Are there any slums in Switzerland?

Florian Menevis, Swiss Bourgeois from Zurich's Golden Coast, Updated Dec 26, 2015

Switzerland has extensive social security laws and facilities that address almost any possible life situations. If a resident (not just a citizen) is unemployed he/she receives unemployment aid for up to 2 years. The monthly unemployment aid is almost equal to a full salary. If he/she is unable to find a job there is either aid for disabled people or social aid that can be received life-long and that is equal to minimum wages and can cover further costs for care, therapy and material requirements in the case of aid for medical reasons (for example a wheelchair, car modifications etc.). Note that social aid is paid without a particular reason other than that a resident or citizen is unable to sustain himself, though the paying government agency would then also give specific and binding directions as to how the receiver has to live (they might decide on which apartment to rent). Receivers of social aid can also not hold any assets while receiving social aid and such would have to be liquidated before receiving social aid. There are further programs, for example for drug addicts wherein they can receive life-long administration of the drug they are addicted to by specialized governmental centers for that purpose. Health care insurance is anyway mandatory so poverty as a result of illness is also not possible. Also, government agencies generally try to re-integrate people into society and employment by subsidizing measures that allow challenged and disabled people (physically or psychologically) to resume employment (e.g. financing measures to make a workplace compatible for wheel chairs).

Conclusion

It is practically impossible for slums to form in Switzerland as most people can live an ordered life by being employed or by receiving aid from social security facilities. There are homeless people that are homeless for no apparent reason or for ideological reasons (punks, anarchists etc.), but they are few in numbers.

(1) Definition of "Slum": A slum, as defined by the United Nations agency UN-HABITAT, is a run-down area of a city characterized by substandard housing, squalor, and lacking in tenure security. Source: Wikipedia > Slum

Note that I am not saying that there are not areas in Switzerland that are not that nice compared to the typical post-card sceneries, though such areas would still not be comparable to slums. One of the ugliest areas around Zurich for example is Schieren, here is a picture of a low-quality residential apartment with partly open hallways, small windows, low ceiling height (the minimum as per the laws is 2.4 meters) etc.

https://www.quora.com/
The limits of our freedom and democracy
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A Letter from Monika Schaefer

7 April 2018
Stadelheim Gefängnis
"Hotel Gitterblick"

Lieber Fredrick
Es hat mich sehr gefreut von Ihnen zu hören! Von einem
der besonders gut versteht.
Für mich war es natürlich auch eine große Überraschung
dem Deutschen Staat eine so großzügige
Urlaubsverlängerung zu bekommen. Sie wollen
anscheinend der Welt zeigen wie gerne sie mich haben –
ha ha.
Verhandlungsdatum kenn ich noch nicht – Heute bin ich
95 Tage in Haft. Es ist alles sehr interessant für mich.
Manchmal frage ich mich in welchem Land ich mich
befinde. Viele sitzen hier in U-haft – egal weshalb – aber
der Punkt ist der, daß man sehr lange in U-haft sitzen
kann. Wie viele in der Öffentlichkeit wissen das? Ich
hätte es nicht gewusst. Ich dachte so was passiert nur in
Guantanamo oder in der alten Soviet Union.
Ich möchte Ihnen versichern, daß es mir gut geht, trotz
Situation, und daß ich meinen Kopf hoch halte. Mit
klarem Gewissen fällt einem das nicht schwer, wie Sie es
persönlich wissen.
Ich habe meine Geige jetzt dabei, aber muß mit
geschlossenem Fenster spielen. Einige tagelang haben
andere Mitgefangenen es genossen wenn ich die letzten
Minuten am offenen Fenster gespielt habe. Es ist streng
verboten vom Fenster zu Fenster zu sprechen, also war
natürlich Skandal, ein paar fiddletunes zu hören! Oh je,
ein bißchen zu viel "party atmosphere" – das möchten sie
gar nicht hier.
Aber in der Kirche beim Gottesdienst ist es gewollt, daß
ich spiele. Das macht mich sehr glücklich.
Vielen Dank fürs schreiben.
Herzliche Grüße – Monika.
Frau Monika Schaefer – “Hotel Gitterblick”
JVA Stadelheim, Schwarzenberg Straße 14,
D-81549 München, Deutschland GERMANY
26. Juni 2018

Liebe Monika,

Ich habe mich sehr über Ihren Brief vom 7. April 2018 gefreut,
der aber erst vor kurzem bei mir ankam. Ich fragte mich schon ob
dass Brief sie überhaupt erreicht hatte.

Es ist schon zu sehen, dass Sie Ihren Humor noch bewahrt
haben und ich musste laut über Ihre Beschreibung von "Hotel
Gitterblick" lachen.

Ich hoffe, dass Ihre Urlaubsverlängerung nicht zu lange
anhält, wie Sie vielleicht wissen, dauerte mein Urlaub sieben
Monate – bevor ich als neugewählter Haft-Gefangenen-Vertreter
bei der JVA Stadelheim die Mannheimer Gaststätte verlassen
konnte.

Sie haben recht wenn Sie schreiben, dass Sie Ihren Kopf, trotz
der Situation, hochhalten können, weil Sie ein gutes Gewissen
haben und keine kriminellen Taten gegangen haben. So war es
mit mir auch, und dass hilft natürlich auch nicht zu verzweifeln
und bitter zu werden. Der Gefangene ist ja eigentlich derjenige,
der Sie reingeschickt hat.

Auch konnten Sie sich freuen, dass es Ihnen erlaubt ist Ihre
Geige zu spielen. In dieser Hinsicht ist Deutschland immer noch
ein bisschen kompliziert. Es versteht sich ja, die Telefongespräche von
Fenster zu Fenster sind wegen Informationsaustausch
unerwünscht.

Soviell ich weiß, beginnt die Verhandlung Ihrer Bruder Anfang Juli an! Wir werden natürlich hier in Australien
Ihren Fall mit großem Interesse verfolgen und hoffen, so wie in
meinem Fall, dass Sie selbst freigelassen werden.

Es kann sein, dass aber in Ihrem Fall die Internetaktivität
eine Rolle spielen könnte, was in 1999 noch nicht mitspielte,
wie es im folgenden 1999 Artikel angedeutet wird:
Die Termine fuer die Geschwister Schaefer sind ja nun festgelegt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wochentag und Datum</th>
<th>Uhrzeit</th>
<th>Zimmer / Etage / Gebaende</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montag, 02.07.2018</td>
<td>09:15 Uhr</td>
<td>Sitzungssaal B 170, 1. Stock Nymphenburger Straße 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Termine zur Fortsetzung der Hauptverhandlung wurden bestimmt auf:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wochentag und Datum</th>
<th>Uhrzeit</th>
<th>Zimmer / Etage / Gebaende / Ort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dienstag, 03.07.2018</td>
<td>09:15 Uhr</td>
<td>Sitzungssaal B 170, 1. Stock Nymphenburger Straße 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittwoch, 04.07.2018</td>
<td>09:15 Uhr</td>
<td>Sitzungssaal B 170, 1. Stock Nymphenburger Straße 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag, 05.07.2018</td>
<td>09:15 Uhr</td>
<td>Sitzungssaal B 170, 1. Stock Nymphenburger Straße 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnerstag, 12.07.2018</td>
<td>09:15 Uhr</td>
<td>Sitzungssaal B 170, 1. Stock Nymphenburger Straße 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag, 13.07.2018</td>
<td>09:15 Uhr</td>
<td>Sitzungssaal B 170, 1. Stock Nymphenburger Straße 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montag, 16.07.2018</td>
<td>09:15 Uhr</td>
<td>Sitzungssaal B 170, 1. Stock Nymphenburger Straße 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


------------------------------------

Another letter from Monika to Diane King and Jim Rizole:
June 10, 2018
Monika Schaefer
From Monica Schaefer, from the Iron Bar Hotel, Stadelheim, 159 days incarcerated, letter #3.

Dear Diane and Jim,

Thank you so much for your two letters dated postmarked April 2nd and April 13th both of which arrived May 31st, so 7 and 8-1/2 weeks respectively! I had to chuckle when I read your statement, "... we are delighted that you are receiving your mail at all..." Me too. I am delighted, but I have to tell you they are playing psycho-tricks with me, because for a long period of time, they were dangling the occasional "carrot," little bits of mail here and there, most of which were speedy and reaching me like in 2 weeks. And so, of course, this could lead me to the conclusion that we are all up to date, and the people are moving on to other matters. Then all at once, May 31st, I received a pile of mail that stemmed back 2-1/2 months! What on Earth were they doing over there at the courthouse?

My jailers here in this institution assure me that these delays did not stem from them. They move the mail quickly, and I do believe them; although, they have also made many mistakes leading to some terrible delays – for example misdirecting mail from the Canadian Consulate in Munich, which should have reached me the next day. They sent it along to the court with the rest of my mail and it said Rush, "ELT" on it, and it reached me 40 days later.

Anyway aside from these kinds of things, I do want to share with you another little story about my mail. The story of Monica Schaefer's mail. I had requested a meeting with the jail boss after certain laws and rules came to my attention regarding the handling of mail, and I felt they were breaking the law in my case. When a person is U-Haft, short for "Untersuchungshaft," meaning arrested and detained before trial or verdict, like me, then all in and outgoing mail gets read by the court - - the prosecutor or the judge or whoever over there - - I'll just call it "court" for short. Then the mail gets forwarded (or not as the case may be). The incoming mail gets put in sealed brown envelopes and those brown envelopes are supposed to be in my presence. I get called to the office in my wing here and they are just supposed to be checking for stuff like stickers, glitter, blank cards, forbidden and presumably dangerous? Things like that. They do not read the mail - - that has all already been taken care of by the court. Now it is different if you are "straffhaft," meaning you have already been sentenced to prison then the mail would no longer be sent to the court to read, and the jailers read the mail before handing it over.

Back to my case. It was clear to me that those brown envelopes have been opened in the mail room downstairs before being sent up to my wing, where it is checked yet again though so this is a TRIPLE check. And monitoring of my mail. I thought this might be a bit extreme so I requested that meeting with the big boss. Well let me tell you, that was a most interesting discussion with the two women (they always have their side kicks with
them). I learned that not only do they open the mail in the mail room to look for inserts or stickers, they DO read my mail here too, even though it has ALL already been through the court! I challenged them on this. And made mention of the laws they have. They pulled out their special Book of Rules, jail house rules you can call it, and they have special rules for special people like me – hahaha. Oh isn't it nice to be special. In their eyes, especially dangerous people like me. There are special rules like security reasons. Yes of course there is that catch-all word “security.” Where have we ever heard that word before? Oh yeah I remember now, 24/7 in MSM. Security justifies any and all of their secrets, as laws, (police state laws), actions, like maybe attacking another country, everything and anything they want to do, it's always in the name of “security.”

So our discussion continued. I asked for clarification. I cannot relay the whole conversation word for word here, but I can tell you they dug themselves pretty deep in their own doodoo. What dangers were they protecting themselves from? BB (or the big boss): I could be converting people here, gathering together a band, gang, a group of followers. I said how would you know from the incoming mail? Outgoing mail goes directly to the court in sealed brown envelopes or do you open those illegally as well?

BB: No, no, we don’t do that.

Monika: So please explain.

BB: Well someone might be answering your letter and saying something like “good plan!” At some point in the conversation I laughed outloud – I couldn't help myself. (Oh they don't like that very much when we laugh in their faces.) They are worried about my contact with other prisoners. I suggested to them that if they did not like it that I am conversing about anything under the sun and socializing with other prisoners, then they would have to put me in isolation, solitary confinement. They flatly replied that would be the next step. Without blinking I said, “the world is watching.” (Just to be clear here that was a threat I am not in solitary.)

Later that day, I had reason to write them a followup letter regarding a small logistical matter about something else and I used the opportunity to also leave them with one further comment relevant to our discussion, as food for thought. I wrote: TRUTH STANDS ON ITS OWN. ONLY LIES NEED TO BE FORCED INTO EXISTENCE BY THE STATE.

Well my friends I was going to write you more stories – they are abundant here! But this letter is long enough for now. Yes please share especially with Arthur as I haven't written him in a while either. All of you are near and dear to me and I am sending you much, much love, Monica.

PS: So sorry Diane I am not ignoring your invitation for discussion about spiritual things. I too look forward to that with you. I appreciated the lyrics you sent me. Love you.

_________________________________________________

FOR THE RECORD - 1985

**No scientific proof Jews exterminated: witness**

**FOR THE RECORD - 1985**

**Montreal Gazette Friday January 18 1985 p12**
Ten years late = remember this advertisement from 1995?

Fredrick Toben, an Australian man who was convicted earlier this year of publishing anti-Semitic material on the internet, has started a three-month jail term after his appeal was quashed. Toben who is wanted in Germany on charges of denying the Holocaust was found guilty in May of 24 counts of contempt of a 2002 court ruling that barred him from publishing anti-Semitic material on the website of his organisation, the Adelaide Institute.

The material found to be in breach of the order included suggestions that the Holocaust did not happen, that questioned whether there were gas chambers at the Auschwitz death camp, and that challenged the intelligence of Jews who questioned Holocaust deniers' beliefs.

In their verdict, the judges of the Federal Court said the case was not about the Holocaust but about whether Toben had complied with orders of the court. "Obedience to the court is not optional," they said in their ruling. The judges said Toben, 64, had a disregard for the orders of the court and had acted to undermine the authority of the court. The 2002 case against Toben stemmed from a discrimination case against him by Jeremy Jones, a former president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry.

Toben participated in Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's 2006 conference called to debate whether the Second World War genocide of Jews took place, where he argued that the Auschwitz death camp was too small for the mass murder of Jews to have been carried out there. He suggested only 2,007 people could have been killed at the camp.


and the Prime Uglies’ decades-long hunt began ending like this:  
------------------------
Holocaust denier Fredrick Toben jailed in Australia, 14 Aug 2009

------------------------

... and the PRIME UGLIESS projected their own hatred on to their perceived enemy, rejecting any personal self-reflection on

The Hidden Power of Beauty

By Thomas Troward
From The Hidden Power  [1921]

Do we sufficiently direct our thoughts to the subject of Beauty? I think not. We are too apt to regard Beauty as a merely superficial thing, and do not realise all that it implies. This was not the case with the great thinkers of the ancient world—see the place which no less a one than Plato gives to Beauty as the expression of all that is highest and greatest in the system of the universe. These great men of old were no superficial thinkers, and, therefore, would never have elevated to the supreme place that which is only superficial. Therefore, we shall do well to ask what it is that these great minds found in the idea of Beauty which made it thus appeal to them as the most perfect outward expression of all that lies deepest in the fundamental laws of Being. It is because, rightly apprehended, Beauty represents the supremest living quality of Thought. It is the glorious overflowing of fulness of Love which indicates the presence of infinite reserves of Power behind it. It is the joyous profusion that shows the possession of inexhaustible stores of wealth which can afford to be thus lavish and yet remain as exhaustless as before. Read aright, Beauty is the index to the whole nature of Being.

Beauty is the externalisation of Harmony, and Harmony is the co-ordinated working of all the powers of Being, both in the individual and in the relation of the individual to the Infinite from which it springs; and therefore this Harmony conducts us at once into the presence of the innermost undifferentiated Life.

Thus Beauty is in most immediate touch with the very arcanum of Life; it is the brightness of glory spreading itself over the sanctuary of the Divine Spirit. For if, viewed from without, Beauty is the province of the artist and the poet, and lays hold of our emotions and appeals directly to the innermost feelings of our heart, calling up the response of that within us which recognises itself in the harmony perceived without, this is only because it speeds across the bridge of Reason with such quick feet that we pass from the outmost to the inmost and back again in the twinkling of an eye; but the bridge is still there and, retracing our steps more leisurely, we shall find that, viewed from within, Beauty is no less the province of the calm reasoner and analyst. What the poet and the artist seize upon intuitionially, he elaborates gradually, but the result is the same in both cases; for no intuition is true which does not admit of being expanded into a rational sequence of intelligible factors, and no argument is true which does not admit of being condensed into that rapid suggestion which is intuition.

Read on - http://www.renegadetribune.com/the-hidden-power-of-beauty/
Then, from the USA on 5 July 1996, soon after Adelaide Institute connected to the Internet on 1 May 1996, Jewish hate groups began their work agitating for action, which local Jews in Sydney gleefully copied – and so the PRIME UGLIES began their BATTLE-OF-THE-WILLS:

...and as early as 1991 a letter from Noam Chomsky defining our right to free expression:
Then the German sojourn of 1999 spawned a thesis about the Töben case:
And Sir Walter Crocker, one of Fredrick Töben’s decade-long guiding light died a few weeks after inviting him for the usual in-depth debriefing “cup of tea”, which was never to be.
On the Laws that Prohibit Holocaust Denial
James Flynn, June 25, 2018

Free speech and the protection of vulnerable minority groups are two vital commitments of liberal democracies. Ideally, and indeed a lot of the time, the two work in harmony; but sometimes they appear to conflict. One touchy case of such a conflict is the denial of the Holocaust and the various ways in which different countries have dealt with it. In 2006, British historian David Irving—who had become infamous for arguing a moronic revisionist history of World War II that called the Holocaust a "myth" and denied Hitler’s role in the extermination of six million Jews—was arrested in Austria for the speech crime of trivializing the Holocaust and was sentenced to three years in prison. The subsequent controversy, which saw a variety of reactions from the West to the sentence, illustrated the legal and cultural differences that countries have in the subject of genocide denial.

