

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



September 2011 No 589

Dr Joel Hayward in the Firing Line Again A Case Study in Zionist Methodology & Academic Corruption By Dr K R Bolton, September 24, 2011

In 1993, Joel Hayward completed an MA thesis on the literature of holocaust revisionism. Hayward was of Jewish descent, was a member of the New Zealand Friends of Israel, and a co-founder of Opposition to Anti-Semitism. Yet in the course of his studies, he had come to regard holocaust revisionist literature as making some valid points. It was a controversial conclusion that nonetheless garnered Hayward First Class Honors. When in the year 2000 a University "embargo" on public release had expired, the NZ Jewish Council, and Professor Dov Bing of Waikato University launched a campaign to have Hayward's Masterate revoked. The matter was made public by Bing, presumably on the safe assumption that the news media could be relied upon to mindlessly smear Hayward, which it duly did.[1]

Although Bing, et al, failed to have Hayward's Masterate revoked on the grounds of "dishonesty" (because there was nothing of a dishonest nature in the thesis - obviously) the *Working Party Report* agonized over Hayward having been permitted to undertake that course of research in the first place. The citadels of "Higher Learning" are apparently intended to be of limited enquiry.

Hayward was harassed, threatened, and had several nervous breakdowns. He had to resign from his position as lecturer of defense at Massey University, Palmerton North, and became unemployable in New Zealand.[2] A few years later he went to the UK and obtained a prestigious post in academe. As for Dov Bing, he was not about to let the matter drop, despite Hayward's retraction of some of his conclusions in the Thesis. Over the course of more than a decade Bing has continued to milk the Hayward matter for all its worth.[3]

This paper deals with the Zionist clique that targeted Hayward and others, in relation to the experiences of this writer with the same interests, for the purposes of examining a common *modus operandi*. The opinions are intended as hypothesis.

Hayward – Muslim Convert – Again Draws Wrath

Move forward to the present, and Hayward is again being pilloried in what appears to be another campaign to have his academic career wrecked. A feature in *The Daily Mail* is provocatively entitled: "Ayatollah of the

RAF. Academic University Head is Muslim convert. Who claims Nazi gas chambers were British propoganda and criticizes Libya air strikes." [4]

The article claims that Dr Hayward, Dean at Cranwell College, where British pilots are trained, is a convert to Islam who has taken a critical line on the NATO and UN bombing of Libya, and questioned whether the British air force should be placed at the service of a rebel army. Hayward is reported to have written in a magazine article that: "The West runs the risks of its good intentions (and inconsistencies) leading to distrust," in its bombing of Libya.[5]

The Daily Mail claims that Hayward's views have caused disquiet among "senior officers at RAF Cranwell, Lincolnshire," where Hayward is the senior academic and was involved with the tutoring of Prince William. From here the article proceeds with smears that I believe lack plausibility:

In a letter to *The Mail on Sunday* entitled "The Air Force Ayatollah," one senior officer expressed concern that Dr Hayward was focusing more on 'Islamist activities that are nothing to do with the RAF'.

He also accused him of giving Muslim cadets preferential treatment and making other students take a 'softly, softly line when writing about Muslim terrorists/Islamist extremists'.

Another officer claimed cadets and lecturers 'are in fear' of expressing anything that might be construed as anti-Muslim sentiment. 'Anyone who fails to follow the line that Islam is a peace-loving religion is hauled into his office for re-education,' he said.

Last night Dr Hayward said he did not 'recognize' the allegations.[6]

The article states that Dr Hayward was appointed to RAF Cranwell in 2007, but was investigated the following year over complaints of 'harassment and bullying'. It is not clear what became of the investigation. He is employed not by the RAF but by King's College, London, which runs academic courses at Cranwell.[7]

The questions that should arise are not in regard to the dubious claims against Hayward's character, but about whether complaints that started the year after his appointment to Cranwell were motivated by his having

displeased certain interests in New Zealand? Given what this writer personally knows about those involved in the harassment of Hayward in New Zealand, I feel that it is a legitimate question.

Hayward is presumably in a good position to try to mitigate the anti-Islamic propaganda that is feeding the "clash of civilizations." Having been hounded for years for his thesis on holocaust revisionism, knowing that he is under constant scrutiny by Zionists, it takes courage for Hayward to have his views on Islam published. He has set up a website called "Islam & War" which includes an essay by him entitled "The Qur'an and War: Observations on Israel Just War." [8]

Dov Bing & Dennis Green

Dr Hayward's predicament goes back to his student days at Christchurch, New Zealand. Dr Dennis Green, later to serve as a religious studies lecturer at Waikato University, Hamilton, and now touring the world engaged in something he calls "anarchaeology," had been a student with Hayward at Canterbury University. They had formed a group, Opposition to Anti-Semitism. *The Christchurch Press* reported at the time of Hayward's thesis debacle:

In May 1992, the university received a letter from an organization called Opposition to Anti-Semitism Inc (OAS). The group, based in Christchurch, was concerned about the direction Dr Hayward was taking in his then half-completed thesis.

Ironically, OAS had been formed a year earlier by Dr Hayward with Yossie EtzHasadeh (previously Philip Woodfield of Christchurch, now in Israel) and Denis Green.

The organization's goal was to monitor anti-Semitic groups in New Zealand and warn people about Holocaust revisionism. Several members were converting to Judaism. Joel Hayward resigned from the group before he started his thesis.

He says he left OAS because of a personality clash.

OAS members soon became worried about the path Dr Hayward's thesis was taking and arranged to meet him. Dr Hayward says he went along on January 30, 1992, to what he thought was an ordinary afternoon tea with friends. As they talked about his half-completed master's thesis a video camera hidden behind a hollowed out book recorded the entire conversation.

Dr Hayward says a selective 13-minute transcript was made of the three-hour conversation by the OAS. "They only included statements that cast me in the worst possible light."

The group sent Canterbury University registrar Alan Hayward (no relation) parts of the transcript with a letter detailing concerns about Joel Hayward's views on the Holocaust.

Dr Hayward did not find out about the video until two months after it was made. He considers the taping dishonest and unfair and says he nearly had a breakdown as a result. [9]

It was as a religious studies lecturer at Waikato University that Green is acknowledged by a certain R W Van Leeuwen as being "the man who planted the seed" for a fraudulently contrived Masterate thesis that Van Leeuwen completed in 2008. Furthermore, Van Leeuwen's co-supervisor was Prof. Dov Bing, lecturer on Political Science and Public Policy at Waikato University. [10]

Hence, enter again, two primary characters involved in the Hayward affair.

Dov Bing is a very active Zionist and apologist for Israel. He has been involved not only in the Hayward matter, but in the debacles concerning German student Hans Kupka, and *Auckland Herald* cartoonist Malcolm Evans.

It is in the matter of the Van Leeuwen thesis that I know something personally of the nature of Bing's attitudes and tactics. The events acting against Hayward, Kupka, and starting from 2008 against this writer, follow similar scenarios.

Dr Hayward wrote on his "old website" of what he endured in New Zealand:

Most of the garbage I received was unimaginative and only semi-literate, and phrases like "hope you die," "you'll get yours," "die scum!," "rot in hell," and "we'll be waiting for you outside your work" seemed so common that, had the calls and mail not come from different parts of New Zealand or been sent from many different email addresses, I probably would have concluded that they came from one small group of hate-filled people.

