

## **Controlling the Narrative: Censorship in Polish-Jewish Matters (14 Books Reviewed by Jan Peczkis)**

Jewish "Peer Pressure" Stifles Polish-Fair Jews [this page]

Chilling Effect in Academia: Nonconformist Scholars Harassed and Punished [p. 3]

Orwellian Unpersons: Unwelcome Scholars Do Not Exist [p. 39]

### **Jewish "Peer Pressure" Stifles Polish-Fair Jews [this page]**

-----

**Together and Apart in Brzezany: Poles, Jews, and Ukrainians, 1919-1945** Redlich, Shimon 2002 ***Jewish Peer Pressure***

***Enforces Polonophobia. Jewish Disloyalty to Poland in the 1939***

***German-Soviet Conquest of Poland*** Brzezany, in the former Kresy, located 80 km SE of Lwow and founded by a Pole (p. 5), was the home of Rydz-Smigly. (p. 22, 27, 29, 50). It was once visited by US President Herbert Hoover (p. 27), a Polonophile. Very few Brzezany Jews survived the Holocaust, and the onetime Brzezany Jews interviewed by Redlich, most living in Israel, were largely prewar emigrants. Most Brzezany Poles interviewed consisted of expellees who now live at Ustron in Silesia. (p. 25). A few Poles still live in Brzezany (p. 12, 26, 154), and one interviewed Brzezany Pole is an American emigre. The Ukrainians interviewed consisted of an assortment of emigre Ukrainians and locals. However, most current "Brzezanians" are postwar-resettled eastern Ukrainians. (pp. 3-4, 147).

**JEWISH PEER PRESSURE FOR JEWS TO BE NEGATIVE ABOUT POLAND** Do Polonophobic Jews influence Jews that are not anti-Polish? Definitely! This is now confirmed in print. Redlich interviewed Jewish sisters Rena Wanderer-Stolarsky and Ruth Wanderer-Biheller, both of whom had survived the Holocaust thanks to being hidden by a series of successive Poles. Both sisters expressed hatred of Poles, and: "Rena advised me not to present the Poles in too favorable a way 'for the sake of our martyrs'. Still, during lunch in Ruth's suburban New Jersey house, she

remarked, 'I wonder what we would have done as potential rescuers.' We didn't follow up on this touchy subject." (p. 22, 169). Good question, and nice dodge.

#### JEWISH DISLOYALTY TO POLAND IN 1939

Froyko Schmidt of Israel recounted how those who greeted the Soviet tanks at Brzezany in 1939 were mostly Jews. (p. 88). Vasyl Fanga acknowledged widespread Ukrainian-Nazi collaboration, and faulted Ukrainians for naively believing that Hitler would create an independent Ukraine. (p. 115).

#### POLISH ANTISEMITISM EXAGGERATED

The awfulization of the Jewish and Ukrainian experiences under Polish rule (1918-1939) is strongly rejected by Redlich. Among the spectrum of Ukrainian opinions are some Ukrainians who remember generally positive Polish-Ukrainian relations. (p. 65). She also comments: "If there was anti-Semitism in interwar Brzezany, it usually assumed quite mild forms." (p. 67; see also p. 70). Also: "Although 'Polishness' was a dominant feature, Jews and Ukrainians weren't completely alienated." (p. 164). For instance, Ukrainians enjoyed considerable cultural autonomy (p. 54), and some Jews and Ukrainians participated in events commemorating May 3, Nov. 11, etc. (p. 47).

#### THE "UKRAINIANS HAD IT BAD IN POLAND" MYTH

The separatist OUN murdered not only Poles but also Ukrainians who merely criticized them. (p. 41, 69). The prewar Polish government eventually closed the local Proswita and abolished the Ukrainian Scouts (Plast) for the unmentioned reason that they had become hives of sedition. The government, well aware of the fact that the extremist OUN wanted to provoke a Polish crackdown that could only antagonize Ukrainian moderates, had long delayed its actions. Consider Vasyl Fanga, a former UPA member who still lives in Brzezany: "Vasyl admitted, however, that Polish anti-Ukrainian acts were child's play compared to what would happen later under the Soviets." (p. 69).

#### UKRAINIANS TRY TO

#### BLAME THE POLES

Redlich touches on the OUN-UPA genocide of Poles, the AK's use of the Bernardine Cloister and the Farny Church at Brzezany as samoobrony (defense points), Operation Burza (Tempest)(p. 111, 130), and the later Soviet-formed Polish STREBKI. (Battalions of Destruction)(pp. 145-147). She repeats the Poles-started-it-at-Kholm (Chelm) myth. (pp. 101-102, 131). In actuality, Polish attacks on Ukrainian (and German) settlements there had been a reaction against the systematic German-sponsored forced replacement of Poles with Germans and Ukrainian collaborators.

#### THE PAST AND THE PRESENT

Various groups of Jews, Poles, and Ukrainians visited eastern Galicia, in recent years, after decades of absence. They remarked that Lwow and Brzezany looked dilapidated and sad compared to their state under Polish rule. (p.11, 161).

## **Chilling Effect in Academia: Nonconformist Scholars Harassed and Punished**

-----

### **The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy**

2006

Mearsheimer, John J.

### ***Widespread Censorship in the "Land of the Free", Including Interference in Polish-Jewish Dialogue, and the Control of Holocaust-Related Discourse***

My review focuses on how the Israeli Lobby controls the discourse on the Holocaust, and sometimes uses censorship for this purpose. I use the term censorship to refer to any organized attempt to obstruct the free exchange of ideas, and not in the narrow sense of the use of government power for such ends. The authors describe quite a few instances of such censorship, and I focus on a few of them. POLISH SELF-CENSORSHIP: CERTAIN INFLUENTIAL JEWS TELL POLES, "JUMP!" POLES ASK "HOW HIGH?", AND COMPLY

Mearsheimer and Walt write, "Consider what happened in October 2006 to Tony Judt, a New York University Historian who is Jewish but frequently critical of Israel's actions. He was scheduled to give a lecture at the Polish consulate in New York City, 'The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy.' The Polish government was not sponsoring the event; the consulate had merely rented its facilities to Network 20/20, an independent group that sponsors lectures on a wide range of topics. David Harris, the executive director of the American Jewish Committee, got wind of the event and contacted the Polish consul general. Harris later explained that he had called as a 'friend of Poland' and said that the lecture 'was going to be entirely contrary to the spirit of Polish foreign policy.' The consul general also received two inquiries from the ADL, and he later described the calls as 'exercising a delicate pressure...We are adults and our IQ's are high enough to understand that.' The consulate canceled Judt's lecture at the last minute, which led to a group of prominent American intellectuals to

issue an open letter denouncing this obvious effort to stifle free discussion. Judt also reported receiving death threats against him and his family on other occasions, inspired by his previous criticisms of Israeli policy." (pp. 185-186).

DISCUSSION OF "COMPLICITY IN THE HOLOCAUST" IS FINE; DISCUSSION OF JEWISH CRIMES IS VERBOTEN

The French embassy in the USA had scheduled a reception to celebrate the publication of Carmen Callil's *BAD FAITH*, which focused on a Vichy French official (Louis Darquier) that had dispatched French Jews to their deaths at Auschwitz. So far so good. But then it got censored for forbidden content, as described by the authors, "Although the book is a passionate and moving indictment of French complicity in the Holocaust, the embassy reportedly received complaints about a brief passage in Callil's postscript: 'What caused me anguish, as I tracked down Louis Darquier, was to live so closely to the helpless terror of the Jews in France, and to see what the Jews of Israel were passing on to the Palestinian people.' Bowing to the pressure, the French embassy said that 'it could not endorse a personal opinion of the author expressed in the postscript of the book' and canceled the reception." (p. 186). Score one for thought control. Evidently, "coming to terms with the past" is good for some people but not others.

THE PEDAGOGIKA WSTYDU (NAME AND SHAME): WHY CHRISTIANITY IS BLAMED FOR THE HOLOCAUST INSTEAD OF THE GUILTY PARTY--THE GERMANS

Most of the time, outright censorship is not necessary in order to maintain control of the discourse on the Holocaust: The chilling effect suffices. The self-censorship imposed by name and shame tactics, and other entrenched forms of political correctness, are usually sufficient. Apropos to this, Stephen Steinlight, former director of national affairs of the American Jewish, in addressing the dual loyalty of American Jews simultaneously supported Israel and the USA, makes the following revealing comment about the value of keeping non-Germans feeling guilty for the Holocaust, "We have no less difficult a balancing act between group loyalty and a wider sense of belonging to America. That America has largely tolerated this dual loyalty--we get a free pass, I suspect, LARGELY OVER CHRISTIAN GUILT ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST--makes it no less a reality." (p. 149; Emphasis added).

However, there is much, much more to gain, by blaming Christianity for the Holocaust, than just diffusing any questions about Jewish dual loyalties in the USA! As I write this (2019), there is a major media effort to blame Poles

and Polish Catholicism for the mythical so-called Polish complicity in the Holocaust. This follows decades of propaganda linking Polish Catholicism, and Christianity in general, with the German-made Holocaust.

THE CENSORSHIP OF AUTHORS JOHN J. MEARSHEIMER AND STEPHEN M. WALT

The authors describe their own experiences after they had been invited to speak at the U. S. Naval College annual Current Strategy Forum, "Following the publication of our original article, 'The Israeli Lobby', in March 2006, the president of the War College received phone calls from several members of Congress who questioned whether it was appropriate to have us speak at the conference. To his credit, the president took no action in response to these calls and we appeared without incident. A subsequent invitation to Walt to speak in a lecture series at the University of Montana also provoked heated denunciations by several faculty members, who began a protracted but unsuccessful campaign to have the faculty coordinator of the lecture series removed from his post." (p. 184).

THE CENSORSHIP OF NORMAN GARY FINKELSTEIN

The authors describe the efforts, of the likes of the ADL (Anti-Defamation League), and Alan Dershowitz, to try to prevent the publication of several named books by Norman G. Finkelstein. (p. 184).

THE CENSORSHIP OF PALESTINIAN-AMERICAN HISTORIAN RASHID KHALIDI

Authors Mearsheimer and Walt point out that, "The campaign to keep Americans from reading or hearing critical views about Israel even occurs at the high school level. In February 2005, for example, the *NEW YORK SUN* reported that Columbia's Khalidi was involved in a lecture program for high school teachers sponsored by New York City's Department of Education. The *SUN* and some local politicians immediately went to work to get him fired...Joel Klein, the chancellor of the Department of Education, dropped him from the program the next day..." (pp. 184-185). Had historian Rashid Khalidi been running down Poland on behalf of the standard narrative on the Holocaust, he would have been made into a hero.

-----

**Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History**

Finkelstein, Norman G. 2005 *Holocaust*

***Industry and Holocaust Supremacism Condemned. Accusations of Anti-Semitism a Silencing Tactic***

In this book. Norman Gary Finkelstein discusses the decades-old massacre of Arab civilians by

Israelis at Deir Yassin as well as larger, lesser-known Israeli massacres of Arab civilians in the early days of the State of Israel (Lydda, 250 victims; Ad Dawayima, "hundreds"; p. 263). ANTI-SEMITISM! A SILENCING WEAPON

Is anti-Semitism in the eye of the beholder? Finkelstein recurrently states that charges of anti-Semitism have been frequently leveled in order to silence valid criticisms of Jews in general and Israeli policies in particular. These charges revolve around the unspoken premise that Jews can do no wrong (e. g., "Holocaust Industry dogma a priori rejects this hypothesis: animus towards Jews can never spring from wrongs committed by Jews." (p. 78)). Furthermore: "It is even doubtful that agreeing with the statement 'Jews have too much influence in the world' proves, as the report claims, anti-Semitism...any more than agreeing with the statement 'White people have too much influence in the world' or 'Males have too much influence in the world' proves, respectively, a racist or sexist cast of mind." (p. 75). Finkelstein rejects Abraham Foxman's contention (that the supposedly Jewish-controlled movie industry, inexplicably, seldom acts on behalf of Jews) with the following retort: "Is that why Hollywood has produced a mere 175 films on the Nazi holocaust since 1989?" (p. 83).