Genocide denial is typically considered a form of hate speech. It insults the victims of genocide and the racial, ethnic, or religious group of which they are members. But it is also feared for its potential to teach future perpetrators the lesson that they may commit genocide and simply deny it afterwards. Denial typically takes three forms: the denial of the facts of the genocide, the denial of the responsibility for it, and the denial of the applicability of the term "genocide" to whatever
First enacted in the conviction of David Irving, many countries, Germany and Austria, strictly enforce restraints on the public display of Nazi symbols, such as the swastika, as well as Holocaust denial (in Germany a violator is subject to up to five years in prison), whereas others such as Romania and Lithuania have laws on the book that they laxly enforce. The countries without such laws, including the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Scandinavian countries, tend to place greater value on individual liberty and free speech. The United States, with a strong tradition of Common Law—a legal system in which principles are based primarily on judicial precedents—protects the public expression of Nazism under the First Amendment.

Laws against Holocaust denial were first enacted in Europe to curb far-right extremism, with Germany leading the way. After World War II, Germany criminalized and banned the Nazi Party to stifle any remainder of its message of ethnic hatred. Holocaust denial did exist in most of post-World War II Germany, but it did not attract wide-scale public attention until the 1970s, when it began to be featured increasingly in the propaganda of the far right. In response, Germany introduced a law in 1985 that outlawed Holocaust denial and other forms of Nazi symbols, and a subsequent law in 1994 that made Holocaust denial a more serious criminal offense under the general anti-incitement law. Considering its history, Germany felt a special obligation to curb anti-Semitic extremism, but throughout that decade, a handful of countries followed its example. France banned Holocaust denial in 1990 under the Gayssot Act. Austria, although it previously had laws to suppress any revival of Nazism, did not have laws banning specifically denial until 1992. Then came Belgium and Spain in 1995 (though Spain rescinded the law in 2007), Poland in 1998, and so on.

In evaluating these laws, it is important to remember that no society has completely unrestricted speech. The United States and the United Kingdom have libel laws and laws against direct incitement of violence, and other democracies have even greater restrictions. There are, moreover, countries going through transitional phases in which memory laws—laws that enshrine state-approved interpretations and narratives of history—prove not just prudent but absolutely necessary.

Take Rwanda as an example. In the decades following the Rwandan genocide of 1994, state leaders, though expressing an eagerness to facilitate a greater environment of open discourse, also had to take into account the real danger of the revival of ethnic conflict, which had brought about the recent genocide. The Rwandan government therefore passed laws in 2003 and 2008 to criminalize the denial of the genocide of the Tutsis by the Hutus. An analysis by the international think tank Legatum Institute, dispensing the “Myth of Free Media,” makes the compelling argument that transitioning countries such as Rwanda must focus on finding the “acceptable limits” of speech instead of abandoning all limits. Such limits should be assessed on a country’s particular situation and stage of development. Thus, present-day Rwanda seems to have the context to warrant laws against the denial of its genocide. The question, then, is whether present-day Europe also has such a context.

Free speech and the protection of vulnerable minority groups are two vital commitments of liberal democracies. Ideally, and indeed a lot of the time, the two work in harmony; but sometimes they appear to conflict. Critics argue against the government’s role in interpreting history and fear a slippery slope of censorship. After the conviction of David Irving, many Americans, who generally have a hard time coming to terms with such relatively strict legal censorship in Europe, weighed in. Peter Singer, for example, makes the point that Holocaust deniers likely will be more persuaded of their error if their views are refuted by argument and evidence and that, on the other hand, they will be more inclined to believe in a conspiracy if the likes of them are being imprisoned. Roger W. Smith suggests that legislation makes martyrs of the deniers, and he raises the alternatives of “education, scholarship, and advocacy.” He also emphasizes the inconsistency of these laws, since no European country other than Switzerland prohibits the denial of the Armenian genocide—a fact that, by the logic of the advocates of these laws, insults the Armenian genocide’s victims. Noam Chomsky in 1981 added another American voice to this the issue: defending the right to speech of a Holocaust denier in the midst of a controversy in France in 1981, he said, “It seems to me something of a scandal that it is even necessary to debate these issues two centuries after Voltaire defended the right of free expression for views he detested. It is a poor service to the memory of the victims of the Holocaust to adopt a central doctrine of their murderers.” Moreover, the critics’ fear of the dangerous precedent that these laws set has been realized in a few instances. In an evaluation of Rwanda’s memory laws, human rights lawyer Nani Jansen observes that the laws have been used to “restrict a free and open debate on matters of public interest in the country,” emphasizing “especially the restrictive effect the laws have had on free speech in the media”; as described in an article in Foreign Policy, Rwanda’s then-prosecutor-general responded that Western critics were hypocritical to censure the same kind of laws that many European countries themselves...
have. A 2014 memory law in Russia, which prohibits the "circulation of false information about the activities of the USSR during the years of the Second World War," was invoked to convict blogger Vladimir Luzgin for mentioning the role of the USSR in collaboration with Nazi Germany in the invasion of Poland in 1939—a historical fact. The law has received international criticism, but its precedents are the memory laws of Europe. Another instance: to the 1998 memory law that was implicitly understood to criminalize Holocaust denial, on February 6, 2018 Poland's far right government, for nationalist purposes, passed an amendment that also criminalized the term "Polish death camps"—a ridiculous and entirely counter-productive outlawing of a mere historical misnomer, which does nothing for the cause of any serious historical discussion of the Holocaust.

It is challenging to assess precisely the efficacy of the laws prohibiting Holocaust denial. One analysis attempting to do so for the case of Germany reported that the laws enacted in the 80s and 90s did cause a substantial decline afterwards in public Holocaust denial; but, instead of outright eliminating Holocaust denial in Germany, they drove the Holocaust denial "underground or overseas"—those deniers continued to influence the German public by propaganda. In light of the recent rise of alt-right populism throughout Europe and the increasing difficulty of stifling the spread of pernicious ideas on the internet, some may argue that there is a need now more than ever for regulation of all forms of hate speech. No one doubts that these laws are well-intentioned; and if one takes the perspective, for example, of Germany, it is easy to see why Germany felt its particular history to warrant memory laws.

It is difficult to take a personal stance on these laws; I watch with horror the rise of a new anti-Semitism in Europe. Yet, in final analysis, the laws as they currently stand are misguided. They infringe on free speech, the essence of which is the protection of even the most disagreeable opinions. They set a precedent for the government's role in interpreting history, and they serve as justifications for authoritarian regimes to stifle dissent on historical matters. The fact that the laws were enacted not directly after World War II but rather in the 90s indicates that they were not necessary to curbing extremism and anti-Semitism in Europe. The best way, therefore, of eradicating the virus of Holocaust denial is not censorship but open discourse, education, and criticism.


Britain's Prince William Brings Message of Homage, Hope on First Israel Visit
By Dan Williams, June 26, 2018, at 3:14 a.m.

"I am well aware that the responsibility falls now to my generation to keep the memory alive of that great crime as the Holocaust generation passes on. And I commit myself to doing this."

After a brief opening greeting in Hebrew, William added: "Israel's remarkable story is partly one of remembering its terrible past but also looking forward to a much more hopeful future ... the modern story is one of inventing, creating, innovating and striding confidently into its future."

Earlier in Jerusalem, he met Netanyahu and Israeli President Reuven Rivlin. On Wednesday he will meet Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas in Ramallah in the occupied West Bank.

Following his engagements in Jerusalem, William went to Tel Aviv and, sporting sunglasses and an open-necked shirt, strolled along the Mediterranean shore, chatting with beach-goers and quipping, "I should have brought my swimming trunks".

William's trip is at the behest of the British government. Until now it had been British policy not to make an official royal visit until the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was resolved. British officials have given no detailed explanation for the change in policy.

YAD VASHEM
At Yad Vashem, he met descendants of Jews hidden from the Nazis by his great-grandmother. Wearing a black skullcap, William laid a wreath at Yad Vashem's Hall of Remembrance, where an eternal flame flickers and the names of extermination and concentration camps are engraved in the floor.

"Terrifying," William said, viewing a display at the memorial's museum of shoes taken by the Nazis from
Jews at Majdanek death camp. "(I'm) trying to comprehend the scale."
Tens of thousands of Jews and other victims were killed at the camp, near Lublin in what is now Poland.

After the tour, the prince - second in line to the British throne - was greeted by Netanyahu and his wife, Sara, at their official residence against the backdrop of British and Israeli flags.

There, the prince met relatives of the late Rachel Cohen, who was hidden from the Gestapo, along with two of her five children, by Princess Alice, the mother of Britain's 97-year-old Prince Philip, in her palace in Greece.

The Greek royal family - Princess Alice was married to Prince Andrew of Greece - had been acquainted with Cohen's late husband, Haimaki, a former member of Greece's parliament.

"You must be very proud of your great-grandmother, who saved defenseless Jews," Netanyahu told William. Princess Alice was recognized as one of the "righteous among nations", gentiles who rescued Jews, by Yad Vashem in 1993. A devout Christian, she is buried on the slopes of Jerusalem's Mount of Olives. William is due to visit her tomb on Thursday.

On Wednesday in the occupied West Bank, after seeing Abbas, William is scheduled to meet Palestinian youngsters.

At a meeting with Rivlin, the prince, on a visit described by Britain as non-political, said he hoped "peace in the area can be achieved". Israeli-Palestinian peace talks collapsed in 2014.

"I had a very moving tour around Yad Vashem this morning, which really taught me quite a lot more than I thought I already knew about the true horrors of what happened to the Jews over the war," William said at the meeting with Rivlin.

The prince also spoke at Yad Vashem with two men who survived the Nazi genocide through British intervention. Henry Foner, 86, and Paul Alexander, 80, were among thousands of Jewish children taken in by Britain as part of the 1930s "Kindertransport" from a continental Europe that was falling to German conquest.

"I said to his Royal Highness that this is a unique opportunity for me to express my thanks to the British people for opening their homes to me and to the other 10,000 children who came," Alexander said.

(Writing by Jeffrey Heller and Ori Lewis; Editing by Matthew Mpoke Bigg)

Copyright 2018 Thomson Reuters.

Who's behind the race mixing agenda in advertising?
Aaron Kasparov, June 24, 2018

The War Against Whites in Advertising
R. Houck

The mass-marketing of interracial relationships, particularly white women with black men, has become so ubiquitous and so militant, even the least observant members of our culture have begun to notice. Walking through a mall recently I noticed three large marketing images of couples in three different stores. Two of the three were interracial couples, depicting a white woman and black man; the third couple was white. Perhaps what struck me as most peculiar was the fact that the city where I was shopping, whites make up about 97% of the population, blacks are less than 2%. I wondered if the purpose of “diverse” advertising was to sell more products, or really to indoctrinate, to condition, and signal how “progressive” they are. Based on small glimpses of culture, one might assume half or more of all relationships involve some sort of race-mixing. If a person who had no information about the US or Europe were to see our television, magazine,
The most common intermarriage was with others of the same race; however, beyond closely related marriage combinations, there were very few heterosexual combinations. The black/white couple depicted in advertising was, by far, the most common mixed-race couple. The combination of white women with black men is握手 down, the most common mixed-race couple depicted in advertising; that combination will be the focus of this essay.

I thought about the probability that two of the three advertisement couples I saw in the mall that afternoon were there by mere coincidence. Between men and women, white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and “other,” there are 25 possible combinations of couples. Twenty of which are inter racial. Here are the possible interracial combinations.

### Mixed-Race Couple Combinations

- **White** woman: black man, Asian man, Hispanic man, other man.
- **White** man: black woman, Asian woman, Hispanic woman, other woman.
- **Black** man: Asian woman, Hispanic woman, other woman.
- **Black** woman: Asian man, Hispanic man, other man.
- **Asian** man: Hispanic woman, other woman.
- **Asian** woman: Hispanic man, other man.
- **Hispanic** man: other woman.
- **Hispanic** woman: other man.

If the “diversity” in advertising was truly about appealing to the greatest number of customers or potential customers, showing white women with black men at such a high level, seems to be a very odd strategy. To focus so much on one combination, while ignoring so many others – there simply must be some other goal beyond selling merchandise.

### Outcomes

There is a notable and interesting body of research on interracial relationships and marriages, it is not exhaustive by any means, but we can synthesize the available data to form an accurate view of such relationships. Pew Research 2012 conducted a large study of interracial marriage that provides a considerable amount of data. Since 1980, the total percent of interracial marriages has risen from 3.2% to 8.4%. Of new marriages, the rate rose from 6.7% to 15.1%. In 2010 the most common intermarriage was white/Hispanic, at 43.3%, other mixed at 30.4%, white/Asian at 14.4% and white/black, the least common, at 11.9%. Not all interracial relationships, of course, are marriages, but we can use the marriage data to reasonably extrapolate the information to the wider society and relationships.

As of 2010, whites, on average, were the least likely to marry outside of their race, less than 10% of whites intermarry, while Hispanics, blacks, and Asians are all two to three times more likely to intermarry.[1] In terms of combined median incomes of interracial marriages, black husbands with white wives earned the lowest amount of any other combination. The black husband and white wife combination were also the least educated. Of the interracial combinations, marriages between whites and blacks were found to be the least stable, and the most likely to result in divorce. The divorce rate is higher in all interracial marriages for white women relative to a white marriage.[2]

A study of over two million online dating interactions revealed distinct racial preferences between groups. White women responded most frequently to white men, and least frequently to black men.[3] In light of this data it is all the more bizarre that the combination of a white woman with a black man is seen so frequently in advertising.

### Sexually transmitted disease rates per the 2016 Center for Disease Control speak for themselves.[4][5][6]

A 2015 study examined the outcomes of women that have children with black men, the results were staggering. Currently, 70% of black children are born out of wedlock, however when the mother is white and the father black, the rate jumps to 97%. 98% of white mothers studied reported the father does not support their children financially, 97% report the father is not in the child’s life, and 97% of the women have used welfare to help support themselves and their children. Only 10% of women that have children with black men out of wedlock end up marrying. The vast majority of white women that have children with black men live far below the poverty line.[7]

A 2013 study of intimate partner violence in relationships, surveyed nearly ten-thousand people, the authors hypothesized that interracial couples would experience higher levels of violence compared to intra-racial relationships. They found that compared to white relationships, both black couples and interracial couples experience statistically significant higher levels of relationship violence. Intimate partner violence is classified as threats, physical, or emotional violence between two people in a committed relationship. The National Center for Injury Prevention and Control estimates that relationship violence costs around $4.1 billion a year in medical and mental health care costs.[8]

### Attitudes

Among whites in 1958, only 4% approved interracial marriages between whites and blacks; in 2007, 75% of whites reported they approve of such unions. Historically and contemporarily, blacks and Hispanics have always held a higher approval rating of interracial marriages.[9]

From a 2011 Pew Research study, 40% of whites, 51% of blacks, and 48% of Hispanics report that more people of different races marrying is a change for the better in society. 12% of whites, 8% of blacks and 9% of Hispanics say it is for the worse, and the remaining of those surveyed said there is no difference. The younger the cohort, the more likely they were to say the increase of interracial marriage is for the better, liberals were more likely than conservatives to say interracial marriages is for the better, and college graduates were also more likely to support the notion.[10]

As a side note, my personal opinion from a considerable amount of spent time in academia is that “more educated” members of our society are not more “open-minded” than “less educated” members. It is my contention that on average, the longer one spends in academia, the more apt one is to be indoctrinated by critical theory. There is likely also a self-selection bias at work as well. Those who are more likely to buy into the narrative of critical theory, are more likely to thrive in an environment that echoes their sentiments.

Pew Research 2010 found that 69% of people surveyed said that single women having children is a bad thing, 43% say unmarried couples raising children is a bad thing, yet only 14% say interracial marriage is a bad thing.[11] There is something oddly ironic about being in favor of interracial relationships, while at the same time abhorring the logical outcomes of those relationships.

Both Pew Research and Gallup’s latest findings report the majority of US citizens approve of interracial marriage and relationships. Although these are generally self-
According to surveys and anonymous studies, there is a social desirability bias coming into play. Social desirability bias is the tendency of survey and study participants to distort their responses to socially contentious questions in a way that is socially and publicly acceptable, even when the surveys are anonymous. A 2017 study in the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* looked at insula activity in the brain when participants viewed images of interracial couples compared to same-race couples. Insula activation is responsible for a variety of emotions. Evidence shows that insula activity is present when a person experiences disgust and is thought to be a reliable marker of both disgust and aversion. The study found statistical significance between insula activation of participants looking at same-race couples compared to interracial couples. Despite a minority of participants explicitly stating they disagree with interracial dating and marriage, the electroencephalogram (EEG), told a different story. This study also used an implicit association task (IAT) to measure response times of participants in categorizing interracial couples and same-race couples with either a silhouette of a human or a silhouette of an animal. Participants were placed in two conditions, one primed with disgusting images, the other with positive images. Researchers found that all participants showed an implicit bias towards matching interracial couples with animals, and the condition primed to be disgusted was even faster, showing a greater implicit bias against interracial couples. There was both a neural reaction of disgust and an implicit reaction of disgust, to interracial couples. The authors write in the abstract of this paper that “These findings are particularly concerning, given evidence of antisocial reactions (e.g., aggression, perpetration of violence) to dehumanized targets.”[12]

**The Psychology**

We now know that whites are the least likely to marry outside of their race. We know that when white women marry outside of their race they are more likely to be abused, to become a single-mothers, live in poverty, and that whites dating outside of their race exposes us to a higher chance of contracting a sexually transmitted disease. We know that despite the feigned acceptance, white people show a legitimate disgust response to interracial relationships. We also know that despite the barrage of “diversity” in films, television, and in advertisements, same-race couples are still the most common, by far. So, what’s the purpose of the blatant propaganda?

