

# THE REVISIONIST CLARION

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER ABOUT HISTORICAL REVISIONISM  
AND THE CRISIS OF IMPERIAL POWERS  
OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO  
TOWARDS THE DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL  
AND THE ROLLING BACK OF USA  
OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

Issue Nr. 22 Fall 2006 & Winter 2007

<revclar -at- yahoo.com.au>

< <http://revurevi.net> >

alternative archives

<http://vho.org/aaargh/engl/engl.html>

<http://aaargh.com.mx/engl/engl.html>

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

## CONTENTS

THE BURDEN OF JERUSALEM by Rudyard Kipling

THE TEHRAN CONFERENCE

REVIEW OF HOLOCAUST : GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

See reviews, accounts, comments in our special issue of *Conseils de révision* <

<http://revurevi.net> >

Mystery of Israel's secret uranium bomb

**Alarm over radioactive legacy left by attack on Lebanon**, Robert Fisk

**Gaza doctors say patients suffering mystery injuries after Israeli attacks** Rory McCarthy

Yes, It's the Lobby: "Political Fear" Drives US Support for Israel, James Abourezk

**A TUG-OF-WAR BETWEEN IRAN AND THE US/ISRAEL** Adrian Salbuchi

**TEHERAN AND THE POLITICS OF THE HOLOCAUST**

**Pierre Vidal-Naquet wants to strangle, crush, kill Faurisson**, Robert Faurisson

French academic again convicted for Holocaust denial

**French "holocaust" myth denier convicted for giving interview to Iran's TV**

**The Influence of a Man Who Denies the Holocaust** By Steven Stalinsky

Succession of scandals leaves Olmert fighting to stay in power By Eric Silver

**Report about the Zundel Hearing October 4, 2006** by Ingrid Rumland

**The Power of Israel in the United States** By Stephen Lendman

**The Big Lie About 'Islamic Fascism'** By Eric Margolis

**Purim will never be the same** Ruth Meisels

**"The Jerusalem Declaration On Christian Zionism"** -- Statement by the Patriarch and Local Heads of Churches In Jerusalem

**Why is Wikipedia Censoring Me?** by James Bacque

**Descent Into Moral Barbarism - Should Alan Dershowitz Target Himself for Assassination?** by Norman Finkelstein

**Jew Blackmails Chavez**

THE ROLE OF ZIONISM IN THE HOLOCAUST, by Rabbi Gedalya Liebermann

**At the Tolerance Museum, André Pinque**  
**HOLOCAUST AND HOLODOMOR** by Nicholas Lysson  
**Why It's Not Working in Afghanistan** By Ann Jones  
**'Stop the looters destroying history'** By Dalya Alberge  
**The Holocaust's Arab Heroes** By Robert Satloff  
**Zündel Trial, Feb. 2007** Description by G. Deckert, translated by W.G. Mueller  
**Letter From Ernst Zundel Written Just Before The Verdict**  
**The Trial of Gernar Rudolf in Mannheim District Court** Reported by Günter Deckert,  
Translated by J. M. Damon  
David Duke Offers Antisemitism 101' at a Ukrainian University Nathaniel  
Popper  
**A HOLOCAUST REVISIONIST CRITIQUE OF THE THINKING OF DEBORAH LIPSTADT** By Paul  
Grubach  
**WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST: THE FINAL COUNTDOWN** por el Movimiento por la Segunda  
República Argentina  
**Why the "special relationship" between Germany and Israel has to be reconsidered,**  
*Manifesto of 25 German Peace Researchers*  
**Two motivations of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in Holocaust denial?**  
**Iran remains home to Jewish enclave** By Barbara Demick  
The Role of Holocaust Denial in the Ideology and Strategy of The Iranian Regime, By Yigal Carmon  
BLACK ADDER  
**Holocaust Revisionism in One Easy Lesson,** By John "Birdman" Bryant  
**Should UK Ban Shoah Denial ?**  
**My Holocaust Problems** by Giuseppe Furioso  
**Other Victories for Revisionism: Addendum to Faurisson's Iran Holocaust Conference  
Speech** By Paul Grubach  
**Lectures on the Holocaust by G. Rudolf** Review by Patrick McNally  
**Italian government to propose bill criminalizing Holocaust denial**  
**Auschwitz work could fuel denials warns camp expert**  
**Professor's Claim Of Truth To 'Blood Libel' Plays Into Hands Of Anti-Semites** Abraham  
H. Foxman  
**THE ITALIAN BOOK, PASQUE DI SANGUE, IS AVAILABLE ONLINE ON THE AAARGH  
WEBSITE**  
<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres7/PasquediSangue.pdf>  
**Historian gives credence to blood libel** By Lisa Palmieri-Billig  
**OFFICIAL ANTISEMITISM IN VENEZUELA** Karl Pfeifer  
**DENYING THE DENIERS** Deborah Lipstadt And The Fight To Preserve The Memory Of  
**The Holocaust** by Allison Hoffman  
**Holocaust Controversies**

This poem, penned by Rudyard Kipling was omitted from the posthumous works published by his widow. Churchill sent it to Roosevelt in 1943, asking him to hide its existence.

<http://heretical.com/miscella/kipling2.html>

## THE BURDEN OF JERUSALEM

But Abram said unto Sarai, "Behold thy maid is in thy hand.  
Do to her as it pleaseth thee." And when Sarai dealt hardly with  
her she fled from her face.  
Genesis XVI.6.

In ancient days and deserts wild  
There rose a feud – still unsubdued –  
'Twixt Sarah's son and Hagar's child  
That centred round Jerusalem.  
(While underneath the timeless bough Of Mamre's oak, mid stranger-folk  
The Patriarch slumbered and his spouse  
Nor dreamed about Jerusalem).  
For Ashmael lived where he was born,  
And pastured there in tents of hair  
Among the Camel and the Thorn –  
Beersheba, south Jerusalem.  
But Israel sought employ and food  
At Pharaoh's knees, till Rameses  
Dismissed his plaguey multitude, with curses,  
Toward Jerusalem.  
Across the wilderness they came,  
And launched their horde o'er Jordan's ford,  
And blazed the road by sack and flame  
To Jebusite Jerusalem.  
Then Kings and Judges ruled the land,  
And did not well by Israel,  
Till Babylonia took a hand,  
And drove them from Jerusalem.  
And Cyrus sent them back anew,  
To carry on as they had done,  
Till angry Titus overthrew  
The fabric of Jerusalem.  
Then they were scattered north and west,  
While each Crusade more certain made  
That Hagar's vengeful son possessed Mohamedan Jerusalem.  
Where Ishmael held his desert state,  
And framed a creed to serve his need. –  
"Allah-hu-Akbar! God is Great!"  
He preached it in Jerusalem.  
And every realm they wandered through  
Rose, far or near, in hate or fear,  
And robbed and tortured, chased and slew,  
The outcasts of Jerusalem.  
So ran their doom – half seer, half slave –  
And ages passed, and at the last  
They stood beside each tyrant's grave,  
And whispered of Jerusalem.  
We do not know what God attends  
The Unloved Race in every place

Where they amass their dividends  
From Riga to Jerusalem;  
But all the course of Time makes clear  
To everyone (except the Hun)  
It does not pay to interfere With Cohen from Jerusalem.  
For, 'neath the Rabbi's curls and fur  
(Or scents and rings of movie-Kings)  
The aloof, unleavened blood of Ur,  
Broods steadfast on Jerusalem.  
Where Ishmael bides in his own place  
A robber bold, as was foretold,  
To stand before his brother's face –  
The wolf without Jerusalem:  
And burthened Gentiles o'er the main  
Must bear the weight of Israel's hate  
Because he is not brought again  
In triumph to Jerusalem.  
Yet he who bred the unending strife  
And was not brave enough to save  
The Bondswoman from the furious wife,  
He wrought thy woe, Jerusalem!

"In Arab media, literature and popular culture, Holocaust denial is pervasive and legitimized."

## THE TEHRAN CONFERENCE

### REVIEW OF HOLOCAUST : GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

Tehran, Dec. 11 - 12, 2006

See reviews, accounts, comments in our special issue of

*Conseils de révision*

< <http://revurevi.net> >

BARBARIANS

## Mystery of Israel's secret uranium bomb

Alarm over radioactive legacy left by attack on Lebanon

Robert Fisk

Did Israel use a secret new uranium-based weapon in southern Lebanon this summer in the 34-day assault that cost more than 1,300 Lebanese lives, most of them civilians?

We know that the Israelis used American "bunker-buster" bombs on Hizbollah's Beirut headquarters. We know that they drenched southern Lebanon with cluster bombs in the last 72 hours of the war, leaving tens of thousands of bomblets which are still killing Lebanese civilians every week. And we now know - after it first categorically denied using such munitions - that the

Israeli army also used phosphorous bombs, weapons which are supposed to be restricted under the third protocol of the Geneva Conventions, which neither Israel nor the United States have signed.

But scientific evidence gathered from at least two bomb craters in Khiam and At-Tiri, the scene of fierce fighting between Hizbollah guerrillas and Israeli troops last July and August, suggests that uranium-based munitions may now also be included in Israel's weapons inventory - and were used against targets in Lebanon. According to Dr Chris Busby, the British Scientific Secretary of the European Committee on Radiation Risk, two soil samples thrown up by Israeli heavy or guided bombs showed "elevated radiation signatures". Both have been forwarded for further examination to the Harwell laboratory in Oxfordshire for mass spectrometry - used by the Ministry of Defence - which has confirmed the concentration of uranium isotopes in the samples.

Dr Busby's initial report states that there are two possible reasons for the contamination. "The first is that the weapon was some novel small experimental nuclear fission device or other experimental weapon (eg, a thermobaric weapon) based on the high temperature of a uranium oxidation flash ... The second is that the weapon was a bunker-busting conventional uranium penetrator weapon employing enriched uranium rather than depleted uranium." A photograph of the explosion of the first bomb shows large clouds of black smoke that might result from burning uranium.

Enriched uranium is produced from natural uranium ore and is used as fuel for nuclear reactors. A waste product of the enrichment process is depleted uranium, it is an extremely hard metal used in anti-tank missiles for penetrating armour. Depleted uranium is less radioactive than natural uranium, which is less radioactive than enriched uranium.

Israel has a poor reputation for telling the truth about its use of weapons in Lebanon. In 1982, it denied using phosphorous munitions on civilian areas - until journalists discovered dying and dead civilians whose wounds caught fire when exposed to air.

I saw two dead babies who, when taken from a mortuary drawer in West Beirut during the Israeli siege of the city, suddenly burst back into flames. Israel officially denied using phosphorous again in Lebanon during the summer - except for "marking" targets - even after civilians were photographed in Lebanese hospitals with burn wounds consistent with phosphorous munitions.

Then on Sunday, Israel suddenly admitted that it had not been telling the truth. Jacob Edery, the Israeli minister in charge of government-parliament relations, confirmed that phosphorous shells were used in direct attacks against Hizbollah, adding that "according to international law, the use of phosphorous munitions is authorised and the (Israeli) army keeps to the rules of international norms".

Asked by *The Independent* if the Israeli army had been using uranium-based munitions in Lebanon this summer, Mark Regev, the Israeli Foreign Ministry spokesman, said: "Israel does not use any weaponry which is not authorised by international law or international conventions." This, however, begs more questions than it answers. Much international law does not cover modern uranium weapons because they were not invented when humanitarian rules such as the Geneva Conventions were drawn up and because Western governments still refuse to believe that their use can cause long-term damage to the health of thousands of civilians living in the area of the explosions.

American and British forces used hundreds of tons of depleted uranium (DU) shells in Iraq in 1991 - their hardened penetrator warheads manufactured from the waste products of the nuclear industry - and five years later, a plague of cancers emerged across the south of Iraq.

Initial US military assessments warned of grave consequences for public health if such weapons were used against armoured vehicles. But the US administration and the British government later went out of their way to belittle these claims. Yet the cancers continued to spread amid reports that civilians in Bosnia - where DU was also used by Nato aircraft - were suffering new forms of cancer. DU shells were again used in the 2003 Anglo-American invasion of Iraq but it is too early to register any health effects.

"When a uranium penetrator hits a hard target, the particles of the explosion are very long-lived in the environment," Dr Busby said yesterday. "They spread over long distances. They can be inhaled into the lungs. The military really seem to believe that this stuff is not as dangerous as it is." Yet why would Israel use such a weapon when its targets - in the case of Khiam, for example - were only two miles from the Israeli border? The dust ignited by DU munitions can be blown across international borders, just as the chlorine gas used in attacks by both sides in the First World War often blew back on its perpetrators.

Chris Bellamy, the professor of military science and doctrine at Cranfield University, who has reviewed the Busby report, said: "At worst it's some sort of experimental weapon with an enriched uranium component the purpose of which we don't yet know. At best - if you can say that - it shows a remarkably cavalier attitude to the use of nuclear waste products."

The soil sample from Khiam - site of a notorious torture prison when Israel occupied southern Lebanon between 1978 and 2000, and a frontline Hizbollah stronghold in the summer war - was a piece of impacted red earth from an explosion; the isotope ratio was 108, indicative of the

presence of enriched uranium. "The health effects on local civilian populations following the use of large uranium penetrators and the large amounts of respirable uranium oxide particles in the atmosphere," the Busby report says, "are likely to be significant ... we recommend that the area is examined for further traces of these weapons with a view to clean up."

This summer's Lebanon war began after Hizbollah guerrillas crossed the Lebanese frontier into Israel, captured two Israeli soldiers and killed three others, prompting Israel to unleash a massive bombardment of Lebanon's villages, cities, bridges and civilian infrastructure. Human rights groups have said that Israel committed war crimes when it attacked civilians, but that Hizbollah was also guilty of such crimes because it fired missiles into Israel which were also filled with ball-bearings, turning their rockets into primitive one-time-only cluster bombs.

Many Lebanese, however, long ago concluded that the latest Lebanon war was a weapons testing ground for the Americans and Iranians, who respectively supply Israel and Hizbollah with munitions. Just as Israel used hitherto-unproven US missiles in its attacks, so the Iranians were able to test-fire a rocket which hit an Israeli corvette off the Lebanese coast, killing four Israeli sailors and almost sinking the vessel after it suffered a 15-hour on-board fire.

What the weapons manufacturers make of the latest scientific findings of potential uranium weapons use in southern Lebanon is not yet known. Nor is their effect on civilians.

*The Independent*, 28 October 2006

<http://news.independent.co.uk/world/fisk/article1935945.ece>

## SECRET WEAPONS

### Gaza doctors say patients suffering mystery injuries after Israeli attacks

**Rory McCarthy** in Gaza City

Doctors in Gaza have reported previously unseen injuries from Israeli weapons that cause severe burning and deep internal wounds often resulting in amputations or death. The injuries were first seen in July, when the Israeli military launched a series of operations in Gaza following the capture of an Israeli soldier by Palestinian militants. Doctors said that, unlike traditional combat injuries from shells or bullets, there were no large shrapnel pieces found in the patients' bodies and there appeared to be a "dusting" on severely damaged internal organs.

"Bodies arrived severely fragmented, melted and disfigured," said Jumaa Saqa'a, a doctor at Shifa hospital, the main casualty hospital in Gaza City. "We found internal burning of organs, while externally there were minute pieces of shrapnel. When we opened many of the injured people we found dusting on the internal organs." It is not clear whether the injuries come from a new weapon. The Israeli military declined to detail the weapons in its arsenal, but denied reports that the injuries came from a Dense Inert Metal Explosive (Dime), a new experimental weapon that causes a powerful blast but in a localised area. The Dime, while causing severe injuries to its target, is intended to limit what the defence industry calls "collateral damage."

In Gaza, Dr Saqa'a said the small pieces of shrapnel found in patients' bodies did not show up under x-ray. "We are used to seeing shrapnel penetrate the body making localised damage. Now we didn't see shrapnel, but we found the destruction," he said. Most of the injuries were around the abdomen, nearly a metre up from the ground, he said. The doctors also found that an injured patient who had been stabilised after one or two days, might suddenly die. "The patient dies without any apparent scientific cause," he said. "So far we don't know why."

At the Kamal Odwan Hospital, in Beit Lahiya, deputy director Saied Jouda, said he had found similar injuries. "We don't know what it means - new weapons or something new added to a previous weapon," he said. "We had patients who died after stabilisation and that is very unusual."

He too found patients with severe internal injuries without signs of any large shrapnel pieces. Often there was severe burning. "There was burning, big raw areas of charred flesh," he said. "This must be related to the type of explosive material." Photographs of some of the dead from Shifa hospital showed bodies that had been melted and blackened beyond recognition. Others showed internal bleeding without signs of shrapnel wounds. In several cases doctors amputated badly burnt limbs.

At least 250 Palestinians have died in Gaza since the latest military operations began and hundreds more have been injured. Neither of the doctors could give exact figures for the numbers of

patients suffering the new injuries, although both said that most of those brought in during July showed signs of these injuries. Dr Saqa'a of the Shifa hospital said the injuries occurred over a six-week period beginning in late June and running until early August, while Dr Joudeh from Kamal Odwan hospital said he believed patients admitted even in recent days still showed signs of these unusual injuries.

The health ministry in Gaza has reported these injuries came from an "unprecedented type of projectile," and also noted severe burning and badly damaged internal organs, often around the abdomen. It called for an investigation into the cause of the wounds. "You have complete burns that lead to amputation. You find shrapnel entering the body and leaving very, very small holes. We have never seen this before," said Khalid Radi, a spokesman at the health ministry.

Tissue samples from patients in Gaza were given to journalists from the Italian television channel RAI. In a documentary shown last week, the channel said the injuries appeared similar to the effects of the Dime. An Italian laboratory that analysed the samples reportedly said its results were "compatible with the hypothesis" that a Dime weapon was involved.

The weapon is new and in the US is still in the early stages of development. It has a carbon-fibre casing and contains fine tungsten particles rather than ordinary metal shrapnel. It causes a very powerful blast, but with a much more limited radius than other explosives. However, the Israel Defence Force (IDF) denies the use of Dime weapons.

"The defence establishment is investing considerable effort to develop weaponry in order to minimise the risk of injury to innocent civilians. With regard to allegations of the use of Dime weaponry, the IDF denies the possession or use of such weapons," the military said in a statement. "Due to operational reasons, the IDF cannot specify the types and use of weapons in its possession. In addition it should be emphasised that the IDF only uses weapons in accordance with the international law."

Some Israeli military experts have also dismissed the suggestion that a Dime weapon is involved. Isaac Ben-Israel, a professor at Tel Aviv University and a retired Israel air force general who was involved in weapons development, had seen some of the photographs of the dead and injured and said he believed the wounds came from ordinary explosives. "I can tell you surely that no one in Israel ever developed such a Dime weapon. It doesn't exist at all," he said. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), which monitors weapons used in conflicts, said it had heard reports of similar injuries from Gaza and was collecting information on the case. "We haven't come to any sort of conclusion about what kind of weapon it was," said Bernard Barrett, an ICRC spokesman.

*The Guardian*, October 17, 2006  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/israel/Story/0,,1924524,00.html>

REVEALING

## Yes, It's the Lobby: "Political Fear" Drives US Support for Israel

**James Abourezk** Former US Senator from South Dakota December 3, 2006

***James Abourezk, formerly US senator from South Dakota, describes below what drives US Mideast policies. He is responding to Jeffrey Blankfort's rebuttal of Noam Chomsky's allegations.***

Dear Jeff:

I just finished reading your critique of Noam Chomsky's positions in an e mail sent to me by Tony Saïdy.

I had never paid much attention to Chomsky's writings, as I had all along assumed that he was correct and proper in his position on the Arab-Israeli conflict.

But now, upon learning that his first assumption is that Israel is simply doing what the imperial leaders in the U.S. wants them to do, I concur with you that this assumption is completely wrong.

I can tell you from personal experience that, at least in the Congress, the support Israel has in that body is based completely on **political fear**—fear of defeat by anyone who

does not do what Israel wants done. I can also tell you that very few members of Congress—at least when I served there—have any affection for Israel or for its Lobby. What they have is **contempt**, but it is silenced by fear of being found out exactly how they feel. I've heard too many cloakroom conversations in which members of the Senate will voice their bitter feelings about how they're pushed around by the Lobby to think otherwise. In private one hears the dislike of Israel and the tactics of the Lobby, but not one of them is willing to risk the Lobby's animosity by making their feelings public.

Thus, I see no desire on the part of Members of Congress to further any U.S. imperial dreams by using Israel as their pit bull. The only exceptions to that rule is the feelings of Jewish members, who, I believe, are sincere in their efforts to keep U.S. money flowing to Israel. But that minority does not a U.S. imperial policy make.

Secondly, the Lobby is quite clear in its efforts to suppress any congressional dissent from the policy of complete support for Israel which might hurt annual appropriations. Even one voice is attacked, as I was, on grounds that if Congress is completely silent on the issue, the press will have no one to quote, which effectively silences the press as well. **Any journalists or editors who step out of line are quickly brought under control by well organized economic pressure against the newspaper caught sinning.**

I once made a trip through the Middle East, taking with me a reporter friend who wrote for Knight-Ridder newspapers. He was writing honestly about what he saw with respect to the Palestinians and other countries bordering on Israel. *The St. Paul Pioneer* press executives received threats from several of their large advertisers that their advertising would be terminated if they continued publishing the journalist's articles. It's a lesson quickly learned by those who controlled the paper.

With respect to the positions of several administrations on the question of Israel, there are two things that bring them into line: One is pressure from members of Congress who bring that pressure resulting in the demands of AIPAC, and the other is the desire on the part of the President and his advisers to keep their respective political parties from crumbling under that pressure. I do not recall a single instance where any administration saw the need for Israel's military power to advance U.S. imperial interests. In fact, as we saw in the Gulf War, Israel's involvement was detrimental to what Bush, Sr. wanted to accomplish in that war. They had, as you might remember, to suppress any Israeli assistance so that the coalition would not be destroyed by their involvement.

So far as the argument that we need to use Israel as a base for U.S. operations, I'm not aware of any U.S. bases there of any kind. The U.S. has enough military bases, and fleets, in the area to be able to handle any kind of military needs without using Israel. In fact I can't think of an instance where the U.S. would want to involve Israel militarily for fear of upsetting the current allies the U.S. has, i.e., Saudi Arabia and the Emirates. The public in those countries would not allow the monarchies to continue their alliance with the U.S. should Israel become involved.

I suppose one could argue that Bush's encouragement of Israel in the Lebanon war this summer was the result of some imperial urge, but it was merely an extension of the U.S. policy of helping Israel because of the Lobby's continual pressure. In fact, I heard not one voice of opposition to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon this summer (except Chuck Hagel). Lebanon always has been a "throw away" country so far as the Congress is concerned, that is, what happens there has no effect on U.S. interests. There is no Lebanon Lobby. The same was true in 1982, when the Congress fell completely silent over the invasion that year.

I think in the heart of hearts of both members of congress and of the administrations they would prefer not to have Israel fouling things up for U.S. foreign policy, which is to keep oil flowing to the western world to prevent an economic depression. But what our policy makers do is to juggle the Lobby's pressure on them to support Israel with keeping the oil countries from cutting off oil to the western nations. So far they've been able to do that. With the exception of King Feisal and his oil embargo, there hasn't been a Saudi leader able to stand up to U.S. policy.

So I believe that divestment, and especially cutting off U.S. aid to Israel would immediately result in Israel's giving up the West Bank and leaving Gaza to the Palestinians. Such pressure would work, I think, because the Israeli public would be able to determine what is causing their misery and would demand that an immediate peace agreement be made with the Palestinians. It would work because of the democracy there, unlike sanctions against a dictatorship where the public could do little about changing their leaders' minds. One need only look at the objectives of the Israeli Lobby to determine how to best change



their minds. The Lobby's principal objectives are to keep money flowing from the U.S. treasury to Israel, requiring a docile Congress and a compliant administration. As Willie Sutton once said, "That's where the money is."

*If Americans knew* 3 Dec. 2006

[http://www.ifamericansknew.org/us\\_ints/pg-abourezk.html](http://www.ifamericansknew.org/us_ints/pg-abourezk.html)

## ARGENTINIAN PROPOSAL

### DRUMS OF WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST:

#### A TUG-OF-WAR BETWEEN IRAN AND THE US/ISRAEL

**Adrian Salbuchi**

Iran's "WMD's" threaten to vaporize the US Dollar [...] Iran's "Holocaust" Conference

Whilst all of this takes place, Iran hosted an International Historical Revisionist Conference in Tehran, on the so-called Jewish "Holocaust", that brought together independent researchers, historians and religious leaders from the whole world, including Frenchman Robert Faurisson and the US Rabbis Against Israel group.

Iran's hosting of this Conference brought with it "fire and brimstone" ire from Israel, the global mainstream media, international Zionist organizations and the US and UK governments. However, in spite of all the hysterical press distortions and abuse, the facts are that this event had three clearly defined objectives which the world press has not properly informed, much less addressed:

#### 1) Achieving a more balanced historical perspective on this issue

World War II cost more than 60 million lives on all the sides in Europe and Asia. It seems, however, that mankind's attention is almost solely focused on the suffering of 10% of those victims - i.e., the alleged 6 million European Jews persecuted by the German National Socialist regime.

Non-Zionist Jewish researchers like Norman Finklestein have described this phenomenon as the "Holocaust Industry", fabricated and used to generate political and public support inside the US and other countries, favourable to Israel (see "The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering" - New York, 2000).

Harvard University, in turn, last March published "[\*The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy\*](#)", a paper co-authored by the Dean of the John F Kennedy School of Government, Stephen Walt and Chicago University professor John Mearsheimer, in which they describe the excessive power, influence and leverage exerted by pro-Israeli Zionist lobbies like AIPAC (American Israeli Public Affairs Committee), which has been able to bend US Foreign Policy so that it prioritizes Israel's national interest over and above that of the United States itself. This reflects the overriding power that "Israel First!" groups exert over US Foreign Policy.

Prestigious academics like Zbigniew Brzezinski have both welcomed and voiced their support for this key investigation ([a summary version is available](#) in *The London Review of Books* (Vol. 28, No. 6, 23-Mar-2006)). In turn, former president Jimmy Carter, in a recent *Los Angeles Times* article ("Speaking Frankly about Israel and Palestine", *LA Times*, 08-Dec-06), said, "For the last 30 years, I have witnessed and experienced the severe restraints on any free and balanced discussion of the facts. This reluctance to criticize any policies of the Israeli government is because of the extraordinary lobbying efforts of the American-Israeli Political Action Committee and the absence of any significant contrary voices. It would be almost politically suicidal for members of Congress to espouse a balanced position between Israel and Palestine, to suggest that Israel comply with international law or to speak in defense of justice or human rights for Palestinians. Very few would ever deign to visit the beleaguered residents. What is even more difficult to comprehend is why the editorial pages of the major newspapers and magazines in the United States exercise similar self-restraint, quite contrary to private assessments expressed quite forcefully by their correspondents in the Holy Land."

"The Holocaust" Myth is clearly an integral part of the Propaganda Machine wielded by Zionist lobbies to generate unconditional support for Israel in the United States. This support includes huge

financial and military transfers, unbending diplomatic backing and giving Israel hundreds of nuclear weapons, a fact which Israeli PM Olmert has just admitted is true. The mass psychological impact of "The Holocaust" dramatizations through literally thousands upon thousands of very well financed "documentaries", "eyewitness reports", Hollywood movies, TV series, books, novels, plays, articles, monuments, anniversaries, cultural events, NGO's, lobbies, museums, school and university courses, news-clips and a myriad of other vehicles used to shove "The Holocaust" down the world's throat, has been so well orchestrated and stage-managed that, among all the horrific and cruel persecutions and genocides perpetrated in modern times, the persecution of European Jews by the National Socialist regime is the only one that has its own "Registered Trademark": "The Holocaust".

Other genocides, many of which were far worse than the one suffered by the Jews, are thrown into History's waste bin: the massacre of 3 million kulaks at the hands of Stalin in the thirties, the genocide of 2 million Armenians at the hands of the Turks in 1904, tens of millions of "disappeared" in the Soviet GULAG, 5 million killed in Cambodia by Pol-Pot's Khmer Rouge, 2 million killed by the US in Vietnam, and the now almost 2 million Iraqis killed by the Bush Family and their Associates since the First Gulf War in 1991 to date, to mention but a handful, are all tragic genocides where world public awareness is close to zero. Clearly, "The Holocaust" is the only genocide-show playing on Broadway...

## 2) Distinguishing between Political Mystification and rigorous Historical Truth

History, as a discipline, requires permanent investigation of new sources, documents, data, information and analyses. This means that any serious historical research must keep an open mind permeable to whatever "revisionism" such new data and documentation may warrant. This applies to World History, Ancient History, National History and, of course, Modern History, as it allows us to have an increasingly correct view of the past. This is actually notably important in the case of Modern History (which is when the persecution of European Jews took place), because the sources of "Modern History" are day-to-day politics and events that, as the years and decades go by, gradually become "history". At least that is how it should be. However "The Holocaust" refuses to become true "History" and, to this day, insists on remaining an autonomous Political System or creature, having clear political objectives.

The key question then is why scientific, objective and serious historical research regarding "The Holocaust" is banned, even banned by law as is the case in countries like France, Canada, Germany and Austria. This is why, for example, prestigious historians like David Irving from the United Kingdom and researchers like Germany's Ernst Zündel could not attend the Tehran Conference: both are presently in prison in Austria and Germany respectively, for having voiced their historical views on the subject. Clearly, very eloquent examples of the true "Newspeak" definition of the "Right to Free Speech" in today's "Democracies".

Additionally, the Tehran Conference never sought to deny that Jews were persecuted in Europe in the thirties and forties. What it merely sought to do was to place this entire Historical episode in its proper perspective, determining its correct dimensions in what refers to: how many Jews were actually killed, how they were killed (as many died as a consequence of the hardship and destruction wrought by the Allied bombing campaigns) and by whom they were killed (especially, in what refers to the actions of the former Soviet Union). Interestingly, the Zionist pro-Israeli mainstream media implicitly admits that any such investigation poses a grave danger to Zionism. Amidst all the insults and threats from such newspapers like the *Los Angeles Times*, in their 13-Dec-06 issue however, they ran an article called "Holocaust denial can be dangerous" which concludes by saying that, "...attacking the legitimacy of the Holocaust allows....(attacking) the legitimacy of Israel, which was created by the United Nations as a result of the Holocaust. If the first act didn't happen, then the second act wasn't necessary."

Now there's the rub! If "The Holocaust" did not happen as Zionists say it did, then Israel should not have been created the way it was. The whole matter would then require being fully re-assessed and re-vamped, forcing all key players to the negotiating table to resolve the "Arab-Israeli conflict" in a balanced manner taking into account the interests of all the parts involved: Palestinians, the Muslim countries, all Jews and other players - and not just the Zionists' interests as is the case today.

If it were to be proven that "The Holocaust" has, in fact, been stage-managed for political reasons in order to promote Israeli interests, then the State of Israel and the United States as public players, and the global Zionist organizations as private lobbying entities would have to accept their share of responsibility for the damage, suffering and hardship they have wrought upon the Middle East and the world and, accordingly, they should be held accountable.

### 3) Achieving a better understanding regarding the origins of the Arab-Israeli Conflict

Finally, and independently of the actual results of "The Holocaust" Conference, there still remains one key and fundamental issue: If European Jews were persecuted by certain European countries in the thirties and forties, why then should the Palestinians have had to pay for those injustices? If there is one thing regarding which there is absolutely no doubt is the fact that the Palestinians had absolutely nothing to do with the persecution of European Jews and "The Holocaust".

The problem is that over the past seventy years, the powerful Allies of World War II supported International Zionism helping them steal Palestinian territory from its rightful inhabitants, who had been there for over a thousand years, and thus allowing Zionist guerrilla groups like The Stern Gang, Irgun Zvai Leumi and The Haganah to displace millions of Palestinians using the most violent and perverse terrorist tactics since before the founding of the State of Israel, until today. We have now seen more than six decades of Israeli Zionists persecuting, assassinating, discriminating, humiliating, torturing and maiming millions of Palestinian men, women and children and attacking all who try to help them. They could not do this without superpower support.

The key objective of "The Holocaust" Conference then, has been to show that the persecution of European Jews by Germany may not have occurred in the way Zionist propaganda insists that it did. It would delegitimize the very act of creation of the State of Israel, which would only remain supported by a weak set of half-truths, blatant lies, distortions and rigging of reality, imposed through violence and coercion upon the peoples of the Region. In other words, Israel's "Birth Certificate" would be shown as being fraudulent.

Within this context, president Ahmadinejad's proposal should be seriously considered: if it was the Germans who were responsible for the persecution of European Jews, then Germany should cede part of its territory to the Israeli Zionists for them to found a new sovereign Jewish State in Europe (which is where the present Israeli ruling class came from in the first place).

This obvious conclusion would allow the whole problem of the Middle East to be quickly resolved once and for all. It would allow rapid devolution of all of Palestine to the Palestinians. Germany would take upon itself a good part of the economic cost of transferring the bulk of the Israeli population out of Palestine and into Germany (no doubt, wealthy Germany has more than enough money to do that), and the United States would also give financial support (for sixty years they have giving away billions of Dollars to Israel, anyway). This seems to be the true spirit of the much distorted and touted phrase of "whipping Israel off the map". What the Muslim World needs is for Israel to be removed from their Lands.

Re-founding Israel in Bavaria, for example, would give Zionist Israelis a privileged place in the world, and would at the same time bring rapid and lasting peace to the whole Middle East. Naturally, the Western media and Western political leaders all react hysterically to such an idea, yelling insults and threats. However, none seem to have the courage nor the arguments to face this challenge and properly address these issues the way they are being presented. It seems to be much easier for Western leaders to slam the door shut, distort reality, and put their ostrich heads under the ground, instead of acting like True Statesmen, helping to resolve a problem that is so serious, that it could very well lead to a Third World War in the coming months.

Finally, there is also a clear moral side to this whole issue: a solution as described above would resolve one of the greatest collective crimes committed in modern times, which is the outright robbery and looting of Palestine by Zionist forces backed by the Allies of World War II.

The Argentine Second Republic Movement (MSRA - Movimiento por la Segunda Republica Argentina), also feels that these complex issues need to be openly and publicly debated in Argentina, so that our own populace may fully understand what this is all really about. This is particularly important for Argentina, considering that international and local Zionist organizations, and the governments of the United States and Israel have succeeded in dragging Argentine president Néstor Kirchner to falsely accuse Iran over the terrorist bombing of the AMIA Jewish Mutual Association in July 1994, thus giving Israel and the US yet another "good excuse" to launch a pre-emptive military strike against Iran.

The stakes for us are very high, because if that were to happen, then Argentina will bear clear responsibility for helping Israel and the US in carrying out their Imperial Wars of Conquest in the Middle East. We have described this in detail in many of our recent Press Releases (some, like Nos. 9 and 10 of 12-November-2006, are available in English at <<http://www.m2ra.com>>).

### **Misinformation and propaganda in the local Argentine press**

The undersigned just had his first hand experiences of how the Zionist Propaganda Machine works when local TV talk-show host "Mauro Viale" (a.k.a., Mauricio Goldfarb) invited me to discuss "The Holocaust" on his program. Only minutes after the interview began, Mr. Viale interrupted to put through a telephone call from a lady alleging that she was "an 82 year old Holocaust survivor", whereupon she immediately began shrieking, screaming and crying whilst Mr.Viale gave her all the TV time in the world to express her drama. It goes without saying that it was not possible to even begin discussing Iran's "The Holocaust" Conference in a serious and mutually respectful manner.

In a way, these grotesque episodes are "good news" because they show that International Zionists have completely run out of all arguments to support, justify and explain the crimes, lies and suffering perpetrated by the State of Israel. They are therefore left with no option but to insult, threaten, yell, interrupt, cry, wail, not listen, not answer, change the subject, become hysterical, shove away, laugh at.... In short, they will do ANYTHING in order not to face the issues and answer the questions they are challenged with by independently thinking people.

Naturally, they can (for the time being) continue doing this because every "politically correct" journalist, political analyst and government officer knows full well that they are backed by the immensely powerful Voice of International Zionism, lavishly financed by tens of billions of dollars generated by their huge worldwide Political, Economic, Military, Media and Propaganda Machine.

But time is quickly catching up with them: the day draws nigh when the peoples of the world will see for themselves that, no matter how loud you scream, a lie remains always just that: a lie.

### **Ushering in a much-needed Public Debate in Argentina**

Lastly, the Argentine Second Republic Movement proposes that a Multi-disciplinary International Conference be organized in Buenos Aires next year, promoting an Open and Public Debate amongst all opinion sectors, with the view of establishing the true nature of power and leverage exerted by International and Local Zionists organizations and interests in our country.

This is particularly important considering that many of these Zionist lobbies active in Argentina, heed the "Israel First" cue emanating from global Zionist lobbies and the Israeli Government, and thus permanently promote the interests of that Foreign Power - presently at war -, over the interests of the Argentine Republic, a fact reflected in the Argentine Government's siding with US and Israeli "Hawks" (Bush & Olmert) in their imminent unilateral pre-emptive war against Iran.

Such an Open Public Debate should focus on two key factors affecting Argentina, but which are also applicable to just about any country in the world:

1. Identify the true nature, extent and sources of financing of Zionist lobbies and leveraging over public affairs in Government, among politicians, in universities, and in the Media.
2. Design checks and balances to ensure that no minority group can acquire excessive power and then use it against the National Interest. If we truly value Democracy, then we must be alert against any minority group acquiring excessive power. After all, Democracy is supposed to be "Government by the MAJORITY of the People", not by a minority. Correspondingly, all illegitimate machinations, maneuvering and lobbying on the part of minorities - whether domestic or foreign - geared on imposing their MINORITY interests and objectives on the MAJORITY of the People, is clearly Un-Democratic. This becomes especially vital when such minorities are aligned with the interests of foreign warring powers.

Movimiento por la Segunda República Argentina - (MSRA) - Buenos Aires  
- Córdoba - Rosario - La Plata - English translation of our Press Release No. 16 - Buenos Aires, 14th December 2006  
<mailto:m2ra@fibertel.com.ar>  
Consultar también El Traductor Gráfico - [www.eltraductorradial.com.ar](http://www.eltraductorradial.com.ar)

## **HOW TO OBFUSCATE THINGS**

### **TEHERAN AND THE POLITICS OF THE HOLOCAUST**

#### ***Concentration camp crematorium***

Iran is holding a conference this week on the Holocaust. According to this report, El Holocausto, según Teherán by Ana Carbajosa *El País* 09.12.2006, the conference is expected to include Western Holocaust deniers such as Robert Faurisson and Serge Thion of France, Flávio Gonçalves of Portugal,

and Gerd Honsik of Austria. Horst Mahler, German leftwing extremist turned rightwing extremist, was invited but can't come because Germany pulled his passport when they learned he was invited to the conference.

*El País* notes that Holocaust denial is explicitly outlawed in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Polonia, Slovakia and Switzerland. The State Treaty of 1955 with the US, Britain, France and the Soviet Union that formally ended the postwar occupation specifies that Austria will outlaw Nazi propaganda and block any efforts to revive the Nazi Party. Although most of the countries just named don't have explicit treaty obligations to do so, a similar concept that the Nazi movement proved itself conclusively to be destructive underlies those laws.

Personally, I prefer the traditional American notion that things work best when people are free to say any dang fool thing they want to, as long as everyone else is free to say what a dang fool thing it is. But on my list of things I would like to see changed in the world, changing the anti-Nazi laws of those nine countries ranks far down on the list.

The Holocaust denial propaganda is nasty stuff, no matter how you slice it. We've maintained a link at *The Blue Voice* ever since we started in mid-2005 to *The Nizkor Project*, a good online resource providing reality-based information on Holocaust-denier claims. It is a good source to check if you're wondering about some claim that pops up in the press in connection with the Teheran conference.

But I would stress that taking Holocaust denial seriously as *a political phenomenon* does not mean taking their bogus claims seriously *as history*. And the point of Holocaust denial is not to convince people that the mass murder of Jews and others by the Nazis did not happen. It's meant to sneer at the victims and promote hatred and contempt against them.

I have some additional comments about this, and I've listed some online and printed resources on the Holocaust and Holocaust denial at the end of this post.

### **The problems of Holocaust-deniers' view of history**

The core of Holocaust-denial is anti-Semitic bigotry. It's also almost always associated in some way with rehabilitating the image of the Third Reich. But there are other ways in which Holocaust denial affect people's thinking about history.

One is that it just promotes plain sloppy thinking. If you can believe that events as well-documented as the mass murder of Jews and other victims that we know as the Holocaust never happened, you can pretty much manage to believe any piece of propaganda. We see some of the same thing in the neo-Confederate arguments, especially the ones that try to show how Southern slaves actually favored the Confederacy.

We see right now with the Iraq War that the consequences of swallowing manufactured propaganda can be very serious. And if you can believe that the Holocaust didn't happen, it wouldn't be hard to convince yourself that Iraq had "weapons of mass destruction" in 2003 and was cooperating with Al Qaida. Sloppy thinking about government propaganda can lead to real harm.

Those who are not familiar with far-right styles of writing might be surprised to find that the "highbrow" Holocaust deniers and even a lot of the "middle-brow" types provide copious footnotes in their publications. This is actually a typical characteristic of the far-right, this obsessive citing of sources. But endless footnotes can't make a lie into the truth.

Still, the exact ploys that fabricators use aren't always clear. For instance, if some Holocaust denier type were to say, "Even Simon Wiesenthal admitted that there were no death camps in Germany," (which actually is a favorite argument of theirs) most people would know there was something wrong with what they said, though maybe not exactly what. In this case, Wiesenthal did say that, and there's nothing exceptional about it. The four camps that were designated as "death camps", of which Auschwitz-Berkenau is the most infamous, were all outside the borders of Germany. There were plenty of concentration camps in Germany and plenty of untimely deaths occurred in them.

In some cases, Holocaust denial may come mixed with some solid historical research. Perhaps the most famous of the Holocaust deniers, David Irving, currently serving time in Austria for Holocaust denial speeches there, is possibly the most famous of the lot. And one of the most talented.

He first gained wide attention for his book *The Destruction of Dresden* (1963). That book had a pro-German tilt and grossly exaggerated the number of killed in the bombing of Dresden in 1945. But even though inflating the number of death in the Dresden bombing became a stock piece of Holocaust-denier talk (see the section on Dresden in the British court decision linked below), it wasn't until the publication of *Hitler's War* (1977) that Irving crossed over into Holocaust-denier territory. In that book, he argued that Hitler himself had no personal knowledge that the mass killing of Jews was occurring and did not order it done.

As Christopher Browning recounts in his book *The Path to Genocide* (1992), historians of the period didn't take that claim seriously. But it did spur them into a closer examination of the record to determine when the decision actually did take place. The answer is that the decision was made during

the spring of 1941 as the Germans planned Operation Barbarossa, the invasion of the Soviet Union. Mass roundups and killing of Jewish men began just after the invasion and by the fall Jewish women and children were also being systematically murdered.

The notorious Wannsee Conference of January, 1942, was not the point at which the decision for mass killing of Jews was taken. That conference focused on planning for the further implementation of decision that had already been made and after the process was already well underway.

So "debunking" of bogus claims can play a useful role. That doesn't mean Holocaust denial is a "legitimate" narrative of that part of history. Creationism isn't science, either, but scientists have found it necessary to systematically refute the claims.

Irving is not representative, though, of most Holocaust-denier hacks. Irving was dishonest in his claims. But he actually did some real research and was famous for unearthing obscure documents. Gordon Craig, one of the leading historians of Germany, wrote 10 years ago in *The Devil in the Details* *New York Review of Books* 09/19/06 issue (behind subscription):

The fact is that he knows more about National Socialism than most professional scholars in his field, and students of the years 1933-1945 owe more than they are always willing to admit to his energy as a researcher and to the scope and vigor of his publications. His first book, *The Destruction of Dresden*, was not always scrupulously balanced in its judgments, but there is no doubt that it encouraged historians to take a more critical look at Allied bombing in the last stages of World War II and supplied important data to support such investigation. Similarly, his book *Hitler's War* — despite its attempts to protect Hitler from any responsibility for the Holocaust and its implied argument that the Führer might well have won the war if his generals had only been intelligent enough to appreciate and exploit his military genius — remains the best study we have of the German side of the Second World War and, as such, indispensable for all students of that conflict. Similarly, his discovery, after a long search in the National Archives in Washington, of the diaries of Professor Theo Morell, who served as Hitler's private doctor from 1941 to 1945, provided useful information for the not inconsiderable number of people who have interested themselves in Hitler's physical ailments and their possible effect upon his policies; and he has been generous in making his private files, which include other unpublished findings, available to other scholars.

I would say that Craig was overly generous on *The Destruction of Dresden*; in fact, it was very influential of giving a very distorted picture of the Dresden bombing to American audiences. Kurt Vonnegut picked up his exaggerated figures on civilian casualties in his very popular novel *Slaughterhouse 5*.

But the point is that Holocaust-denier propaganda can sometimes be quite sophisticated. And picking it apart can be tricky.

### **Real controversies over the Holocaust**

One effect of phony controversies over the Holocaust, of which Holocaust denial is the most notorious, is that they distract attention from real and substantive debates over aspects of the Holocaust. (Arno Meyer with *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken? The "Final Solution" in History* and Daniel Goldhagen with his *Hitler's Willing Executioners* also generated controversies with analytical claims that also did not stand up well to scrutiny and are likely to have little effect on real historians' understanding of the Holocaust.)

One of the larger questions that has been seriously debated is the "structural" explanation of the Holocaust versus the "intentional" explanation. The former, which is identified with historians like Gotz Aly, argues that the Final Solution grew out of a series of bureaucratic adaptations rather than a long-range plan. The "intentionalist" school of historians like Ernst Jäckel argues that Hitler had intended to go for some such goal all along. I lean heavily toward the "intentionalist" viewpoint on this. But this controversy was based on substantial interpretations of the evidence, not on attempts to deny it or twist some crackpot spin out of it.

Another real controversy is over the extent to which the Western democracies were indifferent to the Holocaust in both its preliminary stages and at the height of the killing. I don't remember seeing any polls on this particular idea. But it certainly is widely accepted and, based on the public discussions at the time, influenced the policies of both the United States and Germany in the Balkans during the 1990s. Despite the humanitarian appeal of the argument and generally positive lesson that most people take from it, that aspect of the Holocaust is also disputed.

In this case, I lean very much toward a skeptical view. Some of the key claims used to make that argument are ambiguous, at best, like the often-heard idea that the Allies should have bombed the

railroad tracks to Auschwitz or even the death camp itself. That and most of the other arguments always come up against the practical consideration that defeating the Wehrmacht as quickly as possibly was the only way to put a stop to the killing of the Jews. And the evidence looks very strong to me that Hitler was literally more interested in that goal than he was in victory for Germany in the war. In fact, he had substantial military resources diverted even very late in the war from fighting the Russians to keeping the killing of Jews going at a maximum pace. I just don't find that plausibility of the counter-factual rescue schemes very convincing.

But these are real controversies about reality-based history. Holocaust denial is a phony enterprise not at all aimed at understanding what really happened.

### **Israel and the Holocaust**

Israel uses the Holocaust to promote support for its current foreign policies and generally enhance its own image.

The United States and Russia emphasize their roles in the Second World War to promote support for their current foreign policies and generally enhance their own images. Austria likes to promote the fact that Mozart, Beethoven and Freud were associated with Austria to promote its own image while preferring to let people forget some other famous but not-so-wonderful Austrians.

Its part of what countries do. It's not good or bad in itself, and in any case governments are going to keep on doing that for the foreseeable future.

But that doesn't mean anyone outside those governments, including their own citizens, have to let the pleasant glow of associating in some way with a noble cause in the past cloud our judgment about policies being pursued in the present. As the Baker-Hamilton report just reminded us, the United States has a real and urgent interest in pursuing a peace settlement between Israel and the Palestinians, even if the current government of Israel does not define its own interests in the same way. And that is the case regardless of anyone's attitude toward the Holocaust.

Historical analogies are probably more often misleading than helpful. We should try to learn from history, though how little we actually seem to do so can be discouraging. But that's one big reason why we need to learn history in a reality-based way, so that we can understand the uncertainties and the various possibilities and just a few simplistic lessons. In the US right now, the road to the Iraq War was paved with bad Second World War analogies, which President Bush continue to spew at his news conference with Tony Blair last week. And both war critics and war fans seem to be prepared to pave the way out with bad Vietnam War analogies, though Iraq War realities are likely to overwhelm those sooner rather than later.

It's true that the experience of the Holocaust is now understood as part of Israel's national purpose and identity. It's also true that no current plausible threat nor any on the horizon present any real possibility of someone actually carrying out a genocidal war against Israel. Despite their military defeat by Hizbullah in Lebanon this year, Israel maintains far and away the most powerful conventional military in the Middle East, along with 100-400 nuclear weapons. Whatever emotional appeal there might be in casting current Israeli policies as responding to an immediate threat of another Holocaust, the reality doesn't support that. And American policies in the Middle East have suffered badly from fantasy-based assumptions.

### **The religious importance of the Holocaust**

The Holocaust has come to be seen by many Jews as a central religious problem and reference point. So much so that some rabbis worry that for some believers, the Holocaust is being understood as the central theological experience for Judaism, rather than the Exodus from Egypt.

The Swiss Christian theologian Karl Barth emphasized that the Holocaust also presents a serious theological problem for Christians, though of a different kind. He didn't suggest substituting the Holocaust for the Resurrection as the central event for Christian theology. But he did challenge Christians to understand the ways in which the Christian religious hostility toward Judaism, and the failure of Christians in Germany and elsewhere to act out of human solidarity with Jews who were targeted for persecution, pointed to failures in Christian practice as well as in traditional Christian theology.

I think Barth's point is important. That's one reason I'm so disturbed as the Christian Right ideology that supports the most militaristic and aggressive groups in Israel, to the point of Christian charities funding illegal settlements on occupied Palestinian territory, all under the aegis of a crackpot apocalyptic notion that assumes that God's plan for the End Times is that most Jews in the world will be slaughtered and the remaining few convert to Christianity, i.e., stop being Jews.

Any Christian theology that assumes that it's God intention to have the Jews of the world

slaughtered, except for the ones that convert to Christianity, is seriously screwed up. It makes for bad religion, specifically for bad Christianity. I wouldn't play the age-old trick of saying such a theory isn't "really" Christian. It is Christian, unfortunately, though a warped, destructive version of the faith.

And for those of us to whom Christianity is a religion of peace, it's also important not to use the outrage of the Iranian government staging a Holocaust-denial hate fest as a reason to cheer for war and killing that isn't necessary or justified.

Here are some additional resources among many on the Holocaust and Holocaust denial.

**Online resources:**

*History on Trial* blog by Deborah Lipstadt (only occasionally updated but providing a lot of information on Holocaust-denial agitation) <http://lipstadt.blogspot.com>

Web site on the failed lawsuit against Lipstadt by Holocaust denier David Irving (currently in prison in Austria): Holocaust Denial on Trial. The British judge, Justice Gray, went into considerable detail about some of the historical matters at issue and does an excellent job of showing the Holocaust-denial scam for what it is in his written judgment. If you were going to read just one document or book on Holocaust denial, this would be an excellent choice.

United States Holocaust Museum

Stiftung Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas (German)

Shoah Project of the Universität Duisburg Links zum Thema Holocaust (German and English)

See also main page of The Shoah Project (mostly German, some English)

Holocaust-Referenz: Argumente gegen Auschwitzleugner (German) - focuses in particular on responding to Holocaust-denier claims on the Auschwitz death camps.

**Books:**

Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (Bauer was chief historian at the Yad Vashem memorial in Jerusalem and has written widely on the Holocaust)

David Bankier, *The Germans and the Final Solution: Public Opinion Under Nazism*

Christopher Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*

Lucy Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews: 1933-1945*

Saul Friedlander, *Nazi Germany and the Jews: Volume 1: The Years of Persecution 1933-1939*

Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*.

Eberhard Jäckel, *Hitlers Weltanschauung* (German original; available in English translation)

[Deborah Lipstadt, Denying the Holocaust](#)

Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?*

Robert Wistrick, *Hitler and the Holocaust* (gives an overview of the subject, including the substantive historical issues and disputes)

Tags: holocaust, holocaust conference, holocaust denial, iran,

The Blue Voice posted at 12/11/2006 by Bruce Miller  
<http://thebluevoice.blogspot.com/2006/12/teheran-and-politics-of-holocaust.html>



WHIMSICAL

## Pierre Vidal-Naquet wants to strangle, crush, kill Faurisson

**Robert Faurisson**

The whole back page of today's French daily *Libération* is devoted to Pierre Vidal-Naquet.

The article is by Judith Rueff and headed "L'antimythe" ("The antimyth"). Above the heading: "Pierre Vidal-Naquet, aged 75, historian and Hellenist. Fierce opponent of torture during the war in Algeria, he has never since stopped fighting all falsifications".

*Extracts of the article:* "His job of historian is to demystify [...]. Let him look into Atlantis ('my best book and doubtless the last'), to decrypt the Platonic invention of the lost continent and see in it a portent of National-Socialist madness. Same thing when he morally crushes Faurisson and the deniers of the Nazi genocide. 'One of the things in my life that I take pride in'".

On the paper's website (<http://www.liberation.fr>) a single short audio segment of the interview may be heard, and it is devoted to me and the "negationists", that is, the revisionists.

*Extracts of the recording:* "Faurisson was an absolutely hateful and abject being". "If I had got Faurisson in my hands, I wouldn't have hesitated to strangle him". On the subject of the "negationists", P. Vidal-Naquet declares: "They have to be fought and crushed like cockroaches [...]. The one who's really killed them is me; everyone recognises it, including them, and it's one of the things in my life that I take pride in".

The day before yesterday, January 4 (p. 9), the writer of an article entitled "*Libération* contre Faurisson" announced that Edouard de Rothschild's newspaper was bringing charges against me because "in the December 6<sup>th</sup> issue of the Holocaust denial publication *Dubitando*, close to Robert Faurisson," there appeared the copy of an article, by the same Judith Rueff, devoted to Simon Wiesenthal.

