

Exiles from History

by David McCalden

Preface

The exciting new field of Psychohistory has opened up vast new opportunities for those in search of enlightenment on the origins of contemporary social problems. *Exiles From History* examines the synchronicity of events and attitudes throughout the history of one particular social group: the Jews.

So far, the few studies in this area have been written by Jews themselves. [David McCalden](#), who is not Jewish, draws on these studies to show that many of them have been clouded by the subjectivity of their authors. He suggests that the phenomenon of "anti-Semitism" is not in fact something that is generated by non-Jews and directed against Jews, but is in reality a Jewish internal phenomenon based on Jewish self-hate, and then projected onto non-Jews in order to avoid facing up to it and therapeutically dealing with it. He argues that Jewish self-hate is the root of Jewish paranoia, which in turn leads to Jewish megalomania — always wanting to be in charge and in control for fear of what might otherwise happen ... On a global scale, this neurosis leads to profound injustice for innocent people such as the Palestinians, and if allowed to go unhealed, could well lead to a World War Three. With horrific weapons such as nuclear and neutron bombs now in the hands of dozens of nations, another World War could very well be the last war ever fought on the planet — because there no longer would be a planet.

In this profound and timely study, [David McCalden](#) sympathetically examines the Jewish neurosis down through the ages. He traces their obsession with "Holocausts" and "gas ovens" back to Biblical myths. He illustrates his thesis with in-depth psychological appraisals of three towering Jewish personalities who have left a significant mark on modern thought: [Karl Marx](#), [Leon Trotsky](#), and [Sigmund Freud](#). He goes on to epistemologically examine the movements these men have spawned: [Communism](#) and [Psychotherapy](#), and shows how these movements even today bear all the imprints of their originators' neuroses. In the last part of this study, David McCalden highlights modern Jewish behavior patterns which fit the mold of Jewish neurosis with an uncanny synchronicity, with chapters on: [Sex](#), [Power](#), and [Holocausts](#).

In his [final summary](#), he provides a possible explanation for Jewish psychological dysfunctions, and suggests a series of "models" whereby one can recognize the various manifestations of the Jewish neurosis. He suggests a solution; a solution which not only will head off a reaction of real anti-Semitism, but which could very well head off World War Three.

The author recognizes that this work will undoubtedly be greeted with charges of "anti-Semitism" by Jews, and suggests that such reactions merely underline his thesis, rather than devalue it.

Introduction

There are many who will dismiss this book as "anti-Semitic;" some without even reading it. Others have already pointed out that the term "anti-Semitic" is a misnomer, since the Arabs are Semites and the Ashkenazi Jews are not. But leaving aside this etymological point, I would reply to such critics that most of my sources and references are Jewish. The commentary laced in between the quotations is totally my own, and I do not have an anti-Semitic bone in my body. In any case, why is that nowadays one can usually proffer criticism of any social group — Protestants, Catholics, Poles, Mexicans, even Blacks — except for the Jewish group? To describe or even to criticize any group's behavior patterns is not the same as wishing to destroy that group. For anyone to immediately jump to that conclusion — particularly if they are a member of that group themselves — suggests that there is indeed a profound psycho-social and psycho-historical phenomenon in play. A social and psychological phenomenon which causes people to react in such a bizarre, paranoid manner is sorely in need of rigorous examination. Such reactions in fact become a part of the study.

Then there are others who will dismiss this study as the product of an unqualified author. My reply must be that if the "qualified" academics fail in their duty to examine all areas of society and history, then it is up to laymen to do it instead. When Historians failed to apply to other historical events, then amateurs and academics from other disciplines had to step in. Research must not be allowed to fail by default. Our horizons of knowledge must be forever widened. The history of progress tells us that advances are often made by dissenters — very often amateur dissenters. In Medieval times, dissenters in astronomy were persecuted. In Victorian Britain, Charles Darwin was laughed at. It is sad but true that academics often behave like priests. Theory is only "qualified" if it has been approved, blessed and ordained by the High Priests of Knowledge, the academics. And any theory which deviates from the priests' dogma is shunned, regardless of its content or value. Particularly in the field known as "the humanities" there is also a tendency for the academics to turn inward, and develop an exclusive jargon, and a mystique with which to baffle and therefore impress outsiders. Once in a while one of the "club members" will rebel against the authority of the group, and will publicly condemn the operation of this "in crowd" syndrome, and all the intellectual constipation that goes with it. But, often as not, one dogma will simply be

replaced by another, just as Martin Luther rebelled against the dogma of the Catholic church, only to replace it with another kind of dogma.

Sometimes history throws up egotistical, eccentric individualists who delight in bursting the dogmatists' overinflated sense of their own self-importance. The "muck-raker" Henry L. Mencken was certainly one. So too is today's Tom Wolfe, who takes literary swipes at artists, politicians, philanthropists and architects, with one biting satire after another. The iconoclastic scholar Harry Elmer Barnes was qualified in many areas, but he also put forward radical theories in peripheral subjects, and it is largely thanks to Barnes' inspiration that the Revisionist movement of history is so much in the news today. The Psychohistory movement today is part academic and part lay. The editor of *The Journal of Psychohistory* is a layman, but most of his contributors are academics in the field of psychology. Speakers at Psychohistory conventions come from all walks of life. My introduction to the field came while I was working as Director of the Institute for Historical Review at Torrance, near Los Angeles. Although I had initially been recruited as an Editor for The Noontide Press — a conservative book publishing house — I suggested to the proprietors that a Revisionist history institute would be a most timely venture. The suggestion was taken up with great enthusiasm and I was to be Director of the IHR from its inception in late 1978 until my departure at the end of April 1981. A supporter first drew my attention to the Institute for Psychohistory, and its publications. I was immediately fascinated by its work; my only previous encounter with the term was in Isaac Asimov's science fiction *Foundation* trilogy. I developed an exchange of publications and correspondence with the IFP Director, Lloyd de Mause and one of their prominent contributors, Dr. Howard F. Stein, who is a professor at the University of Oklahoma. I was greatly impressed with the sincerity, intellectual integrity and intelligence of these two men. I was particularly struck by the intellectual and physical courage it took for the Fall 1978 issue of *The Journal of Psychohistory* to be themed on the explosive topic "Judaism as a Group Fantasy". A brilliant article therein by Dr. Stein inspired me to invite him to contribute a similar piece to *The Journal of Historical Review*, and this was duly published in the Winter 1980 issue. I have made extensive use of both Stein's articles in this book, and indeed the title *Exiles From History* is a Stein creation, as will be seen.

Around the same time, I developed a relationship with a young woman who was completing her BA at the University of California at Los Angeles. She and I lived together for six months, and at one time were engaged to be married. She studied Psychohistory under Professor Peter Loewenberg, and I therefore took considerable interest in her reports of the classes. I was disturbed that Dr. Loewenberg had condemned *The Journal of Psychohistory* in class, on the grounds that it was run by "laymen." (He much preferred the "academic" *Psychohistory Review*.) Loewenberg apparently felt that just because a journal called itself that, and appeared academic, didn't necessarily prove that it was. Why, there was even a "journal" of historical review which claimed the Holocaust had never happened! Anyone could start up a journal and call it whatever they liked!

I was also somewhat shocked by Loewenberg's reaction when my friend, during a discussion, brought up the subject of the revisionist authors like Dr. Arthur Butz. Loewenberg dismissed the Butz book as "cross-quoting from other (revisionist) authors." He claimed to have read the book and was supposed to be fully conversant with its thesis. It was obvious that Loewenberg had not read the book at all, otherwise he would not have made such unfounded claims. But her remarks must have made some impact on Dr. Loewenberg, for next day at the IHR offices, we received a book order for the Butz book from Dr. Loewenberg!

I determined to learn more about an academic who would blatantly deceive his students like this, so I attended a lecture with my friend at the Psychoanalytic Institute in west Los Angeles, where Loewenberg was hosting a semi-public lecture one night. The speaker's subject was the Holocaust, but Loewenberg's introduction turned out to be far more interesting than his guest. He claimed that we could detect all kinds of Freudian neuroses among the Nazis, for example their fixation on excrement. Why else would they have "literally" turned millions of Jews into excrement? The audience of students and psychoanalysts didn't even bat an eyelid; I might have been the only person in the room to ponder on what kind of academic mentality could fantasize human beings turned into excrement — for such a thing is not scientifically or pathologically possible. I gained a greater insight a few minutes later, when Loewenberg took a kind of "commercial break" to say that of course, all the horrors of the Holocaust only serve to underline the continuing need for a secure state of Israel as a refuge for the Jews. All in all, my "unacademic" study of Dr. Loewenberg's academic ethics and behavior was most interesting.

But there was better yet. A few months later I travelled around the United States to visit all the various professors and contributors to the *JHR*. I talked with Lloyd de Mause in New York, and stayed with Dr. Stein and his wife in Oklahoma City. I was stunned to learn that Dr. Loewenberg had originally been on the Editorial Advisory Committee of the *Journal of Psychohistory*. Then, when they had announced that the theme of their forthcoming special issue was going to be "Judaism as a Group Fantasy", Loewenberg immediately resigned. He couldn't even wait to see the articles in question.

I was fascinated and at the same time disturbed by the phenomenon of a highly-qualified professor, with doctorates both in history and in psychiatry, who could blatantly lie to his students; who could pretend that he had read certain books when he had not; who could condemn journals without mentioning his previous endorsement; who could use his academic privilege to peddle partisan political positions; and who could suffer from neurotic anal nightmares. In a way, this book should be dedicated to him, for it was the "clinical" Loewenberg case which first motivated me to seek an explanation for such behavior patterns. But as we shall see, the denial of reality, the seeking of refuge from facts, is a phenomenon to be found throughout Jewish life and Jewish history.

This is not just an intellectual exercise. It is a field of research that might very well have consequences for the future of the World. As I write, on Thanksgiving 1981, the sabers are being rattled around the globe for World War Three. Sensible folk in Europe and

other places are protesting against this possibility. But this time around, unlike in the Viet Nam days, American Jews are on the side of the war-mongers. And just as Gentile supporters of the Viet Nam war were vilified and ridiculed, today those Gentiles who support peace are being attacked. According to today's *Los Angeles Times* (26 November 1981) the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Richard N. Perle, believes that "the European anti-war movement (is) the product of Protestant angst ...

"Perle, who is Jewish, drew a distinction between 'Protestant Northern Europe' which has been the scene of massive demonstrations against the new NATO deployment, and the 'Catholic South' where, he said, support for the new weapons is solid. The difference, he said, is that Protestants are suffering from angst — a gloomy, often neurotic, feeling of anxiety or depression ...

"'There's no question it's angst,' Perle said. 'It's a sense of fear and anxiety — troubled people, troubled governments, troubled coalitions. And it's happened before and will happen again, and I think it's a phase that they will go through, and we will have to go through it, holding their hand.'"

As we shall see throughout this study, there is no people on the face of the earth more tormented by fear than the Jewish people. One of the symptoms of this phenomenon appears to be the projection of it onto others. Another symptom is the striking of an arrogant, patronizing attitude — such as treating non-Jews as little children who need to be "held by the hand". The third most prevalent symptom (not evident in the above example, however) is a fixation on anal and sexual dysfunctions and torments.

My thesis focuses on three towering Jewish personalities: [Karl Marx](#), [Leon Trotsky](#), and [Sigmund Freud](#). In my opinion, these three men have influenced the modern world in a significant and unique fashion. Their imprint is on a host of different aspects of society. My argument is that we can trace their behavior back to their psychology. I examine the modern manifestations of the movements they founded.

I also examine three areas where Jews have a unique attitude — [sexuality](#), [power](#), and destruction (the last commonly known as "[Holocausts](#)"). I will argue that here too we can find significant evidence to suggest that Jews suffer from a tremendous sense of fear, together with very low self-esteem.

At the [conclusion](#), I will offer a solution; or at least some hope that the Jewish Exile from History will not end with the ultimate nuclear Holocaust for all of us. Jewish genius has already given us nuclear energy (Einstein), the atom bomb (Oppenheimer), the hydrogen bomb (Teller) and now the neutron bomb (Cohen). Let us hope that Jewish neurosis does not bring about the use of these horrific weapons. (The nuclear work that was accomplished in the US was founded upon information mainly pilfered from the Germans during the 1930s and brought to the US by "survivors" of the yet future "Holocaust". It was the "peace" loving Einstein who favored showering Germany with billions of "love" neutrons and gamma rays. The anticipated nuclear destruction of Germany was indeed a Jewish operation funded by the American taxpayers. See David Irving's *The German Atomic Bomb*, publ. 1967)

Karl Marx (Part A)

Karl Marx was born on 5 May 1818 in the Rhineland city of Trier. His grandfather was a Rabbi Marc Levy, who had gradually dropped the Levy, and changed the Marc to Marx. Shortly after Karl's birth, his father too changed his name, from Heshel Marx to Heinrich Marx. He also adopted the Lutheran religion, into which the boy Karl was baptized. Karl's father was an attorney, who later branched into a career as an entrepreneur, chiefly as a moneylender. He defended the predominance of Jews in the financial business "because they had been barred from more socially useful occupations". As on his paternal side, Marx's mother was descended from a long line of rabbis. She clung to the family's traditional faith much longer than her husband. She was to make a profound impression on her son Karl, who was the first son to survive through childhood. Many of her characteristics appear to be those of a possessive, manipulative, stereotypical Jewish mother.

Karl developed a love-hate relationship toward his mother, and many Jewish commentators have sought to explain Karl Marx's gross anti-Semitic statements as a rebellion against his mother's manipulation. For example:

"To begin with, Marx was a man who, unlike other Jewish sons, hated his mother. In his innermost roots, he had none of the reassurances of maternal love ...

"The Promethean complex, we perceive, is basically different from the kind associated with Napoleonic ambition. A Napoleon could venture forth fortified by his mother's love, with supreme self-confidence, Marx, choosing Promethean revolt as his life's plan — a perpetual struggle against the gods — was always to re-enact a search for self confidence, always seeking recognition as a god, always anticipating rejection. His world was always to be one of struggle because he was never secure in love ...

"Marx's hatred for Judaism — otherwise inexplicable — was the outcome of an animosity toward all that his mother signified for him. His youthful essay *On The Jewish Question* (1843) was the confused argument of a man who hates his Jewish heritage so much that he cannot bring himself to say plainly that he supports political and civil rights for the Jews— Lewis S. Feuer: "Karl Marx and the Promethean Complex," *Encounter*, December 1968.

Although somewhat sophistic and casuistic (Marx also expressed equally vitriolic comments about Christians, Negroes, Slavs, rivals and all) there is more than a grain of truth in this argument.

Karl was almost certainly his mother's favorite. She called him her "child of fortune". Her letters to him were addressed to "greatly beloved dear Carl" or to "dear darling Karl" and were signed "your eternally loving Mother". In return, he referred to her as his "Angel Mother". Her possessiveness over Karl extended right through to his death in 1863, when Marx was middle-aged. When he was a university student she would write him to remind him to "have a weekly scrub with soap and water" (a piece of advice which,

judging by the published comments of his associates, he failed to heed throughout his life). His drunken rowdiness was a source of maternal complaint from his university days through some two decades later.

Upon his father's death when Karl was 23, his mother argued that Karl should take up remunerative work and fend for the family he now headed. Karl reacted with indignation, suggesting in correspondence that his mother's continued tenure on life was standing between him and the family fortune. His mother compounded her son's envy by steadily expanding her investments, even though she was poorly educated and could write only fractured German.

Karl's correspondence with his mother increasingly became mere begging letters, and his letters to friends became callous speculations about how much longer she would live. When Engels' lover Mary Burns died suddenly in 1863, Marx expressed regret that it had been Mary who had died and not his mother. However, Marx's mother was not long in fulfilling his wishes, and on 2 December 1863 she passed away, leaving Marx with a more than proportionate part of her estate. However, Marx had already borrowed enormous amounts of money from his banker uncle, and thus most of his windfall went toward paying off that loan. The rest was soon squandered.

Marx then turned his attention to his patron, the Anglo-German textile magnate, Friedrich Engels. In almost every one of his letters to Engels, he begs for handouts. In one letter, written from London, Marx complains that he is so hard up he has been obliged to pawn the maid's shoes in order to pay for his daughter's private education. It is of course ironic that Marx, the arch-opponent of Capitalism, would rely on the profits of sweat and child labor in the Manchester cotton mills for his living.

Most of what we know about Marx's personal, as opposed to published, views can be gleaned from the Marx-Engels correspondence. However, one has to be careful in dealing with published editions of this correspondence. A German socialist edition, edited by Bebel and Bernstein, and published in Berlin in 1927-32, tones down many of Marx's slurs. Editions published in Moscow and in post-war East Germany also should be handled with care.

To trace the origins of Marx's ideology, we must go to the early part of his career, just after he gained his mail-order doctorate from Jena university. Marx drifted to Cologne, the most liberal and richest city in the Rhineland. Here he met Moses Hess, a 30 year old Jewish socialist, Zionist and mystic. Like Marx, Hess was descended from a long line of Talmudic rabbis. He had been raised by his rabbi grandfather, and thus was thoroughly steeped in Talmudic traditions. Hess believed that Communism could best be brought about by the promotion of Zionism and Hassidism (Orthodox Judaism). Hess is still recognized today as being one of the founding fathers of Zionist thought, for in 1954 his remains were disinterred from their European burial place and shipped to Israel, where they were reburied alongside the ancient Kabbalistic rabbi Simon Ben Yohai (see *Jewish Voice* 29 October 1954). Yohai's best-known contribution to Zionist theology was his scholarly slogan: "Tob shebe - goyyim harog" — "The best of the

Goyim deserve to be killed". The modern-day Israelis obviously thought that Hess would feel at home in such distinguished company. After all, Hess's Communism has been responsible for the deaths of millions of the best "Goys" right up until the present day! Hess negotiated with some of his wealthy Jewish business friends in Cologne for Marx to be given an editorial job on the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* newspaper, which was just starting up in 1842. During this period, Marx editorially attacked just about every ideology: Christianity, despotism and once or twice, Communism. But the newspaper was to be short-lived, for the Prussian censorship board closed it down.

Marx worked with Hess in writing *Die Deutsche Ideologie* (1845), and it is possible he may have inspired Hess's most famous book *Rom und Jerusalem*. This corner-stone of Zionist thought was not published in English until 1945, by the Jewish publishing specialists Bloch & Co. of New York City. This book is a hymn of praise to the Jewish people, and predicts how the future world will be ruled by the Jews from Palestine, which of course is strategically located "between Europe and far Asia ... the roads that lead to India and China ... the World will once again pay homage to the oldest of peoples." (pp 139-140)

When he was not formulating the founding principles of Communism for his protege Marx, and the theological underpinnings for Zionism (to be picked up later by the journalist Theodore Herzl), Hess also found time to indulge in his mystical interests. He was a great admirer of the supposedly supernatural powers of the Kabbalistic Hassidic Jews, from which origins he himself had sprung. Hess effectively translated the abstract messianic notions of Hassidism from the ancient Talmudic books of magick, into his own practical formula of political Communism, which in turn became a battering-ram for Zionism.

After more flitting around the European continent, Marx and his family eventually settled in London. Here he lived in Soho — at that time something of a bohemian quarter; today it is London's red light district. Despite his shortcomings in the English language, he was appointed London correspondent of the *New York Daily Tribune*, the largest and most influential newspaper in America. His friend Engels translated Marx's writings from German into English, and also wrote about a third of the articles himself. Later, Engels would also write much of "Marx's" weighty *Das Kapital*, which Marx spent many years researching in the dusty library of the British Museum.

It was during this period that Marx exhibited one of the most extraordinary phenomena of psychohistory: a gross, neurotic anti-Semitism. Of course, anti-Semitism was nothing new to Marx. While still in Germany he had penned a short essay "On the Jewish Question". This had contained such niceties as:

"What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly cult of the Jews? Haggling. What is his worldly god? Money! ... What is contained abstractly in the Jewish religion — contempt for theory, for art, for history, for man as an end in himself ... "

Nor was his contempt limited to generalities. Every other Jew who crossed Marx's path was subjected to anti-Semitic ridicule, usually of the most puerile kind, dealing with physical features and so on. One of the principal victims of Marx's slurs was Ferdinand Lassalle, a rival German-Jewish socialist with whom Marx worked from time to time. In a letter to Engels dated 30 July 1862, Marx wrote that "the Jewish Nigger, Lassalle" was fortunately leaving London that weekend to return to Germany, adding:

"It is now absolutely clear to me that, as both the shape of his head and his hair texture shows — he descends from the Negroes who joined Moses' flight from Egypt (unless his mother or grandmother on the paternal side hybridized with a Nigger). Now this combination of Germanness and Jewishness with a primary Negro substance necessarily creates a strange product. The pushiness of this fellow is also Niggerish." After a run-in with Fleet Street's *Daily Telegraph*, Marx launched into a diatribe against Moses Joseph Levy, the newspaper's editor. In a bizarre attack on Levy, Marx wrote that "the great art of Levy's nose consists in the fact that it caresses foul odors, and that it can sniff them out over a hundred miles and attract them ... an elephant's trunk, an antenna, a lighthouse, a telegraph."

Marx then continued his attack with the even more curious insinuation that a man named Moses Joseph Levy was trying to conceal his Jewish origin. Marx argued that Levy was not a Jewish name, and therefore the editor had changed his real Jewish name to Levy to pretend that he was not Jewish! This incident would appear to be a straight case of projection, for Marx's true family name was of course Levy, and his family's adoption of token Christianity was purely for business, rather than theological reasons.

Many of Marx's contributions to the *Tribune* were anti-Semitic in nature. Just by way of example, his feature published on 4 January 1856 read as follows:

"Take Amsterdam, for instance, a city harboring many of the worst descendants of the Jews whom Ferdinand and Isabella drove out of Spain and who, after lingering a while in Portugal, were driven out of there too and eventually found a place of retreat in Holland ... Here and there and everywhere that a little capital courts investment, there is ever one of these little Jews ready to make a little suggestion or place a little bit of loan. The smartest highwayman in the Abruzzi is not better posted about the locale of the hard cash in a traveller's valise or pocket than these little Jews about any loose capital in the hands of a trader ...

"Thus we find every tyrant backed by a Jew, as is every Pope by a Jesuit. In truth, the cravings of oppressors would be hopeless, and the practicability of war out of the question, if there were not an army of Jesuits to smother thought and a handful of Jews to ransack pockets ... The fact that 1,855 years ago Christ drove the Jewish money-changers out of the temple, and that the money changers of our age, enlisted on the side of tyranny, again happen to be Jews is perhaps no more than a historic coincidence."

Marx himself was extremely sensitive about his own Jewish origins. He married a Gentile woman, Jenny von Westphalen, a beautiful aristocratic Prussian who had fallen under Marx's spell in their hometown of Trier. Marx himself was typically Jewish in appearance. According to Karl Peter Heinzen who worked with Marx in the 1840s, Marx had "wildly dishevelled, coal-black hair, and his complexion was dirty yellow. Whether the dirty complexion was as nature made it, or whether the dirt came from outside, can no more be decided than whether his shirt and his clothes were originally made in a dirty color or merely acquired dirt." — Robert Payne: *The Unknown Karl Marx* (pp 154-5).

