

ZIONISM

**A RACIST, ANTISEMITIC AND REACTIONARY
TOOL OF IMPERIALISM**

Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

PO Box 78900, London, SW16 9PQ

thecommunists.org

First published in Great Britain by CPGB-ML, 2017
Second edition, 2024

ISBN 978-1-913286-12-5

CONTENTS

Preface	v
Chapter 1 Attempts at criminalising support for the Palestinian liberation struggle	1
Chapter 2 Zionism – a racist ideology	5
Chapter 3 Genesis of Zionism	23
Chapter 4 The non-Semitic origins of modern Jewry	39
Chapter 5 Nazi-Zionist collaboration.....	49
Chapter 6 Memorandum of Edwin Montagu on the Antisemitism of the Present (British) Government	75
Chapter 7 The Balfour Declaration.....	81
Chapter 8 A sustained attack on opposition to brutal Israeli occupation	89

PREFACE

This booklet is comprised of a collection of articles published in *Lalkar* and *Proletarian* over the last twelve months. Nothing contained in these articles is original or new. People well-versed in the origins, the development and history of Zionism are fully aware of the substance of these articles. However, owing to the suppression, by Zionism and its imperialist backers alike, of the historical truth about Zionism, the wider masses, including the Jewish masses, are unaware of the true nature of this pernicious ideology, which is racist, antisemitic and reactionary to its core.

Zionism is not a Jewish project; it is an imperialist construct and an instrument of its policy to perpetuate its domination of the middle east through control of its vast mineral wealth, as a market for goods, and as an avenue for investment and export of capital. The Zionist state of Israel is a dagger aimed at the heart of the Arab people's revolutionary democratic movement.

Far from being a movement for the liberation of the Jewish masses, it has merely served to subjugate mentally a people who were hitherto the most advanced and in the van of every democratic and socialist movement. Through its collaboration with the Nazis, it assisted in the extermination of hundreds of thousands of innocent Jews – all in the pursuit of the reactionary goal of creating a 'homeland' for Jews in Palestine – a place with which the overwhelming majority of present-day Jews had no connection. While Jews are nowhere in our times an oppressed community, Zionism inculcates among them an aura of victimhood which it uses as a diversion and a cover for hiding the real victims of its brutal occupation and colonisation of Palestine, the denial of the most basic rights to the subjugated Palestinian people, their daily suppression, misery and humiliation at the hands of the Zionist police and army of occupation.

The creation of the state of Israel laid the basis for a hundred-year war between Israeli Zionism and its imperialist backers, on the one hand, and the Palestinian and wider Arab masses on the other.

Being the illegitimate child of imperialist intrigues and crazy Zionist ideology, the artificially constructed Israeli state is bound to prove a

historical abortion. Being a colonial enterprise, appearing rather late, at a time when colonialism was well past its sell-by date, it is bound to collapse through the resistance of the Palestinian masses and the fatigue brought upon the Jewish population of Israel by ceaseless warfare.

The Zionists, and their imperialist patrons, are fully aware that the Zionist colossus has feet of clay. That is why they are forever engaged in the suppression of any movement that expresses support for the liberation struggle of the Palestinian people. For its part, the proletariat and all of progressive humanity must expose the reactionary essence of this Zionist monstrosity and oppose it by all possible means.

This booklet is our small contribution towards exposing and defeating this tool of imperialism.

Harpal Brar

3 December 2017

CHAPTER 1

Attempts at criminalising support for the Palestinian liberation struggle

(published in the November 2016 issue of Lalkar)

Introduction

Since September 2015, the Zionist establishment and their imperialist patrons have launched a veritable campaign against what they claim is a phenomenal rise in antisemitism. This campaign has been joined by the Blairite wing of the Labour party who are out to get rid of Jeremy Corbyn, the moderately left-wing social democratic leader of the Labour party. Judging by the screaming headlines in the imperialist print media, and the air time given on radio and television to this question, one could be forgiven for thinking that we were back in fascist Germany of 1935 and the Jews were at risk of losing their lives and possessions.

The Labour party, the supporters of Corbyn in particular, according to the leading lights of this campaign, are guilty of being soft on antisemitism. Here is a random bouquet of the headlines on this question:

- Labour's 'Mayor' savages Corbyn: Party star Khan damns leader over antisemitism (*Daily Mail*, 20 September 2015).
- Jeremy Corbyn – impotent as he fails to halt Labour's antisemitism (*The Telegraph*, 16 March 2016).
- 'Most Jews can't trust Labour': Jeremy Corbyn under fire from senior Jewish figure (*Evening Standard*, 17 March 2016).
- Labour and the left have an antisemitic problem (Jonathan Freedland, *The Guardian*, 18 March 2016).
- Lord Levy 'may quit' Labour over party failure to condemn antisemitism (*The Express*, 20 March 2016).

Naz Shah, a female Muslim Member of Parliament representing the Bradford West constituency, has been savaged for posting a tongue-in-

check map of Israel superimposed on a map of the United States with the caption ‘problem solved’. This was three years ago and she had merely re-posted it from the website of Norman Finkelstein, renowned anti-Zionist Jewish author. The cowardly Labour leadership’s response was to suspend Ms Shah from her party, while she was obliged to offer profuse and humiliating apologies.

Ken Livingstone, former Mayor of London, was viciously attacked for suggesting that Hitler was a Zionist. While the loose use of language by Livingstone leaves a lot to be desired, there is no question that the substance of the argument was on his side, namely, the ideological affinity between Nazism and Zionism – it being the common premise of both these ideologies that Jews were a separate people who did not belong to Germany (in this case). Blairite John Mann MP, having arranged with journalists to witness his histrionics, shouted ‘holocaust denier’ and ‘disgusting antisemite’ at Livingstone. Even the allegedly left-wing shadow chancellor, McDonnell, demanded that Livingstone apologise. Be it said to Livingstone’s credit that he stood his ground, refusing to buckle under the barrage of accusations hurled at him. Livingstone, too, was suspended from the Labour party.

Lenni Brenner, the famous Jewish author of *Zionism in the Age of Dictators*,¹ has established beyond doubt in his book the ideological affinity between Nazism and Zionism, an ideological affinity which was to be the basis of the perfidious Zionist-Nazi collaboration. At the time of its appearance, *The Times* published a review of Brenner’s book in which Edward Mortimer, the reviewer, described the book as “crisp and carefully documented”. Now, however, *The Times* is leading the charge against Livingstone and Corbyn and anyone else who dares to offend, even if ever so mildly, the Zionist fraternity and its patrons.

The charge about a rise in antisemitism, especially among the left, is spurious and baseless. It is used by careerists to promote themselves and to pre-empt any criticism of the truly fascistic state of Israel, created through the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians and their continued slaughter, oppression and expropriation ever since.

After announcing his intention to contest the London Mayoral election, Labour’s Sadiq Khan launched a frontal attack on Corbyn for his supposed links to “terrorist groups” and his support for “extremist” Palestinian groups which, he argued, could inspire attacks on Jews in Britain. He

¹ Croom Helm, London, 1983.

repeated subsequent accusations of antisemitism against the Oxford University Labour Club for no greater sin than that of giving support to the Israeli Apartheid week.

Norman Finkelstein, in an interview at the height of this latest controversy, made this perceptive observation: “These campaigns occur at regular intervals, correlating with Israel’s periodic massacres and consequent isolation ...”²

Following the last major Zionist war on Gaza, which killed over two thousand Palestinians, a quarter of them children, and in which tens of thousands of residential properties were destroyed and whole families wiped out, the Zionists received a bad press. Even the imperialist propaganda organs were obliged to give a modicum of coverage to the victims of the Zionists’ fascist *Blitzkrieg*. Since then, the BDS (Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions) Campaign has gathered traction; people are more aware of Zionist atrocities and Palestinian suffering; no longer do the Zionists enjoy favourable opinion among ordinary people even in the imperialist countries.

In the circumstances, various “dull-witted creeps”, to use the apt words of Finkelstein, personified by Jonathan Freedland, a “Blairite hack who regularly plays the antisemitic card”, initiate campaigns for the sole purpose of diverting attention away from the real suffering of the Palestinian people, which, inter alia, have the effect of poisoning relations between Jews and Muslims. Such campaigns, be it said in passing, have the effect of besmirching the victims of the Nazi holocaust.

The fact is that, according to reliable opinion polls, while a mere seven percent of the British public are prejudiced against Jews, a whopping sixty percent are also prejudiced against Muslims, and a similar proportion against the Roma. Everywhere, remarks Finkelstein correctly, Jews are prospering as never before – proof enough of them not being victims of an allegedly monumental antisemitic campaign:

“It is long past time that these antisemitism mongers crawled back into their sewers – but not before apologising to Naz Shah, and begging her forgiveness.”³

² ‘Five prominent intellectuals question the “anti-Zionism is anti-Semitic” argument’, Telesur, 11 May 2016.

³ Norman Finkelstein in an interview with Jamie Stern-Weiner, 3 May 2016, in Blog, Featured, News.

It is unlikely that the Zionists and their supporters will take Finkelstein's sane advice. In fact, the more isolated they become, the more truculent their behaviour, and the more extreme their demands. The president of the Board of Jewish Deputies in Britain, Jonathan Arkush, absurdly asserts that "there is a problem of antisemitism on the far left, which now eclipses antisemitism that we have always seen coming from the far right". This was in the middle of March 2016. A few days later, he demanded that "Israel should be included in the definition of antisemitism by Europe" and that any hatred of Israel should be characterised as a manifestation of antisemitism.

The antisemitism mongers not only invent antisemitism in places where it has little presence, they completely overlook the barely-disguised fascism of the Zionist rulers of Israel. On 8 March, the then Israeli foreign minister (he has since been given the defence portfolio), talking about the "disloyalty" of Palestinian citizens of Israel, said: "Whoever is with us should get everything. Those who are against us, there's nothing to be done – we need to pick up an axe and cut off his head. Otherwise we won't survive". The imperialist propaganda machine failed even to notice, let alone condemn, Liebermann's bloodcurdling, inflammatory and downright fascist utterance, as did certified creeps such as Freedland.

The only course open to anti-Zionists is to expose Zionism for what it really is, namely, a racist and antisemitic (yes, antisemitic) ideology and a reactionary tool in the hands of imperialism.

It is in furtherance of this course that *Lalkar* has resolved to publish articles by way of this exposure. The first of these articles, printed in this issue, concentrates on the racism of this ideology and its affinity to Nazism on the Jewish question.

Informed readers are, in all likelihood, only too well aware of this fact, but there are others who know next to nothing about it. It is to be hoped that our articles will get a wide circulation and thus further the cause of fighting against this pernicious ideology, which is as harmful to the masses of Jewish people as it is to the masses of Palestinian people and humanity at large.

CHAPTER 2

Zionism – a racist ideology

(published in the November 2016 issue of Lalkar)

Zionism is not now, nor was it ever, co-extensive with either Judaism or the Jewish people. The vast majority of Hitler's Jewish victims were not Zionists.

The majority of Polish Jews repudiated Zionism on the eve of the holocaust and in September 1939 abhorred the politics of Menachem Begin, one of the leaders of the self-styled 'Zionist Revisionist' movement in Warsaw.

There cannot be the slightest confusion between the struggle against Zionism and hostility to either Jews or Judaism.

In 1895, Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism, published *Jewish State*. This book laid the basis for the Zionist movement.

Believing antisemitism to be unbeatable and natural, Zionism never fought it. Instead it sought accommodation with it – and pragmatic utilisation of it for the purpose of obtaining a Jewish state.

Overcome by his own pessimism, Herzl completely misunderstood the Dreyfus case in which a French military officer of Jewish origin, Alfred Dreyfus, was wrongly charged with treason. The secrecy of his trial and Dreyfus's courageous insistence on his innocence, made a lot of people believe that injustice had been done. As a result, there was a deluge of Gentile support for him. The French intelligentsia rallied to his side, as did the working-class movement. Eventually Dreyfus was vindicated, the right wing of French society and the Church were discredited, and the army top brass besmirched. Antisemitism in France was driven into irrelevance until the conquest of France by Hitler's army.

And yet Herzl, a prominent Viennese journalist, could see the Dreyfus affair only as a defeat, and never as a rallying cry in the fight against antisemitism. He was incapable of understanding the significance of the wave of Gentile sympathy for the Jewish victim. He did not see fit to

organise a single demonstration in defence of Dreyfus. Following the victory of the struggle in defence of Dreyfus, French Jewry quite rightly saw Zionism as irrelevant. For this, Herzl savaged them in his diary, revealing in the course of doing so his diehard antisocialist, reactionary views”.

“They [the Jews] seek protection from the socialists and the destroyers of the present civil order ... Truly they are not Jews any more. To be sure, they are not Frenchmen either. They will probably become leaders of European anarchism.”⁴

The views expressed by Herzl in his *Der Judenstaat* ('The Jewish State') had in fact already been expressed by two Russian Jews, Perez Smolenskin (in 1873) and Leo Pinsker (1882). Herzl's particular contribution was the building of an organisation, the World Zionist Organisation, which held its first congress in 1897 in Basle, Switzerland, to negotiate with imperialism for the creation of a Jewish national state. He negotiated for it unsuccessfully with the ultrareactionary Sultan Abdul Hamid II of Turkey, with Wilhelm II, the German Kaiser, with the Tsarist regime through Count Sergei Witte (finance minister) and the minister of the interior, Vyachaslav Von Plevhe, responsible for organising anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia.

Herzl's proposals were always tailored to please the ears of the particular autocrat or representative of a particular imperialism with whom he happened to be having an audience. In every case, “he presented his project in a manner best calculated to appeal to his listener: to the Sultan he promised Jewish capital; to the Kaiser he undertook that the Jewish territory would be an outpost of Berlin; to Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary, he held out the prospect of the Jewish territory becoming a colony of the British empire”.⁵

The Zionist leadership, beginning with Herzl, was clear about two things. First, that their project could only succeed with the backing of a dominant great power; second, that its goal could only be achieved by bypassing the Palestinians, not through any understanding with them. As the dominant great power in the middle east changed several times during the twentieth century, Zionism suitably shifted its allegiance in pursuit of its reactionary aim of a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

⁴ Raphael Pattar, Ed, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl, Vol II*, pp672-3.

⁵ Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*.

Zionism held great attraction for the imperialist, reactionary and antisemitic regimes. Being a reactionary nationalist movement, it held out the prospect of weaning Jewish workers away from democratic and revolutionary movements, while promising to help them get rid of their Jewish population through emigration. Zionism saw revolutionary Marxism as an assimilationist enemy which obliged them to make an alliance against it with their fellow separatists of the antisemitic right-wing nationalist movements in eastern Europe. The essentials of Zionist doctrine on antisemitism were clearly set down well in advance of the holocaust: antisemitism was inevitable and could not be fought; the solution was the emigration of unwanted Jews to a Jewish state still to be created.

Balfour Declaration

In view of the above, it is not surprising that British imperialism, realising the reactionary essence of Zionism, clearly saw the prospect it held for acting as a tool of British policy in the middle east should it manage to entrench itself in Palestine. And who should be history's chosen instrument for providing substance to what at the time was a hare-brained Zionist dream? None other than the antisemitic Arthur Balfour, the British foreign secretary! Hence the 1917 infamous Balfour Declaration favouring "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people" and the promise by the British government to use its "best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object".

The Balfour Declaration was a boon for the Zionists – not for Jewry. A future Jewish state was to act as the outpost for British imperialism against the rising tide of the national liberation movement of the Arab people.

The World Zionist Organisation's leaders understood that the British government's priority was the crushing of the Bolsheviks, and that they had to be on their best behaviour in their activities in the turbulent east European arena.

Churchill saw the struggle unfolding "between the Zionist and Bolshevik Jews as little less than a struggle for the soul of the Jewish people".⁶

Zionism was willing to cooperate with Britain in spite of British involvement with the White Russian pogromists.

⁶ 'Zionism versus Bolshevism', *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, 8 February 1920.

Herzl's successor, Chaim Weizmann appeared at the Versailles Conference on 23 February 1919, where he pronounced the traditional line on Jewry shared by both antisemites and Zionists. It was not the Jews who really had problems, it was the Jews who were the problem.

Zionism offered itself to the assembled capitalist powers as an anti-revolutionary movement. Zionism, he declared, would “transform Jewish energy into a constructive force instead of being dissipated in destructive tendencies”.⁷

Weizmann completely shared the anticommunist mindset of his British patrons. He never changed his opinion. Even in *Trial and Error*, his autobiography, he still sounded like a high Tory, writing of a “time when the horrors of the Bolshevik revolution were fresh in *everyone's* mind”.⁸

Only on the basis of an alliance with the working class and socialists could Jewish rights be obtained and safeguarded. This is precisely what the Zionists were fiercely opposed to.

The Bolsheviks gave the Jews complete equality and even set up schools and, eventually, courts in Yiddish, but they were absolutely opposed to Zionism, as indeed to all bourgeois nationalism.

Bolshevism opposed Zionism as pro-British and as fundamentally anti-Arab. So the Zionists turned to the local nationalists. In Ukraine, they turned to Simon Petliura's Rada (Council) which, like the Zionists, recruited on strictly ethnic lines – no Russians, no Poles, no Jews. The Zionists made every effort to rally Jewish support everywhere for the anti-Bolshevik Rada.

Churchill lost his gamble as, following anti-Jewish pogroms after the first Ukrainian defeat at the hands of the Red Army in January 1919, the Jewish masses deserted the Zionists.

The ideological affinity between Zionism and antisemitism, the Zionist hostility to assimilation and Marxism, could not but incline it towards an alliance with antisemitic nationalists and imperialism. It was not for nothing that Balfour facilitated Zionism's entrenchment in Palestine. But for the support of the British during the early years of the Mandate, the

⁷ Leonard Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, Simon and Shuster, 1961, p348.

⁸ Emphasis added, quoted by Lenni Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Croom Helm, London, 1983), p12.

Palestinians would have had not the slightest difficulty pushing Zionism out.

World Zionist Organisation's policies were continued under Weizmann during the Hitler years.

Blut und Boden

Herzl was not devout. He had no special concern for Palestine – the Kenyan Highlands would do just as well for a Jewish state. He had no interest in Hebrew. The German university graduates who took over the Zionist movement after Herzl's death further developed the racist ideology of Jewish separatism. They agreed with the German antisemites: the Jews were not part of the German *Volk*. Jews and Germans should not mix sexually for the sake of their own unique *blut* and, not being of the Teutonic *blut*, they perforce had to have their own *boden*: Palestine.

Even Einstein subscribed to the Zionist race conceptions and thus reinforced racism, lending it the prestige of his reputation. Though sounding profound, his contribution to the discussion are based on the same nonsense:

“Nations with a racial difference appear to have instincts which work against their fusion. The assimilation of the Jews to the European nations ... could not eradicate the feeling of lack of kinship between them and those among whom they lived. In the last resort, the instinctive feeling of kinship is referable to the law of conservation of energy. For this reason it cannot be eradicated by any amount of well-meant pressure.”⁹

Zionists believed that because they lacked their own *boden*, the Jews were *untersmenschen* and, therefore, for their ‘hosts’, little more than leeches – the world pest.

If one believes in the validity of racial exclusiveness, it is difficult to object to anyone else's racism; if it is impossible for any people to be healthy except in their ‘own’ homeland, then one cannot object to anyone else excluding ‘aliens’ from their territory.

Zionist *Blut und Boden* theory provided an excellent rationale for not fighting antisemitism on its home ground; it was no fault of the antisemites, it was because of the Jews' own misfortune of being in exile.

⁹ Cited by Lenni Brenner, *op cit*, p21.

By this logic, the loss of Palestine was the root cause of antisemitism; therefore in the regaining of Palestine lay the only solution to the Jewish question. In view of this, is it difficult to understand the gullible reader of a Nazi newspaper who concluded that what was said by the Nazis, and agreed to by the Zionists – had to be right?

“Any Jewish movement that prattled about the naturalness of antisemitism,” observed Lenni Brenner, “would, just as ‘naturally’ seek to come to terms with the Nazis when they came to power.”¹⁰

German Zionism, through the Zionist Federation of Germany (ZVfD), turned away from the society in which Jews lived. There were only two Zionist tasks: (i) instilling nationalist consciousness in as many Jews as would listen; and (ii) training youths for occupations useful in the economic development of Palestine. Everything else was useless.

In 1925, the most fervent expounder of complete abstentionism, Jacob Klatzin, co-editor of *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vividly expressed the ramifications of the Zionist approach to antisemitism thus:

“If we do not admit the rightfulness of antisemitism, we deny the rightfulness of our own nationalism. If our people is deserving and willing to live its own national life, then it is an alien body thrust into the nations among whom it lives, an alien body that insists on its own distinctive identity, reducing the domain of their life. It is right, therefore, that they should fight against us for their national integrity ... Instead of establishing societies for defence against the antisemites, who want to reduce our rights, we should establish societies for the defence against our friends who desire to defend our rights.”¹¹

Instead of uniting with the anti-Nazi working class on a programme of militant resistance, the Zionist Federation of Germany leadership in 1932, when Hitler was gaining strength by the day, chose to organise anticommunist meetings to warn Jewish youth against ‘red assimilation’.