However, I am not in charge of that little review — which, incidentally, is quite well put together — and have nothing to do with its circulation. Without asking my permission, *Dubitando* publishes articles by me and other revisionists that have probably been picked up on the Internet.

NB: On Jewish violence see Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *Political Assassinations by Jews / A Rhetorical Device for Justice*, State University of New York, 1993, XX-527 p., and Robert Faurisson, "Jewish Militants: Fifteen Years, and More, of Terrorism in France" [written in June 1995], *The Journal of Historical Review*, March-April 1996, p. 2-13.

6 Jan. 2006

BAD BOY

## French academic again convicted for Holocaust denial

PARIS (EJP)--- Retired literature professor Robert Faurisson has been convicted for Holocaust denial by a Paris court on Tuesday over remarks he made on Iranian television.

Faurisson, 77, well known for his revisionist views, was given a three month suspended prison term and also fined 7,500 euros.

Speaking on the Sahar 1 Iranian satellite channel in February 2005, Faurisson said "there was never" a single execution gas chamber under the Germans.... So all those millions of tourists who visit Auschwitz are seeing a lie, a falsification."

Faurisson was found guilty of "complicity in contesting the existence of a crime against humanity." It is the fifth time that Faurisson is condemned for the same offence. **Patrick Gaubert**, president of LICRA, the French league against racism and anti-Semitism, welcomed the

court decision. "This gives proof that he says lies. But I am not satisfied with the three months suspended prison term as he is a recidivist," he added.

*European Jewish Press*, 3 Oct. 2006  
<http://www.ejpress.org/article/news/10997>

## French "holocaust" myth denier convicted for giving interview to Iran's TV

Publication time: 5 October 2006, 11:53

A world-famous French scientist and researcher, Professor Robert Faurisson, was given a three-month suspended prison term and also fined 7,500 euros for denying the existence of so-called "gas chambers" in National-Socialist Germany.

Speaking 20 months ago on the Sahar 1 Iranian channel in the program "World in Question" on February 3, 2005, Professor Faurisson said "there was never a single "gas chamber" under the Germans.... So all those millions of tourists who visit Auschwitz are seeing a lie, a falsification."

Speaking in his defense, the scientist reminded the "court" of the fact that his interview had been never broadcast neither in democratic France, nor in democratic Europe as a whole.

His lawyer, Mr Eric Delcroix, regretted the lack of freedom of speech and expression these days in France and said that he would discuss with Professor Faurisson a possibility to appeal the unjust sentence.

"I am always for the freedom of expression and the freedom of scientific research. I regret this conviction for a delict of opinion", Mr Delcroix said.

In addition, the "court" sentenced Professor Faurisson to a ritual punishment. He is to pay one euro to each of the three Jewish groups who denounced his interview on TV in distant Iran, containing his Orwellian thought crimes, to the French police, the French magazine [Le Nouvel Observateur](#) reports.

Kavkaz Center.com  
<http://kavkazcenter.com/eng/content/2006/10/05/5827.shtml>

AGAINST FAURISSON

## The Influence of a Man Who Denies the Holocaust

By Steven Stalinsky

October 12, 2006

*"There was never a single execution gas chamber under the Germans.... So all those millions of tourists who visit Auschwitz are seeing a lie, a falsification." — Robert Faurisson, Sahar TV, February 2005*

He exposed the "big lie of the alleged Holocaust." He proved that "the 'Diary of Anne Frank' [is] a fraud" and that "the gas chambers were fabricated."

When Arab and Iranian TV networks such as Al-Jazeera and Sahar need someone to discuss the "big lie of the alleged Holocaust," they go to him.

When Arab and Iranian politicians such as the Palestinian Authority leader, Mahmoud Abbas, and President Ahmadinejad of Iran want to provide evidence that no "alleged crimes" were perpetrated against Jews in World War II, they cite him.

Like other European Holocaust deniers who enjoy rock star status in Iran and the Arab world, Robert Faurisson first appeared on the scene in the 1970s, when he refuted accounts of the gas chambers and the Nazis' systematic killing of Jews.

"The dean of deniers," as Mr. Faurisson is known, is a sought-after interview subject in the Middle East. When Al-Jazeera devoted a program to a planned international conference of Holocaust deniers in Beirut in May 2001, it called Mr. Faurisson.

"We have proved and are still proving that there was no massacre or Holocaust of the Jews, and that there were no gas chambers for the Jews, and that the figure of 6 million victims is exaggerated ... saying the truth about the biggest lie of the 20th and 21st centuries, the lie of the Holocaust," he said.

Arab and Iranian "experts" on the Holocaust frequently cite Mr. Faurisson's theories. In his 1982 doctoral dissertation at the Peoples' Friendship University in Moscow, Mr. Abbas discussed "the secret ties between the Nazis and the Zionist movement leadership." Two years later, the Jordanian publisher Dar Ibn Rushd put out an Arabic-language book based on Mr. Abbas's dissertation.

"Regarding the gas chambers, which were supposedly designed for murdering living Jews: A scientific study published by Professor Robert Faurisson of France denies that the gas chambers were for murdering people, and claims that they were only for incinerating bodies, out of concern for the spread of disease and infection in the region," Mr. Abbas wrote.

In January, when Mr. Ahmadinejad described the Holocaust as "a myth," Mr. Faurisson sent him a letter "expressing his full support of his remarks." The letter was heralded in the Iranian press.

On September 20, Iran's IRINN TV broadcast a report on the country's ongoing Holocaust cartoon contest. The curator of the museum exhibiting the cartoons, Masoud Shojai Tabatabai, told the station that the display proves that the "alleged crimes" that occurred at places like Auschwitz "are in fact a lie." The curator said the proof was based on "the very serious and accurate analysis of Mr. Robert Faurisson."

The editor of the conservative Iranian daily *Kayhan*, Hossein Shariatmadari, wrote an article on December 13, 2005, in which he cited Mr. Faurisson's lectures at the University of Lyon and one of his books, "The Gas Chambers: Reality or Legend?"

The book, translated into Persian by Seyyed Abu Al-Farid Zia Al-Dini, examines dozens of documents "where the Zionists claim" the slaughter took place, "such as the gas chambers, the fabricated museum of the crematoria, Dachau in Munich," Mr. Shariatmadari wrote. Mr. Faurisson "conducted precise and scientific conversations with hundreds of witnesses and ultimately showed, with no interpretation and by means of documents only, that the affair of the slaughter of the Jews in Nazi Germany is a great historic lie."

When the United Nations announced that it would designate a day to commemorate the Holocaust in November 2005, Mr. Faurisson gave an interview to the *Tehran Times*.

"For many years now, I have been telling my acquaintances in the Muslim world that the Jews and the Zionists want to impose the religion of the alleged 'Holocaust' of the Jews on the whole world," he said. "... The Muslim world has been awakening from its too long torpor for only a few years. It ought to have listened to the revisionists long ago and denounced out loud the sham of an alleged German project to exterminate the Jews, the alleged Nazi gas chambers, and the alleged 6 million Jewish victims."

On October 3, a French court convicted Mr. Faurisson of Holocaust denial for statements he made on Iran's Sahar TV in February 2005. It was the fifth time he has been found guilty for "complicity in contesting the existence of a crime against humanity."

*Mr. Stalinsky is the executive director of the Middle East Media Research Institute.*

### **The MEMRI Report**

***What he forgets to say is that it was Memri which furnished the extracts of tv interviews given by Faurisson to French Jewish organizations which forwarded it to the French regulatory body in charge of controlling TV and radio wavelength. In fact, Mr Stalinsky (what a name !) congratulates himself for sending an offender of Jewish power to gaol.***

ROTTEN TO THE CORE

## Succession of scandals leaves Olmert fighting to stay in power

By **Eric Silver** in Jerusalem

Published: 26 August 2006

The Tel Aviv daily newspaper *Maariv* ran a cartoon this week showing a man sitting at his kitchen table with a cup of coffee and a newspaper. The headlines read "sexual harassment", "murder",

"road accidents" and "violence". The man sighs: "It's so good to get back to normal."

The cartoonist might well have added "financial shenanigans" and "political cronyism", such is the list of brewing controversies afflicting the Israeli government as it emerges bruised from the damaging Lebanon war.

An opinion poll in the mass-circulation *Yediot Ahronot* yesterday registered a dramatic collapse of confidence in Ehud Olmert, the Prime Minister, whose authority - along with that of his Defence Minister, Amir Peretz, and the army brass - appears to have been severely weakened by an unpopular conflict.

Asked how they rated Mr Olmert's performance during the war, 74 per cent said it had not been good. Mr Peretz fared worse, with 79 per cent, while Lt-Gen Dan Halutz, the Chief of Staff, rated 63 per cent. If elections were held now, the Prime Minister's Kadima Party would slump to 17 seats, down 12 since the March general election.

Mr Peretz's Labour Party (down eight) would drop to 11, the historic ruling party's lowest-ever representation. The right-wing Likud would top the poll with 20 seats. Binyamin Netanyahu, its leader, is the new favourite for prime minister, scoring 45 per cent to Mr Olmert's 24 in a straight contest.

The slump in support is the price that ministers and generals are forced to pay for a citizens' army. Too many reservists and conscripts are coming home and airing the grievances of patriotic soldiers who went willingly to war and feel let down.

But the Maariv cartoonist had a point. The media, which ran page after page, hour after hour, of war news for a month, is now awash with the latest scandals.

Detectives this week interviewed President Moshe Katsav for 12 hours after a former employee accused him of forcing her to have sex with him. They promise to come back with more questions after the 60-year-old father of five children has taken a family holiday.

Micha Lindenstrauss, the state comptroller, is investigating allegations that Mr Olmert received a \$500,000 (£265,000) discount from the builder who sold him a flat in Jerusalem. In return, Mr Olmert is said to have used his contacts to persuade the planning authorities to double the amount of floorspace he could develop on the site.

Two other senior politicians, Haim Ramon and Tzahi Hanegbi, have already been indicted. Mr Ramon, a flamboyant divorcee, resigned as justice minister to face trial on charges of indecently assaulting a woman soldier.

Mr Hanegbi, a former internal security minister, is accused of appointing 80 Likud cronies to government jobs at a time when he needed their support to keep his parliamentary seat.

Lt-Gen Halutz seems to have weathered the storm over the revelation that he sold his entire stock portfolio, worth 120,000 shekels (£14,500), three hours after the Hizbollah raid that precipitated the Lebanon war - if only because the public are more worried about his failure to destroy Hizbollah.

Israel has a robust, highly competitive media culture. Newspapers and television channels pay for tips; they invest in investigations.

Sex, even adultery, is not regarded as a sin in itself. The media is less likely than its British counterpart to run a story about a public figure sleeping around.

What does stir the law and the media is sexual coercion, especially of subordinates by their bosses in the army or politics. Feminists have won that battle, though men such as Messrs Katsav and Ramon may not have noticed. At the same time, social gaps have widened. Money is status. Ezer Weizman, the previous president, allowed rich men to buy his friendship. Ariel Sharon and his sons were tempted by property developers. So, it is claimed, was Ehud Olmert, though the case has yet to be proven and he has shown himself to be a skilful enough lawyer to avoid disgrace after similar allegations in the past.

### **Politicians under pressure**

\* EHUD OLMERT The approval rating of the Israeli Prime Minister has plummeted over the war with Hizbollah in Lebanon. His opponents are using his lack of military credentials against him. He also faces an investigation into a Jerusalem property deal.

\* MOSHE KATSAV

The Israeli President is caught up in a sex scandal after detectives raided his house earlier this week over allegations he sexually assaulted a former employee. The raid sent shockwaves through Israel as police questioned the country's president for 12 hours following the raid. No charges have been brought against Moshe Katsav and he has denied the allegations, calling them "absurd." But commentators warn he will almost certainly have to resign if police do eventually charge him.

\* DAN HALUTZ

Despite the sale of his £14,500 stock portfolio three hours after the Hizbollah raid that sparked the

latest crisis, Israeli anger at Lt-Gen Halutz is focused on his handling of the war. There are calls for him to resign.

\* AMIR PERETZ

The Labour Party leader and Defence Minister has been heavily criticised by the media and military for not allowing the Israeli armed forces to deal Hizbollah a fatal blow. Even his own party faithful are turning against him.

\* HAIM RAMON

The former leading member of the Labour Party who defected to Kadima resigned as justice minister this week after being indicted for allegedly forcing a kiss on a woman soldier. He has waived parliamentary immunity.

\* TZAHY HANEGBI

The former protégé of Ariel Sharon, and an ally of Ehud Olmert, is facing allegations of election bribery, fraud and perjury. He is accused of trading government jobs for political support. Says he will not seek immunity.

*The Independent* 26. Aug. 2006

[http://news.independent.co.uk/world/middle\\_east/article1221904.ece](http://news.independent.co.uk/world/middle_east/article1221904.ece)

PANDEMONIUM

## Report about the Zundel Hearing October 4, 2006

by Ingrid Rumland

Up-front, please let me apologize for not using correct trial vocabulary since court protocol is very different in Germany from hearings on this continent. Also, since trial transcripts are verboten, what little information I get is second-hand and, of necessity, subjective. With this report, I am doing the best that I can.

I was told that this October 4 hearing was going to be a brief, insignificant session of a couple of hours only, dealing with administrative matters. Dr. Schaller, one of the defense attorneys who had submitted a detailed summary September 29 of the geopolitical significance of Zundel's lifelong quest for truth - "to get to the bottom of what the heck happened at Auschwitz", as Ernst himself put it in his documentary DVD - was not going to be at this hearing, since he has to travel from Austria, an eight-hour trip each way. I did not even announce the date on the Internet, since I did not want Zundel supporters travel long distances at great expense and inconvenience to them, only to be disappointed.

As it turned out, this hearing was one of the most significant and dramatic events as yet that played in the courtroom in Mannheim. It seems that the prosecution, with Judge Meinerzhagen as its designated bottleneck, dropped all pretenses in near riotous outbursts that can only be described as bizarre, hysterical panic to keep the historical truth from coming uncorked!

Prior to this hearing, Defense Attorney Rieger had submitted a number of extensive "requests" to the court - pardon the imprecise term - asking in clear language that forensic and documentary evidence be allowed, as well as the testimony of prominent expert witnesses. I will not go into the details because the copies that I saw were in German and it is too complicated to give you a feel for what these papers summarized, other than to say that this was the first time, to my knowledge, that the defense dropped all hesitation and went on the offensive in a forceful and decisive way - a courageous strategy indeed in the wake of explicit threats to them to be charged with the same "offense" as Ernst Zundel. After all, the court intoned over and over, the Holocaust could not be anything but "self-evident" and should not, could not, and would not be put to the test!

Specifically, in reference to expert witnesses, the Zundel defense team had requested that both the President of Iran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, as well as Hugo Chavez, President of Venezuela, be permitted to testify as to the harmful consequences of keeping the world in the dark by pretending the Holocaust was what it purported to be - a "fact of history" - now contested by this obstreperous Swabian in Mannheim. Several other potential expert witnesses' names were submitted who would shed light where darkness reigned, among them Fred Leuchter, the chief investigator of the dreaded "gas chambers" of Auschwitz and other major Third Reich concentration camps. One of the

interesting and unknown items, for me, was a document listed that showed that Jewish factions had aborted an investigation years ago that would have more precisely determined the number of "Holocaust" victims. Another document that Attorney Rieger had either submitted previously or tried to submit at this hearing was an Open Letter by the Iranian President to Germany's Chancellor, Angela Merkel, in which the Iranian head of state shamed the German government for imprisoning Holocaust researchers in order to prevent the truth from coming out. Ahmadinejad is reported to have said, according to an interview in Germany's Der Spiegel in May of this year:

"The extortion and blackmail continue, and people are not allowed to think about or even question the source of this extortion, otherwise they face imprisonment. When will this situation end? Sixty years, one hundred years or one thousand years, when?"

I have read President Ahmadinejad's letter in both German and English translations - it is widely available on the Net and, naturally, on the Zundelsite ([www.zundelsite.org](http://www.zundelsite.org)) - but to my knowledge it was utterly stonewalled by Germany's mainstream press, and Chancellor Merkel had called it a "scandalous" letter she would, of course, ignore!

One of the most dramatic moments in this hearing came when Ernst Zundel decided to break his self-imposed silence and let them have it, Zundel-fashion, for the first time in more than 18 months. I never understood and was never given an adequate explanation of why he chose to remain silent for so long, but I utterly trust Ernst's political judgment - he must have had his reasons. This day, it seems, he had his fill - he stood up, dug in his heels, accused the court of shamelessly running a secret political show trial where only written submissions were allowed, to be read by the court at the exclusion of both public and press, and proceeded to read President Ahmadinejad's Open Letter right into Judge Meinerzhagen's horrified ears!

At that point, pandemonium!

Judge Meinerzhagen simply lost it - and started to scream, his hands shaking and his face distorted with fury, that this was an "impertinence" - in German, "eine Frechheit!" - that the defense was trying to pull the wool over his eyes by making the defendant the messenger of what, precisely, he had forbidden the attorneys to submit at risk of their own welfare! It seems that the verbal confrontation that ensued was the Mother of all Shouting Matches - it even worried the armed police at one point! Apparently it looked like it would come to blows!

Folks, please take this as an incomplete report that I am writing in the middle of the night, a continent away. I look at this newest twist in the dramatic Zundel Saga with both dread and elation. I will not even attempt to interpret what all this could possibly mean - let's simply say that finally it looks to me as though the German government, on its knees before Zion for more than sixty years, has lost its grip before the precipice and broadcast its own terror - of the inexorable Power of the Truth!

4. Oct. 2006

A VERY IMPORTANT BOOK

## The Power of Israel in the United States

*James Petras' New Book: "The Power of Israel in the United States"*

**By Stephen Lendman**

10/26/06 "Information Clearing House" -- -- James Petras is Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Binghamton University, New York. He's a noted academic figure on the US Left and a well-respected Latin American expert and longtime chronicler of the region's popular struggles. He's also an advisor to the landless workers in Brazil and the unemployed workers movement in Argentina. Along the way, he managed to find time to write many hundreds of articles and 62 books published in 29 languages including his latest one in which he discusses another vital world region he has extensive knowledge of

and has written frequently about - the Middle East and specifically the state of Israel and its relations with its neighbors, the Palestinians and, most importantly and the subject of this book, the US.

Petras' powerful new book is titled *The Power of Israel in the United States*. It's a work of epic writing and essential reading documenting the enormous influence of the Jewish Lobby on US policy in the Middle East. It focuses like a laser to assure that policy conforms with Israel's long-term goal for regional hegemony. The Lobby's influence is broad and deep enough to include officials at the highest levels of government, the business community, academia, the clergy (especially the dominant Christian fundamentalists/Christian Zionists) and the mass media. Petras shows how together they're able to assure the full and unconditional US support for all elements of Israel's agenda going back decades even when that agenda harms our interests such as the unwinnable war in Iraq, any future one against Iran if it's undertaken, and the appalling and brutal subjugation and colonization of the Palestinian people that serves no US interest whatever. In spite of it, the Lobby is able to get the US to go along with Israel unconditionally with no serious opposition to it tolerated.

The book is divided into four parts. This review will cover each one in detail, and what's discussed will likely surprise any reader unfamiliar with the thoroughly documented account presented in it so compellingly. Petras sets the table in his introduction for what's to come in the later chapters. He notes what author JJ Goldberg reported in his book *Jewish Power: Inside the Jewish Establishment*. Goldberg wrote in the early 1990s that 45% of the Democrat Party's fundraising and 25% of that for the Republicans came from Jewish-funded Political Action Committees (PACS). Petras then updates the numbers using the ones Richard Cohen published in the *Washington Post* showing them now at 60% and 35% respectively, and that this funding relates to a single core issue - unconditional US support for Israel's agenda including those parts of it human rights activists and observers of conscience judge most egregious and illegal. Petras stresses that no other single US lobby including Big Pharma, Big Oil, agribusiness, or any other one has this kind of dominant influence over the political process here. He refers to "Zioncon" ideologues and policymakers whose main goal is to make the Middle East into a "US-Israeli Co-Prosperity Sphere" under the fraudulent cover of promoting democracy in the region - but doing it through the barrel of a gun.

Petras explains the root of the Lobby's power lies in the high proportion of Jewish families who are among the wealthiest and most influential ones in the country. He cites Forbes magazine that reported 25 - 30% of the wealthiest families here are Jewish despite the small percentage of Jews in the population overall. They include billionaires with enormous influence, and along with all others comprising the Jewish Lobby, have created a "tyranny of Israel over the US" with consequences grave enough to threaten world peace and stability, the global economy, and the very future of democracy in this country.

That democracy and our constitutionally protected rights now hang by a thread after the recent passage of the Military Commissions Act (aka the "torture authorization act" or more accurately the "US Constitutional annulment act") that makes everyone everywhere an "enemy combatant" subject to arrest and detention out of sight anywhere in the world without regard for our (no longer) constitutionally guaranteed rights. The new law also applies to US citizens as the Jose Padilla case showed. We've effectively lost our habeas and due process rights even though technically we still have them.

Because of the Lobby's power, Petras reports, the US has unconditionally supported Israel's wars of aggression since 1967. It's influence also led to the US Gulf war in 1991 and the second Iraq war begun in 2003, now raging out of control and seen by some noted analysts as unwinnable and causing potential irreparable economic and political harm to the nation. Nonetheless, it persists with no plan agreed on to end it. The Lobby also guaranteed this country's unconditional support for Israel's illegal wars of aggression against Lebanon and Palestine with all the devastation they caused and the horrendous consequences from them unresolved. The Palestinian conflict still rages under the radar, and the status in Lebanon hangs by a hair trigger ready to erupt again any time Israel decides to resume hostilities. But inflaming the Middle East powder keg to a near boiling point is the strong possibility the US and/or Israel will attack Iran because Israel wants it and the Jewish Lobby put its powerful support behind it. More on this, Palestine and Lebanon below.

Today the situation in the Middle East is so dire, Petras reports a large majority of Europeans and a growing number of Americans believe Israel is the greatest of all threats to world peace and stability. Nonetheless, the Bush administration, in acquiescence to the Lobby, has "bludgeoned" its European partners to go along with its uncompromising support for the Jewish state despite all the obvious perils from it. In this country, open debate is stifled, public figures and academics daring to air one truthfully are pilloried, ridiculed, called anti-semitic and even threatened, and no serious dissent is ever tolerated in the corporate-run media or their funded and controlled so-called public radio or PBS parts of it.

No publication is more servile to, supportive of, or more influential than the nation's so-called "paper of record" publishing "All the News That's Fit to Print" - the *New York Times*. It's important because the stories it features prominently resonate around the country and the world. This dominant newspaper pledges unconditional support and fealty to the state of Israel whatever it does. The rest of the major media go along unquestioningly putting out regular one-sided pro-Israel uber alles propaganda with no opposition voices allowed to represent other points of view. We call that a free press - but only for those who own one. The state of the corporate-controlled media in this country is now so pathetic that Reporters Sans Frontieres (Reporters without Borders - for press freedom) just ranked the US 53rd in the world in press freedom behind countries like Benin, Namibia, Jamaica, France and Bolivia.

James Petras is a courageous independent voice who bucks this disturbing trend and refuses to go along. He proves it in his powerful and carefully documented new book that gives no quarter countering the mendacity, deceit and danger of the Lobby, its acolytes and hangers-on, and the corrupted major media. In his introduction, he calls for a "counter-hegemonic movement" to free us from our destructive "Israeli entanglements." It's needed to begin rebuilding our democracy and freedoms that are somewhere between life support and the crematorium. This book, he says, is his modest effort toward that goal. Because of the important information in it, it's considerably more than that. It needs widespread exposure so people will know about it. Hopefully this review will help arouse some of them to want to find out in more detail.

### **Part I - Zionist Power in America**

Petras begins with a discussion of who fabricated the lies about Iraq's threat to our security and why. He mentions two competing channels of policy makers and advisors - the long-in-place formal structure of career military and civilian professionals in the Pentagon and State Department and a parallel one Bush administration neocons set up for this one purpose in the Pentagon, staffed by political appointees, and called the Office of Special Plans (OSP). It was the OSP's job to cook the books, come up with the idea of weapons of mass destruction while ignoring the clear evidence to the contrary and contrive a fraudulent case for war against Iraq. The people in it were those in Donald Rumsfeld's and Paul Wolfowitz's chain of command and were closely connected to a number of influential neoconservative and pro-Israel organizations. They planned a war agenda based on lies because Israel wanted it for its security and hegemony in the region - beginning with the overthrow of Saddam Hussein followed by regime change in Syria, Lebanon, Iran and even Saudi Arabia.

Petras points out, contrary to popular belief, this war happened largely due to the efforts of the Jewish Lobby representing the interests of Israel. Big Oil opposed the idea because it feared attacking Iraq would jeopardize its business prospects with other oil-producing states in the region. Still, Israel and the Jewish Lobby got their war, and aside from the gain from high oil prices, Big Oil may end up a longer-term loser from it. US oil interests always prefer stability and normal relationships with countries where they operate or wish to and were quite comfortable dealing with Saddam Hussein without wanting to risk a war that might upset an otherwise profitable arrangement. Their fears proved justified as the war they feared created such unresolved turbulence in Iraq, it's become too dangerous and unprofitable to undertake new ventures there except perhaps in parts of the Kurdish-controlled north. Big Oil also chafes at not being allowed to deal with the Iranians for contracts now let to its European and other competitors because US sanctions prevent them from doing business there. It's hard to imagine those interests would ever go along with US - Israeli belligerence in the Middle East, but they dare not oppose it publicly.

Petras observes there's never a public discussion allowed about that relationship in the mainstream nor will there ever be any, especially any hint the US attacked Iraq in service to Israel. There should be plenty of it though because the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have enraged hundreds of millions of Muslims and all people of conscience worldwide. They've caused the US to be seen as a pariah state and George Bush as a dangerous and morally depraved president of a failed administration. He and those closest to him like Richard Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld are reviled around the world and increasingly here at home as witnessed by the many thousands who took to the streets on October 5 in over 200 US cities on The World Can't Wait Day - Drive Out the Bush Regime. The cost of Bush's wars far exceed any possible future benefits from them, our security has been jeopardized, the nation's status has been compromised, and some analysts believe the total dollar cost of the Iraq adventure may eventually top \$2 trillion - an amount extremely harmful to the nation's economy that's now worrying key business leaders and responsible people in government.

The only clear beneficiary of the Bush war agenda is Israel. It removed its main adversary in the region and cut off the political and economic support it gave the Palestinians. Petras points out that Iraq along with Iran and Syria comprised the core resistance to Israel's expansionist plans to crush the



Palestinians (one down, two to go), ethnically cleanse them from their homeland and seize their land as one part of a long-term goal for a greater Israel and unchallengeable dominance in the region. Israel is the only country in the world with undeclared borders. It's kept that status to give itself maximum latitude to annex all the territory it can toward the goal of a greater "Eretz Israel" Zionists want that includes the ancient lands of "Judea" and "Samaria," the West Bank biblical parts of Israel. Palestinians claim as their homeland.

With US help, Israel removed one threat to its plan for regional supremacy, but it still faces determined resistance from the Palestinians in spite of having crushed its democratically elected Hamas government. It also faces a resilient Hezbollah in Lebanon that humiliated the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) in the summer war there as well as opposition from Iran and Syria. In addition, there's internal opposition within Israel over its war and colonization agenda because of its enormous cost plus the added insecurity it causes. It's resulted in a level of out-migration now exceeding new arrivals as well as an erosion of the nation's social programs because the state needs the resources for its aggression and annexation agenda. It's much like what's happening under the Bush administration where the people pay the price for imperial wars abroad and the moral decay and authoritarianism at home.

Obstacles and setbacks aside, Israel has pursued its goal to "democratize" the region through a belligerent policy of neutralizing its enemies in it by force. The plan they crafted is for a series of wars with its US ally taking the lead and the eventual goal of joint US - Israeli control over the entire region. Making it work depends on getting US administrations to go along, which so far hasn't been a problem and has never been easier with the Bush administration in power and the high-level pro-Zionist officials in it with long-standing ties to Israel. They have the most important policy-making positions in government or are closely associated with the ones who do. These officials have a history of dedication to Israel's interests even when they conflict with those here at home. They're in the administration, the Congress as well as in the most influential Jewish organizations and lobbying groups like the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, the Anti-Defamation League and what some observers believe is the single most powerful lobby in Washington - AIPAC.

Committed support for Israel also comes from the "Jewish Diaspora" that comprises thousands of dedicated activists here - doctors, dentists, philanthropists, key individuals on Wall Street, the major banks and the Federal Reserve and other key segments of business, the major media, the clergy and academics and journalists given special prominence because of their willingness to corrupt their integrity in return for the handsome benefits they get for their unconditional public support and contrived rationalizations for the US -Israeli agenda. This kind of influence and support has made Israel by far the largest recipient in the world of US financial aid that amounts upfront to about \$3 billion a year with more forthcoming any time as needed in added funding, weapons transfers and large low or no-interest loans that may never have to be repaid.

Israel also gets the unheard of advantage of receiving the latest and most advanced US arms and technology, unrestricted US market access for its products and services, free entry of its immigrants, unconditional support for its aggressive wars and colonization of the Palestinians and South Lebanese, and guaranteed US vetoes in the Security Council against all UN resolutions unfavorable to its interests. It's also able to get prominent Washington officials and the dominant corporate-run and funded media to label all criticism of Israel anti-semitic and freely uses this ruse whenever it serves its purpose. Israel is allowed to get away with its intelligence operations here as well including its covert penetration of military bases, the FBI, IRS, INS, EPA and many other government agencies. In addition, it's believed its agents knew in advance about the 9/11 attack but withheld the information knowing it would serve its interests to let it happen. There's also considerable evidence high US officials either knew about it themselves or were complicit in carrying it out because they also knew it would allow them the kind of reckless free reign at home and abroad they never could have gotten any other way. This is a story that won't go away nor should it, and one day we may finally learn all the parts of it we can only speculate about now.

Because of Israel's unparalleled ties to the centers of power and dominant media, Petras notes it's able get back \$50 in return for every dollar it spends. That's how it's able to finance its military and colonial settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) on annexed land. The Jewish networks here support these practices as justifiable compensation allowed victims of the "Holocaust" (the ones noted author John Pilger calls "worthy victims") and circulate that ideology in the corporate media. They also reinforce anti-Muslim hysteria labelling all Arabs untrustworthy, radical Islamic fundamentalists or Islamo-fascists ("unworthy" victims for John Pilger), claiming the right to arrest, torture and mete out summary justice to them in military tribunals or just attack and kill them in imperial wars of "liberation."

The result for Israel and its people has been disastrous because the Palestinians have refused for almost six decades to accede to this abuse and have waged two Intifadas to end it. With little more

than a fierce determination, their bodies and crude weapons, they've fought back with suicide bombings and attacks on public facilities in Israel knowing what harsh retaliation they'll face afterward. People in the US have also paid a heavy price in the erosion of democracy and freedom. It's evidenced by the Bush administration's harsh legislation beginning with the infamous USA Patriot Act passed in short order right after the 9/11 attack, followed by other repressive laws and practices allowed like illegal surveillance and secret renditions of anyone targeted to torture-prisons with court acquiescence or silence about most of them.

Petras points out that none of this deters powerful supporters of Israel who raise billions of dollars to support the country's war machine and finance its colonization of annexed Palestinian land plus the Golan Heights (with its invaluable water resources) seized and never returned to Syria after the 1967 war. Israel's economy is not self-sufficient, and without this aid, it would have to make unacceptable cuts in social services, reduce its military budget and curtail its expansionary plans. With it, plus the \$3 billion a year direct US contribution and lots more help, US taxpayers (like it or not) have the burden of funding Israel's belligerence and colonization agenda.

Petras itemizes what it all costs:

- \$3 billion annually in direct aid.
- Billions more in loans as needed.
- Millions annually for resettlement help for Soviet (now Russian) and Ethiopian immigrants.
- a \$10 billion loan guarantee in 1990 and a further \$9 billion one in 2004 plus billions more for the asking and to be forthcoming to pay the costs of the 2006 Lebanon and Palestine wars.
- Since 1981, economic aid made in cash transfers, and since 1985 military aid done the same way.
- \$45 billion in repayment waved loans since 1974 and billions more for the asking - free money at US taxpayer expense.
- Since 1982, ESF cash transfers in one early in the fiscal year lump sum with no strings attached while other countries receiving them are paid quarterly with their use monitored. Israel invests the money in US treasuries costing US taxpayers millions more annually and also gets special FMS funding arrangements costing US taxpayers well over \$1 billion since 1991.
- Other privileged benefits include financial aid to develop Israel's defense industry, transfer of state-of-the-art technology and the latest US weapons, US guarantee for Israel's access to oil, and the likely massive aid still to come to defray the country's "special costs" for its Gaza "disengagement plan" morphing into the colonization of whatever parts of the OPT Israel wishes to annex for new settlements US taxpayers pay for.
- Add to this some \$22 billion Israel got over the past 50 years through the sale of its below-market interest paying bonds that have financed half of its development - meaning the colonization of annexed Palestinian lands and military funding for its predatory imperial wars.

Petras explains the Zionist power structure in the US makes it all possible, but its reach extends well beyond the so-called "Jewish Lobby." He identifies a "Zionist power configuration (ZPC) that includes AIPAC as one part of a "complex network of interrelated formal and informal groupings, operating at the international, national, regional, and local levels" unconditionally supporting the state of Israel and all its policies including its wars, colonization and oppression. It's power is like a cancer infecting the highest levels of government and all the other centers of power and influence as already explained. It controls the selection of political candidates and can defeat incumbents or aspirants daring to criticize Israel. It also shapes the reporting on Israel in the mass media suppressing any of it that's unsupportive or critical. And it's powerful enough to get "uncooperative" journalists, and even some academics, fired and banished from the mainstream for daring to step out of line.

Petras reports the power of the ZPC was evident in the run-up to the Iraq war and the Gulf war before it in 1991. Going back to the GHW Bush administration, the US wanted regime change in Iraq, but that decision was heavily influenced by the ZPC that considered Saddam a mortal enemy of Israel who had to be removed. He managed to survive through the 1990s despite our efforts to destabilize the country and bring it to its knees. But once the GW Bush administration neocons took over in 2001, the ugly business of war planning and occupation took hold to complete what the Gulf war left unfinished, and powerful Zionists (like Paul Wolfowitz and Connecticut Senator Joe Lieberman - the senator from AIPAC) in key policy-making positions invented the threat to bring it about in March, 2003 - all based on lies, deceit and subservience to Israel's imperial agenda.

The US military finally removed Saddam and conducted a scorched-earth campaign to destroy Iraqi society, its infrastructure and historical treasures to "dismantle the secular state (and) turn the country in a desert kingdom - a loose collection of at least three 'tribal' client mini-states based on ethnicities, religious-tribal loyalties (and no viable threat against) Israeli expansionism, particularly in Northern Iraq." The effort to do this is now underway after the Iraq puppet parliament's passage of its federalism bill to take effect in 18 months that will effectively divide the country into the three US-ordered, designed and supposedly more easily governed parts it wants.

It's unlikely this can work, but it's clearer than ever now what the human cost of the war has been for Iraqis. It caused the violent deaths of about 655,000 of them attributable to the war according to a shocking new study published by the noted Lancet British medical journal which updated their two earlier ones done after March, 2003. The study used the statistically reliable technique known as random households "cluster sampling" with personal interviews conducted across the country that used death certificate verification in the great majority of cases to come up with the total. It's likely the true number of deaths is even much higher than this appalling number as the interviewers were unable to include in their count the most dangerous and violent parts of the country like Fallujah, Ramadi and other areas of al Anbar province where mass killing still goes on daily as well as families (likely in the thousands) in which all the members were killed.

This new information, just out and covering a period since March, 2003, compares to Human Rights Watch's estimate of 250,000 - 290,000 people killed by Saddam Hussein's Baathist regime over its 20 year existence. It amplifies the outrageous crime of this barbarous adventure to achieve a "Greater Middle East US-Israel Co-Prosperity Sphere" and to give Israel access to the extra water, oil, capital and markets it lacks. It was also part of Israel's greater agenda under the Sharon Likud, and now Olmert Kadima, governments to have free reign to pursue their stated policy of "annexation and separation" in the OPT. The Zionist influence in the Bush administration is so entrenched, it assured there'd be no opposition to it then or now.

It's all gone on in spite of mass anti-imperial resistance to what's seen as an arrogant disregard for the standards and norms of international behavior and laws in the pursuit of an expansionist agenda. Israel and the US today willfully violate the UN Charter, the Hague Regulations and Geneva Conventions relative to the conduct of war and when it may be legally waged, the treatment of prisoners, the use of torture, destruction of infrastructure and historical sites, and plunder of natural resources to establish client puppet-run regimes exploiting their people in service to the dominant capital and political interests of their imperial conquerors.

Then to quell resistance and tighten security, the US and Israel resort to the most extreme methods including mass arrests and detentions and the free use of torture and targeted assassinations as state policy. Amnesty International reports since the passage of the Military Commissions Act of 2006, the US and Israel are the only two countries in the world to have legalized the use of torture. Petras and others report the top leaders in the Pentagon up to Donald Rumsfeld specifically ordered its use "while the Justice and Defense Departments insisted that the President could override any laws - international or national as well as the US Constitution - in defending the empire." These top officials in key areas of government have audaciously given the President "de facto and de jure dictatorial powers" to do whatever he chooses to establish "Imperial Security." It makes our citizens at home no safer than the victims of US and Israeli imperial aggression in Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine or anywhere else in the world.

But Petras reports it's even worse than that as the expose of torture in Iraq revealed a highly organized network of US and Israeli assassins worldwide. They operate as international death squads engaged in "killing, kidnapping and torturing 'suspects' and sympathizers of resistance movements." Petras calls this a US-sponsored "Murder Incorporated" that's composed of Army Special Forces, Navy Seals and a DELTA force operating in a Special Agency Program (SAP). It follows the same practices long engaged in by Israel's Institute for Intelligence and Special Operations known as the Mossad, and its aim is to remove all opposition by whatever extralegal methods it chooses while ignoring international law. It then justifies this activity at the highest levels of government as a matter of policy.

Petras further points to the UN's International Leadership report on the destruction of civilian and military infrastructure in Iraq (much like what Israel did in the OPT discussed below). It showed "84% of Iraq's higher learning institutions have been burnt, looted or destroyed." Archeological museums and historic sites, libraries and archives have also been plundered, and targeted assassinations have been carried out against academics, other teachers, senior military personnel, journalists and other professionals including doctors. In addition, there are random or targeted daily terror killings by US-directed "Salvador option" death squads as well as thousands of kidnappings and other systematic horrors making life intolerable for most everyone in the country outside the four square kilometer fortress-like Green Zone HQ in central Baghdad for "coalition" officials and the puppet "Iraq interim government."

It's all part of Washington's design to destroy the country's cultural identity as an Arab state, separate its oil resources from any large population base, and divide the nation into more easily governed parts just the way it was done in the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s. It's now been reported that longtime Bush family consigliere James Baker, co-chairing an Iraq Study Group, will formerly propose the kind of plan the Iraq puppet government just passed putting a quasi-official US imprimatur on it as part of a US - Israeli divide and conquer strategy that may not be as easy to pull off as as the one in the former Yugoslavia or in the simple north - south divisions of Korea and Vietnam after WW II.

What's happening today in Iraq and Palestine is so outrageous and chaotic, Petras refers to a "House of Horrors" in both countries with the Zionist militarists at the Pentagon and their Israeli counterparts in charge of their respective "Horror Shows....under the big tent of a 'Mid-East Democratic Reform Initiative.'" This is the modus operandi of empire building and colonization - blast and tear a nation to shreds so it can never again exist as it once did. Then terrorize the people into submission and kill off all the ones who resist. It's a barbaric thumb in the eye to humanity, but this is the way rogue empires do things, especially when they're too powerful to challenge.

The US-led killing machine is in full operation in Iraq, and so is the Israeli one in the OPT. Petras calls the one there "Israel's Final Solution" or the "Palestinian Holocaust," and it's focal point is in Gaza which even unoccupied is the world's largest open-air prison for its 1.45 million people in the most densely populated space of its size in the world. Today the Strip and the West Bank are Israeli-directed killing fields targeting Palestinian civilians helpless to stop it beyond their courageous acts of desperation with crude weapons and their bodies against tanks, F-16s, helicopter gunships, and illegal and immoral terror weapons like white phosphorus bombs and shells, cluster bombs that never stop killing and maiming, and experimental new weapons that don't have publicly-known names yet.

Israel's war on Palestine has gone on for nearly six decades, and September 28 marked the sixth anniversary of the al-Aqsa Mosque Intifada resistance against it that began with Ariel Sharon's provocative visit to the holy site in 2000. Israel dramatically escalated the conflict after the minor June 25, 2006 incident at an Israeli military post near Kerem Shalom crossing killing two IDF soldiers, injuring several others and capturing a third still held whose name the corporate media made sure everyone knows but won't ever reveal any of over-10,000 names of Palestinian prisoners held (the fate of "unworthy victims"). The June clash followed a series of bloody earlier in the month Israeli attacks on Gaza including the widely reported beach shelling that killed eight Palestinians and injured 32 others including 13 children. Much as it did in Lebanon (discussed below), Israel's response was swift, deadly, disproportionate to what happened and planned months in advance as revealed by General Yoav Galant, in charge of Gaza, in a candid interview he gave in Israel's Maariv daily.

The Palestinian Centre for Human Rights (PCHR) documented it all including the devastation of the past six years. Overall it created a state of mass-immiseration for the Palestinian people in Gaza and the West Bank:

- essential infrastructure affecting power, clean water and sanitation destroyed
- mobility restricted or denied
- imposition of an embargo threatening the collapse of an already weak economy creating unemployment up to 80% of the population
- hostile incursions into the OPT, daily killings, and frequent extra-judicial assassinations
- home and property demolitions
- mass arbitrary arrests, administrative detentions of thousands of Palestinians without charge, and the systematic use of torture on those held including against women and children
- the destruction of a viable Hamas-led Palestinian Authority (PA) through imprisonments of its democratically elected members held without charge or on contrived ones against them as well as the destruction of its civil and security facilities

All this and much more has been done (as in Iraq) to destroy the cultural identity and very existence of the Palestinian people to prevent them from ever having a viable independent state of their own as well as force a mass-Palestinian exodus to other Arab states willing to help them escape their intolerable situation in the OPT.

The plan to crush these defenseless people now includes credible evidence that the Bush and Olmert administrations have been arming, training and plotting with Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas and his Fatah followers to lead a civil uprising against the Hamas-led Palestinian Authority (PA) and destroy it by force. It follows the Palestinians failed efforts to form a national unity government because Hamas refused Fatah's demand to govern as Israel's enforcer and abandon its own pledge to serve the welfare of its people. Now in an interview on October 8 in the London Sunday Times, Fatah

militia leader Tawfig Tirawi, inflamed matters by accusing Hamas of "accumulating weapons" and that "a full-scale civil war can break out at any moment." He earlier said "civil war is inevitable." The paper also reported President Abbas "notified the US, Jordan and Egypt that he is preparing to take action against Hamas." These statements defy Hamas Prime Minister Ismail Haniyeh who firmly said he'll never allow a civil war to happen, and it's unimaginable the Palestinian people want one. But Haniyeh and his people may have no choice as this seems to be the current joint US-Israeli strategy to destroy Palestinian resistance and do it with help from Fatah President Abbas. This is the same man who pledged his fealty to Israel as a participant in crafting the Oslo Accords sellout of his people and being a principle in the Arafat-led corrupted and mismanaged Palestinian Authority until Hamas won a majority of the seats in the January, 2006 Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC) elections. The Bush and Olmert governments wouldn't tolerate that outcome, and the New York Times reported right after the election US and Israeli officials met at the "highest level" to plan the destruction of Hamas by "starving" the PA and making the people in the OPT pay the greatest price.

For Israel, this is part of its state policy of ethnic cleansing by slow-motion genocide and out-migration all leading to the destruction of the Palestinian identity. It wants to co-opt a corrupted PA leadership of its choice to act as Israel's enforcer and partner in the destruction of its own people. It's to fulfill the intent of what former Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meier meant by her racist comment that "There are no Palestinians" and what Prime Minister David Ben Gurion earlier said after Israel brutally expelled the Palestinians from their homes and land in the 1948 war establishing the state of Israel: "We have come and we have stolen their country....We must do everything to insure they (the Palestinians) never do return....(and 10 years earlier had written his son) We will expel the Arabs and take their places....with the force at our disposal." He and his successors planned to include all the land of biblical Eretz Israel (the land of Israel) within the final fixed borders of a greater Israeli state whenever they're finally declared. The US unconditionally supports Israel's plan to do this as well as its policies of plunder and exploitation, but as Petras explains: "No one in their right mind can claim that the Israeli assault on Gaza advances US policies, interests or US imperial power." It doesn't matter because the power of the Jewish Lobby got the full support of the Bush administration for it anyway as well as the near unanimity for it in the Congress.

### The Rape of Lebanon

What Israel did to the Palestinians in the OPT over decades, it did to Lebanon in 1978, 1982 and in about a five week blitzkrieg beginning July 12, ending formally but fragily with a UN-brokered ceasefire on August 14. Petras compares the assault to the Nazi's November 9 and 10, 1938 infamous Kristallnacht pogrom in the German Reich against the Jews calling that event a "garden party" compared to the rape of Lebanon and vast devastation from it. It began with Hezbollah's cross-border incursion on July 12, killing eight IDF soldiers in the exchange that followed and capturing two others. There's still a dispute over which side of the Lebanese border the incident took place as for years Israel routinely makes hostile incursions into Lebanon by land and air, and still illegally occupies the 25 square kilometer Shebaa Farms area of South Lebanon it never relinquished after seizing it in the 1967 war.

As against Gaza, Israel again responded swiftly and disproportionately in a reign of terror against the Lebanese people by land, air and sea. It killed and wounded thousands and displaced a million or more Lebanese civilians. It also systematically destroyed the country's essential to life and other vital infrastructure and created an amount of physical devastation that could take a generation to recover from if Israel even allows it to happen. It was done in part to destroy Hezbollah as a political entity and as an effective resistance force against Israel's imperial designs on the country. But Israel's plans are much more far-reaching than that as explained below.

Petras reported Middle East expert Juan Cole claims Israel wanted the war and planned it at least a year in advance. Matthew Kallman of the *San Francisco Chronicle* Foreign Service also found and reported evidence that preparations for it began in May, 2000, immediately after Israel ended its occupation of the country that began with its invasion and brutal assault in 1982 that killed about 18,000 Lebanese. Kallman also reported that over a year before the conflict began a senior IDF official gave "PowerPoint presentations" off the record to US and other officials and unnamed journalists and think tanks explaining how the attack would unfold "in revealing detail."

Again, Israel got the full backing, funding and arming as needed from the Bush administration to carry it out, effectively making this gruesome adventure a joint US-Israeli operation. Besides wanting to neutralize Hezbollah's resistance, the goal was to destroy Lebanon as a functioning country and ethnically cleanse the southern part of it up to the Litani River Israel wants to control and eventually annex and keep as it did the Golan after the 1967 war. Israel claims this area (like the Golan) is important for security reasons, but its greatest value (again like the Golan) is as a source of

fresh water from the Litani and from the Wazzani springs that feed into the Hasbani River that's a tributary of the Jordan River. The Hisbani flows into Israel two miles downstream from the Wazzani and runs into the Sea of Galilee that's Israel's largest source of fresh water.

Israel has had designs on Lebanon for 40 years or more and has kept the country in a state of instability, partial occupation and conflict over most of that time. Now the state of the country is a devastated near-wasteland monitored by so-called (Israel-approved and friendly) UN Blue Helmets and Lebanese Armed Forces replacing the IDF on the ground under a fragile UN brokered ceasefire arrangement that could end any time Israel wishes again to unleash its war machine and on any pretext. There's nothing to deter Israel from doing it as it has the unconditional support of the Jewish Lobby and whatever US administration is in power. Unless this changes, the people of Lebanon, like those in Iraq and Palestine, can only look ahead to more conflict and the pain and suffering from it.

That's because there's still unfinished business for both empires, and it's not likely either one will soon give up on what they're determined to achieve. So even though Iraq is a hopeless quagmire, the Bush administration says it will "stay the course." And as long as Israel has full US backing, it will continue pursuing its imperial agenda even though Hezbollah humiliated the IDF in Lebanon and the Palestinians show no signs of ending their determined resistance short of mass-annihilation or forced expulsion. But it's not all smooth sailing as the unholy US-Israeli alliance faces a threat it can't ignore that could derail it. It's a growing broad-based worldwide anti-imperialist movement against these two partnered pariah states. It remains to be seen how far it will go, whether it can achieve critical mass in the US and in Israel, and if it can succeed in changing the direction of these two belligerents so far unstoppable and determined to go on unchecked by what passes for the civilized western world.

## Part II - Israel and Middle East Warfare

It now looks like the only lesson the US and Israel learned from past failure is to press on with a new adventure. It appears the likely prime target is the Islamic Republic of Iran, as ill-advised as it will be to attack it. Petras explains that "Israel's political and military leadership have repeatedly and openly declared (their intention) to attack Iran in the immediate future." And once again it looks like the power of the Jewish Lobby in the US has the Bush administration thinking the same way to help its Israeli partner free itself from another "irritant" in the region that stands in the way of both countries' imperial aims. Petras calls Israel's Iran-directed war preparations "the greatest immediate threat to world peace and political stability (today)." It's hard to disagree.

That threat was heightened following North Korea's nuclear test which Israeli officials were quick to jump on suggesting it will benefit Iran. It came from an inflammatory statement by Miri Eisin, Prime Minister Olmert's spokeswoman, who told the AP: "We should remind ourselves that the North Koreans have already been suppliers of launching platforms which could reach Europe and certainly Israel. As such, they have already shown their willingness to be suppliers to Iran." Then Israel's UN Ambassador Dan Gillerman went further on Israel's Channel 2 TV referencing North Korea's nuclear activity and adding: "what Iran is about to do could be much worse, much more frightening and much more dangerous." This language practically demands an attack on Iran to destroy its presumed "nuclear threat" even though Iran is no threat to any country and the real threat is a growing likelihood of an Israeli and/or US attack on Iran or any other country in the region targeted as an enemy.

The US and Israel are allowed to get away with these kinds of outrageously stark and provocative statements even though the only pretext either country can fabricate is the baseless claim that Iran's legitimate right to enrich uranium for commercial use means the country has embarked on a nuclear weapons program that will threaten Israel. In fact, Iran is a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and, from all the evidence uncovered from years of monitoring by the UN International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), is in full compliance with it. It has every legal right to pursue its commercial nuclear program and nuclear enrichment for it. Israel, on the other hand, never signed the treaty, is known to have two to three hundred or more sophisticated nuclear weapons and launching systems for them, has stated its intention to use them if it chooses to, and is a nuclear outlaw - but one with an important ally the Iranians lack.

Today the debate in Israel is only over the method and timing of attacking Iran. Petras explains the Israelis have been pushing the US to do it for over a decade with the power of the Jewish Lobby in full support claiming the Islamic Republic threatens Israel's security and its dominance in the region. It doesn't matter that Iran never attacked its neighbors and isn't likely to undertake a military action except in self-defense as it did against Iraq in the 1980s. Further, it's an Israeli and made-in-America agitprop fabrication that Iranian President Ahmadinejad threatened "to wipe Israel off the map." The president said a number of things including..."this regime that is occupying Jerusalem must vanish from the page of time" meaning an illegal racist colonial one, but he didn't say or mean it should be removed by force or that Jews should be expelled from Israel.

Further proof of Iran's intentions came from Grand Ayatollah Khamenei's public pledge never to attack another country. He also condemned the development and use of nuclear weapons as being against Islam. The Western media was careful to suppress Khamenei's pledge and instead published false reports that he threatened the US to heighten the tension between the two countries. It's all part of the scheme to get full US support for Israel's intended war plans and the long held desire of both countries for regime change in Iran.

Petras lays out a dire scenario if a US, Israeli or joint attack is launched. It will be especially bad if the US does it using so-called "mini-nuke robust earth penetrator bunker-buster" munitions which are weapons that can be made to any desired potency and are likely to be from one-third to two-thirds as powerful as the Hiroshima bomb. In other words, there's nothing "mini" about them. Aside from the catastrophic level of immediate and long-term casualties from nuclear annihilation and radiation in Iran and beyond, Petras explains such an attack will only be a "pyrrhic victory." If Israel does it alone, it may set off a chain "political conflagration (to) unseat the rulers of Jordan, Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia." If the US attacks, it "would be even worse: major oil wells burning, US troops in Iraq surrounded (with the catastrophic consequences of far greater loss of life on both sides), long-term relations with Arab regimes undermined and increased oil prices (possibly high enough to cause a worldwide economic calamity) and supplies disrupted." It's almost certain this would inflame or enrage public opinion in the US and Israel that could lead to the ouster of the ruling parties in both countries.

It would also likely undermine Big Oil's existing and desired major oil exploration projects and cause the Israelis to crack down harder on the Palestinians and make them face forced massive ethnic cleansing expulsion from their homeland. Further, it would almost certainly get a response from Hezbollah or other resistance in South Lebanon, reignite the conflict there, unleash the Israeli killing machine all over again and cause more mass displacement and reoccupation by the IDF as the UN Blue Helmets and Lebanese forces evacuate the conflict zone. And it would lead to a growing threat of retaliatory terror attacks in the US, other Western countries and in Israel and would likely strengthen the resolve of other nations feeling potentially threatened by a hostile US, Israel and the West to seek defensive economic and military alliances in a structure like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) that was formed in 2001 for political, diplomatic, economic and security reasons to act as a counterweight to NATO which the US dominates.

Still, with all the hazards of attacking Iran clearly in the minds of US policy makers, the momentum for it is moving ahead. It's happening in spite of serious high-level dispute in Washington about undertaking it. The Pentagon has war plans for it to include NATO, Israel and Canada, and it currently has a major US naval strike group deployment in the Persian Gulf and Eastern Mediterranean. Part of it is permanently stationed in the region, and in early October, The powerful Eisenhower Carrier Strike Group got "prepare to deploy" orders, headed there on October 3 and is now in place for whatever action may be intended. It joins the Enterprise and Iwo Jima Expeditionary Strike Groups making a total of three US naval task forces in position opposite Iran for whatever purpose may be planned and will shortly be joined by a fourth Boxer Expeditionary Strike Group that left Singapore on October 16 for the region. Naval forces already there have been engaged in what the Iranian foreign ministry calls "dangerous and suspicious" exercises in the Gulf practicing intercepting and searching ships for potential WMDs and missiles.

