

ISRAEL'S WILLING EXECUTIONERS: THE ROLE OF ISRAEL IN THE NEOCONSERVATIVE MOVEMENT

The Power of Israel in the United States

James Petras

Atlanta: Clarity Press, Inc., 2006

Rulers and Ruled in the US Empire

Bankers, Zionists and Militants

James Petras

Atlanta: Clarity Press, Inc., 2007

Reviewed by Edmund Connelly

“There is presently an inability in America even to formulate or sustain a discourse related to the subject of Israeli influence on the United States.”

—James Petras¹

For over a decade now we've been witnessing a kind of schizophrenia within the Jewish community regarding the wisdom of admitting that the most powerful and active purveyors of neoconservatism have in fact been Jews. Initially, many prominent Jews and publications that are considered to be heavily Jewish were quite proud of the above fact and were not shy about sharing this information publicly. As the “cakewalk” in Iraq turned sour, however, there was a concomitant turn toward silence. When respected sources such as former President Jimmy Carter or elite scholars John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt came out with books that uncomfortably pointed to Zionist power in America, one could witness a circling of the Jewish wagons in many venues.

Such comfortable homes to neoconservatism as *The Public Interest*, *The National Interest*, and *Commentary* (published by The American Jewish Committee) began to ignore any connection between Jews and

¹ *The Power of Israel in the United States* (Atlanta: Clarity Press, Inc., 2006), 54.

neoconservatism. For example, the Winter 2004 issue of *The Public Interest* had an essay titled “Conservatives and Neoconservatives.” Yet author Adam Wolfson offered not even an oblique reference to Jews. Never mind that the journal’s co-founder, Irving Kristol, is considered by many to be the father of neoconservatism, or that the other three editors over the forty-year life of the magazine have also been Jews.

Over at its more foreign policy oriented sister publication, *The National Interest*, Francis Fukuyama, in “The Neoconservative Moment” (Summer 2004) also failed to mention this connection. And in the October 2005 issue of *Commentary*, Joshua Muravchik did likewise in his article “Iraq and the Conservatives.”² This tendency reached its most absurd point at the beginning of 2008, when neocon heavyweight William Kristol was chosen as a columnist for *The New York Times*, and no mention of his Jewish identity was made. For those who might not know, Kristol is the son of just-mentioned neocon godfather Irving Kristol and prominent Jewish writer Gertrude Himmelfarb. The younger Kristol and Robert Kagan (also Jewish) co-founded the Project for the New American Century in 1997, which some have seen as providing the blueprint for our post-9/11 world.³

This ambivalence about naming neocons as Jews was obvious at *The Times* just before and after the beginning of 2008. In mid-December, America’s “paper of record” featured a review of a new book about neocon hawk Richard Perle written by Alan Weisman, “a world-traveled journalist and the son of Ukrainian Jews.” In the review

² Earlier, Muravchik had argued strenuously against those who saw neoconservatives as being overly powerful in the Bush administration. See “The Neoconservative Cabal,” *Commentary*, September 1, 2003. This phenomenon is also now visible at *The American Conservative*, which was created to resist a major neocon initiative—the war in Iraq. Pat Buchanan and Taki in particular verged on bellicosity in their comments on Jewish power. In 2007, however, Taki left the magazine and Jewish businessman Ron Unz took over as publisher. This change gives one pause when reading a cover article on Rudy Giuliani that appeared in the January 14, 2008 issue. Author Michael Desch duly notes that “Team Rudy is all neocon all the time” but fails to say more than that when referring to Giuliani advisors Norman Podhoretz, Martin Kramer, Stephen Rosen, Daniel Pipes, and Peter Berkowitz. Throughout, Desch never refers to the strong ties between neoconservatism, pro-Israel activism, and the organized Jewish community.

³ So far, the only controversy surrounding the appointment has been that Kristol is a “conservative.” In fact, *The Times* has long preferred its “conservative” columnists Jewish. For years, William Safire was the in-house “conservative,” while more recently David Brooks has taken over.

were found familiar neocon names such as Elliott Abrams, Douglas Feith, Michael Ledeen, and David Frum. The reader, however, heard not a word about their Jewish identity, not even in a casual reference or use of code words. One month later, however, the very same *Times Book Review* addressed Jacob Heilbrunn's *They Knew They Were Right: The Rise of the Neocons*—yet another book on neocons written by a Jewish author. But this time the reviewer, Timothy Noah, could not have been more blunt about the Jewish nature of the movement: "There's no point denying it: neocons tend to be Jewish."⁴

This heavily reviewed book should put to rest the arguments that the neoconservative movement is not particularly Jewish in nature or overly favorable to Israeli interests. Further, with Heilbrunn we should all agree that, "It is anything but an anti-Semitic canard to label neoconservatism a largely Jewish phenomenon."⁵ This accords with the claim made in these pages by Kevin MacDonald that "neoconservatism is indeed a Jewish intellectual and political movement." With respect to Jewish involvement in the neocon movement, MacDonald concludes that, "The current situation in the United States is really an awesome display of Jewish power and influence."⁶

This admission comes late in the day, for neocon influence in US foreign policy has continued long past the start of the Iraq War, the ongoing attempts at ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians, the massive 2006 destruction of Lebanon by Israeli armed forces, and robust efforts to preemptively bomb Iran for its alleged nuclear ambitions. Further, neocons and their influence appear to have a bright future, despite premature claims about their star having set. Heilbrunn, for one, argues that the neocons have bounced back before from other seeming setbacks and will likely do so again.⁷

A reviewer of Heilbrunn's book puts it more succinctly:

⁴ In an article in *The American Conservative*, Philip Weiss delivers the same verdict: "Heilbrunn achieves one important chore: a forthright social narrative of the neocons as a Jewish movement." See "The Long Fuse to the Iraq War," *The American Conservative*, January 28, 2008.

⁵ Jacob Heilbrunn, quoted in Evan R. Goldstein, "Fight Makes Right," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 18, 2008.

⁶ Kevin MacDonald, "Understanding Jewish Influence III: Neoconservatism as a Jewish Movement," *The Occidental Quarterly* 4 (Summer 2004), 7, 57.

⁷ Jacob Heilbrunn, "5 Myths About Neoconservatism," *The Washington Post*, February 10, 2008, B03.

They are in it for the long haul; they have been at this for decades. None of these people are going away. They remain energized. This is not a movement that is on its heels. And though the professionalization of the neoconservative movement was in part its undoing as a vibrant intellectual force in American life, the very fact that it has been so institutionalized in Washington guarantees that it will remain an influential force well beyond Iraq.⁸

Needless to say, neocon power and its links to what is generally known as the Israel Lobby have generated resistance. Opinions about this Lobby and Jewish neoconservatives range from pungent to calm and reasoned, with a pundit like Pat Buchanan representing one end of the spectrum and former President Carter or scholars Mearsheimer and Walt the other.

Carter, of course, has raised the hackles of many because of arguments he makes in *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*. For instance, he claims that the United States exhibits “undeviating backing of Israel”; that “because of powerful political, economic, and religious forces in the United States, Israeli government decisions are rarely questioned or condemned”; and that “voices from Jerusalem dominate in our media.”⁹ This echoes the thesis of Mearsheimer and Walt, whose *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* has powerfully critiqued the existence and goals of what they define as “a loose coalition of individuals and organizations who actively work to steer US foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction.”¹⁰

Buchanan adopted a far more belligerent tone in his seminal cover story in *The American Conservative* back in early 2003. Entitled “Whose War?” it answered that the pre-planned attack on Iraq following 9/11 was instigated by a “neoconservative clique.” Ratcheting up the rhetoric, Buchanan went on to write, “We charge that a cabal of polemicists and public officials seek to ensnare our country in a series of wars that are not in America’s interests. We charge them with colluding with Israel to ignite those wars.”¹¹

⁸ Goldstein, “Fight Makes Right.”

⁹ Jimmy Carter, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), 17, 209.

¹⁰ John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2007), 112.

¹¹ These remarks remain consistent with his position prior to the first Iraq War.

Now we have the entry of an eminent American scholar who gives Buchanan a run for title of most strident anti-neoconservative: James Petras, the retired Bartle Professor of sociology at Binghamton University. A well-known Marxist, he is the author of the 2006 book *The Power of Israel in the United States*. How his approach compares to that of Carter et al. is of some interest.

Petras adopts a tone similar to that of Buchanan but expands Buchanan's arguments into a book-length exposé, arguing persuasively that the Zionist project to subvert American sovereignty has succeeded, much to the detriment of many non-Israelis: "The tyranny of Israel over the US has grave consequences for world peace and war, the stability and instability of the world economy, and for the future of democracy in the US."¹² A theory of Jewish power will help to more fully understand Petras's specific arguments.

JEWISH MOVEMENTS

In essence, Petras is discussing a concrete instance of a Jewish movement, in this case one that benefits Israel. The theoretical background for understanding such Jewish movements can be found in

On the McLaughlin Show, he said: "There are only two groups that are beating the drums for war in the Middle East—the Israeli Defense Ministry and its amen corner in the United States." "The Israelis want this war desperately because they want the United States to destroy the Iraqi war machine. They want us to finish them off. They don't care about our relations with the Arab world" (quoted in William F. Buckley, Jr., *In Search of Anti-Semitism* [New York: Continuum, 1992], 26). Paul Craig Roberts has also consistently claimed Israeli pressure is the reason for the US involvement in Iraq. In a recent VDARE post he wrote:

If the US now needs foreign troops to save its bacon in these two lost wars, it should demand them from Israel. Israel is why the US is at war in the Middle East. Let Israel supply the troops. The neocons who dominated the Bush regime and took America to illegal wars are allied with the extreme right-wing government of Israel. The goal of neoconservatism is to remove all obstacles to Israeli territorial expansion. The Zionist aim is to grab the entirety of the West Bank and southern Lebanon, with more to follow later. . . . All of these lies were designed to tie America down in interminable wars in the Middle East for Israel's benefit. There is no other reason for Bush's invasions. We know for certain that Bush and his entire administration lied through their teeth about the Taliban and about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

"Bush Calls on France for Help," http://vdare.com/roberts/080211_bush.htm.