HOLOCAUST SUPREMACISM SOUNDLY REJECTED Finkelstein re-affirms his repudiation of the notion that the Holocaust was "singular, universal, and unique", comparing it with "the uniqueness and universality of Marxism-Leninism" (p. 49), and dismissing it as follows: "Beyond its repellent chauvinism, this intellectually hollow doctrine of uniqueness serves the useful ideological function of allowing Israel to claim unique moral dispensation: if Jewish suffering was unique, then Israel shouldn't be bound by normal moral standards." (p. 62). Furthermore, he writes: "[There is]...an ADL [Anti-Defamation League] poll of the European Union showing that nearly half of the respondents agreed with the statement 'The Jews still talk too much about the Holocaust.' Indeed, the wonder is that the percentage of Europeans resenting chauvinistic incantation and political instrumentalization of The Holocaust isn't much greater." (p. 74).

Finkelstein asserts that his claims of a Holocaust Industry have never been refuted, at least in writing (p. 67), and he cites Raul Hilberg's supportive statements towards the same. Finkelstein then repeats his scathing denunciations of the Holocaust Industry itself: "Under the guise of seeking 'Holocaust reparations,' American Jewish organizations and individuals at all levels of government and in all sectors of American society entered into

a conspiracy--this is the correct word--to blackmail Europe. It was on account of 'Jewish money' that the Clinton administration went along with this shakedown operation, providing--even to the detriment of U. S. national interests--crucial support for it at every juncture." (pp. 82-83). "And just as the Clinton administration promoted the Holocaust reparations scam to get Jewish money and Jewish votes, so the Bush administration undoubtedly supported the new anti-Semitism scam with the same calculations in mind." (p. 61). Throughout his book, Finkelstein has strong words against certain individuals. He repeatedly accuses Alan Dershowitz of making false statements on behalf of Israel, and refers to Elie Wiesel as part of the "anti-Semitism circus at the UN" (p. 62). He calls out the ADL (the Anti-Defamation League) for slandering him in calling him "a known Holocaust denier". (p. 73). He charges Abraham Foxman of the ADL of attempting to censor his book for criticizing Daniel Goldhagen (p. 55), whom Finkelstein elsewhere called a "Holocaust Industry guru". (p. 79). Finally, Finkelstein believes that certain prominent Jews have actually behaved in accordance with the worst anti-Semitic caricatures of Jews: "Yet if Jews act out a Jewish stereotype, it plainly doesn't follow that they can't be committing the stereotypical act. Can't they commit a vile act even if it conforms to a Jewish stereotype?...Should people like Abraham Foxman, Edgar Bronfman, and Rabbi Israel Singer get a free ride because they resemble stereotypes straight out of *Der Sturmer*?" (p. 83). MEDIA DARLING JAN T. GROSS? Note that Jan T. Gross has gotten a great deal of media adulation for his *FEAR*, in which he alleges that postwar Poles were anxious to rid themselves of all remaining Jews out of guilt over the acquisitions of post-Jewish properties. Finkelstein demonstrates how very shoddy books (which Finkelstein compares to the latest publications of the Flat Earth Society) can even become national best sellers as a result of favorable media coverage. (p. 17). Although he does not mention Gross, Finkelstein does expose the absurdity of the bizarre arguments that Jan T. Gross has recently resurrected and placed into a Polonophobic context: "Not only Germans but all Europeans, according to Rosenbaum, were Hitler's Willing Executioners...Imposing on Jews a state apart, Europeans conspired to 'get the surviving Jews--reminders of European shame--off the continent, and leave the European peoples in possession of the property stolen from the Jews during the war.'...Before Rosenbaum came along, who would have guessed that the main impetus behind Israel's creation

wasn't Jews longing for a homeland but Europeans longing to expel them-- and to keep their stolen property, no less?" (p. 43).

-----

**In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Struggle Between Jews and Zionists in the Aftermath of World War II** Grodzinsky, Yosef 2004  
***Unmasking the Censored Fact of Zionist Jew-on-Jew Violence in the DP Camps of Postwar Germany***

Yosef Grodzinsky is (or was) Professor of Psychology at Tel Aviv University, and Professor and Canada Research Chair in Neurolinguistics at McGill University. His book has favorable mentions from Rabbi Michael Lerner, the Editor of *TIKKUN MAGAZINE*, and Avraham Burg, a member of the Knesset. (See back cover). The author covers the history of refugees and DPs after VE day. A significant fraction of the 180,000 (p. 25) individuals released from Nazi German concentration camps died within weeks of release. Grodzinsky estimates that, in the summer of 1945, some 100,000 of those released were still alive and, of these, several dozen thousands were Jews. (p. 26). I now focus on three salient themes: **THE JUDENRAT: NOT BEYOND MORAL SCRUTINY** A certain amount of politics permeates this work. The reader learns, for example, that the Revisionist Party ran a 1947 leaflet in which it stated that, "We wish to rid the committees of the shameful legacy of the JUDENRAT." (p. 154). Obviously, a significant number of Jews at the time believed that Jewish collaborators, under the Nazis at the time of the Holocaust, were still, to some extent, morally responsible for their conduct. They did not share the now-common view that Jewish-Nazi collaboration could summarily be dismissed under the rubrics of "choiceless choices", "right and wrong had ceased to exist", and "All Jews were victims of the Nazis". **AMAZING! ZIONISTS REPEAT ANTI-SEMITIC NAZI THEMES TO TRY TO SCARE JEWS OUT OF PERMANENTLY SETTLING IN POST-WWII GERMANY** Grodzinsky comments, (quote) Several thousand DPs naturalized in Germany, trying [tried] to build a future for themselves there, in many instances successfully. Of these, the Zionists did not approve. Chayim Hoffman (Yahil), who headed the Jewish Agency mission to Germany, and then became the first Israel Consul in Munich, would later mince no words upon reflecting on these: "The 20,000 DPs still in Germany today not only desecrate Israel's honor, but also put the nation as a whole in danger. As



long as a Jewish community exists in Germany, rootless and devoid of values, inherently parasitic and provocative in its practices, we are under the threat that savage anti-Semitism would once again become the main agent for a revival of a chauvinist Germany, whose venom would spread out from here throughout the Diaspora." (unquote)(pp. 115-116).

**VIOLENCE: NOT JUST SOMETHING THAT THE GOYIM DID TO THE JEWS** The standard narrative is this: Gentiles are prone to violence, while Jews are advanced ethically, and have an abhorrence to violence. Predictably, the violence of "those primitive Poles" against Jews is frequently featured, while Jew-on-Jew violence is almost always ignored. Grodzinsky is an exception to this trend. He discusses the "pogroms" of Zionists done on peaceful Jews in post-WWII Germany. At the time that the State of Israel was being founded, Zionist agents often used violence against Jews, in the DP camps of Germany and Austria, who were unwilling to be drafted to fight in Palestine. Grodzinsky (p. 199) states that the archives are replete with hundreds of documents that illustrate this organized Jew-on-Jew violence. The author adds, (quote) It was indeed "unbelievable", as an editorial in the Paris-based Bundist organ *UNSER SHTIME* (Our Voice) read, "that Jews, the standard victims of Fascism and terrorism, would be capable of the kinds of violence Zionists in the camps exercise toward their Bundist and non-Zionist political rivals." (unquote) (p. 207).

**ISRAELI CENSORSHIP: ATTEMPTS TO SUPPRESS KNOWLEDGE OF THE ZIONIST JEW-ON-JEW VIOLENCE**

Nowadays, Poles are often accused of not being willing to "face up to dark chapters of their history", to "engage in moral reckoning", or to "come to terms with the past" (regarding an assortment of Jewish accusations against Poles). Interestingly, the same charge can be turned around, and directed at prominent Israeli Jews. Yosef Grodzinsky comments, (quote) Israeli historians thus decided to be active participants in the nation-building endeavor, rather than commit to the standards and norms of their profession. This is not atypical: Controversial parts of national history receive a similar treatment in many countries. The consequence, at any rate, was that the DP affair I told here was expunged from the books, remaining unknown for long decades. Repeated allegations (mostly by Bund members) regarding violence in the DP camps in the context of the draft were denied by Zionist historians. (unquote). (p. 230).

-----

**Shared History- Divided Memory: Jews and Others in Soviet Occupied Poland, 1939-1941** Barkan, Elazar 2007 *Censorship of*

***Independent-Thinking Scholars: Norman Davies; and Now Bogdan Musial and Krzysztof Jasiewicz!***

The most important content of this book inadvertently highlights the stifling of academic freedom in academia. The censure (or worse) of historians who deviate, from the party line, on Polish-Jewish relations, exerts a dangerous chilling effect on all other independent-thinking scholars. HISTORIAN BOGDAN MUSIAL

APPARENTLY STEPS OUT OF LINE

Regardless of what exactly Polish scholar Bogdan Musial had meant, the abject hostility, towards any hint of thinking that deviates from the standard Judeocentric narrative, is evident from the following statements, of Kai Struve, about Musial and his position, "Musial stresses the support of the Soviet occupation regime among the Jews, and the comparatively better situation the Jews enjoyed when contrasted with other nationalities. Here some readers sensed anti-Semitic patterns of argumentation under the surface Musial's assertions, since this would suggest the Jews themselves bore some responsibility for the pogroms due to their own behavior." (p. 62). A scholar has committed a thoughtcrime by potentially thinking that Jews could do wrong! It always has to be everybody else's fault. PROFESSOR KRZYSZTOF

JASIEWICZ ESTEEMED IN THIS BOOK

At the time this book was published (2007), Krzysztof Jasiewicz tended to downplay the collaboration of the local Jews with the Soviet invaders of eastern Poland in 1939. For this reason, he was hailed as an authoritative and pathbreaking scholar by post-Stalinist Joanna B. Michlic in her Polonophobic screed (p. 76, 81). He was also treated favorably by Rafal Wnuk (p. 151) and Alexander Brakel (p. 242), as well as by Elazar Barkan, Elizabeth A. Cole, and Kai Struve. (pp. 29-30). PROFESSOR KRZYSZTOF JASIEWICZ

SUBSEQUENTLY PUNISHED FOR SAYING UNFLATTERING FACTS ABOUT JEWS

And then--years after this book had come out in print--Jasiewicz no longer toed the line, and he suddenly found himself a pariah. Scholar Krzysztof Jasiewicz was fired from a leadership position that he held at the Polish Academy of Sciences (2013), as a result of Jewish pressure, for now saying things not to their liking. Jasiewicz had suggested that Jews had played a major role in their own extermination by

the Nazi Germans. What he said was unremarkable. German Jew Hannah Arendt had pointed out essentially the same thing decades earlier!

Regardless of what Jasiewicz exactly said, and whether or not I agree with everything he said, one must support his right to free speech and academic freedom. Quite a few Jewish academics had made vile statements about Poles and about Christianity, and yet nobody calls for their dismissal. Away with the double standard!

GRODNO 1939: A POGROM OR A JEWISH ANTI-POLISH, PRO-SOVIET INSURRECTION? Political scientist Marek Wierzbicki comments, "Even some historians who accuse the Grodno authorities of organizing a pogrom of innocent Jews admit that armed groups of Jews and Belarussians attacked the city jail, thus beginning the fighting with the local police and the Polish army units supported by some civilians. The fact that there was still a city jail confirms that the legal authorities still existed then, so the attack was undoubtedly a move directed against the legal authority, which elicited a brutal but effective revenge." (p. 143).

JEWISH PROFITEERING, AND EXPLOITATION OF THE LOCALS, SUPPORTED BY FACTS Jewish Belarussian historian Evgenii S. Rozenblat quotes a Soviet document on the conduct of Jewish refugees at Slonim. He writes, "'In the majority of recorded cases, when refugees leave town, they hang about on the roads the entire day, catch peasants taking their products--butter, eggs, fruit, etc.--to market in town, buy up [the products] at a more reasonable price, and then carry them off to market and sell them at prices that are 2-3 times more expensive. As a consequence, products at the market have risen in price. For example, eggs from 3 rub. 50 kop./10 to 8-9 rub., meat from 6 rub. To 10-12 rub./kg, etc." (p. 217). As an attempted exculpation for this conduct, Evgenii Rozenblat points out that these Jews were refugees that were facing severe privations. But weren't the Polish and Belarussian peasants also going through hard times?

