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When caught cheating, it’s wise to stop competing. But wisdom is the last thing we should expect from Tony Greenstein, founding member of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign. In his latest interminable response to me,¹ he invokes Moshe Menuhin, a regular contributor to the neo-Nazi press in Germany; the “Information Bulletin” of the Soviet-controlled Israeli Communist Party; and a long-defunct journal published by a group expelled from the same party for being too extreme. None of this should cause surprise. Just as citing a Nazi sympathiser comes naturally to one who treats Adolf Eichmann as a truth-teller, so reliance on Stalinists is only to be expected from a writer for the Communist Party of Great Britain.²

Here I will not only expose Greenstein’s “facts” as fictions, I will also show how he uses fabricated sources and quotations, at the same time as he repeatedly falsifies the conclusions of genuine historians.

Greenstein on Nazi Policy Towards Zionism

According to Greenstein’s initial reply, Zionists “didn’t experience the concentration camps like Communists and Socialists.” When I read this, I wondered if Greenstein was about to make the transition from Holocaust falsifier to outright Holocaust denier. It appears not. Belatedly noticing the trap he has set for himself, he now writes: “Of
course I said no such thing. What I did say was that after the arrest of thousands of Jews in the wake of the Kristallnacht pogrom (November 9-10 1938), the Nazis very quickly released Jews who were Zionists.” He adds: “when it came to murdering Jews, the Nazis didn’t distinguish between Zionist, non-Zionist or anti-Zionist Jews, religious or secular.”

In other words, Greenstein is now forced to admit that vast numbers of Zionists were exterminated in the Nazi camps. It is not true that Zionists “swanned around Nazi-occupied Europe organising kibbutzim,” as he once asserted.  

Recognising his earlier claims as indefensible, he tries to retract these David Irving-style lies – but without confessing to the lies. Instead he limits himself to a “quotation” from Tom Segev on the release of Palestine Office officials after the mass arrests following Kristallnacht. Except that there is no such quotation in Segev’s book. Its actual source is the work of Francis Nicosia – who explains in the very same paragraph that the German Zionist Federation had been banned by Hitler’s regime, and that the Zionists had been among the targets of the Kristallnacht pogrom.

But since Greenstein now wants to restrict his claim about Nazi non-victimisation to German Zionists in the 1930s, it may be worth meeting him on his own ground. According to Nicosia, as early as March 1933 – two months after the Nazi takeover – German Zionists were informing the Jewish Agency of “arbitrary arrests, beatings, abductions, and raids by storm troopers on the ZVfD [German Zionist Federation] headquarters.” There were violently anti-Zionist articles in the Nazi press, including “a vicious attack on Chaim Weizmann and the World Zionist Organization” and a
piece entitled “Zionist Agitation Against Germany,” which warned that “the position of the Zionist Federation has been gravely threatened.”

Next there is Greenstein’s exploded fiction about “the Introduction to the Nuremberg Laws,” which supposedly included a Nazi endorsement of Zionism. The Nuremberg Laws have been analysed by numerous historians and even made available online, yet no-one has discovered a trace of his “introduction.” Greenstein tries to prop up the fabrication by mentioning a similarly worded statement by German Interior Ministry official Bernard Lösener. But as Nicosia makes clear, Lösener’s article was a crude attempt to counter foreign protests against the Nuremberg Laws by conjuring up the approval of German Jews for their own persecution.

Greenstein’s sole authority for the existence of his “Introduction to the Nuremberg Laws” is Khamsin, a communist publication; he has found no other source than the one cited there. He can accuse me of “red-baiting, McCarthyist smears” as much as he likes, but he will not change the fact that Khamsin was a project of the Matzpen sect, whose founders had been expelled from the Israeli Communist Party because the fanaticism of their support for Israel’s destruction was too much even for the Soviets. As for the contents of this publication, in which Greenstein reposes such trust, one need only point to its lengthy article accusing Jews of Devil-worship.

