

Roger Garaudy

The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics

AAARGH

[Source of the text: CODOH: <http://codoh.com/> © 1996 *All rights reserved.*]

This text has been displayed on the Net as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Récits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (Aaargh).

The E-mail of the Secretariat is: aaarghinternational@hotmail.com. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA.

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in those places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by article 19 of the Human Rights Charter: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." (The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.)

Contents

Introduction

Part I: Theological Myths

1. The Myth of the "Promise": Promised Land or Conquered Land?
 - a. In Contemporary Christian Exegesis
 - b. In the Prophetic Jewish Exegesis
2. The Myth of the "Chosen People"
3. The Myth of Joshua: Ethnic Purification

Part II: The Myths of the 20th Century

1. The Myth of Zionist Antifascism
2. The Myth of the Justice of Nuremberg
3. The Myth of the Holocaust
4. The Myth of "A Land Without a People for a People Without a Land"

Part III: The Political Use of the Myth

1. The Israeli-Zionist Lobby in the United States
2. The Israeli-Zionist Lobby in France
3. The Myth of the Israeli Miracle: The External Financing of Israel

Conclusion

Addendum:

Annex

1. Letter from Abbé Pierre to Roger Garaudy, 15 April, 1996
2. Letter from Pastor Roger Parmentier to Roger Garaudy, 11 May, 1996
3. The Cry of a Deportee
by Gaston Pernot, Doctor of Law, Commander of the Legion of Honor, Paris
("Le Figaro," Friday, May 3, 1996)
4. Indignation of an Israeli Writer
by Ari Shavit/Haaretz/New York Times Syndication
(Translated from Hebrew in "Liberation" of May 21, 1996.)

Right to Reply--A Pamphlet in Response to Attacks

1. A Reply to the Media Lynching of Abbé Pierre and Roger Garaudy
2. Machination of a Lynching
3. The Scorned "Right to Reply"
4. The Witch Hunt
5. Struggle Against All Fundamentalisms
6. The Magic Word that Kills
7. As for the lies instituted at Nuremberg
8. Then what do I deny?
9. One Goal: Gag Abbé Pierre and Garaudy
10. Zionism against Israel
11. A Very Powerful Lobby in the United States
12. A Very Powerful Lobby in France
13. The Nuremberg Taboo: An Inverted Dreyfus Affair
14. A "Litany of Hate"
15. A Tribal Reading of the Bible
16. A Prophetic Reading: Abbé Pierre
17. Abrogate the Totalitarian Gayssot Law
18. In Whose Interest?
19. But the Truth Bursts Against Darkness



Introduction

THIS BOOK IS THE HISTORY OF A HERESY.

THROUGH A LITERAL AND SELECTIVE reading of a Revealed Word, it makes religion into a political tool and in so doing, hallows it. This heresy is a fatal disease at this end of the century, one that I already defined in "Intégrismes."

I fought Islamic fundamentalism in "*The Greatness and decadence of Islam*" at the risk of displeasing those who did not like me to say it.

I fought Christian fundamentalism in "*Towards a war of religion*" at the risk of displeasing those who don't like me to say: "The Christ of Paul is not Jesus."

I am fighting today Jewish fundamentalism in "*The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics*" at the risk of attracting the thunder of those Israeli-Zionists who did not like Rabbi Hirsch's reminder:

"Zionism wants to define the Jewish people as a national entity ... which is a heresy."

SOURCE: "Washington Post," October 3, 1978.

What is the Zionism that I denounced (and not the Jewish people) in my book? It has often defined itself: it is a political doctrine.

"Since 1896, Zionism refers to the political movement founded by Theodore Herzl."

SOURCE: Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. "Herzl Press." New York, 1971, volume 2, p. 1262.

This is a nationalist doctrine which was not born out of Judaism but out of the European nationalism of the 19th century. Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, did not claim to belong to a religion:

"I do not obey a religious impulse."

SOURCE: Th. Herzl: "Diaries. Ed. Victor Gollancz, 1958. "I am an agnostic." (p. 54)

He was not interested in the "Holy Land" in particular: for his nationalist objectives, he would have equally accepted Uganda or Tripoli, Cyprus or Argentina,

Mozambique or the Congo.

SOURCE: Herzl, Diaries (passim).

But in the face of the opposition of his Jewish friends, he realized the importance of the "Mighty Legend" (June 9, 1895), Diaries I, p. 56) as "a rallying cry of irresistible power."

SOURCE: Herzl, p. 45.

This is a mobilizing slogan that this eminently realistic politician could not ignore. Transposing this "mighty Legend" of the "Return" into historical reality, he declared:

"Palestine is our unforgettable historical homeland ... The name alone will be a powerful rallying cry for our people."

SOURCE: "L'Etat Juif," p. 209.

"The Jewish Question is for me neither a social question nor a religious question ... it is a national question."

This is a colonial doctrine. Here too, the lucid Theodore Herzl does not hide his objectives. The first step is to set up a "Charter Company" under the protection of England, or any other power, as a stepping stone toward the formation of "the Jewish State." That is why he called on the master of this type of operation, the colonial trafficker, Cecil Rhodes, who used his Charter Company to carve out of South Africa a subsidiary bearing his name: Rhodesia.

Theodore Herzl wrote him on January 11, 1902:

"Please send me a letter stating that you have examined my program and that you approve it. You may be wondering why I am calling on you, Mr. Rhodes. It is because my program is a political program."

SOURCE: Herzl, "Tagebuch," Vol. III, p. 105.

The Zionist doctrine adopted at the August 1897 Basle Congress had three dimensions: political, nationalist, colonial. Due to his Machiavellian genius, Theodore Herzl could justifiably say:

"I founded the Jewish State."

SOURCE: "Diaries," p. 224.

Half a century later, his disciples applied exactly the same policies, used the same methods and followed the same political line to create the State of Israel (after W.W. II).

But this political, nationalist, colonialist enterprise was never a fulfillment of Jewish faith and spirituality. At the same time as the Congress of Basle, which could not be held in Munich (as predicted by Herzl) because of opposition from the German Jewish community, another conference was held in Montreal (1892), where Rabbi Isaac Meyer Wise, the most representative Jewish personality in America, initiated a motion against the political and tribal Zionist interpretation of the Bible and for a spiritual and universalist interpretation of the Prophets.

"We totally disapprove of the initiative aiming at the creation of a Jewish State. Attempts of this type highlight an erroneous conception of the mission of Israel ... that the Jewish Prophets were the first to proclaim ... It aims at a Messianic time when men recognize belonging to one great community for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth."

SOURCE: Conférence Centrale des Rabbins Américains. Yearbook VII, 1897, p. xii.

This opposition to political Zionism, inspired by the attachment to the spirituality of the Jewish faith, did not cease from expressing itself. Following W.W.II, using the U.N. and at the same time taking advantage of rivalries among nations and, especially, of the unconditional support of the United States, Israeli Zionism managed to impose itself as a dominant force. Thanks to its lobby, it succeeded in reversing an

admirable prophetic tradition. But it did not manage to stifle the criticism of great spiritual men.

Martin Buber, one of the great Jewish voices of this century, during his entire lifetime and until his death in Israel, did not stop denouncing the degeneracy and even the inversion of religious Zionism into political Zionism.

Martin Buber declared in New York:

"The feeling I had 60 years ago when I entered the Zionist movement is essentially the same feeling I have today ... I hoped that this nationalism would not follow the path of others a beginning with a great hope and degenerating later to become a sacred egoism, daring, even like Mussolini, to proclaim itself sacroegoismo, as though collective egoism could be more sacred than individual egoism. When we returned to Palestine, the decisive question was: Do you want to come here as a friend, a brother, a member of the community of people of the Middle East or as the representatives of colonialism and of imperialism?

"The contradiction between the end and the means to reach it divided the Zionists: some wanted to receive political privileges from the Great Powers, others, especially the youth, wanted to be allowed to work in Palestine with their neighbors, on behalf of their life together, and for the future.

"All was not always perfect in our relations with the Arabs, but there was, in general, good neighborliness between Jewish villagers and Arab villagers.

"This organic phase of establishment in Palestine lasted until the time of Hitler.

"It was Hitler who pushed the masses of Jews to come to Palestine, and not an elite who came to carry on their lives and prepare for the future. Thus, a selective organic development was replaced by a mass immigration requiring a political force for its security ... The majority of Jews preferred to learn from Hitler rather than from us ... Hitler showed that history does not follow the path of the mind, but that of power, and that when a people is quite strong, it can kill with impunity ... This is the situation that we had to combat ... To 'Ihud' we proposed ... that Jews and Arabs not only coexist but cooperate ... This would make possible an economic development of the Middle East, thanks to which the Middle East could bring a great essential contribution to the future of humanity."

SOURCE: "Jewish Newsletter," June 2, 1958.

Addressing the 12th Zionist Congress in Kaarlsbad, September 15, 1921, Buber said:

"We speak of the mind of Israel and we believe that we are not like other nations ... But the mind of Israel is nothing more than the synthesis of our national identity, nothing more than a justification of our collective egoism ... transformed into an idol. We have refused to accept any prince other than the Lord of the Universe. While we are like all other nations and we drink with them from the same cup that intoxicates them. The nation is not the supreme value ... Jews are more than a nation: they are the members of a community of faith.

"Jewish religion was uprooted, and this is the essence of the disease whose symptom was the birth of Jewish nationalism around the middle of the 19th century. This new form of desire for land is the cornerstone of what modern Jewish nationalism has borrowed from modern nationalism of the West.

"What does the idea of 'chosen' have to do with all that? Being 'chosen' does not

indicate a feeling of superiority, but a sense of destiny. This feeling does not originate from a comparison with others, but from a vocation and responsibility to accomplish the task of which the prophets keep reminding us: if you brag about being chosen, instead of living in obedience to God, you commit a felony."

Evoking this "nationalist crisis" of political Zionism, which is a perversion of the spirituality of Judaism, he concludes:

"We hoped to save Jewish nationalism from the mistake of making an idol out of people. We have failed."

SOURCE: Martin Buber, "Israel and the World." Ed. Schocken. New York, 1948, p. 263.

Professor Judas Magnes, president of Hebrew University since 1926, considered that the "Biltmore Program" of 1942, requiring the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine:

"Will lead to a war against the Arabs."

SOURCE: Norman Bentwich. "For Zion Sake." Biography of Judas Magnes. Philadelphia: "Jewish Publication Society of America," 1954, p. 352.

In his opening address in 1946 at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where he had been president for 20 years, he said:

"The new Jewish voice speaks with the voice of guns ... This is the new Torah of the land of Israel. The world has been shackled by the madness of physical force. May Heaven guard us from shackling Judaism and the people of Israel to this madness. It is pagan Judaism that has conquered a great part of the powerful diaspora. During the time of romantic Zionism, we thought that Zion must be redeemed with honesty. All the Jews of America bear the responsibility of this mistake, this mutation ... even those who are not in agreement with the actions of the pagan leadership but stand idly by. The anesthesia of the moral sense leads to its atrophy."

SOURCE: Ibid, p. 131.

In fact, since the Biltmore Declaration, the Zionist leaders had the most powerful protector: the United States. The World Zionist Organization had swept aside the opposition of those Jews faithful to the spiritual traditions of the prophets of Israel, and demanded the creation, not anymore of a "national Jewish home in Palestine," according to the terms (if not the spirit) of the Balfour Declaration of the preceding war (W.W. I), but the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine.

Already in 1938, Albert Einstein condemned this Declaration:

"In my opinion, it would be more reasonable to reach an agreement with the Arabs based on sharing life peacefully together, rather than to create a Jewish State with borders, an army and a project of temporal power, no matter how modest it is. I fear the internal damage that Judaism will sustain due to the development, in our ranks, of a narrow nationalism. We are not anymore the Jews of the Maccabees period. To become again a nation in the political sense of the world will be equivalent to turning away from the spiritualization of our community that we owe to the generosity of our prophets."

SOURCE: Rabbi Moshe Menuhim, "The decadence of Judaism in our time" 1969, p. 324.

The reminders did not miss, following every Israeli violation of international law.

To mention only two examples of what was said loudly, expressing what many Jews think privately but, under the intellectual inquisition of the Israeli-Zionist lobby, do not have the power to express publicly: In 1960, during the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, the "American Council for Judaism" declared:

"The American Council for Judaism addressed a letter yesterday, Monday, to Mr. Christian Herter, denying the government of Israel the right to speak in the name of all Jews. The Council declares that Judaism is a matter of religion, not nationality."

SOURCE: "Le Monde," June 21, 1960.

During the bloody invasion of Lebanon by the Israelis, Professor Benjamin Cohen of Tel-Aviv University wrote to P. Vidal-Naquet on June 8, 1982:

"I am writing to you while listening to a transistor that has just announced that 'we' are in the process of 'realizing our objectives' in Lebanon: to insure 'peace' for the residents of Galilee. These lies worthy of Goebbels make me mad. It is clear that this savage war, more barbaric than any of those preceding it, has nothing to do with the attempt in London or the security of Galilee ... Jews, sons of Abraham ... Jews, victims themselves of so much cruelty, how can they become so cruel? ... The greatest success of Zionism is the 'dejudaisation' of the Jews.

"Dear friends, do whatever is in your power to prevent Begin and Sharon from reaching their twin objectives: the final liquidation (a fashionable expression here these days) of the Palestinians as a people, and the Israelis as human beings."

SOURCE: Letter, published in "Le Monde," June 19, 1982, p.9.

"Professor Leibowitz calls Israeli politics in Lebanon Judeo-Nazi."

SOURCE: "Yediot Aharonoth," July 2, 1982, p. 6.

This is what is at stake in the struggle between the Jewish prophetic faith and nationalist Zionism, based, like any other nationalism, on the refusal to recognize the other, and on making oneself sacred.

Any nationalism has the need to hallow its pretensions. Following the fractionization of Christianity, each of the nation-states claimed that it had received the sacred heritage and the investiture of God.

France is the "eldest daughter of the Church" through which it carries on the work of God (Gesta Dei per Francos). Germany is "above all" because God is with her (Got mit uns). Eva Peron declared that "the mission of Argentina is to bring God to the world," and in 1972, the prime minister of South Africa, Vorster, celebrated the savage racism of "Apartheid" saying, "Let us not forget that we are the people of God, invested with a mission." ... Zionist nationalism shares in this exhilaration of all nationalisms. Even the most lucid let themselves be tempted by this exhilaration.

Even a man like Professor André Neher succumbs to this temptation. In his beautiful book, *"L'essence du prophétisme"* (Ed. Calmann-Lévy, 1972, p. 311), after recalling so well the universal meaning of the alliance of God and man, he ends up writing that Israel is "the sign, par excellence,

of divine history in the world. Israel is the axis of the world, it is its nerve, its center, its heart."

This comment recalls the unfortunate "Aryan Myth" whose ideology was the foundation of panGermanism and Hitlerism. This path is the opposite of the teaching of the Prophets and the admirable "I and Thou" of Martin Buber.

Exclusiveness bans dialogue: one cannot "dialogue" with Hitler or Begin, because their racial superiority or their exclusive alliance with the Divine leaves them nothing to expect from the other.

We are aware that in our time, the only alternative to dialogue is war, and, as we keep repeating, dialogue requires that from the start, everyone is aware of what is lacking in his faith and that he needs the other to fill this void. This is the condition of any desire for fullness (which is the spirit of any living faith).

Our anthology of Zionist crimes is part of a body of efforts made by those Jews who have tried to defend a prophetic Judaism against a tribal Zionism. What nourishes antisemitism is not the criticism of the policy of aggression, deception and blood of Israeli-Zionism. It is the unconditional support of its policy, which by literal interpretation of the great traditions of Judaism, selects only whatever justifies this policy, elevates it above international law by making sacred the myths of yesterday and today.

End of Introduction

I - The Theological Myths

1 - The Myth of the "Promise": Promised Land or Conquered Land?

The Fundamentalist interpretation of political Zionism.

* "If one possesses the book of the Bible, if one considers oneself as the people of the Bible, one should possess all the Biblical lands."

General Moshe Dayan. "Jerusalem Post". August 30th 1967.

* On February 25th 1994, Doctor Baruch Goldstein massacred Arabs praying at the tomb of the Patriarchs.

* On November 4th 1995, Ygal Amir assassinated Isaac Rabin, "by order of God", and of his group of "warriors of Israel", **to execute whoever should yield to the Arabs the "Promised Land" of "Judah and Samaria"** (present-day Cis-Jordania).

a) The Christian exegesis

Albert de Pury, a professor of the Old Testament at the Protestant Faculty of Theology at Geneva, sums up his doctorate thesis in the following words: "Divine promise and cultural legend in the cycle of Jacob» (2 volumes, Gabalda Publishers, Paris 1975), in which he integrates, discusses and prolongs the research of the greatest contemporary historians of the Scriptures, including Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth (see : "History of Israel" by M. Noth, French translation published by Payot, 1954; "Theology of the Old Testament", 1971, Labor et Fides publishers, Geneva, by Von Rad, "Ancient History of Israel" (2 volumes) by Father R. de Vaux, Paris 1971.

"The Biblical theme of the gift of the country has its origin in the 'patriarchal promise', in other words in the divine promise made, according to the tradition of Genesis, to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The stories in Genesis relate several times and in different ways, that God promised the patriarchs and their descendents the ownership of the land in which they were in the process of settling. This promise was made at Sichem (Genesis 12/7), at Bethel (Genesis 13/14-16; 28/13-15; 35/11-12) and at Mamre, near Hebron (Genesis 15/18-21; 17/4-8), in other words at the principal sanctuaries of Samaria and Judea, and appears to apply above all to the region of present-day Cisjordania.

"Biblical narrators present us the history of Israel's origins as a succession of well-defined periods in time. All the memories, stories, legends, tales or poems in their possession, handed down by oral tradition, were inserted by them within a specific genealogical and chronological framework. This determination to put order in handed-down tradition and to classify it also left its mark on the compilation of the patriarchal tales.

"Each of the patriarchs was probably an eponymous hero or legendary figure of independent origins, but for the narrators of the Bible all the names must be united in the same family tree. Thus Abraham is presented as the father of Isaac and as Jacob's grandfather. The eponyms of the twelve tribes of Israel are regarded as the sons of Jacob, etc. It is these twelve sons of Jacob - the embryo of the "people of Israel" concept - who left Palestine for Egypt because of a famine. After an exile of 400 years, their descendents having become the "people of Israel" in the meantime, they left Egypt, wandered about in the desert and finally conquered the land which had been promised to their ancestors. As almost all contemporary exegetes agree, this schema is mostly fictitious.

"The works of Albrecht Alt and Martin North have revealed especially that the division into successive periods (Patriarchs - bondage in Egypt - conquest of Canaan) is artificial."

It is admitted today that most of the tribe and clans which, in the 12th or the 11th century B.C., joined up to become the "people of Israel" (perhaps in the form of a confederation) were originally groups of semi-nomads who had become sedentary in central Palestine, Transjordan, Galilee and the Negev over the course of the previous centuries.

Most of these clans claimed to be descended from an eponymous ancestor about whom they had preserved a body of stories and legends. Thus one of these clans regarded itself as issued from the "patriarch" Abraham; another was issued from Jacob, while others still were considered to be the descendents of Ruben, Simeon or Joseph.

It was only during the assimilation and unification of these different tribal groups that their "ancestors", who had no links originally between them, became integrated within a single genealogical system. It is likely that the "Abraham" and "Isaac" became assimilated to the "proto-Israelite" tribes at a time when Jacob-Israel had already become the common ancestor of the twelve tribes. Thus Isaac had to make do with the status of Jacob's "father", while Abraham was enthroned at the root of the genealogy, thus becoming Isaac's "father".

To sum up, we can see that the Israelite "conquest" was not the "Blitzkrieg" it is made out to be in the book of Joshua, but rather the outcome of a gradual "Landnahme" by nomadic groups. The few military skirmishes that may have occurred only came in the final phase of a long process of infiltration and sedentarization.

Most exegetes have considered and continue to consider the promise of the patriarchs in its classic form (cf for example Genesis 13/14-17 or Genesis 15/18-21) as a post-eventum legitimization of the Israelites' conquest of Palestine under David's reign. In other words, the promise was introduced in the patriarchal tales to turn that "ancestral epic" into a prelude and an announcement of the golden age of David and Solomon.

It was the custom of the heads of the clans to consult the oracle of the god El at the local sanctuary frequented by the tribe at the time of year when they got ready to

leave the fertile lands to go to their winter pastures. The priest of the sanctuary would then reveal to them an "oracle of salvation" which gave the clan the assurance of divine protection during the transhumance and of its safe and sound return to the summer pastures at the end of the rainy season. Furthermore, as the patriarchal tales show us, these oracles could carry a promise of sedentarization in fertile regions.

We can now summarily circumscribe the origins of the patriarchal promise:

1. The promise of land, understood as a promise of sedentarization, was first addressed to groups of nomads who were still submitted to the practice of transhumance and who aspired to settlement somewhere in inhabitable areas. In this form the promise may have been part of the religious and narrative heritage of several different tribal groups.

2. The goal of the nomadic promise was not the political and military conquest of a region or a whole country but sedentarization within a limited territory.

3. Originally, the patriarchal promise spoken about in Genesis was not granted by Yahveh (the god who had entered Palestine with the "Exodus group") but by the Canaanite god in one of his local hypostases. Only the local god, owner of the land, could offer nomads sedentarization on his lands.

- 4- Later, when the nomadic clans had become sedentary and had regrouped with other tribes to make up the "people of Israel", the ancient promises took on another dimension. The goal of sedentarization had been reached and the promise henceforth had political, military and "national" implications.

Thus reinterpreted, the promise was seen as the foreshadowing of the definitive conquest of Palestine, as the announcement and the legitimization of the Davidian empire. None of the promises reported in the book of Genesis have avoided this reinterpretation. The content of the patriarchal promise

"Whereas the "nomadic" promise aiming for the sedentarization of a clan of shepherds probably goes back to an ante eventum origin, the same does not hold true of the promise that took on "national" dimensions. Given the fact that the "Israelite" tribes united only after their settlement in Palestine, the reinterpretation of the nomadic promise to a promise of political sovereignty must have been made post eventum. Thus the promise in Genesis 15/18-21, which envisages the sovereignty of the chosen people over all the regions located "between the Egyptian Torrent (Wadi 'Arish) and the Great River, the Euphrates", and over all the inhabitants of those lands, is clearly a vaticinium ex eventu inspired by the Davidian conquests. It must also be pointed out that other "goals" were added to the initial promise, notably that of countless descendents and the divine blessing. Each narrator has conferred his particular stamp upon the promise. The Yahvist insisted on the countless descendance, while Deuteronomy emphasized the possession of the lands of Canaan and the Sacerdotal on the alliance with Yahveh implied in the promise. Exegetic research has made it possible to establish that the broadening of the "nomadic" promise into a "national" promise must have happened before the first patriarchal tales were set in writing.

"The Yahvist can be regarded as the first great narrator (or rather as the editor of tales) of the Old Testament; he lived at the time of Solomon. Consequently, he was the contemporary and the witness of those few decades when the patriarchal promise, reinterpreted in the light of David, seemed to have been fulfilled beyond all hopes. A

careful reading of the tales shows us that the aim of the Yahvist was to point out the permanent opposition between the indignity of the people to whom the promise was made and the incomprehensible grace of Yahveh. The Genesis 12/3b passage is one of the key texts for the understanding of the work of the Yahvist.

"According to this text, the blessing of Israel must have as its corollary the blessing of all the "clans on earth ('adamah)". The clans of the fertile land are, first and foremost, all the tribes which share Palestine and Transjordan with Israel.

"We are thus not in a position to assert that at such or such a time in history God revealed himself to a historical figure called Abraham and conferred upon him the legal deeds of possession to the land of Canaan. From the juridical point of view, we have no land-act signed "God" to show for, and we even have good reasons to believe that the scene in Genesis 12/1-8, 13/14-18 does not reflect a historical event. The promise in Genesis 15/18 does not allow us either to claim the Euphrates (or even the Jordan) as a frontier of Israel, any more than the visions of the Apocalypse enables us to anticipate the material unfolding of events at the end of time.

"Is it possible then to "actualize" the patriarchal promise ? If to actualize the promise means to use it as a deed of property or to put it at the service of a political claim, however legitimate it may be, then the answer is certainly not. No policy has the right to claim the guarantee of the promise for itself. One cannot rally in any way to those among the Christians who consider the Old Testament as a legitimization of the present territorial claims of that State."

Source : All these texts are taken from the conference given on February 10th 1975 at Cret-Berard (Switzerland) during a symposium on the theological interpretations of the Israeli-Arab conflict, published in the magazine : "Theological and religious studies" n° 3, 1976 (Montpellier).

b) The Jewish prophetic exegesis

(Conference by Rabbi Elmer Berger, ex-president of the "Jewish League" in the United States)

"It is inadmissible for anyone to plead that the setting-up of the present state of Israel has been the fulfillment of Prophecy and that therefore all acts performed by the Israelis in order to set their state up and to maintain it have been automatically ratified in advance by God. The present-day political Israel has, for all of us, obliterated or, at least, adumbrated, the spiritual Israel. I propose to examine two fundamental elements of the prophetic tradition.

"a - First when the Prophets evoked the restoration of Zion, it was not the land itself which was of a sacred nature. The absolute and indisputable criteria of the prophetic concept of the Redemption was the restoration of the Alliance with God, at a time when that Alliance had been broken by the King and his people.

"Micah spells it out clearly : "Hear, I pray you, O heads of Jacob, and ye princes of the house of Israel that abhor judgment and pervert all equity. They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with inequity...Therefore shall Zion for your sake be

plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high place of the forest."

Source : Micah III, 1-12.

"Zion is holy only if the Law of God reigns above it. And this does not mean that every Law edicted at Jerusalem is a holy one.

"b- It is not only the land which depends on the observance and fidelity to the Alliance : the people reinstalled in Zion have the same obligations of justice, uprightness and faith to the Covenant with God.

"Zion could not expect the restoration of a people resting on treaties, alliances, military balances of power or a military hierarchy seeking to establish its superiority over the neighbors of Israel.The prophetic tradition clearly shows that the holiness of a land does not depend on its soil, nor that of its people's sole presence on that territory. The only thing that is sacred and worthy of Zion is the divine Covenant which expresses itself in the deeds of its people.

"The present State of Israel has no right whatsoever to claim the accomplishment of the divine project for a Messianic age.... It is pure demagoguery of soil and blood. Neither the people nor the land are holy and deserving of any spiritual privilege in this world. Zionist totalitarianism which seeks to subject the entire Jewish people, even by violence and force, makes it a people among others and like others."

Source : Rabbi Elmer Berger : "Prophecy, Zionism and the state of Israel." Ed. American Jewish alternatives to Zionism. Conference at Leiden University (Netherlands) on March 20th 1968.

* * *

Ygal Amir, Isaac Rabin's assassin, is neither a delinquent nor a madman, but a pure product of Zionist education. The son of a rabbi, an excellent student at the clerical University of Bar Ilan near Tel Aviv, he has been brought up on the teachings of the Talmudic schools. A first-rate soldier in the Golan, one of his books was the biography of Baruch Goldstein (who murdered 27 Arabs praying at the tomb of the Patriarchs at Hebron a few months ago). Ygal Amir probably saw, on Israeli State television, the long documentary on the "Eyal" group (the Warriors of Israel) swearing on the tomb of Theodore Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, to "execute whoever would yield to the Arabs the 'Promised Land' of Judah and Samaria" (present-day Cis-Jordania).

The assassination of President Rabin, (like the killings of Goldstein) are inscribed in the strict logic of the mythology of the Zionist Fundamentalists : the order to kill, says Ygal Amir, "comes from God", as in the days of Joshua.

Source : "Le Monde" (AFP) November 8th 1995.

Ygal Amir was not an isolated case within Israeli society : on the day of Isaac Rabin's murder, the Kiryat Arba and Hebron settlers danced for joy, reciting the psalms of David, round the mausoleum erected to the glory of Baruch Goldstein.

Source : "El País" (Spain), November 7th 1995. p. 4.

Isaac Rabin was a symbolic target, not because he supposedly "fought for Peace all his life". as Bill Clinton claimed at Rabin's funeral. In fact, Rabin was at the head of the occupying forces at the beginning of the "Intifada", and it was he who gave the order to "break the bones" of the children of the Palestinian soil, whose only weapon was the ancient stones of their land with which to defend their ancestral soil.

But Isaac Rabin was a realist who had understood (like the Americans in Vietnam and the French in Algeria) that there could be no definitive military solution when an Army clashes not just with another army but with an entire people. He had therefore agreed on a compromise solution with Yasser Arafat: a portion of the territories, whose occupation had been condemned by the United Nations, would be granted administrative autonomy. But the Israeli army would continue to protect the "colonies" stolen from the natives and which had turned into seminars of hate such as Hebron.

This was already going too far for the Fundamentalists who had benefited from this colonialism: they created round Rabin - whom they presented as a "traitor" - the climate of hatred which led up to his infamous assassination. After thousands of Palestinians, Isaac Rabin was a victim of the myth of the "Promised Land", ancient pretext for bloody colonialism.

This assassination by a fanatic shows once more that a genuine peace between a State of Israel, secure within the frontiers established by the 1947 partition, and a wholly independent Palestinian State, must involve the radical elimination of the present-day colonialism, in other words of all the colonies which are from within the future Palestinian State, unending sources of provocation and so many detonators for future wars.

2- The myth of the "chosen people"

"Thus speaketh the Lord : my firstborn son is Israel." - Exodus IV, 22

A Fundamentalist interpretation of political Zionism.

"The inhabitants of the world can be disseminated between Israel and the other nations taken as a whole. Israel is the chosen people: chief dogma."

Source : Rabbin Cohen: "The Talmud" Ed. Payot, Paris 1986.p.104.

This myth is the belief, without any historical foundation whatsoever, according to which monotheism was born with the Old Testament. It would appear, on the contrary, from the Bible itself that its two principal transcribers, the Yahvist and the Elohist, were not monotheists, either of them; they only proclaimed the superiority of the Hebrew god over the other gods, and his "jealousy" regarding them (Exodus XX, 2-5). Kamosh, the god of Moab, is acknowledged (Judges XI, 24 and Kings II, 27) as "the other gods" (Samuel I, XXVII, 19) (Kings I, 27).

It was only after the exile, and especially with the Prophets, that monotheism

asserted itself, in other words when formulas such as : "Thou shalt have no god than I." (XX, 4) turned into ones that were not content with demanding obedience to Yahveh and to no other gods (as is repeated in Deuteronomy) : "You shall not follow other gods." (VI, 14), but which proclaimed : "I am God, there are none others." (Essau XLV, 22). This indisputable assertion of monotheism dates from the second half of the VIth century B.C. (between 550 and 539 B.C.).

For monotheism was the fruit of a long ripening process of the great cultures of the Middle East, those of Mesopotamia and Egypt. As early as the XIIIth century B.C. the pharaoh Akhenaton had the plural of the word "god" erased from all the temples. His "hymn to the sun" is paraphrased almost word for word in Psalm 104. The Babylonian religion was heading towards monotheism; when he evoked the god Marduk, the historian Albright delineated the stages in that transformation : "When it is recognized that the numerous different divinities are only manifestations of a single god... it is only one step away from reaching a certain monotheism. "

Source : Albright. "Les religions dans le Moyen Orient." p. 159

The "Babylonian Poem of Creation" (which dates from the XIth century B.C.) bears witness to these "final steps" : "If humans are divided as to the gods, we by all the names we shall have named him by, let him be He, our God." This religion reached a high degree of interiority, in which the image of the suffering Upright man appears : "I want to praise the Lord of wisdom...My God has forsaken me ... I paraded as a Lord and now I hug the walls... Each day I moan like a dove and tears burn my cheeks. And yet prayer was wisdom for me, and sacrifice my law. I believed I was in God's service, but who from the depth of the abyss can understand the divine ways ?

"Who, if not Marduk, is the master of the resurrection? You whose clay he originally molded, Sing the glory of Marduk."

Source : Op. cit. p. 329 to 341.

This image of Job preceded Job himself. A similar image of the "suffering upright man" is that of Daniel (not the Daniel of the Hebrew Bible) punished by God and brought back to earth by his lord ; it can be found in all the Ugaritic texts of Ras Shamrah, in what has been called the Canaan Bible , which preceded that of the Hebrews since Ezekiel mentions Daniel next to Job (Ezekiel XIV, 14 and 20).

These are parables whose spiritual meaning in no way depends on historical authentication. This also holds true for that wondrous parable of resistance to oppression and of liberation that we find in the tale of Exodus. It matters little, therefore, that « the crossing of the reed-filled sea cannot be regarded as a historical event, as Mircea Eliade writes , and that it does not concern all the Hebrews but only a few groups of fugitives. It is, however, significant that the date of this grandiose flight from Egypt was made to coincide with Easter...given renewed value and integrated to the holy history of Yahvism.

From 621 B.C. on, the celebration of the Exodus replaced a genuine Canaan agrarian rite at Easter, in spring : the feast of the resurrection of Adonis. The Exodus thus became the founding act of the rebirth of a people rescued from slavery by its god.

The divine experience of this rescue of man from his ancient bonds is to be found in many different races, from the long wanderings of the Aztec tribe, "Mexico" in the XIIIth century : after more than a century of trials, the tribe arrives in the valley to which its god has led it, opening the way where no road had been traced before.

The African Kaidara also had the same tradition of a journey of initiation towards freedom. The settlement on a land of nomadic or wandering tribes is linked - especially in the Middle East - to the giving of a promised land to a people by a god.

There are myths at every stage of man's human and spiritual development in all civilizations. That of the Deluge, whereby God punished the sins of men and began his creation again, is to be found in all civilizations since the Mesopotamian Gilgamesh to the Popol Vuh of the Mayas of Guatemala (Part I, chapter 3).

Hymns of praise to God are born of all religions, such as the psalms in honor of the Incas' mother goddess, Pachacamac, and their other gods as well :
"Wiraqocha, root of being, God, always near... who creates saying : let man be ! let woman be ! Wiraqocha, luminous lord, God who causes to be and to die... Thou who renewest creation, Keep thy creature a long time, that it may perfect itself ... walking along the straight path."

If it were not for an ethnocentric prejudice in our path, why should we not reflect on all these sacred texts, which were an "Ancient Testament" for each of their people, and study the moment of the discovery of the meaning of life ?

Only then would the message of life and the words of Jesus attain their true universality : it would be rooted in all the experiences men have had of the divine, and not restricted - and even stifled by a unilateral tradition. The very life of Jesus, his radically new vision of the Kingdom of God as no longer resting on the power of the mighty but on the hope of the poor, would cease to be eclipsed by a historical schema going only from promises of victory made to one People until their final victory.

We have here evoked in their anteriority only religions of the Middle East, in which dawned monotheism and which exerted an influence on the Hebrews. In other non-Western cultures the move towards monotheism is even more ancient. For example the Vedas of India.

"Wise men give the Sole Being more than one name." (Hymn of the Rig-Veda III, 7). Vrihaspati "It is our Father, who contains all the gods." (III, 18) "He who is our Father has engendered and contains all beings. God alone, he has made the other gods. Everything that exists acknowledges him as Master...You know He who has created all things; it is the same as the one who is within you." (CXI, 11) "His names are many, but He is One."

These sacred texts date from the XVIth to the VIth century B.C., and Father Monchanin (S.J.), in his effort of intuition to place himself within the Vedas, called them : "the absolute liturgical poem."

Source : Jules Monchanin : "Mystique de l'Inde, mystère chrétien". P.231.229.

3. The myth of Joshua : ethnic purification.

"And from Lachish Joshua passed unto Eglon, and all Israel with him...And they took it on that day, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that were therein he utterly destroyed that day...And Joshua went up from Eglon, and all Israel with him, unto Hebron." (Book of Joshua X,34)

A Fundamentalist interpretation of political Zionism.

On April 9th 1948, Menahem Begin and his Irgun troops massacred the 254 inhabitants of the village of Deir Yassin, men, women and children.

We are studying this passage of fossilization of the myth into history and the claims of that "historical touch-up job" to justify a policy, in just one specific case : that of the instrumentalization of the Biblical tales. They have never ceased to play a determinant role in the fate of the West, insofar as they covered its most bloody deeds, from the persecution of the Jews by the Romans, then by the Christians, until the Crusades, the Inquisition, the Holy Alliance, the colonial dominations exerted by the "chosen people", until the exactions of the state of Israel, not only through its policy of expansion in the Middle East, but also through the pressures of its lobbies, the most powerful of which is the American one, that plays a major role in the American policy of world domination and military aggression. This is the reason for our choice : the exploitation of a mythical past is influencing the future towards what might prove to be world suicide.

* * *

The Bible contains some of the most outstanding images of the divine presence in history, from that first and grandiose explosion beyond our petty morals and logic, of the transcendent sacrifice of Abraham, to the eternal symbol of mankind's flight from servitude in the epic of Exodus, along with the great prophecies of Amos and Ezekiel, of Isaiah and Job, all the way to the announcement of a new alliance with David.

This "new alliance" (or "New Testament") heralds the greatest mutation in the history of men and gods with the advent of Jesus, whom, as the Fathers of the Eastern Church put it : « God became man so that man could become God. » Then, with Saint Paul, returned the traditional vision of a sovereign, all-powerful God who directs the life of men and communities from above and from without, not through the Jewish "law" any more but through a Christian "grace" which similarly destroys man's responsibility.

"It is through grace that you are saved. You have nothing to do with it. It is the gift of God." (Ephesians. II. 10) We will not deal with the Bible in general, but only with that part of it which is claimed to inspire the theocratic Israeli regime of today and the Zionist movement : the Torah (which the Christians call the Pentateuch, in other words the five first books : Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy) and its so-called "historical" annexes, the books of Joshua, Judges, Kings and Samuel; it does include the "prophetic" portions of the Torah, which constantly recall that "God's alliance with men" is unconditional and universal, bound to the observance of the divine law and open to all nations and all mankind.

* * *

The Torah (the Pentateuch) and the "historical" books (as has been proved for more than a century by the exegetes) are a compilation of oral traditions, set in writing by the scribes of Solomon in the IXth century B.C. Their chief preoccupation was to legitimize (by amplifying them) the conquests of David and his empire; these are in any case impossible to verify through other historical documents or archeological traces. There are no other sources than the Bible, except for the story of Solomon of which we find some evidence in the Assyrian archives. Before then, no sources, outside the Biblical tales, can confirm or infirm the historical veracity of the Torah. For example, the archeological vestiges of Ur in Irak give us no more information on Abraham than the excavation of the ruins of Troy have given us on Hector or Priam.

In the Book of Numbers (XXXI, 7-18) we are told of the exploits of the "sons of Israel" who, when they vanquished the Madianites, "killed all the men as the Lord had ordered Moses to do", "took all the women into bondage", "burned all the cities." When they returned to Moses, "Moses was wrathful. What ! he told them, you have suffered all the women to live...! Now, go forth and slay all youths, and slay all the women who have known a man in wedlock... But all the virgins...keep them for yourselves." (14-18).

During the conquest of Canaan, the successor of Moses, Joshua, carried on with this systematic policy of "ethnic purification" dictated by the God of the armies. "On that day, Joshua seized Maqquad and slew them all, including the king with the edge of his sword, and all the souls that were therein; he let none remain in it; but did unto the king thereof as he did unto the king of Jericho And Joshua passed from the Libnah and all Israel with him, onto Lachish into the hand of Israel which took it on the second day and smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that were therein, according to all that he had done to Libnah.

Then Horem, king of Gezer, came up to help Lachish ; and Joshua smote him and his people, until he had left him none remaining. And from Lachish Joshua passed on to Eglon and all Israel with him; and they encamped against it and fought against it : and they took it on that day, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and all souls that were therein he utterly destroyed that day according to all that he had done to Lachish. And Joshua went up from Eglon, and all Israel with him, unto Hebron; and they fought against it."

Source : The book of Joshua. X, 34 , X 36.

And the litany continues, enumerating the "sacred exterminations" perpetrated in Cisjordan. We must, before such tales, raise two fundamental questions :

1 - That of their historical truth ;

2 - That of the consequences of a literal imitation of this exaltation of a policy of extermination.

a - Regarding the first point :

Here, we come into conflict with archeology. Excavations have apparently revealed

that the Israelites arriving at the end of the XIIIth century B.C. could not have taken Jericho because the city was already deserted. The mid-Bronze Age city was destroyed towards 1550 B.C. and subsequently abandoned. It was sparsely resettled in the XIVth century B.C. : pottery dating from this period has been found in Mid-Bronze Age tombs that were re-utilized, and a house containing a small pitcher dating from the mid-XIVth century B.C. Nothing can be attributed to the XIIIth century. There are no traces of New Bronze Age fortifications. The conclusion of Miss K.M. Kenyon is that it is impossible to associate a destruction of Jericho with an entrance of the Israelites at the end of the XIIIth century B.C.

Source : Cf. K.M. Kenyon, "Digging up Jericho", London 1957, pp. 256-265;

"Jericho", in "Archeology and Old Testament Study", D. Winton, Oxford, 1967, spec. pp. 272-274 ; H.J. Franken, "Tell es-Sultan and Old Testament Jericho", in OTS, 14 (1965), pp. 189-200. M. Weippert, "Die Landnahme der isrealitischen Stamme, pp. 54-55.

The same holds true of the "taking of Ay".

"Of all the tales of conquest, this one is the most detailed : it contains no miraculous element and appears to be the most likely. Unfortunately, archeology gives it the lie.

"The site was searched by two different expeditions. The results tally : at the time of the Early Bronze Age, Et-Tell was a large city whose name is unknown to us, and which was destroyed during the Early Bronze Age, around 2,400 B.C. It remained deserted until after 1,200 B.C., when a poor, unfortified village grew up upon a portion of the ruins. This village subsisted only until the beginning of the Xth century B.C. at the latest; after which the site was definitively abandoned. At the time of the arrival of the Israelites, there was no city of Ay, there was no king of Ay, there was nothing but a 1,200 year-old ruin."

Source : Père de Vaux (O.P.) : "Histoire ancienne d'Israel". Ed. Lecoivre et Gabalda. Paris 1971 TI, p.565.

See : in 1933-35 by Judith Marquet-Krause, "Les fouilles de 'Ay (et Tell), Paris 1949, then by J.A. Callaway from 1964, Cf. J.A. Callaway, Basor 178 (after 1965), pp. 13-40 ; RB, 72 (1965), pp. 409 415 ; K. Schoonover, RB 75 (1968) pp. 243-247 ; 76 (1969), pp. 423-426 ; J.A. Callaway, Basor, 196 (Dec. 1969), pp. 2 -16.

b - Regarding the second point.

Why, therefore, if a Jew is pious and a Fundamentalist (in other words a literal reader of the Bible) should he not follow the example of such highly prestigious figures as Moses and Joshua ?