On one occasion when Marx's son-in-law Charles Longuet wrote a flattering article about Marx in a Paris newspaper, he inadvertently outraged his subject by referring to his Jewish origins. Marx flew into a rage and demanded that the unfortunate Longuet never mention his name again in his writings.

Marx's second daughter Laura married a Paul Lafargue in 1845. Marx had done everything possible to prevent the marriage, totally on account of Lafargue's small portion of Negro blood. But when Lafargue's wealthy parents promised a groom's dowry of 100,000 francs, Marx's attitude reversed. However, when the gift did not materialize, Marx reverted to racist slurs against his daughter's husband. Marx remarked that one of his daughters was doing her bit in solving the color question by marrying "a nigger". He often referred to Lafargue as "the little Negro" or as "the Gorilla". When Laura bore a second child in 1870, Jenny Marx wrote Engels that she hoped her daughter would practice reproductive restraint and not produce "ten little nigger boys". When Lafargue decided to run in the municipal Paris elections, Engels too remarked that this was appropriate since the district contained the Paris Zoo, and "a nigger is a degree nearer to the animal kingdom than the rest of us".

In fact, Karl Marx was as racist as any Ku Klux Klansman. He believed that slavery was essential to American progress. He supported the idea of a Greater German Empire extending over the "*lumpengesindie*" (rabble) to the east. Many examples of this attitude are quoted in Nathaniel Weyl's stunning book *Karl Marx: Racist*, Arlington House, 1979. Weyl reveals that little of Marx's economic theorizing was his own. Even his most famous slogan in *The Communist Manifesto* "Workers of the World unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains and a World to gain!" was lifted verbatim from a German revolutionary, Karl Schapper. The "Marxian" idea that society can be divided into two classes was as old as the hills. It had been propounded by Helvetius, by Marat, by Baboeuf and many others. The term "class struggle" had been in use in Britain as early as 1844 in the agitational writings of Chartist leader, Fergus O'Connor. The idea that "the working man has no country" was put forward long before Marx by the English novelist, Edward Bulwer-Lytton, in 1833. His notion of thesis plus antithesis bringing about synthesis was originally put forward by Hegel.

In 1867 the first volume of *Das Kapital* was published in German. Marx had offered to dedicate it to Charles Darwin, but was politely declined. (Marx had earlier described Darwin's book *The Origin of the Species* as being "developed in the coarse English

manner".) The first volume did not appear in English until 1887, translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, the latter being the common-law husband of Marx's youngest daughter Eleanor. The second volume of the work was issued by Engels in 1885 after the death of Marx. The third volume appeared in 1894, and the final portion did not see the light of day until 1905-1910, under the editorship of Karl Kautsky (Jew).

Karl Marx (Part B)

The Russian Anarchist Michael Bakunin was originally taken in by Marx's rhetoric. In 1868 he began to translate *Das Kapital* into Russian, but he abandoned the project when he began to realize the true nature of Marxist theory, and the man behind it. He wrote:

"We met fairly often, because I very much admired him for his knowledge and for his passionate and earnest devotion to the cause of the proletariat, although it always had in it an admixture of personal vanity; and I eagerly sought his conversation, which was witty so long as it was not inspired by petty spite — which unfortunately happened very often. But there was never any real intimacy between us. Our temperaments did not allow it. He called me a sentimental idealist; and he was right. I called him morose, vain and treacherous; and I too was right. " — E. H. Carr: *Michael Bakunin*, (p 129).

The friendship did not last long. When Bakunin began to emerge as an ideological rival to Marx, the latter resorted to every dirty trick in the book to discredit him. In 1848 he published some tittle-tattle in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* that it was rumored that Bakunin was a Tsarist spy. This totally mendacious smear was afterwards withdrawn. Later, when the two actually did contend for the leadership of the First International, Marx referred to Bakunin's "Russian cunning" and described all his followers as "Cossacks." According to Nathaniel Weyl:

"Marx won the battle for control of the International, primarily because he had rich friends who paid the travel expenses of the delegates he needed to give him a majority. Bakunin lacked such connections."

Bakunin was quick to realize that there was more to this "Marxism" than met the eye. In Max Nomad's *Apostles of Revolution* he is quoted as saying:

"That minority, the Marxists say, will consist of workers. Yes, perhaps of *former* workers. And these, as soon as they become rulers or representatives of the people, will cease to be workers and will look upon the entire world of manual workers from the heights of the State. They will no longer represent the people, but themselves and their own pretensions to rule the people. Whoever has any doubt about that does not know human nature."

Later, Bakunin would become even more embittered, and even more insightful:

"Marx is a Jew and is surrounded by a crowd of little, more or less intelligent, scheming, agile, speculating Jews, just as Jews are everywhere — commercial and banking agents, writers, politicians, correspondents for newspapers of all shades; in short, literary brokers, just as they are financial brokers, with one foot in the bank and the other in the socialist movement, and their arses sitting upon the German press. They have grabbed hold of all newspapers, and you can imagine what a nauseating literature is the outcome of it.

"Now this entire Jewish world, which constitutes an exploiting sect, a people of leeches, a voracious parasite, closely and intimately connected with another, regardless not only of frontiers but of political differences as well — this Jewish world is today largely at the disposal of Marx or Rothschild. I am sure that, on the one hand, the Rothschilds appreciate the merits of Marx, and that on the other hand, Marx feels an instinctive inclination and a great respect for the Rothschilds. This may seem strange. What could there be in common between communism and high finance? Ho ho! The communism of Marx seeks a strong state centralization, and where this exists, there the parasitic Jewish nation — which speculates upon the labor of people — will always find the means for its existence ...

"In reality, this would be for the proletariat a barrack-regime, under which the workingmen and the workingwomen, converted into a uniform mass, would rise, fall asleep, work, and live at the beat of the drum. The privilege of ruling would be in the hands of the skilled and the learned, with a wide scope left for profitable crooked deals carried on by the Jews, who would be attracted by the enormous extension of the international speculations of the national banks ..." — Michael Bakunin: *Polemique contre les Juifs*, 1872.

Bakunin must have had a crystal ball, for his native homeland became the first to fall victim to this enormous and cruel confidence trick. Incited by the Jewish Bolsheviks, the Russian people rose up against the ruling class, only to find that the Tsars would be replaced by the Bolsheviks, and the country turned into a financial strip-mine for western Jewish capitalists from Olaf Aschberg and Jacob Schiff who financed the Bolshevik takeover, to Armand Hammer, who makes vast profits from exclusive trade deals with the supposedly "anti-Semitic" commissars today.

Unlike Marx, who had studiously avoided physical involvement in revolution on the streets, Bakunin had manned the barricades in the 1848 rebellion in Dresden and the 1870 rebellion in Lyons. For his troubles in Dresden, he was to spend many years in the Peter and Paul prison in St. Petersburg from which he emerged prematurely aged and toothless. In 1873, Bakunin wrote of Marx in *State and Anarchy*:

"In origin, Herr Marx is a Hebrew. He unites in himself, one may say, all the characteristics and shortcomings of this gifted tribe. Nervous, as they say, to the point of cowardice, he is extraordinarily ambitious and vain, quarrelsome, intolerant and absolutist like Jehovah, the Lord God of his ancestors, who is like Marx himself, vengeful to the point of madness. There is no lie or calumny that he is not capable of

inventing against anyone who has had the misfortune of arousing his jealousy, or — which is the same thing — his hatred."

Bakunin was not the only one to attribute Marx's character to his ancestry. While Editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Marx had chosen as his Vienna correspondent a notorious Germanophile and anti-Semite, Eduard von Muller-Telling. After the relationship soured (did Telling discover his Editor's ethnic origins?) the Austrian authored the very first pamphlet to attack Marx. He called Marx "cowardly ... garlic-smelling ... arrogantly Jesuitical ... a Chief Rabbi." For the first time in his life, Marx was speechless for a response.

An insight into Marx's psychology may be garnered by examining his attitudes towards bodily functions. According to Weyl "his favorite expression in his correspondence with Engels is shit". In his attack on the Jewish editor of the *Daily Telegraph* Marx wrote that just as "all the lavatories of London spew their physical filth into the Thames" so too did all the "social filth" pour into the "central sewer called the *Daily Telegraph*." He suggested that, as Levy was the presiding alchemist of this sewer system, he should have a plaque on his office building inscribed "Wayfarer, stop and piss". In attacks on everyone, Marx would call them "that shit". Even when he was tired of writing his own books, he would describe his work as "this shit". When an infant daughter died, Marx wrote Engels that "this time the whole shit has affected me deeply". After his death, Marx's youngest daughter made a diligent effort to piece together scraps of information about her late father's childhood in Trier. Although she "idolized her father and made up the most beautiful legends" there is a ring of truth to this vignette of his childhood:

"I have heard my aunts say that as little boy, he was a terrible tyrant to his sisters whom he would 'drive' down the Markusberg in Trier at full speed. And worse, he would insist on their eating the 'cakes' he made with dirty dough and dirtier hands. But they stood the 'driving' and the 'cakes' without a murmur for the sake of the stories Karl would tell them as a reward for their virtue."

Two familiar Marxian characteristics emerge from this story. First, Marx's passionate need to dominate others; and second, his almost obsessional preoccupation with dirt and excrement, or as he would put it in his correspondence with Engels, crap ("*Dreck*") and shit ("*Scheiss*").

Marx also exhibited many of the personality characteristics described by Eric Fromm in *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (1973) as "necrophilous". Although Fromm focussed on the German National Socialist leaders Adolf Hitler and Heinrich Himmler, he might well have found a better candidate for this particular dysfunction in Karl Marx. In Marx's early, feeble attempts at poetry, his world is one devoid of joy, happiness, or sunshine. When nature appears to Marx it is a hostile and destructive force grim, menacing and implacable. The following lines are typical of his approach:

Marble pillar towers high,
Jagged summit saves the air.

Putrefaction, life's decay,
Moulders in the abyss down there.
Grim the cliff that upward climbs,
Clamps the ground with iron limbs.
— Karl Marx: *Collected Works*

Further lines from the same collection include: "Waves are murderers every one; they gnaw his ancient skeleton" ... "The Mannikin plucks out his eyes, digs himself a hole deep down; Digs his own grave and lies, buried, buried underground."
Inspired by his own self-praise, Marx then set out to write — but never finished — a tragedy play called *Oulanem*. The characters — mostly projections of Marx's own personality — seethe with hatred against the world; and vow for its destruction. Several characters appear to be also synonymous with the Devil. Perhaps Marx sometimes thought of himself as Satan. He would often sign his letters "old Nick" (a Victorian form of slang for Satan), and would tell his children endless ghost stories which bordered on the horrific.

Marx's legitimate children (three out of six survived infancy) were soon exhibiting the same neurotic symptoms as their father. Marx doted on the three girls, and they on him; maintaining a cool distance from their mother. In many ways their relationship was potentially incestuous. But in any case it was certainly kronist. Kronism, named after the Greek god Cronus, is used to describe those animals which devour their own young. Although certain historical tribes — particularly the Biblical Hebrews (see Judges in the *Holy Bible*) and the Carthaginians — sacrificed their first-born, in this case we mean that the children were psychologically devoured by their parent.

Marx's favorite among the girls was Jenny, the eldest, who was born in Paris in 1844. She was the image of her father, and she emulated his career almost to every detail. As a school-girl she attempted to write poetry in five languages. She was prone to fantasies. She helped her father with his political agitation. But soon, she would suffer from a long series of psychosomatic ailments, including asthma, chronic coughing and insomnia. Her marriage to the Socialist Charles Longuet was a disaster, lurching from one crisis to the next. However, they still managed to produce six children. Longuet deliberately tried to act as a father-substitute to Jenny, but when this failed he was overcome with guilt. Eventually Jenny died at the age of 39, after suffering cancer of the bladder.

The Marxes' second daughter Laura was born in Brussels in 1845. Also committed to her father's ideals, Laura helped out in translating both her father's and Engels' writings into various languages. She fell in love with the French-Creole Paul Lafargue, and despite her parents' racist epithets, married him. All of their three children died in infancy. Lafargue drifted from his medical profession into Socialist politics. But one day in November 1911 they committed suicide together, and were found stone dead sitting side by side in their Paris home.

The youngest daughter Eleanor was born in 1855. Whereas her sister Laura was somewhat cool and aloof, Eleanor was highly charged emotionally. She was dark and Semitic in appearance, and initially was something of a tomboy. From an early age she wanted to go on the stage. Then in 1872, at the age of 17, she fell in love with a 34 year old Frenchman. Her father forbade the relationship, and she eventually acceded to his wishes. But the price was a lifetime of neurotic, psychosomatic ailments. When Marx finally died, and she no longer had to be his "little princess" she took her revenge by taking up with Edward Aveling, an evil rogue who was condemned by everyone within and without Marxist circles. Aveling, who was already married to another woman, lived and travelled with Eleanor for 14 years. Eventually, he (bigamously) married a young actress, and in desperation Eleanor swallowed cyanide. There is some evidence that Aveling had promised her a suicide pact and betrayed her.

Marx also sired an illegitimate son, Freddy, by the household servant Lenchen Demuth. But in order not to upset his wife, he prevailed upon Engels to acknowledge paternity over the boy. No one was taken in by this feeble ruse, but at least it enabled Marx to renege on any financial responsibilities for the boy, and pass these over to the gullible Engels.

Eleanor grew very close to Freddy Demuth, and experienced great difficulty in reconciling her adulation of her father with his treatment of the boy — leaving him to sink or swim in the London slums. Two months before her suicide she wrote Freddy: "I sometimes feel like you, Freddy, that nothing ever goes well with us. Of course, poor Jenny had her full share of sorrow and trouble, and Laura lost her children. But Jenny was fortunate enough to die, and sad as that was for the children, there are times when I think it was fortunate. I would not have wished Jenny to have lived through what I have done."

In choosing a relationship with the sadistic exploiter Aveling, was Eleanor reenacting the masochistic role that her father had thrust upon her when he insisted on her rejection of her French suitor and instead taking care of the number one man in her life — Daddy? Were the suicides of both Laura and Eleanor — and the psychosomatic death of Jenny — belated and indirect acts of rebellion and aggression against their tyrannical father? Psychohistorian Arnold Künzli argues:

"It is a frequent experience of depth psychology that the unconscious conflicts in the psyche of the parents break out in the children. The suicide of the daughters can be interpreted as a delayed, surrogate suicide of Karl Marx himself. 'I will take proud revenge on myself' he had written as a young man ... Thus in the tragic destiny of the daughters of Karl Marx, the existential alienation of the father was repeated in shattering fashion." — Arnold Künzli. *Karl Marx, Eine Psychographie, Vienna, 1966.*

Perhaps the most profound summary of all was provided by Karl Marx himself a short time before his death of bronchitis, at the age of 64, in 1883. In a rare moment of candor, he had told his octroon son-in-law Paul Lafargue: "Ce qu'il y a certain c'est que

moi, je ne suis pas Marxiste" — "One thing I am certain of: that is that I myself am not a Marxist."

What better summary could there be of a man who was tormented throughout his life by hypocrisy. On the one hand he despised workers, Slavs, Negroes, and proletarians generally. Yet at the same time he wrote about the eventual takeover by the working class. He loathed Jews and Jewish characteristics, yet he knew deep down that he himself was a Jew through and through, and that that could never change. He was pursued by the hereditary Jewish fixations on excrement, death, putrefaction, and dirt. And yet he sought to conquer those primeval fears through over-compensating pushiness, arrogance, manipulation, demanding, and even megalomania. He sought refuge with his WASP aristocratic wife Jenny von Westphalen and with the Germanic Friedrich Engels, but nowhere could he escape the eternal truth of his own origins. He was rebelling against himself. He was caught up in an eternal Jewish struggle — the underlying self-hate, and the overlay of compensatory arrogance and "assimilation". The eternal struggle became too much for his daughters, who tried to wriggle free of the vice-like grip of their own psyche. Each of them rebelled against the eternal truth of their own Jewish genetics, and took up with Gentiles (curiously, all Frenchmen). But each in turn was dragged back by their father into the cauldron of torment that is *being Jewish*. Like a drowning man clutching at the river bank they tried to save themselves from being swept away. But swept away they were; in Laura's case taking her rescuer with her. The other two sisters went on a course marked "self-destruct" and whether that course was labelled "groin cancer" or "falling in love with a sadist and then committing suicide" makes no difference. Each was but a terminal symptom of the disease we must surely recognize as "Jewish self-hate."

Leon Trotsky

The Polish surname Trotsky was not the one the revolutionary was born with. His true name was Levi Davidovich Bronstein, and he was born in 1879 into a wealthy family of Jewish landowners in southern Ukraine.

In the fall of 1888, at the age of 9, Levi Davidovich moved from the family estate to the coastal resort of Odessa, where he lived with his mother's nephew, Moses Filipovich Spentzer — a liberal, Jewish publisher. After attending high school in Odessa, he went on to junior college at Nikolayev, where he fell in with a group of Jewish socialists. He began to read Marx around this time and started to agitate among the fledgling trades unions in the area. He ended up being arrested and it was at this point in his career that he decided to adopt a pseudonym. With a stroke of irony, he took on the name of his Polish prison warden, Trotsky.

During the fall of 1899 he was moved to a prison in Moscow, and was tried early in the following year. He was sentenced to four years exile in Siberia. However, before the transfer could be brought about, Trotsky decided to wed one of his fellow Jewish

agitators: Alexandra Lyovna Sokolovskaya. A rabbi was brought to the prison cell to officiate.

Soon after the couple's exile to Siberia, a baby daughter was born, with another following in 1902. Despite the rigors of Siberia, Trotsky was able to contribute prolific articles to the local Irkutsk newspaper, and to receive and study Marxist books. Around this time he heard of Lenin, another Communist agitator, and the two began corresponding. Lenin wrote Trotsky that he should abandon his Siberian exile and go and live in a foreign country. Friends would help.

So Trotsky found his way to Vienna, where he was aided by his fellow Jewish Communist, Victor Adler; and then on to Zurich, where another Jewish Communist, Paul Axelrod, was point man. Trotsky's wife and children were left behind in Siberia. On to Paris, and then to London, where Trotsky finally met Lenin at a rooming house at 30 Holford Square, King's Cross. Trotsky was immediately appointed editor of *The Spark*, an underground Communist newspaper which was directed at Russian agitation. Trotsky also gave some Marxist lectures in London's predominantly Jewish White chapel district, and he took up with a Ukrainian (Gentile) woman, Natalya Ivanovna Sedova. Before long the two became lovers, and produced two male children. After establishing strategy at various conferences in London, Brussels and Paris, Trotsky and Natalya (using fake passports) returned to Russia in 1905 in order to launch the revolution. After several months of apparently harassment-free agitation, Trotsky was arrested and then thrown into the Peter-Paul prison in St. Petersburg, along with two other Jewish Marxists: Leon Deutsch and Alexander "Parvus" Helphand. After VIP treatment in jail, and a democratic trial, the agitators were exiled to Siberia once more. However, after arrival in Siberia, Trotsky hardly even stooped to unpack but merely got on a train going in the opposite direction and ended up once more with his common-law wife Natalya in Finland.

After more agitating around western Europe, Trotsky set sail for New York, where he worked as a journalist on the Russian Communist newspaper *Novy Mir*, out of their offices at 77 St. Mark's Place on the Lower East Side — right in the heart of the Jewish section of Manhattan. *Novy Mir* (New World) was owned by two Communist Jews named Weinstein and Brailovsky. According to the New York police, who monitored Trotsky's activities, his main associates during this period were Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman.

Things were starting to heat up in Mother Russia in 1917, and Trotsky sensed that the time was ripe for another Soviet takeover bid. But finance for the revolution was essential. Oddly, these so-called enemies of Capitalism had no difficulty whatsoever in raising vast amounts of capital from Jewish financiers around the World. Trotsky worked on Jacob H. Schiff, who it was, later admitted, poured \$20 million of Kuhn Loeb bank money into the projected Bolshevik takeover. "Parvus", Trotsky's room-mate at the executive suite of the Peter-Paul prison, was himself a wealthy coal broker, and he was off in the Balkans making deals on behalf of the Imperial German government.

Naturally, being a good businessman with loyalty only to the dollar, he had no qualms about trading with any enemy power during wartime.

In Scandinavia, another Jewish banker, Olaf Aschberg, was busy putting together an investment portfolio to propel the nascent Bolshevik state into financial bliss.

On 26 March 1917 Trotsky embarked from New York, for Russia. He was accompanied by a good many Marxist soldiers-of-fortune from the Lower East Side, plus a large amount of gold courtesy of Jacob Schiff.

However, when the ship stopped to refuel at Halifax, Nova Scotia, Trotsky was arrested by the British authorities, on the sound rationale that he was heading for Russia to take Russia out of the Great War and thereby increase the Germans' capabilities on the Western front. But in a stunning reversal of "how things are supposed to be", the American President Woodrow Wilson intervened with the British and Trotsky was allowed to continue on his way since he had the advantage of an American passport. By the time Trotsky reached Russia, the revolution had already taken place. The Tsar had been deposed and a Democratic government installed. But being a good Communist, Trotsky wanted to have things his own way. The Democrats, under Kerensky, were wise to these ambitions and warrants were issued for the arrest of Trotsky and Lenin. The basis for the warrants was evidence that they were agents of the Imperial German government - a not unreasonable assumption since Lenin had been sent back into Russia on a sealed German train, and Trotsky had been sent by Jacob Schiff, a cousin of the German Minister of the Interior, Felix Warburg, both Jews. But after a short period of imprisonment for Trotsky, and hiding for Lenin, both were back on the streets again. Soon afterward, the Lenin-Trotsky Communists led a street rebellion against the Democrats, and with just a handful of men seized control of the government. Within a short time a delegation of Jewish Communists, led by Trotsky, met with the German commanders and signed away vast tracts of Russia, in return for a cessation of hostilities.

However, the Communists' troubles were not over yet. As soon as their tyrannical regime started to bite into the newly-won freedoms of the Russian people, a civil war broke out, with a White Russian army taking up arms against the Communists. Anarchists under Nester Makhno also fought the new government and the Whites, with his Ukrainian Army of Insurgent Peasants. Makhno soon controlled vast tracts of Ukraine, so in an effort to neutralize him, the Communist government agreed to recognize Ukraine as an autonomous anarchist region. A treaty was signed by three Jewish Commissars: Bela Kuhn, S. I. Gusev and M. V. Frunze. As soon as the other fronts were secure, the Red Army then turned all its force against the Ukrainian autonomous region and, treaties notwithstanding, crushed all resistance. The charismatic Makhno fled overseas and ended up laboring in a Paris factory. Some of the opposition to the Communists was fuelled by anti-Semitism. The Whites published explicitly anti-Semitic posters showing an ugly Jewish Trotsky with Oriental Bolshevik soldiers. Allegations that Makhno was anti-Semitic have never been proven; in fact he had Jewish lieutenants.

