Victimhood and sensationalism pays off big time in our era; they are presently the pillars of modern art-making. Where, one wonders, did this all come from?

Another art expression of considerable controversy, albeit in the movie world, was Martin Scorsese’s film, *The Last Temptation of Christ*, a film that
engendered a storm of protest from angry Christian organizations. Among the protestors was Reverend Don Wildmon who “during his boycott of the Last Temptation of Christ … informed the readers of USA Today of the Jewish background of the studio president that released the film.” [BOLTON, p. 8]

This revelation is considered by Jews as an act of anti-Semitism. The issue – in the political sense – is not whether the Last Temptation of Christ is a good or bad movie. The issue is really the Jewish double standard as dictated by the modern “art” world: Jewish hallowed sanctity (the Holiest of Holies rendered to be the secular Holocaust mythos of Consummate Uniqueness and Irreproachable Innocence), and all other religions and belief systems subject to critical, and deconstructive, attack. While Jewish economic and institutional support is offered to deconstruct Christian mythology in the name of free speech and the expanding of artistic boundaries, a parallel deconstruction of Jewish mythology – religious or otherwise, including the Jewish mythologies of incessant victimization – is unfathomable.

As “conservative” commentator Robert Knight has noted about a 1993 rash of anti-Christian artmaking:

“Included in the Whitney show were [Jewish artist/father] Joel-Peter Witkin’s ‘Maquette for Crucifix,’ a naked Jesus Christ surrounded by sadomasochistic, obscene imagery and many grotesque corpses and body parts. [Jewish artist] Suzie Silver contributed a film entitled A Spy, in which Jesus is depicted as a naked woman with her breasts exposed. It was reminiscent of the Easter event in 1984 at the Episcopal cathedral of St. John the Divine in Manhattan, when a statue of ‘Christa’ was unveiled to give the world an image of Jesus Christ as a buxom, bare-breasted goddess. The Whitney [which is headed by Jewish mogul Leonard Lauder] exhibit also included the famous Andres Serrano work ‘Piss Christ,’ a photo of a crucifix in a beaker of the artist’s own urine, and a film by [Jewish] porn star Annie Sprinkle titled, ‘The Sluts and Goddesses Video Workshop, or How to be a Sex Goddess in 10 Easy Steps.’” [KNIGHT, R., 1998, p. 168-169]

In May 1996 the Jewish entertainment mogul, David Geffen (“whose personal collection of art is perhaps one of the two finest collections in the western United States”) donated $5 million to the Los Angeles Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA) which renamed an exhibition center after him. (Geffen has also been a philanthropist for immigrant Russian and Ethiopian Jews in Israel). A little over a year later, in August 1997 (under the auspices of Jewish curator Paul Schimmel), the “Geffen Contemporary” featured an art installation by homosexual artist Robert Gober, once an altar boy. The installment featured a life-size sculpture, in classical pose, arms open, of the Virgin Mary. A large metal shaft like a spear protruded from her midsection. “While the spiral drain pipe pokes a hole in the Virgin Mary and her protective dogma,” says art critic Suzanne Muchnic, referring to its accompanying catalogue, “It also functions as a phallic symbol that penetrates her body bloodlessly.” [MUCHNIC, Stop]
The setting up of Gober’s art exhibition was a major undertaking, involving the removal of 8,000 cubic feet of earth, essentially creating a basement for the Geffen Contemporary museum. “No one will specify the total cost of installing the piece,” noted the New York Times, but the Geffen’s own costs approached $200,000. [SMITH, R., p. E1,4]

When Gober first cast the Virgin Mary sculpture in New York, the Italian family that owned the business he hired to do the job initially told him, “You shouldn’t be doing this. If you were a Muslim (and made a similar artwork), you’d be dead.” [MUCHNIC, Stop, p. 6] “The piece,” noted the New York Times, “also set off a storm of protest letters from some of the city’s Roman Catholics, including the director of media relations for the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Then it received a positive review, with a photograph in the Los Angeles Times.” [SMITH, R, p. E1] (The president of the Los Angeles Times’ parent company, Time-Mirror, has been David Levinthol, who is also the chairman of MOCA’s Board of Trustees). A rally against the artwork at the museum drew hundreds of protesters and the Geffen was barraged by “thousands of letters, most of them negative.” [LA TIMES, 12-20-97, p. B4]

The show continued unabated. Compare this lack of response to protest to the response of the San Jose Mercury-News – the second largest newspaper in northern California – in 1992 when it completely changed its advertising acceptance policy because the Anti-Defamation League, the Jewish Community Relations Council of San Jose and the County of Santa Clara, and the Human Relations Commission saw anti-Semitism in a carpet ad run in the San Jose newspaper’s pages. The ad featured a “Moses-like figure holding tablets above an epithet that said, “Thou Shalt Not Pay Retail.”” [WOLKOFF, p. 25] No more religious characters in ads would be accepted for publication.

In stark comparison, in 1994 Recycled Paper Greetings, the fourth-largest greeting card company in America, headed by Jewish co-founders Phil Friedmann and Michael Keiser, came under heated attack by Muslim and Arab groups for a “get well” card in its line. The card depicted a head-to-toe woman in a black veil and was captioned with “Rather than confront her morbid fear of germs, Millicent changed her name to Yazmine and moved to Tehran.” Inside, noted the Houston Chronicle, there was “irreverent play on the word ‘Mecca’ and ‘Shiiite.’ Hundreds of telephone callers protested to the company and there were two death threats. The company continued to refuse to pull the card from it’s line. [FRANKLIN, S., 1994, p. 9]

When the Gober exhibit finally closed, the Religion page of the Los Angeles Times ran a small article about the artwork (that defamed one of the symbols of the Catholic faith), entitled “Exhibit That Touched Off Catholic Protest Closes.” Next to it, on the same page, in a story many times larger, an article entitled “Reform Rabbis Back Return to Dietary Kosher Laws” respectfully elaborated how some liberal Jews were returning to aspects of Jewish Orthodoxy. [LA TIMES, p. 12-20-97, p. B4]

In 1999, a parallel event occurred on the opposite American coast. The Brooklyn Museum made headlines with its exhibition called “Sensation: Young
British Artists from the Saatchi Collection.” New York mayor (of Catholic heritage) Rudolph Giuliani and others were outraged by the show which included real mutilated animals and an artwork entitled, “The Holy Virgin Mary.” This piece “included cut-outs from pornographic magazines and lumps of elephant dung.” Giuliani accused the Museum board of “turning the museum into a preserve of Catholic-bashers, people who have no regard for animals, and no regard for the sensitivities of children.” [CASIMIR, L., p. 4] Visitors to the exhibit were formally warned that the show “may cause shock, vomiting, confusion, panic, euphoria, and anxiety.” [BARSTOW, p. B1] Even the United States Senate passed a resolution condemning public funds for such artwork. (One-third of the Museum’s budget is provided by New York City coffers, another $500,000 in the last three years came from the National Endowment for the Arts).

As Michael Holden of the Baltimore Sun complained:

“Imagine a painting about eight feet tall and five feet wide. The subject? Martin Luther King, Jr., or the prophet Mohammed, or Buddha, or the Star of David. Now cover the face in that painting with elephant dung. Next, surround the figure in the picture with color photographs of female genitalia. Call the finished product ‘art,’ more specifically, a ‘collage.’ Then, try to get a museum or art gallery to display your picture for the public. No one would touch it. Why? Because covering a picture of King or Buddha or the Star of David with feces and pornography would be condemned as a hate crime … But if you take the Virgin Mary, the mother of Jesus and a central figure in Roman Catholicism as well as in other Christian religions – and cover her image with elephant dung and female genitalia, your picture will be displayed in London and New York art galleries.” [HOLDEN, M., 10-10-99, p. 46]

Based on alleged abrogations of the museum’s stated policies in securing city funds, the Giuliani administration instituted legal actions to pull its funding from the museum. It also accused the Brooklyn Museum of “conspiring with Christie’s auction house, a sponsor of the show, to inflate the value of the artwork displays, which are all privately owned by Charles Saatchi, the British advertising executive.” [HERSZENHORN, p. A1] In turn, the museum sued Giuliani, accusing him of shutting down free speech.

Not surprisingly, most of the central power mongers in this drama – the manipulative inflation of (controversial) art prices, the celebration of the defamation of a Christian icon in the name of free speech, and the glorification of religious attack, were Jewish. These included the owner of all the art work—Charles Saatchi; the head of the Brooklyn Museum, Arthur Lehman; the Chairman of the Board of the museum, Robert S. Rubin; the lawyer who led the counter suit by the museum against the city, “First Amendment expert” Floyd Abrams; and American Civil Liberties Union defender of the museum, Norman Siegel. The New York Times (whose editorial board is largely Jewish; see earlier) printed an anonymous editorial entitled, “The Museum’s Courageous Stand.” (The actual author of the Virgin Mary depiction elevated to fame was not Jewish. He was African. Lerner
insisted that critics of the painting were being culturally intolerant, that the animal feces that decorated it was really a fertility symbol.)

The Saatchi show was formulated and first exhibited at the Royal Academy in London; that venue is also headed by a Jew: Norman Rosenthal. For another Rosenthal exhibition, after Sensation, the Times of London noted that the

“curators of the Royal Academy insisted yesterday that hardcore porn and images of mutilation by contemporary artists were comparable to the Old Masters. They likened a sado-masochistic video to Michelangelo and Renaissance drawings, a pile of rubbish to the 16th-century painter Giuseppe Arcimboldo, and an assemblage of mutilated toy soldiers to another 16th-century master, Pieter Breughel the Elder. Norman Rosenthal, exhibitions secretary of the 237-year-old institution, and his colleague, Max Wigram, defended the latest objects to fill Burlington House - a sequel to the 1997 Sensation show - against suggestions that they could not be described as art. Walking round the Apocalypse exhibition yesterday before it opens to the public on Saturday, they repeatedly drew comparisons with the Old Masters … Mr Rosenthal was unable fully to explain how it differed from pornography screened in any Soho sex shop: ‘I don’t see porn videos in Soho. This is about men and women. It is a very Existentialist work of art, like a very beautiful drawing.’” [ALBERGE, D., 9-20-00]

London’s Daily Telegraph complained that at this same Royal Academy show, Apocalypse, “its organizer Norman Rosenthal … basks amidst a freak show almost wholly devoid of authentic art.” [JOHNSON, D., 9-20-00] Or, as London’s Guardian noted:

“The Royal Academy is a perverse British institution, and Norman Rosenthal is a perverse institutional figure. You can’t imagine him anywhere else. The [London art gallery] Tate would never have put on Sensation!, the exhibition of Charles Saatchi’s collection the Academy mounted in 1997: how could the Tate have allowed Saatchi to stamp himself on history in that way? But Rosenthal had no qualms about importing all this stuff into the sacred halls of Burlington House, and for many Sensation! is the defining exhibition of young British art, not only here but in America. In his office is a framed front page of the New York Post leading with mayor Giuliani’s attempt to ban the show last year. ‘I was at the opening (at the Brooklyn Museum). All the glamorous people were there. But, he says, no protesters at all. ‘I was almost disappointed. The whole thing took place not in real people’s experience but in the cliches of politicians and journalists. That’s so boring. Art is beyond that.’ This denial of a desire to create a stir is frankly unbelievable. Rosenthal is the epitome of the art curator as showman … Rosenthal’s shows have helped to define British culture now, making the exhibition a phenomenon, a public ritual … Since he became exhibitions secretary more than 20 years ago, Rosenthal has turned the Royal Academy into a venue for
event art. Buzz, hype, noise, crowds are what this purportedly posh and staid organisation thrives on.” [JONES, J., 1-4-00]

Reviewing the Brooklyn Museum’s Sensation, Camille Paglia complained at the Internet magazine Salon.com:

“As an arts educator, I think that the behavior of the Brooklyn Museum has been self-interested and short-sighted … The Brooklyn show [Sensations] is a perfect example of the improper diversion of public monies – in this case to aggrandize a single British collector [Saatchi], an obnoxious advertising executive of dubious taste … And I’m just as sick of ‘Catholic-bashing’ as Giuliani himself. I may be an atheist, but I was raised in Italian-Catholicism, and it remains my native culture. I resent the double standard that protects Jewish and African-American symbols and icons but allows Catholicism to be routinely trashed by supercilious liberals and ranting gay activists … That a Jewish museum director had no compunction about selecting a parodic image of the Madonna from the whole of [artist] Chris Ofili’s dung-bedecked oeuvre shows either stupidity or malice.” [PAGLIA, C., 1999] [Salon.com even had a subtitle for Paglia’s article, Why are a Jewish collector and a Jewish museum director promoting anti-Catholic art?, but it was later discretely removed. POLLITT, K., THE NATION, 1999]

“Charles Saatchi is clearly the big winner in this,” said Bruce Wolman, editor of Art and Auction magazine, “… Saatchi is not a great advertising man for nothing.” [CONNOR, p. 51] The head of the Brooklyn Museum, Arthur Lehman, also stirred Catholic ire earlier when he purchased an Andy Warhol version of the Last Supper for a Baltimore museum. (In October 1999, the Jewish ethnic magazine Forward noted that the Council of American Jewish Museums “was circulating a letter in support of the Brooklyn Museum of Art in its battle with Mayor Giuliani.” Likewise, “the associates division of the American Friends of the Israel Museum were scheduled to visit the Brooklyn Museum exhibit on October 17. The visit was to be followed by a cocktail reception at the home of the Brooklyn Museum’s director, Arnold Lehman.”) [FORWARD, 10-8-99, p. 5]

And the judge selected to hear the city’s case against the Museum? Nina Gershon, described by the New York Times as having studied “psychiatry and the law at the Hampstead clinic, run by Anna Freud, the daughter of Sigmund Freud. She is married to Bernard J. Fried, an acting state Supreme Court Justice in Manhattan.” [FRIED, J., p. B3] In November 1999 Judge Gershon ruled in the Museum’s favor.

Thus armed, completely insensitive to Catholic complaint, Arnold Lehman and his Brooklyn Museum returned in 2001 with yet another controversial defamation of Catholicism. This time African-American artist Renee Cox was afforded space for her photograph “Yo Mama’s Last Supper,” in image in which Christ is depicted as a nude woman. The curator of this exhibition was also Jewish, Barbara Milstein. [HERMAN, J., 2-16-01] As Catholic Defense League president William Donohue wrote to Ms. Milstein:
“I would love to know whether there is any portrayal of any aspect of history that you might personally find so offensive as to be excluded from an exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum of Art. For starters, would you include a photograph of Jewish slave masters sodomizing their obsequious black slaves? And worry not, when contemplating your answer, just think of it as a work of high artistic merit.” [DONOHUE, W., 2-15-01]

Meanwhile, across the world, in 2001 “the Jewish director of Warsaw’s leading state-funded art space, the Zacheta Gallery” resigned. Anda Rottenberg had been under critical fire and national pressure to be fired for two of her controversial exhibitions. [ART NEWSPAPER, 3-13-01] In the first, she presented the work of an Italian artist who had a life-like sculpture of the Pope (a revered figure in Poland) lying on the floor, crushed by a meteor. Upon viewing the exhibit,

“two MPs [members of the Polish Parliament] from the Catholic nationalist party, Halina Nowina-Konopka and Witold Tomczyk, seriously damaged the sculpture when it was on display … They authors of the attack alluded to the Jewish origins of Anda Rottenberg, the museum’s director, ‘How would [s]he like a sculpture to be sent to the National Museum of Israel showing a rabbi squashed by Stalin or Arafat?’ … The Polish Minister for Culture has been inundated with letters of protest about the sculpture calling for Mr Rottenberg’s dismissal.” [ART NEWSPAPER, 2-23-01]

In the Rottenberg exhibition, it was reported that

“one of Poland’s best known actors and film stars is currently under police investigation and faces a possible prison sentence for slashing a portrait of himself, in an exhibition in Warsaw’s leading contemporary art gallery … The show consisted of an uncaptioned series of photographs of actors in Nazi uniform, taken from film stills without the actors agreement, by the Polish artist Piotr Uklanski … Accompanied by TV cameramen and reporters and as the cameras rolled, the actor Daniel Olbrychski, featured in one of the portraits, pulled a sword from under his greatcoat and slashed some of the exhibits, then tore the two featuring himself from the wall and left. The choice of the sword was significant: it was one used in a film about a swashbuckling Polish hero and patriot Kmicic. Mr. Olbrchski later declared: ‘I defend the right to say that there are some frontiers of decency which were clearly overstepped in this exhibition, and I reacted violently in the hope that my gesture will highlight my objections. I did it in the spotlight of the camera and flashlights because I wanted Poland to know my feelings about such ‘artistic practices.’ Furthermore, I received the agreement of other actors whose portraits were in the show, including the French film star Jean-Paul Belmondo who agreed that I should protest in their name. I can understand that there are opportunistic artists but I cannot understand why a director of such a serious institution as Zachenta has accepted this. Soon Mrs. Anda Rottenberg will organize an exhibition at which she will ex-
pose the faces of known actors on lavatory paper because she considers that as we are public figures she is entitled to do so.” [ADAM, G., 2001]

* Note a similar museum case in 1968 and a different result (an example of the usual double standard), when the Jewish community felt defamed by a New York City art institution. A Metropolitan Museum of Art catalogue for its African-American photography exhibition, Harlem on My Mind, was decried as anti-Semitic largely because of the comments about the Jewish community by African-American author Candice Van Ellison. Van Ellison noted high amounts of anti-Semitism in the Black community, due to, as she saw it, the many Jewish landlords in Harlem, the many Black servants and maids in Jewish homes, and other forms of exploitation. Jewish pressure forced the museum to pull the catalogue from circulation, despite the fact that the curator of the show and head of the catalogue was Jewish, Allon Schoener, and the fact that Van Ellison’s offending comments were merely paraphrases of quotes from a sociological study by Jewish author Nathan Glazer and non-Jew Patrick Moynihan. [HOVING, T., 1993, p. 176]

The curator of the Metropolitan, Thomas Hoving, recalls that he received a call from the office of then-NYC mayor John Lindsey, who was also under heat from the Jewish community to act against the catalogue. “Lindsay,” said Hoving, “called upon me to withdraw [the catalogue] at once.” “My advice to you,” (Jewish) mayoral aide Joe Feldstein told Hoving, “is to act now. Do what the Mayor wants or you’re in deep shit!” [HOVING, T., 1993, p. 171] “Two members of the City Council,” notes Hoving, “were calling for a hearing – at once! – to consider halting all funds for the museum until the offensive catalogue was removed from sale … [HOVING, p. 172] … There were increasing outcries from City Council members to ‘launch an economic boycott against the Metropolitan’ …[HOVING, p. 173-174] … On Thursday … twelve of the more prominent members of the City Council issued a resolution requesting the immediate withdrawal of the catalogue and the withholding of city funding until such time.” [HOVING, p. 175]

Museum trustees even called in a former (Jewish) Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, to provide advise about how to resolve the situation. The trustees hoped Goldberg could “figure a way out of this mess” but “what he did was almost the opposite. Goldberg intoned that in his view there was nothing to be gained by the ‘continuance of offering for sale the offending catalogue.’” [HOVING, T., 1993, p. 173] Even the New York Times, defender of “free speech” in the later Brooklyn Museum’s defamations against Christianity, “published a bitter editorial condemning the show and its anti-Semitic statements.” [HOVING, p. 174]

The offending catalogue was published under Metropolitan auspices by Random House. The president of Random House, Robert Bernstein, and its
chairman, Bennet Cerf, were both Jewish. Hoving notes that Cerf and Bernstein,

“who had distinguished career fighting for civil rights all over the world, had called [curator and catalogue head Allon] Shoener to task, asking him to issue a personal apology for the catalogue. Schoener had refused. The publishing executives had informed Schoener that under the continuing and increasing pressures from the Jewish community, they might not be able to hold out much longer on withdrawing the book. Schoener said flatly, ‘But that would be book-burning.’ Cerf, incensed, shaking all over, thrust his finger towards Schoener’s face and shouted, ‘Do you know what you have done to Random House?’” [HOVING, T., 1993, p. 174-175]

The Metropolitan Museum and Random House soon caved in to Jewish pressure and withdrew the catalogue.

Likewise, notes J. J. Goldberg, “In 1994 the San Francisco Jewish community rose up and protested an anti-Semitic mural on the student union building at publicly funded San Francisco State University. Unlike the Brooklyn Museum [and its Saatchi collection], San Francisco State backed down.” [GOLDBERG, J. J., 10-8-99, p. 14]

Also, in 2001, due to immediate pressure from both private individuals and the city of Los Angeles, part of a mural painted by two Hispanic artists in Los Angeles on private property was painted over even before it was finished. The offending section – part of a “timeline” about the Hispanic experience in California – depicted “an unflattering caricature of a Jewish landlord.” The mural was in Boyle Heights, an area of Los Angles once largely Jewish, and now Hispanic. Although Jewish slumdors are a verifiable part of ghetto history throughout America (See Chapter 20, p. 734, p. 889, p. 889), the landlord image was even construed – sight unseen – by the local SPARC artist organization, as the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles tells it, to be “hateful and racist.” Even a non-Jewish local artist, Dawn Pentecost, volunteered to destroy the art work in her neighborhood. “I don’t think we have to accept expressions of anger and hate in our environment,” she told a Jewish reporter, “We have to have standards.” [TEITELBAUM, S., 3-12-01]

Also in 2001, always eager to check anything that depicts Jews or Judaism in anything less than an idealistic light, the American Jewish Congress formally protested “B.C.” cartoonist Johnny Hart for his depiction (at Easter) of the candles of the Jewish menorah going out, being replaced at the end of his comic strip by a cross. “Supercessionism,” the AJC declared, “the belief that Christianity can and will replace Judaism, has been strongly repudiated by many leading Catholic and Protestant theologians … Whatever the cartoonist’s personal beliefs, the sudden insertion of religiously offensive cartoons into the comics section of Sunday newspapers is highly inappropriate and abuses readers, especially young children, who turn to B. C. every week.” There are certainly such people who have bowed to such Jewish lobbying pressure, but not only is Christianity a “supercessionist” faith, but so is Islam, which holds that the prophet Mohammed is the last in the
line of prophets descending from Jewish and Christian tradition. And how is Juda-ism itself not “supercessionist?” How could it not be? Judaism was invented in a social, political, and religious vacuum? The AJC “urged newspapers across the country to either replace [the cartoon] or print a disclaimer on Sunday.” [AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, 2001]
“Washington is an easy place to be Jewish these days. There are some 200,000 Jews living in the area, making this the seventh-largest Jewish community in North America … No one would dispute that area Jews are disproportionately represented in the upper echelons of law, politics, medicine, science, journalism, accounting, and other professions.” [The Washington DC Jewish community includes “at least 62 synagogues” and “32 Jewish preschool and day schools.”]

Barbara Matusow, MAY 2000, p. 79

“Jewish organizations like to deny that there is such a thing as a Jewish lobby, which is, of course, nonsense, but it may fairly be said that the massive strength of the Zionist lobby is of comparatively recent origin.”

Chaim Bermant, 1977, p. 253

“Oscar Cohen, a long-time official of the Anti-Defamation League, wrote to a friend that by the 1970s organized American Jewry had become ‘an agency of the Israeli government… follow[ing] its directions from day to day.’”

Peter Novick, 1999, p. 149

“The president of the United States is concerned about our intelligence. He goes to the president of Israel and asks him to share the secrets of Mossad, the Israeli intelligence agency. The Israeli president is unable to help him but suggests something. He tells the president, ‘If you want to know anything, just go to the synagogue. The Jews there know everything.’ The president dresses up in a skull cap, beard, and all the accouterments of the religious Jew and goes to a temple. He sits down next to an old Jew and says, ‘What’s happening?’ The old Jew says, ‘The president is going to be here.’”


“With money in hand, you can demand.”

Old Yiddish folk saying, [KUMOVE, S., 1985, p. 178]

“Follow the money.”

Common folk wisdom about any given political situation

“No election [in modern America],” says Lenni Brenner, “would be thought complete without the domestic politicians, down to the ranks of mayors and city council members, rushing to appear before Jewish organizations to reaf-
firm their fealty to ‘the only democracy in the Middle East.’” [BRENNER, p. 9] “While some Jewish agencies have persistently denied the existence of a Jewish vote,” says Stephen Isaacs, “just as persistently the politicians have pandered specifically to ‘Jewish’ interests and issues. The pandering has been especially observable since 1948, when the state of Israel was created.” [ISAACS, p. 142]

“The percentage of Jews … who involve themselves in party affairs as policy-makers and fund-raisers,” noted Will Maslow, general counsel of the American Jewish Congress, “is probably higher than any other racial, religious, or ethnic group. The result is that Jews play a role in the political life of the country whose significance far transcends their proportion of the total population.” [BRENNER, p. 121] There are, suggested the 1999 Jewish Democratic Council executive director, Ira Foreman, a “disproportionate number of opinion leaders among Jews.” [ROTH, B., 10-11-99] Jewish theologian and political activist Seymour Siegel suggested that the “messianic drive is present in many great Jews. Having lost the faith that there is a God, but not wanting to give up messianism, they go into politics …” [ISAACS, p. 20] “The pursuit of salvation through politics is a modern disease,” wrote Norman Podhoretz, “And a lot of Jews are infected with it.” [ISAACS, p. 26]

“American Jewry cannot claim the dubious distinction of being normal,” notes Henry Feingold, “It is, to be sure, shaped by the American society with which it casts its lot; but it also has, as part of it, Jewish connections, a long separate history of its own that shapes its vision. It lives delicately suspended between two cultural pulls, the Jewish and the American. It’s that connection to k‘lal Yisrael, the mysterious tie that binds Jews everywhere together, and that also determines its unique political character … It is also that connection that compels American Jewry to exert a special effort to influence the United States government … United States foreign policy contains the most discernible signs of a specific Jewish influence.” [FEINGOLD, p. 115] Jewish influence in American popular culture and government is so great that sociologist Irving Horowitz even felt comfortable asserting that “the critique of American imperialism, reformism, and welfarism readily spills into a critique of America’s Jewish element.” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 91]

So what is the main Jewish concern in high level American politics? Crime? Pollution? The unemployment rolls? The economy? Racism? “In the world of big-league Jewish politics,” noted the Baltimore Jewish Times in 1996, “one question overshadows all others, year after year: how friendly is the current [White House] administration of Jewish and pro-Israel interests? Jewish leaders may be interested in a host of domestic and international issues. But in the end, an unfriendly administration, or one that sends mixed signals, becomes the central organizing principle of Jewish political life.” [BESSE BESSE BESSE [LOVE], p. 34]

“[Israel supporters’] influence,” wrote former United States Congressman Paul Findley in the 1980s, “is pervasive throughout the government and in almost every aspect of life, private and public, across the United States.” [FINDLEY, p. xxvi] Behind the scenes Jewish American political and economic lobbying for governmental concessions to Jewish concerns has a long history.
In 1906, for example, financier Jacob Schiff and other wealthy Jews formed the American Jewish Committee, initially to help fellow Jews across the world in Russia. One way to accomplish this was to put severe economic pressure on the Tsar’s economy. American President Taft, however, was not receptive to Jewish demands for an abrogation of the Russo-American trade treaty. “Calling upon friends and resources,” says Edwin Black, “the [Jewish] Committee began a widespread public appeal to have Congress force the President to end commercial relations with Russia. Within weeks, House and Senate abrogation resolutions – each personally approved by the Committee – were prepared.” [BLACK, p. 31] The rescinding of the treaty passed in a vote shortly thereafter.

Powerful financier Bernard Baruch (whose father was a South Carolina member of the Ku Klux Klan) [COIT, M., p. 12-13] was head of President Woodrow Wilson’s War Industries Board during World War I. [PLESUR, M. 1982, p. 86] A 1957 dust jacket blurb for his biography notes that “for nearly fifty years Bernard M. Baruch has been almost as well known to most Americans as that of the President of the United States, and yet he has never held an elective office … Mr. Baruch is best known in the role of ‘adviser’ not only to six Presidents, but to Cabinet members, congressmen, generals, diplomats and party leaders … As Chairman of the War Industries Board in the First World War, he controlled the entire industrial establishment of the country.” [COIT, M., 1957]

Jeffrey Potter notes his influence in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, when, in 1944, the President fell ill:

“The condition was serious enough for him to go to Bernie Baruch’s plantation, Hobcaw, in South Carolina, for recuperation. FDR didn’t really like his host, [Jewish media mogul] Dorothy [Schiff] explained, as both he and Eleanor thought Baruch too conservative, but he was a source of campaign funding.” [POTTER, J., 1976, p. 194] (Schiff was also an influential friend of Roosevelt: “By the time Dorothy visited [Roosevelt] at Warm Springs, Georgia, a few weeks before Christmas, 1938, she no longer felt ill at ease. As usual, she had to make her own travel arrangement, and it never occurred to her to wonder why it wasn’t done for her. She now suspects [Roosevelt] was afraid to have it known that it was always at his invitation that they met.”) [POTTER, J., 1976, p. 155]

Another such case is that of Jewish Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, “one of [President Woodrow] Wilson’s key advisers.” [MURPHY, B., 1983, p. 27] “After meeting with Jacob de Haas, a former secretary to [Zionist leader] Theodore Herzl in 1912,” notes current Jewish Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer, “[Brandeis] joined the American Federation of Zionists and started making public remarks in support of Zionism … In 1917 … his intervention with President Wilson helped secure American support for the Balfour Declaration [in support of a Jewish state in Palestine], thereby assuring its issuance. In 1938, not long before his death, he called upon President Roosevelt, seeking FDR’s public diplomatic support for allowing more Jewish refugees to travel to Palestine.” [BREYER, p. 18] [De Haas actually became Brandeis’s secretary.] [MURPHY, B.,
“Since Brandeis,” notes Kevin Avruch about the Zionist currents in American government, “the Zionist movement in America functioned effectively as banker for the world [Zionist] movement and as a fulcrum for the political leverage sometimes needed to mobilize American presidents and public opinion in support of the Jewish cause.” [AVRUCH, K., 1981, p. 32] “

By 1956, American Secretary of State John Foster Dulles complained that “I am aware of how almost impossible it is in this country to carry out a foreign policy not approved by the Jews.” [SORIN, p. 216] On another occasion, long before Jews had built their modern political machine, he complained about the “terrific control the Jews have over the news media and the barrage which the Jews have built up on Congressmen … I am very much concerned over the fact that the Jewish influence here is completely dominating the scene and making it almost impossible to get Congress to do anything they don’t approve of. The Israeli Embassy is practically dictating to Congress through influential Jewish people in the country.” [FINDLEY, DEL, p. 105]

In 1984, Admiral Thomas Moorer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, complained that

“I’ve never seen a President – I don’t care who he is – stand up to [the Jews] … They always get what they want. The Israelis know what is going on all the time. I got to the point where I wouldn’t write anything down. If the American people understood what a grip these people have got on our government, they would rise up in arms.” [CURTISS, p. 267]

Another former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General George J. Brown, told an audience at Duke University that “[the Jewish lobby] is so strong you wouldn’t believe now. We have the Israelis coming to us for equipment. We say we can’t possibly get the Congress to support that. They say, ‘Don’t worry about the Congress.’ This is somebody from another country, but they can do it.” [CURTISS, p. 267] Brown’s comments almost cost him his job when Jewish lobbying groups attacked him with charges of anti-Semitism.

A distinction must be made, wrote Republican Senator Charles Matthais, “between ethnicity, which enriches American life and culture, and organized ethnic interest groups, which sometimes press causes that derogate from the national interest.” American elected politicians, adds the senator, “have been subjected to recurrent pressures from what has come to be known as the Israel lobby.” [BLITZER, p. 134]

“During the 1944 presidential campaign,” notes Steven Spiegel, “[Franklin D.] Roosevelt was pressured into promising to work for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth [i.e., modern Israel].” [SPIEGEL, S., p. 12] “There were so many Jews in Roosevelt’s advisory entourage – Samuel Rosenman, Benjamin Cohen, Felix Frankfurter, David Lilienthal, Bernard Baruch, Anne Rosenberg, Sidney Hillman, and David Niles,” says Jewish scholar Barnet Litvinoff, “as well [Louis] Brandeis, [Henry] Morgenthau [Roosevelt’s Secretary of Treasury from 1933-45], and [Herbert] Lehman [the governor of New York] – that many people believed that the President himself must be descended from German Jews.” [LITVINOFF, S., p. 41] (“During
the war, Republican campaigners, referring to Roosevelt’s prominent Jewish associate Sidney Hillman, put up billboards across the nation: ‘It’s Your Country—Why Let Sidney Hillman Run It?’) [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 42] “David Lilienthal was chosen by Roosevelt to direct the Tennessee Valley Authority, an agency that virtually reshaped the role of government toward business. Later, he was also chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 142]

At least three of Roosevelt’s “Palace Guard,” reputedly his seven “most intimate advisers,” were Jewish (Frankfurter, Niles, and Rosenman). [MURPHY, B., 1983, p. 257] Rosenman was an official Roosevelt speechwriter; Frankfurter, a Supreme Court justice, was an unofficial one. The judge also “gradually advanced himself till he was virtually an informal campaign manager [of Roosevelt’s presidential campaign], playing a central role in every aspect of the campaign, from drafting speeches to plotting election strategy. [MURPHY, B., 1983, p. 194-195, 205] “Roosevelt surrounded himself with so many unmistakably Jewish advisers,” notes Barbara Matusow, “that his enemies took to branding his programs the ‘Jew Deal.’” [MATUSOW, B., MAY 2000, p. 79] Leo Rosten was a “popular Jewish writer” and head of the Office of War Information’s ‘Nature of the Enemy’ department. [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 27] In 1943, William Bullitt, a former ambassador was complaining that “the Roosevelt administration’s emphasis on the European war as opposed to the Asian one was the result of Jewish influence.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 28]

Roosevelt himself once joked, when running into Samuel Rosenman, Stephen Wise (a rabbi and World Zionist Organization president) and Nahum Goldmann (who succeeded Wise in the Zionist group) outside his weekend home in the country (where Rosenman rented a home nearby): “Carry on, boys, Sam will tell me what to do on Monday … Imagine what [Nazi leader] Goebbels would pay for a photo of this scene: the President of the United States taking his instructions from the three Elders of Zion.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 156] (Decades earlier, President Theodore Roosevelt’s Jewish circle included Oscar Solomon Strauss, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor who declined an offer to become the country’s Secretary of Treasury. “He was afraid,” says the director of the American Jewish Historical Society, Michael Feldman, “too close an association of Jews and money would be bad for the image of the Jew.” [LIEBLICH, J., 8-19-2000, p. A10] Earlier there was Julius Rosenwald, the Sears-Roebuck mogul: “An unabashed admirer of the solid conservatism of William Howard Taft, and one of his most loyal supporters within the Jewish community, Rosenwald contributed generously to the campaigns of every Republican candidate of his era. He was an especially ardent backer of his friend Herbert Hoover, contributing $50,000 to Hoover’s 1928 presidential campaign and becoming a close adviser and confidant during his presidency.”) [DALIN, D., 1998] Close to Hoover was also Lewis Strauss, Hoover’s “private secretary” and “lifelong friend and trusted confidant.” “Strauss’ volunteer job would not only start a lifelong friendship with Hoover but also open up channels of cooperation and amity between Hoover and leading members of the Jewish community.” [WENTLING, S., 2000, p. 377, 382] “In March 1919, as the feast of Passover approached, Hoover was asked to ensure that the Jews of Poland received flour
in time to make Passover bread. The chief readily complied.” [WENTLING, S., 2000, p. 383]

As early as the 1940s, Zionist propaganda to move American foreign policy to Zionist dictates was massively orchestrated. As Melvin Urofsky notes

“Zionist groups organized massive petition and letter-writing campaigns. President Roosevelt received one such petition in January 1945 seconding the Biltmore program [favorable policy to the Jews in then-Palestine] and signed by more than 150 college presidents and deans and 1,800 faculty members drawn from 250 colleges and universities in 45 states. A total of 41 state legislatures and hundreds of municipalities, representing more than 90 per cent of the nation’s population, approved pro-Zionist resolutions.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 34]

Roosevelt was, of course, a Democrat. From the Republican Zionist side against Roosevelt, Arthur Hertzberg notes the case of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis:

“[Silver] remained a factor in Republican politics, because he could and did produce the necessary Jewish votes in Ohio, especially for his friends in the [politician] Taft family. As a Zionist leader he translated this power into political leverage against Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when the latter faltered on Zionist issues.” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 40]

In the next American presidency, notes Steven Spiegel, “it is astonishing that [President Truman] was not more pro-Zionist, given the pressures on him … [SPIEGEL, S., p. 16] … Truman was often bitter about the Zionist pressures on him. ‘If Jesus Christ couldn’t satisfy them here on earth,’ he is reported to have exclaimed, ‘how the hell am I supposed to?’” [SPIEGEL, S., p. 20] Under Truman, a Jewish White House officer, David Niles, “was strongly committed to the Zionist cause; he was not only prepared to argue with the President in favor of a Jewish state but to counter the effects of the [White House] bureaucracy … [SPIEGEL, S., p. 17] … [Niles’] modus operandi seems to have been to act for the president as long as Truman had not ordered him against a particular action … Truman does not seem to have known precisely what Niles was doing.” [SPIEGEL, S., p. 29]

“Our great stroke of luck,” wrote World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann, “was that Roosevelt was replaced by Harry Truman … He said: ‘My friends are Jews, the Jews want partition [in Palestine], all right, they can have it’ … The president had a Jewish childhood friend called Jacobson, his co-partner in a shop before we went into politics, and it is partly due to this man that we got the Negev [desert as part of modern Israel].” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 33] Eddie Jacobson, member of a B’nai B’rith lodge in Kansas City, flew to Washington DC to expressly implore Truman to see Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann. As Melvin Urofsky notes:

“Although Truman was always glad to see old friends, as soon as Jacobson started talking about Palestine, the President tensed and said that he would rather not discuss the subject, letting the whole problem run its course in the United Nations. But Jacobson, by now very self-
conscious, would not stop, even when Truman started complaining about ‘how disrespectful and how mean’ some of the Jewish spokesmen had been.” [UROFSKY, 1978, p. 165]

Theo Thackery, the non-Jewish husband of Dorothy Schiff (then-owner of the New York Post and granddaughter of famous Jewish investment banker Jacob Schiff), explains an incident he had with President Harry Truman in the White House:

“Almost immediately in the conversation [Truman] said, ‘Now Thackery, if only the goddamn New York Jews would just shut their goddamn mouths and quit hollering ... They’re screwing up the situation, and I could get along with them, if they would just get together and decide what the hell they want. They’re all over the lot, the goddamn Jews, and here you are, not even a Jew, representing the spearhead that’s causing all kinds of hell.’ I had to say, ‘Well, Mr. President, you make it impossible for me to continue this conversation. I’ve got to assume by ‘goddamn New York Jews’ you must mean my wife, who is a Jew. I know you better than to believe that you are consciously anti-Semitic, but I consider it absolutely outrageous.’ Immediately, I went to his press secretary and the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I told them I’d had this absolutely terrible conversation with the President and suggested he be advised more clearly on such matters.” [POTTER, J., 1976, p. 202-203]

Melvin Urofsky notes the successful Zionist pressures upon American government towards the founding of the modern Jewish state of Israel (in 1948):

“Edwin M. Wright has charged that ‘the Zionist propaganda machine was efficient and thorough, blanketing the American political processes in systematic campaigns targeted at the general population, city halls, state houses, and on up the ladder to Washington.’ A study of American periodical coverage of the Palestine debate confirmed that the Zionist viewpoint dominated the medium, with an emphasis on the humanitarian and religious aspects of the movement. Recent studies of Harry Truman’s role in the propartition [of Arabs and Jews in then-Palestine] decision agree that Zionist-generated political pressure proved the major factor in the White House overruling State Department advice, a conclusion James Forrestal [the Secretary of Defense] bitterly reached thirty years ago.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 147]

Behind the scenes Zionist lobbying for special favors swayed FBI director J. Edgar Hoover (he turned a blind eye to Jews smuggling arms out of the U.S. to the Jewish army in Palestine), [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 157] and New York City mayor William O’Dwyer (who arranged for policeman to abandon guard of a Zionist cache of weapons headed also to the Middle East.) [UROFSKY, p. 157]

In recent decades, President Dwight D. Eisenhower in the 1950s best resisted Jewish lobbying pressures. As Melvin Urofsky notes,

“The first five years of the Eisenhower administration … marked the low point in relations between the Israeli and American governments.
One analyst has suggested that Eisenhower, as the only President from Truman to Ford who did not serve in Congress, had never been exposed to Jewish political pressure. Eisenhower’s military career had shielded him from this experience, and of all recent Presidents, he showed, the least inclination to befriend the Jewish community.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 305]

During Eisenhower’s administration, in 1956, in a secret plan devised with France and Great Britain (both which had interests in the Suez Canal), Israel – in an act in direct contradiction to American foreign policy interests – invaded Egypt’s Sinai desert. Then, despite Eisenhower administration and United Nations insistence that Israel withdraw from the territory it had seized, the Jewish army remained. Urofsky notes the American Jewish mood of the period and its efforts to dictate American foreign policy:

“Although American Jews agonized over Israeli intransigence, they did not worry about the old charge of dual loyalty. Here was the classic case that the anti-Zionists of the American Council for Judaism [a now extinct Jewish anti-Zionist group] had so fearfully predicted: a clash of policies between the United States and Israel, with American Jews caught in the middle. What would they do? They bombarded Congress and the White House with demands and protests that the Eisenhower administration pursue a more pro-Israel course. Some experts believed that American Jews would hesitate before contributing – even indirectly – to a nation at odds with their own. Yet just the opposite happened. UJA contributions jumped 20 per cent, from $58.8 million to $70.6 million.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 315]

Eisenhower was an exception in his resistance to incessant Jewish pressures. What has increasingly developed over recent decades in American government, much more the governmental norm, was bluntly addressed on June 6, 1972, by a troubled U.S. citizen, Norman F. Dacey, of Southburg, Connecticut, who bought a full page ad in the New York Times to state his perception that the United States had become “a dancing bear, responding dumbly to the commands given by the government of Israel and indirectly through a potent fifth column which operates here in America and which gives blind obedience to the Zionist credo that all Jews everywhere owe national loyalty to Israel.” The Jewish community responded to Dacey’s ad with outrage; the Anti-Defamation League even bought Times space for a rebuttal. In the midst of a unified Jewish attack against the Times for allowing such an ad, the Jewish vice-president of the paper, Sydney Grenson, formally apologized to the ADL for printing the critical ad, saying that the Times was “trying to work out a policy with the Advertising Acceptability Department to make sure that even the barest chance of such an implication for any ethnic group should not appear in the paper.” [FORSTER/EPSTEIN, p. 120-121]

Jewish influence in (and upon) government is extraordinary. In the spring of 1977, for instance, Congress passed a bill that prohibited American corporations from complying with the ongoing Arab economic boycott against Israel.
“The bill was hammered out between Jewish defense agencies and the Business Council, a prestigious, high-powered big business organization headed by Du Pont’s chairman, Irving Shapiro.” [KREFETZ, p. 92] “The pro-Israeli banks were so dominant in the field,” said Business Week, that they ‘cannot realistically be avoided because of their sheer size.” [KREFETZ, p. 98] “The domestic political game played around the activities of the United States in the Middle East has only one major player,” says Seymour Lipset, “the organized Jewish community who, with campaign contributions, activism, and media influence, constitute a major force.” [LIPSET, p. 157]

In November 2001, during the chaotic Palestinian Intifada (uprising) against Israeli occupation and international outcry against repeatedly bloody Israeli invasions of Palestinian towns and territory (let alone Israeli campaigns of “targetted assassinations”), 89 U. S. Senators wrote a formal letter to President George W. Bush and “urged him not to restrain Israel from retaliating fully against Palestinian violence and to express his solidarity with Israel soon.” “There is constant concern about the administration’s wavering,” declared Jewish Senator Arlen Specter, “[Secretary of State Colin] Powell talks about the cycle of violence that suggests one produces the other and that there is a moral equivalency, which is not true. Terrorists killing civilians is totally unjustified, and Israel’s response is self-defense.” [SCIOLINO, E., 11-17-01]

This focus on Jewish international concerns in United States governmental actions, even aside from Israel, often overrules American ones. “In 1979,” says Jewish scholar Stephen Whitfield, “… the FBI had arrested two Soviet spies operating on American soil. The spies were exchanged not for Americans in Soviet custody but for five Soviet nationals who were political prisoners, including two Jews convicted …. nine years earlier. For American diplomacy to consider the lives of non-American citizens so precious was a pointed contrast to its failures before and during the Holocaust.” [WHITFIELD, American, p. 16] In 1986, a Jew, Karl Koecher “one of the most important [Soviet] spies in United States history” was released from an American prison in exchange – not for an American, but – for Soviet dissident Anatoly Acharansky who then moved to Israel and later became the Jewish state’s Minister of Trade to capitalist Russia. [DEUTSCHE PRESSE AGENTUR, 1-26-97; KESSLER, R., 9-17-98, p. C1]

In 1973 the Jewish Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, “convinced the Soviets that Jewish emigration was a necessary price for winning … coveted trade benefits.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 171] “In 1975,” notes Menachem Kaufman, “when President Ford and Secretary Kissinger were unable to convince the Rabin government [in Israel] to withdraw from the Mitla and Gidi Passes in Sinai without a formal renunciation of belligerency by the Egyptians, the Ford administration placed a partial curb on U.S. military and financial support for Israel. American Jewish reaction was a nationwide campaign of support for Israel.” [KAUFMAN, p. 247] In May 1977 Congress passed an anti-boycott bill against the unified Arab economic war against the Jewish state. “The Jewish organizations,” notes J. J. Goldberg, “had worked together more or less seamlessly, securing the cooperation of friendly Jews in the news media, business, the ad-
ministration, and Congress. The result was a major change in United States policy.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 171]

Prominent (Jewish) CBS television newsman Mike Wallace wrote about the Jewish lobby that heavily leaned on the media, and him, in 1975:

“At that time the so-called Jewish lobby was one of the most powerful pressure groups in America. That is no slur but a simple statement of fact. It was organized, well-financed and extremely savvy, especially when it came to dealing with the media. According to The Power Peddlers, a book published in 1977 about the effect of lobbying activities in the United States, ‘The Israeli lobby is unique among lobby groups with its ‘clout’ with the press. [No other lobby] has succeeded in making reporters look over their shoulders as much as the Israeli lobby.’” [WALLACE/GATES, 1984, p. 286-287]

Jewish influence in the American government is well-known in political circles throughout the world. In 2000, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency reported on this phenomenon, in an article entitled Nations See Jews as Key to Winning with U. S. :

“Why U. S. Jews want to meet with world leaders is clear and well known. The focal point of most of these meetings is Israel and how the Jewish state can strengthen alliances around the world. Why world leaders want to meet with Jews is more interesting, less publicized, and to some Jews, discomfiting. These leaders believe in Jewish power … In fact, Jewish leaders nowadays receive mostly red-carpet treatment. They have access to the corridors of power in most capitals around the world … American Jewish leaders explain all this buttering up in euphemistic terms, suggesting that foreigners have a fascination ‘with or appreciation’ for American Jews. But when pressed, Jewish leaders admit the true driving force behind it is the lingering belief that Jews are capable of making or breaking relations with the United States and capable of wrecking havoc on the world’s financial markets.” [JORDAN, M., 9-13-00]

Per the Jewish state, by 1994, wrote Benjamin Ginsberg, “that fully three-fourths of America’s foreign aid budget is devoted to Israeli security interests is a tribute in considerable measure to the lobbying prowess of AIPAC [the American Israel Public Action Committee] and the importance of the Jewish community in American politics.” [GINZBURG, p. 2] “Each year the United States Congress donates to Israel the equivalent of $1,000 for every Israeli man, woman, and child,” complained former Congressman Paul Findley, “No matter how sharply Congress cuts other items in the Federal budget, gifts to Israel sweep through without restrictive amendment or murmur of opposition. My years on Capitol Hill led me to conclude that aid to Israel is more sacrosanct there than even social security or Medicaid.” [FINDLEY, p. xxvii] … Since 1987 direct economic and military aid to Israel has annually totaled $3 billion or more. In addition, financial arrangements worked out solely for Israel bring the total to about $5 billion a year … [FINDLEY, p. 110] “The magnitude of United States support for Israel,” notes Cheryl Rubenberg, “– militarily, politically, econom-
ically, and diplomatically – goes beyond any traditional relationship between states in the international system.” [FINDLEY, DEL, p. 111] “By the late 1980s,” notes Glenn Frankel, “Israel was not only receiving more United States foreign aid than any other country, but also getting it at more favorable terms than anyone else. While other countries received their economic aid in quarterly installments, Israel got its aid in a lump sum at the beginning of the year, allowing the Israelis to make an extra $75 million in 1991 by investing in United States Treasury bills.” [FRANKEL, p. 223] In the 1990s, when the 104th Congress “slashed nearly all other foreign assistance,” Israel got its regular $3 billion. [BLOOMFIELD, D, Election, p. 52]

“More than one-third of United States world-wide aid,” notes Richard Curtiss, a former career foreign service officer, “has gone annually to one of the smallest and least populous countries on earth.’ [CURTISS, p. 2] The total amount of U.S. taxpayer aid to Israel since 1949 totals well over $83 billion – a value of $14,346 for every single present Israeli. [CURTISS, p. 4] In addition, notes Curtiss, “fueled by the unique U.S. law that grants U.S. tax exemption to donations from the U.S. to any Israeli institution that is exempt from Israeli taxes, the total of tax-exempt [private] U.S. donations to Israel now approaches $1 billion annually.” [CURTISS, p. 6] (Israel and the worldwide Jewish lobby has even managed a deep cash-flow from Holocaust guilt-ridden Germany. Since World War II, Germany has paid $95.64 billion in restitution payments to mostly Jews worldwide, “of which approximately $26 billion has gone to individual recipients in Israel or the state of Israel itself.” [CURTISS, p. 8]) While Israel regularly gets its huge sums, the neglect of other nations is breathtaking. A Washington Post commentator noted in 1999 that “the United States ranks last among developed nations in percentage of resources devoted to foreign aid.” [OVERHOLSER, G., p. 7]

Jane Adas notes that

“All the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts since its creation in 1966 amounts to less than eight months of aid to Israel; the $10 million cut in funding for PBS equals 16 hours of aid to Israel; in 1996 cuts in programs for America’s poor totaled $5.7 billion, cuts in aid to Israel were zero, aid to Israel was $5.5 billion.” [APAS, p. 106]

Among the results of the gigantic American welfare program for Israel (and its subsequent welfare programs) is that noted by Israeli scholar Menachem Friedman: “The establishment of the state of Israel as a western welfare state created nearly ideal economic and social conditions for the flourishing of special Haredi [ultra-Orthodox] educational institutions.” [FRIEDMAN, M., p. 185]

And Israel’s repayment for such phenomenal aid? In 1999, even ardent pro-Israeli (and Jewish) columnist William Safire was aghast at Israel’s installing of aerial reconnaissance radar on Chinese planes. Worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the Jewish state, Safire said the deal reflected “Israel’s amoral policy.” “This flies in the face of U.S. security interest,” he wrote,

“… American forces will be directly threatened by Chinese air, naval and missile forces emboldened by Israel’s Phalcon battle management
... Though candidates for U.S. President today are fearful of raising this question, American supporters of Israel want to know if Israel tips the technological balance against a democratic American ally in Asia [Taiwan], why should the United States guarantee that Israel continue to have a ‘qualitative edge’ in the Middle East?” [SAFIRE, W., 12-25-99]

In 1995, Duncan Clarke, professor of international relations and coordinator of the United States Foreign Policy field at American University, addressed the threat to America of widespread Israeli resale of American weapons systems:

“Other countries have been caught evading U.S. re-export controls, but Israel’s case appears unique. Not only is it the beneficiary of massive U.S. support, but it is also by far the principal offender and foremost concern of U.S. officials responsible for implementing the laws on re-export of U.S. defense products. Unauthorized Israeli re-transfers of U.S. defense items and technology are of particular concern for several reasons, say U.S. officials: Israel re-exports much more often than do other allies and with more sensitive technology; it sells to ‘pariah’ states with which the United States refuses to deal; its sophisticated defense industry makes re-transfers harder to track than other arms exporters; and its re-transfers are generally governmentally sanctioned and not simply the result of a wayward company, as is usually the case elsewhere. Israel’s unauthorized re-transfer of U.S. defense products is part of a larger pattern of illicit behavior that includes diversions of U.S. military aid, industrial espionage, and improper end use of U.S. military equipment. Israel often re-transfers U.S. defense products to states that are potentially hostile to the United States or are blatant violators of human rights. These re-transfers have threatened American commercial interests, compromised intelligence, upset regional stability, strained diplomatic relations, and confirmed the U.S. national security bureaucracy’s long-standing distrust of Israeli technology transfer practices.” [CLARKE, D., 1995, p. 89-90]

Israeli weapons retransfers include versions of the U.S. Sidewinder missile, aerial refueling systems, the Popeye missile, the Star cruise missile, the Arrow missile, thermal imaging tank sights, space launch vehicles, and jet fighters. [CLARKE, D., 1995, p. 104-107] What kind of country are we apparently dealing with here? “Israel,” adds Clarke,

“engages in unauthorized defense re-exports largely to nourish its economy’s large defense sector and because it is confident, for good reason, that Washington will not or cannot enforce the law. Indeed, the Clinton administration relaxed curbs on the transfer of sensitive technology to Israel despite Israel’s dismal record record of unauthorized transfers. There has been a persistent pattern of misconduct ... Israeli scholar Ehud Sprinzak holds that his society is afflicted with an ‘elite illegalism’ that is central to the country’s domestic political culture and international behavior ... [E]lite illegalism deprecates the idea of the rule of law and assumes ‘that democracy can work without a strict adherence to law,’ as Sprinzak writes. He asserts that past leaders like Moshe Dayan
(a ‘soverign personality’ above the law) were role models for a generation of IDF officers.” [CLARKE, D., 1995, p. 108-109]

In 2001, an Israeli newspaper noted that the United States might literally become a parking lot for Israeli weapons:

“Israel has asked the United States to permanently base some Israeli fighter jets at a U.S. Air Force in America for combat training of Israeli pilot, officials of the two countries said Wednesday.” [HAARETZ, 8-2-02]

“Because the security and welfare of Israel are so pivotal to Jewish destiny,” says Jewish scholar Stephen Whitfield, “and to the future of the Jewish people everywhere else, pro-Zionism has become the prerequisite for the practice of Jewish politics in America.” [WHITFIELD, p. 103] Jewish members of the 99th United States Congress included eight seats in the Senate and 29 in the House of Representatives. By this time Jews had also chaired the Council of Economic Development, the Federal Reserve Board, the National Security Council, as well as headed the Department of Defense and the American delegation to the United Nations. [WHITFIELD, p. 92] By 1996, slowly – but ever – increasing, 10 of the 100 U.S. Senators were Jewish (over representing their population percentage by 400%). By 1998 the number was 11. In the House of Representatives, before the Republicans gained control of that body, (http://jewishtribalreview.org/jincong.htm) 7.5% of the House, [GOLDBERG, JJ, Bagels, p. 13] more than a 300% overrepresentation of the Jewish population in America. Among these Jewish Congress members was Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky, a former reporter for NBC. Prominent 1970s-era New York Congresswoman Bella Abzug was probably not atypical in her political perspective when she declared: “Ever since my youth I’ve been a Zionist, and I’ve worked hard for the cause of Jewish homeland too. I’ve visited Israel and I’ve raised my kids with a very strong background in Jewish culture. Besides that, I spent a couple of years of my life as a Hebrew teacher!” [ABZUG, B., 1972, p. 70]

In 2001, the (Jewish) Forward noted the situation for Jewish influence in the now Democratically-controlled Senate (thanks to a defection by a Republican senator to the Democratic side):

“Nothing symbolized the prospect of increased access more clearly than one stark demographic statistic: The 50 Democrats who make up the Senate’s new majority caucus will include nine Jewish members, just shy of one-fifth. The Republican caucus includes just a single Jewish member, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania. Some of those Jewish Democrats will hold positions of crucial importance to Jewish activists when the Senate changes hands. Senator Carl Levin of Michigan is slated to chair the Senate Armed Services Committee, which oversees crucial areas of U.S.-Israeli military cooperation. Senator Dianne Feinstein and Senator Barbara Boxer, both of California, will chair the subcommittees dealing with domestic and international terrorism respectively on the Judiciary and Foreign Relations committees. Most observers expected little in the way of a shake-up in Middle East policy following the shift. ‘We don’t expect much of a change,’ said Ken Bricker, spokesman of the American Israel Public
Affairs Committee, the leading pro-Israel lobby. “That’s one of the benefits of being an organization that places so much emphasis on bipartisanship.” [DONADIO/SCHWARTZ, 6-1-00]

By the 1970s and 1980s more and more Jews were highly visible in positions of great political power in government. At the local level, mayors of New York City (Ed Koch); Atlanta (Sam Massell); Kansas City (Richard Berkeley); Omaha; and San Francisco (Diane Feinstein) were Jewish. Jewish mayors with tenures in the late 1980s and 1990s (some into the new century) included those of San Diego (Susan Golding); Indianapolis (Stephen Goldsmith); Dallas, Texas (Annette Strauss); San Jose (hub of California’s hi-tech Silicon Valley: Susan Hammer); Portland, Oregon (Vera Katz); Las Vegas (Oscar Goodman); St. Paul, Minnesota (Norm Coleman); Louisville, Kentucky (Jerry Abramson); Tucson, Arizona (George Miller); Virginia Beach, Virginia (Meyer Orbendorf); Toronto, Canada (Mel Lastman); Prescott, Arizona (Sam Steiger); and Ottawa, Canada (Jacquelin Holzman). Linda Lingle was also the “mayor” of Maui County in Hawaii for a time in the same era. Even the ceremonial Lord Mayor of London, England, is Jewish: Peter Levene. Much earlier in his career, controversial TV talk show host Jerry Springer was the mayor Cincinnati. [JEWHO, 2000] Even the mayor of Fargo, North Dakota, was Jewish in the 1970s. [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 6]

In Massachusetts, The Jewish Advocate noted in 1994 that “[the Boston-area town of] Chelsea’s former mayor, Joe Pressman – also a Jew – was indicted for corruption shortly after the city was taken into receivership.” [SINERT, M., 12-22-94, p. 1]

Jewish state governors over the years have included those of Oregon (Neil Goldschmidt), Madeline May Kunin (Vermont), Rhode Island (Frank Licht and Bruce Sundlun), Connecticut (Abraham Ribicoff: also Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under John F. Kennedy), and New Mexico (Arthur Seligman). David Barrett served a term as the premier of Canada’s British Columbia in the 1970s. [JEWHO, 2000] In 1977, the Jewish governor of Maryland, Marvin Mandel, and four others were “convicted of conspiracy to have the Governor influence race track legislation in return for $380,000 in bribes.” [AYRES, B.D., p. A1] (Shortly thereafter, in 1982, another Maryland Jewish politician was sentenced to prison. Baltimore City Council President Walter Orlinsky pleaded guilty to “one count of extortion … [He also] conceded that the Government could prove other charges against him.”) [NYT, 9-23-82, p. A24] [BALTIMORE JEWISH TIMES, 1-23-98, p. 8]

Kenneth Duberstein was Chief of Staff to the President from 1988-89. Philip Klutznik was President Jimmy Carter’s Secretary of Commerce. He was also the honorary president of the World Jewish Congress and a “former president of B’nai B’rith International, who raised millions of dollars for Israel.” [OLIVER, M., p. A16] In 1959, he was instrumental in holding, for the first time, the B’nai B’rith yearly gathering in the Jewish state. [GRUSD, E., 1966, p. 268] Carter’s Secretary of Treasury, W. Michael Blumenthal was also of Jewish heritage, as was his Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown. Philip Klutznick was Secretary
of Commerce and Neil Goldschmidt was Secretary of Transportation. “Two of the top nine aides” to Carter were also Jewish, Robert Lipshutz (formerly head of the Atlanta chapter of B’nai B’rith) and Stuart Eizenstat. Other prominent Jewish officials in the Carter administration included Kenneth Axelson, Anthony Solomon, Julius Katz, and Arthur Borg. [LILENTHAL, A., p. 236; PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 142] Robert S. Strauss [was] “Carter’s choice for almost everything.” [PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 143]

Under Republican president Gerald Ford, prominent individuals of Jewish heritage included Henry Kissinger (Secretary of State), James Schlesinger (Secretary of Defense), and Edward Levi (Attorney General). History could have been different: Kissinger’s parents almost emigrated from Germany to Israel. [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 158] “You are much more Jewish unconsciously than consciously,” Zionist lobbyist Nachum Goldmann once told him. “This,” wrote Goldmann, “is quite apparent in his attitude to Israel.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 163] “During Israel’s first years as a nation,” notes Steven Silbiger, “the United States offered it very little financial or military aid. The huge influx of direct aid occurred during the Nixon administration in the 1970s under the leadership of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the first Jew to hold the position. Aid skyrocketed from $300 million to $2.2 billion annually, making Israel the recipient of more U.S. dollars than any other nation.” [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 52]

Appointed positions, however, are not everything. Nor are electoral seats, of course, the real locus of political power. “The one question that Jewish activists tend to tiptoe around,” wrote Stephen Isaacs in 1974, “is the one concerning Jewish money … Jewish money has played a significant role in the current exercise of power … [It] can sometimes play a major factor in whether a senator has won re-election.” [ISAACS, p. 260] “It is one of the worst-kept secrets in American Jewish politics,” noted J. J. Goldberg, “that the campaign contribution is a major key to Jewish power … Almost none of those involved in the process of Jewish campaign funding … donors, fundraisers, candidates, monitors … are willing to talk about it on the record … Jews fear that discussing Jewish money will encourage anti-Semitic conspiracy theories. Non-Jews fear that talking about it will leave them open to charges of anti-Semitism. But it is a fact … [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 266] … The most notorious use of Jewish campaign money is not to support candidates who have been friendly, but to oppose those who have been unfriendly.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 269]

Jewish money in Washington D. C. was even crucial in the very founding of the modern state of Israel. Jewish Democrats Dewey Stone, Abe Feinberg, Ed Kaufmann, and others were key fundraisers for Harry Truman’s Presidential campaigns; they were also Zionists. Going against the will of his own State Department, Truman followed the Zionist line in supporting a 1947 United Nations vote for the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab sections. Afterwards, said long time Democratic activist and brother-in-law of John F. Kennedy, Stephen Smith: “Two million dollars went aboard the Truman [campaign] train in a paper bag, and that’s what paid for the state of Israel.” [COCKBURN, p. 26-27]
During the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, “at the urging of [prominent wealthy Jews] Henry Morgenthau, Sr. and Felix Warburg” the president appointed James D. McDonald as “high commissioner for refugees (Jewish and others) coming from Germany … The bulk of financial support McDonald received came from private Jewish relief societies. Of his advisory council of twenty voluntary agencies, ten were Jewish, and Felix Warburg was personally obliged to supplement McDonald’s meager salary … McDonald [was] … a lifetime supporter of Jewish causes and eventually [became] America’s first ambassador to Israel.” [NICHOLS, p. 43-44] “The State Department representatives [among advisers to President Truman],” notes Melvin Urofsky, “strongly urged that a trained foreign service career officer be nominated, but the President [Truman] after politely listening to their nominees (nearly all of whom came from the Middle East desk), chose James G. McDonald.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 186] Under Secretary of State Robert Lovette, for example, “questioned whether McDonald’s known sympathy for the Zionist cause ought not to disqualify him.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 187]

John F. Kennedy had a strongly negative reaction in 1960 to the conditions Jewish contributors demanded for their donations to his presidential campaign (their “initial” contribution was $500,000). Seymour Hersh notes a conversation Kennedy had with a friend, newspaper columnist Charles L. Bartlett:

“’As an American citizen [Kennedy] was outraged,’ Bartlett recalled, ‘to have a Zionist group come to him and say: We know your campaign is in trouble. We’re willing to pay your bill, if you’ll let us have control of your Middle East policy.’ Kennedy, as a presidential candidate, also resented the crudity with which he’d been approached. ‘They wanted control,’ he angrily told Bartlett.” [HERSH, p. 97]

Among these Jews was Abraham Feinberg, president of the Israel Bonds Organization, who “had helped bankroll Harry S. Truman’s seemingly doomed 1948 presidential campaign; by the presidential campaign of 1960 he was perhaps the most important Jewish fundraiser for the Democratic Party. There was nothing subtle in his message: the dollars he collected were meant to insure continued Democratic Party support for Israel.” [HERSH, p. 93] “My partner to power,” said Feinberg, “was cooperation in terms of what they needed – campaign money.” [HERSH, p. 94] To appease Jewish interest in Kennedy’s White House, Myer Feldman, a liaison to the Jewish American community, was also afforded extraordinary access to “monitor all of the State Department and White House cable traffic on the Middle East.” [HERSH, p. 99] Robert Kennedy, the president’s brother, noted in an interview published in 1988 that Feldman’s “major interest was Israel rather than the United States.” [HERSH, p. 100] Feldman also helped write Kennedy speeches and was “an adviser to columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson.” [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 66] Also, ‘One of Kennedy’s most trusted, and little-known advisers during the 1960 campaign [was] Hyman Raskin, a Chicago lawyer who had helped manage Adlai Stevenson’s presidential campaign in 1952 and 1956.” [HERSH, S., 1997, p. 90]
Upon election, John F. Kennedy lobbied unsuccessfully for ways to reform “the financial base of our presidential campaigns.” “In a statement that was far more heartfelt than the public or press could perceive,” says Hersh, “he criticized the current method of financial campaigns as ‘highly undesirable’ and ‘not healthy’ because it made candidates ‘dependent on large financial contributions of those with special interests.’” [HERSH, p. 97] So important to Democratic purse strings, Abe Feinberg became influential in the Kennedy White House and even managed to get the beholding president to appoint Feinberg’s brother, Wilfred, to a position as a federal judge. [HERSH, p. 97-98] (On the Israeli side of things, he was eventually rewarded for his lobbying efforts on behalf of the Jewish state by being allowed to be a principal owner in the Coca-Cola franchise in Israel. [HERSH, p. 192]) Pierre Salinger was Kennedy’s Press Secretary. Even a Jewish New York physician, Max Jacobson (the infamous “Dr. Feelgood” to so many Hollywood celebrities), regularly drugged the President with painkillers and stimulants, so much that some in the White House entourage began to worry about the President’s reliance upon them. “Carrying his bag of drugs and needles,” notes Seymour Hersh, “[Jacobson] ‘came and went’ in and out of the White House without challenge. He was part of the ‘inner circle.’” [HERSH, S., 1997, p. 234]

In modern political America, in the competing attempts to buy influence, one half of major donations to the Democratic Party is believed to come from Jews, [SLAVIN, p. 20] as is one half of Democratic Presidential campaign funding. [GOLDBERG, p. 276] As early as 1967, William Domhoff, in Who Rules America?, found that 50% of the highest echelon of campaign contributors (“of whom we could find information”) to the Democratic Party in 1960 and 1964 were Jews. [DOMHOFF, p. 95] “Jews donate or raise as much as half of all Democratic Party campaign funds,” noted Jewish author Steven Silbiger in 2000, “… Again, to quote the Jewish proverb, ‘He who pays has the say.”’ [SILBIGER, S., 2000, p. 55] (In 1968, of 21 people who loaned Hubert Humphrey more than $100,000 for his failed Presidential bid, 15 were Jewish. [TIVNAN, p. 84]) Understandably, in 1970, Jewish entrepreneur Robert Strauss was named Treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. “The tiny world of Democratic political consulting and fundraising is a world that is dominated by Jews,” noted J. J. Goldberg in 1996, “Many of them are former employees of AIPAC [the pre-eminent pro-Israel political action committee] and the UJA [United Jewish Appeal].” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 275] (Even the American Revolution reputedly relied in great part upon Jewish money, particularly Hayim Solomon: “Legend has it,” says Julia Lieblitch, “that George Washington appealed for funds to financier Hayim Solomon on the highest of holy days, Yom Kippur.”) LIEBLICH, J., 8-19-2000]

In 1977 Steve Chapple and Reebee Garofalo noted the research of sociologist G. William Domhoff who had “pointed out that principals in Gulf and Western …, 20th Century Fox, and MGM have been part of what he calls the ‘Jewish Cowboy’ fundraising clique that forms a significant part of the Democratic party’s financial base. Arthur Krim and Robert Benjamin, key powers at United Artists, and directors of the parent firm Transamerica have been major Democratic fund raisers in New York. Benjamin has also been a member of the Council on
Foreign Relations. MCA’s Lew Wasserman has also long been an important behind-the-scenes figure in the Democratic Party.” [CHAPPLE, p. 222]

Investigative journalist Dan Moldea wrote an entire volume about the relationship of Republican President Ronald Reagan to MCA, noting that: “President Ronald Reagan’s professional life – his acting career, his personal fiscal fortune, and his rise in politics – has been interwoven with and propelled by a powerful, Hollywood-based entertainment conglomerate named MCA. For nearly fifty years, Reagan has benefited both personally and financially from … the Music Corporation of America – as well as his close associations with the firm’s top executives: Jules Stein, Lew Wasserman, and Taft Schreiber.” [MOLDEA, p. 1]

Stein and Schreiber were prominent Republican activists; Schreiber even was a co-chairman of the finance committee to re-elect Reagan. [MOLDEA, p. 266] Wasserman, a friend of Reagan’s and once his personal Hollywood agent in his movie years, was, as noted, a prominent Democrat. “The antitrust problems [MCA had with the government],” notes Dan Moldea, “would be eliminated in the future by maintaining good relations with both political parties … While Stein and Schreiber covered the GOP, Wasserman was busy making friends with the Democrats. He became a close friend of Lyndon Johnson, a relationship he never discussed, and became a key fund-raiser in the Democratic Party.” Wasserman even reportedly turned down an offer to be Johnson’s Secretary of Commerce. [MOLDEA, p. 236] (There were also problems with MCA’s link to organized crime. Wasserman even reportedly risked a meeting in his office with mobster Meyer Lansky and mob lawyer Sidney Korshak in 1965). [MCDOUGAL, p. 328]

At an awards ceremony for Wasserman in 2000, notes Mother Jones magazine, President

“Clinton joked that he had been to so many fundraisers at Wasserman’s home that, ‘I half expected him to prorate this year’s property tax and send me my share.”’ [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01]

Jews were also key in the Reagan administration’s Iran-Gate scandal [when his administration circumvented a Congressional ban on funding the Contra rebels of Nicaragua by secretly selling weapons to Iran and using the resultant money to pay for Contra weaponry.] Four Israelis – Yaakov Nimrodi, Al Schwimmer, David Kimche, and Amiram Nir – who “arranged the weapons deliveries” demanded immunity from prosecution during a Congressional investigation of the matter. [Three Israelis were also granted immunity in the Jonathan Pollard spy investigation]. [SINAI, R., 1987] The Jerusalem Post reported in 1994 that [Jewish] National Security Adviser Howard Teicher “was being called the mastermind of the [Iran-Gate] affair.” [RODAN, S., 1994, p. 18] The Jerusalem Report also noted heavy Israeli involvement in the “October Surprise” that many believed was planned for Reagan to gain the American presidency: “Regarding just weeks ago as a paranoid delusion, the theory of a secret 1980 deal between the Reagan-for-President campaign and revolutionary Iran is now official Senate business … Conservative versions of the theory allege
that Israeli officials cooperated with the Reagan campaign in what amounted to a bid to prolong detention of U.S. hostages [in Iran] to tilt the 1980 election away from incumbent Jimmy Carter … The current flap seems to have Israeli fingerprints all over it.” [GOLDBERG, J.J., 6-11-91, p. 26]

Yet another Jewish Iran-Contra player was Elliot Abrams. “An Assistant Secretary of State under President Reagan,” noted the Jewish Week in 1997, “who pleaded guilty to two misdemeanor counts during the Iran-Contra scandal, Mr. Abrams has reinvented himself as a leading advocate of increased Jewish religiosity.” [FORWARD, 11-14-97, p. 14] (Reagan himself went far out of his way in asserting Jewish allegiance. “Astoundingly,” notes Anthony Bianco, “Reagan once told Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Shamir that he had seen firsthand the devastation wrought by the Holocaust as a member of an army film crew that filmed the liberation of the concentration camps. ‘From then on,’ Reagan said, ‘I was concerned for the Jewish people.’ The fact was, though, that Reagan never left the United States during World War II and indeed lived at home with his wife throughout his four years in uniform.” [BIANCO, A., 1991, p. 14]

Another angle to Jewish criminal elements in Washington is the case of Teamsters president Jackie Presser (also Jewish, he took the helm of the union in 1984). Presser, well-known to be associated with organized crime (like the Teamsters itself), was the highest paid union official in America at $530,000 a year. He was appointed to act as a senior labor adviser in the Reagan administration (the Teamsters union was the only major labor organization that supported Reagan’s candidacy). [BARRON, p. 4] Presser’s uncle, Allen Friedman, has written a book about his own life in the union and its links to the underworld. In the Washington realm, he notes, “a few years ago, Bill Presser handed me a briefcase he said was filled with cash and told me to take it to [Reagan official] Edwin Meese in Washington … After Reagan [became president], he named Bill’s son, Jackie Presser, to his transition cabinet. Then he wanted to make Jackie under secretary of labor, though I guess cooler heads prevailed.” [FRIEDMAN, A., 1989, p. 3] In the Zionist realm, “Jackie sold Israel Bonds and raised money to build a children’s home in Israel. He also convinced the Teamsters rank and file to buy such bonds, the union leadership and locals buying more than 25 per cent of all the bonds sold in the United States in 1977.” [FRIEDMAN, A., 1989, p. 257] (Russell Mokhiber adds that the Teamsters Union “was not alone in its fondness for the [Israeli] notes. Despite below-market yields and unusually high risk, some of America’s largest unions, pension funds and major corporations have collectively loaned billions of dollars to the Israeli government. Israel’s violent repression of the Palestinian uprising in the West Bank and Gaza – and the threat the uprising poses to Israel’s shaky economy – appears not to have affected investor confidence. Nathan Zirkin [also Jewish], comptroller for the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, told the Multinational Monitor that his union ‘absolutely’ plans to continue purchasing Israel bonds, despite the repression in the occupied territories. ‘The Palestinians didn’t have a damn thing until Israel came in,’ Zirkin said.”] MOKHIBER, R., 4-88]
Presser’s “close associate” in Los Angeles, Marty Bacow, was once involved in Detroit’s (Jewish) Purple Gang. [MCDOUGAL, p. 456] Another Jewish Teamster official from Presser’s home state, Harold Friedman, president of the Ohio Council of Teamsters, was “convicted of racketeering and embezzling” in 1989. [FRIEDMAN, A., 1989, p. 264] In Minnesota, in 1995, the (Minneapolis) Star Tribune noted a few more Jewish Teamsters in trouble, including Jack Mogelson, also a former Board Member of the American Civil Liberties Union in that state:

“Mogelson has been a familiar figure for decades in labor, civil rights and political circles in Minnesota. So when the state’s largest Teamsters’ local was placed in trusteeship earlier this month for alleged financial improprieties, the name on everyone’s lips was Mogelson – not because he is considered less or more culpable than his three fellow officials [president Robert Wiesenburger; Treasurer David Morris; and vice president Lawrence Bastian], but because he’s the one people know … By most accounts Mogelson is a man of contrasts: an old style unionist with liberal leanings, a forceful representative of law enforcement who has been arrested for soliciting a prostitute and who in his youth took a baseball bat to a cop who was arresting his brother for shoplifting … A dedicated activist, Mogelson has fought passionately on a range of issues from workers’ rights to the security of Israel.” [HODGES, J., 5-15-95]

Among other accusations, Teamsters financial indiscretions by the above officers included $55,000 from union funds for sports tickets; $28,000 for message therapists; $7,800 for magazine subscriptions; and a $20,000 (apiece) Teamsters raise for themselves when the union chapter was in financial difficulty.

Then there is the Newspaper and Mail Deliverers Union:

“Formed in the early 1900s, the Newspaper and Mail Deliverers Union was equal parts Irish, Italian, and Jewish, a reflection of the city’s then dominant ethnic groups. Well into the 1970s, Jewish racketeers played a major role in the union … In more recent times, a hustling gangster named Irving Bitz – nicknamed ‘the Little Guy’ for his diminutive stature – also helped keep peace among mob factions in the industry. Bitz, an NMDU member who also ran Imperial News Service, carried his own fearful legend: the feisty businessman was credited with the 1931 slaying of famed [Jewish] gambler Legs Diamond … In 1959, [Bitz] was convicted of conspiring with NMDU officials to control Long Island’s newspaper and magazine deliveries. Bitz remained a powerful force in the industry up until the day in 1981 when his trussed-up body was found in a Staten Island swamp. His murder was never solved.” [Robbins, T., 3-701]

In 1993 a controversial book about former FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover appeared, written by Anthony Summers. Subtitled The Secret Life of J. Edgar Hoover, Summers claimed the decades-long director was a closet homosexual and cross-dresser. This has been refuted and ridiculed by others. Summers argued that the reason Hoover didn’t – inexplicably – corral organized crime was because Meyer Lansky, the Jewish head of “The Syndicate,” had incriminating photographs (or other documentation) of the FBI director. For what it’s worth,
fact or fiction, in this outrageous scenario brewery mogul Lewis Rosentiel (also Jewish) plays a key role:

“Early in Hoover’s career, according to mob interviews, he was trapped by his own homosexuality. Mafia boss Meyer Lansky, who specialized in the use of damaging information to manipulate men in public life, had reportedly obtained compromising evidence – probably photographs … [p. 13] … ‘The homosexual thing,’ said [Lansky associate Sidney] Pollock, ‘was Hoover’s Achilles’ heel. Meyer found it, and it was like he pulled strings with Hoover. He never bothered any of Meyer’s people …’” [p. 243] … By the end of World War II [Rosentiel’s] company, Schenley, had become the leading U. S. distiller … Rosentiel’s lifelong involvement with the Mafia came to light only in 1970 … [p. 248] … [Rosentiel’s fourth wife] Susan Rosentiel’s final and most sensational revelations suggest her husband and [Jewish lawyer] Roy Cohn [famous as the right-hand man of Senator Joe McCarthy during the so-called witch-hunts for communists in the 1950s] involved Edgar in sex orgies – thus laying him more open than ever to pressure from organized crime.” [SUMMERS, A., 1993, p. 253]

“In the thirties,” adds Summers, “Edgar began a long association with the columnist who reigned as the nation’s premier purveyor of gossip for thirty years, Walter Winchell [also Jewish].” [SUMMERS, A., 1993, p. 84] Summers also notes Lansky’s underworld in support of the U.S. government war efforts:

“The OSS [precursor to the CIA] and Naval Intelligence had extensive contacts with the Mafia during World War II, enlisting the help of criminals in projects including the hiring of burglars and assassins, experimentation with drugs, the protection of American ports from Nazi agents and the invasion of Sicily. Lansky helped personally with the latter two operations, meeting with Murray Gurfein, a New York Assistant District Attorney who later became one of William Donovan’s most trusted OSS officers.” [SUMMERS, A., 1993, p. 245]

In 1999, a Tennessee newspaper published an alarming front page article. “The shadow of organized crime,” said the Tennessean,

“has descended on Tennessee’s political landscape, via campaign contributions from the operator [Rod Aycox] of Georgia-based ‘auto title’ loan companies. The man who operates these companies was the top individual contributor to Tennessee’s 1998 political campaigns. Court documents show he is also a business partner of a Florida man, Alvin Malnik, who has been found to have close ties with the mob … Malnik’s associates have included some of the country’s top mobsters.”

The article is not about Aycox (who is depicted as merely a mob front), but Malnik, who in 1997 received half the profits of Aycox’s businesses and in 1999 completely bought him out. Malnik, who lives on a 34-acre estate in Boca Raton, with a private bowling alley and Arabian horse area, was once director of the Bank World of Commerce, a known shell company for mob money laundering. Malnik was also a business partner with mobster Sam Cohen, including
Robert Kennedy once wrote about another formal (Jewish) Teamster member, Paul Dorfman:

“[Dorfman] was a big operator – a major figure in Chicago’s underworld who also knew his way around in certain labor and political circles ... [Teamsters boss Jimmy] Hoffa made a trade with Dorfman. In return for an introduction to the Chicago underworld, the [investigating government] Committee found, Hoffa turned over to him and his family the gigantic Central Conference of Teamsters Welfare Fund Assistance.” [MARRIS, 1989, p. 383]

(Earlier, in 1983, another Dorfman, Allen, former manager of the Teamster’s Central States Pension Fund, was found murdered). [MOLDEA, 1989, p. 366]

Also from Chicago, came mob-linked lawyer Sidney Korshak, also Jewish, and a mainstay in every book about underworld crime and Hollywood. As Dennis McDougal notes:

“While he was gaining a foothold in Hollywood, Korshak continued to practice law in the Chicago loop. Among his closest associates was Alderman Jacob Arvey, a celebrated political fixer in his own right, as well as a pal of Capone syndicate since the 1920s. Alex Louis Greenberg’s longtime business partner in Lawndale Enterprises, Inc., Arvey [also Jewish] was the most powerful figure in Chicago politics. Korshak’s younger brother, Marshall, also became an Arvey protégé and went on to become a state senator, and one of the primary conduits between the Chicago Mob and the Illinois Democratic political machine.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 141]

(Jacob Arvey, notes Harry Golden, “controlled the Democratic Party in Illinois from 1947 to 1959.” By the early 1970s, seven Jews sat on Chicago’s City Council; the Sheriff of Chicago-area Cook County was also Jewish, as was the mayor’s press secretary, who wrote “many of the mayor’s speeches.”) “When they were Democrats,” noted Chicago committeeman Bernard Neistein, in the same era, “the Illinois State Legislature was empowered to invest surplus funds in Israeli bonds.” [GOLDEN, H., 1973, p. 210-211, 216, 218, 220]

Another pal of Sidney Korshak was yet another Jewish lawyer, Paul Ziffren. In 1960, the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee praised Paul Ziffren, saying he “has been the greatest single force and most important Democrat in the resurgence of the Democratic party in California.” Not long after, a Reader’s Digest article outlined “Ziffren’s long-standing ties to major organized crime figures.” [MOLDEA, p. 137] According to a Los Angeles Police Department report, Ziffren was also a supplier of prostitutes to the wealthy and powerful: “It is a matter of general police knowledge that Ziffren’s name appears in many of the call girl trick books which are confiscated by police when these individuals are arrested ... All readily admit to being in the Ziffren service department.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 278]
Many Jewish politicos move in close quarters. As Dennis McDougald notes:

“Just as Wasserman’s close friend and ally Paul Ziffren quietly controlled the California delegation of the Democratic National Committee for many years, so [Jewish lawyer Ed] Weisl ran the New York delegation of the party, particularly during the 1960s when all three would become confidants of President Lyndon Johnson.” [MCDOUGAL, p. 231]

Infamous Jewish lawyer Roy Cohn notes that

“Edward Weisl, Sr., the Democratic power broker who was to become President Johnson’s chief confidant, poured out an earful of venom against Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who had voted against Paramount Pictures in a major anti-trust case. Weisl, a good friend of Paramount’s president Barney Balaban [also Jewish], had gone to Douglas to ask for his vote. He thought he had every right to do this because he was one of Douglas’s closest pals. As Weisel put it to me: ‘We got him in as head of the Security Exchange Commission, we put him over the rim for the Supreme Court nomination with FDR when there were five other people ahead of him, we made the bastard. And now we ask him for something like this, something perfectly proper, and he tells us to drop dead.’” [ZION, S., 1988, p. 22-23]

Former Democratic National Committee Chairman Robert Strauss was also, since 1980, a member of MCA’s Board of Directors (Wasserman’s company). [MCDOUGAL, p. 461]

A more recent example of above-the-table, reputable purse strings influence in Hollywood is the clout wielded by the three Jewish media moguls – David Geffen, Stephen Spielberg, and Jeffrey Katzenberg, and their personal business empires in recent years melded into one, Dreamworks SKG. Dreamworks “became the largest contributor to the Democratic Party with donations totaling over $2 million.” [GOODMAN, p. 379] “I don’t want to present myself as a person with influence,” Geffen remarked in an interview. “Then,” reports Fred Goodman, “he proceeded to return telephone calls to Michael Ovitz, Lew Wasserman, Barry Diller, Ted Field, and several others arranging for them to meet President Clinton when he passed through Los Angeles the following night.” [GOODMAN, p. 379]

In the election year of 1996, Bill Clinton’s re-election year to the presidency, the top six individual donators to the Democratic Party were Jewish moguls from Hollywood:

David Geffen – $575,000
Lew Wasserman – $507,000
Steven Spielberg – $503,000
Jeffrey Katzenberg – $408,000
Sidney Sheinberg – $321,000
Edgar Bronfman, Jr. – $318,000
The three greatest individual beneficiaries of this political philanthropy were California’s two Jewish senators, Diane Feinstein and Barbara Boxer, and West Los Angeles (Jewish) Congressman Mel Levine. President Clinton and Massachusetts Senator Ted Kennedy ranked fourth and fifth in the amount of money received from the above-mentioned six Jewish moguls. West Los Angeles Congressman Howard Berman, also Jewish, was the next ranked beneficiary. [MCDOUGAL, p. 520] In overview, a 1992 Los Angeles Times article noted Mel Levine to have been the object of the largest Jewish donations in the city. “When it comes to the potency of pro-Israel giving,” the paper noted, “... Representative Levine is exhibit A ... Levine has been one of Capitol Hill’s most vocal supporters of Israel.” (Levine’s father-in-law, Max Greenberg, once headed the Anti-Defamation League). [MILLER/MORRIS, 1-26-92, p. A1] And as the Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted after Levine later left office, “One of [Vice President Al] Gore’s oldest and closest friends in Los Angeles is former Representative Mel Levine.” [TUGEND, T., 2-16-2000, p. 8]

The central members of another – largely Jewish – Hollywood Democratic fund-raising political clique of the 1970s (called by Ronald Brownstein the “Malibu Mafia”) included Sidney Sheinbaum (whose wife is the daughter of film mogul Harry Warner), Norman Lear, Miles Rubin, Ted Ashley, Max Palevsky, Harold Willens, and Leopold Wyler.

