



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [1999](#) -> [May](#) -> Here

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Protocol Bookburning Conspiracy

From: **Greg Sandow** <gsandow@prodigy.net>
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 03:32:55 -0400
Fwd Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 02:49:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Protocol Bookburning Conspiracy

>Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 08:50:51 -0500
>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Protocol Bookburning Conspiracy

>Anti-Semitism (and UFO denial) flourishes in ignorance,
>ignorance is a result of censorship, and that would appear to
>make censorship a mechanism of ignorance, Mr. Sandow. Some of
>that ignorance may even be contrived. My bet is most of it's
>contrived. So yes -- there may (!?!) be a "mechanism of
>censorship" that hides facts about anti-Semitism (and UFOs)! I
>didn't get any facts in my grammar school, high school -- and
>only a bit in college. I've an open and inquiring mind, and I'm
>at a loss to explain my ignorance regarding something
>(anti-Semitism) that I've researched with some diligence (will
>produce the paper, with references, on request). Like FOIA
>requests you have to know what you're looking for before you can
>find it, I suppose. As a certified public school teacher I am
>poised to appreciate the shortcomings of our educational
>philosophy in this regard. Ours is a school system that teaches
>the midnight ride of Paul Revere, untested faith in
>fictionalized founders, and a dynamic history made as boring as
>the observed growth of grass.

Possibly I know something about anti-semitism because I'm Jewish and live in New York City. But on the other hand, my family was entirely secular; we celebrated Christmas (well, we had a Christmas tree, anyway), and paid no attention to Jewish holidays. I don't think I learned about anti-semitism at home.

In recent years, my thoughts about anti-semitism have been strongly stirred by watching "Schindler's List" (and then reading the book the movie was based on), and by visiting the Holocaust Museum in Washington, something I urge everyone with a mind and heart to do. It's sad, I'll add parenthetically, and in fact almost shocking, that we have holocaust museums in several cities, but no major museum anywhere about slavery, but that's another debate. The Holocaust Museum in Washington is a dramatic experience, one that deeply shocked and moved me, even though I'd read widely about the holocaust and related issues.

Early in the '90s, I was amazed to see the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" show up (as Stan Friedman noted here) in William Cooper's book. I'd known about the "Protocols," as far as I know, all my adult life. Knowledge of them certainly wasn't part of my Jewish education, since I had none. But somewhere -- maybe from studying political science in college, with an emphasis on Russia (where the "Protocols" were forged), maybe from reading about the Nazis, maybe just from wide reading more generally about history and politics -- I'd learned about them, and had absorbed their wretched history. Seeing them crop up again in

Cooper's book sent a jolt through me, I have to say.

But then I'd already seen them somewhere else, somewhere that gave me an even more shocked jolt -- on tables set up on New York streets, where people sell books on African-American subjects, with an Afrocentric and often militant emphasis. Seeing the "Protocols" there really scared me, especially since I also saw copies of "The International Jew" (if I remember the title correctly), an almost equally well-known anti-semitic diatribe by no less than Henry Ford.

I'd learned something by then about the unfortunate anti-semitism in the black community. I'd encountered it because I was writing about pop music, and the very famous rap group Public Enemy, whose music and politics I admired, turned out to have an outspoken anti-semitic member. He was ultimately fired from the group, but only because of strong outside protest. His public comments about Jews were truly astonishing.

Sometime after that, Ice Cube, a leading rapper (with whom I'd been quite friendly in Los Angeles), got close to the Nation of Islam, and at a press conference held up a book the Nation had published, about Jews and the slave trade. My friend Bill Adler, who worked as a publicist for rap artists, was curious to know what this book might be, and unearthed a copy. He was so shocked that he xeroxed many copies, and circulated them in the music business. He also hired a scholar to write a refutation, which was needed -- because this book, a vicious essay in concentrated hate, alleged that Jews bore main responsibility for the slave trade, and claimed to prove that by only citing Jewish sources! It turns out, of course, that the Jewish sources were all misrepresented, but the main point was that the book exists, and that despite Louis Farrakhan's public disclaimers, his group is deeply, horribly anti-semitic, and that doubtless there are some fair number of people in the black community who agree with him.