There were some ironic twists during the bloody days of the Civil War. A Jewess, Fanny Kaplan, tried to assassinate Lenin in Moscow. And a comrade of hers did actually assassinate Moses Uritsky, the head of the Communist CHEKA (secret police). While the Communists were busy trying to batten down all resistance to their tyranny, the Poles decided to try their luck by invading Russia. A counter-attack by the Reds initially succeeded in driving back the Poles, but ended in a stalemate. The Poles too used anti-Semitic propaganda to counter the Jewish commissars.

Trotsky made sure his various families were taken care of. His father, the wealthy landowner David Bronstein, had been subjected to attack from both sides in the Civil War, so Trotsky gave him a job as manager of a state mill just outside Moscow. Trotsky's Gentile wife was made Minister of Museums in Moscow. His first (Jewish) wife was a political functionary in Petrograd (the new name for St. Petersburg).

Eventually, the White Army resistance was crushed, but not before some startling setbacks for the Reds. Any further opposition was brutally suppressed by the Soviet secret police. Trotsky then turned his attention toward fomenting similar Communist takeovers in neighboring countries. Events did not omen well for this venture.

In January 1919, a Jewish Communist uprising in Berlin was a dismal flop, ending with the deaths of the two main proponents: Rosa Luxembour and Karl Liebknecht. In March 1919, the Soviet Jew Bela Kuhn took over the government of Hungary, but after a bloody couple of months, this attempt also failed. A short-lived uprising in Munich under the leadership of the Jew Kurt Eisner was also put down.

Early in 1921, there was a mutiny at the naval base of Kronstadt. Kronstadt had always had a reputation for revolutionary zeal - the sailors had mutinied against the Tsar and also against the Democrats. Each time Trotsky had supported them. But this time, the sailors were rebelling against Trotsky. So, instead of defending their demands for free speech and freedom of association, Trotsky sent in Red Army units to brutally crush the uprising. To explain away this murder, Trotsky recycled the same lame excuse that he had used to smear Makhno's anarchists — that they were in league with the White Army. Perhaps it was episodes like this that inspired George Orwell to write *Animal Farm*.

Soon, it was Trotsky himself who suffered from such double standard morality. Lenin died suddenly in 1924, and his place was taken by Stalin. (Trotsky was indisposed at the time, taking a health cure on the Black Sea.) Stalin very shortly discovered "crimes" which Trotsky had committed, and he was exiled first to Turkestan and then overseas. Stalin eventually had him murdered in Mexico in 1940. The assassin clubbed Trotsky to death with an ice-pick — a most unusual implement to find lying around in sweltering Mexico City.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Bolshevik takeover in Russia was but a Jewish takeover. As Winston Churchill wrote: "There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution

by these international, and for the most part atheistical, Jews. It is certainly a very great one, it probably outweighs all others. With the notable exception of Lenin, the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders ... In the Soviet institution the predominance of Jews is even more astounding. And the principal part in the system of terrorism applied by the extraordinary Commissions for combating Counter-Revolution has been taken by Jews ..." — *Illustrated Sunday Herald* 8 February 1920.

(Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institute argues that, contrary to Churchill's exception, Lenin was of Jewish descent; his mother's maiden name being Blank — a most unlikely Russian name, and she was in fact the daughter of a Jewish doctor and his German wife.) Both British and American diplomats in Russia at the time sent back reports describing how the vast majority of the Bolsheviks were Jewish. Reproductions and excerpts appear in the comprehensive *Six Million Reconsidered* by William Grimstad. Page after page of frank admissions by Jews themselves and by on-the-spot observers prove beyond any shadow of doubt that Bolshevism was Jewish from top to bottom. Of particular interest to us here is the attitude of the "People of the Book" toward cruelty and destruction. The Soviets' secret police—an alphabet soup of initials which began with CHEKA and ended up today as the KGB - was conceived and operated almost exclusively by Jews. The first head of the CHEKA was Moses Uritsky. His successor was a person of dubious "Polish" origin named Felix Dzerzhinski, but it was common knowledge that he was overshadowed by his nominal subordinate, I. S. Unschlicht. Over the years, control of the torture apparatus has been passed to other Jews: Genrikh Yagoda, Lavrenti Beria, and today, Yuri Andropov.

Yagoda's case was interesting in that he was Chief Inquisitor and Executioner of two Jewish ex-colleagues Kamenev and Zinoviev. As the wheel of fate turned, Yagoda himself was purged and executed.

According to the Russian writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the slave labor camps were dreamt up "by the Turkish Jew, Frenkel". Known as "the timber king of the Black Sea" Frenkel quickly became a consultant to the Bolshevik government, and advised them on the most profitable gems and precious metals to loot from the Russians. It may have been these same valuables which were sent back to Jacob Schiff in New York, as repayment of his original "venture capital" sent over with Trotsky. Later, Frenkel set up the slave labor camps as probably the cheapest form of labor supply in the World, and vast work projects were undertaken, such as the (ill fated) White Sea/Baltic Sea canal scheme.

In the third chapter of volume two of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*, the author provides a rogues' gallery of the Soviet architects of the slave-labor/extermination program: Yakov Rappaport, Matvei Berman, Lazar Kogan, Semyon Firin, Sergei Zhuk. Trotsky himself approved of the reign of terror that swept Russia. He wrote: "Terror as the demonstration of the will and strength of the working class is historically justified, precisely because the proletariat was able to break the political will of the Intelligentsia, pacify the professional men of various categories and work, and gradually

subordinate them to its own aims within the fields of their specialties." — *Izvestia* 10 January 1919.

During a speech at the International Communist Congress in Moscow the following March he opined: "Blood and mercilessness must be our slogans." Later, to try and explain away the bloody slaughter of the rebellious Kronstadt sailors he wrote: "Idealists and pacifists always accused the Revolution of excesses. But the main point is that 'excesses' flow from the very nature of revolution which in itself is but an 'excess' of history."

Lenin too demanded buckets of blood. In June 1918 he reprimanded the Leningrad (nee St. Petersburg) Soviet for being too genteel in their treatment of opponents: "This is unheard of! The energy and mass nature of the terror must be encouraged!" The following month he promulgated a new edict in *Izvestia* (27 July 1918) to the effect that all "anti-Semites" were to be shot.

Lesser luminaries in the Jewish-Soviet heavens took up the refrain. Hirsch Apfelbaum (aka Zinoviev) penned a charming article in the *Krasnaya Gazeta* (1 September 1918) under the rubric "Blood for Blood":

"We will make our hearts cruel, hard and immovable, so that no mercy will enter them, and so that they will not quiver at the sight of a sea of enemy blood. We will let loose the floodgates of that sea. Without mercy, without sparing, we will kill our enemies in scores of hundreds. Let them be thousands; let them drown themselves in their own blood! For the blood of Lenin and Uritsky, Zinoviev and Volodarsky, let there be floods of blood of the bourgeois — more blood! As much as possible!"

One would have thought that all this blood-letting would have quickly terminated any sympathy for the Soviets from their kinfolk in the West. But such was not the case. "There is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism." — London *Jewish Chronicle*, 4 April 1919.

"What Jewish idealism and Jewish discontent have so powerfully contributed to produce in Russia, the same historic qualities of the Jewish mind are tending to promote in other countries." — New York *American Hebrew*, 20 September 1920.

"Jewish histories rarely mention the name of Karl Marx, though in his life and spirit he was far truer to the mission of Israel than most who are forever talking of it." — Rabbi Lewis Brown: *Stranger Than Fiction*, NY, 1928.

However, at the business end of this great contribution to progress, matters were not quite so explicitly dealt with. No Soviet citizen could be referred to as "Jewish" on pain of death. And almost to a man, the Jewish leaders of the Bolshevik takeover changed their Jewish names to Gentile-sounding *noms de guerre*, usually Russian but sometimes, Polish.

How can one interpret this idiosyncratic phenomenon? Let us back-track a little bit. We have Trotsky growing up in a wealthy land owning Jewish family, attending exclusive private schools, and marrying in a Jewish ceremony. Yet he hides his Jewishness behind a Gentile pseudonym and claims to represent the Russian working class. He has definite links with wealthy Jewish foreign bankers, yet he claims to oppose Capitalism. He claims to support continuous working-class violent revolution against the ruling-class, yet when he himself becomes the ruler he suppresses workers' uprisings, such as at Kronstadt and in Ukraine. He opposes privilege for the ruling class, yet he fixes up his own family with cushy positions.

What is the answer to this conundrum? It would be easy to dismiss Trotsky and his fellows as mere charlatans, tricksters and hypocrites. There can be little doubt that George Orwell based the pigs in *Animal Farm* on these crooks. But somehow, this "criminal" explanation does not totally fit the bill, for the "ideals" propounded by Trotsky and company were given theoretical support from respectable Jewish organizations in the West. Can it be that there is some "split personality" at work here, where the Bolsheviks actually believed in what they were advocating, but another part of their personality kept superimposing itself on top of their "principled" side? Did Trotsky perhaps fantasize that he was not Jewish; that he was not privileged; that he was in search of justice? Was there a side of him that was struggling to be Gentile; that craved to feel inside himself the Gentile values of honor, truth, courage, and fairness? Did he envy these qualities so much that he turned jealousy into hate; turned a wish-to-be-like into a wish-to-destroy? All we can do is speculate, because unfortunately little is known of Trotsky's real psychology. There are no personal letters, no opening-up to friends or family, no records at all of any substance. All we can do is line up Trotsky with his kinfolk in this psychohistorical study, and see if we can find any interesting patterns of behavior showing up.

Communism

In a fascinating, detailed, article in *The Journal of Psychohistory*, Fall 1978, Psychohistorian Stanley Rothman provides a useful summary of Jewish involvement with Communism throughout the western World in "Group Fantasies and Jewish Radicalism". He writes:

"In the inter-war years this role was probably most visible in the countries of Eastern Europe, where Jews were prominent in Bela Kuhn's abortive attempt to set up a Communist regime in Hungary and where they came to constitute over 40% of the cadres of the Polish Communist Party, and probably comparable percentages elsewhere. In Hungary, immediately after the Communist Party's accession to power, the Politburo of the party contained only one non-Jew. It was jokingly suggested that this 'Goy' had been admitted to the inner circles only because someone was needed to sign decrees on Saturdays.

"In Germany the situation was rather different. Jews played a very important role in the revolutionary Spartacist Movement of 1918-1919. However ... radical Jewish Intellectuals remained largely unaffiliated, serving as unattached (often bitter) radical critics of the Weimar Republic. The Frankfurt School which produced Adorn, Fromm, Marcuse, Horkheimer and others was almost entirely Jewish.

"In the United States, perhaps some 50% of the Communist Party was of Jewish background during the 1930s; the radical American Student Union was heavily Jewish and, just as importantly, the Soviet espionage apparatus in this country ... was pretty largely of Jewish background.

"In Western Europe ... Jews continued to take an active radical role. In France, during the 1968 upheavals, students of Jewish background dominated Trotskyite leadership cadres.

"Jews provided the critical mass for the student left and the counter culture in the United States during the early and mid-1960s. Studies indicate that in its initial phases, SDS leadership was about 67% Jewish."

Rothman goes on to show how Jewish radicals even "ran the show" at mid-Western campuses. One (Gentile) SDS Organizer at Madison, Wisconsin, commented: "I am struck by the lack of Wisconsin-born people (in the left) and the massive preponderance of New York Jews. The situation at the University of Minnesota is similar." In the faculties too, the radical factions were "largely Jewish".

In another article aimed at *cognoscenti* (*American Jewish Historical Quarterly*, December 1976) Arthur Liebman shows in "The Ties That Bind":

"The members and particularly the officers of the left organizations were predominantly Jewish ... Andre Schiffrin, President of SLID in 1956-57, and himself of Jewish background, was very cognizant of the 'foreign element' within SLID. 'For a while, all our national officers, myself included, were 'foreign born' and the militant rhetoric within the organization was 'usually voiced in a heavy Yiddish accent'. Others noted the frequent usage of Yiddish expressions among the members. Another indication of the large Jewish component was the care taken to ensure that regional and national conventions of these left non-sectarian groups would not coincide with important Jewish holidays. No such attention was paid to Christian holidays and on one occasion a Protestant minister was sharply critical of SLID for scheduling a meeting on Good Friday."

Indeed, Liebman shows that Jews have regarded Communism as an extension of Judaism for many years.

"The Jewish *Daily Forward* (a Yiddish socialist newspaper) to a large extent surpassed the rabbis and Orthodoxy as the educator of the Jewish community in the United States ... The more astute and sensitive Jewish Socialists in the pre-World War I years ... sought opportunities to demonstrate that Judaism, as they defined and interpreted it,

was quite compatible if not supportive of Socialism. Socialism was presented to the Jewish masses as a secular version of Judaism. Thus, during a strike, the Law of Moses was cited in support of the strikers. The Socialist Party's Rand School was lyricized by the Forward at its founding in 1906 as 'the socialist' yeshiva ... where the rabbis and teachers of our movement were being prepared'...

"In their curriculum, these schools emphasized the inter-relatedness between Jewish and radical concerns. The progressive aspects of Judaism were stressed: for example in the case of the Jewish New Year, Rosh Hashanah:

"The traditional blowing of the shofar was the clarion to rally for liberation of the Jewish people from oppressors ... the shofar blowing for the laboring masses will drown out the trumpeting of the temporary ruling interests of the earth.'

"The accomplishments of these schools were summarized in an editorial in Jewish Life, a magazine with close ties to them, in the following manner:

"The schools develop in the children a kinship with Jewish and non-Jewish laboring masses and with the history and progressive culture and traditions of the Jewish people. The children acquire an elementary knowledge of Yiddish. They are taught to identify their interest with those of the Negro people and other oppressed groups."

At this point we could enter into a tedious cataloging of names (and pseudonyms) of Communist leaders throughout the 20th century who "happened to be Jewish". Certainly such a roll-call would be useful for archival purposes, but it would undoubtedly be a boring and unnecessary chore for the reader. Such lists are already available in the British samizdat publication mischievously titled *Let My People Go!* and in the American: *Behind Communism*. But our purpose is not to go over again ground which has already been firmly established. Even our two Jewish writers cited above implicitly acknowledge the aphorism that Communism is, was, and probably always will be, Jewish. Our aim is to explore behind the pages of history; to read between the lines; to analyze and ask why. Why are Jews radicals?

Rothman writes that:

"Jerry Rubin ascribes his own radicalism to being Jewish, and finds that Cohn-Bendit shares the same feelings. It is clear, too, that his primary hostility is toward Christianity, 'telling Pat Boone that Christianity has murdered more people than any other ism in the history of the World.' Roger Kahn, writing about the Columbia conflict, keeps remembering how badly Jews were treated by the WASP establishment, and Paul Cowan is convinced, from his experiences at Choate, that the WASPS are all anti-Semitic racists as Teitelbaum has shown, Jews anxious to deny their Jewishness (those who feel marginal) are more likely to perceive Christians as anti-Semitic than those who continue to identify as Jews."

Rothman argues that "Jewish radicalism (as well as Zionism) stems from the historically marginal position of Jews in Christian societies and to the family structure and personality patterns derived from that marginality. Jews have developed a particular set of perceptions and underlying motivations which can be described as a group fantasy." It may well be that Jews are marginal in western society in terms of religion, culture, lifestyle etc. But they are certainly less marginal than, say, the Orientals so one wonders why Orientals are not more radical than the Jews.

Rothman's subsidiary point is more interesting. He suggests that Jews, perceiving themselves as being surrounded by a hostile, threatening host society, are too few in number to openly display hostility back. So instead they channel their hostility and aggression toward their own families (hence the "emasculating" Jewish mother) and into occupations which allow for much indirect (verbal) aggression. But as Rothman admits "Good studies of 'Jewish Personality Traits' are few in number for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is, as Sanua points out, that scholars have tended to avoid the subject." (No mention of why, of course.) Rothman goes on:

"It is arguable that the European Diaspora and the ghetto experience encouraged among Jews the emergence of a particular family pattern; a pattern characterized by mothers who were 'protective' and controlling, especially with their male children. It was not enough to teach such children to curb the direct expression of aggression against the Christian enemy, for under such circumstances control might be lost in a crisis situation. Rather, aggression must be driven underground by appropriate child-rearing practices.

"The institutionalization of this pattern was to have profound effects upon both Jewish males and Jewish females, effects which have been alluded to in part and are spelled out in some detail by Bibring and Wolfenstein. The Jewish family became, in Bibring's terms, a kind of matriarchy in which the husband was perceived by the children as more fearful, less capable, and weaker than the wife who cared for and somewhat dominated him in crucial areas, whatever his professional and/or business achievements." He goes on:

"Herbert Krugman, in a study of ex-Communists, found that middle-class members of the Party (mostly Jews) placed far more stress on the need for 'hardness' than did working-class members of the Party who were less likely to be Jewish. Krugman studied in greatest depth the case reports by analysts of 10 men and 8 women. Five of the men evidenced strong wishes to submit and 'some slight evidence of overt, passive homosexuality' during adolescence. The therapists described them as sado-masochistic, turning such aggression onto themselves. Their self-images varied between extremes - from worthlessness to superiority - and with many there was an attitude of martyrdom, a 'bittersweet' anticipation of revenge ...

"Many Jewish males, then, seemed to have a character structure classified by Jules Nydes as 'paranoid masochistic'... The following represents a summary of Nydes' formulation:

SADISTIC

1. Identifies with the aggressor.
2. Hostility is reactive and compensatory.
3. Effect of rage is accompanied by a sense of malicious triumph and release is experienced as effect is discharged.
4. The motive for aggression is to hurt someone who seems unable to fight back, and the effect is often intimidation of the victims.

PARANOID-MASOCHISTIC

1. Identifies with the victim in the sense that he is being persecuted.
2. Hostility is defensive against anticipated attack because of unconscious feeling of guilt.
3. Effect of rage is accompanied by self-righteousness and often leads to mounting fury rather than relief.
4. The apparent motive for aggression is to avoid being hurt by counter-attacking an assumed aggressor. The effect is often to provoke punishment — gratification of a repressed wish — and a reality confirmation of preconceived persecution.

Rothman cites several profound examples of this exclusively Jewish phenomenon. He quotes from an interview with a Jewish ex-Weatherman who recalls the motivations of himself and his peers in the 1960s:

"A lot of the Weatherman leadership was Jewish and had never been tough street kids, and I really believe that a tremendous amount of what they were doing was overcoming their own fears about their masculinity ... Most of them ... had been intellectually aggressive, but all of a sudden they were trying to be tough street kids ... I think there was a lot of self-hate going on."

Rothman even draws on fictional, though highly accurate, caricature, such as Philip Roth's highly personal Portnoy in *Portnoy's Complaint*.

"Portnoy, of course, is only a quasi-radical but, whatever he would like to think his real motives are, his tirade to the analyst makes it quite clear that his love for suffering humanity is far less important than his envy and hatred of WASPS and his desire to literally 'screw' the 'goyim', despite the fact that he despises his parents for their 'anti-goyish' attitudes. As he puts it:

"I was on the staff of the house sub-committee investigating the television quiz scandals. Perfect for the closet socialist like myself; commercial deceit on a national scale, exploitation of the innocent public, elaborate corporate chicanery — in short good old capitalist greed. And then of course that extra bonus, Charles Van Doren. Such character, such brains, such breeding, that candor and school boyish charm — that WASP wouldn't you say? And, turns out he's a fake. Well, what do you know about that,

Gentile America? Super-goy, a 'gonif'! Steals money ... Goodness, gracious me, almost as bad as Jews — you sanctimonious WASPS!

"Yes, I was one happy Yiddle down there in Washington, a little Stern gang on my own, busily exploding Charlie's honor and integrity, while simultaneously becoming lover to the aristocratic Yankee beauty whose forebears arrived on these shores in the seventeenth century.'

"The situation is not quite so simple, for, as the quotation indicates, Portnoy also wants to become one of these strong, blond, 'goyim' who own America and whose brothers are 'the engaging, good-natured, confident, clean, swift and powerful halfbacks for the college football teams'. His unconscious hope is that he can somehow become a Goy by sleeping with the 'shiks'es'."

There is much truth in Rothman's analysis. Jewish bourgeois Communism is not just a bunch of Jewish Capitalists suddenly discovering a more profitable venture — State Capitalism. It is also a symptom of the eternal Jewish neurosis; the envy of all things goyish that in turn becomes hatred of all things goyish. Portnoy caricatures for us the eternal Jew: he would like nothing better than to have blue blood flowing through his veins, and by sleeping with the shikse he hopes that some of her blond, aristocratic ways will rub off on him. But when nothing much seems to change, and Portnoy stays pretty much the same little Yiddle he started off, then his envy turns to hate, and his sleeping-with becomes "screwing". We are immediately reminded of Eldridge Cleaver's *Soul on Ice* where he tells us that he raped White women in order to get his own back on Whitey. We also observe the extraordinary disproportion in inter-racial rapes (both male-female and male-male) which are almost 100% Black against White.

Can it be that "Marxism" is no more than an expression of Jewish self-hate redirected against the rest of us?

Sigmund Freud

Freud was born in Freiburg, Moravia, which is today part of Czechoslovakia, but was at that time within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. His father, Jacob Freud (1815-1896) was a successful wool merchant. At the time of Sigmund's birth, Jacob was 40 years old, with two grown-up sons, and even grandchildren. Sigmund's mother was his father's second wife, and she was 20 years his junior.

In 1860, the Freud family moved from the provinces up to the capital city of Vienna. There, the young Freud began to develop the almost inevitable Jewish characteristic — fear of "anti-Semitism." He adopted as his boyhood heroes Hannibal (whom he imagined to be a Semitic hero who fought against the era's traditional "anti-Semites" the Roman) and Oliver Cromwell (whom he identified with the emancipation movement). In passing, it may be noted with some irony that both Sigmund Freud and Adolf Hitler lived in Vienna around the same time. It is open to speculation whether or not they had

a (sub-conscious) influence on each other. Hitler maintains in *Mein Kampf* that he never entertained an anti-Semitic thought in his head until he encountered these people, and experienced their behavior patterns, when he moved to the "big city".

At that time, Vienna was a hot bed of pro and anti-Semitic feelings. The Hapsburg monarchy and the city administration under Karl Luger were all alleged to be "anti-Semitic". And, of course, all the radical movements of the left, such as the Social Democrats under Victor Adler, were dominated by Jews.

It was in this tense environment that Freud enrolled at the University of Vienna in 1873, where it took him three years longer than normal to complete his medical studies. He moved on to the Vienna General Hospital, where he acted as assistant to several Austrian neuropathologists.

From 1884 onwards, he began to experiment with cocaine, using it on himself and on his fiancée Martha Bernays (1861-1951). He called cocaine his "magic carpet" and thrust it on all and sundry, including his sisters, friends, patients, colleagues - everyone. He told his fiancée it made him a "big wild man" and it would "make her strong and give her cheeks a red color". Later commentators would express doubts about this habit. Martin L. Gross, author of *The Psychological Society* writes:

"No one has yet evaluated the hallucinatory effects of cocaine on Freud's mind during the formative years of psychoanalysis. Without cocaine, could Freud have created such improbable flights of human fancy?"

By 1886, cases of cocaine addiction were being reported from all over Austria. Freud's friend Ernst von Fleischl-Marxov (1846-1891) had become a despairing addict after Freud had prescribed cocaine as medicine for a painful hand tumor. There is no doubt that the addiction brought about this early death.