David Vinjamuri for Forbes writes; “What’s the advantage of a wider variety of gender, ethnicity and sexual presence represented in media and advertising? Simply put, we are more likely to identify with someone that looks like us.”[13]

Michelle Castillo for CNBC suggests that Americans want even more “diversity” in ads, where she cites a survey of 2,000 people, where 66% report diversity in advertising is a factor to consider when purchasing a product.[14] These are excuses, at best. We still have not answered why we see the very particular arrangement of white women with black men, time and time again. I do not believe for a second that interracial advertising under the guise of “diversity” is about selling clothes or laundry detergent or cereal. It is propaganda through and through. The purpose of which is to present a distorted worldview, to humiliate, to mock, and to make complacent. White men are the last vanguard against this occupation of a hostile elite. White women are displayed with non-whites not to sell items, but as a tactic of psychological warfare against our civilization. Very rarely anymore are white men portrayed in a favorable light, they are often the overweight, goofy, clumsy, half-wit that relies on women and non-whites to save the day. From films to television to advertisements, this is an increasingly common anti-white canard. The increasing acceptance of interracial relationships over the last 70 years has not been a function of anything other than increased propaganda efforts. The outcomes are socially and individually undesirable, little if any good comes from promoting white women to date and marry outside of their race. What we are seeing is a systemic attack on white identity, we are seeing but one of many aspects of the war on whites becoming a creeping normality in the West.

The psychological effects of advertising have been well-documented. Advertising has the ability to make people chose an inferior product simply by manipulating the affective conditioning.[15] Studies suggest the average American is exposed to as many as 5,000 advertisements in a day. The American Psychological Association has concluded there is a link between unhealthy food advertisements to childhood obesity, and a link between tobacco and alcohol advertisements to underage smoking and drinking. The APA found these effects to be so strong they have called for strict regulations on advertisements that are marketed to children.[16] The power of advertising is so strong, it has the ability to override central-route processing and rationality, to sow subconscious discord, persuade us to make irresponsible decisions.[17] Further, advertising has the power to condition us to be more accepting and to usher in social change. The prevalence of mixed-race couples and an increase of LGBT representation in advertisements has in no small way changed social perception.[18] Although visceral reactions of disgust remain, outward social attitudes have become accepting of all forms of degeneracy and social decay.

**The Danger**

White people are not the only ones seeing constant images of white women with black men plastered across the Occident. These images have an effect on black men as well. They are being told by the film industry, TV, and advertising, that it is not only natural, but also common that white women are choosing black men. I have no doubt that this imagery plays no small part in the increased rate of victimization white women face at the hands of non-white men. These advertisements send a clear message to black men: white women desire you. This plays out in reality when black men, despite being conditioned by advertising to believe white women desire them, are rejected by white women in reality. They often become angry and lash out at the women (as seen in this video).[19] believing they are taking “what is theirs.” Nearly 100% of interracial rapes are white women being raped by non-white men *(National Crime Victimization Survey, 2008, Table 42)*. These advertising images, which have no small part in warping mentality, not only promote a dysgenic society, they place our people in a grave danger.
The most recent and perhaps belligerent example of anti-white propaganda came from Netflix via a set of three commercials for the streaming service. The series of the three commercials is titled The Couple, which features a white woman and a black man. The commercial "Open Relationship" from the series depicts two couples, an interracial couple, and a white couple, where the white man is depicted as small, weak, insecure, "unprogressive," and "closed-minded." His white girlfriend quickly decides to cast him aside to spend the evening with the interracial couple, as the black man quite literally steals the man's girlfriend in front of him, humiliating him. This is a commercial, with the alleged intent to encourage more people to subscribe to Netflix. It came to my attention that this commercial was not a result of white ethnomasochism, but perhaps something far more disquieting. HLG Studios out of Los Angeles was behind the production of the three commercials. HLG has worked on advertising campaigns for a myriad of national brands, from fast food chains, to banks, technology companies, and clothing retailers. HLG Studios was founded by Yuri Baranovsky, the same man who directed Netflix's race-mixing, anti-white propaganda pieces. Baranovsky is Jewish.[20]

This revelation piqued my interest and sent me down a bit of a rabbit hole in the advertising industry. I quickly found that the marketing industry is very much akin to the media industry. Just four mega-corporations control the vast majority of all advertising agencies. The Omnicom Group of New York, WPP of London, Publicis of Paris, and Interpublic of New York are the key corporations in the West. Dentsu of Tokyo is the next largest group, and fifth globally. The New York Times states that these companies are so powerful "they can indirectly set network television schedules and starve magazines to death or help them to flourish," by deciding how and when to spend advertising dollars.[21] Each company owns dozens if not hundreds of smaller agencies; Omnicom has bought over 150 firms alone. CEO John Wren, of Irish descent, currently heads Omnicom Group. Omnicom was founded by Allen Rosenshine, Keith Reinhard, and John Bernbach, all three Jewish.[22]

Long-standing CEO of Publicis (1987–2017) has been Maurice Lévy, who cited his Rabbi grandfather as his greatest inspiration.[23] Lévy has been honored by the Anti-Defamation League, for his work fighting anti-Semitism, and his relentless promotion of "diversity". WPP of London was founded and is currently run by Martin Sorrell, of Jewish descent. Chairman and CEO of the Interpublic Group (IPG), is Michael Isor Roth. I found no mention of his ethnicity. Roth did however condemn the "white supremacist ideology" at Charlottesville and founded the whole event to be "deeply disturbing," as he wrote in an internal memo to 50,000 IPG employees. Roth further wrote that the actions cannot be tolerated, and that of course "diversity" is an American value. Finally, he suggested the events at Charlottesville are not political issues, but "an issue of basic humanity, and standing up for what is right."

I agree with the sentiments of Roth. This whole movement really isn’t political in many ways. This is about basic humanity and fighting for what is right. It just so happens, that some of us do not see our cultural genocide and dispossession as an issue beyond basic humanity. We have the right to exist, whether Roth and his ilk like it or not.

For a brief moment, I thought I was on to something. There seems to be a disproportionate number of Jews and those with Jewish sympathies involved in advertising. From small start-up firms to multi-billion-dollar corporations, all of which are promoting hostile anti-white canards, while praising "diversity" and "inclusion." I’m sure it’s just another coincidence. If you wanted to destroy a civilization, how would you go about it? If you wanted to create dysgenic chaos in a society, what would be your weapon? To destroy our civilization, you would want to start by destroying one of the cornerstones of our culture, the nuclear family. And what better way to destroy the white nuclear family, than to encourage white people, especially white women, to mate with foreign men that are unlikely to support them or raise their children. If you wanted to create a chaotic society that is easy to lord over, you would ensure that the children are raised by the state, the women are dependent upon the state, and that the men were marginalized and seen as social pariahs by their own people. What better way to destroy a people than to promote a relationship that can never produce white children and that is by nature dysgenic?

The media, the press, and advertisers have created a culture of anti-white hatred. These companies are not simply promoting "diversity" and trying to appeal to a wider range of consumers, they are promoting the increased abuse of white women. They are promoting heightened rates of communicable diseases amongst our people. They are promoting a generation of poor, fatherless children, where our tax dollars will be funneled. They are not just trying to sell products, they are trying to recreate a nation, our nation, without us. They are saying they do not want white children to be made. They are telling white men they have no place in society. And that is where we come in.

We need to stand guard with unwavering and watchful eyes, and shine a light on the constant barrage of attacks. Every single time I come across an advertisement that highlights "diversity" in an absurd way or promotes miscegenation, I make a point to share it online and with my friends and family. I personally take note of companies that insist on promoting miscegenation and do not spend my money with them. If they want the "diverse" consumer, they can have them. When the hostile elite sends a message that young white men have no place in society, it is our job to be there for them. To give them a place and more importantly a purpose. The future of civilization, the future for our people, is only being offered by one group of people, and that is us. We are in many ways the last vanguard against a system that would greatly prefer our extinction. Every film that has a hostile anti-white message should be reviewed, critiqued, and dissected by those of us writing articles and creating podcasts. We have the intellectual ability to develop our very own critiques, to be the warriors against this cultural insurrection, and to let the current occupation know they can write us out of their silly commercials, awful sitcoms, degenerate films, and miscegenation promoting magazine ads, but that is all they will be able to accomplish.

And one last thing, as for Dentsu, the Japanese advertising giant? Their entire history of executives has been Japanese.[27] Every July new employees and newly-promoted executives of the company travel to...
Mount Fuji to climb the mountain together. A company tradition dating back to the 1920s. Somewhere in this story of race-mixing propaganda amid the throes of degeneracy, there is a profound lesson to be learned from the Japanese. Although they are not without fault (Dentsu has a reputation of overworking their employees), there is something to be admired about a group of people honoring tradition, country, nature, nation, and each other.

And for us? We have our own Mount Fuji ahead of us, rising with the dawn and reaching towards the sky, waiting to be conquered. In a hostile environment that would much prefer we lie down and accept fate. I submit instead, we pull each other up that mountain — as we always have.

***


[18] Black immigrants in France hit white girl for not giving number, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6cYZ8dUgPuU


Kosher slaughterhouses in South America still use the barbaric ‘tie and raise’ method, which causes great suffering to animals before their deaths. Former Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi Yona Metzger (now in prison) said he is opposed to this slaughter method and has expressed his discontent.

https://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L3880776,0.html

PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) described the method Jews use to slaughter animals as “prolonged suffering and nightmarish deaths.” This torture qualifies these debauched creatures to be sold as kosher.

Halacha (Jewish law) claims to minimize animals’ suffering. “The shochet kills the animal with a quick, deep stroke across the throat with a sharp knife. When performed properly, shechita appears all but painless and quickly renders the animal unconscious.”

PETA’s first investigation at Agriprocessors in 2004 revealed almost 300 instances of inhumane slaughter, in which cows’ sensitive faces were shocked with electric prods, fully conscious cattle had their tracheas and esophagi ripped from their throats with meat hooks or knives, and they writhed in pools of their own blood, trying desperately to stand up for up to three minutes as blood poured from their throats.

https://www.peta.org/features/agriprocessors/

May we interpret this as an example of the way the Jews treat all animal life — and especially human animal life? How about the gassed prepositioned body of a dead Syrian child? The image of that Palestinian boy with half his head blown off is getting a little old. In Israel there are plenty of children just waiting to get their heads blown off by Jews.

If you have the mainstream version of history installed as an operating system inside your skull, you may rest assured you know very little about the actual history of the world.

The kosher slaughter of the American mind really began with Alexander Hamilton, that guy on your ten dollar bill, who coordinated the takeover of America’s financial system by the Jews of London before he was justifiably gunned down in a duel with Aaron Burr. With each passing year Jews hurled new chains across the minds of —

Religion of the abyss

Judaism fails itself and plummets into irrelevance wholly as a result of its own dogma. What normal human can condone the rape of children? An unbiased clinical appraisal of Jewish behavior would demand anyone who believes this material should be locked up as a danger to others. Now that Jews are essentially in control of the world poses a spectacularly serious problem. Our lives and our futures depend on how we deal with this dilemma.

To be more specific, Jews have controlled — almost exclusively controlled — the information people have received for at least a century. Now, that has been significantly increased by all these new levels of cyber communications. All readers should be aware that all journalistic enterprises since the dawn of time have never aimed to report unbiased news but rather to advocate a position or a product, and to impugn all competitors. The hidden factor today on the Web is that nothing is secret except the intent of the creators of the Internet, which was the CIA, by the way.

As the age of radio came upon us, all the major networks were eventually gobbled up by Jews and remain in that condition today. All the major newspapers which survived into the 20th century wound up with Jewish publishers eager to play ball with the Jews who began to penetrate politics, and more importantly, with the guy candidates lined up to take the tribes.

This story is not about anti-Semitism. It is a clear indictment of the criminal record of a single ethnic group. This is an unbiased appraisal of Jewish behavior — narcissistic megalomania, with a strong touch of psychopathic sadism! The Jews’ reluctance to explain their rituals to the public is their knowledge that such an act would create a universal revulsion that likely would lead to a mass slaughter because the world’s reaction would be gut-wrenching disgust at such clearly demented behavior (such as eating children).

So it’s almost like the Jews are always doing preemptive strikes against their fellow humans to forestall attacks on themselves. Then they complain that no one trusts them.

This is the fabled Jewish chutzpah. Their record for swindling is unexcelled in human history.

I speak advisedly to people of conscience, because we are living in a world where conscience is a liability when most everybody else is strictly take-the-money-and-run. Once the criminals got control of the world’s mass media, they set about legalizing the crimes they were committing. To the point where today, we have a culture of crime. Even our leaders gain some measure of jealous admiration when we learn how many billions they have squirreled away, simply for facilitating the swindles of the super rich, and lying about it to the people who elected them.

Financial, entertainment, medicine, pharmaceutical, the law, politics, Biblical, sports, gambling, media . . . you name it. Saboteurs of the food supply.

Especially in the Jewish European Union, today they routinely put people in jail for telling the truth. This “truth” always involves criminal charges against people debunking the bogus Jewish version of reality.

So venal and so scared are these people who prosecute illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in illegal laws that they have resorted to jailing women in
declared right after the Federal Reserve legislation was craftily passed, and the wars have never stopped since. There are always U.S. troops deployed somewhere. As the Commissars have so eagerly and accurately pointed out, America’s opulence rests on the corpses of millions of Third World ordinary human beings.

**Constructing the artificial reality**

But it wasn’t so much what the Jews took (even though they took everything). It was how they changed the way we think.

Freud told us we all wanted to sleep with our mothers and generations paid millions to be drugged on couches by Jewish psychosadists who toyed with their patients. Marx wrote a book about money that failed to mention the Rothschilds, yet generations of college students embraced Marxism without ever realizing that its chief product was non Jewish dead people and the utter ruthlessness of its demagogic leaders. And mimicking the psychology profession (which the Jews invented), Einstein created obtuse equations that could never be validated and which bore no relation to an electrically charged universe. Universities around the world pay millions for eggheads to spout his cosmological gibberish. All these Jewish concatenations are aimed at confusing and controlling people by getting them to believe things that are not true, which keeps them confused and controllable. They have succeeded beyond even their wildest expectations. This has produced rampant promiscuity among the young and widespread hopelessness in the old. Society in general as decaying as Jew release Africans everywhere to accelerate the worldwide destabilization.

The Jewish version of history got us to hate Muslims after 9/11, just as on the eve of both World Wars, Jewish media churned up all these impossible lies that people believed about the Germans, Italians and Japanese. Get serious now. Imagine the smug grin of George W. Bush, surely a portrait of an insane man. When he said “You’re either with us or with the terrorists,” he was talking about himself and his cabal of neocon criminals, because he already knew that the terrorists had been hired and briefed by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Donald Rumsfeld.

It sure looks like the USA is being set up to become the new world pariah, and the dishonor will be well-deserved.

**Trump knows**

Donald Trump knows exactly who did 9/11, he knows the intimate details, how thousands were exposed to radiation but the government and Christie Todd Whitman lied about it, just like the government always lies about every thing it does.

Which leads us to our completely corrupt Congress. Everybody in Congress knows 9/11 was an inside job, masterminded by Israel. As I’ve been saying for 15 years, three presidents and several iterations of Congress are all guilty of complicity in mass murder, treason and obstruction of justice. Perhaps the entire legal system, totally controlled by Jews, is also guilty of willful obstruction of justice. The two Jewish perverts installed on our Supreme Court — one is a transgender expert, the other an advocate of legalized pedophilia — offer irrefutable evidence of the way the American personality has been terraformed into a painful contortion of its former self, a twisted Jewish version of a human being, totally self-absorbed and utterly without compassion or scruples.

Is it anti-Semitic to say Jews committed the greatest crime in American history (not counting the two World Wars, which they also engineered)? If it is anti-Semitic, then anti-Semitism is about the only thing that can save this country, and maybe this world, from the deliberately contrived disaster no being inflicted upon all of us. The Jews have boobytrapped the world from so many angles society can’t possibly survive in its currently recognizable form. Genetic engineering will be about the last step before there are no more humans of the old kind, people you could appeal to their better natures and know they would do the right thing. Not so many of these left these days. Still, in a disaster, there are those who rise above the madness. We will see how many are left, and don’t count on the millennials being there. They seem to be clueless in a predesigned fog of senseless irrelevance.

Donald Trump is a multi-billionaire Jew-connected New York Realtor. His family is immersed in Chabad Lubavitchers, implacable enemies of the entire human race. Trump knew the exact story of 9/11, at the latest, a few days after it happened. How odd that it would take 9/11 insider Rudy Giuliani to rescue him from his own impetuosity, assuring we will never make any progress detoxing the 9/11 through any part of the Trump administration.

**Track record of deceit and terror**

It would seem patently obvious to me that anyone who claims to have a genetic or historical pedigree that elevates him above the mass of humanity on this planet actually is suffering from an acute inferiority complex which necessitates the creation of fantastic stories in order for him to feel at least equal with everyone else. The story of Jacob defeating the angel — which is to say individual Jews declaring themselves more powerful that God — is their primary delusion of grandeur that leads them to denigrate, deface and destroy all that is good, sensible and healthy in the world, because in their crippling pain of detachment from the rest of the human race, Jews cannot fully feel these joys, and hence try to punish those who can wholeheartedly experience the legitimate joys of life, of family and of love. And, of a duty to seek justice for those who would use this life to wreck the lives of others, and laugh about it as these people needlessly die. These people are Jews mostly escaping justice.

First it was Women’s Liberation, maybe the greatest scam of all time, women’s suffrage, promoted by Jews, making the world more receptive to Communism, the ultimately bait-and-switch scam.

And then there’s their fake history. All they have are fabricated evidence and crooked judges. Throw in a few Holocaust survivors who talk about avoiding the gas chambers several times in the same day, gas chambers that never existed from the mind of an honest Jew who swears she saw them . . .

Henry Ford was right. Charles Lindbergh was right (both father and son). These were great Americans who have been erased from our history books by charlatans and crooks who have taken over our minds with false reports about reality.