¹² Petras, POI, 14.

the work of Kevin MacDonald, the evolutionary psychologist who has written a trilogy on the Jewish people:

Jewish populations have always had enormous effects on the societies in which they reside because of several qualities that are central to Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy: First and foremost, Jews are ethnocentric and able to cooperate in highly organized, cohesive, and effective groups. Also important is high intelligence, including the usefulness of intelligence in attaining wealth, prominence in the media, and eminence in the academic world and the legal profession. I will also discuss two other qualities that have received less attention: psychological intensity and aggressiveness.¹³

MacDonald finds that Jewish movement leaders are highly intelligent Jews who persist in their efforts to attain group goals:

These groups may therefore be conceptualized as secular versions of historical Jewish groups not only because of the high levels of Jewish identity characteristic of group members, but also because these groups retained the essential characteristics of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy. Because of these characteristics, these groups were extraordinarily effective in achieving their aims. . . . [H]ighly disciplined, cooperative groups are able to outcompete individualist strategies. Indeed, an important thread . . . is that Jewish intellectuals have formed highly cohesive groups whose influence to a great extent derives from the solidarity and cohesiveness of the group. Intellectual activity is like any other human endeavor: Cohesive groups outcompete individualist strategies. The fundamental truth of this axiom has been central to the success of Judaism throughout its history whether in business alliances and trading monopolies or in the intellectual and political movements discussed here.¹⁴

¹³ MacDonald, "Understanding Jewish Influence I: Background Traits for Jewish Activism," *The Occidental Quarterly* 3 (Summer 2003), 5. For the evolutionary basis of these movements, see his book *A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1994), *passim*.

¹⁴ Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Westport, Conn.:

Writing initially in the mid-to-late nineties, MacDonald focused primarily on the intellectual movements that sought to weaken, if not undermine, Western culture and particularly its ethnic basis in European-derived peoples. These movements offered radical critiques of Christianity and gentile mores, and any sense of a positive gentile identity. Thus, for example, Franz Boas's dominance of American anthropology resulted in attacks on the core of Majority American identity by negating the very concept of race. Sigmund Freud's creation and propagation of psychoanalysis performed a similar function, one that was adopted by the essentially Jewish group known as the Frankfurt School. Viewed more broadly, MacDonald argues that Jews as a constituent part of the Left (Old and New) advanced Jewish interests while weakening the ethnic core of the American majority. He also found that the attack on gentile society was central to the changes in historical patterns of immigration to America and its European homelands.¹⁵

Because the movement known as neoconservatism was hardly a pressing issue at the time MacDonald was writing, he paid scant attention to it. Post-9/11, however, things changed. George W. Bush assumed the presidency just prior to these attacks, and with him came the prominent non-Jewish neocons Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, neoconservatism became a movement of national, indeed international importance.

In response to the rise of the neocons, MacDonald penned a three-part series called "Understanding Jewish Influence," which appeared in *The Occidental Quarterly* in the Summer and Fall of 2003 and the Summer of 2004. The final essay is entitled "Neoconservatism as a Jewish Movement."¹⁶ MacDonald the evolutionary psychologist operates from a perspective utterly different from that of Petras the Marxist. Yet both scholars reach similar conclusions. Thus it seems likely that both are viewing something objective and real.

Praeger, 1998), 5.

¹⁵ These arguments comprise the entirety of *The Culture of Critique*, the final book in MacDonald's trilogy.

¹⁶ MacDonald, "Understanding Jewish Influence I: Background Traits for Jewish Activism," *The Occidental Quarterly* 3 (Summer 2003): 5-37, "Understanding Jewish Influence II: Zionism and the Internal Dynamics of Judaism," *The Occidental Quarterly* 3 (Fall 2003): 15-44, and "Understanding Jewish Influence III: Neoconservatism as a Jewish Movement," *The Occidental Quarterly* 4 (Summer 2004): 7-74.

PETRAS ON THE POWER OF ISRAEL IN AMERICA

Petras's thesis in *The Power of Israel in the United States* (henceforth POI) is simple: The Israel Lobby's ability to influence American Middle East policy is vast. Such power lies behind the US attack on Iraq and a possible wider war against Iran and/or Syria. Further, the Lobby assures that the United States will both condone and contribute to the Israeli colonization of Palestine. Petras sets for himself the task of describing the players, their tactics, and the overall effects of this campaign.

Current Lobby efforts on behalf of Israel do not exist in a vacuum. On the contrary, Petras argues, these efforts are behind "Israel's wars of aggression against Arab states" in 1967, 1973, as well as the first US attack on Iraq (1991). In his introduction, he demands that, "We must call the system of power by its name, organization, and international alignment—without euphemism." That he does.

Petras employs the concept of hegemony to explain the breadth of Lobby power, including great Jewish individual and corporate wealth and such extensive ownership of important media that "hegemony" would apply there as well. Both money and media influence play important roles in the Lobby's successes in Washington.

"Who fabricated the Iraq War Threat?" asks Petras in Part I. He answers that the Israel Lobby and its neoconservative operatives in America (and elsewhere) did. Couching it in terms familiar to those acquainted with MacDonald's Jewish thesis about Jewish movements, Petras writes:

While the design and execution of the US war strategy was in the hands of Zionist civilian militarists in the Pentagon, they were only able to succeed because of the powerful support exercised by Sharon's acolytes in the major Jewish organizations in the US. The Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, the Anti-Defamation League, AIPAC, and the thousands of their activists—doctors, dentists, philanthropists, real estate magnates, financiers, journalists, media moguls, and academics—acted in concert with key Jewish politicians and ideologues to press the case for a war because, they would argue, it was in the interest of the State of Israel . . . (POI, p. 29)

Putting it in political science terms, Petras stresses that "the ZPC's

[Zionist Power Configuration's] formal and informal *structure* has a crucial dynamic element to it: each power center *interacts* with the rest, creating a constant 'movement' and activity, which converges and energizes both leaders and followers" (POI, p. 47). Petras is right to stress this "crucial dynamic element," for it explains how a seemingly small number of actors (Jewish neoconservatives) drawn from a small portion of the American population (Jews constitute roughly two percent of the US population) could effect such large changes. In addition, it allows in-depth analysis of phenomena that are too easily dismissed as "conspiracy theories" and thus left unexamined and unchallenged.

Another shibboleth Petras deals with early is the claim that "Big Oil" is behind US behavior in the Middle East, a belief popular with American progressives in particular. Petras shows that "there is no evidence that the major US oil corporations pressured Congress or promoted the war" (POI, p. 21), revealing this canard as one that survives far more by the power of propaganda than by the facts. Of the facts, Petras writes:

A thorough search through the publications and lobbying activities of the oil industry and the pro-Israel lobbies over the past decade reveals an overwhelming amount of documentation demonstrating that the Jewish lobbies were far more pro-war than the oil industry. Moreover the public records of the oil industry demonstrate a high level of economic co-operation with all the Arab states and increasing market integration. In contrast the public pronouncements, publications, and activities of the most economically powerful and influential pro-Israel Jewish lobbies were directed toward increasing US government hostility to the Arab countries, including exerting maximum pressure in favor of the war in Iraq, a boycott or military attack on Iran, and US backing for Israeli assassination and ethnic cleansing of Palestinians. (POI, p. 22)

Nowhere was this more apparent than in the ability of the pro-Israel lobby to prevent profit-seeking oil companies from going forward with new projects in Iran. The Lobby, Petras claims, was responsible for Congress barring major American oil companies from investing in Iran, as represented by Executive Order 12959, first signed by

Bill Clinton and renewed by Bush.

Returning to his thesis on Zionist power and the responsibility for faulty (if not fraudulent) evidence regarding Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), Petras, like others, zeroes in on familiar suspects: "From all available evidence it was the 'unofficial' political advisers organized by Wolfowitz, Feith, and Rumsfeld in the Office of Special Plans (OSP) who were the source of the fabricated evidence, which was used to 'justify' the invasion and occupation of Iraq" (POI, p. 20). Thus begins the litany of largely Jewish names and groups associated with this intelligence "error," names that Petras finds associated with other US policies in the Middle East.¹⁷

Again, the "dynamic element" in this network is apparent. Former Pentagon insider Lieutenant Colonel Karen Kwiatkowski, for instance, is quoted as identifying "cross-agency cliques" composed of neocon and pro-Israel organizations, including the Project for the New American Century, the Center for Security Policy, and the American Enterprise Institute. "What became very clear was that the OSP and its directors, Feith and Wolfowitz, were specifically responsible for the fabricated evidence of the 'Weapons of Mass Destruction' that justified the war on Iraq" (POI, p. 20).¹⁸

Who, then, benefited from the Iraq War? Petras's answer echoes that of Buchanan, who wrote just prior to the invasion:

Cui Bono? For whose benefit these endless wars in a region that holds nothing vital to America save oil, which the Arabs must sell us to survive? Who would benefit from a war of civilizations between the West and Islam?

Answer: one nation, one leader, one party. Israel, Sharon,

¹⁷ Working through Jewish interests in the mass media, particularly *The New York Times*, Jewish spokespersons were allowed to disseminate the Lobby Party Line that justified the war. Three people named in the effort are Judith Miller, David Frum, and Ari Fleisher (POI, p. 62).

¹⁸ Petras reports that OSP directors Feith and Wolfowitz were primarily responsible for the fabrications. Richard Perle joined Feith in authoring a 1996 paper for Likud Party leader Benjamin Netanyahu called "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm." In addition to calling for Hussein's replacement, it also advised an overthrow or destabilization of the governments of Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Iran, thus leading to something akin to a "Greater US-Israel Co-Prosperty Sphere" (POI, pp. 20–21).

Likud.¹⁹

The response Petras gives to the same question differs only in its identification of the country rather than a specific party in that country: "The only major beneficiary of the war has been the State of Israel" (POI, p. 28).

While others have made similar arguments, Petras—perhaps because he approaches this from a Marxist angle—offers something in a way others have not. First, in describing the odd relationship between America, an imperial power, and Israel, a small regional power, he writes that

Unlike Washington's relation with the EU, Japan and Oceania, it is Israel which pressures and secures a vast transfer of financial resources . . . Israel secures the latest arms and technology transfers, unrestrictive entry into US markets, free entry of immigrants, unconditional commitment of US support in case of war and repression of colonized people, and guaranteed US vetoes against any critical UN resolutions. (POI, p. 31)

These vast transfers of wealth are commonly known, so the figures Petras cites in detail are unneeded. The "unique aspects" of the relationship, however, are what should excite our attention. This second aspect has to do with affronts to America, the alleged greater power. For instance, Israel routinely gives sanctuary to fugitives from American law, such as "super rich financial swindlers like Mark Rich, and even gangsters and murderers." When requests by America are made with respect to these matters, they are "pointedly ignored" by Israel, the "lesser power" (POI, p. 31).

More profoundly, Petras points to case of the 1967 Israeli attack on the US Navy intelligence-gathering ship the USS *Liberty*, an attack which killed 34 American sailors and wounded 173. Despite abundant evidence that the American ship was easily identified as such, and despite strong evidence that the Israelis knew this, an attempt was nonetheless made to sink the ship in international waters. Almost miraculously, the ship survived, but "Washington acted as any Third World country would when faced with an embarrassing attack

¹⁹ Buchanan, "Whose War?"

by its hegemon: It silenced its own naval officers who witnessed the attack, and quietly received compensation and a pro-forma apology” (POI, p. 32).