Freud then left for Paris, to study under the French neurologist Jean Martin Charcot. Charcot was interested in the study of hysteria, which at that time was thought to be an affliction caused by an irritation of the womb (hence its name). Charcot felt that hypnotism was the answer to such personality dysfunctions.

The modern commentator on Freud's work Henry F. Ellenberger, has recently shown in *The Discovery of the Unconscious* that many of Freud's "original" ideas were in fact lifted from his tutors and colleagues. This idea of hypnotizing patients would appear to be one of them.

Another of Freud's plagiarized ideas was that of his colleague Josef Brewer (1842-1925). Brewer felt that the answer to female hysteria was catharsis: the patient would be healed by talking to her calmly and helping her "talk through" her hallucinations and fears. Freud and Brewer collaborated on a book *Studies in Hysteria* which was published in 1895, which described the treatment in detail. One of the most important cases described in the book was that of "Anna O." who later turned out to be Bertha

Pappenheim, and who went on to become a prominent social worker and proponent, of women's liberation in Austria. Ms. Pappenheim suffered from sexual hallucinations, and it may well be that it was this particular case which led Freud to develop his next theory — and only semi-original one — of Psychotherapy.

Psychotherapy was a potpourri of techniques lifted from previous colleagues, laced with a heavy dose of sexual fixations, most of them of an exclusively Jewish nature. Originally, Freud would have his patient lie down on a couch, and ask them leading questions, in order to discover the root cause of their anxieties. Later, he would allow them have "free flow" of ideas, without interruption from him. Soon, Freud began to figure that most of his patients' problems were sexual in nature.

This discovery did not go over too well with the medical establishment in Vienna; the only one to take him seriously initially was one Wilhelm Fliess, a Berlin nose-and-throat specialist. Fliess had some rather peculiar ideas himself, including the notion that sexual dysfunctions were caused by "disturbances in the mucous membranes of the nose"! Freud twice allowed Fliess to operate on his nose for "nasal infections" but it is not known whether or not either doctor had diagnosed a sexual disorder. There is some evidence that Freud and Fliess had a homosexual relationship.

Freud continued to be plagued by bad health: migraine, nightmares, heart trouble and eventually — mouth cancer. He began to interpret his dreams, and when he experienced one where two bird-men laid his mother on the bed, he figured that this represented his boyhood desire to kill his father and have sex with his mother. Another analyst may have interpreted it as having too much cheese and pickles before going to bed, but Freud insisted that such dream symbolisms were "typical," and labelled the phenomenon the "Oedipus Complex" after the famous Greek fable.

Eventually, Freud patched together his dream analysis into a full fledged theory, which was published as *The Interpretation of Dreams*. His theory was that dreams are always "wishful thinking" — even though the "wishes" might be subconscious, and might manifest themselves in the dream in quite different symbol form. Most "wishful thinking" he argued, was sexual in nature.

In this book — which would later become Freud's best known work — the author alluded to a dysfunction from which he himself suffered: a phenomenon he called his "Rome neurosis". It seems that for many years Freud had been unable to visit Rome, even though he had been to Italy many times. Somehow he just could not bring himself to go there. In his book he described how he often dreamed of conquering Rome, just like his hero Hannibal had tried to do. He offered the following explanation:

"To my youthful mind, Hannibal and Rome symbolized the conflict between the tenacity of Jewry and the organization of the Catholic church ... Thus the wish to go to Rome had become in my dream life a cloak and symbol for a number of other passionate wishes. Their realization was to be pursued with all the perseverance and single mindedness of the Carthaginian."

In his startlingly candid article "Group Fantasies and Jewish Radicalism" published in the Fall 1978 issue of *The Journal of Psychohistory*, Stanley Rothman suggests: "There is little question but that a good deal of the impetus for the discovery of psychoanalysis came from Freud's general hostility toward Christianity, especially Roman Catholicism."

He argues that Freud's hatred and fear of Christianity prevented him from visiting Rome, and that he only managed to overcome this fear after the "triumphal" publication of the *Dreams* book.

Freud next turned his attention to human sexuality, with the 1905 publication of *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. He argued that humans go through different stages of sexual development. First, the oral stage where infants derive pleasure from suckling at their mother's breast. Next comes the anal stage, where pleasure focuses on bowel movements. Third is the phallic stage, when the erogenous zone switches to the genitals. At the age of 5 or 6, children enter into the age of their Oedipus complex, when they lust for their mother and seek to destroy their father, the love rival. Freud's first "diagnosis" of this complex was with a 5 year old boy in 1909. He felt that the boy was afraid of horses (penis symbols) because he really feared his father. He feared the horses would bite him and bite off his own little penis (fear of castration by his father). Unfortunately, Freud could not come up with a female counterpart to this argument, and in 1933 he wrote "What I've had to say about femininity doesn't always sound friendly. It is incomplete. If you want to know more, look at your own experience of life ..."

The first years of the twentieth century brought followers into Freud's sphere of influence. Although mostly Jewish, there were one or two Gentiles such as C. G. Jung who became involved with the Psychoanalytic Movement, and attended the first International Congress at Salzburg in April 1908. Jung accompanied Freud on a speaking tour of America in the following year, and soon the Freudian movement became international. But within a couple of years, there were many splits in the movement, leading to Jung and others setting up their own school of analytic theory. According to one commentator:

"It is sometimes said that these splits were caused by Freud's tyrannical and dogmatic personality. But as Freud told his biographer Ernest Jones 'It's not my personality but my ideas about sexuality and the unconscious they don't like!'"

Freud had originally brought Jung into the movement as a kind of "token Goy". Freud told his colleague Karl Abraham that "too many of us are Jews. I don't want Psychoanalysis to become a Jewish national affair." Jung may originally have had a homosexual crush on Freud. He wrote Freud:

"My veneration for you is something like a 'religious crush'. Though it does not really bother me, I still feel it is disgusting and ridiculous because of its undeniable erotic undertone. This abominable feeling comes from the fact that as a boy I was the victim of a sexual assault by a man I once worshipped." — Jung to Freud 28 October 1907.

Freud replied patronizingly on 15 November 1907: "I shall do my best to show that I am unfit to be an object of worship." But privately, Freud predicted that Jung's idolizing of him would end in rebellion. Sure enough, when Jung went alone on a speaking tour of America in 1912, he criticized some of Freud's fundamental ideas. Freud interpreted this "independence" as a resistance to the unconscious and a wish to destroy the father (image). When Jung returned to Europe, Freud tried to patch things up, but ended up in a faint. Matters only grew worse, and Freud began to accuse Jung of encouraging all the splits in the movement.

Freud's new book *Totem and Taboo* (1913) only exacerbated their differences. In this work, Freud argued that sexual customs were based in primitive society's behavior patterns, and not on biological instinct. Where the primitive patterns came from he didn't say.

His therapy practice developed over these years, and he gradually evolved different rules of approach. He determined that neurosis could only be cured by encouraging its transference into something more immediate. The treatment of the "second" neurosis would automatically bring about the cure of the underlying neuroses. The only exceptions, he said, were those neuroses which were narcissistic, and therefore psychotic and untreatable. Even severe depression is narcissistic, he argued, because it is a form of hatred against others which becomes misdirected against oneself, on account of the social taboo on open displays of hatred against "loved ones."

Eventually, Freud concluded that "the aim of all life is death" — an aim to arrive at a condition that is totally devoid of all tensions, stresses and strains. It was around this time that two of his daughters died, and he himself suffered a severe operation of the jaw, resulting in his upper palate being artificially replaced.

Shortly afterwards, the National Socialist regime took over in Germany (1933) and in Austria (1938). Freud's books were declared heretical, and were publicly burned. The Freud family emigrated to London, where Freud died a few days after World War Two broke out.

With more than 40 years between Freud's death and the present, at last there are signs that his erstwhile "infallible" status is being challenged. No longer are his theories accepted without challenge, and some bolder psychoanalysts are now actually turning the tables, and applying analysis to Freud's own life and career. According to Dr. Harold M. Voth, a psychiatrist at the Menninger Foundation, and himself a Freudian analyst: "I think that Sigmund Freud had sexual conflicts within himself which he did not resolve. His belief in constitutional bisexuality, for example, was an excuse for certain personal traits. I believe analysts are brilliant and dedicated people, but analysis tends to attract those with a personality similar to Freud's — passive men and aggressive women." The widely-published author Martin L. Gross writes:

"Dr. Voth is convinced that Freud displayed 'a considerable degree of femininity' in his personality, a trait that has colored the entire profession by making what he calls the 'neurotically troubled' Dr. Freud a model ...

"Those driving needs have infiltrated the psyche of millions of individuals as well, remaking much of our personalities in his image. By offering his catalog of foibles as the symbols of normality, Freud achieved immortality. He has successfully projected his personality and his style of thought onto much of humanity, especially the impressionable American psyche. We have all — some wittingly, others unwittingly — become the children of Sigmund ...

"Although the impact of Freud's personality has been broad, it has not generally been beneficent. The portrait that emerges is one of a man driven by the furies of hostility and envy, weighed down by depression, death wishes, phobias and severe debilitating neuroses. He was professionally distorted by his extreme superstitiousness and gullibility — the antithesis of a man of science. Freud the man is more the unhappy philosopher than the intrepid researcher who society thought would unlock the key to our confused behavior.

"The failure of psychotherapy is now obvious. What is less apparent is how closely that failure is tied to the personal short-comings of the prophet himself. As a theoretician and scientist, Sigmund Freud was impulsive. His work was tainted by an unmistakable style of excessive enthusiasm which often led to inaccuracy. He was an adroit, even brilliant, theory maker, but his wish to have something true overrode all objections.

"Freud was a self-confessed impetuous thinker, a 'conquistador' of the mind, he called himself. The result was that both his career and the disciplines of psychotherapy and psychoanalysis which he spawned are lavishly strewn with errors which Freud presented to the world with absolute confidence, even arrogance."

In a candid and insightful chapter "The Shadow of Dr. Freud" Dr. Gross goes on to show how Freud's theories were all extrapolations of his own personal hang-ups:

"The Oedipal love triangle is a prime example of how Freud's personality has distorted psychology and psychiatry. During his self-analysis, Freud learnt that he felt passion for his mother and jealousy against his father. As an adult, he had a recurring thought in which he visualized his 'beautiful and slim' mother, Amalie. Judging from his belief in the trauma of the primal scene (seeing one's parents during intercourse) Freud as a boy must have watched his attractive mother having sex. What might have been overlooked by a less driven child seemed to dominate Freud.

"Freud obviously experienced Oedipal lust, a disturbance which non-Freudians, such as child psychiatrist Dr. Stellar Chess of New York University, believe affects only a small number of children. He then suffered the delusion that his abnormality was normal and universal ...

"Freud's relationship with his mother was a long and satisfying one, the quintessence of the heralded Jewish mother-son love. She lived to be 95, dying when Freud was 74. Freud hinted repeatedly of the power of her love, stating more than once that 'if a man has been his mother's undisputed darling he retains throughout his life the triumphant feeling, the confidence in success, which seldom brings actual success with it.'

"Freud was Amalie's favorite — 'Mein goldener Sigi' she called him. 'The only thing that brings a mother undiluted satisfaction is her relationship to her son; it is quite the most complete relationship between human beings,' he wrote. Freud added a metaphysical sex idea: for the mother, he said, 'the little boy brings the longed-for penis with him.'" Freud exhibited latent homosexual characteristics, as he himself admitted to his intimate friend Dr. Wilhelm Fliess. And when Freud's biographer Ernest Jones first met him in 1908, he observed, "I dimly sensed some slight feminine aspect in his manner and movements." Modern critics suggest that present-day Freudians are influenced by Freud's "feminine, passive feelings" so much that they "regard masculine assertiveness and aggression as a neurotic manifestation. They tend to project their own conflicts and values about this onto their patients. As a result, much harm may be done to the patient and others in the patient's life."

By a curious coincidence, both Freud and Fliess underwent identical surgical operations within weeks of each other — removal of a furuncle on the scrotum. Freud viewed the coincidence as "a secret biological sympathy."

The men had similar personalities, and according to Gross, were "intrigued with the metaphysical, the magical, the mystical". When Fliess came up with his theory which posited a connection between the mucous membranes of the nose and the female genitals, Freud went along with it, and even allowed Fliess operate on his own nose. Fliess's theory of "periodicity" was grounded in astrology and numerology.

Freud's neurotic dysfunctions manifested themselves in unusual behavior patterns and in psychosomatic ailments — particularly those affecting the mouth, the genitals and the anus. At the age of 7 he walked into his parents' bedroom and deliberately urinated on the floor. He fainted often. He suffered lifelong indigestion, often with constipation in an irritable spastic colon. He suffered phobias about riding in trains, about death and about visiting Rome. More often than not, he was chronically depressed, and bad-tempered. His fear of death obsessed him, and he would spend much time with Fliess figuring out when he would die, using his friend's numerology theories. He often recounted the death of his younger brother Julius, who had died in childhood.

He was unable to separate his emotions. As Gross describes:

"Hostility was penned up inside this almost shy, somewhat feminine man, like a caged feline. His was an angry soul which hated even when it loved, a trait which he has passed down to us as ambivalence. 'We know that with Freud intense love and hate were specially apt to go hand in hand,' comments Jones. His distorted love-hate emotions first made a victim of Brewer, then Fliess, then Jung, Adler, Stekel, and

anyone else who initially advanced, then stood in the way of, his grand design for immortality ...

"He perpetually read unconscious hostility into his cases, including that of Dora, the Wolf Man and the Rat Man. He did this even over the reasonable objections of his patients, who said they felt no such hostilities. The Rat Man complained that he could not have wanted his father's death, for he loved him and feared losing him. Freud countered with one of the convoluted semantic twists that at once made his ideas invincible. The fear of death is actually a wish, he said. Every one of man's fears corresponds to a former unconscious wish, he told his now guilty patient ...

"Max Schur traced Freud's superstitious fear of death to his (own) harboring of such death wishes, first against others, then against himself. It was aggression turned inward, as analysts say. 'In terms of wishes, his superstition meant that because he wanted Fliess, Fleischl, his father, his brother Julius, his sister Anna, and anyone else he hated, to die, he would die,' his physician suggested. Freud's death-wish neurosis became so strong he falsely believed that man had a death instinct, Thanatos, that was normal and universal."

Modern Freudians follow in the footsteps of their prophet. Despite Freud's attempts to prevent Psychoanalysis becoming the exclusive preserve of Jews, Dr. Gross tells us that these days there is "a strong representation of Jewish patients, a tendency possibly related to the large number of Jewish analysts, a tradition begun by Freud and his disciples.

"In the Maryland study, 40% of the patients were Jewish; 33% Protestant; 13% Catholic; and 12% without affiliation. An American Psychoanalytic Association study generally confirms these figures. They report 45.2% Jewish patients; 43.6% Protestant and 10.1% Catholic ...

"The psychoanalytic community is even more geographically clustered than are the general psychiatrists. The two major analytic capitals are almost 3,000 miles apart: Manhattan and Los Angeles."

Psychoanalysis is so much grounded in metropolitan Jewish life that Gross reports 11 central states which do not have a single psychoanalyst. One Manhattan office building houses more psychoanalysts than 7 states combined. The profession is so dominated by Jews that Yiddish words and Jewish expressions are used as part of the jargon. The American Psychoanalytic Association is known as the "kosher" school of analytic therapy, we are told. Curing a patient is commonly called bringing him to be a "mensch." In the area of payment, modern analysts follow Freud's true and tested method: "Freud ingeniously tied the fee to results. If the fee is very low, he warned, the value of the treatment will be denigrated in the patient's eyes. Free treatment is an analytic disaster, he insisted. Without the 'corrective influence' of money, the patient is supposedly deprived of a 'useful incentive to exert himself to bring the cure to an end.'

"Only in a few areas does the modern analysis so slavishly follow Freud. The bill for the month's analysis (some \$1000 at \$50 an hour) is not mailed. It is presented, eyeball-to-psyche, to the patient at the end of the month. If payment is not forthcoming in time, there is an automatic reminder in the next bill. The next step is medicine's most effective collection system: the analyst injects the unpaid bill into the analytic work to find the unconscious reason for the *resistance*."

Resistance is one of Psychoanalysis's most useful shibboleths. It features in one professional joke about a patient's punctuality. If the patient comes early he is displaying *anxiety*. If he comes late he is offering *resistance*. If he regularly comes on time, he is *compulsive*.

Whatever a patient does, there is always something wrong with him. How reminiscent this supposedly witty anecdote is of Sigmund Freud's attitudes. No matter what his patients said or did he would immediately project onto them his own neuroses. Could it possibly be that the psychoanalytic industry is cast in the same mold? Could it be that psychiatry amounts to no more than Jews telling the rest of us that we suffer from Jewish neuroses?

Therapy

There can be no doubt that psychotherapy is the boom industry of our age. In 1955 psychiatric clinics treated a modest 233,000 people. By 1977 the figure had risen to 3.9 million. Another 3 million attend private therapists.

Yet objective tests have shown that much of this "therapy" is totally unnecessary. Dr. Jerome Frank of the Johns-Hopkins University School of Medicine in Baltimore suggests that the therapy industry may be self-perpetuating and self-serving: "The greater the number of treatment facilities and the more widely they are known, the larger the number of persons seeking their services. Psychotherapy is the only form of treatment which, to some extent, appears to create the illness it treats."

Dr. Hans J. Eysenck of the University of London's Institute of Psychiatry compared the success rates of patients who had received therapy and those who had received none. There was little or no difference. This was in 1952. He followed up with a 1965 study which so outraged the psychiatric establishment that he was forced to conclude that it was "as if we were attempting a statistical test of the efficiency of prayer". More recent surveys, cited in Martin Gross's blasphemous *Psychological Society*, underline Eysenck's early findings. Comparisons between patients receiving therapy, and patients receiving placebos or even just staying on waiting lists, showed no difference whatsoever.

Many of the modern therapy gurus started off as orthodox Freudians. Some, like Eric Fromm, started off as Orthodox Jews. Fromm was born in Frankfurt in 1901, descending from a long line of rabbis, and was raised in a strictly orthodox home. After

graduating from Heidelberg University University at the age of 26, he apparently severed his ties to dogmatic Judaism and became an agnostic. He studied at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute and in 1929 returned to Frankfurt, where he lectured at the local university in Social Psychology. He also became a member of the famed "Frankfurt School" (Frankfurt Institute for Social Research) of far-left Jewish thinkers, which also included Max Horkheimer, Frederick Pollock, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse, Franz Neumann and Theodor Adorn. Here, each of them pontificated on the reasons for the rise of Nazism, and Fromm would pirate most of his "explanations" published as *Escape from Freedom* (1942) from his colleague Wilhelm Reich's *Mass Psychology of Fascism* (1933). Other ideas he lifted from Karl Marx, that other great German Jewish rabbinical descendant.

Fromm "explained" that "the psychological foundations of Nazism" were due to: "an ambiguous relationship to authority, characteristic of the German lower middle-class. The petty bourgeois at once craved authority and rebelled against it." Fromm blatantly ignored the fact that National Socialism was a movement of the proletariat, not of the ruling class or bourgeoisie. Even the name of the party was the National **Socialist** German **Workers'** Party. In a straight case of projection, Fromm was actually attributing Jewish bourgeois behavior patterns to the Nazis. As we shall see later on, Jews are caught up in a continual psychological conflict: craving paternal/rabbinical authority while at the same time rebelling against it. The rebelling is often redirected into other areas, of course.

With the advent of a National Socialist government in Germany, the Frankfurt Institute packed up and moved *en bloc*, first to Geneva and then to New York. In the United States, the Frankfurters ungratefully complained about "the authoritarianism which lurked beneath America's democratic facade". Here they all went their separate ways. Fromm revised many of Freud's theories and charged that Freud had omitted a multitude of social and economic factors in developing his psychoanalytic positions. Fromm taught at various U.S. universities before returning to Europe in 1969. In 1973 he again published a book of straight projection: *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness* (Holt, Reinhart; NY) which alleged that Hitler and Himmler suffered from "necrophilous" personalities. As we have seen in the case of Karl Marx, and as we shall see later in the findings of the brilliant psychohistorian Dr. Howard Stein, on the contrary it is Jews who suffer from death-fixations. Fromm himself died a few years later in 1980 in Switzerland.

Fromm's colleague Wilhelm Reich (who was only half Jewish) found the U.S. to be much more to his liking. He wrote that America was the only country in the world where one could "stand up for the pursuit of happiness and the rights of the living". He moved more and more to the right, and condemned Soviet Imperialism, liberal complacency, and trade with the communists. After a couple of years operating a private psychoanalytic practice in Forest Hills, a Jewish suburb of New York, Reich had accumulated enough money to buy an estate near Rangeley, Maine. Here he developed some strange individualistic ideas of his own.

Although Reich had actually trained with Freud in Vienna, and had worked at the prestigious Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute, he was now moving toward a more esoteric analytic position. He developed the theory of "Orgone" which was a unique energy in the human body — actually the primordial sexual energy out of which all life springs. More Orgone could be found in nature, such as in hurricanes, gravity, and the aurora borealis. Only nuclear energy was separate — in fact the history of the universe was a titanic struggle between Orgone and nuclear energy.

The study of Orgone, known as Orgonomy, bridged the gap between science and religion. Reich began to have delusions of grandeur, and compared himself to Jesus Christ and Socrates. He started to become paranoid about having his theories hijacked and spoiled by others. (Indeed, he did receive some questionable support from the homosexual and drug-proponents Allen Ginsburg and William Burroughs). In the hope of heading off the pornographic exploitation of his discoveries, Reich revamped his terminology. In a remarkably revealing pronouncement, the word "sex; abused and smutted into a horrible nightmare, into a rubbing of cold penises within stale vaginas" was abandoned by Reich altogether, and for "sexual intercourse" he substituted "the genital embrace".

Reich eventually developed a therapeutic tool, an "Orgone Accumulator" which was a six-sided phone booth, where the patient would sit in order to absorb concentrated Orgone radiation. He also developed a "cloud-buster" which would cause rain to fall (Truly, the age of the Rainmaker is not confined to the 1930s Deep South.) Eventually, the Federal government noticed some of these strange goings-on, and the Food and Drug Administration raided his estate. In an incredible series of events, Reich's books were burned, his equipment seized, and he himself was thrown in jail. On 3 November 1957, Reich died "of a heart attack" at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania penitentiary, having served 8 months of a 2-year sentence for transporting Orgone boxes across state lines. While we cannot but be outraged at the Federal government's authoritarian treatment of such a man, we are left with the disturbing perception that all cannot have been well with a man who regarded sex as a "horrible nightmare" and a "rubbing of cold penises within stale vaginas."

