

American Freedom

and

Zionist Power

by

Pitman Buck, Jr.

Copyright © 2008 by Pitman Buck, Jr.
All Rights Reserved
Printed in the United States of America

*In memory of
Thomas Paine
whose literary works
greatly influenced
the American Revolution*

PERSONAL PROLOGUE

THE AUTHOR BELIEVES that “hope springs eternal” in the minds of men but that hope must be tempered by Reason. Otherwise, frustration and despair will follow. It is the hope of This writer that this treatise will help to correct a major threat to America’s freedom and, more broadly, aid in bringing humanity together within the conditions of justice, charity and peace.

P.B.

[In this 2008 e-edition (as opposed to the earlier book format) of *American Freedom & Zionist Power*, all text within brackets were added after September 11, 2001. Otherwise, except for page numbers and deletion of the "Contents" page, the text is unchanged from its original 1977 edition.

America's latest, initial war slogan, "Infinite Justice", must surely ring mute upon the hundreds of thousands of Palestinians whom Israel has driven -- with America's help -- from their native homeland, Palestine. In the aftermath of the evil attacks upon the World Trade Center in New York, and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., news pundits and others refuse to ascribe to Israel an *iota* of cause for the attacks. For those in denial, it is apparent that the truth either hurts too much to admit or they are among the brainwashed.]

THE PERVASIVE INFLUENCE of Jewish [Zionist] power upon American domestic and foreign policies is an issue that cries out for public discussion. It should be of concern to every American as to how an ethnocentric, religious group which comprises less than three percent of the population has become a leading factor in American politics. Yet, ironically, in America where free speech and press are constitutionally guaranteed, the subject has been almost completely ignored except in either extremely racist circles or in selected Jewish publications aimed at sympathetic readership.

THE NEWS, JEWS AND GENERAL BROWN

FREE SPEECH AND DISCUSSION on the topic of this pamphlet is so inhibited that even the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot freely speak his mind on a college campus (the traditional site of intellectual inquiry) without being made to apologize to the Jewish community by none other than the president himself.

On October 10, 1974, General George S. Brown appeared before a Duke University Law School forum and in responding to a question he spoke of the strong Jewish lobby in this country whose chief interest is Israel.¹ (in a recent article Joseph Kraft, who is Jewish, wrote of "Jews who cared chiefly about Israel . . ." during the 1976 presidential election.)² General Brown warned the law students of the serious danger to America that unlimited support of Israel entails. For these remarks the general was called "anti-Semitic" by Zionists and pro-Zionists and was told to apologize by a president sworn to uphold the Constitution and the national defense of America.

General Brown made the following remarks to the student forum: "We have the Israelis coming to us for equipment. We say we can't possibly get the Congress to support a program like that. They say, 'Don't worry about the Congress. We'll take care of the Congress.' Now this is somebody from another country. But they can do it."³ A *Commentary* article (referred to below) depicts Israel's United Nations Ambassador Simcha Dinitz and an Israeli military attaché *inside* the Pentagon demanding of Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger full United States military logistical supporting equipment during the height of the 1973 Yom Kippur War. When

both Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Schlesinger demurred, Dinitz threatened to call in several unnamed United States senators to force the issue. After President Nixon received calls from a number of influential supporters of Israel (again unnamed) from both inside and *outside* the United States, *the Commentary* article states, the president then personally intervened on Israel's behalf and ordered the full logistical support of Israel, ". . . being keenly aware of the possible political consequences of a further delay." No doubt this power to dictate is what the general meant when he said, "But they can do it."

Of course, the network television news managers decided to spare the American public such details concerning the Jewish lobby which would have confirmed exactly what General Brown had told the students about that lobby, namely, "It is so strong you wouldn't believe now." The network managers preferred instead to concentrate on a "technical" error made by the general when he said, "They own, you know, the banks in this country, the newspapers." Had the general used the word *control* instead of the word *own*, he would have been home free.

For an enlightening article about the matters of which General Brown spoke -- the huge Israeli draw-down of United States military equipment during the Yom Kippur War, as well as the astonishing strength and operational effectiveness of the Jewish lobby -- the reader is referred to the article, "Kissinger & the Yom Kippur War," in *Commentary* (September 1974). *Commentary* is published by the American Jewish Committee.

Morris J. Amitay, a Zionist lobbyist and former staff aid to Senator Abraham Ribicoff, told *Washington Post* journalist Stephen Isaacs that Jewish legislative staff members keep their Jewishness in mind when "aiding" their legislative bosses. (As reported by Leonard J. Davis, also a Zionist lobbyist, in *The Cleveland Jewish News*, January 24, 1975, p. 20.)

There is ample evidence that many Jewish journalists also keep their Jewishness in mind when "reporting" the news. This evidence is not just a hypothetical parallel drawn from Morris J. Amitay's comments. Jewish writers themselves confirm this bias in Jewish literature. Naomi Ben-Asher wrote: "The question of Jewish identity ... is no stranger to the writer whose Jewishness is largely a biological accident.... For the non-writer ... Jewishness can be a negligible factor in his life.... This irrelevance of a man's Jewishness to his work rarely applies to the Jew who is a writer."⁴ One is hereby well-advised to keep in mind that for propagandic purposes some news may be given national coverage while other news is directed only toward the Jewish community.

In another incident involving General Brown, the American public learned through a leak to the Israeli press -- just two weeks before the 1976 United States presidential and national election date -- that Ranan Lurie, a Jewish columnist, had interviewed General Brown six months earlier. In response to a question in that interview on April 12, 1976, the general had stated his honest conviction that Israel and her armed forces were "a burden" to the United States. The conveniently timed news leak of the general's remarks, duly reported by all three major American media networks, had the expected effect of embarrassing Republican candidate Ford in the American Jewish community. President Ford swiftly issued a statement that he did not agree with "the general's poor choice of words" and that he considered the matter closed.⁵ Thirty-two Jewish organizations immediately announced a special meeting to consider the

situation. The next day the Jewish groups replied with one voice that "The Jewish community does not consider the matter of General Brown to be closed." ⁶

The news-handling of this latest Brown incident was seen by many as another example of Jewish control and manipulation of news stories in order to gain the greatest propagandic effect upon the American people for the sole benefit of Israel. Although Mr. Lurie disclaimed any conspiracy concerning the timing of this news leak, he was quick to recommend (on ABC television news) that President Ford fire General Brown for expressing his view that Israel is a burden to the United States. (Mr. Lurie lived in Israel for years and presumably holds Israeli citizenship.)

As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Brown is in a most favorable position to know how much of a military and economic burden Israel really is to the United States. *The Houston Post* reported that "defense officials said that the vital United States tank reserve in Europe was cut back in 1973 to replace Israel's losses in the Yom Kippur War." ⁷ That paper further reported Pentagon sources as saying ". . . the tanks were rushed to Israel ... leaving the United States army with less than 50 percent of the tanks it believed it needed to meet any thrust by the Soviet Union's vastly greater armored forces." ⁸ An authoritative Pentagon source (reported by the *Middle East Perspective*, October 1976) declared that the "depletion of United States arsenal for benefit of Israel during the October War left our country without a single combat-ready division anywhere." Any American president who places the survival of another nation above the national interests of his own country should be tried for treason and run out of the country.

Every day Jewish power affects the life and pocket-book of each American citizen and taxpayer. Through the control of the national impact media of radio and television and, to a lesser degree, through the handling of national and international wire services and their dispatches, Jewish influence determines what will or will not be on national television, what the voters will know about political candidates and what tomorrow's press headlines will be. At the time of General Brown's appearance before the student forum at Duke University, *Time* magazine, in reporting the Brown incident in its November 25 edition, stated, "According to Washington Post Correspondent Stephen D. Isaacs' recently published book, *Jews and American Politics*, Jews head the corporations that own all three national television networks."

When, on November 13, 1969, former Vice-President Spiro Agnew spoke of "a tiny enclosed fraternity of privileged men" in the television news medium who enjoy "a monopoly sanctioned and licensed by government," he incurred the wrath of a small group of men more powerful than he had imagined. If the vice-president of the United States had hopes of remaining in political life, those hopes would have been better served with an announcement to lead a "Bonds for Israel" drive.