-----

### **Polish-Jewish Relations 1939-1945: Beyond the limits of solidarity**

Kurek, Ewa 2012

***Ewa Kurek: A Courageous, Censored Polish Holocaust Scholar on Jewish Topics***

Author Ewa Kurek has recently (2018 and 2019) been subject to censorship. She was disinvited to

an event because of complaints from some Jews that she does not toe the Judeocentric line on a few issues. [She never said that "Jews enjoyed themselves" because of the Holocaust: She said that Jews individually tried to live quasi-normal lives, as much as possible (including possibly enjoyable activities) during the Holocaust. Two entirely different things! But if a lie serves a political purpose, why not?] EWA KUREK: A VERY

QUALIFIED SCHOLAR To anyone who has carefully examined her works, and heard Ewa Kurek speak (I have done both), it is obvious that her level of knowledge is far above that of the usual authors on this subject. LEWAKS and Polonophobes can dismiss and name-call all they want, but the facts presented in this work remain facts nonetheless. In addition, Kurek is even-handed, and realizes that she will "get it" from both sides, "Some Jews will accuse me of anti-Semitism, and some Poles will say I slander my own nation. I just can't help it." (p. 2). She accepts the premise that Jewish criticisms of past Polish conduct may be valid (p. 108). Any notion that Kurek is "excusing" Endek conduct is patently ridiculous. About the only time she even mentions them is when she quotes Ringelblum praising repentant Endeks for sympathy towards Nazi-persecuted Jews. (pp. 369-371). POLAND DID NOT FORCE JEWS INTO GHETTOS:

NAZI GERMANY DID Certain governments in pre-Nazi Europe sporadically imposed compulsory ghettoization, which never existed in Poland until enacted by the Nazi German conquerors. However, voluntary Jewish self-segregation had existed much longer. (pp. 43-46). Jews were motivated to self-segregate partly as a defense against anti-Semitism, but primarily out of a strong preference of associating with one's own, and of avoiding Christianity. For instance, Jews stayed indoors during Corpus Christi processions, and devout Jews avoided living in homes whose windows overlooked a church. (p. 45). AN INCONVENIENT TRUTH: JEWS GENERALLY DID NOT IDENTIFY WITH POLAND Exceptions like Berek Joselewicz notwithstanding, the inescapable fact is that most erstwhile Polish Jews did not support the Polish cause while Poland was under foreign rule. This went far beyond Jews not getting the rights that they felt they were entitled to from Poland. Polish Jews always saw themselves as a displaced Chosen People forced by circumstances to perform duties to foreign causes in a foreign land, and were reluctant to shed blood for foreigners. Long before Zionism had emerged as a political movement, Jews had always given their allegiance to Zion, for whose

restoration they prayed at least once a year. (pp. 87-88). Even the term POLIN (a place of rest) implies a transitory situation, not a homeland. (p. 88). Later, for Jews, it did not matter if the rulers of Polish lands were Poles, Germans, Russians, etc.--all were equally legitimate. Prominent Jewish historian Meier Balaban called attention to the fact that Poznan-area Jews openly loved Germany. (p. 83).      JEWS, BY CHOICE, LIVED IN SELF-IMPOSED APARTHEID

Although several centuries removed from living in Germany, Poland's Jews not only clung to a modified German (Yiddish), in personal and public life, as their "native" language, but only about 15% of them spoke Polish. (pp. 143-144; p. 321: This later greatly hindered Polish rescue of Jews during the Holocaust). Jews had a sweeping hostility to the Latin alphabet as a GALKHES (Christian clerical) alphabet. (pp. 150-151). Jewish particularism went far beyond Jews being "different", and it became increasingly politicized. With the Polish state resurrected in 1918, Poland's Jews, as exemplified by Parliamentarian Yitzhak Gruenbaum, demanded Jewish autonomy to the point that "Poland" consist of separate, autonomous provinces. (pp. 96-97). Polish Socialists, no less than Endeks, categorically rejected this. (p. 96).

THE RECIPROCITY OF PREJUDICES      Pointedly, open antagonism between Jews and Christians went both ways. For instance, the Jews regularly had their PURIMSZPILEN (PURIMSHPIELS), in which the role of the evil Haman was cast as a Catholic priest (pp. 135-140)(and, in later centuries, any Christian Pole). (p. 153). Obviously, this was a chronic situation, and not merely an angry reaction by Jews undergoing active persecution.      JEWS AND THE POLITICAL LEFT

Kurek frowns upon the term Zydokomuna (Bolshevized Judaism) owing to its stereotypical connotation, but realizes that this concept goes much deeper--to the divergent conceptions of "freedom" as understood by Poles and Jews (p. 98-on), and the unmistakably Jewish (and largely non-Polish) character of the 1905 Russian Revolution. (p. 105). This was no Endek imagination. In the Polish Socialist Party, the term freedom unambiguously included the resurrection of the Polish State. To Jewish members, this issue, if not objectionable, was of little relevance to their definition of freedom. Onetime Polish Socialist colleagues Jozef Pilsudski and Maksymilian Horowitz exemplified this split, with the latter eventually becoming a full-fledged Communist. (p. 100, 103). The failure of Socialism to heal the centuries-old Polish-Jewish divide, as especially hoped by

Polish leftists, had long-term implications. It eventually led to widespread Polish (not just Endek) beliefs that the Jews were burdensome foreigners whose very presence in Poland was increasingly intolerable. (p. 108).

#### JEWS, AT FIRST, COLLABORATED WITH THE NAZIS (YES)

In the first 2.5 years of the Nazi German occupation of Poland (1939-1942), the Germans killed Poles over Jews in a 10:1 ratio. (pp. 300-301). During this time, the Jews realized their age-old wish for autonomous provinces (albeit in the form of Ghettos), as is especially obvious from quotations of the writings of Adam Czerniakow (pp. 200-201) and Emmanuel Ringelblum (pp. 206-208) of the Warsaw Ghetto. The Jewish autonomists actively financed the construction of the ghetto walls (p. 208), and Czerniakow actually believed (the German-propaganda notion) that the ghetto walls served to protect Jews from Poles! (p. 209). Jewish contacts with authoritative Poles, during this time (1939-1942), were almost nonexistent, even spurned (p. 301), and this would later have deadly consequences during the "resettlements" and plans for the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. The thesis that Jews played a major, even indispensable, role in their own destruction during the later Holocaust, as explicated by Kurek (pp. 260-262) and acknowledged by her, is nothing new. German Jew Hannah Arendt, in her *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (Penguin Classics) (see the Peczkis review), not only first brought this matter to light, but also suggested that the Germans could not have murdered anywhere near 5-6 million Jews had it not been for the active collaboration of the Judenrats and the Jewish Ghetto Police. Consistent with "Jewish autonomy", a strong spirit of Jewish cooperation with the German masters had begun almost immediately, and, according to Ringelblum, the Jewish Ghetto Police had a bad reputation among Jews even before the deportations. (p. 245). Clearly, its German-collaborative conduct does not simplistically reduce to the desperation of individuals doing anything to save their own lives, as this threat to life did not come until much later. Kurek examines the situation when Jewish Ghetto Police did dispatch fellow Jews to their deaths in order to save their own lives. She is neither condemning Jews nor evaluating which religion is "better". She is stating facts. The commandment of Kiddush ha-Shem (sanctifying the name of God), as also recognized by Jewish authors relative to the Holocaust, allows the sacrifice of some Jews in order to save the lives of other Jews. (p. 279). Kiddush ha-Shem, or a derivation thereof, also allows Jews to save their own lives even at the expense of the lives of

other Jews. (pp. 283-284). **SURVIVORSHIP OF POLAND'S JEWS DURING THE SHOAH** During the Holocaust, only a tiny fraction of Poland's 3.4 million Jews ever fled the ghettos and thus became accessible to potential Polish help. While Jan T. Gross only cites the highest figures for such escapees (in order to make the fraction of these saved by Poles as small as possible), Kurek cites a range of figures. Contrasted with the fraction of 1% of German-obeying Jews that survived the Holocaust, even the most unfavorable set of figures soundly debunks the Polonophobic notion that a Jew was in as much danger from a Pole as from a German. The notion that Poles were slow or reluctant to address the situation facing Jews is false. A translated March 1941 bulletin from the Polish Underground (written well before the Holocaust), among other orders minimizing any possible Polish-German cooperation (let alone collaboration), categorically forbids Poles from even appearing to take part in any German anti-Jewish actions. (p. 326). The notion that Polish Underground authorities equated Polish and Jewish deaths is also false. An Underground bulletin (September 1942) explicitly highlights Jews as vastly murdered special victims of the Nazis for no other reason that they are Jews. (p. 329).

-----

**Understanding Jewish Influence** MacDonald, Kevin B. 2012  
***Censored Scholar Kevin MacDonald Takes on a Very Politically-Incorrect, VERBOTEN Subject. He Also Understands Polish-Jewish Conflicts***

This book is an anthology of articles. These have subsequently been included in a larger volume: See my review, of *Cultural Insurrections: Essays on Western Civilization, Jewish Influence, and Anti-Semitism*.

**RUFFLING A FEW FEATHERS. ATTEMPTS AT CENSORSHIP OF THE AUTHOR:** In the Introduction, Dr. Samuel Francis comments, (quote) As happens to anyone who discusses Jewish influence openly and honestly, Dr. MacDonald was soon accused of (what else?) anti-Semitism, and efforts were made to end his career, prevent him from publishing, and smear him as a scholar and a person. So far these efforts have been unsuccessful. (unquote). (p. 5). At least Kevin MacDonald is in good company. Francis continues, (quote) But of course,

as with many others who have discussed (or tried to discuss or even to mention) the question of Jewish influence frankly: Pat Buchanan, Joe Sobran, Congressman Paul Findlay or James Moran, and, more recently, Gen. Anthony Zinni, Senator Ernest Hollings, or Ralph Nader's "any effort to argue against the charge is fruitless. The accusation of anti-Semitism, much like those of racism, xenophobia, sexism, homophobia, etc., is essentially a power trip, an effort to avoid and destroy discussion of substantive issues and deflect it onto an ad hominem level that is impossible to deny or defend against. How do you "prove that you're not" whatever bad name you have just been called? (unquote). (p. 6).

"BUT JEWS ARE DIVIDED. SO HOW CAN THEY POSSIBLY BE INFLUENTIAL?" MacDonald retorts, (quote) The American Jewish community is well organized and lavishly funded. It has achieved a great deal of power, and it has been successful in achieving its interests. One of the great myths often promulgated by Jewish apologists is that Jews have no consensus and therefore cannot wield any real power. Yet there is in fact a great deal of consensus on broad Jewish issues, particularly in the areas of Israel and the welfare of other foreign Jewries, immigration and refugee policy, church-state separation, abortion rights, and civil liberties. Massive changes in public policies on these issues, beginning with the countercultural revolution of the 1960s, coincide with the period of increasing Jewish power and influence in the United States. Indeed, one is hard-pressed to find any significant area where public policy conflicts with the attitudes of mainstream Jewish organizations. (unquote). (p. 33).

[Consider Jewish "division" on another matter. What does it matter if there is a range of opinion, among American Jews, about Poles and Poland, when the Poland-fair and Polonophile Jews have no influence, and it is the Polonophobe Jews that are the ones "holding the microphone" in academia, media, and the entertainment industry?]