**Greenstein on Zionist Policy Towards Nazism**

Undeterred by his self-inflicted disaster, Greenstein tries to change the subject from the policy of the Nazis to the record of German Zionists. According to him, “the
attribution to [Lenni] Brenner of the belief that the Zionists had caused the collapse of the Weimar Republic was absurd and lacked any source.” Here is another example of his methods: I gave page references for all of my allegations against Brenner. In this case I referred readers to a chapter in Brenner’s *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*. The chapter is entitled “German Zionism and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic.” According to Brenner, the Zionists, alongside the Social Democrats and the Stalinists, “must bear their full measure of guilt for Hitler’s triumph.”

In my paper on Lenni Brenner, I detailed his misrepresentation of historian Stephen Poppel. Whereas Brenner tried to use Poppel to prove the ideological convergence of Zionism and Nazism, Poppel stated the exact opposite: “Zionists were unanimous in condemning Nazi brutality and racism.” Poppel even quoted an official declaration by the German Zionist Federation attacking Nazism and demanding “full equality and freedom” in Germany. Greenstein has no real answer to my argument: he is unable to deny Brenner’s blatant falsification of this source. He even admits – and he has no choice here – that Zionism opposed Nazi doctrines of “racial supremacy and racial hierarchies.” So Greenstein is forced to accept that Zionism is based on racial equality. Does he surrender and confess that everything he has written about Zionism for decades is a lie? Of course not: he just pretends to see no difference between racial equality and racial supremacy.

As evidence of “Zionist acceptance of Nazi ideas of racial separation,” Greenstein cites Robert Weltsch’s famous editorial, “Wear It With Pride, the Yellow Badge.” As its title suggests, this editorial was a call for Jewish self-affirmation and pride in the face of Nazi terror. And it was understood as such by German Jews: subscriptions to
the Zionist newspaper edited by Weltsch multiplied from 7,000 to 30,000 in the six months after Hitler’s takeover.¹⁵

The memorandum sent by the German Zionist Federation to the new Nazi regime in 1933, on which Greenstein fixates, was a misguided attempt to carve out a niche for the Jewish population in the wake of Hitler’s victory. It might have been preferable to have sent the Nazis a document expressing loathing for everything they represented, but the reaction to such a display of defiance would not have been pleasant. The text of the memorandum offered no sympathy for Nazi doctrines of Aryan supremacy, etc., as I pointed out and as Greenstein is forced to concede. For Greenstein, the very concept of a Jewish nation and opposition to marriages with non-Jews is incipient Nazism, yet Jewish nationalism was advocated by the anti-Zionist Bund in Poland – even Trotsky ruminated on the possibility of a Jewish homeland near the end of his life – while rejection of mixed marriages is central to Orthodox Judaism. But then I forget myself: Greenstein regards Orthodox Jews as Nazis too.¹⁶

Consider another of Greenstein’s distortions on the same subject:

> When Goering summoned the leaders of German Jewry to a meeting on March 25th 1933 to get them to have a massive Boycott rally in the USA called off, the ZVfD’s Secretary Kurt Blumenfeld, alone amongst the representatives, eagerly promised to co-operate with the Nazis in fighting the Boycott.

The source given is Edwin Black: but according to Black, Blumenfeld told Goering that any Zionists sent abroad would tell the outside world “the full truth” about the
situation in Nazi Germany.\textsuperscript{17} Black also explains that the Jewish leaders present at the meeting – Zionist, non-Zionist, and anti-Zionist – \emph{were all acting under duress}.	extsuperscript{18} Needless to say, Greenstein suppresses this rather important detail.

In Greenstein’s version of history, German Jews who used the Transfer Agreement to emigrate to Palestine were “rich Jews who would have found little difficulty in emigrating to other destinations.” In fact, those eligible for the Transfer were Jews with £1,000 in savings – and this condition was imposed by the British government, not by the Jewish Agency.\textsuperscript{19} The refugees could not have gone to other destinations, as Western countries were unwilling to take them, let alone to help preserve some of their assets. And this was one of the arguments made by proponents of the Transfer: rejecting the deal meant leaving all of German Jewry’s possessions to the Nazis.