Not only are the private corporations of the electronic news media under Jewish control but Jews hold many of the government's most sensitive informational outlets to the public. President Ford and First Lady Betty Ford both found it useful to employ Jewish press secretaries. From the level of Department of State on down through the various executive branch agencies, whether it be Attorney General Levi's office, the Securities and Exchange Commission or the United States Information Agency, one is apt to find that the chief press spokesman or his assistant is either a Jew or works for one. If a private citizen wants to voice a complaint about the religio-ethnically biased, controlled broadcast media, he can contact the Federal Communications Commission which is charged by law with the regulation of the broadcast industry that uses the public's

airwaves. A perusal of the 1976 *Congressional Staff Directory* indicates that many, if not most, of the top officials of the FCC are Jewish.

In 1969 the Senate Communications Subcommittee conducted hearings on Senate Bill 2004. The bill would have granted almost automatic license renewals for stations of the broadcast media. All three network presidents were there to testify. So was Nicholas Johnson, a former FCC commissioner but now with the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, a group concerned about single points of view and conflicts of interest. When the hearings began, the network moguls testified enthusiastically for S. 2004 which would have allowed them to forget the public's interest and concentrate totally on making money and propaganda. The networks simply do not want restraints placed upon them by the public. Nicholas Johnson, a man who is not possessed by a mean, forensic disposition, gave a fifty-page statement to the subcommittee and testified thus: "The broadcaster in America today is, without question, the single most powerful man civilization has ever permitted to roam wild. We have used a very long thread to tether a dinosaur. He finds it restricting and asks that it be removed."⁹

One would think that a newspaper, all newspapers, would defend the right of free speech and press as a right of every American -- to be exercised more particularly by those who have the official responsibility to defend the Constitution. But not *The New York Times*, owned by Arthur Ochs Sulzberger. On October 22, 1976, this prestigious newspaper called the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff "a general who talks too much." The writer would put several questions to the *Times*: What are the armed forces defending, if not the constitutional right to freedom of speech and press? During his superb thirty-five year military career, and now as America's chief military officer, General Brown has defended with his life the right of free speech and press for others, including *the Times*. And now the *Times* criticizes the general for exercising the very right he has helped to preserve for Mr. Sulzberger and his editor, A. M. Rosenthal. How unfair and ungrateful can a newspaper be?

If the *Times* were to interview General Brown, would he be expected to reply to questions about Israel honestly and according to his convictions? Obviously not, since that is what the general did in the case of the Lurie interview and the *Times* condemned him for doing so. The *Times* and other media ought to refrain from asking public officials for press interviews if they do not want or expect honest answers.

In an unusually courageous editorial, *The Wall Street Journal* (October 20, 1976) spoke to this issue: "it looks to us as if General Brown's real sin is excessive candor, which leaves us confused, since we thought everyone agreed our leaders needed to be more candid, not less so." The *Journal* then concluded its editorial by obliquely suggesting to pro-Zionist backers of Governor Carter that they might be better satisfied with press interview answers given by Carter administration officials who had been lobotomized.

In his Lurie interview, General Brown also had a few things to say about other nations besides Israel. Concerning Britain, he said that England "is no longer a world power -- all they have got are generals and admirals and bands." Unlike the *Times* which wrote that the general "talks too much," *The Manchester Guardian Weekly* (October 31, 1976) of England wrote, with obvious regard for the truth, that "The General need not apologize. He should tell us more."

The author has concentrated on the General Brown story because in many ways it is typical of

Jewish influence exercised through the control of major news organs. This manipulating, filtering and censoring of information -- done daily to a lesser or larger extent -- depends upon how the media perceive the factual happenings as affecting the Jewish community here and abroad. One other example will be given.

THE NEWS, ISRAELIS AND U.S.S. LIBERTY

ON JUNE 8, 1967, DURING the 1967 Middle East War, Israeli jet aircraft and torpedo-carrying gunboats attacked an American vessel, the U.S.S. *Liberty*, while it was cruising in international waters off the Sinai Peninsula. The *Liberty* was a highly sophisticated communications vessel operated by the United States Navy and a sister ship to the U.S.S. *Pueblo* which was captured by North Korea in 1968. Both ships were operated by the Navy for the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency. The *Liberty* was on an intelligence gathering mission when attacked by Israel as was the *Pueblo* when captured by the North Koreans. Thirty-four Americans died in the Israeli attack on the *Liberty*. One American died during the attack upon and capture of the *Pueblo*.

The news media that later gave very extensive coverage to the *Pueblo* affair displayed no interest in seeking for the public the answer to *Time* magazine's question, "Why did the Israelis go out of their way to attack a neutral ship?"¹⁰ Apparently, no investigative reporters were assigned to the *Liberty* story. News media that appear all too anxious to embarrass American public officials (whether they be presidents or generals) with the Jewish community are very reluctant to uncover and report any evidence to the American public that would embarrass the Jewish State of Israel. Any time a foreign nation is responsible for the deaths of thirty-four Americans, one-hundred and sixty-four others wounded and the ultimate loss of a United States naval vessel, the American people have a right to know something about the "whys" and "wherefores." The *Liberty* affair should have been given widespread publicity. In view of the serious nature of the incident, one can conclude only that a conspiracy operated at the highest levels to keep the matter closed to an inquiring public. Such a conspiracy would find the Jewish controlled news media only too willing to cooperate in this case.

In a brief literature survey this writer found five books on the, *Pueblo* incident listed in the 1975 edition of *Subject Guide to Books in Print*. In addition, the writer examined two other books on the *Pueblo* affair, including one by the captain of the *Pueblo*, Commander Lloyd M. Bucher. The other one was written by Rear Admiral Daniel V. Gallery, Ret., entitled *The Pueblo Incident*.

In his literature survey on the *Liberty* affair, the writer was unable to find listed anywhere a single book about Israel's attack on the *Liberty*. Not one! Furthermore, a lengthy search has turned up only two in-depth articles in national publications about the Israeli attack on the *Liberty*. One was James J. Kilpatrick's "June 8, at 1400 hours" (*National Review*, September 5, 1967, pp. 952-958). Nine years after the *Liberty* incident Anthony Pearson, a Canadian journalist, published the results of his investigation into the *Liberty* affair.¹¹ [In 1979, *Assault on the Liberty*, by James M. Ennes, Jr., a naval officer who survived the attack, was published by

Random House. Now, some 34 years after the attack one can visit the web site at <http://www.ussliberty.com> for the very latest and best documentation concerning this dastardly attack by Israel on an American ship. 09-17-01 PB]

Mr. Pearson spent several years and crossed three continents chasing down leads and information for his *Liberty* story. His findings indicate that a conspiracy had existed between the United States government (President Johnson, CIA and NSA) and Israel which would allow Israel to capture certain Arab lands up to predetermined boundaries. The *Liberty* was on station off Sinai to monitor the war's activities. Because of the initial success and advances of Israel's so-called preemptive attack on Egypt, Jordan and Syria, the Israelis decided to advance beyond the predetermined lines and take additional Arab lands not agreed upon by Johnson. Through the *Liberty's* intelligence surveillance and reports to the CIA (monitored by the Israelis), it was learned that Israel intended to break the agreement with her co-conspirator. Israel decided that the *Liberty's* surveillance of the war's progress could no longer be tolerated. It was then determined in the highest councils in Israel that the *Liberty* had to be sunk. Israeli jet planes were sent out to do the job and were later joined by motor torpedo boats. Thus, one of the most cold-blooded acts of treachery in recent warfare was carried out against a friendly nation, the United States, without whom Israel could not exist. [Facts known by me today do not support Pearson's statements that an *actual* agreement existed between the United States and Israel which would allow Israel to capture certain Arab lands up to predetermined boundaries. But, of course, I readily concede that I am in no position to know *all* the facts. PB]

On January 20, 1969, a *public* naval Court of Inquiry was convened in San Diego, California to investigate North Korea's seizure of the *Pueblo*. It was attended by at least a dozen news journalists who, by their affiliations with many segments of both print and electronic media, assured the public of widespread coverage of evidence developed by the Court of Inquiry.

The Court found evidence of negligence starting with the *Pueblo* chain of command and extending right up through higher echelons of the Navy. Among many other recommendations, the Court of Inquiry recommended that Commander Bucher and a subordinate stand trial by general court-martial. The Court's Convening Authority, Admiral John J. Hyland, rejected the Court's

recommendations on court-martials because of the extenuating circumstances and Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee concurred with the admiral's opinion. Meanwhile, thanks to the news media, Commander Bucher's name became a household word and automobiles driven all over the country bore bumper stickers reminding the public to "Remember the *Pueblo*."