In 1992, the Los Angeles Times also singled out another local key Jewish political fundraiser (this one in the garment business), Stanley Hirsh: “Hirsh is one of the financial magnets who draws politicians from all over the United States to Los Angeles.” “We have a book at the house,” he told the newspaper, “that my wife keeps with records of annual votes by candidates that we follow. A lot of it is how they vote on Israel [and two other issues].” “[MILLER/MORRIS, 1-26-92, p. A1] The Times article focused on the treasure trove of (overwhelmingly Jewish) political money available from the wealthy of the city, noting that

“For individual candidates from either party, supporting Israel may well be the single most important thing they can do to help themselves raise money in Los Angeles. Above all else, this means voting for the annual foreign aid bill, which currently contains $3 billion for Israel ... Most of the biggest political beneficiaries of Los Angeles largesse in 1989 and 1990 are regarded as important friends of the Jewish state ... [Paul Simon of Illinois] became a hero to the pro-Israeli community in 1984 when he ousted former Sen. Charles H. Percy, an influential critic of Israel ... By all accounts [Congressional] pro-Israel credentials give them special entre and appeal.” [MILLER/MORRIS, 1-26-92, p. A1]

Elsewhere, in 1998, billionaire Haim Saban, “the biggest Israeli player in Hollywood, ... hosted a fund-raiser at his home [in Los Angeles] for President Clinton that yielded $1.5 million in donations.” [TUGEND, T, 3-28-99] “[The Sabans,” notes the New York Times, “have given as much as $10 million over the years to the Democratic Party and its candidates.” [WEINRAUB, B., 3-4-01, sec. 3, p. 2] (In Canada, Gerald Schwartz, head of the Onex corporation, friend of
both liberal and conservative politicians, “became a major fundraiser.” ) [NOBLE, K., 10-11-99] Margery Tabankin, also Jewish, headed the “powerful Hollywood Women’s Political Committee” and “ruled the glittering world of left-liberal political fundraising in Tinseltown” till 1997 when she took over the reins of Steven Spielberg’s $55 million Spielberg Foundation. “She also heads the Barbara Streisand Foundation.” [FORWARD, 1-5-01]

Across the country, at America’s other nerve center, in 1994, Crain’s New York Business journal published the results of a report listing “New York’s top contributors to federal elections, parties, and political action committees.” All of the top five money donors mentioned were Jewish: Bernard Schwartz, CEO of the Loral Corporation; Maurice Templeton, chairman of Lazare Kaplan International; Arthur Ortenberg, co-founder of Liz Claibourne Inc.; Robert Rubin, former co-chairman of Goldman Sachs & Co. and later a Bill Clinton cabinet member; and Jeffrey Keil, president of the Republic New York Corporation. [FEIDEN, p. 6] In October 2000, the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz noted that S. Daniel Abraham, founder of the Slim-Fast company, was “the Democratic Party’s single heaviest private donor, contributing no less than $993,000 over the past 18 months.” [LEIBOVICH-DAR, S., 10-13-2000]

In 2001, Mother Jones magazine listed the top 400 individual contributors to political [Democratic and Republican] campaigns. [MOTHER JONES, MAY 2001] These are the people who seek to influence the American political process by economic means. Although Jews represent merely 2.5% of the American population, at least 41 (and quite likely a few more) of the first 100 people listed were Jewish, including four of the top five. Of these first four, three are noted as having strong ties to Israel:

#1 was S. Daniel Abraham, former mogul of Slim Fast Foods, who “has spent most of his political and charitable energies in the last decade supporting Israel and the troubled Middle East peace process. He has helped fund Birthright Israel, a program which sponsors tours of Israel for young American Jews.” Abraham contributed $1,518,500 to the Democratic Party.

#2 was Bernard Schwartz, CEO of Loral Space and Communications, a defense contractor moving more and more into the telecommunications industry. Schwartz donated $1,317,000 to the Democratic Party.

#3 was David Gilo, head of the wireless communications company, Vyyo. Gilo was born in Israel and “emigrated to the United States in 1982, retaining dual citizenship.” Gilo contributed $1,311,000 to the Democratic Party.

#5 was Haim Saban, who is also immigrant from Israel.

More Jews on the list of the nation’s biggest economic string-pullers include:

9. Constance Milstein – “born to one of New York’s most prominent real estate families.”

14. David Shimon – “California’s leading contributor to state campaigns”

18. Walter Shorenstein – “… controls 25 percent of [San Francisco’s] downtown.”
19. **Steven Kirsch** – founded computer company **Infoseek**

20. **David Steiner** – New Jersey-based real estate mogul and former president of the Israeli lobby, AIPAC. He had to resign from that position when he was tape recorded boasting “about his political sway, saying he had ‘cut a deal’ with the Bush administration to give more aid to Israel. He had arranged for ‘almost a billion dollars in other goodies,’ he added and was ‘negotiating’ with the incoming Clinton administration over appointing a Secretary of State who was pro-Israel. ‘We have a dozen people in his [Clinton’s] headquarters,’ Steiner bragged, ‘and they are all going to get big jobs.’”

23. **Sam Fox** – “He and his wife are particularly active in promoting the views of Jewish Republicans. **Marilyn Fox** was the first woman president of the Jewish Community Centers Association in its 112 year history, and her husband is chairman of the Republican Jewish Coalition. The RJC supports a strong Israel... Fox is one of eight leaders of the RJC on the **Mother Jones** 400. Others include **Laurence Kadish**, **Max M. Fisher**, **John Price**, **Earle I. Mack**, **Clifford Sobel**, **Lewis M. Eisenberg**, and **David M. Flaum**.”

37. **Philip Levine** – president of Onboard Media

38. **Lawrence Kadish** – “has been topping lists of Republican donors since **George H. W. Bush** was president. A real estate investor in New York and Florida, Kadish has long worked to build ties between the Republican Party and American Jews. He is chairman of the Republican Jewish Coalition... The group has supported a hard-line approach to negotiating an Israeli-Palestinian peace accord, criticizing President Clinton for ‘appeasing Chairman Arafat’ instead of requiring ‘responsibility and compliance from the Palestinian Authority.’ Allied with Israel’s Likud government, the group supported the construction of the controversial Har Homa settlement in East Jerusalem, over Palestinian objections that the project jeopardized the peace process. It also supports continued American military support of Israel, including a recent project to build an anti-ballistic missile system. On the domestic front, the RJC supports school choice and voucher initiatives, saying they help curb the ‘risk of assimilation’ for some Jews living in the United States.”

39. **Jeffrey Levy-Hinte** – heads an independent film production company, Post 391

41. **Alfred Lerner** – ranked by **Forbes** as the 51st richest American. He is the chairman and CEO of **MBNA**, the giant credit-card company

42. **David Saperstein** – “the biggest stockholder in **Westwood One**, the nation’s largest radio network.”

50. **S. Donald Sussman** – “president of hedge fund **Paloma Partners**... He also sits on the board of governors of the Weizmann Institute of Science [in Israel].”

51. **David Koch** – “**Koch Industries**, a conglomerate with major oil and gas holdings, is the second-largest privately-held company in the United States. It is also the recipient of the largest civil fine ever imposed on a corporation for violating federal environmental laws.”
54. **Marc Nathanson** – appointed twice by Bill Clinton “as chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, which oversees the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and other federal broadcasting services.”

56. **Meyer Berman** – a stock trader

57. **John Price** – real estate mogul, head of Utah-based JP Realty

58. **Jeffrey Katzenberg** – Hollywood mogul, one of the heads of Dreamworks

59. **Jonathan Tisch** – He “brought a torrent of bad press to the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles. As CEO of the Loews Hotel chain, Tisch was fighting to stop a union drive among 300 housekeepers and other service workers at the Loews hotel in Santa Monica, where delegates were scheduled to stay. Loews, as it turned out, was also a major contributor to an effort to kill a labor-backed living-wage measure in Santa Monica and replace it with a business friendly initiative.”

60. **Harold Snyder** – pharmaceutical mogul; member of the Board of Directors of Teva, an Israeli company

61. **Michael King** – heads, with his brother Roger, King World Productions, “one of the most powerful firms in television syndication.”

63. **Marvin Davis** – a billionaire who made his fortune, initially, in real estate. Former owner of **20th Century Fox**.

65. Louis Weisbach – head of Halo Branded Solutions

66. Alan Solomont – nursing home mogul and once finance chair of the Democratic National Committee

68. Leonard Lauder

70. Max Fisher


74. Denise Rich – ex-wife of criminal fugitive **Marc Rich**, the most controversial of President Bill Clinton’s executive pardons.

75. Bren Simon – his family’s Simon Property Group is “the nation’s largest mall owner in the United States.”

79. Samuel Heyman – “His manufacturing firm, GAF Corporation, spent at least $7 million on lobbyists since 1997.”


86. Norman Pattiz – “Founder and chairman of radio giant **Westwood One**.”

87. Eve Weinstein – wife of Harvey Weinstein, co-chairman of Miramax Films.

88. Bernard Marcus – co-founder of **Home Depot**. “Marcus is also attempting to alter politics in the Middle East through a think tank he chairs called Israel Democracy Institute ... Marcus is also working to link the Israeli economy
to his home state ... [T]he hardware mogul has helped persuade state officials to offer ... Israeli firms incentives to relocate in Georgia.”

89. **Lew Wasserman** – popularly known as the “Godfather of Hollywood .. He sits on the board of advisors for the William J. Clinton Presidential Foundation with the [Jewish] DreamWorks triumverate of Jeffrey Katzenberg, David Geffen, and Steven Spielberg.”

93. Frederic Mack – “Like his brother Earle, Frederic Mack has long shown an abiding interest in U.S. relations with Israel ... MAck is currently on the national board of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the nation’s largest and most influential pro-Israel lobby. He also chairs the board of AIPAC’s Northeast chapter, and sits on the board of the New York Jewish Community Relations Council, the Jewish Theological Seminary, and the Israel Policy Forum.”

97. **Ira Lipman** – is “the owner of one of the nation’s largest security firms” – Guardsmark, “which now boasts offices in more than 400 cities in the United States and Canada.”

100. **Irwin Jacobs** – founder of Qualcomm, Inc., “the telecommunications company that has grown to $3.3 billion in annual revenues.”

In Texas, in June 1998, a news article out of Ft. Worth noted that President Clinton was expecting to raise $500,000 for his political party at a fund-raising dinner in the Dallas home of Jewish real estate developer Ray Nasher:

“For between $10,000 to $25,000 per couple, about 60 well-heeled Democratic donors were expected to dine on grilled salmon, lobster salad and fruit sorbet at the posh Park Lane-area home of Nasher, who developed the NorthPark Center but may be best known for his world-famous collection of sculptures displayed in and outside his spacious home ... During [the President’s] Houston trip, Clinton also raised $800,000 for the Democratic National Congressional Committee at an event at the fashionable Royal Oaks home of attorney Richard Mithoff.” [NIX, M., 6-2-98]

In Massachusetts, **Elaine Schuster**, heir to the Wingate Construction Company, is one of the most prominent philanthropists to the Democratic Party. Her father, **Ben Siegel**, “was barred in 1967 by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development from receiving Federal funding due to his history of mortgage defaults and managerial problems. Siegel also had been convicted in U.S. District Court for bribing a Federal official in order to obtain a federal contract.” [MIGA, A., 4-18-96, p. 6] During the 1970s, Wingate Construction received government subsidy funds and “operated one of New York City’s most notorious slums” in the South Bronx. A New York State Assembly investigation of the company reported that the firm “had apparently committed fraud” and that it is an “unscrupulous developer only interested in profits.” [MIGA, A. 4-18-96, p. 6] In 1996 the Boston Herald noted that “Elaine Schuster is living proof that in politics, money talks. The veteran Democratic fundraiser ranks among President Clinton’s strongest financial backers in Massachusetts.” Personal paybacks to Schuster, noted the Herald, including a Clinton appoint-
ment to the Advisory Committee on the Arts for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. [MIGA, A., 4]

Incredibly, in 1995, the American Congress even awarded Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, head of the Chabad Orthodox movement, the Congressional Gold Medal, “the country’s highest civilian honor.” Chabad is arguably a kind of Jewish Ku Klux Klan. See http://jewishtribalreview.org/chabad2.htm for citations from another chapter about Schneerson’s and Chabad’s principles of racism] [Also, http://jewishtribalreview.org/micsam.htm for an emailed moral indictment of Chabad by Jewish scholar Michael Samuel] U. S. Senators and “more than 20 ambassadors and other embassy officials” attended the dinner honoring Schneerson. [BATOG, J., 7-3-95, p. 4] Why was such a racist heralded by Congress? “Rabbi Schneerson,” explained the Baltimore Jewish Times,

“was the first religious figure to get the coveted medal, which was approved by Congress last October. More than a year of intensive lobbying by Chabad forces generated some 225 House co-sponsors of the authorizing legislation. Copies of the gold medal – which was underwritten by donations from admirers of Rabbi Schneerson – are being sold by the Treasury Department. According to Washington sources, that could be a big moneymaker for the federal government.” [BESSER, J., 6-30-95, p. 32]

In 1996, James Glassman, a Jewish journalist cited another example – at the most blatant level, aside from billions to Israel – of the kinds of paybacks Jews can get for political donations:

“What’s wrong with this picture? In a photo in the Washington Post on July 24, [Jewish senators] Sen. Arlen Specter, R-PA., and Sen. Barbara Boxer, D-Calif., are handing a blown-up check – like the grand prize in a golf tournament – to Steve Spielberg, the famous Hollywood mogul. The check is drawn on the U.S. Treasury in the amount of $1 million. It’s made out to a Holocaust Foundation that Spielberg heads. In other words, America’s taxpayers are generously supporting the favorite charity of the director of ‘ET,’ ‘Jurassic Park,’ and other box office blockbusters. This is the same Steve Spielberg who, says Forbes magazine, earned $285 million in 1994 and 1995 – tops in the entertainment world. His net worth is $700 million. Since 1993, he’s given $266,000 to Democratic candidates and political committees, according to Federal Election Commission records. Beneficiaries include the Clinton-Gore re-election campaign, Sen. Ted Kennedy, D-Mass., Sen. Frank Lautenberg, D-NJ, and, of course, Boxer. So one way to view the check is a nice return on Spielberg’s political investment.” [GLASSMAN, p. 11]

Payoffs for Lew Wasserman and MCA in the Reagan era included an exclusive contract (i.e., entitlement to monopoly) to run all guided tours in Washington DC (under MCA’s subsidiary Landmark Services). Likewise, MCA attained exclusive rights (through its Curry company) at Yosemite National Park for “tours, lodging, concessions, and hotels.” MCA’s contract stipulated that the park’s cut of total revenues would be three-quarters of one percent).
[MCDOUGAL, p. 345, 369] (In this genre of political influence, Jewish alcohol mogul Lewis Rosentiel’s heavy lobbying worked to get Congress to pass the “Forand Bill, named after the Congressman of that name, freeing liquor companies from punitive tax on stored whisky for a dozen extra years – ample time to dispose of their stocks. For Rosentiel it meant bonanza as well as salvation. The bill saved the company between $40 and $50 million, and the value of Schenley [Rosentiel’s firm] stock soared by $33 million in a single day.” [SUMMERS, A., 1993, p. 252] (One of Rosentiel’s ex-wives, Susan, even alleged that Rosentiel later once paid president Lyndon Johnson half a million dollars and “a large sum of money” went to Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee). [SUMMERS, A., 1993, p. 252]

Likewise, Jewish billionaire Gary Winnick’s contribution of over a million dollars to the Bill Clinton presidential library netted him a $400 million military defense contract for his company Global Crossing. “Global Crossing’s rivals,” notes journalist Joseph Perkins, “including AT&T, Qwest Communications, Sprint and Worldcom, protested that the Clinton administration rigged the bidding process to favor Winnick’s company.” The then-head of the Democratic National Party, Terry McAuliffe, also “got rich off of Global Crossing, parlaying a $100,000 investment in the telecommunications company into $18 million in a little more than a year’s time.” [PERKINS, J., 2-8-02]

Another version of Jewish financial power in wrenching state and federal funds for special Jewish transglobal interests is the case of Florida and its literal functioning as an agent for Jews and their insurance claims in the Holocaust. Lest we forget, the Holocaust occurred a half a century ago, in Europe, and is merely one of dozens of mass human tragedies and injustices that have befallen groups of people since – and before, for that matter – then. But Jews as a transnational lobby must be economically reckoned with. Hence, in 1998, following a meeting with the World Jewish Congress, Florida Treasurer and Insurance Commissioner Bill Nelson announced that, among other actions:

- his state was budgeting $500,000 to fund Florida’s Department of Insurance “to investigate unpaid Holocaust claims.”
- the Florida insurance pool would “drop two Swiss banks from participating in the insurer’s line of credit if the banks don’t reach satisfactory settlement in a class-action lawsuit brought against them by Holocaust victims.”
- three Swiss banks were warned that Florida intended to drop business with them unless they decided upon a “fair settlement” with Jewish complainants. [PR NEWSWIRE]

Across the country, also in 1998, the National Underwriter noted that “the California Assembly has unanimously approved a plan to establish the comprehensive Holocaust Insurance Registry in the Department of Insurance, giving Commissioner Charles Quackenbush the authority to suspend the business licenses of companies that fail to participate. The 76-0 vote in the normally fractious Democratic-controlled
Assembly reflected the importance of Holocaust insurance as an election year issue.” [HOWARD, J.] [Quackenbush was forced to resign his position two years later for a kickback scandal that involved major insurance companies] [TUGEND, T., 7-10-2000, p. 9]

In Illinois, the governor signed a bill in 1999 that declared that heirs to Holocaust “reparations and other compensations awarded to victims of Nazi persecution” didn’t have to pay taxes on the sums coming their way. [GRAHNKE, L., 12-24-99, p. 12] Norman Finkelstein notes the worldwide Jewish efforts to force reparations from the Swiss government:

“The WJC [World Jewish Congress] working with institutions including the US Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, mobilized the US political establishment. Using the House and Senate banking committees as springboards, the Holocaust industry orchestrated a shameless campaign of vilification. The campaign rapidly degenerated into a libel of the Swiss people.” [FINKELSTEIN, N., 7-13-2000, p. 4]

Among those many caving in to Jewish economic (and, hence, political) pressure in California in 1998 was an Asian-American candidate for the senate, Matt Fong. “Fong’s decision to champion the issue [of a Swiss bank boycott],” said the San Francisco Chronicle, “could enable him to gain backing from Jewish groups, which generally support his opponent in the United States Senate race, incumbent Barbara Boxer, who herself is Jewish ... It was influential Jewish groups in southern California, such as the Simon Wiesenthal Center, that pushed the issue, prompting Fong to respond ... Dozens of other states and cities are expected to enact similar sanctions.” [COLLIER, p. A1]

In New York, both the state and Manhattan drew up sanctions against the Swiss. It helped that the New York City’s comptroller, Alan Hevesi, was not only Jewish but a president of B’nai Zion and a member of the Presidents Conference of Major Jewish Organizations. The (Jewish) Forward notes that

“Mr. Hevesi put his role overseeing some $70 billion in assets to pressure the Swiss in the banking scandal. He has led a campaign to get other public pension fund managers to get Switzerland to own up to its role in Jewish assets it received during World War II. Having made his first trip to Switzerland in May as part of the effort, he has become more involved with Israel.” [FORWARD, 11-14-97, p. 14]

In 1997, the Wall Street Journal also reported that the United States promised to donate $4 million to the Nazi Persecution Relief Fund, aimed at compensating victims of the Holocaust, and hopes to give $25 million over three years, according to the [Jewish] Undersecretary of State Stuart Eizenstat. “ [FRANK, R., p. A19]

What, one wonders, is so special about the suffering of the Jews above and beyond all other millions of non-Jews who also were subject to “Nazi persecution,” let alone the millions of other people who have been murdered or
maimed over the years in other distant lands and situations? Surely they all deserve our sympathy. But as it is dictated for us, for an inexplicable reason some merit our money. So by what perverse reasoning should U.S. taxpayers pay for solely Jewish “relief” for events across the world half a century ago, when we were by no stretch of the imagination remotely responsible as ourselves “persecutors?” If such things are on the economic agenda, where are those clamoring to make economic amends to Native Americans who have truly been robbed, quite literally, of the ground we all stand on?

Jewish lobbying pressure is worldwide in scope. In February 2000, a news item noted that “Poland’s bid to join the European Union could be thrown into doubt unless it makes amends to holocaust survivors, a British Euro-MP warned today ... A group of holocaust survivors [led by New York Jewish lawyers Ed Klein and Mel Urban] visited Euro-MPs in Brussels for help in pressing their claims.” [PRESS ASSOCIATION NEWSFILE, 2-9-2000]

In 1999, a newspaper article entitled “In France, Resentment Is Building Over U.S. Holocaust lawsuits.” Two class-action suits were filed by Jews in New York demanding Holocaust-era restitution from French banks. “The French government and the banks are fighting the suit,” noted the International Herald Tribune, “contending that it violates France’s sovereignty.” French and American Jewish organizations even began squabbling over the issue. [WARDSON, A., 1999] At the fore of the burgeoning lawsuits in Europe in the name of Holocaust restitution has been the World Jewish Congress. The Christian Science Monitor noted in 1997 that “famed Vienna-based Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal ... has said that the focus should be on those who killed Jews, not those who stole from them. And he expressed worried that what he calls the WJC’s stridency could spur a revival of anti-Semitism in Europe.” [ECHIKSON, W., 1997]

The Jerusalem Post added in 1999 that

“Restitution of Nazi-looted property is an issue Jerusalem cannot avoid. The Holocaust is a hot topic driven by the U.S.: by [Jewish Assistant Secretary of Commerce Stuart Eizenstat and American Jewish agitation as well as by sanctions, threats, congressional hearings and class action suits in federal courts targeting Swiss, German, French, Italian and Austrian interests.” [HENRY, M., 9-17-99, p. 4B]

Jewish demands for “restitution” from the past has also turned to Arab nations. As the Jewish Week noted in 1999, “Having successfully recovered millions of dollars worth of Jewish property lost in the Holocaust, restitution experts in Israel and the U.S. are now setting their sights on the Arab world.” Jewish groups were looking to claim “tens of billions of dollars in property left behind by Jews who emigrated to Israel from Arab/Muslim countries.” [CHABIN, M., 1-29-99, p. 1] The double standard here, vis-à-vis the hundreds of thousands of Palestinians who had their property formally confiscated by the Jewish state when forcibly driven away by the Israeli military, is astounding. Jewish author David Pinsky once wrote about a Jewish family that took over an Arab house in
Israel. The wife watched her children playing with toys the Palestinian children left behind:

“What right had she and her family to occupy a house which did not belong to her? To use a garden and field which were taken by force from other people who ran away in the panic of war and are not permitted to return? Are she an her family not living on goods robbed from others? Is she not doing to Arabs what the Nazis did to her and her family?” [EL-LIS, M., 1990, p. 62]

Reparations for vast sums of stolen Palestinian property by the Jews of Israel is to this day rarely even mentioned, let alone legally addressed.

The avalanche of Jewish lobbying internationally for Holocaust reparation demands has caused some Jews, like the head of the Anti-Defamation League, Abraham Foxman, to worry that the vast amounts of money being demanded by Jews today only confirms notions that international Jewry has immense economic power and that “the Jews died [in the Holocaust not] because they were Jews, but because they had bank accounts, gold art, and property.” [SCHOENFELD, G., SEPT 2000, p. 27]

Gabriel Schoenfeld, editor of the American Jewish Committee’s Commentary magazine, notes with concern the endless Judeo-centric demands upon many of the world’s governments,

“With the exception of the forced laborers and some other currently favored groups like Gypsies, homosexuals, and the mentally ill, both European corporations and Jewish organizations have said embarrassingly little about the great numbers of non-Jews who were deprived of life, limb, and property at the hands of the Nazis ... Jewish organizations are fighting first and foremost for Jewish interests ... To lead or participate in a process through which some are given restitution while others in similar circumstances, but on the wrong side of lists, are not, is to sow the seeds of needless acrimony and to court censure on grounds to which Jews of all people should be especially sensitive.” [SCHOENFELD, G., 2000, p. 34]

“The pursuit of billions in Holocaust guilt money,” observes Jewish columnist Charles Krauthammer, “has gone from the unseemly to the disgraceful.” [SCHOENFELD, G., 2000, p. 34]

There are apparently even special rules for bending American law when Israel is concerned. Yitz Greenberg recalls

“From the age of about the age of 12 on, I went out with Jewish National Fund boxes into the Brooklyn subways to collect money for Israel ... My older brother had an old broken down car that he used to transport the boxes from our local branch to the main office. One day he parked his car in a no parking zone to deliver the money and got a parking ticket. The price of the ticket could have broken the back of the organization. Besides that my brother was very headstrong; fighting that ticket was a matter of principle. At the traffic court, everyone was ‘guilty, guilty,’ no matter what they said. When it was his turn, he said, “Well, I
had these boxes to deliver and so I had to park.’ ‘What boxes were they?’ asked the judge. ‘Those were JNF boxes,’ he answered. ‘It’s a good cause.’ ‘Not guilty,’ the judge said. Back at the office, no one believed my brother. They called up the traffic court. It turned out that the judge was **Manuel Rothenberg**, president of the Jewish National Fund.” [FROMMER, M., FROMMER, H., 2001]

There are of course a variety of issues that powerful Jewish groups actively lobby. As **Jack Wertheimer** notes about organized Jewish Orthodox organizations:

> “Orthodox Jews actively engage in the American political process to further their own aims. In this regard, the most right-wing sects have been especially adept at exploiting political opportunities. It has now become routine in New York politics for local and even national politicians to pay court to Hasidic rabbis. What is less well known is the sophisticated lobbying effort that won for Hasidic groups the status of a ‘disadvantaged group,’ with the attendant entitlement to special federal funds.” [WERTHEIMER, J., 1993, p. 119]

On smaller, local scale levels, the underlying machinations of the Jewish community are the same. “In localities across the country,” adds **Stephen Isaacs**, “Jews like non-Jews have been known to invest in candidates in return for government contracts, favorable rezonings on potentially valuable plots of real estate ... Jews have tended to be active in such instances of bribing ... Yiddish has a word for the bribe: *shmeer* (to grease), a word that has somewhat come into the American English idiom.” [BRENNER, p. 78]

There are more public – albeit modified – examples of the bribe. In 1997 the **New York Times** expressed concern that New York governor George Pataki’s acceptance of income-producing speaking engagements

> “invited conflict of interest. Through a Manhattan talent agency ... for $15,000 each, the Governor has already given four speeches, all to out-of-state groups. The audiences included a magazine conglomerate [Jewish?], two chapters of the Jewish National Fund, and the Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association [Jewish?].” [NY TIMES, p. A22]

The (Jewish) **Forward** noted the close ties between Pataki and cosmetics heir and media baron **Ron Lauder** (who we’ve met before):

> “The payments by the JNF [Jewish National Fund] – a series of speaking fees of $15,000 apiece to Mr. Lauder’s pal, Governor Pataki (whose wife is a Lauder consultant) – have raised eyebrows in some corners.” [FORWARD, 11-14-97, p. 14]

A further Pataki example: In 1998 Federal prosecutors were “examining whether state officials gave lenient treatment to a Hasidic rabbi imprisoned in a widely publicized kidnapping case after appeals were made on his behalf by a fund-raiser for the campaign of Governor George E. Pataki.” [LEVY, p. 29] The U.S. government prosecutor in the case complained that “prison officials told him the transfer [decision to eventually release] has been made at high levels.” The rabbi in question, **Shlomo Helbrans**, was not even an American citizen –
he was an Israeli. Originally sentenced to prison for 4-12 years, he was shifted to a program where he was freed on the only condition that he had a job. The “prominent fundraiser” who pulled the strings behind the scenes in this case, Leon Perlmutter (also a member of the ultra-Orthodox Satmar sect) also “lobbied state officials” for the release of two other Israelis convicted of drug dealing. They were paroled and deported home. (Ziv Oved was serving time for his participation in a “$1 million-a-week heroin and cocaine drug ring in Brooklyn.”) [GREENBERG, E., 5-1-98, p. 10] Another Perlmutter associate, Abraham Lekkow, had given $45,000 to the Pataki campaign. [LEVY, 4-26-98, p. 29] Jeff Wiesenfeld, “Pataki’s executive assistant who deals with Jewish affairs, appeared before a grand jury in Brooklyn” about the favoritism allegations. [GREENBERG, E., 5-1-98, p. 10]

In January 2000, New York City mayor Rudolph Giuliani’s “chief fundraiser and former chief of staff,” Bruce Teitelbaum, was investigated for political favors to Orthodox Jewish groups. (Teitelbaum, a Republican, is the husband of Suri Kasirer, “a major Democratic fund-raiser and lobbyist.”) [TOPOUSIS, T., 1-5-2000, p. 10] The collapse of a building under construction that killed a Mexican-American laborer and injured 11 others, says the New York Times, “led prosecutors ... to examine the building practices of the owner, Chaim Ostreicher. But early in the inquiry, Gaston Silva, the city’s former building commissioner, told prosecutors that he had been pressured by Mr. Teitelbaum ... to reassign Joseph Trivisanno, a chief buildings inspector whose style had annoyed some developers in the Orthodox Jewish community. Mr. Trivisanno has told prosecutors he believed he was forced from his position because he has been too tough with Orthodox builders and developers in enforcing regulations. Mr. Teitelbaum was the administration’s liaison to the city’s Orthodox Jews, among whom the mayor has long enjoyed political support.” [BARRY, D., 1-12-2000, p. B10]

In 1978, Alex Liberman (a survivor of Auschwitz), took over as New York City’s director of leasing under the (also Jewish) mayor Ed Koch administration. Liberman oversaw $80 million and soon became New York’s “director of negotiations.” Jack Newfield and Wayne Barrett describe what happened next:

“By this point in his career, Liberman was already taking advantage of his discretionary public power and demanding an assortment of kickbacks for city leases. Landlords were writing checks to his synagogue at his suggestion, and Liberman was pressuring his fellow directors at the temple to split the contributions with him. At first, the synagogue’s president rejected the idea, and Liberman got no part of the initial small donations. But Remsen Heights Jewish Center had a working-class, struggling congregation, and when Liberman began dangling larger and larger contributions, the temple’s leadership weakened ... Eventually the synagogue was laundering $10,000 checks ... [NEWFIELD/BARRETT, p. 215] In the real estate world] the biggest of the immunized bribe-payers was Seymour Cohen, ... a major force in Manhattan real estate. The
company and its principals, who leased more office space to the city than any other landlord, had given Koch $40,000 in campaign contributions and let him run his gubernatorial campaign rent free out of one of their buildings. It had been no less generous with other city officials – giving Comptroller Jay Goldin $178,000 (he had never audited one of their leases) and Manhattan borough president Andrew Stein the free and exclusive use of Cohn’s luxurious Hampton’s home for a summer.” [NEWFIELD/BARRETT, p. 215]

On the Republican side of “the bribe,” in 1995 prominent Congressman Newt Gingrich’s wife raised eyebrows by taking a position (while he was in office) as the vice president for business development for the Israeli Export Company. She had visited the Jewish state in 1993 under the auspices of Israel’s political lobbying arm, AIPAC. Ms. Gingrich was “hired at an undisclosed salary to help recruit business for a free-trade zone in Israel.” [BAER, S., p. 6]

Jewish/Israeli influence in local politics on the other side of the country? In 1989 the Los Angeles Times featured an expose on the questionable personal and business relationship between Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley and his “friend” Abraham Spiegel. A federal grant jury was in fact beginning a criminal investigation, also subpoenaing Bradley’s campaign fund-raiser (also Jewish), Ira Distenfield. (For his part, Distenfield, a Republican, yet the largest personal campaign contributor to Democrat Bradley in 1985, was eventually “sued by five current and former city commissioners for allegedly misappropriating their investments in a limited partnership that included several other political insiders.”) [CLIFFORD, F., 3-27-85, p. B1; KRIKORIAN, G., 9-3-90, p .B1] “The City Attorney,” noted the Times, “found no illegality in ... the way a top mayoral aide cut through city red tape for three Spiegel [real estate] developments ... Nonetheless ... the relationship raises questions about the degree of access to the mayor enjoyed by political contributors and supporters who have dealings with the city ... The sheer number and personal nature of Spiegel favors for the mayor ensures that he shares an intimacy with Bradley that few others enjoy.” [PASTERNAK/BUNTING, p. 1]

Spiegel even drew the African-American mayor of Los Angeles into the web of international activism for Israel. “Bradley,” noted the Times, “has traveled twice to Israel to participate in ground-breaking, and dedication of museum and university buildings donated by Spiegel. And Spiegel in turn raised funds at a Los Angeles dinner to establish a Tom Bradley Chair in Social Integration at a college near Tel Aviv ... Spiegel has often invited local officials to galas for visiting Israeli dignitaries.” The Times noted one especially disturbing meeting Bradley had with Spielberg; the other two guests were former Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban and Israel’s Los Angeles consul general. “The discussion at their table,” said the Times, “centered on two topics – Bradley’s friendship for Israel and Spiegel’s construction projects in Los Angeles ... Spiegel became Bradley’s ‘point man’ in Los Angeles’ Jewish community, raising the mayor’s profile among Israeli officials and thus among affluent local supporters of Israel.” [PASTERNAK, J.; BUNTING, Glenn, F.; p. 1]
The mayor that succeeded Tom Bradley? The Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles notes that another Jewish “mover and shaker,” Steven Soboroff, is the “best pal and top adviser to Mayor Richard Riordan, who is backing Soboroff as his successor in City Hall.” [TUGEND, 10-22-99]

The case of California governor Gray Davis? “Back in the late 1970s, “notes Joel Kotkin in the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles, “... Davis became acquainted with [former Governor Jerry] Brown’s powerful coterie of Jewish political bankrollers like financiers S. Jon Kreedman, superagent Jeff Wald, and Eli Broad. The big Democratic political money in Los Angeles Democratic politics, Davis realized, was Jewish ... Davis made it his job to be the Gentile champion of the Jews.” [KOTKIN, 5-29-98] As the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California noted in 1999,

“This was Davis’ fourth trip to Israel, his first as governor. It’s gratifying to see a political leader who understands and cares about the Jewish homeland.” [JEWSH BULLETIN OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, 11-5-99, p. 24A]

In 1999, Davis “signed a state budget ... that included $2 million for building the new Jewish Museum in San Francisco and $1.25 million for construction of the Peninsula Jewish Community Center in Foster City.” [SCHUSTER, J., 7-9-99, p. 17] Can we imagine millions of tax-payer dollars earmarked for a Christian or Muslim Museum, or a Polish or Guatemalan Community Center?

Former Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres notes his impressions of then-California governor Jerry Brown in the 1980s:

“I once appeared with Governor Jerry Brown before the Union of Meat Cutters in San Diego. He made a wonderful speech. He said, ‘Well, I live on my salary. I never invested in anything. The only thing I’m going to invest in are the bonds of Israel, because I love Israel. If you would show me a map and ask me to identify Israel, I probably couldn’t find it. But Israel is in my heart.’” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 225]

(In 2001, Tom Hayden, left-wing darling of progressive causes, former California state representative, and ex-husband of Jane Fonda, was defeated in a bid for a seat on the Los Angeles City Council. He lost to a Jewish opponent, Jack Weiss, “a former prosecutor who has never held an elected office.” As the Los Angeles Times discreetly noted about the election, “A Midwestern Catholic, Hayden ... faced a subtle challenge in a district known for electing Jewish community activists as leaders.”) [FOX, S., 6-17-01]

What about politics in Philadelphia, the icon of American patriotism? In 2000, President Clinton appointed “Philadelphia attorney, communal leader and state Democratic fundraiser S. David Fineman” as a U.S. District judge for Eastern Pennsylvania. Fineman had been earlier appointed by Clinton as a high official at the Post Office where he “helped shepherd a postage stamp honoring the deeds of Holocaust hero Raul Wallenberg as well as the first stamp to mark Chanukah.” [FELDMAN, S., 3-23-2000, p. 15]

In late 1999, Ed Rendell, a Jew, ended his term as Philadelphia’s mayor. (President Clinton attended a $1,000-per-plate dinner honoring Rendell at the
end of his term.) [FELDMAN, S., 12-9-99, p. 5] The former mayor then became the new general chairman of the Democratic National Party, “the chief spokesman for the Democratic Party.” [CATABIANI, M., 10-3-99, p. A1] Within months his office announced the appointment of three new “finance vice chairs” for the party. Two, Kenneth Jarin and Alan Kessler were also from Philadelphia and they were both Jews. (A third Jew from Philadelphia, Thomas Leonard, continued, since 1993, as a DNC finance vice chairman. He also served as the state of Pennsylvania’s Democratic Party finance chairman).

In Fall 1999, a Jewish Republican, Sam Katz, ran against an African-American, Democrat John Street, (who beat a Jewish opponent, Marty Weinberg, in the primary) to replace Rendell as the mayor of Philadelphia. (Katz’s dog, noted a Jewish journal, is even named Jabo, in honor of the famous right-wing fascist/Zionist Ze’ev Jabotinsky). 87% of the Jews of Philadelphia – despite high nationwide Jewish proclivities to liberalism and the Democratic Party – voted for Republican Katz. [FELDMAN, S., 3-2-2000, p. 1] Katz lost the mayoral contest, however, to the African-American by a narrow margin. A victory against Jewish political dominance? Hardly. Jews, after all, are central to the Democratic Party machine. As the Jewish Exponent observed about the African-American candidate’s victory:

“From mayor Ed Rendell to District Attorney Lynne Abraham to City Controller Jonathan Saidel to primary opponent Marty Weinberg to campaign co-finance chairman Robert Feldman to State Senator Allyson Schwartz – it appeared clear that Street could not have gained his slim victory over Republican Sam Katz Tuesday without key Jewish supporters. Need more proof? Also on stage in the [victory] ballroom at the Warwick Hotel were campaign insiders Leonard Ross, Leonard Klehr and Mark Alderman; Rabbi Solomon Isaacs, who helped get the votes out in the far Northeast, and Philadelphia Federation of Teachers president Ted Kirsch, who prominently endorsed Street in September. In the back of the room, chief campaign spokesman Ken Snyder was busy fielding last-minute questions from reporters, and looking on was campaign media consultant David Axelrod.” [FELDMAN, S., 11-4-99, p. 1]

In a follow-up article, the Jewish Exponent noted that “As was the case during Street’s campaign, Jews are playing prominent roles in the transition phase [to the new mayor].” Two co-chairs of the transition committee were Jewish: Leonard Klehr and Judith Rodin (the president of the University of Pennsylvania). Education Committee chiefs included Lee Annenberg, David Cohen, and Ralph Roberts; working under them were Lois Yampolsky and Deborah Kahn, who was later named to be Philadelphia’s Secretary of Education. [FELDMAN, S., 3-9-2000, p. 15] The Government Organization Committee included Leonard Ross, Mark Adelman, and Alan Kessler. Marty Weinberg was in Policy and Programs. Jewish Task Force transition leaders also included Ed Schwartz, Emmanuel Freeman, Ira Lubert, Moshe Porat, Marciarose Shestack, David Marshall (Campaign Chairman for the Jewish Federation of...
Greater Philadelphia), Harold Goldman (president of Jewish Family and Children’s Services), Michael Blum, Harriet Dichter, Ken Jarin, Robert Feldman, John Binswanger, Steven Cozen and Rabbi William Kuhn. [FELDMAN, S., 12-2-99, p. 10]

Two weeks later the Jewish Exponent featured another article about the many Jews in mayor Street’s entourage, joking to its Jewish audience that “the Jewish community is well represented in this round of appointments. In fact, if your name is not on the list, you just might feel left out.” Appointments of Jews in city government included:

Education: Shelly Yanoff, Sandra Fellman, Ted Kirsch.


In the same time frame, the Exponent also did an article about the visit of the Tel Aviv mayor to Philadelphia, noting that the two sites were “sister cities.” “There has been, for a long time – or as long as I can remember,” noted the Chairman of the Jewish Federation, Joseph Smukler, “a special relationship between Tel Aviv and Philadelphia.” [FELDMAN, S., 4-20-2000, p. 13] Among new mayor John Street’s ceremonial tasks was to cut the ribbon to open Philadelphia’s new “National Liberty Museum: America’s Home for Heroes.” The museum’s Executive Director is Gwen Borowsky. Wealthy media mogul Irwin Borowsky founded the organization. He also is the founder of the “American Interfaith Institute, which aims to expunge anti-Jewish sentiment from editions of the New Testament.” Borowsky’s museum, like so many these days, clearly aims to appropriate American patriotic heritage under the umbrella of Jewish Holocaust mythology. In the heart of Philadelphia, one of the icons of American heritage, the Liberty Museum features a second floor “hall of heroes [which] is studded with Holocaust memories.” [MONO, B., 1-20-2000, p. 9]

And new Philadelphia mayor John Street’s inevitable bending to Jewish Zionist concerns and their ties to Israel? In 1998, while still a city councilman, Street, his wife, and son were flown to Israel for eight days as a guest of a Philadelphia Jewish businessman, Joseph Zuritsky. Criticism of Israel, nor Jewish loyalties, was not the focus of a Philadelphia Daily News story about the trip. After all, as the paper observed, “Most of the potential candidates in the 1999 mayor’s race, as well as Mayor Rendell, have traveled to Israel at some point in their careers – and in most cases the trip was paid for or subsidized by one of several groups promoting closer U.S. ties to the Jewish state.” These pol-
iticians courted by Zionists include Happy Fernandez, Doug Evans, and John White, Jr.) [BUNCH, W., 11-2-98]

Rather, the Daily News piece examined the economic self-interests of Zuritsky (the CEO of the Parkway Corporation, Philadelphia’s major “parking lot developer”), in sponsoring Street’s trip to the Jewish state. The future mayor’s journey

“was paid for by a parking-lot magnate at the same time his firm was lobbying the [City] Council for millions of dollars in low-cost financing for a Center City development ... Zuritsky said he had no motive in sponsoring the trip – which had planning assistance from several local Jewish community leaders – other than to educate Philadelphia’s highest-ranking black leader about Israel and Mideast politics. He said he wanted to promote ethnic harmony.” [BUNCH, W., 11-2-98]

Among the critics of the trip was the president of the Philadelphia division of Common Cause, Barry Kaufmann, also Jewish.

But there’s even more Jewish/Zionist politicking in Pennsylvania. In 2000, that state’s governor, Tom Ridge (later the first appointment as U.S. secretary of Homeland Security), was awarded the “Friend of Zion Award” by the fundamentalist Orthodox Jewish organization Aish HaTorah and the city of Jerusalem. As noted by the Jerusalem Fund, Ridge’s honor was based upon his “unbending support for the Jewish state.” Just the year before Governor Ridge had received the Scopus Award from the American Friends of Hebrew University in Philadelphia. [PR NEWSWIRE,-24-2000]

Jewish/Israeli propagandizing influence in the African-American community – from Los Angeles mayor Tom Bradley across the country to Philadelphia mayor John Street – also includes Marion Barry [the African-American mayor of Washington D.C., named when he was busted for cocaine possession in 1990. Barry’s public relations “image maker” was David Abramson. [JAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 98] (Max Berry, also Jewish, was prominent African-American D.C. city politician Walter Fauntroy’s finance chairman.[JAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 94] John Hechinger, former chairman of the Washington DC City Council after fellow Jew Max Kampleman’s appointment for the position had trouble with the Senate, “became a cornerstone in [Fauntroy’s] organization.” [JAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 94, 62] Joseph Danzansky [CEO of the Giant supermarket chain] had links to the African American political community that allegedly spared his stores’ from being burned in Washington DC riots). [JAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 79] Barry also had a Jewish “long-time friend and campaign fundraiser”: a wealthy real estate developer, Jeffrey Cohen [LA FRANIERE, S., 1-19-90] In Cohen’s real estate hassles with city departments, note Harry Jaffe and Tom Sherwood (in their book about Washington DC politics), Barry was known to have lobbied in Cohen’s behalf, having, for instance,

“stepped in and recommended that the certificate [to build] be okayed ... [JAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 158] ... Cohen, the former Boy Banker, had built his real estate empire with Marion Barry’s
help. The mayor had given his friend sweet-heart government leases and an $11-million city loan to prop up the grandiose Shaw redevelopment project. Cohen had repaid Barry with a pipeline into Jewish campaign contributions and a secret piece of a real estate deal in Nantucket ...

[CJAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 305-306] Cohen says that he vascillated over the deal but he eventually agreed to make Barry a 10 percent partner in the $1 million building for the sake of Barry’s son Christopher. Cohen then created a dummy corporation to hide Barry’s stake. Four months later, on December 2, 1985, the mayor sent city councilman David Clarke a bill that would float $9 million in tax-exempt bonds for Cohen to use in the renovation of the Manhattan Laundry, a sturdy structure that Cohen wanted to turn into offices for himself. The bond passed, and once again the city picked up Jeffrey Cohen’s tab.” [JAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 179-180]

(In a broader political sense, “Cohen’s key to Republican power came through his association with E. Bob Wallach, a San Francisco lawyer who was an old friend of Ronald Reagan official [Ed] Meese’s. Wallach would eventually be indicted in the Wedtech military contracting scandal and smear Meese in the process, but in 1985 he was Cohen’s conduit to raw power. In a complex web that developed during the early 1980s, Wallach invested in Cohen’s Washington real estate deals; Cohen helped get bank loans for Meese; and Meese gave Cohen and Barry entree into the White House.”) [JAFFE/SHERWOOD, 1994, p. 161-162]

Jewish/Israeli influence in the Black community was also noted by the Jerusalem Post in 1996, in a piece headlined “The Israeli “Secret” Diplomacy Inside the Afro-American Community.” As the Post observes:

“There are 100 Black colleges and universities in this country but only 41 are members of the United Negro College Fund presided over by William H. Gray, III, the ex-congressman. And he is the ‘secret weapon’ of Israel ... Black scholars, intellectuals and students are the new Israeli target group.”

Softening African-Americans to Israeli propaganda is expedited by “Israel Cultural Days” at Black American colleges, visits by Ethiopian Jews (who, never stated, face, as Blacks, omnipresent racism in Israel: see Israel chapter, p. 1725), and vacations to Israel for seven presidents of African-American colleges to build “a new bridge between the academic community in Israel and the black academic community in this country.” [NAHSHON, G., 3-96] In March 2002, a controversy arose about African-American politician H. Carl McCall’s visit to Israel. As the New York Times reported:

“When H. Carl McCall, the [New York] state comptroller and a Democratic candidate for governor of New York, visited Israel for three days last week, he insisted that it was an official state visit to allow him to inspect Israeli investments financed with the New York State pension fund. Even though Mr. McCall acknowledged that the trip could benefit his bid for governor, he said it would be paid for mostly by the state pen-
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ation fund, rather than by his campaign. Yesterday, Mr. McCall’s cam-
paign acknowledged the existence of a photograph from that trip taken
of the comptroller with a cocked M-16 held to his shoulder, conducting
shooting practice at what his aides said was an antiterrorist camp at an
undisclosed location in Israel.” [NAGOURNEY, A., 3-12-02]

In 2001, after the September 11 terrorist attacks in New York and Wash-
ington DC, even Al Sharpton, the controversial African-American religious leader
who had long been at odds with Jewish organizations, visited Israel. As Rabbi
Shmuley Boteach explained, Sharpton was known as “someone who was antag-
onistic to the Jewish community. But I think anyone who knew him privately,
Rabbi Schneier, myself, [knew] that was clearly not the case ... After September
11 ... he said to me that he wanted to make a bold gesture of reconciliation to
the Jewish community ... I hope that all my Jewish brothers and sisters will ex-
tend not just an olive branch, but a warm hand of familial friendship, seeing
Rev. Sharpton as a friend of the Jewish community, as a friend of the State of
Israel.” [FORWARD, 10-26-01] The Village Voice also notes that Sharpton has
also been courted by Jewish New York mayoral candidate Mark Green who
“took Sharpton and his wife to the opening of a performance of Judgment at
Nuremberg, a Broadway play about the Holocaust. At the same time Green was
trying to kosher Sharpton, he was riding his coattails to popularity in the Afri-
can American community.” [NOEL, P. 10-22-01]

With expanding Hispanic populations in Los Angeles, New York, and Flor-
da (areas heavily populated with Jews), and rising Hispanic political power,
Jewish attention in recent years has been shifting towards “coalition building”
also with Hispanics. This is despite the fact that Jews and Hispanics have little
in common: Hispanics tend to be ardently Catholic and many are impover-
ished. Jews are the most affluent ethnic group in America, and dominant in the
California garment factories that tend to hire Hispanic workers at low wages.

But, as the (Jewish) Forward noted in 2001:

“In the current Los Angeles mayor’s race, Jews and Hispanics appear
to be backing the same candidate, Antonio Villaraigosa, a former speaker
of the state assembly, over his white opponent, former City Attorney
James Hahn ... ‘I’ve always chided the pro-Israel leadership for not tak-
ing Hispanic leaders to Israel the way they do with blacks,” said Linda
Chavez, a conservative political thinker who was President Bush’s first
nominee for secretary of labor. Such trips have in fact begun. Mr. Vil-
leraigosa, the L. A. mayoral contender, visited Israel in 1999 with other
Latino leaders on an ADL-sponsored trip. ‘On Israel Independence Day
he talked about how that impacted him,” said the ADL’s Mr. Lehrer.”
[DONADIO, R., 5-11-01]

(Linda Chavez is married to Chris Gersten, former Executive Director of
the Republican Jewish Coalition). [BESSER, J., 1-5-01]

On May 31, 2001, during the last Los Angeles mayoral debate, KNX radio
reporter Frank Mottek challenged Villaraigosa about his former secessionist
ideology. The candidate did not respond directly to the question, however, but shielded himself with platitudes and his strong Jewish connections:

MOTTEK: “It has been reported Mr. Villaraigosa that when you were at UCLA you were active in a Latino rights group which among other things says in its constitution that it is in favor of forming a separate republic in the South-west United States. Do you hold the beliefs of that organization as your own and do you still support the group and what do you tell kids that see this kind of stuff on the Internet?”

VILLARAIGOSA: “I say that we have to do everything to combat hate and ignorance. I say that we need to do what the [Simon Wiesenthal] Museum of Tolerance has done. I know, because later in June I’m going to be honored by the Museum of Tolerance. I put together over the last six years more than 18 million dollars for this museum. I put money for this museum. That amount of money is unprecedented in the history of this state. I put money together for this museum because I agree with the Rabbis who work here. Rabbi May, Rabbi Cooper. I supported this museum because they have the tools for tolerance program in our schools and in our police department. I’d like to get the person that worked on that Website in one of those programs so that we can teach them the need to come together and not vilify one another. I’m proud of the fact that this is a great country. This is a country of opportunity and this is also a country of free speech. So I honor his right to free speech, I just hope that he works on the tolerance.” [MOTTEK, F., 5-31-01]

In March 2002, New York politician David Weprin made the news when he – ardent activist for Jewish causes (his mother is a Jew from Cuba) – decided to spread his influence and seek membership in the the New York City Council’s Black and Hispanic Caucus. Some of the members of this minority coalition rebuffed him. “The Weprin name is synonymous with Jewish affairs as it is with Queen politics ... Even if the Hollis Democrat [Weprin] has not identified as much with Hispanic causes,” editorialized Newsday in support of his admission, “he is emblematic of a city in which many people claim multiple heritage.” [NEWSDAY, 3-4-02]

Incredibly, Weprin, Jewish activist reinvented politically as Hispanic, had made the news on behalf of far-right Zionist causes just a few weeks earlier. As the Jewish Forward reported

“A freshman New York City councilman is winning some powerful endorsements for his proposal to name a street in his native Queens after slain Israeli Tourism Minister Rehavim ‘Gandhi’ Ze’evi, who had urged the expulsion of Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The proposal by Democrat David Weprin, who chairs the City Council’s powerful finance committee, has won the endorsement of [Jewish] State Assemblyman Dov Hikind of Brooklyn, as well as Rabbi Avi Weiss of the Hebrew Institute of Riverdale in the Bronx ... The enthusiasm of some mainstream Jewish organizations for the street-naming proposal may be the latest sign of what communal leaders say is a new era in which it is no longer verboten for American Jews to discuss, or in some cases prokmote
Ze’evi’s platform of ‘transfer.’ The term ‘transfer’ has come to refer to the mass removal of Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza to other Arab countries by means that Ze’evi himself was often vague about. Most mainstream Jewish groups, from left to right, historically have rejected the doctrine as immoral.” [CATTAN, N., 1-25-02]

The Jewish lobbying of American politicians towards Zionism and Israel is broad. In 2001, for example, mayor Ralph Appezzato of Alameda (near San Francisco) was one of 46 mayors from 25 countries to attend a special conference for mayors in Jerusalem sponsored by the American Jewish Congress. Wined and dined in Israel, upon returning, noted the Jewish Bulletin of Northern California, Appezzato now “wears the Lion of Judah pinned on his lapel. He also has a mezuzah [the traditional Jewish religious artifact on doorframes], (“slanted correctly – my Jewish friends told me”). “Because of the intifada [the Palestinian uprising against Israeli rule which had so far taken hundreds of lives],” Mayor Appezzato told reporters, “tourism is down. It’s absolutely wonderful to go to all the sites and not have to fight the crowds.” [GOLDSMITH, A., 5-5-01]

In 2001, Jewish mogul Michael Bloomberg was elected to be the new mayor of New York City. The New York Times noted that mayor-elect Bloomberg, current mayor Rudy Giuliani, and New York governor George Pataki were planning a visit to Israel together on Bloomberg’s private jet. “Their schedule,” noted the Times, “would include visiting the sites in Israel that were recently attacked by suicide bombers, laying wreaths and meeting with Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and other officials.” “It is an appropriate time to show the people of Israel that our prayers are with them,” said Bloomberg. “It is an important trip, it is a brief trip, but when you really care you fit things in.” “Events this week require that I be in Israel,” said Governor Pataki. [STEINHAUER, J., 12-5-01] In February 2002, New York City mayor Rudy Giuliani was awarded the “Friend of Israel Humanitarian Award” by the Greater Miami Jewish Federation. “There is a very strong connection between Israel and the United States that’s even deeper than the blood lines,” he told the Jewish dinner crowd, “The actual strength and depth of our connection is very simple: We’re democracies.” [DE VALLE, E., 2-11-02]

In 2002, the Jewish-dominated New York City City Council decided it was an international body when it drafted a proposal “for the removal of the PLO from New York” (the United Nations offices are located in that city) but the State Department intervened to complain that “its passage could complicate cease-fire efforts in the Middle East.” [RADLER, M., 4-25-02]

What about Jewish political purse strings in Massachusetts? In 1998, the Jewish Advocate noted that

“How well three local businessmen each raise funds – while putting aside their friendship – could have a major impact upon the governor’s race in Massachusetts. Boston lawyer Richard Glovsky of Newton is chairing the finance committee of [state] Attorney General Scott Harshbarger’s campaign, while nursing home magnate Alan Solomont and private investor Paul Egerman, both of Weston, are sharing these responsibilities in former state senator Patricia McGovern’s camp. Both
gubernatorial candidates are Democrats ... Egerman’s wife, Joanne, and Glovsky are members of the board of directors of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith’s New England chapter.” [GELBWASSER, M., 2-5-98, p. 1]

How about Jewish political prominence in San Francisco? Jewish scholar Seymour Lipset notes that, despite popular Jewish convictions of rampant anti-Semitism around them,

“San Francisco provides an example of how some Jews can totally ignore reality. Polls taken among contributors to the San Francisco Jewish Community Federation have found that one-third believe that a Jew cannot be elected to Congress from San Francisco. A poll reported such results in 1985 when all three members of Congress from contiguous districts in or adjacent to the city were Jewish, as were two state senators, the mayor and a considerable part of the city council.” [LIPSET, p. 156]

If modern San Francisco is so wonderful for Jews, where does Jewish anti-Semitic paranoia there come from, San Francisco’s anti-Semitic past? Hardly. Earl Raab, an assistant director of the San Francisco Jewish Relations Council wrote in 1950 that

“The Jewish community in San Francisco has been called, with reason, the wealthiest, per capita, in the country. There is, at the same time, a startling poverty of anti-Semitic tradition. San Francisco, for cities of its size, is the nation’s ‘white spot’ of anti-Jewish prejudice ... At times Jewish citizens have concurrently held the presidencies of the Chamber of Commerce, the Community Chest, the Board of Education, Art, Fire, and Harbor Commissions, and many other appointive and elective posts; it is a situation that cannot be duplicated in any other city with a six percent Jewish concentration.” [p. 230]

Not far from San Francisco, in 1998, in a celebration of Israel’s 50th anniversary, a San Francisco Jewish ethnic newspaper noted that “costumed volunteers from Congregation Beth David in Saratoga, representing great 20th century Israeli leaders, will greet the crowd. Mayors Judy Nadler of Santa Clara, Donald Wolf of Saratoga and Ralph Faravelli of Mountain View, plus Santa Clara County Supervisor Joseph Simitian and Mountain View Councilmember Joseph Kleitman will head a ceremony introduced by Jewish community leader Dr. Steve Green.” [JEWISH BULLETIN, 6-5-98]

What about Jewish influence in New Jersey, beside Jewish-dominated New York? “Key campaign strategists for the Democrats’ U.S. Senate primary races,” noted the New Jersey Jewish News in 2000, “are Jewish.” Steven Goldstein was co-campaign manager for one candidate (the later primary winner), and Jim Lanard the director of strategic planning and spokesman for another. “Goldstein believes that his Jewish identity ‘intensely’ informs his career.” Lanard studied Hebrew while living for a year in Israel. [FRIEDLAND, E., 6-1-2000, p. 13] Yet another Jewish behind-the-scenes New Jersey politico, Ira Cohen, was chair of the “pro-Israel” Draft Bob Grant Committee. Cohen noted that he has “no allegiance to anybody exclusive of my people – the Jewish people, my
family, my children and grandchildren, and how this country goes.” [FRIEDLAND, E., 6-1-2000, p. 14]

What about Jewish influence in, of all places, South Carolina? Are there Jews close to the reins of power there, in a state where there are few Jews? In 2000, Sam Tenenbaum chaired Governor Jim Hodge’s inaugural committee. Sam’s wife, Inez, is the South Carolina Superintendent of Education. [GRESOCK, S., 8-3-2000] (Even in Utah, Joe Waldhoutz, husband of non-Jewish Congressman Enid Greene, effectively destroyed his wife’s political career after he committed a variety of crimes worth 21 months in prison. [DILLON, L., 5-29-99, p. A1] In Georgia, Dianne Harnell Cohen is the governor’s deputy chief of staff). [ATLANTA JEWISH TIMES, 6-18-99]

How about non-Jewish, arch-conservative Republican senator Jesse Helms, from North Carolina? How was he conquered for the Zionist cause? Zionist journalist Sidney Zion tells the story of (infamous Jewish attorney, friend of mobsters, and political activist) Roy Cohn’s dragging of Helms onto the Zionist bandwagon:

“Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina was the premier target of the Jewish lobby in his bid for re-election in 1984. It wasn’t just that his voting record on Israel was terrible; the big thing was that Helms was in line to head up the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Jewish money was flowing into the coffers of his opponent, the incumbent Governor James B. Hunt, and the election was attracting nationwide media coverage, particularly in New York. It looked like a toss-up, and Helms was very nervous indeed. What to do? Call Roy Cohn.

Roy held a party for Helms, with a guest list made up of some of the richest Jews in New York plus a few wealthy goyim, who were either pro-Israel out of conviction or out of friendship with Cohn. That anybody in the city would show up at a bash for Helms was an act of friendship for Roy. Helms was being portrayed as practically the reincarnation of the Third Reich. When I got word about this party, I was appalled. I couldn’t believe Roy Cohn would get this far. He was pro-Israel, whatever else his madness, he was consistently pro-Israel. How the hell could he allow his right-wing bullshit to bring him to this?

But I’d never act moralistic with Roy Cohn. All I said was: ‘How’d that Jesse Helms fund-raiser go?’

‘It wasn’t a fund-raiser.’

‘Roy,’ I said, ‘I know you held a fucking fund-raiser for Jesse Helms.’

‘It wasn’t that at all,’ he said. ‘It was interferon.’

‘What?’

‘Interferon. To stop the flow of pro-Israeli money to Hunt. That’s what it what it was about. We didn’t ask anybody for a dime. We told them we didn’t want their money. And we didn’t Jesse didn’t need money. He only needed to cut off the other guy’s money. Anyway it would have been stupid to ask these people for campaign contributions. Let’s face it, they
couldn’t be caught dead backing Jesse Helms. So the cancer cure. Interferon.’

‘Did it work?’

‘Sure. Jesse will win the election.’

‘But why do you want that? You’ve always been for Israel.’

‘Jesse Helms isn’t anti-Israel,’ Cohn said.

‘How’d he manage to fool the world?’

‘He voted against some Israeli appropriations. He votes against appropriation bills all the time. He votes against the Arabs. He’s an old-line Republican. Tha’ts all there is to it. I know him forever, he’s not pro-Arab, he’s not anti-Israel. He’s for Israel.’ Several months after Helms won re-election, he went to Israel with Roy Cohn. Within a week he was a total Israeli hawk, to the right of General Arik Sharon.

When I next saw Roy, I said, ‘Well, you’re the only guy I know who cashed in markers for Israel.’

He didn’t even smile. He said, ‘I told you, Jesse Helms was pro-Israel.’

‘But Roy, nobody knew it until you took him over there.’

‘I knew it,’ Roy said.

‘Did he know it?’

‘He knows it now.’ And now Roy Cohn smiled.” [ZION, S., 1988, p. 264-265]

Atlanta, Georgia? In 2001, the Atlanta Jewish Times noted the Jewish dimensions of the race for mayor:

“The vast majority of Atlanta’s 86,000 Jews will not vote for mayor, since they live outside the city limits. But they will give money, and for good reason. Many work within the city boundaries ... The Jewish supporters who have decided [who to vote for] are primarily aligning themselves with Pitts and Franklin [the mayoral frontrunners]. Each has several Jews on his or her finance committee ... Dr. Larry Cooper ... [a major Jewish supporter] is chairing Franklin’s finance committee.” [POLLAK, S., 5-11-01]

In Miami, Florida, Elaine Bloom “has been a radio talk-show host, regional president of the National Council of Jewish Women and a top UJA activist. She recently stepped down as chief Florida fund-raiser for Israel’s Bar-Ilan University.” Ms. Bloom, notes J. J. Goldberg, “is one of the most powerful and longest serving Democrats in the Florida state legislature.” [GOLDBERG, J. J., 1-28-2000, p. 12] In 1999, Donald Warshaw, Miami’s powerful city manager, was fired after nearly two years in the position. He was accused of “spending $86,563 in pension and charity funds on trips, designer clothes, $21,276 in hockey tickets and other things from 1993 to 1995 while serving as police commissioner.” [WILSON, C., 10-11-2000] Earlier, in 1993, Dade County Commissioner (Miami, Florida) Joe Gersten, also Jewish, was accused of smoking cocaine with a prostitute in a Miami drug den and subsequently fled to Australia. [DE FEDE, J., 3-16-94]
Also in Florida, in 1999, State Senator Al Gutman was sentenced to two years in prison for “conspiracy in a Medicare fraud case.” Gutman and his wife Marci “secretly owned companies that billed Medicare for health care services that were not performed.” He “collected at least $2 million from fraudulent billings while he served in the Legislature.” [FIELDS, T., 10-20-99; FIELDS, T., 10-26-99] In 2002, Edward Mezvinsky, a former Congressman from Iowa, “was indicted on 66 counts of fraud and related charges for allegedly bilking more than $10 million.” Those signing letters to the court trying to get him off easy were Edward Shils (a University of Pennsylvania professor, Jonathan Yarowsky, a former general counsel to the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, and Rabbi Gerald Wolpe. [MOORE, T., 1-9-02] In 2002, the Nashville (Tennessee) Vice Mayor, Ronnie Steine, “withdrew from the 5th District Congressional race ... after admitting he shoplifted from a Target Store ... and [he] says he has been cited one other time for stealing from the same store.” [KNOXNEWS, 4-28-02]

Jewish interest in political activity is not always, of course, expressly linked to Israel and other Jewish causes. The Las Vegas Review noted the case of Arthur Goldberg in 1999. Goldberg heads Park Place Entertainment, the largest casino/hotel conglomerate in America (Cesar’s Palace, Bally’s, et al). “The New Jersey Casino Control Commission,” noted the paper,

“criticized Goldberg and faulted his judgements for allowing his company to pay the Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives $240,000 during a 1994 campaign to legalize casinos ... Goldberg wasn’t here to hear the decision [of the Casino Control Commission] ... [He] was hosting President Clinton at a $10,000 per plate Democratic fund-raiser at the company’s Paris Las Vegas hotel-casino.” [WEINERT, J., p. 2D]

Elsewhere, intensive Jewish lobbying and Jewish money to secure special treatment for fellow Jews around the world has long been a tradition. A 1999 article in the Boston Globe noted the special treatment Jews get in trying to get refugee status to America from Russia (nearly three-quarters of a special refugee program for Russian cases, mostly claiming anti-Semitism, are Jews):

“In other troubled parts of the world, would-be refugees must show they are being persecuted or have a “well-founded fear” of persecution ... But applicants from the former Soviet Union need only show ‘credible basis’ for concern that they might face persecution. Such vague standards left INS employees uncertain what assertions were acceptable to win refugee status. But they said they soon learned from their superiors that a claim of a minor act of discrimination, such as being denied a promotion or a raise, was acceptable, without any need for verification. The majority of the 275,000 who emigrated here through the program were men, women, and children of Jewish heritage ... An attempt to end the program now could prove costly to Democratic candidates, especially to Hilary Rodham Clinton, who has taken steps to court Jewish voters in New York state.” [KURKJIAN, p. A1]

One INS “superior” told the Globe, “I’ll admit the program is more generous than elsewhere, but that’s what Congress mandated.” Dan Stein of the Federa-
tion of American Immigration Reform testified to Congress that “This program has been documented to be so loosely administered that it has served as a conduit for the settlement of a strong refugee mafia to take root in the United States.” [See the chapter on Jewish dominance in the “Russian Mafia”, p. 1055]. “Added one INS interviewer,” says the Globe, “who asked for anonymity: ‘The prevailing attitude was that Congress had passed the … amendment loosening the restriction for Jews to enter as refugees and we weren’t to stand in the way of putting up numbers’ … Refugee status is an immigrant’s dream. Refugees are entitled to special benefits, including welfare of eight months, health insurance, employment services, and instruction in English as a second language for 18 months, that are not available to foreign visitors with work visas. And it allows for them to petition for U.S. citizenship after five years.” [KURKJIAN, p. A1]

Jews across the world have long been a crucial issue for American Jewry, and the Jews of Russia have been of paramount concern to them since the late 19th century. In the early years of the twentieth century, says J. Bruce Nichols, “the American Jewish Committee brought Jewish concern [about Russian Jews] into the political and economic mainstream by forcing Congress to terminate the eighty year-old treaty regulating U.S. commercial ties with Russia … The [Congressional] vote [on ending the treaty in support of Jewish interests] firmly established the AJC as a force in the conduct of the nation’s foreign affairs.” When Turkey in 1914 expelled over a thousand Russian Jews from Palestine, “several U.S. Navy ships were used to transport them to safety in Alexandria, Egypt. In March 1915 the U.S. Navy shipped 900 tons of [American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee] relief supplies to Palestine; a second shipment courtesy of the government followed the next year … According to a report filed in July 1916 by the U.S. Consul in Jerusalem, only 18,000 of the 82,000 Jews in Palestine were self-supporting; the rest depended on American charity.” [NICHOLS, p. 33-34]

American immigration policy towards Soviet Jews parallels that of guilt-ridden Germany where a 1991 law “gives preferential treatment to Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union … Once in Germany … they enjoy a wide range of government benefits intended to aid their absorption, including employee retraining, German language programs, subsidized housing, free health care and generous welfare payments. After a seven-year residency period, they may apply for German citizenship.” [FISHKOFF, 8-8-97] In 1990, there were 29,000 Jews in Germany; within seven years Russian immigrants pushed the number to 90,000. “Given the prevailing pro-Israel atmosphere in reunited Germany,” notes Sue Fishkoff, “where Holocaust education is being introduced in the five new [German] states and where Israel and the German Jewish community’s affairs feature prominently in the daily news, it would be political death for any [German] community leader or business mogul to come out against giving money to a Jewish cause.” [FISHKOFF, 8-8-97]

After World War II, Jewish organizations discretely lobbied to get 100,000 European Jews to American shores. As Peter Novick describes the efforts:

“Two thirds of the million-dollar budget of the lobbying operation was underwritten by the family of Lessing Rosenwald, the most promi-
ponent American anti-Zionist. The goal of the campaign’s initiators was to bring in 100,000 Jewish survivors. But since it was impolitic and contrary to American tradition for legislation to specify the religion of immigrants, and since Jews were estimated to comprise 25% of all DPs [displaced persons], they pressed for a law that would bring in a total of 400,000 DPs over four years. To this end, the Citizens’ Committee on Displaced Persons was established – ostensibly nondenominational, but in fact largely funded and staffed by Jews … The CCDP … systematically downplayed the presence of Jews among the DPs … [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 81-82] … In late 1948 a Jewish journalist charged in the *New York Post* that a high proportion of non-Jewish DPs were Nazi collaborators. The allegation was denounced in the Jesuit magazine *America* as ‘anti-Christianism’ quite comparable to … anti-Semitism.’ An open breach between Jewish and Christian groups was only narrowly averted.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 89]

In the U.S. in the 1970s, concerted Jewish pressure on Congress to force the Soviet Union to allow Jews to emigrate to Israel, and America, resulted in an attachment to a trade bill that afforded “most favored nation status to the Soviet Union on the condition that it lifted its emigration restrictions … When emigration … swell[ed] to an annual high of 51,000 in 1979, Congress also expanded its financial assistance with the relocation of Soviet émigrés in Israel. In 1976 it appropriated more than $100 million for that purpose … [The American Congress began funding Israeli refugee-absorption programs as early as 1951] [NICHOLES, JB, p. 110] … In contemporary refugee work there is no parallel to U.S./Israeli cooperation in the modern aliyah [immigration to Israel]. Since the founding of Israel the United States has played a critical role in financing the immigration.” [NICHOLES, JB, p. 145]

And what has this Jewish protectionism, and special U.S. governmental favoritism, to Jewish immigrants from Russia provided the United States, and the world? As Robert Friedman, author of a book on the “Russian Mafia,” notes,

“Most of [the first wave of Jewish Russian immigrants, beginning in 1975] settled in Brighton Beach, Brooklyn, which became a ground zero for the Russian mob. And then over the course of the next 15 years, they expanded from a neighborhood extortion group to a multi-billion dollar international crime cartel … [They], along with corrupt oligarchs of the former Soviet Union, had looted Russia, had stolen everything that wasn’t nailed down … [Thousands of Jewish criminals] all pretended they were [Jewish Russian Zionist activist Natan] Sharansky … [They] came [to America] under the guises, under the banner of Jewish refuseniks who were fighting for freedom, for religious freedom.” [PENKA-VA, M., 5-3-2000]

As Martha Birsch, an assistant attorney for the U.S. Organized Crime and Racketeering Strike Force, notes, “We view Russian organized crime as definitely a growing and potentially very serious threat in the United States … Russian
organized crime is fairly unique in that it is ... truly international in scope.” [PENKAVA, M., 5-3-2000]

The Jewish American lobby demands special concessions for fellow Jews all over the world. During the politically delicate Israeli airlifts of Jews from Ethiopia to the Jewish state too, “the [U.S.] government had few options but to allow minority interests within the Jewish community to determine its policy.” [NICHOLS, JB, p. 145] In the case of Ethiopian Jewish refugees in Sudan, “at Israel’s request,” notes Jacob Abadi, “Washington promised [Sudan] an increase of $200 million in economic aid in return for a commitment to allow the Falashas to fly out of Sudan.” [ABADI, 1999] Even during the 1979 Iranian revolution, notes J. J. Goldberg, “the INS [Immigration and Naturalization Services] was ordered to exempt Jews and Bahais from the harsh treatment being meted out to Iranians at the border.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 184]

But Russian Jews have long been especially dear to the American Jewish heart (millions of American Jews trace their roots to that country) and again and again American foreign policy bends to Jewish will. A 1986 press report noted that “the status of Soviet Jews has emerged in advance as a central topic at the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting … This development made an arms control-human rights/Jewish emigration linkage a fact of life in superpower negotiations.” “Rarely,” noted New York Times reporter David Shipler in 1987, “has there been as much harmony between an administration and an interest group as there is now between the Reagan administration and the organizations campaigning on behalf of Soviet Jewry.” [BEKER, A., p. 448]

In 1999 intensive Jewish lobbying efforts were still calling the shots in American-Russian foreign policy. “President Clinton,” noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “has rejected an appeal by Russian President Boris Yeltsin to repeal a law that conditioned U.S.-Russian trade relations [the Jackson-Vanik Amendment] on the freedom of Jews and others to leave the country … [Yeltsin spoke to Clinton] as the American Jewish Committee reprinted in full-page ads in the New York Times and Los Angeles Times a letter to Yeltsin from all but one of the 100 members of the U.S. Senate threatening to end economic and political support for Russia unless Yeltsin confronted the rise in anti-Semitic rhetoric.” [DORF, M., 6-23-99, p. 7]

Among President Bill Clinton’s other extraordinary favors for the Jewish lobby was the one that concerned America’s new 1996 spy satellite. “Israel has demanded special treatment,” noted the (London) Daily Telegraph, “deploying America’s influential Jewish lobby to head off what it viewed as a major threat to its national security.” Clinton administration policy ultimately decided that the spy satellite would not be used to view Israeli territory – the only nation on earth afforded such treatment. [WARREN, M., 9-9-96, p. 28]

In 1988, the Palestinians declared themselves an independent nation. Palestinian leader Yassar Arafat requested a visa to visit the United States to speak to the United Nations (whose formal home, of course, is in New York City). Anti-Palestinian Jewish/Zionist influence was so strong in American government that Arafat’s request was refused. In response, notes Israeli Amnon
Rubenstein, “in an unprecedented action, the United Nations then moved the entire General Assembly to Geneva, Switzerland, so that Arafat could speak during a special session on the question of Palestine. A total of 154 countries supported the resolution, with only the United States and Israel voting against it.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 141] Ten years later, in 1998, always following Israeli dictates as United States Middle East foreign policy, the U.S. resisted popular world opinion again. By a United Nations vote of 124 to 4, Palestinians were provided “the right to take part in the [UN] General Assembly and reply to … speeches; to co-sponsor resolutions on Middle East issues” as part of its newly afforded “super-observer” status. “In Washington,” noted the New York Times, “the State Department condemned the vote in strong terms. The department spokesman, James P. Rubin, said the Clinton Administration considered the vote an unnecessary and untimely mistake.” [CROSSETTE, B., 7-8-98]

Under continuous Jewish pressure, in 1995, Congress finally passed an act with profound political implications in the Middle East, requiring that the United States embassy in Tel Aviv be moved to Jerusalem (an action that is widely viewed in the Middle East as an American sanctioning of Jewish claims to all of Jerusalem as its capitol. The move is so detrimental to the Israeli-Arab “peace process” that the actual change has yet to be carried out). [GERSHKOFF, 1999]

For years the Jewish/Israeli lobby has fought to get the United Nations to rescind its November 1975 resolution that formally declared: “Zionism is racism.” One of the avenues to this accomplishment was the United Nations purse strings (in conjunction with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the communist bloc), of which United States contributions by the 1980s amounted to about 50% of the U.N.'s economic base. [Mrejen, p. 67] In August 1985 the United States Congress approved the “Kassebaum Amendment” which substantially cut U.S. subsidies to the world body, precipitating for it a financial crisis. In a 1998 article in Israeli Affairs, Jewish author Emmanuel Mrejen complained about the injustice of “unbridled majoritarianism” (i.e., the system of one nation, one vote) of the UN, a voting design that usually functioned negatively for the powerful western nations. And Israel. “Israel,” wrote Mrejen, “should support [U.N.] reforms aimed at limiting the disastrous effects of majoritarianism [i.e., democratic voting], which both permitted the success of the anti-Israel propaganda at the UN and deeply discredited the UN itself … As explained by [Israeli] professor Yehuda Blum, the charter of the United Nations ‘has been eroded over the years under the deleterious effects of the dictatorship of the majority.’” [MREJEN, p. 81] By the 1990s, thanks primarily to Jewish and American pressures upon the world community, the UN resolution equating Zionism with racism was rescinded.

(A refreshingly uncommon approach to the “Zionism is racism” issue was that of Jewish-born poet Allen Ginsberg. “He told me in our 1992 interview,” says Roger Kamenetz, “that he agreed with the former United Nations resolution stating that Zionism is racism. ‘And the fact that everybody is so screamingly angry that Zionism can’t be called that is even worse.’”) [KAMENETZ, R., 1994, p. 151]
In 2002, Iraq’s deputy prime minister, Tariq Aziz, publicly complained about the U.N.’s handling of its planned investigation of an alleged Israeli massacre of Palestinians in the West Bank town of Jenin. Israel refused to cooperate. As London’s Guardian observed:

“[Iraq] accused the United Nations of double standards yesterday for imposing sanctions on Baghdad for 11 years, but failing to take any action against Israel for blocking a fact-finding inquiry into military action at the Jenin refugee camp ... [Iraqi official] Aziz said [the U.N.’s] handling of the Jenin fact-finding issue was proof of double standards, arguing that while the UN stood firm [under U.S. pressure] on its resolutions on Iraq, it had done little in the face of Israel’s resistance to security council resolutions, even those supported by the U.S.”

[MACASKILL, E., 5-2-02]

Jewish and Zionist interests are also increasingly molded into the U.S. government via the Anti-Defamation League. The ADL – founded in the early 20th century to diffuse hostility towards Jews and, later, to also promote Israeli interests – today functions as a kind of private ethnic police agency. The ADL, accused by some critics as having links to Israeli’s Mossad spy agency, has for decades morphed into various U.S. police and security organizations, providing spy information about what it defines as “hate” groups (those deemed “anti-Semitic” are of course the most important to them). [The ADL was caught spying, on the full political spectrum of political organizations – many critical of Israel – in the early 1990s – See the Anti-Semitism chapter p. 557]. With a yearly budget of nearly $50 million, it also provides indoctrination to its own interpretations of ethnic, religious, and racial “tolerance” (Any of the many, many racist and chauvinistic expressions of Jewish and Israeli intolerance are NEVER part of the curriculum).

In February 2002 the Los Angeles Times reported that the ADL had “announced a new partnership with law enforcement agencies to help deal with hate crimes and extremists ... For much of its history, officials said, the Anti-Defamation League has worked with law enforcement to combat bias and hate crimes, but the creation of the committee formalizes this relationship and brings more agencies together ... Law enforcement groups [involved in the ADL closure] include the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, the Los Angeles police, the Highway Patrol, the FBI, the state attorney general’s office and agencies from Bakersfield, Palm Springs, Pasadena, Riverside, San Bernardino and Santa Barbara.” Also, that same month, the Jewish Bulletin noted that “the [San Francisco-based] Anti-Defamation League has been working with local and federal law enforcement in Salt Lake City to monitor extremist activity at the Winter Olympics.” [GOLDSMITH, A., ADL WORKING, 2-2002] In other words, a private Judeo-centric, pro-Israel propaganda organization has become institutionalized as an active, formalized part of the American law and security system.

Ironically, the ADL’s record with the U.S. government has not necessarily been stellar. Jewish Hollywood mogul Dore Schary – national chairman of the ADL
from 1963–69 – was, for example, noted in FBI reports as a “strong communist sympathizer.” [WILCOX, L., 1999, p. 61, 62] “Ironically,” notes Laird Wilcox, “FBI records reveal that Dore Schary was not the only ADL operative whose alleged communist ‘links and ties’ caught the FBI’s attention. Other references are made in FBI internal documents to David Edelsburg, director of the ADL’s Washington office, as a member of the National Lawyers Guild. A reference to Gilbert J. Balkin, director of the Florida Regional Office of the ADL, and his wife Revy, alluded to ‘links and ties’ with the Council for American-Soviet Friendship and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and noted that they are ‘alleged communist front organizations.’ It also noted that Revy Balkin was editor of a monthly newspaper called the Miami Beacon that ‘was always in accord with the Communist Party line.’” [WILCOX, L., 1999, p. 63]

(As Wilcox underscores, even if such alleged ADL communist links were circumstantial, this is the methodology used very often by the great Jewish organization itself against those it singles out as having associated with “racists,” “Nazis,” “anti-Semites,” etc.)

Jewish money talks in many ways in American political life; some of the committed rich can even take on less overtly Jewish issues – virtually alone – that are dear to them. In 1998 Jewish multi-millionaire Ron Unz, for instance, embarked on what may be a new trend; by “will and wealth,” noted the New York Times, he was the founding – and central – force in successfully lobbying the public to wipe out bilingual education in California. The head of a voter’s initiative that he instigated, its advertising costs totaled $1.2 million, of which he personally contributed $700,000. [BRUNI, p. 1, 30]

In 1999, William Pfaff, a commentator in the Los Angeles Times, noted with profound pessimism that:

“As the United States approaches the 2000 presidential race in which more money will be spent than ever, the fact must be faced that America has become a plutocracy. Money rules government. The transformation is probably irreversible … Many Americans undoubtedly do not realize that other nations do not run their politics in this way … The unrecognized but crucial reality, however, is that even if Americans should come to recognize what has happened, and should wish to restore the democratic foundations of their republican form of government, they could change nothing. Established constitutional interpretation and legal precedent, and the power of money in the legislative process, now can prevent any fundamental change.” [PFAFF, p. 9]

Although crucial and overwhelmingly dominant, money is not absolutely everything in the American political system, of course. There are other political dimensions within which Jews are omnipresent also. “The benefits Jews demand for access to government becomes especially evident when we see the extent to which Jews have relied upon the state and the public economy to achieve positions of influence and status in American society,” says Benjamin Ginsberg, “… Protestants tend to derive their positions mainly from activities in the pri-
vate sector and Catholics from trade union leadership. Jews, on the other hand, have depended primarily on the media, foundations, and public interest groups, and appointed government posts to achieve positions in the American political and social elite.” [GINSBERG, p. 103]

Jews – as 2.5% of the American population and 6% of its electorate – have proven to be twice as likely to vote in political elections as other Americans. Almost half of all Jews live in the most populated states – New York and California, states that account for 166 electoral votes in Presidential elections. These factors – their clustering in important states, their disproportionate proclivity to vote, their profound financial influence, and their deep sense of Jewish/Israel “causes” – make Jews potentially pivotal in any Presidential election. Whitfield notes that

“About a quarter of the voters in New York state … are Jewish. In 1976 they went about 80% for Carter over Gerald Ford, enabling the Democrats to carry the state and with it the Presidency. Had Carter and the incumbent evenly split the Jewish vote of New York, Carter would have lost the state and with it the White House. Thus, the influence of a tiny minority is magnified in an incorrigibly anti-majoritarian, winner-take-all system; and that is why their attitudes and impulses have counted ever since the political alignment that began in 1932.” [WHITFIELD, Am Space, p. 93]

In Bill Clinton’s successful bid for the American presidency, and reelection, he also garnered 80% of the national Jewish vote. [ROTH, B., 10–11–99] As conservative Rabbi Daniel Lapin disdainfully observed, “More than 80 percent of Jews voted for the man whom nearly 60 percent of American voters rejected.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 293]

In 2001 the Jewish Forward also has noted the implications of Jewish voting power:

“The available evidence on Jewish voting patterns, when examined closely, shows that the Jewish community is in fact an extremely potent political force in the United States and will remain so for years to come … Jews are strategically located in the places that make the most difference on Election Day … Jews are concentrated and communally active in all [the “swing states”], especially Florida, Pennsylvania and California. This has been true for decades, even if it did not get national attention until November 2000, when Mr. Bush, by some interpretations, won his presidency thanks to thousands of Florida Jews who unwittingly cast their votes for Pat Buchanan … True, a majority of Jews vote Democratic. However, a study of Jewish voting habits during the past century shows that enough Jewish voters – some 30% – will switch parties to punish a candidate who takes positions they dislike. In states such as Florida and California, in which Jews number 4% to 6% of the electorate, a 30% swing can tip the scales in a close election … In 1972, for example, when Jewish support for the Democrats was at record highs, the party’s candidate was the liberal isolationist George McGovern. So con-
troversial was Mr. McGovern’s stand on the Middle East that Israel’s ambassador in Washington at the time, Yitzhak Rabin, went public with his preference for Richard Nixon. In that election, 16% of the Jewish vote shifted away from the Democrats. An even greater Jewish exodus accompanied the 1980 re-election bid of President Carter, just months after his administration voted for an anti-Israel resolution in the United Nations Security Council. In both case, the defecting Jewish votes made up a significant portion of the Republican victory margin … What all this means is that the Jewish vote counts. While most Jews will not base their votes on the issue of Israel alone, if at all, a large portion apparently will switch parties when a candidate seems threatening to the Jewish state … Thus, Jewish communal identity remains politically potent. If the strident pro-Israel stances taken in the most recent presidential election are any indication, the politicians if not the rabbis – have already figured this out.” [HELMREICH, J., 4-6-01]

As early as 1947, the year before Israel proclaimed its nationhood, a political advisor to President Harry Truman – in discussing upcoming elections – noted that “Jews hold the key to New York and the key to the Jewish voters is what the Administration does about Palestine [Israel].” [GROSE, p. 218] “Zionist influence increased exponentially during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations,” notes J. J. Goldberg, “because the affluence and influence of Jews in American society had increased. Jews had become vital donors to the Democratic Party; they were key figures in the organization’s labor movement, which was essentially the Democratic Party.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 158]

In 1961, in a meeting with David Ben-Gurion at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City, President John F. Kennedy told the Israeli Prime Minister, “I know I was elected because of American Jews. I owe them my election. Tell me, is there something that I can do for the Jewish people?” [TIVNAN, p. 56] Among favors for Jewish lobbyists were the facts that Kennedy “was the first president to provide arms (the Hawk missile) to Israel. In the months prior to his assassination, he was preparing for conferences on Soviet treatment of Jews.” [WEINSTEIN, L., 1985, p. 5] (The “third man” in Jacqueline Kennedy’s life – after the president and Aristotle Onassis – was Maurice Templeton, a Jewish diamond merchant who became Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis’s financial adviser after her second husband’s death in 1975. Templeton “is said to have turned her $26 million inheritance into $100 million.” Templeton moved in with Ms. Kennedy Onassis in 1982, and lived with her until her death in 1994. [O’Clery, p. 8] Jacqueline’s daughter by JFK, Caroline, married Edwin Schlossberg – also Jewish. For that matter, even the wife of President F. D. Roosevelt, Eleanor, in later years had a similar Jewish “close friend and frequent traveling companion” – David Gurewitsch, her physician. There are even existent FBI documents alleging, based in part on a tape recording, that she had an affair with a Jewish American socialist leader, Joseph Lash, in 1943. President Roosevelt was informed of these items. At the time of the alleged affair, Lash was the Executive Secretary of the American Student Union; he had met the president’s wife while testifying at a Senate investigation of left-wing political activities in the United States. In 1972 Lash wrote a
Dorothy Kearns Goodwin’s book about the Roosevelts notes the intensity of the Eleanor Roosevelt-Joe Lash (under investigation for communist activity) relationship like this:

“Although public concerns dominated the thoughts and activities of the president and the first lady in the early months of 1942 ... Eleanor seemed obsessed by her relationship with Joe Lash; and the president, as always, seemed to be removed from everybody, in spite of his ever-tolerant, ever-cheerful manner.” [GOODWIN, D.K., 1995, p. 334] ... On the third floor of the White House, Eleanor set aside a room for Lash to use whenever he was on leave [from the army]. On her desk she placed an enlarged photo of Lash. ‘I want to be able to look at you all the time,’ she explained. In addition, Eleanor told Joe to call her collect at the White House whenever the president was away at Hyde Park, and to ‘know that her love was there for him always. No other engagement can’t be given up, if there is a chance to see you!’ ... In the White House, Eleanor waited anxiously for his letters and calls. ‘Your telegram came,’ he happily noted. ‘I could have kissed the telegram. I was so glad to have word from you.’ [GOODWIN, D.K., 1995, p. 337] Eleanor was not the central person in Joe’s life that spring, however. For more than a year, he had been involved with a fellow worker at the International Student Center. Trude Pratt. The situation was complicated, since Trude was still married to Eliot Pratt, a wealthy man who was threatening to keep the children if she divorced him ... Eleanor had promised Lash before he went into the army that she would give up any other engagement if she had a chance to see him. Despite the pressure of an almost inhuman schedule, she kept her promise. No sooner was Lash transferred to weather-forecasting school at Chanute Field than Eleanor journeyed to Urbana, Illinois, to see him ... Three weeks later, Eleanor joined Joe Lash again, this time at the Hotel Blackstone in Chicago. Here, too, they stayed in Eleanor’s room most of the day. In the afternoon, they went out for a walk; in the evening, Lash was so drowsy that he fell asleep on the bed while Eleanor stroked his forehead. ‘I loved just sitting near you while you slept ...’ Eleanor later wrote. But the pleasures Eleanor derived from her time with Lash were quickly dispelled when she was told by a hotel employee that her room had been bugged. For weeks, it turned out, Lash had been under surveillance by the army’s Counter-Intelligence Corps. Mistakingly convinced that he was part a communist conspiracy, the CIC had been reading his mail and trailing him wherever he went. When the first lady’s telegram arrived, inviting him to join her at the Hotel Blackstone, the CIC bugged her room. Apparently unconcerned about the impropriety of spending two weekends in adjoining rooms with a young serviceman, Eleanor went to see Hopkins as soon as she returned and pleaded with him to find out what was going on. Hopkins took the matter to General Marshall, who confirmed that Mrs. Roosevelt’s room had indeed been bugged. When the president learned that army agents
had put his wife under surveillance without presidential authorization, he was furious. Moving quickly to take action against everyone responsible, he ordered an immediate shake-up of the army’s intelligence operations, including the disbanding of the CIC. In addition, military orders were drawn up to send Lash overseas, along with his entire group of weather forecasters.” [GOODWIN, D. K., 1995, p. 420]

After JFK, the presidential successor was Lyndon Johnson whose treasurer for his first Senate campaign was a member of a prominent Texas Jewish family, James Novy (he was also the regional chairman of the Zionist Organization of America). Other Jewish appointees when Johnson became President included Abe Fortas as a Supreme Court Justice (he ultimately resigned in 1969, after controversy over his “extrajudicial” activities, including financial links to convicted Jewish financier Louis Wolfson), [MURPHY, B., 1983, p. 4-5] Wilbur Cohen (Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare), Arthur Goldberg (Kennedy’s Secretary of Labor) as the ambassador to the United Nations, Walter Rostow as the National Security Adviser, Walter’s brother Eugene as third in power at the State Department, the “intellectual in residence” John Roche, and Abe Feinberg as a close personal aide. Arthur Krim, the head of United Artists was notable as an important Democratic Party fundraiser. (He also had an Israeli wife). Such men, notes Edward Tivnan, “were avid supporters of Israel.” [TIVNAN, p. 59; PLESUR, M., 1982, p. 143]

During Lyndon Johnson’s presidency, notes Steven Spiegel, “the administration was filled with people sympathetic to Israel,” including “John Roche and Ben Wattenberg, two speechwriters on the White House staff… Sheldon Cohen, Chief of the Internal Revenue Service … Arthur Goldberg as Ambassador to the United Nations and Eugene Rostow as Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs.” [SPIEGEL, S., p. 128] Other pro-Israel, influential Jews in President Johnson’s circle included lawyers Ed Weisel and David Ginsberg – Ginsberg even counted the Israeli embassy itself as a client. Johnson also reportedly developed a close personal friendship with Israeli ambassador Ephraim Evron; he was often invited to Johnson’s home. [SPIEGEL, p. 129] Two of Johnson’s “closest advisers” were also Jewish, Abe Fortas and Edwin Weisel, Sr., both of whom “felt deeply about the security of Israel.” [HERSH, S., p. 126] In evaluating President Johnson’s political career, his wife, Lady Bird, once noted that “Jews have been woven into the warp and woof of all his years.” [HERSH, S., p. 128]

As Jewish author James Yaffe noted in 1968, “Many Jews go to work for the government. Though it is impossible to determine to what extent they are actually making policy, they do have key positions in all the departments of the cabinet, even the formerly sacrosanct State Department.” [YAFFE, J. 1968, p. 224]

Johnson’s Republican nemesis for the presidential election in 1964 was Arizona senator Barry Goldwater (ancestor’s name: Goldwasser), whose father was Jewish. Goldwater never foregrounded a Jewish identity and was known as an Episcopalian:

“The Senator had gotten his start in Arizona politics in 1949 when Harry Rosenzweig, son of a pioneer Phoenix jeweler, persuaded him to
run for the Phoenix City Council on a better government ticket. Both were elected. The Senator readily admits that he learned his politics at the knee of his uncle Morris [Goldwater]. Morris, Mayor of Prescott [Arizona] for twenty-two years, was a Democrat … After Barry Goldwater’s [non-Jewish] wife Peggy died, the Senator remarried in 1992. Harry Rosenzweig, Barry’s life-long personal and political friend, remarked with a smile, “Susan Wechsler is a very nice Jewish woman.” ” [SOUTH-WEST JEWISH ARCHIVES, Spring 1993]

In June 1967, during Johnson’s presidency, one of the most infamous (and much-hushed up) incidents in Israeli-American relations occurred off the coast of Israel: a United States spy ship, the *USS Liberty*, alone and unprotected in international waters, was repeatedly strafed, bombed, napalmed, and torpedoed by Israeli jets and ships. 34 Americans were killed and over 130 others were wounded. The Israeli government provided a formal apology, claiming that it was a case of mistaken identity. The United States government officially agreed. Most of those who were on the ship believed this to be a blatant lie: the attack upon Americans was deliberate.