On 18 March 1912, Weizmann brazenly told a Berlin audience that “each country can absorb only a limited number of Jews, if she doesn’t want disorders in her stomach. Germany already had too many Jews.”¹²

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Jacob Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Ram’s Horn Books, Abelard-Schuman, 1963.

¹² Quoted by Benyamin Matuvo, ‘The Zionist wish and the Nazi deed’, *Issues*, Winter 1966/7.

With views like these, he and his fellow Zionists could hardly be expected to mobilise world Jewry against antisemitism and the Nazis. Not one demonstration against Hitler was organised in America by the Zionists before Hitler came to power. Nahum Goldmann was unwilling to work with the assimilationists.

The German Zionists agreed with the fundamental elements in Nazi ideology – that Jews would never be part of the German *Volk* and, therefore, did not belong on German soil. Ideological affinity between them was based on (i) anticommunism; (ii) Common *Volkist* racism; and (iii) mutual conviction that Germany could never be the homeland of its Jews. Because of this ideological affinity between Zionism and Nazism, the Zionist Federation of Germany, believing that it could induce the Nazis to support them, solicited the patronage of Hitler repeatedly after 1933.

In early March 1933, Julius Streicher, the editor of *Der Sturmer*, declared that as of 1 April, all Jewish stores and professionals would be boycotted. In response, Rabbi Stephen Wise had planned a counter-demonstration to be held in New York on 27 March if the Nazis went ahead with their boycott. This worried Hitler's capitalist backers as Jews were prominent throughout the retail trade in America and Europe; any retaliation by them against German companies would prove very hurtful. So they urged Hitler to call off the anti-Jewish boycott. As the Nazis could not do that without losing face, they resorted to using the Zionists to head off Rabbi Wise. Thus, Herman Goering called in the Zionist leaders. He told them that the foreign press was lying about atrocities against Jews; unless the lies stopped he could not guarantee the safety of German Jewry. Above all, the New York rally had to be cancelled. Following this meeting, a delegation of three arrived in London on 27 March to make contact with the world Jewry, where it met forty Jewish leaders at a meeting chaired by Nahum Sokolow who was at the time president of the World Zionist Organisation. The delegation saw two tasks before it: (1) to promote Palestine as "the logical place of refuge" for Jews; and (2) to head off all anti-Nazi actions abroad. The Zionist leadership saw to it that no anti-Nazi action took place in New York or anywhere else.

On 21 June 1933, the Zionist Federation of Germany sent a memorandum to the Nazi party which was nothing short of treason to the Jews of Germany. In it the German Zionists "offered calculated collaboration between Zionism and Nazism, hallowed by the goal of a Jewish state: we

shall wage no battle against thee, only against those who would resist thee”.¹³

All this was taking place in complete secrecy behind the backs of the Jewish people, who knew nothing about the disgraceful machinations of the Zionist leaders acting allegedly in the name of the Jewish masses. But, kept in ignorance as they were, the Jewish masses could not miss what was appearing in the *Rundschau* (the organ of the Zionist Federation of Germany) in which assimilationist Jewry was attacked with gay abandon.

Its editor, Robert Weltsch, took the occasion of the 1 April boycott to lay into the Jews of Germany in an editorial: ‘Wear the yellow badge with pride’. It blamed the Jews for their misfortunes, saying, *inter alia*: “Because the Jews do not display their Jewishness with pride, because they wanted to shirk the Jewish question, they must share the blame for the degradation of the Jewry.”¹⁴

Just at the time when the Nazis were busy throwing communists, socialists and trade unionists into concentration camps, Weltsch attacked left-wing Jewish journalists as “Jewish buffoons”.¹⁵

Be it said in passing that, although the left-wing press had been under attack from day one of the Nazis assuming power, the Zionist press was still legal.

With the ascent of the Nazis to power, racism was triumphant in Germany and the Zionist Federation of Germany ran with the winner. *Rundschau* of 4 August 1933 literally went mad, urging that “Jews should not merely accept silently the dictates of their new masters; they, too, had to realise that race separation was wholly to the good.”¹⁶

Continuing it said: “Race is undoubtedly a very important, yes, decisive momentum. Out of ‘blood and soil’ really is determined the meaning of a people and their achievements.” Jews would have to make good for “the lost generations when Jewish racial consciousness was largely neglected”.

To prove that the “Jewish renaissance movement” had always been racist, the *Rundschau* reprinted two pre-1914 articles under the title ‘Voices of Blood’, which asserted with delirious joy how “the modern Jew ...

¹³ Brenner, *op cit*, p49.

¹⁴ L Davydowicz, *A Holocaust Reader*, Behrman House, New Jersey, p148.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, p149.

¹⁶ Quoted in Brenner, p51.

recognises his Jewishness through an inner experience which teachers him the special language of his blood in a mystical manner”.¹⁷

The charitable interpretation of such kind of nonsense is that it allowed the gentry peddling it to “reconcile themselves to the existence of antisemitism in Germany without fighting it”.¹⁸

The most fervent propagandist of the Zionist Federation of Germany’s racism was Joachim Prinz who had been a social-democratic voter before 1933. He became rabidly *Volkist* in the first years of the Third Reich. The violent hostility towards Jews sprinkling the pages of his book *Wir Juden* could have been easily inserted into the Nazi propaganda. To him the Jew was made up of “misplacement, of queerness, of exhibitionism, inferiority, arrogance, self-deceit, sophisticated love of truth, hate, sickly, patriotism and rootless cosmopolitanism, a psychological arsenal of rare abundance”.¹⁹

Prinz firmly, not to say foolishly, believed that an accommodation between Nazis and Jews was possible on the basis of a Zionist-Nazi accord: “A state which is constructed on the principle of the purity of nation and race can only have respect for those Jews who see themselves in the same way.”²⁰

After Prinz went to the USA, he gave up his bizarre notions, for they made no sense in the prevailing conditions in America.

Even the Nuremberg laws of 15 September 1935 failed to shift the German Zionist belief in an ultimate *modus vivendi* with the Nazis.

The *Rundschau* published a statement by the head of the Nazis’ press association, Brandt, which informed, to the surprise of the world at large, that the laws were “both beneficial and regenerative for Judaism as well. By giving the Jewish minority an opportunity to lead its own life and assuring governmental support for this independent existence, Germany is

¹⁷ Quoted in Brenner, p52.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p52.

¹⁹ Cited by Kopel Pinson, ‘The Jewish spirit in Nazi Germany’, *Menorah Journal*, Autumn 1936.

²⁰ Benyamin Matuvo, ‘The Zionist wish and the Nazi deed’, *Issues*, Winter 1966-67, p12.

helping Judaism to strengthen its national character and is making a contribution towards improving relations between the two peoples.”²¹

The Zionist Federation of Germany was obsessed with trying to unite the segregated Jewish institutions to inculcate a Jewish national spirit. The harder the Nazis pressed on the Jews, the greater became the Zionist conviction that a deal with the Nazis was possible. Their reasoning was that the greater the exclusion of Jews from every aspect of German life, the greater the need of the Nazis for Zionism with the aid of which to get rid of the Jews.

Although Zionist hopes for an agreement with the Nazis vanished in the face of ever-augmenting intimidation and terror, yet there was no attempt at anti-Nazi resistance on the part of the leaders of the Zionist Federation of Germany. Throughout the entire prewar years there was only the tiniest of Zionist involvement in the anti-Nazi underground. Instead, the Zionist leaders vociferously attacked the underground KPD (Communist Party of Germany) which was the leadership of the anti-Nazi resistance

Ideological jackals of Nazism

The World Zionist leaders gave their approval to the general line of their German affiliate. Before the Nazis came to power, German Zionism was no more than an isolated bourgeois cult. Then, all of a sudden, this small group saw itself as destined by history to negotiate secretly with the Nazi regime in opposition to the vast mass of humanity and the vast mass of Jewry alike who wanted to organise resistance to the Hitlerites – all in the hope of gaining support of the deadly enemy of the Jews and general humanity alike, for the building of their state in Palestine. Mere cowardice on the part of the Zionist leadership of the Zionist Federation of Germany does not go far enough to explain the pro-Hitler evolution of Zionist racism, nor does it explain the World Zionist Organisation’s endorsement of their stance. The Zionists did not fight Hitler’s rise to power, “not out of any ... cowardice, but out of their deepest conviction, which they had inherited from Herzl, that antisemitism could not be fought. Given their failure to resist during Weimar, and given their race theories, it was inevitable that they would end up as the ideological ‘jackals of Nazism’.”²²

²¹ Abraham Margalio, ‘The reaction of the Jewish public in Germany to the Nuremberg laws’, *Yad Vashem Studies*, Vol XII, p86.

²² Lenni Brenner, *op cit*, p55.

The World Zionist Organisation saw Hitler's victory in the same light as the Zionist Federation of Germany – not as a defeat for all Jews, but as positive proof of the bankruptcy of assimilationism. Their own hour was at hand ... Hitler's victory was a flail to drive stiff-necked Jews back to their own kind and their own land.

Emil Ludwig, the world-famous author and then a recent convert to Zionism, in an interview given to a fellow Zionist on his [Ludwig's] visit to America, expressed the general attitude of the Zionist movement: "Hitler will be forgotten in a few years, but he will have a beautiful monument in Palestine," adding that the "coming of the Nazis was rather a welcome thing. So many of our German Jews were hovering between two coasts; so many of them were riding the treacherous current between the Scylla of assimilation and the Charybdis of a nodding acquaintance with Jewish things. Thousands who seemed to be completely lost to Judaism were brought back to the fold by Hitler, and for that I am personally very grateful to him."²³

Ludwig's views were exactly the same as those of such veterans as the much-acclaimed Chaim Nachman Bialik, at the time considered as the Poet Laureate of Zionism. Because of his reputation, his statements enjoyed wide circulation, among the Zionists as well as their left-wing enemies. Hitlerism, he held, had saved German Jews from annihilation through assimilation. Like many of the Zionists, Bialik thought of the Jews as something of a superior race: "I, too, like Hitler, believe in the power of the blood idea."²⁴

By 1934, Zionism claimed a worldwide membership of over a million.

The Ha'avara

In early May, 1933, Chaim Arlosoroff, the political secretary of the Jewish Agency, reached a preliminary understanding with the Nazi authorities to allow Zionist émigrés to transfer some of their wealth out of Germany into Palestine in the form of farm machinery. On the Nazi side, the motivation was to weaken and defeat, through dissension within world Jewry, any resolution boycotting German goods at the then-impending Jewish Conference in London and, into the bargain, push a few thousand Jews out of Germany. This coincided with the Zionists' aims of getting German

²³ Quoted by Meyer Steinglas in 'Emil Ludwig before the judge', *American Jewish Times*, April 1936, p35.

²⁴ Chaim Bialik, 'The present hour', *Young Zionist*, London, May 1934.

Jews, especially the young and sturdy, to Palestine and to acquire funds for the project of building a Jewish state in Palestine.

Arlosoroff visited Berlin again in June, returning to Tel Aviv on 14 June, where, two nights later, he was assassinated for his dealings with the Nazis. That, however, did nothing to retard the World Zionist Organisation's accommodation with the vile Nazi regime, which announced the conclusion of the Zionist-Nazi pact on 18 June – just in time for the eighteenth Zionist congress in Prague.

In view of the Jewish hostility to this notorious pact, known as the 'Ha'avara' or Transfer Agreement, the World Zionist Organisation leadership tried to protect itself by resort to outright lying to the effect that the executive of the World Zionist Organisation had played no part in the negotiations leading to this agreement with the Nazi government. Literally nobody believed this barefaced lie.

The controversy over this agreement continued until 1935 among recriminations. All the same, the Ha'avara grew to become a sizeable banking and trading house with one hundred and thirty-seven specialists in the Jerusalem office at the peak of its activities. It was used by the Nazis as an instrument for weakening the boycott movement through damaging the considerable political and economic strength of the Jewish community by using dissension within its ranks – a notorious scheme with which the Zionist leadership went along willingly – even enthusiastically.

Moshe Beilenson, who in 1922 had been a member of a delegation that pledged Italian Zionism's loyalty to Mussolini, presented a spirited theoretical defence of the Zionist Nazi pact, saying that "verily, the eighteenth congress [of the World Zionist Organisation] had the courage to destroy the assimilationist tradition and appeals to others ... For generations we have fought by means of protests. Now we have another weapon in our hand, a strong, trusty and sure weapon: the visa to Palestine."²⁵

Thus it is clear that to the Zionists the land of Israel had assumed greater significance than the urgent needs for survival of the Jewish people. To them, emigration to Palestine had become the sole means for the survival of the Jewish people. The millions of Jews around the world, the real Jewish people, were reduced to no more than a pool out of which they would pluck out some young Jews to build their state. Jews elsewhere, in

²⁵ Moshe Beilenson, 'The new Jewish statesmanship', *Labour Palestine*, February 1934, pp8-10.

their perverse thinking, would either be driven out, as in Germany, or assimilated, as in France. It is hardly to be surprised at that with such a warped perspective on the question of survival of the Jewish people, the Zionists were increasingly driven to seek cooperation with the Nazis in an effort to bring about the realisation of their vision.

Writing on 3 July 1935 to Arthur Ruppin, director of the Colonisation Department in Palestine, in the context of the then-impending Lucerne congress of the World Zionist Organisation, Chaim Weizmann advised that the German question be not discussed at it, for such a discussion would prove “dangerous to the only positive thing we have in Germany, the intensified Zionist movement ... We, being a Zionist organisation, should concern ourselves with the constructive solution to the German question through the transfer of the Jewish youth from Germany to Palestine, rather than the question of equal rights of Jews in Germany.”²⁶

Lewis Namier, an erstwhile political secretary of the World Zionist Organisation, and a major historian of the British aristocracy, had prefaced Ruppin’s book. Knowledgeable Zionists, including Nahum Goldman, quite correctly saw him as an intense Jewish antisemite. Such was his devotion to the gentry that he despised Jews as the epitome of capitalism, of vulgar trade: “Not everyone,” he wrote, “who feels uncomfortable with regard to us must be called an antisemite, nor is there anything necessarily and inherently wicked in antisemitism.”²⁷

Doubtless the most glaring example of the World Zionist Organisation leadership’s unwillingness to offer resistance to the Nazis was the following statement by Weizmann: “The only dignified and really effective reply to all that is being inflicted upon the Jews of Germany is the edifice erected by our great and beautiful work in the Land of Israel ... Something is being created that will transform the woe we all suffer into songs and legends for our grandchildren.”²⁸

The presidium of the Lucerne congress successfully manoeuvred to keep all serious discussion of resistance to the Nazi regime off the floor of the congress. Even the leading American Zionists, such as Rabbi Stephen

²⁶ Chaim Weizmann ‘To Arthur Ruppin’, 3 July 1935, in Barnett Litvinoff, *Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Letters Vol XVI, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, 1982, p464.

²⁷ Introduction to Arthur Ruppin’s book, *Jews in the Modern World*, Macmillan, New York, 1934, pxiii.

²⁸ Barnett Litvinoff, *Weizmann – The Last of the Patriarchs*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1976, p82.

Wise and Abba Hillel Silver, who had talked a lot about boycotting German goods but done nothing in practice to organise it, capitulated to Weizmann and endorsed the Ha'avara. As a result, after the Lucerne congress there no longer were any differences between them and the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation.

Large sections of world Jewry were incensed at the decisions taken in Lucerne. London's *World Jewry*, the best Zionist magazine in the English language at that time, fiercely condemned their own world congress thus: "Dr Weizmann went as far as to state that the only dignified reply the Jews could give was a renewed effort for the upbuilding of Palestine. How terrifying the proclamation of the congress president must have sounded in the ears of Herren Hitler, Streicher and Goebbels!"²⁹

Going further, the Zionist leadership had secretly organised the extension of the Ha'avara system to other countries: through the creation of the International Trade and Investment Agency (INTRIA) Bank In London, it proposed to organise the sale of German goods directly to Britain. The Nazi regime had the satisfaction of this further demoralisation of the forces advocating the boycott, for it was the chief beneficiary of the Ha'avara. Not only did it help the Nazis to get rid of some Jews but, more importantly, it was of tremendous value, providing as it did the perfect rationale for all those who wanted the trade with Nazi Germany to continue. In Britain, Sir Oswald Mosely's newspaper, the *Blackshirt*, could barely contain its delirious joy:

"Can you beat that! We are cutting off our nose to spite our face and refuse to trade with Germany in order to defend the poor Jews. The Jews themselves, in their own country, are to continue making profitable dealings with Germany themselves. Fascists can't better counter the malicious propaganda to destroy friendly relations with Germany than by using this fact."³⁰

Basis for Zionist-Nazi collaboration

While the World Zionist Organisation's bourgeois leadership was busy making deals with the Nazis, thousands of Germans, many Jews among them, were heroically fighting in Spain against Hitler's Condor Legion and Franco's fascist army. All that the Ha'avara did was to demoralise the

²⁹ 'Kiddush Hashem', *World Jewry*, 6 September 1935, p1.

³⁰ 'Blackshirts peeved at Reich-Zion trade', *Jewish Daily Bulletin*, 6 February 1935, p5.

Jews and non-Jews alike and undermine the forces willing and ready to resist the Nazis. It effectively removed the million-strong Zionist movement from the front line of the anti-Nazi resistance, for the World Zionist Organisation, instead of resisting the Hitlerite fascists, sought to collaborate with them.

After the war and the holocaust, a contrite Nahum Goldmann, tortured by his own shameful role during the Hitler years, wrote of a dramatic meeting with the Czech foreign minister, Edward Benes, in 1935. Goldmann's graphic account of Benes' waring to the Jews says everything that needs to be said on the Ha'avara and the totally shameful failure, or rather the unwillingness, of the World Zionist Organisation to offer and organise resistance to the Nazis:

“‘Don't you understand', he shouted, 'that by reacting with nothing but half-hearted gestures, by failing to arouse world public opinion, and take vigorous action against the Germans, the Jews are endangering their future and their human rights all over the world:' I knew Benes was right ... in this context success was irrelevant. What matters in a situation of this sort is a people's moral stance, its readiness to fight back instead of helplessly allowing itself to be massacred.”³¹

The dominant ideologist on the Jewish question was the Baltic German refugee, Alfred Rosenberg, who had developed his theories while still in his native Latvia. He, correctly, was of the opinion that Zionist ideology served wonderfully as a justification for depriving Germany's Jews of their rights and that, perhaps, there was the possibility of future use of the movement for the promotion of Jewish emigration. Hitler began to touch on these themes in his speeches: on 6 July 1920 he stated that Palestine was the proper place for the Jews where alone they could hope to get their rights.

For Hitler the validity of Zionism only lay in its confirmation that Jews could never be Germans. No better proof could be adduced of “Zionism's classic role as an outrider to antisemitism” than Hitler's own statements on the subject in his *Mein Kampf*.

The SS became the most pro-Zionist element in the Nazi party. To commemorate Baron Von Mildenstein's expedition to Palestine in early 1933, Goebbels had a medal struck: on one side the swastika, on the other the Zionist star.

³¹ *Autobiography*, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969, p148.



Even the Nuremberg laws of September 1935, the finishing touches of Germany's pre-second world war anti-Jewish legislation, which the Nazis defended as an expression of their pro-Zionism, had the tacit approval of most of the Zionists. All the speakers at the World Zionist Congress in Lucerne had reiterated that the Jewry of the world were to be correctly seen as a separate people unto themselves regardless of where they lived. Well then, wrote Alfred Berndt in a commentary in the *Rundschau* of the new restrictions: all Hitler had done was to meet "the demands of the international Jewish congress by making the Jews who live in Germany a national minority".

Under the Nuremberg laws, only two flags were permitted in the Third Reich – the swastika and the blue and white Zionist banner. This greatly excited the Zionist Federation of Germany which hoped that this was a sign that Hitler was moving closer to an accommodation with them. In fact it was nothing short of a burning humiliation for the Jewish people.

Heinrich Himmler was *Reichsführer* of the SS. In 1934, his staff presented him with a 'Situation report – Jewish question' which stated that the overwhelming majority of the Jews regarded themselves as Germans and were determined to remain in the country. Since at the time, for fear of international repercussions, in order to overcome that resistance, force could not be employed, the Nazis, in order to overcome their resistance, resorted to the device of installing a distinctive Jewish identity among them by systematically promoting Jewish schools, Hebrew, Jewish art and music, etc, the hope being that it would induce the mass of Jews to abandon their German homeland. Since this formula was far from being effective, the Nazi policy was to give added support to the Zionists with a view to persuading the Jews to join the Zionist movement as a means of averting worse troubles. All Jews, Zionists included, were to be persecuted as Jews; however, within that set up it was possible to relax the pressure. Thus, on 28 January 1935, the Bavarian Gestapo sent a circular to the regular police

that from then on “members of the Zionist organisations are, in view of their activities directed towards emigration to Palestine, not to be treated with the same strictness which is necessary towards the members of the German-Jewish organisation’s [assimilationists]”.³²

The pro-Zionist Nazi policy did not bring about the desired outcome, for the World Zionist Organisation had little interest in the vast majority of German Jews, as these were not Zionists, spoke no Hebrew, were not young enough and were not possessed of the right ‘trades’.