This all may be just a saber-ratling bluff, but if it's more than that it could unfold as a late October or early November "surprise" ahead of the November 7 congressional elections now only days away and be initiated in response to a manufactured incident on the order of the August, 1964 Gulf of Tonkin one or the blowing up of the USS Maine in February, 1898 in Havana Harbor. It's never hard for an aggressor to find reasons for war if it wants one and just needs a convenient excuse to start it.

The Bush administration and Israelis may get their wish if the Navy goes ahead with its reported plans to blockade Iranian oil ports. This action will be an act of war if it's done that Iran will have a legal right to respond to in self-defense under Article 51 of the UN Charter but will surely be met with a "shock and awe" counterattack against about 400 Iranian target sites already designated as ones to destroy in the event of hostilities. None of this guarantees an attack is imminent, but it shows a real possibility one may be coming. It also shows the power of the Jewish Lobby in the US that supports Israel's long-term aim to attack Iran no matter how grim the fallout from it may be. There's so much open speculation about this, it's gotten saner military, political and economic analysts here to believe this would be an act of insanity with the kind of potentially catastrophic consequences Petras outlined above. Will it happen? We can only hold our breathe waiting to find out, but it may not be long before we do.

### **Part III - Experts on Terror or Terrorist Experts**

In this part of his book, Petras goes head-to-head with the so-called self-styled "terrorist experts" (TE) and clearly comes out ahead with his incisive dissection of them explaining why they're prominently featured in the major media. He calls them the "set-up" people - there to play a role to "motivate the colonial and imperial conquerors and reinforce their idea that the terrorists are not worthy of ruling or being ruled," so we have to get rid of them. It doesn't matter that the so-called "war on terrorism" is a shameless overused but very effective ruse scare tactic. It's always used because the public never catches on no matter how many times before supposed threats turned out to be another scam to get them to go along with whatever schemes our government had in mind to undertake. It never ceases to amaze how short an attention span the public has, but it's clear the power of the corporate-run media has a lot to do with it. It led author Studs Terkel to refer to a national Alzheimer's disease and author and political critic Gore Vidal to subtitle his 2004 book *Imperial America - Reflections on the United States of Amnesia*.

It gives the whole propaganda apparatus and the TE an open field to manipulate the public mind and get it to believe most anything. Petras calls these people "verbal assassins" who can't or won't understand that people pummeled by "shock and awe" attacks, their countries plundered in the name of "liberation," their people mass-murdered, raped, arrested and tortured might be desperate and motivated enough to strike back in retaliatory self-defense. It follows logically from Newton's law that for every action there's a corresponding reaction. In 1954, the CIA understood this and invented a term for it (no self-respecting TE will touch). The agency called it "blowback" referring to the unintended consequences from US hostile acts abroad like overthrowing legitimate or otherwise constituted governments as it did against Mohammed Mossadegh in Iran in 1953 ushering in the 25 year terror reign of the Shah. It finally led to the "blowback" 1979 revolution, and it causes other instances of retaliation now ongoing in Iraq and Afghanistan and for nearly six decades in Palestine.

But prominent TE featured in the major media have a different diagnosis of resistance fighters. They call them "incurable psychopaths (who are) extremely dangerous when at large (so we must flush them out to) capture, confine, torture or kill (them)." A convenient division of labor is then arranged to do it and the TE play their assigned role along with the military, recruited satraps, prison commandants, interrogators, guards and assorted other functionaries. They're team member hegemon-devil's disciples turning "victims into executioners and the executioners into victims." They do it by dehumanizing the legitimate resistance they label Islamo-fascists, Islamic fundamentalists, terrorists or other invented designations of inferiority or implied threat that must be destroyed.

It's incomprehensible to the TE that almost any act of retaliatory self-defense might be justifiable resistance given the level of state-directed violence used against them mercilessly. In Israel, and now in Iraq and Afghanistan it led to the phenomenon of suicide bombings which Petras calls "a form of individual sacrifice, of individual resistance taken in the name of the collective." He explains further that in the West individual sacrifice is rewarded with medals, but in the Middle East and specifically in the case of suicide bombers the reward is martyrdom for giving their lives in the cause of national liberation against a superior hostile force. This is a phenomenon common throughout history when a people face an overpowering conqueror and occupier. Petras explains "there have always been and always will be self-sacrificing individuals or (whole populations)...prepared to defend nation and home....and to use (their) body as a missile or weapon (to do it)."

Petras also explains there are different forms of imperial conquest and subjugation, and the one the US uses in Iraq and Afghanistan and that Israel uses against the Palestinians is a cruel and dehumanizing "process of destruction, degradation, and exploitation followed by efforts to 'reconstruct' a colonized military, police, and political structure willing and able to repress and contain anti-colonial resistance." It's a doctrine of "total war" against target nations too weak to fight back except by asymmetrical guerilla warfare means that include tactics like car and suicide bombings. Petras calls this practice "one of the ultimate forms of rejection of tyranny" that will only end when "total war" does. And that will only happen when the "colonial revivalist strand of imperialism in....its US, European and Israel variants" are defeated....Peace and reconciliation is only possible if justice is meted to the architects and practitioners of total war and human degradation." A long and painful struggle for liberation may be ahead before that goal is ever achieved.

### **Part IV - Noam Chomsky and the Pro-Israel Lobby**

In the book's final part, Petras challenges a man who may best be described as an iconic figure on the Left, an anti-war activist, and much more but not one unused to being challenged and sometimes harshly. Petras points out that Chomsky has been a sharp critic of Israeli policies through the years and has been strongly attacked for his views by pro-Israeli organizations and the major media on the



rare times his name is even allowed in it. Still he defends the existence of the Zionist state and has a different view than Petras on the power and influence of the Jewish Lobby in shaping US policy toward Israel. Petras lists what he calls Chomsky's fifteen erroneous theses reflecting his long-held belief that the Lobby isn't as potent as the strong case Petras makes in this book that it is. Not wishing to take sides with two distinguished men this writer holds in high esteem, the points of disagreement will only be listed so the reader can decide who makes the better case.

Petras begins by listing what he calls Chomsky's eight "dubious propositions":

1. The pro-Israel Lobby is like any other one.
2. The Lobby's backers have no more power than other pressure groups.
3. The Lobby succeeds because its interests coincide with those of the US.
4. Israel is a tool of the US empire and used as needed.
5. "Big Oil" and the "military-industrial complex" are the major forces shaping Middle East policy.
6. US and Israeli interests usually coincide.
7. The Iraq war and threats to Iran and Syria stem from the "oil interests" and "military-industrial complex."
8. US behavior in the Middle East is the same as what it practices worldwide.

Petras then uses the above list to discuss what he calls Chomsky's 15 theses and uses the persuasive evidence presented in his book to take issue with them, one by one. He sums up his case stating he's done this because of Chomsky's enormous stature making whatever his views are stand out prominently. It's a matter of consequence when a man like Noam Chomsky believes the Jewish Lobby is like all others which in Petras' view gives a "free ride to the principal authors, architects and lobbyists in favor of the (Iraq) war (and is an) obstacle to achieving clarity about whom we are fighting and why. To ignore the pro-Israel Lobby is (also) to allow it a free hand in pushing for the invasion of Iran and Syria (and any other regime in the region Israel may wish to remove)." Petras sums up saying that "the peace and justice movements, at home and abroad, are bigger than any individual or intellectual - no matter what their past credentials." In this battle of noted titans on the Left, it's for the reader to decide who's right.

### **Summation - Confronting Zionism and Reclaiming American Middle East Policy**

Petras has written a powerful and important new book that needs broad exposure and resonance. But he'll never get its content past the corporate gatekeepers controlling the major media because of his courage to reveal what others fear to do - confront Zionism, its agenda of aggressive wars and colonization, and the power of the Jewish Lobby to assure Israel gets the full and unconditional support of every US administration regardless of whether what it does serves the interests of this country. That Lobby power reached its apogee and full fruition with the ascent of the Bush administration neocons that effectively pledge their fealty to the rulers of the Israeli state and prove Ariel Sharon may have been right when he once arrogantly boasted about his relationship with George Bush saying: "We have the US under our control."

The result has been disastrous for this country and the sacred principles on which it was founded. In partnership with Israel, the US began tearing apart the Middle East and Central Asia by attacking and occupying Iraq and Afghanistan. It now threatens to inflame the whole region enough to make it explode if we go ahead with plans to attack Iran, do it with nuclear weapons, and then move on to Syria and even Saudi Arabia while continuing to hold Lebanon hostage and under siege in a state of interregnum awaiting the next inevitable trigger igniting the whole ugly business there all over again. The Bush administration "long war" against Islam enraged 1.8 billion Muslims worldwide growing in unity against us. It's also destroying our freedom and democracy at home in the process threatening everyone with the emerging power of a national security police state that spells tyranny with an out-of-control president usurping the dictatorial power of a "unitary executive" claiming the right to go around the law of the land and its international obligations to govern as he pleases.

Petras sounds the alarm and asks how did we get into this debacle, and who's responsible for it. He stresses the need for a full-scale Congressional investigation to find out, but laments it's not likely to happen as long as the Bush neocons have their way. The central thesis of his book is that the Jewish Lobby serves the interests of Zionism and acts as agents for the state of Israel. It co-opted the Bush administration, all others preceding it, and the key centers of power and influence in the country leading us to the disaster we now face because of our misguided Middle East adventurism. He equates our actions in league with Israel to the Nazi war crimes committed in WW II, saying "These are the highest crimes against humanity." Referring to the crime of aggression, the Nuremberg Tribunal called

it the "supreme international crime," and those Nazis found guilty of it were hanged. Petras explains that the "worst crimes are committed by those who claim to be a divinely chosen people, a people with 'righteous' claims of supreme victimhood." He goes on to say: "Righteous victimology, linked to ethno-religious loyalties and directed by fanatical civilian militarists with advanced weaponry, is the greatest threat to world peace and humanity."

Petras makes an impassioned plea for progressives (really all people of conscience) to reject the imperial agenda of all nations, and in the case of Israel, to stand firm against inevitably being labelled anti-semitic. Scurrilous name-calling is another refuge of scoundrels that shouldn't be tolerated or allowed to deter our committed assault against the forces of darkness that will destroy us unless we stand firmly against them. Petras tells us it won't be easy, and we can expect forceful ideological attacks against us premised on the notion that Israel is the embodiment of "democracy, liberty and justice" and those daring to criticize the Jewish state will be called supporters of "Arab dictatorships, repression, injustice and terrorism."

The stakes are much too high to let them get away with it using scurrilous name-calling in defense of it. In Petras' words: "Israel and its overseas network in the US....(threatens) not only the oppressed people of Palestine (and Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, Syria and any other state Israel takes aim at) but the rights of people throughout the world." He stresses we have mass public opinion on our side nearly everywhere outside the US, and it's gaining resonance here as well. It sees Israel and our actions in support of the Jewish state as the greatest of all threats to world peace and stability. Petras ends his book with one final impassioned call to arms: "Let's move ahead and de-colonize our country, our minds and politics as a first step in reconstituting a democratic republic, free of entangling colonial and neo-imperial alliances." Wise thoughts from a wise and courageous man. We can't ignore them lest we pay the supreme price of the loss of our freedom (and maybe our lives) because we didn't know it was being taken from us until it was too late to act to save it.

*Information Clearing House*

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article15415.htm>

BUZZWORDS

## The Big Lie About 'Islamic Fascism'

By Eric Margolis

**08/29/06 "Lew Rockwell"** -- -- The latest big lie unveiled by Washington's neoconservatives are the poisonous terms, "Islamofascists" and "Islamic Fascists." They are the new, hot buzzwords among America's far right and Christian fundamentalists. President George W. Bush made a point last week of using "Islamofascists" when recently speaking of Hezbollah and Hamas – both, by the way, democratically elected parties. A Canadian government minister from the Conservative Party compared Lebanon's Hezbollah to Nazi Germany. The term "Islamofascist" is utterly without meaning, but packed with emotional explosives. It is a propaganda creation worthy Dr. Goebbels, and the latest expression of the big lie technique being used by neocons in Washington's propaganda war against its enemies in the Muslim World. This ugly term was probably first coined in Israel – as was the other hugely successful propaganda term, "terrorism" – to dehumanize and demonize opponents and deny them any rational political motivation, hence removing any need to deal with their grievances and demands. As the brilliant humanist Sir Peter Ustinov so succinctly put it, "Terrorism is the war of the poor, and war is the terrorism of the rich." Both the terms "terrorism" and "fascist" have been so abused and overused that they have lost any original meaning.

The best modern definition I've read of fascism comes in former Columbia University Professor Robert Paxton's superb 2004 book, *The Anatomy of Fascism*. Paxton defines fascism's essence, which he aptly terms its "emotional lava" as: 1. a sense of overwhelming crisis beyond reach of traditional solutions; 2. belief one's group is the victim, justifying any action without legal or moral limits; 3. need for authority by a natural leader above the law, relying on the superiority of his instincts; 4. right of the chosen people to dominate others without legal or moral restraint; 5. fear of foreign "contamination."

Fascism demands a succession of wars, foreign conquests, and national threats to keep the nation in a state of fear, anxiety and patriotic hypertension. Those who disagree are branded ideological traitors. All successful fascist regimes, Paxton points out, allied themselves to traditional conservative parties, and to the military-industrial complex. Highly conservative and militaristic regimes are not

necessarily fascist, says Paxton. True fascism requires relentless aggression abroad and a semi-religious adoration of the regime at home. None of the many Muslim groups opposing US-British control of the Mideast fit Paxton's definitive analysis. The only truly fascist group ever to emerge in the Mideast was Lebanon's Maronite Christian Phalange Party in the 1930's which, ironically, became an ally of Israel's rightwing in the 1980's.

It is grotesque watching the Bush Administration and Tony Blair maintain the ludicrous pretense they are re-fighting World War II. The only similarity between that era and today is the cultivation of fear, war fever and racist-religious hate by US neoconservatives and America's religious far right, which is now boiling with hatred for anything Muslim. Under the guise of fighting a "third world war" against "Islamic fascism," America's far right is infecting its own nation with the harbingers of WWII totalitarianism. In the western world, hatred of Muslims has become a key ideological hallmark of rightwing parties. We see this overtly in the United States, France, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Poland, and, most lately, Canada, and more subtly expressed in Britain and Belgium. The huge uproar over blatantly anti-Muslim cartoons published in Denmark laid bare the seething Islamophobia spreading through western society. There is nothing in any part of the Muslim World that resembles the corporate fascist states of western history. In fact, clan and tribal-based traditional Islamic society, with its fragmented power structures, local loyalties, and consensus decision-making, is about as far as possible from western industrial state fascism.

The Muslim World is replete with brutal dictatorships, feudal monarchies, and corrupt military-run states, but none of these regimes, however deplorable, fits the standard definition of fascism. Most, in fact, are America's allies. Nor do underground Islamic militant groups ("terrorists" in western terminology). They are either focused on liberating land from foreign occupation, overthrowing "un-Islamic" regimes, driving western influence from their region, or imposing theocracy based on early Islamic democracy. Claims by fevered neoconservatives that Muslim radicals plan to somehow impose a worldwide Islamic caliphate are lurid fantasies worthy of Dr. Fu Manchu and yet another example of the big lie technique that worked so well over Iraq. As Prof. Andrew Bosworth notes in an incisive essay on so-called Islamic fascism, "Islamic fundamentalism is a transnational movement inherently opposed to the pseudo-nationalism necessary for fascism."

However, there are plenty of modern fascists. But to find them, you have to go to North America and Europe. These neo-fascists advocate "preemptive attacks against all potential enemies," grabbing other nation's resources, overthrowing uncooperative governments, military dominance of the world, hatred of Semites (Muslims in this case), adherence to biblical prophecies, hatred of all who fail to agree, intensified police controls, and curtailment of "liberal" political rights. They revel in flag-waving, patriotic melodrama, demonstrations of military power, and use the mantle of patriotism to feather the nests of the military-industrial complex, colluding legislators and lobbyists. They urge war to the death, fought, of course, by other people's children. They have turned important sectors of the media into propaganda organs and brought the Pentagon largely under their control. Now, the neoconservatives are busy whipping up war against Syria and Iran to keep themselves in power and maintain the political dynamics of this 21st century revival of fascism. The real modern fascists are not in the Muslim World, but Washington. The neocons screaming fascist the loudest, are the true fascists themselves. It's a pity that communist and leftist propaganda so debased the term "neo-fascist" that it has become almost meaningless. Because that is what we should be calling the so-called neocons, for that is what they really are.

August 29, 2006

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article14743.htm>

## THE DELIGHTFUL JEWISH TASTE FOR THE MASSACRE OF GENTILES

### **Purim will never be the same**

**Ruth Meisels**

*Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence* by Elliott Horowitz, Princeton University Press, 340 pages, \$35

Allow me to begin with a confession: For as long as I can remember, I never liked the holiday of Purim, with its story of the massacre of the gentiles and its message of revenge and rejoicing at the downfall of others. As if hanging Haman's 10 sons were not enough, the Book of Esther goes on to

boast that "the other Jews that were in the king's provinces gathered themselves together, and stood for their lives, and had rest from their enemies, and slew of their foes seventy and five thousand" (Esther 9:16). In addition, we read Esther's appalling request that the Jews of Shushan be granted another day to act "according unto this day's decree" - i.e., to slaughter their non-Jewish neighbors brutally. To eliminate any doubt, the author of the Book of Esther emphasizes that this was not a case of self-defense, and that "no man could withstand them; for the fear of them fell upon all people" (9:2). And so every year all that's left for me to do is to grit my teeth during the synagogue reading of the Megillah, taking comfort in the fact that historically, at least, the veracity of this story is very much in doubt.

But then, just after the holiday this year, Elliott Horowitz's book, "Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence," fell into my hands, and I was glad to find in it allies for my aversion to Purim. Since the mid-19th century, I learned, criticism of the Book of Esther seeped into liberal Jewish circles, especially in Victorian England, and various leaders of the community sought to play down the killing and the element of revenge that underlies the holiday.

A "Bible reader adapted for the use of Jewish schools and families," published in 1877 and endorsed by the chief rabbi of Britain, Nathan Marcus Adler, left out many of the gory details that appear in the final chapters of the Book of Esther. Claude Goldsmid-Montefiore, a great nephew of Sir Moses Montefiore, created a stir in 1888 when he published an article in the London-based Jewish Chronicle, harshly criticizing the message of Purim. Choosing his words with care, he declared that he "would not be sorry" if the festival "were to gradually lose its place in our religious calendar."

In his later comments on the Book of Esther in "The Bible for Home Reading," published in 1896, Montefiore was perhaps the first Jew to describe the events of its final chapters as "a massacre of unresisting Gentiles." "If the Bible had not included the Book of Esther," he concluded, "it would have gained rather than lost in religious value and moral worth."

But 19th-century liberals were not the first to criticize the Book of Esther. Censure first came from ecclesiastic circles, and especially the Protestant Church. Back in 1543, in his infamous essay entitled "On the Jews and Their Lies," Martin Luther remarked on how much the Jews "love the Book of Esther, which so well fits their bloodthirsty, vengeful, murderous greed and hope." Elsewhere, he described the book as "too Jewish," and in a seemingly unholy alliance with Jewish liberals hundreds of years later, Luther wrote that he wished the book had never existed. Over the generations, his disciples continued to portray it as the most bloodthirsty, and hence the most "unchristian," book in the Old Testament.

In the Jewish world, however, criticism of the Book of Esther was always a minority view, not reflective of the mainstream. And it is the mainstream approach that stands at the basis of Horowitz's central - and provocative - thesis regarding Jewish violence against non-Jews, especially, though not exclusively, on the festival of Purim.

In contrast to the anti-Semitic stereotype of the Jew as weak, passive and effeminate, Horowitz postulates that throughout the ages, Jews committed their share of violence, which has always peaked around Purim. Even if the bloody account in the Book of Esther lacks historical credence, the very fact that the acts described in it were glorified every year created a tradition of vengeance and violence, as well as the opportunity to act those feelings out.

It is true that Zionism, especially after Israel's occupation of the territories following the Six-Day War in 1967, allowed Jewish violence against the Arab "Amalekites" to flourish, but according to Horowitz, the seeds for such behavior were planted long before. Haman "the Agagite" is described in the Book of Esther as a scion of the Amalekites - a label applied over the years to the Romans, the Armenians, the Christians, the Nazis and in our day, by many rabbis, to the Arabs. And Amalek, as is well known, must be wiped out.

### Mocking Jesus

In the year 408 C.E., the Roman emperor Theodosius II issued an edict prohibiting the Jews from "setting fire to Aman in memory of his past punishment, in a certain ceremony of their festival, and from burning with sacrilegious intent a form made to resemble the saint cross in contempt of the Christian faith." In other words, the custom of mocking Jesus and the cross in Purim processions, which Horowitz discusses at length in the second half of the book, was already common in the fifth century C.E. Theodosius' edict, explains Horowitz, did not put an end to the anti-Christian traditions of the holiday. The combination of a narrative of divine salvation of the Jews and the vengeance taken on their enemies with the carnival atmosphere and the drinking that is characteristic of Purim, led to behavior that was very different from the stereotype of the meek Diaspora Jew.

The second half of the book begins with various accounts of Jewish debasement of the cross during the Middle Ages, not only on Purim. Horowitz cites dozens of instances, many of them conspicuously missing from modern Jewish historiography, of symbolic Jewish violence - or "violence

against symbols," to be more exact - that included setting fire to, and spitting and publicly urinating on, the cross. Such acts often ended in "martyrdom," i.e., the death of the perpetrator, or harm to the entire community. These are the "reckless rites" that give the book its title, and are linked to Mordechai's stubborn but unexplained refusal to bow down to Haman in the Book of Esther.

To return to the present, in October 2004 a student at the Har Hamor yeshiva in Jerusalem, Natan Zvi Rosenthal, spat at the Armenian archbishop as he was walking in a holiday procession in Jerusalem's Old City, carrying a large cross. This incident, which sparked a public outcry and was reported widely in the local media, is portrayed in the book as a link in the long chain of Jewish violence against Christianity and Christian symbols. (To complicate matters further, the Armenians have been described in Jewish writings since the 10th century as descendents of Amalek.) Rosenthal's shameful act must thus be viewed in its historical context: as a direct continuation of the Jewish tradition of public disdain for the cross.

### **Unconcealed agenda**

In the final chapters of the book, Horowitz broadens the historical discussion, moving from violence against Christian symbols to physical violence against Christians themselves. The most serious charge discussed at length here is that Jews participated in the massacre of tens of thousands of Christian captives in Jerusalem in the year 614 C.E., after the Persian conquest of the city.

Other incidents cited by the author are few and far between: the murder of a Christian boy during a Purim parade near Antioch, Syria in the fifth century C.E.; the 12th-century execution on Purim of a Christian who murdered a Jew in Brie, in northern France (carried out with the approval of the authorities); and a violent incident within the community, when a Jewish couple accused of adultery in 14th-century Provence was physically assaulted at a Purim parade. What is interesting here, more than the incidents themselves, is Horowitz's brilliant historiographical analysis of what inspired the documentation of these incidents - from the enthusiasm of a handful of Christian historians seeking to draw attention to Jewish violence, to the efforts of modern Jewish historians to whitewash and downplay them.

Meanwhile, the author himself makes no attempt to conceal his own agenda. On the contrary, in his introductory chapter he lays all his cards on the table: "I have therefore chosen, somewhat recklessly, to begin not at the beginning but at the end," drawing our attention to the lessons for today that emerge from his historical research. Since Baruch Goldstein's massacre of Muslims at prayer at the Tomb of the Patriarchs in Hebron on Purim 1994, he writes, "for me and for many others, Purim has never been the same." In effect, it was this event that brought him to widen the scope of his study, which had originally been planned to end with the 19th century. His moral compass is Mordechai's warning to Esther: "For if thou holdest thy peace at this time" (4:14).

As a Jewish historian, Horowitz felt that he could no longer hold his peace and not speak up about the connection between the legacy of Jewish violence and the current actions of "Jews in the Holy Land [who] are still avenging the 'old and new quarrel' against those they consider to be 'Amalekites,' [while] their malice is hardly as impotent as it was in the distant days of Theodosius II."

Horowitz quotes rabbis and settler leaders who equate the Palestinians with Amalek. He describes the Purim processions in Hebron that are becoming more violent from year to year, ever since a group of Jews moved into the Beit Hadassah neighborhood to "renew" Jewish settlement in the city in 1981 - and chose to do so, significantly, on Purim.

Toward the end of his sweeping study, Horowitz returns to his breaking point - the massacre at the Tomb of the Patriarchs - and concludes with sadness: "The continued celebration of Purim in the streets of central Jerusalem after the news broke of the bloody massacre in Hebron [is] one particular instance in which I would agree with [Samuel Hugo] Bergman's prophetic assertion that the holiday's continued observance is best understood as a consequence of the 'deep decay of our people.'"

*Ha'aretz* 6 Sept. 2006

<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/objects/pages/PrintArticleEn.jhtml?itemNo=724870>

NEWS YOU WON'T FIND ON CNN

## "The Jerusalem Declaration On Christian Zionism"

**Statement by the Patriarch and Local Heads of Churches In Jerusalem  
08/25/06**

Christian Zionism is a modern theological and political movement that embraces the most extreme ideological positions of Zionism, thereby becoming detrimental to a just peace within Palestine and Israel. The Christian Zionist programme provides a worldview where the Gospel is identified with the ideology of empire, colonialism and militarism. In its extreme form, it laces an emphasis on apocalyptic events leading to the end of history rather than living Christ's love and justice today.

We categorically reject Christian Zionist doctrines as false teaching that corrupts the biblical message of love, justice and reconciliation. We further reject the contemporary alliance of Christian Zionist leaders and organizations with elements in the governments of Israel and the United States that are presently imposing their unilateral pre-emptive borders and domination over Palestine. This inevitably leads to unending cycles of violence that undermine the security of all peoples of the Middle East and the rest of the world. We reject the teachings of Christian Zionism that facilitate and support these policies as they advance racial exclusivity and perpetual war rather than the gospel of universal love, redemption and reconciliation taught by Jesus Christ. Rather than condemn the world to the doom of Armageddon we call upon everyone to liberate themselves from the ideologies of militarism and occupation. Instead, let them pursue the healing of the nations!

We call upon Christians in Churches on every continent to pray for the Palestinian and Israeli people, both of whom are suffering as victims of occupation and militarism. These discriminative actions are turning Palestine into impoverished ghettos surrounded by exclusive Israeli settlements. The establishment of the illegal settlements and the construction of the Separation Wall on confiscated Palestinian land undermines the viability of a Palestinian state as well as peace and security in the entire region.

We call upon all Churches that remain silent, to break their silence and speak for reconciliation with justice in the Holy Land. Therefore, we commit ourselves to the following principles as an alternative way:

We affirm that all people are created in the image of God. In turn they are called to honor the dignity of every human being and to respect their inalienable rights.

We affirm that Israelis and Palestinians are capable of living together within peace, justice and security.

We affirm that Palestinians are one people, both Muslim and Christian. We reject all attempts to subvert and fragment their unity. We call upon all people to reject the narrow world view of Christian Zionism and other ideologies that privilege one people at the expense of others.

We are committed to non-violent resistance as the most effective means to end the illegal occupation in order to attain a just and lasting peace.

With urgency we warn that Christian Zionism and its alliances are justifying colonization, apartheid and empire-building. God demands that justice be done. No enduring peace, security or reconciliation is possible without the foundation of justice. The demands of justice will not disappear. The struggle for justice must be pursued diligently and persistently but non-violently. "What does the Lord require of you, to act justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God." (Micah 6:8) This is where we take our stand. We stand for justice. We can do no other. Justice alone guarantees a peace that will lead to reconciliation with a life of security and prosperity for all the peoples of our Land. By standing on the side of justice, we open ourselves to the work of peace - and working for peace makes us children of God. "God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting men's sins against them. And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation." (2 Cor 5:19)

His Beatitude Patriarch Michel Sabbah, Latin Patriarchate, Jerusalem  
Archbishop Swerios Malki Mourad, Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate, Jerusalem  
Bishop Riah Abu El-Assal, Episcopal Church of Jerusalem and the Middle East  
Bishop Munib Younan, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the Holy Land

<http://www.j-diocese.com/DiocesanNews/view.asp?selected=238#sbl238>  
Information Clearing House

BIAS BIAS BIAS

## Why is Wikipedia Censoring Me?

by James Bacque

In 1989, I published the first in a series of books about the Second World War and its aftermath. The first, *Other Losses*, showed the tremendous atrocities committed against enemy prisoners in the prison camps of the US and France after 1945. The next, *Just Raoul*, was a biography of a hero of the French Resistance who saved many refugees from Nazi death camps. The next, *Crimes and Mercies*, described the full extent of all allied crimes against Germans, plus the wonderful charity work of Canada and the USA in saving 800 million people, including Germans, Japanese and Italians, from starving to death in the hungry years after 1945. The next, *Dear Enemy*, illuminated the attitudes of the western allies to Germany from 1945 to now.

Wikipedia reviews and criticizes only *Other Losses*, and in such a biased way, that I finally tried to correct their many errors. Starting in March, 2006, I tried repeatedly over many weeks to correct the errors, but found that within a day at first, then within hours, and finally within minutes, some Wikipedian editor had expunged my corrections, replacing them with ever more hostile and denigrating allegations. Friends of mine tried also to correct the flawed Wikipedia article, but found the same situation. Finally we decided that Wikipedia was deliberately censoring my contributions, and that it was pointless to continue trying to present the facts on Wikipedia. After Serendipity (already acquainted with censorship at Wikipedia) heard of this situation I was offered the chance to publish the real story, which appears below.

Wikipedia quotes Stephen E. Ambrose as saying that *Other Losses* is "...spectacularly flawed ..." without saying that Ambrose also wrote that "You have made a major historical discovery which will ... span the oceans and have reverberations for decades, yea centuries to come. You have the goods on these guys ..."

Wikipedia does not say that Ambrose changed his mind only after he was retained by the US Army to lecture at the War College in Pennsylvania. Nor does Wikipedia mention that in his attack on me in the *New York Times*, he admitted that he had not done the necessary research to reach the conclusions that he published in that same article. Wikipedia fails to mention that the Ambrose it cites as an authority admitted that he had plagiarized several other authors. Wikipedia does not concern itself with the accusations that Ambrose stole work from a graduate student which he published as his own.

Wikipedia ignores my book, *Crimes and Mercies*, which goes far towards balancing the record of western actions after World War Two. The book shows the great charity extended by the western allies, chiefly Canada and the USA, towards the starving around the world after WW2, including the Japanese and Germans. Saying that the overwhelming majority of professional historians reject my work, and citing as an authority one historian who has never worked in this field, Wikipedia ignores the support given me by the eminent US Army military historian Col. Dr. Ernest F. Fisher, a former Senior Historian of the US Army Center for Military History, Washington. Fisher, a professional historian for decades, wrote the official US Army history of the campaign in Italy. He assisted me for months in researching documents in the US National Archives, wrote the Introduction to my book *Other Losses*, and has supported me with public statements for the seventeen years since its first publication. He helped me for many months researching in the archives.

Wikipedia does not mention the expert editing, research help and public support given me by the eminent epidemiologist and biostatistician, Dr Anthony B. Miller, former head of the Department of Biostatistics at the University of Toronto.

Wikipedia also casts aside the support given my work by Richard Overy, King's College, University of London; Otto Kimminich, University of Regensburg; Dr Alfred De Zayas, author of many books on postwar German history; Prof. Dr. Peter Hoffmann, McGill University, author of the most expert books on the German resistance; Prof. J. K. Johnson, Carleton University, Ottawa; Professor Ralph Raico, University of Buffalo; Prof. Ed Peterson, University of Wisconsin; Prof Ralph Scott, University of Iowa; Prof. Pierre Van Den Berghe, University of Seattle; Prof. Dr Richard Mueller, former head, Department of English, University of Aachen; Prof. Hans Koch, University of York and many others.

Among writers who have approved my work and supported me are Julian Barnes; Nikolai Tolstoy; John Fraser, Master of Massey College, Toronto; John Bemrose of Toronto; Robert Kroetsch, Winnipeg; and many others. My work has been published around in the world in ten languages by

Macmillan, Little, Brown, Prima, Ullstein, Editions Sand, McClelland and Stewart, New Press, and many many others.

Finally, the most glaring omission is that the massive and detailed KGB Archives in Moscow have millions of documents whose evidence completely confirms the statistical work in *Other Losses*. The math is simple: about 1.5 million German prisoners alive in allied prison camps at the end of the war never came home, nor were their deaths reported to the German government, their families, the International Red Cross or the UN. The figure was determined by the Adenauer government in Germany, submitted to the UN, and has never been disputed by anyone. Thus when *Other Losses* came out in 1989, alleging deaths of about one million in French and American camps, that left about 500,000 to be accounted for. They could have died only in the KGB camps, because there were not half a million prisoners in any other camps in the world. Thus, in effect *Other Losses* was predicting that when the communists opened the KGB archives, they would show deaths of about 500,000. And lo and behold, when Gorbachev brought down the communist rule, and the archives were opened, I went there, and found the Bulanov Report which showed that 356,687 Germans died in Soviet captivity, plus another 93,900 civilians taken as substitutes for dead or escaped prisoners for a total of 450,587.

This astonishing discovery is not mentioned in Wikipedia, nor by anyother of the "professional historians." Except one, Stefan Karner, who went to the KGB archives, saw the evidence piled up in enormous quantities, and said he did not believe it. Instead, he preferred to publish his own "estimates," which confirm the conventional view.

Information about books written by James Bacque may be found on his website World War 2 Books.

[http://serendipity.li/hr/bacque\\_on\\_wikipedia.htm](http://serendipity.li/hr/bacque_on_wikipedia.htm)

INSANITY

## Descent Into Moral Barbarism

*Should Alan Dershowitz Target Himself for Assassination?*

by **Norman Finkelstein**

Aug. 16, 2006

As Israel's military bravely fires away shells and missiles to lay waste the fragile human and physical infrastructure of Lebanon, Harvard Law Professor Alan Dershowitz, waging battle on a second front to legitimize Israel's criminal aggression, bravely fires away op-eds from his foxhole at Martha's Vineyard to lay waste the fragile infrastructure of international law. These are but the latest salvos in Dershowitz's long and distinguished career of apologetics on behalf of his Holy State.

Since becoming a born-again Zionist after the June 1967 war Dershowitz has justified each and all of Israel's egregious violations of international law. In recent years he has used the "war on terrorism" as a springboard for a full frontal assault on this body of law. Appearing shortly after the outbreak of the second intifada, his book *Why Terrorism Works* (2002) served to rationalize Israel's brutal repression of the uprising. In 2006 Dershowitz published a companion volume, *Preemption: A Knife that Cuts Both Ways*, to justify Israel's preventive use of force against Iran. It is painfully clear from their content that Dershowitz possesses little knowledge or for that matter interest in the timely political topics that purport to be the stimuli for his interventions. In reality each book is keyed to a current Israeli political crisis and seeks to rationalize the most extreme measures for resolving it. If *Why Terrorism Works* used the war on terrorism as a juggernaut to set back the clock on protection of civilians from occupying armies, *Preemption* uses the war on terrorism to set back the clock on the protection of states from wars of aggression. Dershowitz's current missives from Martha's Vineyard take aim at the protection of civilians in times of war.

The central premise of Dershowitz is that "international law, and those who administer it, must understand that the old rules" do not apply in the unprecedented war against a ruthless and fanatical foe, and that "the laws of war and the rules of morality



must adapt to these [new] realities." This is not the first time such a rationale has been invoked to dispense with international law. According to Nazi ideology, ethical conventions couldn't be applied in the case of "Jews or Bolsheviks; their method of political warfare is entirely amoral." On the eve of the "preventive war" against the Soviet Union, Hitler issued the Commissar Order, which mandated the summary execution of Soviet political commissars and Jews, and set the stage for the Final Solution. He justified the order targeting them for assassination on the ground that the Judeo-Bolsheviks represented a fanatical ideology, and that in these "exceptional conditions" civilized methods of warfare had to be cast aside:

In the fight against Bolshevism it must not be expected that the enemy will act in accordance with the principles of humanity or international law. Any attitude of consideration or regard for international law in respect of these persons is an error. The protagonists of barbaric Asiatic methods of warfare are the political commissars. Accordingly if captured in battle or while resisting, they should in principle be shot.

It was simultaneously alleged that the Red Army commissars (who were assimilated to Jews) qualified neither as prisoners of war protected by the Geneva Convention nor civilians entitled to trial before military courts, but rather were in effect illegal combatants. Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.

It is similarly instructive that, although Dershowitz is represented, and represents himself, in the media as a liberal and civil libertarian, the sort of arguments he makes crops up most often at the far right of the political spectrum. For example, in the recent landmark decision *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, the Supreme Court found that the petitioner, a Yemeni national captured in Afghanistan and held in Guantanamo Bay, was entitled, under both domestic statute and international law, to minimum standards of a fair trial, which the Commission Order, setting the guidelines for military commissions, didn't meet. A centerpiece of Judge Clarence Thomas's dissent was that "rules developed in the context of conventional warfare" were no longer applicable because - quoting President Bush - "the war against terrorism ushers in a new paradigm" and "this new paradigm requires new thinking in the law of war." Inasmuch as "we are not engaged in a traditional battle with a nation-state," he went on to argue, the Court's decision "would sorely hamper the President's ability to confront and defeat a new and deadly enemy." It's hard to know where Thomas (and Bush) ends and Dershowitz begins.

The main thrust of Preemption is to justify an Israeli assault on Iran's nuclear facilities. Although the book purports to the lofty goal of constructing a jurisprudence for criminal intent prior to commission of an actual crime, Dershowitz's range of historical reference is pretty much limited to the Bible and Israel, and it is plainly not the Bible that is uppermost in his mind. To justify the Israeli assault on Iran Dershowitz sets up Israel's attack on Egypt in June 1967 as the paradigm of legitimate preemptive war and its attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981 as the paradigm of legitimate preventive war. His argument seems to be that if the legitimacy of the June 1967 attack is beyond dispute and the legitimacy of the 1981 attack has come to be seen as beyond dispute, then the legitimacy of a preventive war against Iran should also be beyond dispute.

Before analyzing this argument it is instructive to look at the current legal consensus on preemptive and preventive war. Dershowitz asserts that an "accepted jurisprudence" doesn't exist. In fact, however, there is an enduring consensus, which recent events haven't shaken. In 2004 a high-level U.N. panel commissioned by the Secretary-General published its report on combating challenges to global security in the 21st century. The report reaffirmed the conventional understanding of Article 51 of the U.N. Charter, which prohibits the unilateral use of force by a State except to ward off an "armed attack" or if a "threatened attack is imminent, no other means would deflect it and the action is proportionate" (emphasis in original), the latter commonly denoted preemptive use of force. The report went on to prohibit the unilateral use of force by a State to ward off an inchoate armed attack, or what's commonly denoted preventive use of force, reaffirming that the Security Council is the sole legitimate forum for sanctioning the use of force in such a circumstance. "For those impatient with such a response," it explained, the answer must be that, in a world full of perceived potential threats, the risk to the global order and the norm of non-intervention on which it continues to be based is

simply too great for the legality of unilateral preventive action, as distinct from collectively endorsed action, to be accepted. Allowing one to so act is to allow all.

Although Dershowitz puts forth Israel's attack on Egypt in June 1967 as the paradigm of preemptive use of force, both as a matter of fact and theory this claim is patently untenable. The scholarly consensus is that an Egyptian armed attack was not imminent while it is far from certain that diplomatic options had been exhausted when Israel struck. Dershowitz himself acknowledges that "it is not absolutely certain" that Egypt would have attacked, and that "Nasser may not have intended to attack." He finesses this with the assertion that Israeli leaders "reasonably believed" that an Egyptian attack was "imminent and potentially catastrophic." Yet, apart from some transparently self-serving public statements there isn't a scratch of evidence to sustain this claim either. Again, Dershowitz himself cites (in an endnote) the acknowledgment of former Prime Minister Begin, who was a member of the National Unity government in June 1967, that Israel "had a choice. The Egyptian Army concentrations in the Sinai do not prove that Nasser was really about to attack us. We must be honest with ourselves. We decided to attack him." Even if for argument's sake it were true that Israeli leaders honestly erred, how can resort to preemptive force on the mistaken belief that an attack was imminent constitute the paradigm of legitimate use of preemption - or, to use Dershowitz's coinage, how can a "false positive" be the paradigmatic case? Rather the contrary, if June 1967 were the paradigm of preemption, it would undercut the legitimacy of any such resort to force. Dershowitz seems not to be aware that he has made a case not for but against preemptive war.

Dershowitz next nominates Israel's attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor as "paradigmatic" of legitimate use of preventive force. He mounts his case from multiple angles, sometimes implicitly, sometimes explicitly, but always falsely. In the first instance, Dershowitz puts preemptive war at one pole of a continuum and preventive war at the opposite pole. Although asserting that "the distinction between preventive and preemptive military action is important," and that there are "real differences between these concepts," he more often than not uses the terms interchangeably. For instance, he goes back and forth depicting the 1981 Israeli attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor and the 2003 U.S. attack on Iraq both as preemptive and preventive uses of force. By collapsing the distinction between them, whereby not even a flea's hop separates the two poles on his continuum, Dershowitz in effect legitimizes preventive war as preemptive war by another name. In like manner he redefines preemption so as to include preventive use of force: "preemption is widely, if not universally, regarded as a proper option for a nation operating under the rule of law, at least in some circumstances - for example, when a threat is catastrophic and relatively certain, though nonimminent." If this is preemption, one wonders what prevention would be.

In addition, although acknowledging that the U.N. panel explicitly ruled out preventive use of force, Dershowitz nonetheless maintains that it has come to be seen as legitimate. To demonstrate this he alleges that Israel's attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor has become recognized as "the proper and proportional example of anticipatory self-defense in the nuclear age" and "the paradigm for proportional, reasonable, and lawful preventive action" in the "emerging jurisprudence of preventive military actions," notwithstanding the "lack of imminence and certainty" of the Iraqi threat to Israel. He bases this resounding conclusion on a recent article in *Foreign Affairs* which "would certainly seem to have justified Israel's bombing of the Osirak reactor." Plainly the import of the U.N. panel's findings pales by comparison.

Finally, invoking a philosopher's wisdom that "no one law governs all things," Dershowitz maintains that although preventive war might be illegitimate for all other States it remains a legitimate option for Israel. This is because the U.N., which is the court of last appeal for inchoate armed threats, is biased against it. Accordingly, unlike all other States, Israel cannot be held accountable to international law or, put otherwise, international law might apply to everyone else but it doesn't apply to Israel: "it cannot expect the United Nations to protect it from enemy attack, and with regard to international law and international organizations, it lives in a state of nature." To demonstrate the U.N.'s inveterate hostility to Israel, Dershowitz specifically cites

"Russia's and China's veto power" in the Security Council, which has allegedly blocked action supportive of it. Yet, not once in the past 20 years has Russia or China used the veto for a Security Council resolution bearing on Israel. On the other hand, the U.S. has exercised its veto power 23 times in just the past two decades (1986-2006) in support of Israel. Moreover, due to the U.S. veto Israel has been shielded from any U.N. sanctions, although the Security Council has imposed them on 15 member States since 1990, often for violations of international law identical to those committed by Israel. Not for the first time Dershowitz has turned reality on its head.

On a related note Dershowitz correctly observes that Israel "was not condemned by the Security Council" in June 1967, although its resort to force violated the U.N. Charter, an armed Egyptian attack having been neither actual nor imminent. The Security Council and General Assembly were both divided on how to adjudicate responsibility for the war. This would seem to suggest that far from being an inherently hostile forum, the U.N. has in fact granted Israel special dispensations. More generally, as former Israeli Foreign Minister Shlomo Ben-Ami observes, it was Israel's policy of creeping annexation that shifted world opinion against it:

Neither in 1948 nor in 1967 was Israel subjected to irresistible international pressure to relinquish her territorial gains because her victory was perceived as the result of a legitimate war of self-defense. But the international acquiescence created by Israel's victory in 1967 was to be extremely short-lived. When the war of salvation and survival turned into a war of conquest and settlement, the international community recoiled and Israel went on the defensive. She has remained there ever since.

Insofar as the professed goal of Dershowitz's book is not descriptive but normative - i.e., to devise ideal laws and institutional arrangements for combating terrorism - it is curious that he doesn't propose reconfiguring the Security Council to mitigate its alleged bias. In this regard another of his claims merits attention: "The UN report fails to address the situation confronting a democracy with a just claim that is unable to secure protection from the Security Council and that reasonably concludes that failing to act unilaterally will pose existential dangers to its citizens." Yet, the High-level panel report explicitly addresses this concern and devotes one of its four parts specifically to proposals for reforming the Security Council as well as other U.N. institutions, noting preliminarily that:

One of the reasons why States may want to bypass the Security Council is a lack of confidence in the quality and objectivity of its decision-making. But the solution is not to reduce the Council to impotence and irrelevance: it is to work from within to reform it not to find alternatives to the Security Council as a source of authority but to make the Council work better than it has.

The reason Dershowitz prefers to shunt aside the Security Council rather than reform it is not hard to find: it is difficult to conceive any configuration of the Security Council that would sanction Israel's periodic depredations of neighboring Arab countries. Finally, Dershowitz justifies ignoring the Security Council's strictures on the use of preventive force because its "anachronistic, mid-twentieth century view of international law" doesn't take into account the threat posed by "nuclear annihilation." It seems he forgot about the Cold War.

Apart from the alleged biases of the U.N., Dershowitz defends Israel's unilateral right to prevent its neighbors from acquiring nuclear weapons apparently on the ground that conventional nuclear deterrence strategy is anchored in the mutually implied threat of inflicting massive civilian casualties. However Israel's neighbors know, according to him, that it would never indiscriminately target civilian population centers. Lest there be any doubt on this score he quotes former Prime Minister Begin, "That is our morality." As Lebanese civilians witnessed for themselves in 1982, and have witnessed again in 2006 from the "most moral army in the world" (Prime Minister Olmert).

The indefeasible right of Israel to wage war as it pleases would seem to grant it very broad license: if there's just "five percent likelihood" that Israel might face a compelling threat in "ten years," according to Dershowitz, it has the right to attack now, and apparently regardless of whether this potential threat emanates from a currently friendly state. This would seem to mean that no place in the world is safe from an Israeli

attack at any moment. In Dershowitz's mind, this is the essence of a realistic and moral jurisprudence on war.

\* \* \*

Since the outbreak of hostilities between Israel and Lebanon in July 2006, Dershowitz has used the war on terrorism to target yet another branch of international law, the protection of civilians during armed conflict. Before analyzing his allegations, it is necessary to look first at the factual picture.

In early August Human Rights Watch (HRW) released a comprehensive report devoted mainly to Israel's violations of the laws of war during the first two weeks of the conflict. Its main findings were these: over 500 Lebanese had been killed, overwhelmingly civilians, and up to 5,000 homes damaged or destroyed; "in dozens of attacks, Israeli forces struck an area with no apparent military target"; Israel attacked "both individual vehicles and entire convoys of civilians who heeded the Israeli warnings to abandon their villages" as well as "humanitarian convoys and ambulances" that were "clearly marked," while none "of the attacks on vehicles resulted in Hezbollah casualties or the destruction of weapons"; "in some cases Israeli forces deliberately targeted civilians"; "no cases [were found] in which Hezbollah deliberately used civilians as shields to protect them from retaliatory IDF attack"; "on some limited occasions, Hezbollah fighters have attempted to store weapons near civilian homes and have fired rockets from areas where civilians live." The "pattern of attacks during the Israeli offensive," HRW concluded, "indicate[s] the commission of war crimes."

Contrariwise, Dershowitz has repeatedly alleged in numerous op-ed pieces that Israel typically takes "extraordinary steps to minimize civilian casualties," while Hezbollah's typical tactics were to "live among civilians, hide their missiles in the homes of civilians, fire them at civilian targets from densely populated areas, and then use civilians as human shields against counterattacks." He adduces no evidence to substantiate these claims, all of which are flatly contradicted by HRW's findings. In addition, Dershowitz juxtaposes the "indisputable reality" that "Israel uses pinpoint intelligence and smart bombs in an effort to target the terrorists" against Hezbollah which "targets Israeli population centers with anti-personnel bombs that spray thousands of pellets of shrapnel in an effort to maximize casualties." Yet, HRW has documented Israel's use in populated areas of artillery-fired cluster munitions with a "wide dispersal pattern" that "makes it very difficult to avoid civilian casualties" and a "high failure rate" such that they "injure and kill civilians even after the attack is over." Finally, Dershowitz deplores not only the actions of Hezbollah but also of "the U.N. peacekeepers on the Lebanese border [who] have turned out to be collaborators with Hezbollah." Shouldn't he get some credit for a job well done after Israel killed four of these "collaborators" in a deliberate attack on a U.N. compound?

The "new kind of warfare" in the "age of terrorism," according to Dershowitz, underscores the "absurdity and counterproductive nature of current international law." He claims, for example, that this body of law "fails" to address contingencies such as the firing of missiles "from civilian population centers." International law "must be changed," he intones, and "it must become a war crime to fire rockets from civilian population centers and then hide among civilians," while those using human shields should incur full and exclusive responsibility for "foreseeable" deaths in the event of an attack. Yet, such a scenario is hardly new and the law has hardly been silent on it: use of civilians as a shield from attack is a war crime, but it is also a war crime to disregard totally the presence of civilians even if they are being used as a shield. Dershowitz further declares that "it should, of course, already be a war crime for terrorists to target civilians from anywhere." It of course already is a war crime. He alleges, however, that "you wouldn't know it by listening to statements from some U.N. leaders and 'human rights' groups." Isn't his real beef, however, that they don't only denounce the targeting of civilians by "terrorists" but the targeting of civilians by states as well?

International law, Dershowitz alleges, is based on "old rules - written when uniformed armies fought other uniformed armies on a battlefield far away from cities" -

whereas nowadays "well-armed terrorist armies" like Hezbollah "don't belong to regular armies and easily blend into civilian populations" that "recruit, finance, harbor and facilitate their terrorism." But these conditions are scarcely novel. In his writings Dershowitz often cites Michael Walzer's 1977 study *Just and Unjust Wars*. He surely knows, then, that Walzer devotes the chapter on guerrilla war to these issues. Consider this passage:

If you want to fight against us, the guerrillas say, you are going to have to fight civilians for you are not at war with an army, but with a nation. In fact, the guerrillas mobilize only a small part of the nation. They depend upon the counter-attacks of their enemies to mobilize the rest. Their strategy is framed in terms of the war convention: they seek to place the onus of indiscriminate warfare on the opposing army. Now, every army depends upon the civilian population of its home country for supplies, recruits, and political support. But this dependence is usually indirect, mediated by the bureaucratic apparatus of the state or the exchange system of the economy.... But in guerrilla war, the dependence is immediate: the farmer hands the food to the guerrilla. Similarly, an ordinary citizen may vote for a political party that in turn supports the war effort and whose leaders are called in for military briefings. But in guerrilla war, the support a civilian provides is far more direct. He doesn't need to be briefed; he already knows the most important secret: he knows who the guerrillas are. The people, or some of them, are complicitous in guerrilla war, and the war would be impossible without their complicity. [G]uerrilla war makes for enforced intimacies, and the people are drawn into it in a new way even though the services they provide are nothing more than functional equivalents of the services civilians have always provided for soldiers.

If the questions Dershowitz poses are not original, it must be said that his answers are, at any rate coming from someone who claims to be a liberal. He writes, for instance, that "the Israeli army has given well-publicized notice to civilians to leave those areas of southern Lebanon that have been turned into war zones. Those who voluntarily remain behind have become complicit." In fact, Walzer ponders precisely this scenario in the context of the Vietnam war where, according to the rules of engagement, "civilians were to be given warning in advance of the destruction of their villages, so that they could break with the guerrillas, expel them, or leave themselves. Any village known to be hostile could be bombed or shelled if its inhabitants were warned in advance, either by the dropping of leaflets or by helicopter loudspeaker." In Walzer's judgment such rules "could hardly be defended" in view of the massive devastation wrought. In the event that "civilians, duly warned, not only refuse to expel the guerrillas but also refuse to leave themselves," Walzer goes on to stress,

so long as they give only political support, they are not legitimate targets, either as a group or as distinguishable individuals. So far as combat goes, these people cannot be shot on sight, when no firefight is in progress; nor can their villages be attacked merely because they might be used as firebases or because it is expected that they will be used; nor can they be randomly bombed and shelled, even after warning has been given.

To be sure, Walzer wrote this in the context of Vietnam. Like Dershowitz, he became a born-again Zionist after the June 1967 war and accordingly has applied an altogether different standard to Israel. Whereas Dershowitz plays the tough Jew, Walzer's assigned role has been to stamp as kosher every war Israel wages, but only after anxious sighs. Thus, while HRW was deploring Israel's war crimes, Walzer opined on cue that "from a moral perspective, Israel has mostly been fighting legitimately," and that if Israeli commanders ever faced an international tribunal, "the defense lawyers will have a good case," mainly because Hezbollah has used civilians as human shields - even if in the real world they haven't.

Dershowitz purports to make the case that the laws of war need to be revised in the "new" age of terrorism. In fact, his real concern is an old one. A standard tactic of Israel in its armed hostilities with Arab neighbors has been to inflict massive, indiscriminate civilian casualties, and Dershowitz's standard defense has been to deny it. But the credibility of human rights organizations that have documented these war crimes is rather higher than that of this notorious serial prevaricator, which is why he so loathes them. Dershowitz now uses the war on terror as a pretext to strip civilians of any

protections in time of war, dragging the law down to put it on level with Israel's criminal practices.