In contrast to the pervasive news coverage given to the North Korean capture of the *Pueblo* and its

attendant Court of Inquiry hearings, the best public relations that tender loving care could provide accompanied news reports about Israel's attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty*. In this endeavor the United States government had the anxious cooperation of the Jewish controlled American news media. Accordingly, on June 11, 1967, a *secret* naval Court of Inquiry convened in London, England, to investigate Israel's attack on the *U.S.S. Liberty*. As far as this writer can ascertain, no newsman put up a squawk concerning the public's right to know more about Israel's attack on the American ship. Newsmen who went to great efforts and traveled long distances to

get seats at the *Pueblo* hearings would rather not complain about the secret *Liberty* hearings in London.

According to Mr. Kilpatrick's *National Review* article, the Court of Inquiry developed evidence "that the Israeli armed forces had ample opportunity to identify *Liberty* correctly," but the Court "had insufficient information before it to make a judgment on the reasons for the decision by Israeli aircraft and motor torpedo boats to attack." Of course, the Court did not know of the secret agreement between Israel and the United States concerning the Israeli-coveted Arab lands and the CIA and the NSA were not about to tell it. Without this knowledge the Court had no way of knowing the true purpose behind the *Liberty* mission; and without knowing that purpose, the Court had no way of knowing that *Liberty's* intelligence had discovered Israel's violation of a top secret agreement. (Three civilian communications experts manned *the Liberty's* "inner sanctum" which housed the electronic communications gear and not even Commander McGonagle was allowed into those quarters of the ship.) It is doubtful if the Court's Convening Authority, Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., knew why the Court hearings were ordered to be held in secret, though he may have suspected it had something to do with the government's fear of public reaction to an act of infamy. But the government need not have worried about that reaction; even if the London Court hearings had been public -- the American news media would have seen to that.

Anthony Pearson reported in his *Penthouse* (June 1976) article that out of secret hearings that Congress held on the *Liberty* affair, a leak revealed that two of the Israeli planes that had attacked the *Liberty* were piloted by Americans -- ex-navy pilots -- who had immigrated to Israel. Since the hearings were secret, this leak could be neither publicly confirmed nor disproved. Now the news media have been notorious co-operators with leak purveyors, but this leak about ex-U.S. navy pilots attacking the U.S.S. *Liberty* while flying for Israel was one leak that the news media *definitely* did not want to broadcast! And they did not, as far as this writer can determine. Again, it may be observed that for the same reason that some legislative staff employees keep their Jewishness in mind when working on Capitol Hill, it is apparent that some journalists keep their Jewishness in mind when reporting, or not reporting, the news. Biased news reporting -- especially with regard to the Arab-Israeli Conflict or other areas of Jewish interests -- reflects the basic philosophy of a handful of men who control the broadcast media and who ultimately influence the news judgments of their paid editors and producers.

The State of Israel called its attack on the *Liberty* "a mistake" and paid a paltry total indemnity of \$6.9 million to *Liberty's* crew casualties and family survivors, but only after an international law suit was filed against Israel in the World Court at The Hague by family members of the crew. Israeli aircraft had reconnoitered the *Liberty* for five hours before attacking her. If the attack were truly "a mistake," it was a mistake that took the Israelis five hours to decide to make. It was also "a mistake" for which no one in Israel ever stood trial. Zionist Israel faced the dilemma of investigating a case of jet pilots and torpedo boat commanders who obviously had not acted on their own in a decision to attack an American naval vessel. A public and thorough investigation of the facts in this case would have opened a bag of worms that even Israel could not have stomached. So nothing was done that could have led to a court-martial or trial of anyone.

The writer has just learned that The American Palestine Committee has obtained, under the

Freedom of Information Act, the Court of Inquiry documents covering the 1967 *Liberty case*. The United States Navy file, now mostly declassified, “. . .contains numerous photographs of Israeli planes and torpedo boats attacking the ship while it was plainly flying a huge 13-foot American flag [in clear weather]. There is also testimony that the attackers engaged in 'jamming' to prevent the ship's calls for help from reaching the U.S. Sixth Fleet."¹² Since the United States State Department has not yet declassified its files on the *Liberty* tragedy, The American Palestine Committee has stated its intention “. . . to pursue the matter until we have all the answers." For further developments on the *Liberty* case the concerned reader should contact The American Palestine Committee and should also write his congressman urging a full and open congressional hearing on the case. [But Congress, ever eager and mindful to please the Zionist lobby, has never -- to this day -- held a public hearing on Israel's deliberate attack on the *USS Liberty*. 09-18-01 PB]

Incidentally, the *Liberty's* captain, Commander William L. McGonagle, was recommended for his country's highest award for service above and beyond the call of duty and his crew was recommended for presidential citations. Commander McGonagle received his Congressional Medal of Honor and the *Liberty's* crew (those that survived) received their presidential citations. [The country's highest award for bravery, the Congressional Medal of Honor, is traditionally placed around the recipient's neck by the president of the United States in the White House, in a public ceremony. However, in order to avoid publicity of the Israeli attack on an American ship, an admiral was selected to present the Medal of Honor to Commander McGonagle – but not in the White House or even in the Pentagon – but in a shipyard and, of course, with no national news coverage. In America, the established press is free only when the Zionists and pro-Zionists want it to be free. PB]

In contrast to all the publicity given the *Pueblo* case, there were no car bumper stickers traversing the country exhorting the people to "Remember the *Liberty*." As far as the American people at large were concerned, these brave men may as well have received their country's highest honors anonymously -- thanks to the American news media which tippy-toed through this whole *Liberty* affair knowing that keeping the American public uninformed would be in Israel's best interest.

THE MAJORITY OF SEVENTY

IT IS CERTAINLY LEGITIMATE to inquire further how the extraordinary Jewish power in American politics could have come about in a democracy whose Constitution was designed to ensure that members of governmental bodies would express and represent the free will of a majority of the people while protecting the basic constitutional rights of all. The free will of the majority of the electorate has been, it seems, more often ignored than expressed or more often frustrated than carried out. The defeat and frustration of America's best interests is continually being initiated, aided and abetted by special interest political activists whose views are often more representative of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) than of the broad American body politic. The AIPAC is the chief Zionist lobby registered in Washington, D.C. It publishes the *Near East Report* and sends it to all congressmen as well as to many State Department and White House staff members.

Former United States Senator J. William Fulbright, who for many years served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has stated that during his tenure in office there were no less than seventy senators ready to vote the bidding of the American Jewish community on any given issue affecting Israel."¹³ Understanding this inordinate and skillful Jewish influence is basic to an understanding of the American political predicament. There are two principal reasons for this extraordinary influence. One reason is the predominant role that Jewish mythology has played in shaping Western culture and religious ethos. The other reason is the large role that Jewish money plays in America's interrelated economic and political systems.

THE MYTHIC POWER

IN HIS FOUR-VOLUME MONUMENTAL work, *The Masks of God*, Professor Joseph Campbell observed that the primary purpose of popular religion is not, and never was, to discover "Truth," but to propagate a sentimental philosophy for maintaining a unified social order which would support the institutions of men."¹⁴ Since time immemorial, strong and widespread belief in popular religions has been utilized by political leaders to rally the common folk around some favored cause -- be it the conquering of territories or the establishment of kingdoms. History is replete with examples of the use of religion for gaining political power. Some of the more notorious examples have been the Judaic Kingdom of David^{15, 16} and the Holy Roman Empire.¹⁷

In this age of scientific enlightenment, the art of manipulating men's minds has blossomed anew with the establishment and expansion of the Zionist State of Israel. In this enterprise Judaism has enjoyed the unique advantage which antiquity provides, aided by an offspring religion, Christianity. America's interest in Israel has been described variously as "sentimental" or "emotional." Even Senator Fulbright, of scholarly fame, has expressed a willingness to commit this nation to a holy war over Israel. From the floor of the United States Senate Senator Fulbright stated, "We have a strong emotional interest in Israel and, as I said in a speech in 1970, I accept the validity of that interest and would go so far as to base a military commitment upon it."¹⁸ Senator Fulbright was referring to his speech entitled "Old Myths and New Realities-II" which he delivered to the Senate on August 31, 1970. In that speech, the senator said that the United States should frankly recognize its "sentimental and cultural bonds" with Israel. The senator further stated that "there is nothing wrong with a policy based on sentimental attachments." While on a trip abroad, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger used the words "emotional ties" in explaining America's support of Israel during the 1973 Yom Kippur War.¹⁹

The United States Constitution totally and emphatically rejects the idea that American military commitment to Israel or any other nation can be constitutionally carried out when based upon "emotional" and "sentimental" interests; these are mere substitute terms used to soften and make more acceptable the real reason for such commitment, namely, the *religious* affiliation with Judaism of a small but influential group of Americans. In his farewell address, George Washington urged all citizens to observe good faith and justice towards all nations and noted that a passionate attachment to another nation, among other evils, facilitates the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists. And later, Woodrow

Wilson warned the Congress that only free people can hold their purpose and their honor to a common end, and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own. The present theme of national support for Zionism leaves the rationalist, who feels no emotional ties to Israel, stranded in a sea of irrationality. He is stripped of constitutional rights, taxed to support a theology he rejects, faces the possibility of being forced or drafted to fight a religious war alien to his nature and stands in social jeopardy of his peers. Somehow, the lessons of the Crusades and a thousand other years of holy wars have escaped even this generation of enlightened Americans.