Most telling, Petras writes, “Not only was this an unprecedented action in US military and diplomatic relations with an ally, *there is no case on record of an imperial country covering up an assault upon itself by a regional ally*” [emphasis added] (POI, p. 32). Normally, such circumstances elicit at least a show of imperial displeasure, yet this case was different:

This apparent anomaly cannot in any way be explained by military weakness or diplomatic failures: the US is a military superpower . . . But the Jewish-American Lobby, Congress people, media and Wall Street moguls strategically located in the US politico-economic system ensured that President Johnson would behave like a docile subject. No direct pressures were necessary, for a hegemonized political leadership acts seemingly on its own beliefs, having learned the rules of the political game. The bottom line is this: the Israel-US relationship is so entrenched that not even an unprovoked military attack could call it into question. (POI, p. 32)

Petras moves next to the Jonathan Pollard spy case, which suggests the question: If Israel is capable of such blatant spying against its ally and protector, what else might it be willing to consider? While remaining prudently agnostic on the matter, Petras does find the US response to further instances of Israeli spying on the US suspicious, particularly as it occurred immediately after the 9/11 attacks.

Over the course of the remaining months of 2001, US authorities acting under the power of the newly instituted Patriot Act arrested sixty Israelis, including active military and intelligence operatives. This information was aired on Fox News by reporter Carl Cameron, who also revealed that even prior to 9/11, 140 other Israelis had been detained or arrested on espionage charges. As extensive as these arrests were, the power held collectively by Jews in Washington and the mass media meant that no other major outlet made reference to these arrests, nor did they refer to the Fox News reports. Fox itself quickly relegated its own stories to the memory hole.

To Petras, this illustrates how “Israeli hegemony ‘persuades’ or

'intimidates' the media establishment and political leaders to operate with maximum discretion in limiting reporting about Israel's appropriation of strategic information." The closest parallel he finds toward this kind of obsequious behavior "is the response of poor, dependant Third World countries to US espionage. In that context docile rulers quietly ask the Ambassador to rein in some of the more aggressive agents." Again stressing the importance of a wide international network of Jews, Petras concludes that, "The lack of any public statement concerning Israel's possible knowledge of 9/11 is indicative of the vast, ubiquitous and aggressive nature of its powerful Diaspora supporters" (POI, pp. 34-35).

THE POWER OF THE JEWISH DIASPORA

As forceful as Petras's case against the Zionist Power Configuration might be, what he is really describing in this book and his subsequent 2007 book *Rulers and Ruled in the US Empire: Bankers, Zionists and Militants*²⁰ (henceforth R&R) is the extensive power Jews in general have amassed, particularly in the United States. It is this general power that allows Israel to exercise such control over America *in this particular instance*. Viewed more broadly, Israeli influence is but one of many interconnected aspects of Jewish power throughout the world. Explaining how this power is gained and wielded—in this instance with respect to the Middle East—is Petras's greater goal.

The root of Jewish power is familiar: money. As Petras notes, "Jews in North America, South America, and Europe are disproportionately in the highest paid positions, with the highest proportion in the exclusive, prestigious private universities, with disproportionate influence in finance and the media" (POI, p. 57). MacDonald has also extensively documented this differential Jewish success in resource competition, naming it as one of the chief sources of gentile resentment and fear (anti-Semitism) over the ages. He summarizes the basic thesis of his second book on Jews, *Separation and Its Discontents*, as

. . . the proposition that Judaism must be conceptualized as a group strategy characterized by cultural and genetic segregation from gentile societies combined with resource competition and conflicts of interest with segments of gentile societies. This

²⁰ James Petras, *Rulers and Ruled in the US Empire: Bankers, Zionists and Militants* (Atlanta: Clarity Press, Inc., 2007).

cultural and genetic separatism combined with resource competition and other conflicts of interest tend to result in division and hatred within the society.²¹

While Petras writes only about the contemporary world, other observers have noted Jewish financial success stretching back to antiquity. Often, this success was a result of serving the interests of local elites, thus earning the antipathy of the oppressed masses. In the fifth century B.C., for instance, Jews acted as imperial clients of the Persian government. During the Hellenistic period, Jews settled in Osroene, Cyrenaica, Egypt, Syria, Parthia, and Anatolia, and did the same. Such financially beneficial activity continued throughout both the Christian and Muslim eras.

A key aspect of these periods was the enrichment of Jews (as well as the ruling elite) and impoverishment of the native population. This is depicted in the Biblical story of Joseph and his sojourn in Egypt: “Then Joseph settled his father and his brothers, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land . . .”²² In the end, Joseph came into possession of all the money of the Egyptians; the Pharaoh took title to the land, while Joseph “made slaves of them [the Egyptians] from one end of Egypt to the other.”²³

A similar process was observed in Hellenistic Syria where Joseph, a Jewish tax farmer employed by the Ptolemies in Egypt, “obtained compliance by killing prominent citizens and confiscating their property in areas that refused to pay their taxes, thereby stripping Syria ‘to

²¹ Kevin MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998), vii. MacDonald further writes that:

. . . there has often been resource competition and other conflicts of interest between Jews and gentiles. Social identity theory predicts that such conditions will lead to group conflict as well as to a number of psychological processes in which both Jews and gentiles develop negative stereotypes of the other group. These stereotypes need not be based on accurate information, and they typically result in positive evaluations of the ingroup and negative evaluations of the outgroup. (p. viii)

While the entire book deals with resource competition, chapter 6 in particular sheds light on the subject.

²² Gen. 47:11.

²³ Gen. 47:20–21.

the bone.”²⁴ MacDonald notes that “in the absence of powerful controls on Jewish economic behavior, Jewish-Gentile resource competition extended throughout the economy to include trade, merchandizing, moneylending, manufacturing, and artisanry.”²⁵

This process was repeated by Sephardic Jews in the Iberian Peninsula, both before and after the Spanish reconquest, and in early modern Poland. In addition, Jewish success in resource acquisition increased after Jewish emancipation following the European Enlightenment. Thus, in Germany, “Jewish emancipation resulted in marked differences in the economic, educational, and occupational profiles of Jews and Germans.”²⁶

Paul Johnson documented the rise of the Jews throughout Europe in this period:

Jews dominated the Amsterdam stock exchange, where they held large quantities of stock from both the West and East India Companies, and were the first to run a large-scale trade in securities. In London they set the same pattern a generation later in the 1690s. . . . In due course, Jews helped to create the New York stock exchange in 1792.²⁷

In recent years, this theme of “the rise of the Jews” is most often associated with historian Albert Lindemann, who introduced it in his 1991 work *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank), 1894–1915*. This rise was both demographic—Jewish population growth exceeded that of surrounding gentile societies—and cultural/financial. It was “part of a remarkable ascendance of the Jews since the late eighteenth century. . . . [I]t is clear that in the long history of the Jews, the rise of the Jews in the nineteenth century has few parallels in terms of the rapid transformation of the condition of Jews—in absolute and relative numbers, in wealth, in fame, in power, and in influence.”²⁸

Lindemann expanded on this theme in his 1997 Book *Esau's Tears*:

²⁴ MacDonald, *A People That Shall Dwell Alone*, 115.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 113–15 and chapter 6 *passim*.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 123.

²⁷ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 283.

²⁸ Albert Lindemann, *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank), 1894–1915* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 10.

Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews. In Germany, for instance, Jews became increasingly more prominent in the latter half of the nineteenth century, when large department stores were largely in the hands of Jewish owners, up to half of the banks were owned by Jews, and Jewish students were overrepresented “often by ten, twenty, even thirty times their numbers in German society.”²⁹

A similar progression was visible throughout Europe. In France, for example, highly visible Jewish success (and links to massive scandals) worried many groups. “What were the limits of Jewish success in a country like France, where they remained less than two-tenths of one percent of the total population?”³⁰ This was the kind of question many Frenchmen asked themselves after the supporters of the Jewish Alfred Dreyfus succeeded in defeating his opponents.

Indeed, this correlation between a nation’s wealth and the presence of Jews prompted Max Weber’s contemporary, Werner Sombart, to famously claim:

Cannot we bring into connexion the shifting of the economic centre from Southern to Northern Europe with the wanderings of the Jews? The mere suggestion at once throws a flood of light on the events of those days, hitherto shrouded in semi-darkness. It is indeed surprising that the parallelism has not before been observed between Jewish wanderings and settlement on the one hand, and the economic vicissitudes of the different peoples and states on the other. Israel passes over Europe like the sun: at its coming new life bursts forth; at its going all falls into decay.³¹

MacDonald emphasizes that, “This was especially the case in Eastern Europe where economic arrangements, such as tax farming, estate management, and monopolies on retail liquor distribution, lasted far longer than in the West”:

²⁹ Lindemann, *Esau’s Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 115.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 235.

³¹ Werner Sombart, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1997), 13. Jacques Attali makes a similar observation: “As Russian Jews invented socialism, and as Austrian Jews invented psychoanalysis, American Jews in the forefront, participated in the birth of American capitalism and in the Americanization of the entire world.” Quoted in Tomislav Sunic, *Homo americanus: Child of the Postmodern Age* (Booksurge.com, 2007), 97.

In this way, the Jewish arendator became the master of life and death over the population of entire districts, and having nothing but a short-term and purely financial interest in the relationship, was faced with the irresistible temptation to pare his temporary subjects to the bone. On the noble estates he tended to put his relatives and co-religionists in charge of the flour-mill, the brewery, and in particular of the lord's taverns where by custom the peasants were obliged to drink. On the church estates, he became the collector of all ecclesiastical dues, standing by the church door for his payment from tithe-payers, baptized infants, newly-weds, and mourners. On the [royal] estates . . . , he became in effect the Crown Agent, farming out the tolls, taxes, and courts, and adorning his oppressions with all the dignity of royal authority.³²

Perhaps nowhere was the rise in Jewish power more pronounced than in Russia during the first half of the twentieth century. In conjunction with Jewish success elsewhere, Russian-Jewish immigrant Yuri Slezkine has dubbed this "The Jewish Century." With respect to Russia, Slezkine highlights the vastly disproportionate success of Jews from the 1850s until well past the Second World War. Bankers, merchants, administrators, entrepreneurs, railroad kings, mining magnates, fishing fleet owners, and a huge array of other wealthy Jews dominated the Russian economy.³³

Though Slezkine adds a disclaimer that, "There was no Jewish

³² MacDonald, "Stalin's Willing Executioners," *The Occidental Quarterly* 5 (Fall 2005): 67–68, where he quotes N. Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland* (1981), 444, and cites O. Subtleny, *Ukraine: A History* (1988), 124.