That's why seeing the "Protocols" for sale with other, much more responsible black literature dismayed and frightened me. Here was anti-semitism come to light, rearing its head right on the streets I walked down every day.

This may seem like a long, discursive, and perhaps not quite relevant comment on Alfred Lehmborg's latest entry in our debate, but I'm giving lots of details to clarify two further points that he raised.

>Where did you first hear about them? You imply that you were >unaware of them yourself. Were you reminded of them as a result >of the Rense brou-ha, and compelled to look up their history? >Perhaps you owe Mr. Rense a modicum of thanks in your own right.

I was, as I've just explained, very much aware of the "Protocols" before this Rense stuff started. I knew their history, but hadn't reviewed it for 20 years, to take a wild stab at how long it's been. Besides, Jeff had posted something about needing more investigation. So I wondered if there might be something in the Columbia Encyclopedia, which sits on one of my bookshelves. That's my first stop for any reference question outside pop music (which isn't well covered there). Turns out there was a reasonably detailed entry, which told me that my memory of the history of the "Protocols" was correct. It also gave me an opportunity to post that history here, for Jeff Rense's information (since he'd called for an investigation), and also for the benefit of anybody else here who wondered what the story was.

I've already said that I don't know exactly where I heard about the "Protocols." It's my experience that people of my generation (I'm about to turn 56) tend to know about them, at least if they read widely about history. I understand that not all people know the same things, and that I'm ignorant of many things other people know about. But to some extent this whole debate baffles me, because I've known about the "Protocols" for as long as I can remember. I'm not saying that others are ignorant because they don't know about them, only that I might possibly be at a disadvantage here because they're so familiar to me.

Of course, when Alfred Lehmborg responded to my tongue in cheek post about Russian conspiracy theories, he said my quote (of a remark made by Zhirinovsky, a Russian nationalist extremist) was

quite arcane. To me, it was more like common knowledge, because I found it in a front-page story that had just appeared in the New York Times. So maybe here we have a difference -- with no blame on either side -- for some of the differences in our reaction to this Jeff Rense issue. I really do read the New York Times every day (or most days, anyway). I imagine that anyone else who's done that for 40 or more years, as I have (and who reads the Times Book Review on Sundays) would run across some mention of the "Protocols" at some point.

Again, I'm not patting myself on the back for this. I'm just saying where I get some of my information. The Times covers a lot of ground, and if you read it regularly, you tend to accumulate a lot of information. The "Protocols" might have entered my mind at some point because the Times had reason to describe them and their history.

>Anything providing me data I
>was ignorant of is preferable to anything I seem to get from Dan
>Rather. You prefer your pap pre-digested by officious talking
>heads (Perhaps assume that role yourself?) and I do not. My
>admonition to Mr. Goldstein was to widen his field of view, not
>dote on Mr. Rense as the sole fount of his informational acumen.
>I fold my arms at your unclever misdirection, simultaneously
>rolling my eyes skyward at the proud sneer present in your
>preceding question. The question is all the news that fits,
>not all the news that's fit.

For what it's worth (and leaving aside the offensive tone of the above) , I almost never watch TV network news. As I mentioned earlier, I read the New York Times most days. If Mr. Lehmborg wants to sneer (proudly?) at that newspaper, he might tell us how often he reads it. If he hasn't read it, he might be in for a surprise.

Each day I also read the New York Daily News, our best tabloid, so I can learn some things the Times isn't telling me, particularly about life in New York City. I often also read the Wall Street Journal, one of the very best sources for anyone who wants to learn about the seamy underside of business.