It is clear that Judaism has benefitted from the protective mentality which shields any established or accepted religion from scientific or intellectual criticism. This protective mentality has been especially true in "Christian" America where the child *Christianity* is loathe to criticize its parent, *Judaism*. Judaism in America has also gained from the reluctance of Americans to examine critically the beliefs and actions of a people that has borne an unusual amount of bias and abuse, for whatever reason, through the centuries.

Sometimes the reluctance to speak out against excessive Jewish political power stems from fearing the defamatory label of "anti-Semitic" which Jews readily and liberally ascribe to anyone who would dare question, investigate or otherwise examine critically the practices of Judaism, Zionism and Jewish exclusivism as these practices affect others. This use of emotional blackmail has effectively deprived many Americans of their First Amendment rights of free speech and free press. This subtle suppression of constitutional rights deserves exposure and the condemnation of all who cherish truth and fairness.

The political exploitation of Judaism and the Bible is clearly illustrated in the 1976 presidential campaign of Jimmy Carter. Mr. Carter's chief issues advisor, Stuart Eizenstat, who is Jewish, said of Jimmy Carter: ". . . he sees Israel's future as a moral and religious matter of deep personal concern. The Governor believes in the Bible. He believes that Israel is not just supposed to exist, but that it must exist as a Jewish State."^{20, 21} Furthermore, Mr. Carter was quoted as telling a group of Jewish leaders (note the selectivity of audience) in Atlanta, Georgia that, if elected president, his administration would give Israel "undeviating, unequivocal" support. In his evangelical quest for the most powerful office in the land, if not the world, political candidate Carter continued: "This is not just a political statement. As a Christian myself, I think that the fulfillment of Israel, the coming of that nation, is a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy."²² Someone must tell Mr. Carter, before it is too late, that religion or the fulfillment of biblical prophecy is *not* a proper concern of any United States government! [After the 09-11-01 attack on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., this message bears repeating: **“religion or the fulfillment of biblical prophecy is *not* a proper concern of any United States government!”** 09-18-01 PB]

President Ford also allowed the use of emotionalism conjured up by biblical belief during his presidential campaign. Three days before the election date, this writer received official President Ford Committee campaign literature citing a specific chapter and verse from the Old Testament as a reason for returning the president to office. The letter was addressed to "Dear Fellow Christians" and began with the words, "I have urged the President Ford Committee to send you this material. Never before has the Bible believing Christian community played such a central

role in a Presidential election." The letter was signed by "A. C. Janney, D. D."

The United States Supreme Court declared in a 1971 decision that "Political division along religious lines was one of the principal evils against which the First Amendment was intended to protect."²³ The appeal by political candidates and office holders for votes based along the religious lines of their constituencies is a throwback to the politics of the Dark Ages. In the words of the historian Edward Frank Humphrey, "Such an irresponsible and potentially dangerous policy may win an election, but it may also make the country ungovernable."²⁴ Any candidate who seeks political office in America on a sectarian basis deserves not the vote but the contempt of the people.

A president-elect is required to swear an oath to defend the United States Constitution. As president, he is not permitted by the Constitution to take governmental measures in order to fulfill personal or popular beliefs in biblical prophecy. (It is, therefore, unethical for a candidate to campaign on that promise.) In the context of the on-going Middle East Conflict it is rather frightening to hear or read of a presidential contender promising Jewish voters that, if elected, he will conduct American foreign policy in such a way as to fulfill his or their private concept of biblical belief. One can only hope that Carter, as president, or anyone else here or abroad, will not *feel* the compulsion to push the nuclear button in order to implement a private or popular interpretation of the biblical Battle of Armageddon! Strong popular belief in a mythical prophecy may result in its self-fulfillment. *Time* magazine (October 4, 1976) states that a late Gallup poll indicates that 40% of all Americans "believe that the Bible 'is to be taken literally.'" From an Associated Press dispatch *The Houston Post* (November 4, 1976) reported that, "Former Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan said Carter's 'religious, almost messianic' attitude toward Israel reflected the feelings of the American people." Again, one can only be thankful that Jimmy Carter was not elected by a landslide as a result of his evangelical crusade for The White House.

The scene of presidential candidates Carter and Ford groveling for Jewish support during their second television debate was so demoralizing and pathetic that *Time* described it thus: "Ford and Carter fell all over themselves in wooing the Jewish vote by vowing all-out support of Israel." *Time* reported that "Jerusalem is relishing the spectacle of both candidates trying to outdo each other in public support for Israel." *Time* quoted Israel Foreign Minister Yigal Allon (who had watched the TV spectacle in New York) as saying, "I don't know if Ford or Carter won. All I know is that Israel won."²⁵

It is most certain that America did not win that debate. On February 3, 1948, former Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal spoke to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who was then worried that the Democrats might lose the election to Tom Dewey if they did not strongly support the Zionist position on petitioning Palestine. Secretary Forrestal pointedly told Roosevelt it was "about time that somebody should pay some consideration to whether we might lose the United States."²⁶ That was twenty-nine years ago. In the interim, four Arab-Jewish wars have been fought and tens of thousands of precious lives lost -- sacrificed at the altars of ignorance and greed. A substantial amount of this killing and dying was paid for by billions of dollars extracted from United States taxpayers who have suffered the ravages of run-away inflation and oil shortages precipitated by a short-sighted Middle East policy of power-seeking politicians who

refused to follow the advice of their own Department of State.²⁷

Now the United States has two-hundred technicians in the Sinai Desert stationed between the combatants. Several American presidents have pronounced the Middle East Conflict the gravest threat to peace confronting the world today. That conflict had its inception with the rise of Zionism and became a full-fledged war upon the declaration of Israel as a national unity. In the context of these facts, one would have to be out of touch with reality to suggest that Israel has not been a burden to the United States and the world community.

The Israel-first policy followed by every American president since Harry Truman, with the exception of Eisenhower, is a policy of treason. The television picture of American sovereignty being held hostage by a small pro-Zionist clique which owes its first allegiance to a foreign nation is a debasing and scandalous sight. America needs no more such debates if the highlight of their greatest contention is to see which candidate can promise Israel the most.

David Ben-Gurion, the first prime minister of Israel, is quoted as saying, "A Jew is a Jew first; his allegiance to the state of his abode is the allegiance of a stranger in a host country."²⁸ Because of their strong political support of Israel most Jews of the world seem to be pro-Zionists if not actual Zionists. There are signs, however, that Israel's appeal to world Jewry may be declining.

Zionist Israel has historically based her emotional appeal to various countries to "Let my people go!" on the supposition that they would flee to Israel from the alleged persecutions in their native lands. Now that the record indicates that most Jews who choose to leave Russia are beginning to "flee" to nations other than Israel, the Israeli Zionists have decided to close the emigration center in Austria and to cut off economic assistance to them -- economic assistance given to Israel by American taxpayers for the specific purpose of helping these Russian emigrants. The 94th Congress passed Public Law 94-330 (H.R. 12203 of June 30, 1976) which granted \$15,000,000 for assistance in the resettlement of refugees from the Soviet Union and other communist countries in eastern Europe. Most of these refugees are Jews. (See also the *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 75, p. 178.)