Some of this mail even came from a senior academic at another New Zealand university, and, with full specifics, I reported that academic's behavior and mail to the Working Party. I felt so distressed by some of the mail that, in a letter to the Head of the Working Party, Sir Ian Barker, dated 1 August 2000, I pointed out my concerns. Sir Ian told me during our interview on 10 October that he shared my grave concerns. [11]

The *Working Part Report* on Dr Hayward referred to this matter of vindictive e-mails, stating:

2.47: On 2 October 1999, Dr Hayward received what he describes as the first of many e-mails from Professor Dov Bing, Professor of Political Studies at the University of Waikato.... Dr Hayward claimed that he had received several nasty e-mails from anonymous persons and was concerned at what action might be taken by Professor Bing and NZJC [NZ Jewish Council].... [12]

The Hans Kupka Affair

In the case of Hans Kupka – a German student who sought to undertake his doctorate on the contribution of German language in New Zealand, but who allegedly had right-wing connections (Republican Party) in Germany – pressure was applied on Waikato University when material first appeared in the student newspaper *Nexus*. Of this Professor Middleton in a "strictly confidential memo" to the Post-Graduate Studies Committee (PGSC) stated:

On April 11 the story broke in *Nexus* in an article full of inaccuracies. These inaccuracies result from the fact that the article is based on the same package of materials that was circulated by Dov Bing to all PGSC members and members of the University Council on or around the same day as the *Nexus* article appeared. I sent an e-mail round the PGSC members cautioning that the materials contained a large number of distortions and inaccuracies and that it was unwise to discuss this matter on e-mail.

During March and April, some of those charged with ensuring that due process is followed have been subjected to harassment and threats and have had to seek support of various kinds. I am prepared to speak only for myself, to whom the damage has been comparatively very minor. You will note that, despite my requests to Dov [Bing] that his correspondence and queries be directed to the Chair (the usual convention), correspondence on this matter continued to be addressed to me – with the result that inaccuracies and distortions of the facts have been attributed to me and circulated to the University Council and the media. My name has therefore been published in *Nexus* (April 11) and circulated round Council.[13]

Kupka, the target not only of media attention, and the machinations going on within the University administration and faculty, but even of street protests from student and Jewish groups, duly left New Zealand.

Malcolm Evans

In addition to the Hayward and Kupka sagas, Bing was also involved in lobbying against *Auckland Herald* political cartoonist Malcolm Evans in 2003. Evans has been president of the NZ Cartoonists' Association, and has won several awards. His cartoons had included criticism of Israeli policies toward Palestinians. The predictable allegations of anti-Semitism arose, and Zionist and Jewish interests lobbied for a year to have Evans sacked from the *Herald*. The editor succumbed to the pressure. However, the sacking was reportedly not sufficient for Bing or for Geoff Levy, head of the Auckland Jewish Council, who both "urged further punitive action against Evans, claiming he had intended to 'incite racial hatred', which was illegal under New Zealand law." [14]

Bing, Green and a Fraudulent Thesis

In 2008 this writer by coincidence happened to find a thesis that had been written under the auspices of Waikato University's Department of Religious Studies. It is fraudulently contrived from start to finish. As stated, the thesis credits Dennis Green for the idea, and is co-supervised by Dov Bing.

My complaint to Waikato University regarding the thesis, and my request for an enquiry in regard to revoking the Masterate, which had received First Class Honors, resulted in a three year saga, during which I was lied to, lied about, stonewalled, and misinformed by the University administration, headed up by a craven Vice Chancellor, Dr Roy Crawford.

Crawford established an enquiry under the direction of an academic of integrity, Deputy Vice Chancellor Doug Sutton (who has since resigned from Waikato University, and does not wish to discuss the matter). The terms of reference for the enquiry included: (3. a) "Whether or not regulations, policies, procedures and guidelines were adhered to in regard to the thesis." If these were adhered to (3. b) "Can the University be confident that the thesis was in fact of an adequate standard to be passed." [15]

Over half a year later, Crawford's "report" comprised a one-page letter stating that "after careful consideration" the thesis had been found to be worthy. "Of particular note" was that the thesis had been examined by "two well qualified academics." [16] Nicola Brennan of the *Waikato Times*, the only journalist whose articles on the subject were of any value, stated that Crawford had told her "it is important to understand that it [the enquiry] wasn't a reassessment of the thesis. It was to check that the processes around it were correct." When asked about the "inaccuracies" [17] that both myself and another complainant, Mr Graeme Wilson, had raised, Crawford stated that "we didn't go through each of those into detail." [18] What transpired, and somewhat to the surprise of Nicola Brennan, [19] Crawford had reneged on the primary aspects of his own terms of reference in regard to the standard of the thesis.

Both Mr Wilson [20] and myself separately complained to the Ombudsman in regard to the failure of the University to properly deal with the matter. More months followed while Dr Crawford was tardy in replying to the Ombudsman. Eventually, Crawford issued what was supposed to be a "report," which is nothing but a series of generalized statements on processes, covering three and a half pages. [21] Crawford here claimed that the decision had been based "largely" on the recommendations of Dr Sutton's enquiry. In fact, Sutton recommended the thesis mark be "downgraded" and considered that both Dov Bing and Van Leeuwen were biased. Sutton's opinion was, it should be noted, formed despite not having looked at the hundreds of pages of evidence submitted by both Mr Wilson and myself proving that Van Leeuwen was a liar.

Crawford also stated, "the University must defer to people qualified to assess the thesis from an academic view point." [22] Yet in my complaint to Victoria University, Wellington, regarding Dr Jim Veitch, external examiner of the thesis, the reply was that "an external examiner does not have any decision-making authority." [23] The buck stops with Roy Crawford. The reader might note the very different ways by which the complaints of Wilson and myself in regard to Van Leeuwen, and the complaints of Dov Bing and the NZ Jewish Council in regard to Hayward, were treated. With the Van Leeuwen matter no external enquiry was held, no bulky report of evidence issued. The news

media was critical of my complaint against Van Leeuwen, yet supportive of Bing's and the Jewish Council's against Hayward.

Threats

In reality, what happened in regard to the Van Leeuwen affair was that the entire cabal of those associated with the thesis, including Dov Bing; W R Van Leeuwen; Marg Coldham Fussell (Van Leeuwen's tutor); Jim Veitch; and Douglas Pratt, head of the religious studies department at Waikato University, slithered off to the Tertiary Education Union, and the TEU threatened the University. It is strange how Crawford makes no mention of the TEU threats in his supposed "report" of December 8, 2010.

The TEU boasted to its members on the TEU website of its disgraceful conduct, stating that the TEU national secretary Sharn Rigg "played a role," and that she had warned Crawford:

It is possible, too, that academics in other New Zealand and overseas institutions may refuse to examine theses from the University of Waikato, or to co-operate on research generally, because of your institution's heavy-handed response to the examination process undertaken by two eminent external scholars.[24]

Rigg had also expressed concern that Sutton's enquiry (the findings of which have never been released) had concluded that Bing was biased. If one goes to the TEU's posting on its website it states that there were "no responses" to the item. More lies... I had immediately responded to the report with a detailed synopsis of the matter, but the TEU had refused to post it. The TEU, et al, had falsely portrayed this as a matter of "academic freedom," when in fact it is a matter of academic integrity, and all those involved are in breach of the *Education Act*, and University and TEU charters, which are supposed to guarantee public accountability and the maintenance of scholarly standards.

...And Legal Threats

Apparently not leaving anything to chance, in addition to the plea to the TEU, information reached this writer on July 4, 2009 that according to a senior source at Waikato University, Bing had "frightened the Uni with significant legal threats."

Previously Bing at an early stage of the enquiry had sought to set this writer up for legal threats in a bizarre effort to wreck the complaint. Bing adopted a very strange tactic indeed. He asked this writer about a website I had created in order to bypass the misinformation being conveyed by the news media.