An equally odd career was led by Fromm's and Reich's Frankfurt colleague Herbert Marcuse. He collaborated on the Frankfurt Institute's study of *Authority and Family*, which was started in Frankfurt, but published in Paris in 1936 after Hitler's takeover in Germany. This was yet another Jewish Marxist "explanation" of the rise of Nazism, due — of course — to German family life. The study would also act as a springboard for Marcuse & Adorn's 1950 diatribe on the "psychological underpinnings of ... the American variants of Fascist anti-Semitism and ethnocentrism", *The Authoritarian Personality*. However, the most authoritarian, ethnocentric and punitive families of all — Jewish families — do not figure in these condemnations, for some odd reason. After fleeing to the United States, Marcuse miraculously landed a job with the newly-formed Office of Strategic Services (OSS) the wartime forerunner of the CIA. His Marxist political outlook was no bar to such a sensitive intelligence job. In fact, it was almost a qualification, for as we read in OSS by R. Harris Smith (U. of California Press,

1972) the service was staffed by radical foreign-born Jews from top to bottom. Many of these Jews would later go on to become lawyers and interpreters at the Nuremberg kangaroo trials in occupied Germany.

After the war, Marcuse took up various lecturing positions at U.S. universities. He engaged in debates in the columns of *Dissent*, the leftist Jewish magazine, with Eric Fromm who by this time had become something of a Freudian revisionist. Marcuse eventually patched together all his criticisms of the "neo-Freudians" into a book entitled *Eros and Civilization*. Marcuse argued that:

"the revisionists continued to espouse the idealistic values which rationalized the exploitation and alienation characteristic of capitalism. This was reprehensible; first of all because it was utterly arbitrary from a theoretical point of view — another example of the theoretical shabbiness of revisionism. Moreover, the specific content of revisionist ethics was the old roster of Protestant-capitalist virtues: productivity, achievement, responsibility, respect for one's fellow men, inner strength and integrity. 'Fromm revives all the time honored values of idealistic ethics as if nobody had ever demonstrated their conformist and repressive features.' " — **Paul A. Robinson: *The Freudian Left*, 1969.**

The term "Protestant-capitalist" or "Protestant work ethic" has long been a code for "WASP" among intellectual Jews. Ever since the days of Max Weber, who argued that Protestantism was the "cause" of Capitalism, Jews have been trying to muddy the waters by making out that Usury and Productivity are the same thing: Capitalism. In actual fact, they are opposites; productivity is hampered by usury. Usury is a parasite on the back of productivity. The Weber thesis was long ago exploded by the German thinker Werner Sombart, who argued in *Die Jude und das Wirtschaftsleben* (Leipzig, 1911) that it was actually the Jews who were responsible for the pyramid growth of usury-capitalism.

Robinson goes on in his description of Marcuse's *Eros* book:

"(Marx) was clearly the unacknowledged hero of Eros and Civilization. That Marcuse never mentioned Marx's name in the book was an extraordinary feat of legerdemain. It is my contention that the underlying tactic of Eros and Civilization was to bring Freudian theory into line with the categories of Marxism."

Marcuse's main argument appears to be that Capitalist society suppresses sexuality and thereby perpetuates and creates neuroses. Sexual liberation — including the re-sexualization of the body instead of just the genital area — would go hand in hand with economic liberation. While Marcuse was a professor at the University of California at Berkeley, he took full advantage of his position to agitate the students in favor of the sexual and political revolution which he sought .

The death of Wilhelm Reich and Eric Fromm, and the passing of Marxism from the realm of campus fads, has meant that an entirely new generation of therapy gurus has sprung up since the old-gang of the Frankfurt School. The trend seems to be away from the intellectual, economic, reductionist philosophies and toward the hedonistic, me-

centered attitudes of the 1970s and '80s. Although the approach may differ, the game remains the same. Just as in the old days of the '50s and '60s the new messiahs - or new psychology *yentas* — who have followed in Freud's and the Frankfurters' footsteps, are busy telling us that we suffer from their problems, and need to pay them a handsome retainer so that they can tell us all about it.

One of the most dramatic of the new therapies is Primal. With all the panache of a Hollywood hype merchant, the developer of Primal Therapy, Dr. Arthur Janov, readily boasts that he is flooded with applications from around the World for his \$6000 courses in learning to cry like a baby. Janov claims — just like the early Freud did — that patients suffer from unhappy reminiscences of infancy. Only by returning to the infant state and reliving these times can the patient be cured. So profitable is Primal Therapy that a whole gaggle of imitators has sprung up around the country, only to be slapped with copyright infringement suits by Janov. He regularly publishes warning notices in popular trade magazines such as *Psychology Today*.

Primal Therapy caters to, and is run by, those who feel dominated, castrated, unloved and controlled, by their mothers. The emphasis is on the Pain of infancy, not the joy. All in all, there could be no better encapsulation of the Jewish trauma than this almost totally Jewish cult.

There have been many imitators of Janov. The most prominent is undoubtedly Dr. Daniel Casriel, who offers "scream therapy" at a much cheaper price tag. He too holds that childhood revolves around Pain, and insists that all patients' statements should be prefaced by the delightful homily "Fuck you!".

One of the more populist neo-Freudians was Dr. Eric Berne, who took Freudianism off the couch and into the parlor with his pulp paperbacks *Games People Play* and *What Do You Do After You Say Hello?* His protege Tom Harris continues today in the same vein with his Transactional Analysis workshops based on his cheery book *I'm OK! You're OK!* Therapy involves Dale Carnegie style pep-talks and T-A parlor games such as one entitled "Schlemiel".

One of the more widely known therapies is Gestalt, a German word meaning configuration. Gestalt was dreamt up by the late Fritz Perls and his wife Laura. Perls dismissed orthodox psychoanalysis as "mind-fucking" and instead practiced **feeling** instead of **thinking**. It was Perls who coined the 1960s slogan "Do your own thing". Therapy involves group counseling sessions to encourage the patient's **awareness** and to discourage **blocking** of feelings. Patients and therapists are encouraged to touch each other. Awareness of feelings and display of them is the key to healing. Perls despised the intellectualism of Freudianism, which he would refer to as "elephant shit". But Perls himself was originally a traditional Freudian analyst in Germany, where he worked with Wilhelm Reich. After spending the war years in South Africa, he came to the United States in the 1950s, where his "Me" centered therapy arrived just in time to exploit the increasingly hedonistic, anti-intellectual groundswell that would sweep the country from west to east.

There have been many spin-offs from Gestalt, which are known generically as the "human potential movement" or "humanistic psychology". There is Carl Rogers, who transferred Perls' group counseling sessions into the "one-on-one situation". There is Mike Murphy, a layman who inherited a large estate at Big Sur, and figured that weekend encounter group-gropes would pay the bills each month; hence Esalen. Then there are lesser prophets in the therapy temple: Paul Bindrim of Nude Encounter, Bill Schulz the Messiah of Joy, and the guru of Humanistic Psychology Abraham Maslow. All of these philosophies offer self-actualization for the individual; salvation from lifelong unhappiness and futility, and escape from loneliness in ready-made, off-the-peg, family-style encounter groups. Much of the marketing technique is disturbingly similar to hot-gospel flim-flam artists of the Bible Belt, Orange County and Sunday Evening television. Even the United States government falls for this quackery. Many federal departments have programs whereby personnel may attend Sensitivity Training sessions. Sensitivity Training (or "T Groups") was invented by the late Kurt Lewis, yet another refugee from Nazi Austria. The kindred Encounter Groups were the brainchild of J. L. Moreno — also a Jewish refugee from Austria.

If one had to choose a top-of-the-line winner in quackery stakes, it would be impossible to decide between est and Scientology. Est was founded in 1971 in San Francisco by Werner Hans Erhard. He adopted this pseudonym in mid-flight between St. Louis and San Francisco after leafing through a copy of *Newsweek* and reading an article about German rocket scientists working at Cape Kennedy. His true name is Jack Rosenberg. Originally est stood for Erhard Seminars Training, but with a change of marketing strategy, the expanded title was dropped altogether, and it is now claimed that est is taken from the Latin for "it is".

Est training ostensibly operates without theory, but it actually combines all the most exploitative gimmicks of both traditional and humanistic therapies. The "training" (*sic*) takes place in large hotel suites or convention centers over two weekends. During the sessions, attendees are refused permission to go to the bathroom, or to eat, or to take notes. Attendees are treated like performing seals. During the first sessions they are ridiculed and often called "ass-holes". Later sessions involve **sharing**, or telling others about oneself and one's problems — a catharsis typical of almost all therapies. Then, **processes**, or play-acting exercises to simulate anger, fear, like, et cetera, are organized — a technique lifted from Gestalt and Scientology. After several days of insult, discomfort, and boredom, the trainees are finally expected to "get it". "It" is no more than the acceptance of one's self as an all-capable and all-loving individual without hangups or blockages — a state that sounds awfully similar to Dale Carnegie's 1960s self-confidence seminars.

Est "graduates" are prevailed upon to bring their friends and family to the final (evening) session, which coincidentally is also a sales session for the new people. Curious about the trainee's account of what took place, these new folk are battered with a 2 hour sales pitch that would put a door-to-door encyclopedia salesman to shame. A salesman promises that a "process" will be organized so they see what it's all about, but for some

reason this never takes place. During an interval toward the end of the 2 hours, the neophytes are lobbied by always-smiling estians (mostly volunteers) to sign up for the \$350 course. An array of credit card machines walls them in.

Meanwhile, the "graduates" are invited to sign up for more est courses, including a "Hunger Project" that never funnels any money to the starving; "hunger can be defeated by raising consciousness" they are told. Graduates who decline further involvement are regularly harassed on the telephone by more est salespeople — always in the early evening or Saturday morning, when resistance is low.

Meanwhile, "Werner Erhard" (the "Hans" has disappeared along with the Rosenberg) lives a life of luxury in Marin County, raking in the shekels from his pyramiding operations, where every single printed piece of paper is "copyright Werner Erhard" in discreet type. Over 100,000 Americans have "graduated" from this used-car salesman's est courses. One of his staunchest advocates is est graduate and folk singer John Denver.

The Church of Scientology is perhaps the most anti-Establishment of all the therapy faiths. Established as a "church" primarily to gain taxation advantages, the Scientologists find themselves in continual battles with federal and state governments. Several Scientologists have been convicted of burglaries into state offices, and harassment of state officials. Scientologists are prominent in the tax-rebel movement. But the purpose of all of this rebellion is not libertarian, individualistic freedom. The purpose of Scientology seems to be the enriching of the corporate coffers through milking the faithful of every spare dime.

The cult was dreamed up by science-fiction writer L. Ron Hubbard. Today, Hubbard heads a world-wide religion with outposts in almost every English-speaking country in the World, and a headquarters church in the rolling South Downs of Sussex, England, at East Grinstead. Hubbard himself is a recluse, until recently living on board a yacht that is perpetually at sea.

Predicated on his early book Dianetics (copyright L. Ron Hubbard, of course) Scientology courses involve counseling or "auditing" sessions where the trainee answers an auditor's questions while holding onto an "E-meter" or lie detector machine. The auditor points out the flaws in the trainee's personality, and helpfully suggests Scientological courses that might remedy this. Since many of these courses cost hundreds or even thousands of dollars, the trainees are encouraged to go into debt through bank loans and so on, in order that they might Save themselves in these courses. Needless to say, the whole process is a perpetual-motion machine where the trainees can complete enough units so that they too can become an auditor, and perhaps eventually even a "guardian" who polices the church for heretical tendencies. So, what do we make out of the Therapy Industry? Is it no more than a boondoggle; a cute way of making money without working too hard? Is it a Californian version of the Deep South's (sorry — Sun Belt's) Marjoes? Are all these laid-back, hip, tanned,

relaxed, cosmopolitan Californians falling for the same line as backwoods folk who flock to the snake-oil salesman? Or is there more to it than that?

We cannot help but notice that most of the Therapeutic rainmakers are Jews. (Hubbard is the only possible exception.) And a large portion are Jewish refugees from Nazi Europe. Can it be that these people have a score to settle with Gentile society? Could it just possibly be that these Jews are "getting off" on "getting back" at the Goy? Was *Portnoy's Complaint* really such a caricature, or was it number one on the best-seller lists precisely because it so vividly brought together all those characteristics which we have all just sneakily suspected might be inter-related?

Further, we cannot help but take note of the salacious nature of much therapy dialog. Toiletry and sexual terms are hurled about, not in a matter-of-fact or clinical sense, but in a abusive way. The (Jewish) therapists take great delight in having their often sensitive clients embarrass and humiliate themselves by bandying around words which would rarely be heard at home. Terms like "cock", "fuck", "cunt" etc. are not used in a loving, appreciative sense as they might be whispered in a lover's ear during a passionate bedroom tryst. They are used as terms of abuse, as they are in the environment of the barrack-room or the dockside, or the factory floor. And the scatological terms "ass-hole", "shit", "crap" etc. are not included in dialog in a healthy, Anglo-Saxon way where bodily functions would be regarded in an ecological, organic sense.

It might be argued that such sexual and scatological banter has a more serious side. It is not just the therapist making sure that everyone in the group is helped to free themselves of verbal inhibitions and restraints. It is not even just that the therapist needs to let off a bit of steam. It is the **way** the therapist chooses to let off that steam. In abusing the clients with sexual and scatological terms, the therapist is telling more about him or herself than he or she is about the client. The therapist is saying that he or she feels suppressed and blocked in these areas; otherwise what would make penises, vaginas and stools into reference points any more than fingers, toes or ear-lobes? Readers who are not privileged to live in locales where the Therapy Industry is well established (chiefly Southern California and New York City) may be somewhat baffled at the continued success of all this quackery. So let us pause for a moment to consider the reasons for the general public continuing to support it.

We can easily understand why it is that Jews flock to Jewish therapists. The therapist articulates for them all the pent-up rage and frustration that being Jewish is all about. The "processes" and the acting-out sessions fit snugly into the mold of Jewish ritual down through the ages. The emphasis on guilt, suffering and torment are part and parcel of Jewish religious and cultural life. The Judaic religion is not one of love and kindness, but one of duty, sin, retribution and cruelty. Even innocent animals are made to suffer. Cattle and sheep are strung up by their hind legs and bled to death ("*shechita*"). Chickens are twirled around the rabbi's head in an annual sin-purging ceremony ("*kapporen schluggen*"). Goats are brought into the synagogue and all the sins of the congregation magically transferred into them (hence "scape goats"). Jews

are fond of telling us that one can judge a nation's standard of civilization by how they treat their Jews. While there is much — ironic — truth in this aphorism, an even more universal measure might be that one can judge a nation's civilization by how they treat their animals...

The Jewish faith is probably the most highly-regulated religion in the World. Rabbis pore over their Talmud and Torahs and nit-pick with each other over whether such-and-such a passage should take precedence over some other passage. Rules and Talmudic instructions are quoted to regulate even the tiniest aspects of Jewish life. Most of the rituals are more akin to Borneo than to Europe. New-born infants have part of their penis chopped in a ceremony that includes masturbation and fellatio in front of a beaming audience. Women are prohibited from entering the synagogue. They are shunned during their periods. Men strap leather thongs around their arms and prayer-boxes on their foreheads. More prayers are placed in little holders on the household doorpost, as good-luck charms. Food must be segregated into kosher and non-kosher; meat and dairy. Even clothes must be regulated according to their fiber content. All in all, the Jewish faith is so steeped in superstition and backward rigmarole that it is not surprising that many Jews find they have a need to express some of their frustration at all of this over-regulation and disharmony with rationality. So they turn to a "Big Brother" figure in the form of a Jewish therapist. There they can be sure of some ethnic empathy and understanding for their predicament. After all, the therapist has suffered those same torments himself.

But what is it that makes Gentiles flock to Jewish therapists? European thought is supposed to be **the** most rational, **the** most objective, **the** most scientific (as compared to the subjective, anti-Hellenic sensism of other races). Is this phenomenon unique only to those Gentiles who happen to reside in the Land of Fruits and Nuts? Or can we trace a similar pattern of gullibility in other areas?

We can note that throughout history, sound, healthy Gentile ideas have often been hijacked and corrupted by the Jews. At the beginning of western history, the healthy, organic nature-worship of our pagan ancestors was hijacked and turned into the poisonous, bizarre cult known as Christianity. The pagan festival of life and fertility (Aestar) was turned completely around and became a celebration of death and necrophilia (the crucifixion of Jesus). The celebration of mid-winter prosperity and vigor (Yuletide) was turned into a neurotic carnival of misogynistic sex-phobia (the Christmas "Virgin Birth").

In the Middle Ages, European libertarian free enterprise was latched onto by Jewish money-lenders and bankers, and became the cruel pyramid-sales scam known as Capitalism.

In the last century indigenous progressive Socialist ideas were stolen and poisoned by the Jewish neurotic Karl Marx, and made into the terror of Bolshevistic Communism. These "Three Cs" — Christianity, Capitalism and Communism — represent worldwide movements where otherwise rational, intelligent Gentiles have fallen, hook, line and

sinker, for Jewish hype. Therapy is merely another example, though it remains to be seen whether or not it will last as long as these other scams. It may well be that therapy is destined to succeed Christianity — from which therapy has lifted much of its structure — now that Christianity has outlived its usefulness in acting as a battering-ram for Capitalism, Imperialism and Liberalism.

Psychoanalysis in particular is so much like Confession that it is uncanny. The Priest-Analyst listens intently to the confessor's "sins"; recommends penance; and issues absolution. We note that Roman Catholics, who practice Confession much more than the other Christian cults, are very much under-represented on the analysis couch. They already have access to the same service at church.

Critical writers such as Martin L. Gross have pointed out how many therapy cults — especially the more esoteric kind — have all the hallmarks of religions, with missionary work, evangelism, a hierarchy of priests, church guardians, articles of faith, and of course heretics. (One therapy cult — Scientology — actually calls itself a church.) The level of discussion in many of the cults' sessions is similar to that of Christians pontificating about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

In summary, then, we must conclude that the reason for Gentiles falling for Jewish therapy is the same as the reason why Gentiles fall for Jewish Christianity, Jewish Capitalism and Jewish Communism. And the detailed discussion of that gullibility must be left until another book.

Sex

The subject of sex has been a focus for Jewish writers since Biblical times. *The Babylonian Talmud*, which is the legal code that forms the basis of Jewish regulations, contains many references to sexual mores and commentaries. Many of these regulations are perverse. For example, *Yebhamoth* 55b permits sexual intercourse with a dead relative, whether the relative was single or married. *Kethuboth* 11b advocates sex with three year old girls. *Sanhedrin* 54b-55a permits sodomy with three year old girls and boys under nine. 78a of the same book allows sodomy with a dying person, but only so long as the act is committed in the presence of a rabbi!

Lengthy debates take place within the holy books about whether or not consummation of a marriage on the Sabbath would constitute work. The law-makers conclude that such intercourse is not work and is permissible because "any act of damage does not constitute labor in regard to the Sabbath"!

Even Jesus is included in these bizarre sexual ramblings. *Sanhedrin* 105a-b tells that "Jesus fornicated with his jackass". And *Gittin* 57a holds that "Jesus is in hell and is being punished by being boiled in hot semen. Christians are boiled in shit."

One of the most complete accounts of Jewish sexual mores is contained in *Erotica Judaica* by Allen Edwardes (NY, 1967). This fascinating, yet little known book, presents a sexual history of the Jews. Edwards, and others, have addressed the vexing issue of Jewish ritual circumcision. The French Jew Leon Poliakov writing in *The History of Anti-Semitism* suggests that the psychological trauma of circumcision contributes to the unique Jewish personality traits. Poliakov has not done his homework properly, for in the United States nearly 90% of Gentile males are circumcised, and Americans have not yet adopted "Jewish" personality characteristics as a result.

Sigmund Freud was closer to the mark when he wrote in *Moses and Monotheism*: "Circumcision is the symbolic substitute of castration, a punishment which the primeval father dealt his sons long ago out of the fullness of his power; and whosoever accepted this symbol showed by so doing that he was ready to submit to the father's will, although it was at the cost of a painful sacrifice."

However, Freud seems to overlook the fact that a new-born infant is not in any position to have any choice in the matter of his mutilation by a mohel or by a pediatrician. Bruno Bettelheim comes much closer when he writes:

"Circumcision ... can only symbolize castration in a society where severe punishment, particularly in regard to sexual behavior, is part of the individual's frame of reference. And only where the punitive figure of an adult looms large will the child easily make the mental transition from circumcision to castration anxiety. Jewish society is one such, and so are the other societies that have been influenced deeply by Judaism." — *Symbolic Wounds*

But Freud did hit the nail on the head with his remarks later in the same tome: "... this feeling of guiltiness which the Prophets incessantly kept alive and which soon became an integral part of the religious system itself. It became not easy to adhere to the illusion, cherished above all else, that they were God's chosen people ... The need for satisfying this feeling of guilt ... made them render their religious precepts ever and ever more strict, more exacting, but also more petty."

Edwardes later reveals some startling aspects of ritual circumcision which Freud just happened to avoid mentioning:

"Jews are even saddled with the sin of masturbatiomania, owing to Gentile observance of the mohel, or circumciser, routinely clasp[ing] the babe's penis with thumb and forefinger and gently stimulating an erection to facilitate the delicate operation; and are heavily burdened with the terrible guilt of being fellatio maniacs: a scandal aroused by Gentile observation of the circumcisional routine of metzizah, or stypic suction of the wound by the circumciser's wine-daubed lips — a highly controversial procedure suggestive of Jewish perversion as well as explanatory of alleged Jewish addiction to fellation. Freudian theories of sexual traumatism were thus afloat in an earlier age!" Despite much aversion to and prohibition of circumcision, early Christians were so gullible to Judaic lore that they even worshipped "holy foreskins" at churches throughout

Europe. At least 12 examples of "Jesus' foreskin" were revered as holy relics at different churches. One Parisian church had the "Virgin Mary's vaginal lips" enshrined. All of these relics were brought back to Europe by the Crusaders.

Medieval times were also significant for the preponderance of Jewish converts to Christianity who were actively involved in the persecution of Jews. In 1240, Louis IX of France set up a committee to investigate Jewish hatred of Christians. Head of the committee was Nicholas Donin, a convert. In the mid 15th century in Spain, a homosexual renegade Jew, Fray Alonso de Espina, published many accusations against the Jews, his best-known being *Fortress of Faith Against the Jews*. But Espina was by far eclipsed by his contemporary, Fray Tomas de Torquemada, the first Inquisitor General (1483) and papal Grand Inquisitor (1487). As Edwardes tells us: "Both his father and his uncle, Cardinal Juan de Torquemada, were of immediate Jewish descent. Uncle Juan became a full fledged converso or "New Christian", rising to great eminence in Church and State, while Tomas' sire remained a crypto-Jew or Marrano (literally, 'Pig'). Although he reared Tomas as a strict Christian, he had dared to have him circumcised in infancy, so that if Tomas ever wished to revert to Judaism, he was already a Jew in the flesh.

"This goes far to explain much of Tomas de Torquemada's excessive severity, for he was the most relentless expeller and persecutor of Jews since ancient times — a monomaniac 'who, shedding floods of honest tears, caused his victims to be burned alive.'

"His successor, Fray Diego de Deza, was also a Christianized Jew — as was Alonso Manrique, Cardinal-Archbishop of Seville and Inquisitor General from 1523 to 1538. These two may not have been circumcised, but they were anti-Judaic infatuates all the same!