The main target of his "reassessment of the laws of war" has been the fundamental distinction between civilians and combatants. Ridiculing what he deems the "increasingly meaningless word 'civilian'" and asserting that, in the case of terrorist organizations like Hezbollah, "'civilianity' is often a matter of degree, rather than a bright line," Dershowitz proposes to replace the civilian-combatant dichotomy with a "continuum of civilianity":

Near the most civilian end of this continuum are the pure innocents - babies, hostages and others completely uninvolved; at the more combatant end are civilians who willingly harbor terrorists, provide material resources and serve as human shields; in the middle are those who support the terrorists politically, or spiritually.

He imagines that this revision wouldn't apply to Israel because "the line between Israeli soldiers and civilians is relatively clear." But is this true? Israel has a civilian army, which means a mere call-up slip or phone call separates each adult Israeli male from a combatant. Israeli civilians willingly provide material resources to the army. To judge by its targeting of Lebanese power grids, factories, roads, bridges, trucks, vans, ambulances, airports, and seaports, Israel must reckon all civilian infrastructure legitimate military targets, in which case all Israelis residing in the vicinity of such Israeli infrastructure constitute human shields. Israel's recent brutal assault on Lebanon, like its past wars during which massive war crimes were committed, has enjoyed overwhelming political and spiritual support from the population. "If the media were to adopt the 'continuum' he has proposed, Dershowitz reflects, "it would be informative to learn how many of the 'civilian casualties' fall closer to the line of complicity and how many fall closer to the line of innocence." It would seem, however, that on his spectrum nearly every Israeli would be complicitous.

In light of the revisions Dershowitz enters in international law, his reasoning begins to verge on the bizarre. He asserts that inasmuch as the Lebanese population overwhelmingly "supports Hezbollah," there are no real civilians or civilian casualties in Lebanon: "It is virtually impossible to distinguish the Hezbollah dead from the truly civilian dead, just as it is virtually impossible to distinguish the Hezbollah living from the civilian living." If this be the case, however, it is hard to make out the meaning of Dershowitz's praise of Israel for only targeting Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon. Didn't he just say that all of the Lebanese are Hezbollah? Similarly he condemns Hezbollah for targeting Israeli civilians. But Israelis are no less supportive of the IDF than Lebanese are of Hezbollah. Doesn't this mean that Hezbollah can't be targeting civilians in Israel because there aren't any? These are of course quibbles next to the fact that Dershowitz has now sanctioned mass murder of the Lebanese people.

It remains to consider Dershowitz's own location on the continuum of civilianity. Israel could not have waged any of its wars of aggression or committed any of its war crimes without the blanket political and military support of the United States. Using his academic pedigree Dershowitz has played a conspicuous, crucial and entirely voluntary public role in rallying such support. He has for decades grossly falsified Israel's human rights record. He has urged the use of collective punishment such as the "automatic destruction" of a Palestinian village after each Palestinian attack. He has covered up Israel's use of torture on Palestinian detainees, and himself advocated the application of "excruciating" torture on suspected terrorists such as a "needle being shoved under the fingernails." He has aligned himself with the Israeli government against courageous Israeli pilots refusing the immorality of targeted assassinations. He has denounced nonviolent resisters to the Israeli occupation as "supporters of Palestinian terrorism." He has dismissed ethnic cleansing as a "fifth-rate issue" akin to "massive urban renewal." He has advised Israel's senior government officials that Israel is not bound by international law. He has now sanctioned the extermination of the Lebanese people.

Finally, in Preemption he boasts of having vicariously participated in a targeted assassination while visiting Israel:

I watched as a high-intensity television camera, mounted on a drone, zeroed in on the apartment of a terrorist ... I watched as the camera focused on the house and the

nearly empty streets.

It seems, however, that this moral pervert missed the climactic scene of his little peep show, although it isn't reported whether he got his quarter back: "I was permitted to watch for only a few minutes, and no action was taken while I was watching because the target remained in the house." One wonders whether Dershowitz carefully inserted these weasel words because, as he well knows, targeted assassinations constitute war crimes, and he might otherwise be charged as an accessory to one.

In Preemption Dershowitz observes that "there can be no question that some kinds of expression contribute significantly to some kinds of evil." In this context he recalls that the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda handed down life sentences to Hutu radio broadcasters for inciting listeners to "hatred and murders." He also recalls the highly pertinent case of Nazi propagandist Julius Streicher, who was described by writer Rebecca West as "a dirty old man of the sort that gives trouble in parks," and by Nuremberg prosecutor Telford Taylor as "neither attractive nor bright." Although Hitler had stripped this self-styled Zionist and expert on Jews of all his political power by 1940, and his pornographic newspaper *Der Stuermer* had a circulation of only some 15,000 during the war, the International Tribunal at Nuremberg nonetheless sentenced Streicher to death for his murderous incitement.

On his continuum of civilianity Dershowitz appears to fall in the proximity of the Hutu radio broadcasters and Streicher - less direct in his appeal, more influential in his reach. It is highly unlikely, however, that he will ever be brought before a tribunal for his criminal incitement. But there is yet another possibility for achieving justice. Dershowitz is a strong advocate of targeted assassinations when "reasonable alternatives" such as arrest and capture aren't available. The conclusion seems clear -- if, and only if, -- one uses his standard and his reasoning. Of course, the preponderance of humanity, this writer [and CounterPunch, Eds.,] included, does not think this way. After all the hard-won gains of civilization, who would want to live in a world that once again legally sanctioned torture, collective punishment, assassinations and mass murder? As Dershowitz descends into barbarism, it remains a hopeful sign that few seem inclined to join him.

Norman Finkelstein's most recent book is *Beyond Chutzpah: On the misuse of anti-Semitism and the abuse of history* (University of California Press). His web site is [www.NormanFinkelstein.com](http://www.NormanFinkelstein.com).  
<http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=107&ItemID=10759>

SHUTZPAH

## Jew Blackmails Chavez

President Hugo Chavez  
Caracas, Venezuela

Your Excellency,

You are on the brink of defining the Bolivarian Revolution that you aspire to lead across Latin America. Whether you like it or not, the way in which you deal with your country's small Jewish minority will ultimately define your place in history. Will you be recorded as a complex and controversial personality, perhaps even a genuine statesman - or as a crude mimic of one of the 21st century's worst tyrants and Holocaust deniers, one branded by the entire civilized world as the most powerful and dangerous spokesman of rogue regimes?

History has proven that no society can flourish in which the Jew feels unease.

You may think that you can separate Jews from Israel. Others have tried. But as you will soon learn, you cannot. The courageous Jews of Venezuela, Venezuelan patriots whose support for Israel, both in word and deed, is unwavering, have proven that. Take heed. If you think you can maintain a friendship with rocket rattlers and the bankrollers

of international terrorism - and also receive support, or even acceptance in the family of civilized nations, you are mistaken.

But at the end of the day, the choice is yours.

Shalom,

Dr. Israel Singer, Chairman of the Policy Council of the World Jewish Congress.

*La Voz de Aztlan*

Website: <http://www.aztlan.net>

UNBELIEVABLE ZIONIST CONSPIRACY

## THE ROLE OF ZIONISM IN THE HOLOCAUST

*Article by Rabbi Gedalya Liebermann – Australia*

### **"Spiritually and Physically Responsible "**

From its' inception, many rabbis warned of the potential dangers of Zionism and openly declared that all Jews loyal to G-d should stay away from it like one would from fire. They made their opinions clear to their congregants and to the general public. Their message was that Zionism is a chauvinistic racist phenomenon which has absolutely naught to do with Judaism. They publicly expressed that Zionism would definitely be detrimental to the well being of Jews and Gentiles and that its effects on the Jewish religion would be nothing other than destructive. Further, it would taint the reputation of Jewry as a whole and would cause utter confusion in the Jewish and non-Jewish communities. Judaism is a religion. Judaism is not a race or a nationality. That was and still remains the consensus amongst the rabbis.

We were given the Holy Land by G-d in order to be able to study and practice the Torah without disturbance and to attain levels of holiness difficult to attain outside of the Holy Land. We abused the privilege and we were expelled. That is exactly what all Jews say in their prayers on every Jewish festival, "Umipnay chatoenu golinu mayartsaynu" - "Because of our sins we were expelled from our land". We have been forsworn by G-d "not to enter the Holy Land as a body before the predestined time", "not to rebel against the nations", to be loyal citizens, not to do anything against the will of any nation or its honour, not to seek vengeance, discord, restitution or compensation; "not to leave exile ahead of time." On the contrary; we have to be humble and accept the yoke of exile. To violate the oaths would result in "your flesh will be made prey as the deer and the antelope in the forest," and the redemption will be delayed.

(Talmud Tractate Ksubos p. 111a).

To violate the oaths is not only a sin, it is a heresy because it is against the fundamentals of our Belief. Only through complete repentance will the Almighty alone, without any human effort or intervention, redeem us from exile. This will be after G-d will send the prophet Elijah and Moshiach who will induce all Jews to complete repentance. At that time there will be universal peace.

### **THE UNHEEDED CRY**

Read the gripping story of Rabbi Weissmandl, valiant holocaust leader who battled both Allied indifference and Nazi hatred. (Available in our Bookstore) All of the leading Jewish religious authorities of that era predicted great hardship to befall humanity generally and the Jewish People particularly, as a result of Zionism. To be a Jew means that either one is born to a Jewish mother or converts to the religion with the condition that he or she make no reservations with regard to Jewish Law. Unfortunately there are many Jews who have no inkling whatsoever as to the duties of a Jew. Many of them are not to blame, for in many cases they lacked a Jewish education and upbringing. But there are those who deliberately distort the teachings of our tradition to suit their personal needs. It is self understood that not just anyone has the right or the ability to make a decision regarding the philosophy or law of a religion. Especially matters in which that person has no qualification. It follows then that those individuals who "decided" that Judaism is a nationality are to be ignored and even criticized. It is no secret that the founders of Zionism had never studied Jewish Law nor did they express interest in our holy tradition. They openly defied Rabbinical authority and self-appointed themselves as leaders of the Jewish "nation". In Jewish history, actions like those have always spelled disaster. To be a Jew and show open defiance of authority or to introduce "amendment" or "innovation" without first consulting with those officially appointed as Jewish spiritual leaders is the ideal equation to equal catastrophe. One can not just decide to "modernize" ancient traditions or regulations. The spiritual leaders of contemporary Judaism better known as Orthodox rabbis have



received ordination to judge and interpret matters pertaining to the Jewish faith. These rabbis have received their rights and responsibilities and form a link in the unbroken chain of the Jewish tradition dating all the way back to Moses who received the Torah from Almighty G-d Himself. It was these very rabbis who, at the time of the formation of the Zionist movement, foresaw the pernicious outcome that was without a doubt lined up. It was a man possessing outstanding Judaic genius, and a level of uncontested holiness who enunciated the Jewish stance regarding Zionism.

### Grand Rebbe Teitelbaum

This charismatic individual, the Rebbe of Satmar, Grand Rabbi Joel Teitelbaum, did not mince any words. Straight to the point he called Zionism "the work of Satan", "a sacrilege" and "a blasphemy". He forbade any participation with anything even remotely associated with Zionism and said that Zionism was bound to call the wrath of G-d upon His people. He maintained this stance with unwavering bravery from the onset of Zionism whilst he was still in Hungary up until his death in New York where he lead a congregation numbering in the hundreds of thousands. Grand Rabbi Teitelbaum, scion to a legacy of holy mystics and Hassidic Masters unfortunately had his prediction fulfilled. We lost more than six million of our brothers, sisters, sons and daughters in a very horrible manner. This, more than six million holy people had to experience as punishment for the Zionist stupidity. The Holocaust, he wept, was a direct result of Zionism, a punishment from G-d.

IT IS COMMON KNOWLEDGE THAT ALL THE SAGES AND SAINTS IN EUROPE AT THE TIME OF HITLER'S RISE DECLARED THAT HE WAS A MESSENGER OF DIVINE WRATH, SENT TO CHASTEN THE JEWS BECAUSE OF THE BITTER APOSTASY OF ZIONISM AGAINST THE BELIEF IN THE EVENTUAL MESSIANIC REDEMPTION.

But it doesn't end there. It wasn't enough for the Zionist leaders to have aroused the wrath of G-d. They made a point of displaying abysmal contempt for their Jewish brothers and sisters by actively participating in their extermination. Just the idea alone of Zionism, which the rabbis had informed them would cause havoc, was not enough for them. They made an effort to pour fuel on an already burning flame. They had to incite the Angel of Death, Adolf Hitler. They took the liberty of telling the world that they represented World Jewry. Who appointed these individuals as leaders of the Jewish People?? It is no secret that these so-called "leaders" were ignoramuses when it came to Judaism. Atheists and racists too. These are the "statesmen" who organized the irresponsible boycott against Germany in 1933. This boycott hurt Germany like a fly attacking an elephant - but it brought calamity upon the Jews of Europe. At a time when America and England were at peace with the mad-dog Hitler, the Zionist "statesmen" forsook the only plausible method of political amenability; and with their boycott incensed the leader of Germany to a frenzy. Genocide began, but these people, if they can really be classified as members of the human race, sat back. "No Shame"

President Roosevelt convened the Evian conference July 6-15 1938, to deal with the Jewish refugee problem. The Jewish Agency delegation headed by Golda Meir (Meirson) ignored a German offer to allow Jews to emigrate to other countries for \$250 a head, and the Zionists made no effort to influence the United States and the 32 other countries attending the conference to allow immigration of German and Austrian Jews. [Source]

On Feb 1, 1940 Henry Montor executive vice-President of the United Jewish Appeal refused to intervene for a shipload of Jewish refugees stranded on the Danube river, stating that "Palestine cannot be flooded with... old people or with undesirables." [Source]

Read "[The Millions That Could Have Been Saved](#)" by I.Domb

It is an historical fact that in 1941 and again in 1942, the German Gestapo offered all European Jews transit to Spain, if they would relinquish all their property in Germany and Occupied France; on condition that: a) none of the deportees travel from Spain to Palestine; and b) all the deportees be transported from Spain to the USA or British colonies, and there to remain; with entry visas to be arranged by the Jews living there; and c) \$1000.00 ransom for each family to be furnished by the Agency, payable upon the arrival of the family at the Spanish border at the rate of 1000 families daily. The Zionist leaders in Switzerland and Turkey received this offer with the clear understanding that the exclusion of Palestine as a destination for the deportees was based on an agreement between the Gestapo and the Mufti. The answer of the Zionist leaders was negative, with the following comments: a) ONLY Palestine would be considered as a destination for the deportees. b) The European Jews must accede to suffering and death greater in measure than the other nations, in order that the victorious allies agree to a "Jewish State" at the end of the war. c) No ransom will be paid This response to the Gestapo's offer was made with the full knowledge that the alternative to this offer was the gas chamber. **These treacherous Zionist leaders betrayed their own flesh and blood. Zionism was never an option for Jewish salvation. Quite the opposite, it was a formula for human beings to be used as pawns for the power trip of several desperadoes. A perfidy! A betrayal beyond description!**

In 1944, at the time of the Hungarian deportations, a similar offer was made, whereby all Hungarian Jewry could be saved. The same Zionist hierarchy again refused this offer (after the gas chambers had already taken a toll of millions). The British government granted visas to 300 rabbis and their families to the

Colony of Mauritius, with passage for the evacuees through Turkey. The "Jewish Agency" leaders sabotaged this plan with the observation that the plan was disloyal to Palestine, and the 300 rabbis and their families should be gassed. On December 17, 1942 both houses of the British Parliament declared its readiness to find temporary refuge for endangered persons. The British Parliament proposed to evacuate 500,000 Jews from Europe, and resettle them in British colonies, as a part of diplomatic negotiations with Germany. This motion received within two weeks a total of 277 Parliamentary signatures. On Jan. 27, when the next steps were being pursued by over 100 M.P.'s and Lords, a spokesman for the Zionists announced that the Jews would oppose the motion because Palestine was omitted. [Source] On Feb. 16, 1943 Romania offered 70,000 Jewish refugees of the Trans-Dniestria to leave at the cost of \$50 each. This was publicized in the New York papers. Yitzhak Greenbaum, Chairman of the Rescue Committee of the Jewish Agency, addressing the Zionist Executive Council in Tel Aviv Feb. 18 1943 said, "when they asked me, "couldn't you give money out of the United Jewish Appeal funds for the rescue of Jews in Europe, I said NO! and I say again, NO!...one should resist this wave which pushes the Zionist activities to secondary importance." On Feb. 24, 1943 Stephen Wise, President of the American Jewish Congress and leader of the American Zionists issued a public refusal to this offer and declared no collection of funds would seem justified. In 1944, the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People called upon the American government to establish a War Refugee Board. Stephen Wise testifying before a special committee of Congress objected to this proposal. [Source] During the course of the negotiations mentioned above, Chaim Weizman, the first "Jewish statesman" stated: "The most valuable part of the Jewish nation is already in Palestine, and those Jews living outside Palestine are not too important". Weizman's cohort, Greenbaum, amplified this statement with the observation "One cow in Palestine is worth more than all the Jews in Europe".

And then, after the bitterest episode in Jewish history, these Zionist "statesmen" lured the broken refugees in the DP camps to remain in hunger and deprivation, and to refuse relocation to any place but Palestine; only for the purpose of building their State. In 1947 Congressman William Stration sponsored a bill to immediately grant entry to the United States of 400,000 displaced persons. The bill was not passed after it was publicly denounced by the Zionist leadership. [Source]

These facts are read with consternation and unbearable shame. How can it be explained that at a time during the last phase of the war, when the Nazis were willing to barter Jews for money, partly because of their desires to establish contact with the Western powers which, they believed, were under Jewish influence, how was it possible one asks that the self-proclaimed "Jewish leaders" did not move heaven and earth to save the last remnant of their brothers?

On Feb. 23, 1956 the Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, Minister for Immigration was asked in the Canadian House of Commons "would he open the doors of Canada to Jewish refugees". He replied "the government has made no progress in that direction because the government of Israel....does not wish us to do so". [Source]

In 1972, the Zionist leadership successfully opposed an effort in the United States Congress to allow 20,000-30,000 Russian refugees to enter the United States. Jewish relief organizations, Joint and HIAS, were being pressured to abandon these refugees in Vienna, Rome and other European cities. [Source]

The pattern is clear!!! Humanitarian rescue efforts are subverted to narrow Zionist interests. There were many more shocking crimes committed by these abject degenerates known as "Jewish statesmen", we could list many more example, but for the time being let anyone produce a valid excuse for the above facts. Zionist responsibility for the Holocaust is threefold.

1. The Holocaust was a punishment for disrespecting [The Three Oaths](#) (see Talmud, Tractate Kesubos p. 111a).
2. Zionist leaders openly withheld support, both financially and otherwise, to save their fellow brothers and sisters from a cruel death.
3. The leaders of the Zionist movement cooperated with Hitler and his cohorts on many occasions and in many ways.

### **Zionists Offer a Military Alliance with Hitler**

It would be wishful thinking if it could be stated that the leaders of the Zionist movement sat back and ignored the plight of their dying brothers and sisters. Not only did they publicly refuse to assist in their rescue, but they actively participated with Hitler and the Nazi regime. Early in 1935, a passenger ship bound for Haifa in Palestine left the German port of Bremerhaven. Its stern bore the Hebrew letter for its name, "Tel Aviv", while a swastika banner fluttered from the mast. And although the ship was Zionist owned, its captain was a National Socialist Party (Nazi) member. Many years later a traveler aboard the ship recalled this symbolic combination as a "metaphysical absurdity". Absurd or not, this is but one vignette from a little-known chapter of history: The wide ranging collaboration between Zionism and Hitler's Third Reich. In early January 1941 a small but important Zionist organization submitted a formal proposal to German diplomats in Beirut for a military-political alliance with wartime Germany. The offer was made by the radical underground "Fighters for the Freedom of Israel", better known as the Lehi or Stern Gang. Its leader, Avraham Stern, had recently broken with the radical nationalist "National Military Organization" (Irgun Zvai Leumi - Etzel) over the group's attitude toward Britain, which had effectively banned further

Jewish settlement of Palestine. Stern regarded Britain as the main enemy of Zionism .

This remarkable proposal "for the solution of the Jewish question in Europe and the active participation on the NMO [Lehi] in the war on the side of Germany" is worth quoting at some length: "The NMO which is very familiar with the goodwill of the German Reich government and its officials towards Zionist activities within Germany and the Zionist emigration program takes the view that: 1.Common interests can exist between a European New Order based on the German concept and the true national aspirations of the Jewish people as embodied by the NMO. 2.Cooperation is possible between the New Germany and a renewed, folkish-national Jewry. 3.The establishment of the Jewish state on a national and totalitarian basis, and bound by treaty, with the German Reich, would be in the interest of maintaining and strengthening the future German position of power in the Near East. "On the basis of these considerations, and upon the condition that the German Reich government recognize the national aspirations of the Israel Freedom Movement mentioned above, the NMO in Palestine offers to actively take part in the war on the side of Germany.

"This offer by the NMO could include military, political and informational activity within Palestine and, after certain organizational measures, outside as well. Along with this the "Jewish" men of Europe would be militarily trained and organized in military units under the leadership and command of the NMO. They would take part in combat operations for the purpose of conquering Palestine, should such a front be formed. **The Israelis and the Holocaust**

"The indirect participation of the Israel Freedom Movement in the New Order of Europe, already in the preparatory stage, combined with a positive-radical solution of the European-Jewish problem on the basis of the national aspirations of the Jewish people mentioned above, would greatly strengthen the moral foundation of the New Order in the eyes of all humanity.

"The cooperation of the Israel Freedom Movement would also be consistent with a recent speech by the German Reich Chancellor, in which Hitler stressed that he would utilize any combination and coalition in order to isolate and defeat England". (Original document in German Auswertiges Amt Archiv, Bestand 47-59, E224152 and E234155-58. Complete original text published in: David Yisraeli, *The Palestinian Problem in German Politics 1889-1945* (Israel: 1947) pp. 315-317). On the basis of their similar ideologies about ethnicity and nationhood, National Socialists and Zionists worked together for what each group believed was in its own national interests. This is just one example of the Zionist movements' collaboration with Hitler for the purpose of possibly receiving jurisdiction over a minute piece of earth, Palestine. And to top it all up, brainwashing!

How far this unbelievable Zionist conspiracy has captured the Jewish masses, and how impossible it is for any different thought to penetrate their minds, even to the point of mere evaluation, can be seen in the vehemence of the reaction to any reproach. With blinded eyes and closed ears, any voice raised in protest and accusation is immediately suppressed and deafened by the thousandfold cry: "Traitor," "Enemy of the Jewish People."

Source for paragraphs marked "[Source]": *The Wall Street Journal* December 2, 1976  
The data presented on this page was prepared by AJAZ.

[www.jewsagainstzionism.com/antisemitism/holocaust/gedalyaliebermann.cfm](http://www.jewsagainstzionism.com/antisemitism/holocaust/gedalyaliebermann.cfm)

## REMEMBRANCE

Whatever you may think about revisionism and revisionists you'll be hard pressed not to thrill to the story of MacKenzie Paine. MacKenzie Paine was the 'nom de guerre' of Audre Pinque - revisionist and Palestinian solidarity internet activist *extraordinaire*.

Audre died in a terrible car accident at six-thirty in the evening on March 12, 2002, in Alabama,USA. With her death, Palestinians, Arabs, Muslims, and the supporters of freedom and justice worldwide lost a vehement supporter and a tireless activist.

One of her last earthly communications was an email to Palestinian revisionist Dr. Ibrahim Alloush. It ended with the words

*"If I fly into Amman can you meet me and point me in the right direction to Palestine?Audre*

Some last words eh?

And as Dr. Alloush, put it in his goodbye: *To her brave, dynamic, and friendly soul, I hereby bid a thousand Palestinian Arab salutes on the behalf of all those who knew and appreciated her.*

Audre's internet sign-off line was as follows: *MacKenzie Paine battles intolerance disguised*

*as tolerance from a dusty hilltop in Mexico.*

Paul Eisen

## At the Tolerance Museum

Audré Pinque (aka MacKenzie Paine)

Teaching tolerance through "Holocaust education" in the public schools is now the law in cities, counties, and states across America. As revisionists are well aware, the standard account of the Jewish Holocaust taught in such courses is more than dubious. So too are the controversial methods, including "role playing" and similar types of psychological manipulation. But does Holocaust education really promote tolerance?

I recently had the opportunity to answer that question for myself when I visited the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles. And, since it is our children who are now the chief targets of "Holocaust education," I took my own two sons with me to gauge the museum's impact, and their reactions.

Prior to our visit, I interviewed my sons on things the Museum of Tolerance regards as key issues for elementary school pupils. Their innocence was evident. They had no concept of Jewishness, were aware of no people or nation that was inherently evil, and knew of Hitler and the Nazis only what they had seen in Hollywood movies. They are both fifth-graders who attend a Catholic school in Mexico, and their outlook is entirely appropriate for their ages and life experience.

On a dreary Sunday morning in early March, we joined the long line for the Museum of Tolerance. Germar Rudolf, visiting town to discuss his role as an expert witness in David Irving's upcoming appeal, accompanied us. We waited, along with dozens of school groups, as each visitor was subjected to a security procedure more searching than any airport or border check I've ever experienced.

After a short explanation of how the tour would proceed, we were pointed toward two large doors. Above them, bright red neon signs designated one door "Not-Prejudiced," the other, "Prejudiced." On a nearby video, a rather sarcastic actor challenged the visitors to consider whether or not they were prejudiced. Then each of us was instructed to choose the door that matched our attitudes. As the already humbled mass ambled herd-like toward the "Prejudiced" portal, I opted to try the "Not-Prejudiced" door. It couldn't be opened -- it was fake. So began the brainwashing of yet another group of young Americans.

The first part of the tour is an emotional barrage of film clips and still photos showing racial strife, riots, and suffering Third World children. There may have been a European-American pictured without a Ku Klux Klan robe, but if there was I missed it. It hurt to see my sons viewing such violence and carnage, so I tried to rush them through as quickly as possible.

Then came the feature presentation, the Holocaust exhibit. The tour is self-guided, so there is no one to ask questions of, no one to challenge. The visitors simply go from one grayish display of mannequins and recorded "conversations" to another. All of them "explain" the political environment of 1930s Germany, without the least attempt at balance or accuracy. As Germar dryly commented after the causes of the Second World War had been neatly packed into a three-minute explanation, "They forgot to mention the Russian Revolution."

The third part of the tour is an emotional assault on the psyche. I watched my two sons gulp, their eyes wide, as they viewed the usual photographs of heaps of corpses and listened to recorded descriptions of diesel gassings, viewed photographs "ordinary" Germans said to have helped the Nazis shoot Jewish civilians, black and white films of people carrying all of their worldly belongings, and more. All of these images flash across multiple screens in a darkened room, and the students absorb them like sponges.

Then came the grand finale, a forty-five minute lecture from Elizabeth Mann, a self-professed Holocaust survivor, to a now traumatized roomful of students and teachers. At the end of her monologue I asked Mrs. Mann why she had told so many impressionable young people that

the Germans made soap out of Jewish corpses during the Second World War, when even the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum says that wasn't so. She responded that she disagreed with the USHMM. How's that? Differences of opinion are one thing, but arguing for a heinous accusation that has never been substantiated, and is dismissed by virtually all historians as false, is quite another. But this was lost on the students.

I next asked Mrs. Mann why she had told her audience that the "gas chamber" at Auschwitz was a dual-purpose shower room, which could be converted into a homicidal gas chamber with the flip of a switch. The lethal gas, she had told us, came out of the showerheads. When I pointed out that all the "orthodox" Holocaust literature on Auschwitz describes only rooms into which the poison was dropped -- in granules -- through windows or holes in the roof, the room erupted into hisses and boos. Mrs. Mann, saved by the booing, made no response.

Once outside the lecture hall, the students called me over to ask me how I could possibly question such a sweet, elderly woman who had suffered so much. They accused me of calling her a liar. I was happy to explain to them, as a mother to her children, that I hadn't accused Mrs. Mann of lying. I had simply questioned some of the things that she had said. I looked out into the group and could see fear in some of the faces, as if they were being confronted by a lunatic with a gun, and I beseeched them to visit the USHMM's Internet Web site and read for themselves what that museum's authorities say about the soap libel, and about gassing at Auschwitz. When one of the teenagers asked me how I knew that soap wasn't made at Auschwitz, Germar, identifying himself as a chemist, told them calmly that it would have been physically impossible to make soap out of human fat in the buildings at Auschwitz. There had been no facilities for such an undertaking.

With each of our responses the group became more unruly, sarcastic, and intolerant. Rather than ask responsible questions or make clear arguments, at last they resorted to taunting us, calling Germar a Nazi and telling us to "f\_\_\_ off." They frightened my sons, so we left, but not before they ended their outburst by chasing our van out of the underground parking lot. Their teacher was helpless to stop them, although she tried.

My sons and I learned a lesson at the Museum of Tolerance, a lesson about intolerance -- taxpayer-funded, state-sanctioned intolerance -- not merely of Germans and Christians and European-Americans, but also of intellectual curiosity and reasoned dissent. While I was able to "de-program" my sons with some healthy discussion and simple logic, I'm one of the fortunate few who have heard the revisionist side. If that angry mob of teenagers is indicative of the effect Holocaust studies have on our children, America risks schooling a generation in bigotry.

## COLLATERAL

### HOLOCAUST AND HOLODOMOR

*[Remark : At first, we thought this "holodomor" was a word coined to fit the "holocaust" in a Gothic competition organised at Hogwarts, the school of the famous Harry Potter. Looks like a hoax. But legitimate Slavic scholars assure us the word is normal and means "famine" in classical Russian. Redaction.]*

by Nicholas Lysson

One might think the worst holocaust deniers—at least the only ones who command serious attention—are those who insist the Nazi holocaust, *as it involved the Jews only*, was without parallel.

Guenter Lewy argues for example in *The Nazi Persecution of the Gypsies* (Oxford University Press, 2000) that while the Gypsies were gassed, shot and otherwise exterminated in great numbers, right alongside the Jews, they were not true victims of "the" Holocaust (capital "H") but only of something collateral. Lewy even suggests the Gypsies invited their own destruction with certain cultural traits—in particular, sharply divergent moral standards for dealing among their own and with outsiders.

But pre- or anti-Enlightenment Judaism is hardly a less ethnocentric or hostile moral system.

As Edward Gibbon correctly notes in *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, v. 1, ch. 15 (1776), "the wise, the humane Maimonides openly teaches [in *The Book of Torts*, 5:11] that, if an idolator fall into the water, a Jew ought not to save him from instant death." See also Rabbi Simeon ben Yohai's remarkable second-century exercise in *ejusdem generis*: "The best of the heathen merits death; the best of serpents should have its head crushed; and the most pious of women is prone to sorcery" (Yer. Kid. iv. 66c; Massek. Soferim xv. 10; comp. Mek., Beshallah, Wayehi, 1, and Tan., Wayera, 20, all as cited by [JewishEncyclopedia.com](http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com)). For "heathen" some translators write "*goyim*"; for "prone to sorcery" they write "a witch."

Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky, in *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel* (2d ed. 2004), write (pp. 150-51) that "the great majority of books on Judaism and Israel, published in English especially, falsify their subject matter [in part by omitting or obscuring such teachings]. . . The information freely available in Hebrew can and should be used to redress apologia by omissions in English." For a fuller discussion of the point, see Shahak, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*, esp. ch. 2 (1994), available online. As to Jews, Gypsies or anyone else, of course, ethnocentrism or even outright cultural hostility as a rationale for genocide is obscene.

A particularly relevant parallel to the Nazi holocaust is the Ukrainian *holodomor* of 1932-33, a state-created famine—not a crop failure—that killed an estimated five million people in the Ukraine, one million in the Caucasus, and one million elsewhere after the Soviet state confiscated the harvest at gunpoint. See Robert Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow*, esp. p. 306 (1986). See also Oksana Procyk, Leonid Heretz and James E. Mace, *Famine in the Soviet Ukraine, 1932-33* (Harvard University Press, 1986); Miron Dolot, *Execution by Hunger* (1985); and the Commission on the Ukrainian Famine, Report to Congress (1988). That report, at pp. 6-7, cites estimates of the number killed that range as high as 8 million in the Ukraine and 9 million overall.

Nikita Khrushchev, in *Khrushchev Remembers: The Final Testament*, p. 120 (1976), says "I can't give an exact figure because no one was keeping count. All we knew was that people were dying in enormous numbers."

In September 1933, Walter Duranty of the New York *Times*—who cultivated his relationship with Stalin, and is remembered today for his public denials that any such thing was happening—privately told fellow journalists Eugene Lyons (United Press) and Anne O'Hare McCormick (herself from the *Times*) that the death toll was 7 million, but that the dead were "only Russians." (*Sic*: mostly Ukrainians; and note the word "only.") See Lyons, *Assignment in Utopia*, pp. 579-80 (1937). Duranty's number is described in Lyons's book only as "the most startling I had. . . heard," but is revealed in Lyons's "Memo for Malcolm Muggeridge" (Dec. 9, 1937), quoted by Marco Carynnyk in "The New York Times and the Great Famine, Part III," available online.

Several days after giving the 7-million number to Lyons and McCormick, Duranty told the assembled staff at the British chancery in Moscow that the toll for the Soviet Union as a whole might be as high as 10 million. See the report of William Strang, the *charge d'affaires* (Sept. 26, 1933), quoted by Carynnyk in the text accompanying n. 46. The British government referred publicly to the ongoing situation as an "illegal famine." *Id.*, n. 46.

Duranty's 10-million number may have come from Stalin himself. It's reputedly the same number Stalin gave Churchill a decade later; see, e.g., Eric Margolis, "Remembering Ukraine's Unknown Holocaust," *Toronto Sun*, Dec. 13, 1998 (available online).

According to Arthur Koestler, *The Ghost in the Machine*, pp. 261-62 (1967):

In 1932-3, the years of the great famine which followed the forced collectivisation of the land, I travelled widely in the Soviet Union, writing a book which was never published. I saw entire villages deserted, railway stations blocked by crowds of begging families, and the proverbial starving infants. . . [T]hey were quite real, with stick-like arms, puffed up bellies and cadaverous heads. I reacted to the brutal impact of reality on illusion in a manner typical of the true believer. I was surprised and bewildered—but the elastic shock-absorbers of my [Communist] Party training began to operate at once. I had eyes to see, and a mind conditioned to explain away what they saw. This "inner censor" is more reliable and effective than any official censorship. . .

Some Ukrainian accounts, and that of Muggeridge, who covered the *holodomor* for the Manchester *Guardian*, take the trouble to say that this mass starvation was imposed in very substantial part by Jews. Lazar M. Kaganovich is often identified as an architect of the policy. In Muggeridge's novel *Winter in Moscow* (1934) Kaganovich appears as Kokoshkin, "a Jew" and "Stalin's chief lieutenant"—which is accurate on both counts.

In 2003 Levko Lukyanenko, the first Ukrainian ambassador to Canada, was said to have made an anti-Semitic embarrassment of himself on this subject. But see Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*,

p. 363 (2d ed. 1994) ("Jews were. . . disproportionately prominent among the Bolsheviks, notably in their leadership, among their tax- and grain-gathering officials, and especially in the despised and feared. . . secret police [emphasis added]"); and Arno J. Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?*, p. 60 (1988) ("As of the late twenties. . . [a] disproportionate number of Jews came to hold high posts in the [Soviet] secret police and to serve as political commissars in the armed services. They. . . were. . . appointed to high-level and conspicuous positions which called for unimpeachable political loyalty. . . "). Mayer, a professor emeritus of history at Princeton, is himself Jewish, and had to flee the Nazis as a refugee.

Jews among the Bolsheviks who imposed the *holodomor* would have relished settling scores after the 40 years of bloody pogroms that followed Czar Alexander II's assassination in 1881—especially the still-recent massacre of 50,000 to 100,000 Jews, mostly in the Ukraine, during the Russian civil war of 1918-21. (A vastly greater number of gentiles, of course, also perished in that war.) See Albert S. Lindemann, *Esau's Tears*, p. 442-43 (Cambridge University Press, 1997):

*In. . . the Ukraine, the Cheka leadership was overwhelmingly Jewish. . . .* George Leggett, the most recent and authoritative historian of the Russian secret police, speculates that the use of [non-Slavic ethnic minorities in the secret police] may have been a conscious policy, since such 'detached elements could be better trusted not to sympathise with the repressed local population.' *Of course, in the Ukrainian case that population had the reputation of being especially anti-Semitic, further diminishing the potential sympathies of Jewish Chekists in dealing with it.* [Citing Leggett, *The Cheka, Lenin's Political Police*, p. 263 (Oxford University Press, 1981).] . . . It is instructive that *the high percentage of Jews in the secret police continued well into the 1930s*, when the proportion of Jews gradually diminished in most other areas of the Soviet and party cadres.

. . . Cheka personnel regarded themselves as a class apart. . . with a power of life or death over lesser mortals. *Comparisons to the secret police in Nazi Germany have tempted many observers. . . . [T]he extent to which both. . . prided themselves in being. . . willing to carry out the most stomach-turning atrocities in the name of an ideal. . . is striking.* (Emphases added.)

Shahak, in *Three Thousand Years*, ch. 4, says Jewish "hatred and contempt" for peasants—"a hatred of which I know no parallel in other societies"—can be traced back to the great Ukrainian uprising of 1648-54, in which tens of thousands of "the accursed Jews" (to quote the Ukrainian leader Bohdan Khmelnytsky) were killed.

The Jews of that time served the Polish *szlachta* (nobility) and clergy on their Ukrainian latifundia as *arendars*—toll-, rent- and tax-farmers, enforcers of *corvee* obligations, licensees of feudal monopolies (e.g., on banking, milling, storekeeping, and distillation and sale of alcohol), and in general as anti-Christian scourges who even collected tithes at the doors of churches and exacted fees to open those doors for weddings, christenings and funerals. They had life and death powers over the local population, and no law above them to which that population had recourse. See, e.g., Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland*, v. 1, p. 444 (Oxford University Press, 1982); and Iwo Cyprian Pogonowski, *Jews in Poland*, pp. 68-79, 283 (1993).

Shahak (*Three Thousand Years*, ch. 4) says "the full weight of the Jewish religious laws against gentiles fell upon the peasants." As to the nature of those laws, see *id.*, ch. 5, esp. under the heading "Abuse." Subtelny (pp. 123-38) says, like Davies and Pogonowski, that the *arendars* leased estates for terms of only two or three years and had every incentive to wring the peasantry without regard to long-term consequences. According to Chaim Bermant, *The Jews*, p. 26 (1977):

. . . [I]f the nobility were. . . the ultimate exploiters, the Jews were the visible ones and aroused the most immediate hostility. Rabbis warned that Jews were sowing a terrible harvest of hatred, but while the revenues rolled in the warnings were ignored. Moreover, the rabbis themselves were beneficiaries of the system.

Indeed, according to Davies (p. 444) the oppressiveness of the Jews as *arendars* "provided the most important single cause of the terrible retribution that would descend on them on several occasions in the future." In 1986 the Stanford history department voted 12-11 against offering tenure to Davies, then a professor visiting from the University of London. Davies sued unsuccessfully for defamation, which suggests the tenor of the discussion. Davies is now a fellow of Wolfson College, Oxford. The queen awarded him a CMG in 2001.

Jewish tax-farming can be traced back to the earliest times, and has sometimes involved copious use of deadly force. See Flavius Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, bk. 12, ch. 4 (1<sup>st</sup> c.), available online (Syria stripped to its "bones" for Ptolemy III); and Elias Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age*, p. 120 (Harvard University Press 1988).

Moreover, *arendas* persisted long after 1654. See [JewishFamilyHistory.org/Grand](http://JewishFamilyHistory.org/Grand)

*Duchy of Lithuania. htm* ("During the 18th century, up to 80 percent of Jewish heads of households in rural areas [of what are now Lithuania, Belarus, Ukraine and parts of Poland] were *arendars*, that is, holders of an *arenda*"). Pogonowski, p. 72, describes the return of the Jews to the Ukraine after 1648-54.

Desire to escape that occupational history may have had something to do with the early Zionist movement's secularism, its longing for direct labor on the land, and its disparagement of introspection, and of intellectual and commercial occupations. Lenni Brenner discusses that in *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, ch. 2 (1983), available online. See also Yuri Slezkine, *The Jewish Century*, pp. 327-28 (Princeton University Press 2004).

Seventeenth- and 18<sup>th</sup>-century tribal antagonisms (and, as suggested above, some far older) were still very much alive at the time of the *holodomor*. Indeed they are alive even today, as demonstrated by the prominence recently given a series called "The Oligarchs" on Israeli television. Uri Avnery, in his essay "How the Virgin Became a Whore" (2004), available online, says of this series—which was most definitely not shown in the U.S.:

Some of its episodes are simply unbelievable—or would have been, if they had not come straight from the horses' mouths: the heroes of the story, who gleefully boast about their despicable exploits. The series was produced by Israeli immigrants from Russia.

\* \* \*

[The oligarchs] exploited the disintegration of the Soviet system to loot the treasures of the state and to amass plunder amounting to hundreds of billions of dollars. In order to safeguard the perpetuation of their business, they took control of the state. Six of the seven are Jews. . . . [Boris] Berezovsky boasts that he caused the war in Chechnya, in which tens of thousands have been killed and a whole country devastated. He was interested in the mineral resources and a prospective [oil] pipeline there.

. . . In the end there was a reaction: Vladimir Putin, the taciturn and tough ex-KGB operative, assumed power, took control of the media, put one of the oligarchs (Mikhail Khodorkovsky) in prison, [and] caused the others to flee (Berezovsky is in England, Vladimir Gusinsky is in Israel, [and] another, Mikhail Chernoy, is assumed to be hiding here [in Israel]).

The persistence of ancient antagonisms, down to this day, can also be seen in Chaim Nachman Bialik's poem, "My Father" (1932), which Shahak (*Three Thousand Years*, ch. 4, n. 9) says is taught in all Israeli schools. The poem depicts Bialik's "righteous and honest" father selling vodka to Slavic peasants "in a den of pigs like men" who "rolled in vomit" with "monstrous faces of corruption." Bialik adds the word "scorpions" for good measure. The poem nowhere acknowledges the common complaint that Jewish tavernkeepers encouraged alcoholism that produced revenue and made Slavs easier to control.

Moreover, I can find no English translation of "My Father" that antedates Atar Hadari's in 2000; the poem is absent from Bialik's *Complete Poetic Works*, published in English well after his death in 1934.

That takes us back to Shahak and Mezvinsky's point, above, about translations that falsify by omission. A related point: A search of the Library of Congress catalogue under the keyword "arenda" turns up 35 apparently relevant items, *not one of them in English*. By comparison, a search under the combination "slavery" and "United States" turns up 5,134. A search under "Ukrainian famine" turns up ten items. A search under "holocaust" turns up 10,000.

Yuri Slezkine's celebratory *The Jewish Century*, above, further confirms Shahak's point about Jewish hatred and contempt for peasants. See Kevin MacDonald's review of Slezkine, entitled "Stalin's Willing Executioners?", [www.vdare.com/misc/051105/macdonald\\_stalin.htm](http://www.vdare.com/misc/051105/macdonald_stalin.htm) (a much fuller version of which appears in the *Occidental Quarterly*, Fall 2005, also available online):

Lev Kopelev, a Jewish writer who witnessed and rationalized the Ukrainian famine in which millions died horrible deaths of starvation and disease as an "historical necessity," is quoted [on p. 230 as] saying "You mustn't give in to debilitating pity. We are the agents of historical necessity. We are fulfilling our revolutionary duty." On the next page, Slezkine describes the life of the largely Jewish elite in Moscow and Leningrad where they attended the theater, sent their children to the best schools, [and] had peasant women (whose families were often the victims of mass murder) for nannies. . . .

The phrase "Stalin's willing executioners"—with its echo of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen—is Slezkine's (p. 130). At pp. 183-84, translating from the Russian, Slezkine quotes Ia. A. Bromberg (1931)



on what Stalinism did to its Jewish servitors:

The convinced and unconditional opponent of the death penalty. . . , who could not, as it were, watch a chicken being killed, has been transformed outwardly into a leather-clad person with a revolver and [has], in fact, lost all human likeness. . . , standing in a Cheka basement doing "bloody but honorable revolutionary work."

The Nazis, too, regarded Slavic peasants with murderous contempt, but were also obsessed with "Judeobolshevism." It would be interesting to know what they made of the *holodomor*, which was still very much in progress when they came to power in 1933.

They surely knew about it. The German intelligence services, even on the unlikely assumption that they had no sources of their own, could hardly have missed the story in the British press as reported by Muggeridge, by former Prime Minister David Lloyd George's heroic protégé Gareth Jones, and by A.T. Cholerton of the *News-Telegraph* and the *Sunday Times*; in the American press as reported by Lyons, by Ralph Barnes of the New York *Herald-Tribune*, by W.H. Chamberlin of the *Christian Science Monitor*, by William Stoneman of the Chicago *Daily News*, by Harry Lang and Richard M. Sanger of the New York *Journal*, and by Adam J. Tawdul of the New York *American*; in the French press as reported by Suzanne Bertillon of *Le Matin*; and in the German press as reported by the liberal (and Jewish) Paul Scheffer of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, and by Otto Auhagen in the scholarly journal *Osteuropa*, VII (Aug. 1932). Even at that early date, Auhagen said peasants were reduced to eating the cadavers of horses, from which they acquired infectious diseases.

The Nazis could hardly have failed to notice, moreover, when Theodor Cardinal Innitzer of Vienna called in August 1933 for relief efforts, stating that the Ukrainian famine was claiming lives "likely. . . numbered. . . by the millions" and driving those still alive to cannibalism and infanticide. See, e.g., the New York *Times*, Aug. 20, 1933, reporting both Innitzer's charge and the official denial ("in the Soviet Union we have neither cannibals nor cardinals").

Other sources can be found by searching on the combination of "Innitzer" and "Ukraine" and "famine." Also, P.C. Hiebert and the Rev. Charles H. Hagus tried to organize relief efforts on behalf of the German Mennonite community. None of the proposed relief operations had any significant success.

Most likely, the lesson the Nazis drew was how safe, easy, even acceptable it was to murder whole populations. That was demonstrably Hitler's own conclusion about the early-20<sup>th</sup>-century Armenian genocide at the hands of the Turks ("Who speaks any more [of that]?")\* and the annihilation of the American Indians ("Treat them like redskins"). Likewise, the Zionist leader Vladimir Jabotinsky actually spoke of the "good name" Hitler himself had supposedly given to forced "mass migrations."

Just before his death in 1940, Jabotinsky justified "transferring" the Palestinian people out of their homes on the ground that "the world has become accustomed to the idea of mass migrations and has become fond of them. . . Hitler—as odious as he is to us—has given this idea a good name in the world." Tom Segev, *One Palestine, Complete*, p. 407 (2000); see generally Nur Masalha, *Expulsion of the Palestinians: The Concept of "Transfer" in Zionist Political Thought, 1882-1948* (1992). Twenty-one years after Jabotinsky's back-handed compliment to Hitler, Adolf Eichmann was put on trial in Israel. Two of the counts on which he was convicted alleged mass forcible expulsion of people—non-Jews at that—from their homes. Those counts (nos. 9 and 10) both carried the death penalty. Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, p. 245 (1963).

Israel is now concerned both to cultivate its relations with Turkey and to preserve the claim of Jewish exclusivity for "the" Holocaust (capital "H"). Accordingly it not only maintains a diplomatic silence about the Armenians but also lobbies against commemoration of their catastrophe in the U.S. See Larry Derfner in the *Jerusalem Post*, April 21, 2005 ("[O]n the subject of the Armenian genocide, Israel and some U.S. Jewish organizations, notably the American Jewish Committee, have for many years acted aggressively as silencers"); and Jon Wiener in the *Nation*, July 12, 1999 ("Lucy Dawidowicz, a leading Holocaust historian, argued that the Turks had 'a rational reason' for killing Armenians, unlike the Germans, who had no rational reason for killing Jews").

Note carefully Dawidowicz's "rational reason" for killing 1.5 million human beings, Kopelev's "historical necessity" and "revolutionary duty" to kill 7 (or perhaps even 10) million, and Koestler's "mind conditioned to explain away what [he] saw." Bernard Lewis, by the way, a Zionist professor at Princeton, actually has the distinction of having been convicted in a French court of "holocaust-denial" as to the Armenians. See Norman Finkelstein, *Beyond Chutzpah*, p. 59n (University of California Press, 2005).

The late David Roth, national ethnic liaison of the American Jewish Committee, once testified before Congress—in 1966, when Israel was describing itself as a bastion against Soviet influence in the

Middle East, rather than as a magnet drawing it in—that "it is outrageous to think that the death of 7 million Ukrainians is somehow less important than the death of 6 million Jews." We should, he said, "deny the Soviets the ultimate victory of our silence."

May 2006

\* This sentence is invented. There is no evidence Hitler uttered such a phrase. (aaargh)

<http://desip.igc.org/HolocaustAndHolodomor.html>

## MONEY THROWN AWAY

### Why It's Not Working in Afghanistan

By Ann Jones

[...]

But there's more to the story than that. To understand the failure -- and fraud -- of such reconstruction, you have to take a look at the peculiar system of American aid for international development. During the last five years, the U.S. and many other donor nations pledged billions of dollars to Afghanistan, yet Afghans keep asking: "Where did the money go?" American taxpayers should be asking the same question. The official answer is that donor funds are lost to Afghan corruption. But shady Afghans, accustomed to two-bit bribes, are learning how big-bucks corruption really works from the masters of the world.

A fact-packed report issued in June 2005 by Action Aid, a widely respected NGO, headquartered in Johannesburg, South Africa, makes sense of the workings of that world. The report studied development aid given by all countries globally and discovered that only a small part of it -- maybe 40% -- is real. The rest is "phantom" aid; that is, the money never actually shows up in recipient countries at all.

Some of it doesn't even exist except as an accounting item, as when countries count debt relief or the construction costs for a fancy new embassy in the aid column. A lot of it never leaves home. Paychecks for American "experts" under contract to USAID, for example, go directly from the Agency to their American banks without ever passing through the to-be-reconstructed country. Much aid money, the report concludes, is thrown away on "overpriced and ineffective Technical Assistance," such as those very hot-shot American experts. And a big chunk of it is carefully "tied" to the donor nation, which means that the recipient is obliged to use the donated money to buy products from the donor country, even when -- especially when -- the same goods are available cheaper at home.

The U.S. easily outstrips other nations at most of these scams, making it second only to France as the world's biggest purveyor of phantom aid. Fully 47% of American development aid is lavished on overpriced technical assistance. By comparison, only 4% of Sweden's aid budget and only 2% of Luxembourg's and Ireland's goes to such assistance. As for tying aid to the purchase of donor-made products, Sweden and Norway don't do it all; neither do Ireland and the United Kingdom. But 70% of American aid is contingent upon the recipient spending it on American stuff, especially American-made armaments. Considering all these practices, Action Aid calculates that 86 cents of every dollar of American aid is phantom aid.

According to targets set years ago by the UN and agreed to by almost every country in the world, a rich country should give 0.7% of its national income in annual aid to poor ones. So far, only the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg (with real aid at 0.65% of national income) even come close. At the other end of the scale, the U.S. spends a paltry 0.02% of national income on real aid, which works out to an annual contribution of \$8.00 from every citizen of "the wealthiest nation in the world." (By comparison, Swedes kick in \$193 per person, Norwegians \$304, and the citizens of Luxembourg \$357.) President Bush boasts of sending billions in aid to Afghanistan, but in fact we could do better by passing a hat.

The Bush administration often deliberately misrepresents its aid program for domestic consumption. Last year, for example, when the President sent his wife to Kabul for a few hours of photo ops, the *New York Times* reported that her mission was "to promise long-term commitment from the United States to education for women and children." Speaking in Kabul, Mrs. Bush pledged that the United States would give an additional \$17.7 million to support education in Afghanistan. As it happened, that grant had previously been announced -- and it was not for Afghan public education (or women and children) at all, but to establish a brand-new, private, for-profit American University of Afghanistan catering to the Afghan and international elite. (How a private university comes to be

supported by public taxpayer dollars and the Army Corps of Engineers is another peculiarity of Bush aid.)

Ashraf Ghani, the former finance minister of Afghanistan and president of Kabul University, complained, "You cannot support private education and ignore public education." But typically, having set up a government in Afghanistan, the U.S. stiffes it, preferring to channel aid money to private American contractors. Increasingly privatized, U.S. aid becomes just one more mechanism for transferring taxpayer dollars to the coffers of select American companies and the pockets of the already rich.

In 2001, Andrew Natsios, then head of USAID, cited foreign aid as "a key foreign policy instrument" designed to help other countries "become better markets for U.S. exports." To guarantee that mission, the State Department recently took over the formerly semi-autonomous aid agency. And since the aim of American aid is to make the world safe for American business, USAID now cuts in business from the start. It sends out requests for proposals to a short list of the usual suspects and awards contracts to those bidders currently in favor. (Election-time kickbacks influence the list of favorites.)

Sometimes it invites only one contractor to apply, the same efficient procedure that made Halliburton so notorious and profitable in Iraq. In many fields it "preselects vendors" by accepting bids every five years or so on an IQC -- that's an "Indefinite Quantities Contract." Contractors submit indefinite information about what they might be prepared to do in unspecified areas, should some more definite contract materialize; the winners become designated contractors who are invited to apply when the real thing comes along. USAID generates the real thing in the form of an RFP, a Request for Proposals, issued to the "pre-selected vendors" who then compete (or collaborate) to do -- in yet another country -- work dreamed up in Washington by theoreticians unencumbered by first hand knowledge of the hapless "target."

### **The Road to Taliban Land**

The criteria by which contractors are selected have little or nothing to do with conditions in the recipient country, and they are not exactly what you would call transparent. Take the case of the Kabul-Kandahar Highway, featured on the USAID website as a proud accomplishment. In five years, it's also the only accomplishment in highway building -- which makes it one better than the Bush administration record in building power stations, water systems, sewer systems, or dams.