Presumably, according to the plan, if Bing could trick me into admitting that I had posted material about himself and others he could threaten me with a libel suit, unless I published a retraction that would repudiate my own complaint. If I did not buckle, I would be bankrupted. Bing had taken offense at my having posted material on his role in the Hayward and Kupka disputes, as well as his role as co-supervisor of the fraudulent Van Leeuwen thesis. I naively fell into

the *Baldriquesque* "cunning plan" and admitted to a matter that had never been hidden. Yes, I had posted the material; there was no secret about it. The e-mails Bing posted to me, with the purpose of "entrapment," follow:

On 25 September 2008 you received a letter from Norris Ward McKinnon about your complaint to the University. I have received a copy of this letter from the University. The Vice Chancellors' Office also tells me that the University's lawyers asked you to delete three pages from your website and that you agreed to do this. The pages were: 'Zionist smear-mongering Posing as 'Scholarship'... Waikato's [sic] university's Subb [sic] -Standards (2 pages) and 'Waikato's Germanophobia' (1 page) It would be appreciated if you could let me know if this information is correct.[25]

I duly informed Bing that the information was *not* correct, replying to him:

1. The pages you refer to were taken down awhile back (possibly a week or two ago), on the basis of 'less is more', and on further reflection. I deleted the material on my own volition. 2. However I am not aware of receiving any letter from the University's lawyers asking me to do this. I will forward this response and your e-mail to the lawyers for clarification.[26]

One would think that any rational mind would pause when I stated that the matter would be raised with Gillian Spry of Norris Ward McKinnon, presumably the lawyer Bing was lying about; but no. Bing was set on his course, presumably confident that nobody at the law firm or the University would dare confront him. Bing responded with more lies:

Thank you for your prompt reply. The request from the University was not in writing but per telephone according to the Assistant of the Vice Chancellor. Surely the Assistant would not make up this information. I have been advised that the information contained on the three pages was defamatory in the extreme and you will be hearing shortly from my lawyer. You will appreciate to hear that I downloaded the three pages when they appeared on your website. At least you don't mince words and are very clear about your views and unfounded accusations.[27]

A third e-mail from Bing arrived, which made less sense than the first two, and does not seem to refer to any matter in the real world:

I am just checking with you if it is correct that you have closed down both your websites? I wonder what your reason for this action is? Cheers, Dov Bing[28]

Bing proceeded to threaten me with litigation for \$300,000 with a quip from his lawyer about not selling the family home. The demand was that I publish an apology in the major newspapers and in the *NZ Jewish Chronicle*. The nature of the retraction was intended to undermine the basis of my complaint concerning the Van Leeuwen thesis. On November 7, 2008 Bing's solicitor, Stephen Williams, Hamilton, wrote to this writer that the learned professor had "merely guided

the student in the structure of the thesis.”[29] He sought to minimize Bing’s role in regard not only to the Van Leeuwen thesis, but also in regard to the Hayward and Kupka matters. I was supposed to publish a retraction in the press by November 21, or face court action for “at least \$300,000.”

In the retraction I was to “unreservedly” and “sincerely” apologize for supposedly having referred to Bing as an incompetent bigot with a political agenda. I was also supposed to state that Bing had supervised the thesis in “a most professional manner.”

Bing’s Lies

Note that in his strange contrivance of a vexatious legal threat against me, Bing quips that the “Assistant of the Vice Chancellor” (Sarah Knox) “surely would not lie” in regard to claims that I had been requested to delete allegedly defamatory material from a website. Of course she wouldn’t; but Bing would... and did. After months of continually requesting from the University lawyer, Gillian Spry, information pertaining to this delusional telephone conversation with me, I finally received a reply, and only because the Assistant Ombudsman, Richard Fisher, had asked – twice – for a response. Ms Spry replied as follows:

Further to your letter dated 30 October 2008 and your e-mail of 16 December 2008,[30] I can confirm that no employee of Norris Ward McKinnon has held a telephone conversation with you in which you have been requested to remove three pages from your website. As such, I believe that providing you with Norris Ward McKinnon’s phone records will not be necessary.

I also believe that a sworn statement from me outlining what was supposedly said in the alleged conversation between yourself and Norris Ward McKinnon will not be necessary at this time. If you subsequently require such a statement as evidence in any future legal action, then I will be able to provide you with an affidavit at such time.

I can also confirm that the Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of the University of Waikato did not have a conversation with Professor Dov Bing in which Professor Bing was told that a telephone conversation between yourself and Norris Ward McKinnon had taken place. The Assistant to the Vice Chancellor is also willing to provide an affidavit outlining this if you are subsequently involved in any legal action.[31]

It is difficult to understand what the mental state of Bing was when he decided to try to entrap this writer into admitting making statements that I openly acknowledged anyway. Was it just a matter of pure *chutzpah*? What is involved here is Bing lying about the University law firm – namely, Gillian Spry – and the “Assistant to the Chancellor,” Sarah Knox, as part of some hair-brained ploy. If the matter had gone to Court, did Bing assume that I would *not* be calling Sarah Knox or Gillian Spry to testify?

In January 2009, I filed a complaint against Bing on multiple grounds of misconduct, including not only lying about others, but misusing his university e-mail account in breach of University regulations, and bringing the University into disrepute. In March 2011, two years after filing the complaint, and on repeated enquiry, I received the following from Crawford:

With respect to your previous complaint regarding Professor Dov Bing, this matter was considered by the University and as a result, Professor Bing was reminded that staff must not use the University’s email system inappropriately.[32]

The little matter of Bing lying about others, including Crawford’s own Assistant, Sarah Knox, which could have embroiled her in a Court proceeding, was not mentioned. I would be surprised if Crawford even bothered mentioning the matter to Bing.

Bing’s Role in Thesis

While solicitor Stephen Williams claimed that Bing had only supervised the thesis in regard to “structure,” to his colleagues in the NZ Zionist Federation, Bing was posturing as the “senior adviser,” and presenting himself as the champion of freedom of scholarly enquiry. The NZ Zionist Federation stated of a Bing presentation that he was indeed the “senior supervisor,” contradicting the previous nonsense by his lawyer that he only played a minor role; and that, “In the end, the Vice Chancellor saved the reputation of the University and rejected the findings of the three investigators, stating that the external examiners and the supervisors had done a sound job.”[33]

“Unease” with Bing as a Supervisor

Ironically Bing’s blue-eyed boy and media darling, Van Leeuwen, when first being told that his co-supervisor would be Professor Bing, felt “unease.” I had received information that Van Leeuwen had created a web “live journal” recording his feelings in the course of contriving his thesis. It had been a heavy burden on his social life, despite having several years to trot out a scant one hundred pages of double spaced diatribe that was largely the product of his imagination, or what Bing called “sound scholarship,” and what the “eminent scholar,” Dr Jim Veitch, recommended as worthy of Honours. Van Leeuwen’s “live journal” contained some embarrassing remarks that were deleted as soon as he realized he’d exposed himself. Now the enquirer will only find where this “live journal” had existed:

Error, This journal has been deleted and purged.[34]

The Waikato Times and *Alf’s Blog*, a community internet newsletter servicing the Ekatahune rural back blocks, were the only media that referred to these postings.