In November 1938, the Nazis finally closed down the Zionist Federation of Germany’s headquarters after *Kristalnacht*. For their dreadful conduct the Zionists could not even assert that they had been deceived by Hitler, for his race theories and views had been there in plain German since 1926. The Zionists ignored the elephant in the room, namely, that Hitler and his party hated all Jews. The Zionists chose to ignore this fact, for they “...were simply reactionaries who ... chose to emphasise the points of similarity between themselves and Hitler. They convinced themselves that because they, too, were racists, against mixed marriage, and believed that Jews were aliens in Germany; because they, too, were opposed to the left, that these similarities would be enough to make Adolf Hitler see them as the only ‘honest partners’ for a diplomatic détente.”³³

Instead of accusing everyone at the slightest opportunity of being antisemitic, the Zionists should look into their own ideology and the entire course of the development of the Zionist movement.

³² Kurt Grossman, ‘Zionists and non-Zionists under Nazi rule in the 1930s’, *Herzl Yearbook*, Vol VI, Herzl Press, New York, 1966, p340.

³³ Brenner, *op cit*, p89.

CHAPTER 3

Genesis of Zionism

(published in the January 2017 issue of *Lalkar*)

The Zionist state of Israel, and its imperialist backers, make three assertions: first, that Jews invented Zionism; second, that Jews are a Semitic people; and third, that the state of Israel ought to be, and will remain, an exclusively Jewish state. This article deals with the first of these assertions alone, leaving the other two for subsequent treatment.

Far from being a “national liberation movement” for the “re-establishment of the Jewish people” in “their homeland and the assumption of Jewish sovereignty in the land of Israel”, as is claimed by Israel’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Zionism is much more the product of European geopolitics than the legitimate child of European Jewry.

Far from being an answer to Jewish “yearning” for Zion (Jerusalem) and a response to antisemitism, the Zionist construct dates back to the Reformation and its struggle against the authority of the Catholic Church. Rather than the Jews, it is the British who, more than anyone else, pursued the policy of Zionisation of the Jews and Judaisation of Zionism.

According to the Zionist historiography, the founding fathers of Zionism include the German Moses Hess, the Russian Leon Pinsker, and the Hungarian Theodor Herzl.

The principal claim of the Zionists is that Jews alone invented Zionism.

Bernard Lewis, lionised as the doyen of middle eastern Studies, locates Vienna as the birthplace of Zionism, Theodor Herzl as its founding father, and the publication of Herzl’s book *The Jewish State* as the beginning of the history of Zionism.³⁴

³⁴ See Lewis, *Semites and Anti-Semites: An Inquiry Into Conflict and Prejudice*, WW Norton & Company, New York, 1986, pp68-9.

Nahum Goldman, founder president of the World Jewish Congress, made the same claim in his 1978 article: ‘Zionist ideology and the reality of Israel’.³⁵

And this claim continues to be repeated by the Zionists and their imperialist backers and has acquired the force of a public prejudice. Anyone who challenges this narrative faces the charge of antisemitism from the camp of Zionism and its powerful supporters. The fear of being characterised as antisemitic accounts for a great number of people, who know better, maintaining silence on this question. Yet somehow the truth must be asserted. And the truth is that, beginning with the Reformation various schemes of colonial ‘Restoration’ – Zionist colonisation of Palestine – were the brainchild of, and developed by, non-Jewish Europeans (religious as well as atheist) long before the time of Theodor Herzl (1860-1904). Herzl’s appearance on the scene merely marked the beginning – a small beginning at that – of the Zionisation of the Jews themselves and their participation in what initially and essentially was a non-Jewish idea of Zionism.

The Reformation

The Reformation gave the call for the Bible to replace the Pope as the ultimate spiritual authority. Prior to that the notion of ‘Jewish return’ to Palestine and the concept of a ‘Jewish nation’ was alien to conventional Catholic thought. The Reformation invented these ideas and formulated a theological construct which included Jewish conversion to Christianity as a prelude the Second Coming of Christ. Stressing the Palestinian origins of Christianity, partly as a means of knocking down the pretensions of Roman Catholicism, the Protestants laid greater emphasis on the Old Testament, Biblical Israelites, and Jerusalem, in contradistinction to the New Testament, the Pope and Rome.³⁶

At the same time, principal European powers were in competition for the use of Jews and Judaism to provide a religious cover for schemes of colonising the Holy Land, which lay at the heart of the rotting Ottoman empire and the emerging Arab world.

The founder of the Reformation, Martin Luther (1483-1546), was the first to show political and theological interest in the Jews. In his pamphlet *That*

³⁵ *Foreign Affairs*, 1978:1, pp70-82.

³⁶ See L J Epstein, *Zion’s Call: Christian Contribution to the Origins and Development of Israel*, University Press of America, New York, 1984.

Jesus Christ was Born a Jew (1523), he characterised the Jews as the true-blood heirs of the Biblical Israelites and the blood relatives of Jesus. In another act of defiance towards the Pope and the Catholic Church, he caused the removal from the Old Testament of the books (Protestant Apocrypha) which were not accepted by the Jewish canon as part of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Cromwell

Protestant Judeophile tendencies, begun with Luther in Germany in 1523, continued to take root in Anglican England; these tendencies registered a new peak with the emergence of the Puritans. Cromwell's Republic in 1655 readmitted Jews to England (Edward I had expelled them in 1290 after cancelling all debts owed to them). In inviting the Jews, Cromwell was mainly motivated by his determination to move the Amsterdam Jewish merchants to London to bolster England in her trade war with Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands, whose Jewish community was famed for its wealth, commercial know-how, and business contacts.

French Revolution and Napoleon

With the French Revolution of 1789 and the subsequent rise of Napoleon, his invasion of Egypt and Palestine, and his Jewish Proclamation, English and French Zionism entered a new phase of fierce competition over European Jewry. Before Napoleon's rise, the French Revolution had already emancipated French Jews, with the French National Assembly decreeing on 24 December 1789 that non-Catholics were as eligible for all civil and military positions as were Catholic citizens. This decree forced many European Conservative governments to admit Jews to civil rights – rights which were taken back again after the fall of Napoleon.

Napoleon was determined to use the Jews throughout Europe as a fifth column. During his invasion of Egypt and Palestine (1798-99), and anticipating the capture of Jerusalem (something that did not happen), Napoleon prepared a Proclamation promising the Holy Land to the Jews, whom he characterised as “the rightful heirs of Palestine”. Anglo-French competition for the allegiance of European Jews was clearly at the bottom of this Proclamation. In 1806, Napoleon convoked an Assembly of one hundred and eleven Jewish notables from the countries of the French empire and Italy. He then invited all Jewish communities to dispatch representatives to the Great Sanhedron which eventually met in 1807. The clear purpose for gathering these notables was to use European Jews in his

war with Russia and his economic battle with Britain. While welcoming his emancipation, the Jews rejected Napoleon's Zionism. The Great Sanhedrin declared that the Jews did not form a nation and the Jews bluntly told Napoleon: "Paris is our Jerusalem."

All the same, Napoleon's endeavours in regard to the Jews were to become blueprints and forerunners of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews (1809), Leo Pinsker's ideas of a Jewish National Congress, and Herzl's schemes for a Society of Jews.

From the time of the Reformation to the rise to power of Napoleon III in France, there were no Jewish leaders in the Zionist movement – all British and French attempts to recruit them were complete failures. The non-Jewish origin of Zionism is further clear from the stark fact that the ideas of the Restoration developed first in Britain (which had hardly any Jewish population) rather than in Germany, Poland or Russia (home to most of European Jewry). Even one hundred years after Cromwell, there were only twelve thousand Jews in Britain, and it took another one hundred years for their number to reach twenty-five thousand, whereas the census of 1897 revealed 5,189,401 Jews in the Russian empire.

British Zionism

In her book *Bible and Sword*, Barbara Tuchman presents a coherent analysis of the interplay between imperial and religious considerations within British Zionism from the time of Cromwell and the Puritans through that of Palmerston and Lord Shaftesbury to that of Balfour and Weizmann. Palmerston worked closely with Lord Shaftesbury (president of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews) on British Zionist plans at a time when there was no Jewish movement prepared to 'return' to Palestine. There being no Protestants in Palestine or any other corner of the Ottoman empire, Britain was hard at work to bring Ottoman Jews under its 'protection' to counter similar Russian and French attempts to place Orthodox and Catholic Ottomans under their respective 'protections'. In March 1838, Britain appointed a vice-consul to Jerusalem, with jurisdiction over "the whole country within the ancient limits of the Holy Land". This was the first step of a meticulously worked-out plan by Britain to use Jews for imperial domination.

British Zionism faced a serious problem, namely, the voice of anti-Zionist Jews, represented in the Cabinet by Edwin Montague, the Secretary of State for India, and expressed in the press by Alexander and Montefiore, respectively the president and secretary of the Jewish Board of Deputies.

British Jewish leaders persisted in considering “Zionism as a mad delusion of an army of beggars and cranks that could only serve to undermine their hard-won rights of citizenship in western countries.”³⁷

“With the difficulty of politically persuading the Jews, the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews began to Judaize Zionism and Zionize the Jews, with more focus on Russian and eastern European Jews.”³⁸

The Society aimed to teach “the Jews their own holy books: it had an eye on the world’s entire Jewry, estimated to be around six million in 1871”.

George Gawler

Following earlier failures to involve the Jews in the Zionist project, Britain enlisted the services of Lt Colonel George Gawler (1796-1869), a committed Christian, who had served as Governor of South Australia from 1838 to 1841. During his term, he had settled British convicts to the tune of one hundred and eighty a month. With his experience in colonial settlement, he was expected to facilitate the establishment of Jewish colonies in Palestine. He visited the Holy Land in 1849, retired from the army in 1850, and founded the Association for Promoting Jewish Settlement in Palestine, which evolved into the Palestine Fund in 1852. Gawler was the first Zionist to articulate the Zionist myth that “Palestine is a land without a people” waiting for “the Jews, a people without a land”.³⁹ Great Britain, he said, ought to gain “protection for, and give protection to, all Israelites who desire to establish themselves in depopulated Palestine” and should “prepare the Jews for their future station by political elevation in England”.⁴⁰

“With the advent of steam navigation, dependent on frequent ports of call for recoaling and the completion of the Suez Canal, Zionism and the interests of world commerce began to link the establishment of depots and settlements along the route to India and China with the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.”⁴¹

³⁷ Tuchman, p333.

³⁸ Mohameden Ould-Mey, ‘The non-Jewish origins of Zionism’, *International Journal of Humanities*, Vol 1, 2003, p603.

³⁹ See Mohameden Ould-Mey, *op cit*, p605.

⁴⁰ G Gawler, *Organised Special Constables*, T&W Boone, London, 1848, p25.

⁴¹ Ould Mey, p606.

Suez Canal and the security of India

This trend was strengthened still further with the purchase of shares by Britain in the Suez Canal, thanks to deft footwork by the British prime minister, Benjamin Disraeli. British Zionist arguments and Gawler's idea regarding the "political elevation" of the Jews received a boost with the publication by George Eliot of the novel *Daniel Deronda* (1876), which presented the Jews as good and moral nationalist heroes, in contrast with their previous image as "Christ killers, apostates, moneylenders, exotic foreigners and poor immigrants".⁴² Just like Luther's pamphlet *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*, *Daniel Deronda* stressed that the Jews were descendants of the Biblical Israelites and that "a whole Christian is three-fourths a Jew". Some even went as far as to claim that *Deronda* created a Jewish nationalist spirit for Zionism and a model of inspiration for Herzl.⁴³

Non-Jewish Zionism came into existence in England long before the appearance of Jewish political Zionism. Some of the most ardent supporters of Zionism were Englishmen who visualised the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine as an instrument for serving British geopolitical interests.

Self-interest was combined, at least at the beginning, with religious obscurantism. In this scheme, although religious dogma and commercial profit nestled cheek by jowl, commercial profit took precedence. For instance, in allowing the readmission of Jews, who had been expelled by Edward I, Cromwell was primarily motivated by self-interest. The English Civil War had adversely affected England's position as a trading and maritime power. The British business and commercial class – almost exclusively Puritan and thus doctrinally very close to Judaism – was especially jealous of the Dutch who had grabbed the opportunity offered by the English Civil War to gain control over the near and far eastern trade routes. And, the Dutch Jews were particularly active in the expansion of Dutch trade during the period of the Civil War. Cromwell agreed to the readmission of the Jews precisely at the time he was busy in a series of trade wars with Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands – a country which had a considerable Jewish community known for its wealth, commercial acumen and international contacts, not to mention considerable amounts of capital that Jews would bring with them.

⁴² Epstein, *op cit*, p47.

⁴³ Nahum Sokolow, *History of Zionism 1600-1918 Vol 1*, Longmans Green & Co, London, 1919, ppxxvi-xxvii.

With British overseas expansion during the following century, the question of Jewish restoration in Palestine became increasingly entwined with imperial considerations, with the religious dogma serving as a screen for British imperial interests in Palestine.

Shaftesbury and Palmerston

At the start of the nineteenth century, Britain underwent an evangelical revival. The British ruling class, shaken to its foundations by the French revolution which it regarded as the result of rationalism, returned to the Bible and its prophecies and acceptance of the Bible as God's word. The chief propagator of this dogma was Lord Shaftesbury who regarded himself as the "Evangelical of the Evangelicals". He was the one who had the vision of a Jewish state in Palestine and occupies a pivotal place in the tradition of non-Jewish Zionism. Although based on alleged Biblical prophecies and their fulfilment, Shaftesbury preached his dogma at a politically convenient time. Jewish settlement in Palestine had become a desirable goal for Britain. The strategic location of Palestine on the route to India via Syria invested it with the importance that it deservedly received at British hands. Sensing the threat to the security of India from France and Russia, the British ruling class pursued the policy of settling Palestine with people who would look favourably upon British imperial interests. Thus began "the curious union of empire policy with a sort of paternalistic Christian Zionism which is evident in British policy in succeeding generations".⁴⁴

Lord Palmerston (British foreign secretary from 1830 to 1841 and again from 1846 to 1851, and prime minister from 1855 to 1865) was an enthusiastic advocate of Shaftesbury's ideas, but purely in terms of British imperial interests. The eastern question being his principal concern, Palmerston was partial to Shaftesbury's idea to use Jews as a British lever within the Ottoman empire.

With the advent of steam navigation in 1840, the near east became very important along the route to India as steam ships required frequent reloading and the British ships used the Mediterranean-Red Sea route with transshipment at Suez rather than the long Cape route. In view of all this, British involvement in the Jewish question was no longer a matter of political option but of political necessity. This is how Colonel George

⁴⁴ William R Polk, David M Stamler and Edmund Asfour, *Backdrop to Tragedy*, Beacon, Boston, 1957.

Gawler, the former governor of South Australia, justified the proposal for a Jewish state in Palestine:

“Divine providence has placed Syria and Egypt in the very gap between England and the most important regions of her colonial and foreign trade, India, China ... a foreign power ... would soon endanger British trade ... and it is now for England to set her hand to the renovation of Syria, through the only people whose energies will be extensively and permanently in the work – the real children of the soil, the sons of Israel.”⁴⁵

Another prominent gentile Zionist was Charles Henry Churchill, a grandson of the Duke of Marlborough and an antecedent of Winston Churchill. It was he, a non-Jew, who called upon the Jews to assert themselves as a nation, four decades before Leo Pinkser, in his *Auto-Emancipation*, announced to his Jewish co-religionists: “we must establish ourselves as a living nation”.

In 1875, Disraeli facilitated Britain’s purchase of the Khedive of Egypt’s shares in the Suez Canal Company, followed by Britain’s occupation of Egypt in 1882. Its proximity to Egypt gave Palestine added importance, both as a means of strengthening the British position in Egypt and as an overland link with the east. The new political realities brought forth a new generation of non-Jewish Zionists, who were empire builders, fully cognisant of the benefits to be derived from a British sphere of influence in the middle east.

Pro-Zionist literature from non-Jewish Zionist writers managed to create a wave of public sympathy for a British-sponsored Jewish state in Palestine. As for Jews, it was only in the 1890s that Zionism began to appear as a very small minority movement among European Jews. Jewish Zionists actively lobbied among non-Jews. Joseph Chamberlain, the colonial secretary, and Arthur Balfour, the prime minister (1902-05) and later foreign secretary (1916-19), were typical of the new non-Jewish Zionist. Chamberlain’s chief concern was the British empire. Neither Biblical prophecy nor humanitarianism was of any concern to him. Lloyd George, in whose Cabinet Balfour served as foreign secretary, was another prominent non-Jewish Zionist, whose part in the Balfour Declaration [2 November 1917] was far greater than that of Balfour. The *Zionist Review*, a semi-official organ of the Zionist movement, assigned to him “the foremost place inside the Cabinet among the architects of this great

⁴⁵ Albert Hyamson, *British Projects for the Restoration of Jews to Palestine*, American Jewish Historical Society, Philadelphia, 1918, p37.

decision”.⁴⁶ After Lloyd George became prime minister in December 1916, Zionism had nothing to fear. Other Zionists, such as Mark Sykes, Leopold Amery, Lord Milner, Robert Cecil, Col R Meinertzhagen, Harold Nicolson, General Smuts and C P Scott also held important positions from which to promote the Zionist cause.

First world war and the Balfour Declaration

As the first world war progressed, British and Zionist interests became increasingly complementary. The Jewish Zionists, Weizmann in particular, identified their own interests with those of Britain. For Britain, the acquisition of Palestine had become a non-negotiable strategic requirement. But this acquisition could not be had through open military conquest. The only choice was for Britain to align its war aims with the principle of self-determination. The Jewish Zionists came in very handy for executing such a plan. For the British, the Zionists were “the guardians in a continuity of religious and racial traditions” and a conservative force in world politics, and thus reliable. British non-Jewish Zionism found it convenient to make its entry into Palestine as a ‘trustee’ for its alleged Old Testament proprietors. Mark Sykes once wrote to Lord Robert Cecil in the following terms: “We should so order our policy that without in any way showing any desire to annex Palestine or to establish a protectorate over it, when the time comes to choose a mandatory power for its control, by consensus of opinion and desire of its inhabitants, we shall be the most likely candidates.”⁴⁷

With the Balfour Declaration providing the ideological and political basis, when the Peace Conference following the war, the defeat of Turkey and the disintegration of the Turkish empire, turned to the question of Mandates, the granting of the Palestine to Britain was a mere formality and a recognition of a *fait accompli*.

While propagating Zionism, most of the non-Jewish Zionists entertained the same prejudices as their antisemitic contemporaries. Both Chamberlain and Balfour opposed the entry into Britain of east European Jews fleeing persecution – as indeed did their Jewish-Zionist protégés. Balfour introduced and pushed through parliament the Aliens Bill that restricted Jewish immigration from eastern Europe to Britain, for reasons of “undoubted evils that had fallen upon the country from an immigration

⁴⁶ December 1917, p214.

⁴⁷ Shane Leslie, *Mark Sykes. His Life and Letters*, Cassell, London, 1923.

that was largely Jewish⁴⁸. Earlier still, when Jews in England were fighting for their civil emancipation, Lord Shaftesbury spoke against the 1858 Emancipation Act. It can thus clearly be seen that Zionism and antisemitism are complementary and reinforce each other. The most glaring example of this cohabitation doubtless remains the Nazi-Zionist collaboration as outlined in a previous *Lalkar* article.

Official Zionist historiography disseminated by the state of Israel ignores the critical role played by Britain in the rise of Herzlian Zionism. In so doing, Zionist narrative has attempted to get everyone to focus on the state of Israel as a given and to present Herzlian Zionism as a national liberation movement of the Jews, by the Jews and for the Jews. This is clearly not the case.

The British empire sponsored the political project of Zionism from the early 1800s, if no earlier.

Historic homeland of Jews

The Jewish question (Jews living among non-Jews) arose in Russia at the end of the eighteenth century consequent upon many geographic, historical and geopolitical factors. The area between the Caspian Sea, the Black Sea and the Baltic Sea has been a meeting place for ancient and medieval Asian and European migrations. It has been the historic homeland for most of the world Jewry for over a thousand years since the centre of gravity of Jews moved from the medieval Khazar empire to the modern Pale of Settlement following the Mongol invasion of Russia and eastern Europe. The concentration of world Jewry in this area, and successive partitions of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century, proved to be significant landmarks in the birth of the Jewish question in Russia and the rest of Europe.

Several medieval geographers and modern historians have studied the rise and fall of the Jewish Khazar empire (following the mass conversion of Turkic Khazars to Judaism) in southern Russia between the eighth and tenth centuries. The Khazar power went into decline after the defeat of the Khazar army by Sviatoslav, Duke of Kiev, in 960. Whatever remained of the Khazar empire was put an end to by Genghis Khan's invasion of Russia in 1218, which led to the dispersal of Khazar Jews between the Caspian and Baltic Seas – the actual historical homeland of contemporary Jews. As the Khazar Jews moved out of their shtetls in the Russian and central Asian

⁴⁸ House of Commons, 10 July 1905, official records.

stepped to the towns and cities of eastern Europe in the process they lost their cohesive identity as Khazar, retaining merely their religion and other traditions.