³³ For instance, as a first cousin to Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin wrote:

There was hardly an area of entrepreneurial activity from which Jewish entrepreneurs were successfully excluded. Apart from the manufacturing industries in the Pale of Settlement, one could have encountered them at the oil wells of Baku, in the gold mines of Siberia, on the fisheries of the Volga or Amure, in the shipping lines on the Dnepr, in the forests of Briansk, on the railroad construction sites anywhere in Europe or Asiatic Russia, on cotton plantations in Central Asia, and so forth.

Slezkine then cites H. Sachar as noting "it was the initiative of Jewish contractors that accounted for the construction of fully three-fourths of the Russian railroad system." In *The Jewish Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 120.

master plan, of course,” he does show how ethnocentrism helped Jews achieve such rapid advances. In the Russian empire could be found “a network of people with similar backgrounds and similar challenges who could, under certain circumstances, count on mutual acknowledgment and cooperation.”³⁴ Such an account fits in well with MacDonald’s account of the Jewish group evolutionary strategy.

As Lindemann and others have noted, Jewish representation among leading Bolsheviki was also high,³⁵ including in the dreaded Cheka (secret police). “Jewish representation at the top levels of the Cheka and OGPU (the acronyms by which the secret police was known in different periods) has often been the focus of those stressing Jewish involvement in the revolution and its aftermath.”³⁶ Slezkine’s statistics on Jewish overrepresentation in these organizations bolster the claim made by Leonard Schapiro that “anyone who had the misfortune to fall into the hands of the Cheka stood a very good chance of finding himself confronted with and possibly shot by a Jewish investigator.” During the 1930s, the NKVD, or secret police, “was one of the most Jewish of all Soviet institutions.” In particular, Jews were in charge of organizations that handled internal deportation and the operation of the gulag, which from its inception until nearly 1939 was headed by Jews, a period in which the worst excesses of the Great Terror were seen. This is what prompts Slezkine to call such Jews “Stalin’s willing executioners.”³⁷

³⁴ Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, 121.

³⁵ In *Esau’s Tears* (pp. 429–35) Lindemann argues that “there were still many Jewish Bolsheviki, especially at the very top of the party,” along with many Jewish revolutionaries in the secret police:

Simple numbers or percentages fail to address the key issues of visibility and qualitative importance . . . [and] citing the absolute numbers of Jews, or their percentage of the whole, fails to recognize certain key if intangible factors: the assertiveness and often dazzling verbal skills of Jewish Bolsheviki, their energy, and their strength of conviction.

Lindemann goes on to note the marked overrepresentation of Jews leading Communist movements elsewhere in both Eastern and Western Europe. Alluding directly to the censorship surrounding the issue, Lindemann writes that the perception of “‘foreign Jews, taking orders from Moscow’ became a hot issue.” As with this topic in America today, in post-World War I Europe, “it remained mostly taboo in socialist ranks to refer openly to Moscow’s agents as Jewish.”

³⁶ MacDonald, “Stalin’s Willing Executioners,” 84.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, and Slezkine, 177, 254, 103.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, Stalin's efforts in the late 1930s to evict Jews from positions of prominence met with severely limited success, as Slezkine's numbers show. At a main research center in 1949, for instance, there were forty-four Jews, fourteen Russians, and only four "others." At the Soviet Academy of Science Institute of Literature (Pushkin House) fully 80 percent were Jews. Eight of the top ten directors of the Bolshoi Theater and nearly half of the directors of Moscow theaters were Jews. Even among circus directors, more than half were Jews.³⁸

JEWISH POWER IN AMERICA

As impressive as such statistics about the rise of the Jews in Europe may be, they are rivaled by Jewish success in the United States, particularly after the arrival of over three million Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe around the turn of the twentieth century. No matter what year chosen from 1900 onward, testimony to this success comes from a broad range of observers. On the critical side were columns written for Henry Ford's newspaper *The Dearborn Independent* in the early 1920s. More positively, *Fortune* magazine in 1936 devoted an issue to Jewish prominence, finding results consistent with those of Paul Johnson, who wrote:

Throughout the twentieth century American Jews continued to take the fullest advantage of the opportunities America opened to them, to attend universities, to become doctors, lawyers, teachers, professional men and women of all kinds, politicians and public servants, as well as to thrive in finance and business as they always had. They were particularly strong in the private enterprise sector, in the press, publishing, broadcasting and entertainment, and in intellectual life generally. There were certain fields, such as the writing of fiction, where they were dominant. But they were numerous and successful everywhere.³⁹

³⁸ Slezkine, 301-302; MacDonald notes that "in the case of Pushkin House, the opponents of the dominant clique stated that it was forged "by long-lasting relationships of families and friends, mutual protection, homogeneous (Jewish) national composition, and anti-patriotic (anti-Russian) tendencies" ("Stalin's Willing Executioners," 78).

³⁹ Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, 567.

Jumping ahead to 1985, Charles Silberman noted such facts as: At *The New York Times*, America's most influential paper, "Jews now hold all seven of the top editorial positions listed on the paper's masthead" and "at *The Wall Street Journal* . . . [t]hree of the *Journal's* four top executives are Jews . . ."; "The motion picture industry was largely a Jewish invention, and it remains a predominantly (although not exclusively) Jewish industry. . . . more than three out of five members of the 'movie elite' are Jews"; "some 23 percent of the people on the *Forbes* 1984 list of the four hundred richest Americans were Jews."

To give a richer flavor of this success, Silberman explains that:

Jews are equally influential, if less well known, in the management of television news. It is the network correspondents, of course, who have become household names, among them Jews such as Mike Wallace, Morley Safer, Bernard Goldberg, and Morton Dean of CBS; Marvin Kalb and Irving R. Levine of NBC; and Herbert Kaplow, Barbara Walters, and Ted Koppel of ABC. The greatest concentration of Jews, however, is at the producer level—and it is the producers who decide which stories will go on the air, and how long, and in what order they will run. In 1982, before a shift in assignments, the executive producers of all three evening newscasts were Jewish, as were the executive producers of CBS's *60 Minutes* and ABC's *20/20*.⁴⁰

Political scientist Benjamin Ginsberg found in 1993 that, "Since the 1960s, Jews have come to wield considerable influence in American economic, cultural, intellectual, and political life." This would include the fact that half of the billionaires at the time were Jewish. In the late 1960s, "Jews already constituted 20% of the faculty of elite universities and 40% of the professors of elite law schools; today, these percentages doubtless are higher." Jews also "play leadership roles in such important public interest groups as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Common Cause. Several Jews also played very important roles in the 1992 Democratic presidential campaign. After the Democrats' victory, President Clinton appointed a number of Jews to prominent positions in his administration."⁴¹

⁴⁰ Charles E. Silberman, *A Certain People: American Jews and Their Lives Today* (New York: Summit Books, 1985), 143–54.

⁴¹ Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State* (Chicago: University of

More recent research shows an increase in Jewish overrepresentation. For instance, social historian David Gerber summed up this prominence as of 1997:

In the most recent Congress, ten United States Senators were Jews, as were some thirty members of the House of Representatives. Very few of them could have depended on Jewish votes to form their electoral majorities. President Clinton's first-term cabinet included four Jews: Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin, Secretary of Commerce Mickey Cantor, Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, and Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman, who was formerly a congressman from Kansas. Glickman seems proof of the success of American Jew at gaining acceptance of power, for neither agriculture nor Kansas has traditionally ranked high on the list of things Jewish in America. The last two appointees to the Supreme Court, Stephen Breyer and Ruth Bader Ginsburg, have been Jews.⁴²

In *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood*, Neal Gabler began by quoting two sources as saying:

Russian-Jewish immigrants came from the *shtetls* and ghettos out to Hollywood. . . . In this magical place that had no relationship to any reality they had ever seen before in their lives, or that anyone else had ever seen, they decided to create their idea of an eastern aristocracy. . . . The American Dream—is a Jewish invention.⁴³

Not only was it a "Jewish invention," it remains a heavily Jewish industry, as writer Steven Silbiger recently noted in his book, *The Jewish Phenomenon*:

Chicago Press, 1993), 1.

⁴² David A. Gerber, "Ill at Ease," *Culturefront*, Winter 1997, 96.

⁴³ In Neal Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1988), 1. For one of the most lyrical accounts of the Jewish rise in American culture, see Stephen J. Whitfield's two books, *American Space, Jewish Time: Essays in Modern Culture and Politics* (Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 1996) and *In Search of American Jewish Culture* (Hanover, N.H.: Brandeis University Press, 1999).

In addition to the corporate chieftains, a huge number of Jewish people participate in the entertainment industry. It has not been part of a grand scheme, but when an ethnic group becomes as heavily involved, and as successful, in a particular industry as Jewish people have been in movies, the group's influence, connections and power produce a vast ripple effect, and other Jewish actors, writers, editors, technicians, directors, and producers follow in their footsteps.

Silbiger goes on to survey Dreamworks, owned by Steven Spielberg, David Geffen, and Jeffrey Katzenberg, who are sitting on five billion dollars in capital; the vast media holdings of Sumner Redstone (including Paramount Pictures); Michael Eisner's stewardship at Disney; the Bronfman family's ownership of Universal Studios; Bob and Harvey Weinstein's success with Miramax (*The Crying Game*, *Pulp Fiction*), etc.⁴⁴

This prominence is no longer a source of fear for most American Jews. On the contrary, it is openly discussed (though mostly only by Jews) and even used as fodder for satire, as Bryan Fogel and Sam Wolfson, the two Jewish authors of the successful play *Jewtopia* do. In their 2006 book version of the play, Chapter 8 is titled "Conspiracy Theories: Do Jews Control the World?" In the following pages they note that of the ten major Hollywood studios discussed, nine were created by Jews (Walt Disney being a gentile), and all ten are run by Jews. "Conclusion: Yes, we do control the movie studios. All Jews please report to the World Conspiracy Headquarters immediately (don't forget to bring your pass code)."⁴⁵

They then do the same for TV networks, finding a leadership figure of seventy-five percent. Discussing print media, they find seven of ten major publications are run by Jews. "Conclusion: Jews have lots of opinions that they love to write about and charge you money to read! Cool."⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Steven Silbiger, *The Jewish Phenomenon: Seven Keys to the Enduring Wealth of a People* (Atlanta: Longstreet Press, 2000), 111. Of course, in the fast-changing world of entertainment, alliances and ownership are constantly changing too.