Is it not said in Numbers, of the conquest of Palestine (Canaan) : "And the Lord hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their cities" (Numbers XXI, 3), and regarding the Amorites and their king : "So they smote him, and his sons, and all his people, until there was none left alive : and they possessed his land." (Numbers XXI, 35)

Deuteronomy does not demand only spoliation of the land and the expulsion of its inhabitants, but massacre, as it repeats : « And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them. » (Deuteronomy VII, 2)

From Sharon to Rabbi Meier Kahane, it is the prefiguration of the way the Zionists behave towards the Palestinians. Was not Joshua's voice that of Menahem Begin, when, on April 9th 1948, the 254 inhabitants of Deir Yassin, men, women and children, were massacred by his "Irgun" troops, to force the unarmed Arabs to flee out of terror?

Source : Menahem Begin : "La révolte : Histoire de l'Irgoun" (p.200). Editions Albatros. 1978.

He called upon the Jews "not only to push back the Arabs but to lay hold of all Palestine." Was it not the voice of Joshua which made itself heard through Moshe Dayan, when he said :
"If one owns the Bible and one considers oneself to be the people of the Bible, one should also own the lands in the Bible."

Source : "Jerusalem Post", August 10th 1977.

The voice of Joshua also made itself heard in the words of Yoram Ben Porath when he was quoted in the major Israeli newspaper, "Yediot Aaronoth" on July 14th 1972 :
"There is no such thing as Zionism, as colonization by the Jewish State, without the eviction of the Arabs and the expropriation of their lands."

As to the means of that dispossession of the lands, they were set by Rabin when he was general-in-chief of the occupied territories : to break the bones of the Intifada stone-throwers. What was the reaction of the Israeli Talmudist schools? To help to power one of the people most directly responsible for the Sabra and Chatila massacres : General Rafael Eytan, who asked for the "reinforcement" of the existing Jewish colonies.

As we have seen, Moses and Joshua applied to the letter these prescriptions of their God in the Torah. Literalism leads to the same massacres.

Animated by the same convictions, Doctor Baruch Goldstein, a colonist of American descent from Kiryat Arba (Cisjordania) killed over fifty Palestinians with a machine-gun as they were praying at the Tomb of the Patriarchs. He was a member of a Fundamentalist group founded under the patronage of Ariel Sharon (under whose protection were perpetrated the massacres of Sabra and Shatila, and who was rewarded for his crime by a promotion : Minister of Housing, in charge of developing the "colonies" in the occupied territories). Baruch Goldstein is now the object of a genuine cult on the part of the Fundamentalists, who come to put flowers on his grave and to kiss it, for he was strictly faithful to the tradition of Joshua, having received the order to exterminate all the people of Canaan in order to seize their lands.

* * *

This "ethnic purification" which has become systematic in the State of Israel, stems from the principle of ethnic purity which must prevent the mixing of Jewish blood with the "impure blood" of any other race.

In the lines that follow God's order to exterminate the population put at their mercy, the Lord advises Moses that his people must not be allowed to marry the girls from these peoples (Exodus, XXXV, 16).

This command of the Torah is confirmed in the same terms in Deuteronomy : the "chosen people" (Deut. VII, 6) must not mingle with others : "Thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son." (Deut. VII, 3) This "apartheid" is the only way to prevent the soiling of the race chosen by God, the faith that binds it to Him.

This separation from the Other has remained the law : in his book "le Talmud" (Paris, Payot 1986, p.104), Rabbi Cohen wrote : "The inhabitants of the world can be divided between Israel and the other nations taken as a whole. Israel is the chosen people : a capital dogma." On their return from exile, "Ezra and Nehemiah" watched over this the re-establishment of this "apartheid." :

Ezra weeps because the "Holy (sic) race has mingled with the peoples of the lands" (Ezra IX, 2)...With the divine blessing, people are punished :

Pinhas impales a mixed-blood couple... and thus wins Jehovah's approbation. Ezra orders racial selection and exclusion : "all those who had taken strange wives, they cast them away, women and children" (Ezra, X, 44). Nehemiah says of the Jews : "Thus cleansed I them from all strangers." (Neh : XIII, 30).

This mixophobia and rejection of others go beyond the racial dimension. To refuse the other's blood through mixed marriage is also to refuse his religion, his culture or his way of being. Thus Jehovah fulminates against those who move away from his truth, the only possible truth, of course : Sophonia struggles against foreign ways of dressing, Nehemiah against foreign languages : "I saw Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon and of Moab. And their children spake half in the speech of Aschdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them and plucked off their hair..." (Nehemiah, XIII, 23-25)

All those who disobey the law are harshly judged. Next to the multiple divine speeches demanding racial purity flourish the comments of those who adhere to these rules, such as Rebekah, wife of Isaac and mother of Jacob, who declares : "I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth ; if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth...what good shall my life do me ?" (Genesis XXVII, 46). Samson's parents, outraged by their son's marriage to a Philistine woman, cry out : "Is there never a woman among the daughters of thy brethren or among all my people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines ?" (Judges, XIV, 3)

Haim Cohen, who was a judge at the Supreme Court of Israel, noted "the bitter irony of fate which has led the same biological and racist laws propagated by the Nazis and which inspired the infamous Nuremberg laws, to serve as a basis for the definition of

Judaism within the State of Israel." (see Joseph Badi : "Fundamental Laws of the State of Israel". New York 1960, p.156).

And indeed, during the trial of the war criminals at Nuremberg, the question was raised at the interrogation of Julius Streicher, the race "theoretician" :
"In 1935, at the Nuremberg Party Congress, the "racial laws" were promulgated. During the preparation of the law-project, were you called upon for consultation and did you participate in any way in the elaboration of these laws ?

"The accused (Streicher) : - Yes, I believe I participated in it insofar as, for years, I had been writing that all mixing of German and Jewish blood had to be prevented in the future. I wrote articles to that effect, and I have always repeated that we had to take the Jewish race, or the Jewish people, as a model. I have always repeated in my articles that the Jews were to be regarded as a model by other races, for they have given themselves a racial law, the law of Moses, which says :

"If you go unto foreign lands, you must not take foreign wives. And this, Gentlemen, is of great importance in judging the Nuremberg laws. It was these Jewish laws that were taken as a model. When, centuries later, the Jewish legislator Ezra saw that, despite this, many Jews had married non-Jewish wives, these bonds were broken. This was the origin of Jewry which, thanks to its racial laws, survived for centuries, whereas all the other races and civilizations were destroyed."

Source : Trial of the major war criminals before the International Military Court (Nuremberg : November 14th 1945 October 1st 1946). Official French text. 26th April 1946 Debates, Tome XII. D 321).

This was indeed how the jurists who acted as advisers for the Nazi Ministry of the Interior, had elaborated the "Nuremberg Laws, of the right of the Reich population and the protection of German blood and of the German honor." These jurists, Bernard Losener and Friedrich Knost, thus commented the text in the compilation : "The Nuremberg laws" :

"According to the Fuhrer's will, the Nuremberg laws do not really imply measures designed to accentuate and perpetrate racial hatred : on the contrary, such measure signify the beginning of a lull in relations between the Jewish people and the German people. If the Jews already had their own State, in which they would feel at home, the Jewish question could be considered resolved, as much for the Jews as for the Germans. It is for this reason that the most convinced Zionists have not raised the least objection against the spirit of the Nuremberg laws."

Hebrew racism, the model for all other racisms, appears as an ideology of the extermination of different peoples.

"The Puritan settlers of America, when they hunted down the Indians to grab their lands, invoked Joshua and the 'sacred exterminations' of the Amalecites and the Philistines."

Source : Thomas Nelson, "The Puritans of Massachusetts", Judaism, Vol XVI, n°2 1967

Between mixophobia and Cannanite-style Shoah, we now have an ideology of population "transfer" which is approved of by 77% of the rabbis in Judea-Samaria. This doctrine of exclusion and extermination is partly founded on religion (it is GOD who wills it), but this in no way excuses the political Zionism of the refusal of others. In Leviticus, God enjoins the Jews not to practice the mixture of "species" (Lev. XX. 20, 25) as He himself has distinguished Israel from the other nations (Lev. 20,24), to practice racial discrimination (« I will make a distinction between my people and your people », (Ex. IIX, 19).

In 1993, Chief Rabbi Sitruk could declare without any fear of being called to order by any authority whatsoever :

"I would wish young Jewish men never to marry any but Jewish girls."

This phobia reaches its highest point when Israel is at stake. Thus Israel "which shall be holy" (Lev.XX, 26) must not "soil" itself through contact with the other nations that God has taken "in disgust" (Lev. XX, 23). The prohibition is oft repeated. God threatens and storms when it is not respected :

"Neither shalt thou make marriages with them (the Canaanite nations); thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son..." (Deut. VII, 3-4).

"Else if ye do in any wise go back, and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, even these that remain among you, and shall make marriages with them, and go unto them, and they go to you ; know for a certainty that the Lord your God will no more drive out any of these nations from before you; but they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you." (Joshua. XXIII. 12-13)

On November 10th 1975, at a plenary session of the United Nations, it was declared that Zionism was a form of racism and racial discrimination. Since the break-up of the Soviet Union, the United States has taken over the U.N. Among many other acts of international banditry, it obtained the repeal of the just 1975 resolution, once more washing away the blood that covers Israel and its leaders. In fact, nothing has changed since 1975; or rather, the repression, the slow massacre of the Palestinian people and colonization have increased tenfold.

II - The Myths of the 20th Century

NOTE: In the course of translation and at least two digital transmissions, some portions of the text of this section were slightly damaged. All text contained in square brackets [...] indicates an editorial substitution or omission of garbled text passages.--
7/20/96

1 - The myth of Zionist anti-Fascism

In 1941, Yitzhak Shamir committed "an unforgivable crime from the moral point of view: he preached an alliance with Hitler, with Nazi Germany, against Great Britain."

Source : Bar Zohar. "Le prophète armé-- : Ben Gourion." (Fayard. Paris 1966, p.99.)

When the war against Hitler began, almost all the Jewish organizations joined forces with the Allies and some of the most eminent leaders, such as Weizmann, declared themselves on the allied side; but the German Zionist group, though it was a small minority at the time, took the opposite side : from 1933 to 1941, it was committed to a policy of compromise and even of collaboration with Hitler. The Nazi authorities, even while they persecuted the Jews, for example by dismissing them from the Civil Service, kept contact with the Zionist leaders, granting them special treatment and distinguishing them from the "integrationist" Jews they were hunting down.

The accusation of collusion with the Hitlerian authorities does not therefore apply to the immense majority of Jews; these had not even waited until the war to fight Fascism with weapons, as they did in Spain from 1936 to 1939 as members of the International brigades, all the way to the Warsaw ghetto where the fighters of the "Jewish Committee" showed that they knew how to die in battle.

But the highly organized minority of Zionist leaders collaborated with the Nazis for eight years. Their one goal was to create a powerful Jewish State, while their racist vision of the world made them more anti-British than anti-Nazi.

* * *

On September 5th 1939, two days after the Anglo-French declaration of war on Germany, Chaim Weizmann, president of the Jewish Agency, wrote to the British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain. In his letter, he declared : "We Jews are on the side of Great Britain, and shall fight for democracy." He added that "the Jewish

representatives are ready to sign an immediate agreement to allow the use of all their resources in men, techniques, material aid and all their capacities." This letter was printed in "**The Jewish Chronicle**" of September 8th, 1939 ; it was a genuine declaration of war on Germany by the Jewish people and raised the problem of internment of all Jews in Germany within concentration camps as "citizens of a nation at war with Germany."

* * *

In the days of Hitler and Mussolini, the Zionist leaders behaved in an ambivalent way with regards to Fascism, at times sabotaging the anti-Fascist struggle and even attempting to collaborate at others. The fundamental aim of the Zionists was not to save Jewish lives but to create a Jewish state in Palestine. Ben Gurion, Israel's first head of State, declared outright to the "Labor" Zionists on December 7th 1938 : "If I knew it was possible to save all the children in Germany by taking them to England, and only half of the children by taking them to Eretz Israel, I would choose the second solution. For we must take into account not only the lives of these children but also the history of the people of Israel."

Source : Yvon Gelbner, "Zionist policy and the fate of European Jewry", in Yad Vashem studies (Jerusalem, vol. XII, p. 199).

"The saving of the Jews in Europe did not figure at the head of the list of priorities of the ruling class. It was the foundation of the State which was primordial in their eyes."

Source : Tom Segev. "Le septième million" Ed. Liana Levi, Paris, 1993, p.539"

(...) Must we help all those who need it without taking into account the characteristics of each one? Must we not give this action a national Zionist character and attempt to give priority to the saving of those who can be useful to the Land of Israel and to Judaism? I know it may seem cruel to pose the question in this way, but unfortunately we must establish clearly that if we are able to save 10,000 people out of the 50,000 people who can contribute to the construction of the land and to the national rebirth, or else a million Jews who will become a burden for us or at best a dead weight, we must restrict ourselves to the saving of the 10,000 who can be saved - despite the accusations and the appeals of the million left behind."

Source : Memorandum of the "Salvation Committee" of the Jewish Agency. 1943. Quoted by Tom Segev. Op. cit. p.124.

It was this fanaticism which inspired, for instance, the attitude of the Zionist delegation at the Evian conference of July 1938, where 31 nations had gathered to discuss the absorption of refugees from Nazi Germany : the Zionist delegation demanded, as the only possible solution, the admission of 200,000 Jews to Palestine.

The Jewish state was more important than the lives of Jews.

As far as the Zionist leaders were concerned, the worst enemy was "assimilation". In this they resembled the Hitlerians as do all racists, for whom the fundamental preoccupation is purity of blood. This is why the Hitlerians regarded the Zionists as

valid interlocutors who served their designs, insofar as Hitler's ultimate goal was to rid Germany, and later Europe, of all Jews. We have proof of this collusion between Nazis and Zionists.

In a memorandum of June 21st 1933 to the Nazi party, the "**Zionist Federation of Germany**" expressed itself as follows :

"In the foundation of the new State, which has proclaimed the race principle, we wish to adapt our community to these new structures... Our recognition of the Jewish nationality allows us to establish clear and sincere relations with the German people and its national and racial realities. Precisely because we do not want to underestimate these fundamental principles, because we too are against mixed marriages and for the maintaining of the purity of the Jewish group...The Jews who are conscious of their identity and in whose name we speak, can find a place within the structure of the German State, for they are free of the resentment that the assimilated Jews must feel;...we believe in the possibility of loyal relations between those Jews conscious of their community and the German State.

To attain its practical objectives, Zionism hopes it will be able to collaborate with a government that is fundamentally hostile to the Jews....The realization of Zionism is impeded only by the resentment of Jews from without against the present German orientation The propaganda in favor of Zionism currently aimed against Germany is essentially non-Zionist... "

Source : Lucy Dawidowicz, "A Holocaust reader", p. 155.

The memorandum added that "should the Germans accept the cooperation of the Zionists, these would try to dissuade Jews abroad from supporting the anti-German boycott."

Source : Lucy Dawidowicz : "The war against Jews (1933-1945)" Penguin books. 1977. p.231-232

The Hitlerian leaders were well-disposed towards the Zionists, whose exclusive aim was to create a state in Palestine, thus favoring their own designs to get rid of the Jews. Alfred Rosenberg, the chief Nazi theoretician, wrote :
"Zionism must be vigorously backed so that a yearly contingent of German Jews shall be transported to Palestine."

Source : A. Rosenberg : "Die Spur des juden im Wandel der Zeiten". Munich 1937. p.153.

Reinhardt Heydrich, who was later to become "Protector" of Czechoslovakia, wrote in **Das Schwarze Korps**, the official organ of the S.S. in 1935, when he was head of the S.S. security. In an article entitled "The invisible enemy", he made a distinction between two kinds of Jews :

"We must separate the Jews into two categories, the Zionists and the partisans of assimilation. The Zionists profess a strictly racial concept and, through emigration to Palestine, they help to build their own Jewish State...our good wishes and our official goodwill go with them."

Source : Hohne. "Order of the Death's Head", p.333.

"The German Betar received a new name: Herzlia. The activities of the movement in Germany had to obtain, of course, the approval of the Gestapo; in fact, Herzlia acted under the protection of the Gestapo. One day, a group of SS attacked a Betar summer camp. The head of the movement then complained to the Gestapo and, a few days later, the secret police declared that the SS in question had been punished. The Gestapo asked the Betar what compensation would seem most adequate. The movement asked that the recent prohibition that had struck them, forbidding them to wear brown shirts, be lifted; their request was granted."

Source : Ben-Yeruham, "Le livre de Betar" T. II, p. 350.

A circular issued by the Wilhelmstrasse indicated :

"The goals that this category of Jews have set themselves (those Jews who oppose assimilation and favor a regrouping of their co-religionaries within a nation), with the Zionists in the front rank, are those least distant from the goals pursued in reality by Germany's policy towards the Jews."

Source : Circular letter by Bulow-Schwante to all the Reich diplomatic missions. #83. February 28,1934.

"There is no reason," wrote Bulow-Schwante to the Ministry of the Interior, "to impede by administrative measures the Zionist activity in Germany ; for Zionism is not in conflict with the National-Socialist program, whose object is to make the Jews leave Germany progressively."

Source : Letter number ZU 83-21. 28/8, April 13, 1935.

These directives confirmed previous measures and were applied scrupulously. By virtue of the privileged status of Zionism in Germany, the Bavarian Gestapo addressed the following circular to the police on January 28,1935: "By reason of their activity orientated towards emigration to Palestine, the members of the Zionist organization must not be treated with the harshness needed in dealing with the members of German Jewish (assimilationist) organizations."

Source : Kurt Grossmann : "Sionistes et non sionistes sous la loi nazie dans les années 30" Yearbook.Vol. VI, p.310.

"The Zionist organization of German Jews had a legal existence until 1938, five years after the advent of Hitler....

The "**Jüdische Rundschau**" (the German Zionist newspaper) came out until 1938."

Source : Leibowitz : "Israel et Judaïsme". Ed. Desclée de Brouwer, 1993. p. 116.

In exchange for their official recognition as sole representatives of the Jewish community, the Zionist leaders offered to break the boycott which the world anti-Fascists were trying to organize.

Economic collaboration began in 1933 : two companies were created : the "Haavara Company" at Tel Aviv and the "Paltreu", in Berlin.

The mechanism of the operation was the following : a Jew wanting to emigrate would deposit a minimum of 1,000 pounds sterling at the Wasserman Bank in Berlin or in the Warburg bank in Hamburg. With this sum, Jewish exporters could buy German goods for Palestine, and pay the corresponding amount in Palestinian pounds into the Haavara account at the Anglo-Palestine Bank at Tel Aviv. When the immigrant arrived in Palestine, he received the equivalent of the sum he had deposited in Germany.

Several future Israeli prime ministers took part in the "haavara" undertaking, including Ben Gurion, Moshe Sharret (who was then called Moshe Shertok), Golda Meir (who supported it from New York), and Levi Eshkol, who was its representative in Berlin.

Source: "Ben Gourion et Shertok, dans Black": L'accord de la "havaara", p.294. Quoted by Tom Segev in "Le septième million", (Ed. Liana Levi. French translation. 1993, p. 30 and 595).

The operation was advantageous for both parties : the Nazis thus succeeded in breaking the blockade (the Zionists managed to sell German merchandise even in Britain); whereas the Zionists were able to operate the "selective" immigration they desired : only millionaires were able to emigrate, their capital providing the funds needed to develop Zionist colonization in Palestine. In accordance with the goals of Zionism, it was more important to save Jewish capital from Nazi Germany that would permit the development of their undertaking, than to save the lives of poor Jews, unable to work or fight, who would have been a burden.

This policy of collaboration lasted until 1941, in other words eight years after Hitler's rise to power. Eichmann liaised with Kastner. The Eichmann trial revealed to some extent the mechanism of this connivance, of these "exchanges" between Zionist Jews "useful" to the creation of a Jewish State (wealthy personalities, technicians and youngsters who could serve to reinforce an army, etc.). with a mass of Jews who, being less favored, were left in Hitler's clutches.

The president of the committee, Ytzhak Gruenbaum, declared on January 18, 1943 : "Zionism comes before everything else.. "

"They're going to say I'm an anti-Semite," Gruenbaum answered, "that I don't want to save the Exile, that I don't have a Warm Yiddish heart (...) Let them say what they want. I won't demand the sum of 300,000 or 100,000 pounds sterling to help European Judaism. And I think that whoever demands such things accomplishes an anti-Zionist action."

Source : Gruenbaum: "Jours de destruction", p. 68.

This was also Ben Gourion's point of view:
"The Zionist's task is not to save the "rest" of Israel which finds itself in Europe, but to save the land of Israel for the Jewish people."

(Quoted by Tom Segev. op. cit., p. 158.)

"The leaders of the Jewish Agency agreed on the fact that the minority which could be saved had to be chosen according to the needs of the Zionist project in Palestine."

Source: Idem p.125.

The conclusion of Isaiah Trunk's book : "**Judenrat**" (MacMillan, New York 1972) was that:

"According to Freudiger's calculations, fifty percent of the Jews could have escaped if they had not followed the instructions of the Jewish councils." (p.141)

Significantly, at the time of the 50th anniversary of the uprising of the Warsaw ghetto, Yitzhak Rabin asked Lech Walesa not to let one of the co-leaders of the insurrection, Marek Edelman, make a speech.

In 1993, Marek Edelman had been interviewed by Edward Alter for the Israeli newspaper "Haaretz". In this interview, he recalled those who had been the true instigators and heroes of the Warsaw ghetto's "**Jewish fighters' committee**" : "Socialists of the Bund, anti-Zionists, Communists, Trotskyites, Mihal Rosenfeld, Mala Zimetbaum, Edelman and a minority of Left-wing Zionists from the Poalei Zion and the Hashomer Hatzair."

"It was they who fought against the Nazis with weapons, as did the Jewish volunteers in the international brigades of Spain. Over 30% of the Americans in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were Jews, who were attacked at the time by the Zionist press because they fought in Spain instead of going to Palestine."

Source : "Jewish Life", April 1938, p. 11.

2,250 of the fighters in the Polish Dombrovski brigade, out of a total of 5,000 Poles, were Jews.

These heroic Jews fought on all fronts side by side with the antiFascist forces of the world. And yet, the Zionist leaders declared in an article by their London representatives entitled : "Must Jews take part in the anti-Fascist movements?" "NO !...", setting a single goal : "the construction of the land of Israel".

In his autobiography, the President of the **World Zionist Organization**, Nahum Goldman, described his dramatic meeting with the Czech Prime Minister, Edward Benes, in 1935. Benes accused the Zionists of having broken the boycott of Hitler with the "Ha'avara" (the transfer agreements) and blamed the refusal of the world Zionist Organization to organize resistance against the Nazis.

"I have had to take part in many painful meetings in my life, but I have never felt as miserable and ashamed as during those two hours. I felt with every fiber of my being that Benes was right."

Source : Nahum Goldman. "Autobiographie", op.cit. pp. 157- 158. Ibid, p.260.

The Zionists, counting on Mussolini's hostility to England, established contact with

him as early as 1922. He had received them after his march on Rome in October, on December 20th 1922.

Source : Ruth Bondy, "The Emissary: a life of Enzo Sereni" (p.45).

Mussolini received Weizmann on January 3rd 1923, and another time on September 17th 1926; Nahum Goldman, president of the World Zionist Organization, had a meeting with Mussolini on October 26th, 1927, where the Italian leader told him : "I will help you to create this Jewish state." (Nahum Goldman : "**Autobiographie**", op.cit., p. 170)

This collaboration was already a form of sabotage against the international anti-Fascist struggle. It subordinated the entire Zionist policy to the sole design of building a Jewish state in Palestine. Its design remained unaltered during the war, even when Hitler's persecution of European Jews was at its worst.

When the Jews were deported from Hungary, Rudolf Kastner, the vice-president of the Zionist organization, negotiated with Eichmann on the following basis : if Eichmann allowed the departure to Palestine of 1,684 "useful" Jews who would help in the construction of the future state of Israel (capitalists, technicians, soldiers, etc...) Kastner would allow Eichmann to make 460,000 Hungarian believe that they were not being deported to Auschwitz but simply being transferred.

At the time of the Eichmann trial, Judge Halevi recalled that Kastner had intervened on behalf of one of his Nazi interlocutors : one of Himmler's henchmen, Standartenführer Kurt Becher, escaped punishment thanks to Kastner's testimony at the Nuremberg Trial.

The Judge was formal :

"There was no truth or good faith in Kastner's testimony...Kastner deliberately committed perjury in his testimony before this court when he denied that he had intervened on behalf of Becher. Furthermore, he concealed this vital fact : his action on behalf of Becher was made in the name of the Jewish Agency and the World Jewish Congress...It is clear that Kastner's recommendation was not made on a personal basis but also in the name of the Jewish Agency and the World Jewish Congress...and this is why Becher was released by the Allies."

After the verdict, Israeli opinion was shaken. In the newspaper "Haaretz", Dr. Moshe Keren wrote on July 14th 1955 : "Kastner must be tried for collaboration with the Nazis..." But the evening paper "Yediot Aharonot" (23rd June, 1955) clearly explained why this was impossible. "If Kastner is tried, the entire government might collapse before the nation, following what this trial will uncover."

What would be discovered was that Kastner had not acted alone but with the agreement of the other Zionist leaders who were members of the government at the time of the trial. The only way to prevent Kastner from talking and causing a scandal was for him to disappear. And indeed, he died at just the right moment, after which the Israeli Government introduced an appeal to rehabilitate him. The Supreme Court granted the appeal.

This policy of collaboration reached its apogee in 1941, when the most extremist Zionist group, the "LEHI" ("Fighters for the Liberation of Israel"), led by Abraham Stern and, after his death, by a triumvirate of which Itzak Shamir was a member, committed "an unforgivable crime from the moral point of view : advocating an alliance with Hitler, with Nazi Germany, against Great Britain. "

Source : Bar Zohar. "Ben Gourion, le Prophète armé" (Fayard. Paris 1966. p.99)

Eliezer Halevi, a well-known Labor unionist, member of the Gueva Kibbutz, revealed in the weekly "Tel-Aviv Hotam" (August 19th, 1983) the existence of a document signed by Itzak Shamir (who was then called Yezernitsky) and by Abraham Stern; this document was handed over to the German embassy in Ankara at a time of all-out war in Europe, and when Marshal Rommel's troops were already on Egyptian soil. The document said, among other things, "In the matter of concept, we identify with you. So why not collaborate with one another ?" In its issue of January 31st, 1983, "Haaretz" quotes a letter marked "secret", sent in January 1941 by Hitler's ambassador to Ankara, Franz Von Papen, to his superiors. In it, he described his contacts with the members of the Stern Gang, joining a memorandum by the Nazi secret service agent in Damas, Werner Otto Von Hentig, regarding the negotiations with the envoys of Stern and Shamir. The memo said, notably : "cooperation between the Israel liberation movement and the new order in Europe conform with one of the speeches of the Chancellor of the Third Reich, in which Hitler stressed the need to use every combination of coalition to isolate and defeat England." It also said that the Stern Gang had "close links with the totalitarian movements in Europe, their ideology and structures." These documents are to be found at the Holocaust Memorial (Yad Vachem) in Jerusalem, classified under the number E234151-8.

One of the historical leaders of the Stern Gang, Israel Eldad, published an article in the Tel Aviv Daily, "Yediot Aharonot" (February 4th, 1983) in which he confirmed the authenticity of these negotiations between his movement and the official representatives of Nazi Germany. He asserted straight out that his colleagues had explained to the Nazis how there was a probable identity of interest between the new order in Europe based on the German concept, and the aspirations of the Jewish people in Palestine, as represented by the Stern freedom fighters for Israel.

This text was entitled :

"Basic principles of the military organization(NMO) in Palestine (Irgun Zevai Leumi) concerning the solution of the Jewish question in Europe and the active participation of the NMO in the war on the side of Germany."

The following are extracts :

It emerges from the speeches of the leaders of the German National Socialist State that a radical solution to the Jewish question implies an evacuation of the Jewish masses from Europe. (Judenreines Europa).

This evacuation of the Jewish masses from Europe is the primary condition of the solution of the Jewish problem, but it is only made possible by the installation of these masses in Palestine, in a Jewish state with its historical frontiers.

To resolve the Jewish problem definitively and to liberate the Jewish people is the goal of the political activity and the long years of struggle of the "Movement for the Freedom of Israel" (Lehi) and its national military organization in Palestine (Irgun Zevai Leumi).

The NMO, knowing the benevolent position of the Reich government towards the Zionist activity within Germany, and the Zionist emigration projects, considers that:

- 1) There could exist common interests between the foundation of a new order in Europe, according to the German concept, and the genuine aspirations of the Jewish people as they are incarnated by the Lehi.
- 2) Cooperation would be possible between the new Germany and a renewed Hebrew nation (Volkish Nationalen Hebraertum).
- 3) The establishment of the historical Jewish State on a national and totalitarian base, linked by a treaty to a German Reich, could contribute to the reinforcement in the future of Germany's position in the Middle East.

On condition that the German government recognizes the national aspirations of the 'Movement for the Freedom of Israel' (Lehi), the National Military Organization (NMO) proposes to participate in the war on the side of Germany.

The cooperation of the Israel liberation movement would go in the direction of the recent speeches of the Reich chancellor, in which Mr. Hitler stressed that all negotiations and any alliance should serve to isolate England and to defeat it.

Because of its structure and concept of the world, the NMO is narrowly linked to the European totalitarian movements.

Source : The original text, in German, is to be found as appendix number 11 of the book by David Yisraeli : "Le problème palestinien dans la politique allemande, de 1889 " 1945", Bar Ilan University Ramat Gan. Israel, 1974,p. 315-317.

According to the Israeli press, which has published a dozen articles on the subject, the Nazis never took the proposals of Stern, Shamir and their friends seriously.

The negotiations stopped abruptly when the Allied troops arrested the emissary of Stern and Shamir in June 1941. The emissary, Naftali Loubentchik, was actually arrested in the Nazi secret service office at Damascus. Other members of the group continued to have contacts with the Nazis until the arrest by the British authorities of Izhak Shamir in December 1941 for **"terrorism and collaboration with the Nazi enemy."**

Such a past did not prevent Izhak Shamir from becoming Prime Minister, and from still being today the leader of a powerful "opposition", the most fiercely determined to continue the occupation of Cisjordania. This is because, in fact, the Zionist leaders all pursue the same racist goal, notwithstanding their internal rivalries : to chase all the

native Arabs out of Palestine through terror, expropriation or expulsion, in order to remain the sole conquerors and masters.

Ben Gurion once declared :

"Begin undeniably belongs to the Hitlerian type. He is a racist, ready to destroy all the Arabs in his dream of unification of Israel, prepared to resort to any means to realize this sacred goal."

Source : E. Haber. "Menahem Begin, the man and the legend." Delle Book. New York 1979, p. 385.

The same Ben Gurion never believed in the possibility of coexistence with the Arabs. The fewer Arabs there were within the borders of the future state of Israel, the better it would be. He did not say so explicitly, but the overall impression one gets from his speeches and his comments is clear: a major offensive against the Arabs would not only defeat their attacks but would also reduce as far as possible the percentage of the Arab population within the State.

"(...) He can be accused of racism, but then one will have to put on trial the entire Zionist movement, which is founded on the principle of a purely Jewish entity in Palestine."

Source : Bar Zohar (op. cit) p.146.

At the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, the Attorney General, Haim Cohen, reminded the judges:

"If it does not coincide with your philosophy, you can criticize Kastner...But what does that have to do with collaboration?...It has always been in our Zionist tradition to **select an elite** to organize immigration to Palestine... Kastner did nothing else."

Source : Court record 124/53. Jerusalem district court.

This prominent magistrate was indeed evoking a constant doctrine of the Zionist movement : its goal was not to save Jews but to build a strong Jewish state.

Rabbi Klausner, who was in charge of "Displaced persons," presented a report before the Jewish American Conference on May 2nd, 1948 :

"I am convinced people must be forced to go to Palestine....For them, an American dollar appears as the highest of goals. By the word "force", I am suggesting a program. It served for the evacuation of the Jews in Poland, and in the history of the 'Exodus'... To apply this program we must, instead of providing 'displaced persons' with comfort, create the greatest possible discomfort for them...At a second stage, a procedure calling upon the Haganah to harass the Jews."

Source : Alfred H. Lilienthal in "What price Israel", Chicago 1953.p.194-195.

There were several variations on this method of inducement and even of coercion.

In 1940, to arouse indignation against the English, who had decided to save the Jews threatened by Hitler by taking them to Mauritius, the Zionist leaders of the "Hagannah" (led by Ben Gurion) did not hesitate to blow up the ship when it called at

Haifa on December 25th 1940, causing the death of 252 Jews and English crew-members.

Source : Dr. Herzl Rosenblum, director of "Yediot Aharonoth", revelation made in 1958 and justified in "Jewish Newsletter", N.Y., November 1958.

Another example was that of Iraq :

Its Jewish community (110,000 people in 1948) was well-implanted in the country. The chief Rabbi of Iraq, Khedouri Sassoon had declared :
"The Jews and Arabs have enjoyed the same rights and privileges for a thousand years and do not consider themselves as separate elements in this nation."

Then began the Israeli terrorist acts in Baghdad in 1950. Confronted by the reticence of the Iraqi Jews to register on the immigration lists for Israel, the Israeli secret services did not hesitate to throw bombs at them to convince them they were in danger...The attack on the Shem-Tov synagogue killed three people and injured dozens more. It was the start of the exodus baptized "Operation Ali Baba".

Source : Ha'olam hazeh. April 20th and June 1st 1966, and "Yediot Aharonoth", November 8th 1977.

This has been a consistent doctrine ever since Theodore Herzl replaced the definition of Jew no longer as a religion but as a race.

Article 4b of the fundamental law of the State of Israel (which has no constitution), which defines the "Law of the return" (5710 of 1950), stipulates that :
...will be considered as Jewish a person born of a Jewish mother, or converted. (racial or confessional criteria)

Source : Klein : "L'Etat juif", ed. Dunod, Paris, p. 156.

This was in keeping with the founding doctrine of Theodore Herzl, who constantly harped on the theme in his "Diaries". As early as 1895, he declared to a German interlocutor (Speidel) :

"I understand anti-Semitism. We Jews have remained, even if it is not our fault, foreign bodies in the different nations."

Source : ("Diaries", p. 9)

A few pages further, he is even more explicit :

"Anti-Semites will become our surest friends, anti-Semitic countries our allies."

Source : ("Diaries", p.19)

They did indeed have a common goal : to assemble Jews in a world ghetto.

The facts have borne out Theodore Herzl's arguments.

Pious Jews, like many Christians, repeated each day : *"Next year, Jerusalem, "* making of Jerusalem not a specific territory but the symbol of the Alliance between

God and Men, and the personal effort to deserve it, so that the "Return" occurred only under the impulse of anti-Semitic threats in foreign countries.

On August 31st 1949, Ben Gurion declared to a group of American visitors to Israel : *"Although we have realized our dream of creating a Jewish State, we are only at the beginning. There are still only 900,000 Jews in Israel, whereas the majority of the Jewish people still remains abroad. Our future task is to bring all the Jews to Israel."*

Ben Gurion's goal was to bring four million Jews to Israel between 1951 and 1961. 800,000 came. In 1960, there were only 30,000 immigrants for the year. In 1975-76, emigration out of Israel outstripped immigration.

Only the great persecutions, such as that in Romania, had given a certain impulse to the Return. Even the Hitlerian atrocities did not succeed in fulfilling Ben Gurion's dream.

Out of the two and a half million Jewish victims of the Nazis which sought refuge abroad between 1935 and 1943, hardly 8,5% went to settle in Palestine. The United States limited their number to 182,000 allowed to enter US soil (less than 7%); England limited the number to 67,000 (less than 2%). The vast majority (1,930,000), in other words 75% found shelter in the Soviet Union.

Source : Institute for Jewish Affairs of New York, quoted by Christopher Sykes in "Crossroads to Israel", London 1965, and by Nathan Weinstock, "Le sionisme contre Israel," p.146.

2 - The Myth of the Justice of Nuremberg

"This tribunal represents a continuation of the war efforts of the Allied nations."

Source : Robert H. Jackson, U.S. Attorney-General (26th July 1946 session)

On August 8th 1945, the American, English, French and Russian met in London to organize "the pursuit and the punishment of the great war criminals of the European Axis Powers," by creating a "military international tribunal" (article I, a).

The crimes were defined under Title II, article 6.

1 - Crimes against peace by those who were responsible for starting the war."

2 - Crimes of war for the violation of laws and customs of war."

3 - Crimes against humanity, in other words crimes essentially committed against civilians.

The constitution of this jurisdiction already calls for a few remarks :

1 - It was not an international tribunal since it consisted only of the victors and, consequently, only the crimes committed by the vanquished were taken into

consideration. As the American Attorney General, Robert H. Jackson, who presided the audience on July 26th 1946, justly acknowledged :

"The Allies are still, technically-speaking, at war with Germany... As a military tribunal, this tribunal represents a continuation of the war efforts of the Allied nations."

2 - It was therefore an exceptional tribunal constituting the last act of war, and excluding by its very principle any responsibility on the part of the victors - first of all in the unleashing of the war. Any reminder of its primary source was excluded in advance : at Nuremberg, no-one raised the question of the Treaty of Versailles and if it was not to be blamed for the resulting consequences - the bankruptcies and the unemployment especially which allowed the rise of someone like Hitler, with the consent of a majority of the German people. The law of the strongest prevailed when Germany was defeated in 1918, asserting itself as the "right" which made might, when the Germans had to pay 132 billion gold-marks (the equivalent of 165 billion gold francs) as reparation, at a time when their country's national fortune was estimated at 260 billion gold-marks.

The German economy was ruined by such measures, and the German people driven to despair by bankruptcy, by the collapse of the currency and above all by unemployment ; it was all this which made Hitler's rise to power possible, giving him his best arguments to sustain his principal slogan : the cancellation of the Treaty of Versailles, with its sum total of misery and humiliation.

It is easy to compare the unemployment figures and the successes of the "National-Socialist Party" at the different elections :

I - from 1924 to 1930

Dates Votes % Seats Unemployed

05/04/1924 1,918,000 6.6 32 320,711

12/07/1924 908,000 3.0 14 282,645

05/20/1928 810,000 2.6 12 269,443

II - from 1930 to 1933

09/14/1932 6,407,000 18.3 107 1,061,570

07/31/1932 13,779,000 37.3 230 5,392,248

11/06/1932 11,737,000 33.1 196 5,355,428

03/05/1933 17,265,800 43.7 288 5,598,855

When Hitler and his political allies won the absolute majority in the Reichstag, they obtained aid for rearmament in dollars, pounds and francs. The German bank, Shreider, financed Hitler's department of propaganda, but it was mostly the great American, English and French trusts which financed the rearmament.

This was true in the case of the American chemical consortium, Dupont de Nemours and of the English trust;

Imperial Chemicals Industry, which subsidized I.G. Farben with whom they had shared the world powder market, and;

Dillon Bank, in New York which subsidized the

Vereinigte Stahlwerke, the German steel trust.

Others were subsidized by Morgan, Rockefeller, et al..

Thus did the pound and the dollar take part in the plot which brought Hitler to power.

In France, a request by Senator Paul Laffont to the Ministry of the national Economy concerning the quantities of iron ore exported towards Germany from 1934 on, received the following answer :

The quantities of iron ore (N 204 of the customs tariff) exported towards Germany in the years 1934,1935,1936 and 1937, are consigned to the following chart :

Year Quantities (in quintals)

1934 17,060,916

1935 58,616,111

1936 77,931,756

1937 71,329,234

Source : Journal officiel de la République française, March 26th 1938.

Yet the directors of Dupont de Nemours, Dillon, Morgan, Rockefeller or François de Wendel were not asked to answer for their actions at Nuremberg, in the chapter entitled "plotting against the peace".

The imprecations of Hitler and the principal Nazi leaders against Communists and Jews are often invoked. This is especially true of Chapter XV of the second volume of "Mein Kampf", in which Hitler evokes the past: that of the war of the gasses initiated by the English during the First World War. The chapter is entitled :
"The right to legitimate defense :

"If, at the beginning or during the war, twelve or fifteen thousand of those Hebrew corruptors of the people had been subjected only once to the toxic gasses that hundreds of thousands of our best German workers from every walk of life had to endure on the front the sacrifice of millions of men would not have been in vain. On the contrary, if we had got rid in time of these twelve thousand or so scoundrels, we could perhaps have saved the existence of a million good brave Germans full of future."

In a speech before the Reichstag on January 30th 1939, he also said :

"If the international world of Jewish finance both within and outside Europe were to succeed in plunging nations once again in a world war, the result would not be the Bolshevization of the Earth alongside with the victory of Judaism, but the annihilation (Vernichtung) of the Jewish race in Europe...For the age in which the non-Jewish peoples were delivered up defenseless to propaganda is over. National-Socialist Germany and Fascist Italy henceforth possess institutions which make it possible each time it is necessary to enlighten the world regarding the full details and issues of a question which many nations feel instinctively without being able to explain it scientifically to themselves."

"Jews can continue to pursue their campaign of harassment in certain States, protected as they are by the monopoly they exert over the press, the cinema, radio propaganda, theatres, literature and still other means. Yet if that people should succeed once again in precipitating millions of people in a completely absurd conflict for them, though it may be profitable for Jewish interests, then we would see manifesting itself the efficiency of a labor of explanation which has made it possible within a few years in Germany alone to get rid of Judaism completely (restlos erlegen)."

Source: I.M.T. Vol. XXXI, p. 65.

On January 30th 1941, Hitler addressed himself to all the Jews of Europe, telling them they *"would have finished playing their role in case of generalized warfare."* Then, in a speech made on January 30th 1942, he declared that the war would see *"the annihilation of Judaism in Europe."*

Hitler's political testament, published by the Nuremberg International Military Court is full of statements to the same effect. For example, we read :

"But I have allowed no doubt to subsist on that score if those international conspirators of the world of money and finance start treating the peoples of Europe like packets of shares, that people which is the true culprit in this murderous conflict will have to render accounts: the Jews ! (Das Judentum !)"

"I have left no-one uncertain as to the fate which awaits he through who millions of children of the Aryan peoples of Europe had to die of hunger, millions of adult men had to die and hundreds of thousands of women and children would be burnt alive in the bombardments of their city. Even if it must be done with more humane means, the culprit will have to expiate his fault. "

Hitler spoke of destroying an "influence"; Himmler spoke more directly of destroying people.

This, for example, is what Himmler said in a speech addressed to naval commanders at Weimar on December 16th 1943 :

"When, wherever I was, I was forced to give the order to march against partisans and Jewish commissars in a village, then I systematically gave the order to also kill the wives and children of these partisans and commissars."