In 1979, James M. Ennes, Jr., a surviving officer of the destroyed ship, wrote a book-length expose (published by *Random House*) about what he, and others involved with the poorly-armed ship, felt was a massive “cover-up” in the American government about the incident. After watching the close and careful inspection of the ship by circling Israeli planes, and researching government and CIA documents, Ennes explains the reason for the subsequent Israeli attack, (six bombing and strafing passes from jets overhead and three torpedoes from a nearby Israeli ship). Ennes spotted the Israeli exploitation of an old, old Jewish theme: the insistence of categorical innocence. In the context of Arab-Israeli hostilities, and the Six Day War of 1967:

“The Israeli government was acutely aware of President Johnson’s warning: the American president had told [Israeli] Foreign Minister Eban that he would support Israel only in self-defense, not attacks against her neighbors. It was important, then, for Israel to be seen as an innocent victim fighting off hoards of wild-eyed Arabs. Not surprisingly, Israel claimed that nearly everything she did was in self-defense … Now, with the war virtually over and with the world crying for peace, could Israel put troops in Syria without being seen as an aggressor? Probably not. Not with the *USS Liberty* so close to shore and presumably listening. *Liberty* would have to go … The invasion of Syria just a few hours after the attack on *Liberty* came as a surprise to most of the world. There seemed to be no connection between the two events, and writers who claimed to see a connection had no facts to back up their speculative stories. They had no facts because the facts were kept from them.” [ENNES, p. 212-213]

Eventually, frustrated at an enforced censorship upon all ship crewman to keep them from speaking freely to the press about what had occurred, the Liberty’s engineer officer, George Golden, among others, secretly leaked their feel-
ings to an Associated Press reporter, charging that both their experience and all evidence pointed to a deliberate, and planned, Israeli attack upon the ship, fully realizing that it was American. In response, the (Jewish) American ambassador to Malta, George Feldman, notes Ennes, “berated Golden by telephone for the unauthorized news leak (still assumed to have originated with some undisciplined seaman), and then dispatched a Navy lieutenant to follow up in person … Feldman held key positions in the Democratic National Convention and in 1965 was appointed to an ambassadorship by President Johnson.” [ENNES, p. 167-168] The USS Liberty story soon was dropped from attention by the nation’s media.

One of the ship’s officers, Jim McGonagle, was eventually awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor for his actions during Israeli attack. But Ennes observes that it was done with as little publicity as possible:

“Why was the presentation made by the Secretary of Navy? And why in the Navy Yard? Medals of honor are ordinarily presented in the White House by the President with great fanfare and elaborate ceremony. McGonagle’s medal should have been awarded with no less pomp. A naval officer with the medals and awards told me the story: ‘The government is pretty jumpy about Israel,’ he said. ‘The State Department even asked the Israeli ambassador if his government had any objection to McGonagle getting the medal.’ ‘Certainly not!’ Israel said. But to avoid any possible offense McGonagle’s citation does not mention Israel at all, and the award ceremony kept the lowest possible profile.” [ENNES, p. 194]

And the consequences of the Jewish nation’s deliberate attack upon the American ship? Ennes notes with disdain that “a few days after the war, the government of France reneged on a contract for delivery to Israel of fifty Mirage fighters. The United States, in turn, began negotiations with Israel for delivery of fifty Phantom F-4 fighters.” Less than two years after the destruction of the Liberty, 120 Israeli pilots were being trained in the United States about their new American-built war planes. [ENNES, p. 196-197]

In a 1974 volume on Jews in the American political process, Stephen Isaacs noted that

“the most respected political reporter of the day (David Broder),” “the best known political media expert (David Garth),” “the top political filmmaker” (Charles Guggenheim), [who noted in later years that “the broadcasting industry is dictating how the political process in the United States is to be carried out,” ROWE] “two of the three principal national public opinion surveyors (Louis Harris and David Yankelovitch),” “the most successful popular political historian (Theodore White),” “the leading authority on campaign financing (Herbert E. Alexander),” “the pre-eminent producer of political radio commentary (Tony Schwartz),” and “the best known political satirist (Art Buchwald)” were Jews. So also were “many of the most prominent political fund raisers, leading political speechwriters, and the Chairman of the Democratic National Convention.” Four of the top Presidential candi-
dates in 1972 had Jews as part of their “top managerial entourage.” [ISAACS, p. 7-8]

In 2001, the New Jersey Jewish News reviewed a biography (entitled “Wild Man: The Life and Times of Daniel Ellsberg”) about Daniel Ellsberg (the man who leaked the infamous “Pentagon Papers” about the Vietnam War during the President Richard Nixon administration). Ellsberg’s parents were both Jewish. “Richard Nixon roundly cursed Ellsberg,” notes the News,

“But Nixon on this occasion didn’t invoke any anti-Semitic slurs. Ellsberg, it seems, just wasn’t Jewish enough to provoke that sort of name-calling. Yet the un-Jewish character of the Ellsberg affair is all the more remarkable for the extraordinary number of Jews involved in the case. How often have so many disparate American Jews taken center stage in a national event? To name just a few, we have Leslie Gelb, the chief author of the Pentagon Papers; Henry Kissinger, Nixon’s national security adviser and Ellsberg’s former Harvard colleague; Leonard Weinglass and William Kunstler, two of Ellsberg’s attorneys; Max Frankel and Arthur O. Sulzberger of the New York Times, which first published the secret papers; Sidney Zion, the maverick reporter who named Ellsberg as the leaker; Seymour Hirsh, the investigative journalist and one of Ellsberg’s close friends; Barbara Streisand, who sang to raise money for Ellsberg’s legal defense front; Louis Marx, the toy tycoon and Ellsberg’s father-in-law; Bernard Barker, the Washington burglar; Noam Chomsky, an outspoken Ellsberg defender; and Ellsberg’s countless Jewish colleagues and acquaintances at Harvard, at the RAND corporation, in the government, and in the anti-Vietnam War movement ... Before, during, and after the Pentagon Papers episode, Ellsberg was an egomaniac, a narcissist, a braggart, a liar and compulsive fantasist, a drug abuser, a negligent husband and father, indeed a serial adulterer [and] pornography collector.” [NESVISKY, M., 9/6/2001]

Jews also of course make the important social rounds. In 1976, notes Lenni Brenner, “Israel Bonds put on a fashion show in Washington. Among the models were Mrs. David Brinkley, Mrs. Martin Agronsky, and Mrs. Dan Rather. It is also revealing that some of the other models were Mrs. Henry Jackson, wife of the pro-Israel ‘Senator from Boeing,’ Mrs. Joseph Sisco, wife of the ex-Under Secretary of State. Present were the wives of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Head of the Federal Reserve Board. Obviously some leading TV news people are too close to the Zionists.” [BRENNER, p. 326]

“Selling has become the most important aspect of politics,” adds Isaacs, “and selling is what many Jews have had to do for centuries. Their major role in merchandizing and advertising, for instance, represents a natural extension of history and tradition ... Since promoting is a sophisticated concomitant of selling, it is unsurprising to see the descendants of Europe’s mercantile class appearing now as political advertising consultants, media specialists, speech writers, campaign managers, [and] mail-order fund raisers.” [ISAACS, p. 29]
“Jews not only staff domestic service agencies,” notes Benjamin Ginsberg, “but are … extremely active in the public interest groups, think tanks, consulting firms, and universities that develop the domestic state’s policies and are funded by its grants.” [GINSBERG, p. 152]

The fulcrum of the massive and continuous Israeli lobbying effort in Washington DC is the American Israel Public Action Committee (AIPAC). (Its original title was the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs.) [KENEN, I., 1981, p. 107] AIPAC was founded in 1953, notes Steven Siegel, when “the tension between the [Eisenhower] administration and Israeli supporters was so acute that there were rumors (unfounded as it turned out) that the administration would investigate the American Zionist Council. Therefore, an independent lobbying committee was formed (which years later was renamed [AIPAC]).” [SPIEGEL, p. 52]

50,000 dues-paying members strong, AIPAC has an annual budget of $15 million and offices in eight cities. “It’s endorsement,” says Paul Findley, “usually results in contributions from the nearly 100 pro-Israel political action committees around the country.” [FINDLEY, DEL, p. 95] In 1987 the New York Times wrote that AIPAC “has become a major force in shaping United States policy in the Middle East … [t]he organization has gained power to influence a presidential candidate’s choice of staff, to block practically any arms sale to an Arab country and to serve as a catalyst for intimate military relations between the Pentagon and the Israeli army. Its leading officials are consulted by State Department and White House policy makers, by senators and generals.” [FINDLEY, DEL, p. 96] AIPAC’s Israel lobby, notes Richard Curtiss, has “the power to pump up to a million dollars into the campaign coffers of any friendly member of Congress, or into the campaign of the opponents of an unfriendly member.” [CURTISS, p. 12]

“A lobby is a night flower,” says AIPAC research director Steve Rosen, “– it thrives in the dark and dies in the sun.” [RAVIV, p. 326] (Another version of this strategy of behind-the-scenes intrigue is past World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann’s comment about Zionism itself: “With us, the watchword is confidentiality.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 47]) “I believe in political loyalty,” said the AIPAC president in 1992, “If someone has been good for Israel, no matter who – if my brother would run against them – I would support them because they’d been good to Israel.” [FINDLEY, p. 105]

“So great is the perceived power of AIPAC to mobilize financial support for pro-Israel candidates – or to challenge those perceived as hostile,” notes Martin Sieff, “that this year [1999], as is usually the case, around half the members of the Senate and one-third of the House of Representatives were expected to attend the policy banquet at [AIPAC’s annual] conference.” [SIEFF, 1999]

Hedrick Smith noted in the New York Times that AIPAC had become a “superlobby … [It] gained so much political muscle that by 1985 AIPAC and its allies could force President Reagan to renege on an arms deal he had promised to [Jordan’s] King Hussein. By 1986, the pro-Israel lobby could stop Reagan from making another jet fighter deal with Saudi Arabia; and Secretary of State
George Shultz had to sit down with AIPAC’s executive director – not Congressional leaders – to find out what level of arms sales to the Saudis AIPAC would tolerate.” [FINDLEY, Del, p. 97] If things go as planned, said AIPAC director Thomas A. Dine, “if there is a Secretary of State who is not positive about Israel, he will not be able to overcome the bureaucratic relationship between Israel and the United States that we have established.” [FINDLEY, Del, p. 98]  

As Michael Massing noted in the Los Angeles Times in 2002, during the bloody Palestinian revolt against oppressive Israeli rule and the American government’s reluctance to restrain Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon’s vicious’ reprisals upon the Palestinian people:

“The American Israel Public Affairs Committee focuses on Congress. Long regarded as one of the most effective foreign-policy lobbies in Washington, AIPAC has an annual budget of $19.5 million, a staff of 130, and some 60,000 members. From its office near Capitol Hill, it researches issues, tracks legislation and lobbies Congress. Most of all, it gives money—lots of it. Between 1997 and 2001, the 46 members on AIPAC’s board together gave political candidates and parties well in excess of $3 million, or an average of more than $70,000 apiece. Many of its members give money as well. Much of this money is distributed through a network of pro-Israel political action committees. Recipients include many key members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, from Democratic Sens. Barbara Boxer, Charles E. Schumer and Paul Wellstone to GOP Sens. Christopher S. Bond, J. Dennis Hastert and Trent Lott. It is not surprising, then, that Congress tends to go along with whatever AIPAC wants. What AIPAC wants, meanwhile, is determined by its wealthy and powerful board of directors, which is united in its commitment to a strong Israel and to securing unwavering U.S. support for it. Since Sharon became prime minister, AIPAC has steadfastly backed him. With the United States coming under strong international pressure to rein in both Israelis and Palestinians, AIPAC has pressed the Bush administration to crack down on Arafat—and leave Sharon alone. Thus, last fall, when U.S. Secretary of State Colin L. Powell was preparing a new peace initiative with Zinni serving as a special envoy, AIPAC sent a memo to its members in the field, urging them to meet with their congressional representatives and press them to keep the administration off Israel’s back. The memo, notes a former AIPAC official, was part of ‘an aggressive campaign to get AIPAC members to call on their congressmen to put pressure on the administration not to send Zinni to the region. Their emphasis was clearly to try to minimize any effort by the administration to say Israel must exercise restraint.’ That effort has largely succeeded.” [MASSING, M., 3-10-02]  

In 1994 Neal Sher was appointed the head of AIPAC. He was formerly the director of the Justice Department’s Office of Special Investigations (OIS), the department that sought to curry Jewish favor by allowing Israel to extradite, and execute, Cleveland factory worker John Demjanjuk on fraudulent charges that
he was Nazi mass murderer Ivan the Terrible. Sher replaced Tom Dine who was forced to resign, alas, for classical anti-Semitic comments about Orthodox Jews:

“I don’t think mainstream Jews feel very comfortable with the Ultra-Orthodox. It is a class thing, I suppose. Their image is ‘smelly.’ That’s what I’d say now you’ve got me thinking about it. Hasids and New York diamond dealers.” [FRIEDMAN, p. A10]

A few days later the AIPAC vice president, Harvey Friedman, was also forced to resign for calling Israel’s deputy foreign minister a “little slime ball.” [WEISSKOPF, p. A23] In yet another top AIPAC resignation the year earlier, the St. Louis Dispatch noted that

“AIPAC president David Steiner was forced to resign abruptly after he was secretly tape-recorded bragging about AIPAC’s influence over State Department appointments in Bill Clinton’s administration.” [LIPMAN, p. 5D]

Despite the fact that Steiner confirmed the obvious, Pat Buchanan, a 1996 candidate for the Presidency, attracted massive Jewish accusations of “anti-Semitism” for his widely reported comment that the United States Congress was “Zionist occupied territory.” “On Middle East policy,” says former Undersecretary of State George W. Ball, “Congress behaves like a bunch of trained poodles, jumping through the hoops held by Israel’s lobby.” [FINDLEY, p. xxvii] Former Ambassador to the United Nations Donald McHenry has complained that “because of the [Israeli] lobby’s influence, our government is unable to pursue its own national interests in the Middle East.” [FINDLEY, p. xxvii]

AIPAC supports the Near East Report, a weekly newsletter sent to all Congressmen, and important academic, media, and governmental officials. It has also published Myths and Facts foregrounding its “facts” to favor Israel, and The Campaign to Discredit Israel, a volume that functions as a blacklist against those who have opposed excessive Zionist influence in America. 21 organizations and 39 individuals were listed “who are active in the efforts to weaken the bonds between the United States and Israel, who seek to enhance United States-Arab relations at the expense of Israel, or who perform paid services to Arab governments pursuing these goals.” The Anti-Defamation League’s version of the same defamations is Arab Propaganda in America: Vehicles and Voices. [FINDLEY, p. 102-103] AIPAC also, notes the White House Weekly, “carefully monitors the pro- or anti-Israel voting records of every congressman on Capitol Hill. A word from its publications can unleash Niagaras of financial support for pro-Israel candidates for national office from Maine to New Mexico. Senators and others hostile to the Jewish state, conversely, find immensely well-funded political action campaigns (PACS) springing up overnight to arm their opponents once AIPAC has pointed the way.” [SIEFF, 1999]

Gregory Slabodkin, who was formerly employed at AIPAC, notes that “To date, revelations about AIPAC’s blacklisting and smear tactics have barely scratched the surface of the pro-Israel lobby’s secret activities … AIPAC operates a covert section in its research department that monitors and keeps files on politicians, journalists, academics, Arab-American activists, Jewish liberals and oth-
ers it labels ‘anti-Jewish.’” [FINDLEY, DEL, p. 103] AIPAC files exist for a variety of people; national politicians or governmental administrators include former Chief of Staff John Sununu, former Reagan Secretaries of Defense Caspar Weinberger and Frank Carlucci, former President Jimmy Carter and former Democratic Presidential candidate George McGovern, Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, Republican Senator John Chafee, House Majority Whip David Bonior, and Democratic Representatives John Conyers, John Dingell, Mervyn Dymally, Mary Rose Oakar, Nick Joe Rahall, James Traficant, Jr., among others. [FINDLEY, p. 104] Liberal Jews afforded files included Richard Dreyfuss, Barbara Streisand, Peter Yarrow, and Woody Allen. [FRIEDMAN, Israel, p. 26] “The most insidious aspect of the files,” said Murray Potner, former editor of the American Jewish Committee’s magazine Present Tense, “is that it leads to enormous self-censorship in the Jewish community. When they track progressive Jews, they are trying to intimidate.” [FRIEDMAN, Israel, p. 26]

“Although it is Israel’s registered foreign agent,” says Jane Hunter, “AIPAC is also a networking mechanism for national and regional Jewish leaders, many of whom sit on its governing bodies … [HUNTER, p. 188] … Of particular concern to Jews who have never felt that the pro-Israel network represented them, it’s actions only confirm the old shibboleth of the anti-Semites: that Jews control the media, that they conspire to control the government.” [HUNTER, p. 191] AIPAC was even criticized by some Israelis in the context of intra-Israeli politics: “[The] new government in Israel … include officials who have harshly criticized AIPAC for a pro-Likud [right-wing] tilt.” [BESSER, J., 5-21-99, p. 26]

In 1997, a group of former public officials took legal steps all the way to the Supreme Court to break AIPAC’s veil of secrecy and try “to force AIPAC to register as a political action committee and disclose its contributors.” AIPAC’s lawyers included Thomas Olsen, an assistant attorney general under Ronald Reagan, and former California Congressman Mel Levine. As the (Jewish) Forward noted, “Whatever the nine justices decide … AIPAC’s involvement on the edge of political funding is likely to attract continuing scrutiny.” [FORWARD, 10-3-97, p. 1]

In 1986, Israeli Ze’ev Chafets (an immigrant from America) followed Lori Posner, an AIPAC national organizer, to a series of Jewish activism meetings throughout the “boondocks” of America – the likes of Nebraska and Louisiana. “Money is no problem for us,” she told him, “… I’m not out here looking for rich Jews. I’m looking for activists.” “People who can make a difference [in the American political system],” adds Chafets,

“become what are known as ‘key contacts.’ Ideally, they have a personal relationship with a member of Congress or a senator, or have political chits they can cash on behalf of Israel. Given the extraordinarily high degree of Jewish involvement in politics, it isn’t too hard to find key contacts – Lori estimates that AIPAC has them for about ninety percent of the members of the House of Representatives, and ninety-eight percent of the Senate.” [CHAFETS, MEMBERS, p. 42-43]

Democratic, Republican, or anything else, so long as they adhere to the single issue of support for Israel, AIPAC is interested in them. “AIPAC,” notes
Chafets, “is an aggressively nonpartisan group, and there is room for everyone.” [CHAFETS, p. 42-43] “Our [Zionist] movement,” declared Cleveland rabbi and Zionist leader Abba Silver in the 1940s, “is not wedded to any one political party. We have strong and warm friends in both.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 58] Or, as Jewish journalist Wolf Blitzer puts it, “those American Jewish political activists who are most successful in supporting AIPAC are those who are Zionists first, Democrats or Republicans second.” [BLITZER, p. 132]

From Israel, the Jerusalem Post ran an article in 2001 about the Jewish Americans who live there – both Democrats and Republicans – who are united on this fundamental pro-Israel issue:

“The local chapters of Democrats Abroad and Republicans Abroad have come together with the Yisrael Ba’aliya Israel Citizen’s Information Council, a project of the immigrant party’s ‘Anglo Department,’ in an effort to impact American policy toward Israel … Democrats Abroad and Republicans Abroad, organizations whose primary role is registering Americans in Israel to vote by absentee, act as vehicles for their members to express political views and try to influence American policy … Yisrael Ba’aliya director-general Eli Kazhdan said … many voters who have moved from America … care deeply about both Israel and America. ‘We don’t see it as interfering with American policy,’ Kazhdan said. ‘It’s not politicians who are doing this. It’s grassroots people who have dual citizenship.’” [HOFFMAN, G., 11-23-01]

In American, AIPAC’s aim is not to let either party, Democratic or Republican, be popularly perceived as a “Jewish” party. As the Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted in 1999:

“Incensed at President Clinton’s plans in March 1998 to pressure Israel with a public blueprint for peace with the Palestinians, Jewish Republicans turned to Capitol Hill. But as Republican senators lined up to voice their opposition to the White House, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee stepped in. The effort could not be partisan, the pro-Israel lobby argued, pushing the National Jewish Coalition aside. It took a two-week, bruising lobbying campaign by AIPAC before 81 senators [of the total 100] would sign a letter to Clinton pledging to oppose United States pressure on Israel.” [DORF, M., 5-12-99, p. 7]

Clinton’s catering to Jewish interests, its money, and its vote was usually a mainstay. During the 1992 presidential campaign, the Washington Post reported on its front page that “Clinton today charged that [Presidential rival George] Bush administration rhetoric has helped create an atmosphere in which ‘overt anti-Semitism is more acceptable.’” [EDSALL, p. A1] “In its new strident rhetoric, public and private, against Israel, against the Jewish community,” Clinton told the Jewish Community Relations Council, “the reference to how the Jewish community will vote in elections … that sort of thing, this [Bush] administration has ever so subtly … broken down the taboo against overt anti-Semitism. And that is very, very dangerous at any time.” [EDSALL, p. A1]
(All politicians must pander to the Jewish lobby. On another occasion Clinton told the Jewish Leadership Council, “If I ever let Israel down, God would never forgive me.” In 1992, Republican Vice President Dan Quayle told the American Israel Political Action Committee, “Fellow Zionists, Israel and the United States need each other. We benefit from each other and our alliance is unshakeable because it rests on two firm pillars – strategic interests and common values.” [HARTUNG, J., 1995])

“AIPAC has placed its supporters into the highest reaches of the Clinton White House,” later noted Village Voice reporter Robert Friedman, echoing the same observation in the Jewish Forward. [FRIEDMAN, p. 26] AIPAC is so entrenched there that in 1992 AIPAC’s legal counsel, David Ifshin, was also legal counsel for the Clinton Presidential campaign. Another overt activist at AIPAC, Richard Schifter, was a senior foreign policy adviser in the Clinton administration. [FRIEDMAN, p. 26] This is an old theme. Bernard Rapoport began membership in the Democratic National Finance Committee in 1976. He was also a member of AIPAC and the Jerusalem Committee. Philip Klutznik, the Secretary of State under President Carter, once even noted that Diaspora Jews were “a creative part of contemporary Zionism … fully legitimate and enduring.” [WALDEN, p. 216]

In the 1980s, prominent Jews in and around the White House who formed an informal AIPAC “advisory group” included John Lehman, eventual secretary of the Navy in the Reagan administration; Elliot Abrams, eventual assistant secretary of state for human rights; Max Kampelman, the head U.S. arms control negotiator (for President Carter, Kampelman headed the U.S. delegation to the Committee for Security and Cooperation, and for President Reagan he headed the U.S. delegation for nuclear arms negotiations with the Soviet Union); [STARR, J., 1990, p. 143] Ben Wattenburg at the American Enterprise Institute; and legislative aides to senators, like Jay Berman and Ken Davis. [BLITZER, p. 123] In 1982, referring to the many national Jewish organizations that work together towards influencing American policy, Nathan Perlmutter, then head of the Anti-Defamation League, noted that, “in a sense our organizations have served as a sectarian government (albeit not elected by the popular Jewish vote) within a secular government, that of the popularly elected legislative and executive branches of the American government.” [PERLMUTTER, p. 69]
“The Jews have been through their traumas,” a [Jewish] Democratic politician explained, “Be we have always survived. We are a separate and destined people. I have no illusion that the U.S. is paradise. America is Babylon. We must ask the question, ‘Do we want death by assimilation? Do we want death by intermarriage? Or do we want to preserve our traditions?’”

from Jonathan Reider, 1985, p. 47

With all these political factors about Jews – as well as the evidence from the rest of this volume – what hypotheses might we make about the recent configuration of the Clinton Democratic White House? Open discussion about Jewish influence in American politics is forbidden, says Israeli commentator Israel Shahak, “which in my view is due to their great political influence in general and their predominance in the media in particular. The Hebrew press [in Israel] does not have such inhibitions. This is due, among other reasons, also to the fact that the power of the state of Israel depends to a considerable extent on its ability to use the organized American Jews and their power for its own interests.” [SHAHAK, BAR-YOSEF, Jews Who]

As reported in the Israeli magazine (1994), Ma’ariv, by Avinoam Bar-Yosef, and translated from the Hebrew by Shahak, seven of eleven top members of President Clinton’s National Security Council – “Senior Directors and Advisors to the President” – were Jewish. (The NSC’s purpose is to “advise the President on domestic, foreign, and military policy related to national security;” members routinely include the President, Vice-President, Secretaries of State and Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.) [ENCY BRIT, 1993, v.8, p. 550] The Jewish contingent (here included as translated from Bar-Yosef’s article, with misspellings) included:

- Sandy Berger – Deputy Chairman of the National Security Council
- Leon Perth – White House Chief of Staff
- Martin Indyk – Middle East and South Asia
- Dan Schifter – Western Europe
- Don Steinberg – Africa
- Richard Feinberg – Latin America
- Stanley Ross – Asia
Other Jewish members of the President’s Office were:

- Abner Mikva – Presidential Schedule and Programs Manager (new Attorney General). In his first position, Mikva succeeded another Clinton-appointed White House counsel, Bernard Nussbaum
- Ricky Seidman – Deputy Chief of Staff (Communications)
- Phil Leida – Economic Advisor
- Robert Rubin – Media Advisor (later Chairman of the National Economic Council)
- David Heiser – Staff Director
- Alice Rubin and Eli Segal – in charge of volunteers
- Ira Mezina – in charge of health program
- Rehm Emmanuel – Senior Advisor for coordinating White House Special Projects
- Stanley Greenberg is Clinton’s pollster. “Greenberg has been advising Clinton since his 1990 [Arkansas] gubernatorial campaign.” [WOODWARD, p. 25]

Even before Clinton was elected, the National Review noted in 1992 that

“Michael H. Steinhardt says he is ‘singularly proud’ of the weighty role played by the upstart Progressive Policy Institute in supplying advice and advisers to Bill Clinton’s presidential campaign.” [NATIONAL REVIEW, 5-9-92]

Steinhardt is also Jewish, and a big financier of the Birthright Israel program, which seeks to pull young American Jews to deeper links to Israel. He was also a “target [in] a government bond manipulation scandal that’s sparked outrage in Congress.” [NATIONAL REVIEW, 5-9-92] The Progressive Policy Institute is a wing of the Democratic Leadership Council, headed by Al From (Jewish too), who is “also a top Clinton adviser.” Vice Chairman of the DLC is David Steiner, former president of AIPAC, who was forced to resign that position when he was secretly tape-recorded bragging about how he manipulated American government on behalf of Israel. “We have a dozen people in his [Clinton’s] headquarters,” the then-president of AIPAC had noted for the tape, “and they are all going to get big jobs.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] Progressive Policy Institute associate Robert Shapiro was also a staff economist for the Clinton campaign.

More importantly and prominently, by 1996 Jews held the following cabinet-level positions in the Clinton administration:

- Robert Reich – Secretary of Labor.
- Mickey Kantor – Secretary of Commerce. (Kantor has been a member of the national advisory council for AIPAC. In 1994, notes Fred Goodman, Kantor “threatened trade sanctions against China … Although the [Clinton] administration refused to make a trade issue of the Chinese government’s political and human rights abuses, it was ready to play hardball to stop the manufacture of unlicensed compact discs and videos. The commercial piracy, which the entertainment industry estimates cost it as much as $2 billion a year, was the kind of issue that was near and dear to the hearts of [David] Geffen and
Time-Warner, who had given the Democratic National Committee a whopping $400,000 in 1992. [GOODMAN, p. 378] Also in 1994, notes Barry Rubin, the world trade agreement “was negotiated by Jews representing both the United States [Mickey Cantor] and Europe [Leon Britton]. [RUBIN, p. xii] France’s Foreign Minister, Dominique Strauss-Kahn is also Jewish (1994); Jean Bernard Levy is France’s Chief of Staff for the Ministry of Industry. In England, an economic counterpart is Peter Mandelson, who resigned in 1998 as that country’s Trade and Industry Secretary after it was discovered “he had failed to declare a large loan from Geoffrey Robinson, who resigned as Paymaster General the next day.” [OTTAWA CITIZEN, p. A7] By 1993, even Palestinian leader Yassar Arafat had a French Jew, Gabriel Banon, as his peoples’ chief economic advisor. Banon was once a “close advisor” to former French prime minister George Pompidou. Banon also claims to have done “favors” for U.S. presidents Gerald Ford, George Bush, and Ronald Reagan. [BERLEY, M., 6-22-96] (Stanley Cohen was even the lawyer in 1995 for “senior Hamas official” Moussa Mohammad Abu Marzook, who was jailed in New York City. “All the Israeli press”, Cohen said, “wants to know how a Jew can represent the head of Hamas. I ask them, ‘How can a Jew NOT represent the head of Hamas?'”) [WALKER, R., 9-11-95] A Jew, Robert Buitkin, can even be found as the state treasurer of Oklahoma. [SCHREINER, B., 8-16-2000] (Even in the 1880s, when a Jew, Simon Wolf, was the American ambassador to Egypt, a Jew, (Julius) Blum Pasha, was Egypt’s Finance Minister!) [PANITZ, D & E, 1957, p. 98]

— Robert Rubin – Secretary of the Treasury. (“Rubin,” noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “is known for his pro-Israel stance.” [BATOG, p. 2]

— Dan Glickman – Secretary of Agriculture. (At a second term Clinton inauguration party, Glickman asked “every organization, every Jewish organization to take another step forward and outreach to Jews.” [DORF, BEHIND, p. 1]

In 1996, FBI agent Gary Aldrich, for five years assigned to do background checks on White House personnel, noted that when Glickman was nominated to be the Secretary of Agriculture:

“The FBI had yet to begin its background investigation into Congressman Glickman, but already congressmen from both parties – including the new Republican majority stepped forward to praise him. Again, it seemed as though our investigation would be superfluous … When Glickman’s case wasn’t finished in the usual thirty days because of serious questions that needed answers, the White House pressured the FBI to complete the probe. One of us [FBI agents], not me, threatened to go to the Washington Post if the pressure from the White House didn’t stop … Meanwhile, the media began its own investigation and reported that there were some questions about bad checks Glickman had written on the House Bank and about dependents of Glickman using congressional credit cards. The media unearthed that Glickman, a millionaire whose wife worked for Congress as chairperson of the Arts Subcommittee, was
alleged to have misused congressional funds for personal business. There was some talk of ‘traffic tickets.’ More shocking were reports that Glickman’s administrative assistant had committed suicide, but not before accusing him, in writing, of misuse of funds. She left instructions to submit these allegations to the House Ethics Committee in the event of her death. The House Ethics Committee, however, apparently took no action. Nevertheless, the Senate – the Republican Senate – stood by its former congressional colleague and confirmed Glickman the day before April Fool’s Day by a vote of ninety-four to zero. I felt the world had been turned upside down. I was disgusted and disheartened.” [ALDRICH, G., 1996, p. 162-164].

– Charlene Barshevsky – Special Trade Representative
– John Deutch – Director of the CIA. Appointed in 1995, “first,” noted the [Jewish] Forward, “he made a series of personnel changes, appointing David Cohen as deputy director of operations and giving the organization’s executive director, Nora Slatkin, broad, unprecedented authority over the deputy directors.” [FORWARD, p. 9-29-95, p. 7] Deutch’s grandfather, Jean Fischer, was a prominent Zionist and friend of the first Israeli president, Chaim Weizmann. Fischer headed the Zionist Federation in Belgium. A town in Israel, Kefar Yonah, is named in his honor. [STOLL, p. 7] Israel’s Jerusalem Post noted, in a 1996 article, the situation for Jews in the CIA: “Jews fill top positions in the U.S. intelligence community. In the CIA alone, intelligence sources say, Jews fill four of the CIA’s seven directorates and the agency is headed by John Deutch, a director described by one Israeli intelligence source as being ‘so traditional in his Jewish outlook that he practically wears a kippa [traditional Jewish skullcap].’” [RODAN, p. 20] (Also in the intelligence realm, a Jewish senator, Arlen Specter, was by the mid-1990s chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee). By the 1960s, Samuel Halpern was the “executive officer of Task Force W”– the CIA team set up to kill Cuba’s Fidel Castro; Sidney Gottlieb, “who could produce a lethal virus or poison on demand” was a “scientific advisor” to CIA assassination projects; and Arnold Silver was the CIA station chief in Luxembourg, also involved in plans for worldwide political murders. [HERSH, S., 1997, p. 191] Journalist Alexander Cockburn noted Gottlieb as the “US official poisoner” who “for many years, most notably in the 1950s and 1960s … presided over the CIA’s technical services division and supervised preparation of lethal poisons, experiments in mind control and administration of LSD and other psycho-active drugs to unwitting subjects.” [COCKBURN, A; GOTTLIEB] In the FBI, during the J. Edgar Hoover era, there were allegations that there were few Jews allowed in that department. Yet, “over the years [under Hoover] two Jews became Assistant Directors. Jewish employees were given days off to observe religious holidays, and Jews once made up most of the FBI basketball team.” [SUMMERS, A., 1993 p. 57] An earlier Jewish Clinton cabinet nomination, Zoe Baird, for Attorney General, was rejected by Congress when it was discovered that she had employed two illegal Peruvian immigrants in her home.
Other major Clinton administrative appointees include

- **William Cohen** – Secretary of Defense. (Cohen’s father was Jewish, his mother not; he has not publicly foregrounded a distinctly Jewish identity. “Nevertheless, “noted the [Jewish] Forward, “[Cohen] received a Jewish education and would perhaps have stayed ‘in the fold’ if a rabbi had not rejected him in his early years. Nevertheless, [Cohen] remains a great friend of Israel, where he had traveled on frequent visits. He has many personal friends there, and we are assure, it is possible to chat with him in simple Hebrew. His defense of Israel on various occasions is well known.” [FORWARD, 2-21-97, p. 7]

(An earlier Clinton selection for Secretary of Defense, Robert Inman, was dismissed in Congressional hearings thanks to Jewish influence in the mass media and the Zionist lobby. Michael Saba notes that Jewish journalist **William Safire** was especially critical of Inman’s “anti-Israel bias,” Inman’s support of the “excessive sentencing of Jonathan Pollard” [the Jewish American spy for Israel] and his reluctance to provide Israel with U.S. spy satellite photographs. [SABA, M., 1994] Another Jewish journalist, **Susan Garment**, of the Washington Post, wrote that “Inman named five journalists who treated him badly. Safire, Tony Lewis, Ellen Goodman, the cartoonist Herblock, and Rita Braven. All five are Jewish … This did nothing to dispel public impressions of Inman’s anti-Israel bias.” [SABA, M., 1994])

- **Madeline Albright** – Secretary of State. (Albright’s story is intriguing. She reputedly had no knowledge of her “lost” Jewish heritage until informed about it by the Washington Post while in office in 1997. The state of Israel is alleged to have known about her Jewish ancestry two years before she did). [JEWISH TELAG, p.2] Albright has suddenly, literally, become the “daughter of Holocaust victims … On a deep, even untapped, psychological level,” says the Jewish Week, “Albright may have strong feelings about Israel.” [SCHOFFMAN, p. 23] “When I say I had known that Albright was Jewish,” wrote Barbara Amiel, wife of media mogul Conrad Black, “I mean that one look at her features told me so. Of course, I put it in the back of my mind because I attributed absolutely no significance to it … (Well, perhaps I dissemble. Being Jewish myself, I had a feeling of kinship and admired her achievement a notch more … Albright happens to be the kind of person whose attractive features correspond to that tribal affinity in an almost unmistakable manner.” [AMIEL, p. 26] The Clinton administration has been involved in more military adventures than any other presidency since the Vietnam War, including the bombings of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Serbia. “The Kosovo conflict,” notes Newsweek, “is often referred to by her friends and foes as Madeline’s War … More than anyone else she embodies the foreign policy vision that pushed [other Clinton officials] into this war.” [ISAACSON, W., p. 25] (In 1999, a wealthy Austrian family threatened to sue Albright for the return of fine art masterpieces allegedly stolen from them from Czechoslovakia by her father). [CAMPBELL, M.]

- **Alan Greenspan** – a holdover from before Clinton took office (appointed during the Reagan administration), is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve
Board. His political career began as an economic advisor to Republican president Richard Nixon in 1968. The (New York) Financial Times noted that Greenspan “has been one of the most powerful men in the world for well over a decade. A single word of expression can be enough to unsettle stock markets around the globe or to send shares soaring.” [FIN TIM, p. 14] Chairman of the powerful Securities Exchange Council (SEC)? Also Jewish: Arthur Levitt. Head of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC)? Also Jewish: Robert Pitofsky, appointed by Clinton in 1994.

In late 1998 the Jewish Week noted that Jewish billionaire George Soros is “often accused of masterminding some world conspiracy … if the [economic] global crisis keeps spreading – as most experts expect – you won’t hear much more talk about blaming Soros and his Jewish cronies. Anger will probably focus increasingly on the leaders of the [International Monetary Fund] and the Washington policy makers who stand behind it. The bad news is that most of them are Jewish too. Israel’s daily Yediot Archronot recently published an unintentionally chilling list of senior economic policymakers known to be attending Kol Nidre services in Washington on the eve of the IMF summit. Among them: Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin and his top deputy Lawrence Summers [who has since succeeded Rubin as Treasury Secretary], World Bank Chairman James Wolfenson and his top deputy, Josef Stieglitz; Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, and IMF Director Stanley Fischer. That’s scary. And it’s only a partial list.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, The Sixth, p. 12]

In the White House, all the powerful people in the Clinton administration pale in importance to who the (Jewish) Forward calls “the biggest Jew in the Clinton world right now.” That is Steve Grossman, who was named in 1997 as the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. And what job did he leave to take this position? The chairmanship of AIPAC. “The highlight of Sunday’s lunch for leaders of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee,” reported the Jewish Exponent, “– in addition to kosher food trucked in from Baltimore – was the arrival of Steve Grossman, until last week the chair of the pro-Israel lobby group and now the national chair of the Democratic National Committee.” [BESSER, SCENES, p. 61] President Clinton, declared Grossman, is “committed to Jewish values, principles, and the Jewish agenda more than any other president that I can remember.” [GELBWASSER, p. 13] Sara Ehrman, an old friend of Hillary Clinton is also a Democratic National Committee senior political advisor; she also served as “a former lobbyist for AIPAC.” [LIFTON, p. 52] During Ms. Clinton’s successful run for the New York senate seat, the (Jewish) Forward also noted in 2000 that “in the latest setback to Hillary Rodham Clinton’s effort to reach out to the Jewish voters, a Democratic Party leader and key Jewish adviser to her campaign was arrested this week on corruption charges. Paul Adler, the Democratic leader of Rockland County and a relator with past legal troubles, was charged Monday with public corruption, fraud, extortion and other charges linked to his real estate transactions.” [FORWARD, 9-15-00, p. 15]
Stunningly, as Grossman rose to head the DNC, in the same year Fran Katz, the AIPAC Deputy Political Affairs Director, became the Financial Director of the Democratic Party. This situation, notes Mitchell Kaidy, “contributed to the impression that the foreign lobby and the incumbent party have become one and the same.” [KAIN, M., 9-97, p. 42] Likewise, as AIPAC seeped deeper into the American political structure, in 1999 the (Jewish) Forward announced that a Jewish “Democratic consultant, Mark Mellman, is hiring AIPAC’s political director, Michael Bloomfield.” [GITELL, S., 5-28-99, p. 19] Conversely, prominent Jewish Democrats may seep into AIPAC – in 1999 Robert Bassin, Chief of Staff for Democratic House of Representatives member John Lewis (Georgia) was reported to be considered for one of the chief AIPAC positions. [GITELL, S., 5-28-99] (There are, of course, Jews in positions of power at the side of non-Jewish Congressman throughout America. Josh Shapiro, for example, is Chief of Staff for Pennsylvania’s Congressman Jan Hoeffel). [SALISBURY, G., 3-30-99, p. 65]

The DNC Finance Chairman before Katz was also Jewish, Alan Solomont, also a “friend” of Steve Grossman. [GELBWASSER, M., 12-6-97, p. 3] In 1997 Solomont, “a nursing home tycoon” and former president of the Massachusetts Federation of Nursing Homes, was subpoenaed by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs about his role as “a major contributor [who] successfully lobbied Clinton administration officials to modify regulations for his industry.” [GOLDSCHLAG, 2-3-97; WEISSENSTEIN, E., 8-18-97] In turn, Solomont “took over the DNC’s troubled funding operation from Marvin Rosen, a Miami lawyer who has been blamed for loosening the controls on fundraising and for using his political contacts to bolster his law firm … [The DNC had accepted millions of dollars] from foreigners whose donations are illegal under U.S. law.” [BRODER, J., 4-3-99] (Amy Weiss Tobe also became the Democratic National Press Secretary in 1996; the next year she was the DNC Communications Director). [The National Finance Chair for the Democratic Party in 1990 was Monte Freidkin, later the Chairman of the National Jewish Democratic Council].

In 1999, Beth Dozoretz, yet another Jew, took the reins as “chief fundraiser for the Democratic Party” in her new position as the Financial Chair of the Democratic National Convention. [BRODER, p. 22] (Dozoretz later lobbied Clinton to pardon wealthy Jewish financier, Israeli philanthropist, and fugitive criminal Marc Rich. “Another key player in the effort [to get the pardon],” adds Newsweek, “was [Rich’s ex-wife] Denise Rich’s friend and fellow Democratic fundraiser Beth Dozoretz, who apparently appealed directly to Clinton”). [ENDA/KUHNHENN, 2-15-01, p. A1; ISIKOFF, M., 2-19-01] On the Republican side, Mel Sembler has been for years the Finance Chairman for the Republican National Committee; he is also chairman of Florida real estate company and an active member in the National Jewish Coalition. (He was formerly the U.S. ambassador to Australia. President George Bush Sr. had “named Sembler ambassador to Australia, which got him included in a series of Doonesbury comic strips poking fun at the link between money and patronage.”). [TROXLER, H., 1-22-97]
In 1992, President Clinton named Fred Goldberg to a position in the Treasury Department. He had for the past three years been the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Goldberg was earlier a partner at the law firm of Skadden, Arps, Meagher and Fromm. Another partner at the firm at the time was Kenneth Bialkin, for years the chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League, and, later, chairman of the American-Israel Friendship Committee. (In January 2000, President Clinton even named an Orthodox rabbi, Irving Greenbaum, as the new chairman of the nearby Holocaust Museum in Washington DC). Head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) through most of the 1990s and into the next millennium? Doris Meissner, “a child of German immigrants.” (Elinor Caplan, head of the Immigration office up North, is Meissner’s mirror in Canada). In 2000, “a three-judge panel ruled … that [Mazer] Al-Najjer, 43, should be freed [from prison], but Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner Doris Meissner appealed to [Attorney General Janet] Reno” to keep him imprisoned. Al-Najjer, an Arab, was accused of have links to terrorist acts against Israel and had been “jailed for more than three and a half years on the basis of secret evidence that immigration authorities refused to show him or his lawyers.” [TAYLOR, M., 9-7-00, p. B1:7; LARDNER, JR., G., 12-16-00, p. 2] Reno released him.

In 1993-94 the two individuals President Clinton appointed to the United States Supreme Court, Ruth Bader Ginsberg and Steven Breyer, were also both Jewish. And multi-millionaires. [CANTOR, p. 401] (A 1987 Jewish justice appointee to the Supreme Court, Douglas Ginsberg, was discovered to have smoked marijuana while a Harvard law professor and was passed over for the government post). Of the nine current American Supreme court justices, notes the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “President Clinton’s two Jewish appointees to the Supreme Court are by far the richest.” Depending upon how one plays with papers, Ruth Ginsberg and her husband are worth between $5.9 to $24.1 million; the Breyer’s assets are valued at between $3.3 to $15.9 million. [KURTZMAN, 5-27-98]

The profoundly disproportionate presence (even dominance) of Jews in important governmental positions, as well as their economic influence in the political field (and its disturbing implications), goes entirely unremarked upon by the mass media. As Seymour Lipset and Earl Raab note:

“Neither Ruth Bader Ginsburg, nor Stephen Breyer’s appointment to the Supreme Court called any public comment about them being Jews … [Likewise] during and after the 1992 campaigns in which Californians elected Jews to both United States senatorial vacancies, not a voice was raised publicly to mark the fact. The Republican nominee for one of these seats was also Jewish.” [LIPSET, RAAB]

“One measure of progress that’s been made,” agreed Hyman Bookbinder, a former official of the American Jewish Committee, “is that when Clinton appointed Stephen Breyer to be the second Jew on the Supreme Court, you heard practically nothing about his being Jewish.” [MATUSOW, B., MAY 2000, p. 79]
(This situation is of course quite different from the past. When receiving an award from the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, notes the Washington Post, Justice Ginsburg “noted the fear of anti-Jewish bias that Supreme Court lawyers felt some 50 years ago. The names of four Justice Department lawyers, all Jewish, are missing from a legal brief they wrote in 1948, Ginsburg said at the Feb. 18 award ceremony. The decision was made by Arnold Raum, No. 2 in the office that handles Supreme Court appeals, and himself a Jew, Ginsburg said. ‘It wouldn’t do, he thought, to make it so evident that the position of the United States was ‘put out by a bunch of Jews,’ Ginsburg said, quoting a later account.”) [GEARSON, A., 2-28-02]

In 1999 Supreme Court Justice Breyer gave an address to the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations entitled “Zion’s Justice.” He said that “the Zionist ideal is, of course, exactly that – an ideal. It is an objective toward which imperfect reality must struggle. But, whatever the imperfection of reality, this ideal retains its hold upon our imagination and that of the world.” [BREYER, p. 19] His speech, and later article, rhapsodized about former Jewish Supreme Court Justices Louis Brandeis (whose term began in 1916) and Felix Frankfurter (who began in 1939), both avidly activist Zionists, and their emulative roles in serving the Zionist cause in high level American government. But how things have changed. “It is important to remember,” says Breyer,

“that Brandeis was a leader when Zionism was controversial among Jews. Indeed, after Brandeis was confirmed as a member of the Supreme Court in 1916, the New York Times, with support from some Jewish groups, argued that Brandeis should resign from his public position in Zionist organizations. And he did so. This opposition reflected something deeper than simple concern for judicial propriety. It reflected a widely held view that American Jews need not – and perhaps out not – support the Zionist cause because doing so might prove inconsistent with their obligations toward their own country or intervene with their participation in American civic life … [p. 18] … Felix Frankfurter was Brandeis’ pupil, in respect to Zionism and everything else … Brandeis needed an assistant to carry on his Zionist activities, particularly after he was appointed to the Court. He chose Frankfurter. Even when Brandeis was on the Court – in one act now considered highly controversial – Brandeis would deposit between $250 and $3,000 in Frankfurter’s expense account as he traveled throughout the country advocating causes which included Zionism … In 1919 … Brandeis told Frankfurter to prepare for a practical task, writing legal bequest forms ‘adequate in several states,’ to organize an effort ‘to get in touch with all Jewish lawyers in America’ and try to have many Jewish clients remember Zion in their wills. That same year, he had Frankfurter travel to the Paris Peace Conference as a leading representative of American Zionists.” [BREYER, p. 18-19]

Brandeis’ wife, Alice, was even a financial supporter of the Zionist underground terrorist IRGUN organization. She held a membership card in the American League for a Free Palestine, a supportive offshoot of IRGUN. Justice
Brandeis himself “met more than once with visiting delegations from the Revisionist Zionist movement to discuss illegal immigration and related issues. At one 1939 session with IRGUN emissary Robert Briscoe, Brandeis reportedly remarked, “If I were a young man like you, I would be with you.” [MEDOFF, 1996] (“Revisionists were heavily fascist and profoundly influenced by Mussolini,” notes Jewish author Edwin Black. [BLACK, E., p. 143])

In 1983 a scholarly work by Bruce Allen Murphy about Jewish Supreme Court justices Brandeis and Frankfurter was published. It was entitled The Brandeis/Frankfurter Connection. The Secret Political Activities of Two Supreme Court Justices. Supreme Court justices, appointed for life terms, are expected to maintain an apolitical, non-partisan bearing as decision-makers of American law. Murphy’s volume studies the two Supreme Court justices’ secret extrajudicial political activities, largely, but not only, of a Zionist/Jewish nature. As Murphy notes, after his exhaustive study of existent document archives:

“Felix Frankfurter learned the art of being an extrajudicially active member of the Supreme Court at the knee of Justice Brandeis. It now appears that in one of the most unique relationships in the Court’s history, Brandeis enlisted Frankfurter, then a professor at Harvard Law School, as his paid political lobbyist and lieutenant. Working together over a period of twenty-five years, they placed a network of disciples in positions of influence, and labored diligently for the enactment of their desired programs. This adroit use of the politically skillful Frankfurter as an intermediary enabled Brandeis to keep his considerable political endeavors hidden from the public. Not surprisingly, after his own appointment to the Court, Frankfurter resorted to some of the same methods to advance governmental goals consonant with his own political philosophy. As a result, history virtually repeated itself, with the student placing his own network of disciples in various agencies and working through this network for the realization of his own goals … So extensive was the extrajudicial behavior of both Brandeis and Frankfurter that one is left puzzled as to how it could have remained secret for so long.” [MURPHY, B., 1983, p. 10, 11]

Under President Lyndon Johnson, Jewish Associate Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, says early AIPAC chief I. L. Kenen,

“accepted my invitation to make a speech to the national AIPAC policy conference and he associated himself with the historic pro-Zionist declaration made by Justice Louis D. Brandeis just fifty years before. Goldberg came under attack because of that speech. [He listened] to a long harangue by Saudi Arabia’s Baroody on Zionism and the influence of American Jews on American political leaders.” [KENEN, I., 1981, p. 228-229]

In 1998, both current Jewish Supreme Court Justices, Breyer and Ginsburg, joined in a 6–3 ruling (a 5-4 loss if non-Jewish Justices in their stead had different views) in favor of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, one that would make
“it unlikely the pro-Israel lobby will have to disclose information about its membership or expenditures. Six former politicians and diplomats, all staunch critics of U. S. Policy toward Israel, have been seeking increased government regulation of AIPAC … the plaintiffs have been urging the Federal Election Commission to regulate AIPAC as a political committee … AIPAC … defines itself as membership organization and registered lobby on behalf of legislation affecting U.S.-Israel relations … Justice Stephen Breyer wrote the majority opinion for the court.” [KURTZMAN, D., 6-5-01]

In Bill Clinton’s second Presidential term, other Jews in prominent positions of power included:

– Gene Sperling – Chairman of the National Economic Council
– Evelyn Lieberman – Director of Voice of America
– Janie Gorelick – Assistant Attorney General
– Stuart Eizenstat – Under secretary of State for Economics
– Aaron Miller – Deputy Middle East Coordinator
– Daniel Kurtzer – Ambassador to Egypt
– Marc Grossman – Assistant Secretary for European and Canadian Affairs
– Princeton Lyman – Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations
– Stanley Roth – Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and Pacific Affairs
– Jeffrey Davidow – Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs
– James Rubin – Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs
– Jack Lew – (an Orthodox Jew); Director of the Office of Management and Budget [GROSS, N., p. 30]

This list is just a sampling. “There are uncounted dozens of Jewish White House staffers,” noted the Jewish Exponent in 1997. [BESSER, Celebrating, p. 1] There are so many that Ira Forman, director of the National Jewish Democratic organization, “tells of one Jewish staffer friend who balked at handling the White House Christmas decorations but was told he had to do it ‘because, heck, everyone else here is Jewish too.’” [GROSS, N., p. 30] “We’ve stopped counting the number of Jews in key places in the Clinton administration,” noted Hyman Bookbinder, the former Washington representative of the American Jewish Committee, “there are so many of them.” [MATUSOW, B., MAY 2000, p. 79]

Richard H. Curtiss, a former State Department officer, noted the situation in 1998:

“A large percentage of other top-echelon State Department political appointees and ambassadors are Jewish. A U.S. ambassador who happened to be visiting Washington in October remarked to the writer that during Rosh Hoshana, the Jewish New Year, many State Department offices took on the forlorn, nearly deserted visage that used to characterize the brief interval between Christmas and New Year’s day. The same was true in the White House, where the top two foreign affairs officials, National Security Adviser Samuel Berger and his deputy, John Steinberg, are Jewish, as is
Vice President Al Gore’s national security adviser, Leon Furth. So are a lot of other White House policymakers ... Nor is there anything particularly incongruous about the high percentage of top Jewish officials in the Clinton White House and foreign affairs establishment. Ins one other government departments, the situation differs only in the details. Ironically, Secretary Donna Shalala of the Department of Health and Human Services is the only Arab American in the cabinet. But according to HHS insiders, most of her second echelon officials, all White House appointees, are Jewish. So are a remarkably high percentage of top officials in the National Institutes of Health, which supervise hundreds of research grants at home and abroad. At the Department of Commerce the situation is similar, even after the resignation of Secretary of Commerce Mickey Kantor, a long-time pro-Israel activist and Clinton’s 1992 election campaign manager. At the Pentagon and CIA, at political appointee levels (in contrast to career military and CIA officers), things are not that different ... The record of a staff meeting at Secretary Robert Rubin’s Treasury Department early in the second Clinton administration shows that when top echelon leaders were discussing the best times to make announcements the Treasury does not want the American public to notice, one official said, ‘The time to do it is Christmas or Easter, since those are the two biggest holidays.’ The ‘they’ the official was speaking about in the apparently all-Jewish meeting were the 90 to 95 percent of US taxpayers who are of Christian heritage but who, in the Clinton administration, are so dramatically under-represented in top foreign policymaking positions.” [CURTIS, R.H., 2-28-98, p. 28]

“There is also a sizeable contingent of Jewish women,” noted the Jerusalem Report in 1998, “many of whom started out with a Hillary [Clinton] connection, in the most senior echelons of the White House, including Communications Director Ann Lewis, White House Director of Public Policy Maria Echaveste [who married a Jewish lawyer and converted to Judaism], and Lynn Cutler, deputy director of White House inter-governmental affairs.” [GROSS, N., p. 30] Hilary’s own personal staff, notes Netty Gross, “is also heavily Jewish.” [GROSS, N., p. 32] (White House FBI agent Gary Aldrich notes on one occasion what it was like decorating Hillary Clinton’s White House Christmas tree, with ornaments from various artists, featuring “sex toys” and self-mutilation devices”: “I couldn’t believe the disrespect that these ornaments represented. Many of the artists invited to make and send something to hang on the tree must have had nothing but disgust, hatred, and disrespect for the White House and the citizens of this country, a disgust obviously encouraged by the first lady in the name of artistic freedom ... Here was another five golden rings ornament – five gold-wrapped condoms. I threw it in the trash. There were other condom ornaments, some still in the wrapper, some not.”) [ALDRICH, G., 1996, p. 105-106]

In July 26, 2000, during Hillary Clinton’s campaign for Congress from New York, Jewish senator Charles Schumer (“a recognized leader in Jewish issues on Capitol Hill”) was recorded on videotape at a fund raiser for the President’s wife. He responded to questions by Jews present about Israel, saying, “My guess
is [Ms. Clinton] will vote exactly as I vote on Jewish issues. She will look to me to see how to vote … Is she going to be a leading voice in the Senate? No. Is she going to have the same feeling about it that I do – born Jewish? No. But she will be good. “Schumer,” noted the Associated Press, “in shirt sleeves, chatted casually with supporters on the tape, seemingly unaware that a camera was rolling.” [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 7-27-2000]

Jews, observed Stuart Eizenstat, eventually the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, “have become much more vocal, not just as an outside interests group, but by integrating into the system.” [BESSER, Escape, p. 38] (Joe Rubin, by the way, is the “chief lobbyist for the US Chamber of Commerce”). [NELSON, S., 11-20-01] Eizenstat, noted the Baltimore Jewish Times,

“said that the Jewish community has reached a kind of critical mass in politics that guarantees that many of the gains of the Clinton years will remain, no matter who occupies the White House. ‘I think the change will last,’ said Eizenstat, ‘people in the middle levels [of national government] will move up in the years ahead; younger people who are being trained at junior levels will, in future administrations, take more senior positions.’” [BESSER, J. p. 38]

(Eizenstat is also notable for his public defense of Rabbi Irving Greenberg – the head of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum – after Greenberg faced condemnation for writing a letter to President Clinton seeking clemency for Jewish American fugitive Marc Rich. Eizenstat praised Greenberg for “embracing … Jewishness from its assimilationist drift.” After hearing Rabbi Greenberg lecture at a Jewish retreat in 1974, “the Holocaust,” writes Eizenstat, something most of us had barely thought about, became central to our lives, our understanding of Judaism and of Jewish ethics.”) [EIZENSTAT, S., 4-3-01]

With so many Jews in the upper echelons of American government, notes the Jerusalem Post, “Arabs have repeatedly complained that the United States has not acted as an honest broker” in Middle East peace negotiations. [GROSS, N., p. 32] Specifically, Israeli commentator Meron Benevenisti described an Israeli newspaper’s depiction of the 4-member Clinton “peace mission” to barter arrangements between Israel and Palestinians in the 1990s as “the mission of four Jews” – the paper “gloated with pride while talking about the Jewish and even Israeli roots of all its members.” “The ‘Israeli roots’ of those US diplomats,” adds Israel Shahak, “comprising what went under the name of a ‘peace mission’ included the fact that a son of one of them was said to be studying in a Hesder Yeshiva, to receive military training there. He was also said to be a sympathizer of Gush Emunim and was awaiting the opportunity to serve in the Israeli army in the Territories.” [SHAHAK, I.]

In the international field, Jewish “current or immediate past” [1997] ambassadors to other countries included those to Egypt, Israel, Poland, Switzerland, Brazil (Melvin Levitsky), Nepal (Ralph Frank), Romania, Spain, Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, France, Morocco (Marc Ginsberg), Venezuela (Jeffrey Davidow), Turkey (Marc Grossman), Bahamas (Arthur Schechter: 1998-2001) and Malaysia, among others. Matthew Dorf notes that
“Indeed, an article in the October [1997] issue of the professional journal of the American Foreign Service Association, Foreign Service – headlined ‘Where’ve All the Arabists Gone?’ – laments the changes taking place. ‘If any other group had taken over, there would have been a big storm, but with the Jewish-American takeover, nobody has the courage to speak,’ William Rugh, a former ambassador to Yemen, was quoted as saying.” [DORF, Focus, p. 3]

In 1972, Evan M. Wilson, the United States Minister-Consul General in Jerusalem till 1967, reflected a view about American foreign policy in that area that has long since been erased by Zionist expansion in the U.S. government:

“In retrospect, it seems clear that our support of the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine, against the wishes of the [Arab] population of that country, was a mistake. It had a catastrophic effect upon our relations the Arab world and our important interests in the Middle East. It has caused us to be associated in the minds of the Arabs with Israel, which they regard as an alien, hostile element in their midst and which they identify with the forces of imperialism and colonialism against which they have been struggling since the First World War.” [WILSON, E., 1972, p. 72-73]

In 1997, when David Hermelin was named to be the U.S. ambassador to Norway, a friend, Jay Alix, was quoted as saying:

“He’s probably one of the world’s great philanthropist leaders. He’s raised more money for Jewish causes than anyone else.” [FRENCH, p. B1]

Hermelin died in office in 2000. He was noted in the New York Times as having been “a devoted supporter of Israel and the Jewish people,” serving as Chairman of Israel’s 50th Anniversary Committee, Vice Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal, and International Chairman of the State of Israel Bonds.” [NEW YORK TIMES, 11-23-00, sec. 11, p. 11]

Also in 1998, Steven Green, the former head of the Samsonite luggage company, and others, packed his bags for his post as Ambassador to Singapore. In the same year the Jewish Forward noted that Richard Holbrooke, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, “surprised the audience [at the Center for Jewish History’s Inaugural Dinner] with the revelation that, like his wife, Kati Marton, he too is Jewish.” [LEON, 9-25-99, p. 15] (Daniel L. Spiegel was Ambassador to U.N. from 1994-96).

Martin Indyk, formerly on Clinton’s National Security Council, is the first Jewish United States Ambassador to Israel in history. All other Presidents recognized the obvious dangers and avoided the intrinsic pro-Israel bias problem in such an appointment. (Canada’s 2000 ambassador to Israel? Also Jewish: David Berger). Indyk’s story is especially disturbing. In 1973 Indyk was a student in Israel. In 1982 he began work for Near East Research, Inc., the research unit of AIPAC. He later founded the pro-Israel Washington Institute for Near East Policy: “many of the Institute’s financial backers were Jews who were members of the American Public Affairs Committee.” [FORWARD, 9-5-97] Co-founder of the Washington Institute was Barbi Weinberg, “wife of AIPAC
Chairman Emeritus Lawrence Weinberg.” [HALSELL, G., MARCH 1993, p. 9] (Such think tanks, notes former U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia Jame E. Akins, “basically provide spokesmen for Israel. And if they would identify themselves as that, fine. What’s pernicious is passing themselves off as an independent think tank. They are not, just as any Arab group would not be.”) [HALSELL, G., MARCH 1993, p. 9] Indyk was even once “an international media and communications adviser to former Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Shamir in Israel.” [HALSELL, G., MARCH 1993, p. 9] Indyk, born in Australia, about to become intimately involved with American national security secrets, became an American citizen only days before starting his job on Clinton’s National Security Council! [FORWARD, 9-5-97, p. 1] Facing Congress for confirmation of his (ultimately successful) appointment to the NSC, the (Jewish) Forward noted in 1994 that

“[Indyk] is expected to face a grilling from Senate Republicans over his decision to become an American citizen only last year, just days before he was tapped for the NSC slot. GOP members will also quiz the London-born, Australian-reared Mr. Indyk about a top position he held in an Australian intelligence service for a former prime minister.” [FEIDEN, p. 1]

Eventually working as the American ambassador to Israel, two Jewish authors understand that as always his final goal, noting that “with the recognition that Indyk has made ‘aliyah’ [immigrated] to America specifically so he could work in Israel, one sees the formation of a new American Jewish myth.” [SAGE/ZAROMB, p. 41] This Jewish-centeredness to Israel “myth” has a jarringly transworld flavor. Although Connecticut-born Dore Gold decided to move to Israel, he became that country’s Ambassador to the United Nations, and acted in that country’s interests in his office near the U.N. building in New York City. Intending no sarcasm, Jesse Sage and Franklin Zaromb also note that “One might ask who is more American: [Israeli prime minister Benjamin] Netanyahu, who spent his entire adolescence in America as well as several years after the [Israeli] army, or Indyk, the newly approved U.S. citizen?” [SAGE/ZAROMB, p. 44] Or as one former U.S. Ambassador to the Middle East remarked, “Culturally, when you run into somebody like Benjamin Netanyahu or Moshe Arens [the Israeli Foreign Minister, from America] or guys who speak American-accented English and know your cultural background as well as or better than you do, it is very hard to remind yourself that you are dealing with a foreign country.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 96] “So many Israelis have studied in the United States that attending an American university,” says Joyce Starr, “at least at the master’s and doctoral levels, has become almost a rite of passage for Israel’s elite.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 101]

As American-born Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens notes,

“We’ve had a Prime Minister from the United States, Mrs. [Golda] Meir, and a Deputy Foreign Minister, Yehuda Ben-Meir. There are many Americans in Israel in key positions.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 232]

In 1998 the Iraqi foreign minister accused Martin Indyk of being “a known Jew and Zionist.” The U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations responded by call-
ing “it ‘deplorable’ to drag in Indyk’s ethnic background,” and demanded that the Iraqi “apologize for this dramatically offensive slur.” Iraq, of course, is easily dismissed these days, and its foreign ministry is given credence by virtually no one. The very next day, however, the U.S. State Department “sat down to discuss the latest foreign tirade against Jewish influence in Washington.” This second, especially uncomfortable attack, was far more difficult to categorically dismiss as an ethnic slur or an expression of irrational anti-Semitism. The new attack came from Nathan Sharansky, a minister in the Israeli government, who complained, noted the Jewish Week, that “Israel was suffering because there were too many liberal Jews in the Clinton administration.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, Too Many Jews?, 7-17-98, p. 4] (The Jewish Week article did not try to dismiss the Jewish influence angle of the complaint, but rather than they were not necessarily “liberal.”)

The blurring of the American government into a Zionist/Israeli one is also poignantly illustrated by New Jersey governor McGreevey’s selection in 2002 of an Israeli citizen, Golan Cipel, to be his “special counsel to the governor on homeland security” for $110,000 a year. Cipel, noted a New Jersey newspaper, had “limited experience in U.S. Domestic security as [the governor’s] closest adviser on terrorism ... He was appointed to the newly created position without an official announcement or the extensive background checks that are routine for most top state officials ... Cipel is a former Israeli sailor” and was once “spokesman for the Israeli Consulate in Manhattan” which was “one of the Israeli government’s top spokesmen in the United States.” [PILLETS/RILEY, 2-2002]

In 1997 Jewish American journalist J. J. Goldberg lectured the Labor Zionist Alliance of Canada. The Canadian Jewish News reported on the talk, noting that Goldberg proclaimed that Jews were the “players” in the modern world, not “victims:”

“[Goldberg] went on to give many examples of American Jewry’s influential role in American politics. He noted that in addition to the Secretary of State Madeline Albright, who was born Jewish, the key Americans shaping Middle East policy are all Jews … A new kosher kitchen was recently installed at the American embassy in Cairo because Dan Kurtzer, the American ambassador to Egypt, is an Orthodox Jew. ‘We Jews run American Middle East policy,’ however most Americans are not concerned that Jews hold such key positions of power, he said. U.S. politicians consult with leadership of the Jewish community on foreign policy matters as well evidenced by the recent state visit of Israeli president Ezer Weizman earlier this month, Goldberg said. Jewish community leaders and chiefs of Middle East policy were all invited to the White House for lunch with the United States and Israeli president, he said. The only non-Jews in the room were Bill and Hilary Clinton … [Goldberg] said by comparison; Canadian Jewry has less political clout – ‘Jews don’t run Ottawa [the center of Canadian government]’ – than American Jews who are able to exert pressure on Congress.” [SILVERSTEIN, B., 10-30-97, p. 5]

Another Jewish journalist, Jonathan Broder, noted the situation for Jews looking for top level positions in the State Department in 1997:
“All [Secretary of State Madeleine Albright’s] top candidates for a slew of senior positions in the State Department are Jewish and male … Albright has already promoted two Jewish appointees to senior positions [Dennis Ross and Stuart Eizenstadt] … Jews lead the list for the six regional assistant secretary posts. According to well informed sources, they are: Mark Grossman, currently U.S. ambassador to Turkey …, Princeton Lyman, currently the assistant secretary of state for international organizations, and former Rep. Howard Wolpe of Michigan …; Stanley Roth, an aide to former Rep. Steven Solarz of New York and a former staffer on the National Security Council; Karl Indefurth, a former ABC News correspondent who served as Albright’s deputy at the United Nations …; Jeff Davidow, assistant secretary of state for Latin American affairs …; Martin Indyk, currently U.S. ambassador to Israel.” [BRODER, J., 2-13-97]

Albright’s “top candidate” for assistant Interior secretary for policy and management? Bonnie Caplan. [BRODER, J., 2-13-97]

Worried about publicity about the presence of so many Jews in the upper echelons of the American government, one “senior official” in the State Department refused to be interviewed for an article about the subject by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, saying, “No good can come from this. Especially because there are so many of us.” [DORE, FOCUS, p. 3] “Although many current Jewish State Department officials dismiss discussion about the Jewish character of the State Department as fodder for anti-Semites and anti-Israel activities,” says JTA reporter Matthew Dorf, “some have privately acknowledged that one’s upbringing can influence policy decisions.” [DORF, p. 3] “Stigmatization by overt anti-Semites,” observes the Jewish magazine Mosaic, “magnifies the extent to which discussions surrounding the American Jewish diplomats can easily descend into nose-counting and age-old racial slurs. Conversely, it is extremely difficult for the American Jewish community to discuss such matters in a comfortable, open, and critical manner … Mindful of this concern, one would hardly want to spur public awareness and inadvertently damage Jewish interests.” [SAGE/ZAROMB, p. 36] The effect of this upon those who seek to work in the State Department who do not have a pro-Israel slant? David Whalen notes that “concerned legislators and interest groups delayed Strobe Talbott’s appointment as Deputy Secretary of State because of some seemingly anti-Israel opinions he expressed fifteen years ago in Time magazine.” [WHALEN, p. 75]

(How times have changed. World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann wrote that, during the Franklin D. Roosevelt presidency, “a majority of the State Department was anti-Zionist.” [GOLDMANN, N. 1978, p. 31])

Want to work in the United States Foreign Service – a division of the U.S. State Department – at an American embassy somewhere in the world? In our American society that is founded on clear principles separating “church” and state (emphatically enforced by Jewish lobbying organizations at every opportunity) the registration booklet for the 1999 Foreign Service Officer Examination (a test for entry into foreign service) noted that the exam would be held,
worldwide, on a Saturday. However, notes the booklet, “applicants whose religious beliefs preclude them from taking the examination on a Saturday may apply to take the test on Sunday.” A letter may simply be sent in writing “as self-certification” that attests to the applicant’s “affiliation with a recognized body that observes its Sabbath throughout the year on Saturday.” [REGISTRATION, p. 21] Although the government document never says the word “Jew” or “Jewish,” this policy of preferential treatment (exceptionality) refers only to them. The government document states this special privilege explicitly: “Alternative dates for the examination will not be authorized for any other reason than for Saturday Sabbath.” [REGISTRATION, p. 22] To the superficial glance, avoiding discrimination against religious Jews is the reason for Jewish exceptionality here. But there is deeper dimension to this governmental policy. Being Jewish is the only acceptable reason for missing the Saturday test. Anybody else’s religious reason or, more importantly, secular reason on the face of the earth is (however incongruent for a secular government) summarily rejected, a paradox that fulfills traditional Jewry’s religiously-based “unique” self-conception of itself, a status dictated even in the context of an areligious civil system. (Want to donate money to Israel’s army? You can and the American government will let you take a tax write-off for it.) [LIBI, 2001]

In 1998 the London Independent noted that “the State Department line on the Middle East, always skewed towards Israel, has been followed obsequiously by most American reporters. Only weeks after United States diplomats were instructed to refer to the Israeli-occupied West Bank as ‘disputed’ – rather than ‘occupied’ territory, American journalists began using precisely the same word.” [FISK, p. 14]

In March 1997 the Washington Times came under attack from Jews for an article stating that “several sources said [Clinton’s State Department] appointments are partly blocked because there are too many ‘white Jewish males’ in senior State Department positions to fulfill the concept of balance the administration seeks, especially with several top women leaving.” [FORWARD, 3-7-97, p. 5] In response, the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Jewish Congressman Benjamin Gilman, saw such commentary – that Jews already were way beyond their reasonable share of power in the State Department alone – as outrageously “discriminatory”:

“For such a statement to appear, even anonymously, in this day and age, is outrageous. It goes without saying that religious discrimination in personnel decision-making is totally inappropriate and against the spirit of all anti-discrimination laws.” [FORWARD, 3-7-97, p. 5]

(Among Gilman’s other curious testimonials is that in behalf of Shabtai Kalmanovich, a known “Russian/Israeli gangster,” [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 166] who was charged with a bank fraud in North Carolina. Gilman, at the time the majority leader of the House Banking Commission, “wrote to the court in North Carolina lauding Kalmanovich’s character.”) [BLOCK, A., 1996, p. 166-167]
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While Gilman wailed about the horrible discrimination against Jews, the Jewish Exponent also noted in the same year that “you can’t blame the Aipacers [members of the AIPAC] for feeling smug these days. In addition to [Steve Grossman’s new role [as head of the Democratic National Committee], a former employee (Martin Indyk) is ambassador to Israel, a former executive director (Tom Dine) is a top official in the Agency for International Development and the former top AIPAC lobbyist (Anne Christianson) is chief of staff to House Speaker Newt Gingrich. And dozens of Capitol Hill staffers cut their teeth in AIPAC’s offices.” [BESSER, SCENES, p. 61] These people are probably often interviewed by Wolf Blitzer, CNN’s White House reporter. Such an expression of “objective news” is stunningly incestuous. Even Blitzer has deep links to AIPAC: he’s a former editor of AIPAC’s newsletter, the Near East Report. [HADER, p. 27]

When a Jewish employee sought to sue the CIA for anti-Semitism in 1999, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted that “one former foreign service officer wondered how one can claim rampant anti-Semitism when Dennis Ross, the U.S. Chief Middle East negotiator, and his deputy, Aaron Miller, who have both lived in Israel, received [highest level] security clearances without trouble. In addition, President Clinton’s national security adviser, Sandy Berger, and State Department spokesman, James Rubin, maintain the highest level clearance.” [DORF, M., 4-14-99, p. 13]

Completely unrestrained, the American Jewish link to Israel enjoys more and more profound closures and configurations. As Jews move up en masse in American government, they increasingly find themselves even negotiating with fellow American Jews (who have emigrated to Israel) in parallel positions in the Israeli government. Such American-Israelis include Dore Gold (Israeli ambassador to the United Nations, who has a PhD from Columbia University and was born and raised in West Hartford, Connecticut), Bobby Brown (Israel’s minister of Diaspora Affairs), and Ari Weiss (adviser to Israeli minister Natan Sharansky). “Unparalleled diplomatic opportunities,” noted the Jewish magazine Mosaic in 1998,

“… have recently opened for American Jews – not just in the United States. Imagine, for instance, that when U.S. Ambassador Ross and Israeli Ambassador (to the United Nations) Dore Gold sit down to negotiate in the context of the Oslo peace process, they converse in their native English, representing the West and East coasts of America, respectively. Belying the ostensible meeting of emissaries from two nations, this thoroughly American ambiance is cross-cultural, transnational, and essentially familiar. The two men are archetypes of unprecedented American Jewish possibility. Ross is himself emblematic of a coterie of Jews who in the last decade have broken the glass ceiling in the State Department.” [SAGE/ZAROMB, p. 35]

At a Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, a questioner asked Israeli ambassador Gold if “the preponderance of Jews on the American [peace] team posed a problem for Israel?” Gold, noted Mosaic magazine, “stared down the
questioner with a twinkle in his eye and stated in superb diplomatic double-speak: ‘It is the policy of the Israeli government to handle representatives of the United States as Americans and nothing more.’” [SAGE/ZAROMB, p. 35]

For American-Israeli Ari Weiss’s part, he was “one of the most influential personalities in Washington in the 1980s, when he served as senior aide to House Speaker Tip O’Neill.” Weiss (also the former secretary of the Democratic Party’s Steering and Policy Committee) years later met American Vice President Al Gore in Israel. “While Weiss was wondering whether Gore would remember him, [Gore] stood up, embraced him warmly, and said, “Ari, how could I possibly forget you. It’s thanks to you that I was appointed to the House Intelligence Committee.” [SAGE/ZAROMB, p. 43]

In 1998, Mosaic’s Jewish authors Jesse Sage and Franklin Zaromb suggested that because the many Jews in the American government had not permanently emigrated to Israel (as declared desirable by traditional Zionist thinking) they were “anti-Zionist Zionists,” a genre of Jewry that was of enormous value to Israel:

“The [U.S.] State Department crew directly shapes the parameters under which Israel operates … These [Jewish] employees of the State Department officially act as model American representatives and public Jews. But most importantly, they enjoy free trips to Israel all the time. This meeting between fantasy and reality reflects a form of non-Zionist Zionism wherein American Jews demonstrate how they can do more for the political Zionist cause as Americans than as Israelis … Representatives of the American government thus evince support for Israel while distancing themselves from the Zionist cause … Non-Zionism argues for the value of a diaspora Jewish politics that can secure responsibility for the Jewish state when Zionism falls short: ironically, non-Zionism believes it can do Israel as a nation-state a better service than the Zionist position itself.” [SAGE/ZAROMB, p. 39-40]

Even when Clinton appointees were not Jewish, the Jewish lobby usually had much to celebrate anyway. Early in Clinton’s first term, in 1993 the MetroWest Jewish News noted that

“The new [Clinton] administration will also have the added strength of two very strong [non-Jewish] supporters of Israel as Secretary of Defense U.S. Rep. Les Aspin, D-Wis, and Central Intelligence Agency director James Woolsey. Aspin, as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has been an architect of – and key figure in – U.S.-Israel strategic relations. Both men are members of the board of advisors of JINSA, the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs.” [BLOOMFIELD, p. 27]

“At the pinnacle of American government,” proclaimed the Jewish Week at the beginning of Clinton’s second Presidential term, “[there is a] raft of Jews (Rubin, Reich, Kantor, Ginsburg, Breyer, Deutch, Berger, Ross, Indyk, et al) who have graced the stunningly philo-semitic Clinton administration, inspiring no small degree of comment among Jew baiters – you can check it out on the Internet – and dinner-table discussion among Jews, but causing very little to-do in the mainstream media.” [SCHOFFMAN, p. 23] “Much of the Bush ad-
ministration’s and almost all of the Clinton foreign policy team ... were Jews,” notes Barry Rubin, “No one complained.” [RUBIN, p. 240]

Some Jewish scholars seem amazed that the massive Jewish and/or Zionist presence at the upper echelons of the American government is never mentioned. “When California’s Barbara Boxer and Diane Feinstein got elected to the United States Senate in 1992,” says Stephen Whitfield, “what mattered was their gender, not their ethnicity; and it seemed almost parochial to tout their membership in Hadassah [the women’s Zionist organization].” [WHITFIELD, p. 9] Incredibly, comparatively, in 1998, California state treasurer Matt Fong’s successful struggle to oppose Boxer for the U.S. Senate revealed another of the many unconscionable American double standards and mass media hypocrisy about Jews in this country. While Feinstein and Boxer are completely screened from critical inquiry about them as Jews and Zionists (with the foreign entity of Israel always hiding in the wings), the Copley News Service noted that:

“Speaking here [in Los Angeles] to a group of Asian-Americans, the treasurer said ‘it hurts’ that reporters and editors have treated him as an outsider with questions that focus only on his ethnicity. [They ask about the recent Clinton] Asian-American fund-raising scandal and whether his loyalties lie with China.” [WILKIE, p. A3]

In the context of this chapter, and this volume, it is mind-boggling that press attention was also focused upon Barbara Boxer who “said yesterday that she was warned by the FBI last year that Chinese citizens or government officials might try to contact her office ‘in an effort to influence U.S. foreign policy.’” [FREEDBERG, p. A1] That such double standard material can be published without ironic intent is a blazing indictment of the American mass media and current political system.

Both of California’s senators, Feinstein and Boxer, are, not surprisingly, also Jewish multi–millionaires. With assets of at least $20 million, Feinstein and her Jewish husband, Richard Blum (who runs a $400 million investment management firm and became part owner of Northwest Airlines in 1989) noted the Los Angeles Times, “are so rich that her [public disclosure statement] form runs 82 pages.” [WILGOREN, p. A1] For her part, in 1998 Barbara Boxer reported a “$1-million to $5-million blind trust.” [WILGOREN, p. A1] “Senator Dianne Feinstein remains one of the richest members of Congress,” noted the Sacramento Bee, “while Senator Barbara Boxer and her husband may be among the most active investors.” [GANNETT, SACRAMENTO, p. A6] In 1993 alone the Boxers traded in 102 different stocks.

In 1992, Feinstein was fined $190,000 for violating state campaign laws. “I think it is the biggest case involving misreporting or improperly reporting in the history of the agency,” FFPC (Fair Political Practices Commission) chairman Ben Davidian remarked. “By failing to report such a huge amount of money, Feinstein kept the voters from knowing the true sources and uses of her campaign funds. This was no simple act of forgetfulness.” [ELLIS, p. A3] For her part, Senator Boxer, judged to be one of the top ten Congressional “publicity hounds” by an East Coast magazine (George), [LACEY, p. A3] in 1996 asked
fellow Jew, **John Deutch**, then the head of the CIA, to investigate reports of a CIA role in the movement of cocaine into America, especially poisoning African-American communities. [KNIGHT RIDDER, SACRAMENTO, p. A3] Curiously, **Boxer** is – and has always remained – completely silent on the bigger issue of Israeli, “Russian” mafia, and Orthodox Jewish involvement in exactly the same thing. [See earlier details]

**Boxer**, in a crowded Jewish field, even defeated a Jewish Republican opponent for her Congressional seat. The *MetroWest Jewish News* guessed that her next Republican challenger would also be Jewish, the mayor of San Diego, **Susan Golding** [KLEIN, D, p. 5] whose husband (also Jewish) went to prison for drug money laundering. [See earlier details] “Presently [1998],” notes **George Goodwin**, “a senator from Connecticut is an Orthodox Jew. Both of Wisconsin’s and California’s senators are Jews.” [GOODMAN, p. 50]

In 1999, among those – Jews and non-Jews – presented Israel’s Friend of Zion Award was **Sam Gejdenson**, a House of Representatives Congressman from Connecticut. (In 2001, outgoing president **Bill Clinton** pardoned Gejdenson’s brother-in-law, **Stuart Harris Cohn**, guilty in 1979 of a commodity trading violation. “Cohn, a lifelong Democrat, said he asked family members, included Gejdenson, to writes letters on his behalf.”) [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 1-23-01] “Though seldom discussed in public,” notes the *Jewish Week*, “the Jewish delegation on Capitol Hill [i.e., Jewish Congressmen] is one of the nation’s most important Jewish institutions. Jewish lawmakers, working through an informal network of relationships, do most of the hard, behind-the-scenes work that wins aid to Israel, secures visas for Jewish refugees, ensures church-state separation, UJA tax deductibility, and a host of other crucial needs.” [GOLDBERG, Bagels, p. 13]

The predominance of high-level appointed Jewish government officials in American government, said Israeli journalist **Bar-Yosef** in his 1994 article in Israel, “are joined by a long list of senior Jewish officials in the [Clinton] State Department, headed by the Middle East Peace Team, **Dennis Ross**, and followed by many deputy secretaries and even more minor senior secretaries’ chief of staff.” [BAR-YOSEF, p. 108-109] Ross has been a mainstay in Washington government, also in the State Department under presidents **Carter, Reagan**, and **Bush**. He was even an adviser to Republican Bush’s 1992 presidential campaign.