In his earlier reply, Greenstein insisted that saving lives was not among the Jewish Agency’s aims in concluding the Transfer Agreement. As I showed in my rejoinder, saving lives as well as property was precisely the justification given at the time by the Jewish Agency leadership. Greenstein falls silent on this point.

**Greenstein on Zionist “Collaboration”**

Greenstein bewails the “lie” that “those who allege Nazi-Zionist collaboration were accusing the Zionist movement of ‘perpetrating the Holocaust in collaboration with the Nazis.’” According to him, I cannot provide one quotation to prove this. In truth I have provided many. In my paper I quoted the Soviet press (on “the true role of the Zionists in organising the mass destruction of Jews”).\textsuperscript{20} I quoted Lenni Brenner
(“instead of Zionism being the hope of the Jews, their blood was to be the political salvation of Zionism”). I quoted the Soviet verdict on Brenner’s book (“Zionism... sacrificed the blood of millions of Jews”), a verdict he greeted with enthusiasm. I also quoted Jim Allen, author of *Perdition* (“privileged Jewish leaders collaborated in the extermination of their own kind in order to help bring about a Zionist state”). It is easy to list similar comments from all manner of antisemites.

One of the many fabricated examples of Zionist-Nazi “collaboration” in Brenner’s book is the Feivel Polkes affair. Polkes was a Haganah agent who betrayed his comrades by offering to become a Nazi informer in 1937. When his activities came to light, he was dismissed from the Haganah. Brenner, however, claimed that Polkes was the vehicle for a Haganah offer to spy for the SS. Greenstein’s handling of the issue is another case of rank dishonesty: he manipulates the chronology by listing Polkes’s services to the Haganah in 1936. At issue is whether or not Polkes was acting on the Haganah’s behalf when he offered to become a Nazi informer and invited Eichmann to Palestine in 1937. Here Greenstein’s source Nicosia is unambiguous:

Haganah records indicate that his Berlin visit and the subsequent Eichmann trip to Palestine and Egypt were the result of Polkes’s own initiative, in conjunction with Reichert... Polkes maintained that he was authorized by the Haganah to cultivate his relationship with Franz Reichert in 1935 and 1936. But the interview also reveals that the Haganah did not favor his trip to Berlin... Polkes’s brief encounter with Eichmann and the SD in Berlin and Egypt in 1937 came under severe criticism within the Haganah after his return
to Palestine, and he was eventually relieved of his responsibilities in the organization. Nothing of substance ever came from this contact.\textsuperscript{24}

The conclusion could not be clearer: Polkes did not have Haganah approval to travel to Berlin in 1937, did not have Haganah permission to invite Eichmann to Palestine in 1937, did not have Haganah support for offering to work as a Nazi informer in 1937, and was dismissed when the Haganah found out what he had done. Brenner’s account of this affair, incompetently defended by Greenstein, is an invention.

A serious embarrassment for cranks peddling the lie of Zionist-Nazi “collaboration” is the Zionist campaign for a Jewish army to fight Hitler. Greenstein, contradicting all historians of the subject, denies outright that the purpose of the proposed Jewish army was to combat the Nazis. He asks why Jews who wanted to fight Nazism could not join the British army. As he knows, the first act of the Jewish Agency after the British declaration of war in 1939 was to announce a census of all Jews of fighting age in Palestine in order to aid the British war effort against Hitler. In total, 136,000 Jews in Palestine registered for service.\textsuperscript{25}

Greenstein also denies that Lehi’s offer to the Nazis in 1941 was designed to evacuate millions of Jews from Nazi Europe. Yet the Lehi document sent to the Germans was explicit: “The evacuation of the Jewish masses from Europe is a precondition for solving the Jewish question; but this can only be made possible and complete through the settlement of these masses in the home of the Jewish people, Palestine, and through the establishment of a Jewish state in its historic boundaries.”\textsuperscript{26} The idea of
saving millions of Jews by offering a military pact to the Nazis was of course absurd, but the initiators of the offer were not known for their realism.