"This leads us to a remarkable discovery, which seems to account for much of the mad excess of Spanish Judaeophobia. Seventeenth century Dutch theologian Philip van Limborch, on the authority of his friend and famed Amsterdam Jewish physician Isaac Orobio de Castro, wrote that 'The monasteries and convents (of Spain and Portugal) are all full of Jews; while many even of the canons, inquisitors, and bishops themselves are of Jewish descent.'"

Even the pope was a Jew. Antipope Anacletus II (1130-38) was descended from Jewish converts; a phenomenon which led St. Bernard de Clairvaux to exclaim: "A Jewish sprout has occupied the Chair of Peter!" Anacletus (Cardinal Pietro Pierleoni) was excommunicated, and thereafter a "papal stool" was provided, so that the pope could dangle his penis through a hole to have it inspected for circumcision by a *toccatogli i testicola* or "testicle-toucher". Pope Alexander VI was subjected to a particularly rigorous examination, on account of his recent name-change. His prepuce was found to be intact, and he continued to reign as the "vicar of Christ" (despite the fact that he continued to sire a multitude of children by a host of mistresses).

Many Jews fled from the Spanish Inquisition and settled in North Africa, where religious tolerance prevailed. Here, many of the younger refugees became prostitutes. The men became known as *maricones* ("fags") and would often paint the word **kosher** over their doors to show that they only accepted "kosher meat", i.e. only the circumcised. The female Jewish prostitutes became known as *shlikkah*, a word passed down to today as "shiksehs" which charmingly now refers to any Gentile woman.

Some writers have noted a neurotic sexual undertone within modern Zionism. Wesley Hazleton's book *The Israeli Women* first deals with Biblical Oedipal/political currents: "As a mystical idea, the return to Zion afforded the bond of a future but never-to-be-achieved-in-our-lifetime Redemption. It was imagined, as Isaiah indicates, in terms of the return of son to mother in sexual union."

She characterizes Ezekiel's prophecies as follows:

"The sons were to mount Zion in the role of rescuer and sexual claimant, the young groom returning to claim his bride; the son his mother. The result of the intercourse between son and mother would be the rebirth of the son himself, who would give new life to his mother by saving her from the iniquities of suffering under foreign rule, and restore her innocence and light as mother and life-giver."

Then, she shows how modern Zionists reflect this urge. She quotes a *kibbutz* leader Muir Yaari, who openly referred to the sexual nature of the *kibbutzniks'* zeal. The land they tilled, he said, was their bride, and they themselves "the bridegroom who abandons himself in his bride's bosom ... thus we abandon ourselves to the motherly womb of the sanctifying earth".

The modern Hebrew language, she tells us, is full of Oedipal terminology. Even archeology is "digging into the motherland; back to the womb." *Gever*, the Hebrew word for "man" also means rooster or cock. The word for "weapon" is *zayin*, which also means penis. Thus the phrase for Israel's Armed Forces can also be translated as "roosters equipped with penises".

Ms. Hazleton touches on one of the most sensitive chords in modern Jewish theology: attitudes toward menstruation:

"Codified in perverse detail by Joseph Caro in the Shulchan Aruch, the laws of niddah forbid sexual intercourse not only during menstruation but for at least seven days after, to ensure that the woman is perfectly 'clean'. Defiance of this law supposedly can lead to premature death for both partners. The detailed means of avoiding this danger make horribly fascinating reading: 'To touch her (a menstruating woman) in a caressing manner is punishable with lashes. He is not permitted to come into contact with her, be it even a long thing, nor should he receive aught from her; he is likewise forbidden to throw anything from his hand into her hand.'

"The two cannot sleep together. He must not sit where she sat. But since he has to eat and drink and his wife has to provide for these needs, she is permitted to prepare food and drink for him as long as she does not do so in his presence. She must then set the food on the table when he is out of the room, if he is in the room and sees her doing so, he cannot touch the food.

"More details follow in abundance, delving into the exact color and quantity of any 'moisture oozing out of her body'. A woman with a vaginal discharge due to a fungal infection is apparently pure while just the suspicion that she has started menstruating even if there is no blood, is enough to make her impure.

"This impurity lasts a minimum of 12 days. During the 7 days after menstruation, the woman must examine herself carefully each day ... This menstrual fetishism culminates in the final proof of purity, the mikveh, a ritual bath in which the woman immerses herself at the end of the 12 days, muttering blessings the while, to emerge clean to the male touch.

"Lest there still remain any doubt to the general uncleanliness of the female sex, it extends even to newborn children: a woman is ritually unclean for 3 weeks after a male child is born, and for double that time after the birth of a female child."

These insulting practices are fully supported by the Israeli government, who pass out to every bride-to-be a booklet entitled *Happy Marriage* which endorses such habits by quoting "experts" on the dangers of "bloody elements". As Hazleton points out somewhat tongue-in-cheek, the pursuit of such habits "may explain why ultra Orthodox men are among Israeli prostitutes' most regular clientele". Other observers have noted that some Orthodox men bend the rules somewhat, by covering their wife with a sheet, and copulating with her through a small hole cut in the center.

Sexuality, often of a salacious nature, features throughout "Holocaust" literature and is often tied into scatological descriptions. However, this whole area deserves a chapter to itself, and hence we pass over this aspect of Jewish psychology for now.

Let us draw together some of the various findings we have uncovered. We have found that Jewish religious literature dwells on perverse sex. We discover that in the modern age, Jews are still practicing weird sex cults, such as circumcision and the rejection of a menstruating wife. We have found that rabbis will masturbate, then mutilate and then fellate a baby's penis. We know that Jews often grow up in matriarchal homes, yet the adult Jew insults his wife through rejection during menstruation, and through according her very few rights under civil or under religious law in the world's only Jewish theocracy, Israel.

Our conclusion must be as follows: Jews suffer from an inadequacy and hatred of themselves which is stimulated by maternal punitiveness, and manifests itself as filial guilt. Fathers exercise their guilt and shame at being Jewish by performing a token castration of their male children; circumcision. But at the same time they try to make

amends to the infant by kissing/fellating his mutilated penis. Resentment against Jewish mothers is transposed onto Jewish wives by rejecting them during their most feminine period. The Jewish wives react by themselves becoming punitive against the males in the family. So the vicious cycle continues. In other chapters we will notice the guilt phenomenon manifesting itself in other areas of Jewish life.

Power

In his strikingly personal book *Jews and American Politics*, author Stephen D. Isaacs spells out some very pertinent questions right on the dust-jacket. He asks: "Why is the political power of American Jews — and their contribution — far greater than their numbers?" "Why do Jews seldom run for office, and why do so many work behind the scenes as strategists?" The book is based on personal interviews with 200 leading American Jews, many of whom initially balked at the thought of "letting it all hang out" for the *goyim* to read, and react to. This paranoia is well-illustrated in a most curious appraisal of the book by Joseph Raft: "A vast storehouse of information on a touchy subject which is poorly understood by Jews and their enemies." Raft might as well have changed the period comma and added "the *goyim*". To the political Jew, the world is not populated by Jews and non-Jews, it is populated by Jews and "their enemies".

Isaac provides a multitude of examples, many in direct response to his manuscript: "Though well aware of the inbred dread of impending doom, this writer was startled by responses of noted public men on the subject of anti-Semitism. One question was repeated to most of those who gave longer interviews for this book: 'Do you think it could happen here?' (Never was it necessary to define 'it'.) In almost every case, the reply was approximately the same: 'If you know history at all, you have to presume not that it could happen, but that it will,' or 'It's not a matter of if: it's a matter of when.' "Fear undoubtedly is the greatest single factor accounting for Jews' high level of political activity. In one way or another, Jews in politics are, at the extreme, striving to avoid becoming lamp shades or, at least, striving for a 'just' society — which may ultimately be the same thing."

Many of those interviewed for the book expressed alarm at the possible uses for such a survey:

"One man named in the first chapter of this book reacted with alarm when he was shown a draft of the chapter. 'Oh no!' he exclaimed. 'You can't do that. PLEASE don't do that.' He explained that, while he felt flattered to be included, identifying him as being Jewish would cause him problems. 'You just don't understand; it's getting bad out there,' he said, pointing his forefinger back over his right shoulder. 'I pick it up everywhere I go. It's increasing like you wouldn't believe. I really wish you wouldn't do this book at all.' "
Even proper nouns are cause for hysteria:

"The syndrome operates when most Jews read their morning newspaper: as their glance flits across the headlines, they might over-look the word 'Jewish' in one. Not so

with the word 'Jew.' The eye rivets to that word, as if it has goose-stepped off the page. To a non-Jew, the two words might seem interchangeable. But the short noun form is clipped and harsh and, when used by a non-Jew, is considered usually pejorative in itself, as if in other surroundings it might be followed by, say, bastard. Its use by a non-Jew almost automatically makes him suspect of being an anti-Semite...

"Jewish radar, the knot of fear, is a characteristic of many of the Jews in politics. At least while they are there, they can work to keep the system free from the terrors that almost all other systems before have meant for Jews. But along with this, the political Jews have, in the main, tried very hard to seem un-Jewish, as if to make themselves acceptable in the 'other' White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant world."

Such a reaction to correct nouns would be cause for psychiatric treatment if it occurred in any other ethnic group. If the British suddenly went into apoplectic fits every time they were called 'Britons' they would surely be regarded as suffering from a group psychological dysfunction. But, perhaps it is because the psychology industry is largely run by Jews, that such behavior among Jews is regarded as rational.

But Isaacs, who usually works as a journalist for the *Washington Post* and is therefore highly qualified to comment on power in high places, has highlighted two very important behavior patterns here. The Jewish paranoia simultaneously drives Jews into positions of political power and at the same time it makes them keep a low profile while they are about it. So we end up with the curious phenomenon of Jews scrambling to keep a tight control over the reins of power, while at the same time pretending to the rest of the world that they are doing nothing of the sort. Who — us? Nawww. As Isaacs points out: *"Thus, up until very recently, many Jews were pleased if someone told them they didn't look very Jewish. If they did look Jewish, they hastened to correct it with a 'nose job' and/or hydrogen peroxide. Even in an industry permeated by Jews as was (and is) the film industry, the Jewish movie stars enjoyed prominence - not under their richly European Jewish names but as WASPS. So one got the celluloid version of Issur Danielovitch as Kirk Douglas, and Bernie Schwartz as Tony Curtis, and Emmanuel Goldenberg as Edward G. Robinson, and Daniel Kaminsky as Danny Kaye and so on. Out in the real world Steins became Stones, Goldbergs became Golds, and Davidoviches became Davises."*

Isaacs might also have pointed out that Jewish producers aid and abet in the masking of Jewish characteristics in Hollywood. For some curious reason, Jewish characters are often played by Goys and righteous-Gentile roles are played by Jews. At the time of writing, a patrician Swedish actress Ingrid Bergman has just been cast as Golda Meir, and the British Jew Michael Caine has just appeared on television as a German officer in a World War Two movie film, *The Eagle Has Landed*. Could it be that the producers are trying to confuse their audience's concepts of what a Jew looks like? Or are they acting out some psychological drive that tells them "this is what Jews **should** look like". Do Jews have such a low opinion of their physical image that they continually seek to upgrade it through celluloid flights of fantasy? We will return to those poignant questions later.

Isaacs opens up his fascinating little book with a detailed description of a 1970 fund raiser for Senator George McGovern. The private Manhattan hotel suite was rented by a group of politically astute Jewish businessmen, who were planning on financially supporting McGovern, since he was far-left Democrat and "right up their street". Everything went smoothly, with McGovern giving all the right answers until the \$64,000 question: "Senator, just what is your position on Israel?"

With all the sophistication and urbane cosmopolitanism with which South Dakota anoints its favorite sons, McGovern answered that the United Nations should work out peace arrangements between the Israelis and the Palestinians. McGovern was obviously laboring under the illusion that the same rules which apply to the rest of the World are also to apply to Israel. Where U.S. intervention anywhere else is a Bad Thing, U.S. military intervention and support for Israel is a Good Thing. Whereas the United Nations was a Good Thing when it voted to establish the Israel entity in November 1947 it became a Bad Thing when it supported the rights of the Palestinians. A heated exchange took place between the assembled Jewish "philanthropists" and the shy, gentle plains man. It ended with one of the Jews reprimanding McGovern like a naughty school-boy who had not done his homework: "Let me ask you a question, Senator. What did you expect this group to ask you? Why are you so poorly prepared on a question of this importance?"

Isaacs sets the tone for his insightful book with this wonderful vignette of Jewish browbeating and string-pulling. Americans have to thank such political action groups for the humiliating defeat of an honest if absurdly naive McGovern, and the landslide victory of the criminal and hypocritical Richard M. Nixon.

The author provides list after list of prominent Jewish advisers, campaign managers, power-brokers, financiers, opinion-makers, lawyers, staff aides, and writers. He disarmingly points out that although in many fields Jews are not over-represented, their positions of importance ensure that they do not need to be. He cites Capitol Hill as being one place where the effectiveness of the Jewish staffers more than outweighs their numeric weakness. And although Jews do not own most of the newspapers or TV stations in America, their ownership of the major city newspapers and of the TV networks ensures that the smaller but more numerous Gentile media have to toe the line. He states that at one time the Jewish-owned newspapers like the *New York Times* would even avoid hiring too many Jews, for fear of this ploy seeming too obvious. But the stranglehold grip of the Jews over the media means that nowadays they can staff the entire building with Jews from editor to doorman, and no one in the rest of America would be the wiser. With the greater visual impact of television, it is a different story, says Isaacs. Although the networks are owned and run by Jews, they still insist on having a WASP as front-man or anchor-man on the air.

In government, Jews percolate toward those departments most suited to their skills. Thus federal departments of justice, welfare, finance, labor, science and health all have large numbers of Jews under their roofs. (Isaacs tells us that the vast number of Jews in

the Department of Justice is because "justice **coincides** with the oldest of Jewish ethics". In a curious Freudian slip, the author has set us thinking which Jewish ethic it is that coincides with "justice" since it is not "justice" itself. Perhaps the Jewish concept of "justice" is: Is it good for Jews?)

In another chapter, dealing with Jewish political donations, Isaacs does indeed spell it out:

".. most Jews are paying to put into power the kind of men who will neither confiscate Jews' assets, wall them into ghettos, nor annihilate them. Most donations have been, at bottom, motivated by fear — fear that what happened in England, France, Spain, Germany, could and may, indeed, happen in the United States too, unless America's Jews are vigilant and insure that the 'right' men get into office. And, since 'right' has many meanings, the money has gone to a wide variety of candidates and causes ... These contributors, by far the largest number of Jewish political givers, have tended to talk in code: they say they invest in 'good government' when they are in fact-paying tribute for survival."

Isaacs goes on to show how Jews have traditionally supported liberalism or even socialism, because such philosophies favored Jewish survival. But things start to get awry when liberal policies are taken too far — i.e. are practiced universally. Jews fully supported the civil rights movement of the 1950s and '60s. They supported affirmative action programs for Blacks. They supported integration of Black and White Gentile schools. But when all of this "progress" started to directly affect Jews, then they began to have second thoughts. When affirmative action would become a quota system, then that would surely mean that Jews would be thrown out of, or kept out of, many jobs, since Jews are grossly over-represented in many professions. The expansion of busing programs and public housing schemes would now mean that — heaven forbid — Jewish children might be integrated, and Jewish neighborhoods might be plagued with Black crime. Simultaneously, in the outside world, the extreme left, the Third World, and the United Nations — all of whom had previously danced to the Zionists' tune — were now turning bitterly anti-Israel. A massive turnaround came about in Jewish thinking, and one-time leftist — even Marxist — Jews almost overnight became "neo-Conservatives". The New York Jewish intelligentsia switched positions so quickly it was almost dizzying. Yet, still we are continually told that the Jews have almost a copyright on ethics, righteousness, justice and honor. In reality, the Jews are concerned only with what is perceived as being **good for Jews**. Whether the candidate belongs to the elephant party or the jackass party matters not at all.

But if that were all there was to it the phenomenon might be considerably easier to understand. Almost every ethnic group that is conscious of its ethnic identity will vote for candidates who "pitch" for its interests. (The notable exception to the ethnic rule is of course the majority White Anglo-Saxon group, which has little sense of its own identity; and if it does, suffers from a "guilt complex" brought about by decades of liberal brainwashing. Many otherwise rational White, people will vote for Black, Mexican or Jewish candidates on the basis that "it's time the minorities had their chance". Non-

Whites find this practice hilarious in the extreme, and take fullest advantage of it in their efforts to become top dog.)

The wrinkles to the Jewish behavior pattern are several. First of all, Jews will vigorously push candidates who represent Jewish interests, while at the same time protesting loudly that there is no such thing as a powerful Jewish lobby and that they are purely interested in "humanity", or "justice" or "good government". In truth, all they are interested in is Jewish humanity, Jewish justice and Jewish government.

But secondly, and perhaps more significantly, as Isaacs points out: the chief motivation for Jewish political power is fear: fear of "it" happening again. Even when the Jews are in total control, and have never had it so good, such as in the United States today, still there is as much fear of being Holocausted as there ever was. This cannot be explained in terms of the empirical evidence. No anti-Semitic policies are part of the platform of any major political party. The Jewish stranglehold over communications means that only philo-Semitic views are broadcast. Candidates representing various American Nazi parties have never garnered more than a handful of votes. Therefore, the intense fear suffered by Jews must be generated inside themselves. It must be psychological in origin.

If we ask why it is that Jews spend a large part of their time acting out their fear of being Holocausted we must conclude that Jews inwardly feel that they **deserve** to be Holocausted. No one has come up to them and announced to them that they ought to be Holocausted; they have imagined that this is what is going on — consciously or subconsciously — in the Gentile's mind. But in reality it is going on in the Jewish mind. The Jews are projecting their fantasies, their fears, onto the rest of us.

Why is it so? We will explore this area in greater detail in a later chapter. But for now, let us just note that much Jewish behavior in politics can be explained in terms of self-hate. Name-changing, nose jobs, Gentile wives, assimilation, are all declarations by Jews that they do not like being Jewish. They hate themselves so much that they wish they were something they are not. The guilt and anxiety inculcated into them by their religion, by their culture and by their mothers is a guarantee of an end-product psyche that is loaded with self-hate and low self-esteem. Jews wish to be in control of political affairs (and everything else of any importance) precisely because they feel that if they themselves hate being Jewish, then it stands to reason that everyone else will hate Jewishness also, and will seek to eradicate it. But if Jews are in charge of society, then they will be in a position to quickly knock on the head any manifestation of this possibility. The irony of course is that by over-compensating and over-reacting in this way they may very well create the kind of anti-Semitism that they set out to suppress. As more and more citizens become aware of, and resentful of, Jewish control of American society, then those same citizens may well begin to strenuously seek the overthrow of that control and the restoration of democratic majority rule.

The Holocaust

Holocausts, we are told, are nothing new to the Jews. They have been suffering regular extermination programs since time began. First the Egyptians and the Persians, then the Romans, then the Spanish, then the Russians, then the Nazis, and today the Arabs. As the candid Jewish psychohistorian Dr. Howard F. Stein wrote in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1980:

"For the Jews, the term 'holocaust' does not simply denote a single catastrophic era in history, but is a grim metaphor for the meaning of Jewish history. The 'Holocaust' lies at the heart of the Jewish experience of time itself. One is either anxiously awaiting persecution, experiencing persecution, recovering from it, or living in a period that is a temporary reprieve from it.

"'Holocaust' is thus the timeless fabric into which the 1933-1945 period is woven... Thus the 'reality' of the Holocaust is inextricably part of the myth in which it is woven — and for which myth it serves as further confirmatory evidence for the timeless Jewish theme that the world is in conspiracy to annihilate them, one way or another, at least eventually."

Indeed, the Jewish perception of many of these "Holocausts" is strikingly synchronous. We can trace the same feature in all of them: "persecution" by anti-Semites, gassings and/or burnings, sexual and toiletry tortures, and general Jewish suffering and torment. The myths tell us more about the tellers than about the subject characters; for many of these tales are totally or partly fictitious. They do not stand up to scientific examination. Let us start at the beginning with the alleged plot by the Persian Prime Minister Haman to exterminate the Jewish population. Every year modern Jews still celebrate Haman's execution, in a festival known as Purim which involves eating pies cooked in the form of human ears. The legend tells us that Haman's plot was foiled when the King (Ahasuerus) took a Jewish bride, Esther, in place of his current Queen, Vashti. Esther was advised by her cousin Mordecai of Haman's plot to kill Persia's entire Jewish population, and so she prevailed upon her husband king to execute Haman, and his ten sons, and some tens of thousands of his followers. However, we read in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* under "Purim":

"The chronological difficulties such as the identity of king Ahasuerus and the absence of any reference in Persian sources to a king having a Jewish consort; the striking resemblance between the names Mordecai and Esther to the Babylonian gods Marduk and Ishtar; the lack of any reference to Purim in Jewish literature before the first century BC; the language of the Book of Esther — which suggests a later date: all these have moved the critics to look elsewhere than the account in Esther for the true origin of the festival. Various conjectures have been made, but the problem still awaits its solution." Esther/Ishtar was a Jewish fertility goddess to whom first-born Jewish children were sacrificed by their own parents. She was part of a pantheon of gods that included Moloch the fire god, in whose fiery, Auschwitzian statue, more Jewish babies were burned alive. In numerous Biblical (Old Testament) passages we find heated debate and condemnation of this practice. Nowadays, Jewish parents do not physically sacrifice their children to an altar of Jewish theology; modern Jewish parents just

inculcate sufficient guilt, anxiety and worry into their offspring that the destruction of their psychological self-esteem is a much more punitive (and therefore valuable) offering.

Jewish Talmudic literature offers all sorts of outlandish claims for Jewish casualties in the various Jewish revolts against Roman rule. The revolt in 115-117 AD started in Libya and spread along the coast to Egypt and then to Cyprus. However, in most places the Jews did not attack the Roman administrators or soldiers; they attacked the Greek and Roman civilians. Hundreds of thousands were massacred. In response, the Roman army started killing Jews, and the Talmud tells us that In Alexandria the casualty toll was "sixty myriads on sixty myriads". This would appear to be a total of 1,200,000 — a rather remarkable figure, since Alexandria only had a total, Gentile and Jewish, population of some 500,000.

The next Jewish revolt was in 132 to 135 AD, under the self-proclaimed "Messiah" Bar Kokhba. According to the Talmud, the revolt ended in the Roman laying siege to Bar Kokhba's fortress at Bethar, near Jerusalem. We are told that Bar Kokhba was so tough that he would kick catapulted Roman rocks back at them with his knee. The Roman finally captured the fortress and in revenge killed 4 billion "or as some say" 40 million Jews. In order to reassure us of the authenticity of these figures, the Talmud tells us that a tidal wave of Jewish blood, carrying large boulders with it, stained the sea for a distance of four miles out. The Jewish schoolchildren in Bethar — all 64 million or "as some say" 150,000 — were rolled up individually in their parchment scrolls and burned alive. Slain Jews were used as fence posts, and blood left over from the tidal wave was used to fertilize Roman vineyards for the next seven years. Needless to say, the Roman literature of the time does not even mention any massacre at Bethar. Credulity prevents us from accepting the Talmudic massacre allegations and their death toll. But we do detect a certain amount of synchronicity between these ancient yarns and modern Nazi Holocaust allegations.