“[My family] opened the first pharmacies in Tel Aviv,” **Rehm Emmanual**, White House Special Projects Director, told his Israeli interviewer, “… My uncle … was killed in Israel’s War of Independence. My father was then a member of Etzel (IRGUN) commanded by Begin. [IRGUN was a terrorist unit fighting British rule in Palestine] … My first visit to Israel was three days after the Six Day War. My father said that we had to go to Israel …” [BAR-YOSEF, p. 108-109]

Incredibly, **Emmanual**, whose office is next door to the White House Oval Office, during the 1991 Persian Gulf War “volunteered for one month service in the Israeli army through the ‘Overseas Volunteer Unit.'” (A 1992 *Baltimore Jewish Times* article even identified **Emmanuel** as an “Israeli.” Dual citizenship? [LIFTON, p. 52])
In 2002, stirring old ethnic politics, Emanuel decided to run to run for Congress from Chicago. Emmanuel, whose fundraising till of $1.5 million doubled that of his challenger, Polish-American Nancy Kaszak, was once “an accomplished fund-raiser for [Chicago] mayor Richard Daley before joining Clinton’s campaign in a similar role ... He returned to Chicago in 1998, where he made millions as an investment banker.” [BUCHANAN, A., 2-26-02] Emanuel’s canidacy was assailed by the president of the Polish American Congress, Edward Moskal, who called him a “millionaire carpetbagger” with too strong an allegiance to Israel. “While the country’s certain elements, to which he gave his allegiance,” said Moskal, “defiles the Polish homeland and continues to hurl insults at the Polish people.” For such true statements Moskal was decried as a bigot by local media and “Mr. Emmanuel’s campaign trotted out a rainbow of religious leaders to attack what they called the infusion of bigotry and hatred into the race.” Emanuel bent Moskal’s complaints into the usual charge of anti-Semitism. “[Moskal’s] weren’t criticisms of Rahm Emanuel as an individual,” Emanuel declared, “Those statements, the meaning behind those statements, were criticisms of me as a Jewish American.” [WILGOREN, J., 3-6-02]

Meanwhile, while Jews can go overseas, join the Israeli army, come back, and head a section in the White House, in 1995 Vice President Al Gore fired his speech-maker, 62-year old Richard Marius for having written a book review three years earlier in Harvard Magazine. Marius’ offense was to write that

“Many Israelis, the Holocaust fresh in their memory, believe that horror gives them the right to inflict horror on others. Winternitz’s account of the brutality of Shin Bet, the Israeli secret police, is eerily similar to the stories of the Gestapo, the Geheimstaatpolitzei in Nazi-occupied territory in World War II.” [DORF, INTERNET]

The book, published by the Atlantic Monthly Press and written by Helen Winternitz, included testimony like this:

“The [Israeli] interrogators [of Palestinian detainees] at Dahiriya were notorious for their painful methods of extracting information and confessions, including beating, humiliations, freezing showers and confinements in coffin-like boxes … There were by now almost nine thousand Palestinians in Israeli prisons or detention camps. The vast majority were not common criminals … The general section was reported to be bad, and the interrogation section a black hole that was the Shin Bet’s province, off-limits even to the army officer in charge of the prison. According to the common wisdom, only a few prisoners stood up to the Shin Bet and refused to cooperate … Neta Goldman, an Israeli lawyer and member of the Association for Civil Rights, visited Dahiriya with a group of colleagues. She was shocked by what she saw when she looked into a cell. ‘When they opened the door of the cell, it was like a deep, dark hole,’ she said. ‘It was so stinky we could hardly breathe. The smell was horrible.’ Fourteen prisoners were confined in the cell, which she estimated was not more than fifteen square yards of space lighted by a single light bulb…” [WINTERNITZ]
Gore was reportedly alerted to the old Marius review of this by Martin Peretz, owner of the New Republic who “also writes for the Vice-President and is a staunch supporter of Israel.” [DORF, JEWISH TELAG] (In earlier years, Peetz was a far-left, anti-establishment radical. He “helped bankroll SDS, Ram-parts, and other radical causes.” [ROTHMAN,/LIICHTER, 1982, p. 106] Peretz had fired New Republic editor Mike Kelly in 1997 “for what, Kelly says, was his harsh criticism of Clinton and Gore.” [KURTZ, H., 8-20, 2000, p. A12] (Ironically, Marius had earlier written an important 1993 Vice-Presidential speech for the occasion of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. Marius’s firing recalls the one in 1977, when President Jimmy Carter fired his Ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young, a Black man, for meeting with representatives of the Palestinian Liberation Organization; information on this meeting is believed to have been provided by Israeli surveillance.)

Marius died in 1999. As James Wall, former Illinois State chairman for the Jimmy Carter presidential campaigns, observes:


Another recent case of similar Jewish-inspired censorship was that of Salam Al-Marayati, head of the Los Angeles-based Muslim Public Affairs Council. In 1999 Democratic Congressman Richard Gephardt, the House Minority Leader, nominated Al-Marayati to serve on a newly created National Commission on Terrorism (an advisory group to Congress). A week later Gephardt withdrew the nomination. Why? “The Al-Marayati affair,” noted the Los Angeles Times, “marked the third campaign against American Arab or Muslim appointments this year by the Zionist Organization of America and other Jewish groups. The incidents have highlighted community concerns that American Arabs and Muslims are targets of character assassination campaigns aimed at excluding them from U.S. policy-making positions.” [WATANABE, p. 1]

Co-complainants to Al-Marayati’s nomination included also the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League, and the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations. Jewish professor Norman Birnbaum noted that “a distinguished Congressman has succumbed to ideological blackmail … [Do] Americans of Arab descent have the rights of other citizens or are [they] to be treated as guilty unless proved innocent, with the Israel lobby as prosecutor, judge and jury?” [BIRNBAUM, p. M5]

Jewish groups argued that Al-Marayati, in his published writings, condoned Muslim terrorism. In an editorial, the Atlanta Journal and Constitution expressed outrage at the successful Jewish efforts to oust Al-Marayati and the disingenuous manner they did it:

“To bolster its case, the Jewish group [the American Jewish Committee] compiled five statements by Al-Marayati and four other statements attributed to members of his organization. Those statements – the worst
the Committee could find going back 10 years – do not come close to justifying Al-Marayati’s removal. For example, here’s the first statement cited by the Committee:

’Most Islamic movements have been branded as terrorists as a result of the rising extremism from a handful of militants.’ Al-Marayati wrote in 1996, ‘American freedom fighters hundreds of years ago were also regarded as terrorists by the British.’ And that’s as inflammatory as he gets.” [AT J & C]

The Washington Post, in an editorial, noted that “Americans should not ignore the Muslim community in discussing terrorism. Many Arabs feel their community bears the brunt of aspects of American terrorism policy. It is important for American counter-terrorism measures not to be seen reflexively by Muslims as illegitimate. People like Mr. Al-Marayati should be at the table.” [WASHINGTON POST, 7-18-99]

The Los Angeles Times noted that “There’s nothing unusual about politicians caving in to organized pressures. But in this case the pressure was unwarranted and Gephardt should have found the courage to resist it. Those who know Al-Marayati know that he is not an apologist for Arab terrorism or a public defender of radical causes.” [LA TIMES, A Loss, p. B4] Others publicly testifying in Al-Marayati’s behalf were James Hilvert, the Executive Director of the National Conference for Community in Justice in Los Angeles, Joe R. Hicks, Executive Director of the Human Relations Commission in Los Angeles, Rabbi Emeritus Leonard Beerman of Leo Baeck Temple, and prominent Jewish Democratic fundraiser Stanley Sheinbaum. Even the editor of the Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles, Gene Lichtenstein, joined in the fray, accusing the Zionist Organization of being a “Jewish Thought Police.” [TUGEND, Liberal, p. 5]

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch noted in an editorial that Congressman Gephardt “appeared to be caving in to the vociferous criticism from Jewish groups … [He] responded as would almost any politician hoping for a future. He found an escape hatch.” [i.e., attributing the nomination withdrawal to a “security clearance” problem.] Al-Marayati (also a member of the Los Angeles Human Relations Commission) responded to the attacks upon him, saying, “There are threats to our democracy, and one of these threats is the exclusion and discrimination that was exposed to us by these developments.” [GOODSTEIN, p. A5] Elsewhere, he noted “that you must toe the line of unconditional, blind support for Israel to be even considered to give advice to Congress.” [MURPHY, p. 6]

Even before the withdrawal of Al-Marayati’s nomination, noted the New York Times, “seven members of Congress sent a letter to Director Louis E. Freed of the FBI last week requesting his ‘personal involvement’ in conducting a background check on Mr. Al-Marayati.” [GOODSTEIN, L., p. A5] (In 2001, Raeed Tayeh, a Muslim staff member for Georgia Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney, was forced to resign after writing a letter to the editor of The Hill, a Washington DC paper. Tayeh accused some Jewish senators of having dual loyalties (between Israel and America) and was bold enough to mention that he worked for Senator McKinney. [DOADIO, R., 12-7-01].
While Muslim Americans are subjected to a background shakedown of disturbing proportions (and then even before the initiation of a check, dumped), in May 1997 the Washington Post ran a front page story reporting that “the FBI has opened an investigation to determine whether a senior U.S. government official has been passing highly sensitive information to the Israeli government.” [BOUSTANY, p. 1] The four month-old investigation originated because of a conversation intercepted by the National Security Agency, between a Washington-based Israeli intelligence officer and a superior in Tel Aviv. Code named by the Israelis as “Mega,” the Post noted that the intercepted conversation led U.S. government officials “to believe that Mega may be someone in the U.S. government who has provided information to Israelis in the past.” [BOUSTANY, p. 1]

Israel’s Ambassador to the United States, Eliahu Ben-Elissor, complained that “apparently there is someone [who leaked the story to the press] who not only wants to besmirch the name of Israel, but also perhaps to cause damage to the relations between Israel and America.” [GELLMAN, B, p. A20] Gerald Steinberg, a foreign policies professor at Bar Elan University in Israel, noted the tension at the time between President Clinton and Israeli prime minister Benyamin Netanyahu over Israeli reluctance to concessions in the Clinton-brokered Arab-Israeli peace process. “When American-Israeli relations already seem tense,” noted Steinberg, “over a whole series of other issues, this is a killer issue.” [BOUSTANY, p. 1]

The Metro West Jewish News noted that “because the Mega story appeared the same day the administration’s top peace process diplomat, Dennis Ross, was meeting with Benjamin Netanyahu in Jerusalem, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the leak was intended to transmit a message to the [Israeli] prime minister: Never mind the pro-Israel/reluctant-to-take-on-the-Jews Clinton White House—we can still get you.” [METRO-JEWISH NEWS, 5-15-97, p. 4] The Baltimore Jewish News complained that the Washington Post printed, with the “Mega” story, a side article about Israeli Ambassador Ben-Elissar, who spent ten years working for Israel’s CIA (the Mossad). [BESSER, J, SPYING, p. 34] Malcolm Hoenlein, executive vice chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations told reporters that he was confident the Mega story “will blow over.” [MANN, C, p. 1] “There’s something almost sinister about the way this was reported,” suggested Abraham Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League, “with so little real information. And there’s something disturbing about the link the Post made to the Pollard case.” [BESSER, J, Spy Charges, p. 1]

The “Mega” story was reported by no other major American newspaper other than the Washington Post. And it suddenly evaporated from the Post pages with no further exploration, or explanation, of the story.

British journalist Gordon Thomas, author of a 1999 volume on the Mossad (based on over 100 hours of interviews with Mossad officials and agents), observed that Mega “may be more than one person. What’s incredible is not so much that they have an American mole at the highest level of the United States
government, but how this small [Israeli] intelligence community of about 1,200 people is able to mobilize *sayanim* [American Jewish agents for the Mossad], and control the American media and the publishing worlds, and get people like Barbara Streisand to spout ‘Israel-first, America-second’ propaganda to the president of the United States over the dinner table at the White House.” [HOWE, R., 6-99, p. 47]

Jewish spies for Israel in the White House is an old, albeit hidden, theme. In 1988, for instance, there was suggestion in some newspapers that a complicated spy-prisoner deal was being worked out with Israel which would “involve the U.S. halting further investigations in the Jonathan Pollard case.” “Pollard,” note Jewish authors Ian Black and Benny Morris, “was already serving a life sentence, but Israeli officials were apparently worried that further inquiries might unearth more spies in the heart of the United States administration.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 443] “Many in the United States intelligence community,” says Seymour Hersh, “… were convinced that [Pollard] had one and perhaps many more accomplices inside the [U.S.] government – men or women who were supplying Israel with the identification of highly classified documents that Pollard could then be assigned to retrieve.” [HERSH, S., p. 307] Interestingly, by 1996, “both the Israeli ambassador to the U.S. and the Israeli ambassador to Canada were former Mossad officers.” [OSTROVSKY, 1997, p. 37] (When George Bush assumed the presidency in 2001, Jewish Congressman Anthony Weiner “immediately beseeched” the new president “on his first workday as president” to “grant Pollard clemency.”) [JORDAN, M., 1-26-01]

In May 2000, a Washington DC paper, *Insight on the News*, after interviewing over two dozen government officials about the problem, described the results of its year long investigation into Israeli spying in the American government:

“The FBI is probing an explosive foreign espionage operation that could dwarf the other spy scandals plaguing the U.S. government. Insight has learned that FBI counterintelligence is tracing a daring operation to spy on high-level U.S. officials by hacking into supposedly secure telephone networks. The espionage was facilitated, federal officials say, by lax telephone-security procedures at the White House, State Department and other high-level government offices and by Justice Department unwillingness to seek an indictment against a suspect. The espionage operation may have serious ramifications because the FBI has identified Israel as the culprit.” [WALLER/RODRIGUEZ, 2000]

As always, a “senior government official” remarked that “It is a politically sensitive matter. I can’t comment on it beyond telling you that anything involving Israel on this particular matter is off-limits. It’s that hot.” “When it has anything to do with Israel,” said a former U.S. intelligence officer, “it’s something you just never want to poke your nose into.” “What price should Israel pay for this?” David Major, former director of counterintelligence programs as the National Security Council said to the paper, “My predictions are that there will be
no impact whatsoever. Do we put our heads in the sand or do we take it as a wake-up call?” [WALLER/RODRIGUEZ, 2000]

In December 2001, a series of Fox News TV programs noted the omnipresence of Israeli “ears” and Jewish power in shielding them from scrutiny:

“Most directory assistance calls, and virtually all call records and billing in the U.S. are done for the phone companies by Amdocs Ltd., an Israeli-based private telecommunications company. Amdocs has contracts with the 25 biggest phone companies in America, and more worldwide. The White House and other secure government phone lines are protected, but it is virtually impossible to make a call on normal phones without generating an Amdocs record of it. In recent years, the FBI and other government agencies have investigated Amdocs more than once. The firm has repeatedly and adamantly denied any security breaches or wrongdoing. But sources tell Fox News that in 1999, the super secret national security agency, headquartered in northern Maryland, issued what’s called a Top Secret sensitive compartmentalized information report, TS/SCI, warning that records of calls in the United States were getting into foreign hands – in Israel, in particular.” [CAMERON, C., pt. 2, 12-14-01]

A second Fox News report notes:

“An Israeli-based company called Amdocs Ltd. … generates the computerized records and billing data for nearly every phone call made in America … [A second Israeli company, Comverse Infosys] provides wiretapping for law enforcement … Adding to the suspicions is the fact that in Israel, Converse works closely with the Israeli government, and under special programs, gets reimbursed up to 50 percent of its research and development costs by the Israeli Ministry of Industry and Trade. But investigators within the DEA, INS, and FBI have all told Fox News that to pursue or even suggest Israeli spying through Converse is considered career suicide.” [CAMERON, C., pt. 3, 12-14-01]

Cameron’s reports about Israeli spying amounted to four in total. He was the first representative of a news organization to also report that scores of Israeli nationals had been rounded up after the September 11 terrorist attack.

In fact, after the 2001 attack on the World Trade Center, a vast swirl of disturbing clues about Israeli spying in America began to appear – however delicately – in small sections of the mass media. (Most media sources – overwhelmingly Jewish in control – censored or ignored the stories. The Fox News articles cited above, for example, were withdrawn, with no explanation, from the company’s web site within a week. Fox is owned by non-Jewish, but ardently pro-Israel, Rupert Murdoch). The well-known French magazine Le Monde, the French Online Intelligence Letter, and antiwar.com were among the very, very few in the vanguard of inquiry about Israeli spying in America. However guarded about the implications of the widening Israeli spy story, the Associated Press noted that
“Authorities have arrested and deported since early last year dozens of young Israelis who represented themselves as art students in efforts to gain access to restricted buildings and homes, U.S. officials said. The Israelis tried to get inside sensitive federal office buildings and the homes of government employees, officials said. A draft report from the Drug Enforcement Administration – which first characterized the activities as suspicious – said the youths’ actions ‘may well be an organized intelligence-gathering activity ... The arrests, made in an unspecified number of major U.S. cities from California to Florida, came amid public warnings from U.S. intelligence agencies about suspicious behavior by people posing as Israeli art students and ‘attempting to bypass facility security and enter federal buildings ... A Justice Department official, who also asked not to be identified, and investigators have been aware of some ‘alleged linkage’ between the students and alleged espionage activities in the United States since early 2001, and said authorities have made arrests in Dallas, Chicago, San Diego and in South Florida.” [BRIDIS, T., 3-6-02, LOS ANGELES TIMES]

These “art students” supposedly had links to the Universal Art Inc. at 10873 NW 52nd St in Sunrise, Florida. Soon after their busts the Sun-Sentinal noted that “there was no sign of a company called Universal Art Inc ... No one answered the door, and several occupants had not heard of the company. The company’s officers, Yitzchak Shish and Chava Sagi, are not listed. The were not among those deported ...” [RAIMONDO, J., 3-8-2002]

Le Monde outlined the entire Israel spy story as it then appeared, connecting the Israeli phone companies and the vast spy network to suggest that the Israelis obviously knew of the imminent attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon but did not warn the U.S. government. (This ruthless Machiavellian attitude of course would guarantee a greater American receptivity to Israeli views and needs if America suffered a major terrorist blow). Le Monde, citing Online Intelligence Letter evidence, estimates that about 120 Israeli spies were rounded up in America, echoing on a much larger scale the results of an earlier “secret” investigation “by division 5 of the FBI regarding Israeli phone-tapping targeting the White House, the State Department and the National Security Council.” Le Monde contacted Fox News three times asking for a “tape of the broadcast” by Carl Cameron but “it was never done. On February 26, Fox told our correspondent in New York that sending it posed ‘a problem,’ without being specific.” [CYPEL, S., 3-5-02] [online at: http://www.antiwar.com/rep/lemonde1.html]

Le Monde’s own investigation further revealed that

“six of the intercepted ‘students’ had a cellular phone bought by an Israeli ex-vice-consul in the United States ... Five at least were intercepted in Hollywood [Florida], and two in Fort Lauderdale. Hollywood is a town of 25,000 inhabitants north of Miami, close to Fort Lauderdale. At least 10 of the 19 terrorists of 9/11 were residing in Florida ... Four of the five members of the group that diverted American Airlines flight number 11 ... resided all at various times in Hollywood Florida ... This con-
vergence is, inter alia, the origin of the American conviction that one of the tasks of the Israeli ‘students’ would have been to track the Al-Qaida terrorists on their territory, without informing the federal authorities of the existence of the plot.” [CYPEL, S., 3-5-02]

Citing a classified U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) report they had somehow acquired, the Online Intelligence web site names some of the captured Israeli spies: Peer Segalovitz (“military registration number 5087989”), Aran Ofek (“son of a renowned two-star general in the Israeli army”), Michael Calmanovic (“headed up the team in Irving, Texas), Hanan Serfaty (headed the Israeli team in Florida), Legum Yochai (headed the Miami) operation. Spies intercepted a year ago included Yaron Ohana, Ronen Kalfon, Zeev Cohen and Naor Topaz. “The network,” wrote Online Intelligence, “targeted some of the most sensitive sites in the U.S., such as Tanker Air Force Base near Oklahoma City.” [RAIMONDO, J., 3-8-02] [http://www.anti-war.com/justin/justincol.html]

As Justin Raimondo notes, citing Online Intelligence material:

“It seems these ‘art students’ ‘cultivated contacts with Israeli information technology companies based in the US and serving as regular suppliers to various U.S. federal agencies, such as Amdocs and others. The Fox News is cited, by Online Intelligence and Le Monde, and the former even provides a convenient map of the Texas chapter of the ‘art students’ underground apparatus, complete with not only names, but arrival dates, corporate connections, when and where they were arrested, and their specific functions in the Israeli military-intelligence apparatus. How much more evidence do we need before the editorialists and the pundits start calling government officials on their lies – and Congress begins an investigation?” [RAIMONDO, J., 3-8-02]

Amidst the many resultant US and Israeli government denials and cover-up about this gigantic Israeli spy story, the Intelligence Online organization’s spokesman Guillaume Dasquie announced that

“It seems irresponsible for us to publish it, but if the denials go on, we could put the report on our Internet site and in so doing possibly blacken the names of the people most exposed ... The document we have [the DEA report] we details not only the identities of the members of this network, but also their activities in the Israeli army, and even their serial numbers in the intelligence services, their passport numbers and their validity, and their visas and their validity.” [RAIMONDO, J., 3-8-02]

Among those under suspicion as an Israeli spy in the heart of American government in earlier years was Howard Teicher, a (Jewish) National Security Council adviser. “Middle East experts in the State Department,” noted John Walcott of the Wall Street Journal, “the NSC staff and some Washington think tanks conducted a tireless whispering campaign against him, intimating that he was an Israeli agent.” “Teicher’s life resembled that of tens of thousands of other young American Jews,” says the Jerusalem Post with no sense of irony in the implications of that statement, “… [He] had a bar mitzva, went to Camp Ramah, spent a sum-
mer in Israel at age 17, learned Hebrew in high school and then in college worked in the fish pond at kibbutz Neveh Or [in Israel].” [RODAN, 1994, p. 18]

Then, in 2001, there is the mysterious three paragraph article from the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz about Robert Philip Hanssen, an American FBI agent turned Russian spy who represented “one of the worst cases of espionage in the history of the United States.” The Ha’aretz headline proclaimed Israeli Angle in U.S. Spy Case Causes Worry in Jerusalem, and then noted that “the recent confrontation between the United States and Russia over the serious espionage case involving FBI agent Robert Philip Hanssen has an Israel angle. This has been the subject of concern at the highest political and security echelons in Jerusalem in the past few days.” [BENN, A., 4-4-01] The article explains nothing else at all about the dimensions of this “Israeli angle,” nor has any other media source ever taken up the story.

**Fox News** addressed the subject of Israeli spies in America after the September 11 terrorist attacks:

“Since September 11, more than 60 Israelis have been arrested or detained, either under the new patriot anti-terrorist law, or for immigration violations. A handful of active Israeli military were among those detained, according to investigators, who say some of the detainees also failed polygraph questions when asked about alleged surveillance activities against and in the United States. There is no indication that the Israelis were involved in the 9/11 attacks, but investigators suspect that the Israelis may have gathered intelligence about the attacks in advance, and not shared it. A highly placed investigator said there are ‘tie-ins’ … Numerous classified documents obtained by Fox News indicate that even prior to September 11, as many as 140 other Israelis had been detained or arrested in a secretive and sprawling investigation into suspected espionage by Israelis in the United States.” [CAMERON, C., pt. 1, 12-14-01]

What about the aforementioned CIA head John Deutch (and perhaps others in his circle) as a very strong candidate for the Jewish-Israeli “Mega” club? In 2000, a troubling story about him began to hit the newsstands, revolving around an incident that happened as he was leaving his CIA post in 1996. **Deutch**, who became Director of the CIA after leaving his position as Deputy Secretary of Defense, was caught with 1,700 pages of CIA documents – many secret, and classified – on his home computer, one that had also been a visitor to “high-risk” Internet pornography sites. Members in Congress were not informed of Deutch’s security lapses until 1998 and not until the year 2000 did all this come under public scrutiny. And he was afforded top-level Pentagon security clearance until late 1999.

**Deutch** was known to be a problem earlier in his career when it came to secret information. “According to a knowledgeable official who asked not be identified,” noted the (New Jersey) Record, “while Deutch was serving as a senior Defense Department official [the number two in command] in the early 1990s, he failed a polygraph test about his handling of classified materials. The official said Pentagon security officers were concerned because Deutch took highly
classified material home with him, but his security clearances were not revoked or downgraded.” [THE RECORD, 2-5-2000, p. A6]

An investigation of Deutch’s information cache was undertaken by the CIA Inspector General. The IG report, noted the New York Times, “disclosed that just three days after Mr. Deutch learned that his computer practices were under review, he deleted more than 1,000 classified files from his personal computers. The report also says that Mr. Deutch declined to be interviewed by the CIA’s security officials.” [RISEN, J., 2-12-2000] Deutch had been taking secret CIA information home for years. As the Times notes, “according to the IG report, “Mr. Deutch used unclassified Macintosh computers for classified work through his tenure as director. He chose not to conduct sensitive work on the classified computer system at the CIA because he said he was afraid the other CIA officials would see what he was writing, according to the report.” [RISEN, J., 2-12-2000]

“This is strange behavior, very suspicious,” remarked the chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Richard Shelby, about Deutch’s actions, “It’s unprecedented, to my knowledge.” [THE RECORD, 2-5-2000]

The CIA investigators, noted a European paper, “became so frustrated at the limits imposed on them that they concluded senior [CIA] officials were protecting Mr. Deutch and wanted to wash their hands of the case.” [BRANSON, L., 2-2-2000, p. 12] “Mr. Deutch,” said the New York Times, “refused to be interviewed by the security staff and senior CIA officials allowed him to avoid being questioned.” [RISEN, J.] A number of media members began calling Deutch’s case a “cover-up.” The CIA didn’t report Deutch’s misdeeds to the Justice Department for over a year. The CIA’s Inspector General only did so in 1998 “after an agency employee complained to the Inspector General’s office that the inquiry had not been properly handled.” [RISEN, J., 2-12-2000] The Justice Department declined to prosecute the former Director of the CIA.

The Deutch revelation, remarked a Scottish paper, “is particularly embarrassing in the light of the high profile case of Los Alamos scientist Wen Ho Lee, who is being held in jail without bail. He is suspected of transferring secrets from the nuclear research base to the Chinese. The charges against him so far are for exactly what Mr. Deutch did: transferring files from work to his home computer.” [BRANSON, L., 2-2-2000, p. 12] Like Deutch, there was no hard evidence that Lee passed along information to a foreign government, but Lee languished in solitary confinement 23 hours a day as a suspected spy (imprisoned for taken classified work home), while Deutch merely had his clearances to enter CIA and Pentagon databases taken away.

It was even discovered that Deutch had helped a CIA official, Nora Slatkin, get a job as a vice-president at CITIBANK while she was working on the investigation of his breach of security case. [RISEN, J., 2-12-2000, p. A10] In recent years Deutch has been a professor at MIT and an adviser to weapons companies. He was paid over $240,000, for example, in 1998-99 as a non-employee director at Raytheon and member of that company’s board of governors. [MCLAUGHLIN, T., 3-30-2000, p. 25] As Bill Clinton left the White House in
2001, Clinton granted Deutch a full pardon, surprising the CIA even as it continued its investigation.

Another curious – and controversial – pardon made by Clinton as he left the White House was that of Marc Rich, a Jewish American citizen, prominent philanthropist to Israel, and “fugitive commodities trader” who fled America in the 1980s. As MSNBC (Microsoft/NBC online news) noted: “The U.S. government is aware that Rich has acted as an intermediary in negotiating the return of captured Israeli soldiers and Jewish dissidents. Several Israeli officials wrote Clinton in support of his pardon.” Clinton admitted publicly that Israel had influenced him “profoundly” in the issuance of a pardon. (Rich has given between $70-80 million to Israeli charities, including $5 million to Birthright Israel, the program that seeks to strengthen Zionist ties among Jewish Americans to the Jewish state. The former head of Israel’s Mossad spy agency, Avner Azulay, heads Rich’s charitable foundation in the Jewish state). [MSNBC, 2-15-01] Rich’s ex-wife Denise has also contributed over $1 million to the Democratic Party. [MSNBC, 2-2-2001] As the Denver Post noted about the Rich controversy:

“President Clinton granted his controversial pardon to fugitive financier Marc Rich in part because Israel’s prime minister repeatedly pressed him to do so as a reward for Rich’s clandestine services to Israeli intelligence … On its face, Israeli support for Rich might seem curious, since Rich did extensive business with Iran and Iraq, two of Israel’s mortal enemies, in apparent violation of U.S. law. But it turns out that Rich used his business contacts in the Arab world to pass intelligence to Israel’s foreign intelligence service, the Mossad, and to top Israeli officials.”


“The Marc Rich story,” laments Jewish author Walter Reich, “disproves the adage that all politics is local. Here, the machinations of Jewish politics have gone national with a vengeance. The cast of characters in this squalid miniseries is – let’s face it – overwhelmingly Jewish.” [REICH, W., 2-25-01, part M, p. 5] (Reich also alludes to the many, many Jewish officials (see http://jewishtribalreview.org/rich.htm) – discussed in this work elsewhere – who chose corruption and disgrace in lobbying Clinton for a pardon of Rich, the international fugitive).

(Clinton pardoned 140 criminals. In a review of the 32 who had their sentences commuted, at least 7 were Jewish (see http://jewishtribalreview.org/commut.htm) – 22% of the 32 – overrepresented here by nearly 1,000 per cent per their American population presence, and an even higher percentage per their representation in American prisons.)

Sure enough too, in 2000, concurrently with Deutch’s escapades, the aforementioned Martin Indyk, Ambassador to Israel, active Zionist, and a former National Security Advisor, had his security clearance suspended by the State Department for “suspected violations” of security norms, ostensibly for, “over a long period of time,” “sloppy handling of classified information.” The Washington Post also noted that
“Three sources familiar with the investigation said that one part of the inquiry [into Indyk] also involves questions about Indyk’s former deputy Ronald Neumann [also Jewish] and his possible involvement in the alleged composition of a classified memo on an unclassified laptop while traveling in the Middle East.” [MUFSON, S., 9-23-2000]

And what are we to make of the following newswire item in 1998? Focusing on the fact that the Israeli premiere’s public Internet web site had been sabotaged by a computer hacker with pornography, the article also noted that only weeks earlier

“the FBI launched a hunt for the Israeli cyber-intruder who managed to steal into some of the Pentagon’s most closely guarded secrets.” [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 3-11-98]

As Jewish author Joseph Aaron, in an extraordinarily unusual public admission, observed in 2000, focusing on the case of Jewish CIA employee Adam Ciralsky:

“Earlier this month, ‘60 Minutes’ featured the case of Adam Ciralsky, an observant Jew fired by the CIA. During the segment, a CIA official said the agency believes the Israeli government has a program that recruits American Jews to spy on the United States … Let’s face it. If there is suspicion about Jews working at the CIA, it’s understandable. If Jews, especially religious Jews, are feared to be working for Israel, we deserve it. For we have done so much to make the suspicions seem justified.” [AARON, J., 2-26-2000, p. 21]

(In 2001, a Jewish reserve officer, Shawn Pine, charged the U. S. Army (as did Ciralsky of the CIA) with anti-Semitism. Why? Raised in America, he emigrated to Israel in the 1970s, returned to the U.S., joined the American army, and in 1995 returned to study in a Jerusalem university, working part-time again in the Israel Defense Forces. Stripped of his high-level army security clearance and his command of an intelligence unit in 2001, Pine charged that anti-Semitism was ‘endemic’ to the U.S. Army.) [SAMBER, S., 10-29-01]

Meanwhile, international Zionist intrigue operates with impunity. In July 1999, for example, the New York Times noted the extraordinary privileges provided to an Israeli spy in Switzerland. The unidentified man was caught by Swiss police during a wiretapping mission. “In an unheard of concession,” said the Times, “Swiss justice officials allowed him to use an assumed name for trial on grounds that disclosing his real one would endanger his life.” The spy, whose real name his lawyers didn’t even know, was convicted on three counts of lawbreaking, but was released with a “one-year suspended sentence.” “There was speculation,” added the Times, “that the Swiss and Israeli authorities had cut a deal for a light sentence to avoid further diplomatic strains.” (Switzerland has been involved in negotiations with Jewish Holocaust survivors over billions of dollars of Jewish World War II-era claims). [OLSON, E., 2000, p. A6]

1999’s White House coddling of the Jewish lobbying empire and international Zionist spy networks included the Islamic nation of Iran. The (Jewish) Forward noted that “At last weekends G-7 talks in Germany, President Clinton
asked the Japanese government to refrain from approving their third loan installment of $820 million to Iran until the 13 [Jewish] prisoners are freed.” [SPENCE] These 13 Iranian Jews, arrested and accused by Iran of spying for Israel (7 non-Jews arrested in the alleged ring are rarely mentioned in the Western press), had not even been yet been brought to trial to prove their guilt or innocence, yet the American president was an active lobbyist for Jewish/Israeli interests to ignore Iranian sovereignty and demand, pre-trial, all the suspects’ categorical freedom. Jewish American National Security Adviser Sandy Berger wrote a formal letter to the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations assuring them that the President planned to “seek international assistance” in freeing the 13. The Jerusalem Post noted the dimensions of international Jewish activism about the issue, noting that an Israeli “Foreign Ministry spokeswoman said Israel had approached practically every country with which it had diplomatic relations and asked help for seeking the release of the Iranian Jews.” [KUTTLER, 6-18-99]

Iranian officials even revealed that some of the accused Jewish prisoners had confessed that they spied for Israel. Nonetheless, U.S. Secretary or State Madeline Albright announced that “We have made this very clear that this is an unacceptable trial. There is absolutely no reason for them to brought up on espionage charges.” A prominent Iranian religious leader, Mohammed Emami Kashani, responded to Albright, saying, “You are a political leader, not a judicial official … There are international laws. Relations between the countries are based on laws … Woman, you who are Secretary of State, on what logic have you based your remarks? On what basis?” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 10-22-99]

Years earlier, as context for understanding such an international Jewish pressure campaign, we may look to Morocco. In 1960 an Israeli-sponsored “underground military cell” (as two Jewish scholars describe it), consisting of about 600 people, was exposed among Jews in that Arab land. Many were arrested. Israel then “foreswore secret diplomacy,” notes Ian Black and Benny Morris, “and launched a widespread public campaign on behalf of Moroccan Jewry. U.S. President John Kennedy sent a personal message to King Muhammad; a group of American Congressmen threatened to table a bill to stop U.S. aid to Morocco unless the “persecution” stopped. French President Charles de Gaulle was also mobilized to exert pressure on [Morocco’s capital] Rabat.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 179] The imprisoned Jews were eventually released. The head of Israel’s Mossad, Isser Harel, wrote at the time that “there is no doubt that the [Moroccan] King’s and the interior minister’s latest steps are a result of our actions and our information campaign around the world.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 179]

In the context of this chapter, this book, and the issues they raise, what are we to make of the curiously timed January 1998 Clinton sex scandal? While Israel’s newspapers “warned darkly of a new wave of anti-Semitism as a result of a scandal that has been called ‘Monica-gate,’” [BESSER, ERIC, p. 22] the mainstream American mass media, of course, systematically neglected to even note the fact that the White House intern, Monica Lewinsky – who had sexual relations with the President – was Jewish. Of the 1,317 articles mentioning Monica
Lewinsky in the America’s major newspapers (as cited in *Newspaper Abstracts*) to March 10, 1998, one – in the context of Lewinsky’s lawyer’s comments about Israel – mentioned the word “Jew” or “Jewish.”

The Jewish press (i.e., those media outlets that expressly address concerns of the intra-Jewish community), of course, very much noted the fact of Lewinsky’s heritage and the Jewish complexion of the sex scandal. The *Jewish Week* reported that “Jewish leaders generally do not expect a backlash stemming from the fact that so many of the actors in the steamy melodrama are Jewish, including Lewinsky, [her lawyer] Ginsburg, and Walter Kaye, a retired New York insurance executive and a major donor to Jewish democratic causes who reportedly introduced the former intern to the First Family.” [BESSER, p. 22] Kaye “was a great friend of Debra Schiff, a receptionist in the White House's West Wing lobby.” [MORTON, A., 1999, p. 113] Karin Joyce Abramson was the Director of the White House Intern Program (Lewinsky started out as an intern there) and it was Evelyn Lieberman who saw Lewinsky as a growing problem in the White House and transferred her to a job in the Pentagon. [STARR, p. 104] Presidential assistant Sidney Blumenthal was also one of those accused of lying about the Lewinsky scandal. [HOROWITZ, D., 1999, p. 240]

“During Ms. Lewinsky’s first Oval Office encounter with Mr. Clinton,” notes the (Jewish) *Forward* in a review of her own book, “he asks what her name is. She replies, ‘Jewish.’” Lewinsky also compared her problems in the limelight of the Presidential sex scandal to Holocaust victims, Ann Frank, and Hannah Senesh, a Jewish heroine who parachuted into Nazi-held territory. [GITELL, S., 3-12-99, p. 1]

“As Monicagate has morphed from a sex scandal to a national fixation to a constitutional crisis,” noted the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, “Jews have been there at every major turn – whether as Clinton’s confidants, steadfast defenders, repairers of the breach, or other bit players.” [KURTZMAN, p. 3] Originally, Clinton “denied the affair, acting on the advice of his political adviser, Dick Morris, a Jew to whom Clinton has turned for guidance at some of the most trying moments of his political career. Morris, who took his own flogging in the media for a sex scandal with a prostitute, advised Clinton to acknowledge nothing, citing a poll that found the public would forgive him for adultery, but not perjury or obstruction of justice.” [KURTZMAN, p. 3] Jewish senator Joseph Lieberman, the only Orthodox Jew in Congress, was the first to attack Clinton in Congress for the scandal. (Lieberman had raised $2 million for Clinton’s election in 1992). [BESSER, J., 11-13-92, p. 34] Another, Robert Wexler, was Clinton’s “staunchest defender in Congress.” Other Jews on the House Judiciary Committee who “played a key role in trying to paint the proceedings as a partisan witch hunt,” included Howard Berman, Jerrold Nadler, Steve Rothman, and Charles Schumer, and Barney Frank. Even the prosecutor of the Clinton sex scandal investigation, Kenneth Starr, has a Jewish wife. [KLAIDMAN, D., 1998, p. 35]

The aforementioned Dick Morris, was billed on the cover of his own 1997 book about himself as “President Clinton’s chief strategist,” a careerist behind-the-scenes propagandist and chameleon who writes that “sometimes I vote
Democrat and sometimes Republican.” White House insider, he has voted throughout his life with the political conviction of a ping-pong ball – for Democratic presidential candidates Hubert Humphrey, George McGovern, and Jimmy Carter, then to Republicans Ronald Reagan and George Bush, and then back to Democrat Clinton. [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. 19] “I had no agenda,” he notes about deciding to work at Clinton’s side, “other than victory.” [MORRIS, R., 1997, p. 22] In 1996 an editor at Time magazine, Walter Isaacson (also Jewish) told Morris that he was going to be featured on the journal’s cover, with the heading “THE MAN INSIDE THE PRESIDENT’S MIND.” Time, says Morris, was also considering a “caricature of Clinton with a hinge in his head and an opening, with a cartoon on me standing in his brain – actually in his brain … [Isaacson called later and] told me that the final cover would show me sitting on Clinton’s shoulder, not in his head and that the heading would be THE MAN WHO HAS THE PRESIDENT’S EAR … While I was talking to Time and to the president, the prostitute whom I’d been seeing for a year was on the balcony outside my door.” [MORRIS, R., 1997, p. 322-323]

Early in Morris’s career, he was an adviser to Jewish senator Howard Metzenbaum, a victor in Ohio in 1976. “Metzenbaum,” says Morris, “had taken such extensive deductions on his tax returns that in 1969 he paid no taxes at all despite an income of $241,000. Ruthless and determined to buy the Senate seat with his personal fortune, he made quite a contrast to the honorable but reserved incumbent, the grandson of President William Howard Taft. Our basic campaign was that Taft was too nice to be a senator, that you needed to send a tough, mean guy to Washington to deal with the big oil companies and government bureaucrats.” [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. 45-46]

Morris wrote Clinton’s speech at the Democratic National Convention in 1996. [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. 330] “The President’s chief strategist” notes that his own six-member “media team” consisted of “Squier, Knapp, Schoen, Steinberg, and Freedman [and Penn]” – at least half of these are Jewish names. Of these, Tom Friedman was Morris’s “chief of staff.” “Team member” Doug Schoen was also a political consultant to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and “when Shimon Peres took office [after Rabin’s assassination],” notes Morris, “he kept Schoen’s services, without, I gather, understanding at first the pivotal role Schoen was playing in the Clinton presidency. [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. 332, 103, 256]

Here are some other Morris comments, a man who always had the ear of America’s President:

“Everything else I have written [before this book] was a speech, an ad, a memo, a tract – all text with a mission to convert, a goal to persuade.” [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. xiii]

“I did not let [the prostitute] eavesdrop on my conversations with the president on an extension phone. What I did, when I let my inflated ego get the better of me, was to put my phone to her ear for a moment or two so she could hear his voice. I had behaved in a similarly immature
way with my brother-in-law and my uncle. It was just a stupid thing to do.” [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. xvii]

“[Considering popular preacher Billy Graham as a speaker at the Democratic National Convention] I worried about how Jews and others would react.” [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. 325]

“[President Clinton] increasingly saw me not as a political medicine man but as an adviser who could develop programmatic ideas to express concretely his idea of where he wanted to lead America.” [MORRIS, D., 1997, p. 324]

The aforementioned Congressman Barney Frank, brother of White House Communications Director Ann Lewis, was likewise no surprise at Clinton’s side in the direction that the President “wanted to lead America.” Frank, elected from the tolerant blue-collar, largely Catholic Massachusetts town of Fall River, had survived his own sensational sex expose in 1989. Frank, noted Newsweek then, “came under fire for his relationship with a male prostitute. The case raises new questions about the private conduct of public officials.” Frank, “darling of the Democratic Party’s left wing,” met hooker Stephen L. Gobie by answering a gay newspaper “personal” ad which read “hot bottom plus large endowment equals a good time.” [WINNEKER, 1998] “His real difficulty,” observed Newsweek, “is explaining how he came to hire Gobie as a chauffeur and personal assistant, why he wrote supportive letters to Gobie’s parole officer, and how Gobie wound up using Frank’s home for commercial sex.” [MORGENTHAU, 1989, p. 14] Gobie was also a “convicted child pornographer and drug dealer.” Especially troubling too, noted Newsweek, was Frank’s long-term pattern of behavior: “Until recently, Frank was often seen in public with young hustlers described by more responsible gays as ‘Provincetown trash.’” [MORGENTHAU, 1989, p. 14] “Frank,” noted Washington’s Capitol Style magazine, “was confronting charges that he not only solicited a male prostitute, but knowingly permitted a brothel to be operated from his Capitol Hill apartment and improperly intervened with probation officers on behalf of a convicted felon. The allegations were so salacious that few politicians could have survived them.” [WINNEKER, 1998] Frank survived; confessing many of the charges against him, he was merely reprimanded by Congress and elected by Fall River voters to a sixth term.

While under public siege during the President’s own embarrassment, Clinton’s “most extensive confessional” was at a national prayer breakfast in which he “turned to the Yom Kippur liturgy. He opened up Gates of Repentance … and read a passage about the challenge of penitence and changing one’s ways … In December, just days before he was impeached, Clinton again turned to Israel, this time traveling to the Jewish state for a three-day visit. Some were baffled when he didn’t cut the trip short and fly home to fight for his political survival.” [KURTZMAN, p. 3]

Wall Street Journal reporter Tom King, in a biography of Jewish media mogul David Geffen, even “credits Geffen as the scriptwriter of Clinton’s ‘inappropriate sexual relations’ speech to the nation during the Lewinsky affair.” And
Geffen’s moral credentials for such work? “When [Yoko] Ono rang him shortly after [Beatle John] Lennon was shot, Geffen had to prise himself away from male prostitute in his bedroom to get to the hospital – a story he delighted in retelling over the years.” [BOYD, B., 3-4-2000] (On the other end of the political spectrum, Frank Luntz “helped write Newt Gingrich’s Contract with America speech” and Lisa Schiffen “wrote Vice President [Dan] Quayle’s famous ‘Murphy Brown family values’ speech.” Both of these people too are Jewish. [FRIEDMAN, M., June/Sept 1999, p. 110]

Tom King, in his biography of Geffen, also notes:

“Geffen eagerly answered the call when President Clinton asked him for feedback on his proposal to end the ban on homosexuals in the military … Geffen … put the art department at Geffen Records on the job of creating newspaper ads advocating the overturning of the ban … Geffen, whom had escaped military service in Vietnam by meekly admitting he was homosexual, could not understand why anyone would want to serve in the military.” [KING, T., 2000, p. 492-493]

(Clinton’s wife, Hillary, also embarked upon her own political career in 1999, looking to garner a few more Jewish votes in her run for the Senate from New York – her campaign spokesman was Howard Wolfson – by letting it be known that she had a Jewish “step-grandfather” named Max Rosenberg. For that matter, the 1988 Democratic presidential candidate, Michael Dukakis, had a Jewish wife, Kitty. Ms. Dukakis, appointed to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, writes that she had a “preoccupation with Israel. By 1979, I’d been to the Holy Land three times.” [DUKAKIS, K., 1990, p. 143] She eventually changed her mind about a planned trip to Cuba because “in a United Nations vote against Israel equating Zionism with racism, Cuba had cast its vote with the majority; I felt I could not in all good conscience go to a country that censured Israel.” [DUKAKIS, K., p. 158] One of current Vice-President Al Gore’s daughter’s also has a Jewish husband. Jewish New Age feminist Naomi Wolf was also brought into the 2000 Gore presidential campaign, earning $15,000 a month to advise on his image. Media jokes emphasized her efforts to remodel the presidential hopeful into an “Alpha Male,” emerging from Clinton’s shadow.) [ORIN, D., 7-6-2000, p. 21]

Born to a rich Jewish family in Beverly Hills, Monica Lewinsky and her lawyer Ginsburg have been to Israel “many times.” [GREENBERG, p. 23] Lewinsky’s mother, Marcia, has written a column for the Hollywood Reporter and, using the pseudonym Marcia Lewis, wrote a “saucy celebrity biography” about the private lives of male opera stars. Divorced from Monica’s father, at the time of her daughter’s scandal Marcia was engaged to R. Peter Strauss (also Jewish), a New York media executive who owns radio stations and newspapers in the upstate Hudson valley. [STONE, A, USA, 1-28-98, p. A6] His family owned Macy’s department store and his late wife was a member of the New York Times-owning Sulzberger family. While Monica landed her intern post with the help of Walter Kaye, before the scandal story broke Lewinsky was provided another job in public relations at Revlon, a company controlled by Jewish billionaire and chum of Michael Milk-
en, Ronald Perelman. [NEWSWEEK, ISIKOFF, p. 31-42] (In 1995 President Clinton and his wife spent a vacation at the Perelman ranch in Wyoming, the same hosts who had earlier held a fundraising party for the President at the Perelman’s Palm Beach home. [WECHSLER, p. 11])

While the mainstream American press completely ignored the Jewish dimensions of the scandal, the ethnic media that expressly served the Jewish community consistently highlighted not only the fact that Lewinsky was Jewish, but also the fortuitous timing of the sex expose, just when Clinton was preparing to forcibly intercede in the stalled and embittered Israeli-Palestinian peace process, in opposition to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s reneging on early agreements of land withdrawals from Palestinian areas.

The Jewish Forward (New York), the Jewish Week (New York), the Jerusalem Report (Israel), and the Jewish Chronicle (England) all immediately noted Lewinsky’s status in the world Jewish community as a “Queen Esther” (Queen Esther, in Biblical tradition, saved the Jewish people from destruction from their nemesis, Haman). (Both the Jewish Chronicle and the Jewish Week published photographs of a billboard campaign in Israel featuring an image of President Clinton and a caption saying, “We support you, friend.”)

A Jerusalem Report headline beamed “Monica Lewinsky: Bibi’s Queen Esther?” (Bibi was former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s nickname. In 1993 he faced his own sex scandal in the Jewish state.) [HIRSCHBERG, P., 4-22-93] Leonard Fein in the Forward noted that:

“Even if some observers from within our own community hadn’t compared Monica Lewinsky to Queen Esther, the idea is that just as the President was preparing to dump on Israel, she whispered sweet Zionist phrases in his ear, or maybe the idea is simply that by pushing him into scandal, she rendered him politically impotent – the Jewish threads of the story would have been intriguing. The sturdiest thread has been provided by Bill Ginsburg, Ms. Lewinsky’s lawyer who, in an interview with Israel’s Yediot Ahronot, allowed that neither he nor his client, devoted Jews, had any interest in bringing down a President who had been ‘so good to Israel.’ The reporter: Should Monica go to Israel and escape the pressures she’s under now? Ginsburg: Not while the proceedings are still under way. But if, when it’s all over, she wants to live in Israel, that might be a wonderful idea.” [FEIN, MONICA, p. 7]

The Jewish Chronicle noted:

“A nationally prominent Orthodox spokesman calls Monica Lewinsky … ‘a modern day Queen Esther,’ and he is only half-kidding. A Northeastern Chabad rabbi says, straight-faced, that Ms. Lewinsky has, as far as they are concerned, removed the White House as a deciding factor in Mideast Peace, at least for now. Because President Clinton’s personal involvement was the one thing keeping the moribund peace talks moving, hopes for a near-term breakthrough are now near zero. Hello [Israeli] land, goodbye peace. Last week was, according to many a pundit, supposed to be a watershed in the troubled tenure of Prime Minister
Binyamin Netanyahu. He came to Washington a wounded leader, expecting intense pressure from a determined Bill Clinton. Enter Ms. Lewinsky and ‘Zippergate,’ and the Middle East abruptly vanished from our screens. The pressure was off.” [J CHRON, p. 2]

A third editorial, this one in the Jewish Week, entitled, “Monica, a Modern Queen Esther?,” began:

“Did you know that Monica Lewinsky is an agent for Mossad, the Israeli equivalent of the CIA? That’s the charge in some of the Arab press, which asserts that the alleged affair between the former White House intern and President Clinton was a Zionist plot to distract attention from the Mideast and take the pressure off the Netanyahu government. ‘Why did it come at the end of Clinton’s meetings with Netanyahu and before his meetings with Arafat?’ wondered a columnist for the Palestinian daily, Al-Ayyam. And Sheikh Ahmad Yassin, the spiritual leader of Hamas who was released from an Israeli prison last year, reasoned that ‘the Zionist lobby and world Zionism creates disasters for anyone who may cause it problems.’ So much for any lessening of Arab paranoia about Jewish clout. On the other hand, some supporters of Netanyahu were referring to Lewinsky as a modern-day Queen Esther – a beautiful young Jewish woman who, through her sexual appeal to the nation’s leader, helped save her people. More than a bit far-fetched, of course, but the description was reflective of the feeling among some Israelis that the sex scandal involving Clinton has taken Netanyahu off the hot seat in terms of complying with U.S. requests from withdrawing from additional West Bank land. There was also speculation in Israel that Clinton may resign, elevating Al Gore to the presidency. Gore is considered even more supportive of Israel than Clinton.” [JEWISH WEEK, 1-30-98]

“Gore,” noted the Jerusalem Report, “engaged a reputation as one of Israel’s best supporters during his 14 years in the House and Senate.” He once told a Jewish gathering that included Israeli Prime Minister Benyamin Netanyahu that “the United States will never pressure Israel to do what it doesn’t want to do.” [BRODER, J., 2-19-98, p. 36] In 2000, Gore during his campaign for president, named an Orthodox Jew, Joseph Lieberman, former head of the Democratic Leadership Council, as his vice-presidential running mate. Lieberman has been a prominent lobbyist to move the U.S. embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem a move American foreign policy makers have resisted for the past half century. [KURTZMAN, D., 6-2-99, p. 3] Upon Lieberman’s selection, Rabbi Steven Dworken, Executive President of the Orthodox Council of America, declared that anti-Semitism “doesn’t show up in the polls, but it shows in the voting booth. It will force Americans to look themselves in the mirror and say, ‘I am not an anti-Semite,’ or to admit to themselves, ‘Yes, I am a bigot.’” [LATTIN, D., 8-8-2000, p. A13] Among those quickly lambasted as an anti-Semite was Wilbert Tatum, the publisher of New York City’s African-American newspaper, the Amsterdam News. Blunting noting the Jewish context of American politics, Tatum editorialized that “America is being sold to the highest bid-
der.” [PR NEWSWIRE, 8-16-2000] One news report also noted that “not only was his active Harvard pupil and friend of 35 years [Al Gore] for president, but the fiercely pro-Israel publisher [Martin Peretz, of the New Republic] got to watch his Jewish buddy of two decades, Lieberman, take the number two spot.” [KURTZ, H., 8-20-2000, p. A12]

The selection of Lieberman as an Orthodox Jew on the traditionally liberal Democratic ticket highlights the usual double standard of evaluation whenever, and wherever, Jews are concerned. What one wonders, would the many homosexual rights, women’s rights, and other organizations say if they had access to open public discourse about the world view of Orthodox Judaism? Lieberman’s conservative religious views in many ways parallel Christians Pat Robertson or Jerry Falwell. But as Jewish journalist Paul Greenberg, “Pulitzer-prize winning editorial page editor of the Arkansas Democrat Gazette,” observed:

“One suspects that, if Senator Lieberman were an equally committed Baptist or Mormon, many of those now, hailing his nomination would be murmuring darkly about the dangers of the Religious Right. It’ll be interesting to see if the ACLU objects to a fundamentalist on the ticket when he’s a Jewish one.” [GREENBERG, P., 8-9-2000, p. B10]

Jewish professor Deborah Lipstadt notes the Jewish response to Gore’s selection:

“The announcement of the Lieberman selection as Al Gore’s running mate unleashed torrents of joy. When the news first broke, American Jews breathlessly called one another to share the news … We caught our breath and let out a collective whoop. Lieberman is not just any Jew. The prism through which his view of the world is refracted is a Jewish prism.” [LIPSTADT, D., 8-20-2000, p. B3]

What about this “Jewish prism?” Soon after the selection of Lieberman as Al Gore’s running mate, an embarrassing relationship came to light between Lieberman and his uncle, Bernard Manger. As the Houston Chronicle noted,

“When Bernard Manger died in 1995, he left behind a will that disinherited two of his four children from his $48 million estate. The reason: they had married people who weren’t born Jewish. He counted on his nephew to enforce his wishes. His nephew is Sen. Joseph Lieberman, the Democratic vice presidential candidate … As he grew older, Manger became more and more concerned that intermarriage was threatening the existence of the Jewish people.” [KUNTZ, P., 8-27-2000, p. 3]

Both of the spouses of the disinherited children had long converted to Judaism, but “not in the Orthodox fashion Manger would have liked.” Lieberman eventually figured out a way to get the disinherited individuals their cuts of the estate (one of the disinherited children found an “unsigned” document that allegedly claimed that Manger had changed his mind). But, after all, Lieberman is a politician; how could he have politically survived among non-Jews if he fulfilled his uncle’s nakedly racist and anti-Gentile wishes? More troubling, one wonders, why is it that Manger so much trusted Lieberman to fulfill his will? He must have known his nephew’s honest position on Jewish identity issues.
Lieberman has been awarded $75,000 to execute the estate, and is entitled to another $50,000 a year to oversee it. Lieberman’s wife, Hadassah, likewise gets $40,000 a year to manage Manger’s wife’s will. [KUNTZ, P. 8-27-2000, p. 3] Manger’s chauvinist and racist views, as we have witnessed throughout this volume, are not an anomaly; they represent a current in the thinking of large numbers of modern Jewry.

Lieberman also found it necessary to dissimulate Orthodox belief in a related area, publicly saying that it didn’t matter to him as an Orthodox Jew if Jews married non-Jews. This, of course, is merely a politician talking. Rabbi Avi Shafran, of the Agudah Israel of America Orthodox organization, quickly responded, emphasizing that, as any Orthodox Jew knows, there is a “clear and irrevocable Torah prohibition” against Jews marrying non-Jews. Even a Conservative rabbi, Jerome Epstein, noted that “I do believe our tradition is quite clear that Jews are expected to marry Jews.” [JOLKOVSKY, B., 9-20-2000]

During a two hour trip to Baltimore, Lieberman absorbed nearly a million dollars for Democratic campaign coffers. “Organizers estimate that between 60 and 80 percent of the money given tonight will come from the Jewish community,” noted the Baltimore Sun, “…. Lieberman, who according to a DNC spokeswoman has brought in more than $17 million in the two months since his nomination, has energized Jewish supporters across the country.” [WALDRON, T., p. 1B] (Lieberman’s “former top aide,” Micheal Lewin, surfaced in the news later as a consequence of the scandals surrounding the collapse of the notorious Enron company. Lewin had left Lieberman to become a lobbyist for Enron. [MARGASAK, L., L., 1-16-02] (One of the central players in the Enron scandal was Chief Financial Officer Andrew Fastow, also Jewish.)

Other Jews in Al Gore’s intimate political circle have included Marc Greenberg, “senior coordinator for foreign policy in the Gore [for president] campaign,” Steve Grossman, “an informal adviser to Gore” (and the eventual head of AIPAC), Mel Levine, and Nita Lowey, an adviser on abortion issues. [SAMBBER, S., 2-92-2000, p. 8] David Steiner, one-time president of AIPAC and continued board member, is Gore’s “financial consultant.” Another AIPAC board member, Meldon Levine, is another “Gore campaign advisor.” [LAKE, E., 3-21-2000, p. 1] Leon Feurth is Gore’s “longtime national security aide.” Marc Ginsburg co-chaired Gore’s Middle East advisory committee. Joan Spero is an advisor on economic policy and Steven Rabinowitz (who also worked on Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak’s campaign) another Gore “consultant.” (Even Al Gore’s father, Al Gore, Sr., a senator from Tennessee was a partner in the cattle business with corrupt Jewish entrepreneur Armand Hammer. Gore, Sr., was a “loyal friend, who had defended Armand against accusations of attempted bribery on the floor of the U. S. Senate.”) [BLUMAY, C., 1992, p. 57] [See http://ukar.org/gore13.shtml for an outside link to Lubomyr Prytulak’s keen analysis of the deep Gore family link to corrupt Jewish businessman Armand Hammer]

“Key campaign strategists at the [2000] Democratic National Committee in Washington and Gore headquarters in Nashville include general election cam-
campaign chairman John Giesser, Josh Wachs, Laurie Moskowitz, Eric Kleinfeld, Deborah Mohile and research director David Ginsburg.” [TUGEND, T., 8-9-2000, p. 17] The law firm of Manatt, Phelps and Phillips was even chosen to represent the 2000 Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles. The CEO of that company is Irving Phillips, and its “principal liaison” to the convention was Lisa Specht, earlier winner of the American Jewish Committee’s “Learned Hand Award.” [BUSINESS WIRE, 6-7-2000] Two (Eli Broad, David Geffen) of the three people “that brought the [2000] Democratic Convention to Los Angeles” were also Jewish, as were both of the Convention co-chairs, Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer. [TUGEND, T., 8-9-2000, p. 17]

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted the Jewish Democratic gatherings in Los Angeles for the National Convention:

“President Clinton, addressing nearly 4,000 Jews at an outdoor party on Sunday afternoon, quoted [Jewish] comedian Red Buttons that ‘in Los Angeles, the Democrats are changing their theme song from ‘Happy Days Are Here Again’ to [the Jewish song] ‘Hava Nagila.’” Senator John Rockefeller (D-W. Va.) keynoted an elegant fund-raiser for the American Israel Public Affairs Committee on Saturday night and wound up a somewhat disjointed speech by declaring, ‘I wish I were a Jew.’” [TUGEND, T., 8-14-00]

In 1999, St. Martin’s Press published a book by British journalist Gordon Thomas about Israel’s Mossad organization. (Major newspapers, including the Washington Post, New York Times, and Los Angeles Times, ignored it). Thomas, a veteran of 40 years of worldwide reporting, asserted (from his extensive interviews with a variety of intelligence operatives) that Danny Yotam, the Inspector General of Mossad, had nearly 30 hours of tapes of President Clinton having telephone sex with Monica Lewinsky and they were considered as leverage to blackmail Clinton into reigning in the FBI’s search for the Israeli mole (or moles), the aforementioned “Mega,” in the upper echelons of the American government. Such an assertion, of course, is impossible to prove. The fact that Clinton had phone sex with Lewinsky, however, was documented by Clinton prosecutor Kenneth Star; it is also public knowledge that Clinton warned her that they had probably been wiretapped by a “foreign government.” As TV journalist Barbara Walters noted: “There was something like 60 different phone calls. There is a lot of phone calls. There was phone sex. It was part of the recklessness of the whole act. He was calling from the White House. The fact that he would do this from the beginning two or three times a week – this is a tremendous chance to take in addition to everything else.” [WHITE HOUSE BULLETIN, 3-3-99; AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 3-3-99; GURDON/DAVIES, 3-4-99, p. 14]

For Hollywood’s part during the Lewinsky scandal, the mass media widely noted with wonder the curious timing of how “art imitates life” in the cases of the then-current motion pictures “Wag the Dog,” directed by Barry Levinson, and “Primary Colors,” directed by another Jewish filmmaker, Mike Nichols. The first film depicted a President of the United States who cuts a deal with a Hollywood producer to create a fake war to detract attention from the Presi-
dent’s womanizing. [In real life, Clinton faced both the Lewinsky scandal and a possible attack on Iraq at the same time]. Primary Colors – based on a book by Newsweek columnist Joe Klein – is about a southern governor who is mired in sexual scandals. John Travolta, as the governor, noted the Washington Post, “mimics Clinton’s style, mannerisms and voice.” [WELKOS, p. A19]

This was not the only sex controversy Clinton had involving a Jewish bedmate, laced with political intrigue. In 1997, a political influence scandal broke open over Larry Lawrence’s grave at Arlington National Cemetery. Lawrence, a San Diego real estate developer who had donated millions of dollars over the years to the Democratic Party, was the Ambassador to Switzerland at the time of his death. He was also Jewish. “A firestorm of criticism erupted yesterday,” noted the Boston Globe, “over allegations that the Clinton administration waived military rules so that major campaign donors could be buried at Arlington National Cemetery.” [HOHLER, B., p. A1] “Congressional investigations,” wrote the New York Daily News, “are trying to determine why [Lawrence’s] lies went undetected when he was named ambassador to Switzerland in 1994, and why he got a special waiver for burial at Arlington with a push from President Clinton.” [GOLDSCHLAG, 10] Only after his death it came to light that Lawrence had built elaborate lies about being a wounded military hero as a Merchant Marine officer – a career that in no way existed. “When he testified before Congress during his 1993 confirmation hearings for his ambassadorship,” noted the Boston Globe, “[Lawrence] told them of being thrown through the air after a torpedo slammed into his ship, the Horace Bushnell. It was a lie, outraging members of Congress and decorated veterans, that led to Lawrence’s removal from Arlington last week.” [FARRAGHER, p. A14]

Soon thereafter, Arianna Huffington, a syndicated columnist, was sued by Lawrence’s wife for stating in a column that her husband’s ambassadorship was a payoff for Lawrence’s silence about an affair between his wife and President Clinton. Huffington appeared on CNN to defend her accusation, noting that lawyers for Paula Jones [a woman suing Clinton for sexual harassment] subpoenaed Lawrence’s wife, Sheila, “to ask her about the possibility of a payoff between an alleged affair and the pact that the man who was so completely unqualified to be ambassador would fabricate his military record, [and] who had dozens of pending disputes with the IRS, was nevertheless appointed to a preeminent ambassadorial position.” Huffington also asserted that she had “at least two dozen sources of people who talked about the alleged payoff … – former employees of the Lawrences who had personal knowledge of an alleged affair.” A former State Department employee, Christina Alexander, also “filed [other] charges against the Lawrences with the State Department under the Management Fraud and Waste Act.” For her part, Sheila Lawrence was also appointed “without any qualifications” by President Clinton to the Conservative Union, an environmental organization. [CNN, Burden of Proof, 3-9-98]

(Yet another Jewish politician, Madeline Kunin [a former governor of Vermont] replaced Lawrence as the ambassador to Switzerland).
In 1999, Rabbi Daniel Lapin noted with concern the repeated Jewish-based governmental scandals in the Clinton administration:

“The scandals in this administration have brought to public attention an entirely different group of Jews, from Monica Lewinsky, whose sexual proclivities have made me burn with shame, to all the spinning defense lawyers on national TV night after night, from Bernard Schwartz of Loral, who apparently sold missile technology to China [discussed elsewhere in this volume], to Larry Lawrence, who falsified his war record to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery. This is a new group of Jewish faces, a whole different generation from that of Einstein, and Cardozo, Salk and Buber. Frankly, they strike me as arrogant, shameless, and very foolish. They have all the answers, or so they think, but the people who see them on TV night after night know better.” [LAPIN, D., 1999, p. 42]

On the Republican side of Jewish politicking, in 1972 Seymour Lipset noted that “some of the most pro-Israel senators are among the most conservative Republicans in Congress.” [LIPSET, in COX, p. 196] Among Richard Nixon’s high-level Jewish appointees were Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the chairman of the President’s Council for Economic Advisors, Herbert Stein, and the chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, Ronald Berman. Ronald Ziegler was Nixon’s press secretary. After Watergate, Len Garment, a Jewish liberal Democrat, became Nixon’s lawyer. [HICKS, J., 3-29-97, p. B1] Among President Ford’s Jewish appointees was Edward Levi, the Attorney General. Among George Bush’s Jewish appointees was David Kessler, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. Bill Kristol was the Chief of Staff for Vice President Dan Quayle in the George Bush administration. The chairman of the Board of Directors of the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy was also Jewish: Joan Abrahamson. “Most of the senior Middle East positions [in the Bush administration] are Jews,” noted Joyce Starr in 1990. [STARR, J., 1990, p. 247]

In 1999, in the early stages of the Republican presidential primary campaign, the former president’s son, candidate George W. Bush, the governor of Texas, “surrounded himself with a number of Jewish advisers, including Indianapolis mayor Stephen Goldsmith; Josh Belton, policy director for the campaign, and foreign policy hawk Richard Perle. [ROTH, B., 10-11-99] Ari Fleischer was Bush’s spokesman to the mass media. (When Bush became president, Fleischer became his press secretary. Fleischer is “active in a group of Jewish congressional staffers who study with the Lubavitch Chasidic movement’s Washington representative, Rabbi Levi Shemtov.” [FORWARD, THE FORWARD FIFTY, 2000/2001] In fact, Fleischer “was an early leader and co-president of Chabad’s Capitol Jewish Forum.” He was awarded Chabad’s Young Leadership award in October 2001. [BESSER, J., 10-26-01, p. 30] Note Chabad’s racist tenets at http://jewishtribalreview.org/cha.htm Bush had gone on a tour of Israel the year earlier, under the auspices of the National Jewish Coalition. “Gov. Bush Shores Up Image with Jews,” headlined the Jewish Telegraphic Agency. “By Visiting Israel.” “The relationship between the United States and Israel is
a very special relationship,” said the candidate, “It will always be that way.” [DORF, M., 12-7-98] **Alfred Lerner**, the Jewish CEO and chairman of credit card giant MBNA, “was the single largest corporate contributor to **George W. Bush** during the last election cycle.” [MOTHER JONES, 5-3-01] A rabbi, **Victor Weissberg**, was even selected to be the religious leader to give the invocation on the first night of the 2000 Republican National Convention. [ZACHARIA, J., 10-3-2000] This is not surprising, especially when two of the three co-chairmen of the Republican National Convention were Jewish, **David Cohen** and **Brian Roberts**. [FELDMAN, S., 6-22-2000, p. 12]

The **New Jersey Jewish News** noted

“**Cliff Sobel**, finance chair of the Bush for President campaign in New Jersey, says the Republican National Committee’s platform subcommittee on foreign policy went out of its way to ‘make sure its positions were right from Israel’s standpoint.’ Although the subcommittee, of which Sobel was a member, confronted issues in “Japan, China, Ireland, and elsewhere, those were dealt with differently than the issues in Israel. Regarding the Middle East, with Israel at its center, there was a uniformity of opinion in determining what is in the best interests of Israel and the United States – always considered a common interest, Sobel said. This predisposition, he added, was ‘opposed to special interests within the framework of some other countries.” [FRIEDLAND, E., 8-10-02, p. 8]

In August of the same year, the **Forward**, a Jewish journal, noted in a headline the depth of the Jewish contingent in the Republican Party: “Republican Convention Gives Key Roles to Jews.” “The ‘who’s who’ of Jews in the camp of the Republican presidential nominee, **George Bush** of Texas,” said the article,

“reaches far into the inner circle, including senior adviser and spokesman **Ari Fleischer**, policy director **Joshua Belton** and foreign policy advisers **Dov Zakheim**, **Richard Perle** and **Paul Wolfowitz**, all former **Reagan** aides. A former mayor of Indianapolis **Stephen Goldsmith**, is Mr. Bush’s top domestic policy adviser, while the campaign’s counsel is lawyer **Benjamin Ginsberg**. Jews also hold top spots in the Republican National Committee and its platform committee: the RNC’s campaign finance director is a former ambassador to Australia, **Mel Sembler**; its communication director is **Clifford May** and its platform committee is headed by **Mitch Bainwol**. Top fundraisers include **Eric Javits**, the chairman of an elite group called the Republican Eagles, and **Cheryl Halpern** of the Republican Jewish Coalition.” [DONADIO, R., 8-4-2000]

The **Forward** interviewed **Kalman Sporn**, the youngest member of the Republican Eagles, who observed that

“The Republican leadership recognizes, rightly or wrongly, that Jews are the key to raising millions for their political interests. To sustain that support, they know they need to support Jewish concerns, and number one, the principal way that Republican leadership has demonstrated support for Jews has been through its unyielding support for the state of Israel.” [DONADIO, R., 8-4-2000]
“Jewish Republicans,” notes the *Baltimore Jewish Times*,

“provide a nagging reminder to the Republican congressional leaders that support for Israel is not the exclusive property of the Democrats. Jewish campaign contributors, an important part of the party’s money base, do more than just nag … Many young, conservative Jews serve as staffers to Republican members of Congress, and some say their numbers are growing … The presence on Mr. Bush’s campaign team of a handful of well-known Jewish activists and the critical role of some top Jewish givers, [some] believe, will pay off when Mr. Bush puts his government together, should he win the election.” [BESSER, J., 7-28-2000, p. 25]

In February 2002, Jewish speechwriter David Frum was identified as the author of Bush’s controversial “Axis of Evil” speech, in which Iraq, Iran, and North Korea were identified as “evil” entities and implicitly threatened. [NOAH, T., 2-5-02] In the wake of taking credit for the speech, Frum resigned his post. The *Asia Times* subsequently editorialized about the profound political power he and other Jews in powerful foreign policy positions represented:

“White House speechwriter David Frum who coined the incendiary ‘axis of evil’ moniker used by President Bush is leaving Bush’s employ for the neo-conservative American Enterprise Institute (AEI). It seems a perfect fit … The AEI has long been a source of provocation, particularly for intelligence professionals at the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency (IA). The staunchly unilateralist AEI, and its foreign policy honcho, Richard Perle [also Jewish] have never been so powerful. Much to the frustration of Secretary of State Colin Powell and Washington’s European and Arab allies, the administration has embraced virtually all of the AEI’s policy positions on the Middle East, including the right-wing [Israeli] Likud Party’s opposition to the Oslo peace process for Israel and Palestine … Unlike the ‘axis of evil,’ members of the ‘axis of incitement’ share a passionate belief in the inherent goodness and redemptive mission of the United States; the moral cowardice of ‘liberals’ and ‘European elites’; existential necessity of supporting Israel in the shadow of the Holocaust and in the face of ‘implacable hatred,’ as Frum has written, of Palsetinains, Arabs and Muslims, and the primacy of military power. Their reach within the administration extends far. At the Pentagon, they include Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz [also Jewish], whose relationship with Perle goes back 30 years, and Undersecretary for Policy Douglas Feith [also Jewish] whose pro-Likud sentiments led him to denounce the 1978 Camp David accords between Israel and Egypt as an Israeli sell-out.” [ASIA TIMES, 3-9-02]

(Perle has an office in the Pentagon today as chairman of the Defense Policy Board. Former U.S. Congressman Paul Findley once noted that an “FBI wiretap recorded Perle discussing classified information with someone at the Israeli embassy.” “In 1983,” adds Grace Halsell, “newspapers reported that Perle had received substantial payments for representing an Israeli arms manufacturer
while he was working for the senator. Despite this background, **Perle** received the Reagan administration appointment as assistant secretary of defense. He later resigned from that post to write and speak for Israeli interests.”) [HALSELL, G., MARCH 1993, p. 9]

Outside government, **Asia Times** also notes the “axis of incitement” extends to include propaganda from the Jewish Institute for National Security, as well as Jewish journalists **Charles Krauthammer**, **A. M. Rosenthal**, and former Jewish “CIA Mideast operative” **Michael Ledeen**. [ASIA TIMES, 3-9-02]

In the new American governmental propaganda wars, post 9-11 attack, to socialize Arab youth to Western/Israeli interests, and spread American cultural imperialism, **Norman Pattiz**, a Jewish radio mogul, headed the project. Pattiz, noted **New Yorker magazine**, 

“is the founder and chairman of **Westwood One**, the $3.5 billion company that is the country’s largest distributor of commercial radio programming. Starting next month, he will oversee an innovative radio network aimed at bringing American values and pop culture to Arabs in the Middle East. The project, which has a budget of thirty million dollars, is being launched by the U.S. Broadcasting Board of Governors, which oversees international government-sponsored programs. Pattiz [was] appointed to the board by President Clinton ... Pattiz also hired Casey Kassem’s producer, **Bert Kleinman**, to give the station a more Top Forty style. ‘Will the [Muslim] religious extremists like it?’ Pattiz asked himself the other day. ‘Probably not. But you’ve got to go after the hearts and minds you can get.’ He has a lot of faith in the power of American pop culture. ‘After all,’ he said, ‘it was MTV that brought down the Berlin Wall.” [MAYER, J., 2-18-02]

In May 2000, in the heat of the American presidential campaign, the **Jewish Telegraphic Agency** noted the sameness, on at least one issue, of the Democratic and Republican candidates:

“Whoever the next president of the United States might be, the pro-Israel community seems to like what he has to say. Then again the messages Texas governor **George W. Bush** and Vice President **Al Gore** conveyed to delegates at this week’s annual policy conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee seemed indistinguishable …

At the end of his speech, Gore brought the crowd to its feet when he said safeguarding Israel was not just his policy, but is ‘in my heart, in my conscience and in my bones and in my soul.” [SAMBER, S., 5-24-2000]

And if **George W. Bush** rival **John McCain** had won the 2000 Republican primary? “I have known the senator [McCain] for many years,” said Jewish McCain fundraiser **Marvin Jubas**, “No one in this town is more aware of his integrity and character than I. Nobody is more pro-Israel than the senator and those of us associated with AIPAC know that if we really need someone, we turn to John.” [TUGEND, T., 2-16-2000, p. 8] [McCain’s 2002 speech to AIPAC: http://jewishtribalreview.org/mccain.htm]
Joseph Gildenhorn, also Jewish, and formerly the U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, also headed the George W. Bush campaign in Washington DC. [FORDWARD, 6-18-99, p. 15] Joel Strom is the chairman for Bush volunteers in the crucial state of California. [TUGEND, T., 2-16-2000, p. 8] In 1999, Jewish billionaire Michael Dell, of Dell Computers, was named chairman of a Bush “high-tech advisory council.” [MARKS, M., 7-15-99, p. 6] Even in the American hinterlands of Utah, Jewish real estate developer John Price “has long been one of the nation’s most generous political donors and the biggest Utah donor to the national Republican Party.” [KNUDSON, M., 3-23-97] With the 2001 bombing of Afghanistan, the Los Angeles Times noted that Bush’s Secretary of State Colin Powell “announced that he had appointed Richard Haass, director of policy planning at the State Department, as his special coordinator to explore with United Nations and key countries the issue of Afghanistan’s future.” [RICHTER/PADDOCK, 10-16-01, p. A13]

Likewise in 1999, on the Democratic side, like virtually all modern day politicians, presidential candidate Bill Bradley felt the same need for Jewish pre-eminence in his campaign. The Jewish Journal of Greater Los Angeles noted that he “has built up considerable Jewish friends and political support. Several of his top aides are Jewish: Doug Berman; his campaign chairman; Gina Clantz, his campaign manager; spokesman Eric Hauser; and Marcia Aronoff, a top adviser.” [SHAPIRO, M., 11-19-99] Even political maverick Pat Buchanan (widely decried by the Jewish community as an “anti-Semite,” particularly for his unusually sharp public stands about Zionist influence in Washington), announced in 1999 that Rabbi Aryeh Spero was a “Senior Adviser” to his presidential campaign. One of his four national co-chairmen for the 1996 Buchanan for President Campaign was Rabbi Yahuda Levin. [BRODER, J., 3-12-96, p. A5] In 2000, Buchanan’s main rival for the Reform party presidential nomination was John Hagelin. Leonard Goldman, “Hagelin’s faction’s attorney, said that if the FEC rules in Buchanan’s favor [for government funding], he will seek a court injunction to freeze the money and file a lawsuit.” [THE COMMERCIAL APPEAL, 8-14-00, p. A4] Hagelin’s vice presidential running mate, Nat Goldhaber, was also Jewish.

When Massachusetts governor Michael Dukakis challenged George Bush for the presidency in 1988, the head of his presidential finance committee was also Jewish, Alan Levanthol. [UPI, 4-20-87] (That year, in his Dukakis’ home state, Jewish businessman Sheldon Adelman made the news for giving both Democrat Dukakis and Republican Bush over $80,000). [BEAM, A., 11-4-88, p. 67] Dukakis’s campaign manager, Susan Estrich, was also Jewish. In 1996, Simon Fireman, also Jewish, vice chairman of the Robert Dole for President Campaign and formerly the head of an organization called Massachusetts Democrats for Reagan, was forced to “pay a record $6 million in fines for funneling illegal contributions through his employees to the Dole camp and other political causes.” [COMMERCIAL-APPEAL, 7-11-96, p. 4A] “His plan,” noted the Boston Globe, “was to raise enough money for Dole so that Dole would consider him for an am-
bassadorship if he won.” [FLINT, A., 7-22-96] Fireman was also that year’s Hebrew Center “Man of the Year.” [PATRIOT-LEDGER, 7-12-96, p. 8]

On the Republican side of Massachusetts politics, in 1996 James Rappaport was re-elected as the chairman of the state Republican Party. At the same time, Ron Kaufman, also from Massachusetts and formerly the Political Director in the White House for the George Bush presidential administration, was the GOP National Committeeman. [KLEMOVICH, D., 4-12-96, p. 7; DISTASO, J., 1-14-97, p. 6]

Elsewhere, within government bureaucracy itself, in 1985, the Jewish Week noted Dov S. Zakheim, the Pentagon’s undersecretary for planning and resources in Ronald Reagan’s tenure as President (and also an ordained rabbi), [STARR, J., 1990, p. 79] adding that

“Zakheim … is not alone as a Jew in a sensitive position dealing with U.S.-Israel matters. Whether in the Pentagon, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the White House, the National Security Council, the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Congress, there is no shortage of Jews working in very senior and extremely sensitive positions.” [BLITZER, 6-27-86, p. 3]

With George W. Bush’s presidential victory in 2000, he appointed Zakheim – “an ordained – and meticulously observant – Orthodox rabbi as Undersecretary of Defense and Comptroller of the Pentagon … Another [Jew], Paul Wolfowitz, [became] deputy Secretary of Defense, the number two position at the Pentagon.” [SIEFF, M., 3-2-01, p. 5] Wolfowitz, noted the Jewish ethnic magazine Forward as the U.S. invaded Afghanistan, “is the official whose feral-sounding surname and bellicose sound-bites have marked him as the administration’s wild-eyed warmonger, the wooly counterpoint to that suave and sensible diplomat, Secretary of State Colin Powell … He has also emerged … as one of the administration’s leading hawks and one of Israel’s most important allies … Mr. Wolfowitz is also a fixture of the capital’s Jewish circles.”) [KINTISCH, E., 10-12-01, p. 6]

Coming into the Pentagon with Wolfowitz was fellow Jewish activist Douglas Feith. As the Forward further notes:

“Mr. Wolfowitz and his associate Douglas Feith, an undersecretary of defense for policy, are known as among the administration’s most hawkish members when it comes to Israel. With [Secretary of Defense Donald] Rumsfeld, they round out a Defense triumvirate that has often clashed over Israel with Mr. Powell. Speaking to the Jerusalem Post last December, an official of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee commended both Mr. Wolfowitz and Mr. Rumsfeld for their ‘very strong records on Israel.’ Mr. Powell’s team at [the State Department] reportedly fought the nominations of both Mr. Feith and Mr. Wolfowitz.” [KINTISCH, E., 10-12-01, p. 6]

In October 1997, Douglas Feith, with his father, Dalck, were formal guests of honor at a yearly Zionist Organization of America awards dinner, both men heralded by the ZOA as “noted Jewish philanthropists and pro-Israel activists.”
Dalck, who “was active in [far right-wing] Betar, the Zionist youth movement founded by [neo-fascist] Ze’ev Jabotinsky,” received the ZOA’s “special Centennial Award ... for lifetime service to Israel and the Jewish people. His son, Douglas J. Feith, the former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, will receive the prestigious Louis D. Brandeis Award at the dinner.” [ZIONIST ORG. of AMERICA, 10-13-97]

Upon Feith’s new appointment in the Bush administration in 2001, James Zogby, head of the Arab American Institute, wrote with alarm in an article entitled “A Dangerous Appointment”:

“Douglas J. Feith has been appointed Undersecretary of Policy at the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD). This is one of the Pentagon’s four senior senior posts, charged with ‘all matters concerning the formulation of national security and defense policy and the integration and oversight of DOD policy and plans’ ... This is a powerful position with great influence ... A prolific writer, Feith has left a long paper trail of anti-Arab tracts and diatribes against those who challenge or seek to compromise Israel’s strength and as he defines it, ‘moral superiority’ over the Arabs ... Feith’s law practice in Washington sheds further light on the one-sided nature of his work. His small law firm hs one international affiliate, in Israel. Over two-thirds of all their reported casework involves representing Israeli interests. And, in light of Feith’s new appointment, one of these cases deserves some attention. As described on the firm’s website, Feith ‘represented a leading Israeli armaments manufacturer in establishing joint ventures with leading U.S. aerospace manufacturers for manufacture and sale of missile systems, to the U.S. Department of Defense and worldwide ... Serious questions must be asked whether or not someone with his views and associations can fairly serve in a critical post at the Department of Defense. I, for one, am terrified at the prospect. He is an ideologue with an extreme anti-Arab bias, and his role in the sensitive position of chief architect of U.S. defense policy can, I believe, have grave consequences for the United States and its relations with the entire Arab world.” [ZOGBY, J., 4-16-01]

Marc Grossman, the new Undersecretary of State, told Israeli President Moshe Katsav at a dinner in Washington DC hosted by the Israeli ambassador that “The main relationship between Israel and the United States is rock solid. Making sure Israel has a military edge over the Arabs is a cornerstone of our foreign policy.” [JERUSALEM REPORT, 2001] Bush’s first appointment for Secretary of Labor was Linda Chavez. She is married to Chris Gersten, former Executive Director of the Republican Jewish Coalition. [BESSER, J., 1-5-01] Jamie Rubin is the State Department’s spokesman in the Bush era.

“At the time Pollard [the Jewish American spy for Israel, exposed during the Reagan administration] was trading secrets with the Israelis,” notes the Jewish magazine Moment, “the Secretary of the Navy was John Lehman [also Jewish]. Never before or since was there a more pro-Israel person in that office. The level of co-operation [with Israel] was unprecedented.” [BLOOMFIELD, 4-30-96,
In 1982, the biography of another Jewish naval officer, Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, head of the Navy’s nuclear power program, was published. “It is difficult to find another twentieth-century American,” noted its authors, “who has striven so hard in so many areas of military and civil endeavor. And, especially, one who is doing so has, without elected office, without even accountability to his superiors in government, attained absolute and total control of a large segment of the American defense establishment … [POLMAR/ALLEN, p. 11] … By the 1970s Rickover was practically an honorary member of Congress.” [POLMAR/ALLEN, p. 244]

And what of the likes of a fellow Jew at the heart of the US Navy nuclear program – Israel-lover Alvin Radkowsky? Radowsky, notes the Jerusalem Post, “immigrated to Israel in 1972 after serving as chief scientist of the US Navy nuclear propulsion program for 24 years.” [SIEGEL, J., 6-2-97] Would not such a scientist moving to Iran or Russia, or anywhere else, deservedly raise some eyebrows, and probably the creation of some new laws?