On the Nazi-appointed Jewish Councils in Poland and other occupied countries during the Holocaust, Greenstein has to prove two facts: that the Councils all collaborated in the destruction of the Jewish masses, and that they were all composed of Zionists. He has proved neither. As he has quietly conceded, some of the Jewish Councils did not collaborate. And as I have shown, his “evidence” that the Councils were riddled with Zionists collapses upon inspection. He cited historian Isaiah Trunk, but the latter was enumerating the replies to a questionnaire he sent to surviving Council members. Greenstein has no evidence that those who answered Trunk’s questionnaire were representative of Jewish Council members in Nazi Europe. Even if they were, he has no evidence that all these Council members collaborated. He tries to finesse the facts, but his efforts expose him as a cardsharp.

Lenni Brenner gave two specific examples of “Zionist” collaborators on the Jewish Councils: Adam Czerniakow in Warsaw and Chaim Rumkowski in Lodz. In his latest reply, Greenstein does not even attempt to justify the claim about Czerniakow being a Zionist. Rumkowski had been expelled from his Zionist faction, yet Greenstein relies on a claim in an apologetic pamphlet that he was later reinstated. In truth, Rumkowski no longer saw himself as a Zionist, as the same source makes clear when it quotes him expressing sympathy for both fascism and communism. Authentic Zionists in the Lodz Ghetto formed a coalition against Rumkowski. Greenstein dares not deny the fact, but dismisses it with a baseless pretence that the coalition did not “amount” to anything.
Greenstein refers to the Kasztner Trial as evidence that Holocaust survivors endorsed the charge of Zionist-Nazi “collaboration.” Here his ignorance is on full display: the Holocaust survivors who testified against Kasztner did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, *they accused Kasztner of betraying the Zionist movement* as well as the Hungarian Jewish masses. In the words of Yosef Krausz, a witness from Kasztner’s birthplace of Kolozsvár, “The Zionists started it [i.e., the post-war campaign against Kasztner]: they said that Kasztner took the [Palestine entry] certificates, divided them among his friends and sent the Zionists to Auschwitz.”

Greenstein accuses the Zionists of suppressing the Auschwitz Protocols, a detailed eye-witness report of the extermination process by Auschwitz escapees Rudolf Vrba and Alfred Wetzler. Actually, the Zionists were already publicising the nature of Auschwitz in February 1944, before Vrba and Wetzler escaped. On the alleged “suppression” of the truth, Holocaust historian Martin Gilbert explained:

In fact the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, headed by Ben-Gurion, warned the Allies on April 6, 1944, five weeks before the actual deportations began, of Germany’s plans to kill Hungarian Jews.

Ten days before the deportations started, a Zionist official in Istanbul telegrammed his superiors in Jerusalem that deportations were imminent. Within hours of this telegram reaching Jerusalem the head of the rescue committee of the Jewish Agency, that same Dr Gruenbaum... telegraphed
directly to the British government in London to urge that “all steps” be taken by the Allies to prevent these deportations.\textsuperscript{31}

Three days before the deportations from Hungary to Auschwitz began, the Zionist press in Britain carried the headline, “800,000 Jews Face Extermination.”\textsuperscript{32} And four days after the start of mass deportations, the Zionist press in the United States warned that the Nazis had prepared “huge gas chambers in which the one million Hungarian Jews are to be exterminated in the same fashion as were the Jews in Poland.”\textsuperscript{33}

If the Jewish Agency leaders did not do enough to publicise the killings over the next month, it was because they became convinced that the deportees from Hungary were being kept alive in transit camps pending negotiations on the Goods For Blood plan, Eichmann’s offer to release a million Jews in return for 10,000 trucks and other goods from the West. This was all explained by Martin Gilbert decades ago.\textsuperscript{34} Greenstein pretends to have read Gilbert. In truth he avoids desperately any source (and there are so many of them) likely to topple his ideological house of cards.