And then, because I don't fully trust establishment media, I read alternative sources. I think, generally, that the establishment media mislead by omission, not by commission. That is, what they say is usually accurate. It's what they don't talk about that can be troublesome. (Though there are exceptions to this. Coverage of UFOs is obviously an example. After my recent visit to Cuba -- and after doing some reasonably thorough reading about Cuban history and current affairs, from both scholarly and journalistic writers -- I've come to feel that casual coverage of Cuba, at least when the baseball game between the Orioles and the Cuban team happened, is another subject where the information printed can be misleading. But that's another story.)

What alternative sources are useful? Well, in the past, I've read various left-wing magazines, since my politics are left -- the Nation, for instance, or Monthly Review (a venerable journal of socialist economics). In New York we also have the Village Voice, an alternative weekly that publishes all sorts of news the NY Times won't touch, and also for years has had a column that monitors the Times. Reading that column has been very helpful in sorting out what I can trust in the Times, and what I can't.

More recently I've gotten weary of the left, which seems moribund these days. And so I tend to read the New York Review of Books. Each issue is like a year in college -- deep scholarly looks at a multitude of subjects, along with political articles which very definitely say things that aren't in the establishment press. I'm also lucky to do volunteer work, reading to a blind sociology professor. He reads political books and magazines, and I learn a lot from that. I also read books on my own -- and, everyone, please forgive me if this sounds self-righteous, or merely boring, but there really is a point to it.

The point is this. Between network news on one side, and Jeff Rense on the other (along with other websites), there's quite a lot of information available, much of which doesn't support the "pap" (good word, Mr. L.) we get from Dan Rather and the like.

This information tends to be readily available -- not, maybe, on newstands in mid-America, but in libraries, and certainly in major cities. To quote an old phrase, it's "hidden in plain sight." If you want to know what's going on that the networks don't tell you (public TV is even worse, in my opinion, but that too is another story), you won't have trouble finding it, not if you really look. To give an extreme example, the Communist Party has a bookstore two blocks from my apartment. If I want a viewpoint very different from the New York Times, I can just take a short walk.

So...while I don't want to be critical, I don't know (returning to Mr. L's opening remarks) what to do with somebody who wants to learn about anti-semitism but can't find the information. There are books on it. There are organizations dedicated to fighting it (the Anti-Defamation League, the Simon Wiesenthal Center). The Holocaust Museum has exhibits devoted to it. There may well be magazines and scholarly journals about it. Regular reading of the New York Times and the New York Review of Books will uncover information on it.

Yes, schools should teach about it (my own elementary school did), but then schools should also teach more about science, about classical music, about jazz and blues, about black and Latino history, a world of subjects. (At least they all, at least around here, celebrate Kwanzaa each holiday season!) But if we think we don't know enough -- and which of us does? -- why don't we dedicate ourselves to reading books and magazines, strongly critical of the established order, which are already out there?

>>Which means he didn't know that they'd been investigated
>>generations ago. He wasn't fighting censorship to bring us
>>important information about anti-semitism. He just made a
>>mistake, and linked to anti-semitic trash without knowing what it
>>was. Now we're getting this retroactive gloss, when we're asked
>>to believe that Rense has done us all a great educational favor,
>>and that his motive all along was to expose the anti-semitic
>>horror. No way.

>So -- what are we left with here, Jeff Rense is an ignorant
>anti-Semite who provides nothing but a misdirecting,
>UFO-credibility-damaging obfuscation as a result of his web-site
>and radio program? I'll see your "no way," and call. If Rense
>was in this game -- I bet he'd raise.

That's utterly ridiculous. I said no such thing. If I may quote the very words the careless Mr. L cited before so badly misrepresenting them, I said that Jeff Rense "just made a mistake." That hardly makes him ignorant or an anti-semite. Nor does it mean he provides "nothing" but "obfuscation." If this is an example of how Mr. L. deals with data right before his eyes -- data he's even willing to share with us -- then I'm not surprised at anything he says about conspiracies.

To repeat: I said, in what looks to me like plain English, that Jeff Rense made a mistake, and that then, instead of admitting it, he tried to cover his ass, with a little help from some of his friends. That, too, is not exactly a crime against humanity.

Can we keep a sense of proportion about all this?

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net
Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.
To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).