"BUT JEWS RARELY FORM A MAJORITY OF PEOPLE IN INFLUENTIAL POSITIONS"

MacDonald should have begun by pointing out that there is nothing incongruous about a tiny group of elitists ruling over vast numbers of people. Think of the relatively tiny group of Britons that once had ruled over the vast population of colonial India. It is a mistake to think of Jewish influence solely as a "grocery list" of Jews in high positions. One must also consider how Jews set the tone for movements and endeavors in which they are prominent, even if they never become a numerical majority



in these movements. In other words [using my terms, not MacDonald's], Jews do not just become a large part of the landscape: They TRANSFORM the landscape. Consider Communism at about the time of the Russian Revolution (1917). We are told that at no time did Jews comprise the majority of the leaders in Communism. However, MacDonald cites a Jewish author, Albert Lindemann, who described non-Jews in the Bolshevik revolution as "Jewified non-Jews". (p. 69). See my review of Lindemann's *ESAU'S TEARS*. [Now consider a more recent example: *GAZETA WYBORCZA*, Poland's leading newspaper, and a leftist one. We are told that Jews in Poland cannot possibly be influential because there are so few of them in Poland. Think again. The head of *GAZETA WYBORCZA* is Adam Michnik vel Szechter, and a significant number of its editorial staff is Jewish. Even if Jews are not the majority of its editorial staff, there are sufficient numbers of them to set the tone for the paper, and to attract like-minded gentile Poles to be on its staff. Besides, *GAZETA WYBORCZA* is funded by the wealthy internationalist George Soros. *GAZETA WYBORCZA* frequently runs cynical articles that besmirch Poland's religious and patriotic traditions. No wonder that some Poles have called it the "Kosher Times".] INFLUENTIAL JEWS DO NOT STAND ALONE: THEY CULTIVATE LIKE-MINDED GENTILES There is more. As discussed in his *CULTURE OF CRITIQUE* [see my review], MacDonald expands on the theme of Jews effectively recruiting like-minded gentiles to help promote their agendas. This is, in part, because influential Jews are relatively few in number, and in part to lessen the Jewish visibility in Jewish-supported initiatives. As MacDonald sagely comments, "This of course lessens the perception that the movement is indeed a Jewish movement, and it makes excellent psychological sense to have the spokespersons for any movement resemble the people they are trying to convince". (pp. 69-70). By contrast, Jews disparage those influential gentiles that are inconvenient to them. (pp. 73-74). [Another example of the foregoing modus operandi is provided by the relatively-new Holocaust establishment in Poland. Jews had befriended, supported, and financed those Polish scholars that willingly cooperate with Jewish attacks on Poland. That way, Jews can triumphantly say, for example, "See, these pathbreaking Polish scholars have now admitted Polish culpability for Jedwabne!" In contrast, Jews have ignored those Polish scholars who disagree with them, making them Orwellian unpersons. Either that, or they

have tried to delegitimize non-Judeocompliant Polish scholars by labelling them (what else) "anti-Semites", "nationalists", "unqualified" or some other smelly species.] WHY THE *New York Times* HAS SO

CONSISTENTLY BEEN ANTI-POLISH Author MacDonald provides a clue to this, (quote) As is well known, the *NEW YORK TIMES* is Jewish-owned and has often been accused of slanting its coverage on issues of importance to Jews. It is perhaps another example of the legacy of Jacob Schiff, the Jewish activist/philanthropist who backed Adolph Ochs's purchase of the *NEW YORK TIMES* in 1896 because he believe he "could be of great service to the Jews generally." (unquote). (pp. 72-73).

GOING BACK IN HISTORY: THE ECONOMIC CAUSES OF POLISH ANTI-SEMITISM Kevin MacDonald touches on the long history of Polish-Jewish hostilities. They were caused by economic rivalry and the Jewish economic hegemony over Poland. This hegemony did not arise simply by Jews 'working hard', but by the following, 'The origins of Zionism and other manifestations of the intense Jewish dynamism of the twentieth century lie in the Yiddish-speaking world of Eastern Europe in the early nineteenth century. Originally invited in by the nobles as estate managers, toll farmers, bankers, and moneylenders, Jews in Poland expanded into commerce and then into artisanry, so that there came to be competition between Jews and non-Jewish butchers, bakers, blacksmiths, shoemakers, and tailors. This produced the typical resource-based anti-Jewish attitudes and behavior so common throughout Jewish history. Despite periodic restrictions and outbursts of hostility, Jews came to dominate the economy apart from agricultural labor and the nobility. JEWS HAD AN ADVANTAGE IN THE COMPETITION IN TRADE AND ARTISANRY BECAUSE THEY WERE ABLE TO CONTROL THE TRADE IN RAW MATERIALS AND SELL AT LOWER PRICES TO COETHNICS.'

Emphasis added). (p. 41). [For a Jewish perspective on how Jews were able to use their extensive friend- and family-networks to defeat nascent Polish business competitors, and thus to maintain their economic privileges, see my review of: *Polin, Volume Seventeen - The Shtetl: Myth and Reality* (Studies in Polish Jewry)].

-----

**Rzeczywistosc sowiecka 1939-1941 w swiadcztwach polskich zydw**

Jasiewicz, Krzysztof

2009

***A Courageous, Censored***

***Polish Scholar Examines the Forbidden Subject of Jewish-Soviet Collaboration in 1939 Eastern Poland***

THE SOVIET REALITY

1939-1941 ACCORDING TO THE TESTIMONIES OF POLISH JEWS, is the title of this Polish-language scholarly work. The bulk of the content of this book consists of the testimonies of those of Poland's Jews that had been deported to Russia in 1939-1941, alongside the larger numbers of ethnic Poles. Some of the cited testimonies are of ethnic Poles.

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR** The author is better-known as a person than for his books. In this book (p. 113), he called attention to the indiscriminate use of the charge of anti-Semitism to obstruct inquiry that might lead to valid criticism of Jewish conduct. (p. 113). This concern proved more than prophetic. Years after writing this book, Krzysztof Jasiewicz was fired from a position that he held at the Polish Academy of Sciences, as a result of Jewish pressure, for saying things that they did not like. Jasiewicz had suggested that Jews had played a major role in their own extermination by the Nazi Germans. What he said was unremarkable. German Jew Hannah Arendt had said essentially the same thing decades earlier. See: *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (Penguin Classics). [Regardless of what Jasiewicz exactly said, and whether or not I agree with everything he said, I support his right to free speech and academic freedom. Let us also have no double standards. Quite a few Jewish academics had made vile statements about Poles and about Christianity, and yet nobody calls for their dismissal.]

**EXPLODING THE "JEWS (THEN) FEARED NAZIS" EXCULPATION FOR THE ZYDOKOMUNA**

One commonly-repeated excuse, for some Jews siding with the Soviets during the 1939 war, was their gratitude for not having fallen into the hands of the Nazis. As elaborated in the next section of this review, the Jewish-Soviet collaboration went far beyond presumed gratitude, and partook of clear-cut and active enmity towards Poles and Poland. In addition, it turns out, the Jews were not, in 1939, particularly afraid of the Nazis. This is proved by the fact that, according to very numerous Jewish reports, Polish Jews in the USSR wanted to return

to German-held Poland! (e. g, p. 135, 137, 144, 249, 285). Nor was this limited to those Jews who had families to return to in German-occupied Poland. (p. 256). Furthermore, according to some reports (e. g., p. 155, 198, 209), the impending Jewish return to Nazi-held territories took on a mass character. Of course, these Jews had no idea that the Nazis would conduct the Holocaust, as this was still in the future. (pp. 358-359).

Although not mentioned, historian Jerzy Robert Nowak had pointed out that Jews who tried to return to German-ruled Poland were often arrested by the Soviet authorities, and dispatched to Siberia. This is confirmed by the Jewish testimonies of Maurycy Karawan (p. 253) and Chaim Piekarczyk. (pp. 317-318).

THE 1939 JEWISH-SOVIET COLLABORATION AGAINST POLES AND POLAND Jasiewicz cites numerous, archived eyewitness accounts. (pp. 86-on). Far from making generalized and stereotyped anti-Semitic statements about Jews, as misrepresented by post-Stalinist Jan T. Gross, these eyewitnesses are very specific about the Jewish crimes. Nor is it true that Jewish supporters of Communism were necessarily limited to the desperately poor or to the scum of Jewish society. At Bialystok, according to eyewitness Marcin Czerniawski, the Jews greeting the Soviets included the well-off and the well-dressed. (p. 87). Pointedly, Jewish-Soviet collaboration was hardly limited to warm greetings to Poland's enemies, and verbal denunciations of Poland. Local Jews who collaborated with the Soviet invaders helped them disarm Polish soldiers, as at Grajewo (p. 40) and Wilno [Vilnius]. (p. 99). At the latter, the Jewish collaborators added insult to injury by ripping off the insignia of the disarmed Polish soldiers and stomping on it. At some locations (as at Lapa), the Jewish militia beat Poles with billy clubs just for speaking Polish. (p. 90). Nor was Jewish-Soviet collaboration some sort of emotional reaction, or one-time act. In many named towns of the Kresy (eastern Poland), local Jewish collaborators formed the nucleus of the ongoing Soviet-serving militia, whose job it was to arrest Poles, confiscate their property, and not rarely to murder them. (e. g., pp. 88-on). In some places, the Jews volunteered for this service, and, at others, they were recruited by the Soviet occupants. (p. 89). At some locations, such as at Lwow, Zolkiew, Bialystok, Lomza, and Lapa, the Soviet-serving militia was mostly Jewish in composition. (pp. 90-92, 99). Unlike Jan T. Gross' implied insinuation that Poles are somehow just imagining things, Jewish eyewitnesses ALSO testify to the fact of extensive Jewish participation in the Soviet-sponsored

militia. (e. g, p. 120, 227, 283). Leopold Spira confirms the fact that, in the large city of Lwow (Lviv), the majority of the militia functionaries were Jews. (p. 338). An assortment of Jewish collaborators helped the Soviets in various other ways. Many Polish eyewitnesses report visits, from the dreaded NKVD, in which specific local Jews were among the visitors. (pp. 98-on). Krzysztof Jasiewicz concludes that it does not matter if the Jewish-Soviet collaborators were relatively few in number. Jews did their treasonous acts willingly, and the power and positions of these Jews enabled them to do great harm to Poles. (p. 93). A

#### PROVOCATION OF THE LATER 1941 JEDWABNE MASSACRE

Eyewitness Tadeusz Nitkiewicz, a pharmacist-assistant from Wizna [Lomza area] described the conduct of the Jews, (quote) Even before the arrival of the Red Army, the local Jews [of Wizna] formed a Revolutionary Committee. Upon the entry of the Red Army, the Jews greeted them, and wreaked horrible cruelties upon our soldiers and upon our civilian population. (unquote). (p. 92). As for Lomza itself, eyewitness Jan Lipinski, a farmer, writes, (quote) The Jews, even before the arrival of the Red Army, assumed rule over the town, created their own militia, took over all the government positions, and displayed overt enmity towards the Polish population. (unquote). (p. 92). JEWISH LIFE IN THE USSR

There are a number of themes that appear frequently in the quoted Jewish testimonies. One is the fact that the Russian authorities had abolished specifically Jewish schools, not only the religious ones such as the yeshivas and the Talmud Torahs, but also secular ones, such as the Zionist Tarbut and the Bundist Tsysho. There were a number of "Jewish" schools that did exist, but they were Soviet in content and Jewish only in terms of those who attended them. In general, Soviet Jews had been pressured to give up their distinctiveness, and to assimilate completely. In fact, the testimonies repeatedly refer to the fact that, especially the younger Soviet Jews had, already by then (early 1940's), virtually no ties to Judaism. [This is ironic in a way. It has seriously been argued that Jewish Communists were not Jews because they did not practice anything specifically Judaic. The reductio ad absurdum of this argument is that, if true, it would also mean that the Soviet Jews, as a whole, were not Jews either!] As a further irony to the rather silly "Jewish Communists were not really Jews" exculpation, some Soviet Jews testified that they, and many other Soviet Jews, did in fact practice Jewish rites--but in secret, while

functioning as Communists in their public lives. (pp. 63-65). Now consider Communist “egalitarianism”. Perhaps the sagest comment, about life in the USSR, was made by the Polish Jew, Jozef Blumenstrauch. (p. 150). He noted the irony of Communist claims that everyone is equal in the Soviet Union, and that Jews are equal to everyone else. Everyone is equal all right--in exile, in prisons, in work camps, and in the state of hunger and servitude toward the ruling Red elite, which consists of thieves. FEW

JEWISH VICTIMS OF THE KATYN MASSACRE Author Jasiewicz

cites the 1995 work, *KATYN. DOKUMENTY ZBRODNI...JENCY NIE WYPOWIEDZIANEJ WOJNY* (p. 446, pp. 451-452), for the following information: There were 14,466 Polish POWs incarcerated at Kozielsk, Ostaszkow, and Starobielsk. Of these, 160 were Jews. (pp. 109-110). This comes out to 1.1%. The foregoing figure is much smaller than that of some other authors, who had placed the Jewish share of those murdered at Katyn at as much as 15%!