Seymour Hersh notes Israeli power in maneuvering through the American government for what it has needed militarily:

“William Bader, who was serving in 1979 as Assistant Deputy Under-Secretary of Defense for Policy, recalled his frustration at knowing that the Israelis were ‘edging deeper into the overhead’ and not knowing how to stop it. ‘You didn’t know where to complain,’ Bader said. ‘We knew that these guys [the Israelis] had access that went around the colonels and the deputy assistant secretaries.’ If a complaint got to the wrong office, he explained, ‘you might get your head handed back to you.’” [HERSH, S., p. 13-14]

In 1988 the Jewish hunt for anti-Semites among Republicans succeeded in having eight George Bush administration aides “dismissed” – or forced to “resign” – for anti-Semitism. One of them was Frederick Malek, Deputy Chairman of the Republican National Convention. His crime was that in 1971, under orders from President Richard Nixon, he collected a list of Bureau of Labor employees with Jewish-sounding names. Nixon was concerned, says the Jewish Week, with a “Jewish cabal” in that bureau. 13 of 35 top administrators in that department were ascertained to be Jewish. [JEWISH WK, 9-16-88] When Nixon faced the Watergate investigations that eventually drove him from office, two of the three Justice Department prosecutors on his tail were also Jewish. [VOLKMAN, p. 103] With the release to the public of the famous “Nixon tapes” in 1999, London’s Daily Telegraph notes that

“In July 1971 Nixon felt he was undermined by the unexpected release of bad unemployment figures by the Bureau of Labour Statistics. He ordered Charles Colson, a staff member he often used for unpleasant tasks, to investigate the bureau with a view to sacking its Jewish head. On the tapes, Colson lists the names of the leading officials at which Nixon exclaims incredulously, ‘They are all Jews?’ Colson replies: ‘Every one of them. Well, with a couple exceptions.’” [FENTON, B., 10-7-99, p. 24]
In 1981, a Reagan appointee to the Department of Health and Human Services office, Warren Richardson, was dismissed when it was discovered he had a link to the far-right-wing Liberty Lobby organization, a group known to be especially critical of the Jewish community. [VOLKMAN, p. 58] Likewise, in the same year, Ernest Lefever was forced to withdraw his nomination as Assistant Secretary for Human Rights when it was discovered that he had written an article that was interpreted to be too sympathetic to Arab nations in their conflict with Israel. [VOLKMAN, p. 62-65]

In earlier years, United States Attorney General William Saxbee found himself under attack as an anti-Semite when, in the context of discussing the shift from governmental concerns about Communist spies to new kinds of subversion, he made the public relations mistake of mentioning the “change in the Jewish intellectual, who in those days was very enamored of the Communist Party.” [VOLKMAN, p. 105] This statement, based on considerable fact as we have seen, threw Saxbee into an apologetic mode for all the Jewish organizations that soon assailed him. Modern Jewish scholarship has also decided that there were anti-Semites in the State Department (so much dominated by Jews and Zionist policy today) in earlier decades. William Carr, “backbone of the State Department” in the 1930s stands accused by Richard Breitman and Alan Kraut, as does William Phillips, an undersecretary to Franklin Delano Roosevelt (“Phillips hated Jews”), and Breckenridge Long. [BREITMAN/KRAUT, 1986, p. 170, 176, 188]

In 1969, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew even told Jewish newswoman Barbara Walters on NBC’s Today Show that a “Jewish cabal” in the media permitted “Zionist influence” to “tilt American foreign policy unduly towards Israel.” (Agnew later even wrote a novel, The Canfield Decision, “in which pro-Israeli zealots conspire with an American vice-president to take over the United States.”) [VOLKMAN, p. 104] Two of Agnew’s former (Jewish) speechwriters – William Safire and Victor Gold (who was also once Agnew’s press secretary) – protested the vice-president’s public commentary on national TV. In the 1970s, Stephen Isaacs noted the “entrepreneurial bent” of men like Safire:

“The strong entrepreneurial bent of Jewish political professionals is discernible in careers like those of [Frank] Mankiewicz, [William] Safire, and [Ben] Wattenberg, to select three of the more prominent ones. Mankiewicz, who has a degree in law, has moved from law to journalism to political staffing to journalism, back to direct politics, then to book writing. Safire went from journalism to television producing to public relations to speech writing in the Nixon White House and then again into journalism, as a columnist for the New York Times.” [ISAACS, p. 34]

Wattenberg started out as a speech writer for Lyndon Johnson. [JARVIK, L., 1997, p. 196] He was also once the campaign manager for ardently pro-Israel senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson. [RADOSH, R., 1996, p. 155]

In 1995, during the Presidential campaign, Republican challenger Bob Dole was accused by a former low-level aide, Stanley Hilton, of having anti-Semitic views. “Dole sometimes privately expressed envy and resentment at Jews for
having an unduly large amount of money, power, and influence in the United States,” wrote Hilton, “… Like his hero Richard Nixon and many other traditional WASP Republicans, Dole has sometimes been critical of Jews, their politics, and their financial power.” [DORF, M, Unauth., p.]

Incredibly, even Hillary Clinton was charged with anti-Semitism in July 2000, an accusation that loomed as a possible death blow to her campaign for Senate in New York. More incredibly, this charge made national news. A former (Jewish) writer for the National Enquirer (!) wrote that Hillary once called a man who worked for the Bill Clinton, Paul Fray, a “Jew bastard.” Fray, the accuser, wasn’t even Jewish, there was no evidence that the incident ever took place except his own charge, and it allegedly took place 26 years ago in Arkansas. Even Ms. Clinton, champion of the Jews, surrounded by Jewish aides and associates throughout government, was twisted down and forced to squirm before the omnipresent Jewish Inquisition. At a special press conference she emphatically denied the charge. [MSNBC, 7-17-2000]

In 1991, the White House Chief of Staff, John Sununu, of Lebanese Arab ancestry, found himself embroiled in controversy over governmental travel expenses for personal use. The controversy stretched further when he was alleged to have accused Jewish lobbying groups of carrying out a vendetta against him. “The charge that he may have blamed Jewish groups and others for his woes is serious,” noted the Boston Globe, “because it could arouse widespread concerns among Jews that Sununu is antagonistic to them.” [KURKJIAN, p. 1] Earlier, the Wall Street Journal had quoted an unnamed source who said that “Israel’s supporters quietly campaign against him.” [KURKJIAN, p. 1] Jewish leaders had long been concerned about Sununu from the start of his tenure, noted the Los Angeles Times, because of his “refusal to join other governors in denouncing the ‘Zionism is racism’ vote at the United Nations.” [WALKER, p. M2]

Also in 1991, a speech by the Bush administration’s Secretary of State, James Baker, to AIPAC, was noted in the Jewish Week: “The speech was written by American Jews because Baker’s key aides are Jewish.” [AIN, S, CULTURAL, 1-18-91, p. 16] (The “speech writer and policy analyst” for the Reagan administration’s first Secretary of State, Alexander Haig, was also Jewish, Harvey Sicherman. Haig’s Executive Assistant was Sherwood Goldberg.) [HAIG, p. 61-62] James Baker’s four-person team to broker the Arab-Israeli peace negotiations were also all Jews – Dennis Ross, Daniel Kurtzer, Aaron Miller, and Richard Haas. [GOLDBERG, JJ, p. 231] “We act in America’s interest, but through a prism,” one of the peace team members told a Jewish reporter, “speaking on condition of anonymity.” [GOLDBERG, p. 232] In the Republican administration’s White House State Department, in the same year, 1991, seven of 19 assistant secretaries were also Jewish.

Even more recently, a popular “media consultant, pollsters, and strategist” for prominent Republican politicians has been Arthur Finkelstein. His client list, noted the Metrowest Jewish News in 1996, “reads like a who’s who of conservatism including [Israeli right-wing Likud party Prime Minister Benyamin]
Netanyahu, New York governor George Pataki, Senator Alfonso D’Amato (NY), Jesse Helms (NC) and Ronald Lauder. [FRIEDLAND, E., 7-11-96, p. 8]

In 1991 President George Bush was nearly overwhelmed by the Jewish American lobby against his efforts to limit (via conditions on loan guarantees, as part of the Israel-Arab peace negotiation) continued Israeli settlement in (the largely Arab) Occupied Territories. Church organizations that urged Bush to deny Israel’s request for money for this project included the American Friends Service Committee, Episcopal Church, American Baptist Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church, Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, National Council of Churches, Presbyterian Churches, Roman Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men, Unitarian Universalist Association and the United Church of Christ. [GINZBERG, p. 227]

Jewish journalist Glenn Frankel noted the scenario: “Reading the satellite data, the headlines and [Israeli minister] Ariel Sharon’s public statements, [Bush] and his staff concluded that Israel had launched a large-scale settlement program even while Shamir was telling Washington that no such buildup was taking place. Bush grew increasingly furious … And now AIPAC and Shamir and their allies in Congress were telling the administration that the loan guarantees were no longer in Bush’s power to grant or deny. To George Bush, it felt as if Israel and its friends were spitting in his face.” [FRANKEL, G., p. 301]

Framing the loan guarantees as non-negotiable humanitarian aide to help build housing for new Jewish immigrants from Russia escaping anti-Semitism, the Jewish forces against President Bush became “one of the biggest and most emotionally powerful lobbying campaigns American Jewish groups had ever organized … Bush fielded phone calls from senators who warned that they could not resist American Jewish pressure to approve the guarantees without a strong public stance by the president himself.” [FRANKEL, p. 303]

Bush did go public, complaining in a speech that he was “up against some powerful political forces … We’re up against very strong and effective, sometimes, groups that go up in the [Capitol] Hill.” [FRANKEL, p. 304] Bush’s courage to stand up to the Jewish lobby, however veiled, drew an avalanche of condemnation from Jews who saw it “as a blatant appeal to anti-Semitism, a claim that Jews were too powerful and too shadowy, that they needed to be confronted. They also did not like being portrayed as serving the interest of a foreign power in opposing the President.” [FRANKEL, p. 305] Israeli cabinet members Ehud Omert and Rehavim Zeevi openly called him an anti-Semite. Bush eventually was forced to make a public apology to the Jewish community for the few careful clauses he had spoken about Jewish power. “Bush’s role in defeating [Israel’s] request [for the funds],” notes Glenn Frankel, “helped elect Democratic opponent Bill Clinton in November 1992.” [FRANKEL, p. 313]

Across the world, in 1999 a French author, Jean d’Ormesson, a member of the French Academy, stirred controversy when he wrote that France’s former socialist president, François Mitterand, made an “anti-Semitic” statement to him in 1995. “According to M. d’Ormesson,” noted the Times (of London), “Mitterand said, ‘There you can see the powerful and harmful Jewish lobby in France.’ Al-
though there is no evidence to support this claim, some of Mitterand’s aides, including Jacques Attali, said yesterday the former president had made similar anti-Semitic comments on other occasions. Jean Daniel, the editor of Le Nouvel Observateur and a staunch supporter of Mitterand, said he had talked of a Zionist lobby.” [SAGE] (For that matter, the same year, another deceased French hero, underwater explorer Jacques Cousteau, was also assailed in the news media for a similar crime. “The biographer of Jacques Cousteau,” announced the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “has uncovered evidence that the late underwater explorer harbored anti-Semitic attitudes.” [DAVIS, D., 6-22-99, p. 14]

In 2002, outgoing French Foreign Minister Hubert Védrine made Jewish international news. “In a closed meeting” with European Union and Mediterranean state foreign ministers, said the Jerusalem Post, Vedrine declared that Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon was “an obstacle to the [Mideast] peace process bolstered in his intransigence by American Jewry, which Vedrine said is essentially more Sharon than Sharon ... The French foreign minister said American Jewry – which supports Sharon – is more ‘intransigent’ than the prime minister, and influences the positions of President George Bush.” [KEINON, H., 4-24-02]

In Italy, in 1994, the Italian government felt enough international Jewish pressure to “formally reassure American Jews that it had no anti-Semitic bias after a Cabinet minister blamed ‘New York’s Jewish lobby’ for Italy’s economic problems.” [COWELL, A., p. 14]

Meanwhile, Jews in the upper echelons of the American university system typically produce protective fictions about Jewish/Zionist power, like this from professor Steven Spiegel:

“Jewish political strength arises from thousands of individual Jews who are prepared to express their sentiments to politicians and officials. Intense concern in part compensates for small numbers. Moreover, Jews have neither a bureaucratic mission nor a profit motive. Their religious, humanitarian, and ethnic concerns often appear more altruistic and less self-serving to politicians than those of their adversaries.” [SPIEGEL, p. 7]

Moving along in the nation’s capital, “the Adat Yisrael synagogue in Washington,” observed Israeli journalist Bar-Yosef, in his article about Jewish influence in the Federal government, “is not only a place of worship. It is a Jewish community center …. its members are the creme of Washington society, rich businessmen. All are wealthy people … The entrance fee to the synagogue is $1000 for a single holiday … the most important reason for their praying is that they feel a close connection to Israel.” [BAR-YOSEF]

Across town, in Georgetown, is another prominent synagogue where “its prayers,” says Bar-Yossef, “are conducted in the Israeli style favored by ‘Gush Emunim’ [the racist Jewish messianic movement]. The Israeli flag is proudly displayed above the Sacred Ark alongside the American flag … Many Jewish Administration officials pray there. They not only don’t try to conceal their religious affiliation but go to great length to demonstrate their Judaism since it may help their careers greatly.” [BAR-YOSEF]
The prominent Washington DC Jewish community does not just have deep roots in the American government. “In the Washington media,” says Bar-Yossef, “a significant part of the most important persons and most popular programs on the TV are warm Jews. A significant part of the senior media correspondents, newspaper editors, and analysts are Jewish and many of them are warm Jews too. Many of them are influenced in Israel’s favor by attending suitable synagogues.” [BAR-YOSEF]

Media members cited by Bar-Yossef include Barry Schweid (Associated Press’ political reporter) and Amy Schwartz (the Washington Post’s education reporter) who “regularly participate in a prayer session which is considered to be close to Israel at the Cleveland Park synagogue. Also the Israeli flag is posted proudly about the Sacred Ark.” [BAR-YOSSEF]

In 1997 the Wall Street Journal carried a disturbing item in its pages about Vadim Rabinovich, founder and head of the All-Ukrainian Jewish Congress and business associate of prominent Jewish-American Republican entrepreneur Ronald Lauder in Eastern European mass media enterprises. Rabinovich, as noted earlier, made the news for his alleged connections to the Russian mafia, particularly through a Russian-owned company in Vienna called Nordex. The Journal said this:

“A Congressional fund-raising probe last year disclosed that Mr. Rabinovich and [Nordex President] Mr. Louthansky met President Clinton in 1993 and were invited to a Democratic National Convention fundraiser in 1995. Though they never attended, the revelation prompted another former CIA director, R. James Woolsey, to issue a written statement accusing the Clinton administration of ‘at a bare minimum … a severe lack of scrutiny and appalling bad judgment. It would be unwise in the extreme for there to be any ties between the United States government and … Nordex.”

The other former CIA director quoted, John Deutch, had noted that Nordex “is an example of Russian criminal activity moving out of Russia.” [BRZEZINSKI, M. WOES, p. A18]

But Vadim Rabinovich did attend the Democratic fundraiser in Miami in 1995. The Washington Post even ran a snapshot of Rabinovich standing between President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore, the three men posing for the camera, obviously as a memento for Rabinovich, this when his visa to the United States had been revoked a month earlier. [FARRIS, p. A18] Who managed to get him there between the two most powerful men in American government? How did they do it? Who was beholding to who and what does it all mean? (Upon Clinton’s closure as American president, he has had many well-paid opportunities to speak to his Jewish constituency, including three such audiences (Glasgow, Manchester, London) in a single week in England. Coming up was a $100,000 speaking engagement in Israel sponsored by “Nes Technologies, headed by former ministry director general Aharon Fogel.” Thanks to Clinton’s efforts in raising $17 million for an Israeli project in the Negev desert, a reservoir was tabbed to be named after him.) [MARCUS, R., 12-17-01]
A common paradigm to Jewish devotion and transcendent allegiance within, but rooted without, the American political scene may be measured in the following example. In 1995, Barry Rubin, a former Jewish American foreign service diplomat (press officer) who was held captive in the notorious Iran “hostage crisis,” by now a professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, listed the following arguments against a complete Jewish assimilation into American society:

- “Total assimilation diminishes the individual … To ignore the unique factors shaping one’s standpoint is intellectually and psychologically impoverishing …
- Total assimilation means the extinction of a type of individual whose worldview and standpoint has shown extraordinary social and intellectual worth …
- However cloaked as altruistic or universalist, total assimilation is a desertion of comrades for basically selfish interests …
- Rejection of Jewish peoplehood for another ideology, nation, or religion does not denote progress but a descent in moral and historical consciousness … Jews … possess … a past and an alternative intellectual universe extending before and beyond America.” [RUBIN, p. 250-251]

How many non-Jewish readers will read this section on government – and the rest of the book – and be stunned by the sheer scope of what they didn’t know. Is a Zionist-centered government the kind of rule non-Jewish Americans would choose, if (breaking through systematically enforced censorship on the subject of Jewish dominance) they had any access to information about the problem, and grasped the enormous dimensions to the issue? This is what President James Madison, one of the founders of the American Constitutional government, had to say about the prerequisite for a healthy democracy, today so disturbingly lacking:

“A popular government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy; or perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own government must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.”

Let’s conclude this section of this chapter with the very tangible implications of our Zionist-centered government for the American people: war, increased animosity against the American people by Arabs and Muslims everywhere because of pro-Israel foreign policy, and a frightening future for everyone. The following words in 1998 are those of Osama Bin Laden, America’s foremost terrorist enemy, internationally notorious after the 2001 Pentagon and World Trade Center jet attacks upon thousands, including both civilians and military personnel:

“The American government, we think, is an agent that represents the Israel inside America. If we look at sensitive departments in the present government like the defense department or the state department, or sensitive security departments like the CIA and others, we find that Jews have the
first word in the American government, which is how they use America to carry out their plans in the world and especially the Muslim world. The presence of Americans in the Holy Land supports the Jews and gives them a safe back. The American government, in a time where there are millions of Americans living on the street and those living below the standard of living and below the poverty line, we find the American government turning toward helping Israel in occupying our land and building settlements in the Holy Land.” [MILLER, J., 6-9-98, ABC News]

Samplings elsewhere:

“Jews,” noted M. Hirsch Goldberg in 1976, “have served as the heads of governments in the Diaspora in nine different countries: England (Benjamin Disraeli), France (Leon Blum, Pierre Mendes-France and Rene Mayer), Italy (Luigi Luzzatti and Sidney Sonnino), Austria (Bruno Kreisky), Australia (Sir Isaac Isaacs), Bavaria (Kurt Eisner), Hungary (Bela Kun), India (Marquis of Reading), and Palestine (Sir Herbert Samuel) … In [South] Africa … Saul Solomon ... declined several offers to serve as Prime Minister.” [GOLDBERG, M., 1976, p. 51-52]

In Great Britain today, Jews are an incredibly influential lobbying presence in the national government. Even England’s most famous (and non-Jewish) statesman, Winston Churchill declared in 1954: “I am a Zionist. Let me make that clear. I was one of the original ones, after the Balfour Declaration, and I have worked faithfully for it.” “As a boy,” notes the Zionist journal Midstream, “Churchill saw that, however rude his father could be to everyone else, he maintained a warm social connection to Nathan Rothschild and Sir Ernest Cassel, the heads of the two greatest banking houses. (Cassel was a German-born banker who adopted England and moved in the most elevated circles, including that of Edward, Prince of Wales, with whom he was an intimate.”) [COLEMAN, D., MAY-JUNE 1999, p. 10]

An Arab critic noted the political situation in England in the 1980s with concern. “English people were often furious about the disproportionate representation the Jews got in [Margaret Thatcher’s] cabinet,” wrote Asem Hamdan, “One branch of the Conservative Party, known as the Monday Club, openly criticized key portfolios such as interior and finance being held by Jews. Thatcher responded by closing the club.” [HAMDAN] (A former “pillar of the Monday Club” was Harold Soref, who resigned from the British Board of Deputies in 1984. “It has long been my view,” he said, “that the policies of the British Board of Deputies help create anti-Semitism.” [DAILY TELE, 3-17-93]

As half of one percent of the British population, Jews in the Margaret Thatcher era held 5 of 20 cabinet positions. Her high office Jewish contingent included Nigel Lawson (Chancellor, who resigned over the “Westland Affair”), Leon Brittan (Trade and Industry Secretary), David Young (Minister without portfolio), Malcolm Rifkind (Foreign Secretary), and Keith Joseph. British
Chief Rabbi **Immanuel Jacobovitz** was awarded a seat in the House of Lords. “I was born to a Lithuanian father and am of Jewish descent,” noted **Minister David Young**. “My only brother, **Stewart**, is chairman of the **BBC**. My father used to say, ‘One son deputy chairman of the government, another chairman of the BBC – that’s not bad for immigrants.’” [TALATI, p. 12]

**Gerald Kaufman**, an eventual British Member of Parliament, notes that he “followed [his father] into Zionism. I became a member of PZ [Poale Zion] and of Labour Friends of Israel … During the [1967 Israeli] six-day war and its aftermath, when I worked in **Harold Wilson**’s office at 10 Downing Street, I went every day to the Israeli embassy as a secret link between the [British] prime minister and the Israeli ambassador, **Aharon Remez**. My work was well known to the Israeli government and a subsequent [Israeli] prime minister, **Golda Meir**, thanked me for it.” [KAUFMAN, p. 14]

In 1983 a Russian communist (**Leonid Belkin**) perspective was cited by the BBC: “Inconspicuous Conservatives such as Brittan and Lawson ascending to the pinnacle of power is by no means a miracle. One contributing factor which is not taken into account as a rule is the support of the Jewish bourgeoisie and the numerous Zionist organizations in Britain which served its interests. This factor reflects the growing Zionist influence on the country’s political life … Before the 1970s the Jewish bourgeoisie was represented by only two MPs in Parliament … By the end of the 1970s the number was 12, and in 1983, 17.” [BELKIN] By 1997, 20 Jews were members of Parliament. [BUTLER/KAVANAGH, p. 200]

As one observer, **Galina Orionova**, noted about traditional Soviet views of the West:

“[The Zionist conspiracy theory] permeates the Soviet press corps at both the national and the local level. They are not only interested in Israel itself. They’re interested in the power of the American Jewish lobby and how it defines American foreign policy.” [RA’NNAN/LUKES, p. 229]

In 1997 the **Jerusalem Post** ran an article sub-headlined: “The British Labor Party Leader **Tony Blair** Has Assiduously Courted the Jewish Community. It Looks Like It Will Pay Off in Next Thursday’s Election.” It did; Blair won. He was England’s new prime minister. The article further noted that:

“Blair has repeatedly pledged that he would ‘not repeat the mistakes of the previous Labor leaders during the Eighties,’ who were regarded as insensitive, if not apathetic, to Jewish causes, notably Israel. Blair has been well rewarded when the media revealed last year that a secret fund had been set up to finance his office, it was also revealed that the architect of the fund was a prominent Jewish accounting firm in London and that the major donors included leading members of the Jewish community.” [DAVID, D., 4-25-97, p. 8]

Such Jewish donors included **Sir Trevor Chinn** (chairman of England’s largest motor dealer, and also “president of the Joint Israel Appeal, Britain’s biggest fundraising charity for Israel,” [RUFFURD] and **Michael Goldstein**, a
partner in the Blick Rothenberg company that oversaw the fund. “David Rothenburg, the firm’s senior tax partner,” noted the (London) Sunday Times, “was in Israel this weekend and unavailable for comment [about the fund].” [RUF-FURD] Other secret contributors included Alex Bernstein – the chairman of the Granada television empire, and Emmanuel Kaye.

In 1998, the (London) Guardian noted another lobbying case, that of the new Lawson Lucas Mendelsohn (LLD) “company [that was] embroiled in the row over political lobbying.” [HENCKE, p. 3] Steve Rubin, “the main venture capitalist” behind the company met John Mendelsohn, a founder of LLD, “after working with him on Jewish charities.” [HENCKE, p. 3] Yet another powerful Jewish British lobbyist (and eventual politician), Michael Levy, was noted by the Daily Telegraph in 1996 as the “millionaire record producer and philanthropist [who] is the power behind the Labour leader’s [Tony Blair’s] throne … His crucial gift to Labour’s war chest will be through fund-raising, something he is extremely good at.” [SYLVESTER, p. 9] Levy noted the Independent, “owns luxurious homes in north London and Israel.” [WOLMAR, p. 3] He “is estimated to have raised some $60 million for Blair, much of it from Jewish donors and much of it channeled through a blind trust to shield the identity of the donors and protect Blair from scandal.” [DAVIS, D., 2-10-2000, p. 5]

By 2000, Levy (now deemed the position of Lord Levy by Blair) was being criticized by the British press for his role as “Blair’s secret Foreign Minister.” “Officials are concerned,” noted the Express, “that Mr. Blair is bypassing normal diplomatic channels, using a close friend [Levy] who is unelected, unaccountable, and publicly unknown, as a roving ambassador. Lord Levy is the man who raised the cash for the ‘blind trust’ which financed Mr. Blair’s office before he became Prime Minister in 1997.” Levy has visited Syria, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, Lebanon, Egypt, and Israel on ambassador-like missions. [BEVINS, A., 3-10-2000] Levy, noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “is deeply mistrusted by large sections of the British political establishment and has been the subject of questions by legislators.” [DAVIS, D., 2-10-2000, p. 5] He “is now the chief fundraiser for the ‘high value’ donors account at the Labour Party, along with his deputy Amanda Delew (who worked with him at Jewish Care).” [RED STAR RESEARCH]

In a later article the Jerusalem Post noted with satisfaction the growing prominence of Jews in places of power in the British government:

“‘We’re not yet a majority, but we certainly have more than a minyan [the minimal number of Jews necessary to hold religious services together] – and Tony Blair is helping,’ said Lord Wolf, one of several Jewish members of the House of Lords. Recent examples of that brand of assistance included Michael Levy, former Jewish Care chairperson … former Labor MP Greville Janner [also an honorary vice president of the World Jewish Congress and former head of the Board of Deputies of British Jews], and Anthony Jacobs, an active Liberal Democrat who is chairman of the board of governors of Haifa University [in Israel]. All three have been elevated to peerage since Blair became prime minister.” [CASHMAN, p. 14]
Other Jews in the House of Lords in the late 1990s were Andrew Stone (also chairman of the British Overseas Trade Board Group for Israel), Daniel Sainsbury (“one of the richest men in the country” [JONES, G.], and Daniel Finkelstein, among many others. (Finkelstein is the “personal policy advisor” for “Tory leader” William Hague. In 2000 the Times of London noted that Hague “is hoping that his current visit to Israel will help to capture at least four marginal [Parliament] seats with significant Jewish votes.”) [WATSON, R., 6-2-2000] The British Home Secretary was also Jewish, Michael Howard. As noted earlier, Peter Mandelson resigned as Britain’s Trade and Industry Secretary. (Caught in a minor scandal, the charges against him, suggests one supporter, was “insidious, unregistered anti-Semitism.” [GLANVILLE, p. 10] In recent years Keith Joseph has been the Education Secretary and head of the Department of Trade and Industry. In 1998, the testimony of a British M-15 officer “linked [former Defense and Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind] to an alleged plot to assassinate [Libya leader] Colonel Gaddafi.” The February 1996 bomb did not succeed in killing him. [HANNAH/DINGWELL, p. 16]

In 1999, Leon Brittan, by now the European Union’s Trade Minister, complained about a trade dispute between the United States and Europe. “He blames,” said the Economist, with no trace of humorous irony, “the ‘extreme political influence wielded by Chiquita,’ an American banana company.” [ECONOMIST, p 2-6-99, p. 56]

Jewish lobbying influence in the British Parliament is comparable to that in the United States Congress. In 2001, during the much-reported Palestinian revolt against Israeli rule, “a meeting of MPs and peers supportive of Israel … [was held] to counter the growing pro-Arab sentiment at Westminster. Organised jointly by the Labour, Conservative, and Liberal Democrat Friends of Israel groups, the rally [was] expected [to attract numbers] … well into three figures. [The sponsoring umbrella group was] the all-party Britain-Israel Parliamentary Group.” [JOSEPHS, B., 3-2-01, p. 19]

In 2002, wary of the subcurrent of Zionism, the Iranian foreign minister to Great Britain was “doing his best to block the appointment of a British ambassador who comes from Jewish stock.” [MARCUS, Y., 1-13-02]

Ireland? There are scant Jews in that country but as Hank Greenspun noted in 1966,

“Bear in mind Robert Briscoe, the Jewish Lord Mayor of Dublin … worked for both Irish Republican and Zionist causes; and Rabbi Herzog, Israel’s first Chief Rabbi, [was] once the Chief Rabbi of Ireland.” [GREENSPUN, H., 1966, p. 35] [More Ireland: http://jewishtribalreview.org/iricorres.htm]

In France, Jews constitute about one percent of the French population. In 1997, the American Jewish Yearbook noted the “relatively high number of Jews active in French politics.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 287] In 1999, Daniel Cohn-Bendit was “one of the best-placed leftist candidates for mayor [of Paris], just behind the socialist finance minister [of the French government], Dominique Strauss-Kahn.” [WEBSTER, 7-9-99] “During the heady days of the [19]68
protests that rocked France, it seemed Cohn-Bendit was everywhere, on every barricade, at the head of every protest.” [SEWARD, D., 3-22-99] “As long as there is anti-Semitism, I am a Jew,” says Cohn-Bendit. [WOSNITZA, R., 1-26-01] For Strauss-Kahn’s part, he resigned in the midst of a scandal in November 1999. He was accused of having earlier accepted $100,000 from a health care company for fictitious services. His signature appeared on two forged documents. Strauss-Kahn had “the broadest portfolio – finance, economy, and industry – in the French government.” [DAHLBURG, J., 11-3-99, p. A20] Jean Kahn is the president of the French Central Consistory and Jack Lang is another former government minister.

Among others of the political elite, Laurent Fabius was the youngest (38) prime minister (the fourth Jewish one) [GOLDBERG, M. H., 1976, p. 167] in French history). He began his term in 1984. By 1999, now president of the National Assembly (the parallel to the U.S. House of Representatives), he was involved in emotionally-charged controversy. He, and two other politicians, were tried on charges of involuntary manslaughter in their decisions (years earlier) to delay government testing that could have prevented the HIV virus from contaminating hospital blood supplies. 1,000 people eventually died as a result of the delay. In a controversial decision by a French court, he and the other defendants were ultimately acquitted. “The Court of Justice of the Republic has given the impression,” responded the Le Figaro daily, “of sparing those in power.” “The verdict,” declared Liberation, “was political.” “The verdict issued Tuesday by the special court of judges and politicians,” noted Agence France Presse, “triggered angry cries of political bias and judicial incompetence from across the spectrum.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 3-10-99] “Mr. Fabius,” said the Irish Times, “has over the past five years orchestrated a vast public relations campaign in which scientists, professors, and politicians have defended him in the media. Some claimed that Mr. Fabius, who is Jewish, was … a victim of anti-Semitism. The strategy paid off yesterday.” [MARLOWE, L., 3-10-99, p. 14] “Friends,” noted the Times (of London), “see the Jewish politician as a victim of anti-Semitic emotion.” [BREMNER, C., 2-13-99] Fabius is also co-author of the Fabius-Gayssot law, which makes it a punishable crime in France to deny the existence of the Holocaust.

For decades, Jewish politician Simone Veil has also been in the forefront of French politics. She was the president of the European Economic Union Parliament in 1979–82. In 1994, as the French Social Affairs and Health Minister, she enforced the government’s ban on Muslim schoolgirls’ headscarves in classes. “The ban has provoked outrage among Moslems,” noted Agence France Presse, “since it effectively allows the wearing of crucifixes and [Jewish] skullcaps.” [AGENCE PRESSE FRANCE, 11-2-94] In 1983, Veil was awarded the Zionist Jabotinsky Foundation’s “Shield of Jerusalem Prize” for “defense of the rights of Jewish people.” [NEW YORK TIMES, 11-14-83, p. B2] She was also, noted the Washington Post, “instrumental in forcing French television to show the American-produced ‘Holocaust’ series on the fate of the Jews in Nazi Europe after the head of all three TV stations had made public statements refusing to show it.” [KOVEN, R., 5-15-79]
As early as the 1950s, notes Barnett Litvinoff,

"From 1950 to 1954 [French] politics were largely dominated by René Mayer and Pierre Mendes-France. They were both of the Radical-Socialist wing, yet at the same time such bitter enemies as to prompt one anti-Semitic monthly, Écrits de Paris, to see their feud as an age-old conflict between Ashkenazi and Sephardi! Gilbert Grandval, a baptized Jew, had been Resident-General in Morocco, Jules Moch was playing an important international role at the United Nations, while the faithful Gaullist René Cassin won immense prestige as president of the Supreme Court of Appeal. Prime Minister [Edgar] Faure’s wife too, was a Jewess [LITVINOFF, p. 126] … The Jews themselves did not realize their own importance until the national elections of March 1967, when every party, not excluding the Communists, hastened to express its admiration for the state of Israel." [LITVINOFF, p. 132]

In 1988, “one of France’s leading Jews,” René Cassin, former president of France’s Jewish umbrella group Alliance Israélite Universelle, “was reinterred in the Panthéon, the resting place of France’s heroes … with full national honors … He represented France at the League of Nations from 1924 till 1938 and served as a legal adviser to [president Charles] De Gaulle’s Free French Forces in London during the war … In 1967 Cassin bitterly criticized De Gaulle’s decision to embargo French weapons to Israel.” [SINGER, D., 1989, p. 313]

Also in France, in 1991, the former national spokesman for the left-wing ecology-based Green Party, Jean Brière, was sued by two Jewish organizations and the “International League Against Racism and Anti-Semitism” for comments he had made in an internal party memorandum about that year’s Persian Gulf War. In it he denounced the “warmongering role of Israel and the Zionist lobby.” Israel he wrote, was a “racist, militaristic, theocratic and expansionist state, with a policy based on the logic of perennial war … The influence of the Jewish lobby in the United States was decisive in the states in favor of war.” [ZLOTOWSKI, M., 4-21-91]

For these statements, Brière was given a suspended three-month jail sentence and fined $3,700 under existing “hate laws” by a French court. The punishments were later overturned, only because the memo was intended as an internal memorandum and not to be made public. . [More France: http://jewishtribalreview.org/frcorres.htm] (In October 2000, the [Jewish] Forward reported that the Green Party, behind its presidential candidate Ralph Nader, “called this week for a suspension of United States aid to Israel and blamed the jewish state for the current violence in the Middle East … Democratic activists are calling the Green Party’s statement one of the most anti-Israel ever attributed to a party engaged in a presidential campaign – They are demanding that Green Party Jews abandon Mr. Nader and his running mate, Winona LaDuke, a Native American activist whose mother is Jewish.”) [CATTAN, N., 10-27-00]

In 1999, a Jewish woman, Ruth Dreifuss, became Switzerland’s new president. Jo Benkow was the head of the Conservative Party of Norway from 1980-84. He was the Speaker of the Norwegian Parliament from 1985-93, a position
that “is often referred to as ‘president’ and is second in the official chain of command behind the King.” [ALTMAN-OHR, 2-11-2000, p. 8] Despite the fact that Jews have always been a tiny group in Denmark, (there are only about 7,000 Jews in today’s population of 4.2 million), Edvard Brandes was once “leader of Denmark’s Liberal Party and twice minister of finance; Herman Trier, president of Parliament; General C. J. De Meza, commander of the Danish army during the war with Prussia in 1864.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 73] In 2001, in the Netherlands, the State Secretary of Justice, Job Cohen, became the mayor of Amsterdam. As the Jewish Chronicle noted, “most recent mayors have been Social Democrats, and Jews … Harry van den Bergh, a Cohen political ally and head of the Dutch Refugees Association remarked, “As a Jew, I find it exceptional that we have a Jewish mayor of Amsterdam for the fourth time since the war … Premier Wim Kok is said to be looking for a chosen successor, and Job Cohen is among the names which have been mentioned…” [FRIEDMANN, E., 1-26-01]

In Italy, Tullia Zevi, head of the Union of Italian Jewish Communities, is described by the American Jewish Yearbook as “one of the most prominent women in Italy.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 324] [See earlier discussion of Jewish prominence in Mussolini’s fascist Italy p. 167 and p. 182] In 2001, non-Jewish media mogul Silvio Berlusconi became the prime minister of Italy, heading a right-of-center government. “Berlusconi’s new administration,” noted the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “will be the most pro-Israel government in Italy in years. Defense Minister Antonio Martino, for example, is vice president of the Italian Friends of Israel association … ‘We have a lot of friends in this government,’ said Amos Vidan, currently in charge of the Israeli embassy in Rome … ‘The people in power have a more sympathetic approach to Israel, especially Berlusconi himself.”’ [GRUBER, R., 6-12-01]


In 2000 in Australia, powerful and influential Jewish mogul Joseph Gutnick made the local political news. Attempting to lobby Prime Minister John Howard to change existing laws to kick alleged former Nazis from the country, Gutnick was rebuffed and threatened to sue the prime minister for his frank commentary about his Jewish donor. As the Melbourne paper The Age noted,

“ABC radio yesterday reported that Mr. Gotnick had threatened to withhold financial support for the Liberals over the issue and when asked on ABC radio if he could ‘do without Gutnick’s money,’ Mr. Howard said … “I don’t change policy according to the financial contributions from anybody, whether it’s Mr. Gutnick or not.” [THE AGE, 8-10-2000]
Even in New Zealand, “as far back as the nineteenth century, Sir Julius Vogel was twice elected prime minister (in 1873 and 1876), while Sir Arthur Myers served as minister of munitions in World War I. There were five Jewish mayors of Auckland, and almost every city had a Jewish chief magistrate at one time or another.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 171]

In Poland, a country that has – post-World War II – only a few thousand Jews (see http://jewishtribalreview.org/jidele2.htm), the government’s Foreign Minister, Bronislaw Geremek, is Jewish, as was 1993 Prime Minister Hanna Suchocka. As noted earlier, while Jews were prominent in leadership positions in the communist rule of Poland, they were also noteworthy in positions of leadership in antithesis to the ruling regime. Prominent leaders of Jewish descent in the Solidarity resistance movement included Jan Litynski, Adam Michnik, and Karol Modzelewski. [WESCHLER, p. 40]

In the Czech Republic, a country that has an estimated Jewish population of only 6,000, in 1998 the Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted that “there is a strong Jewish representation in the Czech Foreign Ministry. Deputy Foreign Minister Otto Pick is Jewish, for example.” So is Jiri Pehe, “senior political adviser” to the president. [GREENE, R., 8-4-98, p. 6 & 6-23-98, p. 11] Thomas Jelinek was elected chairman of the Prague Jewish Community in 2001. He is also “a confidant of President Vaclav Havel and an economic adviser in the presidential office.” “I am strictly separating my agenda with the president, which covers mainly economic issues, from my position as chairman,” Jelinek told a Jewish ethnic news agency, “But for sure if there would be some serious issue affecting the Jewish community in the Czech Republic, it would feel natural to inform him about it.” [BENNETT, M., 7-2-01] A Jewish Austrian member of the European Parliament, Peter Sichrovsky, is even a member of the far right Freedom Party (much maligned for alleged anti-Semitism by the international Jewish community). [HARRIS, D., 2-3-2000, p. 1]

From the Ukraine, in 1994 the Jewish acting head of the Ukrainian cabinet, Yefim Zvyagilsky, “was faced with charges of embezzlement of state property [worth $25 million].” [STETSYURA] After fleeing to Israel, the Jewish state denied the Ukrainian request for his extradition. “Ukrainian officials,” noted Reuters, “say Zvyagilsky, a Jew by origin, acquired an Israeli passport during his two and a half years in Israel but he denies this … Some top [Ukrainian] government officials, including Foreign Minister Hennady Vdovenko have suggested that Ukrainian authorities might have to think twice before appointing Jews to senior jobs in the future.” [REUTERS, 2-12-97] [Bulgaria? See http://jewishtribalreview.org/bulgaria.htm]

Tzippi Hoffman and Alan Fisher note that

“In Cape Town, since 1867 there have been 69 mayors of which 12 were Jews. In Cape Town nearly a third of the Parliamentary Council are Jews.” [HOFFMAN/FISHER, p. 26]

How about the African nation of Zimbabwe, home to 750 Jews? In 2001, that country’s (Jewish) Chief Justice, Anthony Gubbay (born in Manchester, Great Britain) resigned his post after political troubles with president Robert Mugabe. [BELLING, S., 3-12-01]


In 2002, Sheila Firestone retired after 18 years in the Canadian Senate. Firestone won her position in 1984 in election battles against fellow Jews William Dery and Sharon Wolfe. “In her farewell address to her colleagues,” noted the Canadian Jewish News,

“spoke first of her ‘ancestral land,’ Israel … In an interview, Firestone said she regarded bringing the concerns of the Jewish community, including ensuring fair representation of Israel’s cause, as fundamental to her role as a parliamentarian – in caucus, in government, and internationally. ‘I have a strong sense of Jewish responsibility and the need to ensure respect and fair play for Israel,’ said Finestone … ‘I have taken my share of taunts for making representations for Israel. I’ve been called an Israeli agent and Mrs. Israel, but I’m proud to be acknowledged as a concerned member of the Jewish people.” [ARNOLD, J.]

That same year, Jewish politicians from around the world were invited to a conference in Israel. As the Globe and Mail noted:

“An influential group of Canadian Liberal MPs [Members of Parliament], led by Deputy Prime Minister Herb Gray, is lending its support to Israel by attending a conference of Jewish politicians organized by the Israeli government. More than 50 legislators from Europe, the Americas and South Africa are attending the four-day meeting in Jerusalem, sponsored by the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs. ‘I made the decision [to come] because I am a Jew,’ said Anita Neville, a rookie Liberal MP from Winnipeg. ‘I have a large Jewish community in my riding, and I care deeply about the nature of the relationship between Canada and Israel.’ Five of Canada’s six Jewish MPs are attending, along with two Liberal senators. Although the United States has a larger delegation, Canada is the only country to be represented by two senior ministers, Mr. Gray and Immigration Minister Elinor Caplan. Ms. Caplan said she sees no problem wearing ‘two hats,’ one as a Canadian minister and another as a supporter of Israel.” [ADAMS, P., 1-8-02]
In 1985, Frank Stuart Miller became the first Jewish premiere of Ontario, that country’s richest and most populace province. In 1993 Jacqueline Holzman was elected mayor of Ottawa. In 1991, Gary Weiner became Canada’s Secretary of State. In 1991 alone, Judy Rebick became President of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, Harvey Webber became President of the Council for Canadian Unity, and Karen Mock became Chairman of the Canadian Multicultural Advisory Board. Invariably at the helm of any “minority” movement that is open to them, in Quebec, the director (David Birnbaum), the chairman (Harold Chorney), and the first vice president (Andy Housefather) of the “Alliance for Quebec” (an “English-speaking rights group” in predominantly French Quebec) are Jewish. So is Howard Galganov, founder and president of another “English-rights” group there, the Quebec Political Action Committee. Galganov is a former member of Meir Kahane’s Jewish Defense League. In 1996 he charged that the majority French-speaking movement was against him, it was “anti-Semitic,” and they “must be stopped before it [anti-Semitism] gets started.” [FORWARD, JEWISH, p. 2]

Tired of all the Judeo-centric/Zionist censorial power everywhere around us, including America, and like to address it? Perhaps you might think to approach the National Coalition Against Censorship (NCAC) until you discover that the “first and longtime director” was Leanne Katz, succeeded by Joanne Bertin. [BLUME, p. 67] Taking an airplane any time soon? The Director of Aviation Safety for the National Transportation Safety Board, retiring in 2001, is Bernard Loeb. “It did not escape [Egyptian officials’] attention that the legendary head of aviation investigations at the NTSB – a brilliant and abrasive engineer named Bernard Loeb – who was overseeing the Flight 990 inquiry [an Egyptian airliner crash in 1999] – was Jewish and something of a Zionist.” [LANGEWIESCHE, W., NOV 2001, p. 47]

The head of the U.S. Space agency, NASA? Also Jewish: Daniel Goldin, honored at the First Annual National Jewish Leadership Awards dinner in 2001. Goldin, who has “family in Israel and has visited [t]here numerous times since 1967,” announced that an Israeli astronaut would be part of a crew into space in 2002. On a recent trip to Israel he “emphasized the possibilities of integrating Israel into the European space center and having it join the exclusive club of countries participating in the international space station, along with involving Israeli research and researchers in the station. [Israeli Prime Minister Ariel] Sharon commented that he sees Israel’s integration in NASAs’s research and development plans as critically important.” [SIEGEL, J., 8-15-01]


Judeo-centric, pro-Israel (albeit veiled) government think tanks (as of 1993) included the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (co-founded by Martin Indyk), the Foreign Policy Research Institute (“the personal think tank” of Jewish academic Daniel Pipes), and the Jewish Insitute for National Security Affairs (JINSA; founded by Michael Ledeen – Ledeen was involved in the Iran-gate affair. His wife was then-Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle’s secretary). “Stephen Bryen,” notes Grace Halsell, “served as JINSA’s executive director during the time charges were being investigated that, as a Senate Foreign Relations Committee aide, he had offered military secrets to a visiting Israeli defense official. Bryen was not indicted, and subsequently was named Reagan administration deputy assistant secretary of defense in charge of protecting sensitive American technology. While Bryen was in the Pentagon his wife, Shoshanna Byren, served as JINSA’s executive director, during the time charges were being investigated that, as a Senate Foreign Relations Committee aide, he had offered military secrets to a visiting Israeli defense official. Bryen was not indicted, and subsequently was named Reagan administration deputy assistant secretary of defense in charge of protecting sensitive American technology. While Bryen was in the Pentagon his wife, Shoshanna Byren, served as JINSA’s executive director, during the time charges were being investigated that, as a Senate Foreign Relations Committee aide, he had offered military secrets to a visiting Israeli defense official. Bryen was not indicted, and subsequently was named Reagan administration deputy assistant secretary of defense in charge of protecting sensitive American technology. While Bryen was in the Pentagon his wife, Shoshanna Byren, served as JINSA’s executive director, during the time charges were being investigated that, as a Senate Foreign Relations Committee aide, he had offered military secrets to a visiting Israeli defense official. Bryen was not indicted, and subsequently was named Reagan administration deputy assistant secretary of defense in charge of protecting sensitive American technology. While Bryen was in the Pentagon his wife, Shoshanna Byren, served as JINSA’s executive director, during the time charges were being investigated that, as a Senate Foreign Relations Committee aide, he had offered military secrets to a visiting Israeli defense official. Bryen was not indicted, and subsequently was named Reagan administration deputy assistant secretary of defense in charge of protecting sensitive American technology. While Bryen was in the Pentagon his wife, Shoshanna Byren, served as JINSA’s executive director, during the time charges were being investigated that, as a Senate Foreign Relations Committee aide, he had offered military secrets to a visiting Israeli defense official. Bryen was not indicted, and subsequently was named Reagan administration deputy assistant secretary of defense in charge of protecting sensitive American technology. While Bryen was in the Pentagon his wife, Shos-

In 1988, five Jews – all Toronto-based – were elected to Canada’s national legislature. Three became cabinet ministers: Monte Kwinter (Minister of Industry, Trade, and Technology), Elinor Caplan (Minister of Health – later, of Immigration), and Chaviva Hosek (Minister of Housing). Jewish deputy ministers included Martin Barkin and Elaine Todres. [SINGER, D., 1989, p. 255] The chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, Brian Dickson, was also Jewish as was Quebec chief justice Alan B. Gold. Jonathan Schneiderman was also president of the “youth wing” of the Liberal party. [SINGER, D., 1989, p. 268]

The Jewish oligarchs dominating today’s Russian political situation are noted earlier (as is Jewish pre-eminence in the communist governments of the last few decades throughout Eastern Europe), but a 1997 World Press Review commentary sums it up well enough for purposes here:
“The [Russian economic] crisis also explains why Boris Berezovsky and his six prominent Russian bank allies, who, according to Berezovsky’s own account, first made President Boris Yeltsin’s reelection possible, then arranged the promotions of presidential Chief of Staff Anatoly Chubais and First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Potanin. Berezovsky runs a conglomerate that includes Russia’s Channel 1 television network. He boasts of controlling most of the independent television stations and newspapers.” [HELMER, p. 44-45]

Any addressing of Jewish political empowerment in Latin America must inevitably consider the implications following 1998 observations by professor Judith Elkin, whose specialty is the Jews of Latin America:

“Following formation of the state of Israel, Yiddish was replaced by Hebrew in most Jewish schools, and Israel became the preferred locus for teacher training. Financial subsidies for Latin American schools were allocated by the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency. Zionism conquered the schools on the way to conquering the [Jewish] communities as a whole … [ELKIN, 1998, p. 176] … Organized Jewish life came to revolve around Zionist activities: the sale of Israel Bonds, celebration of Israel Independence Day, the training and hiring of Hebrew teachers, and so forth … Jews living in Latin America are occasionally able to apply political leverage in support of the government of Israel … The close relationship between Latin American Jews and Israelis sustain the suspicion among nacionalistas that Jews’ extra-territorial loyalties exceed the bounds of patriotic propriety. The accusation of double loyalty dogged the communities from the start, and continues today.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 232-233]

The potential of Zionism empowered in Peru? There are only 3,000 Jews in Peru, a land of 27 million. [PERELMAN, M., 4-20-01] But when Sally Goodgold followed a fellow Jew identified with the last name of Golden to meet the Prime Minister of Peru, Ephraim Goldenberg, in 1997 at the Museum of Natural History in New York, she noted that “he joked about ‘all the Golds’ at this ‘Gold of Peru’ event … The prime minister bent down and said to me, ‘Madame, … my mother [co-founded] Hadassah [the women’s international Zionist organization] of Peru.” [LEON, 9-26-97, p. 13] “In a meaningful symbolic act,” notes Judith Elkin, “Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori [of Japanese ancestry] prepared for Efrain Goldenberg’s swearing in as prime minister by removing the crucifix that usually presides over such ceremonies.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 278] (A Jewish heir to a mining fortune, August Salcedo, was Peru’s president from 1906-1912, and again from 1919 to 1930.) [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 268]

As Jewish historian Howard Sachar notes about the modern Jewish community in Peru:

“[It] is a tightly knit, quite ethnocentric community, with a remarkably lower record of intermarriage than in most other Latin American nations.” [SACHAR, H., p. 269]
In 2000, the shadowy head of the state Peruvian spy agency, Vladimiro Montesinos, known as Peru’s “Rasputin,” was arrested for bribing a Congressman; the incident was captured on videotape. The arrest of the powerful behind-the-scenes leader (one television-sponsored survey noted that 30% of Peruvians believed Montesinos ran the country) [BOYD, S., 12-97, p. 33-34] caused a crisis in the President Fujimori government. He was born into a “Marxist family” in 1944, later becoming a prominent lawyer known for defending major drug dealers. [LANE, C., 9-22-2000, p. A37] The wife, Elaine Karp, of a defeated Peruvian presidential candidate (Alejandro Toledo), is an Israeli. Karp, noted the Jerusalem Post in 2000, “brought charges against the Israeli defense establishment for allegedly assisting Montesino’s organization.” [COHEN, C., 9-18-2000, p. 5] In 2001, a Peruvian special prosecutor, Dr. Jose Carlos Ugaz, determined that Montesinos – still a fugitive – had stashed millions of dollars in bribery payments in Swiss banks. The money came from “Israeli businessmen as part of a deal for the sale of Russian fighter aircraft to Peru’s armed forces … Montesinos was closely connected to a group of businessmen – some Israeli and some Jews with Peruvian citizenship – who acted for him in international arms deals, from which he collected illegal commissions.” [DAYAN, A., 3-5-01]

(Nonetheless, the Jewish Week noted American Jewish lobbying pressure upon Toledo to pardon Lori Berenson, a Jew from New York, who had been sentenced by a Peruvian court “to 20 years in jail for collaborating with [Peruvian] terrorists.” “California Rabbi Steven Jacobs,” noted the Jewish Week, “who sat with the Berensons [parents of Lori] during the verdict, said he intends to put together a delegation of rabbis to meet with Toledo, whose wife and daughter are Jewish.”) [GREENBERG, E., 6-28-01] Montesinos was dismissed from the Peruvian military in 1977 “for selling state secrets to the CIA.” He grew to power as a lawyer and became part of the Fujimori government in 1990. He is the alleged “architect” of a military coup in 1992. [LANE, C., 9-22-2000, p. A37] “When an ostensible democracy had been restored,” notes Charles Lane, “its revamped institutions were stocked with people Montesinos controlled through classic institutions of espionage: bibl-
ery and blackmail. The previously obscure National Intelligence Services, known as SIN, emerged as the true source of power in Peru, and Montesinos ran it… Even prominent citizens lowered their voices when they mentioned his name … [There are] credible charges of death squads [against Montesinos], drug payoffs, and, most recently, large scale electoral fraud that the two [Montesinos and Fujimori] had faced.” [LANE, C., 9-22-200] “Human rights groups and United States senators,” noted the Los Angeles Times, “also have expressed concern over allegations linking Montesinos to slayings and torture of leftists and turncoat spies. Critics accuse him of masterminding the alleged dirty tricks that brought international condemnation on the presidential election.” [ROSELLA/TARNAWIECKI, 9-16-2000, pt. 1, p. A1]

An earlier defeated presidential candidate, novelist Mario Vargas Llosa, writes that the Peruvian “regime [is] manipulated from behind the scenes by the all-powerful and sinister Vladimiro Montesinos.” [LLOSA, M., 4-4-2000, p. B1] “Brazilian police,” reported Deutsche Presse-Agentur, “believe [Montesinos] is involved in drug trafficking.” [GROTH, H., 7-25-97]

In Chile, the principles of Salvador Allende’s early 1970s Marxist government (overthrown in large part by the CIA) “were in part designed by Senator Volodia Teitelboim, chief strategist of Chile’s Communist party who as a youth had belonged to Hashomer Hatzair, the left wing of the Zionist movement.” Other Jews in Allende governmental posts were David Baytelman, David Silberman, Jaime Faivoich, Jacobo Schaulsohn, Enrique Kirberg, Enrique Testa, and Luis Vega. [ELKIN, p. 268] By the 1970s about 30,000 Jews lived in Chile. The commander of the Chilean air force was Jewish, notes Jewish historian Howard Sachar,

“As was Chile’s ambassador to Israel. Two or three hundred other Jews held administrative positions [in government], served as deans and department chairmans in the nation’s universities … Here, as elsewhere in the West, Zionism served as the binding integument of Jewish life.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 275, 276]

How deep is this commitment to Israel? Former President of the American Jewish Congress, Joachim Prinz, once noted the allegiance of the so-called “secret Jews,” people of Jewish heritage who had been living for generations as Christians in Chile:

“Once, in 1950, when I delivered a lecture in Santiago, Chile, I was asked to receive a delegation of apparently good, faithful Christians who were collecting money for the purchase of land in Israel through the Jewish National Fund. They confessed that this was their link to their Jewish past. When I asked how they knew about their heritage they said, ‘Our fathers passed it down to us, as they received this knowledge from their parents and grandparents. We recognized each other because each of us observed the Sabbath, fasted on the Day of Atonement and kept other Jewish customs.’ Today this group of Marranos [‘secret Jews’] call themselves Sons of Zion and have emigrated to Argentina, where they live in a commune in preparation for their emigration to Israel.” [PRINZ, J., 1973, p. 5]
In Argentina, the American Jewish Yearbook noted in 1987 that

“right-wing members of the military and rightist elements of the Catholic Church and the Peronist trade unions charged that [earlier president Raul] Alfonsin’s government was in the hands of the so-called Sinagoga Radical (Radical synagogue), referring to the large number of Jews in high-level government positions … Among Jews who occupied prominent positions in the government were Marcos Aguinis, secretary of culture and advisor to the president, and later the person responsible for organizing the First National Educational Congress; Cesar Jaroslavsky, president of the Radical Civic Union bloc in the Chamber of Deputies; Bernardo Grinspun, the first minister of the economy in Alfonsin’s cabinet; Leopoldo Portnoi, president of the Central Bank; Jacobo Fiterman, public works commissioner in the Buenos Aires city administration … Fiterman had earlier been president of the Zionist Organization and head of the local United Jewish Appeal, called CUJA.”
[SINGER, D., 1989, p. 72]

The appointment of Aguinis, a “well-known Jewish psychoanalyst and writer,” as cultural minister “enraged the Catholic Church and its allies.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 264-265]

Other Alfonsin-era Jewish prominent officials included the Treasury Secretary (Mario Brodersohn), the Minister of Education (Adolfo Stubrin), the Secretary of State for Science and Technology (Manuel Sadosky), the Undersecretary of State for Information and Development (Robert Schteingart), the Undersecretary for Research and Administrative Reform (Oscar Oszlak), and the rector of the University of Buenos Aires (Oscar Shuberoff). [ELKIN, J. 1998, p. 264] (Earlier, Polish-born Jose Ber Gelbard was a controversial Minister of Economics).

“The warm acceptance of Jews by the Alfonsin regime,” notes David Singer, “was evident not only in the conspicuous presence of Jewish individuals within the government but in specific indications of support for Jewish issues.” [SINGER, D., 1989, p. 272] This increasing warmth to Jews in Argentine business and government prompted a right-wing general, Ramon Campos, to publish “a book in which he charged the Jewish banking interests were subverting the state and [he] warned of Zionist infiltration.” [ELKIN, J. 1998, p. 264] “Some Argentine military sectors,” wrote Jacobo Timerman in 1981,

“… at various times, [ha]ve voiced the need to avoid any expression of anti-Semitism, maintaining this as a tactical necessity … Their main argument in favor of avoidance of any suspicion of anti-Semitism invariably has been the need to avoid confrontation with the powerful Jewish community in the United States.” [TIMERMAN, J., 1981, p. 131]

Alfonsin’s successor through the 1990s, Carlos Menem, has had close Jewish advisors, particularly Samuel Muzykanski and Moises Iknonicoff. His Minister of Interior (Carlos Corach) and Deputy Justice Minister (Elias Jassan) are also Jewish. [ELKIN, J. 1998, p. 265] Celso Lafer was also Minister of Foreign Affairs.
and Israel Klabin the mayor of Rio de Janeiro in the 1990s. [ELKIN, 1998, p. 92] In 1989, the Jerusalem Post noted the visit of the Anti-Defamation League Morton Rosenthal (head of ADL’s Latin American division) to Israel:

“Newly-elected Argentine President Carlos Menem hopes to obtain American assistance in extracting his country from its current economic morass. Rosenthal noted in an interview here last week, ‘Menem is aware that Jewish opinion is important in Washington. Where economic and political help is concerned, we try to help our friends, and Argentina does need our help.’” [HOFFMAN, C.]

Decades earlier, under famed Argentine leader Juan Peron,

“Angel Borlenenghi was appointed Minister of Interior, Abraham Kirslavin became his subsecretary, and Liberto Rabinovitch was named a federal judge. Several Jews were allowed to hold responsible positions in Peron’s Justicialista Party.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 286]

The ambassador from Costa Rica to the United States is Jaime Daremblum, also Jewish. [LAKE, E., 3-31-2000, p. 21] as is Mexico’s Ambassador to the European Union, Jaime Zabludovsky. Mexico’s Secretary of Foreign Affairs is Jorge G. Castaneda (Gutman), also Jewish. [http://www.aztlan.net/mexziston.htm] In 2001, the Washington Post noted that

“Jorge G. Castenda is Mexico’s Foreign Minister and [Andres] Rozental is one of his key troubleshooters. Together, they have played leading roles in engaging the United States and Mexico in their most serious negotiations in decades aimed at reforming their immigration policies … Casteneda, 48, and Rozental, 56, share the same mother – a Russian immigrant to the Mexico – and deep understanding of the United States … Casteneda, whose father was also foreign minister, is the intellectual author of much of [Mexican president Vicente] Fox’s thinking about the world … Named ambassador-at-large while continuing his consulting business, Rozental is often on the road … Rozental’s dual role has led to questions about whether his work on behalf of the government is benefiting his consulting clients … In his private office, overlooking the heart of Mexico City, Rozental [said]: ‘We are each other’s best friend … I don’t think many people know how close we are.’” [SULLIVAN/JORDAN, 8-28-01]

In October 2001, Ernesto Cienfuegas posted the following list in an article (see http://www.aztlan.net/castakip.htm) about Castenda:

“Partial List of High Level Mexican Officials of Jewish Descent”:
- Santiago Levy Algazi (Director General Del Imss)
- Jorge Gustavo Castaeda Gutman (Secretario De Relaciones Exteriores)
- julio Jose Frank Mora (Secretario De Salud)
- Alejandro Gertz Manero (Secretario De Seguridad Publica)
- Aaron Dychter Poltolarek (Subsecretario De Comunicaciones)
- Andres Rozenthal (Ex-subsecretario De Relaciones Exteriores)
– Jaime Cohen Yaez (Dir. Gral. De Sanidad De La Secretaria De La Defensa Nacional)
– David Penchyna Grub (Jefe De La Unidad De Coordinacion Sectorial De La Secretaria De Desarrollo Social)
– Isaac Rojkind Orleansky (Dir. Gral. De Planeacion De La Secretaria De Desarrollo Social)
– Gerardo Guidi Kawas (Dir. Gral. De Administracion De La Secretaria De Medio Ambiente)
– Eikar Meyer Murguia (Jefe De La Unidad Informatica Y Telecomunicaciones De La Secretaria De Energia)
– Andres Rosenzweigh Pichardo (Dir. Gral. De Estudios Del Sector Agropecuario De La Secretaria De Agricultura Y Ganaderia)
– Mario Rozenstein Szraiber (Presidente De La Comision Nacional De Avaluos Nacionales)
– Alejandro Musi Letayf (Dir. Gral. De Administracion De Personal De La Secretaria Del Trabajo)
– Gilberto Jose Hershberger Reyes (Dir. Gral. De Asuntos Juridicos De La Secretaria De La Reforma Agraria)
– Walter Beller Taboada (Dir. Gral. De Prevencion Del Delito Y Servicios A La Comunidad De La Procuraduría General De La Republica)
– Moisés Kolteniuk Toyber (Director General De Minería)
– Samuel Levy (Funcionario Del Instituto Nacional De Ecología)
– Jos… Woldenberg Karakowski (Presidente Del Instituto Federal Electoral)
– Jacqueline Peschard (Consejera Del I.f.e.)
– Jacques Rogozynsky (Director De Banobras)
– Eddy Varon Levy (Diputado Federal Del Pri)
– Rene Drucker Colin (Asesor De Cuauhtemoc Cardenas)
– Adolfo Gilly (Asesor De Cuauhtemoc Cardenas)
– Jenny Saltiel Cohen (Secretaria De Transportes Y Vialidad Del D.f.)
– Roberto Eibenschutz Hartman (Secretario De Desarrollo Urbano Y Vivienda Del D.f.)
– Claudia Sheinbaum Pardo (Secretaria De Medio Ambiente Del D.f.)
– Luis Winternertz (Dir. Gral. De Proteccion Civil Del D.f.)
– León Alazraky Gaycinsky (Contralor Interno Del D.f.)
– Isaac Chertorivsky (Presidente Del Patronato De Bomberos Del D.f.)
– Teodoro Maus Reisbaum (Consul En Atlanta)
– Juan Jose Bremer De Martino (Embajador En España)
– Jaime Enrique Zabludowsky Kuper (Embajador En La Union Europea)
– Carlos Salomon Camara (Director De La Loteria Nacional)
– Carlos Imaz Gispert (Lider Del Prd En El D.f.)
– Ernesto Nemer (Secretario De Administraci’n Del Edomex.)
– Fritz Glockner (Publicista Del P.r.d.)
– Jos… Levy García (Secretario De Finanzas De Jalisco)
In 2001, a Jewish ethnic newspaper featured an article about Mexico’s President, Vicente Fox, and his attendance at the American Jewish Committee’s annual dinner:

“When Barry Jacobs, a Foreign Service officer for 28 years and now director of strategic studies for the American Jewish Committee, learned that Mexican President Vicente Fox was to speak at the group’s annual dinner, he was more than surprised. ‘It’s mind-blowing,’ said Jacobs, who serves as AJ Committee’s liaison to the Mexican-Jewish community. “It was an incredible honor that he flew up for this event. Fox was eager to participate in the May 3 dinner, according to AJ Committee officials … Fox’s well-received speech – indeed, his mere presence at the event – reflects the growing importance that Mexico’s 40,000 Jews have obtained in their country, says observers. When AJ Committee visited Mexico in October and invited Fox, then the president-elect, to speak at their dinner, he accepted immediately … Jacobs said several members of Fox’s Cabinet have some Jewish background, even though Jews make up less than half of 1 percent of Mexico’s population. ‘The importance of the Jewish community in Mexico is that they are a small community doing well economically,’ Jacobs said.” [BERGER, M., 5-11-01]

In fact, the Finance Chairman for the Vicente Fox presidential campaign was also Jewish, Lino Korrodi. [http://www.aztlan.net/fox-funds.htm]

Even in a place like Guyana, in South America, Janet (Rosenberg) Jagan, who was born in Chicago and had married a prominent Guyanan, became that country’s president in 1998.
There are only 44,000 Jews living in Uruguay, but

“in recent decades, there have been Jewish senators, ministers and deputy ministers, directors of the Central Bank and the central tax collection office, a rector of the university. Uruguay was the first Latin American government to recognize Israel … The single lingering consequence of these political changes [a Uruguayan army coups] has been an intensification of Uruguayan Jewry’s Zionist commitment … Leaders of the Jewish institutions [in Uruguay] dutifully consult the Israeli ambassador – their status symbol – on matters not only related to Israel but to domestic Jewish affairs … Jewish education, both the day schools, and in some eleven Sunday schools, has remained Israel-centered.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 273]

In Brazil, notes Judith Elkin, where the 120,000 Jews represent less than one-tenth of one percent of the total Brazilian population,

“Individuals from the important commercial families Lafer, Klabin, Moses, Bloch, and Levy have entered politics as ministers of state, bankers, and presidential advisers. There are Jews in numerous posts and in significant military positions.” [ELKIN, p. 269]

Horacio Laufer was the Brazilian Minister of Finance from 1949-1959. “In later years,” notes Howard Sachar,

“Jews sat in state and municipal cabinets. Max Feffer … was appointed Secretary of Culture, Science and Technology for the state of Sao Paulo … His predecessor, Jose Mindlin, was also a Jew. Jews have been mayors of Curtiba and Rio de Janeiro, where squares and streets are named for [Zionist leaders] Theodore Herzl, David Ben-Gurion, Ann Frank and other Jews. There have been Jewish generals in the armed forces – six of them in 1966. The nation’s cultural life has been as widely influenced by the Jewish leaven as in any Western land, from the conductor of the national symphony orchestra to directors of state academies and institutes to deans of universities.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 258]

“This is a Zionist community,” noted Fiszel Czeresnia, chairman of Brazil’s Zionist Organization, in 1985, “Zionism animated every Jewish institution we have in this country.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 262] And as Howard Sachar adds about the political mood of the very affluent Jewish community in Brazil:

“With a few exceptions – mainly university students and a handful of progressives in the state and national legislature – Jews have not taken a stand on the nation’s horrifying economic inequities. Living in comparative prosperity, accepted by the elite strata of Brazilian society, they appear content with the political status quo. As in Chile and Argentina, the largest numbers of Brazilian Jews remain suspicious of populist democracy.” [SACHAR, H., 1985, p. 264]
In conclusion for this chapter, let us simply note the editorial of a London newspaper, *The Sun*, which in 2001 (in the wake of the results of widespread Western foreign policy that supports the Jewish state) declared its support for Israel in this chilling manner:

“Terrorism is now, without a doubt, the greatest scourge in the free world. It has to be fought with utter determination wherever it threatens us. As we are seeing in [the] Afghanistan [war] this is not a pleasant task. When the Americans turn their attentions to Iraq – as they must – it will get even more unpleasant. And when the Israelis defend themselves – as they must – it will not be pleasant either. But if we have learned anything from the New York attacks, we should have learned this: WE ARE ALL ISRAELIS NOW.” [Emphasis in the original; SUN, 2001]

Or as journalist Richard Brookhiser’s article in the *New York Observer* proclaimed, echoing this growing theme throughout America:

“We Are All Jews in Our Enemy’s Eyes.”

*[New York Observer*, May 4, 2002]*

“Israel’s claim to the Holy Land rests on the existence of God. If it was not God’s will that they possessed Canaan, the nations can reproach them as mere conquering brigands.”

Herman Wouk, Jewish novelist, p. 186

“Is Zionism racism? I would say yes. It’s a policy that to me looks like it has very many parallels with racism. The effect is the same. Whether you call it that or not is in a sense irrelevant.”

Desmond Tutu, South African Archbishop and activist against apartheid, [in HOFFMAN, p. 15]

“Passionate hatred can give meaning and purpose to an empty life. Thus people haunted by the purposelessness of their lives to try to find a new content not only by dedicating themselves to a holy cause but also by nursing a fanatical grievance.”

Eric Hoffer, The True Believer, 1963, p. 102

“Zionism … must after Auschwitz be a Christian commitment as well [as a Jewish one] … The post-Holocaust Christian must repent of the Christian sin of suppressionism … Without Zionism, Christian as well as Jewish, the Holy Spirit cannot dwell between Jews and Christians in dialogue … Christians after the Holocaust, we have seen, must be Zionists on behalf not only of Jews but also of Christianity itself.”

Emil Fackenheim, Jewish author, p. 285, 305

“If power corrupts, the reverse is also true; persecution corrupts the victims though perhaps in subtler and more tragic ways.”

Arthur Koestler, [in GILMAN, p. 33]

“Is there anything more common than the transformation of persecuted into persecutor … ?

Maxime Rodinson, p. 9

“In the twentieth century, men – all of us – find themselves compelled to commit or condone evil for the sake of preventing an evil believed to be greater. And the tragedy is that we do not know whether the evil we condone will not in the end be greater than the evil we seek to avert – or be identified with.”

Emil Fackenheim, [in BELL, p. 317]
“If Israelis know about oppression, it is mostly from the oppressor’s end of the gun sight.”

Benjamin Beit Hallahmi, Israeli professor at Haifa University “

One of the major problems with Israeli democracy is that it has no constitutional guarantees of human rights. To my knowledge it’s the only functioning democracy without such provision.”

Asa Kasher, Israeli philosopher, [in BRANDT, J., 2000, p. 10]

“Israel is working on a biological weapon that would harm Arabs but not Jews, according to Israeli military and western intelligence sources … In developing their “ethno-bomb,” Israeli scientists are trying to exploit medical advances by identifying genes carried by some Arabs, then create a genetically modified bacterium or virus. The intention is to use the ability of viruses and certain bacteria to alter the DNA inside their host’s living cells. The scientists are trying to engineer deadly micro-organisms that attack only those bearing the distinctive genes. The programme is based at the biological institute in Nes Tziyona, the main research facility for Israel’s clandestine arsenal of chemical and biological weapons. A scientist there said the task was hugely complicated because both Arabs and Jews are of semitic origin. But he added: “They have, however, succeeded in pinpointing a particular characteristic in the genetic profile of certain Arab communities, particularly the Iraqi people.” The disease could be spread by spraying the organisms into the air or putting them in water supplies. The research mirrors biological studies conducted by South African scientists during the apartheid era and revealed in testimony before the truth commission. The idea of a Jewish state conducting such research has provoked outrage in some quarters because of parallels with the genetic experiments of Dr Josef Mengele, the Nazi scientist at Auschwitz.”


“A good many Israelis see that if conflict with the Arabs continues, they are in danger of becoming like the Germans from 1933 to 1945 – accomplices if not perpetrators of permanent oppression.”

Norman Birnbaum, Why, p. M5

“The ‘Israeli criterion’ as the key indicator in assessing anti-Semitic has increasingly been widened. The label of anti-Semite is no longer limited to those who reject the legitimacy of the Jewish state. Criticism of Israeli governmental policies and actions has also entered into the calculus … As the ‘Israeli criterion’ for evaluating anti-Semitism has become broader, it has more and more impaled individuals and groups on the liberal-to-left of the political spectrum on the charge of anti-Semitism.”

Arthur Liebman, 1986, p. 352
“Nor is there solid evidence that marginality increases humaneness. **Freud** felt that, on the contrary, Jewish history had produced some negative psychological results. In his essay, *Some Character Types Met with in Psychoanalytic Work*, he discusses the ‘exception’: the person who justifies his rebelliousness and claims special favor to himself by some injury he has suffered and of which he considers himself blameless. Such people, **Freud** notes, often feel quite justified in injuring others. He refers to Shakespeare’s Richard III as a prime example of the type. In the midst of this discussion **Freud** notes: ‘For reasons which will easily be understood I cannot communicate very much about these and other case histories. Nor do I propose to go into the obvious analogy between deformities of character resulting from protracted sickness in childhood, and the behavior of whole nations, whose past has been full of suffering.’ As [Jewish psychoanalyst] Theodore Reik points out, the reference is obviously to Jews.”

**Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter**, 1982, p. 113

“The Holocaust came to be regularly invoked – indeed, brandished as a weapon – in American Jewry’s struggles on behalf of an embattled Israel.”

**Peter Novick**, 1999, p. 145

“A guy gets interviewed by a top Israeli general to be an Israeli spy. As a test, the general asks, ‘If you had a chance to kill an Arab or a cat, which one would you kill first?’ ‘Why the cat? You’re hired!’ the general says.”

Joke told by an ultra-Orthodox Jew to **Stephen Bloom**, 2001, p. 224

“The elements of the Jewish heritage that are hostile to non-Jews have long been known to the world, and anti-Semitic writings quote them at length. Until recently few would have seriously asserted that these passages reflect the opinions of Jews in our own generation. But, when religious extremists inject a contemporary relevance into these passages … they acquire a new and dangerous significance. They provide ammunition for anti-Semites, who can assert that the true Jewish character is revealed not when Jews are subjugated in Christian or Muslim societies, but precisely when they are free. It is in their natural environment, not in subjugation, that they dare disclose their true face, and the nations of the world must redefine their attitudes in view of the strong Jews rather than the impotent Jews.”

**Yehoshafat Harkabi**, former head of Israeli military intelligence, p. 179-180

“Only in fantasies about an all-embracing Jewish conspiracy did a Jewish banker and a Jewish anarchist report to the same boss.”

**Stanislaw Krajewski**, Jewish-Polish author, *The Jewish*, p. 64
“It may be the case that [post-Holocaust] the authentic Jewish agnostic and the authentic Jewish believer are closer than at any previous time.”

Emil Fackenheim, Jewish theologian, in Sack, J., p. 135

The central symbol of Jewish identity today is the nation of Israel, the magnet of international Jewish loyalty and allegiance, an obsessive attraction that is difficult for most non-Jews to fathom. Ironically, even relatively few Jews living out of Israel know many details about the Jewish state; large numbers of diaspora Jews know only the religious or Zionist legends about the place, both views grounded in the myths of Jewish martyrology and redemption. “The vast majority of Jews have no familiarity with the currents of Israeli cultural and even political life,” notes Charles Liebman, “… Those that are devoted to Israel generally focus on the external threat [by non-Jewish nations against Israel] rather than the internal features of Israeli society.” [LIEBMAN, Rel Trends, p. 306] “American Jews … are not interested or knowledgeable [about Israel] as is frequently assumed,” says Chaim Waxman, “… In a number of surveys of American Jewish attitudes toward Israel, most of them are quite ignorant not only of Hebrew but of the basic aspects of Israeli society and culture. In a 1986 national sample, only one-third of American Jews were aware of such elementary facts as that Menachem Begin and Shimon Peres are not from the same political party, that Conservative and Reform rabbis cannot officiate weddings in Israel, and that Arab Israeli and Jewish Israeli children do not generally go to the same schools.” [WAXMAN, p. 136] Ze’ev Chafets, an American Jew who moved to live permanently in Israel in 1967, notes that

“During the first few months in Jerusalem, I found I knew very little about Arabs – and not much more about Jews … In the states I had been considered pretty Jewish by my friends … but in Israel I suddenly found myself little more than a tourist in what I increasingly wanted to see as my own country.” [CHAFETS, p. 15-16]

An “age-old ritual” for American Jews who visit Israel is to pay the Jewish National Fund $10 and plant a tree in honor or memory of a friend or relative. Preying on diaspora sentiment, it is a $50 million-per year business. In 2000 it was discovered by the Israeli newspaper Ma’ariv that workers at the popular Jerusalem planting site “cynically uproot the saplings planted by tourists to make way for the new day’s busloads.” [SONTAG, D., 7-3-2000, p. A4]

“Many American Jews,” says Charles Liebman, a professor in Israel, “… have created their own conception of Israel. This is the chunk of Israel that they see and/or imagine they see or they are shown when they visit Israel. Even when they stay for an extended period of time. I am impressed by how vivid this partial image remains. It is not an Israel of self-serving and inept leaders, of a rude populace, and … an xenophobic culture. Rather, it is a society that excludes universalist sentiment wrapped in symbols of Jewish particularism.” [LIEB-
For most Jews, notes Adam Garfinkle, “Israel is more of an icon than a real place [GARFINKEL, p. 144] … The Jewish sensibility and the Israeli sensibility is suffused with metaphors of chosenness, slavery, exile (galut), wandering in the wilderness, liberation, a covenant over the land of Israel, and the redemption of it, that resound from Biblical narratives.” [GARFINKEL, p. 22]

Many prominent Zionists have restrained, or hidden, fundamental Jewish ethnocentric sentiments to declare pan-human messianic statements about the Jewish state that are, in historical context, as we shall soon see, ludicrous. “Zionism,” insisted Solomon Goldman, president of the Zionist Organization of America, “… became a demonstration without parallel of the creative power of justice and democracy.” [GAL, A., 1986, p. 381]

Over time, notes Jonathan Sarna, “the Zion [Israel] of the American Jewish imagination, in short, became something of a fantasy land: a seductive heaven-on-earth, where enemies were vanquished, guilt assuaged, hopes realized, and deeply felt longings satisfied.” [SARNA, A Proj, p. 41-42] Marc Ellis, in discussing the work of Israeli author Avishai Margalit, notes that “In the Jewish context a glimpse of Masada, or the Wall, or the Temple Mount is enough to move the ‘Jewish heart,’ and the marketing of Israel takes full advantages of these images. Kitsch can also be politicized and become, in Margalit’s terms, part of state ideology whose ‘emblem is total innocence.’” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 34]

Colin Shindler notes the widespread Jewish American efforts to mythify the Jewish homeland and control its depiction in the world mass media:

“The ‘Israel’ that was promoted [after 1967] tended to be one of unreal, utopian dimensions, where public relations had replaced reality … Obsession with the media spawned new organizations, expensive consultants and vigilante journalists to cope with real and imaginary anti-Israel bias in the press.” [SHINDLER, p. 96-97]

In 2001, during an extended Palestinian uprising against Israel occupation, when Israeli brutality against Palestinians was becoming difficult to veil, the Jewish state hired a New York public relations company – Rubenstein Associates – to control popular perceptions about the place. To improve Israel’s image, Rubenstein suggested less security guards around prime minister Ariel Sharon and painting Israeli weapons used on Palestinian rioters orange “to make it clear to television viewers that solders are firing nonlethal rounds.” Cleaning up after Arab riots was also thought to make for a better image on TV. “But Palestinian officials and young boys interviewed at the Ayosh junction in the West Bank town of Ramallah,” noted the Baltimore Sun, “one place singled out by Rubenstein as a problem area, say the proposals prove Israel would rather save face than save lives.” [HERMANN, P., 6-29-01]

An Israeli scholar, Boaz Evron, notes that many American Jews “feel … an obligation toward Israel … Israel, for them, is not … a political space devoted to the continuation of a normal national life, but a historical revenge … [EVRON, p. 110-112] … Perhaps a main factor in Israel’s psychological hold on the Jewish Diaspora is that part of the Diaspora that has lost its religious
framework but has remained locked within the Jewish caste and uses Israel as a means of venting its complexes by proxy. These Jews imagine themselves to be part of the Israeli people, while maintaining their own comfortable existence in the Diaspora … thus Israel deliberately helps Diaspora Jews maintain an illusory existent identity. It is in the obvious interests of the Israeli leadership to prevent such an honest self-appraisal which might lead to a different, genuine Jewish identity.” [EVRON, p. 112]

Jewish American commentator Joyce Starr notes that

“American Jews may talk about Israel extensively, petition on the nation’s behalf, and give generously from their bank accounts, but this does not mean they ‘know’ Israel. American Jews read voraciously about the country and are familiar with the Dead Sea, Jerusalem, and the Green Line [that separates Israel from the West Bank]. Yet the human perspective is all but out of reach.” [STARR, 1990, p. 147]

In paraphrasing the comments of the chairman of the North American Jewish Forum, Starr also asserts that the American Jewish-Israel relationship

“was built with the consent of the leadership in both places for their own convenience. Israel needed emigration, as well as political and financial support, whereas American Jewry was engrossed in establishing the infrastructure of a burgeoning Jewish community in the United States. The way to accomplish both objectives was to build a black-and-white stereotype of Israel as either an idealized society or as a society with security problems. These stereotypes, in turn, stimulated philanthropy and political action.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 151]

In 1998, Rabbi Marvin Hier (of Simon Wiesenthal Center/Museum of Tolerance fame) censored an in-house movie at his Moriah Films center. Entitled “A Dream No More,” the film was scheduled to be shown at various sites on the occasion of Israel’s fiftieth anniversary celebration. Hier scrapped the project because it wasn’t flattering enough to the Jewish state. To the film’s directors (Mark Harris and Stuart Schoffman), noted the Jerusalem Post, “the demise of Dream reflects, at bottom, the unwillingness of American Jews to face the realities of Israeli life and history as a mixture of light and shadow.” [TUGEND, T., 11-16-98, p. 7]

“Zionism conjured up a grand vision of ardent young men and women earnestly engaged in the selfless task of creating and new and better humanity,” says Jonathan Sarna, “this utopian view of Zionism, linked as it was both to the self-image of American Jews and to their highest religious aspirations, had less and less to do with the realities of the Middle East … All of the historic American Jewish images of Israel – from the early image of agrarian pioneers, to the twentieth-century image of the ‘model state’ – spoke to the needs of American Jews and reflected their ideals and fantasies, rather than the contemporary realities of Jewish life in the land of Israel.” [SARNA, J., p. 58]

“Israel became a wellspring for a variety of enriching experiences and myths,” says Sylvia Barack-Fishman, “– paradoxically, making American Jews feel both more Jewish and more physically empowered in the western world.”
“If American Jews were denied … opportunities to act out vigilance for Israel,” wonders Israeli Bernard Avishai, “what would be left of their Judaism? … Is it possible that American Jews now need to invent anti-Semites to feel like Jews?” [AVISHAI, B., p. 353]

As Israeli Boas Evron observes:

“When you try to explain to American Jews that we [Israelis] are not, in fact, in danger of annihilation [from Arabs], that for many years to come we will be stronger than any possible combination, that Israel has not, in fact, been in danger of physical annihilation since the first cease-fire of the War of Independence in 1948, and that the average human and cultural level of Israeli society, even in its current deteriorated state, is still much higher than that of the surrounding Arab society, and that this level rather than the quantity and sophistication of our arms constitutes our military advantage – you face resistance and outrage. And then you realize another fact: this image is needed by many American Jews in order for them to free themselves of their guilt regarding the Holocaust. Moreover, supporting Israel is necessary because of the loss of another focal point to their Jewish identity … They need to feel needed. They also need the ‘Israeli hero’ as a social and emotional compensation in a society in which the Jew is not usually perceived as embodying the characteristics of the tough, manly fighter. Thus, the Israeli provides the American Jew with a double, contradictory image – the virile superman, and the potential Holocaust victim – both of whose components are far from reality.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 37]

“American Jews aren’t usually aware of their ignorance about us,” an Israeli “intellectual” told (new Jewish American immigrant to Israel) Wendy Orange on her sixth night in the Jewish state, “Why do you people always superimpose your fantasies on our reality?” [original author’s emphases: ORANGE, W., 2000, p. 25] Jewish American Joyce Starr recalls addressing an audience of “major donors of one of the largest American Jewish organizations” and making the mistake of mentioning some problems in Israel. “The hostess of the event,” notes Starr, “became visibly furious … So glacial was the reception [to me] … An elderly grandmother-type finally took pity on my shock and confusion. ‘Darling, you must understand,’ she comforted. ‘Everything you said is true, but you never should have said it here.’” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 140]

“I used to conduct a program involving UJA-Federation young leadership types, called ‘Images of Israel,’” says Jonathan Woocher, “It was kind of a Thematic Apperception Test, using photographs to elicit responses regarding attitudes towards Israel. What has always astounded me was the enormous range of values, attitudes, and emotions that American Jews were projecting onto Israel – Israel the heroic, Israel the threatened, Israel the bearer of ancient traditions, and so on. To be sure, those are pieces of the reality, but the responses were more interesting for what they revealed of the respondents: indeed, Israel was being used to help American Jews make sense of their own identity. To me that is clearly something which is not a basis for a healthy relationship.” [WOOCHER, 1990, p. 33]
The large numbers of Jews from Israel living in the United States are even a source of aggravation for some American Jews, whose myths prefer that the emigrants remain happy in the Jewish homeland as role-model Zionists. “American Jews,” says Israeli Moshe Shokeid, “… are bewildered by the presence of Israelis in their midst … American Jews who want to restore the categories and definitions which constitute the order and values of the respective Israeli, Jewish, and Zionist identities, employ a subtle strategy: they ignore the yordim [Israelis in America], they avoid associating with them, and express that disdain and resentment as much as their code of civility allows.” Some American Jews refer to Israelis in America as “Fish,” “the abbreviations stand for ‘fucking Israeli shithead.”’ [SHOKEID, 1998, p. 507] By 1981, the World Jewish Congress estimated the number of yordim in the U.S. to be between 300,000 and 500,000 – “perhaps one for every six Israelis living in Israel. They create a difficult situation for Diaspora Jews, partly because of the yordim’s own sense of embarrassment, and partly because Israel denigrates them and is embarrassed by the undiagnosed phenomenon they represent.” [WALINSKY, L., 1981, p. 67]

Among the most important nationalist legends in the modern state of Israel (and for many in the international Jewish community) has been the story of Masada. In Israeli/Jewish lore, 900 Jewish zealots nobly defended themselves for months against attack and then committed mass suicide at a remote desert fortress near the Dead Sea in 73 AD rather than surrender to besieging Roman legions. The Masada tale of desperate Jewish warriors has popularly been regarded as historical fact and has served as heroic symbol – a “last stand” in Jewish collective consciousness, a story where Jews who were revolting against Roman domination chose to die for their Jewish heritage rather than suffer oppression at the hands of Gentiles. Masada has embodied a range of traditional Jewish beliefs: Jewry as a “nation apart” against all others, the few against the many, Jewish heroism against Gentile hordes, and dedication to each other to the point of death as itself a noble endeavor. Masada story has long been a source of Jewish and Israeli pride, especially since the founding of modern Israel in 1948. “Masada is not just a story,” notes Israeli historian Nachum Ben-Yehuda, “Masada provides, certainly for my generation of Israelis, an important ingredient in the very definition of our Jewishness and Israeli ‘identity.’” [BENVENISTI, p. 35] “Masada,” writes Yitzhak Landau in his famous patriotic poem to Israel and Jewish solidarity, “shall not fall again.” [BENYEHUDA, p. 5]

Astoundingly, however, the Masada legend of courageous Jewish defenders is false. Its historical basis was distorted and embellished to serve the propagandistic needs of early Israeli nation-building. Nachum Ben-Yehuda wrote an entire volume in 1995 that catalogues, not only that the heroic version of the Masada story is not true, but that it was consciously fabricated to serve Israeli propaganda about Jewish identity, especially in the early post-Holocaust period when the Jews of Europe were perceived to have so passively met their fate at the hands of Hitler.

Virtually everything modern scholarship knows about Masada comes from the writings of Flavius Josephus, a man – who born a Jew – joined the Romans
and is generally considered in Jewish circles to be a traitor to his people (an odd source for heroizing ancient Jewry). A close reading of him, notes Ben-Yehuda, reveals that the “zealots” of Masada were actually Sicarri – “assassins,” of both Romans and Jews. The reason they fled to Masada was, not because they were fighting Roman domination, but that they were driven out of Jerusalem by fellow Jews. The Sicarri then “raided nearby Jewish villages, killed the inhabitants, and took their food.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 9] They killed about 700 Jews in Ein Gedi alone, “mostly women and children.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 36]

From this core of information about Masada’s dubious “defenders” provided by Josephus, Israeli propagandists “socially constructed a shrine for Jewish martyrdom and heroism” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 190] whereby the entire nation of modern Israel was itself conceived as a Masada, isolated defenders against gentile hostility towards Jews everywhere, “a symbol of the heroism of Israel for all generations … [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 87] … Masada was not destroyed. It became a symbol of the Jewish will to live as a nation, of refusal to surrender to the forces threatening its extinction.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 123] “In the late fifties and early sixties,” says Meron Benvenisti, “Masada became a national shrine.” [BENVENISIT, p. 38]

Yet, “the Masada mythical narratives,” adds Ben-Yehuda, “was consciously invented, fabricated, and supported by key moral entrepreneurs and organizations in the Yishuv [Israeli community] … [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 307] … [While Masada’s defenders were really] “thieves and assassins who robbed and killed other Jews.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 300] For years, Israeli army recruits were taken to the ruins of the Masada fortress to swear allegiance to the Jewish state, ritually stating “endless devotion” to Israel at this “place of splendor, glory and majesty.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 147] And Israeli newspaper in 1964 called Masada Israel’s “most cherished national asset” and the “mausoleum of the saints of the nation.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 185] A popular patriotic slogan became “Masada shall not fall again.” The Mossad’s assassination division was even called “Masada.”