The highway was featured in the *Kabul Weekly* newspaper in March 2005 under the headline, "Millions Wasted on Second-Rate Roads." Afghan journalist Mirwais Harooni reported that even though other international companies had been ready to rebuild the highway for \$250,000 per kilometer, the U.S.-based Louis Berger Group got the job at \$700,000 per kilometer -- of which there are 389. Why? The standard American answer is that Americans do better work -- though not Berger which, at the time, was already years behind on another \$665 million contract to build Afghan schools. Berger subcontracted to Turkish and Indian companies to build the narrow, two-lane, shoulderless highway at a final cost of about \$1 million per mile; and anyone who travels it today can see that it is already falling apart.

Former Minister of Planning Ramazan Bashardost complained that when it came to building roads, the Taliban had done a better job; and he too asked, "Where did the money go?" Now, in a move certain to tank President Karzai's approval ratings and further endanger U.S. and NATO troops in the area, the Bush administration has pressured his government to turn this "gift of the people of the United States" into a toll road, charging each driver \$20 for a road-use permit valid for one month. In this way, according to American experts providing highly paid technical assistance, Afghanistan can collect \$30 million annually from its impoverished citizens and thereby decrease the foreign aid "burden" on the United States.

Is it any wonder that foreign aid seems to ordinary Afghans to be something only foreigners enjoy? At one end of the infamous highway, in Kabul, Afghans complain about the fancy restaurants where those experts, technicians, and other foreigners gather, men and women together, to drink alcohol, carry on, and plunge half-naked into swimming pools. They object to the brothels -- eighty of them by 2005 -- that house women trafficked in to serve the "needs" of foreign men. They complain that half the capital city still lies in ruins, that many people still live in tents, that thousands can't find jobs, that children go hungry, that schools and hospitals are overcrowded, that women in tattered burqas still beg in the streets and turn to prostitution, that children are kidnapped and sold into slavery or murdered for their kidneys or eyes. They wonder where the promised aid money went and what the puppet government can possibly do to make things better.

At the other end of the highway, in Kandahar city -- President Karzai's home town -- and in the southern provinces of Kandahar, Helmand, Zabul, and Uruzgan, Taliban commander Mullah Dadullah

is reported to have more than 12,000 men under arms and squads of suicide bombers at the ready. They ambush newly arrived NATO troops. The embattled British commander, Lieutenant-General Richards, recently issued a warning: "We need to realize that we could actually fail here."

The U.S. attacks the Taliban, as it did in 2001, with air power. (The *Times* of London reports that in May alone, U.S. planes flew an "astonishing" 750 bombing raids.) Every day brings new reports of NATO and Taliban combat casualties, and of "suspected" Taliban as well as civilians killed, long range, by American bombs.

In the meantime, the Taliban take control of villages; they murder teachers and blow up schools. U.S.-led drug eradication teams take control of villages and destroy the poppy crops of poor farmers. Caught as usual in the middle of warring factions, Afghans of the south and east long ago ceased to wonder where the money went. Instead they wonder who the government *is*. And what ever happened to "peace"

Journalist and **photographer** Ann Jones spent much of the last four years in Afghanistan working as a human rights researcher and women's advocate with international humanitarian agencies and teaching English to Kabul high school English teachers. She writes about her Afghan experience for the *Nation* magazine and notably in a new book **Kabul in Winter: Life Without Peace in Afghanistan** (Metropolitan Books, 2006). For more on her, check out her [website](#).

<http://www.tomdispatch.com/index.mhtml?pid=116512>

## RAZING IRAQ

# 'Stop the looters destroying history'

By **Dalya Alberge**, Arts Correspondent

THE cultural treasures of Iraq — the birthplace of writing, codified law, mathematics, medicine and astronomy — are being obliterated as looters take advantage of the country's bloody chaos.

Fourteen of the world's leading archaeologists have written to the President and Prime Minister of the country, demanding immediate action to stem the vandalism after seeing photographs of sites left pockmarked by enormous craters.

Among examples in the letter, seen yesterday by *The Times*, was a Babylonian sculpture of a lion dating from about 1700BC that lost its head because the terracotta shattered as looters tried to remove it.

Another was the destruction of the Ana Minaret on the Euphrates about 190 miles (310km) west of Baghdad, revered for 1,000 years as a unique construction. It was blown up by Islamic extremists apparently for fear that it would be used as an American observation post.

In 1986 the minaret, an 85ft (26m) stone structure dating from the 6th century, was threatened by the waters of the al-Qadisiya dam project. Saddam Hussein ordered his military to dismantle it and transport it in 18 sections to a new site on a plateau above the lake.

The archaeologists say that the unparalleled heritage, especially that of ancient Mesopotamia, must be saved. The land — the site of the cities of Ur, Babylon and Nineveh — is the cradle of modern civilisation.

"As individuals who have done research for years in Iraq, who have taught its great history and culture, and who have made great efforts to call attention to the potential and real damage to Iraq's cultural heritage due to war and its aftermath, we ask you to ensure the safety of the museums, archaeological sites, and standing monuments in the entire country," the letter says.

About 90 per cent of Iraq's archaeological sites are still underground and a wealth of temples and palaces that have yet to be excavated are being targeted by looters.

Digging several metres below ground, they are leaving a landscape that has been

likened to the surface of the Moon. The signatories include McGuire Gibson, Professor of Mesopotamian Archaeology at the University of Chicago; Robert McC. Adams, Secretary Emeritus of the Smithsonian Institution, and Leon DeMeyer, Rector Emeritus at the University of Ghent, in Belgium.

They are calling for the Antiquities Guards, who were recruited and trained to protect the ancient sites in the countryside, to be kept as a force and increased in number.

The archaeologists have learnt that the guards were no longer being paid.

They are also calling for the holdings of the Iraq National Museum to be kept intact. There are fears that the antiquities could be split up if the country is partitioned.

Professor Gibson said that damage done to the great cities of Sumer and Babylon had been "very extensive".

The city of Larsa — a Babylonian capital from about 1900-1800BC — bears tracks from diggers that are being used to scrape up the site and carry the dirt to the side where it is sifted for objects. The city of Isin — a capital from 2000-1900BC — has been pitted, some holes going as deep as 10 metres (33ft), and there are tunnels running out from the pits.

Professor Gibson said: "This damage is so severe that archaeologists may never return to the site."

Other important cities that have been extensively damaged include Umma, Zabalam, Adab, Shuruppak and Umm al-Hafriyat. "All of these are important for the history and culture of the Sumerians and Babylonians," he said.

Precisely where the looted antiquities are going remains a mystery, although some objects are known to have been offered to wealthy collectors in the Gulf and the Far East.

*The Times*, 25 Oct; 2006

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,7374-2420459,00.html>

## LOST HISTORY DEPT.

# The Holocaust's Arab Heroes

By Robert Satloff

Virtually alone among peoples of the world, Arabs appear to have won a free pass when it comes to denying or minimizing the Holocaust. Hezbollah leader Hasan Nasrallah has declared to his supporters that "Jews invented the legend of the Holocaust." Syrian President Bashar al-Assad recently told an interviewer that he doesn't have "any clue how [Jews] were killed or how many were killed." And Hamas's official Web site labels the Nazi effort to exterminate Jews "an alleged and invented story with no basis."

Such Arab viewpoints are not exceptional. A respected Holocaust research institution recently reported that Egypt, Qatar and Saudi Arabia all promote Holocaust denial and protect Holocaust deniers. The records of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum show that only one Arab leader at or near the highest level of government -- a young prince from a Persian Gulf state -- has ever made an official visit to the museum in its 13-year history. Not a single official textbook or educational program on the Holocaust exists in an Arab country. In Arab media, literature and popular culture, Holocaust denial is pervasive and legitimized.

Yet when Arab leaders and their people deny the Holocaust, they deny their own history as well -- the lost history of the Holocaust in Arab lands. It took me four years of research -- scouring dozens of archives and conducting scores of interviews in 11 countries -- to unearth this history, one that reveals complicity and indifference on the part of some Arabs during the Holocaust, but also heroism on the part of others who took great risks to save Jewish lives.

Neither Yad Vashem, Israel's official memorial to Holocaust victims, nor any other Holocaust memorial has ever recognized an Arab rescuer. It is time for that to change. It is also time for Arabs to recall and embrace these episodes in their history. That may not change the minds of the most radical Arab leaders or populations, but for some it could make the Holocaust a source of pride, worthy of remembrance -- rather than avoidance or denial.

The Holocaust was an Arab story, too. From the beginning of World War II, Nazi plans to

persecute and eventually exterminate Jews extended throughout the area that Germany and its allies hoped to conquer. That included a great Arab expanse, from Casablanca to Tripoli and on to Cairo, home to more than half a million Jews.

Though Germany and its allies controlled this region only briefly, they made substantial headway toward their goal. From June 1940 to May 1943, the Nazis, their Vichy French collaborators and their Italian fascist allies applied in Arab lands many of the precursors to the Final Solution. These included not only laws depriving Jews of property, education, livelihood, residence and free movement, but also torture, slave labor, deportation and execution.

There were no death camps, but many thousands of Jews were consigned to more than 100 brutal labor camps, many solely for Jews. Recall Maj. Strasser's warning to Ilsa, the wife of the Czech underground leader, in the 1942 film "Casablanca": "It is possible the French authorities will find a reason to put him in the concentration camp here." Indeed, the Arab lands of Algeria and Morocco were the site of the first concentration camps ever liberated by Allied troops.

About 1 percent of Jews in North Africa (4,000 to 5,000) perished under Axis control in Arab lands, compared with more than half of European Jews. These Jews were lucky to be on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, where the fighting ended relatively early and where boats -- not just cattle cars -- would have been needed to take them to the ovens in Europe. But if U.S. and British troops had not pushed Axis forces from the African continent by May 1943, the Jews of Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia and perhaps even Egypt and Palestine almost certainly would have met the same fate as those in Europe.

The Arabs in these lands were not too different from Europeans: With war waging around them, most stood by and did nothing; many participated fully and willingly in the persecution of Jews; and a brave few even helped save Jews.

Arab collaborators were everywhere. These included Arab officials conniving against Jews at royal courts, Arab overseers of Jewish work gangs, sadistic Arab guards at Jewish labor camps and Arab interpreters who went house to house with SS officers pointing out where Jews lived. Without the help of local Arabs, the persecution of Jews would have been virtually impossible.

Were Arabs, then under the domination of European colonialists, merely following orders? An interviewer once posed that question to Harry Alexander, a Jew from Leipzig, Germany, who survived a notoriously harsh French labor camp at Djelfa, in the Algerian desert. "No, no, no!" he exploded in reply. "Nobody told them to beat us all the time. Nobody told them to chain us together. Nobody told them to tie us naked to a post and beat us and to hang us by our arms and hose us down, to bury us in the sand so our heads should look up and bash our brains in and urinate on our heads. . . . No, they took this into their own hands and they enjoyed what they did."

But not all Arabs joined with the European-spawned campaign against the Jews. The few who risked their lives to save Jews provide inspiration beyond their numbers.

Arabs welcomed Jews into their homes, guarded Jews' valuables so Germans could not confiscate them, shared with Jews their meager rations and warned Jewish leaders of coming SS raids. The sultan of Morocco and the bey of Tunis provided moral support and, at times, practical help to Jewish subjects. In Vichy-controlled Algiers, mosque preachers gave Friday sermons forbidding believers from serving as conservators of confiscated Jewish property. In the words of Yaacov Zrivy, from a small town near Sfax, Tunisia, "The Arabs watched over the Jews."

I found remarkable stories of rescue, too. In the rolling hills west of Tunis, 60 Jewish internees escaped from an Axis labor camp and banged on the farm door of a man named Si Ali Sakkat, who courageously hid them until liberation by the Allies. In the Tunisian coastal town of Mahdia, a dashing local notable named Khaled Abdelwahhab scooped up several families in the middle of the night and whisked them to his countryside estate to protect one of the women from the predations of a German officer bent on rape.

And there is strong evidence that the most influential Arab in Europe -- Si Kaddour Benghabrit, the rector of the Great Mosque of Paris -- saved as many as 100 Jews by having the mosque's administrative personnel give them certificates of Muslim identity, with which they could evade arrest and deportation. These men, and others, were true heroes.

According to the Koran: "Whoever saves one life, saves the entire world." This passage echoes the Talmud's injunction, "If you save one life, it is as if you have saved the world."

Arabs need to hear these stories -- both of heroes and of villains. They especially need to hear them from their own teachers, preachers and leaders. If they do, they may respond as did that one Arab prince who visited the Holocaust museum. "What we saw today," he commented after his tour, "must help us change evil into good and hate into love and war into peace."

*The Washington Post* 8 Oct. 2006

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/06/AR2006100601417.html>

OL'MAN RIVER

## Zündel Trial, Day Feb. 9, 2007

### Description by G. Deckert, translated by W.G. Mueller

Police was present in the Hall, just like the last time, in the large auditorium 1, on average distributed to both sides. Start was supposed to be punctual today, i.e. @ 9 o'clock. The "Control" was therefore started earlier.

The onslaught of listeners, which I had expected, did not occur, even though it was clear, that it would become very interesting today. This was supposed to be the longest Hearing Day, which was to end at 18:05 o'clock. Trial start was scheduled for 9 o'clock. The Court started only at 9:11 o'clock, despite the promise of a punctual beginning, in any case, as early as never before. Shortly before Ernst was brought into the auditorium. His followers arise from their seats.

Present:

- 1) the Court, in the well known configuration, presided by Dr. (jur.) Meinerzhagen; later only by Dr. M.....
- 2) State Prosecutor Grossmann
- 3) all lawyers, including Dr. Schaller, Vienna, even though he is severely handicapped due to ill health
- 4) 2 x "staschu" (State Security) who were absent in the afternoon. 4 policemen + a court clerk; all armed
- 5) Media: 3 "dpa" - a Blondie (mid 30's) \*\*\*, "taz"- (1) "spinster" (around 50), "ap" representative (middle 30)
- 6) audience (at the beginning) 47, among them 2 x "Antifa"/Jewish Community - In the course of the day these audience numbers decrease.

\*\*\*

They are the source of a "dpa" news item in today's *Mannheimer Morgen* (MM) and likely other newspapers, which copied this "dpa" item. The short text can be found at the end of this report - (1) "taz" = *Tageszeitung*, Berlin, an organ of the radical left, alternative scene.

Dr. M.... opens the session by admonishing the listeners to behave in a disciplined manner and be quiet and to observe the "Dignity of the Court" - non observance will be punished. - He then turned to the members of the Defense (team) and pointed extensively out, that they too were an "Organ of the Administration of Justice". This entails limits. The Court would have to intervene in order to "correct" (Threat), should the honor of any trial participant be damaged. The Court knows of the heavy task of the Defense and recognizes their predicament. He pointed out, that because of the new legal precedences, created by the Superior Court, the choices of the Defense have been limited for paragraph 130 cases. - The Chamber is however inclined to be generous in their interpretation, but will take steps, when certain "limits" are exceeded. Dr. Schaller has, according to the opinion of the Court, exceeded this limit twice or three times during his final submission, but the Chamber does not intend to start any investigations against him, due to his advanced age. - He then asks, whether the sequence Bock, Rieger, will continue. They affirm.

Before lawyer Bock starts his final submission, Lawyer Rieger submits two (written) motions of proof; also lawyer ..... (name missing) offers one.

Dr. M.... interrupts the Proceedings at 9:22 o'clock for 10 minutes, so that photocopies can be made, and to enable the other trial participants to obtain knowledge about this matter. The process continues at 9:44 o'clock. Dr. M... invites responses: State Prosecutor Grossmann, the lawyers Beust, Bock and Hinney decline, Dr. Schaller joins; EZ also declines to make any statement.

Expert Report regarding the "Wannsee-Conference" - Dr. M ... reads parts aloud, because the handwritten submission can sometimes not be easily deciphered. The contents of the submission consists of different theories e.g. about the value status of the "Wannsee Conference" , which is

habitually identified as "Conference about the Destruction of the European Jews", among them theories from the Non-Revisionists. In the second submission, as far as I could catch it, the questions about so-called "reparations" for the victims were again raised. Mentioned in this were also the names of the Jews, John Sack, author of the book *An Eye for an Eye*, Norman Finkelstein, author of the book [The Holocaust Industry](#), Tom Sager (Segev ?), Israeli Jew, and [Israel Shamir](#). After clearing the unclear (passages) Dr. M... declares that, according to the understanding of the Chamber these submission fulfill the requirements of the BGH (Bundesgerichtshof) for the "Qualified Auschwitz Lie". Dr. M. formally warns Lawyer Rieger and dictates this to the Court Clerk. Lawyer Rieger counters immediately very clearly and points to the fact, that he has not made a "public declaration". (On the contrary) Dr. M... has done this and he is therefore subject to a penalty, based on paragraph 130, because he has addressed the public.

Lawyer Bock now starts with his Final Submission. He points out, that the voluminous files (2) of this process will be stored at least for 50 years for future generations in a secure location, to prevent their destruction in case of a possible political change. Following this, he analyses the Final Submission of the State Prosecutor Grossmann and reads him the riot act; he also reads excerpts from paragraph 130 (3), speaks to paragraph 185, and refers to Article 1 of the Basic Law (4). The "State of Grossmann" is a "State of Excommunication and Exclusion", a "State of Book Burning" (5), a "State of Intolerance". As always, when he is boiling inside, Grossmann tries to make fancy gestures with his pencil. Bock continues his citations from the book of the well known defense lawyer, Prof. Grimm, *With Open Visor*, referring to a discussion with the secret service man of the opposing side during his incarceration, which Grimm describes: "Liberated from Freedom and incarcerated" ... The subject being *Lies during Wartime*. And he refers to the book by Arthur Ponsonby (4) *Falsehood in Wartime* (Lies in Wartimes).

The State Prosecutor, as Bock continues, works under orders of the State, and the Chamber is in year 13 after Orlet (5) working, by using the "Self-Evident Cudgel". One deals here with a subjugation mechanism for unwanted opinions just like the Inquisition Chambers of old. This does not have anything today with a "Just" State. - He then cites for a long time and very expansively the *Echo of the Press* about the second judgment of a Chamber of the Mannheim County Court (President: Dr. Mueller, SPD (German Socialist Party, transl.), reporter Dr. Orlet, a Sudeten German, EX CDU (Christlich Demokratische Union, transl.) Committee Member: Frau Folkerts) as can be found in the Docu-Book by G. Anntohn / H. Roques, eds.: *The Case of Guenter Deckert - Martyr for Freedom of Research, Opinion and Speech in the tense field of History / Contemporary History, Justice and Politics* - 480 pages, softcover, DM 48, Weinheim, 1994 (6).

He then turns to the Chamber and asks them, whether they are willing to resist the pressures of the Hate Press, whether they will withstand Light Chains, and Remembrance Guards, Working Disability and a Judge's Prosecution, as in the case of Dr. Orlet - planned but not performed, as he had to first become sick and then had to retire. Should the Chamber members affirm this question, then they would be Supermen. On the other hand, a NO expresses their fear per se and also their fear for the effect on their career. Their Judgment would therefore be the result of them wearing blinkers, of compromises with the Spirit of the Times, of fear and lack of manly courage before the Thrones of Kings. One is working with the Self-Evident Invocations, conform in streamline form to political correctness, for "Fear eats Honor" - are Judges really (still) free (independent, trans) ? - He then mentions examples from his days as Defense (lawyer) during NS processes and his experiences with witnesses. In this connection he also cites from *Mein Kampf* about Jews, from the Nuremberg Laws "for the Protection of German Blood" ....., which were unanimously approved by the Reichstag, among them the archliberal "Papa Heuss", the first President of the BRD. According to Bock, Goering is supposed to have said that "I decide, who is a Jew". Nowadays Prosecuting Attorneys as well as Judges act in this same slogan: "I (or) We decide who (among the people) is a Hatemonger". He points to the "Case of F. Meyer" and his AU (Auschwitz) essay in the magazine *OstEuropa* of May 2002, pages 631-641. This magazine is published by the "Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ost-Europakunde", whose Chief Executive is the infamously well known CDU Dame, Professor Rita Süßmuth: "When two (persons) do the same thing, it is not the same thing !". Similarly, G. Deckert was sentenced because of his publishing the Judgment of the County Court Mannheim II, but not the Left Liberal *Frankfurter Rundschau*. Slogans like "Germany Perish !" or "Bomber Harris, do it again !" (7), on a Transparent of Leftie German Haters remain unpunished: "Freedom of Opinion, Value Judgment, - .... - Self Evidence of Witnesses is only a simulated Self Evidence. The he starts with Chamber Precedences like a.) *Rudolf Gutachten* (Expert Evaluation, trans.) Why are you not consequently saying that this Science has to be evaluated by a circle of (other) neutral scientists ? The Chamber had the opportunity



to do this. - b.) Why is the question of re-building of Gas chambers not being evaluated as means of a factual proof ? - What is Truth? The search for Truth is the existential task of the Historian, as has been expressed by the SPD politician von Dohnany on the occasion of the death of Joachim Fest, the longtime publisher of the FAZ (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*) and author of a remarkable Hitler biography. Also Frau Zypries, SPD, presently Minister of Justice, of the black-red Berlin Government, speaks now for non-persecution. He then gets to talk about the new "Holo...Holding" of Jewry, specifically about the connection between the Fritz Bauer Institute (8), Frankfurt and the "Jewish Museum", who are interested in the continued scientific investigation of the Holo ....And then the Chamber dragged in time and again the SELF EVIDENCE.... He points, toward the end of his presentation, to the problem of the genocide of the Armenians - he, who denies this (event) in France is subject to a penalty, but not he who denies it in Turkey. He concludes with the words "Happy Judging". The time 10:46 o'clock.

Dr. M... orders a break of 10 minutes. We resume at 11.07 o'clock.

At the beginning, Dr. Schaller holds the floor with a remark regarding the presentation of Dr. Bock again pointing out, that both the German born Lord Dahrendorf as also Frau Zypries, in contributions in the Israel-friendly *Die Welt*, speak now in favor of NO-Penalty.

Starting at 11:08 Defense Lawyer Rieger gets the floor. - The background of this Process remains in the Dark, the public is (largely) excluded due to the methods of the Chamber, the contemporary Press is compromised. Noteworthy is a report by the "Mannheimer Morgenpost"..... that the Court is sure to find an angle....." Should a Journalist dare to submit publicly an offer of proof, he will be subject to a penalty ! The political and the Media climate has been heated up. An Inquisition climate rules. The ideological weather situation demands a sorting into Believers and Liars. He points to the problems of witness statements and criticizes emphatically the failure of the Introduction of Proofs of Facts. In this context, he mentions the prime example case of the Will to Believe. It dealt with the alleged rape of a girl. Only when it was proven by means of a Proof of Fact that a loss of virginity had not taken place, did the case of the Prosecution collapse. It is justifiable to speak of a "Holo...Religion". For this purpose, he reads a long text out of the *Junge Freiheit* JF, of Jan. 26, 2007, which deals with remarks made by the Israeli-Jew Dan Diner, who claims to be the High Priest of the "Holo... Religion" and promotes the "Humanisation" of the Holo...experience as well as of a Memory Culture. A comparison with other genocides of World History is not permissible. The Holo... has been unique. The world of Islam will ultimately not recognize that the Holo... stands above Allah. On the other hand, there are a few singular Jewish counter voices, as, for example, that of the Orthodox Rabby Friedman in Vienna, as shown in the *Die Juedische* . . . of 12.12.2006. Frau Merkel, CDU, commands that the Holo.... be a part of the German identity ... it is possible to believe in the HOLO... as a religion, however, disbelief is not punishable, because a counter proof is not permissible. - He then points to the 500 years old European drama of the Witches condemnation, where nine million people became victims. The Church and the Justice system collaborated harmoniously in sending innocent victims to burn at the stakes, among them Giordano Bruno, who was rehabilitated only in 1992. The courts are not populated with experts, and jurists are not historians. Nevertheless, they, in conjunction with politics, create new dogmas in order to remorselessly persecute and punish any dissidents. - According to Jürgen Rieger, Ernst Zündel, has fought for his people, the German people, to re-establish their honor.

All defence claims of proof were denied for similar reasons, even though the numbers of the (alleged, trans) victims of the Holo.... are in free fall. At this time, he points to more recent investigations, among others to those of the Majdanek camp. The Jewish Director of the Museum, Kranz, has reduced the number of formerly 1.7 million to 59,000; the revisionists calculated a number of 42,000. - The Chamber speaks repeatedly about a confirming witnesses reports. These do not exist. He points to the differing reports about the killing methods. Unfortunately, when compared to former Oath Courts, no word for word record exist any more, so that later on, it is very difficult, to emulate such processes. Witness declarations led to Judgments. Historians refer to these. In turn, courts refer to them.... - Revisionist have provided seriously plausible proofs of facts as for example the Leuchter and Rudolf Expert Reports. - Also, the admissions of the accused do not agree with each other; they should be taken with care. He points to the declarations/admissions of Hoess and Baer. The Wehrmacht did have Gas automobiles for the fight against lice. - No Documents besides Invoices exist. - Why does this Chamber refuse the introduction of disharmonious Judgments into this process? Who is this Chamber referring to as support ? We have never heard about this. In this context he points to a contribution by Prof. Nolte, a reputable, serious historian; he had started the "Historians' Dispute",

which he had composed for the *FAZ* on 23.08.1994. In a later Reader's letter he questioned some statements in his (own) contribution. This is Greatness. However, the Court is wearing blinkers.

When lawyer Rieger pauses, (the Judge) uses this opportunity and orders at 12:20 o'clock, a lunch break till 13:30 o'clock.

At 13:37 EZ is being brought from the "Catacombs" into the Hall, the jurors appear only at 13:42 o'clock. - All three Media Humans are still present. Lawyer Rieger continues with his Closing Presentation and points out, that even among serious historians is the number of victims subject to questions. He points to Nolte. The UNIQUENESS is mainly based on the large number of Jews (supposed to have been) killed. The 6 Mill. figure can be found in the Nuremberg Jurisprudence. This in turn is traceable to a Jewish elaboration at the "Jewish World Congress", whose sole existing witness was a certain Vrba, who had escaped from a concentration camp. The Chamber does not base itself on any particular number, since several Millions are SELF-EVIDENT for it. In his further discourse, he refers very detailed to the work of Walter N. Scanning's *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry* (9), which is available in German from Grabert. - There never existed 6 Million Jews in the German controlled area. Jews were also, among others, deported by the Soviets to the East. About 200,000 Jewish partisans were killed. Jews also fell as regular Red Army soldiers. Some Jews died because of old age. There were pogroms against Jews executed by Eastern European people. 3 Million Applications for reparations were made. The Chamber will not be firm on this, since it cannot prove anything concrete. As in the "Nürnberg Process", no defensive facts are being searched for, nor are they even admitted. - There are no factual proofs regarding the murder weapon. It is claimed, that killing took place by means of Diesel engines from the T-34 (a Russian tank, trans.) This is technically impossible. He would be willing to demonstrate this to the Court by a test on himself. The Chamber declined all proofs. This is the capitulation of reasoning, particularly since the Chamber was completely at liberty to present their own proofs. The BGH (Superior German Court) does not forbid this, but opines, that this is not required. - Paragraph 130.3, which is intended to be the basis in the present process, is also unconstitutional. This is now also maintained by the former Chamber President of the County Court, Hamburg, Dr. Bertram. - who had sentenced G.R. Lauck, NSDAP, AO, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA, to four years (imprisonment, transl) ! If this Chamber had so desired, it could have submitted an appropriate Application to the Constitutional Court. Paragraph 130 is a special Extra piece of legislation in (all of) Europe; an attempt to make this special Extra Law for the whole of Europe, would not likely be successful, according to the black-red Berlin Government. Such an extraordinary law would hinder scientific investigation. The BRD has become a Media Dictatorship. Even a R. Herzog, CDU, who among other things was Praesident (Chancellor ?) and "inventor of the BRD Holo.... Day" at one time remarked that the BRD is no longer a Democracy, since there is longer the (required, trans) Division of Powers.

With the "Deckert Case", in 1994, has the Democracy in the BRD found its Finale. ! Thus Rieger, word for word. The Media had been Out for Blood. !

The Judges are too cowardly to oppose the Media Terror. The Media should not decide what Justice or Injustice is. G. Gauss, SPD, has said sometime ago: "the measure of Freedom can be recognized by the lip service, (uttered) so that one is left in peace. A Culture of Embarrassment and Guilt Feelings is being promoted, a Complex of Guilt. Neither the Americans nor the British or the French would ever think of "beautifying" their Capital City or other important cities with Monuments of Guilt"

WHAT is EZ being reproached for ? He is supposed to be the Father / the Maker of the World Wide Net Site the "zundelsite". However, Frau Dr. Rimland-Zuendel has admitted to it. Besides, EZ does not have the technical know-how. Frau Dr. R...Zuendel also produced the "z grams" on her own. The claim, EZ has had to approve every single line, cannot be proven. - His Book (10) is long beyond the Statute of Limitations.

Without the worldwide extension of the Law on the "Scene of the Crime" by the BGH, according to which the BRD-German Prosecuting Attorneys could, in every country of the world, prosecute an event, which would be a crime according to German BDR laws, could a deportation not take place and a sentencing would not be possible. This was acted out for the first time in the "Dr. Töben Case" (11); the German BRD Justice system has entered into Virgin Territory with its " Fight against Crimes on the World Wide Net". - In the case of the *Germania-Rundbriefe* (Circulars) no "intention to distribute" could be proven against EZ. The related attempt of Proof via Witnesses has failed miserably. According

to Rieger, the Chamber, since it is prejudiced in every aspect, will arrive at a sentence by means of distortion. - The fact is, that the Holo.... is a Foundation Myth (12) of the state of Israel. And this is the connection to the cultivation of the Guilt Mythos. The Guilt Complex is essential for the Willingness to Pay (Reparations). He then addresses, step by step, the points of the indictment (13), draws attention to the tactics of the Prosecutors to create the desired tendency by means of omission of passages, which are being replaced by dots. Lawyer Rieger clarifies that all those quotes, which have been torn from their context, are, even according to BRD Law, permissible opinions. When lawyer Rieger, in the context of the indictment point - Number of Victims - starts working with various (different) numbers, Dr. M...., who had been fidgeting for some time, loses his patience and interrupts lawyer Rieger at 15:37 o'clock with the objection that he is denying the state planned mass murder, contrary to the prevailing opinion of Historical Science. Should this happen again, he will withdraw the permission to speak. Besides, there will be consequences according to criminal law. Also, the Reporter Hamm, airs his outrage several times, without having obtained the courts permission. Jürgen Rieger remains unperturbed and continues. Dr. M... again interrupts his presentation at 15:45 o'clock, when he addresses the problem of SELF-EVIDENCE, in connection with the question of the sovereignty of the BRD, because he questions the Self Evident Mass extermination. This means Denial. Lawyer Rieger calls the Judge a coward.

Excited, Dr. M.... interrupts the proceedings for 5 minutes.

Dr. M... then wants to dictate to the Court Clerk the following Chamber decision regarding the insult to the Court: "The illness of the Judges will .....". Lawyer Rieger immediately interrupts and states that he did not say that. He was explaining, that for him the "cowardice of the Judges represents no standard for the Defense". Dr. M.... withdraws and threatens again to withdraw permission to speak: "in case of a repeat... An investigation process will be initiated. Dr. M... and Hamm, who looks like a pumped up June bug, clarify their understanding of the core of historical events to the extent, that approximately 1 Million Jews had perished. This is supposedly a SELF-EVIDENT fact, which is being denied by lawyer Rieger. He wants to forbid him any further reading from the Indictment. Yet Rieger contradicts, clarifies, that these items are in the Indictment and does not let (anybody) confuse him. He continues. Dr. M...submits with gnashing teeth. Later on, Dr. M.... interrupts again, when Rieger directs attention to the BGH, who did not say anything about the Gas Chambers, and remarks that this happened (only) in the subordinate courts. When Rieger doubts that the Chamber, i.e. the professional judges and/or the lay judges, have read everything from "A" to "Z", Dr. M... interrupts again, very excitedly and refuses to tolerate this. Rieger counters, that he could ask the members of the Chamber for details; then it would come out who is wrong. Dr. M... declares the Chamber's "acknowledgement". He renews his threatening, starts dictating, stops and then lets Rieger continue talking. During the continuing presentation, it is evident, time and again, how both Dr. M.. and Hamm are "worked up", but they restrain themselves to throwing dirty looks even in the direction of the public.

Dr. Schaller leaves at 15:30 o'clock - All three media representatives remain.

Dr. M...., supported by Hamm becomes active again at 17:14 o'clock and demands from Lawyer Rieger to address the accusation of the deed. He clarifies that he has been doing nothing but this all the time.

Lawyer Beust leaves at 17:17 o'clock; his college, Hinkey, had already left in the early afternoon.

The term "AU...- Lie" (Auschwitz), explains Rieger, can be interpreted in various ways. Based on the guidelines of the BRD Constitution, the Court is obliged to use that interpretation, which will draw the mildest sentence. For example, the "AU...- Lie" in the meaning of a myth, is therefore not punishable.

Having worked through the Indictment, lawyer Rieger turns in conclusion to two further different points of view. For one, the penalty demanded by the Prosecution has to be considered. 5 years incarceration for dissident opinions in the area of the political-historical arena instead of free discussion in the allegedly freest State in Europe. .... Then the omission of taking into account the torture incarceration in Canada. The Chamber assumes, as before, the legitimacy of the process, conducted by Judge Blais, and his Judgment, even though the Expert Opinion of the M. Plank Institute (for Comparative International Law), Freiburg, a Dr. Koch, has not been in a position to give reasons (for his opinion, trans) as he had no access to the documents. The 11.9 legislation in Canada is presently being critically re-examined, not only publicly but by the Highest Canadian Court. Already in one case, it was clearly necessary to change. The Parliament has apologized publicly and has offered

7 Million Canadian Dollars reparation to the (wrongly, trans) accused. Hamm does not like this either. He interferes again. But Rieger continues calmly and declares the artificial constructs (like) "Destabilization of the German Government", Promoters of the "White Supremacy" movement are not applicable. He pleads for an Acquittal. The Court cannot claim, that it did have no knowledge of the arguments of the revisionists. The deviating opinion of EZ had been well founded. He only distributed Results of Scientific Investigations (Leuchter, Rudolf) in the framework of his Campaign for the Truth. One will also have to consider the expansion of the Law about the Scene of the Crime. What EZ did, is not a punishable offence in Canada or the USA. Jürgen Rieger finishes at 18:05 o'clock

Dr. M... informs, that the Trial will continue on February 15, at 9:00 o'clock.

The "dpa" Blondie and the "taz" spinster were present till the end; the "ap" representative left at 17:00 o'clock. All three composed a report. - The "dpa" news report (can be found, trans) at the very end, the "taz" report, as the "ap" report (only in English) have each been separated from this Report.

### Comment by this Reporter

It can be assumed with great probability that the sentence will be proclaimed on February 15, 2007. - Of both other Duty Defence Lawyers, only lawyer Beust has declared that he will speak, probably with respect to the measure of punishment. His final pleading will likely take hardly more than 20 - 30 minutes. If EZ, who has been silent throughout, will not make any long pronouncements, if at all, then there will be sufficient time for Dr. M...to give "reasons" for his Judgment, i.e. his Sentence - anything else would be a miracle.

### Footnotes of this Reporter

(2) voluminous files - It is hoped that, that one succeeds, to evaluate this trial and to bring it to the interested public, at least in those countries, in which this is still allowed. This means, that the evaluation will have to be done by a circle of experience lawyers and historians, whose result(s) can be publicized both by a publisher and be understandable by the general public.

(3) Everyone should (try) to absorb the contents of Section 130, by purchasing the latest edition of the "Stgb" ( Criminal Code) - I possess the 38. edition, dated 1. Sept. 2002, but will also have to buy the newest one - or try to get a photocopy. The edition as TB (pocket book) in the "dtv" series by Beck is good value for money (formerly Euro 5.--) "dtv" Nr. 5007.

(4) Ponsonby, brit Member of Parliament, also Delegate to the brit. Commons, composed this investigation of almost 200 pages in 1928. First edition in Great Britain in 1928, in USA in 1929. I possess the English Edition (reprinted in 1980 by "Institute for Historical Review"). As far as I know there also existed (still exists ?) a German Translation, possibly by Grabert, Tuebingen.

(5) Dr. jur. Rainer Orlet, Judge at the County Court Mannheim, Reporter (and author of the raw draft of the Judgment) in the 2. Mannheim Deckert/Leuchter - trial. Because of the Reasons for the Judgment (1 year probation, 10,000 DM penalty, destruction of the original video) a worldwide protest occurred, which led to a forced retirement with a pension, of Dr. Orlet and another trial, this time before the County Court Karlsruhe. The judgment of the 3 professional, female Judges, a CDU dame presiding: 2 years without probation despite the identical facts.

(6) I received 15 months jail because of the publication of this document(ation) without probation. The Reason: Printing of the Judgment of the 1. Mannheim County Court, the SPD member and Jew, Dr. Nussbruch, presiding (Personal Declaration). I had again intended to transport the "Leuchter-Message". - The book was "burned", i.e. confiscated at the printers', including the films. Should any recipient of this report, in the circle of the older Comrades, still possess this book, and not know, in whose hands it will end up, then, please send it to me as soon as possible. - The Family has only one more copy.

(7) "Bomber Harris" the nickname for the responsible Britisher in the RAF (Royal Air Force), who was executing Churchill's Air warfare against the German civil population and also against DRESDEN.

(8) Fritz Bauer, a Jew from Swabia, who survived the war in Denmark, (despite the German occupation). He later became the Chief Public Prosecutor in Hessen, "Father of the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trials". An Institute for Research into the Holo.... in Frankfurt, was named after him.

(9) Walter N. Scanning (US-American): [Die Auflösung des osteuropäischen Judentums](#) ("The Resolution"), 319 pages, soft cover, Tübingen 1983 - I do not know, whether this book has been put on the Index. As far as I know, it has not been banned.

(10) Wohl (probable referenc to, trans), "Ernst Zuendel - a Man, who makes History" - Report about a History Trial in Canada", 138 pages, soft cover, Toronto, Canada, 1992.

(11) Dr. phil. Frederick Toebe, born in Stuttgart, Australian Citizen, former teacher, Founder and Director of the " Adelaide Institute", has been sentenced by a Chamber of the County Court, Mannheim, after having been accused by the wellknown, infamous, Prosecutor Klein, to ten months jail, because of "World Wide Net Criminality". - The BGH has revoked this judgment, as being too mild. A new trial failed to take place, because Dr. Toebe does not intend to come to the BRD Germany, for a new trial.

(12) See also the book by French Historian and Philosopher, Roger Garaudy, a former communist, [Les Mythes fondateurs de la politique israélienne](#) ("The founding Myths of Israeli Politics." ), 277 pages, softcover, "Samisdat Roger Garaudy", 1996. In plain language, this means, that no French publisher could be found, who would be ready to publish this book. And this in the "Country of Voltaire"! [A German translation of this manuscript allegedly exists](#). the print is failing because of lack of 1) interest, b) financing.

(13) The "Accusing Writ" has been available in the Internet for some time. I will possibly name the source at the next or after the next report, since I could be penalized (if this is done trans) before the Judgment has been pronounced.

Weinheim, Feb. 11, 2007, being a little late, due to a cold.  
*Guenther Deckert.*

(One column) Report in the "Mannheimer Morgen" MM + plus all associated papers, among them the *Weinheimer Nachrichten*, page 3, February 10, 2007:

### Defence Lawyer cites from *Mein Kampf*

Mannheim. Renewed Éclat in the trial against Holocaust Denier Ernst Zuendel. The County Court Mannheim reproached Defence Lawyer Juergen Rieger, yesterday, to himself, in his final summing up speech, having expressly denied the massmurder of the Jews during NS times. Rieger has exposed himself to prosecution because of inciting people to hate, in form of the Auschwitz Lie, said the presiding Judge. In his six hours Final Submission, Rieger subjected the number of the Jews killed during the Holocaust to doubt. An additional Defense Lawyer did previously cite passages from Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Making reference to "Freedom of Opinion", the Defence demanded that Zuendel be exonerated. Rieger called the five years demanded by the Prosecution "completely mistaken". - dpa.

Whoever evaluates/uses this report either in parts or wholly, should please also name this source. Otherwise, he may be accused of theft of intellectual property. No fees will be charged. It should be obvious, that this Report, is neither an exact record, in the strictest sense of the word, nor can it be a simultaneous record, but represent my personal impressions. The trial of Feb. 09, 2007 is presented, as I perceived it, which was not easy, because of the extraordinary length of the trial. I assume, that the Final Summary, the applications to provide the proofs by the Defense Lawyers and the rejections by the Court, will, hopefully, soon be made available with every detail, for (public, trans) Reading.

NOTES from Translator:

(1) for the sake of proper English I sometimes had to insert words, which are not in the original report. This has been indicated in this format (xyzxyz, trans).

(2) Place and document names were sometimes not translated, as a certain level of knowledge by the reader must be assumed.

(3) Sometimes I inserted words, in brackets (.....) to facility the flow in English or to clarify meaning.

(4) Statistics for security during transmission of this translation: 12 pages, words 5,639 paragraphs 100, lines 519.

## Letter From Ernst Zundel Written Just Before The Verdict

*The following heavily-censored letter was written only ten days before the despicable 'verdict' in the kangaroo court 'rendering' of Ernst Zundel in Mannheim. What shame lies upon Germany and its once proud and industrious people and their remarkable history. Germany is now, as it has been since 1945, fully on its knees, the whipping boy of world zionism, doing the bidding of its masters. The Human Rights and basic legal outrages of the Zundel trial are the stuff of the darkest days of Bolshevik Russia. Mr. Zundel has already had four YEARS of his life stolen and now faces 5 years in German prison. Here is his letter...*

February 5, 2007

My Dear Jeff

Greetings to you from Mannheim Prison...my fifth prison in the last four years. This must be some kind of record for a man not yet convicted of anything. But that, too, will change soon - for we are in the last days of what passes for a 'judicial' proceeding here.

Jeff, NO American could believe - without actually having experienced it - what is going on here. The unfamiliar or the non-initiated could simply not believe that in an otherwise modern nation, proceedings like these could actually take place.

These events surpass even Kafka's worst nightmarish scripts.

Still, I am not allowed to discuss the details of the case, and still, my incoming and outgoing mail is tightly censored. And several times already, letters written by Ingrid to me have been used against me (us?) in the proceedings, as have my own letters, of all things, dealing with Biblical topics...and, get this: KARMA and REINCARNATION.

It is amazing to me to see how far things can go in the nations where there is no tradition of Freedom of Speech like we have in America...and HAD in Canada until the Marxists and their cronies - or should I say 'useful idiots' - took over.

Jeff, it is stunning to see how subjugation and repression will manifest and grow like a cancerous tissue if no one steps in to stop such a creeping, terminal affliction.

I consider myself one of the luckiest Germans for having had the foresight to leave this place so early in my life, and to have enjoyed my most vital years in Canada and America, [countries that] were then, when I arrived, fantastic places throbbing with energy, full of assertive self-confidence and moral strength. There was a refreshing vigor, a can-do and will-do attitude and mood prevalent that was utterly invigorating. I am so glad my children and grandchildren can live there in freedom.

It is an eerie feeling to be living in a in every other respect modern state but with such deeply-ingrained limitations and culture myths or taboos that very, very few dare stray outside the politically-correct intellectual playpens.

For me, the free-roaming who has spent a lifetime expanding my horizon and investigating all manner of things and ideas, [understanding this] is an incredible blessing. I find, instead, the willingness of these current Germans to live - and think - in carefully proscribed, blinkered mental prisons to be incomprehensible.

It is interesting to watch German 'talk shows' about virtually any topic. They resemble stiff, repressed, super-cautious, carefully mentally-scripted rituals. To view them and to have to listen to them, for us who are used to the give-and-take of free, roaming discussions, is almost unbearable at times.

When I try to explain to them that in America one could write about and discuss virtually any topic without the ever-present threat of being arrested, tried, convicted, fined and even imprisoned for just thinking or writing about things other than the orthodox, generally accepted viewpoints, THIS seems unbelievable to most. They respond as if one is feeding them some kind of American propaganda. Thus, I often feel like a fish out of water.

As you well know, I am no stranger to attempts by powerful, well-organized lobbies to enforce their own norms and versions of history and events on people - so I am not naive when it comes to questions of censorship. However, it is something totally different from state-imposed, criminally-sanctioned dictates by the state to tell you not to touch on specific topics.

After centuries of experience with repressive monarchs, communists and other regimes and their censors - and the crippling effects they have on society - one should think that the benefits of an

unfettered exchange of ideas would seem like an obvious and ideal solution. Unfortunately, what seem obvious and logical to us who are 'infected' with the First Amendment intoxicant, seems positively frightening to every trigger-happy bureaucrat, village policeman, and 'do-gooder' around the corner.

I was just sent the decision by the Northern District Federal Court of San Jose, CA, of November 7, 2001 - the famous Yahoo vs the French Court decision in which private French lobbies had demanded that Yahoo cease and desist from allowing websites on their provider which espouse viewpoints these lobbyists didn't like, and products they did not want to be offered to the public.

I have never seen the reasoning by the court in this case, No. C-00-21275JF, November 7, 2001.

Jeff, it is one of the FINEST articulations I have seen of just what the First Amendment protects.

Usually, we get the 'horse and buggy', motherhood and apple pie explanations, sounding out of touch with the modern electronic age of instant global communications.

This San Jose Court has updated and clarified, as well as made relevant, the vital role this over 200 year old legislation means to today's Americans, or all those who live in the geographic area where U.S. laws hold sway.

The document was sent to me by Joseph T. McGinnis, Ingrid's and my [former] attorney in the current litigation in the U.S. against my being denied habeas corpus rights, etc, currently before U.S. courts. The question of official U.S. views and laws pertaining to the internet had been, of course, raised in the proceedings here in Germany by the defence. I knew the outline, or Gestalt, of the U.S. view - but needed hard evidence to prove that what I claimed was right.

Well, this California court ruling supplied that proof, and my German lawyer used it 'in whole' as an official exhibit, filing it with the court on the last day while pleadings had already begun.

The document was declared 'irrelevant' (by the judge) but I was more than pleased to strike one more blow for Freedom. My job was to alert the court to other standards of liberty existing where I lived and worked at the time of arrest (read: kidnapping -ed), incarceration and removal from America without ever having been brought before an American judge.

By the time you get this letter, the verdict may already be in here, but Jeff my case is only one case of many going on in this country. Apparently, there have already been 120,000 similar cases since 1992, virtually all ending in convictions with heavy fines and/or stiff jail terms.

The prosecutor already pleaded for five years in prison, and denying me the two years I served in Guantanamo North in Canada, which would, in effect, mean SEVEN years imprisonment for merely expressing ideas, non-violently, for which the Canadian Supreme Court - where I had lived most of my adult life - had found me Not Guilty. The Court ruled, in fact, that a minority member in multi-ethnic Canada must have a right to his own viewpoint - even if the majority found it not to their liking - or, even if those views were wrong. August 27, 1992.

In a way, Jeff, this case is comparable to a Chinese emigrant living in Canada or America or Australia bowing to the ONE CHILD per family law in place in Communist China. Mao's government adopted that law, as you know, and every Chinese couple is allowed only one child per family. Should the woman become pregnant a second time 'accidentally,' the couple gets hit with a heavy fine. Should there be any further 'accidents,' the wife (or husband) will go to jail and [the wife will] have a state-ordered abortion performed. In China, this issue is a serious crime which is severely punished.

Now comes the twist:

Chinese families were traditionally large, as in other Asian countries, because children were considered 'old age insurance' for the parents.

There are tens of thousands of Chinese - if not millions - who have fled China for other lands in order to practice the Chinese tradition of large families. There are approximately 35 million Chinese overseas and most of those families have more than one child.

China does not ask the Canadians or Americans to imprison their overseas Chinese for having broken this Communist Chinese law. I have not heard of one Chinese deported from Canada or the U.S. for having offended that repressive Red Chinese law.

I certainly have never heard of the Communists having made requests to the Canadian or U.S. governments insisting they stop their overseas Chinese - local residents - from exercising their reproductive freedom. I am also not aware that Chinese returning home to China for a visit with their grandchildren or to visit relatives in China were arrested for breaking this stringent law while living outside of China proper.

But, Jeff, such is the mindset of the blinkered, indoctrinated Europeans who consider themselves enlightened and sophisticated - and that includes virtually anyone I have spoken to - that they cannot or will not see the similarity of the situation. The situation is, of course, ludicrous!

This is a CENSORED letter from a very sad, schizoid place. Be glad you are there... and not here.

Keep the flame of Freedom burning. In spite of Iraq, Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo - America is still a good place to be - the last free place. Keep it so. It is precious.

Ernst

<http://www.rense.com>

*We can see how deeply blind is our friend Zündel: "the last free place" ? From where he was illegally abducted and delivered to freedom-hating Canada ? The center of the world's oppression and submission to Wall Street ? Zündel is still the naive German boy dreaming of the New World - this sinister illusion - and he has learned nothing from his own experience. We just wish him to come out of jail as soon as possible and go into a peaceful retirement.*

GERMAN BUFFOONERY

## The Trial of Germar Rudolf in Mannheim District Court

Day 6, 10 January 2007

**Reported by Günter Deckert**

**Translated by J. M. Damon**

Scheduled for 9 o'clock, the trial began at 9:29. No reason was given for the delay. Seven policemen and one policewoman were on hand with a police car visible in front of the entrance. The security procedure was the same as usual except that it was speedier, more efficient and was not accompanied by bullying.

Present in the courtroom were:

- 1) The usual members of the Court, Judge Schwab presiding;
- 2) District Attorney Grossmann;
- 3) The two lawyers for the defense, Stolz and Bock;
- 4) 1 "Stachu" (Staatschutz) or state police agent, 1 bailiff and 2 uniformed policemen, all armed;
- 5) Media: Once again, no representatives of the media were present.

Are they officially discouraged from covering the proceedings? Boycotting of their own volition?

6) Visitors: Initially 50, increased to 60, including Frau Haverbeck of Collegium Humanum in Vlotho/Weser, Dr. Rolf Kosiek of Grabert Publishing House and Lady Michelle Renouf from London. After noon the "Stachu" agent did not return and the uniformed policemen were relieved by two others.

Germar Rudolf appeared at 9:17, some time before the Court officially convened. Today he was not brought into court in chains.

The proceedings took place in the large chamber, which has seats for 80 visitors and 48 reporters. When Germar entered, the visitors rose in greeting and respect. This was ignored by the police, who usually warn the visitors against showing support for the defendant.

At the beginning of the session Judge Schwab announced his ruling on the materials to be included in Germar's testimony, saying he would allow him to read only such material from his book "Lectures on the Holocaust" as was relevant and written in German. This is because German is the language of the Court. The judge then asked members of the Court if they had read the book. The two female judges as well as the district attorney answered in the affirmative.

The male lay judge said he had read 543 of the 571 pages while the female lay judge had read



494. Attorneys Stolz and Bock had of course read the whole thing. German agreed to proceed with his presentation, thus avoiding interruption or delay, even though the two lay judges had not read the entire book.

Attorney Stolz then objected to Judge Schwab's ruling of 6 December concerning the *Selbstleseverfahren* (reading into the record) of GERMAR's *Lectures on the Holocaust*. The Court adjourned for several minutes to consider the matter, then Schwab reported that, in view of the book's number of pages, the Court stood by the ruling.

GERMAR then resumed his presentation, discussing the portions of his *Lectures* that had been included in his indictment. He explained that the key issue was the question of whether he had denied National Socialist "genocide" of the Jews and specifically the precise figure of six million victims, as well as problems connected with "atonement" as well as the concepts of "Holocaustism" and "Revisionism." Other issues included the question of how photographs of piles of shoes and hair should be interpreted, as well as the fabled "lampshades of human skin" and "Jew soap;" the expressions "Permanent Solution," "Deportation" and "Evacuation;" the concepts of "Uniqueness" vs. "Relativization;" and whether he was denying human rights to Jews by using the expression "Holocaustism." GERMAR repeatedly succeeded in demonstrating that the District Attorney had deliberately misrepresented him, mostly with deletions but also by taking sections out of context. He pointed out that the prosecutor did this in order to arrive at the "desired destination" of using Section 130 of the Penal Code ("Incitement of the Masses") in the indictment. The results of the prosecutor's misquotations and misapplications were deliberate falsifications that distorted the meaning of what GERMAR had written.

He also pointed out that his book was written in dialog form, in which the opinion of the author was never stated. GERMAR referred to the prosecutor as a "historical nonentity" who was malicious as well, and stated that the prosecutor himself should be indicted for his misdeeds.

GERMAR then reached the end of Part 3 of his presentation and Judge Schwab announced a short pause until 11:30.

After the pause GERMAR introduced Part 4 of his presentation, saying that he would now take up the case of Fridjof Meyer and after that, in Part 5, he would deal with the rulings of the *Bundesprüfstelle für jugendgefährdendes Schrifttum* (Federal Bureau for Testing Literature that Could Endanger Youth.) At 11:35, after inquiring about the length of GERMAR's next presentation, Judge Schwab ordered a noontime pause until 2pm. After noon, GERMAR had Attorney Bock distribute visual aids to accompany Parts 4 and 5 of his presentation.

While Bock was doing this, GERMAR informed the Court that a human rights organization in Italy had officially designated him as a political prisoner. Beginning his presentation, GERMAR discussed the article by *Spiegel* editor Fridjof Meyer that appeared in the May 2002 issue of the magazine *Osteuropa*. He described its positive evaluation by two prosecutors, the Bochum District Attorney (in the Horst Mahler indictment) and the Stuttgart District Attorney in the Günter Deckert indictment, which likewise took place May of 2002 (and which was not acted upon for almost 18 months!) GERMAR pointed out that Meyer's conclusions are much closer to those of Revisionists than of the "court historians" favored by the German government. He emphasized that since Meyer was considered a mainstream historian, the government referred to his research as a "scientific investigation" while calling GERMAR's research "incitement of the masses."

Moving into Part 5 of his presentation, GERMAR next discussed decisions and reports of the so called "Federal Testing Bureau" that had led to his "Indexing" and his designation as "dangerous to youth." The sections taken as authority by the Testing Bureau flatly contradict Article 5 of the Basic Law, which guarantees freedom of scientific investigation.