The postings reveal that it was with trepidation that Van Leeuwen found he was stuck with Dov Bing as a co-supervisor. Bing had become proactive in defending Van Leeuwen’s thesis when Mr Wilson and myself exposed its fraudulent nature, and Van Leeuwen became a *cause celebre* at *The New Zealand Jewish Chronicle*. One wonders what they now really think of

this *goy*? In the following entry Van Leeuwen expressed his worry over Bing and comments on the "hysteria" and "unfairness" that had surrounded the Hayward and Kupka issues. Van Leeuwen had written:

About six years ago Universities in NZ were hit by two 'scandals' which were tarred broadly with the brush of 'holocaust denial'- Dr Joel Hayward was taken to task over his Masters thesis in which he said that there were problems with the standard and accepted version of the holocaust. He is not a holocaust denier, but a historian looking at a highly emotive topic. The second was Hans Joachim Kupka, who was a PhD candidate in German language here at Waikato. Kupka **is** a holocaust denier and neo-Nazi, but its important to note that he was enrolled in a language PhD, not in politics or history. To cut a long story short, both investigations had something of a hysterical air about them and I don't believe that either investigation was conducted in an atmosphere of fairness and impartiality. Judge for yourself. Hayward's perspective can be found at <http://www.joelhayward.com> and the official Waikato Uni report on the Kupka Case can be found at http://unipr.waikato.ac.nz/news/kupka_report/pdf/kupka-report.pdf.

My issue with Kupka is that he was enrolled in a language degree - fair enough if he was enrolled in history, politics, religion etc. We do have academic freedom and freedom of thought in this country - it is specifically enshrined in law (one of the few countries to have academic freedom legally protected - thanks Geoff Palmer!) so it's a bugger to see it run roughshod over.

Both these experiences have made the NZ academic community a little bit sensitive, particularly at Waikato, about the topic. Last night I received an e-mail from my senior supervisor [Marg Coldham Fussell] suggesting that I take onboard a supervisor who had specialist knowledge 'in this area'. The person suggested was a member of staff who was instrumental in the Hayward case and central in the Kupka case and is (or was) a senior member of the NZJC.[35] Why am I feeling a degree of unease? Lol In reply I offered two other suggestions for a fourth (!) supervisor. Its not a matter of having anything to hide, just that I think there was a degree of gross unfairness in the above cases and I don't particularly want to be in a position of having to look over my shoulder and modify my research because of paranoia that may or may not be groundless. Anyway, it will be interesting to see where this leads. I am prob making a mountain of a molehill and all that, but still...[36]

When I had written something similar in regard to Bing he threatened me with a vexatious libel suit. Additionally, Van Leeuwen continuously called this writer a "holocaust denier" for having expressed similar opinions as himself in regard to the need for tolerance and freedom of enquiry. It is a red herring that Van Leeuwen relies upon to smear this writer and deflect

attention away from himself. The final news media report on the matter appeared in 2009, and ends with Van Leeuwen trying to make the entire matter of his fraud one of this writer being a "holocaust denier" (sic): I certainly don't regret this coming out. As part of ongoing public awareness, the New Zealand public has to know about holocaust denial. I am quite happy it has come up.[37]

But the Van Leeuwen thesis does not have anything to do with "holocaust denial." Van Leeuwen, was the only individual incessantly referring to this writer as a "holocaust denier," as well as being a "neo-Nazi" and an "anti-Semite," in order to deflect attention away from his own dishonesty. His own statements above would normally be sufficient to have him marked as a "holocaust denier" by Bing et al. But Bing had already shot his bolt and come out in defense of Van Leeuwen, and he could hardly backtrack. Van Leeuwen continues: Well, yesterday I had a meeting with my second supervisor, one I have to say I was somewhat dreading. Marg, my primary supervisor, is cool. She knows me and knows how I work and does little more than ask the occasional question along the lines of "everything going well?" and leaves it at that. Maybe its because she is a laid back quasi-hippy still working on her own PhD.

Dov, on the other hand, is a professor of political science from the old school- but a cool guy. However, I haven't had anything to show him, nor have I been in contact with him for months so when I bumped into him in the men's toilets and he said he wanted to see me, I thought "gads, time to harden my buttocks and prepare for an arse kicking" So, at the appointed hour, I rock around to his office and with some degree of trepidation, knock and enter. We spent the next 1hr 28 mins in discussion, during which my thesis and its progress was raised on two occasions for a total of four minutes- and which he said things were going really well and he is very happy and well impressed with what I am doing. I'm sitting there thinking "What the fuck? How would you know how it's going? I haven't shown you anything fer Christ's sake!" I confess I was somewhat confused and wondered if he had confused me with someone else. I can only assume he has been talking to other people and been getting a second hand opinion, but I did say I would send him through my conference papers and seminar notes so he should have some idea where I am heading with it all.

What did we spend the other 1 hr 24mins talking about, do I hear you ask? Well, we discussed Iran's relationship with the UN, Iran's relationship to Iraq, Iraq's relationship to Israel, Israel's relationship to just about everyone else, US domestic and foreign policy, holocaust deniers we had met, Jews in China, his great great grandfather in Japan, the Dutch military in Indonesia during WW2, his uncle who was in the Dutch military in Indonesia in WW2, a guy he met who knew his uncle who was in the Dutch military in WW2, the

Dutch War records office and corrupt historians and bureaucrats, my father who was in Indonesia after WW2, my grandmother and her resistance work, Dutch civil honours, N Korea's relationship to Iran, Israel and the bomb, Israel's relationship to Palestine, the use of deterrent force and how the West never got the hang on it, justifiable massacre and just war theory. I am sure I missed some bits of the conversation out, but you get the picture. [38]

In the above passages Van Leeuwen shows that while his trepidation about Bing had disappeared, both of his supervisors come across as anything but "most professional." Van Leeuwen in a further entry laments the way in which the thesis is interfering with his social life and other interests, such as his involvement with the occult.[39]

Working at the bottle-store has kept me busy over the last couple of months, much to the detriment of everything else – but I have finally put my foot down and reduced my hours to something more manageable as so I can focus attention on what it is I should be attending to, namely my thesis.

So, my thesis. Well... I have a busy next few months ahead of me.

As it currently stands, I have written about 9000 first-draft words out of 35000 I need and I am supposed to submit it on the last day of Feb. Hands up if you think I can make it? Nah, I don't think so either which is why I have asked for an extension. E-mailed my supervisor about it and she said she already had the forms there as she was expecting such a request. At least this time I have a legit reason since it took 2-3 months to get supervisors actually sorted out and topic agreed on, due to the controversial nature of the thesis. In that time I had between one and four supervisors assigned, and changed supervisory teams about half a dozen times. Needless to say the supervisors I ended up with are not the ones I started off with. Sooooo, anyhoo, I can look forward to handing it in end of Aprilish. This leaves me three months for 30,000 words. 10,000 a month. 3500 words a week, you might say...a walk in the proverbial park, you might say...but it aint quite that simply, because over the next three months I have other things looming on my horizon. Namely: Still working at the bottlestore. Training for part-time work being part of the University promotions staff (and possibly work there over the next few months) Tutoring a Religious Studies paper (and prepping for that) Teaching a Social and Moral Philosophy paper to senior high school kids (and having to get prepped for that). Starting my MPhil in Defence and Strategic studies and I will have one or two essays due in during those first couple of months (but fortunately, since its at another university, I'll not have to work too hard since I am not anal about keeping my marks high and am more than happy to settle for B+s).

Head off to Magick Earth festival at the other end of this half of the country. See Evanescence in concert

(and maybe Weird Al as well) Start the paper-chase to enrol in my PhD at the University of Queensland so I can start that in semester 2. Oh, and also get my management cert from the Liquor Licensing folk. On top of that I want to Start at the gym Return to martial arts training Start up a regular role-playing game evening and Learn the flute. Sleep? Bah, who needs it? Sleep is over rated. All hail the gods of tea, No Doze and Jump! ... Oh Shit, which reminds me, I was supposed to go off jet-skiing with the boss this morning and I plumb fergot. Toodle pip[40]

Van Leeuwen next relates that if he ran out of time and was having problems with the thesis he could just make it up, and nobody would know, which is precisely what he did, despite later protestations to the contrary.