Home of a band of fleeing Jewish murderers or not, the Masada story has not been without its Jewish critics on other terms. The idea of Israel itself as a veritable Masada country, a garrison state with a desperate back-to-the-wall “we against them” worldview (sometimes described as the “Masada complex”) has worried some Israeli commentators. Is collective suicide an appropriate role model for any people? How would this affect Israeli self-conception and behavior in the nuclear bomb world? Is an alienated “last stand” psychology a healthy premise to interact with the rest of the world? Seymour Hersh quotes the comments of an ‘expert who has been involved in government studies on the nuclear issue in the Middle East for two decades: “Israel has a well thought-out nuclear strategy and, if sufficiently threatened, they will use it.” [HERSH, S., p. 92] “Many senior nonproliferation officials in the American government,” adds Hersh, “were convinced by the early 1990s that the Middle East remained the one place where nuclear weapons might be used [i.e., no other Middle Eastern country has nuclear weapons except Israel].” [HERSH, p. 92]
“Our nationalists are leading us to Masada,” once complained famed tank commander Yitzhak Ben-Ari, “in the sense that ‘all the world is against us. We shall fight, and if we have a nuclear bomb, we shall use it.’ And what will remain for us? Nothing.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 157] “It is unavoidable,” worried Israeli historian Benyamin Kedar, “that [nationalist] behavior influenced by identification with Masada will indeed resuscitate it. If the entire world is against us, then one begins to behave as if we are against the entire world and such behavior is bound to lead to ever-increasing isolation.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 246]

It is clear that this Masada model is, of course, merely a secular, militant expression of the traditional religious “nation apart” syndrome itself, Jewish enclaves throughout history self-ghettoized against the non-Jewish Other. And as for the Masada myth itself, “time after time,” notes Ben-Yehuda, Jews who are told that the Masada story of heroism is fake “elicit expressions ranging from mild discomfort to (much more frequently) anger and open hostility. My worse encounters have typically been with [Israeli] history teachers … Obviously, the realization that a major element of one’s personal and national identity was based on a biased and falsified myth is not an easy thing to deal with.” [BEN-YEHUDA, p. 311]

Among the many forms of Masada mythologizing, in this case for American popular consumption, was a 1970 “historical novel,” Masada, subtitled A Novel of Love, Courage, and the Triumph of the Human Spirit, by Ernest Ganz, described by a Kirkus Reviews reviewer as “a return to the days of heroes larger than life.” It was also the subject of an “8-hour TV epic from ABC-TV and Universal.” [GANN, back cover and opening page] The Masada myth also saw American expression in 1987 when Jewish American Marvin David Levy, recently released after a two year prison term for his role in a drug smuggling ring, watched the Chicago Symphony Orchestra perform his “dramatic oratorio, Masada, in its newly expanded version.” The work, noted the Chicago Tribune, “emphasizes the triumph and tragedy of a heroic band that chose individual liberty at great personal cost.” [VON RHEIM, J., p. 26]

In 1971 Michael Rosenberg summarized American Jewry’s irrational views of Israel succinctly:

“Israel is the ultimate reality in the life of every living Jew today. I believe that Israel surpasses in importance Jewish ritual. It is more than the Jewish tradition; and, in fact, it is more than the Mosaic law itself. The anti-religious Jew who supports Israel is welcomed as a Jew and as an integral part of the community. The observant Jew who does not accept the centrality of Israel is not accepted and is rarely even tolerated. In dealing with those who oppose Israel, we are not reasonable and we are not rational. Nor should we be.” [ROSENBERG, M., p. 82]

While Jews have a deeply internalized millennium-old mythology about the place, a crucial instrument in formulating a more broadly favorable opinion
about Israel in America among non-Jews is the mass media. In the 1950s the New York public relations company of Edward Gottleib commissioned a Jewish author, Leon Uris, to write a novel “to create a more sympathetic attitude towards Israel.” [FINDLEY, p. xxv] This novel, Exodus, published in 1958, “did more to popularize Israel with the American public,” says public relations expert Art Stevens, “than any other single presentation in the media.” [FINDLEY, p. xxvi] Until Exodus, most Americans knew nothing about Zionism or the new nation of Israel. Most still have the same essential ignorance, but Uris’s novel became number one on the New York Times best seller list for nineteen weeks and became, notes Edward Tivnan, “the primary source of knowledge about Jews and Americans that most Americans had.” [TIVNAN, P. 51] The New York Times described the book when it first came out as “a passionate summary of the inhuman treatment of the Jewish people in Europe, the exodus in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to Palestine, and the triumphant founding of the new Israel.” [TIVNAN, p. 51] This “new Israel” was founded out of a victorious war against Arab armies in 1948. “In books, movies, and TV shows in the 1950s and 1960s,” says Stephen Green, “the Jewish state was depicted as having defeated the Arabs against overwhelming odds, contrary to virtually every professional strength estimate of the opposing forces that were made at the time of the war itself.” [GREEN, S, p. 75] “Shortly before the outbreak of [the 1967] war in June, President Lyndon Johnson’s intelligence experts debated whether it would take a week or ten days for Israel to demolish its enemies.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 148]

The hardcover Exodus edition was still in print in the 1990s; a paperback edition was still going strong at its sixty-third printing. Uris, a high school drop-out who flunked three English classes and joined the marines at the age of seventeen, is boldly self-referential in a later novel, Mitla Pass (1988). Here an Israeli official says to the novel’s main character, a Jewish author, that “this would be the first American novel about Israel. It could be valuable in gaining favorable world opinion.” [URIS, L., Mitla, p. 304] In real life, even David Ben Gurion, one of Israel’s most revered prime ministers, said that “as a piece of propaganda [Exodus] is still the greatest thing ever written about Israel.” [WHITFIELD, p. 77] “Although propaganda novels have occasionally punctuated the history of United States mass taste,” writes Stephen Whitfield, “Exodus was unprecedented.” [WHITFIELD, p. 77] The prominent Jewish novelist, Saul Bellow, observed that “admittedly, some people say Exodus was not much of a novel, but it was extraordinarily effective as a document and we need such documents now. We do not need stories like those of [fellow Jewish novelist] Philip Roth which expose unpleasant Jewish traits.” [WHITFIELD, p. 79]

Then came the Hollywood film based on the novel. “Uris had the blessings of Hollywood before he wrote the book,” notes Stephen Whitfield, “MGM had commissioned a novel about the birth of the Third Jewish Commonwealth [modern Israel] because it expected that a best seller would lengthen the lines at the box office.” [WHITFIELD, p. 164] Pat Boone sang, “This land is mine, God gave it to me” in the Exodus sound track and there was such media-enflamed interest in the subject that Israel’s El Al airlines created a 16-day tourist package that led visitors on a pilgrimage to the sites where Otto Preminger
made his movie. [WHITFIELD, p. 79] “People are the same no matter what they’re called,” says Eva Marie Saint in the movie. “Don’t believe it,” replies Paul Newman, “People have the right to be different.” [WHITFIELD, p. 164] “In Exodus,” notes Whitfield, “[the Jewish hero] battles not for the cause of democracy, nor for some cosmopolitan ideal of brotherhood, but as an unabashed [Jewish] nationalist.” [WHITFIELD, p. 164]

The book has sold, to date, over 20 million copies. [BREINES, p. 56] “All my life I’ve heard I’m supposed to be a coward because I’m a Jew,” the American Jewish captain of the ship, the Exodus, tells a Gentile nurse in the novel, “Let me tell you, kid. Every time the Palmach [a Jewish military branch in Palestine] blows up a British depot or knocks the hell out of some Arabs he’s winning respect for me. He’s making a liar out of everyone who tells me Jews are yellow. The guys over there are fighting my battle for respect … understand that?” [CHAFETS, p. 218] The real-life Israeli captain, Yeheil Aranowicz, of the blockade-running ship, the Exodus, upon which the novel is based, was subsequently quoted as saying that “the type [of characters in the novel] never existed in Israel. The novel is neither history or literature.” Informed of Captain Aranowicz’s authoritative judgements, Uris responded, “Captain who? And that’s all I have to say. I’m not going to pick on a light weight. Just look at my sales figures.” [BREINES, p. 55] Whatever the case, says Edward Tivnan, “the Israel of most Americans, including Jews, is still the Exodus version.” [BREINES, p. 56]

As Israeli writers Herbert Russcol and Margalit Banai noted in 1970 about the (overwhelmingly Jewish) illusory depictions of Israel:

“It may be better to rely upon the views of foreign [non-Israeli] observers, but most of them are too sympathetic [to Israel]. Their hearts are in the right places and they love us too much to see us plain. They are blinded by their gallant cause. In all the books written about Israel by outsiders there are never whores or alcoholics or greedy bankers or black marketers. There are only hero-farmers with a plow in one hand and a rifle in the other. We emerge from their pages rather like the cloth-dolls-of-Israel types which are sold in the souvenir shops of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv – here is the happy kibbutznik, the attractive girl soldier, the earlocked Jerusalemite, the quaint new immigrant from Yemen.” [RUSSCOL/BANAI, 1970, p. x]

Such views still persist, dominantly, with the widespread help of an institutionalized suppression of counter views to the alleged Israeli reality. Results of a 1987 Roper Poll during the Intifada [Palestinian uprising] era, noted a Jewish scholar, “reveal positive attitudes towards Israel and American Jews on the part of the American public.” These findings “are consistent with previous Roper results, [and] suggest that recent events, including the Iran-Contra affair, the Ivan Boesky insider trading scandal, and the Jonathan Pollard spy case have had little negative fall-out as far as attitudes towards Israel and American Jews are concerned.” [TOBIN, p. 50] Jewish pollster Lewis Harris noted in an interview in 1986 that “support for Israel is high despite all the controversies, just as it’s always been. At present, 78% of Americans feel very warm to Israel.” [TOBIN,
In the Jewish community itself, during the Intifada, “at the largest annual meeting of American Jews, the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Organizations … the Intifada was scarcely more than a side issue on the agenda.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 199]

In 1979, Edward Said, a prominent Palestinian-American professor at Columbia University, was troubled by the growing use of Jewish Holocaust mythologies in the media towards latent political ends:

“Anyone who watched the spring 1978 NBC presentation of Holocaust [by Graham Greene] was aware that at least part of the program was intended as a justification for Zionism – even while at about the same time Israeli troops in Lebanon produced devastation, thousands of civilian casualties, and untold suffering.” [SAID, Palestine, p. 55]

More generally, Jewish anti-Zionist Alfred Lilienthal condemned the dominant pro-Israel slant in the American mass media:

“Zionism did not waste time or energy on proving its extreme program to be morally and historically sound. All it had to do was to equate it with man’s compassion for the victims of history’s most cruel pogrom … The capture of the American press by Jewish nationalism was, in fact, incredibly complete. Magazines as well as newspapers, news stories, as well as editorial columns, gave primarily the Zionist view of events, before, during, and after Partition [of Palestine, creating a Jewish state].” [LILIENTHAL, p. 122]

Rabbi Jonathan and Judith Pearl note popular television's steady diet of pro-Israel emphasis:

“In a bit of serendipitous timing, the rebirth of the state of Israel and the establishment of a nationwide network television in America took place in the same year, 1948. Since then, these two phenomena have been inextricably linked, as scores of television dramas, comedies, and mini-series have turned to Israel and its stunning and turbulent history for subject matter. Many of these images have continued to be in the tradition of popular television, which has generally portrayed Jewish themes in a positive light … [PEARL/PEARL p. 173] … A sense of admiration for the Jewish state informs nearly all portrayals of Israel on American popular television over the past fifty years … Confidence in Israel’s ability to survive and thrive, and praise for its doing so, permeates television’s portrayal of Israel in a way that has seen little, if any, waverer or hesitation from the earliest years of network television until the present time. Almost invariably, these depictions include the expressing of much admiration by non-Jews for Israel’s heroism, achievements, and pioneer spirit.” [PEARL/PEARL p. 193]

After Israel’s Six Day War with Arab states in 1967, notes Amnon Rubenstein, “the reaction of the world press was so overtly pro-Israel … that it worried western diplomats in Arab capitals and forced Arab propagandists to radically alter their stand vis-a-vis the Jewish state.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 158]

Leon Hadar notes in overview that
“Many of the same American Jews who led the fight against US intervention in Vietnam, and supported an unconditional withdrawal of US forces, ignore or defend the long and bloody Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, and the mistreatment of Palestinian population there. How have most supporters of Israel in the United States avoided dealing with their own political inconsistencies? The answer lies in their personal image-maintenance methods designed to avoid the cognitive dissonance between their perceptions of Israel and its reality. That, and an American media that for many years sympathized with the Israeli point of view, has helped them to preserve the Israeli fantasy.” [HADER, p. 27]

In Stephen Green’s research of documents at the United States National Center for a book about the founding of the state of Israel, he noted that “the reality was so different from the myth as to be unrecognizable … Selective historical knowledge has led to fundamental false impressions in America about Israel and about the Middle East dispute generally.” [GREEN, p. 10-11]

Another of the endless mythologies surrounding Israeli society is the enforced illusion that women fare better against male sexist-mores in the Jewish state. Israel has long propagated the symbols of young, noble women working the farm fields and female soldiers in the Israeli army. Lesley Hazelton, in her book *Israeli Women: The Reality Behind the Myths*, is among those who have severely deflated such propaganda. “Myths compel respect, not necessarily by their truth, but because they are needed by those who believe in them,” she says. “It is not a rational need, certainly not a conscious need: but it is often vital, since myths lay the basis for society’s perceptions of itself, for its collective identity and the identity of every member in it … The liberation of Israeli women is such a myth. For nearly three decades Israeli women have been the paradigm of women’s liberation … They have made an essential contribution to Israel’s self-image as good and progressive, the antithesis of its notoriously and cruelly sexist Arab neighbors … But the destructive aspects of this myth far outweigh its creative potential for Israeli women … Their reality has been subordinated to the accepted image, and they have been relegated to the status of shadows, while the gap continues to widen between their public image and their real selves.” [HAZELTON, p. 22]

Herbert Russcol and Margalit Banai noted in 1970 the status of women in Israeli society:

“In Israel, today, a wife is still called by the lowly, pejorative term that the Old Testament calls hers: *isha*, woman. Her husband is still addressed by his splendid biblical title, *ba’al*, master. In the glorious days of the Kings of Israel, upon marriage an *isha* became the physical possession, the chattel, of her *ba’al* along with his handmaidens and slaves, his ox and his ass. For this reason, ‘to marry a wife’ and ‘to become master’ have the same root meanings in Hebrew. The infinitive *liv’al*, commonly used in the sacred texts, means bluntly, and most vulgarly, to possess a woman sexually. What our fiercely free *sabra* girl thinks of re-
ferring to her husband a dozen times a day as ‘my master,’ with all the humiliating connotations described above, may well be imagined by the reader.” [RUSSCOL, BANAI, 1970, p. 178]

New York Jewish feminist Congresswoman Bella Abzug was caught off guard when she visited Israel in the same era. Despite the fact that Israel once had a female prime minister,

“When I was sitting in the Knesset [Israeli Parliament] I noticed, to my surprise, that only 8 of the 120 members were women. One evening I met with some of the most outstanding women in the country and challenged them on this. The reply I got was that since women in Israel have equality they don’t need to prove it so much.” [ABZUG, B., 1972, p. 228]

In Israel itself, central propagandizing myths and blatant historical distortions are only recently being addressed (and this remains controversial) in that country’s school system. In 1999, noted the New York Times wire services, “new, officially approved textbooks make plain that many of the most common Israeli beliefs are as much myth as fact. The new books say, for example, that it was the Israelis who had the military edge in the War of Independence. The books say that many Palestinians left their land not – as has traditionally been taught – because they smugly expected the Arab states to sweep back in victory, but because they were afraid and, in some cases, expelled by Israeli soldiers.” [BRONNER, E., Rewriting, p. 1]

“Only 10 years ago much of this was taboo,” explained Eyal Naveh, a professor of history at Tel Aviv University, “We were not mature enough to look at these controversial problems. Now we can deal with this the way Americans deal with Indians and black enslavement. We are getting rid of certain myths.” [BRONNER, E., p. 1]

A 1984 Israeli history text, for example, from the Israeli Education Ministry stated that (concerning Arab-Israel fighting from 1939-49), “The numerical standoff between the two sides in the conflict was horrifyingly unbalanced. The Jewish community numbered 650,000. The Arab states together came to 400 million. The chances were doubtful, and the Jewish community had to draft every possible fighter for the defense of the community.” [BRONNER, p. 1]

This traditional Jewish/Israeli view is only propaganda, a blatant misrepresentation of facts in mythologizing Jewish heroism and justifying mass expulsions of the Palestinians from their homeland. One of the new Israeli textbooks today concedes this: “On nearly every front and in nearly every battle, the Jewish side had the advantage over the Arabs in terms of planning, organization, operation of equipment, and also in the number of trained fighters who participated in the battle.” [BRONNER, p. 1]

“Instead of portraying the early Zionists as pure, peace-loving pioneers who fell victim to Arab hatred,” noted the Times, “the new historians focus on the early leaders’ machinations to build an iron-walled Jewish state regardless of the consequences to non-Jews living there.” [BRONNER, p. 1]
Among long neglected issues only recently being publicly (albeit guardedly) addressed in America are those of Israeli-instigated atrocities against Arabs. As Israeli author Meron Benvisti noted in 2000,

“Atrocities and acts of [Jewish] brutality characterized this period [the fighting with Arabs to formally create a Jewish state in 1948]: summary executions, rape, blowing up houses along with their occupants, looting and plundering, and leaving hundreds of villagers to their own devices in the fields, without food or water. The most serious atrocities were committed in the village of al-Dawayima, on the western slopes of the Hebron Highlands … The occupying [Israeli] forces indiscriminately killed between 80 and 100 male villagers, blew up houses together with their occupants, murdered women and children, and committed rape. According to eyewitness testimony, these acts were committed ‘not in the heat of battle and inflamed passions, but out of a system of expulsion and destruction’ …. These atrocities – which fifty years later are regarded as libel, invented by the enemies of Israel, and whose retelling is perceived as an example of rewriting history by revisionist historians – were, at the time they took place, known to ministers in the Israeli government, military commanders, and even the general public. The government set up commissions of inquiry and the army set up commissions of its own, but the work of these bodies came to naught because soldiers and officers refused to testify against their comrades in arms.” [BENVENISTI, M., 2000, p. 153]

As Aharon Cizling, the Israeli Minister of Agriculture at the time, wrote:

“Now Jews too have behaved like Nazis and my entire being has been shaken … Obviously we have to conceal these actions from the public, and I agree that we should not even reveal that we’re investigating them. But they must be investigated.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 92]

Amos Kenan, a writer for the Israeli newspaper Yediot Aharonot, once wrote about his experiences on guard duty in an Arab town in the same era:

“At night, those of us who couldn’t restrain ourselves would go into the prison compounds to fuck Arab women. I want very much to assume, and perhaps even can, that those who couldn’t restrain themselves did what they thought the Arabs would have done to them had they won the war. Once, only once, did an Arab woman – perhaps a distant relative of [head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine George] Habash – dare to complain. There was a court martial. The complainant didn’t even get to testify. The accused, who was sitting behind the judges, ran the back of his hand across his throat, as a signal to the woman. She understood. The rapist was not acquitted, he simply was not accused, because there was no one who would are accuse him. Two years later he was killed while plowing the fields of an Arab village, one no longer on the map because its inhabitants scattered and left it empty.” [ELLIS, 1990, p. 106]
In 1988 Israeli author David Grossman recounts with shame his meeting with Wadha Isma’il, a Palestinian woman in an Occupied Territory refugee camp. As a small girl, upon working in the family fields, Wadha watched Israeli soldiers blindfold her father, and then heard him shot behind some bushes. “I began to cry,” she told Grossman,

“The soldiers who had stayed with me asked me: Who is that man to you? I said: ‘He is my father.’ They said: ‘Go to the garden down there, and you will see that he is harvesting lettuce and eggplant.’ When I was some distance from them, I glanced back and I saw one of the soldiers aiming his rifle at me. I was frightened and bent over. His bullet hit my neck and came out the other side.”

“I don’t know what to say her,” writes Grossman, “and she interprets my silence, apparently, as disbelief. ‘Look,’ she says, and her work-hardened fingers undo her kerchief, and she smiles a sort of apology about having to bother me with her wound. I see an ugly scar in back, and another ugly scar in front. Young Hana cries. It seems that Wadha is her mother. ‘Every time I hear that story, it is as if it were the first time,’ Hanan says.” [GROSSMAN, D., 1988, p. 70-71]

Israeli professor and Holocaust survivor Israel Shahak wrote about another set of atrocities by Jews against the Palestinians during the late 1980s uprising (the “Intifada.”) Shahak translated eyewitness accounts from the Israeli Hebrew press into English. In his introduction to a compilation of such testimonies, Shahak noted that:

“The systematic use of atrocities, which in their intensity and the special intention to humiliate are Nazi-like and should be compared to the analogous German Nazi methods, is intentional and in fact constitutes the Israeli method for ruling Palestinians … There should be also no doubt that those Nazi-like horrors can and probably will become worse, if not stopped from the outside, and their use can lead to actual genocide, whether by ‘transfer’ or extermination. Indeed, this is one of my reasons for assembling this collection: to show that the actual genocide of the Palestinians in the territories is now possible, since those Israeli soldiers and officers who have committed the outrages recorded here are capable of anything and everything.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 85]

Such cold realities, so very unwelcome in mainstream Jewish circles, drastically contrasts with widespread Jewish mythology about the Israeli army, the beloved Jewish “child-soldiers” as typically articulated by Elie Wiesel about the 1967 war: “I have seen many armies; none more humble, more humane in its victories … My pride is that Israel has remained human because it has remained so deeply Jewish.” [And what of Wiesel’s subtext here, that if one is less “deeply Jewish,” one is less “human?”] [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 10] American Jewish Zionist historian Melvin Urofsky articulated the common Jewish view of the noble Israeli army and government in 1978: “When the War came, Israeli leaders did their best to convince their Arab neighbors not to run away.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 206] And, in the aftermath of Israel’s 1967 victory over the Arabs, “There is little to be found in history to compare with the behavior

Among the prominent Israeli revisionist authors in recent years are Benny Morris and Avi Shlaim. “The rise of revisionist historiography,” notes Steven Heydemann, “… reflects a serious ambivalence about once-deeply held notions of the moral purposes of Zionism, its position in the Middle East, and the future.” [HEYDEMANN, p. 6] Such Zionist myths have for decades been unquestioned canon in Jewish circles, widely parroted in America, only in recent years been subject to increasing scholarly attack in (but rarely outside) the Jewish state. Such myths include the innately incorrigible morality of the Zionist enterprise and the conviction that a large Palestinian populace chose exodus – and were not driven – out of their homeland. More and more Israeli scholars are arriving at the fact that war with Arabs was not thrust upon the young Jewish nation, but was part of Zionist objective. Seminal Zionist leader Ben Gurion, says Avi Shlaim, “grasped that the essential structure of the conflict left no room for compromise and this would entail the settlement of Zionist claims by violent means.” [HEYDEMANN, p. 23] As Heydemann notes,

“Revisionist writings reveal a style of [Zionist] leadership [over past decades] in which the exercise of will was perceived primarily in terms of power and the application of force. Revisionism places an emphasis on the fierce, single-minded way in which Zionist leaders pursued three dominant strategic concerns: to expand the territory under Jewish control, to reduce the Arab population within this territory, and to encourage divisiveness among Arab states to prevent them from hindering the attainment of the first two.” [HEYDEMANN, p. 12]

These goals also included “compromise [with Arabs] as unnecessary in light of Israel’s evident military superiority,” and “indiscriminate whole expulsion of Arab communities, even those which had lived in peace with their Jewish neighbors.” [HEYDEMANN, p. 14]

“The ‘exhilarating’ possibilities of a land without Arabs,” observes Heydemann, “and the transfer of Arab farms, houses, and wealth into Jewish hands, set, as Morris reminds us, in the context of war and massive immigration, quickly overwhelmed the reservations expressed by minority factions about the morality of expelling Palestinian Arabs and destroying their villages.” [HEYDEMANN, p. 14] “We not only eradicated Arab place names [in Israel],” notes former Jerusalem deputy mayor Meron Benvenisti, “we actually destroyed the places as well.” [BENVENISTI, p. 196] The Israeli erasure of Palestinian history was consciously as complete as possible. As Benvenisti notes

“I was aware for quite some time that the Palestinian Research Institute in Beirut was compiling files on each Palestinian village in Israel. Since the beginning of the [Lebanon] war I wondered about the fate of those files. I was fairly sure that General [Ariel] Sharon and General Eitan would search them out, seize them, and destroy them in order to complete the
eradication of Arab Palestine. That is what eventually happened when the Israeli army entered West Beirut.” [BENVENISTI, p. 198]

Benvenisti also notes the Israeli creation of a place called “Peace Forest” on the sites of eradicated Arab villages near Jerusalem, utterly destroyed to guarantee that the inhabitants never returned. “To call it Peace Forest,” he laments, “to take well-meaning [Jewish] donors and with their money turn all these orchards into a picnic area for Israelis and tourists is something else entirely. This betrays not only a lack of sensitivity but is something that must eventually corrupt our youth… Dehumanization is a contagious disease.” [BENVENISTI, p. 200-201]

Traditional Israeli reluctance to address the facts of history even stretches far into the distant past. As Elliot Horowitz notes about Jewish massacres of Christians in ancient Israel:

“After 1967 the reluctance of Israeli historians, especially those linked institutionally to universities and research institutes, to acknowledge Jewish violence in the distant past has become even greater than in the decades immediately following the Holocaust. This is true especially with regard to acts allegedly committed against non-Jews in the land of Israel and its environs. One suspects that the resistance to acknowledging such phenomena in the past has been related to a desire on the part of many Israelis to see themselves as enlightened and humane occupiers at present.” [HOROWITZ, 1998 p. 8]

Israel is a very small nation – in one area its width is only about ten miles; more than half of its land mass is desert. Only one-fifth of the country is arable. The Jewish nation has few natural resources; potash is one of them. Even limited water supplies loom as long-term threats to political stability with neighboring water-poor countries. Most water is pumped from the “Sea” of Galilee and its headwaters; water crucial to the Jewish state originates in the heavily Arab West Bank and in southern Lebanon. “Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza,” notes Amnon Rubenstein, “are routinely forbidden to dig new wells, deepen existing wells, or put in water systems that might reduce the water available for Israel.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 173] Although Israel is rich in religious lore and tradition, for all practical economic intents and purposes it is physically resource-less. It must rely of course upon the massive beneficence of wealthy and influential Jews throughout the world for help – economic contributions, but – more importantly – world-wide lobbying efforts of governments and peoples throughout the world to sustain the Jewish state which can never sustain itself, in drastic contradiction of seminal Zionist plans for the Jewish state. Hence, the resources of the rest of the world maintain an economic, social, and military level for Israel which it could never remotely maintain by its own means.

Nonetheless, Jewish and Zionist mythology about the sacredness of the land of Israel has fostered an extremely strange, and disturbing, paradox. Israeli Amos Oz notes Jewish myth about the actual land of Israel in Zionist tradition:
“This is … what some of my teachers taught me when I was a child: after our Temple was destroyed and we were banished from our Land, the gentiles came into our heritage and defiled it. Wild Arabs laid the land waste … When our first pioneers came to the land to rebuild and be rebuilt by it and redeem it from its desolation, they found an abandoned wasteland.” [OZ, p. 88]

This is an especially curious myth, given the fact that the deeds of defiling Gentiles and “wild Arabs” over all centuries combined can not remotely compare to the atrocious Jewish care taking of the Holy Land in recent history, in which the modern Israeli military-industrial state rampantly pollutes the place so important to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The most visible physical landmark in the Tel Aviv area, for example, on the outskirts of the city along the highway to Israel’s international airport, is a giant mountain of trash – the Hiriya dump. It had been absorbing 3,000 tons of garbage every day until it was recently closed, but not before the mountain of garbage “collapsed into the Ayalon River, threatening one of Tel Aviv’s sources of drinking water.” [COHN, M., 10-18-98] “As a Zionist,” bemoaned professor Harvey Lithwick, “you can’t believe that you came to reclaim the country … and yet you let the land go to garbage. For me, that’s horrible.” [COHN, M., 10-18-98]

In July 1999 one hundred scientists, under sponsorship of Israel’s Economic Forum and the Technion Institute in Haifa, released a report announcing that Israel’s environment was “on the verge of collapse.” The report noted that “underground aquifers suffer from almost irreversible salination, the quality of air is declining, causing one in ten children to have asthma, garbage is piling up [and] uncontrolled construction is eating away at open areas.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 7-14-99] That same year London’s Financial Times noted that “the statistics make grim reading. More than half of all untreated industrial waste, including poisonous chemicals and salts, flows directly into the [Israeli] environment, damaging underground aquifers, rivers and streams.” [FINANCIAL TIMES, 1-29-99, p. 12] Israel produces 170,000 tons of toxic waste a year – two-thirds of it is believed to be dumped illegally throughout the country and into the Mediterranean Sea. [COHN, M., 10-18-98]

“Zionists – who passionately reclaimed these biblical lands after 2,000 years in exile, “noted the Toronto Star in 1998, “have … a blind spot about their birthright.” “During the past 50 years,” said Israeli environmental activist Bilha Givon, “all the coasts along Israel have become wasteland, polluted by factories.” In 1997, during Israel’s international Jewish sporting event, the Maccabiah Games, a bridge collapsed over the Yarkon River. Two Jewish athletes from Australia survived the fall, notes the Star, “only to die of infection from the polluted river. The scandal over lethal toxins swirling in the water rocked the Jewish Maccabiah games.” [COHN, M., 10-18-98]

Of particular note, and increasing controversy, is Israel’s official toxic waste dumping ground, Ramat Hovav, located twelve miles south of Be’er Sheva in the Negev desert. With 43,000 tons of toxic material a year delivered its way, Ramat Hovav is notorious for mismanagement and haphazard storage of a variety of dangers. “Within the past twelve months,” noted the Jerusalem Post in August
A large community of (Muslim Arab) Bedouin of the Al-Azameh tribe lives in tents across the street. (Many were forced to move there after being evicted from their ancestral lands by the Jewish government). Putrid smells drift through the tents day and night. Environmental Ministry tests in 1994-95, noted Haim Chertok, noted “dangerous levels of pollution, issuing from organic waste stewing in Ramat Hovav, more than 40 percent of the time.” [CHERTOK, H., 5-30-97]

Arab workers are also employed in the most dangerous jobs at the hazardous waste area and in the cluster of pesticide and chemical factories within Ramat Hovav grounds. Explosions at the Chemgas chemical plant in 1999 injured six workers. “There are at least six factories, out of 15 at the site,” noted the Jerusalem Post, “where emissions could result in an accident causing irreversible harm to residents, or even death.” [COLLINS, L., 8-7-97] Mishandling disasters at, and around, the site are common – from overturned trucks hauling toxic cargo to leaking storage barrels to explosions of dangerous chemicals. From 1988 to 1998 there were “ten major incidents” including “two leaks of poisonous gases within a 12 hour period.” [COLLINS, L., 8-4-98, p. 3] In 1997 a lithium battery storage area exploded, a wall of flames 300 feet tall burned for hours, sending thick, black smoke over the area. “No one thought,” notes the Toronto Star, “to alert the Bedouin to the possible peril until three hours later.” [COHN, M., 10-18-98]

(In the same vein, in 1998 Palestinian investigators discovered a secret toxic waste dumping ground that Israeli companies had been using in Arab areas in the Occupied Territories, including “32 hazardous materials, including pesticides and medical waste.” [COHN, M., 10-18-98])

Meanwhile, a former deputy mayor of Jerusalem, Meron Benvenisti, notes the ideological undercurrent of the Israeli “ecological” military order in the Occupied Territories that prohibits local Arabs from picking a herb called Za’atar, a wild plant they had freely gathered for centuries:

“[The order] is only a strong political and ideological statement: You Palestinians despoil the land indiscriminately because you do not feel for it, ergo it is not your homeland. We [Jews] look after it. Therefore it is ours.” [BENVENISTI, p. 24]

The ideological foundation for the modern state of Israel is the political philosophy of Zionism; its fundamental assertions were practical, secular, and activist in nature. Unlike traditional Judaism which passively awaited God’s intervention via an expected Messiah to lead world Jewry into a messianic age of Jewish redemption, empowerment, and leadership, Zionism declared it important that Jews take their destiny into their own hands. “Zionism,” notes Charles Silberman, “… transformed the meaning of Jewishness messianism. Instead of
waiting for God to bring about the Messianic Age in His own way and time, as the Orthodox believed … the Zionists insisted that the Jews had to go to work to bring about their own redemption.” [SILBERMAN, p. 39] And the most pressing Zionist issue at hand was the desire for an explicitly Jewish national homeland. Although in early Zionist years a temporary Jewish homeland in parts of Argentina or Kenya was considered, few of the rank and file members of the movement took such suggestions seriously. The emotional attachment, after all, unlike other European-based nationalist movements, was based on traditional religious beliefs: the ancient homeland that God had reputedly given to the Israelites. The homeland was not really negotiable. It had to be a return to Zion: Israel. “Even those who rebelled against religion,” notes Ehud Luz, “could not ignore the need to deal with it, for the simple reason that Jewish nationalism drew its legitimacy from the Jewish religion: Zionism was rooted in the Jewish past, and no one denied that this past had a religious character.” [LUZ, p. x] “The mythos-driven craving for the ancestral land,” suggests Israeli Jay Gonen, “is tied to deep unconscious layers in the Jewish psyche.” [GONEN, J., p. 200]

Sometimes these “cravings” are not so unconscious. The underlying links between the religion of Judaism and secular Zionism is so great that Henrietta Szold, the founder of Hadassah (the international Zionist women’s organization), was the first woman to study at the Jewish Theological Seminary. [HESCHEL, 1983, p. xiv]

Part of the Zionist revival included reclaiming the nearly dead language of Hebrew (which had been reduced over the centuries to use only for religious purposes). Intended to be applied to a new, secularized Zionist society, as early as 1926 scholar Gershom Scholem noted the latent undercurrents in attempting to secularly appropriate a religiously-charged language: “The Land [of Israel] is a volcano. It provides lodging for the language [of Hebrew] … What will be the result of the updating of Hebrew? Will the abyss of the holy tongue which we have implanted in our children not yawn wide? People here do not realize what they are doing. They think they have made Hebrew into a secular language, that they removed its apocalyptic sting. But that is not so … Every word which is not simply made up but rather taken from the treasure house of well-worn terms is laden with explosives.” [RAVITZKY, A., p. 3]

“Although in rabbinic times an Aramaic translation of the Torah was declared alongside the biblical text in public readings …,” notes Barry Holtz, “it was the Hebrew original that was venerated and preserved. This sense of the sacred quality of the language begins with the Bible itself. God speaks, and through language the world comes into being. Jews, at least since rabbinic times, have taken the holiness of the language with great seriousness.” [HOLTZ, B., 1984, p. 21]

“There is no Sabbath Judaism without Zionism,” notes Dagobert Runes, “Every daily prayer of the observing Jew carries the undertone of return to Zion. The four great holidays of the Jewish faith are imbedded in Zionist land and Zionist homecoming. Judaism is a little possible without Zionism as Christianity without Christ.” [MARX, K., 1959, p. x] “Herein lies the ambiguity of Zionism,” says Jacob Neusner,
“It was supposedly a secular movement, yet in reinterpreting the classic mythic structures of Judaism, it compromised its secularity and exposed its fundamental unity with the classic mythic being of Judaism … What has happened in Zionism is that the old has been in one instant destroyed and resurrected. The ‘holy people’ are no more, the nation-people take their place. How much has changed in the religious tradition, when the allegedly secular successor-continuator has preserved not only the essential perspective of the tradition, but done so pretty much in the tradition’s own symbols and language?” [NEUSNER, J., 1972, p. 100]

“The fact,” notes Alan Dowty, “that many early Zionists sought to ‘divorce’ themselves from Jewish history does not, however, mean that they always succeeded in disentangling themselves from its grip. In fact, the illusion that Zionism could escape the legacies – negative and positive – of the Jewish past, through an exercise of sheer ideological will, may have been the greatest conceit among the necessary self-deceptions of the founding fathers … Holidays and national symbols were also inevitably drawn from the past, even if attempts were made to alter their content and significance. The very legitimacy of the entire [Zionist] enterprise also rested, in the end, on Jewish history and religion, a factor that grew in importance as conflict with the Arab population developed.” [DOWTY, 1998]

Monford Harris sees a strong Judaism-Zionism link in the old religious covenant notion:

“The dynamic of Zionism … is only possible on the basis of covenantal solidarity. … None of the universal categories – race, nation, nationality, or religion – can account for this involvement. It is accountable only on the basis of covenantal solidarity throughout Jewish history. While twentieth century Jewry no longer uses conveniently terms and has lost its conscious awareness of its self-understanding, it does, nevertheless, operate with the ideas of the Covenant.” [HARRIS, M., 1965, p. 92]

Early Zionism in Israel also stressed a “back to the land” ethic, emphatically distancing the new Jewish people from their traditional “Shylock” economic middleman roles in Europe for honest labor in the farm fields of Palestine. Community-owned socialist agricultural enterprises called kibbutzim sprouted up everywhere and were hailed as the foundation for a new, proud, hard-working Jewish identity. By 1986, however, Etan Levine noted that “today’s kibbutz member is profoundly disturbed by the failure to transmit its values to the young … To many an Israeli, today’s kibbutz is seen as sort of a country club, using hired labor for the Arab and Sephardic towns, and exploiting the kibbutz’s favorable tax status and its undue influence in the Israeli Knesset.” [LEVINE, E., p. 46]

Rudiments of the Zionist world view began to take hold among a few Jewish thinkers in the mid-1800s. Moses Hess wrote *Rome and Jerusalem* in 1862, a work generally credited to be the origin of Zionist theory, although the term would not be invented, nor the ideas distilled, till decades later. “Hess,” wrote later Zionist philosopher Martin Buber, “was no ‘precursor’ of the Zionist movement. He was its initiation.” “Everything we have attempted,” said preeminent Zionist
activist Theodore Herzl, “can be found in this [Rome and Jerusalem] work.” [HESS, opening page]

“The pious Jew is before all else a Jewish patriot,” wrote Hess in this seminal work of Jewish secular nationalism, “the ‘new-fangled’ Jew who denies Jewish nationalism is not only an apostate, a renegade in the religious sense, but a traitor to his people and to his family. Should it prove true that the emancipation of the Jews is incompatible with Jewish nationalism, then the Jew must sacrifice emancipation … The Jewish religion is primarily Jewish patriotism. This the Jewish ‘Reformers’ who ‘emancipated’ themselves from the Jewish nation knew quite well. They are wary of expressing their true sentiments frankly.” [HESS, p. 27-28] In an earlier work, entitled Money (1845), Hess had located the worldwide Jewish community in a socio-economic Darwinian sense far from their collective self-perception as humankind’s consummate victims: “The Jews, who in the natural history of the social animal would have had the world-historical mission to elicit the predator in humanity, have now accomplished the task.” [REINHARZ, p. 85] (The turn of the century socialist/Zionist Ber Borochov echoed this perspective of non-Jews, noting that non-Jews tended to gain “their livelihood from nature,” and that “it is obvious that Jews, in contradiction to all other nations, derive their livelihood exclusively from man.” [BOROCHOV, p. 62] Hess also, like so many in the Jewish political world in our own day, abandoned “universalist” political activism for Jewish “particularism.” Hess was for years a communist theorist, even writing in 1847 “a draft for a communist manifesto.” [GIDAL, p. 223]

A second Zionist theorist of considerable import was Leon Pinsker whose treatise Auto-Emancipation appeared in 1882. “We have not ceased even in the lands of our exile to be spiritually a distinct nation,” he wrote, “but this spiritual nationality, so far from giving us the status of nation in the eyes of other nations, is the very cause of their hatred for us as a people.” [SACHAR, p. 300] Traditional religious belief that Gentile hostility to Jews was a punishment from God was secularly adjusted in Pinsker’s argument; he proclaimed what in our day has become Jewish canon: Jewish irresponsibility for their roles in history and the declared irrational essence of a corresponding “Jew-hatred.” Pinsker, says Walter Laqueur, “regarded Judaeophobia as a psychic aberration, but in his view it was hereditary. Transmitted as a disease for two thousand years, it was incurable … Prejudice, subconscious notions, could not be removed by reasoning, however forceful and clear.” [LAQUEUR, p. 71] “One of the fundamentals of Zionism,” confirmed Zionist heroine Hannah Senesh in later years, “is the realization that anti-Semitism is an illness which can neither be fought against with words, nor cured with superficial treatment.” [UMANSKY/ASHTON, p. 175]

The most famous Zionist, however, was Theodore Herzl, a journalist (he was a correspondent for Vienna’s Neue Freie Presse, the most influential newspaper in the Hapsburg Empire), and playwright, who struggled as a dreamer and activist towards resolution of “the Jewish problem” in Europe. Herzl’s novel Altneuland has been described as “the foundation document of the modern state of Israel.” [SELZER, p. 42] “Herzl,” says Michael Selzer, “endorses as
valid the negative image of the Jew with which he had earlier condemned and then catered most extravagantly to [for funds], [the book was the] creation of a fantasy state in which the self-hating Jewish readers of the book could find and identify themselves with their complete antithesis.” [SELZER, p. 42] Herzl’s idea of Israel, says Amnon Rubenstein, was “a mini-Switzerland in the heart of the Middle East.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 11]

As late as 1893, he seriously entertained the idea that the problem to anti-Semitism could be resolved by a mass conversion of all Jewish children to Christianity. [AVISHAI, p. 37] The publication of Herzl’s ideas about the creation of a Jewish homeland, The Jewish State, and mass Jewish exodus to it, became the most influential work in Zionist history.

Jacques Kornberg notes Herzl’s essential world view, so deeply rooted in the Jewish martyrlogical and persecution tradition: “Herzl’s litany of Jewish suffering was wildly exaggerated, for he claimed that Jews were ‘always the carefully looked after and cultivated leeches or the … chamber serfs … of the powerful.’ In Herzl’s view of Jewish history there were no periods of security or normality. Later this view was to become part of his Zionist conception of the Jewish dispersion as a 2,000 year period of captivity and unfreedom.” [KORNBERG, p. 84]

And as World Zionist Organization president Nahum Goldmann once wrote:

“[Theodore Herzl] put [the Zionist issue] in a famous and totally misleading saying: ‘The problem of Zionism is one of means of transport: there is a people without a land, and a land without a people’ … He utter[ed] a double falsehood: first, Palestine was not a country without people, since there were hundreds of thousands of Arabs living there; and second, the Jews were not a landless people, for the assimilated Jews were good Frenchmen, Germans, Englishmen and so on.” [GOLDMANN, N., 1978, p. 88]

Eventually Herzl and his cohorts were visiting powerful people throughout the world, lobbying the Zionist ideas intensely, seeking both funds from the wealthy and political favors. Among those from whom he sought help – particularly in concessions for Jewish immigration to Palestine – in his single-minded focus on Jews was the Sultan of Turkey. “When Herzl,” notes Hannah Arendt, “during these negotiations received cables from students of various oppressed nationalities protesting against agreements with a government which had just slaughtered hundreds of thousands of Armenians, he only observed: ‘This will be useful for me with the Sultan.”’ [ARENDT, in SELZER, p. 236]

Alfred Lilienthal notes the curious similarity of traditional Zionism and anti-Semitic ideology regarding the Jewish inability– or resistance – to assimilate into non-Jewish societies. Seminal Zionist writings, like those of Hess, Herzl and Pinsker, says Lilienthal, argued that “Jews formed in the midst of the nations, among which they reside, a distinctive element which cannot be readily digested in any country. (Strangely, these were practically the same words for which the [anti-Semitic] Dearborn Independent and Henry Ford, Sr. were to be
sued more than sixty years later by American Jews of Zionist leanings).” [LILIENTHAL, p. 13]

This classical anti-Semitic accusation – that Jews live within a host society, but are not truly a fully dedicated part of it – is actually a fundamental belief too of the Zionist credo. An essential principle of Zionism is the secular revamping of the old religious notion of Jewish identity throughout the world: galut – exile. As noted earlier, the idea of galut asserts that Jews – dispersed from ancient Israel throughout the world – are everywhere in places they do not belong. Their own true home can only be Israel. Zionism holds that, because Jews are scattered throughout the world in other peoples’ lands, Jews are ethically, spiritually, morally, and physically impaired from their true natures. In Hebrew, one of the meanings of galut is “sighing under the yoke of oppression.” [GOLDSTEIN, p. 178] In the Zionist view, Jews are not –and cannot be – connected to the lands, culture, and peoples of their Diaspora (dispersion). “The Zionist critique of assimilation,” notes Donald Niewyk, “… rested on a certain conviction that all efforts to blend with non-Jews must lead unswervingly to deformed Jewish lives. The new discipline of psychoanalysis was mustered to demonstrate the neurotic side effects of divided consciousness. Rootlessness and inferiority complexes were shown to generate everything from revolutionary activity to Jewish anti-Semitism, extreme German nationalism, and suicide.” [NIEWYK, p. 126]

Only gathered together in their own nation can Jews of the world attain “normalization.” Once the Jewish people had “normalized,” hoped Theodore Herzl, the Zionist “father” of modern Israel, “it is the anti-Semite who will be our staunchest friends, and the anti-Semitic countries which will be our allies.” [FEUERLICHT, p. 222] In modern Israel the term galut is a slur. “Galut has become a general term of contempt,” says Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “bearing no relation to where one lives.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN]

“In classical Zionist thinking,” says Liebman and Cohen, “the non-Jews are not to be blamed for their hostility to the Jews. The fault lies in the unnatural condition of Jews living as strangers in a host society that understandably harbors suspicions of them and their intentions.” [LIEBMAN/SILBERMAN, p. 58] Even David Ben-Gurion, revered by many Jews as a pioneer Zionist and the first prime minister of the modern state of Israel (to 1963), said that

“The cause of our troubles and the anti-Semitism of which we complain result from our peculiar status that does not accord with the established framework of the nations of the world. It is not the result of the wickedness or folly of the Gentiles which we call anti-Semitism.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 58]

From a Zionist racial perspective, notes Donald Niewyk, “even a moderate Zionist such as Gustav Krojanker could describe anti-Semitism as the ideological superstructure of ‘instinctive animal peculiarities’ that were natural among groups ‘divided by blood and history.’” [NIEWYK, p. 127-128]

For decades, the Zionist movement basically agreed with the standard anti-Semitic criticisms of the Jews of Europe, that Jews were exploitive, often unethical, elitist separatists in their self-perceived “host nations,” and they were en-
trenched in the centers of commerce, overly fixated upon the accumulation of money. “The Zionist position,” says Aleksander Hertz, “was ... similar to that of the anti-Semite. Both spoke of the organic separateness of the Jews and their alienness. Although they differed fundamentally in their evaluations of the role of the Jews and their historic significance, their intellectual premises were the same, and they did not differ greatly in their conclusions.” [HERTZ] “Intriguingly,” notes Bernard Avishai, “political Zionists often accepted as true some of the anti-Semite’s most outrageous stereotypes of the Jew ... Accordingly, political Zionists were often unable to articulate precisely what Jewish principles were to be defended – apart from the assertion that the Jewish people should survive.” [AVISHAI, p. 25]

In pre-World War II Nazi Germany, Zionist assertions that Jews were an unassimilable people mirrored, and reinforced, the Nazis’ own arguments. Both groups asserted that there should be no Jews in Germany. “The anti-Semitic barrage continued weekly with Zionist aspersions sounding painfully similar to the Nazi line discrediting the German citizenship of the Jews,” notes Edwin Black, “It became that much harder for German Jews to defend against Nazi accusations of illegitimate citizenship when a land and visible group of their own [Zionists] continually published identical indictments ... Zionism had become a tool for anti-Semites.” [BLACK, E., p. 173]

On June 21, 1933, the German Zionist Federation sent their evaluation of the Jewish presence in Germany to Hitler, saying:

“Zionism believes that a rebirth ... such as that in German tradition resulting from a combination of Christian and national values, must also come about within the Jewish communities. Racial background, religion, a common fate and tribal consciousness must be of decisive importance in developing a lifestyle for Jews too.” [BLACK, E., p. 175]

The Israeli scholar Yehezkel Kaufman, who represents the revisionist history so popular among Jews today that deems anti-Semitism to be completely irrational in origin, noted that in Zionism’s early decades of development

“Zionist ideology itself was by no means free from the influence of anti-Semitism, and Zionism actually based the national movement on a rationale of charges that it took over from the anti-Semites, and attempted to find a core of justice in the hatred of the Jews. Jews of the Galut, the countries of dispersion, really deserve to be hated: their customs, tendencies, businesses, attitude to the their environment, etc. are the same source of the hatred, the justifiable hatred. Therefore, they must leave Galut.” [KAUFMAN, p. 2451]

“Our function now [as Jews],” wrote Joseph Brenner, an important early twentieth century Zionist, “is to recognize and admit our meanness since the beginning of history to the present day, all the faults in our character, and then to rise and start over again.” [SILBERMAN, p. 39] “With a burning and passionate pleasure,” he wrote elsewhere, “I would blot out from the prayer book of the Jews of our day ‘Thou hast chosen us’ in every shape and form.” [DOWTY, 1998, p. 1] “The old Jew in Zionist iconography,” notes Haim Breseeth,
“was not dissimilar to the standard anti-Semitic portrait – the ‘inversion of what is productive,’ ‘the rootless, cosmopolitan, unproductive, and passive entity, inevitably attracting the hatred of its social environment, as it were. Zionism was to eradicate this type of Jewishness and replace it with the new Jew.” [BRESEETH, p. 194]

“The vocabulary of abuse [from Zionists about the Jewish people of Europe] in Hebrew literature,” notes Yehezkel Kaufman, “–where Jews speak to one another without fear of exaggeration – is of a sort you would find only in anti-Semitic literature of the worst type …. Frishman: ‘Jewish life is a ‘dog’s’ life that ‘evokes disgust.’ Berdichevski: ‘Not a nation, not a people, not human.’ Brenner: ‘Gypsies, filthy dogs, inhuman, wounded dogs.’ A. D. Gordon: ‘Parasitism, people fundamentally useless.’ From the articles of Shwardron: ‘Slaves, helots, the basest uncleanliness, worms, filth, parasitic rootlessness.’ (See his writings in Moznaim, 1933, nos. 33-38). In honor of the anniversary of Histadrut [the national Israeli labor federation], Davar, the Palestinian [i.e., now Israel] newspaper, printed a vowel-pointed headline: ‘National resistance, the regeneration of a parasitic nation.’” [KAUFMAN, p. 241]

As Joachim Doron notes, “the Jewish self-criticism so widespread among the German Zionist intelligentsia often seemed dangerously similar to the plaints of the German anti-Semites.” [FINKELSTEIN, N., 1998, p. 24]

Shaul Avigur, the head of the organization which aided illegal immigration to Israel against British Mandate curtailment, had great disdain for the Jewish survivors of the Holocaust who made it to Israel. Avigur remarked that

“They are different … completely different [from other Jews in Israel]. The propensity to inform is widespread among them … in commerce they engage in everything possible; the children buy and sell dollars; corruption is horrible; … prostitution is terrible.” [PORAT, p. 162]

“The [European] ghetto Jew was doomed from the Zionist perspective,” says Haim Breseeth, “– human dust, as [former Israeli president] Weizmann named him, a historical figure with a despicable past and no future. Thus, the ghetto Jew became the antithesis of the Israeli Jew, even before the creation of the Israeli state. This is very different from how every other Jewish community, notably the buoyant American Jewish community, has perceived the European Jews.” [BRESEETH, p. 194]

“It is a sad opinion one hears many people expressing,” complained Yehezkel Kaufman in 1949, “– that anti-Semitism is in a certain sense an anteroom to Zionism. Many Zionists, and not only Western European Zionists, believe with complete naivety that to be ‘good Zionists,’ we must first become ‘good’ anti-Semites, we must first hate ourselves… [KAUFMAN, p. 244] …If you were to open the notebook of a Hebrew school student [in Israel] you might read such phrases as these: ‘The Jews in the Diaspora are living unhealthy lives, as unsavory tradesmen, and sometimes have unsavory private lives too … They are corrupt … The Gentiles around them are living healthy lives,’ or: ‘The Jews in the Galut prefer storekeeping, banking, and peddling’ and that is why the Gen-
tiles hate them; ‘the lack of Jewish farmers and Jewish workers has been the reason for their unnatural lives, and has aroused hatred.” [KAUFMAN, p. 244]

“[Theodore Herzl, the official founder of the modern state of Israel] did not claim that the charges of the anti-Semite were altogether unjust,” observed Walter Laqueur, “The ghetto, which had not been of their making, had bred [in Jews] certain asocial qualities: the Jews had come to embody the characteristics of men who had served long prison terms.” [LAQUEUR, p. 88] Likewise, Zionist writer Theodore Lessing, says Daniel Niewyk, believed that European Jewry’s “preoccupation with security and material wealth had brought them a half-deserved reputation as exploiters.” [NIEWYK, p. 137]

“Reading today – in the post-Holocaust era – the writings of the founders of Zionism,” says Amnon Rubenstein, “one is slightly embarrassed by the abuse against the very nature of the Jewish communities in exile, in galut … [But] Zionism did not usher in this mood. Nineteenth century Hebrew and Yiddish literature … vilify the Jewish existence within the traditional Pale of Settlement, the ‘parasitical’ occupations which mar it and the sickening submission to brute force and oppression.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 5]

Of course, modern Israeli propaganda needs, and Jewish identity needs, have changed in recent years. Today the official Zionist view, malleable to the times, has reabsorbed traditional Jewish thinking about a mystical, omnipresent anti-Semitism, useful in hardening trans-world Jewish solidarity with Israel – the Protector. As Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen note:

“The role of anti-Semitism in formulations of Zionism and in the importance attributed to the existence of the Jewish state has not diminished. What has changed is the benign image held by Israeli leaders of the Gentile. It is no longer the Jew who is indirectly to blame for being hated. Anti-Semitism is no longer the expected hostility of the hosts toward their uninvited guests. As in the traditional Jewish past, anti-Semitism is now attributed to the Gentile’s irrational hatred of the Jew … The origins of anti-Semitism are no longer explained in terms of Jewish estrangement from their host societies, but as endemic to the non-Jew.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 59]

Increasingly in recent years, the modern state of Israel, and many Jewish apologists throughout the world, publicly espouse views about themselves and Israel that are implicitly irreconcilable. The widespread Jewish illusion of harmonizing completely contradictory worldviews (universalism and particularism) is likewise echoed in the ideology of Zionism (although some important Zionist strands have been disbanding not only allegiance to universality, but to democracy as a social principle). As the first Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben Gurion, (in this realm yet again a claim of Jewish “uniqueness”) put it:

“Two basic aspirations underlie all our work in this country: to be like all nations, and to be different from all nations.” [ARONOFF, Myths, p. 178]

Another example of Israel’s implicitly contradictory nature, notes Rachelle Saidel, is that the eventual “linking [of] the creation of the Jewish state to the
murder of six million Jews causes this state to be born with a built-in paranoia. This ‘birth defect’ has led Israel to beg for normalcy – to be treated as all other nations, while at the same time pointing out how – because of the Holocaust, it should be treated differently." [SAIDEL, p. 17]

The clumsily veiled chauvinism at root here is, as always, the classical religiously-based Jewish notion of the necessity for Jews to be “a people apart,” “unique,” distinct from all others. [“Lo, the people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations.” –NUMBERS 23:9] For some Israelis, notes Myron Aronoff, the biblical admonition that Israel “is a people that shall dwell alone and shall never be reckoned among the nations, [is] a curse. However, others consider it an affirmation of Israel’s chosenness.” [ARONOFF, p. 178]

Alan Dowty notes that eventually Jewish “uniqueness” in Israel, “rather than normalization, was becoming the watchword … Israelis were again seeing themselves, in the words of Balaam’s blessing, as ‘a people who shall dwell alone’ … Israel was moving from a universalistic, secular, rational, civic orientation to one that was particularistic, religious, mystical, and primordial. It was reverting from an ‘Israeli’ outlook, embodied in the concept of the State of Israel, back to a more ‘Jewish’ self-identity.” [DOWTY, 1998]

Israeli Meron Benvenisti sees the transformation – the absorption of traditional Jewish exclusionist identity into Zionism – this way:

“Jewish elitist perceptions of the ‘chosen people’ were crystallized against a background of humiliation, scorn, hate, and alienation in the diaspora. Only a belief in his unique identity could sustain the Jew … The selfsame precepts, transferred to a situation where the Jews are the majority, ruling another nation [Arabs], interacting on an equal basis with the [other] goyim, assume a sinister, domineering significance. Ahavat Israel, the love of Israel, the deep sense of affinity and of common destiny, the belief in col Israel haverim (all Israel are comrades) which sustained the diaspora Jews and gave them a measure of security, resulted in xenophobia – being increasingly perceived as synonymous with sin’at hagoy (hate for the goyim).” [Benvenisti, p. 76]

In 1882 there were only 24,000 Jews in what was then called Palestine, an area under control of the Muslim Ottoman Empire of Turkey since 1516 (Great Britain took over control of Palestine in 1918). The first Zionist Congress was held in Switzerland in 1887 and by the late 1890s Theodore Herzl had seized prominent stage in the new Zionist movement, visiting wealthy Jewish philanthropists and even the Sultan of Turkey in the hopes of creating a Jewish state in the Holy Land. To acquire Palestine, said Herzl, “we require diplomatic negotiations … and propaganda on a large scale.” [LAQUEUR, p. 95] In the case of the Turkish ruler, Walter Laqueur observes that Herzl “was ready to use his
influence [at the most important newspaper in central Europe, the *Neue Freie Presse*] to play down the anti-Armenian persecutions.” [LAQUEUR, p. 118]

Most early Jews in Palestine were religiously-oriented. With increased interest (mainly by Jews in Eastern Europe) in Jewish nationalism, and the growing *Ho-revei Zion* (Lovers of Zion) movement, activist Jews of a more secular nature began to make their way to Palestine in the later 1880s. Between 1881 and 1904 (in what is called the First Aliya – ascension – in Zionist circles) 30,000 Jews emigrated to Palestine. Still, by 1918 and World War I, the (now) 56,000 Jews in Palestine were still tiny compared to the 640,000 Arabs around them. [SHAPIRA, p. 22-23]

Although Zionism was conceived as a Jewish “back to the land” movement, “by 1910,” notes Walter Laqueur, “the [Zionist] settlers were owners of plantations employing mainly Arab workers. Their own children were sent to education in France.” [LAQUEUR, p. 79] “The major reason that Zionism survived its struggling early period before 1917,” says Norman Cantor, “was that it received the endorsement and patronage of many [Jewish] billionaire patriarchs and their charitable organizations right from the start of the modern Zionist ventures in the 1880s.” [CANTOR, p. 298] Of particular importance in this regard in the early Zionist years was Baron Edmond de Rothschild, one of the heirs to the fabulous Rothschild European banking dynasty.

Jews continued to make their way to Palestine, in repeated waves. There were second (1904-1914), third (1919-1923), fourth (1924-1928), and fifth *aliyahs* (1929-1939). After the founding of the Israeli state in 1948, the next ten years witnessed another 900,000 Jews moving to live in the Holy Land. In 1950 over 100,000 Jews emigrated from Israel to Iraq. “They were driven out of Iraq to Israel,” notes Amnon Rubenstein, “motivated by numerous anti-Jewish attacks. At the time, however, it was widely assumed these attacks were perpetrated by hostile Iraqis, but recent scholarship indicates the actions were undertaken by overly zealous Zionists who wanted to create an atmosphere of fear that would convince the Iraqis to move to Israel.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 60]

The Jewish National Fund was created in 1901, in large part to purchase land. Another international Jewish organization, the Jewish Agency, was founded in 1929 to encourage Jewish immigration, raise funds for settlement, and address administration of the new Jewish communities. By 1980, the Jewish National Fund alone had spent $15 billion on the Jews of Israel; per its charters, none of it went to the Arab sector of Israeli society. [AVISHAI, p. 320] By the 1920s, Palestinian Arabs began sometimes violent resistance to what they saw as Jewish encroachment, fearing what their new neighbors’ ultimate intentions might be. Major acts of violence continued to increase between Arabs and Zionists. In 1929, in rioting over control of the Jerusalem Wailing Wall, (the area with high religious significance to both to Jews and Muslims), 38 Arabs and 29 Jews were killed; riots spread into the distant towns of Hebron and Safed. A total of 120 Jews and 87 Arabs were reported killed in the fighting. By 1939 20,000 British troops had largely subdued Arab revolt against Zionist incursion.

“Hundreds of Arab villages” were destroyed by Jews by the end of 1949. “Traditional Israeli history,” says Amnon Rubenstein, “has presented the Pales-
tinian exodus as the responsibility of Arab leaders who ordered the Palestinians to flee, promising that they could soon return to their homes as conquering heroes. Israeli leaders encouraged them to stay in their homes and villages. Recent research by a number of historians and political scientists, including Israeli scholar and journalist Benny Morris, reveals that this is a myth on several grounds.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 52] Rubenstein notes that the “vast majority of Palestinians” were expelled or driven out by terrorist campaigns against them, including those by varied Israeli forces: the Haganah, the Israel Defense Force, Irgun and LEHI. There was even a military plan – Plan Dalet – to empty Arab villages for later Jewish settlement. [RUBENSTEIN, A. p. 53] “Those expelled,” says Rubenstein, “were allowed to take with them only what they could carry; many had their valuables stolen by Israeli soldiers as they passed military checkpoints.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 53]

With heavy fighting between Jews and Arabs in 1948, most of the 175,000 Arabs who remained in the area that officially became part of the new nation of Israel that year were peasants in interior regions that the warring little reached. These people and their descendants are today resident/citizens of the Jewish state of Israel, an underclass to be sure, but distinct from the Arabs in what is generally known as the Occupied Territories: Gaza, the West Bank, and the Golan Heights. Bernard Avishai notes the modern day status of the Israeli Arabs: “About half of Israel’s Arabs still live in nearly isolated towns and serve as a work force for Israeli Jewish industries. A quarter work on Jewish farms and construction sites. These figures convincingly show that the Israeli Arabs are dependent upon and dominated by the Jewish economy, that Arabs have become a segregated industrial proletariat in Israel.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 315]

Tens of thousands of Palestinian refugees flooded into the Gaza area, an area 4-8 miles wide and 28 miles long, bordered by Israel, Egypt, and the Mediterranean sea. In 1967 the 350,000 Palestinians crammed into this small space marked it as the highest population density on earth. (AVISHAI, B., p. 274] With complete Israeli control of the area in all facets of economic, social, and political life, by 1973 a third of Gaza’s laborers were forced to work in low-paying, benefit-less jobs for Jewish employers. With few rights and no hope in an entire area that resembled a prison, Israeli Army Chief of Staff Raphael Eitan once called the Palestinians trapped within Israeli rule in the Occupied Territories “drugged cockroaches in a bottle.” [JANSEN, M., p. 15]

By 1991 55% of the land mass of the West Bank and 30% of Gaza Strip was even controlled by the Jewish National Fund. This means, notes Amnon Rubenstein, “that increasing numbers of Palestinians are forced into ever-smaller amounts of territory and in many cases are denied their means of livelihood.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 91] Israeli-legislated human rights violations in the Occupied Territories has included, for decades, the “shooting and beating of unarmed individuals,” “expulsion from regions without cause,” “suppression of Palestinian culture” (the word Palestine, the displaying of the Palestinian flag, wearing its colors, etc. have all been punishable crimes during Israeli rule), “collective punishment of entire neighborhoods,” “military censorship of all publications,”
“confiscation of land and water resources,” and “restriction of economic activities.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 95]

In 1981 an Israeli-created administration system in the West Bank removed elected mayors it disliked and replaced them with Jewish overseers in the Arab towns of Nablus, Ramallah, and El-Bireh. [AVISHAI, p. 292] “The West Bank is ruled under British emergency regulations from 1946,” notes Bernard Avishai, “which one former Israeli Justice Minister, Yaacov Shimon Shapiro, has called Fascist; Amnesty International reported that, from January to June 1979 alone, some 1500 youths were taken into custody. Tens of thousands more were interrogated, or intimidated during the period of the general strike in the spring of 1982.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 307]

The opportunity to nakedly exploit the subjugated Arab population has not been overlooked by Jewish rulers. “Israeli investors and contractors, meanwhile,” says Avishai, “have not failed to profit from the situation [in the Occupied Territories], [Israeli scholar] Benvenisti points out that hundreds of private speculators and builders have made fortunes here.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 308]

For a small minority of Israelis, such conditions forced upon another people has elicited serious soul-searching. “A prolonged squabble [in this case, with Arabs] does not ennoble,” noted prominent Israeli novelist Amos Oz, “it degrades. In our case it is pushing us back into our ‘hereditary’ depression, into the neuroses, the atavistic tribal madness from which we were trying to escape, back into megalomania, the paranoia, the traditional nightmare.” [OZ, A., p. 194] “The social tensions entailed by occupation,” says another Israeli, Bernard Avishai, “would have taken their toll on any democracy, but they have had a peculiar and unfortunate impact on Israel – inasmuch as Israeli democracy was improvised in 1948 and has subsequently been made to coexist with a number of residual, genuinely Zionist institutions which had always excluded non-Jews [AVISHAI, p. 299] … Since the occupation is run entirely according to military law, Israeli soldiers, many of whom are civilian reservists, have not been subject to normal civilian penalties for the crimes they commit in uniform … In two notorious cases, [Chief of Staff General Eitan] pardoned murderers. Nor are civil prosecutors able to appeal such decisions, and there are no civil rights by means of which an Arab victim’s family might seek redress.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 310]

There was also the 1990 case of Rabbi Moshe Levinger, which epitomized an entire genre of Israeli legal lenience for Jewish violence against Arabs. “Levinger,” noted the Toronto Star,

“a strident founder of Israel’s settler movement [in the West Bank and Gaza] who calls Arabs ‘dogs,’ yesterday drew five months in jail for shooting an unarmed Arab shopkeeper to death in Hebron in the occupied West Bank. Israeli human rights activists decried the sentence as a ‘frightening’ travesty of justice … After his car window was smashed by Palestinian stone-throwers, Levinger reached an army roadblock and safety, and then opened fire on Arab merchants nearby, witnesses said … In 29 cases where Israelis allegedly killed Palestinians since the start
of the Palestinian uprising, only four cases went to court, said Naam Yashuvi, information director for B’Tselem, a prominent Israeli human rights group. Two resulted in jail terms: the Levinger case, and that of Israel Zeev, who in December, 1988, got three years in jail and two more suspended for killing a shepherd.” [BARTHOS, G., 1990, p. A2]

In overview, observed Glenn Frankel, “A country that enforced a permanent military occupation in the West Bank and Gaza that denied its Palestinian subjects even the most rudimentary rights of free speech and the vote, and that locked up, abused and expelled Palestinians without formal charges or trial could not claim to wholeheartedly share liberal American values.” [FRANKEL, G., p. 224]

In response to Jewish dominance in the Holy Land, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was founded in 1964 to violently resist the Jewish state of Israel; it also eventually warred with Arab splinter groups like Fateh and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

With the expulsion of large numbers of Arabs in Israel’s “War of Independence” from self-declared Jewish lands, and with the impossibility of these refugees returning, the new Israeli government declared, in 1950, the Law for the Acquisition of Absent Property. Anyone absent from their property between November 1, 1947 and September 1 1948, and not residing in Jewish-controlled areas, was declared to have abandoned ownership and the property was confiscated by the Jewish state. This process also had the effect of robbing many Arab citizens within Jewish boundaries (who didn’t even know about the new law, or were unable to challenge it) from their lands. As Amnon Rubenstein explains, “once property was declared absentee property, this status would remain in force, even if it could later be proved that the property had been incorrectly classified.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 62] Another device to rob Arabs of their land was through the Emergency Article for the Exploitation of Uncultivated Areas. Land that had not been cultivated in the past three years was also confiscated by the state, often by declaring “an area farmed by Palestinians a closed military zone so that no Palestinian was allowed to enter it. After the three-year period had elapsed, the land could then be declared uncultivated” and seized. [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 63] Some Palestinian land officially under Ottoman Empire or British Mandate registration was also confiscated by the new Jewish state.

Despite condemnation by the international community, Israel formally annexed East Jerusalem in 1967 and the Golan Heights (bordering Syria) in 1981.

In its formative years, Zionism was actually overwhelmingly rejected by most of the world’s Jews. In Europe, in the nineteenth century, one of the most influential leaders of the Reform Judaism movement, Abraham Geiger, attacked Moses Hess as someone who “after bankruptcy as a socialist and all kinds of swindles wants to make a hit with [Jewish] nationalism.” [LAQUEUR, p. 53] In 1919 “French leader Sylvain Levi spoke violently against the restoration of a
Jewish home in Palestine.” [LITVINOFF, B., p. 114] Subscription to Zionism was feared to open Jews everywhere to charges of national disloyalty in the countries they lived. “Except for a few scattered voices,” says Aharon Feldman, “Jewish leadership as a whole saw Herzl’s Zionism as a threat to Jewish survival. The spiritual giants of the times [the turn of the twentieth century] – Reb Yitzhak Elhanem, the Hafetz Haim, and Reb Haim Brisker – refused to enter a partnership with it.” [FELDMAN, p. 23] The first Zionist World Congress was held in Basel, Switzerland. Plans had been to hold it in Munich, Germany, but the Jewish community there didn’t want it. [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 42]

As Jewish philosopher, Morris Raphael Cohen, wrote in The New Republic in 1919:

“A national Jewish Palestine must necessarily mean a state founded on a peculiar race, a tribal religion and a mystic belief in a peculiar soil, when liberal America stands for separation of Church and state, the free mixing of races, and the fact that men can change their habitation and language and still advance the process of civilization.” [ROSENFELD, A., 1997, p. 111]

Some in the ultra-Orthodox world even blamed Zionists for the Holocaust. “As early as the second World War,” notes Israeli scholar Aviezer Ravitzky, “harsh accusations were made by some ultra-Orthodox radicals concerning direct Zionist responsibility for what was happening [to Jews in Europe]: it was the Zionists’ declarations that provoked the anger of the oppressor to the point of bloodshed; it was they who hindered the rescue effort [of European Jewry]; it was they who disturbed the tranquility of the Jews in the lands of their dispersion.” [RAVITZKY, p. 65] While Jewish Orthodoxy rejected Zionism as “a false messianic movement,” so too did “most Jewish liberals and socialists, [who] having accepted the faith of the Enlightenment, rejected Zionism as a reactionary philosophy.” [KOLSKY, p. 15-17]

In Britain, by the 1930s the Anglo-Jewish Association of the Board of Deputies (which included prominent Jews like Edward Montagu, the British Secretary of State for India) believed that Zionism was for a Jews a “traitorous disloyalty to their native lands.” [LILIENTHAL, p. 23] Some Jews worried that the Zionist movement would fuel anti-Semitic hostility, invariably reaffirming perceptions that Jews were, wherever they were in the world, essentially elitist separatists, concerned only with their own people. “Prominent Jewish communal leaders,” notes Thomas Kolsky, “like Lucien Wolf, Claude Montefiore, and Laurie Magnus denounced Zionism as an ally of anti-Semitism.” [KOLSKY, p. 17]

In Germany, prominent Jewish writer Joseph Roth compared the parallel racial structures of Zionism and German fascism, writing a letter to a Jewish friend in 1935: “A Zionist is a National Socialist [i.e., German Nazi]; a Nazi is a Zionist … I cannot fathom how it is you wish to start the fight against Hitler, who is merely the imbecilic brother of the Zionist, using a brother of the National Socialist, i.e., a Zionist, even the most ingenious of them. Perhaps you can protect Jewry in that way. But I wish to protect both Europe and mankind from the Nazis and also from Hitler Zionists.” [SHAKED, p. 186] “In these re-
marks, addressed to another assimilated Jew, Stephan Zweig,” says Gershon Shaked, reflecting a common, modern, pro-Zionist Jewish sentiment, “pathological universalism reached its apogee.” [SHAKED, p. 186]

In America, prominent Rabbi Issac Wise publicly “denounced the whole question of a Jewish state as foreign to the spirit of the modern Jew of this land who looks upon America as his Palestine and whose interests are centered here.” [LAQUEUR, p. 384] Prominent American financier and Jewish activist Jacob Schiff stated that, “I cannot for one moment concede that one can be at the same time a true American and an honest adherent to the Zionist movement.” [WHEATCROFT, 1996, p. 129] The founder and first president of Hebrew University, and an influential American rabbi, Judah Leon Magnes, in the 1930s also rejected the idea of a Jewish national homeland. [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 41] In the ongoing Zionist propaganda war, however incongruously, prominent American Zionist activist Louis Brandeis “regularly linked the ‘Zionist cause’ with the American ideal of democracy, of social justice and of liberty.” [SARNA, J., p. 57] This universalist view is commonly articulated to defend “particularist” Zionism to this day.

In 1942 a Jewish organization was founded by a group of Reform rabbis to oppose Zionism, the American Council for Judaism (ACJ). “The ACJ,” noted Kolsky, “condemned all forms of Jewish separatism … [and] denounced Zionist talk about homelessness, and opposed granting Jews special privileges … It rejected the creation of an exclusively Jewish state as undemocratic and as a retreat from the universal vision of Judaism.” [KOLSKY, p. 4] As ACJ head, and life-long anti-Zionist, Elmer Berger in later years noted one of the reasons Jews had joined ACJ: “The racial peoplehood character of Zionism was, on an ethical and moral basis, something to be particularly repudiated.” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 69] As the mass murder of the Jews under Hitler became better known, however, the ACJ’s position lost support in the Jewish community; it was soon disbanded. By 1946, one poll showed that 80% of American Jews supported the idea of a Jewish state in what was then Palestine. [SPIEGEL, S., p. 18]

Zionism in its development has been varied in ideological expression, manifest over the years in at least four principle branches. The weakest version was “spiritual Zionism”, or “cultural Zionism,” which held that “the Jewish people’s fate was to be dispersed and their mission was to transmit their unique spiritual genius to the societies in which they lived.” [JANSEN, p. 5] Asher HaAm (Asher Ginsberg), who moved to Palestine in 1921, was an influential exponent of this Zionist view. Earlier, upon former visits to the Holy Land, he wrote with concern that Jewish colonists there “treat Arabs with hostility and cruelty, deprive them of their rights, offend them without cause and even boast of their deeds, and nobody among us opposes this despicable and dangerous inclination.” [JANSEN, p. 6]
The most historically important version of Zionism – rooted in the socialist and communist origins of Eastern European Ashkenazi Jewish pioneers in Palestine – has been Labor Zionism. For decades Labor was dominant in founding the socio-political principles of the modern Jewish nation; it created the powerful Histadrut trade union, the Haganah (forerunner of today’s Israeli army), Israel’s largest bank, an insurance and other companies, and it emphasized and disproportionately supported its showpiece “back to the land” movement through communally owned socialist enterprises known as kibbutzim. The effects of Labor Zionism’s state-dominated economy remain today. “Recently published research,” noted Norman Cantor in the mid-1990s, “sponsored by Canada’s Fraser Institute and the U.S.-based Liberty Fund, show that in a survey of hundreds of economics professors around the world, Israel ranked nearly last in degree of economic freedom, ahead of only several communist countries and India.” [CANTOR, p. 385] Nonetheless, with huge infusions of American charity, the “Israeli economy in the 1991-96 period grew faster than any other industrial economy – averaging over 5.2% per year – with the lowest levels of unemployment in the country’s history.” [GARFINKEL, A., p. 117]

Labor Zionism disdained the “economic middleman” character of traditional European Jewry and celebrated physical work and toil, particularly agricultural, and most particularly in Israel, reconnecting with a lost identity. “The Jewish people has been completely cut off from nature and imprisoned with city walls for 2,000 years,” said early Zionist A. D. Gordon, “We have become accustomed to every form of life, except to a life of labor – of labor done at its own behest and for its own sake … A parasitical people is not a living people.” [CHAFETS, Z., p. 30]

At its earliest, idealistic stages some supporters of this brand of Zionism proclaimed a familiar theme: yet another Jewish expression – post-Enlightenment – to attempt to explain Jewish “uniqueness” in terms less problematical and offensive to others, now framed as a Jewish nation that would – at the very least – set emulative examples for others. It was, in secular terms, messianic in scope. Amnon Rubenstein notes that “the Labor [Zionist] movement endeavored to translate the Jewish terms of uniqueness into a contemporary universal language … It sought to go further and place the new Israel at the helm of international society. It spoke with messianic passion about a new millennium; a classless society, the religion of work, the redemption of man, the communal settlement experience, the kibbutz and the moshav [another form of communal agricultural settlement], the Histadrut as a workers’ society.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 45]

Labor Zionism had been completely dominant in Israeli political society until 1977, when the rightist Zionist strands of Menachem Begin was voted to power. Begin’s coalition party was the Likud; his own roots were in one of the right-wing organizations called Herut, which in turn was historically linked to the “radical right” version of Zionism known as Revisionism, founded by Vladimir Zabotinsky. Although overshadowed by Labor Zionism, Revisionists were not tiny. By 1931 the Revisionists claimed 21% of the delegates at the World Zionist Congress. [BELL, Terror, p. 24] “Vladimir Zabotinsky,” noted
David Biale, charged that Jews in the Diaspora “despised manhood, the principle of male power as understood by all free people in history, physical courage and physical force …, [and] prowess of the body … [which was] an object of ridicule.” [BIALE, p. 137] “Because the Yid [Jew] is ugly, sickly, and lacks decorum,” once said Jabotinsky, “we shall endow the ideal image of the Hebrew with masculine beauty.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 4] Elsewhere, Jabotinsky asserted that “Every race possessing a definite uniqueness seeks to become a nation, that is, to create for itself an economic, political, and intellectual environment in which every detail will derive from its specific thought and consequence that will also relate to its specific taste. A specific race can establish such an environment only in its own country, where it is master. For this reason every race seeks to become a state.” [AVISHAI, B., p.125]

“In the 1930s,” says Haim Breseeth, “the Revisionists, a typical European rightist force, were greatly influenced by Mussolini, adapting some of the trappings of fascism: motorcades of blackshirts, a party publication was renamed Diary of a Fascist; and some training camps were held in fascist Italy. Immediately after the coming to power of the Nazis, fascism became a central icon in Palestine, dividing left and right, or more accurately, Labor Zionism, led by Ben-Gurion, from the Revisionist camp, led by Jabotinsky.” [BRESEETH, p. 194-195] “Breaking away [from the other Zionist groups] in the 1920s,” says Peter Grose, “Jabotinsky’s Revisionist Zionism organized its own fighting force in Palestine. The Irgun Zvai Leumi came to remind unsympathetic outsiders of Mussolini fascists; Ben-Gurion called the Revisionist leader ‘Vladimir Hitler.’” [GROSE, p. 161] “Revisionists,” notes Edwin Black, “… were heavily fascists and profoundly influenced by Mussolini … True to fascist ideology, the fist and shout were the preferred methods of achieving Revisionist goals.” [BLACK, E., p. 143] Labor and Revisionist Zionism came close to civil war when the latter group brought a shipload of weapons into Israel. The ship was sunk by rival Zionists’ artillery fire and 16 members of the Irgun were killed. And, “ever since the mysterious murder of the Zionist ‘foreign minister’ Chaim Arlosoroff in 1933,” says Jay Gonen, “allegedly by right-wing Revisionists, there had been fears of Jewish fascism.” [GONEN, p. 58]

“Jabotinsky’s most cherished creation was Betar,” noted Livneh Eliezer, “[This] youth movement … was … a semi-militaristic entity that stressed hierarchy, discipline, obedience to superiors, rituals, and ceremonies. Military values [were] … a virtue,” as was “romantic heroism.” [ELIEZER, p. 26] Another small group (founded in 1931) linked to Revisionist theory was Brit Habironim (the Covenant of Thugs) which “was a mythological rediscovery of the glorious tales of the [Israeli] nation, a romantic glorification of the old days of blood, soil, heroism, and conquest.” [ELIEZER, p. 25] Among the “Covenant of Thugs” was Uri Zvi Greenberg, a popular poet well-respected in today’s Israel. Greenberg saw socialism as a “most dangerous enemy, and became more and more convinced that a dictator was needed to lead the masses.” [LAQUEUR, p. 362]

Some in the Revisionist camp in the 1930s, notes Jewish scholar Walter Laqueur, “expressed the view that but for Hitler’s anti-Semitism German Nation-
al Socialism would have been acceptable [to Jews] and that, anyway, Hitler had saved Germany [LAQUEUR, W., p. 33] … Within the [Revisionist] movement there were … sections, some of them influential [where] … fascist ideas had made considerable headway and, but for the rise of Hitler and Nazism, would no doubt have become even more prominent.” [LAQUEUR, p. 382] Among Revisionist plans for Palestine (and a larger Transjordan area) was the expelling of Arabs to Iraq. [SELZER, p. 218, 219] Revisionist policy foresaw Jewish lands stretching from the Nile River into what is today Jordan. (In 1983, Eryk Spekter, CEO of Fame Fabrics in the U.S. and a former chairman of Herut USA, began awarding a $100,000 “Defender of Jerusalem” prize from his Jabotinsky Foundation at presentation dinners to people “who had stood up for Jewish rights.” Over the years, winner’s of the Jabotinsky Foundation’s award included Menachem Begin, New York Times editor A. M. Rosenthal, American Republican cabinet members Jeannine Kirkpatrick and George Schultz, Hawaiian Senator Daniel Inouye, and former French cabinet minister, Simone Weil among others). [NY TIMES, 12-16-98, B13]

Simha Flapan notes that

“The Yishuv and the Jewish masses in the Diaspora rejected most of his concepts, but [Jabotinsky] left an indelible mark on the Zionist attitude towards the Arab question. He implanted in Jewish psychology the image of the Arab as the mortal enemy, the idea of the inevitability of the conflict and of the impossibility of a solution except by sheer force. He propagated the ‘either-or’ notion by which all and every means was justified including terror and ruthless retaliation in the struggle for survival.” [FLAPAN, S., 1979, p. 117]

A fourth, increasingly important – and disturbing – strand of Zionism has been what is often referred to as “Messianic Zionism,” or “Religious Zionism.” In recent years its umbrella political group is the National Religious Party. Its influence escalated dramatically after 1967. With the “decline of socialist belief” in Zionism,” notes Amnon Rubenstein, “a resurgence of religious feeling gradually emerged … Many Israelis began to harbor a disbelief in the power of a new Jewish nationalism to replace traditional Jewish values.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 94] Aviezer Ravitzky notes that Zionism’s move towards the religious may be inevitable: “Zionism … seemed to [seek] to overthrow the traditional way of life and rebelled against the imperatives of the past. Yet at the same time it looked backwards: it employs the sacred symbols of the past and aspired to fulfill ancient Jewish hopes.” [RAVITZKY, A., p. 10]

Among Religious Zionism’s most prominent proponents was Rabbi Yitzhak Hacohen Kook, who believed that secular Zionist success in bringing Jews to power in the Holy Land was part of the establishment conditions that would lead to the triumphant return of the Messiah. Kook’s son, Zvi Yehudah Kook, also a rabbi who headed a religious school, notes Amos Elon, “raised a generation of zealots, a new Jewish man … Wrapped in a prayer shawl and armed with a Kalashnikov; nationalistic, callously trampling the watermelon bed of the Arabs.” [JANSEN, p. 4-5] This Kook asserted that the modern state of Israel was
“fulfillment of the biblical tradition of redemption.” [RAVITZKY, A., p. 80] Elsewhere, fulfilling the worst concerns of any anti-Semite, he proclaimed that “The state of Israel is divine … Not only can/must there be no retreat from a single kilometer of the Land of Israel, God forbid, we shall conquer and liberate more and more … We are stronger than America, stronger than Russia … Our position in the world, in the world of history, in the cosmic world, is stronger and more secure in its timelessness than theirs. There are nations that know this, and there are nations of uncircumcised hearts that do not know it, but they shall gradually come to know it! … In our divine, world-encompassing undertaking, there is no room for retreat.” [RAVITZKY, A., p. 132]

 Religious Zionism took especially strong hold in Israel after the 1967 War. Jewish seizure of wider territory harkened for some Jewish thinkers the likeliness that conditions were being created for the return of the Messiah. Religious Zionists are particularly noticeable in the many garrisoned Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza Arab areas. Zealous doctrine declares that the Occupied Territories of the West Bank and Gaza must never be surrendered to Arab jurisdiction. Philip Bentley of Floral Park, New Jersey, president of the Jewish Peace Fellowship says that

“I first time I noticed it was in 1981. I was on a post-convention tour of Israel for rabbis and their spouses. Our tour guide spoke of the settlements through the Occupied Territories on the West Bank … He told us that the Land will not produce for the Arabs like it will produce for the Jews, because this is our Land and the Land knows its true people … I immediately recognized this theory for what it was – old-fashioned blood-and-soil fascism … Add this to their … elevation of Jewish possession of the land over all other values; their demonization of Arabs as ‘Amalek’ and of Jews who support the Peace process as traitors or worse; and their belief that God demands of Israel that it expel non-Jews from the land or subjugate them even if it means war because Redemption depends upon it … It is time to promote Jewish unity, but not at the expense once again of ignoring the deadly cancer that exists in Israel and among some Jews the world over – fascism.” [BENTLEY, P.]