Later, speaking before some generals at Sonthofen on May 5th 1944, he added :

"In this conflict with Asia, we must get into the habit of forgetting the rules of the game and the customs in use during European wars of the past, although we have grown attached to them and they suit our mentality better."

This savagery was not, unfortunately, confined to one side.

On September 4th 1940, Hitler declared at the "Sportpalast":

"If the British Air Force throws three or four thousand kilos of bombs on us, we shall throw one hundred, one hundred and fifty, two hundred, three hundred, four hundred thousand kilos and more in a single night."

This is a wild exaggeration of the Luftwaffe's possibilities in terms of strategic bombardments, but it shows the degree of hatred both camps had reached.

In reply, Clifton Fadiman, editor of the "New Yorker" and figurehead of the "Writers' War Board", a semi-official government literary agency, asked writers in 1942 :

"...to arouse an ardent hatred against all the Germans and not only against the Nazi leaders."

These words proving controversial, Fadiman insisted :

"...the only way to make Germans understand is to kill them. And even then, I don't think they'll understand."

In April 1942, praising a book by De Sales, *"The making of tomorrow"*, Fadiman developed his racist concept and wrote:

"Today's Nazi aggression is not the work of a group of gangsters, but rather the final expression of the deepest instincts of the German people. Hitler is the incarnation of greater forces than himself. The heresy he preaches is 2,000 years old. What is this heresy? Neither more nor less than the rebellion against Western civilization which began with Arminius...the dimensions of this war thus appear distinctly..."

He approved of Hemingway's suggestion :

"...the only ultimate settlement would be to sterilize the Nazis in the surgical meaning of the word. "

He ridiculed Dorothy Thomson, who made a distinction between the Nazis and other Germans.

His was not an isolated opinion. After Hitler's speech at the "Sportpalast", the "Daily Herald" in London published an article by the Reverend C.W. Wipp, declaring:

"The keynote must be : "to sweep them" and, to do that, to concentrate our science on the discovery of new and more terrifying explosives...A minister of the Gospel must perhaps not yield to such feelings, but I say frankly that if I could I would strike Germany off the map. It is a diabolical race which has been the curse of Europe for centuries."

Fortunately, there were protests against such aberrations in England where the people, not any more than the German people and its high degree of culture, could be confused with bloodthirsty leaders and individuals full of hatred and baying for blood.

As early as the month of January 1934, the Zionist leader, Wladimir Jabotinsky, declared to the Jewish newspaper "Natscha Retsch" :

"Our Jewish interests demand the definitive annihilation of Germany; the whole German people poses a threat for us."

As for Churchill, he wrote to Paul Reynaud on May 16th 1940 :

"We shall starve Germany. We shall destroy its cities. We shall burn its crops and its forests."

Source: Paul Baudouin, "Neuf mois au gouvernement". La Table Ronde, 1948, p.57.

In 1942, the British minister, Lord Vansittart, a true apostle of hatred, declared to justify the terror of British bombardments:

"The only good Germans are dead Germans; so let the bombs rain down ! "

In July 1944, Churchill sent his chief of staff, General Hastings Imai, a four-page memorandum in which he proposed the following project :

"I want you to think over this question of asphyxiating gases very seriously..."

"It is absurd to take morality into account in this affair when everyone has already made use of them (asphyxiating gases) during the last war, without there being any protest on the part of moralists or of the church. On the other hand, the bombing of open cities was regarded as taboo at the time; today, everyone does it as a matter of fact. It is only a question of fashion, comparable to the evolution in the length of women's hemlines..."

"I want the question of how much it would pay to use asphyxiating gases to be examined coolly...We must not allow our hands to be bound by foolish principles...We could flood the cities of the Ruhr and many other cities in Germany in such a way that the majority of the population would be in constant need of medical help...We may have to wait a few weeks or even a few months before I ask you to flood Germany with asphyxiating gases and, if we do it, let's do it thoroughly. Meanwhile, I would like this question to be examined coolly by sensible people and not by a team of killjoy psalm-singers in uniform of the sort one crosses now and again."

Source : "American heritage", August-September 1985.

Note : The United States produced almost 135,000 tons of toxic chemical agents during the war, Germany 70,000 tons, the United Kingdom 40,000 tons and Japan 7,500 tons.

Neither Churchill, nor Stalin, nor Truman had to face trial for war crimes at Nuremberg.

The Nuremberg court did not try some of the most ignoble calls to crime of which we can mention two of the wildest : one was a call to "genocide" (this time in the true meaning of the term) by an American Jew called Theodore Kaufman, who wrote a book entitled : **"Germany must perish"**. In it, he put forward the following case:

"The Germans (whoever they are : anti-Nazis, Communists and even philo-Semites) do not deserve to live. Consequently, 20,000 doctors must be mobilized after the war to sterilize 25 Germans a day each. In this way, not one German able to breed will remain within three months, and the German race will be totally eliminated within 60 years."

This book, which came out in 1942, was a godsend for anti-Semites. Hitler had extracts from it read on all the radio-stations. Another work of the kind was the "**Call to the Red Army**" by the Soviet writer, Ilya Ehrenburg, published in October 1944 : "Kill, kill ! There are no innocents among the Germans, either among the living or among those yet to be born! Carry out the instructions of Comrade Stalin by always crushing the Fascist beast in its lair. Break the pride of German women by violence; take them as legitimate booty. Kill, kill, valiant soldiers of the Red Army, in your irresistible assault." (quoted by Admiral Doenitz, "**Dix ans et 20 jours**", (pp. 343-44).

Neither of the above-mentioned was tried at Nuremberg, any more than the heads of State which covered them.

Nor were tried the Anglo-American leaders who were responsible for the bombing of Dresden, which killed 200,000 civilians and which served no military purpose since the Soviet Army had already reached the Oder.

Nor was Truman tried, though he was responsible for the atomic apocalypse of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in which 300,000 civilians perished, again uselessly since Japan's surrender had already been decided by the emperor.

Nor were Beria and Stalin tried for the massacre of thousands of Polish officers at Katyn, which was blamed on the Germans.

* * *

The methods of the procedure were based on the same principles (or rather absence of principles) as the choice of the accused among the vanquished only.

The status of the tribunal was defined as follows :

* **Article 19** : The Court will not be bound by technical rules relating to the administration of proofs. It will adopt and apply as far as possible an expeditive and not a formalist procedure, will admit any means it considers to have conclusive value.

* **Article 21** : The Court will not require proof of facts that are of public notoriety, but will take them as established. It also regards as authentic proofs the official documents and reports of the Allied governments.

This was the juridical monstrosity whose decisions were to be canonized and regarded as criteria of an untouchable historical truth, according to the **Gayssot-Fabius** law of May 2nd 1990.

This text inserts an article 24b in the 1981 law concerning the freedom of the press which says:

"Article 24b - whosoever contests the existence of crimes against humanity sanctioned by French or international jurisdiction will be punished by imprisonment of from one month to a year and of a fine of between 2,000 and 300,000 francs, or to one of these penalties only."

* * *

Such a procedure by the Nuremberg Court raised objections even amongst the top-level American jurists: those of the Supreme Court.

One of these was Judge Jackson. The English historian, David Irving, who admitted he had misjudged him earlier, was to say the following :

"Renowned jurists throughout the world were ashamed of the Nuremberg proceedings. Certainly, Judge Robert H. Jackson, the American president of the accusers, was ashamed of these proceedings ; this was obvious from his "personal diary", which I have read."

"I have had the privilege of having access to the "Memoirs" (of Judge Jackson) at the Library of Congress...Shortly after Robert H. Jackson was entrusted by President Truman with the task of leading the American judges at the Nuremberg Trial, he found out about American plans to use atomic bombs; he was uneasy about the task entrusted to him : to pursue in the name of a nation, acts which it had itself committed, for he was aware that the United States was going to commit an even greater crime." (33.9392 and 9394)

Referring to the book by Alpheus Thomas Mason on Harlan Fiske Stone: **"Pillar of the Law"** (Harlan Fiske Stone was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States) the lawyer Christie quoted page 715 of this book, in which Stone wrote to the editor of "Fortune" magazine that not only did he disown such a procedure, but that he regarded the whole thing as "a high-grade lynching party in Nuremberg." (5.995-996) p.716.

Judge Wennerstrum, of the Supreme Court of the United States, President of one of the courts (23.5915-5916) was so disgusted by the procedure that he refused his nomination and went back to the United States, where he voiced his objections in the "Chicago Tribune" : 60% of the members of the board of the trial were Jewish ; so were the interpreters.

"As for the principal accused : Höss, Streicher, Pohl, they have been tortured." (23.5919).

By virtue of the Nuremberg statutes accepting as proofs all declarations by the Allies, the Soviet report on Katyn accusing the Germans of the massacre of 11,000 Polish officers was accepted as an "authentic proof", irrefutable, on August 8th 1945 by the victors.

Source : USSR Document 54, in vol. 39 of the TMI(p.290.32.)

The Soviet Prosecuting Attorney, General Rudenko, could have said according to article 21 of the Nuremberg Trial Statute, "...there could be no object of contestation." (XV, p. 300)

On April 13th 1990, the international press announced that the massacre had been ordered by Beria and the Soviet authorities. When Professor Naville, of Geneva University, had examined the bodies, he found 1940 documents in their pockets which proved that the executions had taken place at that date. In 1940, the Smolensk district was occupied by the Soviets.

* * *

To stick to our theme : **"The founding myths of the State of Israel"**, we will examine one of the untruths which continue to wreak the most havoc after over half a century in today's world, and not only in Israel : "the myth of the 6 million Jews exterminated" that has become a dogma justifying, sacralizing (as the very term "Holocaust" implies) all the extortions of the State of Israel in Palestine, in the entire Middle-East, in the United States and, through the United States, in world politics, placing it above all international law.

The Nuremberg Court made this figure official; it has never ceased since then to be used to manipulate public opinion in the written and spoken press, in literature and the cinema, and even in schoolbooks.

In fact, this figure rests only on two accounts: that of Höttl and that of Wisliceny.

This was what the former declared :

"In April 1944, as told to the Nuremberg judges, Dr. Wilhem Höttl, Obersturmbannführer, of section IV of the Central security bureau of the Reich : the S.S. Obersturmbannführer Adolf Eichmann, whom I had known since 1938, had a talk with me in my apartment in Budapest... He knew he was considered as a war criminal by the Allied nations since he had thousands of Jewish lives on his conscience. I asked him how many there were, and he answered : although the number was a great secret, he would tell me because of his information he had reached the following conclusion : in the various extermination camps, some four million Jews had been killed and two million had died in other ways."

Source : Nuremberg Trial, vol. IV, p. 657.

And the second :

"He (Eichmann) said that he would leap into his grave laughing, for the knowledge of having the lives of five million people on his conscience would be a source of extraordinary satisfaction for him." (op. cit.)

Of these two accounts, M. Poliakov himself said :

"It would be possible that a figure so imperfectly backed up, must be considered suspect."

Source : Revue d'histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale. October 1956.

Let us add that the principal testimony, the most complete and the most precise, is by Höttl, an Intelligence Service officer.

Source : "Weekend" magazine, January 25th 1961, with on its cover a portrait of Höttl, with the caption : "History of a spy. Stranger than fiction : this friend of Nazi leaders, had a British Secret Service chief as a boss."

Confirming the objections of top jurists of the Supreme Court of the United States, and of many others, on the juridical anomalies of the "Nuremberg Court", we shall give the following examples of the violations of the rules that apply to the procedure of every genuine trial.

1 - The establishment and the verification of the authenticity of the **texts** produced.

2 - The analysis of the value of the **testimony** and the conditions in which they were obtained.

3 - The scientific examination of the **weapon** used to commit the crime in order to establish the way it functions and its effects.

* * *

a) The texts

The fundamental texts, which are decisive for establishing what the "**final solution**" must have been, are first of all the extermination orders attributed to the most highly-placed leaders : Hitler, Göring, Heydrich, Himmler, and the directives given for their execution.

First of all, Hitler's directive on the "**extermination**".

Despite the efforts of the theoreticians of the "**genocide**" and the "**Holocaust**", no trace was ever found of it. As Olga Wormser-Migot wrote in 1968:
"Just as there exists no clear order of extermination by gas at Auschwitz, there exists no order to stop in November 1944. " She specifies : " neither at the Nuremberg trial, nor during the course of marginal trials, nor at the Höss trial in Cracow, or of Eichmann in Israel, nor at the trial of the camp commanders, nor at the Frankfurt November 45-August 46 trial of secondary Auschwitz figures, was the famous order signed by Himmler on November 22nd 1944 on the end of the extermination of Jews by gas ever found, the order putting an end to the 'Final solution.'"

Source : Olga Wormser-Migot. "Le système concentrationnaire nazi." P.U.F 1968, 544 and p.13.

Doctor Kubovy, from the Tel Aviv "Documentation Center", admitted in 1960 :
"There is no document signed by Hitler, Himmler or Heydrich which speaks of exterminating the Jews...the word "extermination" does not appear in the letter from Göring to Heydrich concerning the final solution to the Jewish question."

Source: Lucy Dawidowicz, "The War against the Jews (1975) p.121.

After a conference held at the Sorbonne in Paris in February 1979 to fight against the critical works of the "revisionists", Raymond Aron and Jacques Furet had to declare during a press conference which had followed the meeting that :

"Despite the most erudite research, we have never been able to find an order by Hitler to exterminate the Jews."

In 1981, Laqueur admitted :

"Until now, we have never found Hitler's order to destroy the European Jewish community, and in all probability the order was never given."

Source : Walter Laqueur : "The terrible secret", Frankfurt on the Main. Berlin. Vienna. 1981. p. 190.

In spite of all this, there have been other historians who, at the instigation of Vidal-Naquet and Leon Poliakov, signed the following declaration :

"(...) **We must not ask ourselves** how such a mass murder was technically possible. It was technically possible since it took place. This is **the obligatory point of departure** of any historical enquiry on this subject. It was our duty to simply remind people of this truth: there is not and **there cannot be a debate** on the existence of the gas chambers..."

We must not ask ourselves..

the obligatory point of departure....

there cannot be a debate....

Three prohibitions, three taboos, three definitive limitations to research.

Such a text does indeed make history in the history of history: the "fact" which must be established is posed before any research as an absolute and untouchable truth forbidden by three prohibitory imperatives, any research and critique of what was once and for all judged by the victors just after the victory.

Yet history must, if it means to respect a scientific status, be a perpetual search, questioning even what one considered as definitively established as the postulate of Euclid or the laws of Newton. The following is a notorious example:

"The Auschwitz International Committee intended in November 1990 to replace the commemorative plaque at Auschwitz which indicated 4 million dead by another bearing the words : "Over one million deaths". Doctor Maurice Goldstein, president of this committee, was opposed to this decision."

Source : "Le Soir", Brussels, 19-20th October 1991, p.16.

In fact, Doctor Goldstein in no way challenged the need to change the old plaques, but he did not want the new plaque to carry a figure, knowing that it would probably be necessary to again reduce the figure now considered within a short while.

The plaque at the entrance of Birkenau therefore bore the following inscription until 1994:

"Here, from 1940 to 1945, four million men, women and children were tortured and assassinated by Hitlerian murderers."

Thanks to the activity of the State Museum of Auschwitz, whose president is the historian Wladislaw Bartoszewski and whose twenty six members are of all nationalities, the text has been modified in a manner more in keeping with the truth:

"May this place where the Nazis murdered one and a half million men, women and children, mostly Jews from different European countries, be forever for humanity a cry of despair and a warning."

Source: article by Luc Rosenzweig, in "Le Monde", January 27th 1995

This example shows that history, when it escapes intellectual terrorism by the predators of hatred, demands a perpetual "revision". It is "revisionist" or else it is a disguised form of propaganda.

Let us go back therefore to history as such, of a critical, "revisionist" sort, in other words one based on the analysis of texts, the checking of accounts and the expertise regarding the crime weapon.

First of all, this is what concerns the Jews in the National Socialist Party program.

The problem of the Jews is considered in Point 4 of the National Socialist Party (NSDAP) Program:

"Only those who are fully citizens can possess German nationality. And those who are fully citizens are those who have German blood, regardless of religion. Therefore no Jew can fully be a citizen."

Staatsbürger designated the citizen whereas Volksgenosse defined full citizenship as a member of a homogeneous community.

Further on, we come to point 5 :

"He who does not possess German nationality can only live in Germany as a guest (Gast) and will be submitted to the existing legislation regarding the sojourn of foreigners."

Then, point 7 raises the question of the prohibition of stay in the Reich, under certain conditions, of those who do not have German nationality; point 8 demands the stopping of all new immigration of non-Germans, as well as the immediate expulsion of non-Germans who have entered the Reich since August 2nd 1914. This last point is obviously directed against the Jews from the East, who had come to the Reich in large numbers during and after the First World War.

Point 23 also deals with this problem: it stipulates that Jews will not have the right to work in the press, while Point 24 asserts that the Party is struggling against the "Jewish materialistic spirit."

a - The orders of Hitler for the extermination of the Jews

In his book on "**The Destruction of the European Jews**", Raoul Hilberg wrote in the first (1961) edition that there were two extermination orders given by Hitler : one in the Spring of 1941 (invasion of Russia), the other a few months later.

But in 1985, "in the second revised edition, every reference to the orders or decisions of Hitler regarding the "final solution" was systematically suppressed."

Source : "The Revised Hilberg". Simon Wiesenthal, Annal 3. 1986. p. 294)

The 1961 edition indicated on page 171:

"How did the phase decreeing death appear? Essentially through two decisions by Hitler. An order was given in the Spring of 1941."

In what terms were these orders given?

Hilberg: "According to General Jodl, who wrote the document I quote, the terms were the following : Hitler said he wanted the Jewish Bolshevik commissars to be liquidated. This is the first point...Such was the content of the order described by General Jodl." (4-82)

Hilberg: "The order was oral."

Thus: Hilberg said that General Jodl had said that Hitler had said....!

In his first anti-Semitic diatribes and in "Mein Kampf", Hitler proclaimed his determination to expel the Jews from Germany. We shall henceforth retain only those German texts which employ the expression "final solution" in order to obtain a precise definition of it.

On June 24th 1940, after Germany's victory over France, Heydrich spoke in a letter to Ribbentrop, the Minister of Finance, of a "**final territorial solution**" ("Eine territoriale Endlösung").

Source : Gerald Flemming. "Hitler and die Endlösung." Wiesbaden-Munich, 1982, p.56.

To create a Jewish "reservation" outside Europe, and it was then that Ribbentrop suggested the "Madagascar project". In July 1940, Franz Rademacher who was in charge of Jewish affairs, thus summed up this directive:
"All Jews out of Europe !"

Source : Joseph Billig. "La solution finale de la question juive." Paris 1977.p.58.

This "final territorial solution" was in keeping with the new situation of Germany, which now dominated Europe : it was no longer enough to expulse the Jews from Germany.

Rademacher, who was in charge of the "final solution" project to deport all the Jews from Europe to Madagascar, pointed out that it would take four years to carry it out and in the chapter entitled "Financing", he indicated that "The realization of the final solution (Endlösung) suggested will require considerable means."

Source : N.G. 2586.

b - Göring's letter to Heydrich of July 31st 1941

Heydrich asked Göring:

"In 1939, you gave me the order to take measures regarding the Jewish question. Must I now extend the task with which you entrusted me to the new territories we have seized in Russia ?"

There again, there is no reference to the assassination of Jews. Only their geographic transfer is mentioned, simply taking into account the new conditions (33.93739374).[1]

Only "final solution" thus consisted of emptying Europe of its Jews by sending them away ever further until the war (supposing the Germans won it) made it possible to place them all in a ghetto outside Europe (as the Madagascar project had been the first suggestion.)

It is impossible to sustain the hypothesis of a secret coded language since clear documents exist for other crimes : euthanasia, the order to kill British commandos, to lynch American airmen and to exterminate the male population of Stalingrad if it were occupied. " For all these crimes, the documents are there. Whereas in this case alone there is nothing, no originals, nor copies, " nor we can add, directives or the orders needed for the execution of such vast directives. (33.9375-9376)

"In January 1942, Reinhard Heydrich, head of the Gestapo, had informed the Berlin leaders that the Führer had decided the evacuation of all the Jews towards the territories of the East, replacing the deportation beyond the sea previously projected." (34-9544)

In a memo which circulated in March 1942 in Heydrich's office, the ministers were informed that the Jews of Europe were to be concentrated in the East, "while awaiting to be sent to a distant territory like Madagascar after the war, which will become their homeland... " (34-9545-9546).

Poliakov noted:

Until it was given up, the "Madagascar Plan" was sometimes referred to as the "final solution" to the "Jewish question".

Source : Poliakov. "Le Procès de Jerusalem" Paris, 1963, p. 152.

To maintain at all costs the thesis of physical extermination, a subterfuge therefore had to be found:

"Final solution to the Jewish problem was one of those conventional phrases used to designate the Hitlerian plan to exterminate the European Jews."

Source : Gerald Reitlinger. "La solution finale" p.19.

No justification of this hypothesis of a coded language has been given, though the concept of a coded language can be used to give any document any meaning. Here are two examples.

Göring's letter of July 31st 1941 (a month after the letter by Heydrich quoted previously, the meaning of the words would have suddenly changed!). In this letter, Göring completed his directives to Heydrich:

"As a complement of the task which was assigned to you by the decree of 24/1/1939, in other words to obtain the most advantageous solution possible to the Jewish question by way of emigration and evacuation given the circumstances, I charge you by the present letter to proceed with all the necessary preparations...to reach an overall solution (Gesamtlösung) of the Jewish question in the zone of German influence in Europe...I charge you with the rapid submission of an overall project (Gesamtentwurf) bearing on the measures of organization and the material and concrete dispositions to realize the final solution of the Jewish question to which we aspire.(Endlösung der Judenfrage.)"

Source : Hilberg (op. cit.) 2nd edition. p.401 (N.G.2586-E.P.S.710.)

It is significant that, quoting this document (on page 108 of his book), Reitlinger cuts out the beginning which refers to emigration and evacuation, while this letter prescribes a new extension of the evacuation measures taken "given the circumstances" at a time when Hitler dominated only Poland in January 1939, and not yet even France, whereas by July 1941, Germany dominated all of Europe.

And yet the meaning of Göring's text is perfectly clear from the first paragraph : the policy of emigration or evacuation of the Jews, practiced until then in Germany, had to spread henceforth, due to the new conquests, to all the zones in Europe under German domination. The "overall solution" took the new situation into consideration. It could only be a "final solution" after the end of the war or, in case of a total victory in Europe, Russia included, a final evacuation to Africa or elsewhere, that would make it possible, in keeping with Hitler's constant goal, " to empty Europe of its Jews."

To sum it up, Göring's directive to Heydrich, unless one wants to interpret it arbitrarily according to a preconceived schema, only applied to Europe what could, until then, only be applied to Germany. It was an inhuman and criminal objective, no doubt, but at no time did it comprise the idea of "extermination" which it was given by the Attorney-General at Nuremberg, Robert M.W. Kempner, who declared: "With these lines, Heydrich and his collaborators were officially given the task of legal murder (of Jews)."

Göring protested against the English translation of the German word "Gesamtlösung", meaning general solution, as "final solution", which is "Endlösung"; this led Attorney Jackson to acknowledge the falsification and to reestablish the true meaning.

Source: I.M.T., IX, 575

As early as June 24th 1940, Heydrich had informed Ribbentrop of his wish to realize the "final solution" as soon as possible. He wrote:

"The global problem posed by the presence today of some 3 million and 1/4 Jews on the territories presently under German domination can no longer be solved by emigration: a final territorial solution henceforth becomes necessary."

Source: Evidence number 464 at Eichmann's trial at Jerusalem.

Towards the same time, Himmler had sent Hitler a memoir whose conclusion was:

"I hope to see the Jewish question definitively settled thanks to the emigration of all the Jews towards Africa or in a colony."

Source: Vierteljahreshefte, 1957, 197.

Hitler rallied to this suggestion since, on February 10th 1942, Rademacher, who was in charge of the "Deutschland III" at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, wrote in an official letter:

"Meanwhile, the war against the Soviet Union has allowed us to dispose of new territories for the final solution. Consequently, the Führer has decided to displace the Jews not towards Madagascar but towards the East. Thus, there is no longer any need to consider Madagascar for the final solution."

Source: Document N.G. 3933 of the Wilhelmstrasse trial, quoted by Reitlinger. "The final solution" p.79, in which he "interprets" again in the sense of "fiction" or "camouflage" without giving the least justification for it.

The original expression was in fact "die Gesamtlösung der Judenfrage" or the complete "overall" solution there would be no going back on. But Göring used it for the first time in the first paragraph of a letter dated 31/7/1941, in which he gave Heydrich the order to prepare it (P.S.710 T.XXVI, p. 266) using in the last paragraph the expression "die Gesamtlösung der Judenfrage" and, in time, it prevailed, but with the same meaning and not in the sense of liquidating the problem by liquidating those who were the cause of the problem. Taken in flagrante delicto of tendentious translation by Göring himself on March 20th 1946, Judge Jackson had no option but to admit it (T.IX, p. 552). But the press did not breathe a word of this incident which demolished a whole theory.

* * *

The second example of this arbitrary change of the meaning of words to justify a thesis is that of the "Grand Wannsee" conference held in Berlin on January 20th 1942.

At the start of the conference, Heydrich reminded his audience that he had just been appointed "to the post of head of the preparation of the final solution of the Jewish question in Europe" (Endlösung der Europäische Judenfrage) and he will henceforth be responsible for the overall measures needed for the final solution of the Jewish question, **"without consideration of geographical limitations"** (underlined by R.G.)

Heydrich went on to sum up the anti-Jewish policy carried out thus far:

a - The driving out of Jews from those spheres vital to the German people.-

b - The driving out of Jews from the space vital to the German people.

Because of the lightning-quick advance of the German army on the Eastern front (the Soviet Union), Heydrich thus pursued, taking into account the new situation :

"With the preliminary authorization of the Führer, emigration has left room for **another possibility of solution: the evacuation of the Jews towards the East.**" (underlined by R.G.)

"One cannot however consider these actions as palliatives, but practical experiences already obtained in this field are of significant importance for the future final solution to the Jewish question."

Source : N.G.2586 G.

Indeed, this definitive solution could not be carried out until after the war, and this solution was always sought in the same direction : the expulsion of all Jews out of Europe. It was what Hitler told Abetz, the ambassador to Paris specifically : that it was his intention to **evacuate all Jews out of Europe after the war.**

Source : "Documents on German Foreign Policy" 1918-1945. Series D. Vol.X. p. 484.

The Wannsee text (January 20th 1942)

"In the course of the final solution, Jews will be conveyed under appropriate guidance, towards the East to make use of their labor. They will be separated according to sex. Jews capable of working will be taken in large columns to areas of major works, to build roads, and consequently large numbers will doubtless perish through natural selection.

"Those who will finally remain, who without any doubt will make up the most robust element, must be treated consequently, for they represent a natural selection whose liberation must be considered the germ-cell of a new Jewish development as the experience of history has shown..)" (13-3133)

David Irving:

"I have read the minutes of the Wilhemstrasse trial, the second after that of Nuremberg. There were twelve others afterwards. Not one of them brought testimony according to which the liquidation of the Jews had been discussed at Wannsee." (33-9372-9373)

The Wannsee Protocol consists of the minutes of a conference which took place on January 20th 1942, attended by the Secretaries of State administratively concerned by the solution to the Jewish question, and those heads of departments in charge of its execution. In this text, no mention is made of gas chambers or extermination, but only of the transfer of Jews to Eastern Europe.

These minutes have all the characteristics of an apocryphal document if we are to credit the photocopy of them published in Robert N.W. Kempner's "Eichmann und Komplizen", pp. 132 and following (Europa Verlag 1961) : no seal, no date, no signature, ordinary machine type on small format paper, etc....

In any case they make no mention of gas chambers.

In the French versions of it, "die Zuruckdrangung der Juden aus dem Lebensraum des deutschen Volkes" has been translated by "the elimination of the Jews from the vital space of the German people", as it was in English and in Russian.

The Germans, however, preferred to use other expressions to speak of their decision to drive the Jews out of what they called their "vital space", expressions like "Auschaltung" (exclusion, eviction, elimination) and especially "Ausrottung" (extirpation, uprooting). It was this last word which was translated as extermination, which is "Vernichtung" in German.

For example : in his speech at Posen before the Obergruppenführer (the Divisional commanders of the Waffen SS) on October 4th 1943, Himmler said :
"Ich meine jetzt die Judenevakuierung, die Ausrottung des jüdischen Volkes...Das jüdische Volk wird ausgerottet, etc... "

In the following sentence, he uses the word "Auschaltung..." (P.S.1919 T.XXIX p.145) to clarify his meaning. In other words :
"I am now thinking of the evacuation of the Jews, of the extirpation of the Jewish people, etc... "

But in the "Eichmann File", M. Billig translated it as:
"I mean by that the evacuation of the Jews, the extermination of the Jewish people." (p.55) and "evacuation of the Jews, IN OTHER WORDS extermination" (p.47).

Another example : in a note dated 16th December 1941 on one of his talks with Hitler (P.S 1517 T.XXVII p.270) Rosenberg uses the expression "Ausrottung des Judentums".

At the April 17th 1946 session, the American Attorney General Dodd translated it as "Extermination of Jews" (Tome XI, p. 562). Rosenberg protested in vain.
"But in the speeches of the Nazis, the expression "Ausrottung des Christentums", which was often used, is always translated as " the extirpation of Christianity from German culture"

Cf. Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale, October 1st 1958, p.62.

It is when it refers to Judaism (Judentum) or the Jewish people (das jüdische Volk) that the word "Ausrottung" means extermination and applies to individuals, whereas it refers to entities.

The Wannsee conference of January 20th 1942, where, it was claimed for over a third of a century, the decision to "exterminate" European Jews, disappeared from 1984 on from the writings of even the most ferocious enemies of the "revisionists". On this point, they too had to "revise" their history : it was at the Stuttgart Congress of May 1984, where that "interpretation" was dropped.

**Source : Eberhard Jackerl and Jürgen Rohwer. "Der Mord an der Juden im Zweiten Weltkrieg" ("The murder of Jews during the Second World War")
Source : DVA. 1985 p. 67**

In 1992, Yehuda Bauer wrote in "The Canadian Jewish News" of January 30th that this interpretation of Wannsee was "silly".

Finally, the most recent spokesman for the orthodox antirevisionist historians, the chemist Claude Pressac, confirmed this new revision of orthodoxy. He wrote on page 35 of his book : "Les crématoires d'Auschwitz" (CNRS editions, 1993):

"The Wannsee conference was held in Berlin on January 20th. If an action of "driving back" the Jews towards the East was planned, with the evocation of a "natural" elimination through work, nobody then spoke of liquidation on an industrial scale. During the days and the weeks that followed, the Auschwitz Bauleitung received neither a call, a telegram or a letter demanding the study of an installation adapted to that end."

And even, in his "recapitulative chronology", he indicates on January 20th 1942 : "Wannsee Conference on the driving back of the Jews towards the East" (p.114).

The "extermination" was revised : it was a question of "driving back".

It is equally remarkable that, in all this book setting itself the goal of "proving" the thesis of extermination, there was no question either of the document which, after that of Wannsee, was supposedly the most decisive: Göring's letter to Heydrich of July 31st 1941, in which it was asserted that the "final solution" meant "extermination", and not the transfer out of Europe.

At the time of the Toronto trial in 1988, there was also a controversy concerning the role of the "Einsatzgruppen", a kind of free corps designated by the Hitlerian High Command to annihilate the groups of partisans which formed as soon as the Germans swooped down on Moscow in 1941 ; these groups would surge behind the German army, trying to destroy its reserves of fuel, its supplies and its communication networks, cutting the Germans off from their rear bases.

This form of resistance proved so effective that Hitler gave the harshest of orders to the "Einsatzgruppen", to kill off the leaders and the political commissars.

There were many Jews among these political commissars, who played a leading role in which they confronted death bravely.

At the Toronto trial, the problem of the participation of these heroic Jews to the resistance against Hitlerism was evoked at great length.

Christie, Zundel's lawyer, insisted on asking the historian Hilberg, to clarify the meaning of the Nazi orders on this subject.

Christie : The order given to the Einsatzgruppen says : Annihilate the Jewish Bolshevik commissars, and you interpret this as meaning : "Annihilate the Jewish people and the Jewish commissars. Is that correct?

Hilberg : Correct.

Christie : It was therefore said, according to you, that it was not a question of killing the Jews, but the Jewish-Bolshevik political commissars.

Hilberg : The order was given to Himmler to "solve the problem".(4839)

Christie : It concerned the problem of the Jewish-Bolshevik political commissars. Which does not mean : the Jewish problem...Was there not a war on between Communism and Nazism ?

Hilberg : Yes, and the political commissars, at the core of the system, had to be shot.

Christie : This did not mean killing the Jews who were there. Did Hitler think that Bolshevism was of Jewish origin and that all the commissars were Jews?

Hilberg : That was propaganda. But it was the intention from the beginning, since June 22nd 1941.

Christie : Is this an article of faith with you?

Hilberg : No. It's not an article of faith, it's a certainty.

Christie : Can you show me Hitler's second order?

Hilberg : I say that there's a decisive directive from Hitler exposed by Göring to Heydrich on July 31st 1941...It was the text which prepared the Wannsee conference.

Christie : Was it an order or a letter from Hitler?

Hilberg : No.

Christie : You wrote in your book : "Hitler gave this second order. Is that correct?

Hilberg : That is correct.

Christie reverts to the meaning of the word "resettlement" in the East. "Does this mean an order to kill all the Jews?" (4-855)

Hilberg : Resettlement" was a synonym for "deporting the Jews to death camps.

Christie : Wasn't there a plan to deport the Jews to Madagascar ?

* * *

The English historian, David Irving, brought the following information, drawn from original sources, to the Toronto trial.

"...The final solution to the Jewish problem consisted of deporting them to different territories. One of the hypotheses was Madagascar, especially after the fall of France, but the might of the British and later American fleets made this project impossible to carry out.

The only document I possess is a telephone conversation between Prime Minister Lammers and the Führer in the Spring of 1942, and the Führer answered him that the final solution would be decided upon only after the end of the war.

Heinrich Himmler wrote to the Gauleiters that the Führer, Adolf Hitler, had given him

the order to rid Europe of its Jews from West to East, by stages. It was obviously an order of deportation." (33-935 and 9352).

But this involved no order to exterminate the Jews.

No order of this kind was ever given, nor in the archives of the world, including the Jewish archives which cooperated with me. I must also emphasize that, in the British archives where we had deciphered the German codes of the S.S. units operating on the Eastern front, even with those English machines for deciphering codes, we did not decipher any code in which Hitler gave the order to kill the Jews. Only historians claiming to read between the lines and giving vent to their indignation have been able to decipher such a meaning. (33-93.76) "

* * *

The lawyer, Christie, quotes page 651 of Hilberg's book in which is written :
"In November 1944, Himmler decided that for all sorts of practical reasons, the Jewish question was solved. On the 25th of the same month, he ordered the dismantling of all the death installations."

Source : Testimony of Kurt Becher. 8th March 1946. P.S. 3762.

Hilberg recognizes that it was not an order by Himmler (4-861 to 864):
"Becher probably presented it from memory in his testimony. He therefore did not need to use the exact language employed by Himmler."

One more time, Hilberg said that Becher had said that Himmler had said...(4.867)

After lengthy historical research by scholars of every background under the pressure of revisionist critics, the director of the "Institute of history of the present time" at the National Center of Scientific Research, Mr. Francois Bédarida sums up these works on the "**evaluation of the Auschwitz victims**" :

"The collective memory has seized hold of the figure of four million, the very one which, on the faith of a Soviet report, figured until now at Auschwitz on the monument erected to the memory of the victims of Nazism - while in Jerusalem the Yad Vashem museum indicated a total very much above the truth.

And yet, as soon as the war ended, scholarly memory got down to work. The result of these patient and minute investigations was that the figure of four million rested on no serious base and could not be retained.

The court, all the same, relied on an assertion by Eichmann claiming that the extermination policy had caused the death of six million Jews, four million of them in the camps. If now we refer to the most recent works and to the most reliable statistics - as is the case with Raoul Hilberg's work, "**Destruction des Juifs d'Europe**" (Fayard, 1988), we come up with a million dead at Auschwitz. A total corroborated by the specialists as a whole since, today, these agree on a number of victims oscillating between 950,000 minimum and 1.2 million maximum."

Source : "Le Monde", 23rd July 1990.

Nevertheless, people continue after the reduction of the number of victims at Auschwitz-Birkenau from 4 to 1 million, to repeat the global figure : 6 million Jews exterminated, according to the bizarre arithmetic : $6 - 3 = 6$.

That the "final solution" to the Jewish problem was to be resolved only after the war is also testified to by the "Braun Mappe" (Brown File) of the Summer of 1941. The paragraph entitled : "Directives for the solution of the Jewish question" specified : "All the measures concerning the Jewish question in the lands occupied in the East having to be taken after the war, the Jewish question will find a general solution in Europe."

Source : P.S. 702. Henri Monneray. "La persecution des Juifs dans les pays de l'Est presentre " Nuremberg" CDJC 1949.

This restatement of the question does involve any attenuation of Hitler's crimes, but simply recalls a piece of evidence which even the most determined partisans of the theory of "extermination" have not overlooked: during the last two years of the war, after Stalingrad, Hitler was fighting a losing battle : the Allies were destroying his war production centers with their bombs and disorganizing his transport network.

He was forced to mobilize new soldiers, emptying his factories as a result. How could he have been fatally obsessed with the will to exterminate his prisoners and Jews, instead of using them, even in inhuman conditions, for working on his sites? Poliakov himself, in his "**Bréviaire de la haine**" (p.3) emphasized this absurd contradiction : "It would have been so much more economical to have made them carry out the hardest work, parking them in a reservation for instance."

Hannah Arendt also pointed out what was insane about such an operation : "The Nazis turned straightforwardly useless into the harmful when, right in the middle of the war, despite the penury of building materials and of rolling stock, they erected huge and costly extermination factories and organized the transport of millions of people...the manifest contradiction between this behavior and military imperatives gives the entire undertaking a mad, chimerical air."

Source : Hannah Arendt. "Le système totalitaire" Paris 1972. p.182.

What is even odder is that minds as subtle as Poliakov and Hannah Arendt were so completely clouded by their a prioris that they did not question their Surrealistic assumptions and turn to the documents and the facts.

At Auschwitz-Birkenau, there were powerful implantations of the Farben-industry (chemical), of Siemens (transports) of Portland (construction). At Monovitz (one of the camp annexes to Auschwitz) there were 10,000 prisoners at work, 100,000 civilian workers and 1,000 English prisoners of war.

Source : "German crimes in Poland", Warsaw 1946. Vol. I. p.37.

From 1942 to 1944, out of 39 camps that were satellites of Auschwitz, 31 used prisoners as laborers and 19 of them used a majority of Jews.

On January 25th 1942, Himmler addressed the following directive to the inspector-general of the concentration camps :
"Get ready to take in 100,000 Jews...Over the coming weeks, important economic tasks will be entrusted to the concentration camps."

Source : N.O. ; 020

a - In May 1944, Hitler ordered the use of 200,000 Jews as workers in the construction program of Jager and the Todt organization.

An S S W V H A order dated November 18th 1943 awarded a bonus to prisoners-even Jews - who had distinguished themselves at work.

Source : Auschwitz Museum Center 6 - 1962 p.78.

There is therefore nothing "insane or chimerical", but on the contrary an implacable realism, and an extra refutation of the "exterminationist" themes.

b - Eyewitness accounts

The Auschwitz trial was held in Frankfurt from December 20th 1963 to August 20th 1965, in a vast theater which was well-suited to a showy political operation; the vast legal machine could not avoid being forced to acknowledge in the account of the reasons for its verdict that the elements at its disposal for reaching its verdict were absurdly flimsy.

"The court lacked almost all the means of information which an ordinary criminal trial disposes of to compose a faithful portrayal of events such as they really occurred. The bodies of the victims lacking, the autopsy reports, the conclusions of the experts as to the cause of death; traces left by the culprits were lacking, crime weapons, etc...It was possible to check the accounts only in a very few cases."

Source : Page 109 of the account of the reasons for the verdict

According to the accusers, the crime-weapon was the "gas chambers." Yet the judges found no "traces" of them!

It was enough for those gas-chambers to be "notorious" to exist, as in the days of the witch-trials, where no-one would have dared to question the witches' "carnal knowledge" of the devil for fear of being burnt at the stake too.

One of the jurists sent by the United States to Dachau, which had become an American camp and a center of "war-crime trials", Stephen S. Pinter, wrote :
"I lived at Dachau for 17 months after the war as US military judge, and can testify that there was no gas chamber at Dachau. What they show visitors is presented in an erroneous manner as a gas chamber, being a crematorium oven. Nor were there any gas chambers in the concentration camps in Germany. We were told that there was a gas chamber at Auschwitz, but as Auschwitz was in the Russian zone, we did not have permission from the Russians to visit...they thus made use of the old propaganda myth according to which millions of Jews were killed. I can attest, after 6 years spent in Germany and Austria after the war, that many Jews were killed, but that the figure

of 1 million was certainly never reached, and I believe myself to be better-qualified than anyone else on this subject."

Source: Letter by Pinter to the Catholic weekly, "Our Sunday Visitor", June 14th 1959, p.15.

Lacking written proofs and irrecusable documents, the Nuremberg court was forced to base itself on "eyewitness accounts", like the fictionalized works and the films that came later.

The survivors who were called upon to bear witness and who authenticated the existence of "gas chambers" did it not from what they had seen but what they had "heard said".

A typical and famous example is that of Doctor Benedict Kautzsky, successor to his father at the head of the Austrian Social Democratic party.

After declaring that the maximum period of survival at Auschwitz was three months (though he himself spent three years there), he wrote his book : "**Teufel und Verdammte**" (published in Switzerland in 1946), in which he declared about the "gas chambers" :

"I did not see them personally, but so many faithful people confirmed their existence."

"Il will hier noch eine kurze Schilderung der Gaskammern einflechten, die ich zwar selbst nicht gesehen habe, die mir aber von so vielen glaubwürdig dargestellt worden sind... "

A few eyewitness accounts were regarded as fundamental, notably those of Rudolf Höss, Saukel and Nyszli ("**Doctor at Auschwitz**").

The key witness, who turned out to be the perfect witness to "prove" the thesis of the victors disguised as judges was Rudolf Höss, ex commander of the Auschwitz camp.

The description he gave when he was arrested became the synopsis of his declarations at Nuremberg; it was everything the Court expected of him.