It was Moshe Krausz, head of Jewish Agency’s Palestine Office in Budapest, who sent abroad the copy of the Auschwitz Protocols that received worldwide publicity in June 1944. Preposterously, and no doubt insincerely, Greenstein denies this. He must deny it, even if he does not believe what he writes, because otherwise he would have to admit that a Zionist body was instrumental in preventing the deportation of over 200,000 Jews from Budapest to Auschwitz. But Greenstein is dissembling yet again, and he is contradicted by every history of the subject. Randolph Braham, the world authority on the Holocaust in Hungary, states unequivocally: “The material provided
by Krausz was duplicated and disseminated in Switzerland thanks to Mantello.35 It
was Mantello – also a Zionist – who began the press campaign about the Auschwitz
Protocols. Greenstein already knows this: his falsifications are meant to deceive those
who do not.

Greenstein on Zionist Rescue

Having once attacked “the Nazi pronouncements of Jewish orthodoxy,”36 Greenstein
now cites a letter from an anti-Zionist Orthodox rabbi. His aim: to show that Zionists
opposed admitting Jews to destinations other than Palestine. Yet the letter was refuted
two days after publication by another correspondent, who pointed to the 1943 rescue
programme demanding admission of Jews to all Allied and neutral countries.37 Unable
to deny the existence of this rescue programme, which was endorsed by all Jewish
and Zionist bodies in Britain, Greenstein contents himself with the claim that it was
“composed merely as a historical alibi” – as if the main issue on the minds of British
Jewry during the Holocaust was discrediting Greenstein’s fictions seventy years in
advance! Insulting the intelligence of one’s readers is never a good idea, whatever
Greenstein may think.

Greenstein levels the same accusation against Ben-Gurion, seizing on his 1938 remark
that if all German Jewish children could be rescued by sending them to England and
only half by transfer to Palestine, then he would choose the latter for the sake of the
Jewish nation. What Greenstein cannot understand is that Ben-Gurion had to create a
refuge for the whole Jewish people, including millions of endangered Jews in Poland
and the rest of Europe. He could not know whether Nazi expansion would reach
Britain. Bringing Jews to countries likely to be overrun by the Nazis was no solution, as he explained:

Hitler is a fact and he can be relied upon in this regard. If there is a world war and he takes control of Europe, he will carry out this thing; first of all he will annihilate the Jews of Europe.\(^{38}\)

When it came to places not likely to fall under Hitler’s rule, Ben-Gurion was perfectly clear:

Had there been the possibility of bringing Poland’s Jews to the United States or Argentina, we would have done so regardless of our Zionist beliefs. But the world was closed to us. And had there also not been room for us in Palestine, our people would have had only one way out: to commit suicide.\(^{39}\)

Ben-Gurion’s premonitions turned out to be nearly correct: German Jews who fled to European countries other than Britain were indeed murdered when the Nazis caught up with them, just as he had feared. Upon the outbreak of war, the British government banned all immigration from Nazi Europe to any part of the British Empire. No more than 10,000 Jews entered Britain throughout World War II.\(^{40}\) For most of the Jews of Europe, illegal escape to Palestine was the only hope.

Greenstein is probably aware of all this but chooses to deny it, hoping that his readers will not bother to check for themselves. The same can be said of his “quotation” from
Ben-Gurion’s biographer Shabtai Teveth, which is a display of outright dishonesty. As Greenstein would have it, Teveth wrote:

[Ben-Gurion] laid down the guidelines that JAE funds be used only for rescue by immigration to Palestine, whereas rescue by assisting Jews to survive elsewhere was to be funded solely by private and organizational donations.

Proof positive, exclaims Greenstein: Ben-Gurion did not want Jews to go anywhere except Palestine. But here is the full passage from Teveth:

Ben-Gurion made a distinction between “those Jews we can bring out of Europe, over here [and] those whom we cannot bring over here.” While urging that everything possible be done to save them all, he laid down the guidelines that JAE funds be used only for rescue by immigration to Palestine, whereas rescue by assisting Jews to survive elsewhere was to be funded solely by private and organizational donations, in Palestine and abroad. He joined the drive to raise such donations, meeting personally with wealthy members of the Yishuv to obtain pledges.\(^4\)

This passage speaks for itself, as does Greenstein’s falsification of it.