A New York News Service dispatch from Jerusalem reported that "Up to 62 percent of the average 1,000 Soviet Jews granted visas for Israel monthly have switched to other countries during proceedings at an Austrian reception center . . ." ²⁹ The dispatch states that in an obvious move "to block [these] record defections by Soviet Jewish émigrés, Israel has decided to eliminate processing in Austria. . . ." (The reader should know that when Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, himself a Jew, threatened to close down the center several years ago, he was denounced by Israeli Zionists as an "anti-Semitic" Jew.) The dispatch concludes that this decision by Israel "would, in effect, prevent Jews leaving the Soviet Union from choosing destinations other than Israel when they arrive by train from Moscow." It is evident from this mean trick by Israeli Zionists that their much publicized and patronized concern for other Jews is not strictly humanitarian. Israel needs more soldiers and settlers to occupy captured Arab lands that it has announced it will not relinquish peacefully. Russia represents the best national prospect for a source of recruits. But Israel has not hesitated to throw a stumbling-block in the path of those emigrant Jews from Russia who refuse to choose Israel in their search for a better land. (Data from the Austrian emigration center show that the great majority of those who decide against going to Israel come to the United States.) In spite of this harsh turn by Israel,

stubborn pro-Zionists continue to lobby for "unequivocal" support for the Zionist state. The Congress should demand that Israel return any monies granted her for settlement of refugees who decided to settle elsewhere.

THE MONEY POWER

A MAJOR REASON FOR THE disproportionate Jewish influence in the Congress stems from the disproportionate amount of money that Jews give to large numbers of American senators and representatives and the political parties. There can be no doubt that much of this money comes from Zionist and pro-Zionist sources as deliberate bribes to influence American foreign policy. In a greedy and imperfect society, Jews have learned well that economic power is political power. Stephen Isaacs observed in his *Jews and American Politics* (p. 128) that "bribery has been an essential part of Jewish history."

Former Secretary of Defense Forrestal recorded in his diary dated 3 December, 1947, that he realized that a substantial part of the Democratic funds came from Zionist sources inclined to ask in return for "a lien upon this part [the Palestine question] of our national policy." In a diary entry dated 26 November, 1947, Forrestal wrote that the chairman of the National Democratic Committee had told him "Jewish sources were responsible for a substantial part of the contributions to the National Democratic Committee, and many of these contributions were made with a distinct view that they would have an opportunity to express their views, and have them seriously considered, on the Palestine problem."

The speaking engagements of the most pro-Israel politicians, and the flattering awards, plaques and honoraria received by them from pro-Israel groups attest to this deplorable fact of political life. United States public officials -- such as Senators Hubert Humphrey, Clifford Case, Henry Jackson and others -- hungrily seek out and accept speaking engagements before Zionist groups such as the AIPAC where they grub for the Jewish vote and shekel by promising Israel everything but the American sky. The reader can consult sources such as the *Congressional Quarterly*, Federal Election Commission reports and reports filed with the clerks of both houses of Congress for specific documentation of contributions. They are too numerous even to begin to list here but all such reports must be considered as incomplete for the years reported.

Few men or women seeking public office seem able to resist the blandishments offered by the affluent Jewish community. The *Houston Post* describes Senator Lloyd Bentsen's effort to garner Jewish support as follows: "Bentsen, who is testing the waters for a bid for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1976, has begun making appearances before national Jewish groups, many of whose members have been major contributors to Democratic campaigns in the past. Two weeks ago the senator addressed the American Zionist Federation in Miami and last Monday he spoke to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee in Washington."³⁰ (Senator Bentsen is a Texas oil and gas and insurance multi-millionaire who obviously does not need money; it is expanded political power he seeks with help from the Jewish community.)

Political candidates attempt to make these speaking engagements as profitable as possible by sweet-talking the Jews with laudatory comments about Israel. What better way than to compare Israel with America. So, at these functions there is always the inevitable, favorable comparison.

The national interests of both countries are usually described as “common,” “mutual” or “parallel” if not exactly the same. In the aforementioned case of Bentsen, the *Post* quotes his glowing praise of Israel to the Zionist lobby group of AIPAC: “. . . Bentsen described Israel as the United States' 'sister democracy,' a nation that symbolizes to all mankind 'the breaking of the chains of human bondage -- it must not be allowed to perish.' " At another such function, former HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson told 2,000 delegates attending a Jewish War Veterans convention in Houston: “The president sees no need to distinguish in the Middle East between the interest of Israel and the interest of the United States.”³¹

For a fully documented treatise on Israeli democracy and how it compares with democracy in America, the reader is referred to a massive text, *The Golden Calf*.³² The twenty-fifth chapter of this documentary is devoted to the entitled subject, “‘Democracy’ in Israel” and is available in pamphlet form from the American Palestine Committee. This book will inform its reader of more truth and facts about Israel than he will learn from the electronic news media in a lifetime. Israel has become our fifty-first state in all but name. Based upon fiscal year data, Israel is now the annual recipient of more United States aid than all the states of the union combined under the federal government's program of revenue sharing with the states. According to *Business Week* (December 15, 1975), about a third of “\$6 billion a year goes to the 50 states. . .” under the October 1972 Revenue Sharing Act. That is \$2 billion distributed among the fifty states. United States aid to Israel in fiscal 1974 easily surpassed that amount when on December 26, 1973 President Nixon signed the Foreign Assistance Act giving \$2.2 billion to Israel. In each subsequent year, the Congress has appropriated similar amounts for Israel and the end is not yet in sight. For verification of dollar amounts of these and various other appropriations for Israel, the reader should consult the governmental documents, "Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1976," 22 USC 2346, 7 USC 1701, and the note on 22 USC 2751 concerning the "Foreign Military Credit Sales" for 1976. The reader is referred to the *Congressional Record* (December 11, 1973, pp. H 11073-H 11102) for an interesting debate on H.R. 11088 which resulted in the \$2.2 billion aid to Israel.

Leonard J. Davis wrote an article entitled “The 'Jewish Lobby' in Washington” which was published in *The Cleveland Jewish News* on January 24, 1975. Mr. Davis is a staff writer for the *Near East Report*, the AIPAC lobby sheet. Mr. Davis acknowledges that "the Jewish vote is frequently identifiable as a bloc," and refers to Stephen Isaacs's book, *Jews and American Politics*, to confirm that not only the ballot but "the contribution [plays] a major role in securing congressional support" for pro-Zionist legislation. He then explains from the same source: "Jews give more money to campaigns than any other American group, far beyond their 3 percent population figure would suggest. When the time comes for a congressman to decide which way to vote on a controversial issue, he may just remember which side of the 'bread' is buttered." As long as the national impact media are under Jewish influence and control, one will never hear such open confessions of Jewish money power so candidly discussed through the media of radio, television or the popular daily press. These rely too heavily upon Jewish business advertisers and they also know "which side of the 'bread' is buttered."

In a dialogue with Eric Severied," George F. Kennan, a former United States ambassador to Russia and Yugoslavia, noted author (two Pulitzer prizes) and foremost educator in foreign affairs was asked about the Middle East Conflict. Mr. Kennan promptly replied that before the

Mideast conflict can be solved, the Congress must divorce itself from the Zionist lobbyists in Washington. (Mr. Severied just as promptly dropped the subject, evidently preferring not to pursue the matter any further.) In its *Near East Report* issue of September 17, 1975, the AIPAC attacked Ambassador Kennan for making his revealing, straight-forward statement. According to AIPAC logic, it is evidently fine for one of its own staff writers to devote an entire article to "The 'Jewish Lobby' in Washington" as long as it is printed in a selected medium such as *The Cleveland Jewish News*; however, a noted public servant such as Ambassador Kennan must never tell the American people at large of these sordid matters. General Brown and Ambassador Kennan are not alone; the facts and truths of these matters testify with them and will sustain their positions in the pages of history long after the Zionist State of Israel ceases to exist.

The Congress has made only feeble attempts to regulate lobbies and to monitor their lobbying activities. The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 was a step in the right direction. More recently, the House in the 94th Congress passed the "Public Disclosure of Lobbying Act of 1976" which would have required all lobbies to file quarterly reports on the exact nature of their business with congressmen as well as to report total money spent with respect to lobbying efforts. However, the Senate "majority of seventy" failed to act on this much needed legislation. It is possible that the Senate was too busy being lobbied to have time to consider it. Unfortunately, with human nature being what it is, there appears to be no easy solution to the problem. But the problem is a fact and a national disgrace. If the Congress continues to apply ethnic diplomacy in foreign affairs instead of considering the nation's interest as a whole, the future of this country is grim indeed.