RECYCLED COMMUNIST  
PROPAGANDA IN MODERN HOLOCAUST-RELATED DISCOURSE

Polish Jew Dawid Cynberg (pp. 156-157) describes Stalinist anti-Polish propaganda, in which Poles were accused of torturing and killing Jews, and of Polish officers throwing Jews off trains and shooting at Jews in the streets. [Evidently, this propaganda has nowadays become recycled by the aptly-named neo-Stalinists, notably Jan T. Gross and the media that gives him uncritical coverage.] THE BOGEYMAN OF BEREZA

KARTUSKA Some Polonophobes have tried to relativize the prewar Polish internment camp at Bereza Kartuska with the Nazi and Soviet concentration camps. Against such nonsense, Dawid Halpern mentions a fellow Jew who had once been incarcerated at Bereza Kartuska, and now declared how good he had it then compared with his experiences in the Soviet camps. (p. 229). THE MORTALITY OF GULAGS COULD

MATCH THAT OF THE NAZI DEATH CAMPS The death rate at Soviet camps was high. At Sucho-Bezwodnoje [Suchobiezwodnoje], 30% of the prisoners died within a matter of a few months (August-November 1940). (p. 233). At another, unidentified camp, the temperature dropped to 70 degrees below zero Centigrade in winter, and half the prisoners died from exhaustion and various illnesses. (p. 324). Finally, the forest (lumber?) camps were in a class by themselves. No one assigned to a forest work camp emerged alive! (p. 364). BLAMING POLES REGARDING JEWS-

-AGAIN Accusations have sometimes been leveled against the

freed deported Poles not wanting the Jews to leave with them. This is untrue. In fact, it was the Soviets that hindered the Jews joining General Anders' Army, and leaving the USSR after the 1941 "amnesty". (p. 357, 369-370).

-----

**The Shame of Polish Historical Studies in America: The Blacklisting of Prof. Marek Jan Chodakiewicz** Bojemski, Sebastian 2010

***The Censorship of Historian Marek Jan Chodakiewicz in Academia--All Because He Dissents From the Prevailing Standard Narrative on Polish-Jewish Relations***

The following is from an authorized English-language version of the following scholarly article: "**O polskich studiach historycznych w Stanach Zjednoczonych przypadek prof. Marka Jana Chodakiewicza**", by historian John Radzilowski. It is published in the GLAUKOPIS historical monograph (Number 19/20, 2010, pp. 278-285). By way of introduction, censorship does not have to be narrowly limited to the government criminalization of unwelcome viewpoints. Censorship can also occur in academia whenever there is a deliberate obstruction of the free exchange of ideas. After all, the freedom of expression and freedom to express ideas is the very essence of what academia is supposed to be all about!

**A SUMMARY OF THE GROSS INJUSTICE TO THE INDEPENDENT-THINKING HISTORIAN CHODAKIEWICZ** Historian Jan Radzilowski writes, "Nevertheless, there appear from time to time cases of academic abuse so egregious that they violate even the most basic sense of fairness and decency. Into this category we must place the case of Prof. Marek Jan Chodakiewicz, a younger, productive scholar of modern Polish history who has been the victim of a systematic effort to destroy his career, deny him the ability to publish in his field, get him banned from conferences and speaking engagements at public institutions, and blacken his reputation all with the apparent goal of denying him the ability to operate as a scholar in his field. This effort has been conducted by colleagues in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, as well as political opponents in his native Poland." **THE SLANDER OF HISTORIAN MAREK JAN CHODAKIEWICZ** Historian Radzilowski discusses the extreme

measures used by the detractors, "However, the basic claims made by these reviews are that Prof. Chodakiewicz is a blind apologist for 'Polish crimes' and for extreme 'ethno-nationalism,' that he excuses or even favors the murder of Jews, and that he does so by claiming that Jews are responsible for communism in Poland. From this, Prof. Chodakiewicz's attackers are able to suggest or even claim that he is an anti-Semite. Each of these claims is demonstrably false and in some cases are even deployed against books in which Prof. Chodakiewicz argues PRECISELY THE OPPOSITE from what is claimed as his position." (Emphasis added).

THE SPLC (SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER) GETS IN THE ACT After describing various specifics about university professors trying to get Chodakiewicz removed from positions, Radzilowski puts icing on the cake as he writes, "More recently, Prof. Chodakiewicz has been personally attacked by Prof. Gross and by Prof. Piotr Wrobel. This occurred on the website of a far-left wing American organization, the Southern Law and Poverty Center. Prof. Wrobel's remarks are particularly bizarre. While admitting that Prof. Chodakiewicz has never done or said anything anti-Semitic, he states 'There is no doubt whatsoever that he doesn't like the Jews.' This amounts to nothing other than character assassination of the lowest and most unethical sort." Yeah, no kidding. But who cares? At the time of the writing of this review (November 2019), the attack on Chodakiewicz is still present on the SPLC website:

<https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2009/historian-marek-jan-chodakiewicz-controversial-views-serves-holocaust-museum-board>. In addition, the informed reader realizes that, just as in the SPLC hatchet job above, radical-leftist and onetime anarchist Rafal Pankowski continues to be widely quoted, in academia and media, as some kind of pontifical authority figure on Poland, especially on the subject of Polish "hate".

ENFORCING ACADEMICS' CONFORMITY TO THE LEWACTWO Professor Radzilowski continues, "Research in modern Polish history, especially in English-speaking countries, has become dominated by a neo-Stalinist school of historiography. Historians in this school are usually but not exclusively left-of-center. They emphasize Polish history of the past 100 years as largely an exercise in nationalist extremism and anti-Semitism. They claim with varying degrees of emphasis that Poles were collaborators with the Nazi occupation of their own country, complicit in or highly sympathetic to the extermination of the Jews, and downplay or



ignore periods of Soviet occupation. The neo-Stalinist approach is heavily influenced by post-modernism and most neo-Stalinists view scholarship instrumentally. In other words, the goal of scholarship is to change present-day Polish society which they view as largely backward and excessively Catholic. The most important neo-Stalinist scholar is Prof. Jan T. Gross whose previous two books have been highly praised by sympathetic reviewers for forcing the type of change in cultural and social discourse in and about Poland that they view as desirable."

THE JUDEOCENTRIC-UNWELCOME TRUTH ABOUT POLAND IS WHAT IS ULTIMATELY BEING CENSORED

Radzilowski hits the nail right on the head as he assesses the real motive behind the censorship of Professor Chodakiewicz, "First all, the concerted attack on Prof.

Chodakiewicz represents more than just an assault on one individual but a frontal assault on clear, accurate and disinterested research and writing on history of Poland in the English-speaking world." Such censorship, as intended, exerts an obvious chilling effect on any scholar, of any nationality, who deviates from the party line on the ever-innocent Jewish victim and the ever-villainous Catholic Pole. On the other hand, a Pole is "good" whenever he agrees with the standard Judeocentric and left-wing lines on Poles and Poland. This is part of the usual PEDAGOGIKA WSTYDU (name and shame).

ORWELLIAN LABELING AND DELEGITIMIZATION OF SCHOLARS WHO DISSENT FROM THE RULING NARRATIVE ON POLISH-JEWISH RELATIONS

The perceptive criticisms, by Professor Jan Radzilowski, can very much be extended, "Objections or criticisms of Gross' works are viewed as 'ethno-nationalist apologetics and critics are written off as anti-Semites." Surprise. Surprise. The injustices faced by historian Marek Jan Chodakiewicz can be extended. Anyone familiar with academia today is aware of the fact that Polish scholars who dissent from the standard narrative are summarily dismissed as "nationalists". [If so, then why don't the scholars on the other side candidly identify themselves as cultural Marxists, LEWAKS, or Judeo-compliant?]

PROFESSOR JAN RADZILOWSKI HIMSELF FEARED CENSORSHIP, OR WORSE, FOR SPEAKING OUT

Why now? Radzilowski explains, "Since I have known about and personally witnessed aspects of this blacklisting campaign for some time, it may be fairly charged that I should have presented these facts to the public much earlier. I admit that my prior status

as an adjunct professor with a family to support played a role in not speaking out earlier."

-----

**German Intellectuals and the Nazi Past**      Moses, A. Dirk      2007

***Censorship of Scholar Martin Hohmann For Questioning the Party Line on Jewish Innocence, and for Violating the Taboo on Stating the Equality of Nazi and Communist Crimes. (Double Genocide. Red=Brown. Soviet=Nazi). Polokaust Ignored in German "Repentance"***

The Nazi German extermination of 5-6 million Jews is fact. Its self-evident special status is not. That is what I emphasize in my review.      CENSORSHIP: MARTIN HOHMANN FIRED FOR TELLING THE TRUTH ABOUT THE JEWISH LEADERSHIP IN SOVIET

COMMUNISM (ZYDOKOMUNA)      A. Dirk Moses editorializes about this free-speech-chilling incident, as he writes, "Four years later, Hohmann was expelled from his party for an anti-Semitic speech accusing Jews of being (also) a perpetrator people. Most voters and supporters of the Christian Democrats, however, did not regard the speech as anti-Semitic." (pp. 23-24). Evidently, the latter had more common sense than those who fired Martin Hoffmann merely for speaking his mind and for bringing politically-incorrect facts to light.      AND DON'T YOU DARE COMPARE NAZISM TO COMMUNISM

The author dismisses the works of historian Ernst Nolte with the following rather flippant remarks," During the 1970s and 1980s, he [Nolte] advocated the historicization of the Holocaust through a strategy of spurious comparisons with other genocidal experiences." (p. 253). However, Holocaust preeminence aside, author Moses does not explain why such a comparison is imagined to be spurious. On a related VERBOTEN topic, the Social Democratic historian Heinrich August Winkler said that the time had come to end the taboo on associating communism and fascism. (p. 242). Yeah, no kidding!      ONLY THE JEWS ARE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED AS VICTIMS OF NAZI GERMANY

This work focuses on how Germans accept collective responsibility for the Holocaust (e. g, pp. 268-269), but there is no consideration of how Germans should accept collective responsibility for German crimes against other peoples (e. g, for the Polokaust). In addition, this works ignores the strong opposite tendency--of the de-Germanization of the Nazis and other forms of German guilt diffusion. Thus, the title of this book is a bit

misleading. It is less about a "Nazi past" as it is a one-sided German intellectuals' rumination over past German crimes against Jews--as if the Holocaust was the ONLY crime that Germans ever committed. In fact, this work is scrupulously sanitized of any mention of the genocidal German crimes against Poles. Check the index: "Poles" and "Poland" do not appear even once! Note also that this is a regressive step: For some time after WWII, German leaders used to apologize to Poles for Nazi German crimes. But now there is a healthy dose of the mystification of the Holocaust. For instance, we hear of it as "the absolute moral abomination, a denial of all things civilized without precedent or parallel" (p. 24), the "sacralization process" of Jewish deaths" (p. 243), and "the foundational event of suffering" (p. 271). Needless to say, we never hear such grandiose words spoken about the genocides of any other peoples! Much of this work also features the standard Holocaustspeak. For instance, we hear for the umpteenth time about "Coming to terms with the past" (p. 269), which Jews are never asked to do for their crimes--to the contrary (see below).

**THE POLITICS OF VICTIMHOOD: HOLOCAUST SUPREMACISM GOVERNS GERMAN THINKING**

Author A. Dirk Moses comments, "...agreeing with Western intellectuals that the Holocaust was a singular or unique event, above all in relation to Stalinist crimes. In other words, with the backing of American, English, and Israeli historians, these non-German German intellectuals were able to render the Holocaust an internationally-recognized stigma. They became managers of this stigma by excoriating anyone who doubted the Holocaust's uniqueness." (p. 220). The author continues, "Left-liberals asserted that Germany's 'Western,' liberal political culture was inextricably tied to its consciousness of responsibility for Auschwitz. To diminish this memory or to relativize the singularity of the Holocaust threatened this painfully won political 'normality' of the 1980s. Conservatives retorted that the memory had become a dogma and a taboo that amounted to destructive collective obsession with guilt and that prevented the development of a 'normal' national identity like that of the 'Western' powers." (pp. 221-222).