Greenstein dislikes the “preposterous theory” that the official Jewish Agency rescue committee was nothing but a political lightning rod, while the real rescue work was done covertly by the Agency’s outpost in Turkey. He comments, “It is strange that no one else seems to have heard of this rescue work.” In fact every Holocaust historian
has heard of it, and Greenstein’s source Teveth mentions it on the very page he cites:
“By early 1943,” says Teveth, “the JAE had representatives in Istanbul who gathered
information, made contacts in Nazi Europe, and devised ways and means of rescue, in
both senses of the word.”

Greenstein wants to add the late Elie Wiesel – a fervent Zionist – to the anti-Zionist
camp. This is typical Greenstein: the “quotation” he attributes to Wiesel (“Only a few
survivors owed their lives to the efforts of the Zionist movement”) came not from
Wiesel but from Segev, the anti-Zionist journalist. It is in any case untrue. Hundreds
of thousands of Jews who left Europe for Palestine before and during World War II
owed their lives to the Zionist movement. As Nicosia observes, “The approximately
80,000 German, Austrian, and Czech Jews who were able to immigrate legally and
illegally to Palestine between 1933 and 1941 represent 80,000 potential victims of the
Nazi genocide who were saved.” This figure does not include those from Poland and
other countries occupied by the Nazis. Had they heeded anti-Zionist “advice,” these
men, women, and children would have been starved to death in ghettos, machine-
gunned at the death pits, or gassed and burned in the death camps.

Then there are the scores of thousands saved by Zionist rescuers in Hungary, another
well-established fact denied by Greenstein. Zionist operations included the following:

- Moshe Krausz, head of the Palestine Office in Budapest, and his diplomat ally
  Carl Lutz obtained official Hungarian recognition for 7,800 holders of Palestine
certificates, who were given Swiss diplomatic protection. Another 4,000 Jews
  were given Swedish diplomatic protection. By misrepresenting the certificates as
  papers for families rather than individuals, Krausz and Lutz expanded the number
of Jews granted diplomatic immunity to 40,000. The Zionist youth movements further increased this number by forging immunity documents (“safety passes”) and distributing 80,000-90,000 of them in Switzerland’s name alone.

- Krausz also organised dozens of “protected houses” around Budapest, which were granted Swiss diplomatic immunity: 24,000 Jews found refuge from the Nazi and Hungarian fascist terror in homes with Swiss extraterritorial status. Thousands more lived in buildings under the protection of other foreign missions.

- Ottó Komoly, president of the Hungarian Zionist Federation, coordinated a special division of the International Red Cross, known as Department A. Under Komoly’s leadership, Department A established dozens of children’s homes with Red Cross extraterritorial status. In these homes 5,000-6,000 children were saved from the Nazis and the Hungarian fascists.

Greenstein disregards all of this. He has no choice. Were he to acknowledge the rescue of scores of thousands of Jews by Zionists in Hungary alone, his house of cards would collapse. His ideology would be exposed as the pack of lies he has always known it to be.

The rest of Greenstein’s comments, however prolix and repetitive, are hardly worth addressing. He concedes that Gruenbaum, head of the Jewish Agency’s rescue committee, was in a minority of one when he refused to release funds for rescue work, then simply ignores my point – taken from his own source – that the Jewish Agency actually spent nearly $1 million on rescue operations during the war, a huge sum for a non-government body in the 1940s. He accuses Zionists of “selectivity” in rescue, even as he accepts that the Agency was obsessed with negotiating the offer to release a million Jews from Nazi Europe in 1944. He has the gall to deny that Zionists called
for bombing of the railways to Auschwitz, when he knows full well that Gruenbaum was among the first to propose this (as well as the bombing of the camp itself) to the Allies. And so on.