Here is his declaration, written under oath and signed by Rudolf Höss on April 5th 1946 :

"I was commander of Auschwitz until December 1st 1943, and I estimate that at least 2,500,000 victims were executed there and exterminated by gassing and cremation, and that at least half a million others died there of hunger and disease, which makes a up a total of about 3,000,000 dead. The "final solution" of the Jewish question signified the extermination of all the Jews in Europe. I received the order to prepare the extermination at Auschwitz in June 1941. At that time, there already existed three other extermination camps in the general government : Belzec, Treblinka, Wolzek."

One cannot imagine a more perfect confirmation of the theses which were going to be spread by the media for half a century.

And yet this text itself already contains three statements in obvious contradiction with the truth :

1 - The number of 3 million dead at Auschwitz, needed to justify the total number of Jewish victims (6 million), official figure proclaimed from the start at Nuremberg and which has never ceased to be the leitmotif of official history and of the media since that time, has to be reduced by at least two thirds, as the new commemorative plaque at Auschwitz-Birkenau proves, on which the figure of four million has been replaced by: a little over a million.

2 - The camps of Belzec and Treblinka did not exist in 1941. They were not opened until 1942.

3 - As for the Wolzek camp, it never existed on any map.

How could this "capital testimony" have been recorded without prior verification ?

Höss himself explains it: the first declarations were made under the control of the Polish authorities which had arrested him.

The autobiography of Rudolf Höss indicates on page 174 of the French edition :
"At the time of my first cross-examination, the first confessions were obtained by beating me. I do not know what there is in that report although I signed it." (5.956).

(Höss signed an 8-page typescript at 2.30 in the morning of March 14th 1946 which does not essentially differ from what he later wrote and said at Nuremberg or Cracow.)

Höss himself describes in hand-written notes made at Cracow the circumstances of the first interrogatory to which he was subjected by the British military police.
"I was arrested on March 11th 1946 at 11 PM...The Field Security Police subjected me to painful treatment. I was dragged until Heide, precisely to the barracks where, eight months earlier, I had been released by the English. It was there I was interrogated for the first time, during which harsh means were used. I do not know the contents of the report even though I signed it. So much liquor and whip-lashes got the better even of me...A few days later, I was taken to Meiden-on-the-Weser, the main interrogation center of the British zone. There, I fared even worse at the hands of a public attorney, a commander."

Source: Document NO-1210

It was only in 1983 that there was confirmation of the tortures inflicted upon Rudolf Höss to obtain the "proof" of the "two and a half million" Jews exterminated by him at Auschwitz.

This book was written by Rupert Butler and was called : "Legions of Death" (Hamlyn Paperbacks). It publishes the testimony of Bernard Clarke, who arrested Rudolf Höss after finding out his whereabouts from his wife after threat of death to herself and her children. Höss was arrested at the farm where he was hiding on March 11th 1946. Butler describes how it took three days of torture to obtain a "coherent declaration", e.g. the one we have just quoted, signed March 14th 1946 at 2 in the morning.

As soon as he was arrested, Höss was beaten so hard that "in the end, the health officer intervened with insistence to the captain : tell him to stop or you'll bring back a corpse."

It must be noted that Butler and his interlocutor Clarke both seem highly satisfied with these acts of torture.

The American enquiry committee made up of judges Van Roden and Simpson, sent to Germany in 1948 to investigate irregularities committed by the American military court at Dachau (which had tried 1,500 German prisoners and sentenced 420 of them to death), established that the accused had been subjected to physical and psychological torture of every sort to force them to make the desired "confessions". Thus 137 out of 139 German prisoners examined had been kicked in testicles, receiving permanent injuries.

Source : Interview with Judge Edward L. Van Roden, in "The Progressive", February 1949.

The Auschwitz Trial

The fate of the principal defendant, Richard Baer, last commander at Auschwitz, who died before the start of the trial, is particularly interesting. He was arrested in December 1960 near Hamburg, where he worked as a forest ranger. In 1963, he died in goal in mysterious circumstances.

According to several sources, based on French accounts in the French press, Baer had obstinately refused during his imprisonment to confirm the existence of gas chambers in the sector that had once been under his responsibility.

Source: Hermann Langbein, "Der Auschwitz Prozess", Europäische Verlag, Frankfurt 1965.

The autopsy report carried out by the Legal Institute of Frankfurt University concluded that "the ingestion of an odorless and noncorrosive poison...can not be excluded."

The Nuremberg lawyer, Eberhard Engelhardt, quotes this passage in the autopsy report in a letter to the Frankfurt public prosecutor dated November 12th 1973, asserting that Bauer was poisoned during the investigation.

Second example : the Gerstein report, that of a Waffen SS, was so obviously, far-fetched that it was refused as evidence by the military court at Nuremberg on January 30th 1946, but was used at the Eichmann Trial at Jerusalem in 1961.

According to this "testimony" the number of victims (60,000 a day in three camps: Belzec, Treblinka and Sobibor) would have totaled 25 millions !

Source : Cote P S 1553.

Furthermore, he claimed to have seen 700-800 people piled up in a 25 square meter room (over 28 per square meter!).

Professor Roques, of Nantes University, who wrote a thesis demonstrating the inconsistency of the "Gerstein report", was stripped of his doctor's title as a result, although Alain Decaux wrote in "Le Matin de Paris" (December 13th 1986) that "all researchers would henceforth have to take these studies into account", adding that Professor Roques was, "currently the best informed person regarding the Gerstein affair."

They therefore looked for ridiculous administrative reasons.

As he had prepared his thesis in Paris under Professor Rougeot, and as he had been transferred to Nantes to defend his thesis under Professor Rivière, which was perfectly in order, he was accused of not paying his registration fees at the University of Nantes !

This was how Henri Roques found himself deprived...

Third example, if we confine ourselves solely to the most famous "witnesses" : Doctor Miklos Nyiszli, who wrote "Médecin " Auschwitz" published in 1953 by Jean-Paul Sartre in "Les Temps Modernes", and a deported Hungarian doctor (translated by Tibere Kremer, Julliard 1961).

Example : Miklos Nyiszli tells us that the gas chambers were 200 meters long, and the document produced at Nuremberg tells us that they were either 210, 400 or 580 square meters; this would mean respective widths of 1m05, 2m and 2m90, which does not hold water if you consider that 3,000 people would have entered the premises, moved about easily, and that there were columns in the center and benches on each side.

It is significant that neither the "Encyclopedia Judaica" (1971) nor the "Encyclopedia of the Holocaust" (1990) even mention this work, which they regard as discredited which is attached to it since the critique of it made by Paul Rassinier.

Nyiszli's first assertion is that, when he arrived at the camp at the end of May 1944, the exterminations had been going on for four years. Yet the Nuremberg document (N.0.4.401) indicates that orders were given only in August 1942, and document 4r463 that they were not ready until February 20th 1943.

In August 1960, the Munich Institut fur Zeitgeschichte made the following declaration to the press :

"The Dachau gas chambers were never finished or put in action... Mass extermination of Jews by gas began in 1941-42, and only in a few places in occupied Poland, by means of technical installations set up for that purpose, but in no cases on German soil."

Source : "Die Zeit", August 19th 1960.

Other examples :

One of the principal accused, Sauckel, declared on May 30th 1946 before the Nuremberg Court :

"I confirm that my signature figures on this document. I ask the court permission to explain how that signature was obtained. "

"This document was presented to me in its final form. I asked for permission to read and study it so as to decide if I should sign it. This was refused...Then a Polish or Russian policeman came in and asked : Where is Sauckel's family ? We'll take Sauckel with us but his family will be handed over to Soviet territory. I'm the father of ten children and, thinking of my family, I signed this document."

* * *

The testimony of General Ohlendorf is particularly revealing among those of other criminals. From the summer of 1941 to the summer of 1942, he headed the "Einsatzgruppen" in charge of executing the political commissars in charge of the partisans' activities in the Southern Russia. At the I.M.T. trial, he declared that he had received oral orders to add to his functions that of exterminating Jews by using special lorries for the killing of people, including women and children.

Source: I.M.T. Vol IV, p. 311-355 and I.M.T. Vol XXII, p. 478-480 ; 491-494 ; p.509-10 ; 538.

General Ohlendorf's testimony during his second trial (N.M.T. case 9) is completely different: first of all, he retracted his declarations to the I.M.T. regarding the oral order to exterminate Jews ; he acknowledged having killed Jews and Gypsies, but only within the context of the struggle against the partisans, and not as part of a specific plan of extermination of Jews and Gypsies. He also admitted to having killed 40,000 people and not 90,000, as he had told I.M.T.

Source: N.M.T. Vol IV.p. 223-312.

No critical refutation, no scientific contradiction or discussion was opposed to the arguments of critical historians : they encountered only silence at best and repression at worst.

Silence was the lot of the works of Paul Rassinier, a historian who had himself been deported to Buchenwald and Dora. This father of the critical history of Hitler's crime wrote : "Le mensonge d'Ulysse", "Le drame des Juifs européens" and "Le véritable procès Eichmann."

Then silence and multiple persecutions in America of the engineer Leuchter, a specialist of gassings in certain American penitentiaries, who had given a purely technical expertise with regards to the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz, during the previously mentioned trial of Ernest Zündel at Toronto.

Professor Faurisson was dismissed from his post at the University of Lyon, was hounded by the law and was finally victim of an assassination attempt in which he was stabbed with a knife and seriously wounded, because he had questioned the existence of the "gas chambers".

In March 1978, assassination of the French historian, Francois Duprat, by a commando, for publishing a brochure by an Australian who questioned the figure of 6 million dead.

Repression against Henri Roques, who was refused the title of Doctor though he had had an honorable mention for his thesis, because he made a critical analysis of the "Gerstein Report".

Repression of the publisher, Pierre Guillaume, for his publications, "Annales d'histoire révisionniste", forcing him to give up his magazine by crushing him financially through fines and by breaking the windows of his bookshop.

In Germany, the magistrate Stäglich was hounded for his critique of the different texts and eyewitness accounts concerning the camps, pointing out a number of counter-truths in his book : "The Myth of Auschwitz" (1978). Even his doctor's title was withdrawn, according to a Hitlerian law of June 7th 1939. (Reich Code. I, p.1326).

The historian Butz suffered the same treatment when he tried to establish a dividing-line between the truth and the myth in "The Hoax Twentieth Century"(1976). The book was banned in Canada and Germany.

In Canada, the Toronto trial against Zündel for publishing Harwood's work : "Did six million really die?" was persecution since even the official answer to that question is negative like his.

These silences, persecutions and repressions against a historical critique of Hitler's crimes rested on libelous and false premises : to show that Hitler's great crimes against the Jews and all his enemies, the German or Slav Communists who were to defeat him, needed no falsehoods to reveal their horror. It was, according to the adversaries of historical critique (whom they called "revisionists"), "making Hitler innocent or at least attenuating his crimes"!

To them, it was "racism" encouraging discrimination and racial hatred to demonstrate that Nazi crimes were not confined to a vast pogrom against the Jews only, but had led to the deaths of 50 million people in the battle against Fascism.

It is against such a chorus of hate against the critical researchers that we are trying today to bring, with their sources, elements to this dossier in the hope that it will serve to start off a genuine discussion on the objective realities of this past, without lending this or that researcher political motives, without condemning him in advance to repression and silence.

One does not prepare the future by perpetuating hatred and feeding it with lies.

The critique of proven historical accounts and of scientific studies make it possible for public opinion to reflect on past crimes to forestall those of tomorrow; it is a moral as well as a scientific obligation.

Until now, even artists of great talent and of genuine good faith have only been given false and arbitrary figures.

* * *

In spite of this, some authentic masterpieces have emerged, as for example Robert Merle's novel : "La mort est mon métier", which reconstitutes in first-person form, the career of Höss, commander at Auschwitz.

Though he quotes the arbitrary figures of the false witness, Robert Merle sometimes writes in a manner worthy of Stendhal :

"...The public prosecutor cried out : You have killed three and a half million people!

"-- I asked to be allowed to speak and said : I beg your pardon, I killed only two and a half million!

"There were murmurs in the hall. Yet I had done nothing save to correct a false figure."

Source: R. Robert Merle, "La mort est mon métier" Ed. Gallimard, 1952, Folio. p.365-366.

In the film world, a brilliant and yet subtle film like Alain Resnais' "Nuit et Brouillard" gives a poignant and unforgettable image of barbarism and suffering; but it is disfigured by its evocation of the arbitrary figure of 8 million Jewish victims at Auschwitz alone !

But there were soon to be a lot of books, and especially a lot of films for the screen and for TV, which warped the meaning of Hitler's crime. How many times just after the liberation, as a whole generation can testify and judge for themselves, did we see the exploits of those who fought the most efficiently against the Nazis : the film "La bataille de l'eau lourde" evoked the decisive exploit of Joliot-Curie and his team to extract from Hitler the stocks that would have enabled him to be the first to use the atomic bomb ?

"La bataille du rail" shows how the railroad workers sabotaged German transports to paralyze the concentration of their troops. How many films like "Paris brule-t-il?" showed the uprising of the people of Paris, freeing their own city and capturing the German governor Von Choltitz to force the enemy to capitulate.

How many times have such films been shown compared to "Exodus", "Holocaust", "Shoah" and other such works which we can see, along with similar works, on our TV screens, as if the "sacrificial" suffering of some was infinitely nobler than the suffering of all the others in their heroic struggle ?

Lanzman's "Shoah" lasts for nine hours, during which we see endless stones and trains, and are told by someone like the Treblinka barber that he was able to fit into a 16 square-meter room 60 women and 16 barbers !

Those who commission works for the "Shoah business" are generous. The State of Israel for a start : Menahem Begin raised 850,000 dollars for "Shoah", which he deemed "a project of national interest."

Source : "Jewish telegraphic agency," June 20th 1986, "The Jewish journal", N.Y. June 27th 1986, p. 3.

One of the films which helped to manipulate world opinion the most:
"The TV film **"Holocaust"** is a crime against historical truth. The general theme was that such a large-scale event - the extermination of 6 million Jews could not go unnoticed by the German people as a whole. If therefore the Germans did not know, it was because they did not want to know and were therefore guilty."

Source : "Liberation", March 7th 1979.

And these are the wormy fruit of this "breviary of hatred" :
"All these enemy agents must be expelled from the country. We have been asking for permission to do it for two years. What we need is very simple and clear : the authorization, and enough ships. The problem involved in sinking those ships does not, unfortunately, devolve upon the Paris municipal council."

Source : Bulletin municipal officiel de Paris. Assembly debate the Paris Municipal Council, October 27th 1962 session, p.637.

This was not an ill-considered remark, as was confirmed by Mr. Moscovitch on January 15th 1963, who declared during a libel suit he himself had instigated :
"I have indeed regretted that France's enemies were not exterminated...and I still regret it!" ("Le Monde", January 27th 1963).

After a sober and dignified first book, written just after he was released from Buchenwald, "L'Univers concentrationnaire" (Ed. de Minuit, 1946), David Rousset gave us, in a literary and subtle form, in "Les jours de notre mort", most of the hackneyed stereotypes of our concentration camp literature.

Novels too have contributed to this mystification since "Les jours de notre mort" by David Rousset, which warped the reality of the Buchenwald and Dora camps, as did Martin Gray's "Treblinka", which was ghosted by a famous French writer to describe a camp in which he had never set foot. Since the fake archives of the Veterans' Ministry, "discovered" by Serge Klarsfeld, including the apocalyptic fakes by Nobel prize-winner Elie Wiesel, who saw "with his very eyes" "gigantic flames" rising from an open trench in which "little children were being thrown" (flames never spotted by any of the American planes that flew over the camps). In a crescendo of horror and delirium, he adds:

"Later, I learned from a witness that, for months and months, the earth had not stopped moving, and that from time to time geysers of blood had spouted from it." (This concerns an "eyewitness account" on Babi-Yar.)

Source : Elie Wiesel : "Paroles d'Etranger", Ed. du Seuil. 1982, p. 192, p. 86.

The apotheosis of this fictionalized literature is the world best-seller, the "Diary of Anne Frank". The wonderfully touching novel replaces history and, once again, the

myth is disguised as history.

The English historian, David Irving, testified at the Toronto Trial on April 25th and 26th 1988 (33.9399-9.400); he had this to say about the "Diary" of Anne Frank :

"The father of Anne Frank, with whom I corresponded over many years, finally relented and allowed the diaries to be submitted to the kind of laboratory examination that I always insist upon where a document is in question."

The expertise was conducted at the German police criminal laboratory of Wiesbaden. The conclusion reached was that a portion of the "Journal" of Anne Frank had been written with a ball-point pen; such pens did not go on the market until 1951, whereas Anne Frank died in 1945.

David Irving continues :

"My own conclusion on the Anne Frank diaries is for the greater part they are authentic writings of a pubescent teenage Jewish girl who was locked up and hidden, that they were then taken by her father, Otto Frank, after the girl's tragic death of typhus in a concentration camp, and her father or other persons unknown amended the diaries into a saleable form as a result of which he and the Anne Frank Foundation became rich, but as a historical document they are completely worthless by virtue of having been tampered with."

The "Shoah-business" uses only "eyewitness accounts" evoking various ways of "gassing" victims, without our ever being shown the functioning of a single "gas chamber" (of which Leuchter has demonstrated the physical and chemical impossibility), nor a single of those numberless trucks supposed to have served as "ambulatory gas-chambers" through their Diesel fumes; nor the tons of ashes from the bodies, buried after the cremations.

"There are no photographs of the gas chambers and the corpses have gone up in smoke. Only witnesses remain."

Source : "Le Nouvel Observateur", April 26th 1985

Claude Lanzman's endless film was conceived in the same spirit. As Lanzman put it himself :

"We had to make this film from nothing, without any documents from archives, inventing everything."

Source : "Liberation" April 25th 1985.p.22

c - The instrument of crime

If we try to imagine the goal of a criminal trial, we must admit the primordial importance of hearing experts giving their opinion on a wide range of questions, if only to reach a conclusion as to the credibility of many witnesses as well as a few "documents". Let us formulate here what a few of these questions would be :

" How long did it take for "Zyklon B" gas to act, and how did its effects manifest themselves ?

" How long did the gas remain active in an enclosed space (either unventilated or ventilated immediately after use) ?

" Was it possible, as has been stated, to enter the premises without a mask when they were impregnated with "Zyklon B" gas, only half an hour after use of the gas ?

" Was it possible to burn the corpses completely within 20 minutes in a crematorium oven?

" Could crematorium ovens work day and night without time to cool off?

" Is it possible to burn human bodies in ditches several meters deep, and if so how long would it take ?

Until now, no "incriminating proof" has been produced. We shall only give two examples:

* that of the "itinerant gas chambers" in lorries ;

* that of the soap made from human fat (a tall story already used during the 1914-1918 war) (Just as "gassing" is a recycled version of the "gassing" of Serbs by Bulgars in 1916).

Source: "The Daily Telegraph", London March 22nd 1916.p.7

"The history of the exterminations by genuine "mobile gas chambers", which were lorries in which thousands of people are supposed to have been killed by a twist of the Diesel exhaust pipe towards the interior was first spread in Western opinion in the "New York Times" of July 16th 1943, p.7." (Until then, the theme had been developed only in the Soviet press.)

The Daily Telegraph, London June 25th 1946. p.5.

There again, the crime weapon (hundreds, if not thousands, of lorries specially installed for these murders) has disappeared. Not one of them was ever found and shown as evidence at any trial.

Here too, we can note that if the "extermination" plan had to remain an absolute "secret", it would be strange if it had been communicated to thousands of lorry drivers and their assistants who would have dealt with the victims (without any order of mission), making thousands of bodies disappear by magic, while being the keepers of the "terrible secret".

It was Wiesenthal who promoted the legend of "human soap" in articles published in 1946 in the Austrian Jewish community paper, "Der Neue Weg" (The new way). In an article entitled "RIF", he wrote :

"The terrible words "Transport for soap" were heard for the first time at the end of 1942. It was the general Government (of Poland) and the factory was at Belzec, in Galicia. From April 1942 to May 1943, 900,000 Jews were used as raw material in this factory."

After the transformation of the corpses into various raw materials, Wiesenthal wrote:

" the leftovers, the residual fatty waste, was used for the production of soap."

He added:

"After 1942, the people in the general Government knew very well what RIF soap meant. The civilized world cannot imagine the joy this soap gave the Nazis of the general Government and their wives. In each bar of soap, they saw a Jew who had been magically placed there and thus prevented from becoming a second Freud, Ehrlich or Einstein."

The Yad Vashem Memorial has answered very officially that the Nazis did not make soap out of Jewish corpses. During the war, Germany suffered a shortage of fats and the production of soap was placed under the supervision of the government. The bars of soap were marked with the initials RIF, the German abbreviation meaning "pure industrial fat". Certain people mistakenly thought it was RJF and meant "pure Jewish fat".

The rumor spread rapidly.

* * *

There is a document which, if it were discussed seriously and publicly, would put an end to the controversies about the "gas chambers": this is the "Leuchter Report" (April 5th 1988).

Zyklon B gas, made from cyanhydric substances, is considered to have been the product used to gas a multitude of prisoners. It is normally used to disinfect clothing and instruments that could spread contagion in epidemics such as typhus, and was in use before World War I.

[Cyanide gas, HCN] was used for an execution for the first time in Arizona in 1920. Other American states used it for their Death-row inmates : California, Colorado, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico and North Carolina.

Source : Leuchter Report (number 9.004)

Leuchter was an engineer who served as consultant for the State of Missouri, California and North Carolina. Today, several of these states have given up this method of execution because [...] the security precautions required for its use make it an expensive method of execution.

Fumigation with Zyklon B requires a minimum ventilation of ten hours after its use, depending on the dimensions of the building (6.005).

The room in which it is used must be airtight, and [...] the doors must have joints made out of asbestos, neoprene or Teflon (7.0001).

Having visited and expertised by previous deduction the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz-Birkenau and other camps in the East, the conclusions were the following : (12.001 concerning bunkers 1 and 2 at Auschwitz :

"On the spot inspection of the buildings indicates that the conception of these installations would have been extremely bad and dangerous if they had been used as

execution chambers. Nothing was prepared for that use...

"Krema I stands next to the SS hospital at Auschwitz, and has drains that are connected with the camp's main sewage system, which would have allowed the gas to infiltrate all the camp buildings (12.002). On Majdanek, the building could not have been used for the purpose attributed to it and does not correspond even to the minimum needs for the construction of a gas chamber."

Leuchter concluded that none of the conditions existed for the use of these buildings as homicidal gas-chambers. Whoever would have worked there would have been doing so at the peril of his life and the lives of those in the surroundings (32.9121). There was no means of ventilation or air distribution, no way of adding the materials required by the use of Zyklon B (33.145)

"After going over all the documentation material and inspecting all the sites at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, the author finds the evidence overwhelming : in none of these places were there any gas chambers for executions."

Source : Written at Malden, Massachusetts, April 5th 1988. Fred Leuchter Jr., Chief Engineer.

At the Toronto trial, the lawyer, Christie, noted how many "accounts" were in contradiction with the reality of the chemical and technical possibilities. Here are three examples :

a) - Rudolf Höss, in "Commandant d'Auschwitz". p. 198. wrote :

"The doors were opened half an hour after the adduction of the gas, after ventilation had renewed the air. The task of removing the bodies began immediately."

"This task was carried out with indifference, as if it were part of a daily routine. As they dragged the bodies, they ate or smoked."

So they did not even wear masks ? wondered the lawyer, Christie. (51123)

It is [highly inadvisable] to handle bodies that have just been in contact with Zyklon B, within a half an hour after the gassing, and even less so to eat, drink or smoke. It takes at least ten hours to ventilate the premises before the place is safe.

b) - Christie produced Nuremberg document 1553 PS, in which Hilberg acknowledged that the same quantity of Zyklon B had been sent to Oranienburg as to Auschwitz on the same day.

Hilberg indicated that Oranienburg was:

"...a concentration camp and an administrative center where, as far as he knew, no-one had been gassed."

Leuchter's samples and expertise even shown that traces of cyanide from Zyklon B are found in much larger quantities in those rooms we are certain were used for disinfection than in the supposed "gas-chambers".

"One would have expected to detect a higher level of cyanide in the samples taken from the first gas-chambers (due to the larger quantity of gas used, according to the

sources, in these places) than in the control sample. As the opposite is true, we have to conclude ... that these installations were not execution gas-chambers."

Source : Leuchter Report (op. cit.) 14.006.

This conclusion was confirmed by a counter-expertise made at Cracow by the Medical-Legal Institute of Expertise from February 20th to July 18th 1990, at the very time that the plaque commemorating the "4 million" was being taken down.

Source : Institute reference. 720.90. Museum reference 1-8523/51/1860.89.

It is true that tourists are shown if not the functioning of the "gas chambers", at least their sketchy reconstitution, even in places where it turns out they were never used, as in Dachau.

c) - Leuchter examined the sites which, according to official maps of Birkenau, were used as "cremation ditches" by the Nazis to get rid of the corpses. Most of the texts in the Holocaust literature describe them as ditches about 6 feet deep...The most surprising thing about them is that they are about one and a half feet in water from the surface. Leuchter emphasized the fact that it would have been impossible to cremate bodies under water. And there was no reason to believe that things had changed since the war as books about the Holocaust describe Auschwitz and Birkenau as having been built on a swamp (32.9100,9101). Yet there are photographs in the exhibition of these supposed "cremation ditches".

14.008 (as far as the open-air crematoriums in the "cremation ditches" are concerned)
:
"Birkenau is built on a swamp; all its sites are water-logged 60cm from the surface. The opinion of the author of this report is that there never were any cremation ditches at Birkenau." (14.008)

A precious document on these open-air cremations whose smoke filled the sky is :
"The Auschwitz album", a collection of 189 photographs with a commentary by Serge Klarsfeld; it includes aerial photographs of Auschwitz and Birkenau taken from American planes, and was published in 1979 by the Americans Dino A. Brugioni and Robert C. Poirier. (The Holocaust revisited : A retrospective analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination complex, Washington, CIA February 1979.)

Whereas Pressac gives us a Dantean picture : "in the clear blue sky, two squat chimneys spat out flames" (p.91), in this inferno of fire whose flames supposedly devoured, according to the orthodox, 25,000 corpses a day from May to August 1944, chiefly because of the deportation to Auschwitz of the Hungarian Jews, aerial photographs dated June 26th and August 25th 1944 did not show the least trace of smoke, any more than they show evidence of crowds or of any particular activity. "The Auschwitz album", a compilation of 189 photographs taken in the camp of Birkenau around the same period, which has an introduction by Serge Klarsfeld and a commentary by J.C. Pressac, shows us 189 scenes of concentration camp life at the time of the arrival of a convoy of deportees from Hungary. There again, there is strictly nothing to suggest a massive and systematic extermination.

On the contrary, a great number of photographs give us a general picture of the place which, far from confirming this extermination, exclude the possibility of its having taken place simultaneously in some "secret" place in the camp. J.P. Pressac's commentary is so full of obvious extrapolations that it achieves the opposite effect and makes the mechanism of fabrication almost tangible.

Source : "L'Album d'Auschwitz". Le Seuil, Paris 1983, 221 pages.

But it is the Canadian, John C. Ball, a specialist in the interpretation of aerial photos who seems to have compiled the most original photographic documents, competently and rigorously analyzing them. His conclusions totally contradict official history.

Source : Air Photo Evidence. Ball Resource Ltd. Suite 160, 7231 120th street Delta, B.C. Canada. 4C6PS. 1992. 116 pages.

But these technical questions as a whole were raised at the trial of Ernst Zündel at Toronto, where the two sides were able to express themselves freely and fully. The account of this trial is therefore an exceptional source for any honest historian as it makes it possible to become acquainted with theses taking into account all the elements of the controversy. The declarations of the different parties are all the more valuable and significant for the fact that each spoke under the control of the immediate criticism of the opposite party.

A detail which seems decisive in its importance : on April 5th and 6th 1988, the director of the Calgary Crematorium (Canada), Yvan Lagacé, where the crematoriums are built along the same lines as those of Birkenau (though these were built in 1943) was able to expose all the technical restrictions and the need for upkeep of these kinds of incineration apparatus. He spoke of the need to cool the equipment between cremations, and when a body was introduced, because otherwise the ovens' fireproofing was damaged.

Lagacé was asked to give his opinion concerning the evaluation Hilberg made of the capacity of 46 ovens in 4 Birkenau crematories ("La destruction des Juifs européens", second edition, p.978).

Hilberg had claimed:

"The theoretical daily capacity of the 4 ovens at Birkenau was over 4,400 but with stops and slow-downs which made it less in practice."

Lagacé declared that this assertion was "absurd" and "unrealistic" To claim that 46 ovens could burn over 4,400 corpses in a day was grotesque. Based on his own experience, Lagacé affirmed it was possible to burn 184 corpses a day at Birkenau.

Source : 27-736 to 738.

This is very different from the claims made by a book like that of Pressac, "Les crématoires d'Auschwitz" : "La machinerie du meurtre des masses" (1993), which spares only one chapter of 20 pages (out of 147) for the "gas-chambers", and which does not even quote the Leuchter report, to which he consecrated a "refutation" in 1990 (again financed by the Klarsfeld Foundation).

Until a scientific and public debate between equally competent specialists is held concerning the Leuchter report and other works concerning the "gas chambers", there will still be room for doubt and skepticism.

Until now, the only arguments that have been used against those who questioned official history have been a refusal to discuss the matter, attacks and repression.

3 - The Myth of the "Holocaust"

"Genocide : the methodical destruction of an ethnic group through the extermination of its individuals."

Larousse Dictionary

"Like the divine promise contained in the Bible, the Genocide is an element of ideological justification for the creation of the State of Israel"

Source : Tom Segev, "Le septième million" Ed. Liana Levi. 1993. p. 588.

Three terms have often been used to define the treatment inflicted upon the Jews by the Nazis: Genocide, Holocaust and Shoah.

The term "genocide" has a specific etymological meaning: the extermination of a race. Even if we assume there is a Jewish "race", as Hitler claimed and as Israeli leaders still maintain, defining a Jew (in other words someone entitled to the "return")...

...can it be said that there was a "genocide" of the Jews during World War II ?

In all dictionaries, the term "genocide" has a specific meaning. Larousse, for example, gives the following definition :

"Genocide: The systematic destruction of an ethnic group by the extermination of its individuals."

This definition cannot be applied to the letter except in the case of the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, where, we are told for each city conquered : "he left none remaining" (for example in Numbers XXI, 35).

The word was therefore used in a completely erroneous manner at Nuremberg, since it was not a matter of annihilating an entire people, as was the case with the "sacred exterminations" of the Amalacites and the Canaanites, and other peoples still, of which we are told in the Book of Joshua that at Eglon and Hebron: "he left none remaining" (Joshua X,37) or at Hagar : "every man they smote with the edge of the sword, until they had destroyed them, neither left they any to breathe." (Joshua XI, 14).

On the contrary, Judaism (its definition as a "race" belonging to the Hitlerian vocabulary) has enjoyed a considerable development in the world since 1945.

There is no doubt that the Jews were one of Hitler's favorite targets, by virtue of his racist theory of the superiority of the "Aryan race" and the amalgam he made between

the Jews and the Communists, who were his chief enemy, as can be seen in the fact that he had hundreds of thousands of German Communists executed and was particularly relentless in his treatment of the Slav prisoners. For him, the two so went together that he created a special term for them : "Judeo-Bolshevism".

As soon as he created his "National-Socialist" party, he considered not only the uprooting of Communism but also chasing all Jews out of Germany to begin with, and later out of Europe, when he became the master. He proceeded in the most inhuman fashion, first by exiling and expelling them, then, during the war, by incarcerating them in concentration camps in Germany to begin with, then by deporting them. At first he considered deporting them to Madagascar, where they would have formed a huge European ghetto, then to the occupied territories in the east of Europe, especially to Poland, where Slavs, Jews and Gypsies were decimated at first by hard labor in the war industry, then by terrible typhus epidemics, the magnitude of which is borne out by the multiplication of crematoriums.

What was the dreadful outcome of Hitler's persecution of his political and racial victims?

50 million people died during World War II, of which 17 million were Russians and 9 million Germans. Poland too paid a heavy tribute, as did the other occupied countries of Europe, the millions of soldiers from Africa or Asia who had been mobilized for this war as they had been for the first, though they once more had nothing to do with the European rivalries that precipitated the conflict.

The Hitlerian domination was thus far more than the huge "pogrom", as Hannah Arendt described it, of which the Jews were the main if not the sole victims, as a certain form of propaganda would have us believe. Hitlerism was a human catastrophe which, unfortunately, had a precedent in the policy applied over five centuries by the European colonialists to "colored people". What Hitler did to white people, they did to the American Indians, of which they killed [75%] (also through forced labor and epidemics, even more than through massacres); just as they did to the Africans, of which they deported between 10 and 20 million, which means that Africa was robbed of 100 to 200 million of its inhabitants since ten people had to be killed for one to be taken alive during capture by the slave-dealers.

The myth suited everybody : to speak of the "greatest genocide in history" was for the Western colonialists to have their own crimes forgotten (the decimation of the American Indians and the African slave-trade), as it was a way for Stalin to mask his own ferocious repressions.

For the Anglo-American leaders, after the Dresden massacre of February 1945, which killed within a few hours some 200,000 civilians, burned alive by phosphorus bombs, for no military purpose since the German army was being pushed back all along the Eastern front before the lightning quick advance of the Soviet army, which had reached the Oder by January.

For the United States even more, which had just dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, resulting in "over 200,000 people killed and almost 150,000 injured, doomed within a given lapse of time."

Source: Paul-Marie de la Gorce: "1939-1945. Une guerre inconnue." Ed. Flammarion, Paris 1995, p. 535.

The ends were not military but political. As early as 1948, Churchill wrote in his "History of the Second World War" (Volume VI) :
"It would be false to suppose that the fate of Japan was decided by the atomic bomb."

The American admiral, William A. Leahy, confirmed this in his book, "I was there":
"In my opinion, the use of that barbaric weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was not much use in the war against Japan."

And indeed, the emperor of Japan, Hirohito, had already engaged negotiations for the surrender of his country as early as May 21st 1945 with the Soviet Union (which was not yet at war with Japan), through the intermediary of the Japanese minister of foreign affairs and the Soviet ambassador, Malik.
"Prince Konoye was asked get ready to go to Moscow, to negotiate directly with Molotov."

Source: Paul-Marie de la Gorce. op. cit. p. 532.

"The Japanese intentions were perfectly well-known in Washington: "Magic" gave an account of the correspondence between the minister of Foreign Affairs and his correspondent in Moscow."

Source: Idem. p.553.

The goal pursued was therefore not military but political, as the American Aviation Minister, Finletter, admitted, explaining that use of atomic bombs was "to knock out Japan before Russia's entry into war."

Source: "Saturday Review of Literature", June 5th, 1944.

Leahy, the American admiral, concluded (op. cit.):
"By being the first to use the atomic bomb, we stooped to the moral level of the barbarians of the Middle Ages...This new and terrible weapon, which is used for an uncivilized war, is a modern barbarity unworthy of Christians."

Thus all those leaders, which a genuine "International Court" made up of neutral countries would have placed with the war criminals alongside Göring and his gang, discovered an un hoped-for alibi with the "gas chambers", the "holocausts" and the "genocides", that could justify, if not eradicate, their own crimes against humanity.

The American historian, W.F. Albright, who was director of the "American School of Oriental research", wrote in his major work of synthesis: "De l'age de pierre " la certiente. Le monothéisme et son revolution." (French translation : Ed. Payot 1951), after having justified the "sacred exterminations" of Joshua when he invaded Canaan (p.205):

"We Americans have perhaps... less right to judge the Israelites...since we exterminated thousands of Indians in every corner of our great land, and have parked the ones that remained in vast concentration camps." (p.205).

The term "Holocaust", applied to the same tragedy from the Seventies on, based on the book "La Nuit" (1958) and made famous by the title of the film: "Holocaust", shows even more clearly the determination to turn the crime committed against the Jews into an exceptional event without any possible comparison with the massacres of the other victims of Nazism, or even with any other crime in history because their suffering and their dead had a sacred character: the "Larousse Universel" (2 volumes, Paris 1969, p. 772) thus defined the "holocaust":

"Sacrifice practiced by the Jews, in which the victims was completely consumed by fire."

The martyrdom of the Jews thus became irreducible: because of its sacrificial nature, it was part of the divine Plan, like the crucifixion of Jesus in Christian theology, inaugurating a new age. Which was to allow a rabbi to say:

"The creation of the State of Israel was God's answer to the Holocaust."

To justify the sacred nature of the holocaust, there had to be:

- **total extermination**

- **cremation.**

a) Total extermination. A "final solution" to the Jewish problem that would have been extermination would have had to be considered. In fact, it has never been possible to produce a text attesting that the "final solution" of the Jewish problem was regarded by the Nazis as being extermination.

Hitler's anti-Semitism was linked from his earliest speeches to the fight against Bolshevism (he constantly uses the expression "JudeoBolshevism"); the first concentration camps he had built were to be used for German Communists, where thousands, including their leader Thaelman, died.

Hitler accused the Jews of completely contradictory sins: first of all they were, he said, the most active actors in the Bolshevik revolution (Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, etc.); at the same time they were, according to him, the worst capitalist exploiters of the German people.

It was therefore important, after liquidating the Communist movement and preparing the expansion of Germany towards the East in the manner of the Teutonic knights, to crush the Soviet Union; this was the beginning of the end of his career, but it was his chief obsession and manifested itself during his days in power, in the ferocious way he treated the Slav prisoners (Russian and Polish). He even created, during the war against the U.S.S.R. "Einsatzgruppen" in other words units whose special task it was to combat the Soviet partisans and to slay their political commissars, even those who were prisoners. Among these were many Jews who, like their heroic Slavic companions, were massacred.

(This proves the limitations of propaganda regarding "Soviet anti-Semitism": it cannot

both be claimed that the Soviets kept the Jews away from important posts and be asserted that Jews made up the majority of "political commissars" among the groups of partisans the "Einsatzgruppen" were sent out to slay . How can one imagine that the responsibility for directing partisan activity behind enemy lines (where it was easier to desert and collaborate) would have been entrusted to Jews considered suspect?)

One of the Nazis' most monstrous ideas was to aim to rid Germany of its Jews, and later, when Hitler became master of the continent, to rid all Europe of Jews (judenrein).

Hitler proceeded in stages:

- * The first was to organize their **emigration** in conditions that made it possible to plunder the wealthiest. (And we have seen that the Zionist leaders of the "Havara" efficiently collaborated in this undertaking by promising, in exchange, to prevent the boycott of Hitlerian Germany and not to take part in the anti-Fascist movement.)

- * The second stage was expulsion, in the pursuit of the plan to send them all to a world ghetto: after the capitulation of France, the island of Madagascar, which was supposed to pass under German control once the French had compensated the French ex-residents.

The project was dropped not so much because of French reticence as because the number and size of the ships required for this operation would have exceeded Germany's capacities in times of war.

- * The Hitlerian occupation of Eastern Europe, especially Poland, made it possible to attain the "final solution": to empty Europe of its Jews by deporting them en masse to these distant camps: it was there that they suffered the greatest hardships, not only those of all civilian populations in time of war - bombardments, famine and privations of every sort, forced marches that were deadly for the weakest, to evacuate the centers, but also forced labor in the most inhuman conditions to serve the German war effort (for example, Auschwitz was the most active center of the chemical industries of the "Farbeindustrie"). And finally, there were the epidemics, especially typhus, which devastated a concentration-camp population which was exhausted and undernourished.

Was it therefore necessary to resort to other methods to explain the terrible mortality which struck the victims of such treatments and to grossly exaggerate their numbers at the risk of having to lower it at a later date?

- * To change the inscription at Birkenau-Auschwitz to reduce the number of dead from 4 to 1 million?

- * To change the inscription of the "gas chamber" at Dachau to specify that it never functioned?

- * Or that of the Paris "Velodrome d'Hiver" to admit that the number of Jews parked there was 8,160 and not 30,000 as the original plaque (since removed) indicated?

Source: "Le Monde", July 18th 1990. p.7.

Is it really necessary to maintain at all costs the exceptional nature of the "Holocaust" (sacrificial extermination by fire) and to brandish the specter of the "gas chambers"?

In 1980, for the first time, the unique nature of the massacre of the Jews was questioned by a famous journalist, Boaz Evron :

"And as if it went without saying, each important guest is taken on a compulsory visit to Yad Vashem (and) to make him fully understand the feelings and the guilt expected of him."

"If we assume the world hates us and persecutes us, we feel exempted from the need to be accountable for our actions towards it."

The paranoid isolation from the world and its laws would lead certain Jews to treat non-Jews as sub-humans, thus rivaling in racism with the Nazis. Evron warned against the tendency to confuse the Arab's hostility and Nazi anti-Semitism.

"We can not distinguish the ruling class of a country from its political propaganda, for this is presented as a part of its reality", he wrote : "Thus the governments act in a world peopled with myths and monsters of their own making."

Source : Boaz Evron, "Le genocide : un danger pour la nation" Iton 77 Number May-June 1980. p. 12 and following.

First of all because millions of people whose good faith can not be doubted confuse "crematoriums" and "gas chambers". The existence in the Hitlerian camps of a large number of crematorium ovens to try to stop the spread of typhus epidemics is not a conclusive argument: there are crematoriums in all large cities (in Paris - at the Père Lachaise cemetery - in London and in all the major capitals' those incinerations obviously do not signify a wish to exterminate the populations.

"Gas chambers" therefore had to be added to the crematorium ovens to establish the dogma of extermination **by fire**.

The first elementary demand to demonstrate their existence was to produce the order prescribing this measure: but in the archives so minutely established by the German authorities and all seized by the Allies when Hitler was defeated, the budgets allocated to this undertaking, the instructions regarding the construction and the functioning of these chambers, in other words everything that would have made an expertise of the "crime weapon" possible, as in all normal crime investigations, there is not a trace of evidence.

It is astonishing that after officially acknowledging that there were no homicidal gassings on the territories of the ex-Reich, despite numberless attestations to the contrary by "eyewitnesses", the same criteria of the subjectivity of the accounts was no longer accepted when the camps in the East, especially in Poland, were concerned. Even when these "accounts" were most legitimately suspect.

The same Martin Broszat who had published as an authentic document the diary of Auschwitz commander, Rudolf Höss, in 1958, wrote in "Die Zeit" on August 19th 1960, p. 16, a letter declaring that there had been no homicidal gassings at Dachau or,

generally speaking, in any of the German camps within the frontiers of the ex-Reich.

Martin Broszat, from the Institute of Contemporary History at Munich, wrote:
"Neither at Dachau, nor at Bergen-Belsen, nor at Buchenwald, were Jews or any other prisoners gassed."

(In 1972, Martin Broszat became Director of the Institute of Contemporary History at Munich.)

