

British Jews, House of Lords rebuff ADL-OSI 'war crimes' legislation

by Mark Burdman

Complementary initiatives by the British House of Lords and by the leaders of the British Jewish community have dealt a blow to two leading agencies of the East-West global condominium, the Anti-Defamation League and the U.S. Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations (OSI). On June 4, the House of Lords rejected by the decisive margin of 207-74, a "War Crimes Bill" that was sponsored by the Thatcher government and that had been passed by the House of Commons. The bill would mandate holding war crimes trials in Britain for individuals—almost exclusively of Baltic or Ukrainian origin—who allegedly committed atrocities while collaborating with the Nazis. It would also mandate the establishment of a special police unit that would amount to a British OSI. The 133-vote margin against the bill was much bigger than anticipated. This is the first time in four decades that the House of Lords has defeated legislation previously approved by the House of Commons.

The embarrassment was all the greater for Thatcher, on the eve of her June 7-10 visit to the Soviet Union. The Soviets were intent on passage of the bill, in order to use the emotionally laden issue of war crimes committed in Nazi-occupied areas, to defame the Baltic and Ukrainian peoples as "Nazi sympathizers," in part to shift attention away from the Bolsheviks' own criminal activity during the past decades. The U.S.S.R. has been steadily providing "evidence" against certain targeted individuals to such KGB disinformation conduits in Britain as the monthly *Searchlight*, which has operational links to the ADL. On June 5, Radio Moscow was quick to criticize the House of Lords vote, proclaiming that a "wide spectrum of public movements" in Britain favored the bill.

On June 1, Britain's *Jewish Chronicle*, which describes itself as "the world's leading Jewish newspaper," published a lead editorial attacking "those who use the specter of rampant anti-Semitism to further their own purposes, whatever these may be." Such individuals, it claimed, "should be challenged to explain themselves to the rest of us who are now being caught up in a national campaign they have engineered, which can serve only to encourage the lunatic fringe."

The immediate issue at stake, is that certain groups in the orbit of *Searchlight*, have tried to manufacture national hysteria about "rampant anti-Semitism," by pointing to inci-

dents like the recent desecration of a Jewish cemetery in Britain, which occurred soon after the desecration one in Carpentras, France. The *Mail on Sunday* of May 20 published a photograph, supposedly of the desecrated cemetery. But Dr. Lionel Kopelowitz, head of the Board of Deputies, the umbrella organization for Britain's Jews, charged that the photo was actually of hurricane damage from much earlier. The May 25 *Jewish Chronicle* published Dr. Kopelowitz's comment that the media were "attempting to whip up an atmosphere of anti-Semitism in Great Britain." Immediately the *Mail on Sunday* initiated legal action against both Kopelowitz and the *Jewish Chronicle*.

In its June 1 lead editorial, the *Chronicle* stated bluntly: "Before we all terrify ourselves with our own shadows, it has to be said as loudly as possible that there is no new wave of anti-Semitism sweeping Britain. There has been one major incident of cemetery daubing, which was unquestionably intended as a statement of hatred against Jews, alive or dead. But most of the other incidents that have been reported could as well be ascribed to the teenage gangsterism which is an unfortunate aspect of our society and which picks happily on anyone or anything that is different or merely in the way, whether it be the wearer of a football scarf, school uniform or headgear. There is no serious reason to believe that the Board of Deputies holds some secret dossier of unrevealed incidents of attacks on Jews which is kept from the community. There is a lot to criticize the Board for, but the suggestion that its elected officers are engaged in a conspiracy with others to hush up a major threat to the community is ludicrous."

One organization that exploits "the specter of rampant anti-Semitism for their own purposes" and makes "ludicrous" allegations, is *Searchlight*. Its editor, Gerry Gable, accused the Board of Deputies of failing to act against anti-Semitism, in comments made to the *Sunday Telegraph* June 3. In the same interview, Gable made the inflammatory claim that Jews are the only real targets of all "far right" groups in Britain, even if they claim to be anti-immigrant or anti-Asian in their propaganda. His comments were featured by the *Sunday Telegraph*, as part of a full-page "Focus on Britain's Far Right," which gave spectacular publicity to the tiny British National Party (membership 1,600), which has gained

international notoriety thanks to *Searchlight*.

Searchlight's "expertise" on anti-Semitism is otherwise flaunted in its April 1990 edition, which praises the Soviet KGB of Gen. Vladimir Kryuchkov as new allies in the fight against anti-Semitism!