As regards the Spanish Inquisition, we have already seen how the Chief Inquisitor and burner of Jews at the stake Fray Tomas de Torquemada was himself a Jew whose father had feigned conversion to Christianity. Torquemada enrolled the assistance of pious pamphleteer Fray Alonso de Espina in his rabble-rousing activities against Protestants, Jews and other non-Catholics. Espina, besides being a flaming homosexual, was yet another Marrano, or Jewish pretended convert. Torquemada's successor Fray Diego de Deja was also a Christianized Jew. So here again, the Jews can hardly complain about a Spanish "Holocaust" when it was in fact other Jews who were doing the persecuting and Jew-burning. If anyone has a complaint it is surely the Protestants, who were tortured and murdered both by Catholics and by Jews pretending to be Catholics. Some Jews have argued that the recitation of the *Kol Nidre*, or breaking of all vows on Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement) was necessitated by Jews being forced to adopt Christianity during this period, but of course, *Kol Nidre* was in regular use long before.

Before the Nazi monster came on the scene, the main character in the Jewish pantheon of demons was the Tsar and his regular pogroms against innocent Jews. However, try as one may, there is no academic authentication that such pogroms ever took place. In fact, western diplomats who investigated such allegations at the time found that the "massacre" stories were a pack of lies. Oxford University historian Goldwyn Smith found that British consuls visited the sites of alleged pogroms and found that nothing of the sort had taken place. What had happened was that Russian workers had rioted against Jewish money-lenders, and Tsarist troops were called in to quell the Russians, which they did. Various British diplomats in Russia at the time fully acknowledged that Jews were resented by the workers and peasants, not because of their creed, but because of their loan-sharking and sharp business practices.

American writers also noted the Jewish predilection for usury in Russia. Mark Twain had various scathing remarks to make. So too did Poultney Bigelow who wrote for *Harper's*. The Russian intellectuals also held that rampant Jewish capitalism was solely responsible for anti-Jewish feeling. Alexander Pushkin included several unattractive Jewish usurers in his works, as did the lesser known Nikolai Gogol and Dmitri Reshetnikov. A Russian authoress living in America, Zenaide Ragozin, attempted to present a correct perspective on the "pogrom" tales in the prestigious *Century Magazine* (April 1882). In a hard-to-find-work, *Diary of a Writer*, the famed Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoevsky wrote that "the Jews are draining the soil of Russia".

Of course, we cannot leave a survey of Jewish "persecution" in Tsarist Russia without mentioning the case of our dear friend Levi Davidovich Trotsky, or Bronstein to use his correct name. In his autobiography *My Life* he tells us that on his father's estate the workers received no shelter, no meat, and but 10 rubles a month for heavy labor. When they started to deteriorate physically his "father would give them some watermelons, or half a sack of dried fish, and they would go back to work again, often singing..." In the book *Trotsky* by Francis Wyndham and David King, we learn that Trotsky was so "persecuted" that he was sent off to a toney prep school in the Russian resort of Odessa. Plunging into the largely Jewish radical-chic fraternity life, Trotsky and company quickly set about hatching plots to redirect all that peasant resentment against Jewish capitalists into peasant resentment against the Tsar. When they finally succeeded in having the Tsar deposed by popular unrest in the Spring of 1917, who should be waiting in the wings but Trotsky and his crowd of Jewish radicals. Several months later, the popular democratic government was overthrown by a tiny bunch of Jewish agitators, and Jewish power was finally in total control of the reins of power. Now they could set about **really** ripping off the Russian workers since there was no Tsar to apply a modicum of regulation. Deals were struck with wealthy Jewish capitalists in the west, such as Armand Hammer, whereby Russian minerals and Russian labor would be ruthlessly exploited for the mutual benefit of the Jewish capitalists in the west, and the Jewish state capitalists in the Soviet Union. What greater profit-base could there be than a country where the labor force was the captive of the government? The always-upward-socially-mobile Jewish landlords and loan sharks merely exchanged their snazzy civilian clothes for commissars' uniforms.

The "surviving" of Holocausts has become something of a Jewish tradition. There is no greater survival industry than that related to the 1933-1945 period, when 6,000,000 Jews are supposed to have been done to death by the Nazi government of Germany. Again, these claims have been scrupulously examined by academics such as Dr. Arthur Butz of Northwestern University at Chicago, and Dr. Robert Faurisson of the University of Lyon in France, and have been found to be unsupported. The California-based Institute for Historical Review publishes many books and a quarterly *Journal of Historical Review* which debunk such outlandish claims. Naturally, the IHR is the subject of much Jewish and Jewish-inspired opprobrium, as were those who expressed the slightest skepticism about earlier Jewish Holocaust claims.

In this Holocaust-to-end-all-Holocausts, the same features are evident as before. The similarity of "gas-chambers" and "gas-ovens" to Moloch's fiery statue, and to the burning of Shadrak, Meshak and Abednego, is uncanny. The exaggeration of casualty figures beyond the demographic possibilities is the same with the "Six Million" as it was with Bar Kokhba's "64 Million". The heavy lacing of the narratives with sexual and toiletry torments is synchronistic. We also find many references to rats and dogs eating Jewish flesh, which bring to mind the Biblical accounts of street dogs licking up the blood of Jezebel.

Let us examine a few of such narratives. *The New York Times* of 4 June 1974 reported on a Holocaust symposium held at the curious locale of St. John's Catholic Church in Manhattan. The reporter, Israel Shenker, recounted an entire "rap sheet" of Nazi crimes described at the symposium by survivors and by experts. The corpses of Jews were trundled to the ovens in wheelbarrows, he tells us. No water was available to prisoners — all had to "drink mud". Grandparents held hands with their children while "going into the ovens". "Hateful police dogs ate pieces of flesh alive" and rats too "ate up the cheeks of the bodies". Mud is often cited in psycho-analysis as a symbol for excreta. Walking into a horizontal crematory furnace is not physically possible, of course; the narrator is drawing on the Biblical imagery outlined earlier. Dogs and rats eating one's face is more likely the symptom of a deep neurosis than it is an empirical reality. One woman recounted:

"Then they sent us to Birkenau, into the mud where there was fleas and dirt. We had no water at all. We drank mud. I had malaria; I had typhus; I had everything. But it happened that my heart kept on beating in spite of it... You don't manage to survive, it just happens. My brother died in the camp. My mother was sent to Auschwitz at the same time. I saw this big fire and I knew my mother's body was burning, and I was grateful that she should not have to see me burning in front of her or know that I saw her burning in front of me."

Professor Irving Greenberg, of City University New York, also spoke about "burning" but in a more theological sense. He felt that Jews must philosophically learn to expect periods of belief *"interspersed with times when the flames and smoke of their burning children blot out faith, though it flickers again"*.

The symbol of the regeneration of Jewish life through the burning or other sacrificing of Jewish children is one that we have already encountered in our examination of ancient Jewish sacrificial offerings to the fertility goddess Ishtar, and the fire god Moloch. We also recall that when Shadrak, Meshak and Abednego were tossed into the fiery furnace by an enemy king, he was promptly astounded to discover not just the three Israelites walking around in the flames unscathed, but a fourth figure - the Jewish "son of God" - in there with them. We have seen the symbol recycled in the Talmudic accounts of Jewish children being burned in their own Torah scrolls by the Romans.

Almost every day, when one picks up a newspaper, one reads survivors' accounts of the Holocaust which include such Talmudic symbolism. In the University of Tulsa Collegian dated 11 February 1982 we read of a lecture by Jack Glocer, yet another survivor of Auschwitz, who says:

"... he will never forget his work on the crew that was responsible for burying babies alive. It was not only the most inhumane thing ever done by this man who says 'I probably couldn't kill a chicken if I had to'. It also marked the only time he viewed a Nazi act with 'compassion'.

"'There was a Nazi sergeant guarding us as we buried live babies,' Glocer said in his Polish-accented English. 'All of a sudden he pulled a grenade from his belt and tossed it into the ditch. Then a superior officer walked by and told him that the next time he did something like that, disciplinary actions would be taken.'

"'I had a cousin who had a 3-month-old daughter on the train we took to Auschwitz,' Glocer remembers 'When we arrived at Auschwitz the child was grabbed by a Nazi soldier and thrown on top of a pile of burning babies.' "

Other parts of the Talmud are recalled when we study various descriptions of "excremental assault", a survey of which appears in Terrence des Pres' thesis *The Survivor*:

"Everybody in the block had typhus ... it came to Bergen-Belsen in its most violent, most painful, deadliest form. The diarrhea caused by it became uncontrollable. It flooded the bottom of the cages, dripping through the cracks into the faces of the women lying in the cages below, and mixed with blood, pus and urine, formed a slimy, fetid mud on the floor of the barracks."

Here we go with "mud" again. About the only bodily emission that does not get a look in is semen; a vat of which Jesus was boiled in, according to the Talmud. The wicked Nazis even tormented their captives by providing only one latrine for "30,000 to 32,000 women". This inadequacy yet again caused the Jews to foul each other, for:

"We stood in line to get into this tiny building, knee-deep in human excrement. As we all suffered from dysentery, we could rarely wait until our turn came, and soiled our ragged clothes, which never came off our bodies..."

Even the luckier inmates, who worked in the camp hospital, "had to step into human excreta, into urine soaked with blood, into stools of patients suffering from highly contagious diseases". And:

"Some of the patients died before they ever reached the gas chambers. Many of them were covered all over with excrement, for there were no sanitary facilities."

Having just one latrine for all those 30,000+ prisoners apparently caused the inmates to resort to unconventional toilets.

"Many women with diarrhea relieved themselves in soup bowls or the pans for coffee; then they hid the utensils under the mattress to avoid the punishment threatening them for doing so: 25 strokes on the bare buttocks, or kneeling all night long on sharp gravel, holding up bricks. These punishments often ended in the death of the guilty."

Des Pres scoffs at attempts by (Jewish) psychoanalysts to describe the camp experience as a reversion to "infantile" or "anal fixated" levels. He explains that in a deprived environment it is only normal to focus totally on food and excretion. He points out that infants are not "forced to wet and soil themselves" whereas prisoners had no other choice. If they attempted to go to a proper lavatory, they would be attacked by guard dogs or assaulted by guards. He goes on to describe various depraved tortures that the guards would inflict. Prisoners would be forced to urinate into each other's mouths. Soup bowls would be tossed into latrines. At Buchenwald, "ten prisoners suffocated in excrement (pits) in October 1937 alone".

Unfortunately, none of these allegations stands up to scientific scrutiny. At Auschwitz today one can still see the remarkable recreation facilities provided for prisoners, including a swimming pool, a soccer field, a sports stadium, a volley-ball court and a theater. Hygiene was very strictly regulated, with all incoming internees being processed through a delousing facility that involved the fumigation of their clothes in fumigation closets (hence the so-called "gas chambers"). At various sites, British POWs were used to assist in the delousing processes. A report by one of the POWs appeared in the *Journal of the Royal Army Medical Corps* of September 1946. It is quite true that later in the war there were serious outbreaks of typhus in many of the camps, but this was due to the breakdown of the delousing processes, and the general chaos caused by the Allied bombing campaigns. Evacuees were coming in from the east where typhus was endemic. Thousands of Germans, including camp staff, died of this disease. It was not something the Germans would **encourage** through inadequate hygiene — on the contrary it is something they would rigorously try to stamp out. Posters in German and Polish were posted everywhere advising of the fatal dangers of louse infestation.

One of the most telling cases of "survivor fantasy" is that of Kitty Hart, whose experiences as an inmate were described in the Yorkshire Television program *Kitty: Return to Auschwitz* shown on British television in November 1979, and on American PBS stations a year later. The TV dialog with her son at the remains of Auschwitz went like this:

"Kitty: 'If you didn't have your bowl, you didn't have your soup. If you didn't have your bowl, you didn't have your toilet, because your bowl was your toilet! You understand?'

"Son: 'How did you wash the bowl out...'

"Kitty: 'You didn't!'

"Son: '... before you ate?'

"Kitty: 'I mean you didn't! You didn't! You didn't wash it out. That was ... that was your life ... your BOWL. MY BOWL. It was red.'

Later:

"Now, I know, David you're seeing grass but I don't see any grass. I see mud. A SEA of MUD and, believe me, if there was one blade of grass, you know what would have happened? You'd have eaten it!"

Then, just a little while later we find Kitty lying on a complete lawn of grass, this time seemingly resisting the impulse to start grazing:

"It was a glorious summer ... so during the day ... I sat here, on this lawn, sunbathing ... we were laughing and joking ... I was lying here and I was watching the crematoria over there. You saw the SS men, the extermination squad that did the actual killing, you know, the actual gassing. So, somewhere there was a ladder. You could see it when you were lying here ... and this SS man climbed up the ladder with a tin of gas which he had in his hand and through the skylight he just dropped in ... uh ... this tin and then he came down and off he went. And then a few seconds later you heard a sort of muffled sound, and those were people actually suffocating. And then, all of a sudden, it was very quiet and then, soon after that, you lay here and you could actually see smoke coming out of the chimney and those were the VERY people that were burning! And do you think I could believe that there were people actually burning in there? I couldn't believe it. Can YOU believe it? NO! But people were burning there and you could HEAR them SCREAMING ... but you still couldn't believe it ... people were being sent in one end and there were ashes at the other end ten minutes later."

Kitty also reveals that she was one of those odd folk in Auschwitz who washed in her own urine. Throughout the film she continually returns to urine, mud, and bread. She is either bathing in urine, eating from her excrement-encrusted bowl, swimming in a sea of mud, eating mud, or eating mouthfuls of bread. We know right away that something is wrong. Asphyxiated, stone dead people do not scream when they are cremated. Bodies cannot be reduced to ashes in ten minutes (a more reasonable time would be 2-3 hours). And there are just too many self-contradictions in her story to make it the slightest bit plausible. If she would munch on one blade of grass in a sea of mud, how come she could sunbathe on an entire lawn? Kitty is sorely in need of some good counseling to determine the underlying causes of her fixations on anal functions.

Perhaps her childhood toilet-training was too strict, and she subconsciously feels that opening her bowels without permission will lead to dire punishments like asphyxiation and burning.

Another "survivor" whose attic is full of junk is one Fania Fenelon, the subject of an American TV docudrama, *Playing for Time*. The TV production caused a storm of controversy because the anti-Zionist actress Vanessa Redgrave was cast in the lead role. In the case of Ms. Fenelon's book of the same title, we are only on page one of her narrative before she is telling us that:

"A trick I'd found to cool myself was to wash in my own urine. Keeping myself clean was essential to me, and there is nothing unclean about urine. I could drink it if I was thirsty — and I had done so."

With inmates going around drinking their own urine and using their soup dishes as toilets it would hardly be surprising that Auschwitz suffered from epidemics of disease. But it is rather more likely that these "narratives" are largely based on fantasy.

Many of these survivors' accounts have appeared on the pulp paper-back market over the years. In the early 1950s there was a vogue for such material, but this had largely died out by the 1970s. However, the increased use of the "Holocaust" as justification for Israeli imperialism and exemption from normal moral criteria brought about a revival in the market. The showing of the television docu-drama *Holocaust* did much to heighten interest, and of course the Zionists were quick to use the opportunity to draw attention to the alleged correlation between the Nazi Holocaust and the existence of a Jewish theocratic colony in the mid-East. Many survivors sought to jump on the bandwagon and by 1980 there were scores of "personal testimonies" flooding the bookstores. None of these were of an academic nature, and some of them were downright fiction from beginning to end. But still one could detect the same symbols and the same neuroses exhibiting themselves. One particularly trashy novel of the era was *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers* by Filip Müller. Müller's book is full of low-budget horror-movie material that would be laughed out of court in any test of authenticity. He claims that SS doctors would examine victims while they were still alive, and once they were gassed, would slice off bits of flesh for experiments; the flesh jumping around in buckets. He claims to have waded through pits of decomposing corpses, which oozed up out of the ground one hot summer. On one page, a female gassee does a striptease to distract attention. During the mayhem, Müller gets locked into the gas chamber, but "miraculously" escapes. On a later page, the chief gasser Moll gets sexually turned on — as does his dog — with the killing of another beautiful young gassee. Müller gets transferred again to the pits for burning excess corpses. Here he defies science by burning corpses without oxygen getting to them underneath, and by basting them in their melted fat.

It is not therefore surprising that some of the more respectable peddlers of the Holocaust cult, known generally as Exterminationists have attempted to save face by

condemning certain of the more extreme and outlandish claims. In *The Final Solution*, Gerald Reitlinger advises that:

"A certain degree of reserve is necessary in handling all of this material, and particularly this applies to the last section (survivor narratives)... The Eastern European Jew is a natural rhetorician, speaking in flowery similes ... who use numerals as oratorical adjectives and whose very names are creations of fantasy."

In her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Hannah Arendt reports that the prosecution:

"...had been under considerable pressure from Israeli survivors, who constitute about 20% of the present population of the country. They had flocked spontaneously to the trial authorities ... to offer themselves as witnesses. The worst cases of 'strong imagination', people who had 'seen Eichmann at various places where he had never been', were weeded out, but 56 'sufferings-of-the-Jewish-people witnesses', as the trial authorities called them, were finally put on the stand, instead of some 15 or 20 'background witnesses' as originally planned.

"If Eichmann's name was mentioned at all, it obviously was hearsay evidence, 'rumors testified to', hence without legal validity. The testimony of all witnesses who had 'seen him with their own eyes' collapsed the moment a question was addressed to them."

In a remarkable climb-down in the British *New Statesman* of 2 November 1979, Exterminationist scholar Gitta Sereny admits:

"It is true that, along with many authentic works, there have been books or films which were only partly true, or even were partly faked. And unfortunately, even reputable historians often fail in their care... By quoting supposed 'eyewitnesses' who are in fact repeating hearsay, (Martin) Gilbert perpetuates errors which — because they are so easily disproved — provide Revisionists' opportunities...

"This is an area in which commercially motivated rubbish can have terrible long-term consequences. The problem with books like this is that they are 'ghosted' by professional wordsmiths ... who have neither interest in nor capacity for conveying truth with restraint.

"Worse again are the partial or complete fakes such as Jean Francis Steiner's *Treblinka* or Martin Gray's *For Those I Loved*. Steiner's book on the surface even seems right: he is a man of talent and conviction, and it is hard to know how he could go so wrong. But what he finally produced was a hodgepodge of truth and falsehood, libeling both the dead and the living. The original French book had to be withdrawn and reissued with all the names changed. But it retains its format of imagined conversations and reactions — i.e. pure fiction — incredibly remaining nonetheless, in serious bibliographies.

Gray's *For Those I Loved* was the work of Max Gallo the ghost-writer ... I myself told Gray ... that he had manifestly never been to, nor escaped from, Treblinka. He finally

asked, despairingly: 'But does it matter? Wasn't the only thing that Treblinka did happen, that it should be written about, and that some Jews should be shown to have been heroic?'"

In the same article, Ms. Sereny admits that:

"Auschwitz, despite its emblematic name, was **not** primarily an extermination camp for Jews, and is not the central case through which to study extermination policy."

In a lengthy letter to the *Los Angeles Times* of 16 May 1981, Professor Deborah Lipstadt of UCLA History Department writes:

"The fact is that the Nazis never used the bodies of Jews, or for that matter anyone else, for the production of soap. The soap rumor was prevalent both during and after the war. It may have had its origin in the cadaver factory atrocity story that came out of World War I. The letters 'RJF' probably stood for the name of the factory that produced soap. The soap rumor was thoroughly investigated after the war and proved to be untrue."

In an article in *Judaism* of October 1981, the same professor condemns the increased "commercialization" of the Holocaust. She warns that the separation of the Holocaust from the Jewish "historical continuum" is dangerous. She charges that Jewish leaders not only draw on the "articulated sense of guilt that afflicts many of those who survived" but that they even try to create more guilt in order to make their flock "more pliable and responsive".

However, all of this clutching at reality is beyond the intellectual ability of Elie Wiesel, Chairman of the President's Commission (now Council) on the Holocaust. In his 1980 *Report to the President* he described in much detail his neuroses:

"Why then cling to unbearable memories that may for ever rob us of our sleep? Why not forget, turn the page, and proclaim: let it remain buried deep beneath the dark nightmares of our subconscious. Why not spare our children the weight of our collective burden and allow them to start their lives free of nocturnal obsessions and complexes, free of Auschwitz and its shadows?"

Naturally, he immediately goes on to explain why we should suffer eternal insomnia: According to Wiesel, the survivors, "... willingness to share their knowledge, their pain, their anguish, even their agony, is motivated solely by their conviction that their survival was for a purpose. A survivor sees himself as a messenger and guardian of secrets entrusted by the dead."

Yet again, the one crime that has visited and revisited Jewish children with monotonous regularity over the eons is described:

"... in order to cut expenses and save gas, cost-accountant considerations led to an order to place living children directly into the ovens, or throw them into open burning pits."

And yet again, the "Holocaust kingdom" is described in terms of "*charred souls ... darkness ... flames of darkness ... fire ... ashes ... and torture...* "

And, right near the end of his *Report*, a double-double whammy:

"Little did we know that Jewish children would again be murdered, in cold blood, by killers in Israel."

Yet another survivor in the same mold, who obviously has not been keeping up with all the revisions that are being made to Holocaust theory by the leading Exterminationists themselves, is one Mel Mermelstein, author of *By Bread Alone*. Mermelstein is the "survivor" who in 1981 sued the Institute for Historical Review for their \$50,000 reward for proof of "gas chambers". Yet again, burnt offerings are sent to the heavens:

"I turned my head trying to dismiss the picture of the smoking chimneys and the fires below them, but the vision did not leave. It became worse inside me when I realized that at the very moment my mother, Etu, Magda, Angel, and my playmate Karen, might be in there, consumed by the flames. I looked up. I could barely see the sky. The picture became real. I screamed."

Later:

"Suddenly the road burst upon the scene — a scene right out of Dante's Inferno. Ahead were three huge pits dug deep into the ground. In each a fire was raging. Around the flaming pits, naked men were running in an endless circle. All around I could see SS guards and prison kapos swinging their leather whips and driving the prisoners from behind into the pits.. I kept pushing myself away from the pit but something kept drawing me back. I was torn between two worlds, the living and the dead. I pushed my way closer to the edge of the pit. My God, I could see humans on fire, writhing and moaning."

Again, there is no evidence whatsoever that the Germans engaged in any practice of immolating living persons. No documents. No photographs. No evidence that would stand up in court. All we have are the alleged eye-witness reports of people like Mermelstein. And we have seen in the Eichmann case, and in a multitude of other "war crimes" trials, that eyewitness testimony in such cases is grossly unreliable. Every witness wants to be a star witness, regardless of the truth. At least we ought to be grateful that Mermelstein spares us the lurid details of sexual and toiletry nightmares.

Last but not least, we come to the present day turmoil in Israeli occupied Palestine. Here again, we find exactly the same symbolism in play. A report in the *Los Angeles Times* dated 26 August 1979 describes the trial in Israel of two PLO members, who

allegedly attacked a civilian bus. According to the report, the two Arabs "showed signs of having been beaten. One's arm was in a cast, the other's face was cut and had a black eye. Mrs. Tsemel (defense counsel) said prison guards had beaten them."