It must be this historical fact that led Arthur Koestler (a Hungarian Ashkenazi Jew) to argue in his book *The Thirteenth Tribe: The Khazar Empire and its Heritage* that Ashkenazic Jews are the descendants of the Khazars. Equally, it must have led Paul Wexler, Tel Aviv University professor, to write three books namely, *The Ashkenazic Jews: A Slavo-Turkic People in Search of a Jewish Identity*; *The Non-Jewish Origins of the Sephardic Jews*; and *Two-Tiered Relexification in Yiddish: Jews, Sorbs, Khazars and the Kiev-Polessian Dialect*. In these he argues that the Ashkenazi Jews are predominantly of Slavo-Turkic stock rather than Palestinian Jewish emigrants, while Sephardic Jews are mainly of Berber and Arab descent.

Be that as it may, the Zionists consider such research as taboo – even antisemitic. In this context, the Zionists were instrumental in the establishment in 1980 of the International Association of Jewish Genealogical Societies (AIJGS) to elevate Jewish genealogy among Jewish people and in the academic community, with the aim of containing the increasing global awareness of the nonsemitic origins of contemporary Jews and emerging evidence about their Khazar ancestry.

The Jewish question arose in Russia after many partitions of Poland (in 1772, 1793 and 1795) between the Russian, Prussian and Austrian empires. Having destroyed Poland, the partition resulted in the transfer of the largest Jewish communities to Russian rule – the geographic areas of what came to be known later as the Jewish Pale of Settlement.

According to the 1857 Russian census, ninety-five percent of the 5,189,401 Jews of the Russian empire were concentrated in the twenty-five provinces of the Jewish Pale of Settlement and Russian Poland. Russia's policy of Russification, which put restrictions on non-Russian languages and cultures, inflicted the worst suffering upon Muslim Tatars and Jewish Khazars. Many of the restrictions – residential and occupational – on the Jews were inspired by prejudice. As a result, leaving aside the wealthy, the highly skilled, and some long-term soldiers, the Russian Jews were confined to the Jewish Pale of Settlement. They were habitually accused of not taking to agriculture, exploiting the peasantry through the practice of moneylending, purveying liquor to drunken peasants, evading military service, and engaging in disaffection.

The Jewish question came to the forefront of Russian politics and geopolitics following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, for which Jews were blamed. The discriminatory nature of the May 1882 laws provided Britain with a kind of moral and political leverage to directly interfere in Russian affairs on behalf of Russian Jews through the organisation of a number of public meetings in London focusing on the Jewish question in Russia. Throughout the 1880s, the British maintained pressure on the Russians in relation to the Jewish question. In due course, having come into a position to take the debate on the Jewish question into Russia, they shifted the thrust of their diplomatic discourse from simply expressing their views on the May 1882 laws to a direct official representation for the annulment of those laws against the Jews, whom they started calling 'Israelites', in tune with an increasingly aggressive policy of Zionisation of the Jews and Judaisation of Zionism.

British Zionisation of Russian Jews and Judaisation of Zionism

The assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 and the rumoured 'Russian solution' (one third of the Jews to be converted to Christianity, one third to emigrate, and one third to perish) to the 'Jewish problem', provided the British with a pretext and opportunity to establish closer organisational, missionary, and more significantly political contacts with eastern European and Russian Jewry so as to Zionise the latter's aspirations and redirect their migratory movement away from the Americas to Palestine. (All the same, between 1870 and 1914 about two million east European Jews migrated westward to the Americas).

While the question of using Jews in the interests of the British empire had been discussed by Lord Palmerston and Queen Victoria as early as 1839, a concrete proposal for a settler colonial movement aimed at making Palestine a British sponsored state for world Jewry only came about with Colonel Gawler's plan which called for the Zionisation of Judaism and Judaisation of Zionism. The person chosen by the British establishment to take this mission to the Jews of eastern Europe and Russia was Wilhelm Henry Hechler (1845-1931).

Following the 1881 events in Russia and the 1882 London public meetings in support of Russian Jews, Lord Temple and Lord Shaftesbury sent William Hechler to meet the leaders of eastern European and Russian Jewry in Odessa and propagate Zionism as the only solution to the carefully-engineered problem of 'antisemitism' as opposed to the more familiar one of 'Judeophobia' at the time. Hechler met Leo Pinsker and told him that he had forgotten to mention in his pamphlet, *The Auto-*

Emancipation, God's Promise to Abraham and His Children. This is how the British establishment began to inject its Zionism into an otherwise local and natural emancipation movement of eastern European Jewry in its own ancestral homeland.

The Hechler-Pinsker encounter was instrumental in the founding of the Society for the Promotion of the Love of Zion and the Lovers of Zion movement. Initially Pinsker's auto-emancipation movement was a non-Zionist movement seeking a solution for the Jewish question in Russia through independence of the Jewish Pale of Settlement or mass migration to the Americas – not Palestine. He considered Judeophobia, rather than antisemitism, as the problem presented by the Jewish question (Pinsker concluded his pamphlet by emphasising that a Jewish settler state would require a propelling force for migration, a territory to be conquered, and the backing of imperial powers, notably the British to sponsor it).

Pinsker rejected Hechler's Zionism, saying: "The goal of our present endeavours must not be the Holy Land, but a land of our own."

Hechler's visit to Odessa appears to have influenced many Jewish leaders in Russia and eastern Europe to rethink their auto-emancipation as well as their plans for emigration to north America. To carry on his unceasing attempt at impregnating Russian and eastern European Jews with ideas of Zionism, Hechler moved to Vienna, teaching at the University of Vienna and working in the British Embassy there in 1882. After meeting Hechler in Odessa, Pinsker began to entertain some sympathy for Zionism and became the president of the Lovers of Zion.

Hechler had close connections with Theodor Herzl from 1896, the year Herzl published *Der Judenstaat*, until the latter's death in 1904. Having read Herzl's book, Hechler was ecstatic and hurried to tell the British Ambassador Monson that "the fore-ordained movement is here!" Hechler took an active part in the first Zionist congress in Basle, Switzerland, in August 1897. He cannot have failed to have been disappointed when in 1903 the sixth World Zionist Congress, under the leadership of Israel Zangwill, backed by Herzl, voted (295-178) against Palestine and in favour of Uganda as a homeland for the Jews. Hechler was one of the last to see Herzl as he was dying at the Sanatorium in Edlach in early July 1904.

Beyond tutoring Herzl on Zionism, Hechler, a British agent motivated by imperial and religious considerations, was indispensable to Herzl politically, for he introduced Herzl and Zionism to the German Emperor,

the Russian Tsar, the Ottoman Sultan, the Pope and two Russian ministers (Plehve and Witte), and many other important people.

To secure their support, both Hechler and Herzl were offering the German Kaiser and the Russian tsar the prospect that Zionism would help solve the Jewish question by simultaneously weakening the Jewish-led revolutionary and democratic movements in Europe and Russia as well as the power of international Jewish capital. Herzl wrote thus with regard to the socioeconomic position of the Jews in Europe:

“We have attained pre-eminence in finance, because medieval conditions drove us to it. The process is now being repeated. We are again being forced into finance, now it is the stock exchange, by being kept out of other branches of economic activity. Being on the stock exchange, we are consequently exposed afresh to contempt. At the same time we continue to produce an abundance of mediocre intellectuals who find no outlet, and this endangers our social position as much as does our increasing wealth. Educated Jews without means are now rapidly becoming Socialists. Hence we are certain to suffer very severely in the struggle between classes, because we stand in the most exposed position in the camps of both Socialists and capitalists.”⁴⁹

A mere two decades later, the ideas expressed by Herzl in the above paragraph appear to have been borrowed by the vile Nazis when they portrayed and stereotyped the Jews as being the dominant force among the ‘red’ communists and the ‘gold’ capitalists.

In addition to offering to his would-be sponsors the tantalising prospect of ridding them of the revolutionary menace and competition from Jewish capitalists, Herzl, with barely concealed racism and European chauvinism, stated that the Jewish state would “form a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilisation as opposed to barbarism”.

Herzl was never a religious person and once said that religion “is a fantasy that holds people in its grip”.⁵⁰ He had no preference for a particular territory for the Jews, merely desiring Jewish ‘sovereignty’ over a portion of the globe, as strip of territory. As to the choice between Palestine and Argentina, Herzl wrote: “We shall take what is given to us.”

⁴⁹ Herzl, *The Jewish State*.

⁵⁰ Yoram Hazoni, *The Jewish States: The Struggle For Israel's Soul*, Basic Books, New York, 2000.

In the light of the foregoing, we cannot but agree with the following conclusion of Mohameden Ould Mey: “Jews did not invent Zionism. Rather Zionism invented the Jews, though not all Jews are Zionist and not all Zionists are Jews. During the Reformation and mercantilist era, Protestants were interested in Jews as ammunition against the Catholics and leaders of the interest-based rising capitalist sector. Martin Luther’s Jewish-friendly writings in 1523, Oliver Cromwell’s readmission of the Jews to England in 1655, and the quasi-Judaization of the Puritans are graphic examples. With the Industrial Revolution and the European Enlightenment, Napoleon boosted the emancipation of the Jews in an attempt to estrange them from their European and Ottoman rulers as part of his unsuccessful plans to destroy the power of England and Russia and dominate Europe. After Napoleon, the British articulated a complex set of imperialist and religious motives designed to make the Eastern Question fit the Jewish Question. Obviously all of this took place before the alleged founder of Zionism (Herzl) was born in 1860, as well as before antisemitism was encouraged as a propelling machine for Zionism. With the change of Zionism’s guardianship and custody from Britain to the United States in the aftermath of the second world war, Zionism continues to be a geopolitical configuration (rather than a national reality), which facilitates western multilateral hegemony over the Arab world’s strategic location (straits and waterways), cultural heritage (antique and Biblical history), economic resources (oil reserves and business contracts), and possible unification schemes ...”⁵¹

The continuing imperialist obsession with disarming every middle eastern country while preserving Israel’s weapons of mass destruction is an illustration of such continuity.

From its inception, Zionism has been a geopolitical construct. Today it presents the ‘Nazi holocaust’ against the Jews in Europe as the historical explanation and the moral justification for the ‘Zionist holocaust’ against the Palestinians.

If Zionism were a genuine national liberation movement, as is claimed by the Zionists and their imperialist backers, it is pertinent to ask: why did it not seek to liberate the Jewish Pale of Settlement (home to most Jews) in Russia? Likewise the question arises as to why, when contemporary Zionism claims to be exclusively Jewish, are its origins traceable to non-Jewish debates and writings of late nineteenth century England? What claim can Zionism make to Palestine that the Palestinians can’t make with

⁵¹ Ibid, p607.

much greater force? In the name of what can Zionism justify the expulsion, dispossession, dispersal, and oppression of millions of Palestinians on the basis of ancient, medieval and modern atrocities inflicted in Europe by some Europeans against their Jewish populations? What are the prospects of Zionism in view of Israel's rejection of the UN-backed Right of Return for the Palestinians while simultaneously justifying its own existence on the arbitrary law of 'Return'?

As things stand, the Zionist state of Israel, through its occupation of territories it captured in the 1967 war, its continued colonisation and settlement building, has to all intents and purposes scuppered the two-state solution. That being the case, it will either have to impose its rule over the Palestinians through a system of brutal apartheid or grant them rights as equal citizens in a binational state. Either way, it puts paid to the Zionist dream of an exclusively Jewish – not to say theocratic and racist – state. Of these two options, the Zionists are likely to choose the former. History provides sufficient proof that such a state of affairs cannot be maintained indefinitely. It must break down in the face of Palestinian resistance and the fatigue of never-ending war between the oppressors and the oppressed.

CHAPTER 4

The non-Semitic origins of modern Jewry

(published in the March 2017 issue of Lalkar)

The Zionist claim to the territory of Palestine bases itself on the premise that according to the Old Testament of the Bible, taken literally, God promised that land to the Jews after they escaped from slavery in Egypt. Not only did God promise the land to the Jews but he promised it to them for all eternity. And, it would seem, God promised the land to all the people who were ethnically Jewish regardless of whether or not they actually practised, or even believed in, the Jewish religion. How odd of God! On that basis, not only, according to the Zionists, were the German and east European Jews who took possession of Palestine under the aegis of British imperialism perfectly entitled to do so, and not only were people professing to be of Jewish ethnicity from all parts of the world entitled to settle in the territory, but they were also entitled to displace all the non-Jewish – ie, the Arab – inhabitants of the area. It has to be said that if everybody in the world had a right to reclaim territory from which any of their ancestors, however remote, were expelled, this would lead to chaos. How many non-Indian American citizens would be prepared to return to Europe in order to leave the United States to its rightful owners, the Indians? How many Australians would be prepared to leave Australia to its original aboriginal inhabitants? We are sure that the majority of Americans and Australians, who would never dream of questioning Israel's 'right to exist' at the expense of the Arabs it has displaced and is intent on further displacing as far as possible, would equally resist the right of the descendants of the original inhabitants of those countries to take back possession of the territories that were once the exclusive preserve of their ancestors. The whole idea is so absurd that nobody ever even raises it.

From this it follows that the idea of the territory of Palestine 'belonging' to the Jews is equally absurd. However, the interests of the Almighty (meaning not God but US imperialism), backed up by the highly-paid

apologists and propagandists of imperialism in academia and the media, to say nothing of imperialism's financial and military force, demand the silencing of all or anyone who pronounces that the emperor has no clothes.

Be that as it may, research into history, archaeology, linguistics and genetics is consistently discovering that there is virtually no connection between modern Jewry and the territory of Palestine. Some of this research has been brought together in a 2005 paper by Mohameden Ould Mey (the pseudonym of Mohamed Elmey Elyassini), associate professor of geography in the Department of Earth and Environmental Systems at Indiana State University, entitled 'The non-Semitic origins of contemporary Jews' which considerably informs this article.

Tenets of Zionism

As is well known, Zionist claim that 'Eretz Israel', the whole of the land bounded on the north by river Euphrates, the east by the river Jordan, the south by the river Nile and the west by the Mediterranean Sea, is the rightful inheritance of all Jews rests on the idea that all Jews are the descendants of the people who lived in the region in Biblical times. Supposedly these non-Arab people escaped from slavery in Egypt and captured the area from the Canaanites who were effectively exterminated to enable the Jews to set up their original Jewish state. Although in due course they were overwhelmed by the Babylonians and their powerful families were exiled to Babylon, they were allowed to return round about the year 583 BC and remained until expelled by the Romans in AD 73. Having 'owned' the land for so many years, the Jews should never have been driven out and have retained a right to return throughout history. Of course the Jewish claim to the area requires acceptance of the idea that during that period, or at least during a substantial part of it, Jews had a self-governing and sovereign state of their own in the area, whose capital was a thriving Jerusalem. It also requires acceptance that Jews are all or for the most part descended from the Jews who supposedly took it over as the Promised Land after escaping from slavery in Egypt and who, after a period exiled to Babylon, returned to dominate the area for centuries before being expelled by the Romans. Finally, it requires acceptance that Jews are a race separate and apart from any other people who at any time inhabited the area who naturally have no such 'right of return' – a race whose membership depends on being born of a Jewish mother and certainly not on one's religious beliefs. Hence there is no bar on atheists being regarded by Zionists as Jews provided their mothers were racially Jewish too.

The whole of the Zionist narrative, however, is constantly being exposed as inconsistent with historical truth as a result of ongoing historical, archaeological, linguistic and genetic studies.

Biblical ‘history’

To start with there is no trace of Jews ever having been enslaved in Egypt – for all the strenuous efforts that have been made to find such. What is true is that for centuries all or some of the area of ‘Eretz Israel’ was under the control of the Egyptians, and in fact it may have been from the Egyptians that the first Jews took their religion (though not necessarily in Palestine – see below). In around 1350 BC, the Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaten attempted to introduce monotheism into the Pharaonic religion that had already for centuries been placing its various gods in a hierarchy in relation to each other, the order of which kept changing for whatever reasons. Akhenaten concluded that it would be better just to have the one God – with a consequent reduction in the number and power of parasitic priests – rather than several. There were obviously important opponents to this idea among the traditionalists and immediately after Akhenaten died his successor, Tutankhamun, restored polytheism. Nevertheless it is possible to speculate that Akhenaten’s views had a measure of popular support; and that these views would have become current not only in Egypt itself but also in territories such as Palestine which it controlled and/or Arabia where it traded (in 2010, a Pharaonic inscription dating from the twelfth century BC was unearthed near the ancient oasis city of Tayma, evidence of major trade networks crossing the region at the time). It seems quite possible that the Jewish religion evolved as a monotheistic variant of the Pharaonic religion that was popularised among certain of the Arab people, who may have been joined or even inspired by Egyptian followers of Akhenaten escaping the wrath of the traditionalists. Of course, all this is conjecture, but all the same it is more consistent with facts than Biblical mythology.

One hole in this conjecture is a fact that is even more damaging to the veracity of Zionist mythology, namely that neither historians nor archaeologists have been able to find any evidence to support the idea that there was any major Jewish presence in the area of Palestine at the time of their supposed return from Babylon. The area was visited by the Greek historian Herodotus around the middle of the fifth century BC and he “did not notice an Israelite or Jewish presence in that land, nor did the existence

of a Jerusalem or Judah there attract his attention”.⁵² Kamal Salibi, seeing that the enthusiastic Biblical research archaeologists frantically trying to dig up evidence of the truth of the Bible were getting nowhere with establishing the Jewish presence on Palestinian soil, has speculated that the area originally inhabited by Jewish people was not Palestine at all but instead a slightly larger region in southern Arabia with a coast on the Red Sea rather than the Mediterranean, with Biblical references to the Jordan as a boundary not actually meaning the River Jordan – nowhere is any river mentioned – but instead the Sarawat mountains. It is also probable that the area inhabited at the time by Canaanites (Phoenicians) could just as easily have been south Arabia as Palestine. The Bible claims Jewish refugees from Egypt annihilated the Canaanites, but modern research suggests that in fact the Jews of the time were all Canaanites who adopted monotheism.⁵³ At any rate, archaeologists have been unable to turn up any differences between the artefacts dating from before and after the Jews were supposed to have annihilated the Canaanites such as one would expect to find if one civilisation replaced another in any given area.

What is reasonably well established is that in the second century BC some Jews from Babylon did establish themselves on the territory of what is now called Eretz Israel, where they established the Hasmonean kingdom under Simon Maccabaeus. It has been argued that they did so as agents of Babylon put in place to control the local population for the benefit of their masters, and that therefore there was no way that this state was either Jewish or sovereign. Their language at this time switched from Hebrew to Aramaic, suggesting that they were nothing but a minority in an Aramaic speaking area. In any event this state lasted barely eighty years, until the Romans took over around 63 BC. And even if Palestine had been the real place of settlement of the first people who embraced the Jewish religion, it should be noted that they did not rule it since the area was subject to the Persians from 539 BC to 332 BC and the Greeks from 332 BC until 167 BC.

All in all, the historic case for claiming that Palestine is a Jewish homeland promised to the Jewish people by God himself is weak in the extreme!

⁵² See Kamal Salibi, *The Historicity of Biblical Israel: Studies in 1 & 2 Samuel*, NABU Publications, London, 1998.

⁵³ See Israel Finkelstein – of Tel Aviv University – and Neil Asher Silberman – Ename Centre for Public Archaeology, Belgium, *The Bible Unearthed*, The Free Press (Simon & Schuster), New York, 2002.

Most modern Jews are not even Semites

According to Zionist legend, when the Romans destroyed the Jewish temple in Jerusalem in 70 AD, the Jewish population of Palestine emigrated en masse, and modern Jews are descended from these migrants. In actual fact, however, there is no evidence of any such mass migration. Certainly the Jewish population of the area waned in the following centuries, but this was much more likely to have been through conversion of Jews to Christianity or, later on, to Islam. The Jewish populations that popped up in other parts of the world are for the most part converts from among the local populations. Nowadays Zionism favours the view that Jews constitute a race into which you have to be born if you are to be a member, and therefore proselytization would be meaningless. However, this was not always so and indeed the most authoritative Jewish religious texts contain exhortations to the Jews to spread the word everywhere. That being the case, Jewish missionaries are known to have travelled to different parts of the world to carry what they believed to be the word of God.

“Noted historians and scholars tell us that missionary policies extended well past the biblical era. They trace strong missionary activity on the part of the Jewish community throughout the Second Temple period and beyond, and the Latin and Greek literature substantiate it. The Idumeans, Moabites and Itureans converted in 140 BCE. In the later Second Temple period, Josephus cites numerous Jewish converts in Antioch. According to twentieth-century Jewish historian, Salo Baron, as much as ten percent of the population of ancient Rome was composed of Jews, many of whom were converts ...