⁴⁵ Bryan Fogel and Sam Wolfson, *Jewtopia: The Chosen Book for the Chosen People* (New York: Warner Books, 2006). The book is an offshoot of an original Los Angeles play written by the authors. See the homepage for the play and book at <http://jewtopiaworld.com/#>.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* Studios discussed are: Columbia, Warner Bros., MGM, Universal, Paramount, Disney, Miramax, Dreamworks, New Line, and 20th Century Fox. Two ex-

PETRAS ON JEWISH POWER IN AMERICA

None of this immense concentration of ethnic power is lost on Petras, who is at all times cognizant of the fact that, "Jewish families are among the wealthiest families in the United States" and that nearly a third of millionaires and billionaires are Jewish. He also points to similar wealth in Canada, where "over 30 percent of the Canadian Stock Market" is in Jewish hands (POI, p. 14). Alan Greenspan's tenure as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve is also linked to Zionist power, since Greenspan was "a long time crony of Wall Street financial interests and promoter of major pro-Israeli investment houses" (POI, p. 49). (Greenspan was succeeded by coreligionist Ben Shalom Bernanke.)

While he makes much of these facts in *The Power of Israel in the United States*, the issue comes to the fore in his subsequent book, *Rulers and Ruled in the US Empire: Bankers, Zionists and Militants*. Petras answers the question "Who Rules America?" by first cautioning us about "the confusion between those who make government decisions and the socio-economic institutional parameters which define the interests to be served" (R&R, 15).

Debunking the "high school textbook version of American politics," Petras argues that, "the people in key positions in financial, corporate and other business institutions establish the parameters within which the politicians, parties, and media discuss ideas. These people constitute a ruling class" (R&R, 15). Of the two groups cited by Petras—those in control of financial capital and Zioncons—both are so heavily Jewish as to constitute a single "cabal," a word which Petras uses liberally throughout both books.⁴⁷

cellent overviews of current Jewish dominance in a wide variety of fields in America can be found in MacDonald's *The Culture of Critique*, in particular the Preface to the First Paperback Edition, and *Understanding Jewish Influence: A Study in Ethnic Activism* (Augusta, Ga.: Washington Summit Publishers, 2004), particularly Section II: "Jews Are Intelligent (and Wealthy)," 24-27.

⁴⁷ For extended discussions on Jews and money, see Stephen Birmingham, *Our Crowd: The Great Jewish Families of New York* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); Stephen Birmingham, *The Grandees: America's Sephardic Elite* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971); Jean Baer, *The Self-Chosen: "Our Crowd" is Dead—Long Live Our Crowd* (New York: Arbor House, 1982); Judith Ramsey Ehrlich and Barry J. Rehfeld, *The New Crowd: The Changing of the Jewish Guard on Wall Street* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1989); Richard L. Zweigenhaft and G. William Domhoff, *Jews in the Protestant Establishment* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982); Gerald Krefetz, *Jews and Money: The Myths and the Reality* (New Haven and New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1982); Den-

Wall Street supplies many of the “tried and experienced top leaders” who rotate in and out of Washington. At the top of the hierarchy, he finds the big private equity banks and hedge funds. Thus, political leadership descends from Goldman Sachs, Blackstone, the Carlyle Group, and others. Goldman Sachs is a historically Jewish firm; Stephen A. Schwarzman is co-founder and current head of the Blackstone Group, while David Rubenstein is co-founder of the Carlyle Group and served in the Carter administration as a domestic policy adviser.⁴⁸

To get just a minor sense of the interconnectedness of Wall Street and Washington that Petras discusses—and to see its heavily Jewish ethnic nexus—note that during the second Clinton Administration, Robert Rubin served as Secretary of the Treasury and was succeeded by Larry Summers (also Jewish). Rubin worked his way to Vice Chairman and Co-Chief Operating Officer of Goldman Sachs prior to becoming the Secretary of the Treasury, and later became the Chairman of Citigroup. He is currently co-chairman of the board of directors of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The current Secretary of the Treasury, gentile Hank Paulson, was formerly a CEO of Goldman Sachs. Lest one make a partisan argument for Republican dominance here, Petras quotes a financial newspaper as saying, “Neither Mr. Bush nor Goldman have been criticized by Democrats for holding too many powerful jobs in part because the investment bank also has deep ties to the Democrats.” How deep? “Goldman represented the biggest single donor base to the Democrats” prior to the 2006 mid-term elections (R&R, pp. 25–26).⁴⁹

nis B. Levine, *An Insider's Account of Wall Street* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1991); Benjamin J. Stein, *A License to Steal: The Untold Story of Michael Milken and the Conspiracy to Bilk the Nation* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992); Connie Bruck, *The Predators' Ball: The Inside Story of Drexel Burnham and the Rise of the Junk Bond Traders* (New York: Penguin Books, 1988); James B. Stewart, *Den of Thieves* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991); and J. J. Goldberg, *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1996), 117–18.

⁴⁸ See Stephen Labaton and Jenny Anderson, “Mr. Kravis Goes to Washington (Capra Rolls Over),” July 11, 2007, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/11/business/11tax.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin.

⁴⁹ With the richest two percent owning half the world's wealth (and 85 percent of it held by the top 10 percent), questions on control of such wealth are important (see R&R, p. 21). During 2006 mergers and acquisitions reached \$4 trillion dollars (R&R, p. 31). See also Petras's essay “Iran War: American Military Versus Israel Firsters,”

Never failing to link money to the Israel Lobby, Petras shows how two Israel-firsters tightly controlled congressional elections. Wall Street favorites Senator Charles "Israel First" Schumer (elsewhere described as "the Senator for Tel Aviv") and Congressman Rahm Emanuel (who served during the first Gulf War – as an *Israeli* soldier), along with "Zionlib" Barney Frank, declared that they have "good working relations" with Wall Street (R&R, p. 25). Backed by a slush fund, such people ensured that "over thirty Jewish Congressmen and women and thirteen Senators were elected, including all of the Jewish incumbents, [and] a number of senatorial and Congressional leaders married to Zionists (R&R, p. 105).⁵⁰

Apropos of Rahm Emanuel's service in the Israeli military, Petras later notes that

Israel and its US Lobby were and are largely unmoved by the death and injury of US soldiers in Iraq and the squandering of the US taxpayers' money. This has been reinforced by the fact that less than 2/10 of one percent (0.2 percent) of the US soldiers in Iraq were Jewish, and probably very few of those were on the front lines. More young American Jews volunteer to serve in the Israeli Defense Forces. (R&R, p. 118)

This recalls Pat Buchanan's claim that should America prosecute the war on Iraq in favor of Israeli interests, the fighting would be done by kids "with names like McAllister, Murphy, Gonzales, and Leroy Brown."⁵¹

(November 2007): "Since the military would be called upon to carry out the military option which it strongly opposes, the Zion-Cons turn to their automatic, rubber-stamp majority in the US Congress and especially their most zealous Zionists in the federal bureaucracy. Treasury Department functionary Levey has devoted all of his working time browbeating, banning, and blacklisting any and all businesses and banks dealing directly or indirectly with Iran or its trading partners."

<http://petras.lahaine.org/articulo.php?p=1718&more=1&c=1>. Similar figures can be confirmed in Goldberg, 276–78; and Ginsberg, 1.

⁵⁰ Slezkine notes the increase in intermarriage among Jews higher up the chain of command in the Bolshevik hierarchy, such as Trotsky and Zinoviev. Gentiles Bukharin and Molotov, among many others, were married to Jewish women (179). See also Lindemann, *Esau's Tears*, 424.

⁵¹ In Buckley, 28. Slezkine notes a parallel observation about Jews in the Red Army during the Revolution, where "the percentage of them at the front itself was a comparatively small one" (p. 187).

Petras then moves from the concentration of Jewish power in financial matters to its connection to Israel. He notes that leading media such as *The Wall Street Journal* and *New York Times* work closely with Zionists, and in practically all cases, “the Zionist Lobby calls the shots and its Wall Street Acolytes acquiesce” (R&R, p. 27). By way of illustration, he points to the fact that when in 2006 Palestinians voted overwhelmingly in favor of Hamas, the Israeli government refused to recognize it and began a new series of assaults on Palestinian towns, carrying out 369 raids into the West Bank. None of this was reported in the American mass media (print or electronic) (POI, p. 11). Similarly, the offer by the president of Iran to discuss solving contentious issues met with silence: “Not a single major television or print media in the US ran the Iranian president’s offer – as would be predictable in our Zionized media.”⁵²

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR THE IRAQ DEBACLE?

We have seen where the neocons were largely responsible for America’s second attack on Iraq, which has now gone badly. Petras, then, becomes concerned for who is to blame. Suddenly, Jewish neocons have become far less visible, and apologists such as journalist Seymour Hersh “attempt to head off the anti-Zionist headhunting coalition by focusing on two Goyim – Rumsfeld and Cambone” (POI, p. 70). Petras is right about this attempt to protect fellow ethnics. In interviews just prior to the 2006 elections, a host of neocon operatives were interviewed and sought to distance themselves from the Iraq fiasco by blaming others – but only gentiles.

Kenneth Adelman, for instance, though professing deep respect for personal friend Donald Rumsfeld, still blamed him for many of the problems in carrying out the plans of the neocons: “I’m crushed by his performance.”⁵³ Adelman also blamed three other top gentiles: Paul Bremer, George Tenet, and General Tommy Franks. “Those three are each directly responsible for the disaster of Iraq.”⁵⁴

Michael Ledeen, top scholar from the leading neocon think tank, the American Enterprise Institute, felt that Condoleezza Rice, in her capacity as national-security adviser, had sought compromise rather

⁵² Petras, “Iran War.”

⁵³ David Rose, “Iraq: Neo Culpa,” *Vanity Fair*, January 2007.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

than right decisions.⁵⁵ Eliot Cohen saw "a very different quality of leadership"⁵⁶ as responsible for missed chances in 2003 and 2004. Michael Rubin, also from the AEI, faulted the Commander-in-Chief this way: "Where I most blame George Bush is that, through his rhetoric, people trusted him, people believed him. Reformists came out of the woodwork and exposed themselves."⁵⁷

Richard Perle, a chief architect of the war, offered that "this unfolding catastrophe has a central cause: devastating dysfunction within the Bush administration. . . . At the end of the day, you have to hold the president responsible."⁵⁸ Incredibly, Perle claimed, "Huge mistakes were made, and I want to be very clear on this: they were not made by neoconservatives, who had almost no voice in what happened . . ."⁵⁹

The most outlandish opinion, however, came from Ledeen, who argued that the best way to understand the dysfunction of the Bush administration was to ask, Who are the most powerful people in the White House? "They are women who are in love with the president: Laura [Bush], Condi, Harriet Miers, and Karen Hughes."⁶⁰

Writing in 2007, Petras confirmed his previous observations on these matters, claiming "Whatever inside dope Hersh cited that had not been public was based on anonymous sources which could never be double checked or verified, whose analysis incidentally coincided with Hersh's peculiar penchant for blaming the Gentiles (WASPs) and exonerating the brethren" (R&R, p. 119).