THESIS WATCH

Sorry to spam you guys, but I am finding this thesis watch thingy to be a great deal of help in keeping me focussed and achieving those little weekly achievements which are so good for keeping morale up. Thank you for your patience. Total words for thesis: 35,000 Due date: Being negotiated (April 30?) Chapter/sub-chapters completed in draft form: 3 Had a meeting with my supervisors last Wednesday, which was fine and cool, but as an upshot I had a distressing thought.

Up until then I had the idea that what I am writing about is so obscure and the source material is difficult to get hold of that if needed to, I could make shit up and bullshit my way through difficult bits and no one would be any the wiser. Morally bankrupt I know, but it was a comforter knowing I could pull that particular trick out of my hat if I needed to. However, then the thought poked me...that my thesis will be deposited in the library and (because our university is hooked up to a thesis-share system) it will also be electronically available from something like 30 universities. Geep I don't want to be known for dodgy bollocky thesis! Its okay to bluff my way past a couple of markers, but to have utter shite on permanent record at an institution of higher learning (or Waikato University) is tres unkewl. So, *sigh* I guess I will actually have to do the work. But not tonight. Heroes is on in about half an hour. Woot.[41]

From the above it appears that Van Leeuwen was still not going well. He was a very busy chap, with intrusions such as watching the Television series "Heroes," and many other interferences in his scholarly routine. As was subsequently proven by both Mr Wilson and myself he did resort to "utter shite." Other entries include banter with his cyber-friends on the "geekiness" of his best student[42] (while he was a tutor at Waikato), the geeky girls being the filthiest, and fantasizes about the breasts of his female students.[43]

Be Kwiet

Nexus, student newspaper of Waikato University, was kept informed of the enquiry by an inside source at the University. Editor Joshua Drummond could be relied

upon to toe the line, and resort to childish smears, for which he was given a journalism award. It was via *Nexus*[44] that I heard of an intercession by Konrad Kwiet, Professor of Holocaust Studies, Sydney University. However, it was only in 2010 that I got to read Kwiet's "Comment" and "Personal Opinion" sent to Crawford, aping Bing's view that the Van Leeuwen thesis is laudable scholarship. Kwiet had supposedly been approached by Van Leeuwen, during Dr Sutton's enquiry, for an outside assessment of his thesis. Given that Kwiet had also interceded in regard to the Kupka matter, along with other Zionist academics, one might be somewhat dubious as to whether this was just another jack-up by Bing with one of his comrades. In the Kupka affair, as with his opinions on the Van Leeuwen thesis, Kwiet offered nothing of a scholarly nature; just *ad hominem* quips and presumptions.

Kwiet had described Kupka's views, allegedly expressed on the internet, as "garbage" and "cyber space junk." He stated that Kupka is "pleased" to present himself as an "anti-Semite," a "holocaust denier" and a "racist." Kupka's views are described by Kwiet as "stupid" and "arrogant." Comparing Kwiet's statements about Kupka with his statements about myself, he was merely offering a standardized retort.[45]

The introductory statement prefacing the four "scholarly opinions" on Kupka states that the opinions were "obtained by Dr Douglas Pratt, Chairperson Department of Religious Studies and by Professor Dov Bing, Department of Political Science and Public Policy," Waikato University.[46] It might be noted that Pratt was one of those involved in the Van Leeuwen fiasco as head of the religious studies department; and was among the gaggle that crawled off to the TEU. It might be asked how the Kupka matter was of any relevance to Pratt in his professional capacity?

After having read the opinions that Kwiet had sent to Dr Crawford on the Van Leeuwen thesis, I wrote to the learned "professor of holocaust studies" to try and get some sense out of him, as I had also tried with Prof. Veitch, the external examiner, and others. No hope, of course. Some of the questions I posed included:

1. You state that you had been asked by W R Van Leeuwen to comment on his thesis. Would it be fair to say that this was more a jack-up (if you'll excuse the colloquialism) between thesis co-supervisor Dov Bing and yourself?

2. You acknowledge in your first paragraph that the working party enquiry recommended the "downgrading" of the thesis, and that the reasons for this are unknown to you.

a. Did it occur to you that the working party under Deputy Vice Chancellor Dr Doug Sutton might have found material in the thesis, or might have been in possession of evidence that proved the thesis did not – at the very least – merit first class honors?

b. Did you make any effort to read the thesis with a critical approach as to why there might have been allegations that it might be fraudulent?

c. Would it be fair to say that you had a preconception in favor of Van Leeuwen and bias against myself that formed the basis of your judgment, rather than that judgment being informed by a scholarly reading of the thesis?

3. You commend Van Leeuwen for his "extensive" use of literature, including a "plethora" of documents distributed that are in the public domain, and in e-mail communications. You commend Van Leeuwen for making "effective use" of the material in presenting "empirical evidence".

a. Could you please provide me with any examples of the sources Van Leeuwen used, that you personally verified?

b. Do you, as someone who is engaged in examining and advising on academic dissertations, regard references that identify material as nothing more than "archives" as legitimate methodology? How did you verify any of these nebulous "archives", given that I had difficulty locating the material cited, including that credited to myself, and have still not been able to locate some items?

c. Are you aware that the e-mail communications you refer to are those of Mr Graeme Wilson, who is acknowledged for his assistance by his former friend Van Leeuwen in the thesis (and is described by Vice Chancellor Crawford as "a knowledgeable expert"), and that Mr Wilson also lodged a complaint against Van Leeuwen, and unequivocally called Van Leeuwen a liar? ...

Of a general nature:

1. Given that the NZ *Education Act* is supposed to provide for "public scrutiny" to ensure quality of scholarship, why should Mr Wilson and myself be denied that opportunity when we both reached the same conclusions, independently, as to the dishonesty of the thesis?

2. Do you regard threats from the Tertiary Education Union as an appropriate means of deciding the scholarly merits of a thesis?

3. Given that Van Leeuwen expressed in his "live journal" disquiet at having Dov Bing as a supervisor, on the grounds that Bing:

a. "Didn't know what the f... he was talking about" when supposedly discussing the thesis with Van Leeuwen, and

b. Had harassed Joel Hayward, who was denied scholarly freedom, and Hans Kupka,

c. Do you regard Van Leeuwen as an "anti-Semite" and a "holocaust denier"?

4. When Van Leeuwen stated on his "live journal" that if he ran out of time for writing the thesis, which was clearly interrupting his social agenda, he could simply "make b.s. up" and nobody would be the wiser because of the "obscurity of the subjects", did you at any time give pause for thought that just maybe he is a charlatan? ...[47]

Naturally, my questions remain unanswered, and Kwiet can rationalise that he "does not debate with anti-Semites and holocaust deniers."

Conclusion

After months of confabulation between the Chief Ombudsman, Beverley Wakem, and Roy Crawford, they came up with a "solution" that they hoped both Mr Wilson and myself would accept: Crawford stated that "errors" might have been made in the thesis, but there is nothing unusual about this. Wilson and myself were given the opportunity to submit corrections to these "errors" to Van Leeuwen, and – *if he chose* – he *might* include an addendum in the hard copy version of the thesis deposited at the University library.[48] These proposals were rejected because acceptance would mean conceding that Van Leeuwen had made a few "errors" whereas the contention is that he is a liar and a fraud and his Masterate needs to be revoked on the grounds of dishonesty. The Ombudsman, Ms Wakem, refused to reopen her enquiry into the University's antics. She would not or could not respond to my repeatedly having pointed out that Crawford had stated that the University would investigate whether the thesis was of adequate standard, but did not do so.