-----

**God's Playground: A History of Poland, Vol. 1: The Origins to 1795**

Davies, Norman

1981

***Norman Davies--Noted British Professor--Denied Tenure at Stanford University Because of His***

***Objectivity on Polish-Jewish Events*** This book, now dated, is most remembered not for its content but for the shabby breach of academic freedom that surrounded it. But what exactly did historian Norman Davies say about the Jews that so excited the Jewish faculty members at Stanford University? The following [except the section titles in CAPS] are direct quotes. NORMAN DAVIES ON THE BOGUS 1918-ERA MASSIVE

POGROMS IN POLAND Press reports in the West of 'Pogroms in Poland', though accepted by Jewish commentators, were repeatedly discredited by the investigations of independent British and American observers. (p. 262).

NORMAN DAVIES: CONFLICTS BETWEEN NATIONALITIES IN POLAND MUST BE PLACED IN PROPER CONTEXT

The fires of Polish nationalism were fuelled by the fact that the ethnic minorities were so large. According to the linguistic criteria of the 1931 census, the Poles formed only 68.9 percent of the total population. The Ukrainians with 13.9 percent, the Yiddish-speaking Jews with 8.7 percent, the Byelorussians with 3.1 percent, and the Germans with 2.3 percent, made up nearly one-third of the whole. (p. 404).

NORMAN DAVIES: DO NOT RELATIVIZE POLISH CONDUCT WITH THAT OF OTHER NATIONS AT THE TIME

If there was hardship and injustice in Poland, there was no starvation or mass killing as in Russia, no resort to the bestial methods of Fascism or Stalinism. For example, to compare the rigors of the Polish internment camp at Bereza Kartuska (where seventeen persons are thought to have died) with the Stalinist purges which killed tens of millions, or to hint that the discomforts of the Jews under Polish rule were in some way related to the horrors of Auschwitz, is absurd. (p. 426).

NORMAN DAVIES: DO NOT ENLIST POLAND IN THE ROLE OF "PRACTICE HOLOCAUST" IN ANTICIPATION OF THE GERMANS

In view of the Holocaust of the Second World War, it is all too easy to be wise after the event, and to suggest that the tribulations of 1918-1939 were a preamble to the ensuing tragedy. (p. 260). By 1939, no satisfactory solution to the deteriorating problem had been found; and the future was indeed bleak. But historians who glibly state that 'the writing was on the wall', or that the Polish Jews were standing 'on the edge of destruction', or who quote a Warsaw rabbi to the effect that 'We were waiting for death', are mouthing a very partial view of Polish affairs. As Isaac Cohen, of the Anglo-Jewish Association pointed out, Jews who imagined they were maltreated in Poland did not have long to wait for conditions which made Poland look

like paradise; and as Sir Horace Rumbold, British ambassador in Poland was quick to stress: 'It is of very little service to the Jews to single out for criticism and retribution the one country where they have probably suffered least.' (p. 263).

NORMAN DAVIES: WHY THE "INACTION" OF THE POLISH UNDERGROUND, ON BEHALF OF JEWS The Polish Underground failed to oppose not only the actions against the Jews, but equally, until 1943, all the executions and mass deportations of Polish civilians. In the earlier years of the war, it was simply too weak and too disorganized to attempt anything other than local diversions. With the one exception of the Ghetto in Lodz, which survived till August 1944, the Final Solution was all but complete by the time the Underground was strong enough to take action. (p. 265).

NORMAN DAVIES: FACTS ON THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS IN 1968 The crisis of 1968 was thus the result of accumulated failures. It was foreshadowed in the previous summer when a group of Polish officials and Army officers had reacted to the Israeli victory in the June War by celebrating the triumph of 'OUR Jews over THEIR Arabs'. By this act, a link was forged between political dissidence and pro-Israeli (and anti-Soviet) sympathies. The point was not lost on General Moczar who saw the prospect of denouncing his rivals as subversive 'Zionists'. (p. 588).-----End of direct quotations

THE JANUARY 1863 INSURRECTION One item of particularly lasting interest, in this book, is a detailed map of the main battles, along with hundreds of locations of guerrilla combat. (p. 355). Although most of the combat occurred in Russian-occupied Congress Poland, a substantial fraction of it occurred in the Kresy (and not only in Lithuania).

ADDENDUM: OBJECTIVITY IN ACADEMIA, ON POLISH-JEWISH MATTERS, IS A SHAM. THE CHILLING EFFECT, OWING TO PROFESSORS BEING DENIED TENURE OVER IDEOLOGICAL NONCONFORMISM, IS OBVIOUS: ANY PROFESSOR BETTER NOT SEEM TOO CONGENIAL TO POLAND! [Smith, Burke. 1988.

Davies Case Exposes Tenure Process to Public Scrutiny. *THE STANFORD DAILY* 199(25), p. 2. (March 9, 1988)]. Direct Quotes: "Although Stanford recently won the legal battle waged by former Visiting Prof. Norman Davies against the University, many leading historians agree that the History Department mistakenly denied tenure to a scholar considered the world's leading historian on Poland." "According to Davies, the political controversy stemmed from claims by Jewish members of the

department that his work was insensitive to the plight of the Polish Jewry during World War II." "...Zbigniew Brzezinski...Other Davies supporters include noted MIT political scientist and linguist Noam Chomsky; Aloysius Mazewski, president of the Polish National Alliance of the United States; Antony Polonsky, prominent Jewish historian of Poland; and Israel Shahak, chair of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights." "Critics of 'God's Playground,' however, call it 'uncritical,' 'advocatory' or 'non-explanatory'--all terms which imply that the work is unscholarly." [CODE WORDS FOR WORKS THAT DEVIATE FROM THE STANDARD NARRATIVE.]

"Although Davies' reputation appears to contradict the History Department's decision, it is difficult to uncover reasons for his rejection." [BECAUSE THEY ARE BOGUS.] "...observers agree that it was the closest, most acrimonious tenure decision of recent years. Sheehan characterizes the decision as an honest appraisal of Davies' total scholarship, but Davies' court complaint quotes History Prof. Lewis Spitz as calling the 'Jewish issue' the reason for the decision." "Though University Provost James Rosse claimed that the faculty did not focus solely on the controversial chapter, Slavic Studies Prof. Richard Schupbach confirmed in memo that all criticisms at the meeting were in fact 'directed specifically at [Davies' treatment of Polish- Jewish relations].'"

[Abraham, Matthew. 2011. The Question of Palestine and the Subversion of Academic Freedom: DePaul's Denial of Tenure to Norman G. Finkelstein. ARAB STUDIES QUARTERLY 33(3/4)179-203.] "Upon the publication of *THE HOLOCAUST INDUSTRY*, Finkelstein promptly lost his long-term instructor position of political science at Hunter College, City University of New York. Despite possessing an outstanding teaching record and three internationally recognized books to his credit at that time, he was let go under the pretext of a budgetary cut within the political science department." (pp. 193-194). "Despite the sound and the fury around his tenure denial, Finkelstein ultimately praised DePaul University upon reflecting on the unique set of pressures that eventuated in his unjust dismissal: 'For the record, I did not begrudge DePaul's decision to deny me tenure. It has always been my belief that no one except me should have to bear the costs of my political convictions. The sustained pressures exerted on a middle-tier Catholic institution vulnerable to charges of anti-Semitism would probably have proven intolerable.'" (p. 180). "Since Finkelstein's compelling indictments of American Zionism in books such as *THE IMAGE*

*AND REALITY OF THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT, THE HOLOCAUST INDUSTRY: THE EXPLOITATION OF JEWISH SUFFERING*, and *BEYOND CHUTZPAH: THE MISUSE OF ANTI-SEMITISM AND THE ABUSE OF HISTORY* could not be rebutted by serious counterarguments, his ideological nemeses resorted to attacking Finkelstein's tone, writing style, and personality, effectively shifting the terms of the debate from the Israel-Palestine conflict to issues of civility and behavior." (p. 191).

-----

**Did the Children Cry: Hitler's War Against Jewish and Polish Children, 1939-45** Lukas, Richard C. 1994 *Holocaust Supremacism in Its Most Overt, Racist Form: An Attempted-Censored Book Because It Dared to Compare the Sufferings of Polish Children With That of Jewish Children*

This book is known less for its content than for the controversy that has surrounded it. Nominated for the Janusz Korczak Literary Award, it was subsequently beset with a flurry of Jewish protests. After a spate of bad publicity, and the threat of legal action from Poles, the award was belatedly presented--but without any ceremony.

**HOLOCAUST SUPREMACISM IS ALIVE AND WELL** Let us examine the contrived fuss surrounding the Janusz Korczak Literary Award. The reader can clearly see that this book does not fit with the template of modern thinking--where the genocide of Jews is given disproportionate attention, is accorded a special term (Holocaust), and any attempt to compare it with any other genocidal event is called "relativizing the Holocaust." In contrast to all of this, Lukas consistently juxtaposes the experiences of Polish and Jewish children. Perhaps that is what motivated the outburst of hostility to this book. So long as Jewish sufferings are thought to be higher than those of others, or at least more worthy of public attention than those of others, specifically the Poles, any such juxtaposition will be unbearable, especially for a book that is to receive any special recognition.

**THIS BOOK VALUES THE SUFFERINGS OF POLISH CHILDREN AS WELL AS JEWISH CHILDREN** Throughout this book, Lukas consistently relates the experiences of Polish and Jewish children to each other. Both, for instance, experienced the horror of the German

conquest of Poland. Both experienced a breakdown of morality caused by the privations of the German occupation. Both learned how to lie and steal to survive. Both quickly learned not to trust anybody. Both were in German concentration camps. Both were used in sadistic experiments conducted by Dr. Mengele. Both experienced sexual assaults (including homosexual assaults) by German guards and officials (pp. 95-96, 202). Both were sent to secret schools in their respective communities. Both took part in clandestine cultural activities. Both enjoyed the childrens' books written by Polish Jew Janusz Korczak. Both held odd jobs to help their parents. Both were forced to work in Germany as forced laborers under appalling conditions. Both were involved in the rescue of their compatriots. Both served in their respective guerilla movements. Both had to watch their parents die, and both experienced death at the hands of the Germans in large numbers. Both were commonly left orphaned. Both experienced difficulties in locating still-surviving relatives (with postwar Germans commonly resisting attempts to identify kidnapped Polish children: pp. 211-214). Finally, both experienced adjustment problems after the war. For example, both Polish and Jewish children commonly internalized the German hatred directed against their respective nationalities, scorning their respective heritages, and sometimes actually believing that their nationalities had deserved their sufferings.

#### FRIVILIOUS JEWISH ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THIS BOOK

One smokescreen reason given for challenging the Janusz Korczak Literary Award is the transparently bogus charge that this book "sanitizes" Polish behavior. Even a cursory reading of it reveals just the opposite. Lukas criticizes Polish conduct many times. For example, he discusses Polish-German collaboration (e. g., pp. 141-142), even citing an Israeli study that estimates that there were 7,000 Polish collaborators in all (p. 152; which, incidentally, means that about 1 in every 4,000 Poles had been a collaborator). Another reason given for challenging the Janusz Korczak Literary Award is the claim that this book is "borderline anti-Semitic". Indeed it is--if one understands anti-Semitism to be any criticism of Jewish conduct under any circumstances. Lukas, for example, points out that Jews were commonly prejudiced against Poles just as Poles were commonly prejudiced against Jews (p. 152). He also gives examples of Jewish selfishness against fellow needy Jews at the same time that he gives examples of Polish selfishness against fellow needy Poles (p. 28). Lukas also cites a Jewish historian who



faults the method that Jewish organizations used to recover Jewish children after the war (p. 220). Is all this anti-Semitism? Let the reader decide. THE OLD SAW ABOUT POLES "CLAIMING TOO MUCH CREDIT" FOR RESCUING JEWS And, far from overstating the extent of Polish assistance to Jews, Lukas quotes a wide range of estimates (both Polish and Jewish) of how many Poles were involved in such aid (pp. 155-157). Lukas also provides figures for the deaths in some of the extermination camps. The collective death toll at Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka ranges from 1.65 million to 2.54 million (p. 230).