Meanwhile, attempts were made to wind down American involvement in the Iraq War, represented most promisingly by former Secretary of State James Baker and his efforts with the Iraq Study Group. With bipartisan support, backing from the big oil companies, Iran willing to negotiate, and Bush's strategy of "staying the course" discredited, "one would have thought that Baker's proposals for moving forward in a new direction in the Middle East would be a 'cakewalk.' Clearly, the ball seemed to be in Baker's corner" (R&R, p. 103).

Unfortunately, this proved wrong. What optimists missed was "the great elephant in the parlor—the Israeli/Jewish Lobby and its extended

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

reach in Congress, the Democratic Party, the media, and other vehicles for shaping US Middle East policy” (R&R, p. 103). A “massive Zionist propaganda campaign in all the mass media,” along with the Israeli Prime Minister’s “nose leading” of Bush scuttled any prospects for peace (R&R, 99).

This anti-peace campaign reached an absurd level when Arun Gandhi, grandson of Mahatma Gandhi, wrote in an online forum for *The Washington Post*: “Jewish identity in the past has been locked into the Holocaust experience. . . . The Jewish identity in the future appears bleak. . . . We have created a culture of violence (Israel and the Jews are the biggest players) and that Culture of Violence is eventually going to destroy humanity.”⁶¹ Due to Jewish pressure, Gandhi resigned from his post at the M. K. Gandhi Institute for Nonviolence at the University of Rochester, prompting one writer to ask, “How’s that for Jewish commitment to peace?”⁶²

The Jewish Lobby’s aversion to peace became even more obvious after Democrats were swept back into office in what was thought to be a pro-peace mandate. Due in large part to Jewish Lobby control over the Democratic Party, an unmistakable message was given to the country: “the strategy Bush actually committed to was that which was in line with *Israel’s* ‘strategic interest’ of extending its power and domination in the Middle East.” When new Democratic Congressional leader Nancy Pelosi hinted at holding back funding for Bush’s war, the Lobby sent a clear message against it, and Pelosi “swallowed the frog in silence” (R&R, p. 106).

In reality, Pelosi had no need to feel particularly humiliated since, in Petras’s view, such kowtowing to the Lobby was expected. As a mere congresswoman, she had far less prestige than a president, two of whom Petras describes in his characteristic way: “Bush has the dubious distinction of being the President-most-servile-to-a-foreign-power in US history (exceeding his predecessor, ex-President Clinton, Zionist Emeritus)” (R&R, p. 109). (Petras is no kinder to Clinton’s wife Hillary, numbering her among one of the “Zionist-colonized Senators.”⁶³)

⁶¹ Deborah Howell, “The Anger Over an Online Essay,” washingtonpost.com, February 3, 2008.

⁶² Christopher Donovan, *The Occidental Observer*, <http://www.theoccidentalobserver.com/authors/Donovan-Gandhi.html>.

⁶³ Petras, “Iran War.”

ATTACKING CRITICS OF ZIONIST POWER

Petras also points out how critics of Zionist power are attacked, from Carter to Mearsheimer and Walt. Because "the parameters of political debate on Israel-related issues" are shaped by pervasive Lobby influence in the media, critics meet first with censorship, then with virulent attacks should they evade censorship (POI, pp. 46-47). Mearsheimer and Walt have encountered such a "virulent campaign," "a propaganda campaign of defamation" which includes charges that their views amount to "the new Protocols of Zion," are anti-Semitic, and use "sources from Neo-Nazi websites" (POI, p. 55).⁶⁴

Russian-Israeli Jew Israel Shamir offers an apt analogy to this kind of frenzied attack on targeted critics of Jewish behavior or ideas. Describing the way a swarm of gnats attack a horse, driving it to distress, Shamir says the Jews "developed the same style of attack. It is never a single voice arguing the case, but always a mass attack from left and right, below and above, until the attacked one is beaten and broken and crawls away in disgrace."⁶⁵ Arguing in a fashion similar to what we have seen from Petras et al., Shamir emphasizes how the *collective* action of the group matters. "Each attacker is as tiny and irrelevant as a single gnat, but as a swarm they are formidable." He ties the power of these swarm attacks not merely to the Jewish elites but to the "quite ordinary Jews who fully identify with their community." While there may be "many Jewish media-lords, even more editors," it is the ordinary Jews who make enforcement of an agreed-upon policy effective.

⁶⁴ Petras notes that the call to purge Mearsheimer and Walt from their respective places of employment have met with partial success, as the Harvard Kennedy School has distanced itself from their paper. In the United States and France, legislation is being prepared to equate criticism of the Lobby's power with anti-Semitism, which would become then a "hate crime" (POI, pp. 54-57). MacDonald also notes that "controlling the public image of Judaism via censorship of defamatory materials and the dissemination of scholarly material supporting Jewish interests" is an important Jewish strategy (*Separation and Its Discontents*, 34-35). This is borne out in the Mearsheimer and Walt case, where Alan Dershowitz made fourteen references to David Duke and five to the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* when discussing Mearsheimer and Walt's work. Abraham Miller joined this swarm when he wrote, "Professors Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer's recently disseminated anti-Semitic screed has been ripped apart by both prominent scholars and literary figures showing it to be an intellectual fraud being passed off as serious scholarship" (cited in Foreword to *Homo americanus*, xxvii-xxx).

⁶⁵ Israel Shamir, "Carter and Swarm," January 28, 2007, http://www.gnosticliberationfront.com/carter_and_swarm.htm.

“These willing executioners of our freedom, the foot-soldiers of the media lords, automatically defend ‘the Jews,’ i.e., the organised Jewish community at any price.”

Thus, Petras can describe how the “overseas networks” of the Israeli state reinforce sanctions against criticism. “From the height of the network to the lawyers’ boardrooms, and the doctors’ lounges, the pro-Israel supporters of the network aggressively attack as ‘anti-Semites’ any critical voices. Through local intimidation and malicious intervention in the professions, the zealots defend Israeli policy . . .” (POI, p. 37).

ISRAEL’S VOLUNTEERS

These zealots and ordinary Jews in the Diaspora can be of great use to Israel, as Petras explains. Those who cooperate directly with Israeli intelligence agencies are referred to as *sayanim* in Hebrew, and they comprise a “huge worldwide network of Jews in strategic or useful places (real estate, mass media, finance, car dealerships, etc.) who have agreed to help Israeli Mossad activities within their own countries” (POI, p. 141). Others offer help in more informal ways. As we have seen, these Jews can appear to be non-political, innocuous citizens such as professors, doctors, dentists, lawyers (or car dealers as just noted).

Petras concentrates on their current efforts to support right-wing Israeli aims, including the disabling of critics. Of these Diaspora Jews, Petras writes, “there is no crime, no matter how terrible and perverse, that Israel commits, which will not be supported by the respectable professors, investment bankers, journalists, surgeons, policy advisers, real estate moguls, lawyers, school teachers, and other ordinary folk who make up the activist base of the Major Organizations” (POI, p. 102).

Two particular instances of these “helpers” are Noam Chomsky and investigative journalist Seymour Hersh. Chomsky is famed for his sharp criticism of US foreign policy and the injustices that often flow from those policies, and his anti-Zionist credentials might look good by dint of the fact that he has been reviled “by all of the major Jewish and pro-Israel organizations and media” (POI, p. 168).

His shortcoming, according to Petras, is his failure to discuss the formulation of American policy in the Middle East, “particularly the role of his own ethnic group, or the Jewish pro-Israel Lobby and their Zionist supporters in the government” (POI, p. 168). Ultimately, Petras

condemns Chomsky for giving a "free ride" to the "principal authors, architects, and lobbyists in favor of the war" (POI, p. 180).

Petras takes Hersh to task for the disinformation found in his *New Yorker* report on the US use of torture in Iraq. Conveniently, Hersh had omitted the role of Zionists, including the experts from Israel who shared their expertise on torturing Arab prisoners. "The glaring omissions are deliberate—as they are obvious. They form a systematic pattern and serve the purpose of exonerating the Pentagon Zionists and Israel," and placing the blame on a gentile (POI, p. 67).

One more category of enabler comes in the form of "progressive" Jews who nonetheless support the most extreme actions of Israel. As with Chomsky, Petras sees the silence of progressive Jews as amounting to collaboration; the academic "Israel First" supporters of war in the Middle East are even worse (POI, p. 174). More generally, he holds in disdain those "self-styled" progressive Jews "who are ever protective of everything Jewish—even war crimes" (and who receive support from major Jewish organizations). "The tragic myopia or perverse refusal of leftist Jews to face up to the prejudicial role of the major Zionist and Jewish groups promoting the Israel First policy . . . undermines their and our efforts to secure peace and justice in the Middle East" (POI, pp. 56–57).⁶⁶

OLIGARCHS

One of the rare areas in which Petras makes a retreat in his critique of Jewish/Zionist power comes with respect to the small group of men who took over so much Russian wealth immediately following the fall of Communism. In *The Power of Israel* he consistently refers to them as Jewish, noting in fact that, "Six out of the seven are Jews" (POI, p. 46). In *Rulers and Ruled*, however, he omits the Jewish reference, though he remains highly critical of their "gangster tactics."⁶⁷

⁶⁶ See also Scott McConnell ("How They Get Away With It," *The American Conservative*, July 4, 2005) on the impact Jewish participation in a peace movement can have. Unlike the 1960s, today's empire-builders don't have to worry about Jewish dissent because among politically active Jews, there has been a shift associated with the rise of neoconservatism. Nowadays, "political passion, engagement, and activism are as likely to be found on the Jewish Right—at least a Right favoring a pro-war, pro-imperialist (and very pro-Israel) foreign policy—as they are on the Left. Nothing could be more different from 1968."

⁶⁷ For example, he points to the fact that two-thirds of the oligarchs were still in their early to mid twenties: "assassinations, massive theft, and seizure of state re-

Petras claims that former President Clinton and his economic advisers backed the regimes that allowed the plunder of Russian wealth. Though relegated to an endnote, he names Andrei Shleifer and Jeffrey Sachs as those involved. What is relevant here are the ethnic connections going to the top of American society that validate Petras's emphasis on the *combined* power of Zionism and media and financial control.

Petras's endnote shows that Harvard paid \$26.5 million to settle a suit stemming from various improprieties associated with Harvard professors. As Steve Sailer illustrates, however, it is the *Jewish* aspect of the entire scandal that stands out. The principals of this scandal were Jews, and they were allegedly protected by fellow Jew, Harvard President Lawrence Summers (who had just finished a stint as Secretary of the Treasury). The upshot of the scandal was that the "reform" of the Russian economy "turned out to be one of the great larceny sprees in all history, and the Harvard boys weren't all merely naive theoreticians." The 45-year-old Shleifer, though Russian, nonetheless vacationed each year with Summers, which may explain why Shleifer has remained on the Harvard faculty.