As for how this all relates to Joel Hayward's new predicament, based on my own experiences and observations with those who were involved with actions against Hayward previously in New Zealand, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that Hayward is again a target of ongoing vindictiveness. Hayward has not been forgotten by his detractors, despite his having

been at pains to repudiate the conclusions of his 1993 MA thesis, and having apologized repeatedly. Around late 2008 information from a well-placed source came to this writer that certain of these detractors in New Zealand had suggested to Hayward's employers in England that he had been "advising" me on the Van Leeuwen complaint (as if I needed advice), presumably with slanderous remarks about my being a "holocaust denier," etc. Hayward has again put his neck on the chopping block with his efforts to repudiate anti-Muslim sentiment in the military. Such actions can only have aggravated those who have long sought his ruin. Additionally, it is an example of where "scholarship" and "research" can sink when they are adulterated with vested interests; in this instance those of Zionists; and how craven University administrators and academics will be when faced with such pressures. The Van Leeuwen matter has rendered tertiary education in New Zealand, especially in the social sciences, suspect and there are institutions here that appear to operate, at least in certain faculties, as no better than diploma mills.

Notes

- [1] For a comprehensive account of the Hayward saga see: Dr Thomas Fudge, "The Fate of Joel Hayward in New Zealand Hands: from Holocaust Historian to Holocaust?" <http://www.joelhayward.com/thehistorynowarticle.htm>
Fudge's article appeared in the journal of the History Department, Canterbury University, Christchurch, *History Now*, vol. 9, No. 2, May 2003, pp. 12-21. However, the University took fright after pressure from unnamed sources, destroyed the entire edition in a New Zealand example of book burning, and published another edition that excluded Fudge's article. Fudge resigned his post at the University in protest.
- [2] Thomas Fudge, *ibid.*
- [3] "Research Publications for Dov Bing," Waikato University, <http://www.waikato.ac.nz/php/research.php?mode=show&autor=412&mode=show&page=1>
- [4] I Gallagher, "Ayatollah of the RAF," *Mail Online*, London, August 7, 2011, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2023246/RAF-academic-head-Dr-Joel-Hayward-Muslim-convert-criticises-Libya-air-strikes.html>
- [5] I Gallagher, *ibid.*
- [6] I Gallagher, *ibid.*
- [7] I Gallagher, *ibid.*
- [8] J Hayward, "Islam & War," <http://www.islamandwar.com/>
- [9] S Scanlon, "Making History," *Christchurch Press*, May 20, 2000.
- [10] R W Van Leeuwen, *Dreamers of the Dark*, MA Thesis, Waikato University, Hamilton, New Zealand, 2008, i, ii.
- [11] J Hayward, <http://www.joelhayward.com/myoverviewcontd.htm>
- [12] *Hayward Thesis Working Party Report*, <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/hayward/report.pdf> 2.47, p. 29. Also: <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/hayward/>
- [13] Prof. Middleton, *Kupka Report*, Appendix Q, "Confidential Memo," May 1 2000, To Members of the Post Graduate Studies Committee, http://unipr.waikato.ac.nz/news/kupka_report/pdf/g.pdf.
- [14] J Braddock, "NZ Herald covers up reasons for sacking anti-Zionist cartoonist," *World Socialist Web Site*, January 20, 2004, <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2004/jan2004/newz-j20.shtml>
- [15] R Crawford, Waikato University, Hamilton, terms of reference for working party enquiry, October 8, 2008, p. 2, Section 3 a and b.
- [16] R Crawford to K R Bolton, June 30, 2009.

- [17] My contention is that this was not a matter of "inaccuracies" but of lies.
- [18] N Brennan to K R Bolton, July 7, 2009.
- [19] N Brennan to K R Bolton, telephone conversation.
- [20] Mr Wilson had been a friend of Van Leeuwen's and was acknowledged for his help with the thesis. They had known each other through interests in occultism and through Freemasonry. In fact Wilson had only ever seen three draft chapters, none of which were subsequently used in the thesis. Mr Wilson was as appalled as myself at Van Leeuwen, whom he regards as a "liar." He is indignant at being acknowledged for helping Van Leeuwen in this fraudulence. The news media however carefully avoided mentioning that Wilson was also a complainant and opted instead on smearing this writer, rather than uncovering the corruption at Waikato. Interestingly, Crawford has described Wilson as a "knowledgeable expert" on the subject, but his complaint got no further than my own.
- [21] R Crawford, "Complaint regarding W R Van Leeuwen's Thesis," December 8, 2010, 2.2.4.
- [22] R Crawford, *ibid.*, 3.4.3.
- [23] R Miller, Manager HR Shared Services, Victoria University, to K R Bolton, September 17, 2009.
- [24] Tertiary Education Union, July 16, 2009, <http://teu.ac.nz/2009/07/waikato%E2%80%99s-anti-neo-nazi-thesis-back-on-shelves/>
- [25] D Bing e-mail to K R Bolton, Wednesday, 29 October 2008 9:21 a.m. The grammar and the spelling are Bing's.
- [26] K R Bolton e-mail to D Bing, Wednesday, 29 October 2008 5:49 PM
- [27] D Bing e-mail to K R Bolton, Wednesday, 29 October 2008 5:37 p.m.
- [28] D Bing e-mail to K R Bolton, Monday, 3 November 2008 6:42 p.m. I never had "two websites" on the matter, nor had I closed any down.
- [29] S Williams to K R Bolton, November 7, 2008.
- [30] There had been many more requests from me via e-mail and letter.
- [31] Gillian Spry, Norris Ward McKinnon Lawyers to K R Bolton, December 18, 2008.
- [32] R Crawford to K R Bolton, March 2, 2011.
- [33] Zionist Federation of NZ, <http://www.zfnz.org.nz/Web.asp?Page=197>
- [34] <http://diogenes-stone.livejournal.com/21823.html>
- [35] New Zealand Jewish Council.
- [36] W R Van Leeuwen, "Live Journal" entry, April 27, 2006.
- [37] N Brennan, "Thesis can't shake controversy," *Waikato Times*, July 7, 2009.
- [38] W R Van Leeuwen, October 14, 2006, <http://diogenes-stone.livejournal.com/1328.html>
- [39] Van Leeuwen is a Freemason III^o, a Masonic "Kellerman Lecturer," an initiate of the Golden Dawn derivative, the Order of the Table Round, and of the Builders of the Adytum. His associations include Satanists. I mention this because much nonsense was claimed about me being an "occultist," which I am not.
- Among Van Leeuwen's ten Facebook friends, the most interesting is a self-styled Satanist, "Venus Satanus." Van Leeuwen, <http://www.facebook.com/roelvl>
She states of herself:
I am Venus Satanus. I have had an interest in the occult for many years. I am a theistic Satanist. I am independent. I enjoy the occult, magic, tarot and spirituality. Many have seen my videos on youtube where I discuss the various practices of Satanism. Venus Satanus, <http://www.facebook.com/people/Venus-Satanus/1172362777>

This is only raised here because of Van Leeuwen's own convoluted methods of guilt by association.

[40] W R Van Leeuwen, January 28, 2007 <http://diogenes-stone.livejournal.com/15094.html>

[41] W R Van Leeuwen, February 19, 2007, <http://diogenes-stone.livejournal.com/19887.html>

[42] W R Van Leeuwen, April 25, 2007

[43] W R Van Leeuwen, April 29, 2007.