On NBC's "Meet the Press" (July 27, 1975) the following colloquy occurred between NBC's Bill Monroe and Senator Mike Mansfield:

Mr. Monroe: "Another subject involving Congressional action -- Greek-Americans influenced the House vote against arms for Turkey; Jewish-Americans have been lobbying against the idea of missiles to Jordan. Are we getting too far into a foreign policy made by Congress responsive to domestic political issues?"

Senator Mansfield: "Ethnicity does have its effect."

Mr. Monroe: "You are worried about this tendency?"

Senator Mansfield: "Yes, because I can only give my loyalty to one country, and that happens to be the United States of America. My father and mother were immigrants from Ireland, but my loyalty isn't to Ireland: it is to this country, no question."

The risks of ethnic diplomacy involve the dragging of a nation into wars unrelated to its national interests. Furthermore, the prostitution of the nation's laws by the Congress to narrow, separatist groups in order to gain special religio-ethnic results in a foreign land is a far more serious breach of the Constitution than a president's cover-up of a second-rate burglary.

BIGOTRY OR EXCLUSIVISM?

JEWS HAVE MASTERFULLY exploited the economic and political values of religious unity in all ages, but nowhere has this been more evident than in twentieth-century America where they have taken extraordinary advantage of certain freedoms and rights which they sometimes deny to

others.

These exploitations have gained them virtual monopolies in the motion picture industry, television news and programming, merchandise chain-retailing, institutional investment banking and stock brokerage, certain domestic and foreign commodity markets linked to their control of gold and uranium mining in South Africa and, of course, the diamond industry which Jews control world-wide from production to retail distribution."^{34, 35, 36} It would be difficult for even a casual observer to escape the conclusion that this hegemonic, oligarchic control by a single ethnocentric group could have occurred except by conscious, deliberate and conspiratorial efforts nourished from generation to generation by a religious ideology that teaches not so much the equality and brotherhood of mankind as preoccupation with its own greatness. Jews thus exemplify themselves as a self-worshipping people* (a fact which could be related to much of the persecution they have experienced). The practice of *stick-togetherness*, when carried out by non-Jews, is known as bigotry; when practiced by Jews it is politely called *exclusivism*.

*In his *Occidental Mythology* (p. 138), Joseph Campbell astutely observed that the hero in the biblical myth of descent and return is the Jewish *people*. This is in stark contrast to other ancient myths of this order wherein the hero or god is an *individual*. The psychological implications for the Jew who believes in the myth of the Chosen People have been investigated by many, including Sigmund Freud. Some of the suggested implications fall within the bounds of human experience delineated by schizophrenia. This schizophrenic attitude is examined by both Jew and Arab in the excellent articles, "We and the Gentiles" by Rubinstein and "They and the Gentiles" by Mehdi in the July/August 1971 issue of *Atlas* magazine. The literature on this theme is practically inexhaustible and its central point seems best expressed by the Jewish-French writer Rabi: "Judaism is essentially a self-assumed tragedy" and "Anti-Semitism is a part of ourselves, of our being and our life." But as Mazrui has pointed out, "Israel's ethnic exclusivity, tied directly to the political logic of establishing a *Jewish* state, is the moral problem which many Western intellectuals have been psychologically unable to acknowledge."

Imagine, if one can, an entire industry under control of a single Gentile or Protestant group, say the Baptists. How long would it take the American Civil Liberties Union to file a legal suit against such a monopoly, charging violations of various governmental laws which prohibit racial and religious discrimination?

While lashing out at the Arab oil cartel, Jewish groups seem little concerned about the Jewish diamond cartel or the oligarchic, Jewish control of the national television networks -- ABC, CBS and NBC -- whose newscasts and other programs are used daily to propagandize and brainwash the American people on almost any topic from abortion to Zionism. [The *internet* has lessened the effect of this control of news outlets by the established, national television networks. PB]

A recent and blatant example of pro-Zionist propaganda was telecast by CBS on August 26, 1976 under the title "The Tenth Level." This program depicted Jews and blacks as the few persecuted ones while WASPS (White Anglo-Saxon Protestants) were depicted as the ever-present persecutors. The PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) was referred to as a "dedicated terrorist group"; while no mention was made of the half-million Arabs who fled their homes in Palestine because of Jewish terrorist organizations such as the Hagana (the former military arm of the Jewish Agency), the Stern Gang and the Irgun Group which, on the night of April 9, 1948, ambushed the Arab village of Deir Yassin and massacred two-hundred and fifty-four of its inhabitants, many of whom were old men, women and children."³⁷

Some of these Jewish terrorists were later rewarded with election to Israel's parliament, the Knesset. A former head of the Irgun terrorist gang, Menahem Begin, remains in the Knesset where he has convinced Israel it should *never* deal with the PLO because it is a terrorist group!*

*On May 17, 1977, Menahem Begin's extremist right-wing party, the Likud, was victorious in Israel's national elections. The victory will elevate Begin to the position of prime minister of Israel. When Prime Minister Begin comes calling on Washington for aid, as his predecessors have done before him, President Carter's White House welcome to "the Butcher of Deir Yassin" promises to explode the president's human rights issue. Millions of human beings, along with their leaders, will see the president's human rights campaign as nothing more than a political sham.

Scores of movies have been produced about Nazi atrocities in World War II, but the Jewish controlled film industry has yet to produce a single movie about Zionist terrorism during the violent period of 1943-1948 which led to the reestablishment of the "Holy Land." The film makers decided long ago that, to the American audience at least, one "Victory at Entebbe" is worth more than one "Massacre at Deir Yassin."

Jews are good script writers, good image makers and good actors. And because a credulous Western world has accepted their created imagery, that world, so falsely led, is now faced with the enigma of reality. So confronted, Judaism has caused its adherents -- particularly those in Israel -- to be victimized by its own inventions. Truth and Reason are not moldable as putty nor will these fit into a house of fantasy.

Unprecedented social and economic crises exist in Israel today. *The Jewish Frontier* (October 1976, p. 8) contains an advertisement placed by the Development Corporation for Israel. The following quotes are excerpts from that ad: "As we begin the New Year, the people of Israel face tremendous economic burdens which will require a far greater measure of support from the Israel Bond Organization than ever before.... The Israelis are making sacrifices. Taxes are the highest in the world, amounting to about 70 percent. The Government has been forced to cut back on health, education, and other social services.... Israel is in urgent need of increased income" The ad ends with a plea to the American Jew to strengthen his "Bond with Israel with an Israel Bond."

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE

THE FORTUNES OF ISRAEL AND America have been allowed to become so entangled by monetary, political and emotional ties as to be inextricably bound together in an unholy alliance (some would say Holy Alliance). This strange alliance with Israel, developed over the past twenty-nine years, has brought this country -- and the world -- to the very brink of disaster. During the 1973 Yom Kippur War all United States armed forces were placed on world wide alert, to come to Israel's rescue if necessary." The existence of this situation is itself *prima facie* evidence of the extent of Jewish power. There need be no further documentation of this fact.

Mr. Fagan Dickson, an Austin, Texas attorney, has made two trips to the Supreme Court to test the question of whether Israel is an establishment of religion within the meaning of the First Amendment. In the first case, "the court side-stepped the issue on procedural grounds." In the second case, it passed the "buck" to the Congress and the Executive Departments and, without

saying so, relied on the Nixon Doctrine of "Reasons of State."⁴¹

A Pennsylvania businessman, Michael J. Bennett, filed a lawsuit to halt United States aid to Israel until Israel separates religion from state matters. According to *Church & State* (September 1975), "Bennett lived and studied in Jerusalem, where he met his wife, who is Jewish and a native of Israel. They had to be married in the United States, Bennett told reporters, because Israeli law does not allow religiously mixed marriages."

In keeping with an apparent policy to protect Israel from public embarrassment, the nationally televised news programs never informed the American public of Mr. Dickson's Supreme Court challenges to the fundamental issue of American support of Israel in the Middle East religious conflict nor through such media was the public told of the Bennett case as far as this writer can determine.