British Jewish leaders have engaged in other battles with ADL provocateurs. In early May, they began a mobilization to demand that the British Home Office ban U.S. terrorist Mordechai Levy from visiting Britain in September. Levy, who is now out on bail on charges of attempted murder in New York, was quoted by the *Sunday Times* of London May 6, saying that he intended to meet with British Jewish leaders, and set up armed gangs to defend Jewish communities "by any means necessary." According to information provided to an American court, the ADL has utilized Levy's services in intelligence operations against Lyndon LaRouche.

Privately, Jewish influentials express their apprehension that the ADL is gaining a foothold in the Britain. They point to the fact that, in the past couple of years, the ADL has begun providing substantial funding to the London Institute of Jewish Affairs, a research arm of Edgar Bronfman's World Jewish Congress.

'A question of justice'

In the hours-long debate preceding the June 4 vote, some of Britain's most influential Establishment figures, representing both main political parties, spoke out against the war crimes legislation. These included Lord Shawcross, Britain's chief prosecutor at the Nuremberg war trials; former Prime Minister James Callaghan, now Lord Callaghan; former NATO Secretary Lord Carrington; Lord Windlesham; Lord Hailsham, former Lord Chancellor, Britain's highest legal official; Lord Mayhew; Lord Goodman; and Lord Campbell of Alloway, a former World War II prisoner of war.

Shawcross, a former Labour minister, pointed to his government's decision in 1948 to cease prosecutions for war crimes. He stressed that he had been probably been the most active at Nuremberg in trying to ensure that a significant number of war criminals were tried. But Shawcross warned that the push for legislation now, especially in the House of Commons, was motivated by "simplistic ideas of right and wrong. . . . The average age of the members of the Commons who made very eloquent and sincere speeches in favor of this bill, was five years at the beginning of the war. Because of that war, some of them were lucky enough to have a childhood cossetted in Canada or North America." For those who had lived through the horrors of war, matters were more complex, he said. "Of course we can now revive the policy of retribution but we cannot do so without imposing an indelible blot on every principle of British law and justice," he said.

Lord Hailsham warned that the bill was selective and unfair. By dealing only with Germany and Nazi-occupied areas, it ignored crimes such as the massacres ordered by Stalin. "This is not a Jewish question at all," Hailsham stated.

"It is a question of justice, and what is being offered is not the justice which this country is expecting." Hailsham reported that out of complaints on 310 alleged war criminals, in the government report which which recommended the bills' passage, only seven were carefully investigated and only four cases were found to merit a trial. Out of these, one was dead, one too ill to stand trial, one would almost certainly be acquitted. That would leave only one viable prosecution. Of the 75 other cases still to be investigated, one other similar case might result. "For that we are being invited to commit . . . an indelible stain on our standard of our system of justice." Rather than do that, the Lords should "do that which is right in the sight of the Lord."

Upsetting Thornburgh's deals

The Thatcher government has several options. It could invoke the 1911 and 1949 Acts of Parliament, which would override the Lords' decision, and/or it could reintroduce the bill into the House of Commons later this year. Notwithstanding, the magnitude of the Lords' vote is an irreversible defeat.

Similarly, the magnitude of the defeat for the OSI cannot be overstated. On Oct. 23, 1989, OSI director Neal Sher had traveled to London to keynote a meeting sponsored by the British All-Party Parliamentary War Crimes Group, where he defended the use of evidence provided by Soviet bloc agencies and urged Britain to set up an "OSI." His appearance in London followed immediately after the mid-October visit to the Soviet Union by U.S. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh, accompanied by Deputy Attorney General Mark Richard, who oversees the OSI's work. Thornburgh concluded a series of unprecedented accords with the Soviet legal authorities, including on so-called "Nazi-hunting." The legal aspects of U.S.-Soviet cooperation worked out are at the core of the condominium between the Bush and Gorbachov regimes.

According to press accounts at the time, crucial evidence presented at the Oct. 23, 1989 session, was provided by the Soviet Embassy and by *Searchlight's* Gerry Gable, who had accumulated his "information" during a visit to the Soviet Union. *Searchlight's* role in efforts to create a "British OSI" were otherwise on display at the May 6-8, 1990 World Jewish Congress meeting in Berlin. Eyewitnesses report that a *Searchlight* editor chaperoned a Soviet Jewish operative named Yuri Sokol, who boasted loudly to anybody in earshot, that he had personally provided the information to *Searchlight* against a Baltic emigré living in Britain.

The May 15 broadcast of an Independent Television documentary on the OSI's illegal actions in the "Ivan the Terrible" case against retired U.S. auto worker John Demjanjuk helped defeat the war crimes bill. Anybody who saw the performance of the OSI's former director, Allan Ryan, while under questioning from the interviewers, would have seen the dangers of bringing the OSI *modus operandi* into Britain (see *EIR*, June 8).