The revelation is all the more important insofar as a number of "witnesses" and "eyewitnesses" had affirmed the existence of gas chambers in these camps, and the display of a "reconstitution" of Dachau "gas chamber" was the document which most forcefully impress visitors, especially those from the United States.

At the Nuremberg court on July 26th 1946, Sir Harley Shawcross mentioned:
"...gas chambers not only at Auschwitz and Treblinka but also at Dachau..." (TMI, tome 19, p. 4563)

The staging at Dachau made it possible to fool not only thousands of children taken there to be taught the dogma of the Holocaust [and hundreds of thousands of American servicemen-Ed.], but also adults like Father Morelli, a Dominican friar, who wrote in "Terre de détresse" (Ed. Bloud et Gay, 1947, p.15):
"I gazed with utter horror at the sinister porthole through which the Nazi murderers could watch the unfortunate people being gassed writhe."

Even ex-deportees from Buchenwald and Dachau have let themselves be taken in by the legend so carefully upheld.

One great French historian, Michel de Boüard, honorary dean of the Caen Faculty, member of the Institute and ex-prisoner at Mauthausen, declared in 1986:
"In the monograph on Mauthausen I gave (...) in 1954, I spoke about gas chambers twice. When time had made me reflect, I said to myself: "Where did I get the conviction that there was a gas chamber at Mauthausen?" It was not during my stay in the camp, for neither myself nor anyone suspected there could be one; it is therefore an "extra" which I acquired after the war, admittedly. Then I noticed that in my text - whereas most of what I say is backed by references - there were none concerning the gas chamber... "

Source: "Ouest-France", 2nd and 3rd of August 1986. p.6.

Already, Jean Gabriel Cohn Bendit had written:
"Let us fight for the destruction of those gas chambers they show tourists in the camps where there were none, as we now know; otherwise we run the risk of being no longer believed concerning that of which we are certain."

Source: "Liberation", March 5th 1979, p.4.

On August 26th 1960, M. Broszat of the Munich "Institute for the history of the present times", wrote to "Die Zeit"(p.14) although he was a Zionist :
"The gas chamber at Dachau was never finished and never worked."

Since the summer of 1943, a board in front of the showers explains:
"This gas chamber, camouflaged as a shower room, was never put into service."

It adds that the prisoners sentenced to gassing were transferred East.

4 - The myth of a "land without a people for a people without a land."

"There is no such thing as a Palestinian people... It is not as if we came and threw them out and took their country. They didn't exist."

Source : Mrs. Golda Meir. Statement to "The Sunday Times", 15 June, 1969.

Zionist ideology rests on a very simple postulate: It is written in Genesis (XV, 18 - 21) :

"The Lord made an alliance with Abraham in these terms : It is to your descendants that I give this country, from the river of Egypt to the big river, the river Euphrates."

Starting from this, without asking themselves what the alliance consisted of, to whom the promise had been made or if the choice made was unconditional, the Zionist leaders, even the agnostics and atheists, proclaim: Palestine has been given to us by God.

The Israeli government's own statistics show that 15% of Israelis are religious. This doesn't stop 90 % of them claiming that this land has been given to them by God... in whom they don't believe.

The great majority of Israelis today share neither religious practice nor faith and the different "religious parties" who, nevertheless, play a decisive role in the state of Israel, can only muster a tiny minority of citizens.

This apparent paradox is explained by Nathan Wienstock in his book : 'Zionism Against Israel' (Pub. Maspero, 1969, p.315)

"If the obscurantism of the rabbis triumphs in Israel, it is because Zionist mysticism only has coherence by reference to the religion of Moses. Take away the concepts of a "chosen people" and a "promised land" and the foundation of Zionism crumbles. This is why the religious parties paradoxically draw their strength from the complicity of agnostic Zionists. The internal coherence of the Zionist structure of Israel has imposed on its leaders the strengthening of the clergy's power. It was the social democrat "Mapai" party and not the religious parties which, on an impulse of Ben Gurion, made religious instruction an obligatory part of the school curriculum."

"This country exists as the fulfillment of a promise made by God Himself. It would be ridiculous to ask it to account for its legitimacy. This is the basic axiom formulated by Mrs. Golda Meir."

Source : "Le Monde", 15 October 1971

"This land has been promised to us and we have a right to it." restated Begin.

Source : Begin's statement at Oslo. "Davar" 12 December 1978.

"If one possesses the Bible, if one considers oneself to be the people of the Bible, one should also possess the biblical lands, those of the Judges and the Patriarchs, of Jerusalem and of Hebron, of Jericho and others besides."

Source : Moshe Dayan. "Jerusalem Post" 10 August 1967.

Very significantly, Ben Gurion evokes the American "precedent" where, in effect, for a century, the frontier remained mobile (as far as the Pacific, where the "closing of the frontier" was proclaimed in line with the success of the "Indian Hunt" to drive them away and grab their land).

Ben Gurion said very clearly :

"It's not a matter of maintaining the status quo. We have to create a dynamic state, orientated towards expansion."

Political practice corresponds to this remarkable theory: take the land and drive the inhabitants from it, as Moses and his successor Joshua did.

Menachem Begin, more deeply imbued with the biblical tradition than anyone, declared:

"Eretz Israel will be given back to the people of Israel. In its entirety and for ever."

Source : Menachem Begin : "The Revolt : Story of the Irgun", p. 335.

Thus the state of Israel places itself straight away above international law.

Imposed on the U.N. on the 11 May 1949 by the will of the United States, the State of Israel was only admitted on three conditions :

- 1 - Not to touch the status of Jerusalem;
- 2 - To allow Palestinian Arabs to come back to their homes;
- 3 - To respect the borders fixed by the partition decision.

Speaking about this U.N. resolution on "sharing", taken well before its admission, Ben Gurion declares:

"The State of Israel considers the U.N. resolution of 29 November 1947 to be null and void."

Source : "New York Times", 6 December 1953.

Echoing the theories already quoted of the American Albright, on the parallel between American and Zionist expansion, General Moshe Dayan wrote:

"Take the American declaration of Independence. It contains no mention of territorial limits. We are not obliged to fix the limits of the State."

Source : "Jerusalem Post" 10 August 1967

Policy corresponds precisely to this law of the jungle : the "partition" of Palestine, in line with the U.N. resolution was never respected.

Already, the resolution on the partition of Palestine, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations (at the time composed of a massive majority of western states) on the 29 November 1947, indicated the designs of the West on their "forward stronghold" : On this date the Jews constituted 32% of the population and possessed 5.6% of the land : they would receive 56% of the territory, including the most fertile land. These decisions had been secured under U.S. pressure.

President Truman put the State Department under unprecedented pressure. Under-Secretary of State S. Welles wrote:

"By direct order of the White House American civil servants had to use direct or indirect pressure... To ensure the necessary majority in the final vote."

Source : S. Welles, "We need not fail" Boston, 1948, p.63

The Minister of Defense of the time, James Forrestal, confirms:

"The methods used to pressure and to constrain the other nations within the U.N. were close to scandalous."

Source : "Forrestal's Memoirs", N.Y., The Viking Press. 1951, p.363

The power of the private monopolies was mobilized : Drew Pearson, in the Chicago Daily of 9 February 1948, gives details, for example:

"Harvey Firestone, a rubber plantation owner in Liberia, used his influence with the Liberian government."

From 1948 even these partial decisions were violated.

As the Arabs protested against and refused to accept such an injustice, the Israeli leaders took advantage and grabbed new territory, notably Jaffa and Acre, so that by 1949 the Zionists controlled 80% of the country and 770,000 Palestinians had been driven out.

The method used was that of terror.

The most glaring example was that of Deir Yassin : On April 9, 1948, the 254 inhabitants of this village (men, women, children, old men) were massacred by "Irgun" troops (whose leader was Menahem Begin), by the same method as the Nazis' at Oradour.

In his book "The Revolt : The History of Irgun", Begin wrote that there would not have been a State of Israel without the "victory" of Deir Yassin (p. 162 of the English edition). He added:

"The Haganah carried out victorious attacks on other fronts... In a state of terror, the Arabs fled, crying, 'Deir Yassin'." (Idem p. 162 ; French edition p.200)

Any Palestinian who had left his home before 1 August 1948 was considered as "absent".

In this way two thirds of Arab land (70,000 ha out of 110,000) was confiscated. When

a law was passed in 1953 on property ownership, compensation was fixed on the value of the land in 1950, but in the meantime the Israeli Pound had dropped to a fifth of its 1950 value.

Besides, since the beginning of Jewish immigration, and here again in the most classical colonial way, land had been bought from feudal, non-resident landowners (the "effendi") so that were driven from the land which the poor peasants, the fellah, they cultivated by these arrangements between their former masters and the new arrivals without their involvement. Deprived of their land, all they could do was to flee.

The U.N. had appointed a mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte. In his first report, Count Bernadotte wrote:

"It would offend basic principles to prevent these innocent victims of the conflict from returning to their homes, while Jewish immigrants flood into Palestine and, what's more, threatening to permanently replace the dispossessed Arab refugees who have been here for centuries."

He described, "Zionist pillage on a grand scale and the destruction of villages without apparent military need."

This report (U.N. Document A. 648, p.14) was filed on the 16 September 1948. On the 17 September 1948 Count Bernadotte and his French assistant, Colonel Serot, were assassinated in the part of Jerusalem occupied by the Zionists.

Source : For the assassination of Count Bernadotte see General A. Lundstrom's report (who was sitting in Bernadotte's car) which was sent to the U.N. the same day as the attack (17 September 1948). See also the book published by the same general for the 20th anniversary of the crime : L'assassinat du Comte Bernadotte, printed in Rome (pub. East. A. Fanelli) in 1970 under the title : 'Un tributo a la memoria del Comte Folke Bernadotte'. Ralph Hewins' book : 'Count Bernadotte, his life and work' (Hutchinson, 1948). And in the Milanese weekly Europa', Baruch Nadel's confessions (quoted in Le Monde, 4 and 5 July 1971).

It was not the first Zionist crime against someone who criticized their deception.

Lord Moyne, the British Secretary of State in Cairo, declared on 9 June 1942 in the House of Lords that the Jews were not the descendants of the ancient Hebrews and that they had no "legitimate claim" on the Holy Land. In favor of limiting immigration into Palestine, he was accused of being "an implacable enemy of Hebrew independence."

Source : Isaac Zaar : "Rescue and Liberation : America's part in the birth of Israel", N.Y. Bloc Publishing Cy, 1954, p115

On 6 November 1944 Lord Moyne was shot dead in Cairo by two members of the Stern Gang (Yitzhak Shamir's group). Years later, on 2 July 1975, "The Evening Star" of Auckland revealed that the bodies of the two executed assassins had been exchanged for 20 Arab prisoners to be buried at the "Heros Monument" in Jerusalem. The British government deplored that Israel should honor assassins as heros.

On the 22 July 1946 the wing of the King David Hotel where the British military had set up their headquarters was blown up killing about 100 people - Englishmen, Arabs and Jews. It was Irgun, Menachem Begin's group, who claimed responsibility.

The State of Israel replaced the former colonialists and used the same procedures. For example, agricultural aid for irrigation was distributed in a discriminatory way, such that Jewish farmers were systematically favored. Between 1948 and 1969 the area of irrigated land rose, for the Jewish sector, from 20,000 to 164,000 ha and, for the Arab sector, from 800 to 4,100 ha. The colonial system was thus perpetuated and even aggravated : Doctor Rosenfeld, in his book, "Arab Migrant Workers", published by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1970, recognizes that Arab agriculture was more prosperous during the British mandate than today.

Segregation is also a feature of housing policy. The president of the Israeli Human Rights League, Doctor Israel Shahak, a professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in his book, "The Racism of the State of Israel" (p.57) tells us that there are in Israel whole towns (Carmel, Nazareth, Illith, Hatzor, Arad, Mitzphen-Ramen, and others) where non-Jews are forbidden by law to live.

In cultural matters the same colonialist spirit reigns.

"In 1970, the Ministry of National Education proposed two different versions to high school pupils of the prayer to 'Yiskar': one version declared that the death camps had been built by 'the diabolical Nazi government and the German nation of murderers.'"

"The second version evoked, more globally, '...the German nation of murderers' and both contain a paragraph calling on God 'to avenge before our eyes the blood of the victims.'"

Source : "Ce sont mes frères que je cherche", Ministry of Education and Culture. Jerusalem, 1990.

This culture of racial hatred has borne fruit :

"Following Kahana, an ever-growing number of soldiers steeped in the history of the Genocide imagined all sorts of scenarios to exterminate the Arabs", declared Ehud Praver, an officer in charge of the Army teaching body. "It is very worrying that the genocide can thus legitimize a Jewish racism. We must henceforth know that it is not only vital to deal with the question of the Genocide, but also with that of the rise of Fascism, to explain its nature and dangers for democracy." According to Praver, "Too many soldiers have started to believe that the Genocide can justify any dishonorable action."

Source : Tom Segev. op. cit. p. 473.

The problem was posed very clearly even before the existence of the State of Israel. The Director of the "National Jewish Fund", Yossef Weitz, was writing already in 1940 :

"It should be clear for us that there is not room for two peoples in this country. If the Arabs leave it, there will be enough for us (...) There is nothing else to do but to remove them all; we mustn't leave a single village, a single tribe... We must explain to Roosevelt and all the heads of friendly states that the land of Israel isn't too small if all

the Arabs leave and if the borders are pushed back a little to the north, as far as the Litani, and to the east, on the Golan Heights."

Source : Yossef Weitz, "Journal" Tel Aviv, 1965

In the important Israeli newspaper "Yediot Aharonoth", of 14 July 1972, Yoram Bar Porath reminded us forcefully of the objective to be reached:

"It is the duty of Israeli leaders to explain to public opinion, clearly and courageously, a certain number of facts that are forgotten with time. The first of these is that there is no Zionism, colonialization or Jewish State without the eviction of the Arabs and the expropriation of their land."

Here we are, once again, in the most rigorous logic of the Zionist system : How do you create a Jewish majority in a country populated by a native Palestinian Arab community ?

Political Zionism provided the only solution in its colonialist program : Realize a colony of settlements by driving off the Palestinians and encouraging Jewish immigration.

Driving off the Palestinians and grabbing their land was a deliberate and systematic undertaking.

At the time of the Balfour Declaration the Zionists owned only 2.5% of the land and at the time of the decision to "share" Palestine, 6.5%. In 1982 they possessed 93%.

The methods used to dispossess the native of his land are those of the most implacable colonialism, with an even more marked racist coloring in the case of Zionism.

The first stage had the characteristics of a classic colonialism : exploiting the local work force. This was the method of Baron Édouard de Rothschild : Just as he had exploited, on his vineyards in Algeria, the cheap labor of the fellahs, he had simply enlarged his sphere of activity in Palestine, exploiting on his vineyards different Arabs to the Algerians.

A historical twist happened around 1905 with the arrival from Russia of a new wave of immigrants following the crushing of the 1905 revolution. Instead of carrying on with the fight on the spot, beside the other Russian revolutionaries, the deserters of the crushed revolution imported a strange "Zionist socialism" into Palestine : They created artisan cooperatives and peasant "**Kibbutz**", excluding the Palestinian Fellahs to create an economy relying on a Jewish working and agricultural class.

From classical colonialism (of the English or French type), one thus moved to a colony of settlement, in the logic of political Zionism, implying a flow of immigrants "in favor" of whom and "against" nobody (as Professor Klein said) land and work had to be reserved.

From this point it comes down to replacing the Palestinian people with another one and, naturally, grabbing the land.

The starting point of the great operation was the creation, in 1901, of the "National

Jewish Fund", which shows the following original characteristic, even compared to other colonialisms : the land acquired by it cannot be resold or even rented to non-Jews.

Two other laws concern the Keren Kayemet ("**National Jewish Fund**". Law passed on 23 November 1953) and the Keren Hayesod ("**Reconstruction Fund**". Law passed on 10 January 1956).

"These two laws," wrote Professor Klein, "permitted the transformation of these societies, which find themselves benefiting from a certain number of privileges."

Without enumerating these privileges, he introduces, as a simple "observation", the fact that lands possessed by the "National Jewish Fund" are declared "Land of Israel", and a fundamental law was passed to proclaim the inalienability of these lands. It is one of the four "fundamental laws" (elements of a future constitution, which still doesn't exist, 50 years after the creation of Israel), passed in 1960. It is deplorable that the learned lawyer, normally attentive to detail, makes no comment on this "inalienability". He does not even define it : a piece of land "saved" by the Jewish National fund (redemption of the land), is a piece of land which has become "Jewish"; it can never be sold to a "non-Jew", nor rented to a "non-Jew", nor worked by a "non-Jew".

Can one deny the racial discrimination of this fundamental law ?

The agrarian policy of the Israeli leaders is one of systematic despoilment of the Arab peasantry.

The property law of 1943 on expropriation in the public interest is a relic of the British mandate period. This law loses its direction when it is applied in a discriminatory way, for example, when, in 1962, 500 ha were expropriated at Deir El-Arad, Nabel and Be'neh, the "public interest" consisted of creating the town of Carmel, which was reserved exclusively for Jews.

Another procedure : the use of the "emergency laws", passed in 1945 by the British against the Jews and Arabs. Law 124 gives the Military Governor the right, this time under the pretext of "security", to suspend all citizens' rights, including free movement : The army only has to declare a zone forbidden "for security reasons" and an Arab no longer has the right to go onto his land without the authorization of the Military Governor. If this authorization is refused, the land is then declared "uncultivated" and the Ministry of Agriculture can "take possession of uncultivated land in order to ensure its cultivation."

When the British passed this fiercely colonialist legislation in 1945 to fight Jewish terrorism, the lawyer Bernard (DOV) Joseph, protesting against this system of "lettre de cachet", declared:

"Are we all to be subjected to official terror?... No citizen can be safe from life imprisonment without a trial... the power of the administration to exile anyone is unlimited... it is not necessary to have committed any crime, a decision taken in some office is enough... "

The same Bernard (DOV) Joseph, once Israeli Minister of Justice, would apply these laws against Arabs.

J. Shapira, speaking about the same laws, at the same protest meeting of 7 February 1946 at Tel Aviv (Hapraklit, February 1946, p. 58 - 64), declared in even stronger terms:

"The order established by this legislation is unprecedented in civilized countries. Even in Nazi Germany there were no such laws."

The same J. Shapira, once Public Prosecutor of the State of Israel, was to apply these laws against the Arabs. To justify the keeping of these laws of terror, "the state of emergency" has not been lifted since 1948 in the State of Israel.

Shimon Peres wrote in the newspaper "Davar" of 25 January 1972 :

"The use of law 125, on which military government is founded, follows directly on from the struggle for Jewish implantation and immigration."

The law of 1948 (amended in 1949) on the cultivation of fallow land goes in the same direction but more directly : Without even seeking the pretext of "public utility" or "military security", the Minister of Agriculture can requisition any abandoned land. The massive exodus of terrorized Arabs, as in the case of Deir Yassin in 1948, Kafr Kassem on 29 October 1956, or the "pogroms" of "unit 101" (created by Moshe Dayan and commanded for a long time by Ariel Sharon) thus "liberated" vast areas, cleared of their Arab owners or workers and given to the Jewish occupiers.

The mechanism for the dispossession of the fellahs is completed by the law of 30 June 1948, the emergency decree of 15 November 1948 on the property of those "absent", the law relating to the lands of the "absent" (14 March 1950), the law on the acquisition of land (13 March 1953), and a whole arsenal of measures to legalize theft by forcing the Arabs to leave their land and installing Jewish colonies, as Nathan Wienstock illustrates in his book : "Zionism Against Israel".

To wipe out even the memory of the existence of the Palestinian agricultural population and to give truth to the myth of the "deserted country", the Arab villages were destroyed - their houses, walls and even their graveyards and tombs. In 1975 Professor Israel Shahak gave, district by district, a list of 385 Arab villages destroyed by bulldozer, out of 475 existant in 1948.

"To convince us that before Israel, Palestine was a desert, hundreds of villages were razed by bulldozer - their houses, walls, graveyards and their tombs."

Source : Israel SHAHAK, "Racism and the State of Israel", from p. 152.

The overall result is as follows : A million and a half Palestinians having been driven off the land, "Jewish land", (as the people of the "National Jewish Fund" call it), 6.5% in 1947, today represents more than 93% of Palestine (75% to the State and 14 % to the National Fund.)

It is noteworthy (and significant) that the consequences of this operation were summarized at an early stage in the newspaper of the Afrikaners of South Africa, "Die Transvaler", an expert in matters of racial discrimination (apartheid):

"What is the difference between the way in which the Jewish people struggles to remain what it is in the midst of a non-Jewish population, and the way the Afrikaners try to stay what they are?"

Source : Henry Katzew, "South Africa : a Country Without Friends", quoted by R. Stevens (Zionism, South Africa and Apartheid).

The same system of "apartheid" manifests itself in the status of the individual as it does in the appropriation of land. The "autonomy" which the Israelis want to grant the Palestinians is the equivalent of the "homelands" for the blacks in South Africa.

Analyzing the consequences of the law of "return", Klein asks the question: "If the Jewish people are easily the most numerous in the State of Israel, by the same token, one can still say that the entire population of the State of Israel is not Jewish, as the country has a sizeable non-Jewish minority, mainly Arab and Druze. The question which must be asked is to what extent the existence of a Law of Return which favors the immigration of one part of the population (defined by its religious and ethnic adherence), cannot be regarded as discriminatory."

Source : Claude Klein, Director of the Institute of Comparative Law of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. "The Jewish Character of the State of Israel", Ed. Cujas, Paris 1977, p. 33.

The author wonders in particular if the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (adopted on 21 December 1965 by the General Assembly of the United Nations) doesn't apply to the Law of Return.

By a dialectic which we shall let the reader be the judge of, the eminent lawyer concludes with this subtle distinction :

In matters of non-discrimination "a measure must not be directed against one particular group. The Law of Return is in favor of Jews who want to settle in Israel, it is not directed against any group or nationality. One cannot see in what respect this law would be discriminatory."

Source : op. cit. Klein p. 35

To the reader who might risk being led astray by this, at the very least audacious, logic, according to a famous sally, that all citizens are equal but that some are more equal than others - let's give a concrete illustration of the situation created by this Law of Return. The Law of Nationality (5712 - 1952).

It concerns (article 3) "any individual who, immediately before the foundation of the state, was a Palestinian subject and who didn't become Israeli by virtue of article 2" (which concerns the Jews). Those referred to by this circumlocution (and who are considered as "having never had any nationality previously", in other words stateless people by inheritance) must prove that they were living on this land over a given period (documentary proof often being impossible to find because the papers disappeared during the war and the terror that accompanied the establishment of the Zionist state). Failing this, to become a citizen, the "naturalization" route demanded, for example, "a certain knowledge of the Hebrew language." After which, "if he judges it useful" the Minister of the Interior grants (or refuses) Israeli nationality.

In short, by virtue of Israeli law a Jew from Patagonia becomes an Israeli citizen the

very moment he sets foot on Tel Aviv airport; a Palestinian, born in Palestine, of Palestinian parents can be considered as stateless. Here there is no racial discrimination against the Palestinians, simply a measure in favor of the Jews!

It therefore seems difficult to contest the U.N. General Assembly's resolution of 10 November 1975 (Resolution 3379 xxx) defining Zionism as "a form of racism and racial discrimination."

In actual fact, only a tiny minority of those who settle in Israel have come to realize "the promise". The "Law of return" has had very little effect. This is fortunate because in every country of the world Jews have played an eminent role in every area of culture, science and the arts and it would be distressing for Zionism to reach the objective which the anti-Semites set themselves: to tear the Jews from their respective homelands and to enclose them in a world ghetto.

The example of the French Jews is significant; after the Evian agreements of 1962 and the liberation of Algeria, out of 130,000 Jews who left Algeria, only 20,000 went to Israel and 110,000 to France. This movement was not the result of anti-Semitic persecution as the proportion of non-Jewish, French settlers who left Algeria was the same. The reason for this departure was not anti-Semitism but the prior French colonialism and the French Jews of Algeria met the same fate as the other French people in Algeria.

To sum up: Almost all Jewish immigrants to Israel came to escape anti-Semitic persecution.

In 1880 there were 25,000 Jews in Palestine for a population of 500,000.

In 1882 the large-scale immigration started following the great pogroms of czarist Russia.

Thus 50,000 Jews arrived in Palestine between 1882 and 1917.

Then, between the two wars, came emigrants from Poland and the Maghreb to escape persecution.

But the greatest number comes from Germany as a result of the vile anti-Semitism of Hitler; almost 400,000 Jews thus arrived in Palestine before 1945.

In 1947 on the eve of the creation of the State of Israel, there were 600,000 Jews in Palestine out of a total population of 1,250,000.

And so the systematic uprooting of the Palestinians began.

Before the war of 1948 about 650,000 Arabs lived in the territory which was to become the State of Israel. In 1949 there were 160,000 of them left. Because of a high birth rate their descendants numbered 450,000 at the end of 1970. The Human Rights League of Israel reveals that between June 1967 and 15 November 1969 more than 20,000 Arab houses were dynamited in Israel and the West Bank.

There were, at the time of the British census of 31 December 1922, 757,000

inhabitants in Palestine of which 663,000 were Arab (590,000 Muslim Arabs and 73,000 Christian Arabs) and 83,000 Jews (that is : 88% Arabs and 11% Jews). It should be remembered that this so-called "desert" was a cereal and citrus fruit exporter.

As early as 1891 one of the first Zionists, Asher Guinsberg (writing under the pseudonym Ahad Ha'am) "one of the people" visiting Palestine, gives this eye-witness account:

"Abroad, we are used to believing that Eretz-Israel is today semi-desert, desert without cultivation. and that whoever wants to acquire land can come here and get as much as his heart desires. But the truth is nothing like this. In any part of the country, it is difficult to find uncultivated fields. The only uncultivated places are expanses of sand and stony mountains where only fruit trees can grow, and even then, only after a lot of heavy preparatory labor."

Source : Ahad Ha'arn. Complete Works (In Hebrew). Tel Aviv. Devir Publ. House and Jerusalem. The Hebrew Publishing House, 8th edition, p. 23. (Tel Aviv)

In reality, before the Zionists, the "bedouins" (in fact cereal growers) were exporting 30,000 tons of wheat per year; the area of Arab orchards tripled between 1921 and 1942, that of orange groves and other citrus fruit grew seven-fold between 1922 and 1947, production grew ten-fold between 1922 and 1938.

If we just take the example of citrus fruit, The Peel Report, submitted to the British Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in July 1937, based on the rapid growth of orange groves in Palestine, estimated that for the 30 million crates of winter oranges by which the world consumption would rise in the following decade, the producing and exporting countries would be as follows :

Palestine : 15 million

United States : 7 million

Spain : 5 million

Other countries (Cyprus, Egypt, Algeria, etc.) : 3 million

Source : "Peel Report", chapter 8, ° 19, p. 214

According to a State Department study, submitted on 20 March to a Congress commission:

"More than 200,000 Israelis are now settled in the Occupied Territories (including Golan and East Jerusalem). They amount to 'approximately' 13% of the total population of these territories.

About 90,000 of them live in the 150 settlements of the West Bank, "where the Israeli authorities have about half of the territory."

"In East-Jerusalem and in the Arab suburbs attached to the municipality," continues the State Department, "almost 120,000 Israelis are settled in about twelve districts. In the Gaza Strip, where the Hebrew State confiscated 30% of an already overpopulated

territory, 3,000 Israelis live in about 15 settlements. On the Golan plateau, there are 12,000 spread over about 30 localities."

Source : "Le Monde", 18 April 1993

The daily "Yedioth Aharonoth", the biggest circulation paper in Israel, wrote: "Since the 70's, there has never been such an acceleration in construction in the territories. Ariel Sharon (Minister for Housing and Construction), is feverishly busy establishing new settlements, developing those already existant, building roads and preparing new building sites."

Source : These Israeli texts are reproduced in "Le Monde", of 8 April 1993

(Let's not forget that Ariel Sharon was the general who commanded the invasion of Lebanon. He armed the Phalangist militias who carried out the "pogroms" in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Chatilla. Sharon turned a blind eye to these exactions and was an accomplice, as was revealed, even by the Israeli commission appointed to investigate the massacres.)

The maintenance of these Jewish colonies in the occupied territories and their protection by the Israeli army and the arming of the settlers (like the adventurers of the American Wild-West in the past) makes any real Palestinian "autonomy" impossible and makes peace impossible as long as the occupation continues to be a reality.

The main thrust of colonial settlement is directed at Jerusalem with the declared goal of making irreversible the decision to annex Jerusalem in its entirety, a decision which was, nevertheless, unanimously condemned by the United Nations (including by the United States !)

The colonial settlements in the Occupied Territories are a blatant violation of international law and specifically of the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, article 49 of which stipulates:

"The occupying power cannot proceed with a transfer of one part of its own civil population into the territory occupied by it."

Even Hitler did not infringe this international law : He did not install German civilian "settlers" on land from which French peasants had been evicted.

The pretext of "security", like the one of the "terrorism" of the "Intifada", is laughable. The statistics on this subject are telling:

"1,116 Palestinians have been killed since the beginning of the Intifada (the stone-throwing revolt) on 9 December 1987, shot by soldiers, policemen or settlers. The figures break down as follows : 626 deaths in 1988 and 1989, 134 in 1990, 93 in 1991, 108 in 1992 and 155 from 1 January to 11 September 1993. Among the victims were 233 children under 17 years old according to a study carried out by Betselem, the Israeli association for human rights.

"Military sources give a figure of nearly 20,000 for the number of Palestinians wounded by bullets and the U.N. Relief and Works agency for Palestine Refugees

(UNRWA) gives a figure of 90,000.

"33 Israelis soldiers have been killed since 9 December 1987 : 4 in 1988, 4 in 1989. 1 in 1990 2 in 1991, 11 in 1992 and 11 in 1993.

"40 civilians, mostly settlers, have been killed in the occupied territories according to the army's reckoning.

"According to the humanitarian organizations, in 1993, 15,000 Palestinians were being held in prisons of the penal administration and in army detention centers.

"12 Palestinians have died in Israeli prisons since the beginning of the Intifada, some of them under circumstances which have yet to be illuminated, Betsalem assures us. This humanitarian organization also indicates that at least 20,000 detainees are tortured every year during interrogation in the military detention centers."

Source : "Le Monde" of 12 September 1993 p. 118

There have been many violations of international law, considered as a "scrap of paper" and, what is more, as Professor Israel Shahak wrote:

"These colonies, by their very nature, subscribe to a system of despoilment, discrimination, and apartheid."

Source : Israel Shahak: "Racism and the State of Israel", p.263

Here is Professor Israel Shahak's testimony on the idolatry which consists of replacing the God of Israel by the State of Israel.

I am Jew who lives in Israel. I consider myself as a law-abiding citizen. I do my time in the army every year even though I am more than 40 years old. But I am not "devoted" to the State of Israel or any other state or organization! I am attached to my ideals. I believe that one must say the truth and do whatever is necessary to save justice and equality for all. I am attached to Hebrew poetry and language and I like to think that I modestly respect some of the values of our ancient prophets.

But to devote a cult to the State? I can well imagine Amos or Isaiah if they had been asked to "devote" a cult to the kingdom of Israel or Judea!

Jews believe and say three times a day that a Jew must be devoted to God and to God alone :

"You will love Yaveh, your God, with all your heart, with all your soul and with all your might." (Deuteronomy, ch. VI, verse 5).

A small minority still believe in this. But it seems to me that the majority of the people have lost their God and replaced it by an idol just like when they adored the golden calf in the desert so much that they gave all their gold to make a statue to him. The name of their modern idol is the State of Israel.

Source : Ibidem, p. 93

III - The Political Use of the Myth

1 - The Israeli-Zionist Lobby in the United States

"The Israeli Prime Minister has a lot more influence over the foreign policy of the United States in the Middle East than he has in his own country."

Source : Paul Findley, "They Dare to Speak Out", p. 92

How were such myths able to lead to such deep-rooted beliefs in millions of sincere people?

- By the creation of all-powerful "lobbies" capable of influencing the action of politicians and of conditioning public opinion.

The modes of action are adapted to the country. In the United States, where 6 million Jews live, the "Jewish vote" can be an important factor in determining the electoral majority where (because of the high number of abstentions and the absence of major policy differences between the two parties) victory can often be had with a margin of 3% or 4%.

"What's more, the volatility of public opinion, which depends to a large extent on the "look" of the candidate or on his performance on television, depends on the budget of his committees and of the potential of his marketing policy. 'In 1988 the American Senate elections required an advertising budget of 500 million dollars.'"

Source : Alain COTTA, "Capitalism in all its States," Ed. FAYARD 1991. p. 158

The most powerful officially listed lobby on the Capitol is the A.I.P.A.C.
(**"American Israel Public Affairs Committee"**)

The strength of the Israelis in the U.S. as early as 1942, is such that at the Biltmore Hotel in New York a maximalist convention decides that it is necessary to move from the "Jewish homeland in Palestine" (promised by Balfour : a slow colonization by buying land under British or American protection) to the creation of a "sovereign Jewish state".

The duplicity which characterizes the whole history of political Zionism is expressed in the "interpretations" of what was to be the outcome of Herzl's efforts : "The Balfour Declaration" (in 1917). The formula of a "national Jewish homeland" is taken up again at the Congress of Basle. Lord Rothschild had prepared a declaration

advocating "the national principle of the Jewish people". Balfour's final declaration does not talk any more about all Palestine, but only about the "establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jewish people". In actual fact everybody says "homeland" (as if it were a spiritual and cultural center), and, in reality, thinks "State", as did Herzl himself. Lloyd George wrote in his book : **"The Truth About the Peace Treaties"**, (Ed. Gollancz 1938, vol. 2, pp. 1138 39) : "There could be no doubt about what the members of the cabinet had in mind at the time... Palestine would become an independent state." It is significant that General Smuts, a member of the War Cabinet, declared in Johannesburg on 3 November 1915 : "Over the coming generations, you will see the emergence over there (in Palestine) once again, of a great Jewish state."

On 26 January 1919 Lord Curzon wrote : "While Weizmann is telling you one thing, and you are thinking "Jewish national homeland", he has something completely different in mind. He is envisaging a Jewish state and a subjugated Arab population governed by Jews. He is trying to realize this behind the protective screen of the British guarantee."

Weizmann had clearly explained to the British government that the objective of Zionism was to create a "Jewish state" (with 4 or 5 million Jews). Lloyd George and Balfour gave him the assurance "that by using the term "national homeland" in the Balfour Declaration, we did indeed mean a Jewish state."

On 14 May 1948 Ben Gurion proclaims independence at Tel Aviv :
" The Jewish state in Palestine will be called Israel".

Despite the divergence between those who, like Ben Gurion, considered it a duty for every Jew in the world to come and live in Israel, and those who thought that the action of the Jews in America was more important, in the very interest of Israel, it was the latter tendency which was to be more powerful : out of the 35,000 Americans or Canadians who immigrated into Israel, only 5,400 stayed there.

Source : Melvin I. Wofsky : "We are one! American Jewry and Israel", New York, 1978 Pub. Ander Press - Doubleday pp. 265 - 266

The State of Israel was admitted to the United Nations thanks to brazen pressure from the lobby.

Eisenhower didn't want to alienate the oil producing Arab countries : "A prodigious source of strategic power and one of the greatest sources of wealth in the history of the world", he said.

Source : Bick, "Ethnic Linkage and Foreign Policy", p. 81

Truman swept aside his scruples for electoral reasons and it was to be the same with his successors. On the subject of the power of the Zionist lobby and of the "Jewish vote", President Truman himself had declared in 1946, to a group of diplomats : "I am sorry gentlemen, but I have to answer to hundreds of thousands of people who are

expecting the success of Zionism. I don't have thousands of Arabs among my electors."

Source : William Eddy, F.P. Roosevelt and Ibn Saoud, N.Y. "American Friends of the Middle East", 1954 p. 31 (or 39)

The former British Prime Minister Clement Atlee gives this testimony: " U.S. policy in Palestine was shaped by the Jewish vote and by the subsidies of several large Jewish companies."

Source : Clement Atlee, "A Prime Minister Remembers", Pub. Heinemann, London 1961, p. 181.

Eisenhower had, in agreement with the Russians, stopped the Israeli aggression (supported by the British and French leaders) against the Suez Canal in 1956.

Senator J.F. Kennedy had, in this matter, shown no enthusiasm.

In 1958 the "**Conference of Presidents**" of the Jewish associations charges its president, Klutznik, with contacting Kennedy, a possible candidate. He declared to him plainly, "If you say what you have to say, you can count on me. If not, I will not be the only one to turn his back on you."

Source : Melvin I. Wofsky, "We Are One", p. 265 - 266

Klutznik summed up for him what he had to say : The attitude of Eisenhower in the Suez affair was wrong but in '48 Truman was on the right track. Kennedy followed this "advice" in 1960 when he was designated as candidate by the democratic convention. After his declarations in front of Jewish V.I.P.'s in New York he got 500,000 dollars for his campaign, Klutz as adviser and 80% of the Jewish vote.

Source: Ibidem, p. 271 to 280

During his first meeting with Ben Gurion in the New York Astoria Waldorf Hotel in spring 1961, John F. Kennedy said to him: "I know that I have been elected thanks to the votes of American Jews. I owe my election to them. Tell me what I have to do for the Jewish people."

Source : Edward Tivnan, "The Lobby", p. 56 (quoting the biographer of Ben Gurion, Michel Bar Zohar)

After Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson went even farther. An Israeli diplomat wrote : "We lost a good friend. But we have found an even better one... Johnson is the best friend the Jewish State has ever had in the White House."

Source : I. L. Kenen, "Israel's Defense Line", Prometheus Book, 1981. pp. 66 – 67

Johnson did indeed give strong support during the "six day war" of 1967. From then on, 99% of American Jews would support Israeli Zionism. "To be a Jew today means to be tied to Israel."

Source : Schlomo Avineri : "The Making of Modern Zionism", N.Y., Basis Book, 1981, p. 219

U.N. resolution 242 of November 1967 demanded the evacuation of the territories occupied during the war and De Gaulle, after this aggression, declared an embargo on arms destined for Israel. The American congress followed. But Johnson lifted it in December and, under pressure from the A.I.P.A.C., delivered the Phantom planes ordered by Israel.

Source: Bick, p. 65 and 66 or 166

As a consequence of this Israel didn't criticize the war in Vietnam.

Source: Abba Eban, autobiography. D. 460

When Golda Meir came to the U.S. in 1979, Nixon compared her to "biblical Deborah" and smothered her in praise for Israel's economic boom.

Source: Steven L.S. Spiegel: "The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict", University of Chicago Press, 1985, p. 185

The "Rogers Plan", taking up again the essence of U.N. Resolution 242, was rejected by Golda Meir.

Source: Kenen, p. 239

Nixon delivered 45 Phantoms and more than 80 Skylark bombers to Israel.

Nasser died on 8 September 1970 and Sadat proposed peace with Israel. Moshe Dayan, Minister of Defense, refused, in spite of the views of the Minister for Foreign Affairs Abba Eban.

So on 6 October 1973 Sadat launched the offensive which was to be known as the Yom Kippur War and destroyed the reputation of both Golda Meir, who had to resign on 10 April 1974, and Moshe Dayan.

Nevertheless, the Jewish lobby on the Capitol won a great success for the accelerated rearmament of Israel: 2 billion dollars, on the pretext of fighting a competing Arab lobby.

Source: Neff, "Warriors of Jerusalem" (p. 217)

Money from the Jewish banks of Wall Street was added to the governmental aid.

Source: Bick, p. 65 and Abba Eban, p. 460.

Of the 21 people who contributed more than 100,000 dollars to Senator Hubert Humphrey, 15 were Jews, at their forefront the bosses of the "Hollywood Jewish mafia" like Wasserman. Overall, they contributed more than 30% of the Democrats' election fund.

Source: Stephen D. Isaacs, "Jews and American Politics" (N.Y. pub. Doubleday, 1974, chapter 8)

The A.I.P.A.C. mobilized again and got in three weeks, for 21 May 1975, the signatures of 76 senators asking President Ford to support Israel, as they did.

Source: Full text in Shechan, "Arabs, Israelis and Kissinger", Reader's Digest Press (p. 175)

Jimmy Carter's path was marked out for him: at the Synagogue of Elizabeth in New Jersey, dressed in the blue velvet toga, he proclaimed:

"I honor the same God as you. We (The Baptists) study the same Bible as you." And he concluded, "The survival of Israel does not come down to politics. It is a moral duty."

Source: "Time", 21 June, 1976

This was the period when Begin and the religious parties had taken power from the Labor Party in Israel: "Begin considered himself more as a Jew than as an Israeli", wrote his biographer.

Source: Silver, "Begin: The Haunted Prophet", p. 164

In November 1976 Nahum Goldman, President of the World Jewish Congress, came to Washington to see the President, Vance and Brzezinski and gave the Carter administration this unexpected advice: "smash the Zionist lobby in the United States".

Source: "Stern", New York, 24 April 1978

Goldman had dedicated his life to Zionism and played a key role in the "lobby" since the time of Truman and he said now that his own creation, The Presidents' Conference, was a "destructive force" and a "major obstacle" to Peace in the Middle East.

Begin was in power and Goldman was determined to undermine his policy, even if this meant destroying his own pressure group.

Six years later Cyrus Vance, one of the interlocutors at this meeting, confirmed Goldman's proposals: "Goldman suggested to us to smash the lobby but The President and The Secretary of State replied that they didn't have the power and that, besides, this could open the way to anti-Semitism."

Source: Interview with Cyrus Vance by Edward Tivnan, "The Lobby", pub. Simon and Schuster, 1987, p. 123

Begin, sharing power with Labor, appointed Moshe Dayan as Minister for Foreign Affairs in place of Shimon Peres. The President of the Jewish Presidents' Conference in the U.S Schindler, had this turn in favor of the extremists accepted, stressing the pragmatism of Dayan. Begin, for a while, hardly had to worry about the American Zionists whom he considered to be Labor's supporters.

But American businessmen, noticing the influence of the rabbis on Begin and especially the latter's attachment to "free enterprise" (contrary to the state intervention of Labor), welcomed the Camp David Agreement (September 1978). Sadat, making a separate peace with Israel, did not get to touch. The West Bank (Judea and Sumeria, "biblical" lands according to Begin) and only kept Sinai which, for Begin, was not "biblical land".

Source: Stephen D. Isaacs: "Jews and American Policy", Doubleday. 1974 D. 122

In 1976 Carter got 68% of the Jewish vote; in 1980 he only got 45% of it having, in the meantime, sold F15 planes to Egypt and "AWACS" planes to Saudi Arabia, ensuring, however, that these would never be used against Israel as the American Army controlled all the system's data from the ground.