One observer illustrates for us the common intersection of (Jewish) ethnicity, networking and media power: "How did the defendants in the Russia project—Harvard, Shleifer, Hay, and, though he was not charged with wrong-doing in the matter, Summers—convince the [*New York Times*], the [*Washington Post*], and the *Financial Times* that the collapse of [Harvard's] Russia Project was not a worthy story?" Sailer's tentative answer is to the point: because of Jewish power.

Sailer claims that he had not known about the Jewish identity of the "oligarchs" until he read Yale law professor Amy Chua's book *World on Fire* (when Chua correctly noted that six out of the seven of Russia's wealthiest oligarchs were Jews, her Jewish husband quipped to her, "Just six? So who's the seventh guy?").⁶⁸ These oligarchs had

sources, illicit stock manipulation and buyouts" were common. "The future billionaires stripped the Russian state of over a trillion dollars worth of factories, transport, oil, gas, iron, coal, and other formerly state-owned resources" (R&R, pp. 88–89).

⁶⁸ Amy Chua, *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability* (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 77–79. To Chua, such an outcome validates her intriguing concept of "a market-dominant minority," akin to the overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia or whites in Latin America. The Jews, of course, are the "quintessential market-dominant minority."

"paid for Boris Yeltsin's 1996 re-election in return for the privilege of buying ex-Soviet properties at absurdly low prices (e.g., Mikhail B. Khodorkovsky was put in charge of auctioning off Yukos Oil, which owns about 2% of the world's oil reserves—he sold it for \$159 million to . . . himself)." Meanwhile, Jews in Russia represented about one percent of the population.

Sailer's further observations only cast more light on the extent and value of these ethnic connections:

As I've said before in the context of exploring how Scooter Libby could serve as a mob lawyer for international gangster Marc Rich on and off for 15 years and then move immediately into the job of chief of staff to the Vice President of the United States, the problem is not that Jews are inherently worse behaved (or better behaved) than any other human group, *but that they have achieved for themselves in America in recent years a collective immunity from anything resembling criticism* [emphasis added].

Sailer goes on to discuss a number of Jewish reactions that square with what MacDonald has written on Jewish deception and self-deception, including the ability to frame all criticism, no matter how valid, in terms of an anti-Semitic animus. Harvard professors Alan Dershowitz and Ruth Wisse defended Summers in this way, with Wisse asking, "Was anti-Semitism the driving engine of the coup [against Summers]?" Former lecturer Martin Peretz joined them in the suspicion that Summers's strong support of Israel played a role in the attack.

Harvard economics Professor Edward Glaeser, "Shleifer's former pupil, long-standing friend and dogged defender," charged that circulating a damning report about Summers's link to the scandal was "a potent piece of hate creation—not quite *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, but it's in that camp." In the end, Sailer makes a suggestion that speaks directly to how various Jewish movements are tied to and benefit from Jewish power in academia, the media, and public discourse in general: "American intellectual life might have been corrupted by the vast amounts of money the mostly Jewish Russian oligarchs had to toss around to American academics and public intellectuals."⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Steve Sailer, "The Real Larry Summers Scandal?"
<http://isteve.blogspot.com/2006/03/real-larry-summers-scandal.html>

Petras makes a similar argument when noting that, “Political corruption, not economic efficiency, is the driving force of economic empire-building.” As part of this “unprecedented pillage in Russia (1991–99) (R&R, p. 64), brought on by Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs’s and others’ “shock therapy” in Russia (R&R, p. 73), at least a trillion dollars was transferred to US and EU parties from Russia and Eastern Europe (R&R, p. 56).

JEWISH HATRED OF OUTGROUPS

One psychological aspect that contributes to such behavior against perceived outgroups is identified by MacDonald as “a profound sense of historical grievance—hatred by any other name”—against non-Jewish groups.⁷⁰ Similarly, in a rare stance by a prominent scholar, Petras takes the point of view that the ultimate cause of Israeli ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians is “the pervasiveness of racist attitudes which had characterized Zionist extremism since its inception.” His recognition that “Jewish distrust of the non-Jewish world [and] their unwillingness to compromise” (R&R, p. 116) is consistent with the views of Cuddihy and particularly MacDonald, who noted hatred was “a normative aspect of Judaism. Jewish hatred toward non-Jews emerges as a consistent theme throughout the ages, beginning in the ancient world.”⁷¹ Edward Gibbon also pointed to this ancient hatred:

Humanity is shocked at the recital of the horrid cruelties which [Jews] committed in the cities of Egypt, of Cyprus, and of Cyrene, where they dwelt in treacherous friendship with the unsuspecting natives; and we are tempted to applaud the severe retaliation which was exercised by the arms of the legions against a race of fanatics, whose dire and credulous superstition seemed to render them the implacable enemies not only of the Roman government, but of human kind.⁷²

Slezkine is not indifferent to this aspect of Jewish psychology either, referencing Russian nationalist V. V. Shulgin, who wrote directly to the Jews in 1923:

⁷⁰ MacDonald, “Understanding Jewish Influence I,” 14.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 18, and John Murray Cuddihy, *The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Levi-Strauss, and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity* (New York: Basic Books, 1974).

⁷² Quoted in *Ibid.*

We do not like the fact that you took too prominent a part in the revolution, which turned out to be the greatest *lie and fraud*. We do not like the fact that you became *the backbone and the core of the Communist Party*. We do not like the fact that, with your discipline and solidarity, your persistence and will, you have consolidated and strengthened for years to come the maddest and bloodiest enterprise that humanity has known since the day of creation. . . . We do not like the fact that this whole terrible thing was done *on the Russian back* and that it has cost us unutterable losses. We do not like the fact that you, Jews, a relatively small group within the Russian population, participated in this vile deed *out of all proportion to your numbers*.⁷³

Indeed the gentile population of the USSR paid dearly for being hated by Jews, especially the many Jews in high leadership positions. Estimates are that twenty million died during this ordeal.⁷⁴ In order to address problems real (such as a quickly rising Jewish population) and imagined, the Jewish response in the Soviet realm was "the destruction of the traditional societies of Eastern Europe as a panacea for Jewish poverty and for anti-Semitism."⁷⁵ Thus, MacDonald is right to employ with respect to these Jews Slezkine's phrase, "Stalin's willing executioners."

PARALLELS WITH OTHER WARS

There is good evidence that the current push by the Jewish Lobby to enlist gentiles to do their bidding, to sacrifice both blood and treasure for essentially Israeli causes, has historical parallels. MacDonald draws attention to the way in which ethnic Jews in Russia turned to Russian nationalism when it became necessary to face an external enemy, the Germans:

Russian patriotism had suddenly become useful—much like, I would argue, harnessing the patriotism and high regard for military service among Americans has been useful for Jewish neo-conservatives eager to rearrange the politics of the Middle East

⁷³ Quoted in Slezkine, 181.

⁷⁴ See *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*, ed. Mark Kramer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

⁷⁵ Slezkine, 82.

in the interests of Israel. Ideology is a wonderfully effective instrument in the service of self-deception (or deception).⁷⁶

Soviet Jews also turned to their American counterparts to agitate for American involvement in the European war. Lindbergh was not alone in pointing to Jewish efforts to bring a reluctant United States into another distant war.⁷⁷ Anti-war groups organized by American women, for instance, had a membership of six million, yet such protests had negligible effect. Extrapolating backward from Petras's arguments about Jewish efforts to prosecute an American-led war against Israeli enemy states in the Middle East—coupled with the above accounts of Jewish roles in Communism in the Soviet Union—suggests that the American involvement in the war against Hitler could have been an instance of gentiles doing the bidding of powerfully organized Jewish groups.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion here is not a modest one: the argument is that America today is in a position analogous to the one in early Soviet Russia. Two key similarities are “the rise of the Jews” and the hatred of and hostility directed toward the majority gentile populations of both states.

Tomislav Sunic has written about this analogy in terms of “Twin Brothers: *Homo sovieticus* and *Homo americanus*.”⁷⁸ To be sure, “Americanism” has been far more successful in attaining voluntary compliance to the will of the state, infused as it is with a “fun ideology.” Given the choice, humans worldwide would choose the same, though both the Soviet and (postmodern) American version lead to the grave: “Certainly, communism kills the body, in contrast to Americanism which kills the soul, but even the worst type of intellectual ‘soft-killing’ in the postmodern American system seems to be dearer to the masses than physical maltreatment or a violent communist death.”⁷⁹

In point of fact, of course, the (current) American version of soft

⁷⁶ MacDonald, “Stalin’s Willing Executioners,” 77. MacDonald makes the comparison to the current Jewish efforts on behalf of the American war on Iraq on p. 78.

⁷⁷ A. Scott Berg, *Lindbergh* (New York: Putnam Adult, 1998); MacDonald, “Stalin’s Willing Executioners,” 95.

⁷⁸ Sunic, chapter 2.

⁷⁹ Sunic, 29–30.

totalitarianism is not so "fun," though we are misled because it is a regime "maintained less by brute force than by an unrelenting, enormously sophisticated, and massively effective campaign to constrain political and cultural activity within very narrow boundaries." A violent communist death is not yet necessary because dissenters "are not trundled off to jail or beaten with truncheons, but are quietly ignored and marginalized. Or they are held up to public disgrace, and, wherever possible, removed from their livelihood."⁸⁰

Fair enough: the avoidance of physical terror and the ministrations of the therapeutic state have made rule easier, but in the end this "fun-infested ideology" still leads to "warm death." In any case, it may soon turn "hot." We have seen the process at work in Russia, so we know many of the details, chief among them the tremendous loss of gentile life there.

Petras and others have also pointed to the loss of constitutional liberties in America as well as the establishment of an incipient police state post-9/11, with its "rise of a virulent form of Zionist neo-McCarthyism spreading throughout our academic, artistic, and other public and private institutions" (POI, p. 180).⁸¹ Repeating his claim

⁸⁰ MacDonald, Foreword to *Homo americanus*, xv.

⁸¹ On right-wing Internet sites, for example, there is much talk about the "Zionist Occupation Government" and the like. For a case in point, see Edgar J. Steele, "First Annual State of the Revolution: A Report to the American People," where he writes about the loss of civil rights: "And they certainly will not cede the power they have stolen from us peacefully. More likely: bloodshed and death far in excess of that seen during America's first Civil War . . . *per capita!*" "It's going to be more of the same: *more killing in the Middle East, more death for our children, more tyranny and poverty for us and more money for the bankers . . .*" "America's money goes to war, but not to America's basic needs. American children die in Israel's wars, while Israel's children safely stay home and shoot unarmed Palestinian children." <http://www.conspiracypenpal.com/columns/state1.htm>, February 17, 2008.