The greatest Americans have been erased from history and replaced with these Jewish actors like FDR and Bill Clinton and these black heroes who become champions
of mediocrity that have greatly reduced the American capacity for honest self reflection.

Now the great Jewish retailers of our day have further claimed down on what we are allowed to say, and even think.

You will be forced into believing what they demand you believe or you will be cut off from the money supply and spend the remainder of your short life as an emaciated, diseased wastrel.

Here is how they are shaping us into droids.

Reduction of brain space using several methods; first, making illegal statements that are contrary to the approved narrative, then you are labeled anti-Semitic and no longer eligible for inclusion in the Jewish news package presented to us every night on the TV. Word goes out among distributors of your product that you are actually an anti-Semite because you don’t believe 6 million Jews were murdered by Germans during World War II, you don’t believe that in the concentration camps Jewish skin was fashioned into lampshades, and you don’t believe protecting Israel is more important than remembering how Jesus is readily available to all who seek him.

The power generated by simply having faith in your god is by itself far greater than the dark denial of people who do not believe that love is real. Then when you tack on the genuine benefits of believing and your connection to everything that lives, it’s no contest. The Jews are forever lost, and should not try to be saved, because it wouldn’t be worth it since they have proven repeatedly over thousands of years that they are totally untrustworthy, and this shall always be, forever and ever, Amen!

Let them go where they deserve to go and by all means assist their passage!

The only thing that can save the world

Is it anti-Semitic to say the Jews did 9/11 when all the evidence points to their involvement in every aspect of the caper and the coverup?

Is it anti-Semitic to say the Jews engineered both World Wars when the clear evidence of the Balfour Declaration and Roosevelt’s Pearl Harbor foreknowledge have been stuffed into the trash can of history?

It’s definitely anti-Semitic to say Jews have taken over almost every country in the world through their control of money, fleeced them of their valuables, and then bankrupted them.

Are all these assertions false? Or are they true? The defense for libel is truth. I have verifiable facts. Jews can only counter with carefully choreographed denials, all of which have been disproved, despite the vivid testimony of thousands of hysterical Jews, none of which can be believed.

If what I assert is true, there can only be one reason for the anti-Semitic laws — to enforce lies and to cover up the truth.

If these laws take hold as the law of the land, there will be no way to further investigate all of these unsolved crimes that bear the clear fingerprints of Jewish, Israeli or Mossad manipulation.

There will be no way to investigate the sinister relationship among the CDC, Big Pharma and the real purpose of the medicines they produce.

Will ordinary people ever be able to complain about crimes committed by Jews? There is no evidence this will ever happen.

As long as you permit Jews to run the show, this is your dismal future.

*John Kaminski is a writer who lives on the Gulf Coast of Florida, constantly trying to figure out why we are destroying ourselves, and pinpointing a corrupt belief system as the engine of our demise. Solely dependent on contributions from readers, please support his work by mail: 6871 Willow Creek Circle #103, North Port FL 34287 USA.

http://johnkaminski.org
* http://johnkaminski.info/
* http://www.rudemacedon.ca/kaminski/kam-index.html
* http://www.serendipity.li/john_kaminski_articles.htm

*********

Response from
Alfred Schaefer, 28 June 2018

Cheer up John, things are turning.

People are snapping to attention much faster than you can imagine.

The foreskin nibbling parasites are all having hissy fits.

If the inquisition we are facing were not on the menu, we would have had to order it.

Next week the show begins. I do believe the happiest person on the stage may very well be my dear sister Monika and I.

Here is a little video that may cheer you up.

https://vk.com/video493602319_456239032

Everyone on the stage will be representing a particular role in this paradigm shift, and those who are trying to prosecute us have landed in the most UN-enviable role anyone can imagine.

The music has long stopped playing and they will scramble to find a seat when there are none left. Musical chair, we used to play that as children growing up in Canada.

They have placed their bets on a dead horse. We can not help them for that level of stupidity.

It is a case of Inquisition vs. Court of Law for the people and by the people.

If this Inquisition were not to take place, it would sadden me, for now I have the stage I need to go through, from start to finish, how I came to the conclusions that I have come to. My confession may be the most important part of this. It was my good fortune that I was attacked and robbed of all of my computer stuff as an act of revenge for the "Sorry Mom, I was wrong about the Holocaust" video. It was Bnai Brith that ordered their little puppets in Germany to silence me. These people are so dumb, they attacked us for an apology and for me using the Swastika as a negative reference point. From the time of that video (911 Gatekeepers and controlled opposition), I have decontaminated myself from those components of the indoctrination to understand the important role that this symbol has always played for us and the inherent power that it represents. It is like garlic or sunlight to a vampire.

I explain that in this little video:

https://vk.com/video493602319_456239035

Without that first raid in the summer of 2016, there would never have been a confession. Then there were two more raids, each of them also served a purpose.


Now they have returned the first computer that they had stolen from me, and I have explained the relevance of this in a number of talk shows and will go through all that at the inquisition. Everything is perfect.

I am one of the happiest people anywhere now. They always help me when I need it.

https://vk.com/video493602319_456239035
Remember in school - that minus times minus is positive? That is why the foreskin eaters are actually helping me, over and over again. They are a minus working for a minus, and that is a positive. Monika is just bursting with positive energy, and this would not have been the case had they simply left her in peace to go back home. But no, they had to PUNISH her, and now, one day before the six month deadline to release or charge her, they start the Inquisition, and this pressure led them to make even more mistakes than they made before. So it is clear to see the total panic and helplessness in their bones. Good for us, bad for them.

Let the show begin!!!

Alfred Schaefer

*********

Response from Fredrick Töben, 28 June 2018

Hi Alfred – I, too, am enjoying your optimism, which has kept me going for decades, and I wish you all the very best in that coming confrontation.

Yet, dear Alfred, be prepared for a negative outcome. Just the other day Prince William embarked on the first ever official royal visit to Israel and Palestinian territories – and, of course, visited the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial, where he was given the full treatment - https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/prince-william-israel-palestinian-territories-royal-visit-holocaust-memorial-netanyahu-middle-east-a8418156.html - and a recitation was given: ...

The GERMAN NAZIS KILLED 6 MILLION JEWS !!! That this story continues to be used is a shameful indictment of what?

Attached please find a copy of a letter I sent to Monika. Again good luck

Portraying Monika as a mass murderer is all biology. We must not take the Jews seriously

If you accept that one definition of a sense of humour is the ability to laugh at oneself, then Jews have no sense of humour.

Of course, we've all heard that some Jews joke at their own expense, but the kind of cynical self-exposure here implied can hardly be defined as humour, all the more so because it only appeals to the chosls from El Jewish Barrio. But no Gentile may make fun of Jews. We must take the Jews seriously.

To remind the obscure and the powerless that the famous and the powerful are only human after all, it is vital to parody them regularly. The Pythons memorably satirized the Freemasons. Everybody and every group or organization may be the subject of ridicule. But we must take the Jews seriously.

The Jews, with their pancake headgear (sometimes affixed with a buddy pin) and often curious get-ups, beards and braids, and above all, their wondrous claim to

Reply from Alfred Schaefer, 28 June 2018

Dear Fredrick,

the immediate outcome may very well be negative, but over space and time the immediate short term outcome is almost irrelevant. This is not about Monika, or about myself, or about any one individual who has contributed to the healing of our problem. This is about our RACE. These are natural processes that are now kicking in.

When Monika was arrested on Jan 3 2018 I said, "we will accrue mass and energy to get her out". That is what we are doing.

It is hard to imagine how many very good people will be emerging out of nowhere as they understand what is going on here.

We can expect armadas of Olympic runners who are taking their casts off of their legs and starting to walk and then to sprint as they regain control over their own minds. It is a rebirth to get rid of the casts that prevented a person from running, let alone from walking. The adverse conditions that our people are beginning to find themselves in, actually helps to put them in the very conditions that promote what is needed to get it right.

To put it simply, once people understand the extent of the lies, any "Royalty" that crawls and grovels in front of the foreskin nibblers to demonstrate subservience at a "Hollow Hoax" memorial, is in fact helping to grow the emotions and the passion needed to actually do something. Monika understands this very very clearly, and in her last letter to us, which went through in record time, she articulated this. (((They))) know their game is up. Those who grovel before the Hollow Hoax museum now, in mid 2018, could rightfully be put away for being mentally retarded. They will have to be put away for their own protection.

With each and every day my optimism grows. All the expected symptoms of the healing process are clearly showing. This is all biology.

Alfred

**********

On 16 June 2018 Gerard Menuhin reflects and responds to Arthur’s messages (in spam again) about prosecution under Canada’s law 319 (1) (a) and to Alison’s plight, also about Australia’s government:

We must not take the Jews seriously

If you accept that one definition of a sense of humour is the ability to laugh at oneself, then Jews have no sense of humour.

Of course, we’ve all heard that some Jews joke at their own expense, but the kind of cynical self-exposure here implied can hardly be defined as humour, all the more so because it only appeals to the chosls from El Jewish Barrio. But no Gentile may make fun of Jews. We must take the Jews seriously.

To remind the obscure and the powerless that the famous and the powerful are only human after all, it is vital to parody them regularly. The Pythons memorably satirized the Freemasons. Everybody and every group or organization may be the subject of ridicule. But we must take the Jews seriously.

The Jews, with their pancake headgear (sometimes affixed with a buddy pin) and often curious get-ups, beards and braids, and above all, their wondrous claim to
choseness, should be perfect targets of derision, but they are not. When this typically English custom is used against them, they react with the most virulent and abusive hostility, while accusing their opponents of their own hatred. Why is this? Surely they would not want us to doubt their humanity?

No one doubts their ingenuity. It took imagination and foresight for the Jews to invent their own God and then to ascribe to this invention the decree of God-given distinction to themselves. One hand washes the other. To bolster their distinction of choseness, Jews claim the exclusivity of a sacred covenant with their God and assume the above-mentioned peculiar dress, language, and various solemn rites. This disparity is typical of all sects, most of which, at one time or another, have been the butt of humour. But we must take the Jews seriously. We must take Jews seriously because, if we don't, we may be accused of something called ‘antisemitism’. This carries with it the stigma of social and professional death through organized character assassination. The mystery is why. It is (at least) a two-part question.

1) Why should such an accusation carry the same weight as an infamous crime?
2) What does ‘antisemitism’ mean anyway?

1) To be ostracized as a pedophile or murderer may be understandable, but hardly for slighting a minority.
2) A best-selling journalist (Douglas Reed) declared that ‘antisemitism’ might as well be ‘antisemolina’, for all the significance the word holds. Whereas antisemitism could mean ‘against Semites’ or ‘against those speaking a Semitic language’, such an accusation is surely not sufficient to condemn anyone. Moreover, the term is particularly misapplied if it is presumed to mean anti-Judaism, when its inference is anti-Arab (reportedly 90% of Jews being descendants of Khazar converts and not Semitic). However, in typically ignorant, lazy, re-educated modern society, the meaning given to ‘antisemitism’ is ‘anti-Jewish’, after the publicist and communist agitator Wilhelm Marr who popularized this designation in 1879. Although ‘antisemitism’ is a convenient catch-all, it is therefore a misnomer or pseudo word. Yet the accusation of ‘antisemitism’ carries with it dire consequences. Have we been castigated for about 140 years for something which is, in fact, meaningless? Anti-Jews should be defined as such (why not call a spade a spade?). Then, we would see if various laws would be revised to punish anti-Judaism.

Lately, our language has undergone several less than subtle changes, separate from its normal and constant evolution. In fact, these changes amount to a distortion or even a contradiction in the previous meaning of words. ‘Tolerance’ for instance no longer means patience in the face of difference. It means praise and support for extreme-- even alien in the sense of repugnant—differences and professed convictions, invented and exploited for the occasion by neo-minorities to take advantage of and promote this convenient new credo of tolerance (one hand washes the other). Particularly welcome are those factions which threaten to overturn traditional structures.

But perhaps more importantly for those ultimately responsible for the disfigurement of our language, it means open season on all those who dissent from this radical re-interpretation. Once a compliant government has passed into law the required curtailment in our freedom to say what we like, it is able to arrest and prosecute anyone who violates these laws. So ‘tolerance’ now means intolerance of all who do not conform to the new meaning of ‘tolerance’. Non-conformists may be prosecuted and fined, or even imprisoned for their dissent.

This desperate striving to tolerate all, even those who are obviously aberrant, is accepted as well and good among the unchosen and of course among the credulous. The result is a society composed of the ignorant, the gaggled, and a few imprisoned ‘thought-criminals’.

These changes are fundamental, but they have been gradually, almost imperceptibly achieved. (“We decide on something, leave it lying around, and wait and see what happens. If no one kicks up a fuss, because most people don’t understand what has been decided, we continue step by step until there is no turning back.” J.-C. Juncker, EU chief liar). They have been summed up under the general label of ‘political correctness’ (PC), initially an attempt at comprehensive coercive behaviour, but recently a legally enforceable measure. The result of PC is that individual thought, based on common sense, is gradually being suffocated by an imposed, retrogressive ideology. Society has become unrecognizable to anyone over fifty.

A prime example of such an unnecessary law is the prohibition of so-called ‘hate crime/hate speech’. The very concept of ‘hate crime’ betrays an infantile and condescending attitude towards an often sophisticated public, as no rational adult could define convincingly what hate crime is supposed to be, deriving as it does from the sensibilities of a minute minority which allegedly has been offended by criticism. A law based only on the perception of a minority, in defense of that minority, cannot be in the interests of the majority of any population.

As this law has almost invariably been used to prosecute criticism of Jews (lately in the UK* Jez Turner, Alison Chabloz) it must be assumed that it has been introduced by them and their ever-industrious lobby — and publicized in their media -- with the sole intention of silencing such criticism. A further proof of the identity of the promoters of ‘hate crime’ law is the historical origin of such legislation. ‘Hate crime’ laws were introduced by the Soviets, so the laws under which non-PC persons are being prosecuted and punished for speaking their minds are Communist laws:

'59-7. Propaganda or agitation, directed toward arousing national or religious enmity or discord, or likewise the dissemination or preparation and storage of literature of the same character, shall be punishable by-- deprivation of freedom for a term up to two years.
The same activity in time of war, or during mass disorders shall be punishable by --
deprivation of freedom for a term not less than two
years, with confiscation of all or part of property, with
increase, under especially aggravated circumstances,
up to the supreme measure of social defense --
shooting, with confiscation of property. [6 June 1927
(SU No 49, art. 330)].

The trail of entries related to ‘social defense’ on
Wikipedia provides the following information:
‘Hate speech is speech that attacks a person or group
on the basis of attributes such as race, religion, ethnic
origin, national origin, gender, disability, sexual
orientation, or gender identity.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
(ICCPR) states that “any advocacy of national, racial or
religious hatred that constitutes incitement to
discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited
d by law” (Article 20). The ICCPR is monitored by the United
Nations Human Rights Committee.

The United Nations Human Rights Committee is a
United Nations body of 18 experts that meets three times
a year for four-week sessions (spring session at UN
headquarters in New York, summer and fall sessions at the
UN Office in Geneva) to consider the five-yearly
reports submitted by 169 UN member states on their
compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and
Political Rights, ICCPR..

The Committee itself comprises 18 members nominated
for election for their specialised knowledge in human
rights and ‘high moral character’.

UK representative until 2010 was Sir Nigel Rodley (father
Hans Israel Rosenfeld).

One could go on researching these links, but what would
be the point? Officially “created to promote peace,” “the
United Nations is nothing but a trapdoor to the Red
World immense concentration camp. We created and
control the UN and it will play a vital role when we
establish a one world government.” (Harold Wallace
Rosenthal interview)

Among the now many distorted and misused previously
neutral terms which have acquired a negative meaning is
‘populism/populist’. The press routinely warns against
‘populist’ leaders who are supposed to be on the rise in
Europe and, by definition, are a danger to their
countries. (In fact, none of these leaders are more than
controlled opposition, all of them having demonstrated
their compliance with the system.) The Latin root
popularis (populate, popularize, etc.) is a neutral term,
having to do with the people generally. The Concise
Oxford Dictionary defines ‘popular’ thus: ‘of, carried out
by, the people’. Also however, ‘party representing Left
elements’. A ‘populist’ in its most sinister definition can
be an ‘adherent of Russian political party advocating
collectivism’.

By perverting the meaning of ‘popular’, are the semi-
literates who regularly derail our language
disgenuously maligning tame ‘populist’ politicians as
dangerous Right-wingers, or as proponents of Leftist
(Soviet) collectivism? It doesn’t matter, as their game
has always been to fabricate adversaries as a problem
and then to ‘solve’ the problem.

What’s the most practical and affordable way of freeing
ourselves from our predicament, as outlined above? Not
the repetition of facts which disprove the contentions of
the powerful; that has been futile. Not the courts; the
law is designed to confuse laymen and to profit those
who operate in its tortuous labyrinth. Not the return of
meaning to our language and to an education worthy of
the name; that would take too long. The most natural
and most quickly attainable cure for our afflictions and
one which is instantly intelligible to all, is humour. Don’t
surrender to the corruption and degeneracy generated by
malevolence, you’ll only humiliate yourself. Laugh at it.
Show and share with everyone how ridiculous our world
has become under the influence of constant lies.

Governments, global organizations like the U.N. and
other marionette-infested bodies should be disconnected
from civilized communities and left to their own nefarious
devices. When you view the distortions of truth these
minions use to achieve their diabolical ends, the hoops
they force themselves through (admittedly accompanied
by sizeable rewards), you have to laugh. It’s all so
obvious.

The English must rely on their celebrated sense of
humour being esteemed by all, despite the new climate of
Tolerance ™. They must not take the Jews seriously.