Our founding forefathers wisely forbade governmental establishment of religion or the union of church and state in any form or endeavor, whether it be called Zionism or just *ism*. Thomas Jefferson wrote, ". . . to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of [religious] opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical."⁴² In Washington, D.C., these immortal words are engraved in the stone of the Jefferson Memorial: "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." No free intellect can do less and remain free. It is indeed ironic that the success and fate of the theocratic State of Israel -- where religion and politics are wedded -- depend upon the military power of the United States whose Constitution requires the separation of church and state.

It now seems more than chance that determined that the ascendancy of America's post-World War II power should coincide with the establishment of the State of Israel. That Israel was established at a time when America had no military peer bespeaks volumes about Zionist influence and manipulation of American foreign policy.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. *U. S. News & World Report*, 25 Nov. 1974, p. 68.
2. Joseph Kraft, "Carter faces quagmire unless his goals change," *The Houston Post*, 12 Nov. 1976.
3. *loc. cit.*
4. Naomi Ben-Asher, "Jewish Identity and Christological Symbolism in the Work of Three Writers," *The Jewish Frontier*, Nov. 1972, p. 9.
5. *The Houston Post*, 20 Oct. 1976.
6. *ibid.*
7. *ibid.*
8. *ibid.*

9. *Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism 1969-70*, (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1970), pp. 69, 70.
10. *Time*, 7 July 1967, p. 15.
11. Anthony Pearson, "The Attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty* MAYDAY! MAYDAY!", *Penthouse*, May 1976, pp. 54-57; "Conspiracy of Silence," *Penthouse*, June 1976, pp. 60-151.
12. "Navy Department releases 'Secret' files on *Liberty* Inquiry," The American Palestine Committee news release, 20 Oct. 1976.
13. CBS "Face the Nation," 7 Oct. 1973.
14. Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology* (New York: The Viking Press, 1964), p. 378.
15. J[ohn] C[oert] Ry[laarsdam], "David," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1972.
16. Abram Leon Sachar, *A History of the Jews* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), pp. 34, 35.
17. G[eoffrey] B[arraclough], "Holy Roman Empire," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1972.
18. *Congressional Record*, 21 May 1973, p. S9444.
19. "NBC Evening News" telecast, 12 Nov. 1973; *Congressional Record*, 11 Dec. 1973, p. H11113.
20. *Near East Report*, 28 July 1976.
21. *SWASIA*, 12 Nov. 1976, pp. 1, 4.
22. *Action*, 13 Sept. 1976, p. 1.
23. *Lemon vs. Kurtzman*, 310 F Supp. 35 (1971).
24. As quoted in *Church & State*, Oct. 1976, p. 6.
25. *Time*, 18 Oct. 1976, pp. 18, 23.
26. The Forrestal Diary.
27. Edwin M. Wright, *The Great Zionist Cover-Up* (Cleveland: The Northeast Ohio Committee on Middle East Understanding, Inc., 1975), pp. 21, 23.
28. As quoted in *The Pay-Off* (Bridgeport: The American Palestine Committee, 1975), p. 1.
29. *The Houston Post*, 30 Oct. 1976; Jewish Telegraphic News Agency bulletin, 29 Oct. 1976.
30. *The Houston Post*, 5 May 1974.
31. *The Houston Post*, 17 Aug. 1972.
32. Norman F. Dacey, *The Golden Calf* (to be published). [In my last contact with Mr. Dacey, he had contacted cancer and had yet to find a suitable publisher. PB]

33. "A Conversation with Eric Severeid," CBS Documentary, 7 Sept. 1975.
34. Paul Gibson, "An Interview with Harry Oppenheimer," *Forbes*, 15 Dec. 1972, pp. 28, 30, 32.
35. "It Worked for the Arabs . . .," *Forbes*, 15 Jan. 1975, pp. 19-21.
36. *Standard and Poors Register of Corporations, Directors & Executives 1976; Dun & Bradstreet Million Dollar Directory 1976.*
37. Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *0 Jerusalem!* (New York: Pocket Books, 1972), pp. 295-315.
38. *U.S. News & World Report*, 5 Nov. 1973, pp. 72-74.
39. *Dickson vs. Nixon*, W.D. Tex. 1974, 379 F Supp. 1345 (1975).
40. *Dickson vs. Ford*, 419 U.S. 1085 (1974).
41. *Dickson vs. Ford*, 521 F (2d) 234 (5th Cir. 1975), Cert. Denied, 44 U.S. L.W. 3501 (U.S. March 8, 1976).
42. Thomas Jefferson, "Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom," 1786.

EPILOGUE- A LARGER PERSPECTIVE

A GREAT SAGA, CONCEIVED in mythic fantasy, is being acted out in the real world and, as each scene is played, it becomes part of the historical setting for what is to follow. The script for that story was finished by the Temple Jews about 400 B.C. with the Book of Ezra. For other Jews and converted Gentiles (Christians) the script was not completed until about 96 A.D.

Both scripts have been studied and the lines, although not always agreed upon, have been well learned. The rehearsals are over. The curtains are open. We are late as the play unfolds before us. The paramount question is, "When will the play-acting end?" That, of course, will depend upon which script is followed, and for how long, and which scene Reason will interrupt.

THE DECLINE OF THE WEST

The 1973 Yom Kippur War, with its attendant Arab oil embargo against those nations helping Israel, marks the end of a period of global, strategic hegemony of the Western nations, led by the United States. The worm has turned or is turning. The beginning of the decline of Western, cultic imperialism has begun. Before this generation ends, the blacks who mine the gold and diamond riches of South Africa will tear down the fences which the cults of *bigotry and exclusivism* have erected.¹

A comparison of *apartheid and Zionism* shows enough similarities that an overt, conscious effort is required to avoid the conclusion that both derive from a form of racism. For comparison purposes and examination of some of the issues involved, one should read the following articles

in *Foreign Affairs*: "Black Africa and the Arabs" (July 1975), "Inside the Laager: White Power in South Africa" (October 1976) and "The Anti-Zionist Resolution" (October 1976). Other comparative examinations of Zionism and racism can be found in *The Link* (Vol. 8, No. 5, Winter 1975-6) and in the "Report on the Relations Between Israel and South Africa" released by the United Nations Special Committee Against *Apartheid*. It may well be that the decline of the West, aided by an intransigent Israel, will bring the social salvation of mankind. A spark of hope lies with the youth and anti-clericalists of the Jewish community. Often more sensitive and alert to social injustices than their elders, many young Jews openly condemn the racist capitalism which contains some of the seeds that perpetuate the historic Jewish problem.²

Compare the writings of young Jewish authors such as those who wrote *The Class Nature of Israel* with those of the old traditionalists such as Rabbi Stanley A. Ringer. Rabbi Ringer, writing in *the Jewish Frontier* (March 1972), stated: "First of all we need a strategic base. That is to say, Jews must establish their own 'conditions' of production to be able to build a group structure based on mutual cooperation, ethnic self-interest and cultural and ethical integrity." If this statement by Rabbi Ringer does not advocate economic racism then the English language has no meaning.

The rabbi's advocacy of a *Jewish* economic system is racism of the rankest kind -- a racism dependent upon religious bigotry. It is the kind of racism that has plagued the Jewish people throughout their history. What the world Jewish community needs is more Noam Chomskys, Moshe Machovers, Akiva Orrs, Israel Shahaks and Felicia Langers [and Martin Bubers and Alfred M. Lilienthals]; these are people concerned about the *brotherhood* of mankind.

WHO IS A JEW?

Few seem to recognize that the solution to the Jewish problem lies in the answer to the question, "Who is a Jew?"⁴ The author hesitates to use mystical arguments to answer a question which Judaism raises, but the question itself is cloaked with mysticism and, therefore, seemingly would exclude itself from logical or intellectual inquiry. Many years of study have convinced the author that any serious attempt to solve the Judaic dilemma (exemplified by the Arab-Israeli Conflict) must address itself to the temporal Jew's belief in his unique relationship with God. The spiritual analogue of that relationship is beautifully explained in the New Testament where the answer to the central question was given long before the Israeli Keneset ever sat in council to debate the issue:

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh:

But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

Romans 2:28, 29

The author could not resist giving the King James translation of this passage because of its poetic symmetry, but for his exegetic purpose *The Living Bible Paraphrased* is best rendered:

For you are not real Jews just because you were born of Jewish parents or because you have gone through the Jewish initiation ceremony of circumcision.