Among the most influential of the Religious Zionists is the group known as Gush Emunim (Block of the Faithful). Founded in 1974, its physical expression is symbolized men in knitted skullcaps carrying automatic weapons. Many are activists in Jewish settlements in the occupied territories. And many of these Jews are from America. “It is important to realize,” notes Amnon Rubenstei, “that [Gush Emunim’s] significance is not confined to the political area and does not lie merely in their ability to force their will upon the country. Gush Emunim … provides a vociferous and occasionally theatrical voice to a wider tendency within Israeli society … The influence of the Gush – always numerically a small fractional minority – upon Labor [Zionism] cannot be overestimated. They imposed their will upon successive Labor cabinets and forced the government’s hand on critical issues.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 104, 106]
By the late 1990s, noted the *Jewish Monthly*, “an estimated one-third of the recruits in IDF officer-training programs are religious Zionists.” [KEINON, H., p. 31] Concerns have been growing in some Jewish circles that such people will listen to Orthodox rabbinical instruction over military superiors. “In fact,” says Herb Keinon, “the army faced the beginnings of such a crisis in July 1995 when a dozen leading rabbis in the national religious camp signed a decree stating that the Torah forbids soldiers to evacuate army bases and then turn them over to non-Jews.” [KEINON, H., p. 31]

Ironically, with secular Labor Zionism being increasingly threatened by traditional religious-political currents, Israeli society today roils today in a furious imploding of the traditional Jewish Victimhood identity; confronted with a society that is predominantly other Jews, Jewish complainers must sooner or later face an inevitable Jewish Enemy in a Jewish-constructed society: the Victimhood Society itself as Oppressor. In a country where there are principally only other Jews to accuse as neighbor-monsters, what must be inevitably expressed is the curious spectacle of an intra-Jewish civil war over pre-eminent Victimhood status, i.e., opposing Jewish ideological groups asserting – and demanding – their respective version of the Jewish Persecution Tradition as pre-eminent over the other. “Each community,” says Emmett Ayala, “the secular and the religious, feels that it is on the margins of Israeli society, expressing anxieties of powerlessness in a public culture defined by the other.” [AYALA, E., p. 129]

To the degree that the Israeli government does not act entirely by Jewish religious law, notes Boas Evron, “to a certain extent the Orthodox communities in Israel regard the state in which it lives as an alien ‘gentile’ state (and in Israel this is accompanied by a particular hostility, for the very reason that the state claims to be Jewish).” [EVRON, B., 1995, p. 110]

Forms of Jewish Orthodoxy and ultra-Orthodoxy in Israel continues, often militantly, to grow. In 1988, Knesset elections marked “a dramatic rise in the political power of the Haredi (or ultra-Orthodox) parties.” Noteworthy beneficiaries were Agudat Israel and Shas, the Sephardic Haredi party. [FRIEDMAN, M., p. 177] “As fundamentalist-religious movements began to acquire power elsewhere in the world,” notes Menachem Friedman, “many observers – in Israel and abroad – tended to view the rise in Haredi strength as a genuine threat to liberal-secular culture.” [FRIEDMAN, M., p. 178] This growing influence in Israel is rooted in the belief that “the Jewish people are above history, and their political and spiritual destiny is determined directly by God, according to their fulfillment of Halacha.” [FRIEDMAN, M., p. 179] “Orthodoxy in Israel is no longer a creed,” complained Uri Huppert in 1988, “it is a well-established clerical rabbinical hierarchy and lay political and administrative infrastructure affecting very strongly the most sensitive political issues … Now, a generation after the Six Day War, nationalistic-Zionist Orthodoxy has emerged as a ‘nationalized’ Talmudic-halachic ideology of the Israeli ‘Moral Majority.’ This trend represents almost 50 percent of the Israeli electorate.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 21]
In 1998, Ran Kislev, citing a range of Orthodox rabbinical controls over burial practices, marriage, and other momentous personal milestones in Israeli society, wrote that:

“Not only are the laws of [medical] pathology adapted according to rabbinical rulings, but also an entire branch of surgery on transplants is limited by them … There are those among us warning against the dangers of Israel’s transformation into a halachic state. They instill in us a fear of an ayatollah state, like Iran. They may have missed the boat. We are not merely en route to an ayatollah state, we are already well in the midst of one.” [KISLEV, 7-24-98]

In 2000, confronting secular Israeli society, a news report noted that “Israel’s leading orthodox rabbis [the Council of Torah Sages] have issued a ruling banning the Internet from Jewish homes,” declaring that it is “1,000 times more dangerous than television” (which they banned thirty years ago) and it “threatened the survival of the country.” [PHILLIPS, A., 2000, p. 18]

Increased Orthodox influence in Israeli life also has serious ramifications for Jewish women. Israel already was problematic for the equality of women: in 1997 Jewish Israeli women earned half as much in their jobs as did their male counterparts. [LIPSCHITZ, M., p. 37] Since Israel’s founding, only 6.8% of the member of the Israeli parliament (Knesset) have been women. Most women who go into the Israeli army serve in a special unit called chen (Hebrew for “charm.”) The first female mayor elected to a town in Israel was not Jewish; she was Violet Khoury, an Arab woman in the Arab village of Kfar Yassif. [POPE, V., p. 202-211] Of especially momentous consequence to women, there is no civil marriage or divorce permitted in Israel; such matters – as well as rulings on child custody, deaths, and so on, in a standing compromise with the secular government – are controlled by the Orthodox rabbinate. “Among Jews,” says Juliet Pope,

“these matters are ruled by rabbinical courts which not only prohibit women from serving as judges but even ban the appearance of women as witnesses. According to Jewish law, a woman cannot get a divorce without the consent of her husband. Even in extremely difficult cases where a wife is physically abused or where her husband is missing or insane, the civil courts cannot grant her a divorce … A recent study suggested that in Israel there are currently as many as 7,000 women, termed agunot, who have been refused divorce, many of them subject to blackmail and extortion.” [POPE, p. 216, 217]

The oppression of women under Orthodox Jewish law even includes bigamy. “In several cases,” notes Israeli lawyer Uri Huppert,

“and they are not rare, the rabbinical tribunal [in Israel] permits a husband to take an additional wife. Thus criminal law in Israel allows Jews to practice bigamy when it has been permitted, with certain limitations, by the Chief Rabbinical Council … In only the year 1984-85, seventy-six requests were approved in Israel to marry an additional wife. For the same period, in Jerusalem alone, eighteen such requests were granted.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 167]
In 2000, due to Orthodox political influence, “women who worship in prayer shawls or chant from Torah scrolls at the Western Wall, the holiest shrine in Judaism, could go to prison for seven years under new legislation proposed by Israel’s parliament, the Knesset.” [VENTURA COUNTY STAR, 6-3-2000, p. A10]

Ironically, increasing Orthodox domination of Israeli society profoundly threatens many Jewish Americans’ myths about Israel. For many, it is even threatens their very identity as Jews. Whatever people who have only a Jewish father think of themselves (as well as converts to Reform and Conservative versions of Judaism, and a number of other categories), many are shocked to discover in visits to Israel that they are, by the Orthodox standards that govern such matters in Israel, not Jewish. Not only that. Because marriages, burials, and governance for Jewish identity itself are Orthodox-controlled and so-sanctioned by the Israeli government, Jews who align themselves with more liberal Reform or Conservative Judaism are prevented from fully expressing their religious beliefs in Israel. As Reform Rabbi Uri Regev, head of the Israel Religious Action Center, frames it: “Israel is the only country in the free democratic world which … denies Jews religious freedom.” [HYMAN, M., 1998, p. 107]

Whatever else the modern Jewish nation is, it is a military state: a heavily armed Jewish collective. Jewish youth (with a few exceptions, for example, chassids) after age 18 must join the military, men for three years and women for two. Men must also serve time every year (generally 30-60 days) in the ranks until they are age 55. “Compulsory military service,” observes Hanna Herzog, “reserve duty, and Israel’s recurring wars have made the Israel Defense Force (IDF) a staple of the Israeli experience and a key to Israeli identity … A significant portion of the socialization of Israeli youngsters is related to preparations for military service.” [HERZOG, H., 1998]

“Israel has been an armed camp and its entire population a citizen army,” says Laurence Silberstein, “The social and cultural consequences of a virtually total conscription policy have been far-reaching and significant. The army has been the meeting place for all Israelis … For the [Jewish] immigrant, the army has served, by conscious plan, as a primary school of Israel’s socialization.” [SILBERSTEIN, p. 34] “Military status is the single most important measure of social status for young men,” adds Zev Chafets, “To volunteer for an elite combat unit is the equivalent of attending an Ivy League university.” [CHAFETS, p. 212] “Being a professional soldier in Israel,” says Adam Garfinkel, “is a very high status profession. Being a member of an elite battalion, such as the Golani Brigade, is the dream of thousands of boys … The Ministry of Defense is usually thought of as the key civilian cabinet post [in the government] … In Israel, children generally stay in the same group all the way through school and go into the army together … They … know by second nature how to function and think as a unit … Army service for immigrants or their children has traditionally been the critical means
of integrating into the society, of learning the language, and of apprehending the zeitgeist of the country.” [GARFINKEL, p. 108-109, 113]

25-45% of the Israeli Gross National Product is devoted to defense-related programs. [GARFINKEL, p. 115] (Despite its tiny size of only six million people, by some estimates Israel is the fourth largest military power on earth). Glenn Frankel noted in 1987 that Israel “still operated one of the most centralized state-run economies this side of North Korea. Bitahon, the Hebrew word for ‘military security,’ dominated people’s lives and dreams … [Israelis] paid more than half their income in taxes … There was one television station and it was state-owned … Every Memorial Day Israel dispatched to its elementary schools the parents of slain soldiers to tell the story of their children’s sacrifice and plant the seed of fear, pride, and determination in the new generation.” [FRANKEL, p. 24] “Memorialization of the dead,” says Myron Aronoff, “is a Leitmotiv in Israeli culture … In fact, it has become so extensive and central to the political culture that I suggest it has evolved into a national cult of memorializing the dead … Regularized rites institutionalized by the IDF are held at 39 military cemeteries throughout the country and two major monuments the day before the celebration of Israel’s Independence Day.” [ARONOFF, p. 54] Among those early Zionist heroes in Europe who have been reburied in Israel include Moses Hess, Vladimir Jabotinsky, and Theodore Herzl. [ARONOFF, p. 54]

Israel’s self-image, says Glenn Frankel, has been “a garrison-nation waving its defiant flag before implacable enemies in a treacherous part of the world. Its unifying myths were the twin traumas of Masada and the Holocaust. Its heroes were military men.” [FRANKEL, p. 23] “Israeli political history,” says Adam Garfinkel, “is full of generals moving into politics. Yitzhak Rabin, Ezer Weizman, Moshe Dayan, Yigal Allon, Ariel Sharon, Rafel Eytan, Avigdor Kahalani, and Ehud Barak.” [GARFINKEL, p. 188] Israel’s first prime minister, Ben Gurion, says Jacob Agus, believed that “the golden age of Israel was not the rise of literary prophecy in the eighth century before the Christian era, but the heroic generations of Joshua and the Judges that captured the Holy Land and slaughtered its inhabitants [AGUS, p. 214] … Men like Alexander Yannai, who could eat and drink while he watched with delight the torment and crucifixion of his enemies, were the real heroes of Jewish history. So were all the Maccabean rulers, including in particular that moral monster, Herod the Great.” [AGUS, p. 215] For the likes of modern demagogue Meir Kahane, “force, violence, and domination seem the very content of Jewish experience, its peak, as it were.” [BLIDSTEIN]

“There exists,” says Victor Azarya, “a strong similarity between army culture and civilian popular culture. Military slang and linguistic expressions are widely used in the civilian society. Army overcoats and other clothing items set the pace for young people’s fashion [AZARYA, p. 102] … The IDF [Israeli Defense Force] operates its own radio station [broadcasting, by 1981, Israel’s most popular radio channel, Galei Zahal], publishes various books, magazines and newspapers, and until a few years ago maintained a number of musical and theatrical ensembles. The civic education objective is never lost in these activities.” [AZARYA, p. 111]
Like any nation, the modern state of Israel has a discernible collective psychological attitude: a communal “personality.” It is formed at core by the conviction that Israelis as a Jewish island are a people under constant siege by hostile \textit{goyim}, immediately at hand manifest by neighboring Arabs. A key ingredient of the Israeli public persona, much championed, is that they are tough, macho, and emotionally hardened. And ruthless. Israeli popular culture celebrates a rugged self-image through the symbol of the “\textit{sabra}” (literally meaning a cactus fruit, but colloquially meaning a Jew born in Israel). In popular Israeli folklore, the Jews of Israel are “thorny and tough on the outside, but soft inside.”

This macho, mean Israeli self-image that has developed is the result of a consciously promoted Zionist self-identity towards a secular, redemptive inversion of the old Shylock Ghetto Jew image, of which all were so ashamed. “These Jews, described as ’sheep who went to the slaughter,’” says Carmon Arye, “have been perceived as the antithesis of the self-image that has been inculcated into Israeli collective consciousness.” [ARYE, p. 76] “Puny, ugly, enslaved, degraded and egoistic,” said Nachum Syrkin, one of the foremost Zionist theorists, “is the Jew when he forgets his great self; great, beautiful, moral and social is the Jew when he returns to himself and recognizes his own soul.” [in RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 6] The necessity in Zionist leadership to replace a perceived shameful communal past is noted by Jacques Kornberg:

“The traits [Theodore] Herzl derided in the bourgeoisie – greed, opportunism, lack of idealism, vulgar ostentation – were characteristics imputed to Jews above all. Capitalism was a new phenomenon in Austria, Vienna, viewed especially after 1873, as morally shady and as a Jewish creation, arising out of Jews’ proclivity for commerce … [KORNBERG, p. 66] … Herzl saw cowardice as a Jewish trait and … this fed his Jewish self-contempt … [KORNBERG, p. 70] … Describing an evening at a wealthy business friend’s home, Herzl wrote: ‘Yesterday a grand soiree at Treitel’s. Around 30 to 40 ugly little Jews and Jewesses. No consoling sight.’” [KORNBERG, p. 72]

Hence, Arab threat or not, the emphatic inversion in modern Israel. “The predominant attitude in all walks of life in Israel,” noted Georges Tamarin in 1973, “both in the written and spoken languages, tends to raise the \textit{sabra} [image] to an idol-like stature and a superman. This begins in the kindergarten, with tales in which the \textit{sabras} are depicted as \textit{free} and \textit{proud}, in contrast to their inferior parents from the Diaspora.” [TAMARIN, p. 115]

The \textit{sabra} image also has deep psychological sources in the nationalist “lessons” learned from the Holocaust, a situation where a perceived lack of Jewish physical force and power in the diaspora (\textit{galut}) throughout the world inevitably must – sooner or later – lead to disaster at the hands of Gentiles.

Ze’ev Chafets notes that

“It is impossible to underestimate the centrality of the Holocaust in the Israeli psyche … This sense of fear and rage is omnipresent. Every anti-Israeli or anti-Jewish statement or action feeds it, and people take a perverse pleasure in collecting examples. Not a day goes by without
press reports [in Israel] of persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union, in
Syria, Iran, Argentina, Romania … The sense of persecution remains
the national glue … A great many Israelis have come to see the [Arab-
Israeli] conflict in an emotional way, as a continuation of the Jewish
condition. And, since anti-Semitism is a mysterious and irrational dis-
ease, the tendency is to view the conflict in irrational, almost fatalistic
terms.” [CHAFETS, p. 100-101]

Zionism, in whatever form, has invariably dovetailed with some of the cen-
tral tenets of classical religious Judaism, including the old “people apart” syn-
drome: Jewish alienation from all other peoples. “The civil religion [of Israel],”
notes Charles Liebman and Eliezer Dov-Yehiya, “has been most forceful in as-
serting that Israel is an isolated nation confronting a hostile world … The grow-
ing importance of traditional Judaism and Jewishness is associated with the
centrality of the Holocaust as the primary political myth of Israeli society, the
symbol of Israel’s present condition and the one which provides Israel with le-
gitimacy … The Holocaust to a great extent fashions ‘our national conscious-
ness’ and the memory is omnipresent in Israeli society.” [SAIDEL, p. 18]

“As the show drew to a close, the group swung into an up-temp number.
‘Ha’olam Ku’lo heg’denu,’ they sang. ‘The whole world is against us.’ The audi-
ence knew the song and joined in on the chorus … [:] ‘The whole world is
against us; never mind, we’ll get by; we don’t give a damn about them anyway.’”
[CHAFETS, p. 98] (Peter Novick notes that this song was “at the top of the

Jewish scholar Daniel Niewyk notes the racist dimension of the Zionist ide-
ology of alienation from others, especially as it developed in Germany:

“At the heart of the Zionist critique of liberal assimilation lay the con-
viction that Jews constitute a unique race. It was the belief in insur-
mountable racial differences that made the inevitability of anti-
Semitism credible, just as it rationalizes the view that every effort to as-
similate must go aground on the barrier reef of biological determinism
… [NIEWYK, p. 129] … The maintenance of that [racial] purity was es-
sential to German Zionism, for it acknowledged the essential prerequi-
site for nationhood to be [in the 1922 words of Zionist Fritz Kahn]
‘consanguinity of the flesh and solidarity of the soul’ together with the
‘will to establish a closer [Jewish] brotherhood over [and] against all
other communities on earth.” [NIEWYK, p. 130]
Amnon Rubenstein notes the disturbing irony expressed in this world view of the Israeli people: “The establishment of Israel was an attempt to make Jews like everybody else. They would now have a state. It has not worked out that way. Israel has made Jews more, not less, exceptional. The pariah people, it seems, have simply succeeded in creating a pariah state.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 88] Perhaps, however, this situation is inevitable. Unmentioned by Rubenstein is the religiously-based “nation apart” self-concept always so deeply embedded in Jewish mass psychology, a self-understanding and communal choice that apparently cannot be shaken, even in a secular nation-state context.

Non-Jewish scholar Virginia Dominguez, who spent long periods of time in Israel in later years doing research, noted the traditional Jewish narcissism and interest in pedigrees of identity expressed by the Israelis she met:

“‘What do you mean you say you are not Jewish?’ I was asked on several occasions. ‘That you’re not religious? That your mother wasn’t Jewish? That “we the Jews” wouldn’t count you as a Jew because you had some Jewish ancestry but not the right ones, according to Halacha?’ I was incredulous at first. I had no way then to anticipate this reaction. Everything else seemed to point to the importance of Jewishness, and to controlling both the content and limits of Jewishness.” [DOMINGUEZ, V., p. 179]

The omnipresent stresses of a predominantly military state, the emphatic “we versus them” paradigm of traditional Jewish identity, the glorification of power and aggression, millennia-old disdain for non-Jews, and the emotional powder keg of Holocaust death camps as a motivational tool has invariably led to the noxious Israeli persona that is so much remarked upon by non-Israelis (often even Israelis themselves) who spend much time in Israel. This “national character” is commonly cited for its arrogance, insolence (chutzpah), coldness, roughness, and rudeness, to begin a long list of unpleasant “uncivil” attributes.

Many American Jews, in noting this Israeli character, tend to romanticize it. “There is a coldness,” notes Jewish scholar Norman Cantor, “a mystery, a distance from humanity about [Israelis] that anyone from another country who lives and works in Israel for a half a year will be impressed by.” [CANTOR, p. 417] “Israelis have a reputation for bad manners,” notes Jewish American immigrant to Israel Charles Liebman, “to the extent this reputation is deserved it stems from the sense of familiarity that Israelis feel towards one another.” [LIEBMAN, p. 21] In noting their “curt nature,” Adam Garfinkle adds that “Israelis are sometimes rude to an extent that it even bothers other Israelis. In 1995, Bezek, the communication company, instituted a program to get people to be more pleasant on the phone.” [GARFINKLE, p. 113] “The behavior of young Israelis,” notes Israeli Jay Gonen, “…is characterized by a high degree of chutzpah or gall; it is direct, blatant, unruly, clever, humorous, and indicates a certain lack of sensitivity to social requirements … [It has a] disregard for rules, regulations, social norms, and good manners.” [GONEN, p. 111] Melford Spiro, in his study of the kibbutzim, discusses “insolence” as an “outstanding characteristic of the sabras” (native-born Israelis). [SPIRO, p. 427]
Herbert Russcol – a Jewish American emigrant to Israel – and his sabra wife Margarit Banai noted the Israeli national character this way:

“’Horror stories’ about the chutzpah – of the sabra-men, women, and children alike – are notorious. What appears to be (and often is) their cheek, their insolence, has shocked and enraged everyone who has met them. Sabras freely admit their chutzpah as a people, but are rarely aware of being chutzpadik themselves. They will tell you, ‘Oh, we’re terrible. It’s a national vice. I am not so bad, but I have some very rude friends’ … Chutzpah is alarmingly close to chauvinism, and it must be admitted that the sabra is usually passionately chauvinistic in an era when no gospel has been more discredited in the West than blind, excessive patriotism … Our young [in the West] wish to be as universal as blades of grass. But the young Israelis cannot afford this, and will tell you defensively, ‘After all, you can’t build a nation without nationalism.” [RUSS-COL/BANAI, 1970, p. 170, 172]

“The deliberate and unadorned frankness [of Israelis],” notes Zionist historian Melvin Urofsky,

“so highly prized by Israelis, scornful of Westernized and ‘assimilated’ manners, struck [Jewish] Americans [who sought to live in Israel], accustomed to some courtesies in life, as downright rude. (As late as 1965, a study of bureaucratic behavior in one large Israeli enterprise disclosed that 60 per cent of officials in contact with the public did not believe in greeting a visitor, nor would they reply to his greeting; an even higher percentage would not offer him a chair, simply letting him stand during the interview).” [UROFSKY, M., 1978, p. 274]

Such attributes, it may be recalled, are among those that Jews have been noted for across the centuries of their diaspora. Leon Poliakov rhetorically noted the inevitable echo here in the European Jewish past: “Are the Jews congenitally unsociable and rude, or are they this way as a result of having been segregated in ghettos? Such was the form of the question in which arguments raged [among non-Jewish intellectuals] in the 18th century on the eve of Emancipation.” [CUDDIHY, Antisem, p. ix]

As Joyce Starr notes:

“Among Americans who have had extensive dealings with Israelis, whether in government, business, or Jewish circles, the first adjectives that comes to their lips are arrogant, willful, and sometimes infuriating.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 31]

Ms. Starr, who is also Jewish, notes the interchange she had with a man called J.R., “a high-ranking Israeli intelligence officer”:

“’Most Americans I interviewed in the government sphere – the State Department, Defense Department – use certain words when they describe Israelis.’

’Arrogant,’ J. R. replied.

’Yes, arrogant is a word that comes up frequently.’

1772
’By the way, I think it’s true. It applies to most Israelis. American fairness and Israeli fairness are different.’
’What is Israeli fairness.’
’Israeli fairness is ‘You give me 75 percent and leave 25 percent.’
’Do they know they do it?’
’Most of them do not. I think most of them believe that by some divine decree, they deserve to get everything.’
’What is divine decree?’
’It comes from God.’ He saw me laughing. ‘It’s not funny, Joyce.”

[STARR, J., 1990, p. 34]

“To the brief tourist,” wrote Leonard Wolf, a Jewish resident of Israel in 1970,

“[Israelis] are a rude, unsympathetic people, intent on themselves, irresponsible to nuances of feeling. Americans, who are instantly, if not profoundly, genial, are apt to find the slow pace of Israeli friendliness cold, comparing the Jewish hotelkeepers and tourist guides they meet unfavorably with the extraordinarily warm Arabs.” [WOLF, L., 1970, p. 7]

In 2001, a Jewish ethnic newspaper, the Forward, noted that the national Israeli propensity to be cheats and hustlers (always evasive of the law) probably had roots in Jewish history in other lands:

“[There is] universal awareness that something is definitely rotten in the state of Israel. This is, after all, a country in which bending the rules is said to be a national pastime, cutting corners a way of life and cheating the authorities the proof of merit … Sticklers for the law are ridiculed and abused, where anyone who works by the book is branded a sap, a ‘freier,’ the worst insult in modern Israeli lexicon … Many people believe Israeli laxity, which borders on anarchy, is a national personality trait that cannot be eradicated by laws alone. Some trace the trait all the way back to the historical Jewish Diaspora, where Jews often found solace in bending the rules imposed by the often anti-Semitic authorities.”

[SHALEV, C., 6-1-01]

In 1986, B. Z. Sobel, an Israeli sociologist at the University of Haifa, discussed his research into reasons why so many Israelis emigrate from Israel to other lands. Among the motivations for leaving, he noted that “there is indeed an edginess [in Israeli society]; tempers flare, and verbal violence is rampant … A large proportion of those [Israelis] interviewed for my study … have been abroad [overseas] or were born or raised abroad, and in almost all cases reference is made to the fact that ‘people are nice in chutz la’aretz.’ Strangers wish you a good day as they make change or pass you in the street, whereas at home [Israel] you can consider yourself fortunate to receive minimally civil treatment.”

[SOBEL, p. 153]

Among Sobel’s interviews with fellow Jews in Israel was one with an immigrant who had resided there for twelve years. At some point in his interview with her, she “broke down and wept … repeating over and over the word ‘garbage’: ‘People here are garbage, garbage. They’re hateful. I hate this place.’” [SO-
Another interviewee, this one born Israeli, when asked by Sobel why she was emigrating to the United States, “laughed almost hysterically, and shouted, ‘Why? Why? Because over there [in the United States] I am a child of God, a child of God. I am treated like a human being wherever I go. I am not shouted at our abused. Washer women in the supermarket don’t command me to watch my step. Why?’” [SOBEL, p. 153]

“Americans are much more polite, I would say,” remarked Israeli journalist Ze’ev Schiff, “while we are rude and have no patience … You can see it when some of us are waiting in a queue in a bank or waiting for a bus … This is the way we deal with each other, with the Egyptians, the Europeans, whoever.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 35] As Joyce Starr adds, “The tension [in Israel] spills out in sudden eruptions of rudeness. You can be standing in line in a gas station, and suddenly there will be an outbreak of shouts and terrible cursing for no apparent reason except that people explode in Israel.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 41]

Moshe Shokeid notes the comments of an Israeli identified as “Eli,” and his perceptions of the Israelis he met in New York City:

“When I looked at the crowd, I subconsciously saw myself in the mirror. When you see other Israelis screaming in Hebrew, you realize that you possibly look the same. Unfortunately, I rediscovered the ugly Israeli.” [SHOKEID, 1998, p. 510]

In the 1980s, Virginia Dominguez, a non-Jewish American sociologist of Cuban heritage, fluent in Hebrew and a Fulbright scholar in Israel, worried that obnoxious Israeli behavior and Jewish self-obsession threatened to push her into the camp of the anti-Semites:

“Has my obsessive, long-term encounter with Israeli society over the past six years turned me into the anti-Semite I never was? I find myself sharply intolerant of the noisy, brash behavior of most Israeli children. I coin terms of description that are even explicitly judgmental. I get exasperated with the perennial references in the [Hebrew] media to the Jewishness of well-known public figures abroad.” [DOMINGUEZ, p. 15]

Wendy Orange, a Jewish American, a new immigrant to Israel, noted with irritation the commentary of a group of Christian visitors she overheard in Jerusalem restaurant:

“I overheard one Ghanaian woman say, ‘Just ghastly, these people!’ She’s talking to a pregnant Irish woman, who responded wholeheartedly: ‘I never imagined they’d be so crude … so rude.’ The Ghanaian, tall and dignified, her hair wrapped high in a colorful African sash, became more emphatic: ‘No manners … They drive like madmen.’ She paused. ‘They are far more barbarian than I was warned. And I was warned, my dear, many times.” [ORANGE, W., 2000, p. 52]

An American Jewish scholar, Adam Garfinkle, noted his own child’s experience in Israel’s playgrounds:

“One day I saw two boys square off in the playground, and one gave the other a good pop to the chin. The victim ran to the teacher and com-
plained that Yossi had hit him. The teacher said, quite typically, “Well, go hit him back.” By the time the child gets to first grade, he knows not to embarrass himself by going to the teacher for such matters. When [my son] Nate entered the first grade in the states the next year, we were not surprised to learn that he was ‘a bit rough’ with his friends.” [GARFINKEL, p. 110]

In such an Israeli socialization of children, Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, a professor in Israel, sees the classical Zionist dynamic:

“A significant part of the Israeli self-image is an ideal of toughness, which is contrasted to the softness of Diaspora Jews. The creation of a separate new Israeli identity was accomplished by many expressions of contempt for any form of weakness or moral sensitivity.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 238]

This harsh worldview, deeply aggrieved, shamed and angered by the Holocaust, and “centuries of persecution,” celebrates ruthless pragmatism as its interrelational essence. Exploiting the Jewish suffering in the Holocaust as a moral shield from criticism, David Ben-Gurion once proclaimed, “It is not important what Gentiles say, what matters is what Jews do.” [CHOMSKY, p. 236] Or as another Israeli prime minister (born in America), Golda Meir, put it: “The nations of Europe who did not help us during the Holocaust are not entitled to preach to us.” [in RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 81]

In 1973, Georges Tamarin, an Israeli psychologist, was alarmed at what he called the Israeli “cult of toughness,” the “Israeli authoritarian personality,” and its attendant “traits of ethnocentrism, glorification of strength and the prevailing admiration of the army.” [TAMARIN p. 80] “Aggressiveness, loudness, ignorance of basic international expressions, and fascination with arms are held to be grounds for pride.” [TAMARIN, p. 116] Tamarin saw in such national values an emphatic counter-construct and overcompensation against the embarrassing image of the physically weak European “ghetto Jew.” He noted the

“the constant preoccupation of Israeli youth with physical strength and courage and some caricaturist demonstrations of toughness and ‘(he) manhood (lack of inhibitions, loud speech, the ideal of the [military] parachutist, about whom all the women are ‘crazy,’ overemphasis on masculine symbols (in a style which is a curious mixture of Biblical and Hollywood-type narratives; see the ‘Exodus’) are dominant traits of the Israeli authoritarian personality.” [TAMARIN, p. 87]

“Our negligence,” complained Israeli Meron Benvenisti in 1989, “of … values such as the brotherhood of man, social justice, and civil equality to all ha[s] led inexorably to chauvinism and xenophobia … It is tempting to take the easy way out and dismiss the right-wing chauvinists and religious fundamentalists [in Israel] as an aberration, as marginal, half-crazed fanatics. Yet very influential sections of Israeli public opinion accept their philosophy, albeit considering them ‘good boys who slipped’.” [BENVENISTI, p. 45]

In 1989 an American-born Jew, Aaron Wolf, wrote a book about his experiences in the Israeli army. On one occasion after the killing of some Arab com-
batants, says the author, “I cornered Alon, the Chicagovan whose specialty is falling in love and who was one of the men on that patrol. ‘Hey, Alon,’ I said, ‘Tell me something. You’ve been trained as a medic. You’ve had a three-month course learning how to save lives. How do you feel now that you’ve killed somebody?’ ‘How do I feel?’ he said. ‘I feel hungry.’” [WOLF, A., p. 171]

In 1989, Israeli commentators noted with concern a rash of brash “Russian Roulette”-styled behaviors in the country’s youth. Groups of children were playing games of life and death daring with passing cars and trains, leaping out, or lying down, in front of them. Reuters called it a “deadly plague” happening to the Jewish state. “Adults gamble,” a Jerusalem high school teacher told the wire service, “but the children have less money so they gamble with their lives. I believe Israeli behavior on the roads is macho, and I this is the way children without licenses behave in the streets.” Reuters also noted that “when Education Minister Yitzak Navon asked during a school visit why pupils played the deadly game, students replied: ‘To show they’re brave,’ ‘To tempt death,’ and ‘Just to show off.’” [GOLLER]

Perhaps these children sought to emulate their parents; driving cars dangerously is an Israeli tradition. Too many people in Israel drive their automobiles like maniacs, daring death on the highways. “Twice as many Israelis,” notes Lesley Hazeleton, “were killed on the roads during the Lebanon war as in the war itself. If a man was driving particularly recklessly, people would say that he’d just come back from reserve service in Lebanon. They were only half joking.” [HAZELETON, L., 1987, p. 214] From the founding of the Jewish state in 1948 to 1990, over 30,000 Israelis died in car accidents, more than twice the number of all the Jews killed in Israeli wars in the same period. In the years 1985 and 1986, a total of ten Israelis were killed by terrorists. Meanwhile, 893 people died in car crashes on Israeli highways. Although Israel is a country of only about six million people, between 1948 and 1990 nearly 630,000 people had been injured in car accidents. [STARR, J., 1990, p. 42] As Joyce Starr noted in 1990,

“If the present pace of accidents continues, two people in every Israeli family will be injured, and one person in every ten families will be killed. The number of children killed in auto accidents since 1967 is equivalent to almost a hundred grade school classes.” [STARR, J., 1990, p. 42]

By 1999, the New York Times wire services noted the concern in Israel that its collective aggressive psyche was beginning to run amuck: “Israel has always had a rough edge, it has always been a society where aggression and rudeness was accepted as by-products of life under siege … [But] after several exceptionally brutal crimes – two men killed their wives and children and set their bodies on fire – and new studies detailing the level of brutality in the schools, there has emerged an intense focus on violence among Israelis that has temporarily pushed aside the historic focus on conflict with the Arabs.” “We have to deal with it exactly as we have with terrorism,” said Ze’ev Friedman, “director of health, welfare, and social services for the city of Tel Aviv, “… because this is nothing less than an integral form of terrorism.” [BRONNER, p. 6] The same year a Tel Aviv Municipality study found that 12.5 percent of the homes in the
Tel Aviv-Jaffa area (the largest population density in Israel) were tainted by domestic violence. [FISHBEIN, 12-22-99]

In 2000, Israel’s National Council for the Welfare of the Child noted in its annual report the alarming rise in violence emanating from Israel’s youth. “Complaints of violence by children in educational institutions” rose by 227% from 1995 to 1999. There were 29,000 criminal investigations of minors in 1999 alone. Also between 1994 and 1999, the number of children under 12 seeking help from call-in hotlines because of sexual abuse rose from 143 to 603. “I have no other words to describe it than to say our society is undergoing a process of bestialization,” declared Dr. Asher Ben-Arye, the deputy-general of the National Council, and the editor of the disturbing report. By 2001, the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz reported that “Israel, one of the world’s smallest countries, ranks eighth in the world in youth violence.” [HAARETZ, 4-18-01] That same year, Miss Israel, Ilanit Levy, wore a diamond-studded bullet-proof vest as a fashion statement at the Miss Universe competition. [WASHINGTON POST, 4-18-01]

In 2001, Great Britain’s online Telegraph newspaper noted:

‘Israelis – who take pride in being blunt and outspoken – are to teach children good manners in an attempt to cut the nation’s tendency towards violence. From the next school year, 12-year-olds will be taught how to behave politely, which knife and fork to use at table, and how to resolve arguments without shouting or coming to blows. Ronit Tirosh, director-general of the Education Ministry said:

‘We are a brutal and impatient society, and the delicacy learned through these lessons may reduce our society’s violent tendencies.’ Israelis are proud not to say thank you and relish the informality of life … Israeli life is a bruising contest of one-upmanship. The deepest fear is to be thought a ‘sucker’ who obeys the rules. Brusqueness has been cultivated by native-born Israelis as a reaction against the manners of Europe’s Diaspora Jews, who were seen as cringing and subservient … Educationalists have become worried about the level of playground violence.” [PHILIPS, A., 6-15-01]

In 1999 the mood in Israel was such that an Israeli court was expected to give a convicted Israeli murderer of a British tourist a reduced sentence because of flashbacks he had of his military work executing Arabs. Major Daniel Okev claimed he murdered Gentile hitch-hiker Max Hunter and wounded his girlfriend

“during a flashback to his days in a secret Israeli hit squad which targeted suspected Palestinian terrorists for summary execution … When he found himself at night in his car with two strangers, Okev said he believed he had a flashback to similar occasions on operations in Gaza. He looked down and saw his gun, sparking the murder.” [REES, M., p. 12]

Traditional Jewish “chutzpah” is of course an integral part of the Israeli identity. “To a large degree,” says Israeli professor Jay Gonen, “… Herzl’s impact [on Jewish nationalism] was due to a quality of chutzpah, or unmitigated gall, which became an integral part of Zionism and was subsequently elevated al-
most to an art form by native-born Israelis, or sabras.” [GONEN, p. 47] An example of how far this chutzpah can go was evidenced in an incident during the Palestinian uprising – known as the Intifada – that began in 1987 against Israeli occupation in Gaza and the West Bank. Of the hundreds of Palestinians shot and killed or wounded by Israeli troops in the Intifada’s first year, one young Arab teenager, Nasir Hawwash, was shot in the head and lay in a hospital, irrecoverably brain dead. One day Nasir’s brother received a telephone call from a Jewish Israeli citizen, an emissary for the family of a fellow middle-aged Israeli in the hospital with a serious heart condition. The stranger on the phone asked that the Hawwash family donate Nasir’s heart to save the Jewish man in the hospital who needed it.

“Nasir’s older brother,” notes Glenn Frankel, “was appalled that an Israeli would ask such a thing. She told him, ‘This is how we’ll make peace between Arabs and Jews.’ He was not buying it. ‘How can you make peace when you shoot someone and then you take the heart to give life to another Israeli?’ he told her.”

As the story for the heart request made the Israeli news, one Palestinian “radical” noted that “If we give the Israelis this heart, soon they’ll be shooting us for our organs.” [FRANKEL, p. 110-111] The Arab boy’s father was eventually offered “more money than [his] family would have seen in a lifetime” for his son’s heart, but he told the Israeli pleaders no. “What did they want from me?” he asked. “This was my son. They took him away, then they wanted his body. This I could not give.” [FRANKEL, p. 111]

In 1967, a landmark year in Jewish and Israeli history, the Jewish state began a self-described “pre-emptive” attack against Egypt, overcoming their Arab adversaries in six days. “The ideological and practical ramifications of the Six-Day War,” says Amnon Rubenstein, “were so all-encompassing in Israeli thinking and politics that there is justification for regarding it as a turning point in Zionist and Israeli history.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 76] This included the victorious Israeli army expanding Jewish-controlled territory into what has become known as the Occupied Territories: Gaza, the West Bank, and the Golan Heights. A pro-Israel euphemism is the “administered territories.”

Gaza is a thin strip of land on the Mediterranean Sea 4-8 miles wide and 30 miles long that is today the reservation for over 800,000 stateless Arabs. The West Bank is an area west of the Jordan River; the Golan Heights borders Syria in the north. Since 1967 Israelis have in these places “controlled every facet of Palestinian life.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 63]

In 1973, Syria and Egypt launched surprise attacks upon Israel on one of its holy days, Yom Kippur. Israel barely managed to avoid defeat; the United States’ supply of arms to Israel was “crucial.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 77]

In 1987 a popular Arab uprising against Israeli rule began, sparked by a car accident (driven by a Jew) that killed four Arab pedestrians in Gaza. Rioting quickly spread to other parts of the Occupied Territories – East Jerusalem and
the West Bank; the grass-roots revolt dragged on for years. Largely expressed by
the hurling of stones at Israelis, public defiance, and burning tires in the streets,
the Palestinians called it the “Intifada.” Strikes were initiated against Israeli rule,
some groups refused to continue to pay taxes. As rioting escalated, then-Israeli
Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin called for “might, force, and beatings.” [PE-
LEG, I., p. 170] The Jewish state also responded by establishing curfews, cutting
off electricity and phone lines, and accelerating arrests. “In an effort to reduce
the large numbers of shooting deaths,” says Amnon Rubenstein, “the IDF im-
plemented a policy of beating demonstrators with the intention of breaking
bones. This new approach was loudly condemned by the international commu-
nity, and soon soldiers reverted to the more frequent use of live ammunition,
supplemented by deadly plastic and rubber bullets.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 97]

In 1988 plastic bullets were provided to Israeli troops, but by January 1989
47 Arabs were yet killed with such ammunition. [GOLDSTEIN, E., p. 44] In the
first 30 months of unrest, 837 Arabs were killed – 688 by gunfire, 61 by beatings,
and 88 from tear gas inhalation; over 1,000 Palestinian homes were demolished.
90,000 Arabs sought medical treatment for wounds, broken bones, tear gas in-
halation and other inflictions of Jewish occupation. Colleges and universities
were shut down by Israeli authorities, various Palestinian administrative orga-
nizations were banned, tens of thousands of orchard trees were destroyed by Is-
raeli troops, and both Gaza and the West Bank were placed under military
curfew. [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 99-100]

Between 1987 and 1994, 2,156 Palestinians were killed, most by Israeli sol-
diers. Dozens were killed by Jewish settlers and vigilantes. Over 120,000 Arabs
were imprisoned. [FRANKEL, p. 377] In the first thirty months of the Intifada
20% of the Arab dead were 16 years old or younger. [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 99]
The human rights group Middle East Watch wrote that despite the fact that Is-
raeli law declares that “all news reports be submitted to the military censor prior
to publication [GOLDSTEIN, E., p. 176] … hundreds of [news] correspon-
dents have traveled extensively throughout the territories during the Intifada,
their reporting on human rights conditions has provoked international sympa-
thy for the plight of the Palestinians.” [GOLDSTEIN, E., p. 64] As Jewish author
Marc Ellis noted in 1990:

“The resistance on the part of the Jewish community to what one
might call the Nazi analogy [to Israeli violence against Arabs during the
Intifada] is understandable and so strong as to virtually silence all such
references. Yet during the brutal attempt to suppress the Palestinian up-
rising, in fact from the very beginning the Jewish struggle for statehood
in Palestine in the 1940s and continuing to the present, the connection
between the Jewish experience of suffering in Europe and the Palestin-
ian experience of suffering at the hands of the Jewish people in Palestine
and Israel has been, and continues to be, repeatedly made by Jewish Is-
raelis.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 108]

Jewish American journalist Glenn Frankel noted the murder of Hani
Elshami, “beaten to death for protecting his son from arrest,” his “limp body”
beaten further after it was “dumped at a prison camp”; the much-publicized story of three soldiers who buried alive (with a bulldozer) four Palestinian stone-throwers; and the case of CBS News’ 45 minutes of footage depicting four soldiers beating two Arabs on the ground. “Such a beating,” noted Israeli soldier Saguay Harpaz, “was the norm. That’s the way it was. Every day.” [FRANKEL, p. 80, 81] Israeli soldier Omer Rasner noted what he told his parents about his activities against the Intifada: “They didn’t understand how their little child could become such a beast.” [FRANKEL, p. 85] Most of what Israeli troops faced during Arab unrest was stone-throwing. Yet, “for the first eighteen months of the Intifada,” wrote Frankel, “… [Israeli] soldiers killed a Palestinian a day. By contrast, the highly trained riot police of South Korea, faced with a steady barrage of firebombs and brutal attacks, killed a total of one person during a constant year of unrest.” [FRANKEL, G., p. 83]

In 1990 the Swedish branch of the Save the Children Fund estimated that between 50,000 and 60,000 Palestinian children had been treated for injuries; 6,500 of them were hurt by gunfire. The report, notes Victor Ostrovsky, “said most of the children killed had not been participating in stone-throwing when they were shot, and one-fifth of the cases examined showed that the victims were shot either at home or within thirty feet of their homes.” [OSTROVSKY, p. 333] “The Intifada and resultant breakdown of moral order and humanity [in Israeli society],” suggested Ostrovsky, “are a direct result of the kind of megalomania that characterizes the operation of the Mossad [Israel’s CIA] … It is a disease that began with Mossad and has spread through the government and down through much of Israeli society.” [OSTROVSKY, p. 336]

During the Intifada, noted Eric Goldstein, principal author of a 1990 report by Middle East Watch, “scores of Palestinians have been killed while fleeing [Israeli troops] … The conduct of the IDF, taken cumulatively, more closely resembles what would be appropriate to a situation of combat, with the result that many Palestinians are killed outside of life-threatening situations for [Israelis].” [GOLDSTEIN, E., p. 23] As the Intifada intensified, the Israeli army was issued guidelines that permitted soldiers “to use live ammunition to apprehend masked persons whether or not they were armed.” [GOLDSTEIN, E., p. 38] Among the tens of thousands arrested was Taher Shriteh, an Arab journalist in Gaza, who was working for CBS News. Accused of illegal use of a FAX machine, illegal publication of information about Palestinians killed by Israeli troops, and the like, Shriteh spent 38 days in prison – two and a half years later, his trial was still pending. [FRANKEL, p. 259-261]

Israeli Ilan Peleg notes that of the various human rights reports that were published about the Intifada in the occupied territories, they

“paint a picture in which widespread abuse of human rights and violations of the norms of international law occur with relative frequency in the Arab territories under Israeli control [PELEG, I., p. 169] … Even the annual human rights report of the [U.S.] Department of State, usually a relatively mild document, is rather harsh in dealing with human rights violations in the territories. The report criticizes human rights
practices, stating that Israeli troops ‘caused many avoidable deaths and injuries’ by using gunfire in situations that did not present mortal danger to the troops. The report also documents cases in which Palestinian detainees ‘died under questionable circumstances’ while in detention or ‘were clearly killed by the detaining officials.”” [PELEG, I., p. 170]

“I want to tell you the truth,” eventual Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin once admitted, “For 27 years the Palestinians … have risen in the morning and cultivated a burning hatred for us as Israelis and Jews. Every morning they awake to a difficult life and it is partly our fault … It cannot be denied: the continued rule of a foreign people who does not want us has a price. This is first of all a painful price, the price of constant confrontation between us and them.” [FRANKEL, G., p. 377]

During the Intifada uprising in 1987 and 1989, the American Jewish Committee sponsored surveys of American Jewry. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents, notes Penkower, agreed that “aside from a few regrettable incidents, Israel has used a reasonable and appropriate level of violence in the West Bank and Gaza (only 12% disagreed).” [PENKOWER, p. 331]

Matti Golan, an Israeli, notes with concern the Jewish-American moral bankruptcy in their complacent support of Israel’s mistreatment of Arabs:

“What the occupation is doing to us as human beings … [is] something that threatens to wreak irreparable damage to the fabric of our lives] while turning us into a brutal and insensitive society. Such a society is not one in which I would want to belong to. And yet [American Jews] don’t seem to particularly bothered by that … [For example, the] Israeli media revealed that the director of the GSS [General Security Service] had ordered two Palestinian terrorists killed without trial and had lied to an official committee of inquiry … In several of my talks in the United States, I expressed the opinion that, even if the episode damaged Israel’s image abroad, it was crucial to bring it to light, because in a democratic society not even the security apparatus should be allowed to be above the law. Not a single American Jewish audience enjoyed hearing that. The almost universal reaction to what I said was: Yes, but why wash our dirty linen in public? … When it comes to [Israel, American Jews] practically demand that I should say to hell with democratic principles. It’s not so terrible if Israeli officials and government agencies take the law into their own hands. It’s not good, but there are worse things. And one of these is a tarnished image. Indeed, I sometimes think that as long as Israel’s image in America remains decent and humane, you wouldn’t care if in actual fact we were a society of cannibals.” [GOLAN, M., p. 44]

As published in a report called “Captive Corpses” by the Israeli human rights organizations B’Tselem and HaMoked, even the Arab dead may be abused by Israelis – particularly the corpses of so-called “suicide bombers” who seek, in their last actions, to kill Jews. These Arab dead, notes Israeli professor Neve Gordon, “are not only buried in a demeaning and shameful manner, but … Israel refuses to return bodies to the bereaved families … Israel’s treatment of en-
emy corpses exposes an atavistic policy informed by vindictiveness instead of justice. Privileging nationalistic sentiments over democratic practice has led Israel to punish people – the perpetrator’s bereaved family – who are neither guilty nor even suspect. Not unlike other measures Israel takes, such as demolition of homes, holding corpses hostage constitutes collective punishment of innocent persons.” [GORDON, N., 1999]

In September of 2000 the second Palestinian uprising against Jewish oppression began. Russian/Israeli Israel Shamir noted its tenor:

“Another email comes into my laptop, this time from Gaza. An American girl, Alison Wier from San Francisco evades Israeli bullets, comforts the scared Palestinian kids, and writes: ‘The problem is when you know the truth, it is far too cruel, far too diametrically opposite what we used to think and what everyone thinks to express. The lie is too big, the repression too complete, the Palestinians’ lives too horrible to write about reasonably.’ Well, Alison is right. We face a huge lie, an anti-Moslem blood libel.” [SHAMIR, I., 2001]

Despite all this, the modern state of Israel frames itself as a democracy and Jewish American supporters are quick to proudly underscore its noble mantle as the “only democracy in the Middle East.” As Gabriel Sheffer notes,

“Early on in the history of the Jewish state, its leaders realized that maintaining a democratic polity is not only of great value in itself, but is also a potentially important asset in promoting Israel’s relations with Western states and especially with the United States … Consequently, Israel’s leaders promoted the notion that democracy was the cornerstone of its ‘special relationship’ with the U.S. and with other western democracies … This view has been repeated in countless speeches made by Israelis, Americans, and European politicians and officials and has become a significant element in justifying the level of political, military, economic, and financial support given to Israel.” [SHEFFER, p. 32]

The term “democracy,” when it comes to Israel, however, is a very relative term. The Israeli claim of democracy is drastically different than any other in western societies and must be stretched thinly to veil a range of extremely undemocratic, Judeo-centric principles to diffuse the hard reality: Israel is an expressly Jewish state created especially for Jewish citizens, with all the racism, injustice, oppression of non-Jews, and ethnocentrism this might be expected to entail. The crucial “truth” test of any so-called “democracy” are the formal policies towards, legal status of, and resulting condition of all a country’s citizens – a test Israel emphatically fails. Arabs and other non-Jews are systematically and institutionally marginalized, often humiliated, and exploited in all walks of life.

Israeli sociologist Sammy Smooha notes that

“Israel’s ethnic nature is well evident today. The state claims to be the homeland of the Jews only. The dominant language is Hebrew, while Arabic is degraded to an inferior status. The institutions, official holidays, symbols, and heroes are exclusively Jewish. The major law of immigration [to Israel] admits Jews freely but excludes Palestinian Arabs. Israel confers
a special standing on the [private international funding agencies] Jewish Agency and the Jewish National Fund which, by their own constitutions, cater to Jews only. Laws and settlement policies are geared to further the interests of Jews only ... [SMOOH, S., p. 326] It is part of the national consensus to keep Arabs a nonassimilating minority, just as it is to keep Jews a nonassimilating majority ... Independent Arab organizations are denied official recognition, and government and quasi-government offices refuse to deal with them directly.” [SMOOH, p. 331]

“The Law of Return,” notes Israeli author Avirama Golan, “gives every Jew [in the world] the automatic right to citizenship, and Israeli citizenship, therefore, is bound to *halakhic* definitions and the Orthodox monopoly and creates blatant, undemocratic discrimination.” [GOLAN, A., 2001] [Note, in another chapter, a range of questionable Israeli ethical/unethical activities]

“There remain unresolved issues of democracy in Zionist thought and certainly in the Zionist state,” says Zvi Gitelman, “Among them is the question of whether Israel can both be an ‘ethnic state’ – that is, a Jewish state – and a ‘civic state’ – one for all of its citizens, including the nearly 20 percent who are not Jews.” [GITELMAN, Z., 1997]

In 1980, Jewish author Ian Lustick wrote an entire academic volume about the ways that Israel’s Arab citizens are “controlled” in the Jewish democracy. “What explains the existence within Israel,” he asks, “of a substantial community [Arabs] with virtually no independently operated industrial, commercial or financial institutions, no independent political parties, and almost no command over the attention or interest of the mainstream [Jews] of Israeli society?” [LUSTICK, I., 1980, p. 24] His answer entails the three “components” that he identifies which “form a system’ which does result in control” – *segmentation*, *dependency*, and *co-optation*. Segmentation, Lustick says, “refers to the isolation of the Arab minority from the Jewish population and the Arab minority’s internal fragmentation.” Dependency “refers to the enforced reliance of Arabs on the Jewish majority for important economic and political resources.” Co-optation “refers to the use of side payments to Arab elites or potential elites for purposes of surveillance and resource extraction.” [LUSTICK, I., 1980, p. 77] Lustick also notes the institutionalized undercurrent of the Jewish police state:

“The regime’s fundamental distrust of the Arab minority has been reflected in the fact that five of the six men who have served as Adviser to the Prime Minister on Arab Affairs – Yehoshua Palmon, Uri Lubrani,
Shmuel Divon, Rehavam Amid, and Shmuel Toledano – were recruited for that post from the secret services.” [LUSTICK, I., 1980, p. 66]

“Imposed legal measures,” noted Micheal Roman and Alex Weingrod years later, “institutional frameworks, and allocations of economic resources are all designed to consolidate the Jewish demographic, spatial, and economic dominance [over Arabs], and are often based upon ethnic differentiation [ROMAN/WEINGROD, p. 226] … Putting it succinctly, under the present structure of political and economic power the trend has inevitably been toward a system of ‘separate but unequal.’” [p. 228]

Israeli Bernard Avishai poses a troubling question to American Jews who everywhere herald and propagandize about the “democracy” of modern Israeli: “[Jewish] Israelis enjoy many civil liberties, but the state also enforces important laws and economic regulations which contradict democratic ethics. What American Jews, for example, would want to live in an America without civil marriage, or which only certified Christians were permitted to buy certain properties? … Some of the reasons for Israel’s failure as a democracy are internal to the logic of the Zionist revolution.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 9]

“From the very beginning of the Zionist endeavor,” says Israeli Jay Gonen, “most Zionists displayed a blind spot in their view of Arabs … The absence of Arabs from the Jewish visual field was sometimes total.” [GONEN, p. 182]

“Public opinion surveys in Israel,” add Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “regularly exclude non-Jews, even though they make up roughly a sixth of the population.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 24] “There are over 14,000 Arab graduates of Israeli universities,” says Keith Kyle, “but of some 5,000 academic posts only 20 are held by Arabs.” [KYLE, K., p. 253]

One of these few Arab academics is Majid Al-Haj, a senior lecturer in the Sociology and Anthropology Department at Haifa University. He notes that “It has been repeatedly emphasized that formal policy towards the Arabs in Israel is directed by three main considerations: the democratic principle, the Jewish-Zionist principle, and security considerations. While the first drives toward equality and integration of Arabs, the other two pull in the opposite direction. When these features are juxtaposed, it is clear that Jewish-Zionist and security considerations have gained the upper hand.” [Al-Haj, M., 148]

“To [Israeli political scientist Ze’ev Sternhall],” note Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “Israeli political culture rejects the basis of democratic thought – that ‘society and state exist in order to serve the individual … and are never ends in themselves.’ Sternhall traces Israel’s collectivist culture to the Jewish tradition, among other elements. He maintains that even the non-religious Zionists never really freed themselves from the traditions of their father’s home, and in one form or another they deferred to ‘Yisrael Saba.’ In this view of Sternhall and others like him, Israel needs urgently to overcome its inherent anti-democratic and anti-liberal Jewish identity.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 119]

“In recent years,” notes political scientist Arend Aijphart, “Israeli democracy has been subjected to frequent and increasing criticism, both by Israelis themselves and foreign berserkers … Many people believe that there is some-
thing seriously and fundamentally wrong with Israeli democracy.” [LIJPHART, p. 107] “What matters in the Israeli-Jewish perception,” says Liebman and Cohen, “is that liberalism – support for individual rights for minorities – offers the Jews no protection.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 118] “Israel is unique in the Western world,” says Sammy Smooha, “for remaining an ethnic state (i.e., a state identified to serve one of its constituent population groups). Such a structure is bound to clash with political democracy, which is based on the principle of equal rights and equal treatment of all citizens.” [SMOOHA, p. 325]

Smooha cites four central foundations of the systematic slighting of non-Jewish civil rights and injustice in Israel:

1) The lack of a formal Israel Constitution or Bill of Rights as final law.

2) The legal technicality that Israel continues to function in a perpetual state of emergency (per the threat of local Arab attack).

3) The central premises of the Jewish-Zionist nation is intrinsically discriminatory to non-Jews.

4) Jewish public opinion in Israel supports restrictions upon Arabs and privileges for Jews. [SMOOHA, p. 328]

The lack of a formal Constitution serves to avoid a formal expression of what exactly Israel’s intentions and goals are, thereby diffusing the issues of final Jewish state boundaries, the role of Jewish religious Orthodoxy in government, and the legal rights of non-Jews. Existing laws can be changed at any time. According to Noam Chomsky, “[Israeli prime minister] Ben Gurion wrote that ‘a Jewish state … will serve as an important and decisive stage in the realization of Zionism,’ but only a stage: the borders of the state ‘will not be fixed for eternity’ but will expand either by agreement with Arabs ‘or by some other way,’ once ‘we have force at our disposal’ in a Jewish state. His long term vision included Jordan and beyond, sometimes even ‘the land of Israel’ from the Nile to the Euphrates.” Another Israeli prime minister, Golda Meir, once said that “The borders are determined by where Jews live, not where there is a line on the map.” [CHOMSKY, N., p. 236]

Among the important discriminations against the Arabs of Israel (approximately 18% of the total population), are those veiled by laws that prohibit Arabs (with few exceptions) from serving in the army. “Army service is a major gateway to rights and privileges in Israel,” notes Adam Garfinkel, “and as a result, Israeli Arabs are saddled with major disadvantages.” [GARFINKEL, p. 105] Because of the focus on army service as the key to social and economic benefits, “the bulk of discrimination,” says Sammy Smooha, “is … covert.” [SMOOHA, p. 328] Not so terribly invisible were the revelations of an Association for Civil Rights in Israel study in 1999. Of the 13,000 people who worked for the Israeli Electric Corporation, six (0.00046 percent) were Arabs. Only five percent of all Israeli civil service jobs were filled by Arabs; most of these jobs could only be filled by Arabs as they served, intimately and in close quarters, Israel’s segregated Arab community. Of these Arab civil service workers, half did not have tenure in their positions, and one-third were doing temporary work. [DAYAN, A, 12-19-99]
By 1993, 60% of Israeli Arab children lived in what was officially considered poverty (three times the percentage of Jews). “Their parents,” notes Keith Kyle, “not having served in the IDF [Israeli Defense Force], get child allowances two or three times smaller than those available to most Jews with children.” [KYLE, p. 253] A more blatant discriminatory device is the Israeli national identity card, required of all citizens, which states whether the bearer is Jewish or Arab.

“Jewish landlords have often refused to rent their premises to Arabs,” notes Micheal Roman and Alex Weingrod, [p. 39] “… There can be little doubt that one of the major features of Jewish-Arab relationships is the predominant force of persistent, widespread segregation … Residential segregation has remained practically complete. No mixed Jewish-Arab neighborhoods have developed during the more than two decades of coexistence.” [p. 221] In 1999, a major Israeli legal case brewed when a prosperous Arab, Fathi Muhammed, sought to live in a home in Katzir, like most of the best living areas, a purely Jewish town. “The actions of Fathi Muhammed,” notes the Boston Globe, “set off a court battle that has drawn attention to Israel’s treatment of its Arab minority, who have full citizenship yet face discrimination in almost all areas.” [MARCUS, A., 8-5-99, p. A1] The hard details of the such a land/home purchase, however, are elusive; most land in Israel is leased – not purchased – for long terms from the Zionist government, thus insuring indefinite Jewish control of Israel’s physical terrain. In the Katzir case, the land is leased from the government by the gigantic Jewish Agency, an organization that has a singular Zionist interest in aiding Jews in Israel.

Traditional anti-democratic Jewish religious tenets are also an integral part of Israel’s “democracy.” There is little pretense of a “separation of church and state,” a mainstay in western democracies and a principle emphatically demanded, and enforced, by Jews in other countries. Among the examples of traditional Jewish, anti-universalist religious dogma in Israeli’s “democracy” is that it is illegal for a Jew to marry a non-Jew in the Jewish state. And because religious Jews hold the Sabbath (Saturday) to be a day of rest, this period of work shutdown is enforced by public institutions with repercussions upon everyone (Muslims, Christians, and other non-Jews). One consequence of this Jewish religious dictate, for example, is the nation-wide closing of public transportation on Saturdays. “There are few democracies in the world,” notes Zev Chafets, “where spiritual leaders are so blatantly involved in the action. Some of Israel’s most venerable rabbis are power brokers who cut deals with the secular pools over money, legislation, and patronage with all the restraint and dignity of Tammany ward heelers.” [CHAFETS, p. 153]

In 1988, the Minister of Interior for the Israeli government, Rabbi Yitzhak Peretz (head of the Shas party) visited a Bedouin community in Israel’s southern desert and took the occasion to remark that

“It is written in the Torah that it is essential for each nation to preserve its character and breed. This is the guarantee for peace among nations. Intermixture leads to hatred, conflict, and war. Since I would like to live in peace, I do not hold with excessively close association between Jewish
and Arab youth. At a tender age meetings of this type give rise to love; love leads to marriage. This is neither good nor healthy.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 37]

In recent years there has been growing support in some Israeli quarters for a government that is completely founded upon Torah and Talmudic dictates. As Rabbi David Bar-Haim noted in 1988:

“We have before us a very clear proposition: All human beings are equal, Jews and Gentiles. As we shall now see, this belief stands in total contrast to the Torah of Moses, and is derived from a total ignorance of and assimilation of alien Western values. It would not even merit comment had not so many people been led astray by it.” [ELIEZER, p. 27]

Knesset member Meir Kahane also declared in the 1980s that

“[Democracy] is based on the idea that we are incapable of knowing the truth. And since nobody holds the truth, nobody can say what is true. Therefore the majority has to decide. It’s a practical deduction. Judaism is founded on the idea that we know the truth … You don’t vote on a truth … Democracy and Judaism are two opposite things. One absolutely cannot confuse them … These are two totally opposite conceptions of life.” [AVRUCH, p. 134]

The above two speakers may be framed by some as “extremists.” Yet, “all Orthodox Jews,” notes Livnet Eliezer, “irrespective of their political convictions, believe in the future establishment in Israel of a halachic state [a state directed by Jewish religious law], a Jewish theocracy. Though this state is expected to respect certain democratic principles, its system of government would not be democratic and would be founded on a totally different set of suppositions.” [ELIEZER, L., p. 290] “The situation in Israel,” adds Adam Garfinkle, “… is nearly the exact opposite of the situation in the United States today. Here, toleration of diverse beliefs and practices is accepted but public association with religion is not. In Israel, public association with religion is accepted but toleration of diverse belief and practice is not.” [GARFINKLE, p. 135]

“When asked if the Arabs of Judea, Samaria, and Gaza [the Occupied Territories] should be given the right to vote in the event of [Israeli] annexation,” notes Bernard Avishai, “only 31 percent of high school students said yes. Can this be unrelated to the fact that there is no legal apparatus for an Arab to marry a Jew in Israel? … Israeli schools have taught children more about the tribes of Israel than about the Enlightenment [AVISHAI, B., p. 304] … One poll by [newspaper] Ha’aretz during 1984 revealed that 32 percent of Israelis felt violence towards Arabs, even terrorism, was either ‘totally’ justified or had ‘some’ justification. Over 60 percent of young Israelis believe that Arabs should not be accorded full rights in the state.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 307]

As Simha Flapan notes:

“There is no intrinsic connection between Judaism and democracy. There always was an orthodox, fundamentalist current in Judaism, characterized by racial prejudice toward non-Jews in general and Arabs in particular. A substantial portion – perhaps even the overwhelming
majority—of the religious movements [in Israel], and a growing part of the population in general, came to conceive of the West Bank not as the homeland of the Palestinian people but as Judea and Samaria, the birthplace of the Jewish faith and homeland of the Jewish people. Many people not only became indifferent to the national rights of the Palestinians living there, they did not even see the necessity for granting them civil rights.” [original author’s emphasis; FLAPAN, S., 1987, p. 240]

“Universalism,” notes Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “a central component in the American Jewish understanding of Judaism that extends to many Orthodox, is deliberately rejected by mainstream Orthodoxy in Israel. The triumph of Jewish particularism is evident with regards to relations between Jews and non-Jews.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 146] “Unfortunately,” says Yehoshafat Harkabi, “in recent years, the xenophobia [in Israel] has increased in intensity and extended to new areas. For some it is not merely an attitude but also the basis for deriving general principles of conduct—including proposals for laws against non-Jews and against their residence among Jews.” [HARKABI, p. 160]

The growth in Israel (and America) of perspectives like Meir Kahane are not tiny, nor are they aberrations. In 1988 a nakedly racist and brutal bill that “would in effect decriminalize acts of violence by Jews against Arabs” was introduced by nine Knesset members. [SEDAN, G., 12-2-88, p. 10] It did not pass, but what kind of “democracy” would America be considered if nine United States senators felt secure enough to sponsor such a bill here, a comparable one, say, that “decriminalizes white violence against Blacks?” What would it mean to this country if such a group of American congressmen could support such opinion openly, confidently, and freely as members of elected government?

Michael Jansen notes that

“According to Israeli sociologist Yoram Peri, ‘every Jewish generation born in Greater Israel becomes more and more like South Africa [under apartheid]’ and 1984 opinion polls in Israel ‘should alarm anyone who still has any humane feelings left.’ 15% said Palestinians should be deported, 43% said they should remain with no civil and political rights. Only one out of ten [older Israelis] favored deportation … while three out of four in the 18-22 age group supported this resolution.” [JANSEN, p. 13]

According to a 2001 survey of Israelis by the University of Haifa’s center for national security research,

“A majority [71%] of Jews in Israel believe that Arab citizens’ complaints of discrimination are unjustified, that Arabs excessively influence politics in the country [62%] and that Israeli Arabs are to blame for tensions between Jews and Arabs in the state [59%] … More than two-thirds (68%) of the Jewish respondents said they do not want Arabs to live in their neighborhoods.” [NIR, O., 12-12-01]

In 1985, Dr. Arik Carmon, chairman of Israel’s Committee on Education for Democracy, resigned, complaining that “the demands voiced by ministers and Knesset members to release the Jewish terror defendants [a group of Jews accused of terrorist acts against Arabs], the violence by Jewish lawbreakers, which has ac-
companied this demand, and the silence of political, spiritual, and social leaders in the light of this violence have created the conditions for an anti-democratic climate which is beginning to prevail in Israel.” [JEWISH WEEK, 7-12-85, p. 5] That same year the Jewish Week noted that the Israeli Defense Ministry “employs 58 civilian censors to scrutinize mail of persons under security clearances. The public was largely unaware of this until recent[ly].” [JEWISH WEEK, 7-26-85]

In a 1988 survey in Israel, notes sociologist Smooha, “43% of Israeli Jews favored the denial of Arabs the right to vote,… 74% were unwilling to have an Arab as a superior in a job. Informal, daily discriminations against Israeli Arabs abound.” [SMOOGHA, p. 329] “There is a feeling that the state of Israel is the state of the Jewish people,” says Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “in the narrowest meaning of the term, of which non-Jews are not really a part… Israeli non-Jews are not Israelis by natural right; they are something else, a something generally left unspecified and unclear.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 79] Reflecting the most ominous political undercurrents in the Jewish state, in 1990 surveys by the Israeli Democracy Institute found that “over 55% of the Israelis are willing to replace democracy with the rule of a ‘strong man.’” [SPRINZAK/DIAMOND, p. x]


In 1965, says Israeli Jay Gonen, Kalman Benyami, a psychology professor at Hebrew University, was so “shocked” by the results of his research “that he decided not to publish them. Benyami had discovered that the image of the Arab in the eyes of Israeli youth was very distorted and negative. After the Six Day War [in 1967] he repeated the study and found that Israeli youth viewed the Arab as even sicker, drunker, uglier. At the same time he found an overestimation of self on the part of the Israelis.” [GONEN, J., p. 187] “Following the Yom Kippur War,” says Zev Chafets, “army psychologists were astonished at how many [Israeli] soldiers involved in the first desperate days of fighting had imagined that the Syrian and Egyptian armies were Nazis, bent on carrying out mass murder.” [CHAFETS, p. 106]

In 1984, Israeli Uriel Tal wrote that “The equality of humanity and civil rights is a foreign democratic principle [in Israel]… A denial of human rights[is] because our existence in Eretz Israel is made conditional on the emigration of the Arabs from the country… The third issue of a non-Jewish person’s human rights is based on the Biblical commandment to annihilate the memory of Amalek, i.e., real genocide… The danger of this totality lies in the fact that it leads to a totalitarian concept of the political realm because within its framework there is no room for the existence of the human and civil rights of a non-Jew.” [TAL, p. 59-65]

In 1967 Zev Chafets moved from America to live in Israel. He recounts an early visit to Jerusalem: “As we lounged in the shade talking, I idly peeled an orange, tossing the skin on the ground. Suddenly, an enraged Arab shopkeeper
emerged from his store and demanded that I picked up the peels. At first I was embarrassed to have littered so thoughtlessly, and I gathered up the refuse as he watched. Then, in a flash, it dawned on me: This was my country, my capital city. I tossed the peels back on the street and told the shopkeeper to pick them up himself.” [CHAFETS, p. 15-16] (Chafet’s self-described “Jewish guilt” led him to return to apologize to the shopkeeper the next day).

In the late 1980s, Yoram Binur, a Jewish Israeli, embarked on a project to learn what it was like to be an Arab in Israel. Fluent in Arabic and with a physical appearance that could be mistaken as that of an Arab, he began an elaborate—and dangerous—deceit to learn about Arabs’ lives in the Jewish world of his homeland. The results of his disturbing experiences were published as a book. He started out looking for work from Jewish employers, standing early in the morning at a well-known “slave corner” and secured a 16-hour a day job for kitchen work that paid a total of $10 a day, with free food and a place to sleep (on a mattress “one-third the length of a finger.” [BINUR, p. 11] Despite a different self-choice for an Arabic name, he was routinely, and disparagingly, called “Ahmed” or “Mohammed.”

Binur’s adventures led him to learn about the rape of two Arab girls by Israeli soldiers (“Until then I hadn’t believed that members of the IDF [Israeli Defense Force] were capable of such things; now one more naive belief was shattered.” [BINUR, p. 29] and to visit an Israeli officer training center where “I was able to witness corruption among the higher ranks at close hand.” [BINUR, p. 32] At a second job his Jewish boss goaded him to change his name from an Arab to a Jewish one (“I was outraged. It wasn’t enough that the man was paying me starvation wages, and this his people denied me the right to even aspire to freedom and independence. He also had the effrontery to suggest that I give up the little that remained to me, that I drop my name and assume the incongruous aspect of a Jew.” [BINUR, p. 54] During this job a boss once noted that, “I see our Arab is a little idle, so let him take out the glasses and wash them over again.” [BINUR, p. 68]

Among the most disturbing, humiliating experiences Binur felt as an Arab was when one of his Jewish employers backed up next to him with a lover as Binur was washing dishes in a cramped kitchen. “I lowered my eyes,” says Binur, “and concentrated on washing the dirty dishes in the sink, so I wouldn’t embarrass them with my presence… Then a sort of trembling came suddenly over me. I realized that they had not meant to put on a peep show for my enjoyment. Those two were not the least bit concerned with what I saw or felt even when they were practically fucking under my nose. For them I simply didn’t exist. I was invisible, a nonentity. It’s difficult to describe the feeling of extreme humiliation which I experienced. Looking back, I think it was the most degrading moment I had during my entire posing adventure.” [BINUR, p. 69]

Binur was also roughed up by Jews (merely for being perceived as an Arab) and was warned that a group of Jews were planning to attack him. [BINUR, p. 115-116] Eventually he found work on a kibbutz, the legendary socialist communal work/living experiment famed in pioneer Zionist folklore. Despite
the fact that kibbutzim have a reputation for openness and liberality, Binur found serious problems for him as an Arab there too. “The kibbutzim,” he wrote, “are probably the best representation of the moderate left in Israel. With its liberal ideology which stresses equal rights for all members of the human race and its high regard for the dignity of labor… I quickly learned that fear, suspicion, and prejudice against Arabs existed no less around kibbutzniks than among other Israeli Jews.” [BINUR, p. 120] Here too he was warned by a friendly Jew that others planned on beating him up one night with the intention of driving him off the kibbutz. [BINUR, p. 134] Completely innocent, he was also accused of theft. [See also David Grossman’s account, in his *The Yellow Wind*, of similar tales of chronic exploitation and Arab degradation at the hands of Jewish employers].

(The anti-Arab racism in Israeli society stretches to all corners of Jewish society. In 1989, a Bedouin man formally converted to Judaism under prominent Orthodox Sephardic rabbi Ovadia Joseph. The Arab had served in the Israeli army and moved with his Jewish wife to a moshav—a [Jewish] agricultural settlement. When his original identity became known, he was driven out by the Jewish community, a community was not, by political standards, a “conservative” group; 83% of the moshav had voted for the liberal Labor party in the last election. [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 25])

Among Binur’s conclusions after his experiences posing as an Arab in Israel are that:

“[The Palestinian Arab] sees and recognizes the value of freedom, but is accorded the sort of treatment that characterizes the most backward dictatorial regimes. How can he be anything but frustrated?” [BINUR, p. 196]

“This book has sought to emphasize how, on the level of day-to-day interactions, Israeli Jews have exploited and humiliated their Arab neighbors.” [BINUR, p. 198]

“The Palestinians, employed as a cheap labor force, are forced into the role of active observers with respect to Israeli society, whereas Israeli Jews don’t even do that much and are satisfied to rule without exhibiting the least curiosity about how the other side lives.” [BINUR, p. 214]

These are long-standing perceptions in the Jewish state. “As I grew up [in Haifa in the 1930s and 1940s],” says Israeli Jay Gonen, “I took Arabs for granted. They were usually called Eṣma, which is a distortion of the Arab Isma, meaning ‘Hear! Hear!’… In the late forties the term Arabush (plural Arabushim) became more popular. A more demeaning term, it connotes the scorn that the efficient and strong feel toward the weak and inept… The Jewish conviction [was] that the Arabs understand only the language of force, a bias that persisted for many years and became especially pronounced after the Holocaust.” [GONEN, J., p. 180]

Lesley Hazeleton was raised in Great Britain, moved to Israel for over a decade, and had dual British-Israeli citizenry. “The racism [in Israel],” she wrote in 1987,
“is as crude as anywhere in the world. Sometimes it is familiar: ‘I was in the bank yesterday and this filthy old Arab comes walking in with a sack full of money. Cash. So where did he get his hands on all that money? What’s he got to complain about? He’s making plenty out of us.’” [HAZELETON, LESLEY, 1987, p. 106]

“[Israelis have] tolerance for government secrecy and selected abridgement of human rights,” notes Adam Garfinkle, “Most Israelis accept it as natural that some things should not be made public… Also, most Israelis realize, and accept as necessary, that the security services use physical and sometimes very harsh interrogative methods against Arabs in the occupied territories who have been arrested for security violations… The general view is that the security of Israeli society, especially when it comes to matters of life and death, overrides the individual rights of Arab suspects.” [GARFINKLE, p. 111]

In 1996 the Carmel Center for Social Research released the results of a study conducted under sponsorship of the Israeli Education Ministry. Over 35 percent “of Israeli youths said they hate Arabs.” Two-thirds of the high school students surveyed didn’t believe that Arabs should have equal rights in the Israeli state. [SEGAL, N., 11-27-96, p. 12] In 1993, the Israeli Institute for Military Studies released the results of a similar survey of 5,400 Israeli high school students. To the question, “Do you hate Arabs?,” 40 percent of the respondents answered yes to either the choices “all” or “most” of them. [DERFNER, L., 1-8-93, p. 8]

“I’ve seen and heard anti-Arab racism so many times,” wrote American immigrant to Israel Larry Derfner, “… that I know it exists… The bigotry quotient is… much higher than the nominal level I expected to find before moving here… I’ve heard not only countless right-wingers, but also Laborites and even a couple members of a left-wing kibbutz utter variations on, ‘The only good Arab is a dead Arab.” [DERFNER, L., 1-8-93, p. 8] The secretary, Massi Raz, of Peace Now (the best known Israeli group advocating Israeli concessions for peace with Arabs) noted the problem of “natural racism of almost all Israelis.” [ARNOLD, M., 1999, p. 72]

While serving in the Israeli army, Derfner found himself watching the activities of a group of Israeli Border Patrolman attack a number of waiting Arab taxi drivers in Gaza City. They smashed their cars and “one policeman walked up to a driver seated in his cab, and punched him in the face. Another policeman called over a young man sitting at the bus stop, and swung open the door of his jeep into the fellow’s face. Three or four of the policemen… took off after the departing taxis, throwing their batons at them. When they came back to their jeep, they pounded each other on the back, exulting like they’d just scored a goal in a soccer match. The soldier guarding the base with me, an immigrant from Denmark, watched the scene with his mouth literally hanging open, “They’re like Nazis,” he said. [DERFNER, L., 1-8-93, p. 8]

In the earlier years of modern Israel, the eminent British historian Arnold Toynbee (who once was supportive of the founding of a Jewish state in Palestine) wrote:
“In the German Nazis, and in the English ‘Black-and-Tan,’ I see the detestable dark side of the countenance of western civilization. I myself am an involuntary participant, and in the Jewish Zionists I see disciples of the Nazis. The Jews are, of course, not the only persecuted people that have reacted to persecution by doing as it has been done by; and, of course, too, the Jews who have reacted in this tragically perverse way are only one section of Jewry. Yet the spectacle of the Jews, however few, following in the Nazi footsteps is enough to drive a sensitive gentile or Jewish spectator almost to despair. That any Jews should inflict a third party some of the very wrongs that Jews have suffered at Western hands is a portent that makes one wonder whether there may not be something irredeemably evil, not in Jewish human nature in particular, nor again just in Western human nature, but in the human nature common to all men.” [TOYNBEE, A., in GOULD, p 455]

In 1995, Hebrew University professor Moshe Zimmerman found himself in trouble when he reportedly told an Israeli newspaper that “there is a whole sector of Israeli society, that without hesitation I would call a copy of the Nazis. Look at the [Jewish] children of Hebron. They are exactly like Hitler Youth. They are brainwashed from age zero that Arabs are bad and about anti-Semitism, making them paranoid and racist – just like the Hitler Youth.” “Zimmerman,” wrote the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “said that his remarks had been misquoted and, in one case, fabricated. But he did not withdraw his opinion that some similarities exist between Nazi hate propaganda and the ways [Jewish] settlers indoctrinate their children to hate Arabs.” [SEGAL, N., 5-7-95, p. 7]

Zimmerman was probably referring to the likes of studies at Israeli high schools after the 1994 murder of nearly 30 Muslims at prayer by American-born doctor Baruch Goldstein. Many students supported the random slaughter (as high as 60% of one Jewish high school class in the southern Israeli city of Be’er Sheva). As Joe Kolodner, head of the Psychological Services department for Israeli public schools noted, “It worries me that young people here are growing up without being able to emphasize with the pain of others and identify with their suffering… We must undergo a soul-searching. We’ve failed to develop values and create a humanistic society.” [DERFNER, L., 4-1-94, p. 2]

Journalist Lesley Hazelton, living in Jerusalem, noted in 1984 a conversation she had with an anonymous Israeli newspaper editor. “I’ve been in this country for fifty years,” he told her,

“and in all that fifty years, I have never, been so saddened and so concerned about the state of the country and its future. It’s like 1984 from the other side. In the novel, it was Communist totalitarianism. Here, it’s heading for right-wing nationalist totalitarianism, mystical and fascist.” [HAZELETON, L., 1987, p. 110]

After fifty one years of Israeli statehood, only in September 1999 did the Israeli Supreme Court formally ban the use of torture by the government’s security departments during interrogations of (Arab) detainees. (Somehow twisting half a century of behind-closed-doors brutality into an expression of
Jewish moral superiority, Jewish American newspaper columnist Anthony Lewis wrote that the Supreme Court decision “has turned Israel toward the role that… early Zionists saw for a Jewish state: to be a light unto other nations).” [LEWIS, A., 9-15-99, p. B3] Amnesty International was among those who appealed to the Court to forbid the violent shaking of prisoners, multi-day periods of sleep deprivation, forcing victims into difficult postures and oppressive environments for extended periods of time, extreme weather exposure, and other inhumane assaults. “Israel,” declared the group, “is the only country in the world to have effectively legalized torture by authorizing interrogators to use these methods.” [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 1-12-99] The Israeli human rights organization Betselem noted that 85 percent of the 1,000-1,500 Arabs detained by Shin Bet [the Israeli FBI] each year have been tortured. [TORONTO STAR, 5-21-98, p. A6] In 1998, an Arab-American citizen, Hashem Mufleh, was detained and tortured while traveling in the West Bank. The U.S. State Department had even posted a warning against Arab-Americans visiting that area. [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 11-9-98] Earlier, three other Arab-Americans (Anwar Mohamed, Yousif Marel, and Bashir Saidi) were detained, imprisoned and – according to their depositions – tortured. Saidi was imprisoned for 18 months, Mohamed for 40 days; all were eventually released to return to America. [BRISCOE, D., 8-26-99] The same year, an American born teenager, Hashem Mufleh, faced similar treatment, and a trial, after being accused of associating with the Islamic militant Hamas organization in the Occupied Territories. [KRAFT, D., 11-18-98] In 1999, human rights organizations charged that ten Arab prisoners have been killed while being interrogated over the past decade at Israeli prisons. [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 1-13-99] In 1980, during a prisoner hunger strike for better conditions, two jailed Arabs were essentially tortured and killed when, in a showdown of wills, their Israeli wardens attempted to force milk into their stomachs, instead flooding their lungs. By now torturously and terminally ill, they were not taken to a hospital until the next day. [GROSSMAN, D., 1990, p. 88] In Lebanon, the Israeli-trained Khiyam prison directors of the South Lebanon Army also tortures detainees. In September 1999 Israeli Major General Dan Halutz told an Israeli court that Shin Bet teaches those who run the Khiyam facility. [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 9-28-99]

The insertion of the modern Jewish nation of Israel and its oppressive policies into the heart of Arab lands has created a whole new dimension, and a new population of adherents, to the long tradition of “anti-Semitism.” Whereas for centuries the Jewish people in their ghettos disdained the Christian faith and its people, with the creation of a militant, garrisoned, exclusionist ghetto in what was once Palestine, they have now solicited yet another antagonist front: the outrage and hatred from Islam and its many millions of believers. “The Palestinian problem,” notes Jewish professor Maxime Rodinson, “created by Zionism and compounded by its logical triumph, has spread hatred of Jews into Arab countries where anti-Semitism was virtually unknown. The Zionists have very actively aided this with their incessant propaganda to persuade people that Zionism, Judaism, and Jewishness are equivalent concepts.” [RODINSON,
“No enemy of the Jewish people, throughout history,” said another Jewish scholar, Leonard Fein, “has had so powerful an argument or so plausible a position as the Arabs, and… Arab passions, at long last, are now coming to be seen as authentic, no less authentic than the Jews.” [FEIN, Israel, p. 8-9] “Many of the peoples of the world who have developed antagonism or suspicion about the Jewish people have no historical legacy of antagonism towards us,” argues Michael Lerner. “In the years since the second World War they have come to know us primarily through the activities of the state which calls itself the state of the Jewish people.” [LERNER, M., Goyim, p. 431]

Yet another group of the exploited under the racist norms of Israeli society are the so-called “foreign workers.” For decades, poorly paid and defenseless Arabs from the Occupied Territories (and Israel) have served as cheap labor sources for Jewish society. While the average per capita income in Israel is $16,000 a year, thanks to over $3 billion a year in U.S. aid to the Jewish state, the official “minimum wage” for foreign workers is about $3.50 an hour, although many are paid less. With increasing violent acts from Arabs against Jewish citizens in recent years, Palestinian labor was viewed as a security risk. Hence, in the mid-1990s, Arab labor for the Occupied Territories was drastically curtailed (in Gaza, employment rose to 60% of those desiring work), and cheap laborers from distant lands (particularly from Romania, the Philippines, and Thailand, but also South and West Africa, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine, and other places) were permitted to come to Israel to do the tasks for low pay that the Jewish strata is not interested in doing. And they usually have few, if any, benefits and rights in Israeli society: there is no overtime pay, for example, sick leave or paid holidays. [TROUNSON, R., 3-8-97, p. 16] By 1998, there were such 190,000 foreign workers living in Israel; less than half had legal work permits and Jewish public opinion was increasingly hostile to them. Foreign workers were blamed for “spreading disease, drug use, alcoholism, prostitution and violence.” Israeli police, however, note that “most foreign workers ‘respect the law’ and many, particularly those here illegally, are victimized in thefts and rapes.” [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 7-9-98] A 1999 survey noted that only 35% of those Israelis polled said “they would agree to have workers live near them.” [FISHBEIN, 12-23-99]

In 1998 the Romanian prime minister, Radu Vasile, and nine cabinet ministers journeyed to Israel. Estimates of Romanians working in Israel legally were about 30,000, illegally tens of thousands more. Among issues to be discussed with the Jewish government was “the treatment Romanian workers receive in Israel. Romania has repeatedly protested that its nationals working in Israel are harassed by police and humiliated and exploited by employers.” [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 6-28-98] The month before, the Ambassadors from Romania, Ghana and Nigeria complained about mistreatment of their citizens including “street arrests and harassment, non-payment of wages, appalling living conditions and lack of social rights” and employers’ refusal to return passports to workers who wished to leave the country. [DEUTSCHE PRESSE-AGENTUR, 6-24-98] In 1998, the Israeli government even ordered that, because of a
shortage, gas masks and chemical protection kits (in case of chemical attack from Iraq) could not be sold to foreigners. [WALKER, C., 2-7-98]

In 1999, Thailand’s ambassador to Israel, Domedeg Bunnag, complained that “if the workers’ conditions were not improved, his government would no longer permit Israel to import Thai workers.” “I am almost moved to tears when I see the conditions of Thai workers in Israel,” he told an Israeli newspaper, “They live in sub-human conditions, and are constantly exploited by both the moshav [agricultural center] owners and the manpower agencies.” Bunnag also charged that Thai workers were faced with unhealthy working condition, were overcharged for rent, underpaid, and routinely cheated by Israeli employers. [BAR-MOHA, Y., 7-19-99]

Foreign workers coming to Israel are legally bound to their initial sponsoring employer, no matter what unjust, inhumane or exploitive conditions are thrust upon them. “This requirement of linking the [worker’s] visa to one employer creates tremendous potential for abuse and exploitation,” notes Hanna Zohar, founder of a worker aid organization. [FINANCIAL TIMES, 1-23-97, p. 4] “Israelis lately,” noted the Los Angeles Times, “have become uncomfortably aware of the inhumane living and working conditions forced on many of the workers by their Israeli employers… Some employers take away the workers’ passports and, toward the end of one-year or six-month contracts, have them deported without paying their final wages. Confiscating passports is illegal but common, workers advocates say.” [TROUNSON, R., 3-8-97, p. A16]

In September 1997 an international news report noted that “Israel’s foreign ministry pledged Thursday to ensure ‘humane treatment’ of foreign workers after a Romanian laborer died at a Tel Aviv construction site from a lack of medical attention.” Such workers are often required to work 12-13 hours a day. [AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, 9-2-97] “We came here to make money and support our families so our children have a chance for a better future,” one Romanian worker told a Los Angeles Times reporter, “But they treat us like animals.” [TROUNSON, R., 3-8-97, p. A16]

Jewish racism in Israel also impacts the “Black Hebrews,” the African-American community of immigrants (who are rejected as Jews) in the desert town of Dimona. In 1999, the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz noted that the Dimona municipality and the Ministry of Religious Affairs continued to block the Black Hebrews’ attempts to get land for a cemetery. They have been forced to bury their dead in the local garbage dump. [ARBELI, 10-3-99]

Jewish racism in Israel does not screech to a stop at the wall between goyim and the Jewish people. Although anti-Gentile racism in Israel cannot be reasonably compared to the intra-Jewish dimensions of the problem, it very much exists within the Jewish community too. Israel has always had a discriminatory society. The Ashkenazim – Jews of European heritage – largely founded, and still run, the country. (In its early years, Zionism’s strongest hold among Jews was in Russia and Poland, and these people essentially founded the modern Jewish state). Later mass immigration to Israel included the Sephardim (“Oriental” Jews from Arab countries, Iran, India, et al). By 1992, Israel’s Jews con-
sisted of about half Ashkenazi and half Sephardi, although over 90% of the rest of the Jews of the world – including those in America – were Ashkenazi.

