The Goldhagen Fraud Cannot Succeed

Daniel Goldhagen’s ethnic vilification, *Hitler’s Willing Executioners*, alleges that the Nazi mass murder of Jews occurred because of an ancient anti-Semitism, intrinsic and peculiar to the German people.

Released in March 1996, this book was received with outrage by those who despise such a spur to hatred. World-renowned violinist Yehudi Menuhin told a German TV interviewer April 19, that the book was “a disgrace,” and that its author “should be totally ashamed.” Moshe Zimmermann, German history professor at Jerusalem’s Hebrew University, wrote in the April 29 Neue Zürcher Zeitung, “A mythological, or even quasi-racist definition of the concept of ‘the Germans,’ which in Goldhagen’s case lurks in the background of his work, is scientifically and morally unacceptable.” The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung reported April 30 that former Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban, speaking in Washington earlier that month, had rejected Goldhagen’s thesis of “collective guilt.”

Goldhagen mimics the tedious methods of the anti-Semites. He has shopped through what other writers, in particular vague sociologists, have said against the ethnic group he targets; this he repackages as the thousand-year story of evil Germany. He is so perversely thorough, as to denounce as “anti-Semites” those Germans who resisted Hitler, and those who in previous centuries had worked for the emancipation of the Jews.

Goldhagen’s final chapters catalogue with gruesome details the Nazi shoot- ings of terrorized Jewish civilians. The reader is supposed to be so bloodily numb by the end of the book, that he will succumb to the outrageous, racist *explanation* of these crimes, which was presented in the first chapters.

Although the book has been criticized, it has not yet been widely subjected to analysis as a political provocation, with reference to the identity and intentions of those behind it. We are simply presented with author Goldhagen, a young Harvard University teacher, whose publisher is the old-line Alfred A. Knopf company.

This reviewer, however—being aware of the *British* geopolitical campaign against Germany as a new “Fourth Reich,” aimed at preventing Germany, in alliance with the United States under President Clinton’s leadership, from contributing to the economic development of Eurasia,—visited Harvard, interviewed Goldhagen, probed his sponsors’ backgrounds, and studied the history of the Knopf firm.

The real origins of the book cannot long be kept from the wider public in America, or in Germany, where a translation will be distributed this fall. And once exposed as British gangsterism, this fraud will become a mere embarrassment to its sponsors.

Daniel Goldhagen is employed by the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies at Harvard. Goldhagen’s salary is paid by a certain Guido Goldman, who heads the German studies program at the de Gunzburg Center. This Goldman has great access to German and American officialdom, owing to the splendid, humanist reputation of his father, Jewish leader Nahum Goldmann (1895-1982). The elder Goldmann led a 1930’s political battle against the Hitler regime (employing this reviewer’s father as a strategist), and worked for postwar German-Jewish reconciliation and for Arab-Israeli peace. But unlike his father, Guido is a playboy jet setter, a protégé and intimate companion of Henry Kissinger. Goldman is officially a leading American agent for British military intelligence’s International Institute for Strategic Studies.

The center employing Goldhagen was built with money from Baroness Aileen “Minda” Bronfman de Gunzburg, daughter of mobster Sam Bronfman, the founder of Seagram’s Liquor and a 50/50 partner with the British whiskey trust. Minda’s brother Edgar Bronfman took the World Jewish Congress leadership from Nahum Goldmann, and perverted it to British geopolitics.

Beginning in 1967, Henry Kissinger and Guido Goldman together organized the “German studies” program which employs Goldhagen. This project arose following the murder of President John F. Kennedy. British intelligence leader David Ormsby-Gore (Lord Harlech), and his closest U.S. allies headed by Averell Harriman, created a reactionary British geopolitical center at Harvard, usurping the slain President’s name for a “John F. Kennedy School of Government.” Kissinger, Goldman, and others who went on to manage the “German...
The value of Jim Wright’s book is that it reflects the views of a leading former Democratic officeholder, who is not a Baby Boomer, but rather of a generation shaped by having lived through the Depression and World War II. As Wright comments: “Two events had shaped my philosophy and formed my life’s driving ambition. They were the great Depression of the 1930’s and World War II. A world without war and without depression. That vision never faded.”

Wright, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives who served for thirty-four years, entered the U.S. Congress in the era of Joe McCarthy, and was forced out by the new McCarthyism of Newt Gingrich. Thus, his book documents the paradigm shift which has occurred in this country since the assassination of President Kennedy.

In a certain sense, the book is Wright’s contribution in this election year to defeating this new McCarthyism, and to reforging a bipartisan alliance committed to reviving the principles for which World War II was fought. As he said in his farewell speech to the House of Representatives: “All of us in both political parties must resolve to bring this period of mindless cannibalism to an end!”

At a time when Gingrichite Republicans and Democrats are intent upon reducing the role of government, Jim Wright shares the view expressed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his 1938 message to Congress: “Government has a final responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. If private cooperative effort fails to provide work for willing hands and relief for the unfortunate, those suffering hardship through no fault of their own have a right to call upon the government for aid.”

T

Not What We Fought For

As Wright emphasizes, “This, for me, was the business of government and the purpose of power. . . . We had come a very long way in the first twenty-five years after World War II. Now, retrogression had set in.

“Today, a new band of Visigoths is at the gate with bulldozers and wrecking balls, gleefully preparing to tear down our temples and uproot the trees we planted. . . . They have an entirely different destination in mind. Their vision is not an egalitarian society but a predatory society, whose rewards are survival of the fittest. . . . This is not the America most folks of my generation thought we were fighting for in World War II.”

On the impact that having lived through the Depression had on his political philosophy, Wright is explicit: “The political philosophy I would carry with me to Congress must have begun taking shape, I think, in 1932, when I was nine years old. My grandfather, then 63, lost the job he’d held for twenty-three years, two years shy of a promised retirement annuity. Jobs were almost nonexistent in that Depression year. My family moved from Weatherford to Fort Worth to rent an apartment in my grandparents’ house. The purpose was to provide income for them to meet mortgage payments and avoid losing their home. Even today, when I read of layoffs and unemployment, I don’t see statistics. I think of human dramas. My mind returns to that time in my youth and to a man I grew to love.”

‘People Are the Ends’

It is, therefore, no accident that in reflecting on the assassination of President Kennedy, he wrote: “Men and women of