“Missionizing that began in Torah times did not end with the Christianization of the Roman empire. Even in those pockets of paganism surrounded by Christian or Islamic nations, there was unencumbered proselytization. Among the pagan converts were the Khazars in the Caucasus (eighth century) and the Aksunite Kingdom of Ethiopia from whom emerged the Falashas.

“Proselytizing continued throughout the Crusades almost up to the Reformation.”⁵⁴ This Jewish proselytization activity only seems to have come to an end as a result of the victimisation of Jews that arose later in medieval Christian states where the ruling classes depended on the universal observance of the official state religion as the means of

⁵⁴ Susan Perlman, ‘When Jews were proselytizers’ on the *Jews for Jesus* website, <https://jewsforjesus.org/issues-v09-n10/when-jews-were-proselytizers>.

maintaining their ideological control over the oppressed masses and would not brook the ideological competition offered by Judaism.

It is clear therefore that the number of Jews descended from the original middle eastern Jewish community dwindled, while those who were converts from completely separate communities increased exponentially. This is why today most Jews are not actually what is called ‘Semitic’.

Meaning of ‘Semitic’

The word ‘Semitic’ is in fact extremely ideologically charged. As a word it was invented by eighteenth-century linguists to describe a group of related languages spoken mainly in the middle and near east. These languages included both Biblical Hebrew (which was by then a dead language), Arabic and Aramaic. The word was then extended, in the way words are, to cover a somewhat different concept, ie, the people who spoke those languages as their mother tongue. Had language usage remained there, no harm would have been done. However, the word was then co-opted to give credence to the idea that those people to whom it applied formed a racially distinct group. This extension was all the easier because of the derivation of the word from the name of Shem, one of the three sons of Noah. Bearing in mind that according to the Bible no human beings were left in the world following the great flood other than Noah and his family, all people on earth had to be descended from Noah’s progeny. According to the Bible, those descended from Shem were the people of the middle east, including the Jews; those descended from his brother Ham were the Africans; and those descended from his brother Japheth were the Persians and Europeans. This accounted for all the types of person that the pastoralists of the Arabian peninsula were likely to have come across at the time the Old Testament was written, and it amounts to an early categorisation of people into different ‘races’ according to certain physical genetic characteristics common to people from different geographical areas. Again, this might not have been harmful of itself had the concept of ‘race’ not come to include characteristics of the culture of people from different geographical areas, and perceived differences of personal value in people of these different ‘races’, as if these were as genetically programmed as hair type, skin colour, etc.

Interestingly, by any definition Arabs must be included in the concept of ‘Semitic’ peoples. That being the case, there are none so antisemitic as Israeli Jews a majority of whom are utterly convinced that Arabs are *untersmenschen*, inferior beings.

Using language to trace the real origins of modern Jewry

It is not generally known that the Hebrew currently spoken in Israel and in use in current Jewish religious practices is not Semitic. Although it uses vocabulary and script similar to those used in Biblical Hebrew, it is structurally Slavic and not Semitic, having been derived from Yiddish and not from Biblical Hebrew. This has been demonstrated by Paul Wexler, Professor Emeritus of Linguistics at Tel Aviv University, whose work has been dismissed as ‘pseudo-scientific’ by the academic establishment but whose arguments are nevertheless strongly supported by available evidence. He argues that the proselytizers who took the Jewish religion to parts of the world where it was avidly adopted also brought the Semitic language and script of the Bible, all enthusiastically adopted by local populations, although it was a dead language that nobody knew how to speak any more. However, the way the Biblical language was written, using only consonants and no vowels, precluded these populations from knowing very much about the grammar or even the syntax of Biblical Hebrew since these were not fully apparent from the texts, so they merely transferred to their own languages the vocabulary of the Semitic language and not its structure. Indeed, Wexler’s linguistic studies convinced him that: “All contemporary forms of Judaism and Jewish culture are relatively recently ‘Judaized’.”⁵⁵



Wexler’s thesis is that modern Hebrew is derived from Yiddish, and that Yiddish is structurally a Slavic language that absorbed a German vocabulary after the break-up of the Khazar state, which was at its height genuinely a Jewish state following mass conversion of Khazars to

⁵⁵ P Wexler, *The Non-Jewish Origin of Sephardic Jews*, State University of New York Press, Albany, 1996.

Judaism. It existed from c650 to c1048 and was situated between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea and to the north of them, within the territory of what is now Georgia and Armenia. During the period of the Khazar state, the Jewish community of Slav and Turkic converts gradually came to adopt the local Sorbic language, a language still spoken in parts of eastern Germany to this day. This was a language that was part of the Slavic group of languages. When Khazaria was overwhelmed and broken up by a Russo-Byzantine alliance, many of the Turkic Jewish converts inhabiting the area were forced to migrate to the Pale of Settlement situated in large part in territories inhabited by native speakers of German. At this point a German vocabulary became gradually incorporated into the Slavic structure of the language spoken by the Khazaris, which language became known as Yiddish, which, despite its German vocabulary, is nevertheless a Slavic and an Indo-European language.

Modern Hebrew was artificially pieced together by scholars starting from a Yiddish base into which a Hebrew vocabulary was incorporated and is therefore itself a Slavic, not a Semitic, language.

As far as Wexler is concerned, the linguistic evidence is incontrovertible that those of modern Jewry who are descendants from the Jewish people who lived for centuries in eastern Europe are certainly not descended from the original Jewish inhabitants of the middle east.

Genetic research

Genetic research also tends to support this thesis.

Nicholas Wade reported on 27 September 2003 in the *New York Times* that geneticists had found a large genetic similarity among Ashkenazi Jews with those of populations inhabiting central Asia: “A team of geneticists studying the ancestry of Jewish communities has found an unusual genetic signature that occurs in more than half the Levites of Ashkenazi descent. The signature is thought to have originated in central Asia, not the near east, which is the ancestral home of Jews.”⁵⁶

Several geneticists have been forced to the same conclusion.

In addition, another research paper showed that the genes of Jews whose families have been based in the middle east from time immemorial are genetically almost identical to those of Palestinian Arabs (not to those of Jewry elsewhere). Such was the furore caused by this finding that the paper

⁵⁶ ‘Geneticists report finding central Asian link to Levites’.

was pulled out of publication in the leading journal *Human Immunology* because “it challenges the claim that Jews are a special chosen people and that Judaism can only be inherited”.⁵⁷

Conclusion

Mohameden Ould Mey offers towards the end of his article several conclusions which *Lalkar* cannot but endorse, including these three main ones:

“First, the Jewish Semitic claim made by the Zionists in the name of contemporary Jews remains unsubstantiated according to scholarly findings in history, archaeology, linguistics and genetics. Second, the Semitic claim is essentially used to justify the dispossession, displacement, and impersonation of the Palestinians by Jewish settlers in one of the most complex forms of cultural identity theft. Third, even if contemporary Jews were actually ‘Semitic’, this will not justify their dispossession of the Palestinians who have nothing to do with any past, present, actual or alleged persecution of Jews in Europe or anywhere else in the world.”

⁵⁷ R McKie, ‘Journal axes gene research on Jews and Palestinians’, *The Observer*, 25 November 2001.

CHAPTER 5

Nazi-Zionist collaboration

(published in the July 2017 issue of Lalkar)



Kastner



Eichmann

Claims of Nazi-Zionist collaboration are not antisemitic fantasies, as Zionists will have everyone believe. They are based on historical facts and material long accepted as an integral part of serious literature on this question, and which has been legally available in the state of Israel. Crucially, most of the English language literature on this question was written by Jews, including prominent Zionists.

No serious student of history can be in doubt that some Zionists, including the top leaders of the Zionist movement, collaborated with the Nazis and went to the extent of rendering assistance to them to exterminate huge numbers of Jewish people.

Israel has on its statute book a special law to deal with exactly these types of people, which uniquely applies to crimes committed beyond the territory of Israel and to crimes committed prior to the establishment of the Israeli state. This law provides for the death penalty and is exempt from the statute of limitations. In all fairness, many high-ranking Israeli leaders, being proven collaborators with the Nazis, ought to have been tried under this law and executed on conviction.

Dr Hannah Arendt, who was by no means either left wing or pro-Palestinian but was a supporter of the existence of Israel as a Jewish state, dealt with some of the issues involved in her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. She wrote that during the early years of the Nazi regime, Hitler's rise to power was regarded by the Zionists mainly as "the decisive defeat of assimilationism". Hence they could, argued the Zionists, cooperate with the Nazi authorities because they too, like the Nazis, believed in "dissimilation ... combined with emigration to Palestine of Jewish youngsters and, they hoped, Jewish capitalists"; such a policy could be the basis of a "mutually fair solution". All leading posts in the Nazi-appointed Reichsvereinigung (Reich Association of Jews in Germany) were held by Zionists, as opposed to the authentically Jewish Reichsvertretung, which included Zionists as well as non-Zionists, for "Zionists, according to the Nazis, were 'the decent' Jews since they too thought in 'national terms'. In those years there existed "a mutually highly satisfactory agreement between the Nazi authorities and the Jewish Agency for Palestine – a 'Ha'avarah', or transfer agreement". As a result, in the Thirties, when American Jews tried to organise a boycott of German merchandise, Palestine of all places was swamped with all kinds of goods 'made in Germany'.

Arendt goes on to say: "Of greater importance for Eichmann were the emissaries from Palestine," who came in order to "enlist help for the illegal immigration of Jews into British-ruled Palestine, and both the Gestapo and the SS were helpful ... They negotiated with Eichmann in Vienna, and they reported that he was 'polite', and that he even provided them with farms and facilities for setting up vocational training camps for prospective immigrants." For these emissaries from Palestine, their main enemy "was not those who made life impossible for Jews in the old countries, Germany or Austria, but those who barred access to the new homeland: that enemy was definitely Britain, not Germany".

And further: "they were probably among the first Jews to talk openly about mutual interests and were certainly the first to be given permission to pick young Jewish prisoners from among the Jews in concentration camps ... they too somehow believed that if it was a question of selecting Jews for survival, the Jews should do the selecting themselves. It was this ... that eventually led to a situation in which the non-selected majority of Jews

inevitably found themselves confronted with two enemies – the Nazi authorities and the Jewish authorities.”⁵⁸

Dr Arendt gives a heart-wrenching account of the officials of Judenrat (Jewish Councils – a widely used administrative agency imposed by the Nazis during World War Two, predominantly within the ghettos in Nazi-occupied Europe and the Jewish ghettos in German-occupied Poland), the cruelty they displayed towards fellow Jews in their collaboration with the murderous Nazi machine. “To a Jew,” she wrote, “this role of the Jewish leaders in the destruction of their own people is undoubtedly the darkest chapter of the whole dark story.”⁵⁹

Dr Arendt concluded that without this collaboration many lives could have been saved:

“But the whole truth was that there existed Jewish community organisations and Jewish party and welfare organisations on both the local and international level. Wherever Jews lived, there were recognised Jewish leaders and this leadership, almost without exception, cooperated in one way or another, for one reason or another, with the Nazis. The whole truth was that if the Jewish people had really been unorganised and leaderless, there would have been chaos and plenty of misery but the total number of victims would hardly have been between four and a half and six million people.”⁶⁰

Dr Arendt’s book initially received sympathetic response from the Israeli press. However, almost immediately the Zionist propaganda machine went into overdrive to attack it savagely as the “concept about Jewish participation in the Nazi holocaust ... may plague the Jews for years to come”.⁶¹

On 11 March 1963, the B’nai Brith Anti-Defamation League released a ‘summary’ guideline to “book reviewers and others when the volume appears” which accused Dr Arendt of saying, *inter alia*: “That Europe’s Jewish organisations in the main, played a ‘disastrous role’ by cooperating with the Nazi extermination machine. *As a result the Jews, themselves, bear a large share of the blame*”. In essence, Dr Arendt was accused of

⁵⁸ Dr Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Viking Press, New York, 1963, pp59-61

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, pp117-9.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p125.

⁶¹ Hannah Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah*, Grove Press, New York, 1978.

putting forward the thesis “that the Jews had murdered themselves”. (Our emphasis.)⁶²

This line of attack was repeated by nearly every reviewer of Arendt’s book. The response of the Zionist establishment to Arendt’s book is typical of its reaction whenever questions about Nazi-Zionist cooperation crop up. This is how Dr Arendt, in *The Jew as Pariah*, describes the campaign against her.

“No one will doubt the effectiveness of modern image-making and no one acquainted with Jewish organisations and their countless channels of communication outside their immediate range will underestimate their possibilities in influencing public opinion. For greater than their direct power of control is the voluntary outside help upon which they can draw from Jews who, though they may not be at all interested in Jewish affairs, will flock home, as it were, out of age-old fears (no longer justified, let us hope, but still very much alive) when their people or its leaders are criticised. What I had done according to their lights was the crime of crimes. I had told ‘the truth in a hostile environment,’ as an Israeli official told me, and what the ADL and all the other organisations did was to hoist the danger signal.”⁶³

The campaign, said Dr Arendt, though farcical, was “effective”.

“Or *was* it? After all, the denunciation of book and author, with which they achieved great, though by no means total, success, was not their goal. It was only the means with which to prevent the discussion of an issue ‘which may plague Jews for years to come’. And as far as this goal was concerned, they achieved the precise opposite. If they had left well enough alone, this issue, which I had touched upon only marginally, would not have been trumpeted all over the world. In their efforts to prevent people from reading what I had written, or, in case such misfortune had already happened, to provide the necessary reading glasses, they blew it up out of all proportion, not only with reference to my book but with reference to what had actually happened. They forgot that they were mass organisations, using all the means of mass communication, so that every issue they touched at all, pro or contra, was liable to attract the attention of masses whom they then no longer could control. So what happened after a while in these meaningless and mindless debates was that people began

⁶² See Dr Arendt’s comments in ‘The formidable Dr Robinson – a reply’, *New York Review of Books*, 26 January 1966.

⁶³ *The Jew as Pariah*, p275.

to think that all the nonsense the image-makers had made me say was the actual historical truth.

“Thus, with the unerring precision with which a bicyclist on his first ride will collide with the obstacle he is most afraid of, Mr Robinson’s [Jacob Robinson, one of Dr Arendt’s critics] formidable supporters have put their whole power at the service of propagating what they were most anxious to avoid. So that now, as a result of their folly, literally everybody feels the need for a ‘major work’ on Jewish conduct in the face of catastrophe.”⁶⁴

The Kastner case

Zionist cooperation with the Nazis, and the assistance furnished by the Zionists in the extermination of several hundreds of thousands of Jews, were a logical culmination of their shared aims and nationalist, anti-assimilationist beliefs and theories.

This can be clearly demonstrated by reference to the most notorious case of Nazi-Zionist collaboration – that involving Rudolf Kastner. Not much is publicly known about this, thanks to the thorough suppression of information regarding it by the Zionist establishment and its backers in the imperialist countries.

The accusations against Kastner can be summarised as follows: Dr Rudolf Verba, a Doctor of Science then serving at the British Medical Research Council, was one of the few fortunate escapees from Auschwitz. In February 1961, he published his memoirs in the London *Daily Herald*, in which he wrote:

“I am a Jew. In spite of that, indeed because of that, I accuse certain Jewish leaders of one of the most ghastly deeds of the war.

“This small group of quislings knew what was happening to their brethren in Hitler’s gas chambers and bought their own lives with the price of silence. Among them was Dr Kastner, leader of the council which spoke for all Jews in Hungary. While I was prisoner number 44070 at Auschwitz – the number is still on my arm – I compiled careful statistics of the exterminations ... I took these terrible statistics with me when I escaped in 1944 and I was able to give Hungarian Zionist leaders three weeks’ notice that Eichmann planned to send a million of their Jews to his gas

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

chambers ... Kastner went to Eichmann and told him, ‘I know of your plans; spare some Jews of my choice and I shall keep quiet.’

“Eichmann not only agreed, but dressed Kastner up in SS uniform and took him to Belsen to trace some of his friends. Nor did the sordid bargaining end there.

“Kastner paid Eichmann several thousand dollars. With this little fortune, Eichmann was able to buy his way to freedom when Germany collapsed, to set himself up in the Argentine.”⁶⁵

Verba’s accusations are fully corroborated by the ‘Eichmann Confessions’ produced in the 28 November and 5 December 1960 issues of *Life* magazine:

“By shipping the Jews off in a lightning operation, I wanted to set an example for future campaigns elsewhere ... In obedience to Himmler’s directive, I now concentrated on negotiations with the Jewish political officials in Budapest ... among them Dr Rudolf Kastner, authorised representative of the Zionist Movement. This Dr Kastner was a young man about my age, an ice-cold lawyer and a fanatical Zionist. He agreed to help 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. It was a good bargain. For keeping order in the camps, the price ... was not too high for me ...

“We trusted each other perfectly. When he was with me, Kastner smoked cigarettes as though he were in a coffeehouse. While we talked he would smoke one aromatic cigarette after another, taking them from a silver case and lighting them with a silver lighter. With his great polish and reserve he would have made an ideal Gestapo officer himself.

“Dr Kastner’s main concern was to make it possible for a select group of Hungarian Jews to emigrate to Israel ...

“As a matter of fact, there was a very strong similarity between our attitudes in the SS and the viewpoint of these immensely idealistic Zionist leaders ... I believe that Kastner would have sacrificed a thousand or a hundred thousand of his blood to achieve his political goal ... ‘You can have the others,’ he would say, ‘but let me have this group here.’ And because Kastner rendered us a great service by helping to keep the deportation camps peaceful, I would let his group escape. After all, I was

⁶⁵ Cited in Ben Hecht, *Perfidy*, Julian Messner Inc, New York, 1961, pp261-2.

not concerned with small groups of a thousand or so Jews ... That was the 'gentleman's agreement' I had with Kastner."⁶⁶

It is worth remembering in this context that Nazi Zionist Adolf Eichmann stated in 1960, "*Had I been a Jew, I would have been a fanatical Zionist. I could not imagine being anything else. In fact, I would have been the most ardent Zionist imaginable.*"⁶⁷

The government of Israel characterised these accusations of Verba's as a lie. When Michael Greenwald, a fiercely pro-Zionist Israeli citizen, published these accusations against Kastner, the government did more than demand that Greenwald's views be not broadcast. Since a prominent Zionist official was involved, Israel's attorney general prosecuted Greenwald for criminal libel.

The judgment

The verdict in the case given by Judge Benjamin Halevi in Israel's District Court of Jerusalem is self-explanatory. We reproduce here excerpts from the verdict of Judge Halevi, who was later to be part of the panel of three judges who tried Eichmann:

"The masses of Jews from Hungary's ghettos obediently boarded the deportation trains without knowing their fate. They were full of confidence in the false information that they were being transferred to Kenyermeze [a model camp where they would be comfortable and well looked after].

"The Nazis could not have misled the masses of Jews so conclusively had they not spread their false information through Jewish channels.

"The Jews of the ghettos would not have trusted the Nazi or Hungarian rulers. But they had trust in their Jewish leaders. Eichmann and others used this known fact as part of their calculated plan to mislead the Jews. They were able to deport the Jews to their extermination by the help of Jewish leaders.

"The false information was spread by the Jewish leaders. The local leaders of the Jews of Kluj and Nodvarod knew that other leaders were spreading such false information and did not protest.

⁶⁶ Rudolf Verba, cited in *ibid*, pp260-1.

⁶⁷ A Eichmann, 'Eichmann tells his own damning story', *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, 28 November 1960, pp19-25.

“Those of the Jews who tried to warn their friends of the truth were persecuted by the Jewish leaders in charge of the local ‘rescue work’.

“The trust of the Jews in the misleading information and their lack of knowledge that their wives, children and themselves were about to be deported to the gas chambers of Auschwitz led the victims to remain quiescent in their ghettos. It seduced them into not resisting or hampering the deportation orders.

“Dozens of thousands of Jews were guarded in their ghettos by a few dozen police. Yet even vigorous young Jews made no attempt to overpower these few guards and escape to nearby Rumania. No resistance activities to the deportations were organised in these ghettos.

“And the Jewish leaders did everything in their power to soothe the Jews in the ghettos and to prevent such resistance activities.

“The same Jews who spread in Kluj and Nodvarod the false rumour of Kenyermeze, or confirmed it, the same public leaders who did not warn their own people against the misleading statements, the same Jewish leaders who did not organise any resistance or any sabotage of deportations ... these same leaders did not join the people of their community in their ride to Auschwitz, but were all included in the Rescue train.

“The Nazi organisers of extermination and the perpetrators of extermination permitted Rudolf Kastner and the members of the Jewish Council in Budapest to save themselves, their relatives, and friends. The Nazis did this as a means of making the local Jewish leaders, whom they favoured, dependent on the Nazi regime, dependent on its good will during the time of its fatal deportation schedule. In short, the Nazis succeeded in bringing the Jewish leaders into collaboration with the Nazis at the time of the catastrophe.

“The Nazi chiefs knew that the Zionists were a most vital element in Jewry and the most trusted by the Jews.

“The Nazis drew a lesson from the Warsaw ghetto and other belligerent ghettos. They learned that Jews were able to sell their lives very expensively if honourably guided.

“Eichmann did not want a second Warsaw. For this reason, the Nazis exerted themselves to mislead and bribe the Jewish leaders.