In 1980 he was, however, beaten by Reagan who, on the contrary, extended 600 million dollars of military credit for the following 2 years.

Begin, reassured after Camp David of not being attacked from behind by the Egyptians and also by the fact that the AWACS sold to Saudi Arabia were entirely under American control, was able to show the Americans his capacity for a preventive war (like the Japanese at Pearl Harbor and the Israelis with the Egyptian aviation during the Six Day War) by proceeding to destroy, without a declaration of war, the Iraqi power station of Ozirak which had been built by the French. Begin always invoked the same sacred myth:

"There will never again be another Holocaust."

Source: "The Washington Post", 10 June 1981

Encouraged by the weakness of the American protesters who feared an escalation in the Middle East situation, Begin, one month later, on 17 July 1981, bombarded West Beirut to destroy, he said, P.L.O. bases.

Reagan then announced the project to sell 8 billion dollars worth of AWACS along with missiles to Saudi Arabia, still under conditions that in no way threatened Israel as American control was total.

To such an extent that a Senate majority accepted this good economic deal and reinforcement of American control in The Gulf. (The Saudis had to bind themselves to overfly neither Syria nor Jordan, and therefore not Israel.)

Source: Facts and Files, 20 September 1981, p. 705

Begin, still possessed by the vision of "Greater Israel" of biblical legend, continued with the establishment of Israeli colonies in The West Bank (begun by Labor) which Carter had declared "illegal" and which were in breach of U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338. But Reagan saw in Israel a way of blocking Soviet designs on the oil of The Gulf. In November 1981 Ariel Sharon, Begin's Minister of War, met his American opposite number Casper Weinberger and drew up with him a "strategic cooperation" plan to dissuade any Soviet threat in the region.

Source: "N.Y. Times", 1 December 1981

On 14 December Begin annexes The Golan. Reagan protests against this new violation of Resolution 242. Begin flares up: "Are we a banana republic ? A vassal state of yours ?"

Source: Steven Emerson, "Dutton of Arabia" in "New Republic", 16 June 1982

The following year Begin invaded Lebanon. General Haig, at the head of the war department, gives the "go ahead" for this invasion destined to set up a Christian government in Beirut.

Source: Ze'ev Shiff and Ehud Ya'ari: "Israel's Lebanon War", N.Y., Simon and Shuster, 1984

Few Americans criticized this invasion just as few Israelis had criticized that of Vietnam. But the massacres of Sabra and Chatila (carried out under the eyes of, and with the complicity of, Sharon and Eytan) and the images which were given to television, forced the Jewish lobby to break the silence.

The Vice-President of the World Jewish Congress, Hertzberg, and many rabbis criticized Begin in October 1982. Begin reproached rabbi Schindler who had made his criticism on television, for being "more American than Jewish" and one of his assistants denounced him as a "traitor".

Source: Michael Kremer, "American Jews and Israel. The Schism", N.Y., 18 October 1982

A spokesman for A.I.P.A.C. explained the strategy of those who, like him, approved of the invasion:

"We want to reinforce our support for Israel on the right wing - with people who aren't worried about what's going on on the West Bank but who target the Soviet Union."

Source: interview recorded by Tivnan, p. 181.

On this occasion the Zionist Christians supported the Israeli aggression and their leader, Jerry Falwell, whom Begin called "the man who represents 60 million American Christians" in a country where there are only 6 million Jews, received the highest Zionist honor : The Jabotinski Prize for services rendered to Israel, plus 100

million dollars from the State of Israel and 140 million dollars from the Swaggert donation.

Source: "Time", "Power, glory, politics", 17 February 1986

Financial power and, consequently, political power, in a world where everything is bought and sold, is becoming more and more decisive.

Since 1948 the U.S. has supplied Israel with 28 billion dollars in military and economic aid.

Source: "Time" magazine of June 1994

* * *

Comforted by the financial flux which flooded into Israel:

- 1 - From German and Austrian "reparations";
- 2 - Because of unconditional American generosity;
- 3 - From payments from the Diaspora;

the Israeli leaders could consider, in foreign policy, the most ambitious aims of a "greater Israel".

We have an accurate testimony from an article of the revue "Kivounim" (Orientations) published in Jerusalem by "The World Zionist Organization" on "the strategic plans of Israel for the 80's":

"As a centralized body, Egypt is already a corpse, especially if one takes account of the ever more violent confrontation between Muslims and Christians. Its division into distinct geographical provinces must be our political objective for the 90's, on the western front.

Once Egypt has been thus dislocated and deprived of central power, countries like Libya, Sudan and others farther away will experience the same dissolution. The formation of a Coptic state in Upper Egypt, and of small regional entities of little size is the key to a historic development which has been slowed down by the peace agreement, but is inescapable in the long term.

In spite of appearances, the western front presents fewer problems than the one in the east. The partition of Lebanon into five provinces... Will prefigure what will happen all over the Arab world. The disintegration of Syria and Iraq into regions, based on ethnic or religious criteria, must be, in the long term, a primary goal for Israel, the first step being the destruction of the military power of these states.

The ethnic structures of Syria expose it to a dismantling which could lead to the creation of a Shiite state along the coast, a Sunni state in the Aleppo region and another one in Damascus, and a Druze entity which might hope to constitute its own

state - perhaps on our Golan - in any case with Houran and the north of Jordan... Such a state would be, in the long term, a guarantee of peace and security in the region. It is an objective which is already within our reach.

Oil-rich, and victim of internal strife, Iraq is in the Israeli firing line. Its dissolution would be, for us, more important than Syria's, because it is Iraq which, in the short term, represents the more serious threat for Israel."

Source: "Kivounim", Jerusalem, No. 14, February 1982, pp. 49 - 59

(The integral text, in its Hebrew original, is reproduced in my book: "Palestine, terre des messages divins", Pub. Albatros, Paris, 1986, pp. 137 to 387, and in its French translation starting on page 315.)

For the realization of this enormous project the Israeli leaders had at their disposal limitless American aid. Of the 507 planes which they had on the eve of the invasion of Lebanon, 457 came from the U.S. thanks to gifts and loans sanctioned by Washington. The American lobby took it on itself to obtain the necessary means even if this meant going against the national interest, under pressure from the Zionist lobby.

When the objectives of the Kivounim plan were too far away and the confrontation too risky, the Israeli lobby succeeded in having the job done by the U.S. The war against Iraq is a striking example.

"Two powerful pressure groups push the U.S. to opening of hostilities.

1 - The "Jewish lobby", because the elimination of Saddam Hussein would do away with the threat of the most powerful Arab country.. The American Jews play a key role in the North American media. The permanent state of compromise between the President and Congress leads the White House to pay serious attention to their entreaties.

2 - The "business lobby"... has got to the stage of thinking that war could relaunch the economy. Didn't the Second World War, and the enormous orders which it generated for the U.S put an end to the crisis of 1929 out of which it hadn't really emerged? Didn't the Korean War provoke a new boom?

Oh happy war which would bring prosperity back to America..."

Source: Alain Peyrefitte, "Le Figaro", 5 November 1990

"It is difficult to overestimate the political influence of the American Israeli Public Affairs Committee (A.I.P.A.C.)... which has a budget which quadrupled between 1982 and 1986 (1,600,000 dollars in 1982 ; 6,900,000 dollars in 1988)."

Source: "Wall Street Journal", 24 June 1987

The Zionist leaders didn't hide the role of their lobby. Ben Gurion stated clearly:

"When a Jew, in America or in South Africa, talks to his Jewish companions about 'our' government, he means the government of Israel."

Source: "Rebirth and Destiny of Israel", 1954, p. 489

At the 23rd congress of the World Zionist Organization he stipulates that the duty of a Jew abroad includes "the collective obligation of every Zionist organization in various countries to help the Jewish State unconditionally and in all circumstances even if such a stance is in contradiction with the authorities of their respective nations."

Source: Ben Gurion: "Tasks and Character of a Modern Zionist", "Jerusalem Post", 17 August 1952 and "Jewish Telegraphic Agency", 8 August 1951

This confusion of Judaism as a religion (worthy of respect like all others) with political Zionism including unconditional allegiance to the State of Israel (substituting for the God of Israel), can only feed anti-Semitism.

The State Department was forced to react. In a letter addressed to the "American Council for Judaism", made public by the latter on 7 May 1964, Secretary of State Talbot, referring to the very principles of the American Constitution, regarding which the demands of the Zionist leaders constituted a challenge, reminded us that his country "recognizes the State of Israel as a sovereign state, and the citizenship of the State of Israel. It "recognizes no other sovereignty or citizenship in this regard. It doesn't recognize any politico-legal relationship founded on a religious identification of American citizens. It doesn't discriminate between American citizens on religious grounds. Consequently, it should be clear that the State Department doesn't consider the concept of a "Jewish people" to be a concept of international law."

Source: Quoted by Georges Friedman in "Fin du peuple juif", (Gallimard, 1956), Idées poche, p. 292

A strictly platonic declaration, besides, as this obvious legal reminder was followed up by no measure against the lobby.

The Pollard affair gives us an example.

In November 1985 an American Zionist militant, Jonathan Pollard, an analyst at navy headquarters, was arrested while taking home some secret documents. Interrogated by the F.B.I., he admits having received 50,000 dollars since the beginning of 1984 for sending these documents to Israel.

"The Pollard affair didn't come out of nowhere. It is in keeping with the current system of American-Israeli relations, more and more unwholesome, characterized by an excessive dependence which favors brazen attitudes.

This situation was created in 1981, when the Reagan administration gave Israel what was interpreted as a "carte blanche" to its military adventurism, under the pretext of self-defense. The first result of this was the invasion of Lebanon.

...It was predictable that such complacency from Washington would encourage arrogance in Jerusalem. It is well known that ties of close dependence sow resentment and aggression. In Israel's case, this resentment takes ill-considered forms ; the attack on Tunis is one. It is possible that the Pollard affair is another."

Source: "Washington Post", 5 December 1985

"For decades American Jews have been trying hard to convince American public opinion that their unconditional support for Israel didn't effect their loyalty to the U.S.. It now seems that it will be difficult to trust them on this point, and those who talk about "double allegiance" will find an understanding ear."

Source: "Haaretz", 1 December 1985

There is no shortage of examples where the Israeli-Zionist lobby succeeds in imposing on the U.S. an attitude which is unfavorable to American interests but useful for Israeli policy.

Here are some examples:

The president of the Senate Foreign Affairs Commission, Senator Fulbright, decided to summon the main Zionist leaders before a committee which threw some light on their underground activities. He summed up the results of his enquiry in a "Face the Nation" interview on C.B.S., 7 October 1973: "The Israelis control policy in Congress and in the Senate". He added: "Our colleagues in the Senate, about 70% of them, make up their minds more under the pressure of a lobby than from their own vision of what they consider to be the principles of liberty and justice."

In the next elections Fulbright lost his seat as senator.

Since Senator Fulbright's enquiry, the Zionist "lobby" has continued to strengthen its grip on American policy. In his book, **"They Dare to Speak Out"**, (published in 1985 by Lawrence Hill and Co.) Paul Findley, who had a seat in the U.S. Congress for 22 years, described the current working and power of the Zionist "lobby". This veritable "branch of the Israeli government" controls Congress and Senate, the Presidency of the Republic, the State Department and the Pentagon as well as the media and it exercises its influence in the universities as well as in the churches.

There is no shortage of examples showing how the Israelis' demands take priority over the interests of the U.S.: On 3 October 1984 the House of Representatives repealed, by a majority of 98%, all limitations to exchanges between Israel and the U.S. in spite of the unfavorable report of the Ministry of Commerce and the opposition of all the unions (p. 31). Every year, whatever the restrictions on other areas of the budget, credit for Israel is increased. The degree of espionage is such that the most secret dossiers fall into the hands of the Israeli government. Adlai Stevenson (former presidential candidate in the U.S.) wrote in the winter '75 - '76 issue of "Foreign Affairs": "Practically no decision concerning Israel can be taken, or even discussed, at executive level, without being immediately known about by the Israeli government." (p. 126) In spite of the refusal of the Secretary of State for Defense, founded on American law, to deliver to Israel, during its offensive in Lebanon,

fragmentation bombs (a weapon used against civilians), the Israelis get them from Reagan and use them on two occasions in Beirut to massacre the population. (p. 143)

In 1973 the American admiral Thomas Moorer (head of combined military H.Q.) testifies: The Israeli military attaché in Washington, Mordecai Gur (future commander-in-chief of the Israeli forces), asks for planes armed with a very sophisticated missile (called "Maverick") from the U.S.. Admiral Moorer remembers that he said to Gur: "I cannot deliver these planes to you. We only have one squadron. And we swore to congress that we needed them." Gur said to me, "Give us the planes. As for Congress, I'll take care of it." That's how", the Admiral adds, "the only squadron equipped with Mavericks went to Israel." (p. 161)

On 8 June 1967 the Israeli air force and navy bombard the American ship "Liberty" (equipped with very sophisticated detectors) to prevent it from detecting their invasion plans for the Golan. 34 sailors are killed and 171 wounded. The ship is overflown for 6 hours and bombarded for 70 minutes. The Israeli government excuses itself for this "error" and the matter is closed. It is only in 1980 that one of the eyewitnesses, Ennes, an officer on the bridge of the Liberty, can establish the truth, destroying the "official" version of the "error", ratified by the "commission of enquiry" at the time, chaired by Admiral Isaac Kid. Ennes proves that the attack was deliberate and that it was a question of murder. Admiral Thomas Moorer, while Ennes' book was smothered by the Zionist "lobby", explains why this crime was kept quiet: "President Johnson feared the reaction of the Jewish electorate..." . The Admiral adds: "The American people would go crazy if they knew what had happened." (p. 179)

In 1980 Adlai Stevenson, having sponsored an amendment demanding a reduction of 10% in military aid to Israel in order to force them to stop setting up colonies in the occupied territories, reminded us that 43% of American aid went to Israel (3 million inhabitants) for its arms, to the detriment of 3 billion people starving in the world.

Adlai Stevenson concluded, "The Prime Minister of Israel has a lot more influence over U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East than he has in his own country." (p. 92)

Any thing goes for the Zionist lobby: from financial pressure to blackmail, from boycotting the media and publishers to death threats.

Paul Findley concludes: "Whoever criticizes Israeli policy can expect painful and incessant reprisals and even the loss of his means of existence by the pressure of the Israeli "lobby". The President is afraid of it. Congress gives in to all its demands. The most prestigious universities see to it that in their programs there is nothing which opposes it. The media giants and the military chiefs give in to its pressure." (p. 315)

Source: Hearings, Part 9, 23 May, 1963

2 - The Israeli-Zionist Lobby in France

"There is in France a powerful pro-Israeli lobby exercising its influence especially in the domain of information."

(General De Gaulle)

Source: Philippe Alexandre. "Le préjugé pro-israélien", "Le Parisien Libéré", 29 February, 1988

In France, General De Gaulle was the only one to dare to say: "that there was in France a powerful pro-Israeli lobby exercising its influence especially in the domain of information. This affirmation, at the time, caused an uproar. However, it contains an element of truth which is still relevant today."

Source: Philippe Alexandre. "Le préjugé pro-israélien", "Le Parisien Libéré", 29 February, 1988

Since then there hasn't been a single candidate for the Presidency of the French Republic, whatever his party, from Michel Rocard to Jacques Chirac, by way of Mitterrand, who hasn't gone to Israel to get the media investiture.

The media power of the lobby, the controlling center of which is constituted by the "LICRA" (League against racism and anti-Semitism), is such that it can freely manipulate opinion. Although the Jewish community constitutes about 2% of the French population, Zionism reigns over the majority of decision makers in the media, on television and radio, in the press, weeklies or dailies, the cinema (especially with the Hollywood invasion) and even publishing is in their hands (by the reading committees where they can impose their veto) as is advertising, financial regent of the media.

The proof is the general alignment of the media where it's a case of reversing, in Israel's favor, the nature of events: The violence of the weak is called "terrorism" and the violence of the strong is called "fight against terrorism".

An invalid Jew is thrown overboard from the "Achille Lauro" by a P.L.O. renegade. It is, incontestably, terrorism. But when, by way of reprisal, an Israeli bombardment of Tunis causes 50 deaths, including several children, this is called "fight against terrorism", defense of "law and order".

As if under the baton of a clandestine conductor, we hear the same music in all the media, whether it is attacks on the synagogue of rue Copernic or the desecration of the graveyard at Carpentras, the invasion of Lebanon or the destruction of Iraq.

I can contribute my personal testimony: Until 1982 I had free access to the biggest publishing houses, T.V., radio and press.

At the time of the invasion of, and massacres in, Lebanon I got the publication of a full page (paid) in "Le Monde", 17 June 1982, from the Director, Jacques Fauvet, where, with Father Michel Lelong and Pastor Matthiot, we drew a conclusion "after the massacres in Lebanon" about "the meaning of Israeli aggressions".

We showed that it wasn't a momentary lapse but the internal logic of political Zionism on which the State of Israel is founded.

I received, by anonymous letters and by phone calls, nine death threats.

L.I.C.R.A. instituted proceedings against us for "anti-Semitism and provocation of racial discrimination".

Jacques Fauvet's lawyer reiterated that one cannot confuse the Jewish community, and even less, its faith, with the State of Israel, the exactions of which in Lebanon were denounced by Jewish people of great standing such as Mendes France and Nahum Goldman.

Our defense (Father Lelong's, Pastor Matthiot's and mine) comes from the text itself: we reiterate what our lives owe to the faith of the Jewish prophets.

But political Zionism has replaced the God of Israel with the State of Israel.

Its behavior, in Lebanon and in Palestine, by creating odious hodge-podges, dishonors Judaism in the eyes of the world. Our fight against political Zionism is, therefore, inseparable from our fight against anti-Semitism.

For my part, I reiterated, in front of the court, the analyses of my study on "La Palestine, terre des messages divins": Political Zionism, founded by Theodor Herzl (and condemned at the time by every rabbi in the world as a betrayal of the Jewish faith), flows, not from the Jewish faith but from 19th century European colonialism and nationalism.

The last vestiges of colonialism by settlement, in Palestine like in South Africa, come up against, by their racism (officially denounced by the U.N.), the resistance of the native inhabitants to the colonial occupier.

As with any colonialism and any regime of occupation (we experienced it in France under Hitler), repression is called "maintenance of order" and resistance is called "terrorism".

Listening to the judge of the L.I.C.R.A. trying to portray me as an anti Semite, I could see myself in Jerusalem, at the Wailing Wall accompanied by the Israeli minister Barzilai in 1970, and then in Nahum Goldman's house (at the time president of the World Jewish Congress), in 1967.

I see myself at the concentration camp with my friend Bernard Lecache (founder of the L.I.C.R.A.), who was helping me to prepare my classes to our comrades, deported like us, on "Les Prophètes d'Israël."

The almost total domination of the French and American media by Israeli Zionism imposes on the world this subversion of meaning: An Israeli diplomat is attacked in London (Mrs. Thatcher herself proves, in the House of Commons, that the author of the attack wasn't from the P.L.O.), it's "terrorism". The Israeli army invades Lebanon and cause thousands of deaths: the operation is called "Peace in Galilee"!

On 1 January 1989 I hear of the toll of the "revolt of stones" on the television: 327 killed on the Palestinian side (mostly children, throwing stones) and 8 on the Israeli side (mostly soldiers, firing bullets). The same day an Israeli minister declares: "Negotiation will only be possible when the Palestinians renounce violence." Is it me

who is dreaming? Or is this anesthesia of the critical spirit a collective nightmare?: the triumph of nonsense!

As early as 1969 General de Gaulle was denouncing the "excessive influence" of the Zionist lobby in all the media: From the press to television, from cinema to publishing. Today this "excessive influence" has succeeded in effecting a total inversion of meaning, calling the artisan resistance of the poor "terrorism" and the infinitely more murderous violence of the strong "fight against terrorism".

We were wrong, Father Lelong, Pastor Matthiot and myself, to denounce the lie of this subversion of meaning. The 'High Court' in Paris, in its ruling of 24 March 1983 "considering that it was a case of legitimate criticism of the policy of a state and of the ideology which inspires it, and not of racial provocation... "Nonsuits the L.I.C.R.A. of all its requests and orders it to pay costs".

The L.I.C.R.A. appeals the decision. On 11 January 1984, the "Haute Chambre" of the Court of Paris pronounced its judgment.

The appeal court quotes a passage of our article where we accuse the State of Israel of racism.

The court "considering that the opinion given by the signatories only concerns the restrictive definition of judaism held by Israeli legislation... confirms the referred judgment where it nonsuited the L.I.C.R.A. of its requests and orders the L.I.C.R.A. to pay costs".

The L.I.C.R.A. goes to the Court of Appeal. The ruling of the Appeal Court of 4 November 1987 destroys the hope of the Zionists of legally dishonoring us : The Court "rejects the appeal and orders the plaintiff to pay costs".

The smothering operation continues above the legal domain. The Zionist lobby has the means. If we had been found guilty, we would have had the right to appear on the front page of every paper to be pilloried as anti Semites. However, the L.I.C.R.A.'s condemnation by the courts was systematically hushed up - even 'Le Monde', whose former director, Fauvet, is involved with us in this fight, contented itself with a bland statement.

However, the blockade I had been hoping for was realized masterfully. At the time of the appearance of the page in "Le Monde" on the logic of Zionist colonialism, I added two lines asking the readers to make contributions to pay for the cost of the advertisement. This had cost five million centimes. I received seven, in hundreds of small checks. Almost a third of the donors were Jews, two of them rabbis.

But, from this point, the media asphyxiation begins: no more access to television, my articles refused. I had published forty books in all the great publishing houses, from Gallimard to Seuil, from Plon to Grasset and Laffont. They had been translated into twenty-seven languages. From now on, all the big doors are closed: One of my biggest publishers is heard to say to his adviser: "If you publish a book by Garaudy, you will no longer have the right to translate American works." To have accepted me would have brought the firm down. Another "big wheel", about another work, said to

his literary director (who, impassioned by the book, worked for three months to help me to finish it): "I don't want any Garaudy in the house."

Such is the story of the walling up of a man.

Our networks of resistance to nonsense are condemned to secrecy. And myself to literary death. For the crime of hoping.

This is just one example, on which I can personally testify, of the "inversion of meaning" of Zionism.

We could give many more examples but every day we all witness it: It is the very meaning of Hitler's crime against all humanity which is perverted by Zionist propaganda, which reduces this crime against humanity to a vast pogrom of which only the Jews were victim.

* * *

A further step will be taken when these ukases are imposed by law, turning the magistrates into judges of historical truth in spite of prior laws on the liberty of the press.

The crime of opinion is henceforth on the statute books thanks to the Fabius law (no. 43), (the so-called "Gayssot Law", after the communist deputy who accepted to sponsor this wicked law), in May 1990.

It consists of inserting into the law on the freedom of the press of 1881, article 24b, saying:

"They will be punished according to the sixth paragraph of article 24, those who contest... the existence of one or several crimes against humanity, as defined by article 6 of the statute of the International Military Tribunal annexed to the London Agreement of 8 August 1945."

Source: Proposition for adoption by the National Assembly, transmitted by the President of the National Assembly to the President of the Senate, no. 278, an annex to the minutes of the sitting of 3 May 1990.

Mr. Aseni's (deputy) report stipulated (p. 21) : "You are asked to create a new means of incrimination regarding 'revisionism'".

Furthermore, it recommended "enhancing the possibility for associations to legally pursue in the case of infraction." (article 7)

At the moment of its introduction the reporter defined the goal: "To complete the existing repressive arsenal, to see to it that the criminal law... fully plays its role of intimidation and repression." (p.5)

Source: Report no. 1296, annex to the minutes of the sitting of 26 April 1990

The Nuremberg Trials, as we have shown, deserve less than any other to make jurisprudence.

A year later an amendment to the law was proposed by Mr. Toubon:

"Article 24b of the law of 29 July 1981 on press freedom is repealed." This canceled the repression proposed by Mr. Gaysot against "revisionist" historians", and refused to put historical criticism in the same camp as racism or Hitler's apologists.

His argument went as follows:

"When we discussed it in 1990, on the basis of a bill proposed by the communist group, of which the first signatory was Mr. Gaysot, I had challenged - and I wasn't the only one - the principle of this text, which consists of fixing historical truth by means of the law instead of letting history reveal it.

Certain people object that if it is history which reveals the truth, it is not up to the law to impose it. Certain proposals go too far and they must not be allowed to be expressed. This would be to slip imperceptibly towards making politics a crime and opinion a crime

Article 24b represents in my opinion, a very grave political and legal error. In reality, it constitutes a "**law of circumstance**", and this saddens me greatly. A year has passed. We are not a month away from the **events of Carpentras**. There is no need to examine a text which the 'Presidents' Conference' had, I remember, hastily registered on the day's agenda, 48 hours after its deposition, and which had been **discussed immediately because the President of the Assembly, Mr. Fabius, had decided to subscribe himself**. One year later, we can, as I have just done, calmly examine the validity of this law, the validity of this offence of '**revisionism**' presented by Article **24b** and conclude, with Simone Veil, that this offence is ill-timed."

Source: 'Journal Officiel', of 22 June 1991, p. 3571, Parliamentary Debates, 2nd sitting of 21 June 1991

In effect, it was forbidden, from then on, for any historian to question the conclusions of the Nuremberg Trials which the American President had, nevertheless, sincerely recognized to be "the last act of the war" and as such" wasn't bound to the legal rules of ordinary courts on matters of proof or conviction."

* * *

Hot on the heels of this wicked law, Jacques Chirac's declaration of Sunday 17 July 1995 marks an important moment in our history: That of the end of the unity of the nation, replaced by the collusion of renunciation. When the President of the Republic proclaims that" the criminal madness of the occupier was seconded by the French and by the French State [two crimes are committed against France].

* First, by talking of Vichy as a 'French State', thereby giving it legitimacy ;

* Next, by degrading the French people by confusing them with the servile leaders

who served the occupier. And so in this way was rendered official the conception of Zionism defended by Bernard-Henri Levy in his book, "**L'Idéologie Française**", where he writes: "It's the whole of French culture... it is our most cherished French traditions which, one by one, testify to our long history of abjection."

Source: Bernard-Henri Levy, "L'Idéologie Française", where he writes: "The icing on the cake was that the ceremony was presided over by the Chief Rabbi of France, Sitruk, who, on 8 July 1990, declared to Yitzhak Shamir in Israel (the very man who offered his services to Hitler and whose policy, that of the State of Israel which he presided over, hasn't stopped violating international law and takes no notice of decisions of the U.N.O.): "Every French Jew is a representative of Israel... Rest assured that every Jew in France is a defender of that which you defend."

"Without, however", he said on his return, "thinking of a 'double allegiance'."

Source: "Le Monde", 9 July, 1990

Such remarks to Shamir (who offered his collaboration to Hitler) would have rightly earned him his place among the penitents rather than the presidents.

Of course, this smearing of the French people was greeted with enthusiasm by the leaders of the C.R.I.F. (Representative council of Jewish Institutions in France) who expressed their "intense satisfaction to see the continuity of the "État Français" between 1940 and 1944 at last recognized by the highest French authority."

The shame is that the leaders of all the French parties approved this denial of Chirac's in all the public organs, from "Le Figaro" to "L'Humanité."

De Gaulle never considered Vichy to be a state. "Hitler", he said, "created Vichy" (Memoirs I, p. 389) and he talked of the "stooges of Vichy" (idem. p. 130).

"I proclaimed the illegitimacy of a regime which was at the discretion of the enemy" (I, p. 107). "A truly French government doesn't exist." (I, p. 388, Brazzaville).

Referring to the agreement of 28 March 1940 with Britain, excluding any suspension of separate arms (I, p. 74), he said clearly: "The organ located at Vichy, and which claims to carry this name (State), is unconstitutional and is subjected to the invader... This organ is only, and can only be, an instrument used by the enemies of France." (I, p. 342)

De Gaulle stuck to this attitude for the whole war. On 23 September 1941, in the order creating the "Comité National Français" he proclaimed:

"Given our orders of 27 October and of 12 November 1940, together with our organic declaration of 16 November 1940 ;

Considering that the situation resulting from the state of war continues to prevent any reunion or free expression of national representation ;

Considering that the Constitution and the laws of the French Republic have been, and

are still being, violated over the whole metropolitan area and in the Empire, as much by the action of the enemy as by the usurpation of the authorities which collaborate with it ;

Considering that many instances of proof establish that the massive majority of the French Nation, far from accepting a regime imposed by violence and treason, sees in the authority of "Free France" the expression of its wishes and free will..."

Source: "Mémoires", I p. 394

He thus dissociated the French People from the servility of its leaders.

"The condemnation of Vichy in the person of its leaders dissociated France from a policy which was one of national renunciation." (III, p. 301)

Evoking the uprising of the people of Paris, he wrote :

"Nobody could ignore, neither in our enemy's camp nor in our own, that four years of oppression hadn't been able to grind down the soul of the capital, that the treason was only the vile scum on the surface of a body which had remained healthy, that the streets, houses, factories, workshops, offices and building sites of Paris had seen the heroic acts of the Resistance in the gun battles, torture, imprisonment."

Source: III, p. 442

"Even in the worst moments, our people never gave up." (III, p. 494)

That is what Chirac, in a few words, denied in order to pander to the media power of the Zionist leaders and , by the same token, the vassalage vis-à-vis the U.S. stronghold of the Zionist lobby, which had already made him abandon his opposition to Maastricht, ruin of France, and confirm his submission to the American dictates of G.A.T.T. (rebaptized "World Trade Organization") destroying the possibility of independence and of a renewal of France by the radical transformation of its relationship with the Third World.

* * *

Zionism has always agitated the "bogeyman" of anti-Semitism to have us believe in a permanent threat against Israel and in the necessity of running to its aid. There is no shortage of recent provocations destined to hide Israel's exactions. The method is always the same. At the time of the massacres of Sabra and Chatila, the writer Tahar Ben Jelloun wrote:

"There are coincidences which, by virtue of repeating themselves, end up becoming a major clue. At the present time we know what purpose an anti-Semitic attack in Europe serves, and who benefits from the crime: It serves to mask a deliberate massacre of Lebanese and Palestinian civilians.

One can remark that these attacks preceded, followed or coincided with a blood bath in Beirut. These terrorist operations are mounted in such a way and executed with

such perfection that they have, until now, directly or indirectly met the political objective: To divert attention every time the Palestinian question gains a little more understanding or even sympathy. Is this not a case of systematically turning the situation upside down in order to turn the victims into torturers and terrorists? By turning the Palestinians into terrorists, they are expelled from history and, consequently, deprived of their rights.

Didn't the killing of rue des Rosiers on 9 August precede by a few hours the deluge of all sorts of bombs on Beirut ?

Wasn't the assassination of Bashir Gemayel followed, two hours later, by the entry into West Beirut of the Israeli army (which, in the same way, eclipsed Yasser Arafat's historic meeting with the Pope) ?

Didn't the explosion of the booby-trapped car in rue Cardinet and the gun battle the following day coincide with the unprecedented massacre in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Chatila ?"

Source: "Le Monde" Wednesday 22 September 1982. p. 2

There are historical precedents from which we should learn lessons: a systematic effort to shape opinion by saturating it with "information" of ethnocentric inspiration fans antisemitism.

"In Berlin the theater, journalism, etc... was a Jewish business. The "Berliner Tageblatt" was the biggest German newspaper and, after it, the "Vosiche Zeitung". The first belonged to Mese, the second to Ulstein, both of them Jews. The director of "Worwartz", the main socio-democrat paper, was a Jew. When the Germans accused the press of being Jewish - "juden press" - it was the pure truth."

Source: Y. Leibowitz: "Israel et Judaïsme", Desclée de Brouwer, 1993, p. 113 (chapter on the sources of anti-Semitism.)

The most recent example of these maneuvers and their media exploitation is that of Carpentras.

In May 1990 in the Jewish cemetery of Carpentras, tombs were desecrated. A corpse was impaled and transported onto another tomb.

The Minister of the Interior, Pierre Joxe, declared immediately: "There is no need for a police enquiry to know what criminals are guilty of this 'racist abomination'." And yet, five years later, despite the involvement of dozens of investigators, judicial or police, nobody can say for sure who the perpetrators of this vile deed are.

All that we know is that there was desecration in the Jewish cemetery, that there was a "staging", because the body of Mr. Germon hadn't been impaled, as the enquirers admitted a few days later. So, one might wonder by whom? Why? In whose interest was this "staging" to increase the horror of the event and to stir up the hatred of public opinion?

The method was practiced at Timisoara where corpses were taken out of the morgue so that photographs sent all over the world might provoke more indignation and hatred against so-called massive massacres.

Jean-Marie Domenach (former director of the magazine "Esprit") wrote in "Le Monde" of Wednesday 31 October 1990, under the heading "Silence on Carpentras": "It is almost six months since the desecration of the Jewish cemetery of Carpentras... Six months later we still don't know who the criminals are. There is something more disturbing: the written and audiovisual media, who had made from this abominable event a scandal which brought hundreds of thousands of protesters onto the streets and tarnished France's reputation abroad, have not sought to pursue the enquiry and have fallen silent. No parliamentarian, no moral or intellectual authority dares to question the government. Carpentras seems to be definitively part of the black legend of the nation without our knowing the guilty and without our knowing exactly what happened. Nobody yet can, or dares, speak the truth about Carpentras."

The strange "silence on Carpentras", denounced by Jean-Marie Domenach, contrasts with the racket made by the media in the early days.

At the time of the organized demonstration of 14 May 1990, 80,000 people, according to the police, (200,000 according to the organizers) had marched in the streets of Paris. The great bell of Notre Dame was rung in their honor.

In reality, nobody knew who the authors of the terrible act of Carpentras were. So whom were they protesting against ?

Against whom? Only the enquiry could have told us but it didn't.

But who gains ?

It was obvious: the flag of Israel stood out in all its splendor at the head of the demonstration.

This strange "Union Nationale" during this demonstration where Georges Marchais ostentatiously shook the hand of Francois Leotard, set the stage for the launching of a global attack against anyone who questioned the dogmas which put Israel above any international law. Chief Rabbi Sitruk, who gave a short speech defining the meaning of the demonstration, was able to shout: "Let's not allow any old thing to be said. Let's give a lesson to the "revisionist" professors and the irresponsible politicians."

Source : Le "Mérional". Monday, 14 May, 1990

However the truth about the desecration of Carpentras still hasn't been established because of all the leads suggested to the investigators, only one has been ignored, the one which is the most likely.

Why were those who could have been the most necessary witnesses ordered to be quiet ?

"The caretaker of the Carpentras synagogue and keyholder for the cemetery, Mr.

Kouhana, who had been one of the first to discover the body of Felix Germon, refuses to talk to us : "Even if you were the Prefect, I got the order to say nothing. the President of the Consistory forbade him to talk "because he would have said any old thing to the T.V. people", argues Dr. Freddym Haddad, himself very reticent to talk about the desecration, as is Rabbi Amar."

Source: "Var Matin" magazine, Monday 15 April 1995, an article by reporters Michel Letereux and Michel Brault

Why did the Carpentras Rabbi, who was asked if the place would be resanctified, reply : "It is not my resort !", the President of the Consistory : "There's no reason it should be !" and the Mayor : "No one has asked me." Why didn't any French newspaper refer to a totally similar precedent - that of a "desecration" which happened in the Israeli cemetery of Rishon Letzion near Tel Aviv during the night of 2 March 1984: the body of a woman had been dug up and thrown out of the Jewish cemetery. **"Barbaric anti-Semitic act"** proclaimed Jewish communities around the world immediately. A few days later the Israeli police, after an enquiry, revealed the true meaning of this abjection: The body which had been so shamefully treated was Mrs. Teresa Engelowicz's, the wife of a Jew but of Christian origin. The Jewish fundamentalists considered her presence in the Jewish cemetery contaminated the purity of the place and the rabbi of Rishon Letzion had already called for her exhumation.

Why did no French newspaper point out this parallel? Mr. Germon, whose body had also been exhumed during the night and subjected to the sinister "staging" of the impaling, was also "guilty" of having married a Christian, and his body was transported onto a neighboring tomb, that of Mrs. Emma Ullma, "guilty", too, of having married a catholic. Why did nobody remind us that in Israel, in order to convince that before Israel Palestine was a "desert", hundreds of villages were razed by bulldozers - their houses, their walls, their cemeteries and their tombs.

Source: Israel Shahak, "Le racisme et l'État d'Israel", p. 152 and after.

The day after the "Day of Democracy" in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem Jewish students put the real question:

" Why do you not protest when you know that Agron Street in Jerusalem and the Hilton Hotel in Tel Aviv are constructed on destroyed Muslim cemeteries ?"

Source: "Students of The Israeli Socialist Organization (Matzpen)", P.O.B. 2234, Jerusalem

3 - The myth of the "Miracle of Israel": The External Financing of Israel.

"The power of the Jewish fist comes from the American steel glove which covers it and the dollars which line it."

Source: Yeshavahou Leibowitz in "Judaism and Israel", p. 253

As far as the sums paid to the State of Israel by Germany are concerned, I'll let Nahum Goldman (the principal negotiator on the amount of reparations) speak. He gives the details in his "autobiography" which he kindly signed for me on 23 April 1971 to thank me for the work which I had carried out, at his request, two years earlier, with Nasser after the "SIX DAY WAR".

"At the beginning of 1951 Israel entered the stage for the first time, sending two notes to the four allies in which the Jewish claim for compensation from the new Germany came to the sum of a billion and a half dollars of which one half should be paid by West Germany and the other by East Germany. This total was based on the following calculation :

Israel had taken in 500,000 Jews and the economic reintegration of a refugee cost about 3,000 dollars. Having saved these victims from the Nazis, having personally assumed an enormous financial burden, Israel considered itself within its rights to make these demands in the name of the Jewish people, albeit without a legal basis, as the Jewish State didn't exist under the Nazi regime." (p. 262)

It is in these circumstances that the Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs contacted me, during the summer of 1951, as President of the "Jewish Agency for Palestine" and asked me to invite to a conference the big Jewish organizations of the U.S., of the countries of the British Commonwealth and of France, in order to support the Israeli claims and to find a way to have them accepted. (p. 263)

The negotiation which we had in mind would have to be of a very special nature. They had no legal basis whatsoever. (p. 268)

With a lot of courage and magnanimity the Federal Chancellor had accepted the sum of a billion dollars as starting point for the discussion but I knew that a group hostile to such a huge bill had already formed within the government, among the leaders of the political parties and in the world of banking and industry. It was repeated to me from very different quarters that it was useless to count on a sum even close to this.

In the first phase of negotiations between the Germans and the delegation of the Claims Conference a general agreement is reached on the matter of reparations and the legislation regulating it. We put off until another phase the issue of the global claim coming to five hundred million marks.

After long conversations, this series of meeting ended with the agreement of the German delegation which undertook to recommend to the government an Israeli claim of three billion marks (25% less than what we had asked for). (p. 272)

I had to return to Bonn on 3 July where I made the following concession: 10% of the five hundred million would be destined for the non-Jewish victims of the Nazis and distributed by the German government itself. (p. 282)

The agreement was signed on 10 September 1952 in Luxembourg: The Chancellor represented Germany, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Israel, and myself, the 'Claims Conference'. (p. 283)

The German payments have been a decisive factor in Israel's economic boom over the last few years. I don't know what the fate of Israel would have been at certain critical moments in its economic development if Germany hadn't respected its undertaking. The railroads, the telephones, the infrastructure of the ports, the irrigation systems, whole sectors of industry and agriculture wouldn't be in their current state without the German reparations. Finally, hundreds of thousands of Jewish victims of the Nazis have received, over the last few years, significant amounts under the indemnity law. (p. 286)

When, on the morning of my arrival, I went to the house of the Israeli Prime Minister, David Ben Gurion, he came to me solemnly: 'You and I have had the pleasure of experiencing two miracles: The creation of the State of Israel and the signing of the agreement with Germany. I was responsible for the first and you for the second'. (p. 284)

Source: Nahum Goldman, "Autobiographie", Pub. Fayard, Paris 1969

In another one of his books, "**The Jewish Paradox**", Nahum Goldman talks not only about his negotiations with Germany but also how he got reparations from Austria and from Chancellor Raab. He said to the Chancellor : "You must pay reparations to the Jews !"

"But we were victims of the Germans !" said Raab.

And Goldman replied : "In that case, I'll hire out the biggest cinema in Vienna and every day I'll show the film of the German troops and Hitler entering Vienna in March 1938."

Raab then said : "All right, you'll get your money !"

It was in the order of 30 million dollars. After a while Goldman came back: "We need another 30 million !"

"But," said Raab, "we agreed on just 30 million."

"Now, you have to give more !", said Goldman and he got it. He came back a third time and got the same amount. (31.8507)

There were two other sources of financing of what some people call "the Israeli miracle" in the economic field and also of the enormous arsenal (including nuclear) of the State of Israel, which renders laughable the image so often used of a little David with his catapult facing the giant Goliath. In modern warfare strength is not measured in the number of soldiers mobilized but in the technical equipment of the army. Israel's, thanks to the flow of capital into the country, has an attack capability infinitely superior to that of all the Arab states together.

Apart from the "reparations", Israel benefits from an almost unlimited supply of arms and money coming, principally, from the U.S., where its all powerful lobby has shown itself to be particularly efficient, and also from the "Diaspora".

Mr. Pinhas Sapir, at the time Minister for Finance, revealed in 1967 in Jerusalem at the "Conference of Jewish Billionaires" (sic) that from 1949 to 1966 the State of Israel received 7 billion dollars.

Source: "The Israeli Economist", September 1967, vol. 9

Doctor Yaakov Herzog, Director-General of the Israeli Prime Minister's cabinet, defined as follows the goal of these meetings: "To examine how to attract greater investment to Israel and to closely associate Jewish holders of capital resident abroad with the Israeli economy in such a way that they have an immediate feeling of responsibility and participation... We are now planning something else: a sort of dialogue on a grand scale on the identification of the Diaspora with Israel, in the framework of the struggle against assimilation abroad."

The operation proved to be lucrative as American Jewish organizations sent, on average, a billion dollars each year to Israel. (These contributions, regarded as "charitable", are deductible from the income tax returns of the donor, in other words, they cost American taxpayers even if they go to support the Israeli "war effort".)

But the greatest share comes directly from the American State, whose "aid" amounts to more than three billion dollars each year. Almost half of this "official" aid consists of gifts and "loans" which are quickly "forgotten"... The rest is added onto the Israeli foreign debt, which is growing rapidly and is now approaching twenty billion dollars - that's to say, an unprecedented average of five thousand dollars per head of population.

The main part of this annual aid is made up of arms deliveries for which Congress, anxious to limit their dramatic nature and to avoid public criticism, organized a special means of finance through its Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

To measure the significance of these figures of external financial aid, we need only remember that the aid of the Marshall Plan, given out from 1948 to 1954 to western Europe, reached thirteen billion dollars. In other words, the State of Israel received for fewer than two million inhabitants, more than half of what two hundred million Europeans received. That means one hundred times more, per head of population, than the Europeans.