*On the Continent: Horst Mahler (82), Ursula Haverbeck
(90), Arnold Höfs (82), Sylvia Stolz, Gerd Ittner,
Wolfgang Fröhlich, Monika Schaefer and her brother
Alfred, and countless other lesser-known dissidents.

********

On 27 June Gerrd Menuhin writes:
Fredrick,


Maybe you shouldn’t publish my article.

For most people, I’m hard to categorize. Am I really a
Jew? If so, why don’t I behave like one?

Am I trustworthy? Am I deliberately deceitful?
My problem is that I write for a sophisticated public,
probably an ever-shrinking number of readers.

While I have sympathy for Germans who won’t accept
anything said or written by a Jew, it saddens me when
I’m faced with this attitude.

However, deliberate or feigned -- for the occasion --
stupidity riles me. My article was written in response to
and in connection with Alison’s predicament. (Alison
praised it.) It was also written chiefly with British humour
in mind, the kind that Alison and all true English
understand.

It’s precisely because Alison’s humour hurt that they
reacted as they did. They discovered that their laws
hadn’t covered this angle yet (hard-hitting songs
distributed on the net). Truth-tellers normally must act
defensively. Humour is an offensive -- in all senses of the
word -- weapon.
If a "tiefernst" German blogger or whatever he is decides to take me at what he perceives is my word, he should go back to school and learn irony.

Best,
Gerard

On 27 June 2018 Fredrick Töben replies:
Hi Gerard - I'm already in bed and half asleep when I heard your message come in on my IPhone - all very interesting because I've had my run-in with her - such individuals do not understand the wisdom contained in Heidegger's maxim that states Jews act according to the principle of race, i.e. it's a mental construct and to date there is no Jewish DNA in anyone - Semitic-Middle Eastern yes - it is a cultural-mental construct with physical attributes such as circumcision, etc- as you know. Gilat Atzmon has his rabbi, et al - I have never heard you refer to an advising Rabbi - nor do I regard your behaviour as typical Jewish because I find typical Jewish behaviour in humanity at large-those who identify as Jews have no monopoly on any form of behaviour - look at Donald Trump who is outdoing the Jews with his Germanic mindset! Kevin MacDonald has pointed out Jews as a group - dynamic entity behave in specific ways that retain group cohesion - again something that's done less effectively by other groups., etc and there the Jerusalem/Palestinian and Babylonian Talmud and Tanach give those who follow the advice therein some chilling head start in matters of the universal battle-of-the-wills. As to running your essay or not - why don't we run her response to it with your below reflections and my response thereto? Just thinking aloud before my mind closes down for the night.

On 28 June Gerard Menuhin responds:
Fredrick,
That's a good idea. Jews are very powerful but also very ridiculous. What does one do when someone is ridiculous? One makes fun of them. It's one way of curbing their power. (I haven't found a satisfactory German translation of 'sophisticated')

Best,
Gerard

The response to Gerard Menuhin's reflections from German Victims – Deutsche Opfer

Wir brauchen keinen Juden um uns Falsch zu belehren!

Posted on June 23, 2018 by eyes wide open


Das destruktive Verhalten der Juden mag eine religiöse (Talmud, OT) und / oder rassistische Frage sein, aber es ist vor allem ein Völkermordplan für die gesamte Menschheit außer den Juden. Selbst wenn ihr Verhalten auf einer Religion beruhen würde, müsste es immer noch als Völkermordplan beurteilt werden. Was die Juden getan haben und was sie zu tun gedenken, KANN NICHT durch "sie nicht ernst nehmen", wie Herr Menuhin in seinem Artikel vorschlägt, gehandhabt werden. Würden Sie einen Mörder ernst nehmen, der Ihnen droht, an Ihre Haustür zu kommen und Sie zu töten? Würden Sie sich über ihn lustig machen und das war's? Das wäre selbstmörderisch! Schlägt uns Herr Menuhin vor, unseren Selbstmord weiter zu planen?

Am 18. Juni 2018 schreibt Gerard Menuhin einen Artikel mit der Überschrift "We must not take the Jews Seriously" [Wir müssen die Juden nicht ernst nehmen]. Klingt nach Spaß auf den ersten Blick, aber ich kann sagen, dass die Vorschläge in diesem Artikel nur Juden dienen und zu unserem Untergang beitragen!

Menuhin schreibt:
“Antisemitismus sollte durch "Anti-Jude" ersetzt werden; er sollte als solcher gestaltet sein, warum sollte man nicht das Kind beim Namen nennen.”
Hier würde das Entlarven eines Judenverbrechens weiterhin als Anti Jude erklärt und verurteilt werden. Dies würde unsere Hinweise auf jüdische Verbrechen und Intrigen immer noch als Angriff auf den Juden als Person bezeichnen. Damit haben wir immer noch das gleiche alte Problem.

Herr G. Menuhin sagt weiter:
“...Antisemitismus durch Anti-Juden ersetzen und sehen, ob die Gesetze revidiert werden, um Anti-Judaismus zu bestrafen.”

IN KEINER WEISE HILFT UNS DAS, DA ES DEN FALSCHEN GLAUBEN über die JUDEN UND IHRE DIENER VERSTÄRKT, DASS UNSERE KRIITIK EIN ANGRIFF AUF DIE JUDEN selbst IST (WEIL SIE EINE RASSE, EINE RELIGION, EIN CLAN ODER WAS AUCH IMMER SIND), WÄHREND ES IN WIRKLICHKEIT IN ERSTER LINIE EIN HINWEIS AUF DIE VERBRECHEN UND INTRIGEN DES JUDEN, SEINE TATEN IST, UM IHN DAZU ZU BRINGEN AUFZUHEOERN ODER IHN STRAFRECHTLICH ZU VERFOLGEN, UND DAS VOLK ÜBER DEN JUDEN AUFZUKLÄEREN. Hier hätten wir Nicht-Juden also das gleiche alte Problem: Zerstörung und Verfolgung für uns. Es ist nur ein Austausch von Worten mit dem gleichen Ergebnis. Das ist ein nutzloser Vorschlag von Menuhin. Dann schreibt Menuhin:
“Was ist der praktischste und günstigste Weg, um uns aus unserer misslichen Lage zu befreien, wie oben beschrieben?”
[Erstmals, er ist keiner von “uns”, das ist eine Täuschung, so es trifft auf ihn als Jude gar nicht zu.] Mit dem Folgenden, war ich ein wenig aufgeregt und freute mich auf neue Ideen, die funktionieren werden. Aber leider war ich nicht nur enttäuscht, sondern bekam einen Zorn.]

Menuhin schreibt vor:
“Nicht die Wiederholung von Tatsachen, die die Behauptungen der Mächtigen widerlegen; das war sinnlos.”

Es stimmt zwar, dass die Justiz uns verrät, aber dieser Vorschlag ist lächerlich! Sie ziehen unser Volk gegen ihren Willen vor Gericht, und nicht umgekehrt, und die Redner der Wahrheit haben keine andere Wahl, als mit dem Gericht zu sprechen. Die Gerichte müssen informiert werden, und gegen ihre Ungerechtigkeit müssen sich die Menschen aussprechen, denn wir müssen glauben, dass es neben den Juden und Verrätern auch noch gute Menschen in der Justiz gibt, sonst verlieren wir jede
Hoffnung. Ich halte es für eine gute Sache, vor Gericht zu gehen, wenn Wahrheitssprecher keine andere Wahl haben, als strafrechtlich verfolgt zu werden. Sie dokumentiert auch die Handlungen der Gerichte. Also was sollen sie tun, alle ins Ausland abhauen? Oh, ich verstehe, es wäre nützlich für die Juden, sie aus dem Weg zu räumen!
Weiter bestimmt er:
"Nicht die Rückkehr des Sinnes zu unserer Sprache und zu einer Bildung, die diesen Namen verdient; das würde zu lange dauern."


Er gibt uns den Rat:
"Das natürlichste und am schnellsten erreichbare Heilmittel für unsere Leiden [Es ist nicht sein Leiden, denn er ist ein Jude!] und eines, das für alle sofort verständlich ist, ist Humor." Versuchen Sie, einem Juden auf humorvolle Weise zu sagen, dass der sogenannte Holocaust ein Holohoa ist, und sehen Sie, was passiert. Nun, ich habe persönlich herausgefunden, was passiert, obwohl ich keinen Humor verwendet habe; das hätte es noch schlimmer gemacht.

Kontinuierliche Belästigung über Jahre hinweg, bis sie rechtlich gestoppt wurde, ist das, was ich als Reaktion erfahren habe. Aber das Schlimmste an diesem Vorschlag, die Juden nicht ernst zu nehmen, ist die Tatsache, dass die Juden es TÖDERNST MEINEN mit ihren Drohungen von der Ausrottung von uns, und das haben sie in der Vergangenheit oft bewiesen. Und darauf schlägt Herr Menuhin vor, nur mit Humor zu antworten!

WIR MÜSSEN ALLES IN UNSERER MACHT STEHENDE TUN, UM SIE AM ERFOLG ZU HINDERN. DAS KANN NICHT MIT WITZEN WEGEBLASEN WERDEN, ODER INDEM WIR ES WEITERHIN NICHT BEACHTEN WAS SIE SAGEN, TATEN UND TUN. WIR HABEN DIE JÜDISCHEN LÜGEN UND VERBRECHEN VIOL ZU LANGE WEGEBLASEN, OHNE ZU GLAUBEN, DASS DIE JUDEN SO UNVERSCHÄMT KRIMINELL SEIN KÖNNTEN. DIE Weißen VOELKER KÖNNEN ES SICH OFT NICHT VORSTELLEN, DASS EIN MENSCH SO BÖSE SEIN KÖNNTE; DESHALB WINKEN SIE OFT DIE WAHRHEITSSAGER AB UND NENNEN SIE VERSCHWÖRUNGSTHEORETIKER.

Hier ist die by Menuhin gewollte Aktion fuer unsere Idioten:
"Regierungen, globale Organisationen wie die UNO und andere marionettenverseuchte Organisationen sollten von zivilisierten Gemeinschaften getrennt und ihren eigenen ruchlosen Geräten überlassen werden, man muss lachen."

Und ich sage, die UNO loswerden, damit stimme ich ueberein. Aber, die Trennung von unserer Regierung, anstatt Veränderungen zu fordern oder Veränderungen vorzunehmen und damit das Chaos zu schaffen ist was die Juden wollen. Die Ratten kommen jetzt aus ihren Loechern mit ihrer weiten Geisteszersetzung.
Wir brauchen keinen Juden um uns Vorschaeg zu machen!


Weiter schreibt Menuhin:
"Die Engländer müssen sich darauf verlassen können, dass ihr berühmter Sinn für Humor von allen geschätzt wird, trotz des neuen Klimas von Tolerance™. Sie dürfen die Juden nicht ernst nehmen.“

Nun, commedioinne Alison Chabloz hat genau das in ihren Liedern getan, die Juden nicht ernsthaft genommen, und könnte nun ein neues Lied über ihre Strafverfolgung singen!
Hier ist Gerard Menuhins Artikel der mir zugesandt wurde:

**We must not take the Jews seriously**

*By Gerard Menuhin – see above.*

*This entry was posted in Deutschsprachig, FRG-Bundesrepublik, Holocausts und Holohoa, Jews genociding nations-Vernichtung, Jews-Juden. Bookmark the permalink.*

---

**"Not Taking the Jews Seriously" Has Brought Us Near Extinction**

*There Can Be No White Race! Prof. Noel Ignatiev, Jew →*


---

**Hitler-Geburtshaus wird auf 1,2 Millionen Euro geschätzt**

11.33 Uhr, 21. Juni 2018

Die Enteignung des Hitler-Geburtshauses in Braunau könnte die Republik wesentlich teurer kommen als gedacht.

Die Enteignung des Hitler-Geburtshauses in Braunau könnte die Republik wesentlich teurer kommen als gedacht: Ein Gutachten im laufenden Zivilprozess am Landesgericht Ried schätzt den Wert des Hauses nämlich auf etwa 1,23 Mio. Euro. Die Republik hat die frühere Eigentümerin aber nur mit 310.000 Euro entschädigt.

Das Gericht bestätigte am Donnerstag einen entsprechenden Bericht des "Kurier". Diese 310.000 Euro waren der früheren Eigentümerin aber zu wenig. Sie zog vor Gericht und klagte gegen die Höhe der Entschädigung. Das vom Gericht in Auftrag gegebene Immobiliengutachten schätzte den Wert der Liegenschaft nun wesentlich höher ein, nämlich mit 1,23 Mio. Euro.

60.000 Euro Miete

Die 1,23 Mio. Euro sind ein Mittelwert aus zwei Beträgen: Inklusive der "Besonderheit des Hauses" -


60.000 Euro Miete

Die 1,23 Mio. Euro sind ein Mittelwert aus zwei Beträgen: Inklusive der "Besonderheit des Hauses" -

The narrative of victimhood may feel good for the moment and help you grab headlines but it doesn’t do anything to improve lives. President Trump cares a lot about the Palestinian people and so yes we are looking very closely at Gaza and have spent a lot of time with our partners and hope to put forth ideas to relieve some of the pressure and try to change the trajectory of the situation for the people. Finally we have said from the beginning that there is no path to peace without finding a solution for Gaza.

That first sentence could apply to a lot of people, not just the Palestinians.......
own countries. They want to see a deal that respects the dignity of the Palestinians and brings about a realistic solution to the issues that have been debated for decades. They all insist that Al Aqsa Mosque remain open to all Muslims who wish to worship.

Q: Does the deal you are working on accommodate these points?
A: I don't want to speak about specifics of the deal we are working on, but like I said in my speech in Jerusalem – I believe that for a deal to be made, both parties will gain more than they give and feel confident that the lives of their people will be better off in decades from now because of the compromises they make. It will be up to the leadership and the people of both sides to determine what is an acceptable compromise in exchange for significant gains.

Q: You mention "up to the people." Are you saying that you could see a world in which you put out a plan and let the people vote on it?
A: I didn't say that, but that’s something that the leadership of both sides should consider doing. Perhaps that's a way for them to take less political risk on endorsing a solution, but that is still a few steps ahead of where we are now.

Q: This conflict has been going on for so long and so many people have tried to bring a resolution on what seems like intractable problems – how is your approach different?
A: We have done a lot of listening and have spent our time focusing on the people and trying to determine what they actually want. At the end of the day, I believe that Palestinian people are less invested in the politicians’ talking points than they are in seeing how a deal will give them and their future generations new opportunities, more and better paying jobs and prospects for a better life. Each of the political issues are very controversial and there are people on both the Israeli and Palestinian sides who will object to any compromise.

Q: We think that the deal should be looked at by both sides as a package and both sides should as themselves – are we better off with what we are getting in exchange for what we are giving.
A: Not everyone will agree that it’s the right package, but reaching for peace takes courage and the need to take the right calculated risks. Without the people pushing the politicians to focus on their needs and giving them the courage to take a chance, this will never be solved.

Q: What do you make of the recent statements by Nabil Abu Rudeineh, the spokesman for President Abbas, that your trip is a "waste of time and is bound to fail"?
A: I think the Palestinian leadership is saying those things because they are scared we will release our peace plan and the Palestinian people will actually like it because it will lead to new opportunities for them to have a much better life.

Q: Have you reached out to President Abbas to see if he would meet you on this trip?
A: Not directly. President Abbas knows we are in the region and we have many mutual contacts who convey messages – he knows that we are open to meeting him and continuing the discussion when he is ready. He has said publicly he will not meet us and we have opted not to chase him. We have continued our work on the plan and on building consensus on what is realistically achievable today and what will endure for the future. If President Abbas is willing to come back to the table, we are ready to engage; if he is not, we will likely air the plan publicly.

Q: When will you be ready?
A: Soon. We are almost done.

Q: Will the breakdown in the relationship with President Abbas impact your ultimate ability to get a deal done?
A: President Abbas says that he is committed to peace and I have no reason not to believe him. More importantly, President Trump committed to him early on that he would work to make a fair deal for the Palestinian people. However, I do question how much President Abbas has the ability to, or is willing to, lean into finishing a deal. He has his talking points which have not changed in the last 25 years. There has been no peace deal achieved in that time. To make a deal both sides will have to take a leap and meet somewhere between their stated positions. I am not sure President Abbas has the ability to do that.

Q: What makes you think he doesn’t have that ability?
A: I didn’t say that he doesn’t have the ability, I said I am not sure. I greatly respect that there are many things he has done well for establishing the foundations of peace, but I don’t think the Palestinian people feel like their lives are getting better and there is only so long you can blame that on everyone other than Palestinian leadership. The global community is getting frustrated with Palestinian leadership and not seeing many actions that are constructive towards achieving peace. There are a lot of sharp statements and condemnations, but no ideas or efforts with prospects of success. Those who are more skeptical say President Abbas is only focused on his political survival and cementing a legacy of not having compromised than on bettering the lives of the Palestinian people.

Q: Do you think that is the case?
A: I hope not. My job is to work with the parties in charge, so I am ready to work with President Abbas if he is willing. There is a good deal to be done here from what I assess.

Q: What does “economic prosperity” look like for the Palestinian people in your view?
A: Think about the prospects for the Palestinian people over a 5-20 year horizon if they get massive investments in modern infrastructure, job training and economic stimulus. The world is going through a technological industrial revolution and the Palestinian people can be beneficiaries by leapfrogging to be leaders in the next industrial age. The Palestinian people are industrious, well educated and adjacent to the Silicon Valley of the Middle East - Israel. Israel’s prosperity would spill over very quickly to the Palestinians if there is peace. Many countries from around the world are ready to invest if there is a peace agreement. I feel strongly that while in order to make a peace deal you need to define and have secure borders, economically you want to eliminate boundaries and allow the economies to become more integrated to increase the opportunity and prosperity for
all of the people – including the Jordanians and Egyptians and beyond.