Specifically, this concerned the following works:

1) Jürgen Graf's and Carlo Mattogno's [\*Konzentrationslager Stutthoff bei Danzig\*](#) (Concentration Camp Stutthoff near Danzig).

**GERMAR pointed out that worldwide, this is the only scientific investigation of the subject, thus the Testing Bureau's indexing was based on false pretenses.**

2) Graf's and Mattogno's *Konzentrationslager Majdanek* (Majdanek Concentration Camp.)  
Here again, these authors were the first to scientifically investigate the subject.

3) Jürgen Graf, *Riese auf tönernen Füßen* (The Giant With Feet of Clay.)

This is a critique of the book by Raul Hilberg, a Viennese Jew who became a professor at a university in the US. Hilberg's book, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, became a classic of pro-Holocaust literature.

Even the title of Hilberg's work is misleading, since 80% of the book deals with other matters.

Germar explained how Graf disproved Hilberg's thesis by critically examining the testimonies of eyewitnesses, since Hilberg did not consider primary sources in his investigation.

4) Several articles from VffG *Vierteljahrsheft für freie Geschichtsforschung* (Quarterly Publication for Free Historical Research) that he publishes.

In this case according to the Federal Testing Bureau, the basis was "too short and not comprehensive enough,"

5) Germar's Expert Report on Auschwitz.

6) *The Hoax of the 20th Century* by the American Professor Arthur Butz. The Federal Testing Bureau objected to this because, among other things, it does not include all subsequent verdicts arising from the various National Socialist trials. Germar pointed out that where history is concerned, judges are laypeople, consequently their verdicts correspond to their personal opinions. **Those who write the verdicts of the Testing Bureau likewise have no knowledge of scientific research in general and historiography in particular.** This is obvious from the very composition of the Testing Bureau: **it does not include a single scientist.**

The Federal Testing Bureau is intellectually incompetent to judge scientific research. Like the "Ministry of Truth" in Orwell's prophetic work *1984*: it is the bureaucracy that determines official truth for the almighty State.

In Part 6 of his presentation Germar presented a large number of quotations of world famous defenders of freedom of speech and scientific research. He spoke very eloquently of Articles 5 and 20 of German Basic Law

< <http://www.iuscomp.org/gla/statutes/GG.htm> >.

These concern basic freedom and civil disobedience, the struggle for justice and the citizen's duty to resist censorship, repression and governmental usurpation of citizens' rights.

Germar demonstrated that Article 130 of the Penal Code ("Incitement") is a very exceptional law since it does not protect the state, but rather damages the constitutional foundations of democracy. (See

< <http://www.iuscomp.org/gla/statutes/StGB.htm> >)

For this reason, Article 130 is inherently unconstitutional. Germar said that he does not acknowledge the authenticity of this "Special Law" which is ascribed to "German history," meaning the Jewish policies of the Third Reich. He assumes the right and duty to freely express his opinion in both the spoken and written word.

The origin of the repressive and unconstitutional Article 130 is purely political, with misapplication by the judiciary. He asked: what would happen if more Germans refused to submit to censorship and the deprivation of their human rights? For example, what if German historians finally said "Enough! We do not believe in your so-called "Holocaust!" He observed that German historians lack the courage of their convictions. In this regard he referred to his dealings with Professors Maser and Topitsch, specialists in the life of Hitler.

The government persuaded them to abandon their research.

He also mentioned the Austrian witch trial of Prof. Pfeifersberger, which finally drove him to suicide. In his view most German historians are cowardly liars. He has to agree with David Irving in this respect.

Germar then gave examples of how the German media also participate in the official "concert of lies," including several selections from the book *So lügen Journalisten!* (See how journalists lie!)

written by former *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* reporter Udo Holtkötte.

He included a disclosure in *Bild Magazine* as well as a press statement released by District Attorney Grossmann in the summer of 2006 in which Grossmann wrote that Germar had also been charged with anti Semitic activities, although nothing written by this same Grossmann was to be found in the indictment. It was clear for all to see how this revelation affected Grossmann. He attempted to distract himself by juggling with his pencil, but did not succeed as it fell to the floor several times. The judge stared at him but said nothing. Afterwards Grossmann made no comment on Germar's revelations.

Germar explained that in the countries where he had lived for the past ten years, historical research and revision were not punishable offenses, whereas German laws are similar to those of China and North Korea. The appropriate measure for dealing with controversial historical research and publication is argumentation, not coercion and violence. He pointed out that he cannot possibly be "resocialized" in prison, that is, "re-integrated into society." On the contrary, the government is doing everything it can to destroy him, his family and his reputation. At 16:10 he ended his testimony with the observation that "Violence always brings forth counter violence!"

Germar did not appear to be in top form today. His voice was hoarse, suggesting that he might have a cold.

Judge Schwab announced that the following should be entered into the proceedings:

- 1) VHO website issue for 29 June 2004;
- 2) VHO website issue for 2 July 2004;
- 3) Stuttgart District Court Verdict of 23 May 1995, which concerns the 14 months that he has now been incarcerated on account of an entry in his Auschwitz Expert Report that he allegedly did not write, but rather the "Remer Circle," to be entered by oral testimony. Attorney Stolz objected to the ruling and requested a decision by the Court. The Court adjourned briefly and denied the motion because "unnecessary." Today's session ended at 4:15pm.

**The next session will be at 9am on 22 January, with additional sessions on 29 January, 12 and 13 February, and 5 and 20 March.**

Weinheim/Bergstraße, 10 January 2007

*Günter Deckert*

A friendly request of whoever uses or circulates this report: please be so kind as to mention my name in conjunction with it. Thanks! G.D.

**Day 7, 22 January 2007**  
**Reported by Günter Deckert**  
**Translated by J. M. Damon**

Today the security procedures began earlier and were handled more skillfully, more casually than heretofore. I counted only 7 policemen in the building. The trial session, scheduled for 9 o'clock, began at 9:08.

Present in the courtroom were:

- 1) The usual members of the Court, Judge Schwab presiding;
- 2) District Attorney Grossmann;
- 3) The two lawyers for the defense, Stolz and Bock;
- 4) 4 "Stachu" (Staatschutz) or state police agent, including two new faces; 1 bailiff and 2 uniformed policemen, all armed;

- 5) “Establishment” Media: Once again, none present. Are they officially discouraged from covering the proceedings? Ashamed of knuckling under to government censorship? Simply disinterested?
- 6) Visitors: Initially 32, with others coming later. These included Dr. Rolf Kosiek of Grabert Publishing House and F. Duswald of Linz, Austria with colleagues from the liberal–patriotic magazine *Aula*, which is published in Graz. Other visitors came from a considerable distance, including Berlin, the Rheinland and Switzerland.

Judge Schwab opened the proceedings and asked the members of the Court whether they had read the Internet printouts dated 29 June 04 and 2 July 2004, as well as the verdict of Stuttgart District Attorney. Germar Rudolf had not received the printouts. The two lay judges said that they had now read Germar’s *Lectures on the Holocaust* (available on the Internet at < <http://vho.org/dl/ENG.html> >) in its entirety, except for those portions not written in German. Their affirmations were entered into the record by the court historian.

Germar began by discussing at length the book by scientist and philosopher Karl Popper (1902-1994) *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*, dealing with science and the scientific method. Popper is best known for repudiating the classical observationalist method. He advanced the principle of “empirical falsifiability” as the correct criterion for distinguishing between valid and invalid science. He was a vigorous defender of liberal democracy and the principles of social criticism that make it possible for the open society to flourish.

At 9:15 Germar requested a brief pause in order to confer with his lawyers. Proceedings resumed at 9:51 and Germar announced the final part of his presentation. He began this final part by explaining his philosophy as a publisher, quoting Voltaire’s famous dictum “Sir, I disagree with every word you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.” This dictum is central to the European concept of civilized discourse. Germar explained that all his life he has been fundamentally opposed to every sort of censorship. He said that for the sake of balanced discourse he has often published materials with which he personally disagreed. He then quoted former President of the Federal Republic, Prof. R. Herzog, CDU. On the occasion of an award by German Book Dealers, he stated: “No one must suffer consequences for expressing his opinion.” (Remark by reporter: Herzog then went on to introduce “Holocaust Remembrance Day.”) Germar pointed out that such utterances on festive occasions are purest hypocrisy since in Germany, this presumed country of laws, there is no freedom of speech. On the contrary, Germany practices the most stringent censorship.

Germar then read an article written by the former presiding judge of Hamburg District Court, G. Bertram, concerning Paragraph 130 of the German Penal Code. The article appeared in NJW (*Neue Juristische Wochenschrift*) issue of 2005, pages 476. In it, Bertram deals very thoroughly and critically with the question of whether Paragraph 130 can be considered constitutional at all. He characterizes Paragraph 130 as the German *Sonderweggesetz* (Peculiar Way) *par excellence*. That is to say, it is comprehensible only against the background of so-called “Recent German History.” Bertram mentions a remark made by Minister of the Interior Wolfgang Schäuble, during a discussion with Ignaz Bubis, now deceased, at that time “Head Jew of the BRDDR.” It was clear that Schäuble understood very well the problems connected with Paragraph 130 but nevertheless, for political reasons, he continued enforcing it unquestioningly and unconditionally.

Germar pointed out that for the present government, the important thing is not for the citizens to know, but to believe. He referred to the history of the medieval Church: “One had to believe that the world was flat, because our planet had to be unique. Educated persons who knew better had to believe it, extremist though it was.” Germar has always opposed the mandatory and extremist concept of German collective guilt, shame and responsibility for the War. As its name implies, the Second World War was the sequel to the First World War. It was the most atrocious war of all time, won by the side that committed the greatest atrocities. Whenever the concept “unique” emerges as the central characteristic of an event, then a “unique investigation” of the event is logically required. The present “BRDDR” system has learned nothing from history. It is in fact incapable of learning. It persecutes dissenters as ruthlessly as preceding systems did. Germar noted that every age has its taboos, and Germany’s present taboo is rooted in Paragraph 130 of the Penal Code. It boils down to Germans’ curtailing German rights and freedoms. Paragraph 130 is the instrumentalization and institutionalization of anti German racism. He recalled the famous quotation of Frederick the Great referring to the Prussian Justice Ministry as “that band of thieves.” He compared the Prussian

ministry's methods of repression with those used against today's Revisionists, who are determined to shake the foundations of this "peculiar" German state structure.

He compared the procedures of the present State with procedures of the Catholic Inquisition and pointed out close parallels between his case and that of Galileo: Germany today is experiencing a relapse into the Dark Ages that Europe thought it had overcome. At 10:30, Germar ended with the impassioned line from Schiller's Don Carlos: "Sire, grant us freedom of thought!" The visitors clapped their approval; Judge Schwab glanced sharply at the crowd but said nothing and did not admonish them. Judge Meinerzhagen, presiding over the Zündel trial, would have thrown one of his famous tantrums at this juncture.

Judge Schwab then addressed several questions to Germar, including :

- 1) Who had responsibility for the Internet pages of <VHO.org.>? When was the "Historical Revisionism" Section placed on the Internet? How were the books listed on Internet promoted and advertised? How did Germar react to 'indexing' by the Federal German Bureau for Protection of Youth?
- 2) The total number of copies of *Lectures on the Holocaust* that had been published; how many copies had been sold in Germany; why the price was listed in dollars and then in Euros; and when the entire book had been posted on the Internet?
- 3) Questions about the financial situation. Germar replied that he would have to consult with his lawyers, and the question was postponed until next trial session.
- 4) Judge Schwab asked about the pseudonyms that Germar had used. Germar replied that he had used pseudonyms to protect himself, in the beginning. Once in exile he stopped using them because he felt safe. The judge suggested that he might have used the various names in order to deceive his readership. Germar denied this, referring to his preceding publications. Judge Schwab and the rest of the Court had no further questions at that point.

District Attorney Grossmann wanted to know what had become of Germar's publishing house. Germar replied that he was no longer in the picture, but had the impression that the firm had divided into British-European and US affiliates.

Judge Schwab wanted to terminate today's proceedings at 11:30 when Germar requested permission to present the opinions of several scientists who have expressed opinions regarding his case. He asked Attorney Stolz to begin. These were articles by two college instructors, one a geographer and the other an engineer. Attorney Bock then read from three additional letters that were available only in English, since they had been written in conjunction with Germar's request for political asylum in the United States. They included an expert opinion by Prof. Ernst Nolte as well as a professor in Sweden. These letters demonstrate that basic freedoms no longer exist in Germany and that Article 5 of German Basic Law has been gutted for political reasons.

In conclusion, Attorney Bock moved that the Court reassess Germar's investigative arrest and release him from incarceration. District Attorney Grossmann opposed this of course. Judge Schwab said that the Court would consider the motion as well as future procedure, in the afternoon. He announced that the Court had plans to take testimony from **two or three witnesses from the BKA** (Bundeskriminalamt, similar to the US FBI) in the next session. When asked about witnesses for the Defense, Attorney Bock said that it has no plans at this time to call on additional witnesses. Judge Schwab adjourned today's session at 12:04 and announced that the main trial would recommence at 9 am on 29th January.

Weinheim, 22 January 2007  
*Günter Deckert*

This report is obviously not a literal transcription of proceedings, it is based on my personal observations. As I have mentioned before, I assume that Germar Rudolf will publish his account of the trial in the form of a book, in the near future. Whoever makes use of my trial reports, in whole or in part, please be kind and decent enough to mention my name as reporter, and not take credit for things

he or she did not do. There are no restrictions on distribution of these reports or their translation into foreign languages. G.D.

Day 8, 29 January 2007

**Reported by Günter Deckert.**  
**Translated by J. M. Damon.**

Only a few uniformed policemen were present. Most of the time there were just five of them, and the routine security check was rather haphazard. Germar was not brought into court in chains today. Proceedings took place in the main courtroom. Scheduled for 9 o'clock, they began at 9:16.

The following were present:

- 1) The usual members of the Court, Judge Schwab presiding;
- 2) District Attorney Grossmann;
- 3) The two attorneys for the defense, Bock and Stolz;
- 4) Three "Staschu" (*Staatschutz*) or state police agents, including an *Anlernling* (trainee). They did not remain in the courtroom the entire time. In addition, there was one bailiff and one court policeman, both armed.
- 5) Continuing their boycott of the Rudolf trial, the "Establishment" media sent no one to cover the proceedings. A retired former reporter for FAZ (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*) was there. We became acquainted and exchanged addresses.
- 6) Visitors: 43, including Dr. Kosiek of Grabert Publishing House and several observers who had traveled long distances, some from Berlin.

Judge Schwab called the court to order and asked the attorneys for the Defense if they had read the 1995 verdict of Stuttgart District Court in its entirety (Germar was tried *in absentia* and given a sentence of 14 months). Attorney Stolz replied that she had been unable to read it because the copy given her was illegible. Judge Schwab ordered that she be given a legible copy.

The first witness was then called: Agent Brockmüller of the BKA (BKA=*Bundeskriminalamt*, the German *Gedankenpolizei* or "Thought Police."). This BKA agent had headed the Rudolf investigation at the behest of the Mannheim District Attorney. He described the course of the investigation, from the BKA's location Germar in the US to his abduction and arrival in Frankfurt. The BKA agent stated that during Germar's first interrogation on 16 November 2005, Germar was still somewhat shaken on account of his sudden abduction and separation from his wife and child. In a rather transparent effort to sow discord within Revisionist ranks, the BKA agent said that Germar requested an "informal discussion" in which he offered to collaborate with the government. The agent said that Germar offered to give up all rights to his website, turning over intact all subscription lists. The agent said Germar offered to assist the government in compiling *Multiplikatorendaten* (replication data) that would be helpful in its war against thought crime, if only the government would allow him to return to his wife and child in the USA. (Germar's associates say that his offer was to vacate an empty domain from which all data had been removed. They doubt that Germar used the expression "*Multiplikatorendaten*," which is a term and concept favored by the bureaucracy of repression.) The BKA agent said that Germar said that if the German government did not accept his terms, his supporters would "flood the market" with revisionist literature and that he, Germar, was the only person who could stop such a thing. (Germar's associates point out that he is not in the habit of making threats.) The BKA agent said the government rejected Germar's offer but he did not say why. The agent said that after seizure of the bank account of Germar's publishing firm at Heidenheimer

Volksbank, a different BKA agent had taken charge of all data concerning sales, subscriptions and circulation. Agent Brockmüller said that this new BKA agent is a specialist in *Hochrechnen der Umsätze* (projecting turnover.)

Judge Schwab then asked who was responsible for the homepage of Germar's website, <vho.org>. Agent Brockmüller said that Germar had accepted full responsibility from the beginning. District Attorney Grossmann then asked questions about the results of the BKA search of the home of Germar's colleague Dr. G., who had managed the firm's account. The BKA agent said they had seized a large list of subscribers, 75% of whom were citizens of the Federal Republic. The BKA agent said that they had analyzed the list in order to estimate *Meinungsvervielfältigern* (opinion replicators). Grossmann then asked what role Germar played in the worldwide movement to revise contemporary historiography. The BKA agent said that Germar's role had been a key one. The BKA agent claimed that since seizure of Germar's bank account and his extradition from the United States, which was a separate operation, Revisionist opinion in Germany had greatly diminished.

Defense Attorney Bock then asked the agent when the BKA had first become involved in Germar's case. The BKA agent replied that the Mannheim District Attorney first approached BKA in 2001. Bock then asked what is meant by *Meinungsvervielfältiger* (opinion replicators). The BKA agent replied that every reader of illicit literature is a *Meinungsvervielfältiger* since he discusses what he has read with third parties. Attorney Bock then questioned the BKA agent about his mission as it concerned Germar. The BKA agent replied that it had been to clarify Germar's residential status in the United States through its Washington contacts. He said the BKA had originally learned Germar's address through wiretaps. They "bugged" the telephone of Dr. G., who immediately called Germar to inform him of the house search and seizure of the bank account.

Attorney Bock asked Agent Brockmüller more questions about his initial interrogation of Germar. Suddenly unable to recall details, the BKA agent replied only that Germar had been agitated. The agent went on to say that he had explained to Germar that he could make no promises concerning the proposed "*Kuhhandel*." He said he told Germar that the two German jurisdictions (Stuttgart and Mannheim) were not the only ones involved in the matter, the Americans were involved as well. He said he told Germar that he would inquire into the matter. The BKA agent said that Germar then told him the government could not have it both ways : they could not expect his cooperation if they kept him in prison.

The BKA agent went on to say that at the second interrogation in Rottenburg, Germar had been more composed, having adjusted to his new situation. The BKA agent said that Germar now claimed that he could not recall having ever entrusted subscription data to Dr. G. The BKA agent said that the subscription and circulation data, which included lists acquired from Thies Christopherson, Udo Walendy and Siegfried Verbeke, included around 9,000 names, 75% of whom lived in the German countries. The agent said that around 4,000 addresses were "active" and organized according to the customer's inclination to buy. The judge then dismissed the witness *unvereidigt* (unsworn.) That is to say, he was not required to take an oath "to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." Perhaps it is significant that Agent Brockmüller's testimony was not given under oath...

The next witness was BKA agent Achilles, who was called into the courtroom at 9:57. He is the BKA "financial expert." He had been responsible for the *dinglicher Arrest* (material arrest) and attachment of the bank account. This BKA agent said that the government has established gross receipts of 214,000 Euros based on various estimates of sales of illicit literature. The agent explained that the BKA method of estimating sales of revisionist literature is the same as its method of estimating sales of illegal drugs. It is also the method that was used in prosecuting Frank Rennie, a writer of **unlawful songs**. The BKA agent stated that in the Fall of 2005, Germar's account showed a balance of 9,000 Euros. This BKA agent went on to say that he had also headed the investigation of *Lectures on the Holocaust*. He said that in the fall of 2005 he had received a copy of *Lectures* from the Mannheim District Attorney. The agent said he was told that it had been downloaded from the Internet and that the unlawful *Lectures* are still available cost free on the Internet at < <http://vho.org> > .

Judge Schwab then invited members of the Court to question the witness.

District Attorney Grossmann had no questions. Defense Attorney Bock asked the agent who had done the official evaluation of *Lectures on the Holocaust*. He asked: what were the professional qualifications of the evaluator? Avoiding his question, the BKA agent responded that “the book” was used as evidence by the Mannheim District Attorney because it had been used in the trial of Ernst Zündel. The agent said that there was a specialized department in the BKA for evaluating unlawful books but that he himself had not read “that book.” Defense Attorney Stolz asked the BKA agent what kind of reading he preferred but she received no reply. Then she asked whether he had read the BKA evaluation of *Lectures on the Holocaust*. The agent said that he had read the evaluation about a year ago but did not find it interesting and did not remember it. Germar then asked about the authors of the evaluation but he received no answer. At around 10:10 this second BKA witness was also released *unvereidigt* (unsworn,) that is, without being required to take an oath to tell “the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.” Perhaps it is significant that BKA Agent Achilles’ testimony, like BKA Agent Brockmüller’s testimony, was not given under oath...

Germar then responded to questions about his financial situation, which he had not discussed in his presentation. He stated that until 2004, around 60 – 70% of all payments had been made through the Volksbank, the remainder having been sold either for cash or else through the mail. He himself had kept books and prepared the tax statement. As a rule, around a third of his total income had consisted of donations. He said that sales of titles not published by Germar’s firm (Revisionist “classics” such as [The Hoax of the Twentieth Century](#) by A. Butz; [The Auschwitz Myth](#) by W. Stäglich and [Foundations of Contemporary History](#) edited by Gauss/Rudolf) have been modest because the market is saturated. Most of his firm’s sales have been of newly released titles.

Judge Schwab then asked questions about Germar’s debts in Britain and the USA.. Germar said they amounted to around 30,000 Euros. He said that he has been able to pay his debts through donations made by his supporters but is still indebted to attorneys in the US. Judge Schwab asked about support payments for the two children of his first marriage and Germar replied that he had been paying 500 Euros, but this has since been increased to 650 Euros, and his present wife is making the payments. He said that his monthly income in the period before his abduction had been around 1500 US dollars. Neither the District Attorney nor the Defense had any questions for him.

Judge Schwab then took up the verdict of Stuttgart District Court dated 23 June 1995. This concerned a strategy paper for future efforts to revise contemporary historiography. Germar said that the inspiration for this had been Klaus E.’s German translation of *The Holocaust on Trial* before the Zündel court in Toronto, in which Zündel was acquitted on account of lack of forensic evidence of the Jewish “Holocaust.” Germar said he did not care for the style of the translation. The other members of the Court had no questions on this issue and they did not state their positions.

Judge Schwab then gave a preview of the coming course of events. He read out the verdict of Mannheim County Court dated 18 August 2004 concerning material arrest, as well as the attachment order relating to the Heidenheimer bank account dated 24 August 2004. The County Court’s total amount is 213,927.63 Euros. Referring to Paragraphs 227 and 265 of the *Strafprozeßordnung* (Rules of Criminal Procedure). He then announced that not only excerpts from the submitted books, brochures, websites and articles would be included in Court records, but the entire texts, along with the advertisement posted on <vho.org> on 29 June 2006. He noted that, according to the findings of the Court, 700 copies of *Lectures on the Holocaust* had been sold in Germany as of January 2005. Defense Attorney Stolz requested the above in writing and Judge Schwab agreed. At 10:30 he announced a pause which lasted until 11:13.

After the pause, Judge Schwab questioned Germar about page 77 of the Stuttgart verdict. This concerned Germar’s attitude toward Jews in general and Ignaz Bubis in particular, as expressed in a personal letter addressed to Karl P. (Translator’s note: Bubis, known as the “Jewish Kaiser” and head of the German *Judenrat* [Jewish Council], had directed the Max Planck Institute to terminate



Germer's employment after the release of the *Rudolf Expert Report*, a chemical analysis of the walls of the camp morgue at Auschwitz. The report proved definitively that the walls had not been exposed to cyanic acid, therefore the morgue could not have been used as a homicidal gas chamber.) Germer did not mince words in his private correspondence, using the outspoken language of Martin Luther and referring to the present German government as *Judenrepublik Deutschland* (Jewish Republic of Germany.) The letter had been written specifically with reference to a speech by the CDU politician Richard von Weizsäcker (subsequently president of the Federal government) in which he urged that Bubis be elected President. Germer apologized for his and Martin Luther's choice of words but said his opinion of Bubis has not changed.

The judge also addressed the subject of incarceration. At the insistence of the powerful American Jewish lobby, Germer had been detained in the US on 19 October 2005 and extradited to Germany on 11 November 2005. The pretext for this was the Stuttgart verdict, even though Germer had committed no act that would have been a crime in the United States. The prison sentence imposed by the Stuttgart verdict was completed on 14 January 2007. Since that time Germer has been held under *Untersuchungshaft* (investigatory detention.) Since July 2006 he has been held in *Überhaft* (superior arrest), which is both *Strafhaft* (punitive incarceration) as well as investigatory detention. On 14 July 2006 still another arrest warrant was issued in conjunction with the trial now under way. Judge Schwab announced that the Court would consider the motion for *Haftüberprüfung* (review of arrest order) filed by Defense Attorney Bock. He said the investigatory detention continues in effect at any rate, since the warrant was renewed on 29 January 2007. He said the consideration of Bock's motion would take place in closed session. He said he would now terminate today's session because a female lay judge was not feeling well. He noted that Germer's record contained the verdict of Stuttgart County Court. Attorney Stolz, responding to Judge Schwab's question concerning motions for continuation of the Defense, moved introduction of the following books in the trial record:

- 1) G. Rudolf: *Das Rudolf-Gutachten* (The Rudolf Expert Report, newest edition);
- 2) E. Gauss: *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (The Foundations of Contemporary History);
- 3) H. Verbeke: [Auschwitz - Nackte Tatsachen](#) (Auschwitz: Naked Facts);
- 4) W. Stäglich: [Auschwitz-Mythos](#) (The Auschwitz Myth);
- 5) J. Graf / C. Mattogno: *Konzentrationslager Stutthoff* (Stutthof Concentration Camp);
- 6) J. Graf: *Riese auf tönernen Füßen* (The Giant with Feet of Clay);
- 7) A. Butz: [Der Jahrhundertbetrug](#) (The Hoax of the Twentieth Century.)

When asked his opinion, District Attorney Grossman expressed no position on the motion. The Court's decision will come in the next session, which will begin on 12 February 2007 at 9 o'clock. The following session will be one day later 13 February (the anniversary of the atrocious Allied destruction of Dresden in 1945.)

Judge Schwab ended the session at 11:00 and announced that the consideration of the review of Germer's *Haftbefehl* (arrest order) would now take place, in secret session. The public had to leave the courtroom. At 12 o'clock Attorneys Bock and Stolz emerged from the courtroom and were quickly surrounded. Attorney Stolz announced that the new arrest order had been affirmed, with added *Erhärtung des Tatvorwurfs* (aggravation of charges) on basis of the present indictment as well as the danger of Germer's absconding.

Attorney Stolz pointed out two circumstances:

- 1) At the time of the first interrogation, Germer had completed two weeks of extradition arrest.
- 2) The Court's objections had to do with the findings of another court.

The picture of the accused as described in the Stuttgart verdict caused the Court, especially the lay judges, to exercise great caution. The Stuttgart verdict stressed subjective considerations such as "what kind of person is the accused?"

Günter Deckert

Weinheim/Baden, 30 Januar 2007

Important notice:

This report is based on my personal observations. It is not based on any literal transcription that I have made and certainly not on the official court transcription. It is a rendition of the course of the proceedings as I observed them.

Whoever makes use of this report, in whole or in part, please be so kind as to mention my name as the source.

Thanks! G.D.

### **Day 11, 5 March 2007**

**Reported by Günter Deckert  
Translated by J. M. Damon**

On 5 March, Day 11 of the trial of Germar Rudolf in Mannheim District Court ended with a thunderclap!

The following events took place:

1. Defense Attorney Sylvia Stolz was dismissed!
2. Attorney Pauls of the prominent Bossi legal firm in Munich appeared alongside Defense Attorney Bock!
3. Defense Attorney Bock withdrew all pending motions that had been filed by Attorney Stolz!
4. Neither Attorney Bock nor the new attorney filed any new motions!
5. Judge Schwab concluded the presentation of evidence and allowed District Attorney Grossman to plead his summarization (more about this below.)

What was going on?

Today's proceedings had been scheduled for 9 am but did not begin until 9:54. There was an atmosphere of expectation in the large courtroom. For one thing, a new face had appeared on the Defense side. For another thing, Silvia Stolz repeatedly got up from her seat and walked back and forth in an agitated manner.

In addition, Defense Attorney Bock and the new attorney held a long consultation with Germar in the "catacombs" (the cellar containing windowless holding cells for the defendants.) Tensions mounted, especially when the Defense attorneys visited the judge's chambers as well. Germar entered the courtroom one minute before the Court appeared in its familiar composition.

Germar was not in chains today.

After today's proceedings, Silvia Stolz informed a large crowd that Germar had dismissed her on Friday without giving a reason.

She said she had learned no more about her dismissal until this morning.

Apparently the Defense has been engaged in plea-bargaining with the District Attorney, and this is very probably connected with the entry of the Bossi law firm into the case. Apparently Germar agreed to fire Silvia and refrain from submitting additional motions in return for concessions by the government.

Apparently the District Attorney agreed to reduce his demand for a five-year sentence (the sentence imposed on Ernst Zündel by Judge Meinerzhagen) by half if Germar would get rid of Silvia.

(Silvia's relentless pillorying of the "BRDDR" and her insistence that this "vassal regime" is not the legitimate government of Germany – an argument supported by experts on international law as well as many members of Federal Parliament -- is a major source of embarrassment for the government. Silvia had represented Ernst Zündel until Judge Meinerzhagen ordered her to be forcibly removed from his courtroom.)

Apparently Gernar and the government have reached an American style "deal" or "horse swap" (*Kuhhandel* in German). In keeping with this "deal," District Attorney Grossmann made a very brief summary. It was not even ten minutes long.

He stated that National Socialist "genocide against the Jews" is a "historical fact" even though Revisionists continue to deny this "fact." He stated that the government had proven all the charges contained in Gernar's indictment by quoting from Gernar's Internet postings as well as his widely read book *Lectures on the Holocaust* (available on the Internet at web site <vho.org>), thus meeting the requirements of Paragraph 130 of BRDDR Basic Law.

The District Attorney reiterated several examples taken from the Rudolf-Verbecke thirty page indictment. (The Court refused to accept the Verbecke case, however.) The District Attorney described Gernar as a "wolf in sheep's clothing," and a "crafty denier" of "Holocaust" and accused him of "trivializing National Socialist crimes." He claimed that although Gernar denied being a National Socialist and anti Semitic, certain of his remarks as well as certain passages from his personal correspondence painted a different picture. He said Gernar is in fact a "serial evildoer" who "spreads lies around the world."

He said that Gernar (who has a PhD. degree in Chemistry from the Max Planck Institute) pretended to be a scientist and liked to compare himself with great men such as Luther, Gallileo and Karl Popper. He implied that Gernar confused himself with Jesus and remarked that he might even believe he could walk on water. The District Attorney then noted that the Court had scheduled additional proceedings on 20 and 27 March, 23 and 27 April and 8 May but had now adopted a new procedure. He observed that Gernar had already been separated from his family and penalized by incarceration and that a prison sentence of thirty months would be appropriate for his transgressions of opinion.

Defense Attorney Bock dispensed with a summarization. Defense Attorney Pauls of the Bossi agency then made a short statement, emphasizing the "change in direction" that had come about through Gernar's changing defense attorneys. He described this as a positive development for all concerned. **He said that future restraint on Gernar's part regarding revisionist matters, as well as the prospect of a peaceful and fulfilling family life, were sufficient reasons why a sentence of twenty four to thirty months would be appropriate.** Since he was the defendant, Gernar had the last opportunity to address the Court. He announced that he had already said all he had to say in his initial testimony, which was over 100 pages long, and he declined to make further statements.

(Regarding the Nature of the Present German Government, Gernar's Defense had earlier maintained that the present "BRDDR" or "OMF" [Prof. Carlo Schmid's "Organizational Form of a Modality of Foreign Rule"] is not a legitimate sovereign government but rather a pseudo democratic dictatorship. He had maintained that the present government is a vassal regime imposed on Germany by the victors of World War II, which illegally imposes taboos on its citizens in violation of Article 19 of the United Nations Charter [Declaration of Human Rights].  
[http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/Dissenters1/Mahler/Hennig\\_engl.htm](http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/Dissenters1/Mahler/Hennig_engl.htm)

Judge Schwab closed the session at 10:45 and announced that he would pronounce verdict on 4:15 pm on March 15.

*Günter Deckert*

Weinheim in Baden, 5 March 2007.

Reporter's remarks: Germar did not authorize this account of today's session, nor do I have his power of attorney, nor do I need his power of attorney. He does not desire this report to be made. This is my own report on today's proceedings and it is all I will write at this time. However, I will also report on the verdict when it is announced.

IN KIEV THEY FIGHT BACK

## David Duke Offers Antisemitism 101' at a Ukrainian University

### Nathaniel Popper

Ex-Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke visited Ukraine's largest university last week to give a stump speech on what he calls "radical Jewish extremists" — his phrase for the Israeli and American government. Duke has become a regular at the university, the Inter-Regional Academy of Personnel Management, which is known by its Ukrainian acronym, MAUP. Last year, Duke was a featured speaker at the university's conference, "Zionism: Threat to World Peace," and he has received both a doctorate and an honorary doctorate from the Ukrainian school.

This time around, Duke's talk in front of university administrators drew particular attention to MAUP's legal battles with its Jewish critics. "The Jewish extremists — the Zionists — they don't want there to be academic freedom in this country, or political freedom in this country," Duke said in a speech that was also broadcast on his personal Web site. "This university and your students and faculty are resisting this attack." Duke was referring to what has become an intense legal tug of war between MAUP on one side and Jewish activists and western governments on the other. The United States State Department has labeled MAUP the leading purveyor of antisemitic material in Ukraine. The American and Israeli embassies in Kiev, along with Jewish organizations, have lobbied the Ukrainian government to take a number of steps to force out the school's current leadership.

MAUP's leaders have struck back in force. In the past year alone, the university has launched **dozens of lawsuits against Ukrainian journalists, rabbis, politicians and academics** — anyone who suggests that the university is antisemitic. A number of possible reasons have been given for MAUP's anti-Jewish efforts. The State Department alleged in an official report that Middle Eastern governments funded the school. Whatever the explanation, the resulting confrontation has international consequences and is drawing in many of the most significant players in the Ukrainian political community. Ukrainian President Victor Yushchenko resigned from his place on MAUP's board last December. Members of the United States Congress debated the situation during negotiations over a American-Ukrainian trade bill. And Vadim Rabinovich, a media magnate and a leader of the Jewish community in Ukraine, has been the target of repeated lawsuits.

One of the newest suits arose out of an effort to show just how excessive the legal battles have become. In September, a leading rabbi in Kiev, Yaakov Bleich, went on television. When asked during a television interview what problems Ukraine was facing, Bleich brought up MAUP. "For instance," Bleich said he told the interviewer, "right now, I'll say on television that MAUP is antisemitic and the guy who runs it is antisemitic. I can expect to be sued by them very shortly." "Sure enough" Bleich added, "two weeks later, they announced the suit. Now they are just attacking anything that moves. They feel the pressure." A spokeswoman for the university declined to comment on the court cases. Little of the enmity and courtroom machinations is evident on a visit to MAUP's campus in suburban Kiev.

The school was founded in 1989 as a private alternative to Ukraine's public university. It now has about 57,000 students. Courses on business and agriculture are taught on a leafy campus that is decked with only a slight overdose of blue and yellow Ukrainian flags. In general Ukrainian society, criticism of the school tends to focus on its low academic standards — the State Department described MAUP as a "diploma mill," and the Ukrainian ministry of education revoked thousands of diplomas that were improperly distributed. But students coming down the main walkway — through a gate that reads "Vivat Academia" — said they had heard little about MAUP's problems with the Jews. Nastia Gukin, a 17-year-old banking student, said that "the students have their own lives. Whatever goes on in the publishing house is separate from us." It is at the upper

echelons where the university is becoming consumed by the ever-widening campaign to expose the perceived misdeeds of the Jews.

Last year, the president of the university, Geogy Schokin, founded a political party, the Ukrainian Conservative Party, which had an election list stacked with MAUP professors. While the Ukrainian officials rejected a request from the Israeli government to ban Schokin from the elections, the party garnered only .09% of the vote, far from the minimum needed for a seat. Schokin laid out his philosophy in a lecture titled "Dialogue of Civilizations," which he presented at a 2002 conference. In bombastic academic language, Schokin explained that Jews around the world are aiming for the "creation, above all, of an extensive and multi-branch network of secret societies coordinated from a single center and based on man-hating principles, 'consecrated' by appropriate religious and historical legends and traditions, the core and pivot of which reside in the doctrine of racial 'selectness,' and a maniacal dedication to and enthusiasm for the 'super-idea' of world supremacy."

For critics, Schokin's influence is felt most widely in MAUP's publishing houses, which publish 400 books, including the works of Schokin and David Duke. Another title is "Sioniski Protocols: Sources and Documents," which had a print run of 5,000. In the book, "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," an antisemitic hoax created by the tsarist secret police, is treated as a genuine document from Jewish hands. The English summary at the back explains that "Talmud ideology creates some tragic actions in human history, compares Hebrews to the world, and proclaims them as a 'selected nation.' This book is intended for researchers of said issue and for global audience." The MAUP presses also put out a magazine and a newspaper. One copy of the newspaper, "Personal Plus," in late September included a piece about a Holocaust memorial service ("Tragedy is good for making money"), a book review ("Greedy American and Jewish corpocrats think that they can steal from other people") and an article about an award for an Israeli poet at a recent book fair, where MAUP's display booth was put next to the toilet ("The organizers showed where the place is for the opponents of the Zionists").

It is these publications that have sparked a number of the lawsuits. A Ukrainian Jewish journalist, Eduard Doks, was sued after making comments at a press conference about the kiosks where MAUP sells its publications. That suit was dropped earlier this week, Doks said, after a judge found that MAUP did not follow "proper legal procedure." MAUP has had more success in its lawsuits against Jewish tycoon and media owner Vadim Rabinovich, who is president of the United Jewish Community of Ukraine. MAUP has launched numerous lawsuits against Rabinovich's Capitol News, and two months ago it celebrated a victory with a special posting on its Web site. The judge had ordered Rabinovich to pay the university \$9,000. The legal framework of these cases has not always been clear. Doks says that the Jewish critics have lost the court cases "because national legislation does not have a definition of antisemitism." But Bleich, the chief rabbi, says the reason for the court victories is easier to understand: MAUP has been willing to bribe judges. "They are paying off judges; there is no question about it," Bleich said.

MAUP's spokespeople did not return phone calls for comment. When a Forward reporter visited the administrative offices, a spokeswoman shut the door after saying, "You can see everything on the Web site." The pressure on MAUP has been increasing during the past year. The school was drawn into negotiations earlier this year in the United States over the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, a piece of legislation that restricted America's trade relations with Ukraine. According to Jewish activists, when Congress was deciding whether to end these restrictions on Ukraine, the decision became linked to the Ukrainian government's promise to rein in MAUP. "We've been pressing the government on this for a long time," said Mark Levin, executive director of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry. The Ukrainian government has not ignored these requests. The government's ministry of education has shut down a number of MAUP's regional branches over the past few months. In the Ukrainian parliament, a Jewish member, Alexander Feldman, has pushed the president and prosecutors to do more; however, even if he succeeds with this, Feldman told the Forward he is not sure what silencing effect it will have. "They enjoy lawsuits," said Feldman, who is initiating his own suit against the university. "The more they get sued, the more P.R. they have. It supports their image of victims."

*Forward*, November 3, 2006

Adelaide Institute

[http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/2006December/contents\\_articles\\_maup.htm](http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/2006December/contents_articles_maup.htm)

REFUSAL TO DEBATE

## A HOLOCAUST REVISIONIST CRITIQUE OF THE THINKING OF DEBORAH LIPSTADT

By Paul Grubach (copyright 2006)

Preliminary Note: In the interest of fairness and accuracy, the following essay was emailed to Dr. Deborah Lipstadt prior to its publication on the [CODOH](#) and [RODOH](#) web sites. She was asked to identify any problems, errors, misinterpretations, falsities, etc. If need be, these would be eliminated or corrected. We have no desire whatsoever to publish any false or misleading material. Quite predictably, she never responded.

### I. The Importance of Deborah Lipstadt

In her 1993 critique of the Holocaust revisionist movement, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*, Dorot professor of Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies at Emory University, Deborah Lipstadt, attacked British historian David Irving and labeled him “one of the most dangerous spokespersons for Holocaust denial.”<sup>1</sup> In response, Irving sued Lipstadt and her publisher, Penguin UK, for libel. The subsequent trial in London, beginning in January 2000, received world-wide coverage, as the media spotlight fell upon the historiography of the Holocaust and the ongoing battle between traditional and revisionist views of the Jewish tragedy in WWII.

The trial ended in April of 2000. Irving lost his case and Lipstadt’s victory was front page news worldwide. However, the trial’s implications were far from over. As historian Daniel Jonah Goldhagen so rightly noted in *The Washington Post’s Book World*, “The trial was an event, covered around the world, of substantial social and political importance.”<sup>2</sup>

The *Daily Telegraph* of London proclaimed the Irving-Lipstadt courtroom drama did “for the new century what the Nuremberg tribunals or the Eichmann trial did for earlier generations.”<sup>3</sup> “All critics agreed,” *Bookmarks Magazine* noted, “that Lipstadt’s story is a fascinating one and an important historical lesson for the record.”<sup>4</sup> The influential *Kirkus Reviews* claimed that Lipstadt’s version of events, *History on Trial*, is “A fascinating and meritorious work of legal—and moral—history.”<sup>5</sup> Even the contemporaneous Prime Minister of Israel, Ehud Barak, took the time out from meetings with President Bill Clinton to praise Lipstadt for her “important victory on behalf of the Jewish people.”<sup>6</sup>

Although well known attorney Alan Dershowitz claimed that Lipstadt’s victory was the most important courtroom defeat for Holocaust “denial” in recent history, Irving didn’t lose his case because of any inherent flaw in Holocaust revisionism.<sup>7</sup> For one thing, the maverick British historian, who represented himself in court, is not a lawyer, and he squared off against a very talented legal team. But just as importantly, David Irving himself has stated that he is not an authority on the Jewish tragedy of WWII or Holocaust revisionism. Indeed, he has admitted that he has not even read important Holocaust revisionist studies--most notably, Arthur Butz’s *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*.<sup>8</sup>

Even the trial judge, Mr. Justice Charles Gray, pointed out in his final ruling that Irving was at a disadvantage because he could not cross-examine Lipstadt in regard to his claim that there was an international Jewish conspiracy to silence him. “Irving has been greatly hampered, “the British magistrate noted, “ in presenting this aspect of the case by the unexpected decision of the Defendants, in full knowledge of the allegations which Irving was making about the conduct of Lipstadt, not to call her to give evidence and to be cross-examined by Irving. It goes without saying that the Defendants were perfectly entitled to adopt this tactic but it did place Irving, acting in person, at a disadvantage.”<sup>9</sup>

In the eyes of the mainstream media, Deborah Lipstadt has emerged as one of the world’s most important authorities on “Holocaust denial.” Establishment media sources have “lionized” her, and she is looked upon as a major defender and spokesperson for the Jewish community in particular, the forces of “morality, peace and justice” in general. The state of Georgia’s most important newspaper, the *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, put it in these terms: “In Britain, as in the United States, she had been widely portrayed as the defender of good against David Irving’s bumbling prince of darkness.”<sup>10</sup>

In contrast to this bombastic picture, Lipstadt, in a refreshing burst of honesty, hinted that she

really did very little to deserve this exaggerated praise. “During the [press] interviews,” she writes, “a number of reporters commented on my ‘dignity’ during the trial. Since I had done nothing but remain silent, I was, at first, perplexed by their reaction.”<sup>11</sup>

It is important to penetrate and analyze her thinking, because it is reflective of a large and powerful segment of the Jewish community in particular, the Western mainstream media in general—two entities that wield enormous power and influence. Her books and statements express in a very clear way the distorted ideological line of thought that “justifies” and “legitimizes” the current sociopolitical status quo in parts of the world today.

## II. Lipstadt’s Dogmatic View of Holocaust Revisionism and Her Refusal to Debate

One of Lipstadt’s most important claims is that Holocaust revisionism is utter nonsense, on a par with flat earth theory, implying that her orthodox view of the Holocaust is as certain as our knowledge of the earth’s spherical nature. In her own words: “[Holocaust revisionist] arguments make as much sense as flat-earth theory.”<sup>12</sup>

Here we have an excellent example of the fallacy of “faulty analogy.” As logician Alex C. Michalos points out, this flaw in reasoning is committed when the analogous or compared things have more *differences* than similarities.<sup>13</sup>

In addition to scientific experiments that can be performed here on earth to demonstrate the earth’s spherical nature, there are photographs from outer space.<sup>14</sup> By way of contrast, one of the foremost Holocaust authorities, historian Raul Hilberg, admitted that scientific proof for the existence of the “Hitler gas chambers” is missing. No authentic and genuine autopsy report exists to show that Jews were killed with poison gas. No one has ever produced any photographs of Jews being gassed.<sup>15</sup>

As the late Jean-Claude Pressac (widely considered to be an authority on the alleged Auschwitz gas chambers) has pointed out, in the blueprints, construction documents and work orders that trace the construction and subsequent use of the buildings that allegedly housed the “Auschwitz gas chambers,” there is no explicit reference to the use of gas chambers or Zyklon B for homicidal purposes.<sup>16</sup> This was also reluctantly admitted at the Irving-Lipstadt trial in London.<sup>17</sup>

Notwithstanding the capture of literally tons of German documents after WWII, no documentary evidence of a wartime extermination order, plan or program has ever been found. Hilberg admitted as much during his testimony in the 1985 trial in Toronto of Revisionist activist Ernst Zundel.<sup>18</sup> Lipstadt herself confirms there is no written order from Hitler authorizing the destruction of the Jews.<sup>19</sup>

One of the most important pieces of “evidence” traditionally adduced to “prove” the “Holocaust” is the testimony of Rudolf Hoss, a commandant of Auschwitz. Lipstadt and Christopher Browning (a prominent Holocaust historian who was a part of her defense team at the Irving-Lipstadt trial) have admitted that Hoss’s confessions are unreliable, as he had been tortured by the British into confessing to a fantastic and unbelievable number of murders.<sup>20</sup>

Dr. Lipstadt insists “the existence of the Holocaust [is] not a matter of debate.”<sup>21</sup> But as we have just pointed out, negating this viewpoint is the fact that all the necessary photographic, documentary, and scientific evidence needed to prove Lipstadt’s version of the Holocaust is missing.

Lipstadt adds this most revealing caveat to her claim that Holocaust revisionism is as absurd as flat earth theory: “However, in dramatic contrast to flat-earthers, they [Holocaust revisionists] can cause tremendous pain and damage.”<sup>22</sup> This may be interpreted as an implicit admission that Holocaust revisionism has much more credibility that she cares to publicly admit. If Holocaust revisionism is inherently ridiculous and absurd, the equivalent of flat-earth theory, how could a public airing of it possibly cause “tremendous pain and damage?” A public airing of a belief system that is inherently stupid and foolish would be a golden opportunity for Lipstadt and her colleagues to expose its absurdity and subject its proponents to public humiliation, and ultimately, relegate the Revisionist movement to the dustbin of history.

“When I received invitations to debate deniers,” she writes, “I consistently declined, explaining that while many things about the Holocaust are open to debate, the existence of the event is not.”<sup>23</sup> To debate the Holocaust skeptics, Lipstadt insists, “would give them a legitimacy and stature they in no way deserve. It would elevate their anti-Semitic ideology—which is what Holocaust denial is—to the level of responsible historiography—which is what it is not.”<sup>24</sup>

Despite what Lipstadt writes, if hard evidence for the Holocaust is overwhelming and the claims of Revisionists ridiculous, to engage the latter in debate would not lend them credibility and respect. Quite the contrary! Crossing swords with these “cranks” would be a golden opportunity for Lipstadt to expose their quackery and stupidity. Only if Revisionism has intrinsic validity will it gain stature by a public hearing. The Jewish lady’s refusal to debate carries with it the implicit recognition that

Revisionism has more legitimacy than she cares to admit.

Even if Revisionism is pure balderdash, the public interest would still be served if it was given serious attention in the mainstream media. The truth of the traditional view of the Holocaust could be proven anew. Lipstadt has been quoted as saying that she is “only interested in getting at the truth.”<sup>25</sup> If this is so, then a more complete perception of the truth would be gained in a public debate where her “Holocaust fact” clashed with “Holocaust denial fiction.”

Karl Popper, a prominent philosopher of science, proposed that a statement (a theory, a conjecture) has the status of belonging to the empirical sciences if, and only if, it is potentially falsifiable.<sup>26</sup> If the Holocaust cannot be questioned nor debated, and must be blindly accepted as a “fact,” then it is not falsifiable. If it is not falsifiable, then it is not a scientific theory. Lipstadt’s position violates the canons of good science. A true scientific theory is open to continuous question and debate.

Lipstadt’s ulterior agenda is, I believe, readily apparent. What she is saying is that one must accept the traditional view of the Holocaust doctrine without question, *a priori*. She wants to prevent the public and mainstream media from giving Holocaust revisionism a fair and public hearing, because once the public does this, this would spell doom for her traditional version of the Holocaust.

Furthermore, her position is self-contradictory. She writes: “Deniers, I argued, should be stopped with reasoned inquiry, not with the blunt edge of the law.”<sup>27</sup> Reasoned inquiry includes the fair and reasoned examination of the opponent’s arguments, and a willingness to publicly debate the opposition. Refusing to debate your opponents is not “reasoned inquiry.”

She continues: “Deniers...distort, falsify, and pervert the historical record and, consequently, fall entirely outside the parameters of any historical debate about the Holocaust.”<sup>28</sup> If this is indeed an accurate description of the methods of “Holocaust deniers,” then it would be in the best interests of Lipstadt and her fellow establishment historians to publicly debate them, because this would be a golden opportunity to publicly expose their distortions, falsifications, and overall idiocy. It would be a wonderful opportunity to expose the “Holocaust deniers” as the fools and charlatans that we allegedly are. If the “Holocaust deniers” really do distort, falsify and pervert the historical record, Lipstadt should relish the idea of debating them, because this would be an opportunity for her to expose them and help destroy the revisionist movement once and for all.

It appears as though Lipstadt’s “justification” for refusing to debate is nothing more than a conscience-salving self-deception designed to cover up her fear and insecurity in regard to the validity of Holocaust revisionism. It is actually a somewhat favorable sign for Holocaust revisionism that some of its major detractors like Deborah Lipstadt refuse to debate. It sends the implicit message to the public at large that Holocaust revisionism has more credibility than its opponents dare to publicly admit.

Her real ulterior agenda was laid bare by California psychology professor Kevin MacDonald. At the Irving-Lipstadt trial he pointed out: “They [the Jewish-Zionist Holocaust lobby] think...that their version of events [should] be accepted as the truth and that dissent from certain of these tenets should be viewed as beyond the pale of rational discussion.”<sup>29</sup>

Lipstadt wants her Jewish-Zionist version of the Holocaust to be accepted as “the truth,” and all dissent or questioning of it to be rendered taboo. In this way her traditional view of the Holocaust will be accepted by mainstream society without question. It thus becomes self-perpetuating.

### III. Are Holocaust Revisionists Fascists and Nazis? Lipstadt’s Serious Omission

Another of Lipstadt’s most important dictums is that Holocaust Revisionism is intimately connected to a neo-fascist/neo-Nazi political agenda, adding: “One of the tactics the deniers use to achieve their ends is to camouflage their goals. In an attempt to hide the fact that they are fascists and anti-Semites with a specific ideological agenda, they state that their objective is to uncover historical falsehoods, *all* historical falsehoods.”<sup>30</sup>

In *History on Trial*, Lipstadt makes a determined effort to “prove” that Holocaust revisionism is, in essence, a “neo-Nazi movement.” In this regard, she quotes her defense attorney, Richard Rampton: “The bridge between Holocaust denial and the Hitler apology from antisemitism is very easy to build, because what more would an historian who is an anti-Semite want to do in the exculpation of Hitler...what more would he want to do than to deny the Holocaust?”<sup>31</sup>

*Rampton further charged that David Irving deliberately ignores or attempts to “rationalize away” evidence that does not fit his preconceptions. In his own words: “What he [Irving] does not like, he ignores.”*<sup>32</sup> This charge could very well hurl back at his client, Deborah Lipstadt.

In her 1993 book, *Denying the Holocaust*, she cited an article by a noted expert on political extremism, Laird Wilcox.<sup>33</sup> In that 1988 article, Wilcox pointed out that possibly 25% of Holocaust



revisionists are neo-Nazi apologists, which meant that the majority, 75%, were not. She must have been aware that Wilcox made this point, because she briefly discussed the Wilcox article in which he made this point. Yet, because it contradicts her claim that Holocaust revisionism is a “fascist/neo-Nazi movement,” I believe she ignored it and failed to bring it to the attention of her readers. Thus, Rampton’s charge—that Irving ignores what he does not like—hurls right back at his client, Deborah Lipstadt.

#### IV. Miscellaneous Criticisms of Lipstadt’s View of the “Nazi Final Solution”

A comprehensive discussion of the National Socialist “Final Solution” to the Jewish Question is beyond the scope of this article. However, a few important comments are called for, since this is a topic of discussion in Lipstadt’s books.

Lipstadt has discussed the current debate among establishment historians concerning the nature of the “Final Solution.” She writes that “*intentionalists* contend that Hitler came to power intending to murder the Jews and instituted an unbroken and coherent set of policies directed at realizing that goal. In contrast, *functionalists* argue that the Nazi decision to murder the Jews did not originate with a single Hitler decision, but evolved in an incremental and improvised fashion.”<sup>34</sup> Yet, nowhere in *History on Trial* or elsewhere (to my knowledge) does she cite the evidence from the Irving-Lipstadt trial that undermines both viewpoints.