Second element for comparison: The average annual aid received by the "underdeveloped countries" for the period 1951 - 1959 didn't exceed 3.164 billion dollars while Israel with, at the time, 1.7 million inhabitants, received 400 million, in other words, with less than a thousandth of the population of the "underdeveloped" countries of the world, Israel received a tenth of the total. Two million Israelis received, per head of population, one hundred times more than two billion inhabitants of the third world.

If we take only the American contribution into account, we see that between 1945 and 1967, the United States gave 435 dollars to each Israeli and 36 dollars to each Arab, in other words that 2.5% of the population gets 30% of the aid attributed to the remaining 97.5%.

Source: Drawn from UN statistics published in "Le courant international des capitaux a long terme et les donations publiques" (1951-1959). Quoted by Georges Corm in "Les finances d'Israel" (IPS, 1968)

But the financing methods of the State of Israel are even more ambitious still: they tend to create, in favor of that State, a world financial network whose investments they orientate (On the occasion, in 1967, of the first "Conference of Jewish billionaires").

A recent doctor's thesis, presented at Paris II University by Jacques Bendelac, published under the title of "Les fonds extérieurs d'Israël" [examines different aspects of Israeli finances with precise information from impeccable sources].

Source : Jacques Bendelac : "Les fonds extérieurs d'Israël", Ed. "Economica". Paris, 1982

The author chiefly studies the relations between the contributions of the Diaspora and the direct aid of the American government.

This is how he defines these relations: "If the Diaspora was, until recently (the 70s), the main supplier of Israeli capital, the present tendency indicates that American government aid (about 2 billion dollars per year) largely outstrips the financial contributions of the Diaspora (about 900 million dollars per year)."

Thus, for the tax year of 1980, the sale of one billion dollars in armament was authorized to Israel. But, immediately after these deliveries, half the sum five hundred million in the form of loans - was wiped out...and the remainder simply added to Israel's debt towards the American government...A debt with a delay for reimbursement of over ten years. Furthermore, taking into account the constant worsening of Israel's economic situation since 1973, these reimbursements are fictitious insofar as the payments are immediately compensated by an increase in U.S. Yearly aid.

Source: T. Stauffer. Christian Science Monitor, December 20th 1981

Already, at the time of the 1956 Israeli aggression against Egypt, the American aid in weapons was huge; the Zionist, Michel Bar Zohar, wrote: "From the month of June on, enormous quantities of weapons began to flow into Israel as a result of a top-secret agreement, and these deliveries would not be known about either in Washington or at the Anglo-Franco American organization in charge of watching over the balance of power in the Middle East, or by the Quai d'Orsay, jealously opposed to a rapprochement with Israel, regarded as too risky, which would compromise France's remaining links with its Arab clientele".

Source: Michel Bar Zohar: "Ben Gourion, le Prophète armé", Ed. Fayard, Paris, 1966, chapter 27.

A second financial source comes from the Israeli State Bonds, in dollars, that are sold abroad but are refunded in Israeli currency, as are the interests.

These bonds (of which 99.8% were sold in the United States in 1951, and still 80% in 1978) have placed more than 5 billion dollars at the disposition of the Israeli economy.

Source: State of Israel Bonds, Jerusalem-New York, American Jewish yearbook 1972, p. 273 ; 1978, p. 205 ; 1980, p. 153

Between "gifts" and "bonds", the Zionist State received almost eleven and a half billion dollars between 1948 and 1982.

Source: Statistical abstract of Israel (annual) and Bank of Israel, Annual Reports

Such efficiency implies what Mr. Bendelac calls the "collusion between power and the world of finance" in the Zionist movement. He gives a striking illustration for 1982 :

"Guy de Rothschild is president of the Unified Social Fund and the AUJF ;

David is treasurer of the FSJU and French member of the Administrative Council of the Jewish Agency;

Alain has been president of the Representative Council of Jewish Institutions of France and of the Israeli Central Consistory;

Elie is president of the executive Committee of the AUJF ;

Edmond is president of the European Organization of Israel Bonds ;

Finally, Alix de Rothschild was world president of the "Youth "Aliya"."

Source: Bendelac, op. cit., p. 76.

But dependence on the American government has been even greater, especially since the 70s.

"At the time of the Six-Day War, the external deficit reached 700 million dollars, and exceeded one billion dollars at the beginning of the 70s. The financial contribution of world Judaism no longer sufficed to fulfill the needs in capital of the Israeli economy ; it therefore became necessary to appeal to the American government for aid, which started off by supplying military credits, before extending its aid to the economic sector, after the Yom Kippur war. This contribution of capital by the American government led to a spectacular increase in Israel's foreign debt, which rose above 20 billion dollars in 1982. Thus, the deterioration in the financial aid of the Diaspora since the early 70s can be analyzed in two ways regarding the economic dependence of Israel: American government aid and the weight of the foreign debt."

Source: Bendelac. Op. cit., p. 79.

Since 1948, American government aid to Israel has reached almost 18 billion dollars, equally divided between loans and gifts, two thirds of which were destined for military purposes.

Source : until 1977: "Trésor, Division des échanges extérieurs" from 1978 to 1981, US Embassy (Tel Aviv)

The acceleration of this aid is breathtaking: usually inferior to 100 million dollars in 1975, and 2 billion dollars in 1981. In January 1985, the State of Israel, demanded a further 12 billion dollars over eight years.

As for the external debt, it rose from 6 billion dollars in 1973, 10 billion dollars in 1976, to 17 billions dollars by January 1st 1981, in other words a record figure of 4,350 dollars per inhabitant!

Aid increases with sub contracting deals, especially in the field of aviation (for example, Israel Aircraft Industries receives manufacturing contracts for elements for F4s and F15s).

Finally, economic aid includes facilities granted to Israeli exports to the USA, with preferential tariffs of developing countries, so that 96% of these exports (1 billion dollars) enters the USA tax-free.

In a word, only one figure is enough to define the nature of the Zionist State of Israel: the total official US aid which it receives corresponds alone to over 1,000 dollars per head, in other words as a bonus added to its national revenue, more than three times the net national income per inhabitant of Egypt or most African countries.

Professor Yeshayahou Leibowitz of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, who wrote a major work on "the faith of Maimonides". (translated into French in 1992, in Paris, Editions du Cerf), and who edited the "Hebrew Encyclopedia" for twenty years, summed up the attitude of a Jew living in Palestine since 1934, whose religious Zionist faith has been outraged by political Zionism, in "**Israel and Judaism**", published in Hebrew at Jerusalem in 1987 :

"Our system is rotten at the core" (page 245). And this for two reasons:

1-"The misfortune comes from the fact that everything is articulated around the problem of the nation and the state." (page 182) "If the state and the nation are held to be an end in themselves, then "Judaism" is rejected since the State of Israel is the most important." (p.182) " Nationalism is the essence of the destruction of mankind." (p.182) "The State of Israel is not a state which possesses an army, but an army which possesses a state." (p.31)

2 - The dependence of this state on the United States : "here, total collapse could occur overnight: consequence of the total stupidity which makes our whole existence depend on American economic aid." (p.225) "The Americans are interested only by the idea of maintaining an army of American mercenaries here under the uniform of Tsahal." (p.226)" The strength of the Jewish fist comes from the iron glove of America which covers it, and from the dollars which cushion it." (p.253)

Conclusion

a) - How to use myths properly as stages in the humanization of Man. Every people, even before the discovery of writing, has elaborated oral traditions that are sometimes based on real events but whose common point is to give a justification - often poetic - to its origins, its social organization, its cultural practices, its leaders' source of power or the community's projects for the future.

These great myths mark the epic of the dawn of humanity, expressing, through the tale of the exploits of a god or a legendary ancestor, the major moments during which man grew aware of his powers and his duties, of his vocation to surpass his present condition by way of his experience or his hopes, projecting himself into an ultimate future in which all his dreams of happiness and "salvation" would be accomplished.

To mention but a few examples stemming from various continents, the Ramayanah of India gives us, through the tale of the trials and victories of its hero, Rama, and his wife, Sita, the highest image of man and woman, their sense of honor, of fidelity to the demands of a spotless life. The very name of the hero, Rama, is close to that of God: Ram. The power of the myth is such - far beyond the tale - that it provided inspiration for thousands of years in the lives of different peoples, giving them a grandiose vision of man on the horizon of their own existence: centuries after the version of Valkimi, which gathered together in writing the finest oral traditions, the poet Tulsidas rewrote the Ramayanah in the XVth century, in accordance with a more profound mystic vision of the never-ending poem of human ascent. When Gandhi was dying, as he blessed his assassin, the last word upon his lips was the name of Ram. The same holds true of the Mahabharata, which culminates in the Bhagavad Gita, in which Prince Arjuna asks himself in the midst of battle the ultimate question as to the meaning of life and its struggles. In another civilization, in other words within another concept of the relationship between man and nature, of man with other men and of man with God, there was the Iliad; all the popular oral traditions of which it is made up were set in writing by Homer, as Valkimi had done for the Ramayanah. The Iliad gave the highest possible image that could be given of man, as for example when Hector walked to a predestined death with inflexible resolve for the salvation of his people.

The characters in the Prometheus of Aeschylus were to become, two thousand years later in the XIXth century, with Shelley's "Prometheus Unbound", the eternal symbol of the greatness of struggles for freedom, or Antigone's appeal to the "unwritten laws" whose echo has continued to ring in the heads and hearts of all those who wish to "live high", beyond the written word, the powers and the laws.

The great epics of initiation from Africa, such as those of the Kaydara, oral traditions set in writing by Hampate Ba, the African Homer or Valmiki were, like the anonymous authors of the Exodus of the Aztec tribes, like Goethe who spent a lifetime nurturing his "Faust", myth of all XIXth century Europe's desires, like Dostoyevski creating in his novel, "The Idiot", a new version of Jesus with his Prince

Mishkin, who breaks with all the idols of modern life, as did the prophet-knight, Don Quixote, who unflaggingly attacked all the institutions of a century ruled by money, where fearless and blameless generosity could only end in failure and ridicule.

The above are only a few examples, selected at random, of the "Legend of the Centuries", as Victor Hugo called the poems with which he too aroused the conscience of his fellow-men.

But, taken as a whole, the body of these epics makes up the genuine "Bible" of humanity, the history of man's greatness, asserting itself even through his abortive attempts to go beyond established order and customs. What we call "History" is written by the winners, by the masters of empires, by generals who devastate men's lands, by the financiers who loot the world's wealth and subjugate the genius of great scientific and technical inventors, putting it at the service of their economic or military domination.

Traces have remained of those masters, inscribed on stone monuments, in fortresses, in triumphal arches, in palaces, in texts praising their glory, in the images carved on stone such as those of Karnak, celebrating the ferocious deeds of Ramses, or in the memoirs of the chronicler, Gilbert de Nogent, which are an apologia of the crusades, or in the writings of greedy conquerors like Julius Caesar, with his "Gallic Wars", or Napoleon, who boasted of his exploits through the complacent pen of Las Cases in the "Memorial of Saint Helena", though all he achieved was to leave France smaller than he had found it.

This kind of history is not above pressing myths into its service and chaining them to its chariots of victory.

b) - The myth disguised as history and its political use A reading of this work on "The founding myths of the policy of Israel" must not engender any religious or political confusion.

Criticism of the Zionist interpretation of the Torah and of the "historical books" (especially those of Joshua, Samuel and Kings) in no way implies an underestimation of the Bible or what it too has revealed of man's human and divine epic. Abraham's sacrifice is the eternal model of how a man can go beyond temporary morality and the fragile logic on which it is based, in the name of unconditional values that make morality a relative value. In the same way, the Exodus remains a symbol of a people's quest for freedom, wresting itself from bondage in its quest for God and the Spirit.

What we reject is Zionism's tribalistic and nationalistic interpretation of those texts, the reduction of a great idea - an Alliance between God and all of mankind, His presence within each human being - to the most nefarious concept of all: that of a "chosen" people, elected by a partial god, a notion which justifies in advance every kind of domination, colonization and massacre.

This work is based entirely on factual sources; its aim is not to preach the destruction of the State of Israel, but simply to desacralize the underlying concept: the land in question was never promised but conquered, just like that of France, Germany or the United States, according to the prevailing balance of power at the time.

The object is not to wage war on anyone or to rewrite history indefinitely, but simply to demand the application for all concerned of an international law that will not perpetrate the law of the jungle.

In the case of the Middle East, we only ask for the application (without questioning their original legitimacy) of the decisions taken by the United Nations after World War II, in particular resolution 242, which excluded the erosion of the frontiers of neighboring countries and the illegal appropriation of their waters, as well as the implantation in illegally occupied zones of colonies protected by the Israeli army and settlers' guns. It is the perpetration de facto of the occupation which makes a genuine peace impossible, as it prevents a lasting peaceful cohabitation between two equal and independent peoples; this peace would be symbolized by the common respect of Jerusalem, without claims to exclusive possession; the holy city would be a meeting-place for the three religions derived from Abraham.

* * *

In the same way, the critique of the myth of the "Holocaust" is not a macabre body-count of the number of victims. If only one person had ever been persecuted for his faith alone or for his ethnic origins, this would still be a crime against all mankind.

But the political exploitation by a nation, which did not exist at the time the crimes were committed, of arbitrarily exaggerated figures, used to try and prove that the suffering of some far surpassed that of others, and the sacred nature given the event by the very use of a religious term like "Holocaust", tend to make us forget other, even more ferocious genocides such as the massacre of the American Indians and the enslavement of countless Africans, as well as many other mass murders by bloody dictatorships.

The Nuremberg trial by the winners of World War II satisfied everyone, making the Americans forget their Indian manhunts, and letting Stalin forget his purges, while the English and the French could blot out the memory of their imperialist crimes.

The biggest winners were the Zionists, who posed as the sole victims of the war and created the State of Israel in the process; despite the 50 million people killed in the war, the Zionists made themselves out to be almost the only ones to have suffered at Hitler's hands, and thus placed themselves above and beyond the law in order to legalize all their internal and external exactions.

* * *

It is not my intention to accuse of bad faith the millions of honest people who have believed in these deceitful myths propagated by all the media; they are justly horrified by the gas chambers, or else convinced by a literal reading of the Bible which totally ignores a modern reading of that text, believing in the god-given truth of the divine promises to a "chosen people". For over a thousand years (from the Vth century A.D. to the Renaissance, pious Christians believed that Constantine had "donated" the Papal estates to the Roman pontiff. That deceit lasted a whole millennium. Like thousands of other people in good faith, my own grandmother saw with her very eyes

a bleeding cross rise up in the sky on the night of August the 2nd, 1914, and she believed in her vision until her death.

The sole purpose of this book is to provide the reader with elements that will enable him to judge the bloody misdeeds engendered by a Zionist mythology which, with the unconditional support of the United States, has already engendered five wars and poses a constant threat to world peace and unity, due to the influence exerted by its lobby on the United States and, through that, on world opinion.

c) The forgers and critical history Finally, it was essential for us - by giving the source and the proof of what we assert even for the smallest item of information to separate ourselves radically from all the forgeries destined to throw discredit on a religion or a community, and to thus draw hatred and persecution upon it. The model of this type of forgery is the infamous "Protocol of the Elders of Zion", which I spoke of in my book: "Palestine, land of divine messages (p.206 to 214), demonstrating how it was fabricated, basing myself upon Henri Rollin's irrefutable demonstration, "L'Apocalypse de notre temps" (published by Gallimard in 1939). This work was destroyed by Hitler in 1940 because it annihilated one of the Nazis' favorite instruments of anti-Jewish propaganda.

Henri Rollin exhumed one of the two plagiaries from which the forgery was fabricated by Von Plehven the Russian Minister of the Interior, at the beginning of the century.

1° - A pamphlet written in France in 1864 by Maurice Joly against Napoleon III: « Dialogue in Hell between Montesquieu and Machiavel », of which he reproduced, paragraph by paragraph, all the criticisms of the Emperor's dictatorship, which can be applied to any policy of domination.

2° - An essay composed by a Russian emigré, Ilya Tsion, against Russia's Minister of Finance, Count de Witte, entitled: « Where Mr. Witte's dictatorship is leading Russia » (1895), which was already a plagiarism of a pre-1789 lampoon against Monsieur de Calonne, and which can be applied to all the relations between a Minister of Finance and the international banks. In this particular case, the attack was directed by Von Plehve against de Witte, whom he hated.

Unfortunately, this ignoble police forgery has widely been used (especially in certain Arab countries, that I have long blamed for doing so). It gave the Zionists and the Israelis an excuse to denounce any criticism of their policy in the Middle East and of their pressure groups throughout the world, assimilating it to the work of forgers.

This is why, at the risk of tiring the reader who is eager to reach conclusions without going through the wearisome labor of reading through the evidence, we have not put forward a single argument without giving the sources.

* * *

Let us sum up what critical history can say without being sacralized by myths used to serve a policy.

Hitler based himself on his racist ideology from the first political manifestations to take the Jews as a target after Communism, whose destruction was his principal mission (a fact which gained him the indulgence of the "Western democracies" for a long time, leading to his rearmament by industrialists as well as betrayal of populations by the West, as at Munich). Hitler's first pretexts for fighting the Jews were contradictory: on the one hand, he claimed that the October Revolution was the work of Jews who threatened to set up Communism in Europe, and he developed the theme of "Judeo-Bolshevism" as the incarnation of the world Communist movement; at the same time, he denounced the Jews as the incarnation of world capitalism.

The program of the National-Socialist Party proclaimed from the start that « a Jew cannot be a compatriot. » **Source: P.S. 1708.**

Hitler thus excluded from Germany some of its most outstanding figures in the realm of culture, music and science, because they were of Jewish descent; he deliberately ignored the distinction between religion and race. Starting from this monstrous exclusion, which disowned the poet Heine as well as the great Einstein, Hitler defined what he called his "ultimate goal" ("letztes Ziel") in a letter to his friend Gemlich as early as 1919: "the removal of the Jews". This "ultimate goal" would remain a constant until his death, as would the struggle against "Bolshevism", which led to his defeat.

This "removal of the Jews", one of the leitmotifs of his policy, was to take various forms according to the vicissitudes of his career. As soon as he came to power, his Minister of the Economy signed an agreement with the Jewish (Zionist) Agency, on August 28th 1933. This agreement facilitated the "transfer" ("Haavara" in Hebrew) of German Jews to Palestine.

Source: Broszat, Jacobsen, Krausnick: "Anatomie des SS staates", Munich 1982. vol.II, p. 263.

Two years later, the Nuremberg laws of September 15th 1935 turned into official legislation article 4 and 5 of the Party program formulated at Munich on February 24th 1920. These laws concerned citizenship of the Reich and the "defense of the blood" as the "Catholic kings" of Spain had done in the XVIth century for the sake of "purity of the blood" (limpieza del sangre), against Jews and the Moors. Both Hitler and the Spaniards were only copying the example of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Bible. These laws made it possible to exclude the Jews from the Civil Service and from prominent positions in private business. They made intermarriage illegal and gave to the Jews the status of foreigners.

Discrimination was to become more fierce still in 1938, with the "Crystal night" set off on a pretext.

On November 7th 1938, a young Jew called Grynszpan assassinated Von Rath, an embassy councilor in Paris.

The event, clamored by the Nazi press, sparked off a manhunt of Jews in the night of the 9th-10th November, with the looting of their shops, the ransacking of their wares and the breakage of their shop-windows (from whence the name "Crystal night").

The end result was appalling : « Looting and destruction of 815 shops, 171 houses, 276 synagogues, 14 other monuments of the Jewish community, arrest of 20,000 Jews, 7 Aryans, 3 foreigners, 36 dead and 36 injured. » Source: Report by Heydrich to Göring dated November 11th 1938, Nur. T. IX. p.554. Document recognized as authentic by Göring and all the accused against which it was produced."

It was not a passionate reaction on the part of the German people but a pogrom organized by the Nazi party. This is borne out by the report of the Supreme judge of the National-Socialist party, Walter Buch, who was put in charge of the investigation that followed (Doc. P.S. 3063 dated February 13th 1939, Nur. T. XXXII, p. 29) who was to judge the 174 Party members arrested on November 11th by order of Heydrich for having organized the pogrom and taken part in it.

But the 174 included only minor Party cadres.

The government (apart from Goebbels, who approved of the crime), and even the Führer himself, disowned the pogrom. But this does not exclude the theory of directives "from above", as would suggest the fact that Göring immediately passed three decrees aggravating the discrimination. - the first concerned the German Jews, who were given a collective fine of one billion marks (P.S. 1412 Reichsgesetzblatt 1938, part I, page 1579); - the second excluded the Jews from German economic life (P.S. 2875 Reichsgesetzblatt 1938, part I, page 1580); - the final one decided that the insurance companies would pay the State and not the insured the damage caused to his property on the Crystal night (P.S. 2694 Reichsgesetzblatt 1938, part I, page 1581).

1 - A striking parallel can be drawn between the pretexts and methods used to persecute the Jews in Germany and the Arabs in Palestine: in 1982, an attempt was made on the life of an Israeli diplomat in London. The Israeli leaders instantly attributed it to the PLO , invaded the Lebanon to destroy the PLO bases, resulting in the death of 20,000 people. Begin and Ariel Sharon, like Goebbels in the past, had their "crystal night", with a much higher number of innocent victims.

The difference is in the pretext for setting off an invasion of Lebanon planned by Israeli leaders a long time in advance. On May 21st 1948, Ben Gurion wrote in his "Diary":

« The Achilles' heel of the coalition...is Lebanon. Muslim supremacy in that country is artificial and could easily be reversed; a Christian state must be set up in that country. Its southern frontier would be the Litani river. »

Source: Michael Ben Zohar: "Ben Gurion ; le prophète armé" . p. 139.

General Moshe Dayan set out the method on June 16th 1955: « All that remains to be found is an officer, even a simple captain. We must win him to our cause, buy him, so that he will declare himself to be the savior of the Maronite population. Then, the Israeli army would enter Lebanon, would occupy the territories where a Christian regime allied to Israel would be established, and everything would work like clockwork. The Southern part of the Lebanon would be completely annexed to Israel.»

Source: "Diary" of the ex-Prime Minister of Israel, Moshe Sharett, published in Hebrew in 1979

What makes the crime of Lebanon even more odious by its very principle (beyond the massacres perpetrated under Sharon's very eyes and prepared thanks to him) is that the pretext for them could not be imputed to the PLO.

Margaret Thatcher brought the proof before the House of Commons that the crime had been the deed of a declared enemy of the PLO. Immediately after the arrest of the criminals and the police investigation, she declared: « On the list of personalities marked out for assassination, found on the authors of the attempt, figured the name of the head of the PLO in London... This would tend to prove that the attackers did not, as Israel has claimed, have the PLO support... I do not believe that the Israeli attack on Lebanon was an act of reprisal consecutive to this attack: the Israelis used it as a pretext to reopen hostilities. »

Source: International Herald Tribune, June 8th 1982.

This denial of Israeli propaganda went almost unnoticed in France, while it destroyed the legend of "legitimate defense" which had served as a pretext for this new aggression.

For this war, like all the aggressions and extortions of the State of Israel, was wholly in keeping with the Zionist doctrine, just as the "Crystal night" was wholly in keeping with the internal logic of Hitlerian racism.

The situation of the Jews after the "Crystal night" became more and more dramatic. The "Western democracies" met at the Evian Conference in 1938, an assembly of 33 countries (the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia were not represented; Hungary, Romania and Poland were only allowed observers to ask to be rid of their own Jews).

President Roosevelt set an example of selfishness when he declared at the "Warm Springs" press conference that « no revision or increase in immigration quotas to the United States was forecast. »

Source: Mazor: "Il y a trente ans, la Conférence d'Evian" in "Le monde Juif", April-June 1968, N° 50; p. 23 and 25.

At Evian, no-one was concerned to « take charge of the persecuted ones, or even to be seriously concerned by their fate »

Source: "Dix leçons sur le Nazisme", edited by Alfred Grosser. Paris 1976,p.216.

In March 1943, Goebbels could still declare ironically : « What will be the solution to the Jewish question ? Will a Jewish State be created one day in one territory or another ? We shall know later. But it is curious to note that those countries whose public opinion is in favor of the Jews still refuse to take them in. »

Source: Leon Poliakov. "Bréviaire de la haine" p.41.

After the defeat of Poland, another temporary solution to the Jewish question seemed possible: on September 21st, Heydrich, recalling the "ultimate goal" (Endziel) ordered the heads of security to create a sort of "Jewish reserve" at the new frontier with the USSR.

Source: Leon Poliakov. Op. Cit. p.41.

The defeat of France opened new perspectives to the Nazis. One could use the French colonial empire for the "final solution" of the Jewish question. The idea of expelling all the Jews to Madagascar had cropped up at the time of the Armistice in June 1940.

As early as May 1940, Himmler wrote in a note entitled « A few thoughts concerning the treatment of foreigners in the East »: « I hope to see the notion of Jew definitively eradicated through the evacuation of all the Jews towards Africa or in a colony. »

Source: V.f.Z. 1957.p. 197.

On June 24th 1940, Heydrich wrote to Ribbentrop, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, that one could henceforth glimpse "a final territorial solution". ("eine territoriale Endlösung") of the Jewish problem.

Source: Gerald Fleming: "Hitler und die Endlösung" Wiesbaden Munich. 1982.p.56.

From that time on, the "Madagascar project" was elaborated technically-speaking: on July 3rd 1940, Franz Rademacher, who was in charge of Jewish affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, elaborated a report which said: « Imminent victory gives Germany the possibility and, in my opinion, also the duty to resolve the Jewish question in Europe. The desirable solution is: all Jews out of Europe ("Alles Juden aus Europa"). Referat D III proposes as a solution to the Jewish question: in the peace treaty, France must make the island of Madagascar available for the solution of the Jewish question and must transfer and compensate the 25,000 French residents. The island will be placed under German mandate. » Source: N.G. 2586 -B. See: "Documents on German Foreign Policy (1918-1945)" Series D Vol.X. London, 1957, p. 11-113.

On July 25th 1940, Hans Frank, governor of Poland, confirmed that the Führer agreed to this evacuation, but that overseas transport on that scale would not be feasible for as long as the British hold the keys to the seas.

Source: P.S. 22.23. I M G vol. XXIX, p. 405.

A temporary replacement solution had to be found. It is said in the "minutes of the meeting"(cf s): « It is the SS Reichsführer and the head of the German police who will be responsible for the overall measures required for the final solution (Endlösung der Judenfrage), without regards for the geographical limits. » Source: N.G.2586 G.

Henceforth, the Jewish question was posed on the European scale, in those countries occupied by the Nazis. The Madagascar project was temporarily postponed; « The war against the Soviet Union has placed new territories at our disposal for the final

solution (für die Endlösung). Consequently, the Führer has decided to expel the Jews not to Madagascar but towards the East. »

Source: N.G. 5570.

Indeed, the Führer had declared on January 2nd 1942: « The Jews must leave Europe. The best thing is for them to go to Russia. »

Source: Adolf Hitler: "Monologues" 1941-1944. Albrecht Krauss Verlag. Hamburg 1980.p.241.

With the surging back of the German armies under the pressure of the Soviet army, the solution to the "Jewish question" demanded "ruthless severity". Source: H. Monneray: "La persécution des Juifs dans les pays de l'Est." p. 91-92.

In May 1944, Hitler gave orders for 200,000 Jews guarded by 10,000 Waffen SS to work be put to work in the armament factories or in the concentration camps. Conditions were so dreadful that tens of thousands died of typhus, leading to the multiplication of crematorium ovens.

The deportees were then sent out on roads that they themselves had to build in conditions of exhaustion and famine such that the majority of them died by tens of thousands.

This was the martyrdom of the deported Jews and slaves of the savagery of the Hitlerian masters, who treated them like slaves deprived even of the human value of useful workers.

These crimes by Hitler cannot be underestimated, any more than the untold suffering of the victims. That is why there is no need to add to this horrendous picture the light of flames borrowed from Dante's Inferno, or to attribute to them the theological and sacrificial attributes of the "Holocaust" to describe such basic deeds of stark inhumanity. The least emphatic history is, on its own, more accusatory than the myth. And above all it does not reduce the breadth of the true crime against humanity, which led to 50 million deaths, to the dimensions of a pogrom towards only one category of innocent victims, while millions died fighting to combat barbarity.

* * *

This historical evaluation, we must emphasize once again, is still provisional. As for any critical history and any science, it is revisable and will certainly be revised according to the discovery of new elements: tons of German archives were seized and taken to the United States: they have not yet been completely analyzed. Other archives in Russia, whose access had long been forbidden to researchers, are starting to be opened.

A great deal of work therefore remains to be done, on condition myth and history are not confused and conclusions not reached before research, as a certain intellectual terrorism has tried to impose it until now: "the canonization of the Nuremberg texts

has proved extremely fragile. History, like science, cannot use an untouchable a priori as a point of departure.

Nuremberg had promulgated figures whose most important have proved to be false: the "4 million" dead at Auschwitz have been reduced by scientific research to "a little over a million", and even the "authorities" have had to accept this revision and change the plaques commemorating the crime. The dogma of the "six million", already questioned by the most intransigent defenders of the genocide like Reitlinger, who reached the figure of four and a half million in his book, "The Final Solution", is henceforth excluded by the entire scientific community, even if it remains a theme of propaganda with the media for schoolchildren and the general public.

If we challenge the figures regarding the number of Jewish victims, it is not in a macabre or quibbling spirit, but to show how the deliberate wish to perpetrate a lie has forced people to falsify history systematically and arbitrarily.

Because they supposedly did not want the genuine martyrdom of the Jews to seem "banal", the deaths of 17 million Russians and 9 million Germans have been relegated to second place, and the real suffering of the Jews was also given a "sacred" character (under the name of "Holocaust") which was denied to the others.

To attain this objective, it was necessary to violate all the elementary rules of justice and of the establishment of the truth.

For example, the "final solution" had to mean extermination, "genocide", whereas no text allows this interpretation, always dealing with the expulsion of all the Jews from Europe, first to the East and later to some African reservation. This in itself was monstrous enough. To do this, all documents had to be falsified: the word "transfer" translated by "extermination", in such a way that this "method" of interpretation made it possible to make any text say what it was supposed to say. What was a horrible massacre became a "genocide". To quote only one example of this tendentious manipulation of the texts: in his book, "Les crématoires d'Auschwitz" (1993), Claude Pressac was so determined to add further horrors to this fearful mortality that every time he encountered the German word "Leichenkeller", "body chamber", in other words "morgue", he translated it as "gas chamber" (example p.65), once again introducing the notion of "coded language", explaining that Messing, the killer, "did not have the guts to write that the "body chamber" was a "gassing cave""(p.74)

The hypothesis of the "coded language" constantly used to make texts say what one wants them to say has no foundation; first of all because, as we have already shown (p....) Hitler and his accomplices never tried to dissimulate their other crimes, proclaiming them cynically in clear language, and secondly because the British had developed to a very high degree the techniques and the apparatus used for deciphering codes, having access to the messages, which would have been numerous if there really had existed a technical undertaking huge enough for the deliberate extermination of millions of people.

In the same arbitrary way, when it was proven that, despite a large number of "eyewitness accounts" concerning the existence of "gas chambers", these had never existed on German soil, so people continued to regard as unchallengeable the identical

accounts on their existence in the Eastern camps.

Finally, the refusal to discuss in a scientific and at the same public way the technical appraisements by experts, and on the contrary to answer them only by repression and silence, can only serve to maintain doubt. There is no more effective indictment against Hitlerism than the establishment of the historical truth.

It is to that truth we wanted to contribute with this work.

Annexes

Letter of Abbé Pierre to Roger Garaudy

April 15, 1996

Very Dear Roger,

You know the limits of my strength. I weaken every day, even though many think that my strength is great because my voice is still resounding and because, as soon as I have the conviction that an action or an issue creates injustice or falsehood, I recover my energies, however briefly.

Forgive me for talking so much about myself, but this is to explain to you and to all who would deem it useful to make my letter known, why, despite phone calls, I am late in expressing my convictions concerning you as a person, whom I have known for over 50 years, and concerning your actions, from the most intimate to those having great public consequences.

As a communist deputy, you were the first person with whom I had a debate, the memory of which has remained unforgettable because it was fruitful for both of us.

Your most recent book reached me while I was at the limits of my strength, attending to other pressing tasks. At 83, with all that is happening to me, I can read very little. I have only 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the afternoon when I can really work.

About this crushing, thousand year old unending drama surrounding Israel, you have known, for many years, my careful considerations and you know that my thoughts extend beyond the contemporary dramas.

We have had serious discussions about this subject.

It is impossible for me to speak about your new book with all the care that is required, not only because of its fundamental subject, but also because of the amazing, brilliant and scrupulous scholarship on which each argument is based, as I noticed while going through it.

I will do my best so that soon, true historians with your same passion for truth will set out to debate it with you.

The insults against you that I have seen (even in a Daily that I like most because of its customary objectivity) and that have bombarded you from all sides show the dishonesty of those who have rashly condemned you.

In this letter, I want to make public two convictions: one, in a few words, concerning your person; the other (still imperfectly expressed) concerns how my life has led me to conceptualize the succession of historical events, which I view with sadness. Such is the admirable faith (but for many centuries withdrawn to itself) of this people, my brothers, that limits itself by not hearing the call to a mission of another, nobler greatness.

Providence had allowed me, in other times (that seem so near), at the risk, voluntarily accepted, of my life, to come to the help of those I could help. Because of this, I am particularly sensitive to their pain.

About you and your life, a few words suffice. You are one of those men who will never cease to be tormented by a devouring thirst for the Absolute, until faced with Infinite Love.

I blame those who are too superficial, or too busy with many other things, that they do not know how to respect and love your research, and do not understand the manner in which (all during your life) you have tried to approximate the Absolute, approaching it from its many, perceived, fragmented dimensions, from all over the world and through the centuries, that people share (and over which they are led astray, and sometimes fight).

It is not without some painful trembling and great humility that I invoke another of my convictions concerning the Jewish portion of the human universe.

After I finished my theological studies, I pursued my own biblical studies. It came as a horrible shock when I discovered the Book of Joshua. I had already been gripped by more serious trouble when I learned of the Golden Calf's order to massacre 3000 people a short time before Moses brought the "Table of Laws," which said, "Thou shall not kill!" But with Joshua, I discovered (surely told centuries after the event) how a true Shoah took place on all existing life in the "Promised Land."

I say: "If I promise you my car, and if you come at night, kill the guard, force the door open and take the promised car, then what is left of the 'promise'?"

Doesn't violence destroy the foundation of the promise? Indeed, afterwards, the Covenant will continue to be repeated constantly with a people who (not unique, it seems, but unique as a highly constituted people) have in their conscience the notion of a Unique Eternal (indeed, not yet clearly knowing that this Essence is Love). I live this revelation with Jesus, Jesus who founded the Trinity of faith: Deus caritas est. But does not this Covenant also concern this part of the world (that can and must be called not "Promised Land," but "Holy Land," filled with crimes but also with Prophets)?

I can no longer justify promises by God (even if orders to massacre are attributed to Him -- and isn't this an offense to God?) for only this corner of the earth, for or against which so many are still dying today.

Is not the Covenant to send all of Israel to spread the faith it has received, for all of the earth?

The promised land is for every Believer (hence, for every Jew, too). I cannot swerve from this idea, of carrying to the whole earth the JOY of experiencing the true GOD.

Oh, how I would like to still be young, to work with fraternal groups for the realization of the mission received first in Israel, then in Jesus.

I do not ignore that the retreat of Israel upon itself is partly due to the strange reversal of history caused by Constantin after the Edict of Milan, and the harmful consequences that accompanied its beneficial effects.

We have heard that in the year 2000, the Pope (will it be the same Pope?) will express the intention to confess the historic mistakes that accompanied the zeal of Christian missions.

Could he underestimate the role that the words, "deicidal people," played in anti-Semitism? This would be insane, for it is to all peoples, to all humans, that Jesus offered himself in ransom.

At that time, forbidden martyrs were replaced (to compensate for the decadence of the empire) by the disastrous structures of privilege: Prince-Bishops, Pope-Kings, including the most abusive confusion between the spiritual and temporal.

Roger, we are both old men, and we have to talk more about this and question people more scholarly than myself. Please, from these illegible lines that we will read together over the telephone, keep the force and loyalty of my affectionate esteem and my respect for the enormous work of your new book. To confuse it with what has been called "revisionism" is a deception and a veritable slander by unthinking people.

I embrace you and assure you that you and your family will remain present in my daily offering.

Your brother,

Abbé Pierre

Testimony of a Protestant Pastor

May 11, 1996

Dear Abbé Pierre, Dear Roger Garaudy,

I am saddened by the flood of hatred and contempt heaped upon you. This reveals the feeling that many carry in their hearts. Remember, Abbé Pierre, a devoted man, dragged in mud, will enhance your value (in the eyes) of the one who judges and condemns.

And you, Roger Garaudy, you have a twofold luxury: in the eyes of the French, you

incarnate two phobias -- communism and Islam. One would think you do it on purpose.

You have proved that you love the Jews infinitely more than those who give lessons. But here you are, you also love the Palestinians and Arabs in general, the majority of whom are Muslims, but sometimes Christians. All Palestinian or Arab brothers who, for generations, have been humiliated, colonized, dispossessed, bashed, imprisoned, starved. And you have reason to love them and to want justice and peace for them. Nobody understood (and nobody explained, either) that it is because of them that you embarked on the mad enterprise that consists in trying to explain (to the ignorant and to people who do not want to know) the consequences of the horrible extermination of Jews, or the fate of the Arabs, who had nothing to do with Polish or Russian pogroms, the Dreyfus Affair, the concentration camps, or the Nazi extermination. And yet, it is they who are dispossessed. What is contested is not the abjectness and horror of anti-Semitic massacres, it is their use to justify the creation and permanent expansion of the State of Israel and to cover up mad injustices. To make of "Auschwitz" a political argument to support Israel is to run the risk that this argument be contested. And when the historical reexamination of the Nazi period is refused, when the files are closed, is not that really to prevent the questioning of the legitimacy of the State of Israel and its behavior? Yet history will prevail. One day, everything will be known.

Thank goodness that it was a Jewish historian (for whom I have great respect) who wrote 30 years ago in "Les Temps Modernes" a marvelous article, "Israel, Colonial Fact?" Is he right or wrong? And if it is true that the colonization of Palestine was devised by the Zionist movement a hundred years ago, during the height of the colonialization period, is there no reason to doubt that this colonial domination will end like the others? It is better to think about it than to curse. Has not Arafat agreed to pay a heavy price for peace? And, to a certain extent, the Israeli pacifists, too? Rabin included? Are "negationists" the Nazis of today who want to revise history in order to give good reason for the Nazis of yesterday? I will never believe (after reading Abbé Pierre's declarations and R. Garaudy's book) that these brothers have converted to Nazism.

It is said that the theology of Abbé Pierre is "obsolete." I know others who are even more so, and who could do better to be more modest.

As for you, my two brothers, the struggles you are waging, at your age, to raise the consciousness of all those who need it, compel respect and contribute to hope.

Pastor Roger Parmentier

The Cry of a Deportee

A 1940 Gaullist veteran of the Free French Forces (FFL), I was arrested in October, 1943, and deported for 18 months to Buchenwald, then to the hell of Dora, where thousands of French deportees lost their lives in the underground factories of V1 and V2. I returned disabled.

This is to tell you that we shared with our Jewish comrades all the ordeals of the camps. Having said that, I ask journalists with what right they deny veteran deportees the right to question theories elevated to truth, not by Jewish deportees but by some Zionists?

What kind of society do we live in, where we do not have the right to criticize, in any manner, either Jews or Israelis or Zionists, without being automatically accused of anti-Semitism or racism?

Let journalists know one thing: The vast majority of deportees in Nazi camps were not Jewish, even though the media give credence to the thesis that only Jews were deported and exterminated.

Let them know, too, that in France, there were about 250,000 deportees, of which about 25,000 were French Jews. Between 80,000 and 100,000 returned, of which about 15,000 were Jews.

Nobody speaks about the non-Jewish deportees. Why? There is a lot of talk about Shoah, but nothing about the underground factories of V1 and V2 in Dora, where thousands of French deportees died of exhaustion and bad treatment. Dora, too, was a camp of extermination, by work and by hunger.

As for Auschwitz, it is true that about 800,000 Jews from all of Europe perished after 1943, but we must not forget that the first exterminated deportees were 400,000 Soviet soldiers, about 150,000 gypsies, 500,000 to 600,000 Polish, and deportees of other nationalities.

There is no talk about this, either. So why talk only about Jews' sacrifices and conceal the martyrdom of other deportees? They, too, have the right to memory.

As a senior deportee, Garaudy is saying the same thing, when he maintains that deportation of "non-Jews" was concealed and when he denounces the manipulation of numbers, from the official talk initially of about 4 million Jews exterminated in Auschwitz, now reduced to 1 million.

Is it "revisionist" or "negationist" or even antisemitic to maintain this?

In the camps, there was no monopoly by any category. We were all equal in the face of suffering and death.

We cannot accept that deportation be monopolized by some and that journalists who have known neither deportation nor war be permitted such manipulation.

Gaston Pernot
Doctor of Law
Commander of the Legion of Honor, Paris
("Le Figaro," Friday, May 3, 1996)

Indignation of an Israeli Writer: Ari Shavit

Cana: 102 Faceless Dead

We killed 170 people in Lebanon, most of whom were refugees, during the month of April, 1996. Many of them were women, old people and children. We killed 9 civilians, one a 2 year old girl and one, a centenarian, in Sahmour, on April 11th. We killed 11 civilians, including 7 children, in Nabatyeh, on April 18th. In the UN Camp in Cana, we killed 102 people. We made sure to inflict death from a distance. In a very secular manner, without the archaic idea of sin, without the antediluvian worry to consider man in the image of God, and without the primitive proscription, "You shall not kill!"

Our solid alibi is that we are responsible for nothing, that the responsibility falls on Hezbollah. A most doubtful alibi. For when we decided to launch a massive attack on the civilian region of South Lebanon (while Israel ran no vital risk), we decided, ipso facto, to spill the blood of X number of civilians. When we decided to drive half a million people out of their homes and to shell those who remained behind (while in Israel, we did not have one single victim), we decided, in fact, to execute several dozen of them. This (alibi) allowed us to make such cruel decisions without seeing ourselves as rotten.