#### THE POLOKAUST NOT FORGOTTEN--NOT THIS TIME, ANYWAY

The genocide against Jews is well known, but Lukas makes it clear that Poles were also victims of genocide. The genocide of Poles does not spark the imagination as much as the industrial-scale gassing and cremation of Jews by the millions, but it was no less real. Heinrich Himmler stated (p. 17) that all Poles will disappear from the world and that all Poles will be destroyed. Martin Bormann (p. 21) asserted that Slavs should be kept alive only as long as they are needed as forced laborers. 2-3 million Polish gentiles, including roughly half of the Polish intelligentsia, were already murdered. Of course, since the Polish population was much larger than the Jewish one, the genocide of Poles had to be a long-term German project, with greater emphasis placed on passive genocide, at least until Germany won the war. Hitler spoke of reducing the Slavs' fertility and, by 1942, the Polish birth rate had fallen by 80% relative to its prewar level (p. 87). SS General Odilo Globocnik noted that the mass killings of Poles and their replacement with German colonists meant that Poles would be gradually crushed "economically and biologically"(p. 107). Obviously, the objective was to destroy Poles as a biological unit, and not merely as a culture or nation. Heinrich Himmler wanted the General Government (German-occupied central Poland) to be completely Germanized within twenty years (p. 107).

-----

**The Crucifixion of Russia: A new English translation of Solzhenitsyn's  
200 Years Together Falco, Columbus 2017 An Eye-  
Opening, Sometimes-Censored Book on Jewish Conduct in Eastern**

***Europe and the USSR*** This repeatedly-suppressed classic is more relevant than ever. There has been a large media wave of Jewish Polonophobia (early-mid 2018 and after) designed to manipulate public opinion in order that the Holocaust Industry can hopefully line its pockets at Poland's expense (e. g, H. R. 1226 and S. 447). For details, see [stopacthr1226.org](http://stopacthr1226.org). This hasbara is based on the narrative that people in Poland and elsewhere in Eastern Europe are bad people, and that they owe the Jews. It is equally based on the mirror-image narrative: Jews in Eastern Europe were just victims and never did anything wrong. Alexander Solzhenitsyn's book challenges these premises. No wonder it has been censored. The most recent attempt at an English-language translation, *THE CRUCIFIXION OF RUSSIA* (by Columbus Falco) has suddenly disappeared from Amazon after being carried for a few months. Here below is my review of *THE CRUCIFIXION OF RUSSIA*:

The earlier censorship of Solzhenitsyn's classic, *200 YEARS TOGETHER*, is described by author Columbus Falco, "Published in the original Russian in 2002, the book was received with a firestorm of rage and denunciation from the literary and media world, from the Jews, and from almost the entire intelligentsia of the established order in the West...immense efforts have been made by the Russian authorities and also by the Western liberal democratic power structure to ignore *200 YEARS TOGETHER*, to suppress it as much as possible, and above all to prevent and interdict the book's translation into foreign languages, most especially into English, which has become essentially the worldwide language of our epoch...The Russian authorities have to this date refused to allow any official English translation of the book to be published". (p. 2). Columbus Falco refrains from vainglory about his translation, "This is an attempt to create a READABLE translation of *200 YEARS TOGETHER* for a worldwide English-speaking audience which is--let us be brutally frank--largely dumbed-down and functionally illiterate, due to the degeneration and destruction of English-speaking society since the end of the Second World War. This horrific truth is the result of a pervasive Cultural Marxism..." (p. 3; Emphasis in original).

**CHARACTERISTICS OF SOLZHENITSYN'S MAGNUM OPUS** So what is so naughty, naughty about this book? Most of it consists of unremarkable information that can be found in standard, non-censored texts. Agree with author Solzhenitsyn or not, but recognize the fact that he is no lightweight. Solzhenitsyn goes

into considerable detail about many different historical epochs, and clearly has a deep knowledge of the issues that he raises. His approach is balanced. He is sympathetic towards Jews as well as critical of Jews. The latter evidently does not sit well with many, because it does not comply with the standard Judeocentric narrative, in which Jews are just victims and can do no wrong. Worse yet, a famous writer is bringing sometimes-unflattering information about Jews to light, and this is threatening. Hence the censorship.

JEWS IN 19TH CENTURY TSARIST RUSSIA      Far from living in oppression, Russia's Jews not only had more freedom than the serfs, but also more than the Russian traders and merchants. (pp. 16-17), and this was also true of more recent times. (p. 45). Soon after the Partitions of Poland, Derzhavin visited the area and reported on the Jews in the then-current manorial society. The Polish nobility had turned over the management of their estates to the Jews (p. 21), and the Jews engaged in conduct that brought them short-term profits and long-term antagonisms. Consider the PROPINACJA (taproom). The Jews accumulated wealth by cooperating with each other. (p. 31). They made profits by taking the peasants' grain to the point of impoverishing them (and causing famine), turning it into brandy, and then encouraging drunkenness. (p. 21, 24). Jews forced peasants into lifelong debt and crushing poverty by requiring payment, in cattle and tools, for liquor. (p. 31). In addition, a system of bribery protected this arrangement. Thus, the Polish magnates were on the "take" of part of the wealth squeezed by Jews out of the peasantry, and, without the Jews and their inventiveness, this system of exploitation could not have functioned, and would have ended. (p. 22). Solzhenitsyn adds that, "...the Jewish business class derived enormous benefit from the helplessness, wastefulness, and impracticality of landowners..." (p. 54). The Jews kept moving around in order to prevent an accurate count of their numbers--in order to evade taxes. (p. 25). A delegation of Jews travelled to St. Petersburg to try to bribe Russian officials to suppress Derzhavin's report. (p. 28). In 1824, Tsar Alexander I noticed that Jews were corrupting local inhabitants to the detriment of the treasury and private investors. (p. 32). Jews were not forced into "parasitic" occupations: They chose them. (p. 31). By the late 19th century (the time of the pogroms), Russian anger had boiled over, focusing on such things as Jews not making their own bread, massive overpricing and profiteering, enriching themselves while impoverishing the muzhik (Russian peasant),

and taking control of forests, lands, and taverns. (pp. 78-80). Nor is it true that the Jews were kept out of "productive" occupations. To the contrary. A concerted 50-year tsarist effort to turn Jews into farmers attracted few participants (p. 33), and ended in failure. (p. 58). None of the rationalizations for its failure are valid: Other newcomers to Russian agriculture (Mennonites, Bulgarian and German colonists, etc.), facing the same challenges as the Jews, did quite well. (p. 36). Jewish farmers neglected farm work (pp. 34-35), and kept drifting back into selling goods and leasing of their property to others to farm. (pp. 56-57). The century-later efforts by the Communists, to get Jews into farming, fared no better. (p. 208, 251). Jewish resistance to assimilation is usually framed in terms of the GOY excluding the Jew. It was the other way around. For the first half of the 19th century, rabbis and kahals (Jewish courts) strenuously resisted enlightenment, including the proffered Russian education to Jews. (p. 38). Jews have always tended to exaggerate the wrongs they have experienced from others. (p. 42). This applies to such things as double taxation, forced military service, expulsion from villages, etc. (p. 42, 46, 50). The Jews of the Vilnius (Wilno), Kaunas, and Grodno regions sided with the Russians during the Poles' ill-fated January 1863 Insurrection. (p. 69). This confirms Polish sources. Mainstream Judaism did not conduct ritual murder. However, it is possible that some Jewish cults did so. (p. 40). [For more, see the book *BLOOD PASSOVER*]. As for the PROTOCOLS, their authenticity was rejected early-on by the tsarist government. However, this did not erase legitimate grievances about Jewish influence. (p. 174).

#### JEWS IN COMMUNISM: THE USUAL EXCUSES DEBUNKED

We often hear that Communist Jews were "not real Jews". This nonsense is equivalent to saying that Lenin and other Russian Communists were "not real Russians"--a contrived distinction that Solzhenitsyn refuses to make. (p. 117). One common exculpation for Jews supporting revolutionary movements, and then Communism, is that of the tsarist system preventing Jews from improving their lot. This is nonsense. Once the Jews accepted the Russian education system, their numbers increased, to such a spectacular extent (by about 1870: p. 63, 71), in Russian higher education, that quotas (*numerus clausus*) had to be imposed upon them. This nowadays-called affirmative action became necessary because Jews were wealthier and thus unfairly advantaged in schooling-related matters. (p. 88). Hungary is instructive. There, Jewish

grievances were the least valid. Hungarian Jews had enjoyed atypical freedoms and a high standard of living, and there had been no pogroms. Yet the 1919 Hungarian Communism was especially dominated by Jews, and was odiously cruel. (pp. 153-154). Another exculpation for Jews in Communism was the alleged need for defense against pogroms conducted by the Whites. Not so. The massive influx of Jews into the Soviet apparatus occurred in late 1917 and 1918, but the White pogroms did not begin until 1919. (p. 121).

**THE CRUCIAL ROLE OF JEWS IN COMMUNISM** One can easily make lists of Jews in high positions in the Soviet Union. Influential Jews commonly occurred at a rate 10 or more times the abundance of Jews in the USSR. (e. g, pp. 143-on, 225-on). Whether or not motivated by "ethnic solidarity", Jews in authority tended to promote other Jews to high positions. (p. 138). However, the Jewish role in Communism goes far beyond what is apparent in any such "grocery list". For instance, consider what some call the Judaization of academia, and its impact on the bloody events of 1917. Solzhenitsyn comments, "The February Revolution was carried out by Russian hands and Russian foolishness. Yet at the same time, its ideology was permeated and dominated by the intransigent hostility to the historical Russian state that ordinary Russians didn't have, but the Jews had. So the Russian intelligentsia too had adopted this view." (p. 98). Now consider the October Revolution. Lenin contended that the Bolshevik success in the revolution had been made possible by the role of the large Jewish intelligentsia in several Russian cities. (p. 119). Furthermore, according to Lenin, the October Revolution was preserved by the actions of Jews against the attempted sabotage by government officials. (p. 128). The energy and high intelligence of the Jews made them indispensable. (p. 129, 189). In fact, Solzhenitsyn suggests that Soviet Communism lost its ideological fervor, and began slowly to die of "Russian laziness", already in the late 1960s, all because the Jews were largely gone. (p. 317).

**SOME INTERESTING FACTS** Dekulakization was not just an economic measure. It was a tool to uproot peoples and destroy their traditions and culture. For this reason, Stalin's dictatorship can in no sense be accepted as a nationalist (Russian) phenomenon. (p. 221). Religious Judaism was never persecuted as intensely by the Communists, in the 1920s and 1930s, as was Russian Orthodox Christianity. (p. 306). High-level Jew Lazar Kaganovich directed the destruction of the Church of the Redeemer. He also wanted to destroy

St. Basil's Cathedral. (p. 223). The famous mobile gas chambers were not invented by the Nazis. They were developed, in 1937, by Isai Davidovich Berg, a leading Jew in the NKVD. (p. 237). COMMUNISM IS OK-- UNTIL IT NO LONGER SERVES JEWISH INTERESTS Solzhenitsyn notes the irony that, in the West, there was little effective concern about the Eastern European victims of Communism until it turned on the Jews. He quips, "15 million peasants were destroyed in the 'dekulakisation', 6 million peasants were starved to death in 1932, not even to mention the mass executions and millions who died in the camps, and at the same time it was fine to politely sign agreements with Soviet leaders, to lend them money, to shake their 'honest hands', to seek their support, and to boast of all this in front of your parliaments. But once it was specifically JEWS that became the target, then a spark of sympathy ran through the West and it became clear what sort of regime this was." (p. 346; Emphasis is Solzhenitsyn's).

NOWADAYS JEWS DODGE THEIR RESPONSIBILITY AND BLAME THE RUSSIANS Alexander Solzhenitsyn describes the standard double-standard (one which Poles are all too familiar with), as he describes current Jewish attitudes, "There are so many such confident voices ready to judge Russia's many crimes and failings, her inexhaustible guilt towards the Jews--and they so sincerely believe this guilt to be inexhaustible almost all of them believe it! Meanwhile, their own people are coyly cleared of any responsibility for their participation in Cheka shootings, for sinking the barges and their doomed human cargo in the White and Caspian seas, for their role in collectivization, the Ukrainian famine and in all the abominations of the Soviet administration, for their talented zeal in brainwashing the 'natives'. This is not contrition." (p. 335). Of course, Solzhenitsyn is not insinuating that Jews are collectively guilty for Communism. However, Jews should accept collective liability for Communism and its crimes in much the same way that Germans accept collective liability for Nazism and its crimes. (p. 141, 321). Until they do so, this issue of the ZYDOKOMUNA (Judeo-Bolshevism) will not go away.