No, a real Jew is anyone whose heart is right with God. For God is not looking for those who cut their bodies in actual circumcision, but he is looking for those with changed hearts and minds. Whoever has that kind of change in his life will get his praise from God, if not from you.

The tropology of Scriptural language is here so clearly explained by the Apostle as to preclude any preference for the *natural* Jew unless, of course, one is intent on justifying certain ethnic attitudes and practices upon biblical or religious grounds. These grounds can and have been used by unreasonable and predisposed minds to justify anything.

It should be obvious that the efficacy of a wholly *spiritual* relationship cannot depend upon, nor relate to, the question of one's ethnic heritage. And clearly, societal discrimination should be on a higher plane such as ethics and not upon a basis of ethnocentrism. In the words of Dr. John Nicholls Booth, an eminent minister and educator, "Experience has shown that religion or ethnicism as the bases of nations are Neanderthal structures inconsistent with enlightened and beneficial political entities."⁵ Further contemplation by that facility which unites mankind, the power of Reason, leads to the recognition of man's common origin.⁶ The recognition and acceptance by man of his common genesis will not lead him into a system of theology or philosophy which is rooted in racism.

In Israel, the question of "Who is a Jew?" has caused deep family and social disruptions created by state efforts to define the question legally. Any illegitimate child born in Israel of Jewish parents is not permitted to marry there because of the state rabbinate's monopoly on marriage. The rabbinical courts in Israel interpret the Bible to say that *mamzerim* – Hebrew for bastards – cannot be regarded as Jews. These *mamzerim* are forced to wed outside Israel because of the rabbinate's refusal to allow their marriage. Even then their marriage is not recognized in Israel and the children born of *mamzerim* are also classified as bastards. In 1971, there was an estimated 40,000 Israelis whose social and family statuses were affected by Israel's biblical marriage laws. Dr. George Tamarin, an Israeli psychologist and anti-clericalist, has stated: "When India became independent, it did away with the untouchable cast [caste]. When Israel became independent, it introduced it."⁷ To dramatize their struggle in this area, anti-clericalists have set aside November 9th in Israel and declared it to be "National Bastard Day."

The Legend of the Chosen People is a product of the art of manipulating men -- a prime example of mythic inflation. The Chosen People concept of Judaism is repugnant to Reason from which derived the principle of the dignity and equality of mankind. When followed in practice, it leads to violations of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the United Nations Charter. Moreover, Christianity rejects the Judaic concept of ethnocentrism and Paul rebuked Peter for his hypocrisy in this matter.⁸

The Chosen People concept is the bedrock of doctrinal racism. It is the founding rule of Jewish nationalism promulgated by modern Zionists under color and the supposed protection of religion. Historically, the concept has acted to deter the unity of mankind and the peace of nations. In this generation alone, four wars have been fought over it and a fifth is in the offing but has to wait

while the nations involved take time out to rearm themselves. One wonders if the flames of passion against the *goyim* (other nations [*i.e.*, Gentile]) are rekindled when the biblical exploits of King Saul are read by the "chosen people."⁹

The United Nations debate on Zionism brought the following response from the Synagogue Council of America which represents the Reform, Orthodox and Conservative branches of Judaism in the United States: "Zionism is the liberation movement of the Jewish people in modern times. . . . But Zionism is more than a political phenomenon. It is an expression of Jewish religious belief and hope, for it witnesses to the most distinctive aspects of Jewish faith. Specifically, it is a profoundly spiritual expression of Jewish fidelity to the Biblical covenant which links a people, a faith, and a land in an indissoluble religious unity. It is that unity which is most characteristic and distinctive of Jewish spirituality."¹⁰ It is noteworthy that Zionism is more than just politics or "a political phenomenon"; it is essentially espoused to a religion of biblical origin. The union of politics with religion has bedeviled the Jewish people throughout their history. It has caused perpetual strife not only within the Jewish community itself but between it and its neighbors, whoever these neighbors have been.

There can be no truthful denial that the Arab-Jewish conflict has grown from theological roots. Israel's own ambassador to the United Nations, Chaim Herzog, again confirmed this during the United Nations debate on Zionism when he stated that Zionism is the name of the national movement of the Jewish people as established in the Bible and is an integral part of the Jewish religion.¹¹ After interviewing Israel's Prime Minister Ben-Gurion in 1956, the Jewish columnist Joseph Alsop wrote an article for the now defunct *New York Post Dispatch* (June 13, 1956): "In these days, the Old Testament is hardly news. Yet every Western policymaker and every Arab leader ought to study it prayerfully, for there is no other way to understand the spirit of David Ben-Gurion, which is also in large measure the spirit of his people. That spirit is a cardinal fact in the Middle East; and if you do not take it as fact, you are bound to make the wildest misjudgments and nourish the most idiotic false hopes."

Because of the theological nature of the Middle East Conflict, it is unlikely that the diplomatic or military forces of the United States, or of other nations, can solve the dispute. That dispute is the result of belief in Jewish mythology and it will end when men quit their beliefs in mythic folly. That dispute will end when man learns that in *creedal*, formal religions symbols are created to fill the void of man's ignorance or to stand in place of the ineffable. But God will not be mocked by any definition of creed or limitation of symbolism.

"Like the Nyanga tribesman ... [who] shares a 'psychic identity' with the animal -- an identity that exists in the realm of myth and symbolism,"¹² the Christian fundamentalist shares a psychic association or "mystical participation" with the natural Jew who claims to be the "chosen" of God. Unfortunately, Zionists and other zealous fundamentalists have concerned themselves with the symbols (such as the temporal "Holy Land" or the temporal "Holy City") rather than the realization of a spiritual relationship with their Creator. So while the natural Jew fights his symbolic war with murderous weapons supplied by the United States government, his spiritual counterpart will be attempting to follow the Golden Rule.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. James Cook, "Blacks, Whites and Harry Oppenheimer," *Forbes*, 15 June 1973, pp. 38-49 and editorial, p. 11.
2. *American Jewish Year Book 1974-75* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1974), Vol. 75, pp. 548,555.
3. Haim Hanegbi, Mose Machover and Akivar Orr, *The Class Nature of I\$rael* (Cambridge: Middle East Research & Information Project).
4. J. J. Goldberg, "Who Is A Jew?", *Jewish Frontier*, March 1974, pp. 44-47; *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 71, pp. 437,438.
5. John Nicholls Booth, "The Decline of America and its Middle East Policy," *U.S. Farm News*, Aug. 1975.
6. John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government* (New York: The New American Library, 1965), pp. 429, 430.
7. *The Galveston Daily News*, 1 Nov. 1971.
8. Galatians 2:11-13.
9. Abram Leon Sachar, *A History of the Jews* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), pp. 34, 35.
10. *New York Times*, 31 Oct. 1975.
11. Chaim Herzog, *U.N. Monthly Chronicle*, Dec. 1975, p. 40.
12. Carl G. Jung, *Man and His Symbols* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1964), p. 45.

SPECIAL NOTES

In lieu of a comprehensive bibliography which would be disproportionately lengthy compared to the text of this small book, I deem it important to note for the reader the following volumes: *Abraham in History and Tradition* (Yale 1975) by Professor John Van Seters and *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Harvard 1973) by Professor Frank M. Cross. The works of these American scholars, together with those of Professor Joseph Campbell, are proving to be almost indispensable to the unraveling of the mysteries surrounding the origin of the Bible.

My special thanks belong to Dr. Edwin M. Wright, formerly with the United States Department of State, Division of Middle East Affairs and later Assistant Dean of the Foreign Service Institute. His detailed analyses and encouragement in personal letters to me are gratefully acknowledged.

[After assisting Dr. Wright in the publication (in book form) of his *Torah, Zionism and Palestine* (1983), I was honored with his visit in my home. Photographs taken of us during his visit are posted on my web site at <http://www.the--beauty--of--truth.com> . He was then in his eighties. Among our many enjoyments while he was in Texas was a tour of NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston. Within a few months of returning home to Ohio, Dr. Wright passed away. I look forward to revisiting his gentle spirit and abiding with the Omnipotent Spirit. P.B.]

[Update, September, 2001: In my last contact with Norman Dacey, he was no longer living in America; he had contracted cancer and had not found a suitable publisher for his book. I am no longer a member of the United Nations Association of America nor a director of the Gulf Coast Council on Foreign Affairs. I have been retired from the chemical industry for many years. PB]