We killed them because the increasingly wider gap between the sacrosanct character that we attribute to our own lives and the more limited character we give to theirs, allowed us to kill. We believe, in the most absolute manner, with the White House, the Senate, the Pentagon, and the New York Times on our side, that their lives do not have the same weight as ours. We are convinced that with Dimona (Israel's atomic site), Yad Vashem and the Shoah Museum in our hand, we have the right to compel 400,000 people to evacuate their homes in 8 hours. And we have the right, at the end of 8 hours, to consider their homes as military targets. And we reserve the right to rain 16,000 shells on their villages and their populations. And we reserve the right to kill without any guilt feelings.

But all this cannot alleviate the gravity of the massacre, Israeli style, and our responsibility for its execution. For it is perpetrated, in general, in places to which we give free range to immoderate violence.

The shelling of Cana was executed according to the rules, orders and objectives of operation, "Grapes of Wrath." There is something wrong in these rules, orders and objectives. Something that is no longer human. Something that touches on the criminal.

And all of us, without exception, were an integral part of this machine. The public supported the media, who supported the government, who supported the Chief of Staff, who supported the inquiry officer, who supported the officers, who supported the soldiers who fired the three shells that killed 102 in Cana.

Nothing can prevent Cana from becoming an integral part of our biography. Because, after Cana, we did not denounce the crime, we did not want to subject the affair to the

eyes of the law, we merely wanted to deny the horror and go on with our current affairs. That is how Cana is part of ourselves -- like one of the features of our face.

As the massacre perpetrated by Baruch Goldstein (in the Cave of the Patriarchs on Muslims while praying) and the crime committed by Ygal Amir (like the reactions to them) were manifestations of rotten seeds in the heart of the national-religious culture, the massacre of Cana is no less extreme a grain of rottenness in the heart of secular Israeli culture: its cynicism, brutality, instrumentalism, egocentrism of the powerful; this tendency to blur the frontier between good and evil, between permitted and prohibited; this tendency not to require justice, not to care about truth.

The manner in which contemporary Israel has functioned during and after Cana shows that modern, rational Israeli life conceals a terrifying aspect.

Ari Shavit/Haaretz/New York Times Syndication.

Ari Shavit is a writer and columnist of the Israeli newspaper, Haaretz. He lives in Jerusalem. (Translated from Hebrew in "Liberation" of May 21, 1996.)

This pamphlet is a reply to the lies of the media about Roger Garaudy's book, "The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics: A Reference Book to Purify Political Life in the 21st Century."

Roger Garaudy

Right to Reply

Reply to the Media Lynching of Abbé Pierre and Roger Garaudy

Samizdat
Roger Garaudy
1996
(June)

No "Right to Reply" (yet written in our law) was granted to me by the media when they discharged the worst lies against my book, "The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics."

I was walled up in silence.

Only Abbé Pierre dared raise his great voice.

By enacting laws that limit freedom of expression, the French State has ceased to be a State of Law. In particular, the Gayssot Law restores the law, abolished after Vichy, that defines questioning of official truth as a criminal offense (*délit d'opinion*). In fact, this law restores discrimination against anybody who does not submit to "one-track thought" and to the cult of "politically correct" taboos imposed by American leaders and their Western mercenaries, especially the Israelis.

After this imposed silence, here is my reply to the "witch hunt" lobby, the guardian of taboos.

Machination of a Lynching:

Not a word of refutation about the collaboration of Zionist leaders with Hitler.

In the flood of insults unfurled against Abbé Pierre and myself, no argument was produced to refute the proofs I provided of each accusation in my book against Israeli politics.

For example, the collaboration of Zionist leaders (who became Israeli leaders) with the Nazis, since the Haavara agreements allowing Jewish billionaires to transfer their German capital to Palestine.

Then there was the collaboration of the Zionist, Betar, in Hitlerian uniforms and under the flag of the Star of David until 1938 (during 5 years under the Hitler regime).

Then there were the propositions of collaboration, including military, made by Itzhak Shamir to the Hitlerian authorities in 1941. And until the negotiations with the "Jewish Agency" to provide Hitler with 10,000 trucks with the single condition that these trucks be used solely on the Eastern front against the Soviet Union, so as to

achieve a separate peace with the United States and England, thus fulfilling the dream of the Western "allies", viz., to use Hitler to crush the Soviet Union (see the proofs of this collaboration with Hitlerism in my book, "Founding Myths of Israeli Politics" (pp. 65-90).

Not a word on Israeli terrorism.

No word to question my analysis of Israeli state terrorism from the massacre of 237 civilians in Deir Yassin by Begin's troops, to the massacre of Arabs praying in Hebron by Baruch Goldstein; the assassination of Comte Bernadotte and of Lord Moyne, who were guilty of denouncing at the U.N. the terror against the Palestinians driven out by the hundreds of thousands from their villages and their desecrated and bulldozed cemeteries; to the aggression against the Suez Canal planned by Sharon and Perez with General Challe (future leader of the coup in Algiers); the massacre of thousands of Lebanese civilians by Sharon in 1982 and his responsibility, together with General Rafael Eytan, for the killings of Sabra and Chatila; the occupation, after the "Six Day War" of whatever remained of Palestine and also of South Lebanon, of the Syrian Golan.

To the Israeli leader, the UN resolutions condemning these occupations were not worth "the paper they were written on": Resolution 181 of 1947 stipulating the partition of Palestine; resolution 242 of November 22, 1967, requiring "the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories"; resolution 338 of October 22, 1973, reiterating this demand after the Kippur War; resolution 425 condemning the occupation of Lebanon. Like the one (adopted unanimously) of July 4, 1967, on the annexation of Jerusalem. On March 12, 1991, the French foreign minister, M. Roland Dumas, stated in an interview with "Le Monde," "The Security Council has taken a total of 197 resolutions concerning the Arab-Israeli problem and 34 concerning the Palestinians. All these resolutions remain a dead letter."

The first, dealing with the partition, was dismissed by Ben Gourion as "a piece of paper." For 50 years, the Israeli leaders, irrespective of their party, have put themselves above international law. They are not afraid to make public their project of disintegration of all Arab states in the region, as they did in 1982 in the magazine, "Kivounim" (see pp. 203-204 in my book, "The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics.")

Nobody has contested my analysis of the control of American politics by the Israeli "lobby" and of the financing of the State of Israel as a proxy of American politics in the Middle East.

The Scorned "Right to Reply"

Not even an attempt at refutation. With a naive cynicism, Vidal-Naquet wrote in "Le Monde" of April 4, 1996: "The day we accept one of these gentlemen in a public debate on television or in a colloquium of historians, they will have won the game. They are considered as a school. We have to absolutely bar them from such activities." It is in the name of this "principle" that I was refused any "right to reply" by all the newspapers, which told brazen lies about my book. Yet the "right to reply" is written in the laws. And this goes from "La Croix" to "L'Humanité," passing by "Le Monde," "Libération" or "Le Journal du Dimanche." Similarly, none of the 3

television channels let me speak directly, but they set up caricature montages, never allowing me to answer the slanders. It is significant that they all spoke with the same voice, that of a "litany of hatred" using the same jargon to accuse me of "negationism," a word that does not exist in any French dictionary, for lack of being able to define what is being denied.

It is as though the watchwords came from the same central agency of lies and hate that led General de Gaulle to say, "There exists in France a powerful Israeli lobby, exerting its influence most notably in the information world."

In 1978, a former president of the World Jewish Congress, Mr. Nahum Goldman, asked President Carter "to break the Jewish lobby," which he considered "a force of destruction, an obstacle to peace in the Middle East."

During the Gulf War, Mr. Alain Peyrefitte wrote in "Le Figaro" of November 5, 1990: "Two powerful pressure groups push for the outbreak of the conflict: 1) The Jewish lobby, playing an essential role in the transatlantic media; 2) The business lobby (to revive the economy by the war)."

The Witch hunt

To burn me on the stake, a magic word "negationism" replaced the Middle Ages' accusation of those who dealt with the devil and thus deserved the stakes: "witchcraft."

Like the word, "negationist," that of Shoah (which means extermination in Hebrew) comes, too, from the litany of hate. It was popularized by Lanzmann's film, financed by Menachem Begin (author of the "crime against humanity" in the massacre of hundreds of civilians in Deir Yassim), who invested 850,000 dollars in this "project of national interest."

The witch hunt started in "Le Monde" (which, since it has been rescued from its financial difficulties by other investors, is no longer the newspaper of Beuve-Mery or Jacques Fauvet).

"Roger Garaudy negationist" was the headline of an article in the book section of January 26, 1996.

The rumor spread like the slander in the Barber of Seville. It already occupies 4 columns in "Liberation" of January 31st: "Roger Garaudy joins the 'negationists'".

With time, exaggerations increase. In "Liberation" of May 8, 1996, where the headline stretches across the whole page: "Negationism is reassessment."

The same obsession spreads through the whole gamut of the press. From "L'Humanité" of January 25, 1996, which hypocritically pities "a man whose humanism left its mark on an era" and became a "racist," to "La Croix" of February 2, 1996, which was saddened by "the suicidal drowning of a man who might have been the witness of an era" had he not gone to "the most servile madness of antisemitism."

Obviously, my past bothers them. Three months after being decorated with a war medal as a soldier against Hitler, I was arrested on September 14, 19440. When we rose against Nazism prior to the existence of deportations in Germany, we were sent to the Sahara. I was subjected to 33 months in a concentration camp, together with the founder of "LICA" (International League Against Antisemitism, which became "LICRA," International League Against Racism and Antisemitism), Bernard Lecache, with whom I gave lectures about the prophets of Israel to our atheist companions. Upon my return, I received the deportation medal. This is what the LICRA people call today a "neo-Nazi"!

Struggle Against All Fundamentalisms

I fought all fundamentalisms as an organizer of Christian-Marxist, then Christian-Muslim dialogues. In 1970, I was expelled from the Communist Party (of which I was one of the theoreticians and leaders) for declaring that "the Soviet Union is not a socialist country"!

In my last three books, I have analyzed, one after the other, 1) Roman Catholic fundamentalism in "Do We Need God," where I wrote, despite the anger of some people, that Jesus could not be the founder of reigning theologies of domination; 2) in "Greatness and Decadence of Islam," I denounced "Islamism" as a sickness of Islam; 3) finally, in "The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics," I analyze the "Zionist heresy" that replaces the God of Israel with the state of Israel and thus, through tribal nationalism, renounces the universalist faith of the great Jewish prophets.

My critiques of Christian and Muslim fundamentalisms naturally raised polemics, which is normal and fruitful. But with my last book, I was touching a taboo, and this time, lacking arguments, they called the police.

Naturally, all the provincial press orchestrates the rumor. It crosses borders, for the Zionist organization has a worldwide network. In Canada, the World Jewish Congress succeeds in banning my lectures (on other topics. But it is the man that must be demonized!) In Switzerland, the LICRA leader, Vodoz, asks the courts to press charges against me. The international press spreads the same slander as the French press, exported, for example, by Finkelkraut in "Corriere de la Sera" in Italy and "El Mundo" in Spain. From the "New York Times" in the United States to "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" in Germany, the same chorus sings the same song.

The Magic Word that Kills

"Negationist," negation of "SHOAH." The same supranational vocabulary serves to "banish" me, as Joshua would say.

Let us see what I "DENY":

1) Nowhere do I deny Nazism's crimes or its persecution of Jews. It is an attack against my honor to attribute to me a "denial of crimes against humanity." My book does not cease denouncing "the monstrous objectives of Hitler (pp. 62, 251), their savagery (p. 97); these "immense crimes do not need lies to reveal their atrocity (p. 54). After describing "the horrible conditions that resulted in tens of thousands of

victims," I conclude: "Such was the martyrdom of Jewish and Slavic deportees and the ferocity of Hitlerian masters treating them as slaves without any human value" (p. 257).

I add (p. 257), "These crimes cannot be underestimated, nor can the unspeakable suffering of the victims." "Doubtless, the Jews were one of Hitler's preferred targets because of his racist theory of the superiority of the Aryan race" (p. 152).

As for the lies instituted at Nuremberg:

4 million dead at Auschwitz (according to a Soviet report) and the successive "revisions" of historians; 2 million, according to Zionist historian Poliakov in his "Litany of Hate"; 1 million, 250 thousand, according to another Zionist historian, Raoul Hilberg (p. 160 in my book). Bédarida, Director of the Institute of Contemporary History at CNRS reached the conclusion that "the number of 4 million does not rest on any serious basis and must not be kept." "The number of about one million dead is corroborated by all specialists because they agree on a number of victims that varies between 950,000 and 1,200,000" (Le Monde, July 23, 1989).

My "revisionism" that my detractors (none of whom read my book) call "negationism" without saying what I deny is nothing but the resumption of "revisions" of "all the specialists" (as Bédarida says), which led in 1994 to replace the plaque that said 4 million (in Auschwitz) with one that says "a little over one million" (p. 159). I add: "It is not a matter of establishing a macabre counting."

The assassination of one single innocent, whether he is Jewish or not, is a crime against humanity (which I repeat, p. 257).

2. As for the "gas chambers," I clearly said that no tribunal, neither Nuremberg nor those that followed it, have ever sought to examine this crime weapon. Expert opinions exist, namely that of the engineer Leuchter, a specialist in the United States, of gas chambers built in 6 states for those sentenced to death. His investigations at Auschwitz-Birkenau led him to radically negative conclusions. "One would have expected the detection of higher rates of cyanide in samples taken from the alleged gas chambers (due to the larger quantities of gas used in these places) than in the control samples taken from the disinfection chambers. Since the opposite is true, it is imperative to conclude that these installations were not execution gas chambers."

Given in Malden (Massachusetts) April 5, 1988 by Fred A. Leuchter Jr., Chief Engineer.

Subsequent studies by other experts in Cracow in 1990 and in Vienna did not produce any new findings.

Since I am not a chemist or a biologist, I cannot decide. I simply say in my book (p. 150) that I am surprised that these reports were not published and openly debated. The only attempt to refute them was a book by Pressac, subsidized by the Klarsfeld Foundation, which curiously enough, nobody refers to. Even Pressac, in his 1993 book, does not even cite the Leuchter Report, while at the same time he triumphantly refutes it.

Concerning the interpretation of the "final solution" and the "gas chambers," my book states clearly these problems.

1. According to the official theory, Hitler might have given the extermination order. However, in a colloquium on "revisionism" in February 1982 at the Sorbonne, Raymond Aron and Jacques Furet stated in the closing press conference: "Despite the most scholarly research, no Hitler order to exterminate the Jews was ever found."

We are told later that the order was given at the Wannsee Conference of January 20, 1942. In the January 30, 1992 issue of "Canadian Jewish News," Yehuda Bauer wrote that this interpretation of Wannsee is silly.

Pressac is the latest scourge of revisionism. On p. 114 of his book, "Les crématoires d'Auschwitz," he refers to "the Wannsee Conference on the driving back of the Jews towards the East."

Was there a "coded language?" In the absence of proof, this is suggested by Nicolas Weill (after many others) in "Le Monde" of May 6, 1996.

Pressac maintains that public works projects did not use any coded language: "Contrary to what is said, there was never a camouflage." (Quoted by Laurent Greilsamer in "Le Monde" of September 26 and 27, 1993.)

After being hailed as a savior of the extermination propagandists, he became more and more suspect: he destroyed their "coded" interpretations of Wannsee. He questioned their "testimonies" refuting Höss, commander of Auschwitz, the main witness, and Eichmann, too (pp. 41 and 132).

He contradicted their Dantesque interpretations of "Sondermassnahmen" (special measures): contrary to what was believed, these terms have no criminal connotation (p. 107).

He ridicules the numbers given by Wellers, of Jews passing through Auschwitz: "It is obviously inexact." (p. 147)

Is it a matter of a repenting or camouflaged "revisionist?"

While waiting for this technical debate, I stand by what is clearly established: the odious watchword of the Nazis, "all the Jews out of Europe!"

The execution of this plan was initially realized by pushing back Jews toward the East under such inhuman conditions that tens of thousands succumbed. Then, as it was clearly written and asserted, after the war and victory, all European Jews shall be deported to an African island (Madagascar was mentioned, following the fall of France).

This project was already monstrous enough so that even the first stages of its execution cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of Jews.

It is always this objective: the deportation to an African ghetto which was considered as the "final solution," and it is pure Barbary.

As to "the extermination," during his 10 years of absolute rule, four of which were over all of Europe, Hitler had all the time to realize it, and fortunately, despite all the indisputable massacres, the Jewish community, though decimated, remained in Europe among us.

Then what do I deny?

I deny that the Zionists assume the power to minimize Hitler's crimes by reducing them to the indisputable persecution of Jews. His drive for expansion and conquest resulted in 50 million dead, of which 16 million were Slavs, Russians and Polish, as Pope John Paul II recalled in Miami.

What I deny, what I fight, is the will to remember only one category of victims and to hedge the language so as to conceal contempt for others.

This leads to an inversion of even the meaning of our history, to the negation of the resistance of the overwhelming masses of our people to the Nazi occupation and to the handful of renegade, ruthlessly ambitious collaborators put in power by Hitler's invasion. During the first years of the liberation, "deported" meant resistance fighter. Today, through perversion, "deported" would only mean Jewish victims.

The massacre of a large number of Jews is indisputable, but why call it "genocide"? Genocide means extermination ("There remained no survivor" as it is said in the book of Joshua, telling of the conquest of Canaan). This is unquestionably boastfulness, since the majority of the Canaanite population survived. But if, as Francois Bédarida pretends in "Le Monde" of May 5 and 6, 1996, "the invocation of Joshua by Roger Garaudy seems to me an intellectual stupidity," [note 1: this new tone of language was set in "Le Monde" by Kouchner (the comic actor who carried a rice bag in a Somalian port in order to attract the attention of the media) who called me "bastard."] because "it was put together many centuries after the fact and based on fairly embellished traditions." If this is the case, would Mr. Bédarida explain to us why the Bible that is distributed to young Israeli soldiers with, since 1990, a preface by the Grand Army Rabbi, Gad Navon, stresses the book of Joshua? Its characteristic is the extreme chauvinism underlying the antagonism between Jews and other peoples, to the point of presenting Abraham as "the father of the Jewish nation" standing on one side, and the whole world on the other.

This is what gives Joshua an extreme relevance, all the more as to this Bible, transformed into a nationalism manual, where every stranger is an "enemy," an Atlas has been added where every young soldier can find a map of all the land of Israel, including not only Judea and Samaria but also Jordan, with a glorification of the GOD of armies, who gives victory over the enemies in order "to reinforce the combative spirit of soldiers." (Source: Haaretz of January 22, 1996. Article of Yaron Ezrahi about "the chauvinistic preface of the Bible currently distributed to Israeli soldiers.")

Without denying the extent and the horror of massacres of Jews and other opponents (3.5 million Russian prisoners died in captivity said Bédarida in the same article of

"Le Monde"), I reject this "Apartheid of the dead." Under the theological name of Holocaust, it makes the martyrdom of Jews irreducible to any other.

By its sacrificial character, it could be integrated into a divine project in the manner of the crucifixion of Jesus in Christian theology (p. 156 of my book).

But such discriminations are inherent to the heresy logic of political Zionism, breaking off with the grandiose universalism of the Jewish prophets.

According to the founding father of Zionist heresy, and to Professor Klein, Director of the Institute of Comparative Law at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the notion of a Jewish state is incompatible with any true democracy. The definition of Jewish is given by Professor Klein in his book, "Le caractère juif de L'Etat d'Israel" (Ed Cujas, Paris, 1977) as it is formulated in the "Law of Return," the fundamental law of 1950, article 4b: "A Jew is considered any person born to a Jewish mother or converted according to halakah." A racial criterion and a parochial criterion. All others are second class citizens.

A true democracy cannot exist in a state based on such discrimination. Not in a "Christian state" where Jews, nonbelievers, Muslims and even non catholics would be second class citizens, even enemies to destroy, as the Crusaders did (by pogroms of Jews along their way to the holy land, where they would massacre the Muslims) or to organize Saint Bartholomews against the Protestants, or today where every Muslim immigrant is a potential terrorist.

Neither can there be "democracy" in a "Muslim state," where Christians cannot worship GOD in a church or Jews in a synagogue, and where their rights are not equal to those of all other members of the nation.

One Goal: Gag Abbé Pierre and Garaudy

Being unable to find in my book any trace of antisemitism, a negation or even a minimization of Hitler's crimes towards the Jews or any other opponent of the regime, my accusers had only one recourse: the question of justice at the Nuremberg Tribunal fell under the blow of the Gayssot Fabius Law.

After dooming me to public prosecution as a "negationist," they try to silence me by resorting to the police and to a gag law.

It is true that the court of one-track thought is subject to abrupt variations. On Sunday, April 28, 1996, the Grand Rabbi Sitruk, speaking on "Jewish Radio," thought it useful to "assemble historians to debate the Shoah." Abbé Pierre, hoping for a dialogue, was quickly disappointed. He said in "Liberation" of May 2, 1996: "The Grand Rabbi accepts what LICRA refuses." Monday, April 30, Rabbi Sitruk declared on Europe 1: "There can be no debate on the Holocaust" and that "historians have given definitive proofs." [Note 2: This led Max Clos, one of the rare journalists who, even in his criticism, managed to save the honor of his profession by commenting that "the notion of 'definitive proof' irrespective of the subject is offensive, for these were the practices of totalitarian regimes such as those of Hitler and Stalin."]

Then the cries of triumph rose to hound me: "Roger Garaudy is under investigation for contesting crimes against humanity" is a headline in "Le Monde" of April 27, 1996. The Zionized "L'Humanité" rejoices that Garaudy is charged under the Gayssot Law that punishes "questioning of crimes against humanity." Pierre Aidenbaum, the president of LICRA, set the tone in his press release of April 24, 1996: "Some can no longer hide their antisemitism under the cover of antizionism. In our country, this has been decided by the courts."

Yes, Mr. Aidenbaum, this has been decided by the courts and precisely to convict your "LICRA," which seeks to make believe that Zionism which is politics is identical with Judaism which is a religion. I recall only the sentence rendered by the High Tribunal of Paris on March 24, 1983 (upheld by the Appeals Court) in the lawsuit filed by LICRA against Father Lelong, Pastor Matthiot, Jacques Fauvet (Le Monde) and myself: "In view of the fact that this is lawful criticism of the politics of a state and of the ideology that inspires it, and not a racial provocation, the court dismisses the suit and orders LICRA to pay the legal costs."

What Nourishes Antisemitism is Not to Denounce its Crimes, but to Commit Them

My struggle against the Zionist politics of the State of Israel that feed antisemitism is an integral part of my unremitting struggle against antisemitism, which is a crime justifiably punished by law.

Zionism against Israel

The worst enemy of the prophetic Jewish faith is the nationalist, racist and colonialist logic of tribal Zionism, born of the nationalism, racism and colonialism of 19th century Europe. This logic, which inspired all the colonialisms of the West and all its wars of one nationalism against another, is a suicidal logic.

There is no future or security for Israel and no peace in the Middle East unless Israel becomes "dezionized" and returns to the faith of Abraham, which is the spiritual, fraternal and common heritage of the three revealed religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

This is why, after so much trash published in "Le Monde" by the Kouchners, the Vidal-Naquets and others, Bédarida or Weill, the record of infamy is held by Claude Imbert, who likened my book to the "Protocol of the Elders of Zion" in "Le Point" of May 4, 1996. While on p. 249, I analyze the mechanism of fabrication of this vile falsehood (which I refuted in detail in a preceding work, "Palestine, Terre des messages divins," Ed. Albatros, 1986, pp. 206-212).

For slanders of this type, I demand the "right to reply" from "Le Monde," "Liberation," "Parisien," "Journal du dimanche," "La Croix," "L'Humanité." They all refused me this right, recognized by law. This shows the power of the lobby. In fact, those who deny the "crimes against humanity" are precisely the newspapers, radio and television stations, almost the entire media, where nobody dared to designate, as "crime against humanity," the shelling of ambulances carrying wounded children, the deliberate bombardment of a UN camp resulting in over 100 civilian deaths, the

pounding of Beirut and all of the coastline by Israeli warplanes. To them, there is no "crime against humanity" when it does not affect Jews.

A crushing UN report shows that it was a deliberate criminal action, supervised and controlled by a helicopter. All of this is treated as a blunder of some air force captain, or some technical mistake, excusing the real villain, the government of Israel and its military command, as it acted in Sabra and Chatila, whose main culprit, Ariel Sharon (recognized as such by the Kahn Commission of Inquiry), was immediately appointed minister in charge of precisely the establishment of "colonies" in the occupied territories (despite UN condemnation and the violation of international law).

All of this shows the diversionary role of the lynching by the media of Abbé Pierre and of myself. The day of the shelling of Cana, the front page headline of the largest French newspaper announced the crime of Cana in the same character type as "the mistake of Abbé Pierre" and not the reality: "Shimon Peres' crime against humanity."

The day this criminal was received in Paris with great pomp, and when "Likud of France" welcomed in Paris another criminal, General Rafael Eytan (who knowingly let the massacre of Sabra and Chatila take place, and who is now #2 in Likud) with a hymn to the Messiah, the newspapers' headlines announced "Abbé Pierre is expelled from LICRA" for his support of Garaudy.

A Very Powerful Lobby in the United States

Such unanimity is a testimony to the existence and power of the lobby.

First, because it is an organ of the State of Israel. Its status appears in the Law of November 24, 1952 of the "World Zionist Organization." Articles 5 and 6 specify its attributes.

Article 5: "The State of Israel counts on the participation of all Jews in all Jewish organizations in building the State" (Israel Government Yearbook. Jerusalem, 1953-54, p. 243).

In the United States, this powerful lobby is officially credited in the Capitol. It is AIPAC (American Israeli Public Affairs Committee). Zionist leaders in the United States do not hide their role. In the 23rd Congress of the World Zionist Organization, Ben Gurion stated clearly: "The collective obligation of all Zionist organizations in all nations to help the Jewish State in all circumstances is unconditional, even if such an attitude is in conflict with their respective nations" (Jerusalem Post, August 17, 1952). (See my book, p. 206.)

An example of this power is when Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, summarized on CBS television on October 7, 1973 his investigation of the lobby, saying: "The Israelis control politics in Congress and in the Senate." He lost his senate seat in the following elections.

A Very Powerful Lobby in France

In France, this pressure is not lesser but is less blatant.

For example, while in Israel, the Grand Rabbi Sitruk declared to Shamir (who proposed an alliance with Hitler in 1941): "Every French Jew is a representative of Israel. Rest assured that every Jew in France is a defender of what you defend" (Le Monde, July 12, 1990). But upon his return to France, he added "without necessarily thinking of double allegiance" (Le Monde, July 13, 1990). That could be a mistake!

More recently, July 16, 1995, under the leadership of the same grand rabbi, Chirac declared: "The criminal madness of the occupant was assisted by the French people and the French government." This is a double denial of General de Gaulle's attitude.

General de Gaulle refused:

1. All legitimacy to the "puppets" of Vichy, which he never considered as a state: "I proclaimed the illegitimacy of a regime that existed at the discretion of the enemy." (Mémoires, I, p. 107). "There did not exist a properly constituted French government." (I, p. 388). "Hitler created Vichy." (I, p. 389.)

The leaders of CRIF (Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France) enthusiastically welcomed this denial. They expressed an "intense satisfaction to see the highest French authority recognize the continuity of the French State between 1940 and 1944." All the parties and all the press from "Le Monde" to "L'Humanité" fall in behind.

2. De Gaulle did not have such contempt for the French people: "The vast majority of the French people, far from accepting the regime imposed by violence and treason, considered the authority of Free France as the expression of its wishes and its will" (I, p. 394). And he added, as proof, the uprising of the people of Paris: "Four years of oppression did not crush the spirit of the capital. The treason was no more than vile scum on a body that remained healthy" (III, p. 442). "Our people never gave up, not even in the worst moments" (III, p. 194).

In the recent lynching of Abbé Pierre and of myself, the lobby power was asserted not only in the media, but even in the Church. We learned from "L'Humanité" (!) of April 30, 1996 that "Henri Hadjenberg, president of the Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France (CRIF), requested that the Church hierarchy in France take a position on the book of negationist Roger Garaudy and the support given to him by Abbé Pierre."

The Church bowed immediately. Hadjenberg pronounced his diktat on April 29. A text was published immediately by the Episcopate "deploring the engagement of Abbé Pierre on the side of Roger Garaudy."

Hadjenberg said that he was satisfied by the position of the Church of France that on Monday "marginalized Abbé Pierre." The same day, LICRA expelled Abbé Pierre because he "maintains his support for Roger Garaudy."

The Nuremberg Taboo: An Inverted Dreyfus Affair

What is this media racket?

In other words, what do I deny in what they call, in the jargon, "negationism"?

It is sufficient to read the book in order to see that I do not deny the crimes against humanity committed by Hitler -- due to his bloody racism -- against the Jews. He accused them of being the authors of the October Revolution (he coined the phrase, "Judeo-Bolshevism") and of being the masters of international capitalism. This is a criminal double demagogy: First to please the West as a rampart against communism, and second, for internal consumption, to appeal to the masses. His main trump card was the Treaty of Versailles of 1918, which bled Germany dry. The great English economist Lord Keynes stated in his book, "The Economic Consequences of Peace" (1922): "With this treaty, you will have war within 20 years!"

Here, too, the Nuremberg Tribunal's designation of "crimes against peace" did not indict those who facilitated the rise of Hitler, thus allowing the butcher of people to pass for a savior of his people.

What I deny is that the Nuremberg Tribunal set a legal precedent and served as a criterion of historic truth, while many scholarly revisions have shown how distorted its deliberations and procedures were. (See my book, pp. 91-150.)

My criticism of the "principles" of Nuremberg is based on:

a) The very definition of the Tribunal, given on July 26, 1946 by its Presiding Judge Robert Jackson, Attorney General of the United States: "The Allies are technically still in a state of war with Germany. As a military tribunal, this tribunal represents a continuation of the Allied nations' war efforts."

b) The emergency statutes of this Tribunal (put together in London on August 8, 1945 by American, English, French and Russian leaders) leave no doubt on their "exemplary legal value."

"Article 19: The tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules relating to the admission of evidence."

"Article 21: Documents and reports of allied governments shall be admitted as authentic evidence."

Thanks to the application of these "principles," or rather the absence of principles and deliberate violation of legal ethics, the Soviet prosecutor Rudenko, for example, forced the admission of the report that blamed the German army for the massacre at Katyn of 11,000 Polish officers, while it was proved that the perpetrators were the Soviet leaders.

Similarly, when the Soviets liberated the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp, they presented a report, accepted on their word, of 4 million dead. Since then, this number continues to be controversial, as we have seen.

I have shown in my book that the rules that govern courts were not applied at Nuremberg. Neither texts nor testimonies concerning "the final solution" were verified, and the crime weapons (exhaust from trucks, or "gas chambers") were never authenticated.

Making this taboo sacred evidently required a ban on all research, the suppression of all scholarship and the demonization of whoever dares to raise questions.

This is similar to the trial of Captain Dreyfus, where it was deemed blasphemous to question the ruling of an antisemitic military tribunal backed by a Church that demonized Jews by calling them a "deicidal people."

The symmetry is striking. Today, the lobby has taken over the military and religious headquarters, not only to lynch people (like Abbé Pierre and myself) who dare to break the new idols of one-track thought and the "politically correct," but to put under investigation entire peoples, the new "deicidal peoples," against the only "chosen people."

A "Litany of Hate"

Today, there is a resumption of themes launched by Theodor Kaufman in 1942: "Germans, whoever they are, do not deserve to live." He showed the means by which the German race will be totally eliminated in 60 years. He mistook a whole people for its criminal leaders ("Germany must perish"). His racist frenzy paralleled that of Hitler.

In 1942, Clifton Fadiman requested the weekly "New Yorker" to incite blazing hatred against all Germans and not only their Nazi leaders, when he said: "The actual Nazi aggression is not the work of a group of gangsters, but rather the final expression of the deepest instincts of the German people."

In 1996, a product of American Zionist education (like Ygal Amir, Rabin's assassin, or Baruch Goldstein, killer of Hebron), a certain Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, inspired by the same "litanies of hate," describes Germans as a "Nation of Killers" in his book, "Hitler's Willing Executioners."

A similar process in operation by Bernard-Henri Levy in his book, "L'Idéologie Française" (French Ideology). At the price of the worst historical distortions, he tries desperately to make all the French people under the Vichy regime the creators of a "French fascism." Vichy would be the product of all French culture. "French culture is a witness to our seniority in abjectness" (p. 61), and it makes France "the homeland of National-Socialism" (p. 125).

A Tribal Reading of the Bible

The Zionist feeling of superiority very much resembles the glorification of Aryan racial purity, which serves as a justification for any bloody domination policy.

In his book, "Le Talmud," (Ed. Payot, 1983), Rabbi A. Cohen is quite diligent in finding universalist elements in the Talmudic tradition. Early in the introduction (p.

19), he apologizes in advance for discriminatory passages: "A Jew needed a religion that not only distinguished him from pagans, but constantly reminded him that he is a member of the Jewish race."

He says that he found in Esdras what he calls "the fire frontier," "distinguishing and separating the Jew from all other people." This, he says, is the seed of the Talmud (p. 19).

We will not tackle here a discussion in theology, but we will only mention the political interpretation and the feeling of superiority that follows from a fundamentalist and literalist reading.

"One is more of a man when one is more Jewish" writes Rabbi Eisenberg, who runs the Sunday Jewish program on Channel 2 (Source: Rabbi Eisenberg "une Histoire des Juifs" (CAL, 1970).

This theme is taken up by Elie Wiesel, citing the Talmud in his book, "Celebration Talmudique" (Ed. du Seuil, 1990): "A Jew is closer to humanity than anybody else."

This tribal reading of sacred texts, be it by Israeli extremists, "Islamists" or Christian fundamentalists is a permanent source of conflicts. To track them down is our task, whose aim is unity among men and not division.

Israel has no future in the harmonious fraternity of peoples, unless it is "dezionized," that is, becomes faithful to the admirable Jewish faith of the Prophets, whose goal was not nationalist and colonialist military conquest, but illumination of the divine message on the whole earth.

I have no word to change in my book, which is in line with my human struggle during the past half century, changing my fraternal ties whenever my challenge was not accepted. But I never changed my aim: the defense of man, every man. For GOD dwells in everyone.

A Prophetic Reading: Abbé Pierre

This brotherly love for all mankind is precisely what unites me with Abbé Pierre all through this century despite the different paths that we have followed in order to try to accomplish our divine task for humanity. This brotherliness does not require any blinding of one to the other. When we had divergent views, from the Miners' Strike of 1948 until the Maastricht Treaty, we confronted our differences candidly, but always enriching ourselves with our mutual criticisms, as a brother should help his brother along the path of truth.

That is why the treacherous attacks waged against Abbé Pierre because he refused to disown me are a disgrace to those who do not know that dialogue can be filled with controversy and that love means to be in harmony with a truth that is human, hence relative and humble, but filled with divine faith.

How pitiful are those who spoke of "blind friendship" or insulted the Father by accusing him of being senile, or "manipulated" by his entourage, or "antisemitic."

At the beginning of this "Affair," when I met the Abbé, I said to him: "You know, Pierre, how much I admire your work for the excluded, especially the homeless. Millions of Palestinians have been driven out of their homes by Zionist terror and millions of Lebanese had to flee on the road during Israeli aggressions. Don't you think that their defense is an extension of your work for the homeless of France?"

The untiring prophet went to Gaza and asked forgiveness in the name of the West from Palestinians for the despoliation of their lands and homes (he was criticized by the "Jewish Tribune" and the Kouchners). He added that no Arab was responsible for the crimes of Hitler (a "Christian apostate," said Abbé Pierre). Responding to the infamous and untruthful lawsuit against me, he said that violence annuls the Promise. In denouncing the "suicidal policy" of Israeli leaders, he was speaking the language of the Jewish Prophets, from Amos to Micah, shouting: "Listen, leaders of the House of Israel, you are building Zion with the blood of Jerusalem and with crime. Because of you, Zion will be plowed like a field; it will become a pile of rubble." (Micah, III, 1-12.)

Abbé Pierre refused to call a conquered land a "Promised Land," whether conquered by the legendary sacred exterminations of Joshua in Jericho or Hebron, or the very real massacres of Begin and the Irgun in Deir Yassin in 1948, in Kafr Kassim in 1956, or in Lebanon, from Sharon in 1982 to Perez in 1996.

The pack of apostates of the grand universalist faith of the Prophets was set against Abbé Pierre: Jacques Attali, Schwarzenberg, Kouchner, and the "high priests," Sitruk and Kahn, who summoned him to appear, like Jesus, before the Sanhedrin, before the new Inquisition tribunal, charged by the thought police, "LICRA." He refused to recant and was expelled. This was his honor and the shame of the Pharisees.

It is not at all a matter of a religious quarrel, as the sophist, Jean Daniel, wrote in an editorial in "Le Nouvel Observateur" on "Religions Against Peace." On the contrary, Abbé Pierre and myself are against the use of religions for political ends. Jews, Christians and Muslims recognize the same "Father of believers," who was neither Jewish, nor Christian, nor Muslim but anterior to all of them, an "Aramean wanderer," who announced a Covenant of GOD with "all the families of the earth." And since we are all filled with the same GOD, Abbé Pierre, myself and all people who struggle for human unity resist the temptation to attempt to appropriate the divine promise, which is in all of us, thereby making it a tool of bloody nationalism and colonialism.

It is not true, as Jean Daniel claims, that it is religions that are against peace but rather the nationalist heresies, a striking example of which is Israeli leadership. It sanctifies a policy of despoliation, aggression and violation of international laws, according to the goal assigned by its spiritual leader, the atheist Herzl, who wrote in his book, "The Jewish State": "We will be an advanced bastion of Western civilization against the barbarism of the Orient."

Abrogate the Totalitarian Gayssot Law

Today, there is no other resource for the thought police than to press charges against us in the name of the Gayssot Law. This law has not only disgraced the "communist" party and the "socialist" party, but all the political parties that fought it when they

were in the opposition. They do not dare abrogate it now that they are in power, for fear of the lobby. During the debate of May 2, 1990, at the National Assembly (Official Record of May 3, 1990) when the "Gayssot Law" was passed, its stated objective was "to repress what is called 'revisionism'" (O.R., p. 912). "Revisionism must be sanctioned because it is a vehicle for antisemitism" (O.R., p. 956).

The hidden premise of the text is that there is no "crime against humanity" unless the crime is against Jews.

The meeting took place under heavy surveillance. A deputy remarks (O.R., p. 905): "We witnessed tonight an extraordinary stage production. During our debate, we rarely saw so many journalists and television cameras. They wanted to show that those who will vote 'against,' refuse to fight racism." (Then current Justice Minister) Toubon said, "It is not a law against racism, it is a manipulation" (O.R., p. 929) and he added, "The law they are going to enact is a media coup" (O.R., p. 936).

In Whose Interest?

Already in an article of July 5, 1983 in "Liberation," Luc Rozenzweig wrote, "'LICRA' enjoys an incredible privilege: the law of July 1, 1972 against racial discrimination, delegates to it the power to automatically decide who is antisemitic and who is not. It alone judges the appropriateness of proceedings, and within the framework of the law, reduces judges to the role of notary public in the register of infamy."

The "Gayssot Law" increases this power further. As Toubon said, "This proposition [Article 7, R.G.] was made by 'LICRA' during the work of the consultative commission on human rights" (O.R., p. 948).

Today, it is precisely Kahn, the grand master of "LICRA," who is the president of this commission!

Mssrs. Chirac, Juppé, Seguin, the current ministers of Justice and of Domestic Affairs (Toubon and Debré) and 265 deputies voted against the "Gayssot Law." One wonders what (or who) prevents them today from abrogating this law that they had so clearly denounced?

Francois Terre, the great French jurist, Philosophy of Law Professor at the Assas Faculty of the Institut, wrote: "The spirit of this law is totalitarian. It instituted negationism as a criminal offense. It is up to jurists to safeguard the fundamental freedoms undermined by the Gayssot Law: freedom of opinion and of expression. It is not in the courts that history finds its judges. Then, how can the implementation of the Gayssot Law be prevented when, prior to its promulgation, it could have been stopped by the Constitutional Council (the President of the Republic, the President of the National Assembly and of the Senate, 60 deputies, 60 senators) but which did not have the courage to do so?" The author proposes to submit it to the European Court in Strasbourg, to put an end to "the appalling character of a law that restores 'délit d'opinion' (i.e., defines questioning of official truth as a criminal offense)." ("Le Figaro" of May 16, 1996.)

It is sad to have to appeal to a foreign authority to remind France of what is a state of law.

In the same issue of the paper, a reader wrote about "the dangerous schizophrenia of a country where Salman Rushdie is a hero while Roger Garaudy is banned and Abbé Pierre is exposed to public contempt."

When Deputy Vodoz, President of "LICRA" in Switzerland, demands that a lawsuit be filed against me (in Switzerland!), Georges Andre Chevallaz, former President of the Helvetic Confederation, wrote: "As a historian, I am amazed by this spirit of McCarthyism and witch hunt every time the Holocaust is concerned" (Journal de Genève, of May 2, 1996).

In France, during the debate on June 21, 1991 of the Gayssot Law in the General Assembly, Deputy Toubon, then Justice Minister, proposed to reject it: "It is a very grave political and legal error. It is an artificial law that imposes historical truth instead of allowing truth to be determined by history. I am sure this law will never be applied" (O.R. of June 22, 1991, p. 3571).

Today, another deputy wrote about "the official truth that fossilizes history." Recalling that the law was enacted during the Affair of Carpentras Cemetery, He described the conditions at the time of the vote, in an article entitled, "A Harmful Law": "The parliamentarians were subjected to a kind of implicit blackmail: any deputy who did not vote for this law would have been suspected of negationism. At the time, influential groups created an unhealthy climate." He added, "It is a law that imposes an official truth. It is worthy of totalitarian regimes, not of a democracy" ("Le Figaro," of May 3, 1996).

If one remembers, as Max Clos wrote in his "Bloc Notes de la semaine," that "The Gayssot Law of July 13, 1990 makes a crime of 'negationism,' the questioning of Nazi crimes against Jews," one can guess which were the "influential groups" that exercised "implicit blackmail" on the parliamentarians and why today, they do not have the courage to abrogate it, as Professor Terre said. We now know who controls and remote controls Presidents of the Republic (current or former), the Assemblies, the Media, the Parties and the Churches, and how difficult it is, through slander or silence, to help millions of well-meaning French people to liberate themselves from this "brainwashing" that hides the role played by this lie in the world domination strategy of the United States and its mercenary guardian of Middle East oil, through a project of disintegration of all the countries in the region (where the Kivounim plan is only an outline).

But the Truth Bursts Against Darkness

Efforts to silence us will be in vain. For this, they must kill us. The surge of hate against our misquoted writings, a real call to murder, shows that some are thinking about it, as though only prison will gag DREYFUS. But this will be a new proof that they cannot find any argument against us. -- *Roger Garaudy*