Tainted by Arabic cultures, the Sephardim have never measured up to traditional western Jewish self-identity. “The great Hebrew poet Chaim Nachmann Bialik,” says Zev Chafets, “was supposed to have joked that he hated Arabs because they reminded him of Sephardic Jews.” [CHAFETS, Z., p. 118] “Israeli identity of immigrants,” says Yohan Peres, “is constructed on the perceived Ashkenazic identity.” [AYALA, E., p. 155] “Israel’s first prime minister (and Ashkenazi) David Ben Gurion remarked in 1960 that the Sephardim in Israel had “come from a society that was backward, corrupt, uneducated, and lacking in independence and self-respect” and they should seek to attain “the superior moral and intellectual characteristic of those who created the state.” [BEN GURION, in SELZER, p. 65]

A journalist in one of the major Israeli dailies, Ha’aretz, once wrote that the Sephardim were “the likes of which we have not yet known in this country. You will find among them dirty card games for money, drunkenness, and fornication. Many of these suffer from serious eye, skin, and venereal disease; not to mention immorality and stealing.” [SELZER, p. 69]

In his study of the Israeli kibbutz system, Melford Spiro noted that at the schools “immigrant [Sephardim] children bear the brunt of this out-group aggression. Many students, ideologically in favor of immigration, are hostile to the immigrants from the Middle East, whom they view as inferiors – they call them schnorim, the ‘black ones.’ They are the constant butts of verbal aggression, taunting, and teasing.” [SPIRO, p. 319]

In more recent years, Zev Chafets notes the time he witnessed the stir created by an Israeli Ashkenazi journalist at an American Jewish Committee conference in New York. As Chafets recalls, the woman proclaimed that the Sephardim in Israel

“are brutal, vulgar people, people who have introduced violence and intolerance. I hate their values, their attitudes. They have destroyed our [Israeli] dream. They’ve stolen my homeland and I feel like a stranger in my own country.”

“There was a shocked silence in the audience,” says Chafets, “I had heard this kind of diatribe a dozen times in Israel but it was a new experience for the American Jews. More than a few of them, I guessed, were remembering similar statements expressed about themselves only a generation ago by America’s bluebloods.” [CHAFETS, Z., p. 129-130]

In 1998 the BBC reported the controversial accusations of Knesset [Israeli Parliament] Member Ori Or: “Among other things, Or told the [Israeli] newspaper that it was impossible to hold a normal conversation with Oriental Jews, adding that they were not really Israeli. He called the Moroccan Jewish community the biggest and the most problematic group in Israel… Or accused Oriental Jews of portraying themselves as victims of exploitation.” [BBC, 7-31-98]

“With inadequate living space, schools, day-care centers, kindergartens, youth clubs, and cultural programs,” said Etan Levine by the 1990s, “it is small wonder that [Jewish] Moroccans account for 90% of Israel’s prison population.
And this is a community that in its native land was far from a criminal element. Crime was learned in Israel itself… There is real hostility in the Sephardic community today. The Ashkenazim are identified as responsible for every injustice – real or imagined – that the Sephardim suffered since arriving in Israel. This resentment has been expressed in Sephardic voting patterns, in violent demonstrations, and in a host of other less bellicose ways.” [LEVINE, E., p. 41, 42]

By 1990, 56% of Ashkenazim Jews born in Israel had a college education; comparably, only 16.5% of the Sephardim born in Israel had such schooling. [SMOOHA, S., Jewish, p. 162] “The most crucial material gulf between the two ethnic groups,” observed Israeli sociologist Sammy Smooha in 1992,

“lies in the quantity and accumulation of wealth… In the Jewish population the poor and working class are predominantly Oriental, the middle stratum is ethnically mixed with some Ashkenazi over-representation and the upper-middle class and elite are predominantly Ashkenazi… The mobility of Ashkenazim was… to a large extent predicated on the channeling of Oriental newcomers to the lower rungs of society… Ashkenazim still continue to stereotype themselves as superior westerners and to project Orientals as inferior, arabized Middle Easterners.” [SMOOHA, S., Jewish, p. 163, 164, 165, 168]

The Sephardim also represent a Jewish tradition of ghettoization even within the Jewish state. “It is clear,” wrote Shlomo Swirski, “that the majority of Orientals now live in neighborhoods, towns, and villages that are overwhelmingly Oriental.” [AYALA, E., p. 154]

For decades there have even been accusations that, in the early years of the new Israeli nation, Jewish Ashkenazim stole Sephardim children to sell to other Jews or raise as their own. Such wild stories had never been taken seriously by Israeli mainstream society until 1997, when it was biologically proven that a Jewish woman in California, Tzila Levine, was the daughter of an emigrant to Israel from Yemen. They were separated – and didn’t know for certain of each other – for nearly fifty years. Mother and daughter, noted the Los Angeles Times,

“asked searching questions about why the state of Israel, in its early days, and in the years since, had all but dismissed the claims of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of immigrants that their babies had disappeared… Leaders of the Yemenite Jewish community here and in the United States have long suspected that the missing children did not die, as many parents were told, but were kidnapped and sold to childless Jewish couples of American and European descent… Most Israelis have long dismissed the stories as the fantasies of an undereducated group caught up in the chaos of mass immigration… The sensational case, which sparked hundreds of phone calls to radio talk shows, is expected to spur new demands for investigations into the decades-old claims and to intensify simmering racial tensions between Sephardic Jews, of Middle Eastern and North African origin, and Ashkenazim.” [TROUNSON, R., p. A6]

Of course the Sephardim are Jews, and despite Ashkenazi discrimination towards them, they ride securely above an entire class of people yet beneath them.
“Sephardim Jews,” says Amnon Rubenstein, “have also benefited since 1967 by the Palestinians to the West Bank and Gaza Strip taking the lowest manual work within Israeli society, allowing the Sephardim to move up a step on the socioeconomic ladder.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 61]

Yet another (very recent) level of Jewish underclass in Israel is the Ethiopians. In the 1980s and early 1990s the Israeli government began airlifting the Falasha (Blacks from Ethiopia who have a Jewish self-identity) to Israel. This was part of Israel’s standard “absorption” policy – using also large numbers of immigrant Jews from Russia, and others – to swell Jewish ranks in a country where the minority Arab birth rate is considerably larger. The “Jewish” link legislated by the state of Israel between Ethiopians and Russians, however, is peculiar. Russian and Ethiopian Jews are in no way similar: their “race,” their language, their culture, and their religion are all drastically dissimilar. (Russian Jews, for example, raised under communism, have become largely atheist and exemplify the mores of western civilization; Ethiopians practice some religious rituals that are unknown otherwise in Israel and are, upon arrival to Israel, emphatically Third World in worldview). All that binds the two groups together are the ancient legends and religious convictions about the “seed” of Abraham-Isaac-Jacob, a “lost tribe” of Jews, and its legendary addenda. As Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen note, “the myth of common ancestry implies both common biological traits and a common history (it matters not whether the myth is true, only that those who share the same culture believe it to be true).” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 13] Ironically, much of the Ethiopians’ traditional Third World culture is closer akin to the indigenous Muslim Arab Bedouin (some too, who are of African origin) of the Jewish state. The influx of a Third World psychological temperament was also in marked difference from the predominant Israeli machismo; “Several Israeli newspaper commentators,” says Adam Garfinkel, “have remarked that the gentility of the Ethiopians is a welcome antidote to the brashness and hard-edgedness of Israeli culture.” [GARFINKEL, A., p. 102]

Allowing Black Jewish Ethiopians to migrate to Israel also has some international political expediency, in particular public image-making, i.e., helping to diffuse the 1975 United Nations General Assembly resolution (repealed under heavy Jewish lobbying pressure by 1992) that “Zionism is racism.” “The predominant interest in putting the spotlight on the Falashas and keeping it there,” says Virginia Dominguez, a non-Jewish scholar in Israel, “seems to have come from certain sectors in the American Jewish community. [DOMINGUEZ, V., p. 73]

Ethiopians as Jews has long been a controversial issue. Only in the mid-1970s did Israel’s Sephardic Chief Rabbi Ovadia Josef finally proclaim them officially to be real Jews. In the late 1970s Ethiopian males who made it to Israel were forced to surrender blood from their male organs in a circumcision ritual, a little understood expression of rabbinate doubts about, and an impugning of, their own Jewish identity. Other Jewish immigrants to Israel have met similar affronts about their identity. Virginia Dominguez cites the case of Jewish immigrants from India: “Members of the Bene Israel community who moved to Israel after the establishment of the state in 1948 found that most rabbis in Is-
rael questioned their Jewishness and that they were not allowed to marry non-Bene Israel Jews without first undergoing at least nominal rituals in conversion to Judaism.” [DOMINGUEZ, p. 176]

The Ethiopian Jews in Israel have, of course, discovered at first hand the nature of enduring Jewish racism. In an Ashkenazi-Sephardim-Ethiopian Jewish hierarchy, the blacks find themselves at the bottom of Jewish society (although above Arabs). Among the most publicized Ethiopian protests about racist treatment occurred when Ethiopian-donated blood (a word which has connotations to the word “soul” in their Amharic language) was dumped by the Israeli health establishment in 1996 for fear of AIDS contamination. 10,000 Ethiopians rioted in outrage near the Prime Minister’s Office in Israel; scores of police and demonstrators were injured.

By 1996 too, governmental policy had directed about 80 percent of Ethiopian children into vocation-directing Youth Aliyah boarding schools, [SCHOFF-MAN, S., 1996] guaranteeing a future Black Jewish economic underclass (although again, as Jews, still above Arabs) in Israeli society.

In Israeli society, even recent Russian immigrants are discriminated against. Their Jewishness is often held suspect (anywhere between 5-30% of them are accused of being non-Jews. In 1990 the head of the Ministry of Absorption declared that as many as 30% were not Jewish, while at the same time the Israeli Interior Ministry cited a 5% figure). [FRANKEL, p. 176] Those suspected of not-being Jewish must face traditional Jewish animosity towards them as “goyim.” As the Israeli newspaper Ha’aretz noted about the situation, concerning two parents who lost a daughter to a Palestinian “suicide bomber”:

“In addition to being immigrants from Russia [Tatiano and Viktor Madbaneko’s Jewishness is ‘in doubt’ and they are forced into hopeless shadowboxing with a society that is practiced in ‘hating gentiles.’ They so much want to find a way to the heart of this society, with all its prejudices.” [USHPIZ, A., 2001, 6-8-01]

Most Russian Jewish were atheists under communist rule and few followed traditional Jewish religious dictates. Over 30,000 Russian-born men have been ritually circumcised in Israel. Glenn Frankel notes the case of an Israeli rabbi who “ordered a circumcision performed on the corpse of a Russian immigrant killed in a traffic accident before the rabbi would allow it to be buried in a Jewish grave. Later it turned out that hundreds of other corpses had been similarly mutilated at cemeteries throughout the country.” [FRANKEL, p. 168]

The Russians are a very educated community. By 1990 more than half of all immigrants from the Soviet Union to Israel had university degrees, a fifth had at least two degrees. [KYLE, p. 236] Reflecting serious problems in assimilating into Israeli society, “the Russians,” noted Yoram Peri, editor of the Israeli daily newspaper Davar, “say the Israelis treat their men as mafia and their women as prostitutes.” [FRIEDLAND, E., 6-29-95, p. 10] Russian immigrants to Israel are widely perceived to be a criminal element, particularly promoting prostitution. “Russian women,” notes Glenn Frankel, “with the light colored skin and blonde hair were known to locals as ‘white meat.’” [FRANKEL, G., p. 174]
In 1977, two Soviet Jews in Vienna, claiming to represent 700 others, held a news conference decrying “Zionist propaganda” that enticed them to move to Israel; they wanted to return to Russia. [ASSOCIATED PRESS, 4-28-77] In 1991 the Netherlands denied political refugee status to 50 Russian Jews who had fled Israel, unhappy with conditions in the Jewish state. Another 230 Russian Jews in the same situation were expected to be deported soon after from Germany. [TASS, 12-17-91] “In August 1995 the Federal Court of Canada upheld an immigrant panel’s denial of asylum to Russian émigrés who had left Israel were they had been citizens, claiming harassment and persecution. Israel was troubled that Canada had even considered such a claim concerning the nature of Israeli society.” [SINGER/SELDIN, 1997, p. 247] By 1993, 5-10% of Russian immigrants to Israel were disillusioned enough to go back to the country of their birth. A 1993 survey of 1,200 Russians revealed that 75% considered their economic situation to be worse in Israel than Russia. [FRANKEL, p. 183]

So what holds all these disparate Jews in Israel together, despite the serious strife, animosity, huge social and cultural differences, and conflict between them? The ancient theme, configured as government policy – the bond that has held Jewry tightly together in its ghettoes throughout history. The perceived threat of non-Jews.

Terrorism these days is generally defined as the random murder or harassment of the innocent towards a political goal; most agree that terrorist acts are cowardly deeds of violent desperation. In modern western society, the best known terrorists are those of Islamic and/or Arab origin, usually rooted in reaction to political conditions in the Middle East, particularly regarding Israel. The accusation of “terrorism” is, of course, a very relative term. It is an old adage that one person’s “terrorist” is another’s “freedom fighter.” Israelis are routinely spared the accusation of terrorism today despite the fact Israeli history has included brutally random violent activities. Menachem Begin, for instance, became the prime minister of Israel in 1977. In his younger years the British labeled him a terrorist for his leadership role in the underground IRGUN organization and its attacks against the British and Arabs in then-British controlled Palestine.

Begin took the heal of IRGUN in 1943. “Israel was,” wrote William Zukerman, “in part at least, a child of an underground terrorist movement – the Irgun Zvai Leumi (now named the Herut Party) which conducted one of the most ruthless terrorist campaigns against the British Mandate government.” [ZUKERMAN, W., p. 163] Under Begin, IRGUN membership numbered 50,000 Jews; “they carried out operations resulting in the death of some 300 British personnel.”

In 1946 Begin’s IRGUN group bombed the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, randomly killing 82 people, including 17 Jews. The British executed three captured IRGUN terrorists accused of the crime a week later. Begin responded by
hanging two randomly captured British sergeants in retaliation. [AVISHAI, B., p. 174] “We’re guilty of nothing,” said Clifford Martin, as his murderers wrapped a kerchief over his eyes. His swinging body was even booby-trapped and hung upside down with the other to maim or kill those who came to cut it down. [HABER, E., p. 188; HERSH, S., p. 259] Begin later made his first visit to England in 1972. “Members of the families of the two sergeants,” notes Eitan Haber, “staged demonstrations against him. The communications media asked uncomfortable questions and got the by now well-known response: ‘I understand too well the feelings of the two families, but what choice did we have? We were in the midst of a war for our liberation.’” [HABER, E., p. 190]

“Individual IRGUN units,” notes Jewish historian Walter Laquer, “in response to the killing of Jews, began to attack Arabs passing through Jewish quarters. There was also indiscriminate bomb throwing in Arab markets and at bus stations.” [LAQUER, p. 375]

In 1964 Begin responded to those who called him a terrorist: “Our enemies called us terrorists… People who were neither our friends nor our enemies… also used this Latin name… [The British] called us ‘terrorists’ to the end… And yet, we were not terrorists… The historical and linguistic origins of the political term ‘terror’ prove that it cannot be applied to a revolutionary war of liberation… Fighters for freedom must arm; otherwise they would be crushed overnight… What has a struggle for the dignity of man, against oppression and subjugation, to do with ‘terrorism?’” [BEGIN, p. 59-60]

Noble words of a Jewish freedom fighter, but this exact text could of course be equally wielded as a justification to defend the Palestinian peoples’ own “war of liberation” for the “dignity of man, against oppression and subjugation” against the modern state of Israel. In the 1930s and 1940s, during Jewish efforts to throw the British out of Palestine, before Jews became much publicized as innocent victims of random Palestinian attacks, the nomer of “terrorist” was not so completely negatively charged. Later books exploring Jewish terrorism in Palestine (without complete condemnation) include the likes of The Lady was a Terrorist (1953), Woman of Violence: Memoirs of a Young Terrorist (1966), Memoirs of an Assassin (1966), and Terror Out of Zion (1977). In 1996 convicted Jewish terrorist Era Rapaport’s justification of his murderous deeds (Letters From Tel Mond Prison. An Israel Settler Defends His Act of Terror) won the National Jewish Book Award. (Can we imagine such a justification of the 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center winning a National Muslim Book Award?) The charge of terrorism, and its meaning, in the Israeli-Palestinian context, is, it appears, entirely relative to who is talking. Menachem Begin once called Palestinian guerillas – his liberation-oriented mirror image – “two-legged animals.” [JANSEN, M., p. 15]

We hear alot about “terrorists in Palestine” these days, but, apparently, when these terrorists were Jews – not Arabs – it was cool. Ben Hecht was a successful Hollywood screenwriter. And Irgun activist. Here’s what he says about a newspaper ad he wrote for that terrorist group:
“The ad carried the headline: ‘Letter to the Terrorists of Palestine.’ It read: ‘My Brave Friends. You may not believe what I write you, for there is a lot of fertilizer in the air at the moment. But on my word as an old reporter, what I write is true. The Jews of America are for you. You are their champions. You are the grin they wear. You are the feather in their hats. You are the first answer that makes sense – to the New World. Every time you blow up a British arsenal, or wreck a British jail, or send a British railroad sky high, or rob a British bank, or let go with your guns and bombs at the British traitors and invaders of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts ...” [HECHT, B., 1985, p. 615]

“The ad,” continues Hecht, “appeared in a few days. Some fifteen newspapers printed it at their ‘usual advertising rates.’ Hundreds of other newspapers in the U.S., Mexico, South America and France ran the ad gratis. It appealed to them, apparently, as news.” [HECHT, B., 1985, p. 617]

From the position of today’s empowered Israeli state, another eventual prime minister of Israel, Benyamin Netanyahu, offered an official definition of terrorism created by an Israeli-sponsored conference in Jerusalem in 1979: “Terrorism is the deliberate and systematic murder, maiming and menacing of the innocent people to inspire fear for political ends.” [NETANYAHU, p. 9] In 1986 Netanyahu edited an entire volume about containing terrorism against Israel and the West, (none of the volume’s 41 authors mentions Jewish-inspired terrorism) saying, “For the terrorist... legitimacy is derived from whatever cause he is fighting for or professes to be fighting for. There is no need to ask the people. He, the terrorist, is the self-appointed arbiter of what is just and necessary.” [NETANYAHU, p. 5] Although Netanyahu didn’t have Menachem Begin and the founding of Israel itself in mind, Begin even argued, in justifying his own terrorism, that any kind of resistance to oppressive political authority must ultimately result in violence: “All civil disobedience, if it has serious purpose, must inevitably, by iron laws of events, bring on an armed uprising.” [BEGIN, p. 198]

Another such Jewish terrorist/freedom fighter who rose to become the Israeli foreign minister and later prime minister (succeeding Begin in 1983) was Yitzhak Shamir. Among other accomplishments, Shamir headed a group of underground Jewish terrorists (LEHI) who assassinated a United Nations peace representative in 1948, Count Folke Bernadotte, a Swedish diplomat. [COCKBURN, A.; L., p. 35] As the prime minister of Israel, says Glenn Frankel, “he would cut any corner, shade any truth, anger any friend, defy any foe, to secure the land of Israel.” [FRANKEL, G., p. 286] The founder of LEHI (also known as the “Stern Gang”) was Abraham Stern.

In 1944 the Stern gang also assassinated Walter Guinness (Lord Moyne) in Cairo, Egypt. Guinness, “was, nominally at least, the key figure in British policy in the Middle East” and “the only British minister to have been assassinated in this century.” Two Jewish murderers were captured – Eliahu Hakim and Eliahu Bet-Tzuri. “Our deed,” the two declared before the were hung, “stemmed from mo-
tives and our motives stemmed from our ideals. And if we prove our ideals were
right and just, then our deed was right and just.” A third Stern gang member,
Raphael Sadovsky, involved in the Guinness murder, was later captured and his
“50-page confession… includes names, dates and places and led to the wholesale
arrests of suspected Sternists in Egypt and Palestine.” [BLACK, I., 11-5-94,
p. T39]

In 1963, Jewish author Gerald Frank heroized the Guinness terrorist act in
a volume called The Deed. “When The Deed was published,” notes Ian Black,
“the New York Times wrote an editorial condemning it as a glorification of ter-
rorism.” In 1975, continues Black,

“the Israeli government… negotiated with the Egyptian government, via [Jewish American Secretary of State] Henry Kissinger, to allow the bodies of the two Eliahus to be exhumed and brought to Jerusalem, where they were reburied with full military honors.” [BLACK, I., 11-5-94]… James Callaghan, then [British] Foreign Secretary, ordered a for-
mal protest ‘to make it clear to the Israeli government that an act of ter-
rorism should not be honored this way’… Under the premiership of the
former Irgun chief, Menachem Begin, postage stamps were issued ho-
nouring the two Eliahus and guaranteeing them an honoured place in
the martyrology of the ‘fighting family.’” [BLACK, I., 11-5-94]

In another well-documented, and larger scale, atrocity, on April 9, 1948,
members of terrorist IRGUN and LEHI squads murdered two-thirds of the in-
habitants of the Arab village of Deir Yassin. In 1953 Israeli general Ariel
Sharon headed a group of soldiers who murdered 70 Jordanians in the border
village of Kibiya. “A statement was issued,” notes Seymour Hersh, “in [prime
minister] Ben Gurion’s name blaming the atrocity on the inhabitants of nearby
Jewish border settlements.” [HERSH, S., p. 78]

In more recent times, in October of 1985 Israeli jets bombed targets in the
sovereign nation of Tunis, killing at least 12 Tunisians and 60 Palestinians. “This
too was an act of terrorism,” argues Israeli Amnon Rubenstein, “for its intent
was not only to assassinate Yassir Arafat and retaliate for the killing of three Is-
raelis in Cyprus, but to promote a sense of fear and intimidation among all Pal-
estinians. In short, none of the parties to the current [Arab-Jewish] conflict has
a monopoly on the use of terror.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 156-159] Israeli Gide-
on Levy also noted, in the midst of the slaying of hundreds of Palestinians in the
2000-2001 Intifada against Jewish occupation:

“Who’s a terrorist? Aida Fatahia was walking down the street. Ubei Daraj was playing in the yard. She was the mother of three; he was nine
years old. Both were killed last week by Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) bul-
lets, for no reason. Their killing raises once again, in all its horror, the
question of whether Palestinian violence is the only violence that should
be called terrorism. Is only car bombing terrorism, while shooting at a
woman and child is not? Is only car bombing terrorism, while shooting
at a woman and child is not? Fatahia and Daraj join a long list of men,
women, and children who were innocent of wrongdoing and killed in
the past five months by the IDF. In the Israeli debate, their deaths were not a result of ‘terror actions’ or ‘terrorist attacks’ and the killers are not ‘terrorists.’ Those are terms used only for Palestinian violence… IDF Chief of Staff Shaul Mofaz, commander of an army that has killed almost 90 children in the last five months, calls the Palestinian Authority (PA) a ‘terrorist entity,’ and totally ignores the actions of the army – and the results of those actions. But the questions must be asked: Aren’t massive land expropriations, systematic house destructions, the uprooting of orchards and groves, also a form of violence? Isn’t cutting off entire towns and villages from their source of water a type of violence?” [LEVY, G., 3-11-01]

In a later 1960s Israeli government-sponsored terrorist act against the United States government, Jewish critic Daniel Bell notes the case of the notorious “Lavon Affair”:

“The Lavon Affair is a striking instance. Some years ago, Israeli intelligence agents in Cairo set fire to a United States Information Agency building, in order to blame the Egyptians for the act and arouse anti-Nasser [then the head of Egypt] sentiment in the United States. When the plot miscarried, members of the Israeli service forged papers to demonstrate that Pinchas Lavon, then Minister of Defense, had approved the action. Lavon was then forced to resign… The Lavon Affair poses a painful question on the relationship of morality to political expediency.” [BELL, Alphabet, p. 307]

In the 1970s, American-born Israeli Joel Lerner headed a secret group that planned to blow up the Dome of the rock, the third holiest site for the world’s Muslims. “Others included,” noted Uri Huppert in 1988, “the present Chief Rabbi, Mordechai Eliyahu, and a leader of the ultra-Orthodox Sephardic community.” [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 107]

In 1982, another Jewish American (also with Israeli citizenship) Allen Goodman killed two Arabs near the Dome of the Rock. Resultant Arab riots resulted in another 11 Muslims slain by Israeli soldiers and police. Goodman was pardoned by Israeli authorities for his murders in 1997, on the condition that he returned to America. Still unrepentant, he declared that “what I did was politically correct.” Arab Americans in Baltimore, where Goodman was returning, expressed worry and outrage that such a man would be living in the Maryland community. “If I was a member of the Baltimore Muslim community, I’d watch my children after [Goodman’s] arrival,” noted Ibrahim Hooper of the Council on American-Islamic Relations, “As Congress enacts legislation against terrorism, it is accepting a terrorist.” [LOVIGLIO, J., 10-28-97]

In 1984 a cache of guns and explosives were found in the same Dome of the Rock area. [HUPPERT, U., 1988, p. 109] Four more Jews were arrested. On October 8, 1990, two months after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, thousands of Muslims gathered to resist a planned march in the area by Jewish nationalists; Israeli soldiers killed 19 Arabs and wounded 150 people in a subsequent riot.
In the 1980s a sensational plot by a group of apocalyptic messianic Zionists to blow up the Dome of the Rock (built where the ancient Jewish Temple is reputed to have existed) was uncovered by Israeli police. Some of the members of the plot were officers in the Israeli army reserves. Aviezer Ravitzky describes the plan: “It was a mystical attempt to cut off the forces of impurity, the ‘husk of Ishmael [Arabs],’ from the source of their vitality on the holy mountain. For some, however, it was also an apocalyptic move to bring about a historic turn, to force the hand of the Master of the Universe by bringing a catastrophe. By precipitating a great holy war against Israel, they would ‘oblige’ the Redeemer of Israel to wage a great and terrible campaign on their behalf. By facing the End below, they would activate the higher powers above.” [RAVITZKY, A., p. 133]

The identities of the 27 people involved in the arrested terrorist Jewish underground included “war heroes, teachers, graduate students, scholars, and respected builders of pioneer towns… they cited the Bible and the opinions of contemporary rabbis to justify their actions.” [RAPAPORT, E., 1996, p. 3] “Several members of the same loosely-tied West Bank Underground Movement killed several students at random in an Islamic college. They also planned to place bombs under civilian Arab buses.” [RAPAPORT, E., 1996, p. 9]

In a 1983 peace march by liberal Jews in Jerusalem, Emil Grunsweig was even killed by a grenade thrown by a fellow Jew. And in 1989 the Jewish Week reported that “two Jews were arrested [in Israel] on suspicion of throwing the bombs [into a Jewish home] in order to create an atmosphere of hostility against Arabs. Their intention, police said, was to discourage the presence of Arabs in this town where three Arabs were burned to death recently in the hut where they slept.” [ROTEM, 9-2-89, p. 6]

There is nothing, of course, that should shield the possibility that truckloads of men dressed in military fatigues may be terrorists too. In 1982 Israeli troops invaded Lebanon, eventually surrounding the capital city, Beirut. The announced objective was to drive the there entrenched PLO out of artillery range of Israel. Prime Minister Menachem Begin “compared Arafat to Hitler and the PLO’s stand in Beirut to that of Nazi Berlin in 1945.” “An estimated 15,000 to 20,000 Palestinians, Lebanese, and Syrians, the majority civilians, were killed during the three months of the war.” [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 88]

Among the disturbing results of the invasion was the notorious Shabra-Shatila massacres, much reported in the world press. In an area under Israeli military patrol, members of the Lebanese Phalangist militia were allowed into Palestinian refugee camps. Over 1,000 men, women, and children were slaughtered over a 40 hour period. In response to worldwide outrage, Begin brushed off criticism directed his way, saying that “Goyim kill goyim, and they come to hang Jews.” [PENKOWER, p. 326] Yet an International Commission of Inquiry announced that “the Commission concluded that the Israel authorities bear a heavy legal responsibility, as the occupying power, for the massacres at Sabra and Chatilla. From the evidence disclosed, Israel was involved in the planning and the preparation of the massacres and played a facilitative role in the actual killings.” In Israel itself, a commission headed by Supreme Court Justice Yitzhak
Kahan found Israeli General Ariel Sharon “guilty of indirect responsibility” for the carnage in the refugee camps. [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. 87]

In defense of Israeli policies in Lebanon, Begin said, “If Hitler were hiding in the building along with twenty innocent civilians would you not bomb the building?” In response, Israeli novelist Amos Oz, wrote that

“No, sir. Your parable is invalid. Adolf Hitler died thirty-seven years ago. He is not hiding in Nabatiyah, Sidon or Beirut. He is dead and burned to ashes. Time and time again, Mr. Begin, you betray a weird urge to resurrect Hitler, only to kill him over and over again… You must remind yourself that the people of Israel have a state whose existence is now under a double threat, not only from an enemy that seeks its extraction, but also from our own well-known tendency to extreme hysteria tinged with messianic madness, a tendency that has brought catastrophe and destruction upon us before in our long history.” [BLOOMFIELD, I., p. 31]

To Israeli credit, popular condemnation of Begin and general Ariel Sharon was enormous: an estimated 400,000 people [RUBENSTEIN, A., p. xiv] rallied against the Lebanon war, about ten percent of Israel’s Jewish population.

So what is and is not “terrorism?” However one views the term, there is an underlying double standard always applied in the West towards Jews and their combatants in the Middle East — especially Muslim Arabs and Iranians, each populated with “terrorists,” while their mirror-image Jewish equivalents are usually honored as “freedom fighters.” The famously accused Saudi-born terrorist living in Afghanistan, Osama Bin Laden, is a case in point. As Fisk observes:

“The use of the word ‘terrorist’ – where Arabs who murder the innocent are always called ‘terrorists’ whereas Israeli killers who slaughter 29 Palestinians in a Hebron mosque or assassinate their prime minister, Yitzhak Rabin, are called ‘extremists’ – is only part of the problem. ‘Terrorist’ is a word that avoids all meaning. The who and the how are of essential importance. But the ‘why’ is something the West usually prefers to avoid. Not once yesterday – not in a single press statement, press conference or interview – did a US leader or diplomat explain why the enemies of America hate America. Why is Bin Laden so angry with the United States?… The reason almost certainly lies with US policy – or lack of policy – towards the Middle East… Bin Laden himself was obsessed for many months with the massacre of Lebanese civilians by the Israelis at the UN base at Qana in south Lebanon in April 1996. Why had Bill Clinton not condemned this ‘terrorist’ act? he asked. (In fact, Bill Clinton called it a ‘tragedy,’ as if it was some form of natural disaster – the Israelis said it was a ‘mistake’ but the UN concluded it wasn’t.” [FISK, R., 8-22-98, p. 3]

As Israeli scholar Simha Flapan notes about the double standards of Jewish and Arab “terrorism”:

“Diaspora Jewry and friends of Israel abroad must realize that present Israeli policy is doomed to reproduce over and over again the cycle of
violence that shocks our sensibilities every time we read or hear of wanton murder and bloodshed, whether the hand that perpetrates it detonates a bomb or fires a pistol. The collective revenge of an army for the murder of one of its citizens is no more righteous or admirable than the individual revenge of a desperate youth for the murder of one his people. It is only propaganda and distorted vision that labels one ‘terrorism’ and the other ‘national defense.’” [FLAPAN, S., 1987, p. 243]

Among the many things the Zionist pioneers of modern Israel have to be ashamed about was what became known in infamy as the “Transfer Agreement.” In the early 1930s, while worldwide Jewry and others spearheaded an economic boycott of the growing threat of Nazi Germany, the Jewish leadership in Israel (then Palestine) made a secret deal with the Hitler regime to get both German products to help build their developing Jewish nation, and a number of immigrant German Jews – some who were particularly committed to the philosophy of Zionism. By 1935, the Palestine economy “was saturated with German goods.” [BLACK, E., p. 373] (Peter Novick notes the “paradox” in later years that “American Jews shunned Volkswagens and Grundig radios at a time when Israel, as a result of [German post-war] reparations payments, was awash in German consumer durables”). [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 109] Between 1933-1941 perhaps $100 million went to Israel from Germany and “some of Israel’s major industrial enterprises were founded with those monies.” Some 60,000 German Jews were able to emigrate to Palestine from Hitler’s regime, most because of the “agreement,” and many with much of their wealth intact. [BLACK, E., p. 379] One such immigrant to Israel (from Hungary), Rudolph Kastner, was assassinated in Israel in 1957 for his role in dealing with the Nazis. As Nazi leader Adolf Eichmann later testified: “This Dr. Kastner was a young man about my age, an ice-cold lawyer and a fanatical Zionist. He agreed to keep the Jews from resisting deportation – and even keep order in the collection camps – if I would close my eyes and let a few hundred or a few thousand young Jews emigrate illegally to Palestine.” [BRENNER, L., p. 152] As the clandestine Zionist dealings with the Nazis became better known, there was worldwide outrage, especially in Jewish circles.

In 1933, for instance, a prominent American rabbi, Abba Hillel Silver, decried the Zionist-Nazi dealings: “Why, the very idea of Palestinian Jewry negotiating with Hitler about business instead of demanding justice for the persecuted Jews of Germany is unthinkable. One might think that the whole affair was a bankruptcy sale and that the Jews of Palestine were endeavoring to salvage a few bargains for themselves.” [BLACK, p. 320] Zionists had a very special interest in Jews who subscribed – or at least could be pulled – to their own political philosophy, and a dedication above all else to the practicalities of building a Jewish state. As David Ben Gurion once said in a closed meeting of the Jewish Agency: “If I knew that all the Jewish children of Europe could be saved [from Hitler] by settlement in Britain and only half could be saved by set-
tlement in Palestine, I would choose the latter.” [AVISHAI, B., p. 152] “Labor Zionism desired the many, but not the multitudes,” explains Edwin Black, “Mapai’s [Labor’s] Israel would be not for every Jew – at least not in the beginning. At first Israel would be for the approved cadre of pioneers.” [BLACK, E., p. 142] “From the beginning of Hitler’s regime,” notes Peter Novick, “Ben Gurion, guided by what his biographer terms ‘his philosophy of… beneficial disaster,’ had insisted that ‘it is in our interest to use Hitler… for the building of our country’; “the harsher the affliction, the greater the strength of Zionism.” [NOVICK, P., 1999, p. 77]

“When the Zionist organizations,” says Hannah Arendt, “against the natural impulses of the whole Jewish people, decided to do business with Hitler, to trade German goods against the wealth of German Jewry, to flood the Palestinian market with German products and thus make a mockery of the boycott against German-made articles, they found little opposition in the Jewish National Homeland, and least of all its aristocracy, the so-called kibbutzniks.” [ARENDT, in SELZER, p. 222]

A Jewish author, Edwin Black, wrote an entire volume, The Transfer Agreement, about this dark side of Zionist history. “For months,” he wrote, “the information confounded me. Nothing made sense. There were so many contradictions. Nazis helping Jewish nationalism. American Jewish leaders refusing even to criticize the Third Reich [BLACK, E., p. xiii]… Zionists leaders, during April 1933, sought to cooperate with the Nazi Reich to arrange the orderly exit of Jewish people and wealth from Germany. [BLACK, p. 104]… In the minds of Zionists, Jewish life in Germany could not be saved, only transferred. Even if Hitler and the German economy were crushed, Jewish wealth in Germany would be crushed with it. The wealth had to be saved [BLACK, p. 226]… The Nazi Party and the Zionist organization shared a common stake in the recovery of Germany. If the Hitler economy failed, both sides would be ruined [BLACK, p. 253]… It soon became impossible to distinguish between the unhappy burden of doing business with the Third Reich to facilitate immigration [to Israel], and the gleeful [largely Israeli] rush of entrepreneurs frantic to cash in on the captive capital of Germany’s Jews.” [BLACK, p. 310]

“Both Nazis and Zionists had something in common,” notes Lenny Brenner… “It was shared belief [counter-Chosen people; counter nationalisms; agreement that Jews could not assimilate into German society] which made the Transfer Agreement possible… For a propagandist who seeks to strike at the very core of Jewish sensibility, awareness of the Transfer Agreement is like a dream come true.” [BRENNER, p. 164] Edwin Black wrote about the problem he had in writing his book about the limited Nazi-Zionist collusion: “My greatest worry is that the revelations of this book might be used by enemies of the Jewish people. For those who seek to besmirch the Zionist movement as racist and Nazi-like, this agreement might seem to be perfect ammunition.” [BRENNER, L., p. 164]

One especially radical branch of Zionism had even deeper interests in German fascism. As Anthony Heilbut notes, “There is no denying that members of
the Stern Gang, like [former Israeli prime minister] Yitzhak Shamir, had in 1940 sought an alliance with Hitler, while advocating a national and totalitarian Jewish state.” [HEILBUT, p. 345]

Since its early dealings with Hitler’s Nazi’s, the Zionist cause has expanded into economic relationships with many other totalitarian regimes, for decades deeply involved in weapons dealing and military and police training, often with brutal dictatorships and repressive military juntas throughout the Third World. By the 1990s, Israeli arms dealing accounted for nearly 40% of the country’s export earnings, about $1.5 billion a year. [COCKBURN, A, p. 7] By 1987 between 20-40% of Israel’s “industrial labor force” was employed in arms making. [HUNTER, p. 13] Sometimes Israelis (both governmentally-sponsored and as private entrepreneurs) act as a clandestine force to expedite the morally distasteful “dirty work” of United States foreign policy; more often Israel and its functionaries are maverick international predators engaged in state and personal self-interest. It is an insidious role of profiteering upon the death, destruction, and misery of people the world over, a modern revival of one of the old Jewish entrepreneurial bases: war contracting. “Zionism,” notes Israeli Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, “has clear, inescapable ideological implications, in terms of dealing with the Third World. Zionism meant the creation of a Jewish sovereignty in Palestine through settlement and political domination. Thus, by definition, it entails an attack on the indigenous populations, and a confrontation with the Third World.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 229]

“In 1993,” notes Alan Vorspan, “the CIA testified before a Congressional committee that Israel is involved in a major arms deal with China and providing China with advanced technology that the United States and other western powers will not supply. In the past, Israel has sold arms to unsavory ‘right wing’ dictatorships operating death squads in Central America at a time when Congress sought to cut off arms shipments to human rights violators. Israel was the primary provider of arms – perhaps even nuclear technology – to apartheid South Africa at a time when the racist regime was held in contempt by the rest of the world. Israel played a role in the tragi-comic IranGate debacle. Among western-style democracies… Israel’s track record makes it one of the world’s most promiscuous arms dealers.” [VORSPAN, p. 23]

The best known incident in recent years of underhanded military dealing was the so-called Iran-Contra scandal in the 1980s when the state of Israel – at the request of the Reagan administration – circumvented existing United States laws to get weapons to American-supported “Contra” rebels fighting the Marxist government of Nicaragua. Arms were also provided to Iran by Israel in secret efforts to free American hostages in the Middle East. But this much-publicized escapade is only the tip of an ominous iceberg. Less widely known, for example, is a 1994 State Department ban on all United States trade to two Israeli companies owned by Nachum Mamber. Mamber is alleged to have sold materials to Iran that have use in the manufacture of chemical weapons.” [HIRSCHENBERG, p. 13]
Earlier, Israel had been a prominent exporter of weapons to Nicaragua during the dictatorship of Anastasio Somoza García “until the defeat of Somoza by the Sandinistas.” [ELKIN, p. 245]

“The extent of Israeli activities in the Third World is baffling to both friends and foes of Israel,” wrote Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, a professor at Israel’s University of Haifa, in 1987, “…. Mention any trouble spot in the Third World over the past ten years and, inevitably, you will find smiling Israeli officers and shining Israeli weapons on the news pages… We have seen them in South Africa, Iran, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Namibia, Taiwan, Indonesia, the Philippines, Chile, Bolivia, and many other places… [HALLAHMI, p. xii]…. Most of the details of these involvements are not known while they take place. So that reliance on open sources will inevitably lead us to underestimate the extent of the involvement. Consequently, present Israeli activities are probably much wider and deeper than what we have been told in public forums or the media.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. xiii]

“The main markets for Israeli military goods and services have shifted over time,” says R. T. Naylor, “from sub-Saharan Africa to Iran to Central America to South Africa and Latin America today. But the nature of the favoured customer has changed little. Where there is a particularly thuggish regime in power, especially one so ostracised from the rest of the international community, that it is willing to pay premium prices, Israel is likely to be there, energetically peddling its wares.” [TAYLOR, p. 135] “Every time there’s a television show dealing with the seaminess and underside of American foreign policy, a “pro-Israel” Congressional aide told the Jerusalem Report, “and you see an Israeli arms dealer sitting there, it hurts Israel.” [GOLDBERG, J.J., 6-11-1991, p. 26]

“New reports,” says Adam Garfinkle, “noted Israeli weapons were even ending up with the Serbs in 1995.” [GARFINKLE, p. 194] That year a Jewish immigrant to Israel from what was formerly Yugoslavia, Igor Primoract, a professor of philosophy at Hebrew University, also wrote an article charging that Israel’s Mossad was funneling weapons to Serbia despite a world-wide arms embargo. “The Israeli government,” said Primoract, “has been at odds with most of the rest of the world since Yugoslavia began disintegrating. In… 1991, when Serbia’s onslaught on Croatia was in full swing and Serbian atrocities were receiving worldwide coverage, Israel accepted Belgrade’s offer to set up diplomatic relations.” [CURTISS, R., 5-1-95]

“In today’s Israel,” noted Dan Raviv and Yossi Melaman in 1990, “… making money has become a Golden Calf before which much of the society – including its intelligence and military circles – kneels… [RAVIV/MELMAN, p. 347]… The new symbols for Israel in the international community have become the arms merchants and other ‘formers’ [i.e., former military men in the private arms business].” [RAVIV/MELMAN, p. 359]

Reflecting the kind of society Israel has become, Hirschberg wrote that “Israeli private security firms are active ‘in every country imaginable,’ says one leading expert. They’ve trained anti-terrorist units in the jungles of South America and security officers at Mexican power plants. For
years, an Israel-run firm guarded the Presidential palace in Nigeria. Since 1993, the Israeli firm Levron… has been setting up an army from scratch in the Congo… The Tel Aviv *Golden Pages* classified phone book has ten full pages listing private investigation firms, offering everything from personal protection and domestic investigations to debt collection, lie detector tests, electronic surveillance and debugging, and recovery of stolen property… The *Jerusalem Report* contacted about two dozen of the hundreds of firms listed. All confirmed that their top staffers were veterans of some branch of the government security services of the police. And their field workers were all recent graduates of army elite combat units.” [HIRSCHBERG, p. 14-16]

Israeli involvement in fueling bloody Third World struggles is long standing. During the dictatorship of the *Shah of Iran*, Israel was only second to the United States in military support to him.” In some areas such as domestic intelligence [the training of Iran’s dreaded secret police],” says Beit-Hallahmi, “Israel’s involvement was even greater.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 9] A political scientist observed in 1965 that the Shah’s Iran “supplied much of Israel’s oil needs during the Arab [oil] boycott [of Israel]… Although not generally known, Iran maintains a close military liaison with Israel’s army staff… The magnitude of the Iran-Israeli program remains generally secret.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 10]

In eleven visits to Iran in the 1970s by Israeli prime ministers, a foreign minister, and a defense minister, “the man who hosted all these visits was Nem-atollah Nasri, deputy prime minister and head of SAVAK, the Iranian secret police.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 10] was internationally notorious for its kidnapping, torture, and murder of Iranian citizens, well documented by Amnesty International and other human rights groups. The *Washington Post* reported a source who claimed during that era that “innumerable Iranians, including many in a position to know, told me that the Israelis oversee the SAVAK technique.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 11] A 1976 CIA report noted that “Mossad has engaged in joint operations with SAVAK over the years since the late 1950s.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 183] Israel also helped the Shah put down a revolt of dissident tribesmen in southern Iran in 1963 and was working with the dictator in developing a missile that could deliver nuclear war heads when the Iranian revolution toppled him. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 11]

In Turkey, the Israeli international spy organization – Mossad – has had a station since the 1950s and helped train the Turkish secret police. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 16] Citing a CIA report, Ian Black and Benny Morris note that “the Mossad set up a triangular organization with the Turkish National Security Services (TNSS) and the Iranian SAVAK.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 189] “There is one well-publicized aspect of the unpublished contacts between Israel and Turkey,” says Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, “The Israeli government forbid any mention of the Turkish genocide of Armenians in 1915 in any government-controlled media or government-sponsored activities… It has taken actions against any mention of the Armenian case.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 17] In 1998, Neil Lochery noted that “The Turkish alliance [with Israel] is ideal given the Turkish mili-
tary’s eagerness to undertake a programme of modernization of its large armed forces using primarily Israeli companies. In simple terms, [military] orders placed by the Turks have prevented [Israeli] job losses and helped secure projects which may have otherwise been in jeopardy.” [LOCHERY, p. 58]

In 1999 Israeli security guards at the Israeli Consulate in Berlin opened fire on a crowd of 100 rioting Kurds, killing two men and a woman and wounding fifteen others. The protesters had gathered in outrage of the Mossad’s alleged role in capturing Kurdish rebel hero Abdullah Ocalan in Greece for Turkey. [WILLIAMS, C., p. A1] Earlier, in 1998, two Israelis were captured in Cyprus, under suspicion that they were spying for Turkey. “The Israeli media,” noted Agence France Presse, “accepted that the men were Israeli agents but varied widely over what they were doing.” [CHARLAMBOUS, C., 11-8-98]

In 1991 four Israeli agents were also caught attempting to bug the Iranian embassy in Cyprus, in 1998 Mossad members were caught bugging the home of Swiss citizen of Lebanese origin, and in 1996 two Israeli agents were captured in a failed attempt to murder a Hamas leader in Jordan. [CHARLAMBOUS, C., 11-8-98]

Israel has long aided the dictatorial dynasty of Sultan Qaboos ibn Said in Oman. Mossad has also helped stir Kurdish revolts in Iraq beginning in 1958 and has long supported minority Christian groups in Lebanon to secure an Israeli buffer zone against hostile Muslim areas. This included Pierre Gemayel’s fascist Phalangist party, founded in 1936. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 18] The 1976 creation of the South Lebanon Army has also long functioned as a “puppet organization” for Israeli interests.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 19]

Mossad’s main clandestine station in Asia is in Singapore, from which Israel has maintained military ties with South Korea and Taiwan. “Particularly sensitive,” says Joel Kotkin, “… are Israeli arms traders and elite military training teams who, for the purposes of mollifying Muslim public opinion both inside Singapore and in neighboring countries, pass themselves off as ‘Mexicans’ to the local citizenry.” [KOTKIN, p. 39] “It has been reported,” notes Beit-Hallahmi, “that Israel has transferred to Taiwan both nuclear technologies and chemical-warfare technology and a CIA report [says that Israel] has provided intelligence training to the Taiwanese secret services.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 28] Not far away, “Indonesia and Israel have a long-standing military relationship.” [PARIS, p. 112]

In 1999, USA Today headlined a story “U.S. is concerned, but unable to stop Israel-China deal.” The Jewish state ignored American concerns despite the billions of dollars in aid it receives from America. The deal with mainland China was for high-tech AWACS radar systems to be installed on Chinese jets, elevating them to new thresholds of warfare capabilities. “The United States has banned military sales to China since that country’s 1989 crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square,” noted USA Today, “But Israel, though it has received billions of dollars worth of U.S. military aid, is under no such limitation, provided that the technology it sells has no U.S. content.” [SLAVIN, B., p. 17A]
In the Philippines, dictator Ferdinand Marcos “was protected by Israeli bodyguards who had served in elite Israeli commando units. The wealthy friends of the President also enjoyed such services.” Entire “private armies” in the Philippines were trained by Israeli advisers. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 28-29]

The distinction between the Israeli government itself and Israeli private citizen entrepreneurship in supporting brutally repressive regimes against freedom and justice movements worldwide is blurred. Former Israeli military officers, and even rank and file soldiers (usually from “elite” units), invariably remain active in the army as “reserves” to age 55 and still well-connected thereafter. Private exploitation of worldwide disaster is often indivisible from the clandestine policies of the Israeli government. An example of this private enterprise-Israeli government symbiosis is the Tel Aviv-based Tamuz Control Systems, an organization owned by a retired general who “offers Third World regimes assistance in solving their security problems.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 30]

Israeli governmental enterprise and private military business exploits are so entwined that when two private citizens, employed by Tamuz, passed along classified military material to the Philippines in 1984, despite some attention in the Israeli press, it was ultimately deemed to be inconsequential. The reason? The two Tamuz employees in question had worked – and still had contacts with – an Israeli anti-terrorist unit. As an Israeli newspaper reported: “[Tamuz] is headed by former generals and the transfer of material to Third World companies is coordinated with senior defense officials.” Another reporter wrote that, “The offense is only technical because, as is known, [Tamuz] is directed by former generals who are in constant contact with SHABAK and MOSSAD [Israeli secret police organizations].” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 30] As Beit-Hallahmi sees it:

“Israeli mercenaries… arrive at their destinations through a system that has much to do with the Israeli state, and most of them are emissaries of the state, not soldiers of fortune. There is a connection and a similarity of oppression in one particular situation and oppressions in other situations, geographically and culturally remote. How does an Israeli officer feel in Namibia or while training South Africans in counter-insurgency? The answer is ‘right at home.’” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 233]

Israel also has a MOSSAD station in Jakarta, Indonesia, fronted as a commercial company; Israeli advisers also helped Sri Lanka in its ongoing efforts to quell the rebellious Tamil minority. Israeli weaponry or personnel has also found its way to Afghanistan, Thailand, and China. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 32-36]

In Africa, Israelis helped train the armies of the Ivory Coast, the Central African Republic, Dahomey (Benin), Cameroon, Senegal, Togo, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Somalia. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 38] “In several African countries,” notes Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, “we can observe a pattern in which, without formal relations, our Israeli agent manages to get very close to the head of state, becoming known as the President’s personal adviser, his right hand man, or his best friend. Such patterns were in evidence in Senegal,
Zaire, Liberia, the Ivory Coast, and other places. The MOSSAD agent performing his task is typically charming.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 73]

In 2001, the Democratic Republic of Congo “revoked the monopoly of the Israeli company International Diamond Industries.” A United Nations report had documented that the Congo was being cheated by the company and that it was the African nation’s desire for “access to Israeli military equipment and intelligence, that sealed the original deal for the monopoly.” [AVNI, B., 4-27-01]

For years, the Israeli Mossad has also had worldwide assassination teams to eliminate Palestinian leaders who violently struggled against Israeli “occupation” of their homeland. It is even believed to have assassinated Gerald Bull, a Canadian scientist who had in recent years helped Iraq in one of its weapons program. “The full truth about Israeli hit squads,” note Ian Black and Benny Morris, “will probably never be known. The basis of all such operations is complete deniability, however implausible these denials may be. In [one such] case, the need for operational secrecy was twofold: to guarantee the safety of the killers and their back up teams; and to prevent the expose of any official [Israeli] connection to the assassinations.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 272] Among the most publicized Israeli-backed assassinations was the 1973 murder of an Arab worker in a small town in Norway, a case of mistaken identity. Six Israeli Mossad agents were captured, five received prison terms, the longest sentence was only five years. [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 276] More recently, in a bungled attempt, a group of Mossad agents were captured when they tried to murder a Hamas leader in Jordan by throwing poison in his ear.

Close Israeli attachment to the apartheid regime of South Africa was often questioned, even in the world media. In 1963 a United Nations Security Council resolution called upon the nations of the world to boycott South Africa militarily; in 1977 a second resolution made the boycott mandatory. Israel ignored both completely. [BEITH-HALLAHMI, p. 117] Israel is even believed to have conducted joint nuclear tests with South Africa in 1979, 1981, and 1985. [HUNTER, p. 36-38] Among Israeli activities in support of South Africa was financial investment in the apartheid regime, including, notes Jane Hunter, “a rapacious ‘private enterprise’ interest in the Bantustans, the barren pseudo-states that warehouses much of the black majority… [HUNTER, p. 71]… No government in the world recognized the benighted Bantustans as the independent countries the racist regime has declared them to be.” [HUNTER, p. 74] Israelis were even employed to guard casino tables at Sun City, a gambling resort linked to the Bantustan of Bophuthatswana. By 1985 there were 200 Israeli advisers, technicians, and entrepreneurs in the Bantustan of Ciskei alone (near Cape-town), an area described “as one of the most economically underdeveloped areas in the world.” [HUNTER, p. 71] That year a series of scandals and scams by Israeli investors resulted in their expulsion from the area. [HUNTER, p. 72]

“I cannot understand,” remarked South African Black leader Bishop Desmund Tutu in 1987 to a Jewish audience, “how people with your history would have a state that would collaborate in military matters with South Africa and carry out policies that are a mirror image of some of the things from which
your people suffered.” [JEWISH WEEK, 3-20-87, p. 17] An American journalist could understand the link. In 1972 J. Hoagland noted that “to Afrikaners, the parallels [between them and the Israelis] are as obvious as they are embarrassing to the Israelis. They and the Israelis are essentially white, Europeanized peoples who have carved their own nations out of land inhabited by hostile, non-European majorities that would destroy the two nations if the Afrikaners and Israelis listened to the United Nations or world opinion. Their religions are similar, each being a ‘chosen people.’” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 160]

During the Algerian war for independence to break from French colonialism, Israel supported the ultra-right wing French OAS settler community. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 44] Indigenous Jews in Algeria (a community of about 100,000 people) also provided information to the Mossad about Algerian revolutionary activities against French control of the country; this information was passed along to the French (Israel was at the time seeking French good graces for joint research in the creation of a nuclear bomb). [HERSH, p. 36]

In Morocco, by 1965 Israelis had “set up [King] Hassan’s internal security system, including the personal guard unit to the King himself.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 46] Israeli aid in helping the Moroccan government murder a dissident, Medhi Ben-Barka, on French soil which caused an international incident. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 46] “Since King Hassan’s succession to the throne of Morocco in 1961,” note Ian Black and Benny Morris, “Israel’s intelligence had enjoyed a special relationship with his security services… Israeli operatives helped the new king to reform his secret service and trained its agents on a regular basis.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 203] During Tunisia’s struggle against French colonialism, there was fighting between French and Tunisian troops in 1961 over a French naval base near the town of Bizerte. “Hundreds of Arabs died. The 1,200 strong Jewish community was accused of collaborating with the French. Many of the Jews worked in the base or serviced it.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 181]

In Sudan, Israelis discreetly aided Anyanya rebels in its South. Also, “by the mid-1980s,” notes Jacob Abadi, “Israel became increasingly concerned over the fate of the Falasha Jews in Ethiopia and in the refugee camps of Sudan. Besides, Israel had other grandiose schemes, which required Sudanese cooperation. Israel sought to establish a huge arsenal on Sudanese territory. In addition, Israel explored the possibility of using Sudan as a base of operations, aimed at helping the son of the deposed Shah of Iran to return to Iran and topple Ayatollah Khomeini’s regime.” [ABADI, 1999]

In Ghana “military and intelligence cooperation… [and] training was given by MOSSAD.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 49] In Ethiopia, Israel joined with the United States and Britain in trying to prevent the collapse of the Haile Selassie regime to the Eritrean Liberation Front. Israelis had earlier helped train the Ethiopian secret police. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 51-52] “INCODA, a wholly-owned company that exported Ethiopians beef was a useful commercial front for intelligence activities… In December 1960 the Israelis helped [Emperor] Haile Selassie crush a coup attempt.” [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 186-187]
“In Zaire,” says Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, “the regime of Mobuto Sese Seko... can only be described as a murderous tyranny... When we look at the record carefully, we discover that Israel has played a continuous role for twenty-five years in keeping Zaire under western control and under Mobutu’s.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 55] MOSSAD agent Meir Meyohas was even “Mobutu’s personal right hand man for over twenty years.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 60] Mobutu believed “in the great power of the Jews to influence governments and the press, especially in the United States.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 57] To pander to this conviction, it was arranged for Kenneth Bialkin, chairman of the President’s Conference on American-Jewish Leaders, “to represent Mobutu in the United States.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 57]

In Uganda, the notoriously ruthless ruler Idi Amin was installed by Israel, the United States, and British intrigue; “the Israeli advisers in Uganda were especially close to Colonel Idi Amin.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 61] “The Israelis,” observed two scholars on the area, “... were disturbed by [the former head of Uganda and his] growing anti-Zionism... Amin they thought would be a useful puppet and come to rely on a large military presence for his survival.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 62] When Palestinians hijacked an Air France jet to Israel in 1976, in the famous Entebbe airport incident in which Israeli troops clandestinely flew to Uganda and freed Jewish hostages in a shootout, it helped in siege plans that the Entebbe airport had been built by an Israeli company, Solel Bonch, which provided Israeli rescuers with information about airport terrain. [BLACK/MORRIS, p. 340]

In Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) Israel supported the colonial white minority regime in various ways, including the construction of a 500-mile long mine field along the Rhodesian border with Mozambique and Zambia. There were even Israeli mercenaries in the Rhodesian army. [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 63]

In Mozambique and Angola, Israelis had militarily equipped Portuguese colonial regimes against indigenous liberation movements; in Kenya Israel supplied arms, in Chad advisers and weapons during its civil war. In 1984 five Israelis were arrested in England as they tried to smuggle a drugged former Nigerian senator, Umaru Dikko, in a box out of the country and back to Africa to a new regime. Conspirators included an Israeli doctor, Lev Shapira. At their trial, they said they worked for the Israeli secret service, the Mossad. [RAVIV, p. 357]

In Latin America, formal and informal Israeli support of murderous military dictatorships has been widespread. As one commentator put it: “Many former [Israeli] officers have been traveling through Central America offering their services as anti-terror consultants, personal advisers, trainers, and even simple bodyguards.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 78] Yair Klein, for instance, helped train Colombian drug cartels in paramilitary techniques. “A videotape broadcast in August 1989,” note Dan Raviv and Yossi Melman, “show Klein and other Israelis training armed Colombians who were identified as assassin squads for the cocaine barons of Medellin.” [RAVIV/MELMAN, p. 355] And “ex-Mossad man Mike Harari,” says Hirschberg, “a close aide to Panama’s in-
international drug-dealing President Manuel Noriega, reportedly obtained weapons systems and bugging devices for the dictator.” [HIRSCHBERG, p. 13]

By 1975 Israel had become a major arms supplier to the region. “Central American generals,” notes Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, “often say they admire Israel because they view the Israelis they know as practical, efficient, and tough, and because they see Israel ‘unencumbered’ by issues of human rights.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 77-78] “The Israelis do not let this human rights thing stand in the way of business,” one Guatemalan politician told Reuters, “You pay, they deliver. No questions asked. Unlike the gringos.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 78] Another reason the Israelis are appreciated by military juntas, says Beit-Hallahmi, is because of “the strong pro-Israel lobby in the United States, which is believed to be able to do wonders for a reactionary regime in the dangerous waters of United States public opinion.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 78]

Latin America has been home to some Jews for centuries. In 1987, during bloody turmoil going on throughout the area, the Jewish Week noted that:

“In several Latin American nations – including Cuba, Chile, and Nicaragua – individual Jews have been identified with both left-wing and right-wing regimes. Nonetheless, most observers interviewed agreed that Jews, when forced to chose, fared better with right-wing regimes simply because Latin American Jews tend to be upper-class and suffer from the economic policies of left-wing reformers... One veteran Latin American Jewish leader, Dr. Gil Sinay of Chile, said Jews do not necessarily need to fear right-wing military dictatorships.” [GOLDBERG, JJ, JEWISH WEEK, 6-31-87, p. 4]

Among the various profitable areas of suffering in Central America is Guatemala. “Even in the midst of the endless misery and cruelty of Central America,” observes Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, “Guatemala stands out as a country where those in power have been fighting the powerless with an unusual degree of ruthlessness and bloodiness. Over the years reports of the horrible realities of Guatemala have been numerous and the judgements harsh. What is unique is the extent to which those who carried out the deliberate policies of endless killings have proclaimed their indebtedness to Israel, as the source not only of their hardware, but of their inspiration. Israel became the main support of the Guatemalan regime.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 79] In merely one incident there was “the discovery by the Greek authorities of an Israeli arms consignment on board a ship bound for Central America. The cargo included eighty tons of ammunition, twenty tons of explosives, and a helicopter which, according to crew members, were going to Guatemala for delivery to neighboring countries.” [KLIICH, p. 38]

The Israeli presence in Guatemala has been deep, from military advisers to corporate arms dealers. Some have, unusually, even personally engaged in killing expeditions. “Israeli soldiers are not just instructors,” noted Beit-Hallahmi, “Israeli advisers – some official, others private – helped Guatemala internal security agents hunt underground rebel groups. They have been directly engaged in counterinsurgency campaigns against the Indian communities.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 84] “Israel not only provided the technology for the reign of terror,” observes
Jane Hunter, “it helped in the organization and commission of the horrors perpetrated by the Guatemalan military and police.” [HUNTER, p. 111] By 1987 at least 45,000 people were killed and a million exiled within their own country.

In El Salvador, even during the Carter Administration’s sanctions against the country as a major human rights violator, Israel maintained its usual ruthless presence there too, involved in “anti-guerilla assistance.” “During 1977-79,” says Beit-Hallahmi, “when Israel was most active [in El Salvador], it was also training counterinsurgency teams less elegantly known as death squads.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 86] During the Carter sanctions, “Israel supplied the military regime of El Salvador with over 80% of its weaponry for the next several years, including napalm for use against the Salvadoran civilian population.” [MARSHALL/SCOTT/HUNTER, 1987, p. 89]

Israel’s undercover secret police and military assistance has also been provided to the dictatorial regimes of Honduras and Nicaragua. With the collapse of the Somoza dictatorship in the latter, Israelis joined United States efforts to topple the new Marxist regime. In the resulting Civil War, the Israeli press reported that “on June 26, 1979… Israeli-made Arava planes were being used to bomb the poor neighborhoods of Managua [the capital of Nicaragua].” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 91] Prominent “private” Israeli arms dealers and their agents funneling weapons to the anti-government Contras included Ya’acov Nimrodi, Pesakh Ben Or, Pinhas Dagan, Amos Gil’ad, Michael Kokin, Emil Sa’ada, Yehuda Leitner, and David Marcus Katz. [MARSHALL, SCOTT, HUNTER, 1987, p. 115-116]

“Pro-Israel groups in the United States,” says Benjamin Ginzburg, “cooperated closely with the [Reagan] administration’s efforts to undermine support for the [leftist Nicaraguan] Sandinista regime… Jewish groups, including the Anti-Defamation League, obliged… They worked with White House officials… to publicized charges that the Sandinista government was anti-Semitic.” [GINZBURG, p. 210] (In 1983 the U.S. Embassy in Nicaragua noted that it had “no verifiable ground” to charge the Sandinista government with anti-Semitism. The Associated Press even noted in 1986 that most Jews fled Nicaragua when its dictator was toppled, and that perhaps as few as five Jewish families remained in that country. [NOKES, R., 3-20-86]

In March 1988 the Jewish Week reported that “[President] Reagan accused the [leftist] Sandinista regime of rampant anti-Semitism and of cooperating with the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Behind the scenes, the President’s remarks were, in part, the result of research provided by the National Jewish Coalition (which began life as a committee of the 1980 Reagan-Bush campaign) and brought to the president’s attention by the White House liaison to the Jewish community, Max Green.” [BESSER, p. 9]

In the 1980s, Panama military strongman Manual Noriega ran the country and its links to Colombian drug rings, assassinations, and frauds with the help of right-hand man Mike Harari, an Israeli Mossad officer. For a time, a Jew, Eric Arturo Delvalle, was the formal President of Panama; his brother-in-law was the publisher (Robert Eisenman, a convert to Judaism) of Panama’s major daily newspaper, La Prensa. [GOLDBERG, JW, 6-31-87, p. 4]
In Haiti, Israelis were army suppliers and advisers to dictator Jean-Claude Duvallier, and in Chile “Israel became a major arms supplier… after the Carter Administration suspended all United States aid to the Pinochet regime in 1977.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 99] Israelis were also involved in varying military degrees with regimes in Argentina, Paraguay, and Bolivia. “Israel continued the selling armaments to Argentina during [its] Dirty War,” notes Judith Elkin, “Some Israeli weapons bought by the junta were undoubtedly used for repressing civilian populations, Jews and non-Jews alike. Critics (including Rabbi Marshall Meyer, a principal defender of human rights during the proceso) condemned Israel’s readiness to sell weapons to morally indefensible regimes.” [ELKIN, 1998, p. 144]

Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, in his 1987 volume, The Israeli Connection, underscores what he believes to be some of the disturbing foundations to all this Israeli profiteering in blood and gore throughout the world. In this view, such deep Israeli activism in the suppression of liberation and human rights movements everywhere in the Third World has a close echo to the situation in their own backyard: the Palestinians. To accept any movement for human justice against imperialism and colonialism across the globe is to be forced to inevitably recognize and uncomfortably face the profound injustices Israel inflicts upon the Arab community in, and around, its own territory. “The idea of liberation for Third World groups,” says Beit-Hallahmi, “threatens the very existence of Zionism. Concepts of human rights are too dangerous for the Israeli political system… The injustice done to the Palestinians is so clear and so striking that it cannot be openly discussed, and any discussion of what Israel has been doing in the Third World is certain to lead to an examination of the rights of the Palestinians.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 236] To allow the many dictatorships of the world to collapse and be replaced by political liberation movements would be to increasingly isolate the oppressive state of Israel as an extinct breed, and grievously endanger it.

Beit-Hallahmi, himself an Israeli citizen, addresses the disturbing issue at stake here succinctly:

“Israeli activities in the Third World are significant reflections of the basic nature of Zionism and the state of Israel, and the resulting Israeli society and worldview. From Manila in the Philippines to Tegucigala in Honduras to Windhoek in Namibia, Israel’s emissaries have been involved in continuous war which is truly a world war. And what enemy is Israel fighting? It is the population of the Third World, which cannot be allowed to win its revolution. The only thing that guarantees the continuing rule of Third World oligarchies is the suppression of any spark of independence or power among their peoples. Israeli advisers have much to offer in the technology of death and oppression and that is why they are so much in demand.” [BEIT-HALLAHMI, p. 243]

But the Israeli marketing of death does not stop suddenly at the doors of the Third World. For all the billions of dollars the United States government continues to pour into Israel and its military foundation in search of Jewish “security” in the Middle East, there is even a disturbing payback form the Jewish state in helping to make the streets of America as dangerously insecure as possible.
Israeli arms profiteering, after all, knows no moral compulsion and must seek any selling opportunity. In September 1997 the Los Angeles Times noted that:

“Thirty United States senators urged President Clinton to suspend the importation of thousands of assault weapons that have come to symbolize the ineffectiveness of laws designed to staunch the spread of such rapid-fire weapons… Specifically, the lawmakers asked Clinton to block the importation from Israel of semi-automatic Uzi and Galil firearms that have been modified to avoid restrictions placed on them and other assault weapons in 1994… [Senator Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey], a strong supporter of Israel, said he had never envisioned he would be part of a campaign critical of that country’s government, which owns the company exporting the contested weapons. ‘If there is any country in the world that should understand the problem of dangerous weapons and the damage they can do in a civil society,’ Torricelli said, ‘it is Israel.’ He said he could not let ‘an obvious evasion of the law’ exist without adding his voice.” [BRAZIL, 9-28-97, p. A28]

———

With all the evidence of chronic racism, injustice, inhumanity, brutality, ruthlessness, exploitation, oppression and aggregations of all manners of expressive evil noted in this chapter, what may we conclude about the continued, widespread Jewish American effort to stick their collective heads in the sand and stifle much-merited criticism of their hallowed “homeland?” What planet, for instance, was Eugene Borowitz on when he declared twenty years ago that “most diaspora Jews are proud of the state of Israel for what it has done to transform the normal dictates of politics to a more humane style of using power.” [BOROWITZ, p. 127] For many American Jews, of course, endlessly absorbed in identity myth-making, trying to salvage Jewish “chosenness” in a democratic context, the contradictory avenues of Jewish ethnocentric “particularism” and pan-human “universalism” are, as always, forcibly entwined like a band-aid to an oil slick in cushioning Jewish-American conscience. Israel, claims Leonard Fein, “was – and is – an effort to produce a society parochial in structure but universal in ideology.” [FEIN, p. 6] “The primary concern… of Zionism,” insists Steven Katz, “is justice.” [KATZ, in STALLSWORTH, p. 99] “I’ll tell you what Zionism is,” said New York politician Bella Azburg, “It’s a liberation movement for a people who have been persecuted all their lives throughout human history.” [POGREBIN, L., p. 48]

Not surprisingly, in the widely held Jewish view, criticism of Israel is merely a disguised version of irrational anti-Semitism. “According to an unpublished survey in 1986 by the political scientist Asher Arian,” notes Charles Liebman and Steven Cohen, “58% of all Israeli Jews believe that criticism of Israel heard in the world stems from anti-Semitism.” [LIEBMAN/COHEN, p. 62] “Since 1967,” says Israeli Meron Benvenisti, “[Israel] has become one of the pariah states in the international system. Israelis do not try to explain their isolation in
rational terms such as opposition to their holdings in the occupied territories or international power politics. For them it is a recurrence of anti-Semitism directed now towards the new Jewish state instead of towards individual Jewish communities in the Diaspora. This being the case, all criticism can be dismissed as anti-Semitic and unfavorable actions perceived as an added instance of persecution.” [BENVENISTI, p. 77]

In America, in one survey six out of ten American Jews agreed in 1993 that ‘the criticism of Israel that we hear about derives mainly from anti-Semitism.” [LIPSET/RAAB, p. 126] “It always astounds me,” wrote Letty Pogrebin, a senior editor at Ms magazine, “when people say that the answer to anti-Semitism is Palestinian rights rather than the lack of Jew-hating.” [POGREBIN, in KLEIN]

“Anti-Semitism,” says psychoanalyst Mortimer Ostrow, “has acquired a new face recently – it presents itself as antagonism to the state of Israel.” [OSTROW, p. 58] “One senses hostility towards things Jewish in a nonreflective anti-Israel stance,” says Sara Horowitz (about African-Americans, Hispanics, and other American “multicultural” minority groups), “an inclination to overlook, minimize, or trivialize racism when aimed against Jews; a denigration of Jewish traditions, communities, habits, cultural markings, and learning.” [HOROWITZ, S., 1998, p. 120] “On this point,” notes Arthur Liebman, the Jewish [political] Left, Center, and Right as well are in strong agreement: the Left’s denial of the legitimacy of Israel is necessary and sufficient grounds to label it anti-Semitic.” [LIEBMAN, A., 1986, p. 352]

“Anti-Israel sentiment,” asserts Justin Hertog of Vassar College, “has replaced anti-Semitism as a more sophisticated form of Jew-hatred.” [HERTOG, p. 14] “Blanket condemnation of Zionism as against specific Zionist policies,” declares Irving Greenberg, “is ipso facto anti-Semitism.” [ELLIS, M., 1990, p. 27] “An area of major concern today,” wrote Yehuda Baer, “is that very complicated issue of anti-Semitism masquerading as anti-Zionism… Whether one deals with Israel as a people or Israel as a state, anti-Zionism is an anti-Jewish program.” [PEARL/PEARL, p. 129] In the world of sociology, complained Irving Horowitz in 1993, there are “assaults on the ‘fascist’ state of Israel, with the claim that the high participation of Israeli sociologists in the American Sociological Association is a function of ‘the huge U.S. aid to Israel.’ The emergence of Israel as a nation state, far from taming the anti-Semitic conundrums, has only intensified such attacks… Whether this anti-Zionist/anti-Jewish tendency will sprout wings and take off remains difficult to determine.” [HOROWITZ, I., p. 91]

“Those who are critical of Israel,” says Tobin, “are more likely to hold anti-Semitic stereotypes. Some anti-Israelis may represent new forms of anti-Semitic expression.” [TOBIN, p. 50] “Almost half a century after the establishment of the Jewish state,” adds Evyatar Friesel, “… many Zionists have discovered that there are historical characteristics in the Jewish community that are very resilient. None seemed more resilient than what Leon Pinsker, over a hundred years ago, called the ‘Judeophobia of the Gentile.’ It is quite astonishing that more than forty years of Jewish statehood has hardly changed the basic premises of the relationship between Jews and non-Jews.” [FRIESEL, E., p. 232]
“To say that anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism is a lie,” once declared prominent Jewish Argentinian Jacobo Timerman, “It is like saying that there is difference between authoritarianism and totalitarian governments — another adventure in semantics.” [BECK, E., 1982, p. 193]

The profoundly disturbing subtext to such commentary is that it is not the aberrant commentary of marginal Jewish fanatics, it is the Jewish norm. Intelligent, well-read, informed, largely secular people collectively cling in a veritable religious manner to martyrological folklore above all empirical evidence about the causes of anti-Semitism and the moral foundations of their Jewish homeland. The widespread Jewish refusal to face, and remedy, the enormous suffering the state of Israel causes non-Jewish people grossly transcends mere oversight. It is a consciously created political program of international Jewish elitism and it is sinister. Unfortunately, probably most of Jewish identity and its ceaseless passion for itself truly boils down to the most selfishly primitive of all human emotions: individual — and in the Jewish case, collective — self-preservation at all, and any, moral costs. As the dominant world view in the Jewish community, it is the complete unwillingness — even paralysis — to recognize and address human suffering unless it is Jewish. As Jewish psychotherapist Irene Bloomfield suggests,

“In its desperate fight for survival and in becoming an occupying power, Israel has used harsh and inhuman methods, which would probably not have deserved mention if used by some of the Arab states, but torture, oppression, and inhumanity cannot be justified according to our own laws, yet any criticism of Israel by outsiders often evokes a furious and extreme reaction on our part and is experienced like an attack on the family and is therefore intolerable.” [BLOOMFIELD, I., p. 28]

It has been suggested by some Jewish observers (as reported elsewhere in this work) that anti-Jewish hostility (“anti-Semitism”) is a necessary glue to maintain the “otherness” of Jewish identity. The World Jewish Congress noted a similar theme in 1981, that Israel’s violent tensions with the Arab world are a very crucial rallying point for Jewish identity:

“For the preponderant part of Diaspora Jewry whose attachment has been to Israel, rather than to Judaism and Jewish ways of life as such, it seems quite clear that a comprehensive peace [with Palestinians], given present trends [in 1981], must be expected progressively to result in a weakening sense of Jewish identity, a lesser concern for Israel and for other Jews, and in less identification with Jewish organizations and communal affairs.” [WALINSKY, L., 1981, p. 104]

What, one wonders, would modern Jewish identity be without the necessary antithetical echo of non-Jewish hostility to it? The World Jewish Congress seems to suggest what the answer might be for many Jews: very little. Or even nothing.
A 2001 survey of Israelis by the World Jewish Congress found that:

- 57% believed there was more anti-Semitism in the world than 10 years earlier.
- 75% “agreed that international anti-Israel sentiment is motivated by anti-Semitism.
- 67% “said anti-Israel politics at the United Nations is driven by anti-Semitism. [AXELROD, T., 10-29-01]

APPENDIX

Members of the Presidents’ Conference of Major Jewish Organizations:

American-Israel Friendship League, American Friends of Likud, American
Israel Public Affairs Committee, American Gathering, American Jewish Com-
mittee, American Jewish Congress, American ORT Federation, American
Sephardi Organization, American Zionist Movement, Americans for Peace
Now, AMIT, Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, Central Conference of
American Rabbis, CAMERA, Council of Jewish Federations, Development
Corporation for Israel, Batunah of America, Friends of Israeli Defense Forces,
Hadassah (Women’s Zionist Organization of America), Hebrew Immigrant Aid
Society, Jewish Community Centers Association, Jewish Council for Public Af-
fairs, Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, Jewish Labor Committee,
Jewish National Fund, Jewish Reconstruction Federation, Jewish War Veterans
of the USA, Jewish Women International, Joint Distribution Committee, Labor
Zionist Alliance, Mercaz USA, NA’AMAT USA, National Committee for Labor
Zionism, National Conference on Soviet Jewry, National Council of Jewish
Women, National Council of Young Israel, Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbinical
Council of America, Religious Zionists of America, Union of American Hebrew
Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jews, United Congregations of America,
United Israel Appeal, United Jewish Appeal, United Synagogues of Conserva-
tive Judaism, WIZO USA, Women of Reform Judaism, Women’s American
ORT, Women’s League for Conservative Judaism, Women’s League for Israel,
Workman’s Circle, World Zionist Executives USA, Zionist Organization of
America
“One must come to terms with the past. One cannot wholly escape it. One may reject it, but the very mode of rejection is often conditioned by the past itself. A man is, first, the son of his father. In almost all tribal societies, the patronymic is part of one’s name. And the sins of the fathers – in the psychological, if not the legal sense – are apt to be burdens on the sons as well.”

Jacob Neusner, 1972, p. 64

We must inevitably conclude a circle in these many pages, back where we began: a reassertion of the ethical legitimacy of investigating collective (“peoplehood”) responsibility for collective deeds, so clearly, and ominously, epitomized in the example of the Germans and the growth from them of Aryan fascism.

Primo Levi, a well-known Jewish survivor of Auschwitz, flying in the face of “political correct” platitudes, confronts directly the obvious value and logic of critical generalizations:

“It is dangerous, wrong, to speak about the “Germans,” or any other people, as of a single undifferentiated entity, and include all individuals in one judgment. And yet I don’t think I would deny that there exists a spirit of each people (otherwise it would not be a people) a Deutschtum, an italianità, an hispanidad: they are the sums of traditions, customs, history, language, and culture. Whoever does not feel within himself this spirit, which is national in the best sense of the word, not only does not entirely belong to his own people but is not part of human civilization. Therefore, while I consider insensate the syllogism, ‘All Italians are passionate; you are Italian; therefore you are passionate,” I do however believe it legitimate, within certain limits, to expect from Italians taken as a whole, or from Germans, etc., one specific, collective behavior rather than another. There will certainly be individual exceptions, but a prudent, probabilistic forecast is in my opinion possible.” [LEVI, P., 1988, p.183-184]

What, we may fairly wonder, from the evidence found in this volume, is the “probabilistic spirit” of the Jewish people? Levi’s unemotional, reasoned assertion opens the door to an avalanche of troubling issues about them.

The positive side of the Jewish “contribution to civilization” (“Jonas Salk invented the polio vaccine,” etc.) is not in this volume. That perspective is represented in its one-sided form everywhere elsewhere, always: an impenetrable
monolith of saintly Jewish self-celebration in today’s popular culture. This volume, however, is more akin to a long complaint, an underscoring of Jewish historical responsibility.

This book insists that, while Jews take credit for so much good in modern civilization, they must also take their fair share of blame where it is also reasonably merited. Why is this necessary? Because modern Jewry is not an oppressed minority. It is, by all measures, a center of economic and social power, and political control. Virtually all corners of society are effected by Jewish influence. Yet modern Jewish identity continuously screams its alleged disadvantages, configuring as a relentlessly Accusing Finger, constantly demanding – demanding attention, demanding concession – all rooted in the foundation of the Jewish martyrlogy tradition. To this day the Jewish community still defames Arabs, Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Russians, and others, including all Gentiles as a categorically “guilty” Other for historical crimes against Jewry. Modern Jewish identity has become a collective aggression, a collective demand, a collective accusation, a collective insistence upon continued, never-ending reparation and further power. As the old saying goes, there are two sides to every story – but the non-Jewish side of history (in its interaction with Jews) is afforded absolutely no forum anywhere in popular culture.

The best defense is an offense, as the Jewish community today knows well; they are so very skillful at it. This volume asserts a counter-view to Jewish mythology and aims to balance the scales. The common notion that anti-Semitism is a “mystifying disease,” or that “prejudice” and “discrimination” is always and completely irrational, is preposterous. All people make prejudicial and discriminatory decisions about everything continuously, based upon their life experience, as part of the process called life. What human being is not “discriminatory?” We are all human. But why are Jews afforded so much “prejudicial” slack in their apparent “right” to defame all others around them with impunity? In the long term, endlessly one-sided “victim” assaults upon alleged oppressors are not healthy solutions to interethnic tensions. True resolution, true health, is a dialogue, an exchange, and exploration of mutual prejudices (and the reasons for them), and a willingness to be drawn to sympathy for the others’ side – not merely consistent concession to one group’s accusation and demand.

If today’s Jewry did not constantly wield – and exploit – a distorted history as evidence of (and claim to) moral supremacy, if Jewry did not function as an unified entity towards collective self-aggrandizement at the expense of all others, and if Jews melted as truly equal neighbors into American (or wherever they lived) society, and if Israel was merely another country and not an international Jewish nerve center, there would be no reason to write this volume. Unfortunately, this book is much, and crucially, merited.

One cannot fairly discuss Gentile racism without addressing the very powerful Jewish version of the same thing. One cannot righteously discuss any notion of “anti-Semitism” without equal attention to Jewish “anti-Gentilism.” One cannot fully address Jewish identity without examining its traditional reli-
gio-racist tenets. One cannot understand the worldwide centuries-old animosity towards Jews without understanding the enduring Jewish animosity towards all others. One cannot understand the Holocaust without understanding the genocidal basis of Israelite land claims in the Old Testament. One cannot understand how the Holocaust fits into modern Jewish identity without an examination of the virtual Jewish need (rooted in old religious tenets: “punishment by God”) to be victims. One cannot understand the nature of American consumer society without understanding the enormous Jewish contribution to its formation and maintenance. (Conversely, one cannot fully understand the nature of communism without addressing its Jewish impact in deconstructing Christian social order). One cannot fully understand the workings of the modern mass media without addressing its Jewish component. One cannot understand Jewry’s claim to be champions of social justice without noting its significant obverse: traditional Jewish “double standard” ethics and the profoundly disproportionate, and elite, Jewish representation in white collar fraud, international drug networks, the prostitution trade, the slumlord ethic, and so forth, as well as Jewry’s rank as the wealthiest ethnic community in America. One cannot dismiss the many “stereotypes” about Jews and money, without investigating the evidence that prove cores of truth to these assertions. (How, one wonders, does a collective commitment to social justice in capitalist society make a group of people – so incongruously – the most affluent?) One cannot understand the awesome American governmental charity to Israel without understanding the Jewish role in American government and popular culture. One cannot understand “democratic” Israel without understanding its profoundly undemocratic fabric and the ancient “nation apart” principles upon which it has been created. And one cannot understand today’s notions of American democracy without understanding “particularist” Zionism’s increasing subversion of it via the dominance of Jewish political money.

There are plenty of people of Jewish descent who do not support Israel, who are not wealthy slumlords, who are not racist, and who exhibit in all spheres the solidiest of moral character. But where are they when the Collective Jewish Body speaks, acts, and oppresses in their name? If the Jewish community dictates a “community of fate” by bloodline, surely all those of even partial Jewish heritage have a stake in raising critical voices against the steamroller that claims them.

In the non-Jewish world, there are those who have no interest in being led by Jewish messianism, whether religious or secular. There are those who do not believe that Jewry and disputable “Jewish values” represent the navel of the world. There are those who are tired of endless Jewish complaint and demand. And our proposed multicultural society must ultimately fail if it is so incredibly Jewish-centered and, emulating the Zionist model, so heatedly Balkanized. A just, and real, multicultural democracy in the social, political, and economic worlds would represent ethnic communities in a rough approximation of their population numbers. Let all peoples have a voice, per the original concepts of the Constitution. That’s fair, at least as fair as humans can aspire. But we do not have that. In far too many realms, we have Jewish dominance.
Does speaking the truth about Jewish identity, power and history lead to Jews being led to concentration camps and ovens? (As so many Jews preposterously proclaim, as a veritable religious conviction today). Nonsense. World wars (where murder is the norm) lead to people thrown in ovens. Fanatical ethnocentrism leads to people thrown in ovens. The suppression of free speech leads to ovens. Military states and institutionalized racism leads to people locked up in concentration camps. Censorship, intolerance, and allegiances to sacred racial pedigrees lead to mass murder. How is it that the mere mention of the unpleasant facts of Jewish history is dictated to be tantamount to genocide against the Jewish people? True, there was an Adolf Hitler: his existence is used as a Jewish shield against any criticism. True, Hitler condemned the Jews and sought to exterminate them (as he did others) as part of a master plan to rule the world. But it is absurd, even manipulatively sinister, to dismiss the context of the broader scope of World War, and the struggles and sufferings of all other people, and equate criticism of Jews with mass murder. For good reason, as we have amply seen, criticism of Jews throughout history knows the full political spectrum. Even Hitler’s hated ideological enemy and polar opposite, Karl Marx, criticized Jews. Even in the works of Theodore Herzl, the secular Zionist “King of the Jews,” one can find echoes of the same themes. Not mass murder. But legitimate criticism.

The Jewish community maintains a “head in the sand” approach to Jewish history and identity, systematically censoring all the many Jewish-inspired unpleasantries of the past, singularly gleaning from all of human history only the “Jew as victim” scenario. Those who dare to break the institutionalized muzzles today to address Jewish bigotry, past and present, are themselves defamed as bigots. Always and everywhere, the Jewish community is held to be beyond criticism. Today “anti-Semitism” is repeatedly and categorically described throughout the Jewish community as merely a “mystifying disease,” only attributable to Hitlerian psychological perversions. This is profound evidence that the collective Jewish community has lost its intellectual, and moral, compass. It fears even partial blame for the tragedies in its history. The Jewish community is in denial. Not only is it in denial, it censors at every opportunity any penetration of this denial. When one studies history carefully, intent upon finding a rational “cause” for anti-Semitism, there are, unfortunately, answers to be found. And if there should ever be a real “cure” for this “disease,” the FULL story of history must be squarely faced. And honestly. That’s the beginning of real dialogue.

The Jewish conviction that their historical suffering transcends all others is religiously based (even the term “Holocaust” has religious roots) and the “Holocaust is unique” theology can be dismissed, as we have seen, rather easily, except to the degree that ANY atrocity is in some ways special to its own context. This Jewish view of itself (that no other genocide approaches the special Jewish suffering) is also racist: it is the traditional Chosen People identity (the racial lineage to Abraham theme) expressed in a secular (although catastrophic) form.

Because of profound Jewish power and presence – and enduring intra-Jewish allegiance – throughout modern popular culture, the many myths of
Jewish identity are an integral part of the daily diet of modern America. And, increasingly since the Enlightenment, the Jewish struggle to cope with its collective neurosis (Who is a Jew? What is a Jew? How do I balance Jewish chauvinism and ethnocentrism against worldwide universalistic themes?) has been woven like a knot into the very essence of modern western society.

It is the principle of democracy that it is in everyone's best interests to resolve an issue by fully, and freely, exploring it. In a true democracy, those that are factually and ethically wrong may be proven as wrong, not repeatedly threatened, shouted down at first voice and suffocated. The alternative to the free exchange of ideas is censorship, authoritarianism, totalitarianism. And fascism. Jewry's self-preserving strategy through the centuries has always been to stifle free debate, lobby with governing powers behind the scenes, and to sit on the lid of the resultant pressure cooker. (Orthodox Jewry, after all, formally forbids critical exploration of its tenets). Then comes the shock for Gentiles when, all at once, as if an explosion, the repressed story is somehow suddenly revealed. This volume argues that in a free society, all facts, and the full realm of evidence, must be placed on the table towards open discussion. And, afforded the full range of information, “the people” (moral, decent, democratic people – Jews among them) can decide what it means.

The fact that this simple democratic premise is such a radical idea in the case of the Jews is the beginning of the healthy debate. Let us begin with honesty for a change:

Who are the saints of history?

No one.
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