Q: So what you are working on is more regional in nature?
A: The actual deal points are between the Israelis and the Palestinians, but the economic plan we are working on can show what comes as part of a deal when it is achieved with some massive investments that will extend to the Jordanian and Egyptian people as well. This conflict has held the whole region back and there is so much untapped potential that can be released if peace is achieved.

Q: Can you give some details about the economic plan you are working on.
A: Yes. We believe we can attract very significant investments in infrastructure from the public and private sectors to make the whole region more connected and to stimulate the economies of the future. This will lead to increases in GDP and we also hope that a blanket of peaceful coexistence can allow the governments to divert some of their funds from heavy investments in military and defence into better education, services and infrastructure for their people I know you recently hosted a conference on Gaza in the White House. Has anything come from that? What are you doing to make that situation better while we are all watching it deteriorate before our eyes. Well, what’s happening in Gaza is very sad. The humanitarian situation started long before President Trump came into office, but nonetheless we must try and make improvements.

The level of desperation and despair shows the worst-case scenario of what happens when these problems are left unresolved and allowed to linger. The people of Gaza are hostages to bad leadership. Their economy has spiraled downward because of the inability to have connectivity with the world. As long as there are rockets being fired and tunnels being dug, there will be a chokehold on resources allowed to enter. It’s a vicious cycle. I think the only path for the people of Gaza is to encourage the leadership to aim for a true ceasefire that gives Israel and Egypt the confidence to start allowing more commerce and goods to flow to Gaza. This is the only way to solve the problem from what I have seen. Many countries would be willing to invest in Gaza if there was a true prospect for a different path. It will take some leadership in Gaza though to get on that path.

Q: Saeb Erekat recently criticised your efforts to help Gaza saying its a political situation that you are trying to make a humanitarian issue in order to divide the Palestinians. Is this your intent?
A: The last I checked they are divided, they are not connected by government or land and it’s needlessly become a dire humanitarian situation because the Palestinian leadership has made it a political situation. While it’s been on a downward spiral for a decade, long before this administration got involved, with multiple wars and a terrorist government, the political dysfunction, greatly exacerbated by the PA’s salary cuts, has made Gaza ungovernable. It’s time for the Palestinian Authority and Hamas to stop using the people of Gaza as pawns. The narrative of victimhood may feel good for the moment and help you grab headlines but it doesn’t do anything to improve lives. President Trump cares a lot about the Palestinian people and so yes we are looking very closely at Gaza and have spent a lot of time with our partners and hope to put forth ideas to relieve some of the pressure and try to change the trajectory of the situation for the people. Finally we have said from the beginning that there is no path to peace without finding a solution for Gaza.

Q: Do you see a world where the Israelis and Palestinians can co-exist peacefully?
A: I really hope so. A lot of people tell me that this can never happen because there is a lot of distrust and hatred that comes from years of conflict and people using politics to blame the hardships of life on others. There have been wars, conflicts, demonstrations, acts of terrorism and more. This is not exactly a solid foundation on which you can build co-existence and peace. However, I am an optimist and I have met so many people and also have seen so many examples of Israelis and Palestinians reaching out to each other and trying to forge bonds to try and circumvent a failed political process. These people know their lives will only be improved by working out the issues and moving on. So yes, there is a lot of hatred and a lot of scar tissue, but I do not underestimate humankind’s ability to love. To be successful, we must be willing to forgive in the present, not forget the past, but work hard towards a brighter future.

Q: You clearly are very focused on improving the economic circumstances of the Palestinian people — what about the traditional core issues?
A: The traditional core issues are essential and we focus on them extensively with a strong appreciation of the historic differences between the two sides. We are committed to finding a package of solutions that both sides can live with. Simply resolving core issues without creating a pathway to a better life will not lead to a durable solution.

Q: Finally, if you could deliver a message directly to the Palestinian people, what would it be?
A: You deserve to have a bright future. Now is a time where both the Israelis and Palestinians must bolster and re-focus their leadership, to encourage them to be open towards a solution and to not be afraid of trying. There have been countless mistakes and missed opportunities over the years, and you, the Palestinian people, have paid the price. Show your leadership that you support efforts to achieve peace. Let them know your priorities and give them the courage to keep an open mind towards achieving them. Don’t let your leadership reject a plan they haven’t even seen. A lot has happened in the world since this conflict began decades ago. The world has moved forward while you have been left behind. Don’t allow your grandfather’s conflict to determine your children’s future. My dream is for the Israeli and Palestinian people to be the closest of allies in combating terror, economic achievement, advancements in science and technology, and in sharing a lifestyle of brotherhood, peace and prosperity.

http://www.alquds.com/articles/1529825341641719400/
Head of Jewish Agency Herzog:

‘A Jew is a Jew is a Jew, no matter which stream he belongs to, if he wears a skullcap or not.’

ed note—remember that any Gentile saying the very same thing, word for word, is subjected to an organized screeching campaign on the part of Jewish interests that is relentless and remorseless. Note as well how our ‘Joo is a Joo is a Joo’ Herzog attempts to worm his way out of the obvious hotspot in which he finds himself for his rather incautious words by saying that his use of the word ‘plague’ in describing Jews marrying Gentiles was not a ‘negative term’.

When, we ask, within the entire course of human history has the word ‘plague’ been anything other than ‘negative’? Yet another example of the position we maintain here, which is that fish swim, birds fly, and Jews lie. Also, please use this little drama as an opportunity to compare and contrast as well as prime efface evidence of ‘how they do it’. Remember, that whenever Jews as individuals or as a hive want to be allowed into the otherwise ‘off-limits’ areas of societies they intend to invade and corrupt from within, they utilize the mechanism of ‘hey, we’re all the same…we’re just like you…let us in or you’re a racist’, but then, when the tables are obviously turned, they betray the utter dishonesty and duplicity of their entire MO by maintaining themselves as a ‘separate’ people.

prevalence of Jews partnering with non-Jews in the Diaspora, and said there must be a “campaign, a solution” to address this widespread concern. Hysterical opinion columns ensued. On Wednesday, Herzog told me in a phone call from Israel — his first with an American news outlet — that reactions to the Ynet interview “distorted the meaning and intention of what I said. A Jew is a Jew is a Jew, no matter which stream he belongs to, if he wears a skullcap or not.” The discourse on interfaith relations is different in Israel, he said. He was using magefa as a slang word: “I didn’t mean it in any negative terms.”

Now, Herzog is a seasoned politician born into what passes for Israeli aristocracy, who should be well acquainted with American sensibilities since he was educated at the prestigious Ramaz School on the Upper East Side while his father was a United Nations ambassador, and has interacted with Diaspora audiences numerous times. Still, I’m willing to give him the benefit of the doubt here — as long as takes this early stumble as a warning sign that many American Jews are becoming increasingly unwilling to let anyone, from Israel or their own communal organizations, tell them what to think and how to behave and who to love. Herzog assumes the helm of the Jewish Agency at a time when its very reason for being is under scrutiny. Originally established in 1929 to promote immigration to what was then Mandate Palestine, the sprawling organization began to focus more on promoting Jewish identity under its outgoing leader, the heroic Natan Sharansky.

It’s ironic that some American leftwing commentators are lambasting Herzog for his intermarriage remarks when, in fact, his election was a poke in the eye to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who backed another candidate for the post. But that’s not the only reason many others thought he was the right person for the job. “Herzog has a good understanding of Diaspora Jewry, especially some of the major challenges we are facing,” Ken Bob, national president of Ameinu and a JAFI board member, wrote in an email. “Addressing the distancing of liberal young Jews from Israel is a defined project of JAFI now, and he is well equipped to lead a process that will creatively provide programs and engagement.”

He certainly is eager to cite his liberal bona fides. “I’m a liberal in my political beliefs,” Herzog told me. “It is not my role in life to be judgmental.”

His comments on intermarriage reflected concerns he heard from many friends in the Diaspora “who are talking to me about their worries about the Jewish education of their kids in interfaith marriages,” he said. This doesn’t surprise me. The rate of Jews raised in Reform and Conservative households who marry non-Jews is steadily increasing, and I am not surprised that the kinds of folks Herzog interacts with are anxious about their grandchildren’s fealty to faith and tradition. But in our conversation, Herzog demurred when asked about specific policies on conversion and egalitarian...
prayer — the two contentious religious issues at the source of the growing Diaspora disaffection with the hard-line Netanyahu government and, by extension, organized Jewry. (It was a relatively brief interview, and we didn’t get to other subjects, including the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.)

“We need to open the gates and the doors and the windows for anyone who wants to join the Jewish people,” he said. “What we have to do is find a historical solution for the gap that has opened up between what I call Jerusalem and Babylon [considered the first Diaspora community.] We have to find a way to maintain that bridge.”

Close observers in Israel, such as the Haaretz columnist Anshel Pfeffer, believe the Jewish Agency “has failed to articulate a core mission for itself” and wonder whether Herzog is bold enough for the revitalizing task. I sincerely hope he is. Herzog is motivated, he said, by “a passion for the state of the Jewish people.” He’ll need that passion and much more to re-imagine his new agency as a true conduit between Israel and Jews elsewhere — even if they happen to be married to someone outside the faith.

https://forward.com/opinion/israel/404272/newjewish-agency-chieflearnsquicklessonaboutintermarriage-its/
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Using the courts to defeat anti-Semites proving very effective in Britain

By Ron Csilag, Staff Reporter, June 27, 2018

Gideon Falter (File Photo)

Using courts to fight anti-Semitism, whether in criminal or civil cases, or shaming prosecutors into action, is proving an effective tool in Britain, and may have valuable lessons for Canada.

Gideon Falter, the volunteer chairman of London, U.K.-based Campaign Against Antisemitism, explained that the tactic is about more than “lawfare” (using the legal system to achieve a particular objective).

“That’s not all we’re doing,” Falter said of his organization. “We are upholding people’s rights. We are saying Jews are equal citizens under the law, just like everybody else. We are upholding victims’ rights and, in the process, changing the law.”

Falter was recently in Toronto to deliver two talks, which were sponsored by B’nai Brith Canada and Canadians for the Rule of Law.

Founded in 2014 in the wake of Israel’s war in Gaza and resulting anti-Semitic fallout in London, Campaign Against Antisemitism is run by about 900 volunteers, including some of the U.K.’s top lawyers, and is dedicated, as its website states, “to exposing and countering anti-Semitism through education and zero-tolerance enforcement of the law.”

Falter, a 34-year-old law school graduate who went into business, said one of the group’s mandates is using British courts to ensure “that if someone commits an anti-Semitic act in the U.K., we can ensure ruinous consequences, be they criminal, financial or reputational. We want to increase the cost of doing business for anti-Semites in the U.K. and deter them from engaging in their activity.”

Cases can include anti-Semitic graffiti, verbal or physical abuse, or anti-Semitism cloaked as criticism of Israel.

The group also encourages private prosecutions when police or Crown lawyers won’t act, Falter noted. It helps with civil defamation lawsuits and pursues professionals whose conduct is governed by regulatory bodies, and all of its services are free.

It’s agile, aggressive and innovative, Falter said, “and it’s working.”

But it’s also strategic.

During its first two years in operation, the group turned down every case that was brought before it. “We are very clear that if we take on a case, we have to win it,” Falter said.

However, things have picked up since then. In the last month alone, Falter said, the organization won three cases, each a landmark decision that “has changed the law in Britain.”

Among them was the trial of a neo-Nazi leader who received a one-year jail sentence for a speech — a case the Crown, Falter said, was “forced” to prosecute after a judicial review by his group — and the high-profile conviction of a woman whose songs on YouTube mocked the Holocaust as a hoax.

Campaign Against Antisemitism is “sending a very clear message to anti-Semites. It’s driving them off social media and forcing them to hold their meetings and demonstrations away from the public eye,” Falter said.

He said the group has had an effect. Not only are anti-Semites being driven from the limelight, but polls in Britain suggest a decrease in anti-Semitic sentiment among the public.

“We’re able to make anti-Semites afraid to openly express their views, and I believe that people are starting to re-appraise their views of Jews.”

Falter said the organization’s mission is not about enacting new hate laws. “What we need is to enforce the laws more effectively.”

Falter added he feels like a visitor to Canada “from the not-too-distant future.”

“What’s happening in Britain is maybe only two or three years ahead of what Canada has in store,” he warned. “I’ve grown up in one of the best countries in the world to be Jewish, and we’re losing that. The country is changing and it will change irreparably unless we fight hard and effectively now.”

Canada has some choices to make, he said.

“I believe that Canadian (Jews) increasingly will be looking to exposing and countering anti-Semitism through education and zero-tolerance enforcement of the law.”

Falter, a 34-year-old law school graduate who went into business, said one of the group’s mandates is using British courts to ensure “that if someone commits an anti-Semitic act in the U.K., we can ensure ruinous consequences, be they criminal, financial or reputational. We want to increase the cost of doing business for anti-Semites in the U.K. and deter them from engaging in their activity.”

Cases can include anti-Semitic graffiti, verbal or physical abuse, or anti-Semitism cloaked as criticism of Israel.

The group also encourages private prosecutions when police or Crown lawyers won’t act, Falter noted. It helps with civil defamation lawsuits and pursues professionals whose conduct is governed by regulatory bodies, and all of its services are free.

It’s agile, aggressive and innovative, Falter said, “and it’s working.”

But it’s also strategic.

During its first two years in operation, the group turned down every case that was brought before it. “We are very clear that if we take on a case, we have to win it,” Falter said.

However, things have picked up since then. In the last month alone, Falter said, the organization won three cases, each a landmark decision that “has changed the law in Britain.”

Among them was the trial of a neo-Nazi leader who received a one-year jail sentence for a speech — a case the Crown, Falter said, was “forced” to prosecute after a judicial review by his group — and the high-profile conviction of a woman whose songs on YouTube mocked the Holocaust as a hoax.

Campaign Against Antisemitism is “sending a very clear message to anti-Semites. It’s driving them off social media and forcing them to hold their meetings and demonstrations away from the public eye,” Falter said.

He said the group has had an effect. Not only are anti-Semites being driven from the limelight, but polls in Britain suggest a decrease in anti-Semitic sentiment among the public.

“We’re able to make anti-Semites afraid to openly express their views, and I believe that people are starting to re-appraise their views of Jews.”

Falter said the organization’s mission is not about enacting new hate laws. “What we need is to enforce the laws more effectively.”

Falter added he feels like a visitor to Canada “from the not-too-distant future.”

“What’s happening in Britain is maybe only two or three years ahead of what Canada has in store,” he warned. “I’ve grown up in one of the best countries in the world to be Jewish, and we’re losing that. The country is changing and it will change irreparably unless we fight hard and effectively now.”

Canada has some choices to make, he said.

“I believe that Canadian (Jews) increasingly will be looking at their situation and asking, ‘Do we have a future in this country?’ And that’s a question they shouldn’t be having to ask at all.’’

It’s “vitally important that Canada take some of the same action we’re taking in Britain.”

*READ: FORD PLEDGES TO ‘TAKE ACTION’ AGAINST AL-QUDS DAY RALLY*


---

**Turning things upside down – to BELIEVE - sophistry at its best!**

We believe that there is a common responsibility to conduct free research, to promote understanding and to preserve the understanding and history of the Holocaust,” he said, continuing to read from the statement. We support free and open historical expression and research on all aspects of Holocaust so that it can be conducted without any fear of legal obstacles.

-----------------------------------------------

Netanyahu takes credit after Poland amends Holocaust law, says dispute now over As Warsaw drops criminal penalties for blaming Poland for Nazi crimes, PM says Israel fulfilled its goals in opposing the law, condemns 'anti-Polonism'

31
Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu at a press conference at the Defense Ministry in Tel Aviv on June 27, 2018, to discuss Poland’s amended Holocaust Law. (Tomer Neuberg/Flash90)

Israel and Poland on Thursday ended a bitter dispute over the Polish Holocaust law, with Warsaw dropping penalties for blaming Nazi crimes on the country and Israel acknowledging some of Poland’s concerns.

Reading out a joint statement crafted between the two governments, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu welcomed the Polish decision to amend the law and credited it to Israel’s standing up for the truth.

In a speech at the Defense Ministry in Tel Aviv, Netanyahu spoke of the anger caused in Israel and elsewhere by the law, which raised fears it could squelch free speech on the Holocaust. But he also highlighted the importance of ties between the two countries.

“These ties, he said, include a “joint responsibility for preserving the memory of the Holocaust.”

“It is clear to everyone the Holocaust was an unprecedented crime, a crime carried out by Nazi Germany against the Jewish nation, including the Jews of Poland,” Netanyahu said in Hebrew. “The Polish government expressed understanding for the meaning of the Holocaust as the most tragic chapter in the history of the Jewish people.”

“We stood up for defending the truth and fulfilled our chief duty: To guarantee the historical truth of the Holocaust,” he said. “This is how we'll continue to act.”

Anna Stupnicka-Bando, left, a Polish woman recognized by Yad Vashem for helping Jews during the Holocaust, speaks with Polish Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki in Warsaw, Poland, on Monday February 26, 2018. (AP Photo/Czarek Sokolowski)

The Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial, which had strongly condemned the law before its passage, called the change a “positive development in the right direction.”

“We believe that the correct way to combat historical misrepresentations is by reinforcing open, free research and educational activities,” Yad Vashem said in a statement.

Striking a sharply different note than Yad Vashem, Yesh Atid party leader Yair Lapid called the amendment to the law a “bad joke.”

Lapid, the son of a Holocaust survivor, has been one of the most outspoken Israeli critics of the law, which he labeled an attempt to rewrite history.

The new draft bill was presented to parliament by Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki and lawmakers held an emotional debate, with members of the opposition lashing out at the Law and Justice party for passing the law in the first place.