“The personality of Rudolph Kastner made him a convenient catspaw for Eichmann and his clique, to draw into collaboration and make their task easier.

“The question here is not, as stated by the attorney general in his summation, whether members of the Jewish Rescue Committee were or were not capable of fulfilling their duty without the patronage of the SS chiefs. It is obvious that without such SS Nazi patronage the Jewish Rescue Committee could not have existed, and could have acted only as an underground.

“The question is, as put by the lawyer for the defence, why were the Nazis interested in the existence of the Rescue Committee? Why did the SS chiefs make every effort to encourage the existence of the Jewish Rescue Committee? Did the exterminators turn into rescuers?

“The same question rises concerning the rescue of prominent Jews by these German killers of Jews. Was the rescue of such Jews a part of the extermination plan of the killers?

“The support given by the extermination leaders to Kastner’s Rescue Committee proves that indeed there was a place for Kastner and his friends in their Final Solution for the Jews of Hungary – their total annihilation.

“The Nazis’ patronage of Kastner, and their agreement to let him save six hundred prominent Jews, were part of the plan to exterminate the Jews. Kastner was given a chance to add a few more to that number. The bait attracted him. The opportunity of rescuing prominent people appealed to him greatly. He considered the rescue of the most important Jews as a great personal success and a success for Zionism. It was a success that would also justify his conduct – his political negotiation with Nazis and the Nazi patronage of his committee.

“When Kastner received this present from the Nazis, Kastner sold his soul to the German Satan.

“The sacrifice of the vital interests of the majority of the Jews, in order to rescue the prominents, was the basic element in the agreement between Kastner and the Nazis. This agreement fixed the division of the nation into two unequal camps: a small fragment of prominents, whom the Nazis promised Kastner to save, on the one hand, and the great majority or Hungarian Jews whom the Nazis designated for death, on the other hand. An imperative condition for the rescue of the first camp by the Nazis was that Kastner will not interfere in the action of the Nazis against the other camp and will not hamper them in its extermination. Kastner fulfilled this

condition. He concentrated his efforts in the rescue of the prominents and treated the camp of the doomed as if they had already been wiped out from the book of the living.

“One cannot estimate the damage caused by Kastner’s collaboration and put down the number of victims which it cost Hungarian Jews. These are not only the thousands of Jews in Nodvarod or any other community in the border area, Jews who could escape through the border, had the chief of their rescue committee fulfilled his duty toward them.

“All of Kastner’s answers in his final testimony were a constant effort to evade this truth.

“Kastner has tried to escape through every crack he could find in the wall of evidence. When one crack was sealed in his face, he darted quickly to another.”⁶⁸

Referring to the meeting of Kastner with SS officers Becher and Rudolf Hoess, Commandant of Auschwitz at the time when the ‘new line’ of ‘rescuing’ Jews was disclosed by Hoess, Judge Halevi observed:

“From this gathering in Budapest, it is obvious that the ‘new line’ stretched from Himmler to Hoess, from Jutner to Becher and Krumej”, adding that this meeting not only exposed the ‘rescue work’ of Becher ‘in its true light’, but also ‘the extent of Kastner’s involvement in the inner circle of the chief German war criminals’.”

Continued Judge Halevi: “Collaboration between the Jewish Agency Rescue Committee and the Exterminators of the Jews was solidified in Budapest and Vienna. Kastner’s duties were part and parcel of the general duties of the SS.

“In addition to its Extermination Department and Looting Department, the Nazi SS opened a Rescue Department headed by Kastner.

“All these extermination, robbery and rescue activities of the SS were coordinated under the management of Heinrich Himmler.”⁶⁹

As if all this were not enough, Kastner furnished a false affidavit in support of Becher, in his own name as well as that of the Jewish Agency and the

⁶⁸ Judgment of Judge Benjamin Halevi, Criminal Case 124/53; *Attorney General v Malchiel Greenwald*, District Court, Jerusalem, 22 June 1955.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

Jewish World Congress. This wilfully false affidavit was given in favour of a war criminal to save him from trial and punishment in Nuremberg.

In view of the foregoing, Judge Halevi found Greenwald mainly innocent of libel against Kastner, but fined him one Israeli pound for one unproven accusation, namely, that Kastner had received money from the Nazis for assisting the latter in their extermination programme. He also awarded the court costs in favour of Greenwald, ordering the Israeli state to pay 200 Israeli pounds towards them.

But the story, which proved beyond doubt that Kastner was a collaborator, whom the Israeli government had attempted to defend, did not end there.

Public reaction to the trial

Israeli public opinion was near-unanimous in demanding that Kastner and his associates in the ‘Rescue committee’ be put on trial as Nazi collaborators. Here lies the rub. Kastner’s associates were the government of Israel. As the Israeli evening paper *Yedi’ot Aharonot* put it:

“If Kastner is brought to trial the entire government faces a total political and national collapse – as a result of what such a trial may disclose.”⁷⁰

Not surprisingly then, the Israeli government, instead of putting Kastner on trial, lodged an appeal against Greenwald’s acquittal for criminal libel. In launching this appeal, the government showed “exemplary expediency”, as someone writing in the Israeli paper *Ma’ariv* put it:

“At 11.00pm the verdict was given. At 11.00am next morning the government announces the defence of Kastner will be renewed – an appeal filed. What exemplary expediency! Since when does this government possess such lawyer-genius who can weigh in one night the legal chances of an appeal on a detailed, complex verdict of three hundred pages?”⁷¹

The motivation for the Israeli government’s defence of Kastner was made crystal clear at the appeal hearing in the Supreme Court by the following words of Chaim Cohen, Israel’s attorney general:

“The man Kastner does not stand here as a private individual. He was a recognised representative, official or non-official of the Jewish National

⁷⁰ 23 June 1955.

⁷¹ 24 June 1955.

Institutes in Palestine and of the Zionist Executive; and I come here in this court to defend the representative of our national institutions.”⁷²

This perfectly true statement constitutes the crux of the matter. Kastner’s collaboration with Nazi war criminals was not an individual isolated case. It represented the collaboration of the echelons of the Zionist leadership.

The Supreme Court’s unanimous verdict was that Becher was a Nazi war criminal, whom Kastner, in his own as well as the Jewish Agency’s name, had without justification helped escape justice. Therefore Greenwald was acquitted of libel on this point.

The Supreme Court also accepted the finding of the lower court that Kastner had deliberately concealed the truth about Auschwitz from the masses of Hungarian Jewry in exchange for the Nazis allowing a paltry thousand or so to be taken to Palestine.

Thus Kastner can hardly have been rehabilitated, let alone “fully rehabilitated”.

The Supreme Court’s judgment

Yet, after unanimously accepting the above facts, shockingly the Supreme Court decided, by a majority of three to two, that Kastner’s conduct was morally justifiable and found Greenwald guilty of criminal libel for characterising it as ‘collaboration’. With their defence of Kastner, the Nazi collaborator, the government of Israel and the Supreme Court furnished conclusive proof that Zionism fully stood for collaboration with the Nazis.

That the court majority, far from rehabilitating Kastner, joined him is clearly revealed from the following excerpts taken from the majority judgment of Judge Shalomo Chesin, which reveal an attitude of extreme cynicism and callousness, at variance with the compassion, decency and moral concern for the fate of hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews exterminated by the Nazis with the collaboration – yes, COLLABORATION – of Kastner.

Let Judge Chesin speak for himself:

“What point was there in telling the people boarding the trains in Kluj, people struck by fate and persecuted, as to what awaits them at the end of their journey ... Kastner spoke in detail of the situation, saying, ‘The Hungarian Jew was a branch which long ago dried up on the tree’. This

⁷² Hecht, p268.

vivid description coincides with the testimony of another witness about the Hungarian Jews, ‘This was a big Jewish community in Hungary, without any ideological Jewish backbone’.⁷³

In other words, if they were not Zionists (“without any ideological Jewish backbone”, if it pleases the Zionists), or willing or fit for travel to Palestine, they were not worth bothering about.

Judge Chesin goes on to assert, without foundation, that the Jews of Hungary were not capable, physically or mentally to offer forcible resistance to the Nazi deportation scheme. As such, no rescue could have flowed from the disclosure of the news about Auschwitz.

Even though Kastner’s silence when he arrived in Kluj was “premeditated and calculated”, even though his omissions made the Nazi extermination plans “easier” to execute, it could still not be regarded as collaboration! Continued Judge Chesin:

“And as to the moral issue, the question is not whether a man is allowed to kill many in order to save a few, or vice versa. The question is altogether in another sphere and should be defined as follows: A man is aware that a whole community is awaiting its doom. He is allowed to make efforts to save a few, although part of his efforts involve concealment of truth from the many or should he disclose the truth to many though it is his best opinion that this way everybody will perish. I think that the answer is clear. What good will the blood of the few bring if everybody is to perish? ... As I said, I am not arguing with the basic factual findings of the learned president of the Jewish District Court (Judge Halevi) but it seems to me, with all due respect, that his findings do not, as of necessity, demand the conclusion he has arrived at. That is to say, collaboration on the part of Kastner in the extermination of the Jews. And that they better coincide with bad leadership both from a moral and public point of view ...

“In my opinion, one can say outright that if you find out that Kastner collaborated with the enemy because he did not disclose to the people who boarded the trains in Kluj that they were being led to extermination, one has to put on trial today ... many more leaders and half-leaders who gagged themselves in an hour of crisis and did not inform others of what was known to them and did not warn and did not cry out of the coming danger ...

⁷³ Moshe Shweiger, a Kastner aide in Budapest, protocol 465.

“Because of all this I cannot confirm the conclusion of the District Court with regard to the accusation that Greenwald has thrown on Kastner of collaboration with the Nazis in exterminating the Jewish people in Hungary during the last war.”⁷⁴

“In other words, the court approved of Kastner’s contempt for the Hungarian Jews and could not allow him to be condemned for doing exactly what many other Zionist leaders and half-leaders did – concealing their knowledge of the Nazi extermination plans so that Jews would board the trains to Auschwitz peacefully while their Zionist ‘leaders’ boarded a different train for Palestine”. These words taken from page 25 of the excellent pamphlet on the subject, *Nazi-Zionist Collaboration*, produced by the Jews Against Zionism and Anti-Semitism (JAZA) group in Australia and reproduced by the British Anti-Zionist Organisation/Palestine Solidarity (BAZO-PS) in 1981 sum up the Zionist contempt for vast layers of the Jewish people.

A fitting refutation of Judge Chesin’s sickeningly revolting judgment is to be found in the minority judgment of Supreme Court Judge Moshe Silberg, in which he tears to shreds the majority verdict. What right, asked Judge Silberg, did Kastner have to decide the fate of eight hundred thousand Hungarian Jews? He went on:

“The charge emanating from the testimony of the witnesses against Kastner is that had they known of the Auschwitz secret, then thousands or tens of thousands would have been able to save their lives by local, partial, specific or indirect rescue operations like local revolts, resistance, escapes, hidings, concealment of children with Gentiles, forging of documents, ransom money, bribery, etc – and when this is the case and when one deals with many hundreds of thousands, how does a human being, a mortal, reject with complete certainty and with an extreme ‘no’ the efficiency of all the many and varied rescue ways? How can he examine the tens of thousands of possibilities? Does he decide instead of God? Indeed, he who can act with such a usurpation of the last hope of hundreds of thousands is not entitled to claim good faith as his defence. The penetrating question *quo warrento* [a writ requiring to show by what authority an office is held or exercised] is a good answer to a claim of such good faith ...

“And if all this is not enough to annul the claim of good faith which was put before us on behalf of Kastner by the attorney general, then Kastner himself comes and annuls it altogether. Not only did he never make this

⁷⁴ Hecht, *ibid*, pp270-2.

claim, but his own words prove the contrary. He writes in his report to the Jewish Agency that the Committee sent emissaries to many ghettos in the countryside and pleaded with them to organise escapes and to refuse to board the trains. And though the story of these pleadings is untrue, and the silence of Kastner in Kluj is proven, the very uttering of these statements entirely contradicts the claim that Kastner had concealed the news about the fate of the ghetto inmates in good faith and only as a result of his complete despairing of the chances of escaping or resisting the Germans. You cannot claim at the same time helplessness and activity. Anyway, such a claim is not convincing ...

“We can sum up with three facts:

“A. That the Nazis didn’t want to have a great revolt – ‘Second Warsaw’ – nor small revolts, and their passion was to have the extermination machine working smoothly without resistance. This fact was known to Kastner from the best source – from Eichmann himself – and he had additional proofs of that when he witnessed all the illusionary and misleading tactics which were being taken by the Nazis from the first moment of occupation.

“B. That the most efficient means to paralyse the resistance with – or the escape of a victim – is to conceal from him the plot of the coming murder. This fact is known to every man and one does not need any proof of evidence for this.

“C. That he, Kastner, in order to carry out the rescue plan for the few prominents, fulfilled knowingly and without good faith the said desire of the Nazis, thus expediting the work of exterminating the masses.

“And also the rescue of Becher by Kastner ... He who is capable of rescuing this Becher from hanging proves that the atrocities of this great war criminal were not so horrifying or despicable in his eyes ... I couldn’t base the main guilt of Kastner on this fact had it been alone, but when it is attached even from afar to the whole scene of events it throws retroactive light on the whole affair and serves as a dozen proofs of our conclusion.”⁷⁵

In the Kastner case the top Zionist leadership of Israel was shown to be continuing publicly to defend collaboration with the Nazi mass murderers in the extermination of hundreds of thousands of Jews.

⁷⁵ From the minority judgment of Supreme Court Judge Moshe Silberg, 1957, pp273-5.

Although the Supreme Court concluded that Kurt Becher was a war criminal, the Jewish Agency (World Zionist Organisation) declined to withdraw the false certificate given to him by Kastner on their behalf, thus sparing Becher from hanging, to remain free in west Germany at the head of several corporations with a personal wealth of \$30 million at the time. Becher even used his certificate as a 'good' SS officer in order to give evidence in favour of his fellow criminals at several war crimes trials in west Germany. The Israeli government never attempted to bring him to trial, presumably out of fear of what such a trial might reveal.

Similarly, none of Kastner's colleagues on the Zionist Relief and Rescue Committee nor his superiors in the Jewish Agency were ever brought to trial as demanded by the Israeli public, let alone the several hundred 'prominents' who assisted Kastner in reassuring the Hungarian Jews that they were destined for Kenyerméze and not Auschwitz, in return for tickets on the train that eventually took them to Palestine.

Kastner, with his undisputed claims that he did everything with the blessing of the Jewish Agency, was a source of huge continuing embarrassment to the Zionist leadership. He had to be got rid of. He was got rid of in the immediate aftermath of the conclusion of the appeal hearing, but before the judgment 'rehabilitating' him had been delivered. He was shot dead by Zeer Eckstein who was not a Hungarian aching to avenge the mass murder of Hungarian Jews but a paid undercover agent of the secret service of Israel.⁷⁶

The Kastner case, in addition to refuting Zionism's cynical use of the holocaust as a propaganda tool, also reveals that the very existence of the Jewish Agency, far from being an instrument for the protection of the Jewish masses, was a source of real assistance to the Nazis in their extermination plans. Lots of Jewish lives could have been saved but for the existence of the Jewish Agency.

Zionism is no answer to the problem of antisemitism, but a dreadful and cowardly way of avoiding participation in the struggle against discrimination, repression and extermination.

A sick and warped ideology

We have to go beyond documenting what Kastner did, and the approval of his conduct by the Supreme Court of Israel and the Israeli government. We

⁷⁶ Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah*, p208.

have to ask: why did Kastner consider it correct actively to assist the Nazis by leading several hundred thousand Jews to extermination in return for the lives of fewer than two thousand? Further, why did the top Zionist leadership feel obliged to come to his defence after his crime had been proved?

The answer is that before, as well as during the war, Zionism considered itself as a political movement concerned only with those Jews who were desirous of colonising Palestine, while the vast majority of the Jews were opposed to it. Rescuing the Jews in general from the Nazis was not the aim and function of Zionism. Zionism is not, neither then nor today, a movement for the protection of Jews but a movement for establishing a Jewish state in Palestine – its rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding.

During the dreadful years of Nazi rule, millions of Jews desperately wanted to leave Europe, but the last place they wanted to go was Palestine. Contrary to popular myth, there was no historical or cultural affinity between the Jewish masses and Palestine. Most Jews were urban people, and the United States, which had between the 1880s and 1914 absorbed nearly two million Jews from eastern Europe, would have been their preferred destination. Failing that, any other country away from the blood-drenched claws of the Nazis, would have been eagerly welcomed.

For the Zionists, however, the establishment of the Jewish state was the *raison d'être* of their existence. Guided by this warped outlook, the majority of mainstream Zionists sat out the war trying to construct the 'national homeland' in Palestine and conducting campaigns for unhindered Jewish immigration into Palestine and for a Jewish army, whereas the majority of Jews, like everyone else during the second world war, had more important things to worry about, including participation in partisan anti-Nazi resistance movements and enlisting in large numbers in the Allied armies. The World Zionist Organisation neither publicised nor participated in the anti-Nazi resistance; it neither publicised the holocaust nor supported resistance to it; instead it participated in covering it up until the Allies publicised it.

Vast numbers of Jews organised and participated in the partisan underground throughout Europe – generally under communist leadership, often under the direct command of the Red Army, thus making a sizeable contribution to the Allied war effort.

Even in the Warsaw ghetto, where the Zionist contribution was greatest, the majority of the fighters were communist, Bundist or unaffiliated, although from the Zionist propaganda the unwary may be forgiven for

getting the impression that the Warsaw ghetto rebellion was all a Zionist effort.

Yitzhak Greenbaum, while speaking on ‘The diaspora and the redemption’ in February 1943 at a Tel Aviv gathering, succinctly, not to say coldbloodedly, explained the Zionist policy during the holocaust in the following words:

“When they come to us with two pleas – the rescue of the masses of Jews in Europe or the redemption of the land – I vote without a second thought for the redemption of the land.”⁷⁷

He restated this stance in his postwar book *In Days of Holocaust and Destruction*:

“When they asked me, couldn’t you give money out of the United Jewish appeal funds for the rescue of Jews in Europe, I said ‘NO’ and I say ‘NO’ again ... one should resist this wave which pushes the Zionist activities to secondary importance.”⁷⁸

This buying of land from the Arabs of Palestine took priority over rescuing European Jews threatened with extermination. More than that. He called for a conspiracy of silence over the mass murder of Jews so as not to distract attention from purchasing land. In his words: “The more said about the slaughter of our people, the greater the minimisation of our efforts to strengthen and promote Hebraisation of the land.”⁷⁹

Let it be noted that Greenbaum was not some minor Zionist official. He was the immediate superior of Kastner in the Jewish Agency, in his position of the head of the Rescue Committee for European Jewry, and occupied the position of a cabinet minister in Israel’s first government. Although in a minority in the Zionist leadership on this question, damningly he was left in charge of the ‘Rescue Committee’ after blatantly making clear his opposition to using Zionist funds for the rescue of Jews. Clearly, Greenbaum’s policy was also the policy of the Zionist movement – an agreed policy that Kastner was merely implementing.

This policy was succinctly captured in the coldblooded slogan: “One goat in Eretz Israel is worth an entire community in the diaspora.”

⁷⁷ Quoted by Rabbi Moshe Shonfield, *The Holocaust Victims Accuse*, Neturei Karta, New York, 1977, p26.

⁷⁸ Yitzhak Greenbaum, *In Days of Holocaust and Destruction*, quoted in *ibid*, p26.

⁷⁹ *Ibid*.

To the Zionist leadership, the most important question was the building of the 'Jewish homeland'. If this involved sacrificing a million or more Jews, that was for them a price worth paying.

Contrary to popular belief, Zionist leaders did not seriously question that they were silent during the holocaust. Dr Nahum Goldman, president of the World Jewish Congress, speaking on 4 March 1962 at a commemorative meeting frankly stated:

"If there is a basis to the historical 'I accuse', let us have the courage now to direct it against that part of the generation which was lucky enough to be outside of Nazi domination and did not fulfil its obligations toward the millions killed."⁸⁰

While admitting responsibility for the deaths of those who could have been, but were not, rescued, Goldman rather slyly attempted to spread the blame so as to accuse everyone not actually a victim of the holocaust, instead of laying the blame where it belongs, namely, on the Zionist leadership.

The Zionist leadership ignored heart-wrenching pleas from beleaguered Jews threatened with deportation to, and extermination at, Auschwitz. One such request was sent from a cave near Lublin (Poland) on 15 May 1944 by Rabbi Michael Dov Weissmandel. The author of this appeal wrote passionately that the Zionist leadership put pressure on the allies to bomb the crematorium at Auschwitz and the roads and bridges leading to it. No such bombing took place. The heart-wrenching messages were ignored. One can only conclude that the Zionist leadership could not initiate 'strong protests' against Nazi extermination without imperilling the sordid deals their representative Kastner was negotiating for the rescue of a few hundred Jews and their transportation to Palestine.⁸¹

The revisionist Zionists, for their own political reasons, were responsible for bringing to light the collaboration between the Nazis and the mainstream Zionist leadership. One of these revisionists was lawyer Shmuel Tanir, who was Greenwald's defence counsel in the Kastner case, who later on was to become Israel's minister of justice.