[44] J Drummond, "Dark Dreams," *Nexus*, July 13, 2009, <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/ED0907/S00049.htm>

[45] "Opinions of Four Holocaust scholars on Mr Kupka's internet postings," p. 2 (A) Professor Konrad Kwiet. http://unipr.waikato.ac.nz/news/kupka_report/pdf/i.pdf

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[47] K R Bolton to Konrad Kwiet, June 24, 2011, "Re: W R Van Leeuwen Thesis, Waikato University, 2008."

[48] R Crawford to K R Bolton, "Complaint Regarding W R Van Leeuwen Thesis," December 8 2010, 5.1 - 5.3.3.

*

K R Bolton is a Fellow of the Academy of Social and Political Research, and an assistant editor of the peer reviewed journal *Ab Aeterno*. Recent publications include 'Trotskyism and the Anti-Family Agenda,' *CKR website, Sociology Dept., Moscow State University (October 2009)*; 'Rivalry over water resources as a potential cause of conflict in Asia,' *Journal of Social Political and Economic Studies, and Russia and China: an approaching conflict?*, Vol. 35, No. 1, Spring 2010; Vol. 34, no. 2, Summer 2009. Read more articles by Dr. K R Bolton: <http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/author/k-r-bolton/>

Jews know acceptance still has its exceptions

Opinion, July 12, 2011

A century ago, Australia was a relatively tolerant society. Even so, Jews and Catholics were banned from Protestant-dominated gentlemen's clubs in Sydney, Melbourne and elsewhere. In other words, discrimination against certain minorities became acceptable and fashionable. Consequently, it was rarely commented on or even noticed.

Today Australia is an accepting society which formally outlaws discrimination on the basis of race or gender and disapproves of intolerance towards minorities. Except, it seems, Jews and Catholics.

On the evening of Friday, July 1 - at the commencement of the Jewish sabbath - there was a demonstration outside the Max Brenner chocolate shop in Melbourne. This was part of the Boycotts, Divestment, Sanctions campaign against Israel. Demonstrators prevented customers entering the premises. The reason? The Strauss Group, the parent company of Max Brenner, supplies confectionary goods to the Israeli Defence Force.

There's not much connection between buying hot chocolate on a cold winter night in Melbourne and the events in the Middle East - where Israel remains, with the possible exception of Iraq, the only democracy. Yet this was a violent demonstration. Victorian Police suffered three injuries and 19 protesters were arrested. Demonstrators called for the destruction of Israel and chanted: "From the river to the sea/Palestine will be free." The protest was reported in the *Herald-Sun* but all but ignored by *The Age* and the ABC.

Michael Danby, the Labor MP for Melbourne Ports, put the matter in perspective when he commented: "These people are prejudiced fanatics who should look into their soul. While 1500 people are murdered in Syria, they launch their own sad little attack on a chocolate shop because it also has stores in Israel."

Danby's point about double standards is well taken. There is little doubt that most ABC and *Age* journalists would regard a violent boycott of a kebab shop, in opposition to Hamas rocket attacks on Israel, as both a provocation and newsworthy.

Then there are the historical parallels. In the mid-1930s, Sir Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists used to go on rampages outside Jewish-owned shops in London's East End - some were boycotted, others smashed up. The British government responded by implementing the Public Order Act. Mosley targeted Jewish traders because they were Jews. The BDS protesters targeted the Max Brenner chocolate shop

because its parent company does business in the Jewish state of Israel.

The demonstration in Melbourne (there was also one in Sydney in June) has attracted little attention, apart from coverage by Andrew Bolt and reports in the *Australian Jewish News*. This suggests society has become complacent when the target of a protest is Jewish.

It's much the same with traditional Catholics, such as Tony Abbott. Last week he was subjected to two negative advertisements: one by the Labor Party, endorsed by the ALP national secretary, George Wright; the other by the left-wing CFMEU, which was endorsed by the trade union's national president, Tony Maher.

The Labor advertisement has Abbott being woken by an alarm clock and then going through his wardrobe to choose his attire for the day. Among the outfits rejected are a red pair of swimming briefs, bicycle clothing and a cassock with a crucifix on the front. Get it? Abbott, who trained as a seminarian, once thought about being a Catholic priest.

The CFMEU advertisement is more of the (sectarian) same. The Liberal Party leader is presented as one of the popes of old who rejected Galileo's scientific findings. Abbott is presented as not merely someone who declines to believe that the world is round but a Catholic who wears a crucifix on his cassock.

I know and respect Wright. I doubt that the newly appointed ALP national secretary understands just how sectarian Labor's advertisement is - or that such anti-Catholic material is capable of offending conservative Catholics who vote ALP. But that's the point. Like pro-Israeli Jews, conservative Catholics are readily taken for granted.

As is its practice, Britain's irreverent *Private Eye* publishes anonymous reviews. Whoever had the task of assessing the latest offering by the atheist A.C. Grayling made a perceptive point about modern Western manners. He or she pointed out that, for the likes of Grayling, Anglicans, Catholics and Methodists make easy targets.

The reviewer added: "The wise would quite like to be equally contemptuous of Muslims and Hindus, but these persons generally have brown skins and thus criticism of their religious beliefs is better avoided." Australia's very own born-again atheist Catherine Deveny admitted as much on Q&A in February when she said she was "flat out" attacking the "Catholic faith".

Conservative Catholics are a large enough minority to look after themselves. However, there is reason to be concerned about the re-emergence of anti-Semitism in the West. Australia, New Zealand, the US and Canada have been relatively free of this blight in recent times. Not so Europe, including western Europe.

In his recent essay *From Blood Libel to Boycott*, Professor Robert Wistrich paints a disturbing picture of anti-Semitism in contemporary Britain. A similar case has been made by the British lawyer and historian Anthony Julius about the hostility to academic Jews exhibited by the University and College Union in Britain.

Wistrich asks the hard question: "Why is Anglo-Jewry the only important ethnic or religious minority in contemporary Britain that has to provide a permanent system of guards and surveillance for its communal institutions, schools, synagogues and cultural centres?" A similar question could be asked about Australia - both with respect to Jewish property and anti-Catholic sectarianism.

<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/society-and-culture/jews-know-acceptance-still-has-its-exceptions-20110711-1haka.html#ixzz1RqAjWpMG>

Servicing the Commander-in-Chief

From: Denver Media Service - ron@denvermediaservice.com

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2011 8:48 AM

In the lead-up to Israel's Six-Day Land Grab, Johnson was lobbied by U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg. LBJ had moved Goldberg from the Supreme Court to the U.N. so he could be replaced with Abe Fortas, Johnson's personal lawyer. Fortas was a senior operative in a network of Zionists who helped produce the Johnson presidency and shaped its policies.

When Goldberg used heart-rending rhetoric to weave for Johnson a storyline about Israeli vulnerability and the pending victimization of hapless Jews at the hostile hands of an Arab "ring of steel," LBJ waved a Central Intelligence Agency report predicting that Israel could win *any* war in the region in two weeks.

When Goldberg persisted, Johnson ordered the CIA to revisit their analysis. The agency returned with a revised report concluding that Israel could win any war in the region in one week.

On June 4th, at a Fortas-hosted dinner for Johnson, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and New York investment banker John Loeb, Fortas cautioned Johnson that war might soon erupt in the Middle East.

When the president turned to McNamara for his opinion, the Pentagon chief agreed with Johnson that there would be no war. Johnson then confirmed that U.S. intelligence agencies agreed with McNamara's assessment. Johnson left for the White House at 10:58 p.m.

Less than six hours later, at 4:30 a.m. on June 5th, National Security Adviser Walt Rostow called LBJ to announce that Israel had attacked Egypt. Mathilde Krim, a former Irgun operative, was Johnson's guest at the White House that night. Before informing anyone else, LBJ stopped by the blonde beauty's bedroom to tell her, "The war has started."