The new version removes the penal provisions and is likely to allow Poland to repair its international standing and relationship with its allies. However, Law and Justice also risks losing some support from its nationalist voters.

Morawiecki tried to put a positive spin on the whole affair, arguing that while abandoning the original law, it still had been a success because it had made Poland’s wartime history a topic of international debate.

Polish Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki visits the Ulma Family Museum of Poles Who Saved Jews during WWII, in Markowa, Poland, on February 2, 2018. (AP Photo/Alik Keplicz)

“Our basic goal was to fight for the truth, for Poland’s good name, to present what reality looked like, the realities of World War II and we achieve this goal,” Morawiecki said.
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“Our basic goal was to fight for the truth, for Poland’s good name, to present what reality looked like, the realities of World War II and we achieve this goal,” Morawiecki said.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu at a press conference at the Defense Ministry in Tel Aviv on June 27, 2018, to discuss Poland’s amended Holocaust Law. (Tomer Neuberg/Flash90)

Israel and Poland on Thursday ended a bitter dispute over the Polish Holocaust law, with Warsaw dropping penalties for blaming Nazi crimes on the country and Israel acknowledging some of Poland’s concerns.

Reading out a joint statement crafted between the two governments, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu welcomed the Polish decision to amend the law and credited it to Israel’s standing up for the truth.

In a speech at the Defense Ministry in Tel Aviv, Netanyahu spoke of the anger caused in Israel and elsewhere by the law, which raised fears it could squelch free speech on the Holocaust. But he also highlighted the importance of ties between the two countries.

“These ties, he said, include a “joint responsibility for preserving the memory of the Holocaust.”

“It is clear to everyone the Holocaust was an unprecedented crime, a crime carried out by Nazi Germany against the Jewish nation, including the Jews of Poland,” Netanyahu said in Hebrew. “The Polish government expressed understanding for the meaning of the Holocaust as the most tragic chapter in the history of the Jewish people.”

“We stood up for defending the truth and fulfilled our chief duty: To guarantee the historical truth of the Holocaust,” he said. “This is how we'll continue to act.”

Anna Stupnicka-Bando, left, a Polish woman recognized by Yad Vashem for helping Jews during the Holocaust, speaks with Polish Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki in Warsaw, Poland, on Monday February 26, 2018. (AP Photo/Czarek Sokolowski)

The Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial, which had strongly condemned the law before its passage, called the change a “positive development in the right direction.”

“We believe that the correct way to combat historical misrepresentations is by reinforcing open, free research and educational activities,” Yad Vashem said in a statement.

Striking a sharply different note than Yad Vashem, Yesh Atid party leader Yair Lapid called the amendment to the law a “bad joke.”

Lapid, the son of a Holocaust survivor, has been one of the most outspoken Israeli critics of the law, which he labeled an attempt to rewrite history.

The new draft bill was presented to parliament by Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki and lawmakers held an emotional debate, with members of the opposition lashing out at the Law and Justice party for passing the law in the first place.

The new version removes the penal provisions and is likely to allow Poland to repair its international standing and relationship with its allies. However, Law and Justice also risks losing some support from its nationalist voters.

Morawiecki tried to put a positive spin on the whole affair, arguing that while abandoning the original law, it still had been a success because it had made Poland’s wartime history a topic of international debate.

Polish Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki visits the Ulma Family Museum of Poles Who Saved Jews during WWII, in Markowa, Poland, on February 2, 2018. (AP Photo/Alik Keplicz)

“Our basic goal was to fight for the truth, for Poland’s good name, to present what reality looked like, the realities of World War II and we achieve this goal,” Morawiecki said.
In response to the removal of penalties, Jewish community leader Klaudia Klimek said that the result was positive; however, “as usual, this government destroyed good relations with Israel, Ukraine and the US and only after reasonable external pressure admitted its mistake and changed.”

The dispute with Israel sparked a wave of anti-Semitic rhetoric in Poland, even by members of the government and commentators in public media, as well as hate speech directed against Poles abroad.

In April, a Polish nationalist group asked prosecutors to investigate whether Israeli President Reuven Rivlin broke the law during a visit to Poland.

The vice president of the National Movement, Krzysztof Bosak, said the request was filed after Rivlin told his Polish counterpart during commemorations at Auschwitz that Poland enabled the implementation of Germany’s genocide.

In February, Morawiecki said that, alongside Poles, Jews were also responsible for perpetrating the Holocaust.

“Of course, it’s not going to be punishable, [it’s] not going to be seen as criminal to say that there were Polish perpetrators, as there were Jewish perpetrators, as there were Russian perpetrators, as there were Ukrainian; not only German perpetrators,” he told Yedioth Ahrnon.

In March, the Polish attorney general’s office described the law as partly unconstitutional, saying it was “dysfunctional,” could have “opposite results than those intended,” and could “undermine the Polish state’s authority.”

*https://www.timesofisrael.com/israel-poland-resolve-dispute-over-polish-holocaust-law/
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Kevin MacDonald and the Elevation of Anti-Semitic Pseudoscience

Why are ostensibly respectable, peer-reviewed journals now publishing discussions of what has long been dismissed as bigoted psychological research?

06.27.2018 / By Michael Schulson

Kevin MacDonald, a white nationalist blog, sometimes refers to him affectionately as “K-Mac.”

With a few exceptions, though, mainstream evolutionary psychologists have long ignored MacDonald’s work — that is, until this year. In March, the journal Human Nature published a pointed but respectful rebuttal of the theories postulated in “The Culture of Critique.” Then, in early June, a full-throated defense of MacDonald’s work appeared in Evolutionary Psychological Science, a mainstream, peer-reviewed journal published by Springer Nature.

That paper, titled “Jewish Group Evolutionary Strategy Is the Most Plausible Hypothesis,” largely repeats MacDonald’s arguments. It claims that Jews have evolved to pursue strategies that “promote Jewish interests in the West,” and that Jews may be biologically wired to be more ethnocentric than other people.

As experts have pointed out, these arguments evoke a long history of anti-Semitic rhetoric. But more than that, they raise troubling questions in an era of shifting norms with regard to race, politics, and even science. Does bigoted academic work like MacDonald’s warrant a fair rebuttal, for example? Or does even a respectful critique have the effect of legitimizing it as part of mainstream discourse? After 20 years, why is Kevin MacDonald suddenly finding defenders in academia? And finally, why are ostensibly respectable, peer-reviewed journals — including one that counts intellectual luminaries like Harvard’s Steven Pinker and neuroscientist Sam Harris on its board — now publishing lavish defenses of what has been dismissed for decades as anti-Semitic pseudoscience?

---

Kevin MacDonald’s work is only called “pseudo-science” because it addresses the Jewish problem! ***- ed.A1

---------------------------------------

MATTERS OF FACT: Exploring the culture of science.

Does bigoted academic work like Kevin MacDonald’s warrant a fair rebuttal, or does that legitimize it as part of mainstream discourse?

Kevin MacDonald, an emeritus professor of psychology at California State University, Long Beach, has complained that his work receives scant attention from academics — though there are reasons for the silence. The book, after all, has much in common with centuries-old anti-Semitic conspiracy theories, and, using the language of evolutionary psychology, MacDonald infamously argues that many Jews oppose the values of Western civilization in order to pursue insular group interests.

MacDonald complains, for example, of “a Jewish-dominated elite” that “has emerged to dominate intellectual and political debate,” even as it “almost instinctively loathes the traditional institutions of European-American culture.”

“Indeed, intense hatred of perceived enemies appears to be an important psychological characteristic of Jews,” MacDonald writes.

Since the book’s publication in 1998, MacDonald has openly aligned himself with white nationalists, including former Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke, and testified on behalf of the Holocaust denier David Irving. More recently, MacDonald’s work has become popular among the ascendant alt-right. The Daily Stormer, a white nationalist blog, sometimes refers to him affectionately as “K-Mac.”

As it turns out, the author of the criticism of MacDonald’s work, Nathan Cofnas, travels in the same intellectual circles as Edward Dutton, who wrote the pro-MacDonald response. The two men met a few years ago at the London Conference on Intelligence, an annual gathering where attendees reportedly talk about contentious (and largely disproven) topics like eugenics, IQ, and the biology of racial difference.

“The establishment clearly rejected MacDonald’s ideas... [but] why didn’t they just point out what’s so wrong about it?”

Both men also have ties to the Ulster Institute for Social Research, a small British think-tank that publishes reports on
racial differences, human evolution, and IQ. The organization is run by Richard Lynn, a controversial scholar popular among those who argue that black people are inherently less intelligent than white people. Cofnas published a book with the Ulster Institute in 2012, which he has since withdrawn from publication — hoping, he says, to preserve it for inclusion in future work. Dutton told me that he receives funding from the Institute, where he is an affiliated scholar.

In an interview with Undark, Cofnas said that he first became interested in MacDonald’s work as a teenager, but that an academic mentor had discouraged him from writing about it. MacDonald’s work has seemingly grown more popular with the rise of the alt-right, and Cofnas, who is pursuing a Ph.D. in the philosophy of biology at Oxford, felt that it was time to respond. “The establishment clearly rejected MacDonald’s ideas and said he doesn’t represent evolutionary psychology, and all that. But why didn’t they just point out what’s so wrong about it?” Cofnas told me. “He’s not on the radar of most mainstream thinkers. But he is very influential.”

Alt-right figures like Richard Spencer, Cofnas continued, admire MacDonald’s work. Cofnas claims that some evolutionary psychologists do, too — albeit in secret, because the ideas are so charged. “A response was definitely warranted,” he said.

In his 21-page long response to MacDonald’s work, Cofnas argues that the theorist misuses sources, applies his theory differently to Jews and non-Jews, and chooses a complicated explanation for Jewish history when simpler ones would suffice. Cofnas wasn’t sure that a journal would even accept a rebuttal of MacDonald’s work, but the first journal he submitted a draft to, Human Nature, took the paper.


When we spoke, I asked Cofnas whether he was concerned that responding to MacDonald would legitimize his ideas. Why not say that the guy has a long track record of anti-Semitism, seems to be repeating old tropes, and leave it at that? “There’s nothing wrong, in my opinion, in principle, with trying to understand why any group behaves the way it does,” Cofnas said. “I don’t think certain questions should be put off limits,” he continued, “because they remind us of a history that we don’t like. But it’s not necessary to dismiss MacDonald for that reason, because I think there are straightforward scientific reasons to reject him.”

The audience for his rebuttal was substantial. Scientific papers rarely get more than a few hundred downloads, but Cofnas’ paper was downloaded more than 30,000 times in the first two weeks it was online. Today, it has been downloaded more than 50,000 times. Jane Lancaster, an emeritus anthropologist at the University of New Mexico and the editor of Human Nature, told me she had no idea Cofnas’ paper would get this kind of response. She wasn’t previously aware of MacDonald’s popularity on the alt-right, she said, and she did not realize that people outside the field were so interested in Jewish cultural evolution. “I was astonished,” she said, adding that the paper got as many downloads in a month “as we are likely to get for all manuscripts for the year.”

Was she worried that Cofnas’ paper, by taking MacDonald seriously, would legitimize his argument? That concern, Lancaster said, didn’t even come up. “If it had come up, I wouldn’t buy that argument,” she added. “Not responding doesn’t make it go away.”

Lancaster told me that Edward Dutton had submitted his response to Cofnas — the paper that defends MacDonald — to Human Nature as well. It was “unsubstantiated as a critique” she said, and she rejected it. Instead, Dutton’s paper quickly found a home in Evolutionary Psychological Science. That journal was founded in 2014, and a number of prominent figures sit on its editorial board — including Pinker, the Harvard cognitive psychologist and bestselling author; Harris, the neuroscientist and moral philosopher; and University of Texas evolutionary psychologist David Buss.

“The reason I asked what your background was is because I infer from your surname that you’re probably Jewish.”

For his part, Dutton — who lectures at the University of Oulu in Finland — is not trained as a scientist. His Ph.D. is in religious studies, but he has a longstanding interest, he said, in evolution, and he recently cowrote a book with Richard Lynn about “evolution and racial differences in sporting ability.” His papers about IQ and religious belief have also been widely cited in the media.

When we spoke by Skype earlier this month, Dutton paused the conversation at one point to ask me where I came from. I told him that I didn’t quite understand the question. “Are you from Iran?” he asked. I explained that I was from Tennessee. “Your background — you look like you’re Iranian, or something like that.” When I asked him why the topic was relevant, he changed the subject.

At the end of the interview, Dutton raised the issue of ancestry again. “The reason I asked what your background was is because I infer from your surname that you’re probably Jewish,” he said, adding that he did not understand why I was covering this topic for Undark.

When not inquiring about my ancestry, Dutton said that he was initially skeptical of MacDonald’s work, but that he ultimately decided that his core principles might be sound. In a paper published in 2016, Dutton and a colleague analyzed survey data of four American religious groups — Baptists, Catholics, Methodists, and Jews — talking about their group identity. This may seem like flimsy evidence on which to base a grand theory of Jewish history, but from this and other studies, Dutton concluded that Jews may be inherently more ethnocentric than other groups. And, he told me, if Jews are “congenitally more ethnocentric,” then “it is a reasonable hypothesis that if they are overrepresented in intellectual movements which are for the good of the Jews, that would be, or in some way it could be argued that part of that is probably an ethnocentric strategy.”

In the paper, and in our conversation, Dutton echoed MacDonald’s argument that Jews, for hidden ethnic reasons, gravitate toward intellectual movements like multiculturalism or feminism. These are movements, Dutton argues, that
undermine white ethnic solidarity in the West. "That's what I think is going on with the high representation of Jews in ideologies which specifically question Western traditions, and therefore make the West less ethnocentric," he told me.

"Undermine the structures which make the West ethnocentric — things like religion, things like sexual boundaries, that kind of thing."

I asked Dutton what he made of the contention that MacDonald comes to conclusions that mirror longstanding anti-Semitic theories.

"There's nothing you can do about it," Dutton replied. "Not everything that was thought in the past was wrong."

Todd Shackelford, an evolutionary psychologist at Oakland University in Michigan and the founding editor of Evolutionary Psychological Science, describes Dutton's paper as "risky." But, he says, that made it a good fit for the journal. "I want this to be a journal where you do see riskier stuff. Stuff more on the edge. Stuff that's taking more of a chance," Shackelford told me.

Shackelford said that he didn't agree with everything in Dutton's paper, and, in a follow-up email, stressed that he has "serious reservations about Dutton's arguments." But he saw it as a serious response to Cofnas' dissection of MacDonald. "I thought Dutton did a very nice job of saying, 'hold on here, maybe we've thrown the baby out with the bathwater,'" Shackelford said.

MacDonald's arguments resemble "venerable anti-Semitic tropes," Steven Pinker said, "with every proposition being invidious to Jews rather than described in scientifically neutral language."

Shackelford reports rejecting between 75 and 80 percent of submissions, but the Dutton paper made the cut. Cofnas was one of the two anonymous peer reviewers, and both recommended it for publication.

Of course, not all scholars in the field of evolutionary psychology are quite so eager to address MacDonald's theories. Asked for expert comment on Dutton's paper, Robert Boyd, an anthropologist at Arizona State University and a senior figure in the field, responded that he wouldn't touch the topic with a 10-foot pole. "This topic is totally toxic," he wrote in an email. "There's no possibility of doing good science. The data are poor, people have very strong priors, and the issues are so charged that every discussion becomes instantly moralized."

After receiving a request for comment from Undark, Steven Pinker indicated that he had not read the Dutton paper. Upon doing so, he sent a note to Shackelford, the journal's editor, expressing his disappointment with the decision to publish it. "I'd be the first to acknowledge that politically controversial ideas should not be censored from scientific journals if they are supported by rigorous theory and data," Pinker told Undark in an email. "But both MacDonald's theory and Dutton's defense of it are extraordinarily weak..."

(On a call to Undark after receiving Pinker's letter, Shackelford noted that the journal plans to publish a response from Cofnas. "In hindsight, I would have liked to have delayed the online appearance of Dutton's paper so that it could be published simultaneously with Cofnas' response," he wrote).

MacDonald's theory, Pinker argued in his email to me, "is not derivable from the foundational ideas of evolutionary psychology." But his arguments "do resemble, point for point, venerable anti-Semitic tropes, with every proposition being invidious to Jews rather than described in scientifically neutral language." Pinker also questioned how Dutton's paper added anything to the field. "I have never before seen an article in a scientific journal whose purpose is to establish a theory's 'plausibility,' an inherently subjective judgment," Pinker told me.

"Worse, the article fails to make the case even for plausibility, trotting out one ad hoc excuse after another for the obvious counterexamples to MacDonald's claims."

Aryeh Tuchman, associate director of the Anti-Defamation League's Center on Extremism, has been tracking MacDonald's work for years. "I was struck by the way in which MacDonald incorporates age-old anti-Semitic tropes," he said.

"I was like, 'Oh my gosh," he continued, "I've studied this in graduate school, I've written papers about this, and now here's a guy who's actually doing it, in the wild, so to speak, and presenting it as science rather than simply an anti-Semitic gloss or portrayal of historical events or historical phenomena."

Tuchman is concerned about the effect of renewed interest in MacDonald's ideas.

"Now that we've had two articles in an academic journal, everyone is going to feel like they need to weigh in," he said. "That's really unfortunate. These ideas are best left on David Duke's podcast, and not in an academic journal."

In my conversation with Shackelford, the journal editor, he argued that it was important to debate controversial ideas openly. "We need to be careful about writing something off because it upsets us," he told me.

"If MacDonald is wrong," he said, "let's see why he's wrong."

Therein lies the unconquerable, circular logic: If Jews are Jewishly-motivated, then anything Jews do can be chalked up to Jewish motives.