The defense lawyer was harangued by both the prosecution witnesses and by the spectators. "You sold out your country, you bitch, for PLO money" screamed one. Yet again, the witnesses drew on the usual imagery:

"When the girl terrorist grabbed a baby and threw it into a burning seat, he started to clap. Then I saw him shoot the boy and a man with glasses who said one word to him in Arabic."

More abuse was heaped on the defense lawyers:

"One of the male survivors of the massacre shouted at Mrs. Tsemel, with whom he had gone to school. 'Your day will come too, Leah. Your children should burn as others did.'"

Yes indeed. **Your children should burn as others did.** What is it about the sacred rite of child sacrifice through immolation that purges the Jewish soul? Are the Jews ridding themselves of some hereditary hang-up, or are they providing themselves with a rationale to feel guilty for the rest of their lives? Or might it not be that when his children are sacrificed as a burnt offering unto God, the Jew is vicariously destroying part of himself? Are the Jews so self-hating that they seek the destruction of their own progeny?

Why?

Jews are without a doubt the most literary and prolific publishers in the world; indeed they have been called "the people of the book". Besides owning or controlling large sections of the commercial book, newspaper and magazine publishing world, their ethnic publications by far outstrip those of any other racial or religious group in America. Even the Communist Party USA has a special publication for Jews: *Jewish Affairs*; a privilege not accorded to much larger minority groups such as Negroes or Irish-Americans. Probably the most respectable Jewish publication is the monthly *Commentary*, whose editor, Norman Podhoretz was one of those Jews who "switched" from leftist to neo-Conservative when some naive folk started trying to apply humanitarian values to Israel's naked imperialism and colonialism. The values which Jewish radicals busily advocated in regard to U.S. policy in Vietnam suddenly became "absolutist" and "sentimental" when applied to the Jewish statelet.

The better-known Jewish publications like *Commentary* are consequently those which are accessible to non-Jews. Editorials and position-papers are written in flowery,

urbane, if somewhat turgid, style. They will take a dozen pages to arrive at a single point in the last paragraph which more often than not will ask: "Is it good for Jews?" Once in a while, a Jewish writer will acknowledge this ethno-centric position in more personal terms. In *Newsweek* magazine of 15 September 1980, Joseph Eger wrote: *"Survival was the big and only question in my family when I was growing up — economic survival and survival of the Jews as a people. My grandmother judged all but strictly family affairs by one criterion: 'Is it good for Jews?'"*

Eger also described how his family cut off, and declared as dead, his sister who married a Goy. They even recited the rites for the dead on her behalf, and:

"She obediently died a few years later — of colitis, which many psychologists connect with repressed grief or anger."

We have already noted in our odyssey about the tomes and tombs of Judaica that anal fixations do indeed seem to have greater frequency among Jews than among non-Jews. Whether that fixation emerges as colitis, cancer of the colon, chronic constipation, obsessions with toilet jokes or abuse, excretory nightmares; whatever the particular manifestation, the root cause remains the same. Jewish guilt and self-hate brought about by a punitive childhood seems to be at the bottom of it all. We are immediately reminded of the oft told Jewish joke where the Jewish mother is telling her son: "Eat your chicken soup! You'll need strength to worry!"

Humor is, of course, the synthesis of much "street-wise" knowledge of many social phenomena. Put simply, ethnic jokes would fall flat on their face if there was no grain of truth within them. Jewish jokes told in North Dakota would probably have little impact, because there would be such a meager data base for the listener to draw upon. But a Jewish joke told in New Jersey would be the hit of the evening, on account of the listener's intimate familiarity with the Jewish culture and lifestyle. Of course, Jewish humor is often times only permissible when it is presented by Jewish comedians. Anyone else who takes the liberty of lampooning Jewish values is liable, in fact destined, to be labelled as that social leper: an "anti-Semite".

The more specific, more ethnic Jewish publications also give a better insight into the Jewish outlook. The *Jewish Press* of Brooklyn is probably the largest circulation of all the strict Jewish newspapers (although there are ultra-orthodox publications and groups beyond it; notably the Neturei Karta sect which regards Israel as a blasphemy). The *Jewish Press* vigorously supports Israel, Menachem Begin, and the Jewish Defense League. A survey of the *Press's* features reveals that the contributors appear to suffer from an excess of punitivity. Regular features like "Ask the Rabbi" explore debates on the observation of the tiniest details of Jewish ritual law, and the regulation of Jewish life. News features about this or that aspect of U.S. relations with Israel are full of punitive expressions like "rebuke", "chastise", "slap in the face", "wrath", and "penance". Nowhere can one find the slightest manifestation of joy, happiness, nature, or love. Rarely does America get any appreciation. The American government is the subject of continuous complaint and invective. The Israeli government - especially its more chauvinistic wing - is the recipient of great praise.

Psychohistorian Howard F. Stein has written extensively on the nature of this Jewish obsession with brooding. In his article "Judaism and the Group Fantasy of Martyrdom" which appeared in the *Journal of Psychohistory* Fall 1978, he pointed out that a favorite Jewish expression is "Der Olem is a Golem" — "The Universe is a Monster".

"The world is experienced as a heartless, mechanical monster that may strike at any time. The Golem is a creature Jews created to protect them, but which then menacingly turned on them and threatened — and continues to threaten — to destroy them ...

"One need only evoke the modern literary imagery of Franz Kafka's *Castle*, *The Penal Colony*, *The Trial*, *The Burrow*, and *Metamorphosis* to know that the Golem still reigns unchallenged. Only the characters and settings are different; the Jewish script is the same as it has been for millennia: trials, endless judgments, judges, painful punishments, death, and execution ...

"The unfolding of the Golem drama is an unearthing of what Jews felt they might become, and perhaps have become, to their own people. The fear of the Golem is the Jew's fear of himself, of his own projected unbridled rage... The legend of the Golem teaches Jews what not to become, while (protectively of course) reminding them of who they in fact are and fear to become. Like God, the Golem is supposed to bring life; instead he is nothing but God in another of his guises: the Angel of Death."

Stein reveals that even in the heights of "enjoyment" Jews are still not free of the shadows of their own obsession with death. The well-known toast *L'chaiym* ("To Life!") is only for stage shows like *Fiddler on the Roof* it seems. There is a second toast which undoes the first — a toast to death which is never uttered. As Stein comments:

"The historic Jewish covenant with death is far stronger and more enduring than with life. The language of death is spoken unconsciously, unofficially. Its toast is one of depressive self punishment and ultimately, self-destruction. The Chosen People ... have chosen themselves for sacrifice, suffering, martyrdom, persecution, victimization. At the close of his novel *The Family Moskat* (written *before* the Holocaust) Isaac Bashevis Singer pens the terrible truth that 'Death is the Messiah'."

Stein also gives us yet more examples of — wouldn't we have guessed — Jews being burned alive wrapped up in their Torahs:

"In Roman times ... the study of the Torah had been prohibited, on penalty of death. The venerated Rabbi Hananyah ben Tradyon and his students were caught by Roman legionaries in the act of secretly studying the Torah in a cave. According to legend, Rabbi Hananyah was wrapped in the sacred scrolls and burnt alive. During my early Hebrew education he was invoked by countless teachers and rabbis as perhaps the quintessence of Jewish loyalty and valor... I (also) remember hearing as a child the grueling story of Rabbi Amnon of Medieval Mainz, Germany. Living during times of forced conversion to Catholicism, Rabbi Amnon was a devout Jew who refused to capitulate. The Archbishop made one final attempt to convert him, and failing, ordered that the Rabbi's hands and legs be severed, as an example to other stubborn Jews... Years later I was told that Rabbi Amnon probably never existed, nor did the events happen."

Stein does not discuss whether the Nazi immolating and torturing of Jews might not be as equally soundly based as the yarns about Rabbis Hananyah and Amnon. But he does provide us with a remarkable insight into the mentality that would create such a scenario:

"Mark Zborowski has elegantly documented how the Jewish experience of illness and pain expresses dominant Jewish preoccupations. One is anxiously future-oriented about the outcome of disease. One's current doctor really did not cure the disease at all. Feeling good, healthy, is only temporary. Relapse is bound to occur. The future is bleak, just as illness is chronic. Life itself is a fatal disease; it is only a matter of time.

"In a letter written to me several months ago, a Jewish literary colleague expressed the same thing, thoughbeit in humorous admonition: 'I think actually that I am down because I've been up for too long. It is not good for a psyche to be up for too long. You begin to feel arrogant about your place in the world and you know and I know that will never do for us Jews. It's in the blood to come down when you've been up for quite a while.' One should not feel too good, too competent, too secure; it just isn't Jewish...
""The solution is self-constriction, self-doubt, a depressive, self-punitive, self-castrating, making oneself, incidentally, into the stereotypically stooped-over, invisible 'little Jew' whose male dominion consists of the ritualized confines of Talmudic (or scientific) scholasticism..."

"There are no 'small' errors: to err in the slightest is to bring upon oneself ridicule, severe reprimand, a censure from the teachers — and from an anxiously performing classroom of sibling-rivals, all competing for the taskmaster's (or taskmistress's) favoritism and protection from further ridicule. To survive, one must be compulsively perfectionist - while fomenting its opposite, a recalcitrance toward authority and a wish for vengeance on the exacter of tribute (mother, father, teacher, rabbi, God) and an exodus into instinctual freedom. The latter, of course, generates guilt and the fear of punishment, so that one becomes his own severe moral judge, exacting from and suppressing in others what one forbids in oneself."

Now we are getting closer still to the kernel of Dr. Stein's brilliant analysis. The infliction of guilt upon Jewish children by their parents causes them to become self-hating. Whatever they do, it is not enough. No matter how successful, how wealthy, how smart; never is it enough to conquer the genetic Jewish fatalism. Always there is the knot of fear that just around the corner is yet another Holocaust. Always there is the even deeper fear that perhaps Jews deserve to be Holocausted. Always there is the dread that within one's Jewish self there is a *schlemiel*, a fool whom the Gentiles will take advantage of — "a part of oneself that parents mirrored to him and warned him not to become".

How do Jews act out these internal psychological forces? We have seen in the preceding chapters, that Jewish self-hate can manifest itself in many different forms. It will almost surely exhibit what are almost psychosomatic characteristics, in that self-

hating Jews almost invariably have "hang-ups" in their sexual and anal functions. Karl Marx was for ever going on about "shit" and "crap" in his correspondence with Engels. Freud seemed to be unable to think in any other terms. Modern humanistic psychologists seem to have a "thing" about sexual and toiletry terms of abuse. Many Holocaust survivors and Exterminationists seem to harp about such matters in their testimony. Many of the Jewish personalities we have studied have suffered (often terminal) ailments in these areas.

Self-hating Jews also frequently dwell on the symbolism of self destruction . They will conjure up the imagery of Dante's Inferno, where Jews are burned alive (with or without Torah scrolls) by Romans, by Medieval Germans, by Nazi Germans, and by Palestinians. Jews are torn apart by dogs or by rats or by more Germans.

Always, the fear and anxiety of brutal destruction hangs like a shadow over Jewish life. In reaction, Jews exhibit neurotic behavior patterns. Male Jewish babies are mutilated in a weird, primitive ritual known as circumcision, which surely exists as a token castrating. Brooding over their own sense of inadequacy, Jewish fathers vicariously and tokenly castrate their own sons, perhaps because they wish that they could chop off their own penis. Or perhaps they mechanically react to **their** parents' dumping on **them**, by passing on all that neurosis onto their own children. What better way could there be to start off a life of neurosis than to mutilate a tiny baby's penis without the benefit of an an aesthetic, in the middle of a crowd of spectators, where the castrator ritually gives the baby a "blow-job".

Then there are the Jews who go overboard in seeking to deny their own origins. They are so full of self-hate and a sense of personal inadequacy that they will change their name, change their religion, change their noses, change their hair, change their friends, change their lifestyle — all in a mad scramble not to appear Jewish. Some, like Karl Marx, will make a special point of over-compensating and will deride and ridicule every "little Jew" who crosses his path — often in the most outrageous way. (But as the insightful Russian Anarchist Bakunin pointed out, Marx had not a word to say about the immensely powerful Jewish banking dynasties, such as the Rothschilds.) Then we have Trotsky, who changed his name, but otherwise stuck pretty hard and fast to the traditional Jewish pattern of ambition and power-seeking. Most of the modern Jewish radicals, especially those of the 1950s and '60s would fit into this mold. Although on the surface they might be perceived as "trying to pass" not very far underneath one will find all the (compensatory) chauvinism that less radical Jews openly display. As Stein pointed out earlier, this kind of Jew is projecting his hatred and resentment of parental/rabbinical authority against the Establishment. But always this rebellion is laced with guilt, and the Jewish radical "becomes his own severe moral judge, exacting from and suppressing in others what one forbids in oneself". The Yippie movement of the 1960s, which was almost totally Jewish-led, illustrates this perfectly. Anyone over the age of 30 was derided and hated. Jewish radicals were enlisting and bamboozling thousands of gullible Gentile youngsters into acting out their own Jewish anxieties and neuroses.

Not **all** "passers" are radicals of course. The worlds of politics, show business and commerce are strewn with examples of Jewish name-changers who somehow think that adopting an Anglo-Saxon *moniker* will advance their careers. In this case the names are changed not so much as an attempt to deny one's own Jewish identity, but to try and hide it from the Gentile's querulous gaze. If Jews start to make themselves too obvious, and if the Gentile starts counting up just how many Jews there are in positions of control, well ... you just never know how they might react. Most of these name-changers will admit their Jewishness when questioned, and indeed will privately support Jewish causes and even attend synagogue once in a while. In Hollywood, there is a kind of party game played which revolves around "Is he, isn't he?" where partners exchange tidbits of background information to determine which star is "one of us".

A variation to the Jew who tries to "pass" is the "Portnoy" type. The Philip Roth novel *Portnoy's Complaint* describes what happens to the Jew who tries ever so hard to "pass" and then fails. Portnoy seeks to integrate into WASP society; sleep with the most Aryan WASP women; do WASP things; and hope that some of all that WASPness will rub off on him. There was nothing Portnoy would have loved better than to have had some of that blue blood flowing through his Jewish veins. When he finds out that it doesn't quite work out that way, he turns bitter and resentful, and his original envy turns into hate. Although the 100% Portnoy caricature is a rarity in the everyday, non-fictional world, we can still detect aspects of his *Complaint* interwoven amongst other Jewish behavior patterns.

But of course, the most common, "typically Jewish" manifestation of Jewish anxieties is the pushy, ambitious, aggressive, manipulative Jew who readily admits his Jewishness and seeks to fulfill Momma's dreams by always **trying harder**. This too is a form of self hate, because as Dr. Stein indicates, whatever one does, **it is never enough**. High achievement is still **inadequate** achievement. Momma and all the others have drummed it into their Jewish sons that no matter what, you have to get out there and **work**. Work night and day. Take work home with you. Worry during your sleep. For, if a Jew starts to slip and loses his social position of importance and power, then when the next Holocaust comes: Pow! Jews must always be on the lookout for anti-Semitism around every corner, under every rock. Jews must negotiate themselves into positions of influence — no, not obvious positions of influence like President or TV News anchorman, but back room positions like Presidential advisor, News Editor or whatever. It's not a question of "if" the next Holocaust will come, but "when". And Jews must be ready for it.

Many Jews are of course aware of these symptoms. Few actually deal with them on an objective basis. Even those in the psychology industry seemingly avoid facing up to such questions by simply universalizing their fears and anxieties and projecting them onto non-Jews. As we have discovered in an earlier chapter, psychotherapy appears largely to be a program of Jews telling Gentiles that they suffer from Jewish problems! Fortunately, not all are afflicted with this tunnel-vision. Again, we defer to Dr. Howard Stein's superb article, where he concludes:

"Auschwitz does not stand alone as one grim event, but is a metaphor for Jewish history itself. Holocaust is the meaning of Jewish history. The price of Jewish history is the enactment of a group-fantasy in a martyr-role which has made varieties of dying a way of life. For Jews do not alone passively find themselves in that world but also employ it to make victims of them. The world of social reality is coerced into confirming the Jewish group-fantasy of history. The ultimate lesson of Jewish history is that 'peace' will never be attained until Jews can relinquish their grim and lachrymose fascination with millennia of *Auschwitz*: until they can let go of the self-destruction fantasy that is the very substance of Jewish identity.

"Jews cannot escape Jewish history by trying not to be Jews. Only by not having to live by and to live out the group-fantasy of martyr/victim will Jews be able psychohistorically to transcend Jewish history. Perhaps then Jews will not have to 'escape' from history at all and will no longer need to fashion idols in the wilderness to redeem them. For, no longer self-imposed exiles from history, erstwhile Wandering Jews will have found a homeland rooted in the only secure home this world can offer: in themselves, and thereby in life."

Dr. Stein has indeed described the only possible final solution to the "Jewish Problem". Only through the Jews regaining their own self-esteem will they be at peace. Continuation of Jewish anxiety and low self-esteem can only mean, as we have seen, a continuation of the Jewish "bunker mentality" where every non-Jew is seen as an enemy or potential enemy. It can only mean a continuation of quack therapy cults, where the Jews try to purge themselves of neuroses by projecting them onto non-Jews and insisting that it is the non-Jew and not the Jew who suffers from such anxieties. The development of Psychohistory by Dr. Stein and his colleagues is truly one of the most encouraging phenomena to arrive on the academic scene in decades. Let us hope that the "exiles from history" do not retreat into their psychological bunkers, dismissing Psychohistory with the most ironic projection of all: "self-hate".

Source Notes

1. Two books provide an excellent survey of Karl Marx's paradoxical outlooks. His hypocrisy is dealt with in *Karl Marx: Racist* by Nathaniel Weyl (Arlington House, NY; 1979) and his personal life is detailed in Saul K. Padover's *Karl Marx: An Intimate Biography* (New American Library, NY; 1980). Trotsky is the simple title of beautifully illustrated large-size biography on the Bolshevik leader, compiled and written by Francis Wyndham and David King (Praeger, NY; 1972). Although the book is almost a hymn of praise from beginning to end, it does reveal some fascinating facts. Much collateral material can be found in Bill Grimstad's magisterial, comprehensive work *The Six Million Reconsidered* (The Noontide Press, Torrance; Historical Review Press, Brighton; 1979).
2. We deliberately avoided using sources perceived as "anti-Semitic" in the chapter on "Communism". The *Journal of Psychohistory* costs \$18 per year, or \$4.50 per copy, and may be obtained from 2315 Broadway, New York City, NY 10024. *Portnoy's Complaint*

is thought now to be out of print. But since it was no. 1 on the best-seller lists in 1969 it will probably be found in any used book store.

3. Jewish sexuality is dealt with in Grimstad's book cited above, in *Erotica Judaica* by Allen Edwardes (The Julian Press, NY; 1967) and *The Jew, The Gypsy and El Islam* by Sir Richard Burton (1898 and reprints). The Fall 1978 issue of *The Journal of Psychohistory* entitled "Special Issue: Judaism as a Group Fantasy" deals with Jewish sexual psychology in several articles. The most comprehensive work dealing with the role of women in Jewish society is *The Israeli Women* by Lesley Hazleton (Touchstone, NY; 1977). Some interesting arguments are also to be found in *A Psychohistory of Zionism* by Jay Y. Gonen (Meridian, NY; 1975).
 4. Freud's life and philosophies are sympathetically dealt with in *Freud for Beginners* by Richard Appignanesi (Pantheon, NY; 1979). His influence is condemned by Martin L. Gross in *The Psychological Society* (Touchstone, NY; 1978). Dr. Gross's book was also the source for much of the disturbing information on therapy cults. A survey on the Freudian Marxists is contained in *The Freudian Left* by Paul A. Robinson (Harper & Row, NY; 1969). An expose of Scientology is contained in *Cults of Unreason* by Dr. Christopher Evans (Delta, NY; 1973).
 5. Jewish power in America is dealt with sympathetically in Stephen D. Isaacs' candid book *Jews and American Politics* (Doubleday, NY; 1974) and critically in *The Zionist Connection* by Dr. Alfred M. Lilienthal (Dodd Mead, NY; 1978).
 6. I was myself the conceiver and the Director of the Institute for Historical Review and Editor of *The Journal of Historical Review* from inception in the winter of 1978 until the end of April 1981. The *Journal* contains a wealth of research material exposing the bogus nature of much Holocaust propaganda. It currently costs \$30 per year, and can be obtained from the IHR at P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505. Their booklist of Revisionist books is also unique and invaluable.
 7. Dr. Howard F. Stein teaches at the University of Oklahoma in Oklahoma City.
 8. Terrence Des Pres' book *The Survivor* is a useful collection of Holocaust nightmares (Oxford University Press, NY; 1976). In *The Journal of Historical Review* of Fall 1981 have reviewed several of the other "survivor" books mentioned in this chapter. For further commentary on the Arendt and Reitlinger extracts, see my article entitled "The Mendacity of Zion" in the Summer 1980 issue of the JHR.
 9. Jewish psychology is examined in *The Mask Jews Wear; The Self-Deceptions of American Jewry* by Eugene B. Borowitz (Simon & Schuster, NY; 1973), *The Jewish Paradox* by Nahum Goldmann (Grosset & Dunlap, NY; 1978), *The Jewish Mystique* by Ernest van den Haag (Stein & Day, NY; 1969) and *The Ordeal of Civility* by John Murray Cudding (Basic Books, NY; 1974).
-
-

Free receipt, possession, dissemination, discussion and transmission of this document (or documents contained in this collection or archive) are all hereby claimed and maintained as under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; including (but not limited to) those following:

From the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Article Twelve of the Universal Declaration

- 1. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation.**
- 2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.**

Article Eighteen of the Universal Declaration

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article Nineteen of the Universal Declaration

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.

FAIR USE NOTICE

This site contains copyrighted material, the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, scientific, and social justice issues etc.

US LAW

We believe that our use of any such copyrighted material constitutes a 'fair use' as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>.

EU LAW

As regards the use of copyrighted material within the European Union. The [European Directive 2001/29/EC](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society provides in its art. 5 an exhaustive list of exemptions that can be implemented by the Member States.

Amongst that list, the exemption(s) invoked must cover the reproduction and communication to the public (since the publication on the Internet implies those two acts). Generally, exemptions will be based on the purpose of the intended use. For instance, the Directive provides for an exemption to the exclusive right of reproduction and

communication to the public when it is made ***for the sole purpose of illustration for teaching or scientific research, as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible and to the extent justified by the non-commercial purpose to be achieved.***

Another exemption is "reproduction by the press, ***communication to the public or making available of published articles on current economic, political or religious topics or of broadcast works or other subject-matter of the same character, in cases where such use is not expressly reserved, and as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, or use of works or other subject-matter in connection with the reporting of current events, to the extent justified by the informatory purpose and as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible***".

All the exceptions must comply with the three step test which imply that exemptions must only apply in certain special cases (1) which do not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work or other subject-matter (2) and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the rightholder (3).

If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.