Even Ben Hecht, another supporter of the revisionists, in his book *Perfidy*, concludes that had the mainstream Zionists organised to rescue the Jewish

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, p70.

⁸¹ See JAZA pamphlet *Nazi-Zionist Collaboration*, pp40-3.

masses “by any measure, such honourable human behaviour would have been of deeper worth to the world than a dozen states of Israel”.⁸²

The Zionist thinking during the holocaust is correctly outlined by Mapai (predecessor of the present-day Israeli Labour party) leader Eliezer Livetz, who expressed his regrets in the following words in *Yediot Aharonot* in an article entitled ‘Thoughts on the holocaust’:

“Our Zionist orientation educated us to see the growing land of Israel as the prime goal and the Jewish nation only in relation to its building the land. With each tragedy befalling the Jews in the Diaspora, we saw the state as the evident solution. We continued employing this principle even during the holocaust, saving only those who could be brought to Israel. The mandate’s limitation on immigration served as a political factor in our battle to open the doors to aliya (immigration) and to establishing the state. Our programs were geared to this aim and for this we were prepared to sacrifice or endanger lives. Everything outside of this goal, including the rescue of European Jewry for its own sake, was a secondary goal. ‘If there can be no people without a country’, Rabbi Weissmandel exclaimed, ‘then surely there can be no country without a people. And where are the living Jewish people, if not in Europe?’”⁸³

The revisionist paper, *Herut*, correctly stated that the leaders of the Jewish Agency and leaders of the Zionist movement in Palestine, could have appealed in the “broadcasts of their ‘secret’ Haganah radio station to Jews in ghettos, camps and villages to flee to the woods, to mutiny and fight, to try to save themselves.” By their silence “they collaborated with the German to no less extent than the scoundrels who provided the Germans with the death lists. History will yet pronounce its verdict against them. Was not the very existence of the Jewish Agency a help for the Nazis? When history tries the so-called Judenrat and the Jewish police, she will also condemn the leaders of the Agency and the leaders of the Zionist movement.”⁸⁴

That surely is the verdict of history.

Just as Judge Benjamin Halevi concluded that the Budapest ‘Relief and Rescue Committee’ of the Zionist Jewish Agency was a department of the Nazi SS, along with the departments for extermination and looting, so we

⁸² p193.

⁸³ Shonfeld, *op cit*, pp24-25.

⁸⁴ 25 May 1964, cited in V Bolshakov, *Anti-Communism, the Main Line of Zionism*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1972, p40.

must conclude that the very existence of the Jewish Agency was of assistance to the Nazis in carrying out and covering up unspeakable crimes.

When the news about Auschwitz eventually found its way into the Swiss, *not* Palestinian, press, notwithstanding attempts at suppression by Zionist officials in Geneva, it caused a furore throughout the world, causing the Hungarian government to suspend deportations consequent upon threats from the Allies. The deportations were only resumed after the German occupation of Hungary. It is most unlikely that the destruction of Hungarian Jewry could have been achieved in the little time available without Zionist collaboration in luring the Jews to board the Auschwitz-bound trains in a lightning operation that took them out of Hungary just in time before the arrival of the Red Army.

The Zionist leaders were opposed to publicising the news about the ongoing murder of Jews because they believed that such publicity would have served to distract attention from ‘Hebraisation’ of the land of Palestine, that is, clearing the land of the Arabs.

Keeping doors shut to Jews

For the same twisted reason, during this time there were Zionists furiously busy organising to keep the doors shut to Jews fleeing Nazi persecution in every country except Palestine. In Britain they were instrumental in defeating a Parliamentary motion in January 1943 aimed at rescuing the threatened Jews. The argument of the Zionist leadership was: “Every nation has its dead in the fight for its homeland – the sufferers under Hitler are our dead in our fight”!

Persecuted Jews were barred from entering the USA during this time by a combination of antisemitism of State Department officials (Assistant Secretary of State Breckeridge Long was a notorious antisemite), supported by Lawrence Steinhardt, one of very few Jews who at the time were in an important position in the US foreign service. A director of the American Federation of Zionists and afterwards of the American Zionist Commonwealth in the 1920s, Steinhardt achieved notoriety for his unrelenting support for the State Department’s anti-refugee stance. He opposed large-scale immigration of eastern European Jews, declaring them as totally unfit to become American citizens, characterising them as lawless, scheming, defiant and unassimilable.

Selective immigration

Even as regards Jewish immigration into Palestine, the Zionists aimed for selective immigration to build a Jewish state, not at rescuing Jews fleeing extermination. And the policy of selective immigration had been firmly in place long before the war, with German awareness of what this policy meant for those not selected. Not for nothing did Chaim Weizmann, first president of Israel, speaking at the twentieth Zionist congress in 1937, make this nauseating statement:

“The hopes of six million Jews are centred on emigration ... I was asked, ‘But can you bring six million Jews to Palestine? I replied, ‘No’ ... In the depth of the Jewish tragedy – I want to save two million of youth ... The old ones will pass, they will bear their fate or they will not. They are dust, economic and moral dust in a cruel world ... Only a remnant shall survive ... we have to accept it.”⁸⁵

It is this heartless tradition which provides the explanation for Kastner’s actions, as well as their defence by the Supreme Court and the government of Israel. In his defence of Kastner, the attorney general of Israel, Chaim Cohen, appealed to this tradition:

“It has always been our Zionist tradition to select the few out of many in arranging the immigration to Palestine ... Are we therefore to be called traitors?”⁸⁶

“The answer to Chaim Cohen’s question is ‘YES!’ – for continuing to ‘select the few out of many in arranging the immigration to Palestine’, during the holocaust, when the problem was how to get the many to any haven that would have them – Zionists are ‘therefore to be called traitors’.

“It was not a great jump from Weizmann’s description of the masses of European Jews as ‘economic and moral dust in a cruel world’, to the Supreme Court of Israel’s majority Judgment that Kastner was entitled to mislead the Hungarian Jews about Auschwitz because:

“‘The Hungarian Jew was a branch which long ago dried up on the tree.’

“And:

⁸⁵ *Nazi-Zionist Collaboration*, p54.

⁸⁶ Quoted in Ben Hecht, *op cit*, pp194-5.

“This was a big Jewish community in Hungary without any ideological Jewish backbone’ (ie, not much Zionism).⁸⁷

“As Ben Hecht remarks, it was not a much greater jump from there to Dr Goebbels diary entry in 1943:

“In our Nazi attitude, toward the Jews, there must be no squeamish sentimentalism.’

“Indeed, as Ben Hecht also remarks, the sneer and belittlement of Dr Goebbels who wrote ‘The Jews deserve the catastrophe that has now overtaken them,’ seems to echo in the voice of the attorney general of the State of Israel who says:

“For those and millions of Jews like them there came true the old curse. “And, lo, they were meant to be taken like sheep for slaughter, for killing, for destruction, for crushing and shame.” There was no spirit in them. The Jewish masses in Warsaw were in the same condition.”⁸⁸

“This basically Nazi philosophy, displayed here towards Jews instead of Arabs, helps explain how the concept of saving the few at the expense of the many led Zionists to become the most suitable collaborators for the Nazis in administering the Jewish Councils or Judenrat in the ghettos.”⁸⁹

A shared racist philosophy

The Nazi-Zionist collaboration was not accidental, nor a matter of isolated individual actions. It arose logically from shared aims. The Nazis wanted a Jewish-free Germany and Europe. The Zionists wanted to get them to Palestine. When confronted with the choice between saving the masses of European Jews from persecution and extinction, on the one hand, and building the so-called national home, on the other, the Zionist leadership unflinching chose the latter. This is made perfectly clear in a letter from David Ben Gurion, Israel’s first prime minister, to the Zionist Executive on 7 December 1938, in which he stated that saving Jewish lives from Hitler was a potential threat to Zionism unless the Jews thus saved were brought to Palestine. “When Zionism had to choose between the Jews and the Jewish state, it unhesitatingly preferred the latter.”⁹⁰

⁸⁷ Hecht, p271.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p149. (Court records, CC124/53 Jerusalem District Court.)

⁸⁹ *Zionist-Nazi Collaboration*, p55.

⁹⁰ See Arie Bober (ed), *The Other Israel: The Radical Case Against Zionism*, Anchor Books, New York, 1972, p171.

No decent person, Jew or non-Jew, can shut their eyes to the collaboration of the Zionist leadership. In his book *Perfidy*, written principally to expose the Israeli government's support and defence of Kastner, Ben Hecht, an extreme revisionist Zionist of the Menachem Begin variety, and hardly a friend of the Palestinians, felt obliged to say:

“Such a book was not easy for me to write. For the heart of a Jew must be filled with astonishment as well as outrage ... that a brother should be so perfidious.”⁹¹

Elie Wiesel, who reviewed the manuscript for *Yediot Aharonot* of 4 April 1959, cited Ben Hecht as saying: “the best known, most respected leaders of Zionism – were actually criminals”. Wiesel went on:

“Somehow, my typewriter refuses to write about Weizmann and about the heads of the Jewish Agency who helped the Germans to destroy European Jewry.”⁹²

Anyone, even a Zionist, with an open mind and a tinge of decency would have to agree with Ben Hecht's conclusion: honourable human behaviour would have been of deeper worth to the world than a dozen states of Israel.⁹³

The state of Israel is often talked about as some entity “for which six million Jews died”. Although a lot of Jews died, they were not martyrs who died for the Zionist ‘cause’. Apart from being simply untrue, the propaganda of Zionists, as well as their imperialist backers, on the question of the holocaust, it is unbearably offensive to anti-Zionist Jews, for, in the words of Isaac Deutscher:

“It should be realised that the great majority of eastern European Jews were, up to the outbreak of the second world war, opposed to Zionism. This is a fact of which most Jews and non-Jews in the west are seldom aware. The Zionists in our part of the world were a significant minority, but they never succeeded in attracting a majority of their co-religionists. The most fanatical enemies of Zionism were precisely the workers, those who spoke Yiddish, those who considered themselves Jews; they were the

⁹¹ Hecht, *op cit*, pvi.

⁹² Shonfeld, *op cit*, pp105-6.

⁹³ See Hecht, p193.

most determined opponents of the idea of an emigration from eastern Europe to Palestine.”⁹⁴

Fight against imperialism

These were the folk who were exterminated by the Nazis on an industrial scale. The holocaust victims perished not in order that a ‘Jewish state’ be established. They were simply murdered in cold blood by the Nazis acting on their sick racist theories. The Nazis murdered millions of Jews, communists, Soviets, Poles, gypsies and others in one of the greatest crimes against humanity. The Nazi ideology was the product of crisis-ridden imperialism. And the most important lesson for humanity to learn from the holocaust, which claimed the lives of six million Jews, and of the far greater holocaust with its fifty million dead, an even greater number maimed, and colossal destruction of wealth, namely, the second world war, was that it too was a product of imperialism. The only way to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies is to overthrow imperialism, for war and genocide cannot be put to an end while this system lasts.

Nazism, far from leading to the “rejuvenation of the Jewry”, as is often claimed by the Zionists and their apologists, led to the mass murder of Jews. “The shock and demoralisation, and also amoralisation suffered by the survivors of the holocaust goes far to explain how a poisonous ideology like Zionism could, for the first time in history, gain a real mass following among Jews.

“But to call the mass murder of Jews followed by the decline and decadence of traditional universalist Jewish values and the takeover of Jewish community institutions by narrow nationalist zealots, a ‘rejuvenation of Jewry’, takes real gall.”⁹⁵

In the words of Rabbi Moshe Shonfield: “The first and foremost action [of the Zionists] was to establish the ‘state’ and the masses of Jews merely served as convenient means. And wherever there existed a contradiction between the two, the needs of the masses, and even their salvation, were subordinated to the needs of the state-information.”⁹⁶

“The author accuses the Zionists of having collaborated in the murder of six million Jews,” stated the orthodox Torah Jews of the ‘Neturei Karta’

⁹⁴ Isaac Deutscher, *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays*, Oxford University Press, London, 1968.

⁹⁵ *Nazi-Zionist Collaboration*, p79.

⁹⁶ *I Accuse From the Depths*, cited in *ibid*, p81.

in advertising Shonfeld's book *The Holocaust Victims Accuse* in the *New York Times*. Whenever the Zionists, or the Zionist state of Israel, are criticised, the Zionist movement has a kneejerk reaction. If the criticism emanates from non-Jews, they are dubbed antisemites; if such criticism comes from Jews, they are dismissed as 'self-hating Jews'. The Zionist movement is busy, with the help of the leading imperialist states, attempting to criminalise every public expression of support for the Palestinian people, any criticism of Israel's brutal policies and the conditions of apartheid imposed on the Palestinians in their own land. If Zionism collaborated with the German fascists in the 1930s and 1940s, helping the latter in the murder of hundreds of thousands of Jewish people, it has since the establishment of the state of Israel served as a faithful servant of US imperialism – a dagger pointed at the heart of the Arab democratic and socialist movement. As such, just like its chief patron US imperialism, it has become an enemy of all progressive humanity including especially the Jewish masses. It needs to be fought against and shall be fought against and defeated, however long and arduous the struggle.

CHAPTER 6

Memorandum of Edwin Montagu on the antisemitism of the present (British) government

(published in the July 2017 issue of Lalkar)

Submitted to the British Cabinet, August 1917

On the centenary of the Balfour Declaration, the sixty-ninth anniversary of the Nakba – the tragedy of the creation of the Zionist state of Israel and the expulsion of seven hundred and fifty thousand Palestinians from their homes, and the fiftieth anniversary of the brutal Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, we reproduce below the Memorandum of Edwin Montagu, the only Jewish member of Lloyd George’s cabinet. In this Memorandum, Montagu correctly characterises the Balfour Declaration as a scurrilous piece of antisemitism, which will serve as a convenient tool for governments of countries in which Jews live, and have lived for generations, to get rid of them – which is precisely what the Nazis went on to do, not without the collaboration of the Zionist leadership, be it said in passing.

Rejecting religion as a test of citizenship, Montagu correctly asserts that there is no such thing as a Jewish nation. As for Jews in Britain, he observes, they are not British Jews but Jewish Britons.

The creation of a Jewish home in Palestine would result in the catastrophic expulsion of the inhabitants of that land and turn it into the “world’s ghetto” for Jews, says Montagu’s Memorandum.

Finally, he says that he would “willingly disenfranchise every Zionist” and would be tempted to “proscribe the Zionist organisation as illegal and against the national interest”.

No wonder then that this sane statement of Montagu's lies buried in the archives and is not brought into the light of day whether by Zionists or their imperialist backers.

We are publishing a slightly edited version of this extremely important document, for it questions the very rationale and basis of a Jewish state in Palestine, characterising it as antisemitic and a disaster for Jews and Palestinians alike.



I have chosen the above title for this memorandum, not in any hostile sense, not by any means as quarrelling with an antisemitic view which may be held by my colleagues, not with a desire to deny that antisemitism can be held by rational men, not even with a view to suggesting that the government is deliberately antisemitic; but I wish to place on record my view that the policy of His Majesty's Government is antisemitic in result and will prove a rallying ground for antisemites in every country in the world.

This view is prompted by the receipt yesterday of a correspondence between Lord Rothschild and Mr Balfour.

Lord Rothschild's letter is dated the 18th July and Mr Balfour's answer is to be dated August 1917. I fear that my protest comes too late, and it may well be that the government were practically committed when Lord Rothschild wrote and before I became a member of the government, for there has obviously been some correspondence or conversation before this letter. But I do feel that as the one Jewish minister in the government I may be allowed by my colleagues an opportunity of expressing views which may be peculiar to myself, but which I hold very strongly and which I must ask permission to express when opportunity affords ...

... The government proposes to endorse the formation of a new nation with a new home in Palestine. This nation will presumably be formed of Jewish Russians, Jewish Englishmen, Jewish Roumanians, Jewish Bulgarians, and Jewish citizens of all nations – survivors or relations of those who have fought or laid down their lives for the different countries [in the first world war] which I have mentioned, at a time when the three years that they have lived through have united their outlook and thought more closely than ever with the countries of which they are citizens.

Zionism has always seemed to me to be a mischievous political creed, untenable by any patriotic citizen of the United Kingdom. If a Jewish Englishman sets his eyes on the Mount of Olives and longs for the day when he will shake British soil from his shoes and go back to agricultural pursuits in Palestine, he has always seemed to me to have acknowledged aims inconsistent with British citizenship and to have admitted that he is unfit for a share in public life in Great Britain, or to be treated as an Englishman. I have always understood that those who indulged in this creed were largely animated by the restrictions upon and refusal of liberty to Jews in Russia. But at the very time when these Jews have been acknowledged as Jewish Russians and given all liberties, it seems to be inconceivable that Zionism should be officially recognised by the British government, and that Mr Balfour should be authorised to say that Palestine was to be reconstituted as the "national home of the Jewish people". I do not know what this involves, but I assume that it means that Mahommedans and Christians are to make way for the Jews and that the Jews should be put in all positions of preference and should be peculiarly associated with Palestine in the same way that England is with the English or France with the French, that Turks and other Mahommedans in Palestine will be regarded as foreigners, just in the same way as Jews will hereafter be treated as foreigners in every country but Palestine. Perhaps also citizenship must be granted only as a result of a religious test.

I lay down with emphasis four principles:

I assert that there is not a Jewish nation. The members of my family, for instance, who have been in this country for generations, have no sort or kind of community of view or of desire with any Jewish family in any other country beyond the fact that they profess to a greater or less degree the same religion. It is no more true to say that a Jewish Englishman and a Jewish Moor are of the same nation than it is to say that a Christian Englishman and a Christian Frenchman are of the same nation ...

When the Jews are told that Palestine is their national home, every country will immediately desire to get rid of its Jewish citizens, and you will find a population in Palestine driving out its present inhabitants, taking all the best in the country, drawn from all quarters of the globe, speaking every language on the face of the earth, and incapable of communicating with one another except by means of an interpreter ...

I claim that the lives that British Jews have led, that the aims that they have had before them, that the part that they have played in our public life and our public institutions, have entitled them to be regarded, not as British Jews, but as Jewish Britons. I would willingly disfranchise every Zionist. I would be almost tempted to proscribe the Zionist organisation as illegal and against the national interest. But I would ask of a British government sufficient tolerance to refuse a conclusion which makes aliens and foreigners by implication, if not at once by law, of all their Jewish fellow citizens.

I deny that Palestine is today associated with the Jews or properly to be regarded as a fit place for them to live in. The Ten Commandments were delivered to the Jews on Sinai. It is quite true that Palestine plays a large part in Jewish history, but so it does in modern Mahommedan history, and, after the time of the Jews, surely it plays a larger part than any other country in Christian history. The Temple may have been in Palestine, but so was the Sermon on the Mount and the Crucifixion. I would not deny to Jews in Palestine equal rights to colonisation with those who profess other religions, but a religious test of citizenship seems to me to be the only admitted by those who take a bigoted and narrow view of one particular epoch of the history of Palestine, and claim for the Jews a position to which they are not entitled.

If my memory serves me right, there are three times as many Jews in the world as could possibly get into Palestine if you drove out all the population that remains there now. So that only one-third will get back at the most, and what will happen to the remainder?

I can easily understand the editors of the Morning Post and of the New Witness being Zionists, and I am not in the least surprised that the non-Jews of England may welcome this policy. I have always recognised the unpopularity, much greater than some people think, of my community. We have obtained a far greater share of this country's goods and opportunities than we are numerically entitled to. We reach on the whole maturity earlier, and therefore with people of our own age we compete unfairly. Many of us have been exclusive in our friendships and intolerant in our attitude, and I can easily understand that many a non-Jew in England wants to get rid of us. But just as there is no community of thought and mode of life among Christian Englishmen, so there is not among Jewish Englishmen. More and more we are educated in public schools and at the Universities, and take our part in the politics, in the Army, in the Civil Service, of our country. And I am glad to think that the prejudices against intermarriage are breaking down. But when the Jew has a national home, surely it follows that the impetus to deprive us of the rights of British citizenship must be enormously increased. Palestine will become the world's Ghetto. Why should the Russian give the Jew equal rights? His national home is Palestine ...

I do not know how the fortunate third will be chosen, but the Jew will have the choice, whatever country he belongs to, whatever country he loves, whatever country he regards himself as an integral part of, between going to live with people who are foreigners to him, but to whom his Christian fellow countrymen have told him he shall belong, and of remaining as an unwelcome guest in the country that he thought he belonged to.

I am not surprised that the government should take this step after the formation of a Jewish Regiment, and I am waiting to learn that my brother, who has been wounded in the Naval Division, or my nephew, who is in the Grenadier Guards, will be forced by public opinion or by Army regulations to become an officer in a regiment which will mainly be composed of people who will not understand the only language which he speaks – English. I can well understand that when it was decided, and quite rightly, to force foreign Jews in this country to serve in the Army, it was difficult to put them in British regiments because of the language difficulty, but that was because they were foreigners, and not because they were Jews, and a Foreign Legion would seem to me to have been the right thing to establish. A Jewish Legion makes the position of Jews in other regiments more difficult and forces a nationality upon people who have nothing in common.