One last point: Greenstein reproduces a post-war “quotation” from Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, president of the Zionist Organisation of America (“are we again, in moments of desperation going to confuse Zionism with refugeeism which is likely to defeat Zionism”). He cites a New York Times report. No such statement appears in the New York Times report of Silver’s speech. Nor is it in any other issue of that newspaper. I have done my best to trace the original inventor of the quotation, which seems to be virulently anti-Zionist American Council For Judaism. My previous exposure of the fabrication has not deterred Greenstein, and I am confident that he will continue to repeat it whenever he expects to get away with it.

Sundry Evasions and Diversions

The subject of my paper on Brenner, which induced Greenstein to waste weeks of his time scribbling his two rebuttals, was Brenner’s systematic dishonesty in the use of sources. Greenstein is anxious to distract attention from that issue: he produces his usual litany of misquotations and falsehoods, then he complains that I have ignored his brilliant insights – even as he retreats from answering my charges against Brenner. Many of his fabrications – such as identifying the anti-Zionist Christopher Sykes as a Zionist writer or denying that Holocaust historian Lucy Dawidowicz ever supported the anti-Zionist Bund – are unworthy of comment. But since Greenstein is obviously
wounded by my indifference to some of what he wrote, I consider a few examples of his methods below.

Greenstein is upset that I accused him of defending communist collaboration with the Nazis and of denouncing Zionists as joint perpetrators of the Holocaust. He calls this “a lie twice over.” Both counts are, alas, true.

- On the German communists, Greenstein wrote: “The KPD’s appeasement of the Nazis flowed from their third position politics – e.g., the fact that none of its Reichstag members were Jewish from 1930 onwards or its attacks on ‘Jewish’ capitalists... The KPD, for all its sins, was part of the labour movement.”

Thus Greenstein offered an apologia for those who aided Nazism by banning Jews from their Reichstag faction and, worse still, by vilifying Jews as capitalists.

- On Greenstein’s view of Zionists as joint perpetrators of the Holocaust, it is a wonder that he bothers to disclaim it. None other than Greenstein has written: “without a Zionist movement – both within and without occupied Europe, it is hard to believe that anything like 6 million would have been allowed to die. If it was the Nazis who pulled the trigger it was the Zionists who provided them with the alibi.”

Contrary to what Greenstein says, my charges against him were wholly accurate. He maintains a deafening silence on my third allegation: that he openly defended the extreme right-wing Islamist who donated to David Irving.

Greenstein now confirms my point about his values by making excuses for antisemitic outbursts on the far left as well. He even stoops to exonerating the bigot who raved about Hitler being the “Zionist god” and Jews having “big noses.” But it is one thing
for a Jewish scriptwriter to put an antisemitic remark in the mouth of a comic character and another thing for a Jew-baiter to take that remark seriously in real life. Greenstein’s fanatical commitment to the defence of the worst antisemites on the extreme left can be seen in his excuses for another bigot, who pontificated about Jews being the chief financiers of the African slave trade. To Greenstein, this is not the same as saying that Jews were behind the slave trade – no, not at all!

Greenstein objects to “guilt by association,” e.g., linking Brenner with the neo-Nazis who market his work. But in his hypocrisy, he tries at the same time to taint me by association with a website that ten years ago re-posted three of my articles (none of them about Islam) without consulting me. His charge of “Islamophobia” rings hollow, coming as it does from an adherent of the ideology responsible for the genocide of over a million innocent Muslims in Afghanistan.

**Conclusion**

Anyone who has taken the trouble to go through Tony Greenstein’s rambling blog posts and my rejoinders deserves congratulations. Greenstein writes at such excessive length that in order to expose his sleight-of-hand methods, my replies needed to be far longer than I would have liked. Greenstein’s tactics of deception include using fabricated quotations, falsifying genuine quotations, citing worthless and lunatic-fringe sources, misrepresenting legitimate sources, denying facts he knows to be true, and asserting facts he knows to be false. And all this, for the same squalid purpose: defaming dead Jews as Holocaust perpetrators, while besmirching millions of living Jews as Nazis.
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