Judge Gray made this statement in his “Final Judgment,” which Lipstadt failed to inform her readers of: “In this connection, Irving, in order to rebut the claim that Hitler displayed a vindictive attitude towards Jews on this (or any other) occasion, drew attention to the willingness of Hitler on occasion to approve some merciful disposal for individual Jews or groups of Jews. Irving instanced the permission given by Hitler for 70,000 Jewish children to leave Romania and travel to Palestine. Longerich [a German defense expert for Lipstadt’s defense team] agreed that there were times when Hitler exempted certain Jews from deportation or extermination.”<sup>35</sup>

If Hitler ultimately intended to murder the Jews of Europe and wipe them off of the face of the earth, why would he allow 70,000 Jewish children—the seeds of future Jewish generations—to escape the National Socialist grasp and leave for Palestine? It is evidence like this that calls into question all traditional views of the Final Solution, and which Lipstadt fails to bring to her reader’s attention.

Lipstadt tries to explain away the fact that there is no single document to prove the existence of the infamous “Nazi gas chambers.” In her own words: “[Historians] do *not*, as Irving kept demanding, seek a ‘smoking gun,’ one document that will prove the existence of the gas chambers.”<sup>36</sup>

This is very misleading. Let us assume for the sake of argument that historians found an authentic and genuine document (i.e., forensic studies showed that it was not a forgery), dated between 1941 and 1945, signed by Adolf Hitler and it stated: “I, Adolf Hitler, hereby order that all Jews under German control are to be murdered in homicidal gas chambers.” If such a document were found, this would be proof that the National Socialists did have a policy (or at least attempted) to murder Jews in gas chambers. In fact, historians have found a *single* document that proves that Hitler did order into existence a policy to kill the incurably sick.

In October 1939, Hitler had one of his secretaries type on his own headed notepaper a memorandum that contained this order: “Reichsleiter Bouhler and Dr. med. Brandt are commissioned with responsibility of extending the authority of specified doctors, so that, after critical assessment of their condition, those adjudged incurably ill can be granted mercy-death.”<sup>37</sup> Here we have a single document proving that Hitler did authorize the incurably sick to be killed. So if there was a written order from Hitler authorizing the incurably ill to be killed, why wasn’t there a written Hitler order to mass murder Jews in gas chambers?

By the mere fact there is no *single*, authentic and genuine, war-time document ordering the mass murder of Jews in gas chambers is just one more good reason to be skeptical of the existence of the “Nazi gas chambers.” (Establishment historians offer only twisted and contorted rationalizations as to why there is no single document ordering the mass murder of Jews in gas chambers.)

Lipstadt continues. She claims that not a single document, but a “convergence of evidence” proves the existence of the “Nazi gas chambers.” In her own words: “[Historians] seek a nexus or convergence of evidence [to prove the existence of the Nazi gas chambers].”<sup>38</sup>

Here, Lipstadt puts forth the worn out and fallacious “convergence of evidence proof” for the traditional view of the Holocaust that has been refuted by revisionists in other studies. Revisionist historian Mark Weber revealed that one could use a convergence of evidence to “prove” that inmates were gassed en masse at Dauchau concentration camp, where it is now generally agreed there were no homicidal gassings.<sup>39</sup> A convergence of evidence (complete with eyewitness testimonies, expert

reports, and an onsite, physical study of the murder weapon itself) could be employed to “prove” the Germans murdered prisoners in “steam chambers” at Treblinka.<sup>40</sup> But it is now agreed no one was ever murdered in such a manner, as this “convergence of evidence” is entirely false. In point of fact, the evidence used to “prove” homicidal gassings in Auschwitz-Birkenau, Treblinka, etc. is not really qualitatively different from the evidence used to “prove” the mythical gassings at Dauchau and in the phony “steam chambers” of Treblinka.

For a thorough refutation of this “convergence of evidence proof,” I refer the reader to the analysis of Revisionist scholar Carlo Mattogno.<sup>41</sup>

## V. Does Deborah Lipstadt Have the Psychological Characteristic of an Extremist?

Two experts on political extremism, Professor John George and Laird Wilcox, pointed out that one psychological characteristic of a political extremist is that she openly advocates double standards and feels no guilt for so doing.<sup>42</sup> As we shall soon see in the following sections, Lipstadt appears to display this psychological characteristic in regard to the race and ethnic intermarriage issues. It is somewhat ironic that she condemns her ideological opponents of extremism, yet she herself exhibits a prominent characteristic of a political extremist.

## VI. The Zionist Politics and Hypocritical Double Standard of Deborah Lipstadt

In order to understand the agenda and emotional driving force behind Lipstadt’s behavior and public pronouncements, one has to know something about her intense political sympathies.

Lipstadt points out that she is an “openly identifying Jew,” and owns up to an early perception that her Jewish ethnic group is different from the surrounding non-Jewish society.<sup>43</sup> “As a young child,” she reminisces, “I remember sensing that these Central European Jewish homes, with their heavy, dark furniture and steaming cups of tea accompanied by delicate homemade strudel and other distinctly European pastries, were different from those of my American schoolmates.”<sup>44</sup>

She expresses pride in the fact that, early in life, she marched in solidarity with those who wanted to implement Black-White integration policies in the United States: “My mother and I marched in Harlem in solidarity with the Birmingham-Salem civil rights protestors. We took a vicarious pride in the fact that Andy Goodman, one of the civil rights workers murdered in Mississippi, had lived down the block from us and we always pointed out this building to visitors.”<sup>45</sup>

Early in life, she did not have a passionate attachment to Israel and political Zionism: “In 1966, anxious to experience travel abroad, I made a relatively impetuous decision to attend Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Though my family were supporters of Israel, I was not driven by a Zionist commitment.”<sup>46</sup> Yet, when she visited Israel for the first time, it was akin to a religious experience: “Going to Israel was not a purposeful choice but was to have a life-changing impact.”<sup>47</sup> In Lipstadt’s own words: “It was time to go ‘home’ [Israel].” Never before had I thought of Israel with such emotion.”<sup>48</sup>

The politics of Deborah Lipstadt are pervaded by a hypocritical double standard. She actively worked to create a racially integrated, multicultural society in the United States. And, all throughout her books she pays lip service to “racial equality,” and ardently condemns non-Jews that reject ethnically integrated, multiracial societies outside of Israel. Yet, she most passionately identifies with Israel—an ethnically segregated society whose government actively works to ensure Jewish supremacy and to destroy any chance of an egalitarian, multiracial society from developing between Jews and Arabs.

Far from working for an integrated society in which Jews and Arabs functioned as social and political equals, the Jews who founded Israel created a society in which Israeli Jews dominate “Israeli” Arabs, a separate and unequal society in which discrimination against non-Jews and Jewish supremacy are an integral part of the established social order.<sup>49</sup>

Diplomat, international lawyer and statesman (a former Undersecretary of State in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations), the late George W. Ball, describes in stark terms the racist foundations of the Jewish state that Lipstadt so ardently identifies with: “The Jewish plan for an exclusively Jewish state, free of the inconvenient presence of native peoples was scarcely new. Theodor Herzl [founding father of modern Zionism] had laid out the framework for such a system in 1898, when he sought a charter from the Ottoman Sultan...One of the provisions of that abortive charter gave the [Jewish Colonial] Society the power to deport the natives, and Herzl sought such powers whether the new Jewish homeland was to be in Argentina, Kenya, Cyprus or Palestine. The Jewish Land Trust incorporated this doctrine in its rules, which designated all of its properties exclusively for Jewish use and even prohibited the employment by the Jewish tenants of non-Jews, thereby forcing such persons to seek employment abroad.”<sup>50</sup>

Predictably, the Zionists ended up producing an Athenian democracy for Jews and second-class citizenship or feudal servitude for non-Jews.<sup>51</sup>

Just recently, an important Israeli official made it perfectly clear that it was a goal of Zionist policy that Israeli Jews in Jerusalem are to be segregated from Palestinian Arabs in order to make certain that Jews remain the dominant element in that city, and that the ethnic/racial character of the city remains predominantly Jewish. In the article's own words: "Israel's separation barrier in Jerusalem is meant to ensure a Jewish majority in the city and not just serve as a buffer against bombers, an Israeli Cabinet minister acknowledged Monday."<sup>52</sup> This clearly contradicts Lipstadt's publicly stated policy of favoring ethnically integrated, multiracial societies where all ethnic and racial groups function as social and political equals.

Why the contradiction? That is to say, why does Deborah Lipstadt favor creating ethnically integrated, multiracial societies in the United States and Europe, yet she most passionately identifies with the Israel--an ethnically segregated state where Jewish dominance and racialism are the order of the day?

Enter California State University Professor Kevin MacDonald, an evolutionary psychologist who Lipstadt bitterly attacks. MacDonald pointed out that certain powerful Jewish groups favor ethnically integrated, multiracial societies outside Israel because societies such as these foster and accommodate the long-term Jewish policy of non-assimilation and group solidarity.<sup>53</sup>

MacDonald and African-American intellectual Harold Cruise observe that Jewish organizations view white nationalism as their greatest potential threat and they have tended to support Black-white integration policies presumably because such policies dilute Euro-American power and lessen the possibility of a cohesive, nationalist Euro-American majority that stands in opposition to the Jewish community.<sup>54</sup>

In a racially integrated, multicultural society with numerous different and competing ethnic groups with divergent interests, it is very unlikely the surrounding gentiles can ever develop a united and cohesive majority to oppose the very cohesive Jewish community. "Tolerant" gentile populations that have only a weak and feeble sense of their own racial/cultural identity are less likely to identify certain powerful groups of Jews as alien elements against which they must defend themselves. Gentile populations that have a strong racial/cultural identity are more likely to identify certain groups of Jews as alien outsiders, against which they must compete with. Thus, a racially integrated, multicultural society (outside of Israel) is what most Jewish-Zionist groups prefer, because in such a cultural milieu they can gain tremendous power and influence.<sup>55</sup>

Lipstadt bitterly condemns the personhood and theories of Professor MacDonald.<sup>56</sup> Yet, her hypocritical behavior actually vindicates MacDonald's theories. If the creation of racially integrated, multicultural societies were truly her ultimate goal, we should expect that she would insist on such society in Israel just as earnestly as she insists on such a society in the US and Europe. But this is not the case. She is proud of the fact that she marched in solidarity with those who worked to build an integrated society in the US, yet she most passionately identifies with an ethnically segregated, apartheid state in the Middle East. This suggests that she is indeed using "racial brotherhood" ideologies in the service of her own Jewish-Zionist nationalism.

## VII. The "Holocaust," European and Jewish Identity, and the Ethnic Double Standard

In her books, Lipstadt condemns the Holocaust revisionist [Institute for Historical Review](#) (IHR) for bringing to light some of the damaging effects of the lies and exaggerations in the Holocaust story. In a tone of self-righteous hypocrisy, Lipstadt claims: "[The former Director of the IHR] revealed another of the IHR's true agenda items with his warning that acceptance of the Holocaust myth resulted in a radical degeneration of acceptable standards of human behavior and lowering the self-image of White people. These racist tendencies, which the IHR has increasingly kept away from the public spotlight, are part of the extremist tradition to which it is heir."<sup>57</sup>

In other words, it is "racist and extremist" for non-Jewish Europeans to be the least bit concerned about the negative effect that the Holocaust ideology has on the European identity.

Enter Dr. Robert Jan van Pelt, an important member of Lipstadt's defense team who authored the very important anti-Holocaust revisionist tome, *THE CASE FOR AUSCHWITZ: EVIDENCE FROM THE IRVING TRIAL*.<sup>58</sup> He claimed that Holocaust revisionism is an evil assault upon the Jewish self-image and identity. In a frank and honest discussion, he admitted that when he read Holocaust revisionist literature, he "had come face to face with a dangerous personal abyss." His implicit conclusion is that this is one of the main reasons why Holocaust revisionism should be attacked and destroyed.<sup>59</sup>

Professor van Pelt then quotes Jewish writer Erika Apfelbaum as to why Holocaust revisionism

is “so evil” and why it should be attacked and refuted. She stated: “Current Jewish history is deeply rooted in Auschwitz as the general symbol of the destruction of the Jewish people during the Holocaust. For someone whose past is rooted in Auschwitz, the experience of reading through the revisionists’ tortured logic and documentation is similar to the psychologically disorienting experience of sensory deprivation experiments or solitary confinement in prison, where one loses touch with reality. The insidious effect of reading this [Holocaust revisionist] literature is to lose one’s identity as a survivor and, more generally, as a Jew. Therefore, the revisionist allegations serve to dispossess the Jews from their history and in doing so, in seeking to destroy a people’s history, a symbolic genocide replaces a physical one.”<sup>60</sup>

Consider the overall “moral” judgments in this whole scenario. According to Lipstadt, van Pelt and the Holocaust lobby in general, it is “evil, racist and extremist” for white gentiles to be the least bit concerned about the damage that certain Holocaust lies and exaggerations are doing to the European collective identity. Indeed, Europeans and Euro-Americans are supposed to just meekly accept what the Jewish power elite says about the Holocaust, no matter how damaging it is to the European collective self-identity. Yet, it is positively demanded that Jews fight against Holocaust revisionism, so as to protect and vindicate the Jewish self-identity.

At the beginning of his tome, van Pelt quotes Jewish-Zionist theologian and “moral beacon” Elie Wiesel. He says that the alleged mass murder of Jews at Auschwitz “signifies...the failure of two thousand years of Christian civilization...”<sup>61</sup> He is clearly referring to all European Christendom.

Further evidence showing that Lipstadt’s traditional view of the Holocaust is indeed a psychological assault upon the entire European world, and not just upon the Germans and those who were allied with them during WWII, was demonstrated by the remarks of Israel’s Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, in a special Knesset session marking the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau. According to *The International Jerusalem Post*, “Sharon blamed the Western allies for knowing about the annihilation of Jews in the Holocaust, but doing nothing to prevent it.” He said the “sad and horrible conclusion is that no one cared that Jews were being murdered.”<sup>62</sup>

According to the “morality” of Lipstadt, van Pelt, Wiesel, Sharon and the Jewish-Zionist power elite that they represent, European Christians are supposed to meekly accept the aforementioned statements as “the truth,” and any attempt to debunk certain Holocaust lies and exaggerations and their ensuing moral implications is of course “racist, evil and extremist.”

Using language very similar to that of Apfelbaum, the European Christian could say: “The insidious effect of reading the lies and exaggerations in the Holocaust literature is to lose one’s identity as a European Christian. Therefore, the ‘gas chamber’ tale and some other false Holocaust allegations serve to dispossess European Christians from their history, and in doing so, in seeking to destroy a people’s history, a symbolic genocide replaces a physical one.” The problem is of course, the predominant “morality” in the Western world doesn’t allow the European Christian to think this way.

Just as Jews have the right to maintain a good collective self-image, so too with non-Jews of European descent. They too have the right to fight against those historical lies and distortions that damage their collective self-identity.

### VIII. Deborah Lipstadt and Her Hypocritical Talk on Ethnic Inter-marriage

Since Lipstadt’s pronouncements on racial/ethnic inter-marriage accurately reflect the duplicity, deception and hypocrisy that characterize so much of what Jewish and non-Jewish mainstream media outlets promote, a thorough discussion is called for.

When asked by Lipstadt’s attorney Rampton about his views on interracial marriage, historian Irving stated: “I have precisely the same attitude about this as [Lipstadt]...I believe in God keeping the races the way he built them.”<sup>63</sup>

In response, Lipstadt writes: “As soon as Irving said this, I began to pulsate with anger. This was not my view. I was deeply troubled by inter-marriage between Jews and non-Jews because it threatened Jewish continuity. Color or ethnicity were entirely irrelevant to me.”<sup>64</sup> She goes on to say that she was very disappointed that nothing was done to clarify her position on racial inter-marriage at the trial, and that false ideas were floating around about her position on racial inter-marriage.<sup>65</sup>

If *ethnicity* is truly entirely irrelevant to her, and *Jewish continuity* was her only concern, then we should expect that she would have adopted the following policy. It is acceptable for Jews to marry non-Jews of any color or ethnic group, as long as the non-Jewish partner adopts the Jewish religion and Jewish cultural customs. But she did not adopt this policy; she is flatly opposed to inter-marriage—period. As the Jewish journalist Dan Gutenplan pointed out: “[I]t was hard not to feel queasy listening to Rampton quiz Irving about his attitude to ‘inter-marriage between the races’—on behalf of [Lipstadt] who has written, ‘We [Lipstadt and her fellow Jews] know what we fight against: anti-Semitism and

assimilation [of Jews and non-Jews], intermarriage [between Jews and non-Jews] and Israel-bashing.”<sup>66</sup>

Furthermore, she may not be revealing how she *really* feels about intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews. As Jewish author Ellen Jaffe McClain pointed out in *Embracing the Stranger: Intermarriage and the Future of the American Jewish Community*, Lipstadt is simply flatly opposed to intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews: “Although people like Deborah Lipstadt, the Emory University professor who has written and lectured widely on Holocaust denial, have exhorted Jewish parents to just say no to intermarriage, much the way they expect their children not to take drugs, a large majority of parents (and more than a few rabbis) are unable to lay down opposition to intermarriage [between Jews and non-Jews] as a strict operating principle.”<sup>67</sup> According to this, she is not just “deeply troubled” by intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews—she loathes it.

There is even evidence within *History on Trial* itself that suggests Lipstadt may be engaging in deceit when she claims that “ethnicity is entirely irrelevant to her.” On pp. 12-13, she implicitly condemns the policy of the former Soviet Union on the issue of the Holocaust, because of the USSR’s refusal to validate the concept of a “Jewish ethnicity” by identifying the victims of the Holocaust as Jews. In her own words: “To have identified the victims [of the Holocaust] as Jews would have validated the notion of ethnicity, a concept contrary to Marxist ideology.”

So let’s get things straight. She implicitly condemns the Soviets for refusing to validate the concept of “Jewish ethnicity.” (The reader is encouraged to read pages 12 and 13 to see for himself that this is correct.) Yet, when it suits her ideological purposes to condemn David Irving and weasel her way out of her dilemma, on page 182, she claims that “ethnicity is entirely irrelevant to her.”

There is more evidence that she is possibly being duplicitous when she claims that “color and ethnicity are entirely irrelevant to her.” Dr. Oren Yiftachel, an Israeli professor at Ben-Gurion University, pointed out that Israel is not a democracy in the sense in which it is currently understood in the West. Rather, it is an “ethnocracy”—a land controlled and allocated by ethnicity. In his own words: “The Israeli regime is ruled by and for one ethnic group in a multi-ethnic reality. Factors that make Israel an “ethnocracy” include the facts that 1) immigration to the Jewish state is restricted to Jews only. Some 2.5 million displaced Palestinians who would like to return are not allowed to migrate to Israel; 2) military service is according to ethnicity; 3) economic control is based on race, religion, and ethnicity; 4) The country’s land regime entails transfer of land ownership in one direction, from Arab to Jewish control, but never back again.”<sup>68</sup>

If ethnicity is entirely irrelevant to her, then why does she passionately identify with apartheid Israel—a state that is based on the principle that the Jewish ethnic group is to be preserved for all time, and is to remain separate from and dominant over non-Jews within the state?

Lipstadt may have made this statement—“color and ethnicity are entirely irrelevant to me”—to meet the propaganda needs of the moment. That is, to “refute” the allegation of David Irving and hide her strong feelings of Jewish racialism. Said claim does not appear to reflect her real feelings.

## IX. Closing Statement

The work of Deborah Lipstadt contains fallacies, apparently false claims, omissions and flawed judgment calls that are riddled with a hypocritical double standard.

One question remains. Why Didn’t Deborah Lipstadt testify at the Irving-Lipstadt Trial? She pointed out that Rampton was against putting her on the witness stand. In his own words: “If we go to trial, I will probably not put you in the witness box. You are being sued for what you wrote. Having you give testimony will not advance our case. It will only divert the judge’s attention from the main focus, David Irving.”<sup>69</sup>

She then adds that “according to British law, Irving could not compel me to give testimony. I listened to Rampton with mixed emotions. I was relieved that I would not have to be cross-examined by a man whose views I abhorred and who certainly would use the opportunity to cross-examine me as a way of ‘settling scores’ for the wrongs he felt he had suffered. At the same time, I was disappointed that I would not be able to openly express my contempt for him. I feared that people would think that I was frightened of facing him.”

In the same vein, she adds: “...I was worried we had made a tactical mistake, allowing Irving to portray me as not only scared of facing him but having something to hide.”<sup>70</sup>

One suspects that Rampton, being the shrewd attorney that he is, may have realized that it could end up being a total disaster if Lipstadt was cross-examined by Irving. Irving could have caught Lipstadt in the hypocritical double standards, fallacies, omissions, bad logic, etc, that we have shown here.

One of Lipstadt’s defense team experts, Dr. Richard Evans, was quoted as saying: “Irving is

essentially an ideologue who uses history...in order to further his own political purposes.”<sup>71</sup> Should we take out the name of David Irving from the sentence and put in Deborah Lipstadt’s?

She admits that Evans may have “thought me a hyperbolic, American, Jewish woman who was more an ideologue than an open-minded historian.”<sup>72</sup> An “ideologue” is one that promotes a body of ideas, distorted and untrue in the main, that serves the political, social and psychological needs of a power elite. Based upon what has been revealed in this essay, could Deborah Lipstadt be described as a Zionist ideologue?

Prominent British intellectual John Keegan made this most cogent comment: “Prof. Lipstadt...seems as dull as only the self-righteously politically correct can be. Few other historians had ever heard of her before this case. Most will not want to hear from her again.”<sup>73</sup>

Is Deborah Lipstadt a self-righteous Zionist ideologue that operates with hypocritical double standards? I will let the reader be the judge.

At the dawn of a new age of reason, Lipstadt’s books will, I believe, stand as a testament to the political, moral and ideological corruption that currently pervades Western Society.

## Footnotes

1. Deborah E. Lipstadt, [\*Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory\*](#) (The Free Press, 1993), p. 181, passim.
2. See Daniel Jonah Goldhagen’s book review of Deborah Lipstadt’s *History on Trial* in *The Washington Post’s Book World*. Online: [http://www.amazon.com/History-Trial-Court-David-Irving/dp/0060593768/sr=1-3/qid=1161982923/ref=pd\\_bbs\\_3/002-9151824-0830420?ie=UTF8&s=books](http://www.amazon.com/History-Trial-Court-David-Irving/dp/0060593768/sr=1-3/qid=1161982923/ref=pd_bbs_3/002-9151824-0830420?ie=UTF8&s=books).
3. Quoted on dust jacket of Deborah Lipstadt’s *History on Trial: My Day in Court With David Irving* (Harper-Collins, 2005).
4. Online. [For URL, see footnote 2.](#)
5. Ibid.
6. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.278.
7. Ibid, p.304.
8. Personal communication to Paul Grubach.
9. See The Hon. Mr. Justice Gray, “Judgment to be Handed Down on Tuesday, 11th April 2000, Between David John Caldwell Irving and Penguin Books Limited, Deborah Lipstadt.” Paragraph 3.7.
10. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p. 268.
11. Ibid, p.269.
12. Ibid, pp. 16, 301.
13. Alex C. Michalos, *Improving Your Reasoning* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), pp.109-110.
14. Irving Copi, *Introduction to Logic*, 5th ed., (Macmillan, 1978), pp.486-491.
15. *The Sault Star* (Canada), “Scientific evidence of Holocaust missing,” January 18, 1985, p.A11; See Hilberg’s testimony in [Barbara Kulaszka, ed., \*Did Six Million Really Die? Report of the Evidence in the Canadian “False News” Trial of Ernst Zundel—1988\*](#) (Samisdat, 1992), p. 39. Online: <http://zundel.org/english/dsmrd/dsmrd09hilberg.html>. Jean-Claude Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, 1989), p.429. Online: <http://www.mazal.org/Pressac/Pressac0429.htm>
16. Pressac, p.429. Online: <http://www.mazal.org/Pressac/Pressac0429.htm>.
17. See Paul Grubach, “Convergence of Evidence: Reflections on the Irving-Lipstadt Affair,” *The Revisionist*. Online: <http://www.codoh.com/revisionist/tr09irving.html>.
18. [Barbara Kulaszka, ed., \*Did Six Million Really Die? Report of the Evidence in the Canadian “False News” Trial of Ernst Zundel—1988\*](#) (Samisdat, 1992), pp.24-25. Online: <http://zundel.org/english/dsmrd/dsmrd09hilberg.html>.
19. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, pp.127-128.
20. *Vanity Fair*, December 1993, p.117.
21. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, p.1.
22. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.301.
23. Ibid, p.18.
24. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, p.1.
25. *Vanity Fair*, December 1993, p.117.
26. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 1967 ed., s.v. “Karl Raimund Popper,” by Anthony Quinton.
27. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.xx.
28. Ibid, p.25.
29. Ibid, p.158.
30. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, p.4.
31. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.260. Also, see Rampton’s statements on p.259.
32. Ibid, p.259.
33. See Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, p.187. The article being referred to is Laird Wilcox, “The Spectre Haunting Holocaust Revisionism,” *Revisionist Letters* (Spring 1989). Online: <http://www.codoh.com/revisionist/letters/rlspectre.html>.

34. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p. 23.
35. See Hon. Justice Mr. Gray, Paragraph 5.209.
36. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.133.
37. See Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews: Student Edition* (Holmes & Meir, 1985), pp. 225-226.
38. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p. 133.
39. See the video, "The Weber-Shermer Holocaust Debate: The Holocaust Story in the Crossfire." Available online: <http://www.noontidepress.com/catalog/index.php?cPath=35&sort=2a&page=2>. Also, see Pat N. Mason, Jr. , "Exchanging Views on the Holocaust: Debating the Undebatable: The Weber-Shermer Clash," *The Journal of Historical Review*, January/February 1996, p.30.
40. See Paul Grubach, "Convergence of Evidence: Reflections on the Irving-Lipstadt Affair," *The Revisionist*. Online: <http://www.codoh.com/revisionist/tr09irving.html>.
41. Carlo Mattogno, "'Denying History'?—Denying Evidence!: The Phony 'Convergence of Evidence' to 'Prove' the 'Holocaust,'" *The Revisionist*, September 2005, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 9-44.
42. See discussion in Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?* (University of California Press, 2000), p.88.
43. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.283.
44. *Ibid*, p.3.
45. *Ibid*, p.5.
46. *Ibid*, p.6
47. *Ibid*, p.6.
48. *Ibid*, p.9.
49. See the study by Israeli academic, Dr. Uri Davis, *Israel: An Apartheid State* (Zed Books Ltd., 1987).
50. George W. Ball and Douglas B. Ball, *The Passionate Attachment: America's Involvement with Israel, 1947 to the Present* (W. W. Norton & Company, 1992), p. 29.
51. *Ibid*, p.65.
52. Mark Lavie, "Barrier Meant to Ensure Jewish Majority," Associated Press Release, July 11, 2005. Online: <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/n/a/2005/07/11/international/i073139D24.DTL>
53. [Kevin MacDonald](#), *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Praeger, 1998).
54. *Ibid*, pp. 255-257.
55. MacDonald, *passim*.
56. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, pp.151-159.
57. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, p.144; *Denying History*, p.17.
58. Robert Jan van Pelt, *The Case For Auschwitz: Evidence From the Irving Trial* (Indiana University Press, 2002).
59. *Ibid*, p.70.
60. *Ibid*.
61. *Ibid*, p.6.
62. Liat Collins, "From the Ashes," *The International Jerusalem Post*, February 4, 2005, p. 3.
63. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.182.
64. *Ibid*.
65. *Ibid*.
66. Lipstadt quoted in D.D. Guttenplan, *The Holocaust On Trial* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2001), p.209.
67. Ellen Jaffe McClain, *Embracing the Stranger: Intermarriage and the Future of the American Jewish Community* (Basic Books, 1995), p.18.
68. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, July/August 1999, p. 120.
69. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, p.53.
70. *Ibid*, p.89.
71. *Ibid*, p.43.
72. *Ibid*, p.67.
73. *Ibid*, p.282.

<http://p102.ezboard.com/frodohforumfrm50.showMessage?topicID=298.topic>

See further down the self-aggrandizing portrait of Lipstadt by herself in a Bnai Brith paper written by **Allison Hoffman**

## Movimiento por la Segunda República Argentina - (MSRA)

(*Argentine Second Republic Movement*)

English translation of our [Press Releases Nos. 9 and 10](#) - *Buenos Aires, 12th November 2006*

# WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST : THE FINAL COUNTDOWN

As described in our Press Release No. 8 of 25th October, Argentina's National Interest has been severely impaired by local State Prosecutors Alberto Nisman and Marcelo Martinez Burgos who formally accused top government officers of the Republic of Iran of having perpetrated the terrorist bomb attack on the AMIA Jewish Mutual Association's headquarters in July 1994 killing 85 persons. In this way, they are irresponsibly implicating Argentina in a new stage in the vast imperial wars of aggression that the United States and Israel are about to unleash in the Middle East.

The complex political manipulation leading to these false accusations was planned abroad counting with the local support not only of both Argentine State Prosecutors Nisman and Martinez Burgos, but also of Rodolfo Canicoba Corral, the Argentine Federal judge hearing on this case who just ordered the international arrest of ten former Iranian government officers, including former president Ali Akbar Rafsanjani.

Argentina's Judiciary is thus acting on a requirement of the Bush Administration and powerful international and local pro-Israel Zionist lobbying organizations on Argentine President Néstor Kirchner, demanding that he falsely accuses Iran for that terrorist attack. Indications are that Mr. Kirchner bowed to this manipulation in spite of the fact (or rather *because* of the fact) that, after more than twelve years since that attack, the United States, Israel and key Zionist organizations have not been successful in fabricating sustainable proof of any involvement on the part of Syria, Iran or Hezbollah. At the same time, Argentina's Judiciary and intelligence agencies have systematically ignored much more plausible circumstances and evidence which point to the fact that this criminal attack may very well have been the result of deeply embedded conflicts INSIDE of Israel, in particular, and of Zionist interests in general.

Now, all that is needed is for President Kirchner to give the final green light ordering the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to support the Judiciary's decision of ordering the arrest of the accused Iranian officials, something that today appears not only very likely but practically guaranteed. As the president of the Political Counsel of the World Jewish Congress, Rabbi Israel Singer eloquently described these maneuvers which are moving forward with clockwork precision, Argentina's accusations against Iran "*ratify a COMMITMENT on the part of President Kirchner, his wife (First Lady and Senator for Buenos Aires Province, Cristina Fernández de Kirchner) and (Argentine Foreign Minister) Jorge Taiana*" which they made during meetings held with major international Zionist organization top brass in New York City last September.

These are very grave times for Argentina. Right under our noses, the Kirchner government and *its* "Judiciary" are dragging Argentina into the imperial wars of aggression that the United States and Israel are fighting in the Middle East. This will no doubt have very serious consequences for our country. Whilst these maneuvers were being cooked with President Kirchner and his colleagues and relatives in New York, back home in Buenos Aires the AMIA and DAIA Zionist organizations and the local media were raising a hysterical fuss over alleged "Antisemitic Campaigns" (which never took place as we explain in our Press Release No. 3 of 18-Sept-06).

Has the extremely powerful pro-Israeli Zionist lobby threatened to withdraw its support to Mr. Kirchner for his 2007 re-election ambitions? Or is he being threatened about something far, far worse as we explain in our Press Release No. 8 of 25-Oct-06?



GERMAN THINKING

## Why the “special relationship” between Germany and Israel has to be reconsidered

*Manifesto of 25 German Peace Researchers, 15 November 2006*

*Proposed by the authors*

In an interview in the *Die Zeit* on 31 August 2006, on the occasion of a Berlin visit, the Israeli Foreign Minister Zipi Livni said: “But the relationship (between Germany and Israel) has always been special and friendly.” From the German viewpoint, the essence of this special relationship can be formulated as follows: In view of the atrocity of the Holocaust and the precarious situation of Israel, Germany must support the existence and well-being of that country and its population unconditionally, among other things by supplying state-subsidised valuable weapons technology, even if Israel violates international law and human rights and is at war; criticism of Israel's actions should, if at all, be extremely subdued and better refrained from, as long as the country's existence has not been definitively secured.

### Three issues will be discussed here:

1. Is it appropriate and meaningful – as the authors believe it is – to maintain these “friendly relations” and regard them as “special” in the sense indicated above?
2. Is Germany really only obliged to Israel in the Near East?
3. If these two questions are seriously raised, what does this mean for the inner German debate, and for relations between non-Jewish, Jewish and Muslim Germans?

Whatever answers we and our readers, with or against us, arrive at, one thing is not in question: The fact that given the historical uniqueness of the Holocaust, the relationship of non-Jewish Germans to Jews, to all those who regard themselves as such, is unique and must be characterised by particular reserve and sensibility, and that nothing can relieve us of the obligation to resolutely oppose religious Anti-Judaism and ethnically and/or racially motivated anti-Semitism, wherever they appear.

### Friendship or a “special” friendship?

At the inter-human level there can be no doubt that a stable friendship is characterised by the fact that friends also warn one another about mistakes, wrong decisions and wrong actions, and they do this out of a concern for the other's well-being. All the more so, when a lot is at stake for both. As long as such criticism is not made as a moral judgement or in a derogatory language, but instead with sympathy and understanding for the circumstances that caused the other to act, with respect for the freedom of the other, and out of a need to contribute to his or her (also spiritual and moral) well-being, the friendship will benefit as a result.

Does this also apply when one of the two has a deep and long-standing liability towards the other? We believe that the more mature the friendship, the more this is the case in such a relationship. However, the required attitude must be sought anew, and found, in each new situation.

Can this be applied to a large collective or to a political relationship such as that between Israel and Germany? Do not other laws and standards apply here? Yes and no. Yes, because the relationship is considerably more multifaceted, due to the large number of persons involved and their different experiences and views. Those who personally embody this collective relationship as active politicians have to take into account the different feelings and needs of those they represent. Only to a certain extent can they act as they would personally like to. This must always and everywhere be taken into account. No, because large collectives in particular are reliant on critical perceptions and feedback from outside so that wrong decisions can be righted and the development of dangerous blind spots and wrong attitudes be prevented.

Let us assume that after the killing of eight Israeli soldiers and the abduction of two more by the Hizbollah on 12 July 2006 the Israeli government, as would be normal among friends, had informed the German government about their intended responses (destruction of a large part of the infrastructure in Lebanon, including the water, electricity and oil supplies, and of tourism thanks to

the oil spill along the coast; expulsion of the population from southern Lebanon, deliberate risk of high civilian casualties in order to achieve at least a military weakening – if not a disarming – of the Hizbollah; refusal to allow humanitarian corridors so as to get supplies to those who could not flee; complete destruction of the Shiite quarters of Lebanese towns; the week-long blockade of the coast and the airports; and the use of splinter bombs)?

How might the German government, as a friend of Israel's, have reacted? Would it perhaps have been easier for the German government than for the Israeli government to assess the catastrophic global consequences of such "massive retaliation" based on the principle of collective liability? Perhaps the German government would have advised step by step action or an appeal to the Security Council, or something else. We are not concerned here with detailing and assessing the possibilities such friendly advice might involve. It is sufficient for our purposes just to imagine what "friendship" could have meant in such a case. An absurd idea? Absurd, certainly, if the relationship continues to be viewed as "special" in the sense described above. If you distance yourself from that idea, however, it becomes obvious that it would have been advantageous both for Israel and for Germany to develop a pressure-resistant friendship in which criticism, with a supportive not offensive intent, had a place.

Needless to say, such a change in the relationship between Germany and Israel would also affect Israel's relations with the EU, the USA, etc. This is also not of concern here. Suffice it to say that the change would not have been detrimental to those involved in any of these cases.

### **Germany's responsibility towards Palestine**

All too frequently, little consideration is given to one particular consequence of the Holocaust. Until 1933 – 37 years after the publication of Theodor Herzl's *Der Judenstaat* which grounded Zionism, and 16 years after the Balfour Declaration in which the mandatory power England promised the Zionists a "homeland" in Palestine – a maximum of 160,000 Jews had emigrated to Palestine. And many of them had taken this step believing that it would be possible to cultivate and develop the Holy Land together with the local Arabs. No one was to be expelled, as Martin Buber was still arguing in 1950. Only after the soon recognisable radical threat to the Jews in the sphere of influence of the National Socialists did mass immigration come about, and with it a threat to the demographic balance with the Arabs. Not least under the shock of the Holocaust did the international community – against the wish of the Arab states – decide to accept the resolution of the United Nations on the foundation of the State of Israel, despite the initial strong reservations of the British and, for a long time, the US State Department .

In other words: It was the Holocaust that has permanently inflicted unbearable suffering on the (Muslim, Christian and Druse) Palestinians over the past six decades. That is not the same as if the Third Reich had committed genocide against the Palestinians. Yet in this case too, the result has been countless dead, the division of families, expulsion, or accommodation in emergency quarters to this very day. Without the Holocaust against the Jews, Israel's politicians would not feel justified or forced to so stubbornly ignore the human rights of the Palestinians and the inhabitants of Lebanon in order to secure the existence of Israel. And without the Holocaust Israel would not receive the necessary material and political support from the USA in the form granted above all since the 1990s. (America's financial aid to Israel is 3 thousand million US dollars annually and thus corresponds to 20% of all the foreign financial aid given by the USA.)

The Near East Conflict, which has lasted for six decades and is becoming increasingly savage, undoubtedly has German and, to a degree, European origins; European to the extent that the German notion of a "final solution to the Jewish question" was spawned by European Anti-Semitism and Nationalism. The Palestinian population had no part whatsoever in the "relocation" of part of Europe's problems to the Near East.

So it is not only Israel that has a right to special attention, consideration and friendly criticism from Germany (and Europe). As Germans, Austrians and Europeans, we are not only co-responsible for the existence of Israel, which must be secured without reservations for the future now that history has taken this path, but also co-responsible for the living conditions of the Palestinian people and a self-determined future for them.

Once again, it is not possible or necessary to go into detail about what it would mean to take this responsibility more seriously than it has been so far. But money transfers alone are not enough. It is clear that the goal must be an economically-viable Palestine with unimpeded freedom of movement between the Gaza Strip and West Jordan, not a second-class state, not a homeland, not a fragmented Bantustan. And only a negotiated settlement, not a one-sidedly decreed one, has a chance of survival. It is also clear that every effort must be made to decrease the attractiveness for Palestinians of taking part in murderous assassinations and rocket attacks on Israeli civilians, and to increase the attractiveness of participating in constructive reconstruction work. With appropriate support,

European Muslims could contribute towards promoting greater recognition in Palestine of those basic Islamic values which oppose suicide bombings, which were not invented by Muslims, and towards publicising and acknowledging Islamic models of peaceful resistance to state injustice.

Israel's security can only be guaranteed in the long-term when it has around it neighbours who are so content with their individual and state living conditions and future prospects that they can even begin to think of a joint negotiation of solutions for the problems in the whole of the Near East – such as, for example, the use and distribution of water. And the security and intactness of Palestine and the Palestinians can only then be guaranteed when Israelis no longer fear being driven into the sea. In view of all the past horrors, perhaps there must actually be a separation – without annexations – for several decades, including corridors through tunnels between Palestine's different regions – until the situation has settled down. Voluntary encounters especially between young people on "neutral ground" could at the same time help to eliminate stereotype perceptions on both sides.

A German approach that does justice to the Holocaust and its consequences for both sides means accepting responsibility for a transformation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This is only possible if that transformation is balanced. The first prerequisite for this is that the suffering and injustice (the violence of the conflict) on both sides be perceived, and that the need for security, human dignity and contract compliance on both sides be taken into account. Not only the military groups of Palestinians and the Hizbollah have destroyed the spirit of Oslo through their mortar attacks and the continued suicide bombings; the illegal continuation and massive expansion, since the time of the Oslo Agreement in 1993, of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, the arbitrary destruction of houses, gardens, olive groves, and infrastructure, the daily humiliation of Palestinians, and finally the de facto annexation of about 10% of the West Bank by means of what is called a "fence", which in parts is an eight-metre-high wall, have had the same fatal impact. The question of cause and effect here is like that of the chicken and the egg: unproductive. A solution to the conflict is only possible in the very long term in the framework of a joint regional economic Near East cooperation, including Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. By contrast, a transformation of the conflict can begin immediately. This demands renewed efforts to find a modus vivendi that draws conclusions from the mistakes of Oslo. German policy could make a contribution here if it sees itself as friendly towards both sides.

### **What does all this mean for the inner-German discourse?**

The intimated, and in our view desirable, change in the German attitude also presupposes changes in inner-German relations. Despite a serious engagement with the causes, course and effects of the Holocaust in literature, art and science and in different psychotherapeutic schools, prejudices, resentment and mistrust towards Jews are still widespread in Germany. Anti-Semitism is stubbornly alive not only in dismal neo-Nazi peripheral areas, it is also to be found, more or less disguised, in the mainstream of the German population and the big political parties.

At the same time, the guiding forces in German politics and society have reduced the grief about the incredible outrage to more or less empty rituals and therefore impeded rather than promoted a change in attitude. The result is a problematic philo-Semitism. Problematic because ultimately the mere inversion of a rigid enemy-image that has no link with reality is just the same thing in reverse, and is also immune to reality and to differentiated judgement. In his *Dialectic of Enlightenment* Theodor W. Adorno ascertained that it was not the "anti-Semitic ticket" that was anti-Semitic, but the "ticket mentality" as such. Along with the above-mentioned tacit prohibition of open criticism of Israeli decisions, philo-Semitism in Germany strengthens anti-Semitism rather than weakening it.

Much has to be done to enable young Muslim, German and Jewish people to develop a positive relationship with one another. In the long run, a German Near East policy that is open and friendly to both sides will only be possible when it gains the support of both the Jews and the Muslims in Germany, and when anti-Semitism is clearly restrained. As long as one of these two groups feels undervalued or ostracised, nothing can become of peaceful coexistence or equal dialogue.

Each new attack on Israeli civilians, each new violation of the rule of commensurability by the Israeli army and government, increases the camp mentality in Germany for and against Israel, a mentality which has already taken on frightening dimensions. In this situation what is necessary is a broad public and open debate on the questions raised here. Ultimately, the fact is that in a democracy (and not only there) "the" politicians can only successfully implement and assert the policy that is desired by the large majority of the citizens. It is no longer sufficient, therefore, to shake one's head in private at Israel's actions or to clench one's fist in view of the attacks by Hamas or Hizbollah. We must all distance ourselves to an equal degree from the violent aspects of Israeli policy, just as we distance ourselves from the military actions of part of the Palestinians and the Lebanese Hizbollah. Each voice from Israel and Palestine that demands this of us – and fortunately there are such voices – is a valuable help on this path and should receive the attention of our media.

Perhaps it would help in the current circumstances to imagine the reactions of the many intellectuals, writers, artists and musicians of Jewish origins, from Adorno to Einstein, Freud, Marx and Zweig, of whom we are so proud and without whom the German culture and the German contribution to science would be so much smaller. We are convinced that they would subscribe to the following statement:

Only equality and respect for justice and international law can guarantee peaceful community and are the only guarantors of a permanent and secure existence of the State of Israel and the future State of Palestine – and of the safety of Jews among us and all over the world.

The human rights formulated in the UN Charter and the UN declaration of human rights emerged against the backdrop of Nazi barbarism, in particular the industrialised racial mass murder of Jews, Sinti, Roma, and other minorities. Both documents recognise only the equality of people without exception. That must also apply for the parties to the conflict in the Near East.

### **Altruism or Vested Interest?**

What has been said here about the necessity for a balanced and friendly German Near East policy may sound idealistic in many ears, influenced too much by ethics and too little by interests. It is appropriate therefore to reveal the associated vested interest, which in our view does not detract from the arguments that have been advanced.

The 11 September 2001 made it definitively clear that we are on the road to a new, highly-explosive East-West conflict which will be much more difficult to control than the old conflict with its strictly centralised and reliable commando structures. Although transnational terrorism has many sources, it is evident that one main source of the increasing terrorist energy is the unresolved Near East conflict. (The weight of this insight is not weakened by the fact that many authoritarian or dictatorial Arab regimes set great store by the maintenance of this source of conflict because it helps to distract from their own internal political problems.)

If the opposition between the Islamic and the western world is further thwarted in the Near East, which was the case in the war in Lebanon to an extent that exceeded the expectations even of the experts, then not only the Near East, but more or less the whole world will be effected. The attacks in Madrid and London and the foiled attacks on trains in Germany have exposed Europe's great vulnerability. All further blindly anti-western solidarity in the Islamic world is a direct threat to the European Model, which today is so attractive for so many people in the world, and means more suffering for countless civilians of all possible religious orientations and nationalities. Everything possible must be done therefore to remedy this new East-West conflict – at home and abroad. We owe it to the victims of National Socialism to achieve this and to support human rights no matter where or by whom they are being violated.

### **Authors**

Dr. Dieter Arendt, professor of literary studies at the University of Gießen; Dr. Detlev Bald, historian and researcher in peace studies in Munich; Dr. Johannes Becker, lecturer in political science at the University of Marburg; Dr. Jörg Becker, professor of political science at the University of Marburg; Dr. Tilman Evers, lecturer in political science at the Free University of Berlin; Dr. Marianne Gronemeyer, professor of pedagogy and social science at the University of Applied Sciences in Wiesbaden; Dr. Dr. Reimer Gronemeyer, professor of sociology at the University of Gießen; Dr. Karl Holl, professor of history at the University of Bremen; Prof. Dr. Karlheinz Koppe, former director of the board of the German society of peace and conflict research (DGFK) in Bonn; Dr. Gert Krell, professor of political science at the University of Frankfurt; Dr. Georg Meggle, professor of philosophy at the University of Leipzig; Dr. Werner Ruf, professor of political science at the University of Kassel; Dr. Hajo Schmidt, professor of philosophy at the University of Hagen; Prof. Dr. Udo Steinbach, director of the German Institute for Oriental Studies in Hamburg; Dr. Reiner Steinweg, literary studies, peace research and conflict advisor, Linz/Danube; Prof. Dr. Helmut Thielen, Coordinación General del Instituto Alexander von Humboldt-ICIBOLA in Porto Alegre/Brazil; Dr. Wolfram Wette, professor of recent history at the University of Freiburg.

### **This statement is generally supported by**

Dr. Hanne-Margret Birckenbach, professor of political science at the University of Gießen; Dr. Ernst-Otto Czempel, professor of political science at the University of Frankfurt; Dr. Egbert Jahn, professor of political science at the University of Mannheim; Irene Krell, teacher in Schwalbach; Dr. Gerald Mader, president of the Austrian study centre for peace and conflict resolution,

Stadtschlaining/Burgenland; Hannah Reich, Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management in Berlin; Erich Schmidt-Eenboom, head of the Peace Research Institute in Weilheim/Upper Bavaria; Dr. Christian Wellmann, Deputy Director of the Schleswig-Holstein Institute of Peace Studies in Kiel.

**Url of this article :**

<http://www.tlaxcala.es/pp.asp?reference=1569&lg=en>

PATTERN

## Two motivations of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in Holocaust denial?

Sunday, March 12th, 2006

"The President of Iran thinks the Holocaust never happened." Which part of the sentence is more absurd, the claim that the Holocaust never happened or this: the man making the claim holds the office of *President of Iran*, a land of 70 million people and several millenia of history? It is a bit unnerving to think of state power in the hands of such a man.

Nor is this a private belief; rather it is state policy. On [The Beltway Boys](#) (transcript when available), Mort Kondracke said that Ahmadinejad has instructed Iran's foreign embassy personnel to lecture host country diplomats that the Holocaust was an historical fabrication (what a swell guy he must be to work for). There is a sensible aspect to this lunacy, since it forms the logical foundation of Ahmadinejad's remove-Israel policy. As he explained in December (via [CNN](#)):

*"They have invented a myth that Jews were massacred and place this above God, religions and the prophets," Ahmadinejad said in a speech to thousands of people in the Iranian city of Zahedan, according to a report on Wednesday from Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting. "The West has given more significance to the myth of the genocide of the Jews, even more significant than God, religion, and the prophets," he said. "(It) deals very severely with those who deny this myth but does not do anything to those who deny God, religion, and the prophet." "If you have burned the Jews, why don't you give a piece of Europe, the United States, Canada or Alaska to Israel," Ahmadinejad said. "Our question is, if you have committed this huge crime, why should the innocent nation of Palestine pay for this crime?"*

You can't fault Ahmadinejad's logic as much as his sanity. His point is well taken. He thinks the Holocaust was a part of the Jewish plot to blackmail Europe into giving Jews their own state. (See the [Iran Holocaust cartoon exhibition](#), one of which has a line of very-much-alive orthodox Jews recycling themselves again and again through a "gas chamber" as the counter registers 5,999,999.) So why should Palestine pay the price for Europe's fantasy of a European "crime." Fair enough, we suppose (except for the idea that the biblical lands were historically non-Jewish).

Ahmadinejad would be dangerous enough if he were just a nut with some lunatic ideas of history. However, a review of the people that Ahmadinejad has chosen to affiliate himself with suggests a potentially darker explanation for his views than the "practical" explanation he offered above. In an article by the Iranian news service headlined [Major world historians support Ahmadinejad's holocaust outlook](#), a number of names are mentioned. See if you can detect a pattern among them, [in addition to Holocaust denial](#):

Serge Thion, apologist for [Pol Pot](#)

John Kaminski, [Jewish interests](#) behind 9-11

Dana I. Alvi, "Polish death camps" were after 1945 and [presided over by Jews](#)

David Irving, "[Hitler the Great](#)"? No, [contemporary History is unlikely to swallow such an epithet](#).

Ernst Zundel, "[The Jews of the world have a Holocaust coming...](#)"

It occurs to us that beyond his "practical" political reasons for denying the existence of the Holocaust, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad may have a deeper and more nefarious motivation. Perhaps he dreams that he (not the German Führer with the Endlösung) will hold the true and uncontested title of author of the Final Solution.

Posted in [General](#), [War](#), [Religion](#), [radical chic](#), [EU](#) | [No Comments](#) »

<http://www.dinocrat.com/archives/category/war/page/7/>

<http://www.dinocrat.com/archives/2006/03/12/two-motivations-of-mahmoud-ahmadinejad-in-holocaust-denial/>

JUDEOCENTRISM (1997)

## Iran remains home to Jewish enclave

By Barbara Demick

TEHRAN - The Jewish women in the back rows of the synagogue wear long garments in the traditional Iranian style, but instead of chadors, their heads are covered with cheerful, flowered scarves. The boys in their skullcaps, with Hebrew prayer books tucked under their arms, scamper down the aisles to grab the best spots near the lush, turquoise Persian carpet of the altar. This is Friday night, Shabbat - Iranian style, and the synagogue in an affluent neighborhood of North Tehran is filled to capacity with more than 400 worshipers. It is one of the many paradoxes of the Islamic Republic of Iran that this most virulent anti-Israeli country supports by far the largest Jewish population of any Muslim country. While Jewish communities in Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Egypt, Morocco and Algeria have all but vanished, Iran is home to 25,000 - some here say 35,000 - Jews. The Jewish population is less than half the number that lived here before the Islamic revolution of 1979. But the Jews have tried to compensate for their diminishing numbers by adopting a new religious fervor. "The funny thing is that before the Islamic revolution, you would see maybe 20 old men in the synagogue," whispers Nahit Eliyason, 48, as she climbs over four other women to find one of the few vacant seats. "Now the place is full. You can barely find a seat." Parvis Yashaya, a film producer who heads Tehran's Jewish community, adds: "we are smaller, but we are stronger in some ways." Tehran has 11 functioning synagogues, many of them with Hebrew schools. It has two kosher restaurants, and a Jewish hospital, an old-age home and a cemetery. There is a Jewish representative in the Iranian parliament. There is a Jewish library with 20,000 titles, its reading room decorated with a photograph of the Ayatollah Khomeini. Khomeini protection Iran's Jewish community is confronted by contradictions. Many of the prayers uttered in synagogue, for instance, refer to the desire to see Jerusalem again. Yet there is no postal service or telephone contact with Israel, and any Iranian who dares travel to Israel faces imprisonment and passport confiscation. "We are Jews, not Zionists. We are a religious community, not a political one," Yashaya said. Before the revolution, Jews were well-represented among Iran's business elite, holding key posts in the oil industry, banking and law, as well as in the traditional bazaar. The wave of anti-Israeli sentiment that swept Iran during the revolution, as well as large-scale confiscation of private wealth, sent thousands of the more affluent Jews fleeing to the United States or Israel.

Those remaining lived in fear of pogroms, or massacres. But Khomeini met with the Jewish community upon his return from exile in Paris and issued a "fatwa" decreeing that the Jews were to be protected. Similar edicts also protect Iran's tiny Christian minority. Just as it radically transformed Muslim society, the revolution changed the Jews. Families that had been secular in the 1970s started keeping kosher and strictly observing rules against driving on Shabbat. They stopped going to restaurants, cafes and cinemas - many such establishments were closed down - and the synagogue perforce became the focal point of their social lives. Iranian Jews say they socialize far less with Muslims now than before the revolution. As a whole, they occupy their own separate space within the rigid confines of the Islamic republic, a protected yet precarious niche. Jewish women, like Muslim women, are required by law to keep their heads covered, although most eschew the chador for a simple scarf. But Jews, unlike Muslims, can keep small flasks of home-brewed wine or arragh to drink within the privacy of their homes - in theory, for religious purposes. Some Hebrew schools are coed, and men and women dance with each other at weddings, practices strictly forbidden for Muslims. "Sometimes I think they are kinder to the Jews than they are to themselves. ... If we are gathered in a house, and the family is having a ceremony with wine or the music is playing too loud, if they find out we are Jews, they don't bother us so much," Eliyason said. "Everywhere in the world there are people who don't like Jews. In England, they draw swastikas on Jewish graves. I don't think that Iran is more dangerous for Jews than other places." Some problems exist. Testimony from Jews who have left Iran suggests more serious problems than those cited by Jews inside the country. In written testimony to a congressional subcommittee in February 1996, an Iranian Jew complained of being imprisoned for two years on trumped-up charges of spying for Israel. He also said his arrest was preceded by harassment at work and pressure to convert to Islam.