I feel that the government are asked to be the instrument for carrying out the wishes of a Zionist organisation largely run, as my information goes,

at any rate in the past, by men of enemy descent or birth, and by this means have dealt a severe blow to the liberties, position and opportunities of service of their Jewish fellow countrymen.

I would say to Lord Rothschild that the government will be prepared to do everything in their power to obtain for Jews in Palestine complete liberty of settlement and life on an equality with the inhabitants of that country who profess other religious beliefs. I would ask that the government should go no further.

ESM

23 August 1917

CHAPTER 7

The Balfour Declaration

published in the December 2017 issue of *Proletarian*

The second of November 2017 marked the one hundredth anniversary of the notorious Balfour Declaration which took the simple form of a letter dated 2 November 1917, written by the then foreign secretary, Arthur James Balfour, on behalf of the Foreign Office, to Lord Rothschild (Lionel Walter Rothschild, the second Baron Rothschild, who was at the time the president of the English Zionist Federation and a longstanding friend of Balfour's). This letter reads:

Dear Lord Rothschild,

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

“His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.”

Most Jews oppose Zionism

Subsequent Zionist narrative asserts that the Balfour Declaration was the culmination of a long struggle by the Jewish masses for the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. As a matter of fact, the Jewish people were overwhelmingly and fiercely opposed to the idea whose genesis had nothing to do with them – for Zionism is an imperialist construct, conceived, nurtured and promoted by British imperialism to serve as an instrument of its policy and a tool for protecting its interests in the middle east.

Only a small coterie of fanatical Zionists, such as Chaim Weizmann and Nahum Sokolow, were advocating and pursuing the adoption of some such declaration. The idea was not at all popular among the Jews at the time. The late historian Lord Beloff, himself a Jew, and many others, aptly characterised Zionism as a movement in which one Jew asks another for money to send a third Jew to Palestine. Most Jews regarded Zionism as a mad and crazy fantasy and treated it with supreme contempt.

In 1917, Anglo-Jewry was, in the main, not just indifferent, but positively hostile, to Zionism and to the Balfour Declaration. At the time, only about a quarter of a percent of the community, that is, about five thousand out of a total Anglo-Jewish population of roughly a quarter of a million, were members of the English Zionist Federation.

“The so-called ‘mass meetings’ occasionally convened in urban centres with a high density of Jewish immigrants – presumed to be Zionism’s ‘natural’ constituency – rarely lived up to their billing.” So writes Stuart A Cohen in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 2 November 2017 in an article entitled ‘Anglo-Jewry was, in the main, indifferent’.

For the Jewish masses had many more urgent matters to attend to. The burning issues in London’s East End had nothing to do with Zionism. What concerned the Jewish immigrants most were the government’s threat to deport them or the fate of their loved ones back in Russia.

What is more, the loudest participants in these debates were the opponents, not the supporters, of Zionism.

The masses of immigrant Jews were not the only ones fiercely opposed to Zionism. Most vocal anti-Zionists were native born, many of them members of the Anglo-Jewish plutocracy, as for instance Edwin Montagu, son of the Jewish banker Lord Swaythling, made Secretary of State for India, who delivered a virulently anti-Zionist memorandum to the British Cabinet, while the leaders of the Board of Deputies of British Jews (David Alexander) and the Anglo-Jewish Association (Claude Montefiore) wrote on 24 May 2017 to *The Times* denouncing the scheme for the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people – all in an effort to block the Balfour Declaration.

Shortly after the Balfour Declaration was made public, “leading figures in the Anglo-Jewry combined to form a League of British Jews dedicated to the principle that Jews were a denomination rather than a nation”.⁹⁷

The unpopularity of the idea underlying the Balfour Declaration, the positive hostility it aroused among all classes of British Jews, goes a long way to explaining why this declaration was sent in the form of a letter to Lord Rothschild rather than being made the subject of a parliamentary announcement or White Paper.

Thus it is clear that the Zionists in Britain, or elsewhere for that matter, had not won over the mass of Jews to their cause and by no manner of means could they claim to speak on their behalf. It was realisation by the government that anti-Zionist sentiment ran strong throughout the Jewish community “which determined how the statement would be published. Only by incorporating it within a private letter to Lord Rothschild could the recognised Jewish ‘establishment’ be neatly bypassed and the inconvenience of [an] unseemly intracommunal brawl be avoided”.⁹⁸

The Balfour Declaration was received equally unenthusiastically by the British press, with the solitary exception of *The Manchester Guardian* which, under the editorship of C P Scott, was supportive of Zionism. On the day that his paper published the news, Scott dedicated his editorial to the announcement, calling the declaration “at once the fulfilment of an aspiration, the signpost of a destiny. Never since the days of the Dispersion has the extraordinary people scattered over the earth in every country of modern European and of the old Arabic civilisation surrendered the hope of an ultimate return to the historic seat of its national existence. This has formed part of its ideal life, and is the ever-recurring note of its religious ritual”.

The ‘liberal’ *Guardian* has never departed from the ideology of this editorial, whose content is a mixture of fabricated historical facts and myth. Through the likes of “dull-witted creeps”, such as Jonathan Freedland and suchlike hacks, it continues to this day to sing from the same Zionist hymn sheet.

Mr Cohen correctly concludes that even though the Balfour Declaration “owed very little to the Zionists within Anglo-Jewry, the latter certainly owed much to the Balfour Declaration”, for the declaration “conferred on

⁹⁷ David Ceserani, ‘How the Jewish Chronicle helped shape the debate’, *Jewish Chronicle*, 2 November 2017.

⁹⁸ Cohen, *op cit*.

the Zionists an unprecedented degree of communal legitimacy. Once considered a fringe element of fantasists, they now posed as a group of hard-headed realists who had the ears of the great and mighty of the land.

“Hence, although anti-Zionism still remained a force, it was Zionism that henceforth exerted increasing control over Anglo-Jewish hearts, minds and purses.”⁹⁹

The Palestine Mandate

Following the first world war, at the 1919 Peace Conference and then in 1920 at San Remo, and two years later, the League of Nations voted in favour of Britain being the Mandatory Power in Palestine. The wording of the Balfour Declaration was incorporated into the Mandate, thus conferring some sort of international stamp of approval on the declaration.

The second half of the declaration which provided that “nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine” was, and continues to be, honoured in the breach. The Balfour Declaration is a perfect example of imperialist, particularly British imperialist, duplicity. While Sir Henry McMahon, British High Commissioner in Egypt, was promising the Sharif of Mecca, the perpetrator of the revolt against the Ottomans, an undivided Arab state after the defeat of Turkey, Britain was at the same time busy concluding the Sykes-Picot Agreement, which carved up the rotting Turkish empire between Britain, France and Russia. The October Revolution in Russia took Russia out of the equation and into the bargain the Bolshevik revolutionary government published the secret Treaties and exposed the fraudulent nature of the pretexts which lay behind the participation of the allied powers in the horrendous slaughter that was the first world war.

At the time of its making, the Balfour Declaration was no more than a promise, and a fantastical one at that, since Palestine was part of the Turkish empire over whose disposal Britain had no right of say, let alone to give it to a people with no claim to the territory whatsoever, and who did not even live there.

All the same, the Balfour Declaration was a crucial step towards the materialisation of the Zionist project. Soon after the Balfour Declaration became generally known publicly, Palestinian revolts broke out – in 1920, 1921 and 1929 – which were suppressed by Britain, the mandatory power.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

Through the decades of the 1920s and 1930s, the British authorities permitted the Jewish Agency – a quasi-government of Jews in Palestine – to develop institutions and infrastructure that would lay the foundation for statehood at a later date – something that was not allowed to the Palestinians. Meanwhile, the Jewish population in Palestine was increasing through immigration, spurred on by developments in Nazi Germany.

Sensing the danger to their own future statehood through being colonised, the Palestinians rose in a revolt which lasted from 1936-39. Though Britain crushed this uprising with brutal force, it was obliged, with the second world war looming on the horizon, to take measures to ameliorate the condition of the Palestinians. Hence the adoption by Britain of the 1939 White Paper with its promise to end all Jewish immigration to Palestine in five years, with a total of seventy-five thousand immigrants to be allowed in during that time. This brought the Zionist establishment into serious contradiction with the British authorities, leading, after the second world war was over, to armed attacks by the Zionist terrorist group, the Stern Gang, who murdered Lord Moyne, the British minister in Cairo, the hanging of two British soldiers as reprisal for the hanging of two Stern Gang members – the final straw being the blowing up of the British army headquarters at the King David Hotel in Jerusalem.

No longer able to control the situation, Britain, having laid the foundation of a future Zionist state, washed its hands of the Mandate and passed over responsibility to the United Nations. The United Nations Special Committee on Palestine came up with a partition plan which was adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November 1947, with Britain declaring its intention to withdraw from Palestine by 15 May 1948, allowing well-armed Zionist groups to grab a major part of Palestine. On the final departure of British troops, Ben-Gurion declared the State of Israel.

Nakba

For the Palestinians, the creation of the colonial state of Israel was *Nakba* – the catastrophe, accompanied by expulsion, through terror and massacre, of seven hundred and fifty thousand of them from their homes and villages, turning them into refugees. Over four hundred villages were erased by well-armed Zionists to grab a major part of Palestine.

Quite rightly, 2 November is for the Palestinians a black day – the day that a one-hundred-and-thirty-word letter laid the basis for their dispossession and expulsion from their homeland. Twelve million Palestinians today live

under occupation or as refugees, and throughout the world, yearning to return to their land and homes.

At Oslo in 1993, the Palestinians, making the most painful decision, agreed on a two-state solution which would have given them a state of their own within the pre-1967 borders – a mere twenty percent of historic Palestine. While all the imperialist states pay lip service to the two-state, with the exception of Sweden and Greece, none of the western governments has recognised Palestine as an independent state. Instead they continue to give military, financial and diplomatic support to Israel, while the latter through its incessant war against the Palestinians, and ceaseless construction and colonisation within the internationally recognised Palestinian territory, is making the two-state solution all but impossible – be it said in passing that one hundred and thirty UN members, representing the vast majority of humanity, recognise Palestine within the 1967 borders, notwithstanding its military occupation by Israel.

Thus it is clear that Herzl may have founded the Zionist Organisation but, without the support of imperialism, in particular British imperialism, “the minuscule Jewish community in Palestine could never attain the necessary critical mass to become a sovereign state. Not only did Herzl fail; before the first world war the Zionist movement as a whole was uncertain about its goals.”¹⁰⁰

Far from being “the Magna Carta of Jewish liberties”, as that hyperbolic creep Weizmann characterised it in a letter to Walter Rothschild, it (the Balfour Declaration) served to lay the basis for Palestinian dispossession and sow the seeds for a hundred-year war which can only end eventually in the dismantling of this imperialist construct, namely, the Zionist state of Israel and its replacement by a single state in which Jews and Palestinians enjoy equal civil, political and religious rights.

Zionist celebrations

Unmindful of what lies ahead, the Zionist establishment and its friends engaged in an orgy of celebrations to mark the centenary of the Balfour Declaration:

“The government has resisted disgraceful calls for an apology and has clearly stated, from the prime minister and other ministers and officials,

¹⁰⁰ Derek Penslar, ‘Weizmann, Herzl and Eretz Yisrael’, *Jewish Chronicle*, 2 November 2017.

that the government will mark the Balfour Declaration with pride. The landmark Dinner hosted by Lord Rothschild and Lord Balfour was attended by the prime minister and key ministers from both the UK and Israel.

“One hundred years ago, Zionist statesmen and British ministers worked together to pave the way for a Jewish home in the land of Israel.

“In 2017, let us be proud that it was our government which took the first step to recognise the heritage of the Jewish people and which continues today to protect our connection with the land of Israel.”¹⁰¹

The Balfour Declaration was a fundamental step on the road to the establishment of the state of Israel.

Programmes in schools and universities, lectures and academic events, newspaper articles and journals, over one hundred events in synagogues and communities around the country discussed the Balfour Declaration.

The Balfour lecture, delivered by the well-known historian Simon Schama at the Royal Society, was live-streamed to venues in Brighton, Glasgow, Leeds, Manchester and other places.

All the opponents of Zionism, especially anti-Zionist Jews, all the friends of the Palestinians, must pledge on the occasion of its centenary to expose the Balfour Declaration as a shameful document which has brought misery and war and sullied the name of the British people, whose government was the author of this tragedy. They must expose the hypocrisy, cynicism and duplicity of the likes of Mark Regev, the present Israeli ambassador in Britain, who called for the British people to be proud of the Balfour Declaration. This, according to him, enshrines the “finest values that the United Kingdom cherishes today”. Cynically ignoring the jackboot of the Israeli occupation and the denial of all rights to the Palestinian people, Regev has the Goebbelsian chutzpah to characterise Israel “as a beacon of democracy, pluralism and the rule of law”, with its declaration of independence guaranteeing: “complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants, irrespective of religion, race or sex”. He invites the people of the UK to join Israel “and proudly mark their [Britain’s] role in ... creating the middle east’s only tolerant and free democracy”.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Advertisement in the *Jewish Chronicle* of 2 November 2017 by Simon Johnson, Chief Executive of the Jewish Leadership Council.

¹⁰² ‘A milestone in the journey to Israel’s rebirth’, *Jewish Chronicle*, 2 November 2017.

Yes indeed! Mr Regev's Israel may be a democracy for its Jewish inhabitants, but for the Palestinians it is dispossession, demolition of homes, life in Bantustans, daily oppression and humiliation at myriads of checkpoints that dot the Palestinian territories, the apartheid wall and a daily siege of their territories. There is nothing for them to celebrate – only the arduous struggle to destroy the monstrosity whose foundation stone and building blocks rest on the Balfour Declaration.

And remember, Mr Regev: The laws of history are stronger than the laws of artillery. The Palestinian people will overcome!

CHAPTER 8

A sustained attack on opposition to brutal Israeli occupation

published in the March 2016 issue of Lalkar

The following article reproduces with modifications parts of an article entitled 'The greatest threat to free speech in the west: Criminalising activism against Israeli occupation' posted on The Intercept on 16 February in the name of the famous journalist Glenn Greenwald and Andrew Fishman, with thanks.

On 16 February 2016, the UK government announced that it is will be illegal for “local [city] councils, public bodies, and even some university student unions ... to refuse to buy goods and services from companies involved in the arms trade, fossil fuels, tobacco products, or Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank”.¹⁰³ Thus, any entities that support or participate in the global boycott of Israeli settlements will face “severe penalties”.

In addition to being an infringement of free speech and political activity, the government’s move is a response to, and collusion with, a very coordinated and well-financed campaign led by Israel and its supporters literally to criminalise political activism against Israeli occupation, based on the particular fear that the worldwide campaign of Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions, or BDS – modelled after the 1980s campaign that contributed to the downfall of the Israel-allied apartheid regime in South Africa – is succeeding.

The Israeli website +972 reported last year about a pending bill that “would ban entry to foreigners who promote the [BDS] movement that aims to pressure Israel to comply with international law and respect Palestinian rights”. In 2011, a law passed in Israel that “effectively banned

¹⁰³ Oliver Wright, ‘Israel boycott ban’, *Independent on Sunday*, 14 February 2016.

any public call for a boycott – economic, cultural, or academic – against Israel or its West Bank settlements, making such action a punishable offence”.¹⁰⁴

However, the current pronouncements and actions of the British and other western governments are to make such activism a crime not only in Israel, but in western countries generally.

They propose to outlaw activism against the decades-long Israeli occupation – particularly though not only through boycotts against Israel. In October, we reported on the criminal convictions in France of twelve activists for the ‘crime’ of advocating sanctions and a boycott against Israel as a means of ending the decades-long military occupation of Palestine, convictions upheld by France’s highest court. They were prosecuted for “wearing shirts emblazoned with the words ‘Long live Palestine, boycott Israel’” and because “they also handed out fliers that said that ‘buying Israeli products means legitimising crimes in Gaza’”.

Pascal Markowicz, chief lawyer of the CRIF umbrella organisation of French Jewish communities, gleefully published this shameful decision of the highest French court.

Similar measures are afoot in the USA to prosecute and outlaw BDS. The *Washington Post* reported last June, “A wave of anti-BDS legislation is sweeping the USA under a Customs Bill recently passed by both houses of Congress, American companies will be obliged to treat settlements in the West Bank as a valid part of Israel, by outlawing any behaviour that would be deemed cooperative with a boycott of companies occupying the West Bank. US companies would be forced to pretend that products produced in the occupied territories are actually produced in ‘Israel’.”

Dozens of anti-BDS bills being introduced in Congress and state legislatures across the USA, are proof of the lengths that Israel’s staunch supporters will go to shut down any discussion critical of Israeli policies and supportive of Palestinian freedom.

Under the existing laws, American companies have been fined for actions deemed supportive of boycotts aimed at Israel. For decades, US companies and their foreign subsidiaries, for instance, have been required by law to refuse to comply with the Arab League boycott of Israel. Penalties for violators include up to ten years of imprisonment.

¹⁰⁴ *Independent on Sunday*, *op cit.*

The suppression of anti-occupation activism is particularly acute on American college campuses.

This campus censorship on behalf of Israel was comprehensively documented in a report last year by Palestine Legal titled ‘The Palestine Exception to Free Speech’. The nationwide censorship effort has seen pro-Palestinian professors fired, anti-occupation student activists suspended and threatened with expulsion, pro-Palestinian groups defunded, and even discipline for students for the ‘crime’ of flying a Palestinian flag. The report documents how pro-Israel campus groups and alumni “have intensified their efforts to stifle criticism of Israeli government policies”. The report explains: “Rather than engage such criticism on its merits, these groups leverage their significant resources and lobbying power to pressure universities, government actors, and other institutions to censor or punish advocacy in support of Palestinian rights.” And all this is in the name of outlawing ‘hate speech’!

It is now routine for students advocating BDS or otherwise working against Israeli occupation to be disciplined or endure other forms of sanctions – clearly a reaction to the increasingly crucial role played by universities and colleges in support of the Palestinian liberation struggle.

When nothing else works, the authorities resort to gutter tactics of equating anti-Zionism with antisemitism. In September 2015, the University of California debated proposals to ban BDS campaigns by characterising them as manifestations of ‘antisemitism’.

Similar attempts to ban opposition to Israeli occupation are widespread. The New York state legislature actually passed “a bill that would suspend funding to educational institutions which fund groups that boycott Israel”. Such legislation is becoming commonplace, as the group United With Israel boasted just last month:

Florida became the fifth state in the USA to introduce a resolution to confront the anti-Israel BDS movement when it passed a law on 21 December, similar to the first anti-BDS legislation introduced in Tennessee last April.

By doing so, Florida has joined Tennessee, New York, Indiana, and Pennsylvania. Another thirty-five states are reportedly considering similar legislation.

The pro-campus-speech group FIRE has repeatedly documented and denounced attempts to suppress BDS advocacy on campus.

Yet this censorship effort to ban BDS and other forms of criticism of Israel continues to grow in many countries around the world, for the simple reason that the Israeli authorities and their most powerful backers have spent vast sums of money and brought to bear their considerable political clout into the campaign to institutionalise this censorship.

Last year, GOP billionaire Sheldon Adelson and Democratic billionaire Haim Saban donated tens of millions of dollars to a new fund to combat BDS on college campuses. Also last year, Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu “decided to implement a 2014 resolution to establish a special task force to fight the anti-Israeli sanctions”; that task force has funding of “some 100 million Israeli shekels (roughly \$25.5 million)”.

Anti-BDS legislation has become a major goal of AIPAC. As part of the controversy at the University of California, Richard Blum, the mega-rich investment banker and husband of Sen. Dianne Feinstein, threatened the university that his wife would take adverse action against the university if it did not adopt the harsh anti-BDS measures he was demanding.

This is not to say that suppression of anti-occupation activism is the only strain of free speech threats in the west. The prosecution of western Muslims for core free speech expression under ‘terrorism’ laws, the distortion of ‘hate speech’ legislation as a means of punishing unpopular ideas and putting pressure on social media companies to ban ideas disliked by governments are all serious menaces to this core liberty.

But in terms of systematic, state-sponsored, formalised punishments for speech and activism, nothing compares to the growing multi-nation effort to criminalise activism against Israeli occupation. Rafeef Ziadah, a Palestinian member of the Palestinian BDS National Committee, told *The Intercept*: “Israel is increasingly unable to defend its regime of apartheid and settler colonialism over the Palestinian people and its regular massacres of Palestinians in Gaza; so is resorting to asking supportive governments in the USA and Europe to undermine free speech as a way of shielding it from criticism and measures aimed at holding it to account.”

Commentators and activists who prance around as defenders of campus free speech and free expression generally – yet who completely ignore this most pernicious trend of free speech erosion – can certainly not be allowed to get away with parading themselves as believers in free speech. They must be condemned for what they really are – the most disgusting hypocrites, attempting to justify the crimes of Israeli fascism.