Even more mainstream commentators have proffered similar arguments. For one example with impeccable credentials, see Paul Craig Roberts, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury during President Reagan's first term, and a former Associate Editor of the *Wall Street Journal*. His academic appointments include the William E. Simon Chair, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, and Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. In "Bush Calls on France for Help," February 11, 2008, http://vdare.com/roberts/080211_bush.htm, he writes:

The neocons who dominated the Bush regime and took America to illegal wars are allied with the extreme right-wing government of Israel. The goal of

that “the ZPC has effectively colonized the White House and Legislative Branches,” Petras draws attention to the appointments of “ultra-Zionist” Attorney General Michael Mukasey and “Israel-First” Head of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff.⁸² (Chertoff’s father was a rabbi, and his mother was born in Israel. Ironically, Mukasey’s father was born in the Russian Empire discussed by Slezkine, but Mukasey himself was born in the Bronx and graduated from an Orthodox Jewish prep school; his wife later taught there, and his two sons attended it as well.)⁸³

Having seen how talent, high intelligence, and above all ethnic networking have allowed Jews to exercise great power despite low numbers, it becomes less of a stretch of the imagination to consider what I have just written. This becomes more conceivable when it is remembered that Jewish intellectual and political movements in America have already succeeded in disestablishing the traditional European-derived majority, whether through Boasian anthropology with its scientifically unsupported claims that race is an illusion; whether through the arguments of Horace Kallen and others that America is merely a “propositional nation” without a founding people; or whether through activists like those of the Frankfurt School who combined psychoanalysis and Marxism into a “devastating weapon against the ethnic consciousness of white Americans.”⁸⁴

Finally, from an evolutionary perspective, the encouragement of high rates of immigration of non-white populations (many of which

neoconservatism is to remove all obstacles to Israeli territorial expansion What total traitors the neoconservatives are. Every last one of them should be immediately arrested for high treason. Neoconservatives are America’s greatest enemies, and they control our government! All Americans have to show for six years of Bush’s ‘war on terror’ is an incipient police state.

See also Paul Craig Roberts, “What Do We Stand For?” February 17, 2008, http://vdare.com/roberts/080217_stand.htm.

Kevin MacDonald also fears the erection of a police state in America. See his Foreword to Sunic’s *Homo Americanus*, xxxvi.

⁸² Petras, “Iran War.”

⁸³ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mukasey>. To be sure, these may in fact be honorable men, but the point is the parallel to the rise of Jews to power in Soviet Russia and their role in the deaths of millions of perceived ethnic enemies (disguised as “class” enemies).

⁸⁴ MacDonald’s *Culture of Critique* deals with all these Jewish intellectual movements.

have higher rates of reproduction than whites) means that the proportion of white gentiles in America has fallen from nearly ninety percent in 1970 to only two-thirds today. No evolutionist would find this trend trivial. And all of these movements have been heavily supported by Jewish groups and individuals.⁸⁵

In addition to these Jewish movements, other observers have found intense Jewish activism in the effort to encourage abortion on demand, one important reason for the abrupt decline in reproduction rates for majority Americans. Further, Jewish-led attacks on the majority religion—Christianity—have eroded many of the foundations of European-American life.⁸⁶ Finally, the mass media, led by Hollywood, have created a fictional world in which whites no longer have an admirable sense of ethnic cohesion, a world in which non-whites are, in fact, elevated far beyond their status in real life (and Jewish power assiduously hidden), a world in which individual whites have no racial self-interests at all.⁸⁷

Where might this lead? In Russia, Slezkine shows that Communism was indeed good for the Jews—at least until Russians and other ethnic groups mobilized effective counterstrategies. Currently, the situation in America for Jews is an unparalleled story of wealth and success,

⁸⁵ MacDonald, "Stalin's Willing Executioners," 87.

⁸⁶ While the reader of *Culture Wars* over the last few years would find numerous essays on these topics, they are best summed up in editor E. Michael Jones's scathing review of Buchanan's book *Day of Reckoning: How Hubris, Ideology, and Greed are Tearing America Apart* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2007), where Jones mocks Buchanan for naming Mexican immigrants as a threat but not previous, more destructive immigrants. "What group promotes the ideology of 'heaven on earth' and the coming 'terrestrial paradise'? Is it the Mexicans? Is Charles Krauthammer a Mexican, Pat?" Jones then quotes Buchanan on the specifics: "This revolution involved the overturning of all laws rooted in Christian doctrine regarding divorce, homosexuality, abortion—and the purge of all Christian symbols, books and practices from public schools. This revolution was about de-Christianizing and secularizing America." Jones names the ultimate taboo as discussion of Jewish influence over American culture: "Why then does Pat focus his ire on the Mexicans? Well, perhaps it's because if he mentioned the Jews as a baleful cultural influence he would no longer have a job" (January 2008). Perhaps as punishment for writing about baleful Jewish influences, a series of speeches at Catholic University to be given by Jones was abruptly cancelled due to pressure brought by the heavily Jewish Southern Poverty Law Center.

⁸⁷ See Edmund Connelly, "The Jews of Prime Time," *The Occidental Quarterly* 6 (Fall 2006): 25–41 and "Eye on Hollywood: *The Interpreter*," *The Occidental Observer*, February 17, 2008, <http://theoccidentalobserver.com/>.

but there are pessimists, beginning with Petras: “In effect, the Zion-cons will kill their own US goose, which has laid golden eggs for Israel for almost 6 decades.”⁸⁸ The “goose” is not merely being bled and bankrupted by perpetual wars, but also smothered by the soft totalitarianism of immigration and multiculturalism.

And there is no guarantee that our totalitarianism will remain soft. If the system is threatened by a crisis, the Zionist establishment might well adopt Soviet methods to hold onto power. During the Red Terror in Russia, some expressed shock that seemingly pacifistic Jews changed almost overnight.⁸⁹ As one observer wrote

We were amazed by what we had least expected to encounter among the Jews: cruelty, sadism, and violence had seemed alien to a nation so far removed from physical, warlike activity; those who yesterday did not know how to use a gun are now found among the executioners and cutthroats.⁹⁰

In another instance, a “formerly oppressed lover of liberty had turned into a tyrant of ‘unheard-of despotic arbitrariness.’”⁹¹ He had been “transformed outwardly into a leather-clad person with a revolver and, in fact, lost all human likeness.”⁹² He could now be pictured as “standing in a Cheka basement doing ‘bloody but honorable revolutionary work.’”⁹³ Petras makes a similar claim with respect to Jews today, at least “those who claim to be a divinely chosen people, a people with ‘righteous’ claims of supreme victimhood.” We must, he admonishes us, expose the fact that “many descendants of victims have now become brutal executioners” (POI, p. 184).

In normal circumstances, American Jews lead peaceful and productive lives. But too often Judaism and Jewish groups have worked on such ethnic Jews to radicalize them, with or without their consent. As MacDonald has emphasized, “At all the turning points, it is the more

⁸⁸ Petras, “Iran War.”

⁸⁹ In writing about the visibly Jewish cadre charged with killing the Russian Tsar and his family, Slezkine notes that one assassin, Shaia Goloshchekin, had been a dentist before the revolution (p. 178).

⁹⁰ Slezkine, 183–84.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ *Ibid.*

ethnocentric elements—one might term them the radicals—who have determined the direction of the Jewish community and eventually won the day."⁹⁴ Petras makes the same point, noting that, "Judeocentrism is the perspective which guides the *organized, active minority driving the major Zionist organizations* and their billionaire camp followers. And it is always the organized, zealous, and well-financed minority, which *assumes 'legitimate' claim to speak 'for the community'*" (emphasis in original).⁹⁵

We have seen the radical turn in Russia, which resulted in rivers of gentile blood. Currently, the Middle East is in turmoil, with the neocon war in Iraq raging on, Lebanon in shambles, and the Palestinians suffering mightily under their Israeli masters. Now Jews have risen in America. Ominously, as MacDonald notes, "If there is any lesson to be learned, it is that Jews not only became an elite in all these areas, they became a hostile elite—hostile to the traditional people and cultures of all three areas they came to dominate."⁹⁶

Sunic sees dark clouds on the horizon for any group in America that might be targeted: "Thus, in order for the proper functioning of future Americanized society, the removal of millions of surplus citizens must become a social and possibly also an ecological necessity."⁹⁷ MacDonald identifies what sectors might be targeted "and therefore worthy of mass murder by the American counterparts of the Jewish elite in the Soviet Union—the ones who journeyed to Ellis Island instead of Moscow."⁹⁸ They are the European-derived whites populating vast

⁹⁴ Kevin MacDonald, "Understanding Jewish Influence II," 16; he also writes:

The vast majority of Jews eventually became Zionists, to the point that now not only are Diaspora Jews Zionists, they are indispensable supporters of the most fanatic elements within Israel. Within Israel, the radicals have also won the day, and the state has evolved to the point where the influence of moderates in the tradition of Moshe Sharett is a distant memory. The fanatics keep pushing the envelope, forcing other Jews to either go along with their agenda or to simply cease being part of the Jewish community. (p. 33)

⁹⁵ Petras, "Iran War."

⁹⁶ MacDonald, "Stalin's Willing Executioners," 96.

⁹⁷ Sunic, 38.

⁹⁸ MacDonald, "Stalin's Willing Executioners," 94. For a biblical perspective on such prospective population transfers, see Richard Faussette, "Race and Religion: A Catholic View," in *Race and the American Prospect: Essays on the Racial Realities of Our Nation and Our Time*, ed. Samuel Francis (Mt. Airy, Md.: The Occidental Press, 2006);

areas of the American nation, particularly in the so-called “red states.” Petras envisions a similar progression, noting that:

Yesterday the major Zionist organizations told us whom we may or may not criticize in the Middle East, today they tell us whom we may criticize in the United States, tomorrow they will tell us to bend our heads and submit to their lies and deceptions in order to engage in new wars of conquest at the service of a morally repugnant colonial regime. (POI, p. 81)

Naturally, one despairs at these prospects, but perhaps in the end a kind of justice will prevail. As Dostoevsky, one who had seen firsthand the Jews of the Pale, wrote: “In the very work the Jews do (the great majority of them, at any rate), in their very exploitation, there is something wrong and abnormal, something unnatural, something containing its own punishment.”⁹⁹

*Edmund Connelly is an academic and frequent contributor to **The Occidental Quarterly** and **The Occidental Observer**.*

“Niche Theory, Population Transfer, and the Origin of the Anti-Semitic Cycle, *The Occidental Quarterly* 6 (Winter 2006–2007): 69–89; and “The Book of Genesis from a Darwinian Perspective,” *The Occidental Quarterly* 7 (Summer 2007): 37–56.

⁹⁹ Quoted in Slezkine, 156.