President Johnson With Israel's Matahari, Mathilde Krim, wife of Arthur Krim, head of United Artists

Not until 7:45 a.m. did Johnson speak with Soviet Premier Aleksii Kosygin who expressed his hope and expectation that the U.S., as Israel's closest ally, would restrain Tel Aviv.

Mathilde Krim was the wife of Arthur Krim, chairman of the Finance Committee for the Democratic Party and president of United Artists. While Johnson was in the Senate, Krim bought land near the LBJ Ranch in Texas where he built "Mathilde's House." When Arthur was away on business, Johnson routinely took Marine One, the presidential helicopter, to visit Mathilde.

In the war's first few hours, the "victimized" Israelis destroyed the Egyptian Air Force while its aircraft were still on the ground. Walt Rostow sent Johnson a memo describing the success of Tel Aviv's "vulnerable" military as "the first day's turkey shoot." By evening, the Jordanian air force was also largely destroyed.

Johnson also received a memo from Arthur Krim that read, "Many arms shipments are packed and ready to go to Israel, but are being held up. It would be helpful if these could be released." Johnson ordered them released.

By evening of the second day, two-thirds of the Syrian air force had been destroyed. The glee in the State Department Operations Room was palpable, leading Under Secretary of State Eugene Rostow to caution, "Gentlemen, gentlemen, do not forget that we are neutral in word, thought and deed."

At the State Department's mid-day press briefing, spokesman Robert McCloskey repeated Rostow's official "neutrality" lie. Zionist advisers surrounded Johnson in the decision-making that lent U.S. support to the 1967 war. "Everyone around me, without exception was pro-Israel," recalls Johnson speechwriter Grace Halsell. She identified more than a dozen close advisers to Johnson, including Walt Rostow, his brother Eugene and Arthur Goldberg.

An Inside Job

White House counsels Leo White and Jake Jacobsen were likewise pro-Israel as were two key speechwriters: Richard Goodwin, husband of biographer Doris Kearns Goodwin, and Ben Wattenberg whose parents moved to the U.S. from Palestine. Likewise domestic affairs adviser Larry Levinson and John Roche, an avid Zionist and Johnson's intellectual-in-residence.

The Non-Separation of Powers

In the lead-up to this Israeli aggression, Fortas served as an enabling back channel between the Israeli embassy and the White House. Fortas had known Israeli Ambassador Avraham Harman since the ambassador's arrival in Washington in 1959. During the March 1960 visit to Washington of Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, Fortas sponsored a breakfast at his home

attended by Harman and Johnson who was then Senate Majority Leader.



President Clinton Gives Israel's - Mathilde Krim - the U.S. Presidential Medal of Freedom

Fortas' biographer conceded: "For several weeks before the crisis erupted into war, the Israeli ambassador was 'in very frequent contact' with Fortas and regularly visited the justice at his chambers or his house." An outspoken Zionist, Fortas also attended a critical White House strategy meeting on the Middle East on May 26th, ten days before the land grab began. When it came to Israel, Fortas was never neutral. "When they get back from Egypt," a law clerk in his Supreme Court chambers overheard Justice Fortas say, "I'm going to decorate my office with Arab foreskins."

Throughout the six days of carnage that Israel inflicted on its neighbors, Near East experts met daily with Johnson in the Cabinet Room. Fortas attended each meeting. Reflecting on comments by Fortas to Johnson at their June 4th dinner party, John Loeb wrote to Fortas on June 6th: "You were prophetic about the Middle East. Thank the Lord the President has you as a friend and counselor."

In 1968, Johnson failed in his attempt to elevate Fortas to Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Fortas resigned in May 1969 in the wake of a series of scandals. In the summer of 1970, *The New York Times* reported his registration as a lobbyist for Kuhn, Loeb & Company.

Fortas cemented his relationship with Johnson in 1948 when, in LBJ's first Senate race in Texas, the Washington lawyer finessed the extensive vote fraud apparent in the Democratic primary in which Johnson claimed an 87-vote victory, including 200 votes tallied in alphabetical order.

A Fortas-devised legal strategy led to Johnson's name appearing on the November ballot as the Democratic Party nominee. In a strongly Democratic state, that primary victory assured the ambitious Texan a victory in the general election and a seat in the U.S. Senate. Decades later, those familiar with this political history continued to refer to him as "Landslide Lyndon."

A Strategic Provocation

The Six-Day Slaughter of 1967 pre-staged the geopolitical dynamics for all that has followed—not only in the Middle East but also in the U.S. as Israel's violent taking of land outraged everyone in the region and set American foreign policy on today's ruinous course.

The periodic carnage visited on Palestinians ensures that this strategic provocation remains fresh in the minds of Muslims worldwide. Reactions to these serial provocations, in turn, fuel the plausibility of the latest storyline, *The Clash of Civilizations* and its corrosive counterpart: the Global War on Terrorism with "Islamofascism" the essential Evil Doer branding.

Israel has performed with reliable consistency every act required to provoke and sustain extremism in the Muslim world. Only by duplicity has the Zionist state sustained a U.S. alliance whose main effect has been to make America appear guilty by association.

On August 9, 2000 in a White House ceremony, President Bill Clinton presented Johnson paramour Mathilde Krim with the Medal of Freedom. By then this former Irgun terrorist had been rebranded as a high-profile medical researcher and AIDS activist adored and promoted to political prominence by her pro-Israeli supporters in Hollywood.

It's not expected that Israeli-American Rahm Israel Emanuel, White House Chief of Staff to Barack Obama, will urge that Monica Lewinsky receive the nation's highest civilian honor. It's not yet known what role Emanuel and White House political strategist David Axelrod have played in sustaining our costly "special relationship" with the Jewish state.

As yet another Israeli Prime Minister arrives in Washington with yet another rationalization for continuing this entangled alliance, a nomination is pending for the appointment to our highest court of a third Jewish Zionist for a court with just nine jurists. In time, historians will identify the role played by the Israel lobby (and Emanuel/Axelrod) in the nomination of Elena Kagan.

Based on the consistency of "Bibi" Netanyahu's duplicitous conduct over decades, Barack Obama needs to know when an Israeli Prime Minister is once again deceiving a U.S. president. History suggests a reliable test: are his lips moving?

The End of History

Though the U.S. has been deceived with stunning consistency for more than six decades, a mid-course correction remains possible. If this latest president can concede to himself that his political career is a product of those complicit at this deceit, he may yet emerge as the transformative leader that his supporters once hoped he could be.

If Barack Obama can be honest with himself, he will speak candidly to the American people and explain why this long-running deceit must be brought to a speedy close. If on July 6th he announces support for a one state solution, that will start to unwind this perilous alliance.

Senior military leaders have confirmed the common source undermining U.S. national security. Should the current commander-in-chief fail to act consistent with the known facts, this latest political product of the Chicago Outfit may risk their continued allegiance.

To advance peace, he needs only declare U.S. support for the designation of Jerusalem as an international cultural site under the protection of U.N. troops. To end the multi-decade cycle of provocation/reaction, he needs only reassign 30,000 U.S. troops to Palestine to rebuild a destroyed society, resettle its ousted people on occupied land and secure Israel's nuclear arsenal.

The Zionist experiment was a failure before it began. An overdue end to this apartheid regime can begin July 6th. Or this perilous alliance can continue—at untold cost in blood and treasure.

July 6th could be a defining moment for a president in need of such a moment. That date could also mark the restoration of American values to U.S. foreign policy and grant solace to those moderate and secular Jews long appalled at the conduct of Zionists who in 1948 deceived a U.S. president to recognize as a legitimate state their extremist enclave in the Middle East.