Of course, there are many ideas — some with passionate followings — that don't receive much attention in academic journals. These might include flat-earth theory, for example, or the belief in unicorns, or the theory that the federal government stages school shootings. To debate a theory like MacDonald's is both to legitimize it and to tacitly accept one of its premises — namely, that there's such a thing as a distinct, subtle "Jewish agenda" or "Jewish psychology" that exists in tension with white European society.

That idea, as Pinker, Tuchman, and others point out, is not radical or new. It's perhaps the single most influential anti-Semitic concept of the past few centuries. But that's the real bind here — one that confronts not just scientists, but journalists and other citizens in an era of rising white nationalism. Are bad ideas permitted to flourish when we simply ignore them? Or is it the debate — the open back-and-forth and public rebuttals — that actually gives them oxygen and legitimacy?

Along these lines, I debated whether or not to call MacDonald himself for this essay. He's not hard to find: For all his claims to intellectual exile, he retained his tenured position at California State Long Beach for years — though the university's faculty has taken steps to distance themselves from him. In the end, I decided to call and ask what he made of seeing his work debated in academic journals in 2018. "It's great that, after 20 years, the book is finally getting some attention," MacDonald told me.

"I was very surprised to see that [paper] published in Evolutionary Psychological Science," he added, saying that he was "quite happy" with the result.

In his paper, Cofnas argues that MacDonald applies a double-standard to Jews and non-Jews in his work, constantly hypothesizing and investigating ethnic motives for the actions of Jews, and assuming other kinds of motives for everyone else. MacDonald seemed unsure how to respond when I asked him about this charge. "I don't know — when I evaluate Jews, I try to see if they're Jewishly-motivated," he said, adding: "You can't find Jewish motives with non-Jews."
True enough. And therein, of course, lies the unconquerable, circular logic: If Jews are Jewishly-motivated, then anything Jews do can be chalked up to Jewish motives.

MacDonald did pen his own, lengthy response to Cofnas — 17,000 words — which appeared on his ResearchGate page and at The Unz Review, a blogging platform that hosts many alt-right authors. He ends his rebuttal by suggesting that Cofnas, who is Jewish, may have had more than scientific and intellectual rigor in mind when challenging the elder academic’s theories.

“I do think,” MacDonald told me, “there’s an ethnic motive.”

Michael Schulson is an American freelance writer covering science, religion, technology, and ethics. His work has been published by Pacific Standard magazine, Aeon, New York magazine, and The Washington Post, among other outlets, and he writes the Matters of Fact and Tracker columns for Undark.

https://undark.org/article/kevin-macdonald-anti-semitism-psychology/
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Escape from Auschwitz

By Panagiotis Heliotis

When it comes to Holocaust survivors we almost always tend to think about Jews. It can't be helped actually as it is only Jews who appear on the media. But Jews were not the only ones sent to concentration camps. There were others as well. Today we will have a look at the testimony of one of them: Russian POW Andrei Pogozhev and his book Escape from Auschwitz (Pen & Sword, 2007).

Pogozhev was sent to Auschwitz in October 1941 and then transferred to Birkenau. In November 1942 he managed to escape along with other prisoners and in 1965 he testified at the Auschwitz Trial. Let's see what he witnessed regarding the exterminations.

It's May 1942 and Pogozhev writes:

“It was in those days of pan Olek's sickness, during visits from his numerous comrades, that I first discovered the Fascists had begun mass extermination - not only of prisoners but also of whole transports of people. Apparently the main extermination effort had shifted to Birkenau. They'd set up a 'bath-house' with pipes and a 'shower' grid and turned it into a gas chamber. People would be sent inside as if for a shower, then locked in and gassed. [...] Fires cremating corpses after gassings in the 'bath-house' burned day and night at Birkenau. The fires and gas chambers were serviced by 'Sonderkommandos' ['Special Units' - trans.], specially formed from prisoners held outside the camp. No one knew exactly who they were.” (p. 97)

In 1942 there were no crematoriums in Birkenau and the only gas chambers according to the official story were Bunkers 1 and 2, or Little Red House and Little White House. Those were simple farmhouses outside the camp that had been converted into gas chambers. The corpses were then buried in pits.

Pogozhev continues:

"Early July 1942. Birkenau is meshed with barbed wire, giving it the appearance of a huge spider's web. I can see that a central road divides the camp in two. On the right sprawls a vast area under construction - the gouged ground ready for new drains and foundations. Meanwhile, prefabricated wooden huts stand already completed. On each of them shines a bright enamelled square containing large, black German script: 'Pferde Baracken' - 'Horse Barracks'. On the left of the road I see the entrance to the women's camp. Behind it, separated by barbed wire, is that of the men. In both these compounds big new structures have been built alongside the original brick barracks - they look just like the stables opposite. Now I look straight ahead: the only road crossing the camp from east to west terminates at a small grove immediately beyond its limits - the gas chambers and crematorium are situated there. This is the appearance of the Birkenau camp - 'Auschwitz II' - as our truck approaches. I am one of a large group of prisoners being driven from Central Auschwitz ..." (p. 104)

Here a map (of reality on the ground) is needed (North to the right): At one would enter the camp, the women's barracks was on the left of the road but the men's was on the right and not behind them. Also the grove was not visible from the main road as it was a little further to the north. Referring to Bunker 2, Pogozhev places also a crematorium there which he clearly distinguishes from the pits. For example:

"Away to our left, pyres were blazing deep in the Secret Grove. Further beyond, the crematorium was puffing out black smoke. “ (p. 146)

Continue Reading
LETTER #6 TO RADICAL PRESS
FROM MONIKA SCHAEFER

Letter #6 from Monika Schaefer
To Arthur Topham & The Radical Press
Dated June 14th, 2018. Received June 28th, 2018
Dear Arthur,

I was fully planning on writing to you next and then voila! your letter dated May 23rd arrived. That was yesterday; it is now early morning, my favourite time to write letters. So I’m getting settled in for a good chin wag with you. Soon there will be a steaming cup of coffee at my side when they deliver the hot water through the little hatch in the door – ah the wonderful room service!

Your letter came at lightning speed in comparison to most lately. I’ve been receiving a lot of 6, 7, 8, or 11 week old mail lately. They’re really messing with my mail, and trying to mess with my head – they are not succeeding with the latter. I just wrote to Jim & Diane a few days ago, a bit of a story regarding mail and I know they’ll share that with you, so I won’t repeat that all here. I just have to count on all my mail going through. There are so many things I want to tell you about, talk about and at the same time my writing hand tells me whoa! take it easy on me…getting a little cramped up here…It is true – my hand is feeling the effects of a lot of writing. I’ve tried all the different pens on offer, and even the most expensive one 6.60 Euros does not really offer much reprieve, and runs out of ink far too quickly. Anyway I don’t mean to be complaining, the hand seems to be working just fine right now.

Room service just came to let me know the water will come later today as the machine which heats it up didn’t switch on and so it is now on. Okay no problem, I’ll savour the coffee a wee bit later and appreciate it all the more.

You might be surprised to know that I get a lot of news out of your letters sometimes that I did not yet know. I knew Ursula and Gerd are now behind the wire, but Jez! I did not know that. And I wonder where Alison is right now.

Also I did not know about a hearing in Dresden for Alfred. Isn’t that funny :-) that I get this from you? Someone threw me a hint in a letter “that was a close call...” or something like that. That got me all worried of course because I had no idea what they were talking about. an accident? What? I asked Elfriede on her next visit is everything okay? Oh yes, everything is fine, no there was nothing. The time delays of letters of course makes these things old news when I’m seeing Elfriede face-to-face, so she didn’t think of the hearing because obviously nothing happened ha ha.

Two days ago I got a call from the office and the guard said, ”lots of mail has come for you that you can’t have” – don’t they have a way with words that kind of gets your heart beating faster! There were a couple of books there, among other things. The reason I’m telling you this Arthur is two-fold. One is to say thank you to one of the senders as I do not have his address and I know that you do (I’ll get to that in a bit) and the other reason is because I know you reach a lot of people so if you can please let them know that NOTHING other than letters can be sent. I can only receive books if they come directly from a publisher. And even then, I first have to gain permission from the court to receive said-book, then I ask for a “Buchpaketmarke” which I would send to the person who wants to send me the book. They would then get that book ordered, get that “Marke” to the publisher (or maybe I would send it to the publisher – I don’t know exactly) and THEN the book could come to me. But that 1st step of getting “permission” through the court – that is quite a hurdle to jump. They tell me that they don’t do thought control here (surprise!), and yet they originally denied me a certain magazine (direct from publisher, all the right channels bla bla ) because it was too “Rechts”, too right wing so it was “dangerous”* [*I’m not kidding! They really did say that.] Ha ha ha ha ha ha. (Recently they have now granted me permission for that magazine after I shamed them. :-) ) Anyway it is a very sad thing when someone has gone to the effort and expense of sending me a book, and I can’t have it. To be clear, it is not gone forever. It is in storage. Now I have no idea what that storage looks like – I may need a few wheelbarrows when I get released.

Okay now back to the sender of a certain book (I think you know him). He sent a most beautiful Bible! It was “Nach Martin Luther” and it was German-English. I was able to briefly look at it in the office – German and English were side by side on each page. The print was beautiful. The guard felt really bad – she too could see the tragedy of the situation but they are so RULE-bound here it is pathetic. So this beautiful Bible that (someone) sent to me – and I am sure he must have had to turn cartwheels to acquire it – is is now in my “storage” somewhere deep in the bowels of this institution. Can you please send him my sincere and heartfelt gratitude and love. And please assure him that I will have that Bible in my hands after I am released and I will treasure it. In the meantime, I do have a bible, in German, in my cell. They do provide us with a bible if we ask. And I asked quite early on.

Isn’t the whole thing crazy though?! Things are moving right along here. One day before the six-month legal period of detention is up, court starts, July 2nd. I am feeling remarkably calm about it all. The last “Haftprüfung” (May 16) taught me something and gave me a gift. The written justifications for keeping me detained showed me so clearly that the outcome of that little exercise was predetermined. So here is the gift: freedom to say and do exactly as I please, because they have determined the outcome for me already anyway. I see it as a gift – that is how I am taking it.

As I said to a mutual friend the other day, I am receiving a lot of help, from Spirit, and from the loving energy being sent to me from many people. It is why I can maintain my strength and my peace of mind and soul, and remain joyful throughout.

I certainly could not do it alone! and I am never alone. I am always in Good Company.

We are working all together on this, just some of us from different sides of the wire. But we are so together!

...Thursday afternoon...
I just have to add this Post Script. Luckily I still have your letter here. I'll add postage, as this extra sheet might push me over the 20 grams but since I don't have a scale, better to be safe than sorry.

This little story is completely relevant to what I already wrote to you about the books, and simply underscores the lunacy I am dealing with here...

(Friday morning now... June 15th)
Okay, so yesterday during Aufshluss I received a little document from the judge – it was an answer to my request from April 9th – 91/2 weeks ago!!! –to receive permission to buy a French-German dictionary. It was a one sentence answer to say it was the jurisdiction of the prison and that they have objections.

Now you may ask why on earth would you ask permission for a dictionary from the court in the 1st place, especially given the fact that I had been borrowing the exact same book from the library already – always 2 weeks at a time (too bad it just can’t be read like a novel), and I also had a German-English dictionary on semi-permanent load from the social worker here. Indeed, any thinking person would be correct to ask that. That is why I first requested the “Buchpacketmarke” directly from the prison boss. That was way back in March. They immediately informed me that, no, I would have to receive permission through the court. I remember laughing so hard and being so disgusted with the ridiculousness of it all that I didn’t do anything about it for a while. Finally on April 9th I sent that letter to the court. Perhaps the 91/2 week delay ws due to the backlog of all my mail over there, or perhaps the judge also thought it was a joke, and only responded after reading in some of my outgoing letters that I was writing about the fact that I couldn’t even get an answer to my request for a dictionary, so don’t try to send me any books.

So now I had my answer, I was asking the senior guard to give me instructions for next steps – what is the process? I remarked – this must be a common process, don’t lots of prisoners do this? No, she replied, it is rare. They used to get more books sent in but now it is very rare.

Well duh! I wonder why. Thank God for Laughter.

I will keep you all posted on the story of the acquisition of a dictionary.

The poor slaves of the system! The inability to think! The institution boss who could not operate outside of her robotic abeyance to the Rules when she could easily have given me that Buchpacketmarke back in March. Where is George Orwell? We are unfortunately witnessing the results of the systemic attack and destruction of Germany (extend that to all whites), the degeneration, the dumbing down and demoralization. The story of the dictionary is one little tiny symptom of a very ill nation. We have much work to do.

Love,
Monika

---

Israeli-US teen convicted of thousands of bomb threats, including against JCCs

19-year-old from Ashkelon hoaxed Jewish centers, airports, hospitals and schools; told police he ‘liked to see people running around in panic’

By Tamar Pileggi Today, 12:22 pm

“I realize that this isn’t a game and I’m sorry,” he told police, according to court documents. “I like to see people running around in panic.”

Delivering the verdict in a closed-door session, Judge Zvi Gurfinkel rejected the defense’s claim that the teen was mentally unfit to stand trial, saying he was fully aware of the consequences of his actions.

“The defendant has changed his version of events multiple times according to what suits him the most,” the judge said. “He very much understands the significance of his actions.”

The 19-year-old was found guilty of hundreds of counts of extortion, publishing false information that caused panic, computer offenses and money laundering, among other charges.

Authorities say he made thousands of threatening calls, mostly to community centers and schools in the US, from January to March 2017, using an online calling service that disguised his voice and allowed him to hide his identity. He also targeted hundreds of airlines and airports, malls, and police stations, in the US, Canada, the UK, New Zealand, Australia and Britain, and tried to extort Republican State Senator Ernesto Lopez from Delaware.

In addition to the bomb threats, the unnamed teen offered his extortion services through an online black market. Court documents unsealed in August linked him to a post on the now-shuttered illicit marketplace.

The suspect brought for a court hearing at the Rishon Lezion Magistrate’s Court, under suspicion of Issuing fake bomb threats against Jewish institutions around the world, on March 23, 2017. (Flash90)

The Tel Aviv District Court on Thursday convicted an Israeli-American teenager of multiple counts of extortion for waging an intimidation campaign of bomb threats, including against Jewish Community Centers in the United States last year.

The 19-year-old Ashkelon native, whose name remains under gag order in Israel, has admitted to making some 2,000 fake bomb threat calls to hospitals, airlines, schools and various Jewish institutions out of boredom.
AlphaBay advertising a "School Email Bomb Threat Service." The ad offered to send customized threats to schools for $30, plus a surcharge if the buyer seeks to have someone framed.

The lawyer of the young Israeli hacker, suspected of sending bomb threats to Jewish facilities across the world, shows the court an image of a tumor in her client’s brain, at the Rishon Lezion Magistrate’s Court, on March 30, 2017. (Flash90)

His threats caused fighter jets to scramble, planes to dump fuel and make emergency landings, schools to evacuate, and numerous other chaotic consequences. In some cases, he allegedly threatened to execute children he claimed to be holding hostage.

The hoax bomb threats, which came in the midst of a far-right surge in the US, sent a chill through Jewish communities and raised fears of anti-Semitism.

The defendant’s parents have maintained their son has a brain tumor and is on the autism spectrum, and that those conditions affected his behavior.

Illustrative photo of police tape at the JCC in Nashville, Tennessee, after the community center received a bomb threat on January 9, 2017. (Screenshot: The Tennessean)

His lawyer told Israeli news outlets the teen has attempted suicide at least five times while in prison since his arrest last March. Earlier this year, he briefly escaped police custody after a hearing at a Jerusalem District Court.

In April, police said the defendant managed to make dozens more bomb threats against over 100 schools in Israel during the year he was incarcerated at the Nitzan Prison in Ramle.

‘A poor boy, not a criminal’

During Thursday’s proceedings, the defendant’s father told the court that his son’s ill health made him unfit to stand trial.

“There was no motive of hate or trying to make money,” he said. “The state [prosecutors] will say he has criminal motives, but that’s one big lie. He’s a poor boy, not a criminal,” he said. “His special problems need to be understood.”

But the court rejected the defense’s claim that his mental and physical disabilities rendered him unfit to stand trial. Court documents released on Thursday said mental health evaluations of the defendant determined he was highly intelligent and that while he was likely on the autism spectrum, he ultimately understood right from wrong.

The court said he told psychiatric professionals that he didn’t believe that he had done anything wrong, and that thanks to him, his victims experienced something “fun” they would not have otherwise. But in another test, he expressed remorse for making the calls, and admitted he was wrong.

G and S, the parents of alleged bomb hoaxer M, at their home in Ashkelon, with medical documents, one of the maps drawn by M, and an MRI of his brain, on the table in front of them, April 26, 2017 (DH/Times of Israel staff)

In his decision, Gurfinkel said the extensive efforts the teen used to cover his tracks, and the fact that he used the dark web to advertise his services, indicated that he was aware of the significance of his actions. The judge also noted that he he previously said he enjoyed watching the ensuing panic that his death threats caused.

“The defendant sowed terror and panic in a systematic and sophisticated way, all while concealing his identity, and disrupted the lives of many people whom he has threatened,” he said.

US charges

In addition to facing a possibly long jail sentence in Israel, the teen has also been indicted on hate crimes charges by the US Department of Justice that would carry a hefty prison term there.

In March, charges were lodged against him in Florida, Georgia, and Washington, DC; and US officials said he could face a maximum jail term of 20 years for hate crimes, 10 years’ imprisonment for each bomb threat, and a five-year sentence for other hoax and cyberstalking charges.

The Justice Department has not said whether the US would seek his extradition, but reports in Hebrew-language media over the last year claimed that Israel has refused a US request in favor of trying him at home.