## Orwellian Unpersons: Unwelcome Scholars Do Not Exist

-----

**The Polish Underground and the Jews, 1939-1945** Zimmerman, Joshua D. 2015 *Much Information in a Contextual Vacuum. Effectively a Censorship by Making Orwellian Unpersons Out of Unwelcome Scholars and Their Findings.*

The sophisticated reader who is looking for something new--a book that candidly addresses both sides of Polish-Jewish antagonisms--can stop right here. It does not. It retains the standard Jewish-wrongdoing-denialism format. To address and correct all the issues raised in this book would require its own book. I focus on a few of them.

**INTRODUCTION** The author provides more details on Polish suffering under German Nazi occupation than do many Jewish authors. However, Zimmerman fails to internalize the implications of Polish suffering. He does not appreciate the crushing poverty and degrading circumstances faced by Poles, which, for example, drove some of them to hanker after post-Jewish property or to denounce fugitive Jews for a reward. Furthermore, Zimmerman's "fishing expedition", in Polish Underground documents, tendentiously culls certain "fish". Pole-against-Jew conduct is "caught" and highlighted, while Pole-against-Pole, Jew-against-Jew, and Jew-against-Pole conduct is "thrown back into the water". Author Zimmerman, to his credit, distances himself from the most egregious Polonophobic accusations of some previous Jewish authors. He recognizes both positive and negative Polish attitudes towards Jews--for example in the many Polish Underground reports he cites. However, his over-800 pages of text are scrupulously sanitized of recognition of the fact that Jewish conduct played a role in Polish indifference and hostility against Jews. Worse yet, he shows open disregard--even contempt--for scholars whose views do not fit the "Jews can do no wrong" standard narrative. This, in my opinion, borders on intellectual dishonesty.

**DELEGITIMIZING SCHOLARS WHO PRESENT UNWELCOME EVIDENCE** Instead of intelligently telling the reader why he disagrees with their research findings, Zimmerman summarily dismisses historians Marek Jan Chodakiewicz, Marek Wierzbicki, and the late Tomasz

Strzembosz, as "nationalist historians" or of the "nationalist school". (p. 39, 661). Evidently, to Zimmerman, this leftist and Holocaustspeak buzzword is supposed to make them, and their unwanted facts, smell bad and disappear down an Orwellian memory hole. [BTW, Chodakiewicz unambiguously repudiates the nationalist characterization.] Clearly, the author is engaging in poisoning-the-well tactics. And if Zimmerman must resort to characterizations, then why doesn't he identify himself for what he is--a Judeocentric scholar of the Holocaust Establishment? What is good for the goose is good for the gander. But, wait. It is actually worse. Zimmerman relies uncritically on the assertions of Joanna Beata Michlic on these scholars. (p. 39). To begin with, what makes Zimmerman think that Michlic, in ANY case, is some kind of authority on--much less the final word on--this subject? As it turns out, Joanna B. Michlic presents no evidence in support of her flippant opinions of historians not to her liking. See my review of her rather superficial *THE THREATENING OTHER*. Not surprisingly, Zimmerman sings an entirely different tune about those Polish (and half-Polish) authors who agree with him, and who support Jewish attacks on Poland. (e. g., Jan T. Gross, Jan Grabowski). He lauds them for being "path-breaking" (p. 177) and exhibiting "critical scholarship" (p. 39). Yeah, right. Having reviewed a number of earlier works by Zimmerman, I had thought better of him. Instead, his willful abandonment the most elementary canons of objectivity can only cause the informed reader to reasonably question Zimmerman's credibility. However, for purposes of this review, I assume that Zimmerman accurately quotes from works that I have not checked myself, and that he does not omit material facts from them.

**PRE-WWII POLISH-JEWISH RELATIONS: EVERYTHING IS THE POLES' FAULT** The author consistently tells half the story. He repeats the endless complaint that Poles commonly did not see Jews as fellow Poles, or as part of the Polish nation. He avoids the fact that most Polish Jews didn't EITHER. For centuries, the Jews had lived in religious-based self-imposed apartheid. In time, Jewish religious-based separatism gave way to an even more aggressive and politicized self-imposed apartheid--based on the Yiddishist movement. When Poland was about to be resurrected (1918), Jews clamored, through the so-called Minorities Treaty, for the expansive special rights of a separate nation on Polish soil, complete with government-funded Yiddish-language Jewish schools, their own courts, their own representation in the Sejm (Polish parliament) as a bloc, etc.



Other Jews became Zionists which--by definition--meant their loyalties were to another nation rather than Poland. The relatively few assimilated Jews had done so less in order to "become Poles", in some way, than in order to advance themselves in society by escaping the enclave mentalities of traditional Judaism and the "new ghetto" Yiddishist movement. In any case, few of Poland's Jews considered themselves Poles first and Jews second. The author selectively mentions Endek calls for most Polish Jews to emigrate, leaving behind as little as 50,000 Jews in Poland. (p. 54). What he omits is the fact that many Jews ALSO thought that Poland had a "Jewish problem"--that Poland was vastly overcrowded with Jews, that the Polish economy could never support so many entrepreneur-minded Jews, that Polish and Jewish ways were fundamentally and eternally incompatible with each other, and that the only lasting solution was for nearly all of Poland's Jews to emigrate. This included, but was hardly limited to, Zionists such as Vladimir Jabotinsky and Alfred Nossig. Economic rivalry also had two sides, but the reader would never guess it by reading Zimmerman. As Poles began to encroach on the centuries-old Jewish economic privileges, Jews banded together to drive Polish newcomers out of business. The Poles then retaliated with boycotts, discriminatory policies (nowadays called affirmative action) against Jews, and sometimes violence. Zimmerman exaggerates, and recycles old information about, violent anti-Jewish acts in pre-WWII Poland. (pp. 63-on). He is silent about the violence, by the militantly-Zionist Betar, against Pole-conciliatory Jews. More glaringly, Zimmerman omits the fact that, according to police reports, violent incidents by the ONR were dwarfed by violent incidents by Communists. See my review of *DUCH MŁODYCH*. Evidently, to Zimmerman, Polish ONR violence against Jews was a horrible thing, but Jewish Communist violence against Poles (and anti-Communist Jews), which was much more common, was no big deal. POLISH GUERRILLAS AND THE JEWS

The selective attention to facts, exhibited so consistently by Zimmerman, extends to wartime situations. The author elaborates on the generally good relations between Jews and the ARMIA KRAJOWA (A. K.), in most regions of German-occupied Poland, with the glaring exception of the Nowogrodek area. Again, the author omits essential facts. Apart from animosities resulting from recent events surrounding Communism, there were older, deep-seated antagonisms going back many decades--to the time that the Nowogrodek area of Poland

had been part of the Pale of Jewish Settlement in tsarist Russia. These Jews were Litvaks (Litwaks) and their descendants, and had a long history of extreme separatism, frequent Russophilia, and strong anti-Polonism. Zimmerman uncritically brings up Michal Cichy, and his accusations of the A. K. killing Jews during the Warsaw Uprising. He is silent on contrary evidence. Please see my review of *PASZWIL WYBORCZEJ* by historian Leszek Zebrowski. The author dusts off, and presents as gospel truth, the decades-old Communist propaganda about the NSZ being a Jew-hating and Jew-killing guerilla organization. For corrective, please read the Sebastian Bojemski research article in *GOLDEN HARVEST OR HEARTS OF GOLD*. ELECTION RESULTS, JEWS, AND COMMUNISM

Zimmerman cites a study (which I have read) on Jewish voting patterns in some 1920's Polish elections. These indicate that 7% of Jews voted for the Communists (p. 421). From this, Zimmerman draws the completely non sequitur conclusion that Jewish support for Communism was minimal. To begin with, Jewish support for Communism was hardly limited to electoral support for, or open identification with, overtly Communist movements--far from it! Various mainstream Jewish political parties and movements were ALSO infected with Communism to varying degrees, usually in muted or disguised ways. These included Jewish socialist parties, the Hashomer Hatzair, the Poalei Zion, and the Bund. In addition, Jews commonly switched loyalties to whoever coincided with their immediate interests, or whoever was the stronger. After Poland was Partitioned, Poland's Jews generally supported the empires that ruled over Poland, and few Jews supported Polish national aspirations. By the 1920's, with the resurrected Polish state a fait accompli, and Poland having recently (1920) defeated the Soviet Union, the Polish nation had unambiguously emerged as the stronger. For this reason, it is hardly surprising that relatively few Jews openly supported Communism in the 1920's. In 1939, with Poland on the ropes and the USSR the stronger, it was a different story. Finally, why waste one's vote on a party that had no chance of winning? Surely the Jews knew that Communists hardly ever come to power through free elections, least of all likely in Poland. They come to power by force. To make Poland Communist, wait for renewed Soviet aggression, and then come out of the woodwork. That is exactly what happened. JEWS AS VICTIMS, NEVER VICTIMIZERS

Zimmerman glosses over the Jewish fifth-column activity on behalf of

the Soviet invaders of eastern Poland in 1939. (e. g, p. 150, 165). These did not exclude murderous acts against Poles. Do you need still more evidence? Then read the detailed, free, online book: "*A TANGLED WEB: POLISH-JEWISH RELATIONS*" by Mark Paul. Although Zimmerman repeatedly tries to pooh-pooh the fact of Jewish banditry against Polish villagers, done by Jews independently and as part of the intentional terror-causing policy of banditry conducted by the Communist GL-AL bands, it was very real. Apropos to this, the author mentions the *TAJNE OBLICZE* book for a trivial reason (p. 661), but chooses to run away from it, completely ignoring its detailed archive-based findings on the magnitude of Jewish banditry and collaboration with the GL-AL. Not surprisingly, Zimmerman is silent about the large-scale Jewish-Soviet collaboration in the massacres of Polish civilians in villages such as Naliboki and Koniuchy. For the truth, see *INTERMARIUM* by Chodakiewicz. Let us put all this in broader context. Consider the Zydokomuna (Judeo-Bolshevism), a term which Zimmerman regularly brings up, but would prefer that the reader not think about. The considerable extent of Jewish complicity in the murderous Soviet Communist apparatus is an inescapable fact. The extensive Jewish involvement, in all phases of the Soviet subjugation of Poland, is also undeniable. For details, see the first comment. And let us hear no silly exculpations about Jewish Communists not being real Jews, or Jews not knowing what Communism really was. They most certainly were, and they most certainly did. We also keep hearing that, in terms of absolute numbers, few Jews were Communists. This is a facile argument, as it goes both ways. No doubt, in absolute terms, few Poles were involved in the denunciation or murder of fugitive Jews, but this does not prevent Zimmerman, and innumerable other Jewish authors, from making an issue of them. So let's hold Jews to the same standard. What about innocent Jews being blamed for Communism? Innocent victims fell on both sides. During the Holocaust itself, millions of Jews, most of whom had nothing to do with Communism, were being put to death. Earlier, however, millions of non-Jews, most of whom had never done anything to Jews, had been put to death, in large part thanks to the deliberate acts of Jewish Communists. This included children, who least of all could be suspected of anti-Jewish acts that deserved punishment.

WAS GENERAL ZYGMUNT  
BERLING JEWISH? WHO CARES

The author tries to make something of the fact that some Poles had reckoned Berling a Jew, and

that historian Marek Jan Chodakiewicz allegedly does also. (p. 636, 662). [Chodakiewicz (personal communication) told me that he was merely informing the reader that some Poles had pointed to Berling's Jewish roots.] Zimmerman does not tell his readers that there are different opinions about Berling's practice of Judaism, notwithstanding his baptism. Pointedly, however, the issue is more basic. Jews have no problem identifying baptized Jews, as Jews, if it serves their purposes. For example, think of Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx. In fact, Jewish authors commonly write of Karl Marx--alongside Sigmund Freud and Albert Einstein--as the three most influential 19th- and 20th-century Jewish thinkers. Now, if Jews can recognize baptized Jews, as Jews, as they see fit, then surely Poles can do likewise.