Inside Iran, Jews say that they frequently receive alarmed telephone calls and letters from relatives in the United States concerned about their well-being, but that they themselves do not feel physically endangered. Their major complaint is the inability to visit family in Israel, and what they say is inadequate funding for Hebrew schools, which are administered by the Iranian Ministry of Education. Although many Jews hold jobs in government ministries or within state-owned firms, they

say they are unlikely to rise to top positions. In addition, Iran's strict Islamic law, or "sharia," contains many discriminatory provisions toward non-Muslims. Jews 'part of Iran' Still, Jewish leaders say their community has far stronger roots in Iran than other Middle East Jewish communities, which were virtually eradicated by massive immigration to Israel in the 1940s and 1950s. Esther, the biblical Jewish queen who saved her people from persecution in the fifth century B.C., is reputed to be buried in Hamadan, in western Iran. The grave of the Old Testament prophet Daniel lies in southwestern Iran. "We are different from the Jews of the diaspora. You see the name 'Persia' in the Old Testament almost as often as the name 'Israel.' The Iranian Jews are very much part of Iran," said Gad Naim, 60, who runs the old-age home in Tehran. Iranian Jews trace their history to the reign of Persia's King Cyrus. As the Bible tells it, Cyrus conquered Babylonia in 539 B.C., liberated the Jews from captivity, and raised funds for the rebuilding of their destroyed temple in Jerusalem. The return of the Jews to Jerusalem at that time was accompanied by a large migration to the lands that were then Persia, and now Iran. In Esfahan, an Iranian city famed for its intricate Persian tile work, the first Persian Jews were settled under the reign of Cyrus. The ancient city was once known as Dar-Al-Yahud ("House of the Jews" in Farsi), and as late as the 19th century it was the home of 100,000 Jews, according to Elias Haronian, head of Esfahan's Jewish community. Today, the city is a repository of Jewish lore. It has a cemetery with Jewish graves 2,000 years old, stunning synagogues and Jewish mausoleums with tiles to rival those of the mosques - but a population of only 1,500 Jews. What happened to the Jews? Some converted centuries ago. Indeed, in Muslim villages surrounding Esfahan, a distinctive Jewish dialect of Farsi is spoken, and Muslims still follow certain Jewish rituals, such as lighting candles on Fridays. Others left for Tehran, or for California or New York. Some went to Israel. "It is not that life is so difficult for us, but a minority is a minority We are like a glass of water in the sea," Haronian said. Haronian, a petroleum engineer, worries less about persecution than about the faltering Iranian economy, the lack of job opportunities for his four children, and the shortage of suitable Jewish spouses. "There are very few Jewish boys here. There are so few of us," said his 17-year-old daughter, Shirin. At Esfahan's Hebrew school, students confided that they are deeply torn between a love of their homeland and a desire to escape from the stifling isolation of Iran. The decision to stay or go may rest largely on Mohammad Khatami, a relatively progressive cleric who won a landslide election May 23 as the next president of Iran. Although he is virulently anti-Israel in his public comments, Khatami was considered sympathetic to the Jews during his term as Iran's minister of culture and Islamic guidance. He paid a campaign visit to a social club for Jewish women in Tehran. "We expect more freedom, an easier life, not just for Jews, for everybody," said Farangis Hassidim, an administrator of Tehran's Jewish hospital. Not everyone in the Jewish community favors liberalization of Iranian society. Arizel Levihim, 20, a prospective Hebrew teacher, said Judaism has fared better within the confines of Iran's strictly religious society. "I believe it is good for women to keep their head covered. I think it is good to restrict relations between boys and girls," Levihim said. "I agree with the ideals of the Islamic republic. These are Jewish values too."

KNIGHT-RIDDER September 30,1997  
<http://italy.indymedia.org/print.php?id=1049845&comments=yes>

THE CALL IT : "INTELLIGENCE" !!! AH! AH!

## The Role of Holocaust Denial in the Ideology and Strategy of The Iranian Regime

By Yigal Carmon

*Today, December 14, 2006, a symposium titled "Holocaust Denial: Paving the Way to Genocide" was held at Yad Vashem in Jerusalem. MEMRI President and Founder Yigal Carmon spoke at the symposium.*

The persistent Holocaust denial of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad raises a vital question that needs to be addressed: What function does this denial serve in the ideology of the Iranian regime and in its strategy? The answer to this question bears cardinal importance to the future of the State of Israel.

When we, at The Middle East Media Research Institute, collect and analyze the statements made by Ahmadinejad and others in the Iranian regime, we can distinguish two major goals, both

of which lead to the same conclusion: the Iranian regime's Holocaust denial is not a manifestation of *irrational* hatred, but a premeditated and cold-blooded instrument to achieve its goals.

### **Denial of Israel's Legitimacy**

The first of these goals is the attempt to deny any legitimacy to the creation and continued existence of the State of Israel as a safe haven for the Jews after the Holocaust. In order to achieve this goal, he proclaims that no Holocaust occurred, and that if Jews were indeed harmed in World War II - a claim that requires thorough and "objective" research - this was no different than the experience of others in World War II. At any rate, Ahmadinejad and other top Iranian officials claim that this "myth" cannot justify the establishment of Israel in Palestine.

### **Elimination of the Zionist Entity, i.e. Israel**

The second goal is - as often proclaimed by Ahmadinejad - to "wipe Israel off the map." His Holocaust denial is therefore planned, intentional, and premeditated. He is aware that as long as the world remembers the Holocaust, it will resist any new attempt to perpetrate another genocide against the Jews. Thus, eradicating the memory of the Holocaust is essential in order to achieve his goal.

### **Demonization**

In order for Ahmadinejad to bring his plans to fruition, however, he has to demonize the Jews and the State of Israel. Demonization is a necessary precondition for genocide. As we well know, Hitler first engaged in a major campaign of demonization of the Jews before actually murdering them en masse. Ahmadinejad and the Iranian regime are taking the same path, and are conducting a similar virulent, antisemitic campaign of demonization.

To this end, Iranian state-controlled television produces various TV series dedicated to the demonization of Jews. These include classic blood libels, depicting Jews as using the blood of non-Jewish children to bake their Passover matzos, and as kidnapping non-Jewish children to steal their body parts. Jews are reduced to sub-human levels, depicted as pigs and apes. They are accused of persecuting the Prophet Muhammad in voodoo ritualistic scenes, and as tormenting a historic figure reminiscent of Jesus on the Cross. All these TV series exist alongside others that deny the Holocaust.

Again, it should be stressed that all these phenomena are interrelated, and are state-directed at the highest level. It is most indicative that Ahmadinejad's first public appearance after coming to power was made before television producers.

All this is done in order to achieve the goal of demonization of Jews and Israel, which, as I mentioned earlier, is vital for their elimination. However, it is not possible to demonize a people as long as it is viewed as a victim of the Holocaust. Therefore, as long as the Jews are perceived as victims of the Holocaust, this demonization cannot take root. Holocaust denial is thus vital, in order to wipe out the image of the Jews as victims.

This is the reason why these three elements - Holocaust denial, the elimination of the State of Israel, and demonization of the Jews - are constantly present in statements by Ahmadinejad and other senior Iranian officials.

Let us hear the Iranians in their own words. True, many of these statements have already circulated separately in the media. But hearing them together, in the context I have just outlined, will enable us to understand their function and significance within the ideology and strategy of the Iranian regime.

In his well-known speech at the Iranian "World Without Zionism" conference on October 23, 2005, Ahmadinejad laid out his views on the State of Israel. It is an absolute evil, a tool in the hands of the West to dominate the Muslims. In reply to those who ask if it is indeed possible to bring about a world without America and Zionism, he says: "You had best know that this slogan and this goal are attainable, and can surely be achieved."

Later, he cites Khomeini: "The Imam said: 'This regime that is occupying Qods [Jerusalem] must be eliminated from the pages of history.'" Commenting on this statement by his spiritual mentor, Ahmadinejad says: "This sentence is very wise. The issue of Palestine is not an issue on which we can compromise." Later he adds, "Very soon this stain of disgrace [i.e. Israel] will be purged from the center of the Islamic world - and this is attainable." This speech clearly announced the ultimate goal: the elimination of Israel.

At the Organization of the Islamic Conference meeting, which took place in Mecca in early December 2005, Ahmadinejad made statements that explicitly tied this goal with Holocaust denial: "Some European countries are insisting on saying that Hitler burned millions of oppressed Jews in crematoria. They insist so much on this issue that if someone proves the opposite, they convict him and throw him into prison. Although we do not accept this claim, let's assume that it is true, and we ask the Europeans: Does the killing of oppressed Jews by Hitler [justify] their support for



the regime that is occupying Jerusalem?..."

This statement by Ahmadinejad is telling. The implication is that the Holocaust is the only justification for the existence of Israel. The line, therefore, is twofold: a) the Holocaust is a myth, and b) even if it is true, it cannot justify Israel's existence. In either case, Ahmadinejad's primary obsession is not with the Holocaust, but with Israel's very existence. If the Holocaust gets in the way of achieving this goal, it must be denied.

Later on in the same speech, he adds: "If you [Europeans] think that you committed an injustice against the Jews, why must the Muslims and the Palestinians pay the price for it? All right, you oppressed [the Jews]. So put some of Europe at the disposal of this Zionist regime..." Again, the guiding principle is that Israel cannot exist. Holocaust denial is important to Ahmadinejad because the Holocaust lends moral justification to the creation and continued existence of the State of Israel.

In the speech you saw earlier on the DVD, from December 14, 2005, Ahmadinejad once again linked these two elements together. He calls the Holocaust a "myth," but also adds: "If you [Europeans] are correct in saying that you killed six million Jews in World War II... If you committed a crime, it is only appropriate that you place a piece of your land at their disposal - in Europe, America, Canada, or Alaska..." Once again, Holocaust denial is important to Ahmadinejad first and foremost as a means of de-legitimizing Israel's existence, and since the goal is the elimination of Israel, the speech includes the necessary element of demonization as well.

Then the Iranian president takes pains to portray the Jews as the true oppressors, and not as victims. "Zionism itself is a Western ideology and a colonialist idea, with secular ideas and fascist methods, which was founded by the English. So far, with the help and direct guidance of America and part of Europe, [Zionism] is slaughtering the Muslims." Later on in the speech, he says: "An important question that the Western countries and media must answer clearly is: What crime did they [i.e. the West] commit at that time [i.e. WWII] that the Zionists are not committing today? In essence, Zionism is a new Fascism..."

This, therefore, is Ahmadinejad's truth: the Zionists are the true oppressors and murderers. But while at times Ahmadinejad claims to differentiate between Zionists and Jews in general, in truth, this campaign of demonization uses and abuses history to depict Jews throughout the ages - not Zionists alone - as oppressors and murderers.

As you have just seen in the DVD, the true Holocaust, as portrayed by Ahmadinejad, was committed by the Jews: for example, by the Jewish king of Yemen, Yosef Dhu Nuwas, who, he claims, burned the Christians in the early days of Christianity, and by the Iranian Jews, as described in the Book of Esther. Moreover, Jews in modern times are continuing their murderous ways: killing large numbers of Christian children in London and Paris - again, as you saw with your own eyes - in order to procure blood for Passover matzos.

To sum up, Holocaust denial is an inextricable part of demonization, on the way to the final goal: the elimination of Israel.

All these elements figure prominently in the identity and works of those invited by the Iranian regime to the Holocaust denial conference in Tehran. First and foremost is their explicit opposition to Israel's existence. This is why members of the anti-Zionist Jewish sect of Neturei Karta were invited, following the ongoing, strong ties maintained by the Iranian regime with them. Then comes the demonization of Jews in order to justify the agenda of elimination. Thus the invitation of Holocaust deniers, such as Frederick Toben, who not only denies the Holocaust, but also claims that the Jews intentionally spread the AIDS virus in the U.S.

In essence, the speech made by Ahmadinejad at the Holocaust denial conference best illustrates the role of Holocaust denial in the ideology and strategy of the Iranian regime. He begins his speech by addressing the Holocaust deniers participating in the conference: "Iran is your home, and here you can express your opinions freely, in a friendly manner and in a free atmosphere." Then, without batting an eyelid, he adds: "The life-curve of the Zionist regime has begun its descent, and it is now on a downward slope towards its fall... I tell you now... the Zionist regime will be wiped out, and humanity will be liberated."

<http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=ia&ID=IA30706>

One can see Carmon reading aloud, with difficulties, in a pedantly germanic English, the above text at <http://www.thememriblog.org/>

## BLACK ADDER

[...] Even to many of the most liberal critics of Bush the Chavez speech went too far. In part, there was outrage about the fact that Hugo Chavez, a foreigner and guest on U.S. soil, was giving such

harsh and extreme criticism of a U.S. President. Verily, I saw it myself. People in my personal life who had called Bush a 'devil' *ad nauseum* expressed indignation and outrage at Chavez' remarks - the exact same 'devil' remarks that these personal friends of mine had made. And yet some on the far-left even praised and supported Hugo Chavez; Danny Glover later [gave him a great big hug](#) at a Harlem event and [Cindy Sheehan even kissed him](#).

So it was only *slightly* shocking to see Hugo Chavez promoting Noam Chomsky's new book during his U.N. speech. Chavez waved it around as if it were the constitution of Venezuela. Noam Chomsky, [a well-known anti-Semite](#) and self-proclaimed anarchist, seems to be the type of author a totalitarian leader such as Chavez would agree with on many issues. Chomsky certainly received some benefits from having a Latin American dictator endorse his book. It shot to #1 on the Amazon bestseller list. Who would have thought anarchy, capitalism, and oppression went together so well. It is just unfortunate for Robert Faurisson and Serge Thion that they did not receive bestseller status when [Noam Chomsky endorsed their works denying the Holocaust](#).

[http://thegiantotter.blogspot.com/2006\\_09\\_01\\_thegiantotter\\_archive.html](http://thegiantotter.blogspot.com/2006_09_01_thegiantotter_archive.html)

AT LAST !

## Holocaust Revisionism in One Easy Lesson

By John "Birdman" Bryant

From the book *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Jews But Were Afraid to Ask Because You Thought You'd Be Called 'Antisemitic'*

Note: The original version of this essay was written especially for fellow Mensan Max Loick, who declared, in his superintelligent and openminded way, that he wasn't going to read it. It is dedicated to Lawrence Nevers, whose scholarship on the Jewish Question has been both an inspiration and a critical help in writing this essay.

\*\*\*\*\*

Eisenhower's *Crusade in Europe* is a book of 559 pages; the six volumes of Churchill's *Second World War* total 4,448 pages; and de Gaulle's three-volume *Mémoires de guerre* is 2,054 pages. In this mass of writing, which altogether totals 7,061 pages (not including the introductory parts), published from 1948 to 1959, one will find **no mention either of Nazi "gas chambers," a "genocide" of the Jews, or of "six million" Jewish victims of the war.** --Richard Lynn, Professor Emeritus, University of Ulster - <http://www.rlynn.co.uk>

-----

The term 'historical revisionism' was first used to apply to the work of historian Harry Elmer Barnes and his associates, whose earliest historical work was motivated by the belief that the generally-accepted versions of events of the First World War not only harbored serious errors, but were heavily influenced by the biases of the institutions which underwrote the "Court Historians" responsible for these versions. Barnes, however, noted that historical revisionism -- "The effort to correct the historical record in the light of a more complete collection of historical facts, a more calm political atmosphere, and a more objective attitude" in his words (Barnes Review Oct 94: 3) -- was itself an activity with a very long history, going back at least as far as the exposure of the forgery of the "Donation of Constantine" by Lorenzo Valla (1407-57).

The subject which has attracted the most attention in historical revisionism, both among scholars who contribute to the revisionist literature, and those who are interested in the results of revisionist work, is Holocaust revisionism, ie, the examination of the supposed genociding of Jews in the Third Reich. The generally-accepted version of this event -- or, more properly, this NON-event -- is what I call the Orthodox Jewish Version of the Holocaust, or OJV for short, which holds in its present version that the Nazis killed 'six million' Jews in 'gas chambers'. As it happens, however, there are numerous problems with the OJV. The following is a list of the major ones.

The 'evidence' for the OJV consists primarily of the records of the court proceedings of the Nuremberg trials. As it happens, however, vengeful Jews were largely in charge of these trials. (According to Louis Marshall in his book *The World Conquerors*, of the 3000 persons on the trial staff, 2400 were Jews.)

Adding to the problem was the fact that (1) there was no historical precedent for war crimes trials in which only the vanquished were called to account for their actions; and (2) these trials violated the fundamental principle of fairness that no one is to be tried for violating a law that was instituted 'ex post facto', ie, after the crime was committed.

\* 'Confessions' used in the trial were highly dubious, since many were extracted by torture or other unethical means, such as threatening the families of the accused (According to British scholar Vivian Bird, more than one hundred German defendants had their testicles beaten to a pulp by 'interrogators'.) Two confessions were particularly egregious: That of Rudolf Hoss, commandant of Auschwitz, which was (among other things) written in a language he did not even understand, and which provided the major basis for the 'six million' figure; and that of Kurt Gerstein, the dubiousness of which was the subject of a French doctoral dissertation.

\* Many of the atrocities that were seriously alleged at the trials are now rejected by even establishment historians as false, the most prominent of which are the stories that Jewish bodies were made into soap and their skin was made into lampshades. Evidently such stories were created as war propaganda, just as were similar stories in WW1 about 'Huns' who were 'bayonetting babies'.

\* The defendants in the trials had no opportunity to gather evidence in their defense, and in addition were often given poor food, subjected to freezing weather without proper clothing, deprived of sleep, and -- as stated earlier -- often brutally beaten. Furthermore, those who were condemned to death had their sentences postponed until they could be carried out on the Jewish High Holy Days in a sort of 'blood libel' celebration.

\* The printed trial transcripts often do not match the trial recordings, and were evidently deliberately changed to cover up embarrassing facts brought out by defendants in their trials.

\* Auschwitz was not a 'death camp', as alleged at the trials, but a large industrial complex in Poland, and the inmates were forced laborers. The Nazis were desperate for labor, so it would have been irrational for them to have 'gassed' anyone, and equally irrational for them to have mistreated inmates or underfed them. In fact, there was a special court, under SS Judge Konrad Morgen, to try complaints against camp personnel for abusing inmates. Beyond this, Heinrich Himmler, who held principal authority over the camps, sent a memo to all camp commandants stating that inmate deaths must be reduced 'at all costs' -- hardly something one would expect to find in a 'death camp'. And while it was alleged at the trials that 4 million Jews were 'gassed' at Auschwitz, the German camp records were not admitted into evidence, and would probably have vindicated many of the defendants if they had been. In particular, the Auschwitz death books, which were released by the Russian government about a decade ago, show that only about 74,000 people died at Auschwitz in all the years of its operation, most from typhus, with only about 30,000 of them being Jews. Furthermore, the crematoria were intended not for the 'killing of Jews', but rather for the sanitary disposal of the bodies of those who died from typhus.

\* While there were Allied spies in most camps reporting on camp conditions by radio, none of these spies ever made a report about mass killings or 'gas chambers'. The idea of 'gas chambers' evidently arose from the fact that all the clothes of arriving inmates were disinfected in a kind of gas chamber in which Zyklon B was used to kill lice which were feared as disease vectors (Lousy Jews?). These delousing chambers, it should be noted, were far too small for killing people, particularly in the numbers posited by the OJV. It should also be noted that Zyklon B, the form of cyanide supposedly used to kill Jews, was in fact a special form of slow-release cyanide which was appropriate for delousing clothing, but inappropriate for the instantaneous killing that was supposedly done in the "gas chambers". (The irony of Germans being accused of killing Jews by an instrument which they (Germans) used for preserving Jewish lives should not go unnoticed.) In addition, as revisionists have noted, such killings would have been impossible on the scale claimed by the OJV because cyanide is so dangerous that the bodies would have had to lie for hours before they could be safely removed, even by those wearing protective clothing and gas masks. Beyond this, cyanide gas is explosive, so that any

little spark, as from the friction of shoes on the floor, or any flame, as from a cigaret, would have caused any 'gas chamber' to be transported to the place where it was supposedly sending Jews.

\* Revisionists have proved that the rooms alleged to be 'gas chambers' could not possibly have served this purpose. The first investigation of this problem was done not for the Nuremberg trials, but rather many years later by Fred Leuchter, an American execution expert, who took samples from the walls of supposed 'gas chambers' at several camps and found that there was essentially no cyanide residue -- an impossibility if the rooms had been used as alleged. (Altho Leuchter's work was flawed, his conclusions have been confirmed independently by two other experts, Walter Luftl and Germar Rudolf.) Other problems posed for the OJV by the alleged 'gas chambers' involve such things as no air circulatory system for dispersing or ventilating the gas, no means for heating the Zyklon B discs for proper dispersal, the fact that the doors of the 'gas chambers' opened from the INSIDE, and that Allied aerial photographs of Auschwitz during the war showed no holes in the roof of the supposed 'gas chambers' which would have allowed the introduction of Zyklon B -- a point made by Holocaust revisionists in their oft-repeated challenge, "No holes; no Holocaust!"

\* There is no good evidence that Nazi references to the 'final solution to the Jewish question' referred to anything other than removal of Jews from the area of the Third Reich, the (false) allegations about the Wannsee Conference notwithstanding. In particular, no 'Hitler order' (or order from anyone else) has ever been discovered, in spite of the known German propensity for extensive record-keeping, altho there is an internal memo of a phone conversation with Hitler signed by Hans Lemmerer of the Ministry of the Interior showing that Hitler wanted the solution of the Jewish problem SHELVED until the end of the war. Beyond this, the Nazis actually cooperated with the Zionists under the so-called Transfer Agreement ("Ha'avara") to train Jews for settlement in Palestine, and the training camps for Zionists were the only places in Nazi Germany in which the flag of the Zionist state was allowed to fly.

\* Jewish population numbers published in standard reference works both before and after the war do not show a decrease of Jewish numbers, but rather an INCREASE. These reference works also demonstrate that THERE WERE NOT EVEN SIX MILLION JEWS IN NAZI-OCCUPIED EUROPE DURING THE PERIOD.

\* The 'six million' is a mystical number derived from Jewish scripture, and in particular is the number of Jews who are said to be required to die before Israel can be re-established. This accounts for why "New York governor Martin Glynn, in a major Albany speech in October 1919 [that's TWENTY YEARS BEFORE THE START OF WORLD WAR TWO, for all you who are a tad weak on dates], reported at length on the 'holocaust [of] six million Jewish men and women' who were dying due to the 'awful tyranny of war and a bigoted lust for Jewish blood' during the 'Great War'" (Irena Zdiarska, "Holocaust Is Undeniable -- But Should Be Debated", Barnes Review Oct 94: 27)). It also accounts for the fact that, in spite of the formal reduction from 4 to 1.1 million of the number of Jews claimed to have been killed at Auschwitz (see pix of Auschwitz plaques below), the 'six million' number has never changed, and thus that in the Orwellian Kabbalistic mathematics on which it is based, six minus three still equals six.

\* The OJV has changed significantly over the years. We have already mentioned that the 'soap' and 'lampshade' allegations are now rejected by even establishment historians, altho this does not keep Jews from continuing to hold burial ceremonies for newly-discovered bars of old Reich soap (we don't know whether they have also done the same for lampshades.) Another feature of the original OJV that has now changed was the allegation that Jews were exterminated at the camps in Germany as well as Poland -- an allegation which has been abandoned for some time. Yet another abandoned allegation is that mass killings were carried out by means of steam, electricity, gas vans (using the exhaust), and burning in pits; and in fact, the Holocaust received its name from the latter allegation -- yet another irony of this congeries of lies.

\* The one thing which has done most to convince people that the allegations of German atrocities are true is the film clips we have all seen of the liberation of the concentration camps, in which bodies are shown piled high, and surviving inmates are seen to be little more than walking skeletons. But in fact these admittedly-shocking films do not make a case for German atrocities, and in fact actually refute the notion of "gas chambers": If Germans were gassing Jews by the millions, as the OJV alleges, then Jews simply would not be around long enuf to starve, as the "walking skeletons" and emaciated bodies of the dead obviously were doing. The starvation, it should be noted, was simply a

reflection of the fact that, toward the end of the war, the German supply lines had broken down, and food was not getting to the camps. And above all, one should not think that there is anything unique to Germany about "walking skeletons" in "concentration camps": Exactly the same thing happened at the Andersonville prison during the American Civil War, and the photo at the left is a picture of one of those inmates.

\* If there is any one thing which is a clinching argument to the matter of the OJV, it is the fact that it is illegal to openly express doubt about this story in most countries of the Western world, including Germany (of course!), Israel (of course!), Austria (of course!), Spain, France, Australia, and Canada; and in those few countries in which it is not illegal, the laws forbidding 'race hate' are increasingly being interpreted as forbidding such expression. The point here is that truth does not require the support of legislation -- only falsehood does. And of course it does not take a rocket scientist to figure who is behind this illegalization; nor does it take a rocket scientist to figure why cases of 'Holocaust denial' are so vigorously prosecuted: Jews, and particularly Israel, have profited in numerous ways and by billions of dollars in playing this scam, including an unending number of Holocaust movies (more than 400 at last count, according to scholar Michael Hoffman), Holocaust museums (popping up everywhere), Holocaust books (Elie 'The Weasel' Wiesel has written more than 30; The Diary of Anne Frank is a perennial best-seller, etc, etc, etc), TV dramas (the airing of 'Holocaust' in 1970 is when the scam really took off), 'survivors' by the millions -- all pensioned by the German government, shakedowns of companies which supposedly profited from 'slave labor' or were otherwise tinged by Third-Reich-related activities (eg, IBM, Swiss banks), and of course the billions in 'reparations', 'foreign aid' and other 'guilt money' showered on Israel by Germany and the US. It has gotten so bad that Jewish Professor Norman Finkelstein calls it "The Holocaust [Industry]" in his book by the same name, where he quotes his mother as asking, "If Hitler killed so many Jews, then where did all the 'survivors' come from?" No need to explain, then, why there is a saying among Jews that "There's no business like Shoah (Holocaust) business."

\* The only facts that come within even a country mile of supporting the contention of Nazi extermination of Jews are reports of the shootings on the Eastern front of communist partisans, many of whom were Jews. The following is what Lawrence Nevers has had to say on the subject:

"The notion that the Germans were 'exterminating' the Jews in Russia rests on two sources. The first is British intercepts of captured German anti-partisan radio decrypts claiming huge numbers of Jews executed during Operation Barbarossa. The second are the Einsatzgruppen reports of executed partisans sent back to Berlin. Before considering these two sources it is necessary to realize, as Walter Sunning has demonstrated, that between one-half and two-thirds of all the Jews in European Russia had been deported into the interior of the Soviet Union by the largely Jewish commissars ahead of the German advance. How could the Germans have killed the number of Jews alleged when most had already been removed? The conclusion must be that the intercepts are either forgeries or that the kill totals are interpolations. The English forged a great many claims of German atrocities during the First World War. Why would they not have done the same a second time? With respect to the Einsatzgruppen reports, the reports still extant are only the reports to Berlin. The field reports from the units to their commanders in Russia have conveniently disappeared. One suspects that the numbers in the field reports are considerably lower than the numbers claimed in the easily-doctored-after-the-war Berlin reports. The diaries of the German police chief Heinrich Himmler have been in Israeli hands since the war. What is there in those diaries which the Israelis do not want the rest of the world to see?" (Nevers, personal communication)

If anyone were guilty of "war crimes" during WW2, it was the Allies. The RAF's General "Bomber" Harris' terror firebombing of Dresden, a city of no military importance, caused the deaths of some quarter-million civilians; and a similar effect was produced by Gen Curtis LeMay's firebombing of Tokyo. The dropping of the two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki may also be mentioned, particularly in view of the almost desperate attempts of the Japanese government to surrender well before those events. And then there was the Allied treatment of Germans and their allies at the end of the war -- a curious replay of what happened at the end of WW1, but worse: Much of the story is recounted in James Bacque's books *Other Losses* and *Crimes and Mercies*; while another part of the story will be found in Jewish author John Sack's book *An Eye For an Eye*. And guess what: The death rate for Allied prisoners in German POW camps was lower than for the Allied civilian population as a whole!

But if, as the revisionists allege, the OJV is wrong in so many important respects, we should ask

why this came about. The general answer, I think, is that, as Harry Elmer Barnes remarked, "Truth is the first casualty of war." This point is of special interest here because it was actually the Jews who were first to declare war on Germany (in the form of an economic boycott), which they did shortly after Hitler came to power in 1933, and which predated by some six years the beginning of military conflict. But if Jewish hatred of Hitler were a major factor in the lies of the OJV, there is yet another factor whose importance may be considerable, namely, that Jews were looking for a devil to take attention away from the atrocities committed by the regime of 'Jewish Bolsheviks' in Russia, particularly those of Stalin, now known to be a Jew (his family name, Dugashvili, means 'son of a Jew' in Georgian), who -- with his right-hand man the Jew Kaganovich -- deliberately starved millions to death, and sent other millions to the Gulag. In fact, as Robert Conquest and other scholars have discovered, deaths under the communist regime in the Soviet Union totalled some 60 million, and in China some 80 million, both of which far outnumber anything Hitler was ever accused of. And yet we hear little or nothing about "communist atrocities", in spite of being deluged on an almost-daily basis with Holocaust mythology.

As a final important point, it should be noted that a number of men have had to suffer considerably for daring to speak out about the Jewish 'Big Lie' of the Holocaust. (Jews accuse Hitler of using the Big Lie technique -- telling a lie so big that it is believed because no one could conceive of such a lie being told unless it were true -- but in reality this was a lie, for it was Hitler that accused the JEWS of using the Big Lie technique, which they have certainly done with the Holohoax, er, Holocaust.) Among the best-known of these are the following:

\* Germar Rudolf, because of his revisionist Rudolf Report which concluded that gassings were 'irreconcilable with the laws of physical science', was denied his PhD and fired from his job at the prestigious Max Planck Institute, and was forced to leave Germany in order to avoid a 14-month prison sentence.

\* Fred Leuchter, the execution expert who did a forensic examination of the 'gas chambers' has been hounded unmercifully, and in particular was required to fight an artificial charge in Massachusetts of "practicing engineering without a license".

\* Ernst Zundel was charged with 'hate crimes' and 'reporting false news' in the Pimple Republik of Kanada for publishing revisionist writings, but, after protracted battles which twice went all the way to the Kanadian Supreme Court, won a stunning victory. Unfortunately, this victory has now been largely nullified, both from the legal standpoint which allows Kanadian 'Human Rights Commissions' staffed with easily-offended minorities to pass judgment on 'hate incidents' and which have formally declared that 'truth is no defense' against minority offense; and also from Zundel's personal standpoint, as he was hounded out of Canada by one of these tribunals, and then kidnapped in the US and -- after more than a year in solitary confinement in Kanada, was extradited to Germany where he is still a citizen and where he will probably remain incarcerated for the remainder of his life.

\* Revisionist scholar and "Shoah Constrictor" Robert Faurisson, author of *Are the Diaries of Ann Frank Genuine?* (It turns out parts of the diary were written with a ball-point pen which was manufactured after 1945) was beaten almost to death by a bunch of Jewish thugs.

\* Henri Roques wrote his doctoral thesis debunking the 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein, a set of documents on which the OJV is significantly based; but altho the doctorate was awarded, it was later revoked because of pressure from the Uno Hooze.

\* The revisionist Institute for Historical Review was burned down on July 4, 1984 by an unknown group -- most probably the Mossad (the Israeli equivalent of the CIA).

But if the cases of the men whom we have mentioned above are tragic, it is at least as tragic that the organizations which are supposed to stand up for free speech have had a severe case of weak knees in the case of revisionism, and for that matter, in virtually every case where there is opposition to establishment Jewish interests. These particularly include Amnesty International, which supposedly supports 'prisoners of conscience', but seems to think that those who engage in 'hate speech' (ie, anything the Self-Chosen do not like) do not qualify for support. Likewise, the premier organization supporting free speech on the Internet, the Electronic Frontier Foundation, will not touch 'hate speech' with a ten-foot pole. As a third example, the ACLU became infamous among its liberal clientele several years ago for supporting the free speech rights of the 'Skokie Nazis', but since that time has not to my

knowledge offered any help to the 'hate community'. But it is of course precisely the most unpopular speech that requires defense, and that is exactly what 'hate speech' is in the present day. And with these organizations in the lead, there is virtually no support at all for real free speech, except among those who dare to do it and be damned.

In conclusion, some might say that the Jews and their friends are trying to suppress revisionism because they think it is false; but my suggestion is that they are trying to suppress it because they know damn well it is true.

<http://www.thebirdman.org/Index/Jews/Jews-HoloRev.html>

MECHANIZED LABOUR MINISTER

## Should UK Ban Shoah Denial ?

Britain should hold a debate on whether to introduce a law banning Holocaust denial, a senior government minister said this week.

Police and Security Minister Tony McNulty, was speaking exclusively to the Jewish News less than two weeks after Holocaust denier David Irving arrived back in Britain after serving 13 months in an Austrian jail.

Irving was arrested in 2005 on a warrant dating back to 1989 relating to comments he made in a speech and interview during a visit to Austria in which he claimed there had been no gas chambers at Auschwitz.

While Austria, Germany and France are among countries to have laws against Holocaust denial, there is currently no law outlawing this in the UK.

However, McNulty said: "David Irving is one to watch. There is a debate to be had on a Holocaust denial law, especially in terms of incitement to religious hatred or anti-Semitism." "But there is a danger of people becoming martyrs to the cause." Lord Janner, Chairman of the Holocaust Educational Trust, welcomed McNulty's views. He said such legislation would be "great". However he was pessimistic over the chances of such a law being introduced. "Holocaust denial is worse than libel, but it won't happen. The chances of getting it in the UK are nil."

McNulty, the MP for Harrow East, insisted those who deny the Shoah should be challenged and added his voice to the chorus of criticism of ultra orthodox group, Neturei Karta, after members attended the recent Holocaust conference in Tehran.

He said: "It's strange to see orthodox Jews sitting side by side with Iran. Anyone taking part should be treated with contempt they deserve."

Meanwhile, the Muslim Council of Britain has said that it will consult members of the Muslim community about whether to participate in January's Holocaust Memorial Day for the first time. The organisation has not participated in the annual event since it was founded in 2001, arguing that it is too exclusive and does not lend enough weight to other tragedies.

But following a meeting last month, a posting on its website said: "MCB's elected Central Working Committee discussed whether or not to accept the invitation to this year's Holocaust Memorial Day. A vote was held and it was decided to undertake a wider consultation of British Muslims on this issue."

The Holocaust Educational Trust's Karen Pollock said she was pleased the MCB are considering whether to take part. "Let's hope this next step will reverse what has always been in my opinion a misguided decision" she added.

McNulty added: "The MCB is wrong to boycott Holocaust Memorial Day, whatever they feel about other events in history, it misses the point. For all the other atrocities in history, **the Holocaust was so mechanised**, so formal in a way we have not seen before and happily not since."

4 Jan. 2007

[http://www.totallyjewish.com/news/national/?content\\_id=5240](http://www.totallyjewish.com/news/national/?content_id=5240)

WHY DID ELIE WIESEL SURVIVE ?

## My Holocaust Problems

by Giuseppe Furioso

The Holocaust consists of three basic elements:

- (1) Approximately six million Jews were deliberately killed.
- (2) These killings were part of a state sponsored program on the part of the Third Reich whose ultimate goal was the total eradication of the Jewish people.
- (3) The bulk of these murders took place in special death camps where the principal mechanism of execution was the homicidal gas chamber that utilized Zyclon B, a commercial pesticide whose active ingredient was hydrogen cyanide.

That the Third Reich possessed the technological and administrative means to carry out such a vast amount of killing there is little doubt. The Soviet Union with significantly inferior assets in these areas was able to kill far greater numbers of human beings. Furthermore, the armies of the Third Reich succeeded in killing at least ten million of its heavily armed military opponents in the course of World War II. Hence the killing of six million unarmed civilians should not have presented any unique problems to such an industrially advanced and bureaucratically efficient state as Nazi Germany, on the contrary, it would have been far easier.

My doubts about the Holocaust are not centered around whether it could have happened but whether it did happen. In fact many of the doubts that I have are a direct consequence of the fact that I have no doubt that it actually could have happened... but certainly not in the ways that have been described thus far in the "official" literature. It is part of the Western tradition in legal, scientific and intellectual matters that those asserting something have the burden of proof and that those who disagree are not required to provide evidence. This tradition however has been turned on its head regarding the Holocaust since the "historical truth" of the Holocaust has been posited in advance. Furthermore, even to express doubts can result in criminal penalties in at least 11 so-called democratic countries and the ruining of lives and careers in numerous others. Listed below are some of the "problems" I have with the Holocaust. Should these be cleared up, it would go a long way toward my accepting it. They are in no particular order.

- 1) Why did Elie Wiesel and countless other Jews survive the Holocaust if it was the intention of the Third Reich to eliminate every Jew they got their hands on? Elie was a prisoner for several years; other Jews survived even longer. Most of these "survivors" were ordinary people who did not have any unique expertise that the Germans could have exploited for their war effort. There was no logical reason for them to be kept alive. The very existence of more than a million survivors even today, some sixty years later, contradicts one of the basic components of the Holocaust i.e. that the Germans had a policy to eliminate every Jew they got their hands on.
- 2) Why is there no mention of the Holocaust in Churchill's six volume History of the Second World War or the wartime memoirs of either De Gaulle or Eisenhower or any of the other lesser luminaries who wrote about the Second World War. Keep in mind all these were written years after the war ended and thus after the Holocaust had been allegedly proven by the Nuremberg Trials? With regard to the Holocaust, the silence of these "conoscenti" is deafening!
- 3) What was an inmate infirmary (and a brothel) doing in Auschwitz if in fact it was a death camp?
- 4) Why would the Germans round up Jews from their far flung empire, thereby tying up large numbers of personnel and rolling stock, while fighting a world war on two fronts to deliver people to "death camps" hundreds of miles away who were then executed upon arrival? Wouldn't a bullet on the spot have appealed to legendary German sense of efficiency?
- 5) Why after sixty years have historians been unable to come up with a single German document that points to a Holocaust? Should we believe the likes of Raul Hilburg that in the place of written orders there was an "incredible meeting of the minds" by the literally tens of thousands of people who would have had to coordinate their actions in order to carry out an undertaking of this magnitude?
- 6) How come it is still insisted upon that six million Jews were killed when the official Jewish death toll at Auschwitz, the flagship of the Holocaust gulag, has been reduced from a immediate post war figure of 3 [?] million, to a figure of somewhat less than one million? Why do many respond to this



observation by saying, " what's the difference whether it's six million or one million". The answer is that the difference is five million. Another difference is that saying so can get you three years in an Austrian jail...just ask David Irving!

7) All of Germany's wartime codes were compromised including the one used to send daily reports from Auschwitz to Berlin. The transcripts of these messages make no mention of mass executions or even remotely suggest a genocidal program in progress. Furthermore it has been insisted that the Germans used a kind of euphemistic code when discussing their extermination program of the Jews e.g. final solution, special treatment, resettlement etc. Why was it necessary for them to use such coded euphemisms when talking to one another unless they thought their codes had been cracked by the Allies?

8) The water table at Auschwitz lies a mere 18 inches below the surface which makes claims of huge burning pits for the disposal of tens of thousands of victims untenable.

9) Initially, claims were made that mass executions in homicidal gas chambers had taken place in camps located within the boundaries of the old Reich e.g. Dachau, Bergun-Belsen. "Evidence" to that effect was every bit as compelling as what was offered for other camps, located in occupied Poland, yet without explanation in the early sixties we were told that this was not the case and that all the "death camps" were located in the East i.e. Poland outside (some would say conveniently) of the probing eyes of western scholars.

10) No one has been able to reconcile the eyewitness accounts that personnel entered the gas chambers after twenty minutes without any protective gear and the fact that Zyklon B was a "time release" fumigant that would have had a lethal capability for at least another twenty four hours. And that even after twenty four hours the corpses would have themselves remained sufficiently contaminated by the hydrogen cyanide gas that they would have had the capacity to kill anyone who touched them who were not wearing protective gear.

11) Why do we no longer hear claims that the Germans manufactured soap, lamp shades and riding britches from the bodies of dead Jews? Could it be that in the light of modern forensics and DNA knowledge these claims are totally untenable?

12) Why do we no longer hear claims that huge numbers of Jews were exterminated in massive steam chambers or electrocuted on special grids? "evidence" of this was presented at Nuremberg? Evidence that sent men to the gallows.

13) Elie Wiesel has been described as " the Apostle of Remembrance" yet in his memoir, "Night" which deals with his stay at Auschwitz he makes no mention of the now infamous homicidal gas chambers. Isn't this a bit like one of the Gospels making no mention of the Cross?

14) Virtually every survivor who was examined at Auschwitz says that he or she was examined by the infamous Dr. Mengele.

15) According to survivor testimony, hundreds of thousands of Jews were executed at Treblinka and then buried in mass graves in the surrounding area. Why is it that extensive sonar probing of these burial grounds reveals that this alleged final resting place for Holocaust victims has remained undisturbed since at least the last ice age?

16) "Proof" of the Holocaust rest primarily on survivor testimony; there little if any hard evidence. The best of this has been described by Jean Claude Pressac as merely "criminal traces". Even Judge Grey who presided at the Irving-Lipstadt Trial commented that he was surprised the evidence pointing to the Holocaust was "extremely thin". To paraphrase Arthur Butz, "a crime of this magnitude would have left a mountain of evidence" where is it? There was more hard evidence against OJ Simpson at his trial and he was FOUND INNOCENT!

17) Why has Holocaust Revisionism been criminalized in at least eleven countries? What other historic truth needs the threat of prison or the destruction of one's career to maintain itself. Should someone be sent to prison for expressing skepticism about the official Chinese claim that they suffered thirty five million dead in World War II ?

18) Why do the court historians insist that "denying the Holocaust" is like denying slavery or saying the earth is flat when it is nothing of the sort. The leading Revisionists are first rate scholars who hold advanced degrees from the world's leading universities. Is there anyone comparable among those who say the world is flat or that slavery never existed?

19) Promoters of the Holocaust have expressed concerns about the remembering the Holocaust once the last survivors die. Why haven't Civil War historians expressed similar concerns since the last survivor of that conflict died in 1959.

20) Survivors of the Holocaust have testified that smoke billowed from the crematoriums as they consumed the bodies of murdered victims. Some eyewitnesses even claimed they could detect national origins by the color of the smoke. How can this be reconciled with the fact that properly operating crematoriums do not produce smoke of any color?

21) According to the official version of the Holocaust hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews were

rounded up in mid 1944 and sent to Auschwitz where most were gassed immediately upon arrival and their bodies were disposed of by burning in huge open air pits using railroad ties and gasoline. Why is that there is no evidence of these huge funerary pyres in the high resolution surveillance photos taken by Allied aircraft who were overflying the camp on a daily basis during this time period. Furthermore, why have no remains been found, since open pit burning, even when gasoline is used, generates insufficient heat to totally consume a body?

22) All of the liberated camps were littered with corpses; is there a single autopsy report or any other forensic evidence that shows that even a single one of these deaths was a consequence of poison gas?

23) The death toll for the Holocaust relies exclusively on population statistics provided by Jewish sources; has any independent demographic study been produced that shows that approximately six million Jews were "missing" at the end of the war?

24) Why do the wartime inspection reports of camps made by the International Red Cross contain no references to mass executions? It strains credulity that such monumental crimes could be hidden. The only explanations are that either these crimes were not occurring or that the Red Cross was complicit in a cover up.

25) Why has there been no effort to respond to the Leuchter Report?

26) "The Holocaust was technologically possible because it happened". Why is this intellectually bankrupt argument, which turns scholarship on its head, considered by the promoters of the Holocaust as historical truth, considered a sufficient response to the mounting Revisionist evidence to the contrary?

27) What other historical truths rely to the extent that the Holocaust does on so-called "eye witness" testimony? And why have none of these witnesses ever been cross examined?

28) According to the official version of the Holocaust, the Jews remained ignorant of their fate until the very end so skillful were their Nazis murderers in deceiving their victims. How can this ignorance be reconciled with the fact that the Jews have historically been as a group, the most literate and highly informed people on the planet with legendary access to the highest echelons of government.

\*\*\*

They have been cross-examined and found wanting in the two Zundel Holocaust Trials in 1985 and 1988.

<http://www.armahellas.com/modules.php?name=Content&pa=showpage&pid=145>

POST TEHRAN

## **Other Victories for Revisionism: Addendum to Faurisson's Iran Holocaust Conference Speech**

By [Paul Grubach](#) 2007

At the recent momentous event in the history of Holocaust revisionism, the Iran Holocaust conference (December 11 and 12, 2006), veteran revisionist scholar Robert Faurisson delivered a speech entitled, "The Victories of Revisionism." Although it was not a history of the revisionist movement, it did list and discuss twenty important concessions to and victories by the Revisionist movement over the traditional view of the Holocaust. In his own words: "[The speech] deals only with victories that our opponents have had to concede to us either explicitly or implicitly."<sup>1</sup>

This essay will list other significant concessions to and victories by Revisionism that Dr. Faurisson did not mention.

1) At the post war Nuremberg Trials, the victorious powers charged that four million people were murdered at the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp complex. The four million figure was concocted by the Soviet Extraordinary State Commission, and later reiterated by a Polish commission that investigated Auschwitz. Until 1990, the four million figure was backed by the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, as it was engraved on memorial stones that were blessed by Pope John Paul II in his June 1979 visit to the camp.<sup>2</sup>

In 1989, Israeli Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer pointed out that the four million figure was a deliberate myth.<sup>3</sup> In his 2002 tome, *The Case for Auschwitz*, Holocaust historian Robert Jan van Pelt also admitted that the four million figure was a falsehood, and it was maintained to serve an ulterior political agenda.<sup>4</sup>

Why is this admission of such importance? One of the standard charges leveled against Holocaust revisionism is that it is an unfounded, foolish "conspiracy theory." Consider the words of

the bitter critic of Holocaust revisionism, Deborah Lipstadt. In her attack upon Arthur Butz's revisionist study, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, she wrote: "Despite its veneer of impartial scholarship, Butz's book is replete with same expressions of traditional anti-Semitism, philo-Germanism and conspiracy theory as the Holocaust denial pamphlets printed by the most scurrilous neo-Nazi groups."<sup>5</sup>

Professor van Pelt also criticized Holocaust revisionism, because in his view it attacks the traditional view of the Holocaust "on the unproven assumption of a general conspiracy."<sup>6</sup> In what some consider as the most important book on the Holocaust in the past decade, Jeffrey Herf's *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust*, it is claimed that conspiracy theories are a danger to the world. Here is what is stated on the dust jacket: "In an era when both anti-Semitism and conspiracy theories continue to influence world politics, Herf offers a timely reminder of their dangers..."<sup>7</sup>

In the "four-million-murdered-at-Auschwitz" falsehood, we have evidence that conspiracy (i.e., conscious intent to deceive for political purposes) was involved in the shaping of the Holocaust story. As Israeli historian Bauer pointed out, it was a deliberate myth concocted to serve ulterior political purposes, and van Pelt concedes that even into the 1980s the four million myth was put forth because it continued to serve a political purpose.

2) One of the standard dictums of the mainstream Holocaust historians is that the traditional view of this Jewish Holocaust is an indisputable fact that is not subject to debate. In the words of Deborah Lipstadt: "The existence of the Holocaust [is] not a matter of debate."<sup>8</sup> In the aftermath of the Iran Holocaust conference, the Swiss Foreign Ministry expressed it as best as anyone: "The Shoah is a historical fact. It is unacceptable to call this into question."<sup>9</sup>

According to premier Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg, Treblinka, Sobibor and Belzec were three concentration camps in Nazi occupied Poland where approximately one million, five hundred thousand people were supposedly murdered.<sup>10</sup> Yet, in one of the most important Holocaust histories ever published, Professor van Pelt's *The Case for Auschwitz*, it is admitted that the evidence for mass murder in these camps is very sparse at best, thus undermining the claim that the Holocaust is "indisputable fact."

In regard to the alleged evidence for mass murder at these three camps and their role in the Holocaust, here is what he stated: "The evidence for the role of Treblinka, Belzec, and Sobibor—sufficient as it may be to come to a moral certainty about the wartime history of those places—is much less abundant. There are few eyewitnesses, no confession that can compare to that given by [Commandant of Auschwitz Rudolf] Hoss, no significant remains, and few archival sources."<sup>11</sup>

3) Dr. Richard Evans, a Cambridge University historian, served as the principal expert witness for the Lipstadt defense team at the famous David Irving-Deborah Lipstadt libel trial in London in 2000. In his book in which he attempts to discredit Holocaust revisionism, he admits that non-Jewish corpses are exploited and used to prop up the Jewish Holocaust ideology. He wrote: "Visiting the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C., for example, I was struck by its marginalization of any other victims apart from the Jews, to the extent that it presented photographs of dead bodies in camps such as Buchenwald or Dachau as dead Jewish bodies, when in fact relatively few Jewish prisoners were held there."<sup>12</sup>

I believe I understand him correctly. He is claiming that the Holocaust Memorial Museum is promoting a falsehood, by using non-Jewish bodies to gain sympathy for Jews.

4) One of the main forms of evidence for the traditional view of the Holocaust is the eyewitness testimony of former concentration camp inmates and other "Holocaust survivors." Yet, what the renowned "expert" on "Holocaust denial," Deborah Lipstadt, admitted in her 1993 book casts doubt on the value of this form of evidence.

She wrote: "For a variety of reasons some [former Nazi concentration camp ] inmates did and still do embellish their experiences. Others sometimes adopt the experiences of fellow survivors as their own."<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, she argues that there are methods by which to corroborate the testimony of former concentration camp inmates. The reader is encouraged to examine her argument.

But even more revealing is this admission. Yad Vashem is Israel's national memorial to the Holocaust. In reference to a very important concession from this Israeli institution, Lipstadt wrote: "[T]he Institute for Historical Review published a report from the *Jerusalem Post* in which the director of Yad Vashem's archives reported that more than half of its testimonies from Holocaust survivors are 'unreliable.' According to Yad Vashem officials, these testimonies have never been used as evidence in Nazi war crimes trials because survivors who wanted to be 'part of history' may, in fact, have allowed their imaginations to 'run away with them.'"<sup>14</sup>

It seems as though a day does not go by that the mass media does not try to “prove” that the “Nazi gas chambers” existed by using some “newly discovered eyewitness testimony” of former concentration camp inmates. Indeed, in the January 14, 2007 issue of the *Chicago Tribune*, it was reported that “new” testimony that “proves” the existence of the “Nazi gas chambers” was recently found.<sup>15</sup>

But here we have Deborah Lipstadt, a major Holocaust historian, unwittingly putting forth reasons that show that a large portion of this “eyewitness testimony” is simply unreliable. Since such a large portion of this “eyewitness testimony” has been declared unreliable, it is certainly correct for historians to be, at the very least, skeptical of all such testimony.

5) We close this essay with a tidbit of information from an Israeli source that corroborates a conclusion that Arthur Butz put forth as far back as 1976. “The consequence of World War II did not create Zionism as an effective political movement,” he observed, “they merely gave Zionism the world political victory it needed for the final stage of the takeover of Palestine. All world power had fallen to the U.S. and the Soviet Union, both of which were most friendly to the Zionist cause at the time. Under the circumstances the Arab position was hopeless, since it depended on the firmness and political independence of a Britain that was almost prostrate politically and economically.”<sup>16</sup>

I direct your attention the study of the Israeli historian, Benjamin Pinkus, *The Jews of the Soviet Union*. Buried in a footnote we read: “According to what Roosevelt told [Zionist leader] Stephen Wise in March 1945 (Weizmann archives, 18 March 1945): ‘The Big Three [Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin] agreed on handing over Palestine to the Jews. As far as the immediate future is concerned, Jewish immigration will be continued.’”<sup>17</sup>

So there you have it. An Israeli historian unwittingly put forth evidence that corroborates what Holocaust revisionist Butz had the historical vision to see in the 1970s.

#### Footnotes

- 1 Dr. Robert Faurisson, “The Victories of Revisionism,” A paper read by Professor Robert Faurisson to the Tehran Holocaust Conference, December 11, 2006. Online: [http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/Faurisson/at\\_Teheran\\_conf\\_2005.html](http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/Faurisson/at_Teheran_conf_2005.html)
2. Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum, ed., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp* (Indiana University Press, 1994), pp. 61-62.
3. Yehuda Bauer, “Auschwitz: The Dangers of Distortion,” *Jerusalem Post International Edition*, week ending September 30, 1989, p.7; Peter Steinfeld, “Auschwitz Revisionism: An Israeli Scholar’s Case,” *New York Times*, November 12, 1989.
4. Robert Jan van Pelt, *The Case for Auschwitz: Evidence from the Irving Trial* (Indiana University Press, 2002), p.5.
5. Deborah Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (The Free Press, 1993), p. 126.
6. Robert Jan van Pelt, p.140.
7. Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During WWII and the Holocaust* (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006).
8. Lipstadt, p.1.
- 9 See “Iran Hosts Anti-Semitic Hatefest in Tehran: Responses from World Leaders.” Online: [http://www.adl.org/main\\_International\\_Affairs/iran\\_holocaust\\_conference.htm?Multi\\_page\\_sections=sHeading\\_4](http://www.adl.org/main_International_Affairs/iran_holocaust_conference.htm?Multi_page_sections=sHeading_4)
10. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews: Student Edition* (Holmes & Meir, 1985), p. 338.
11. Robert Jan van Pelt, p. 5.
12. Richard J. Evans, *Lying About Hitler: History, Holocaust, and the David Irving Trial* (Basic Book, 2001), p. 261.
13. Lipstadt, p. 53.
14. Ibid., p.101.
15. Ron Grossman, “Echoes of history: Holocaust voices resurface at IIT,” *Chicago Tribune*, January 14, 2007. Online: <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chi-0701140387jan14,1,4214717.story?coll=chi-news-hed&ctrack=1&cset=true>
16. Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century: The Case Against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry* (Institute for Historical Review, 1976), p. 233.
17. Benjamin Pinkus, *The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority* (Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 346, footnote 98.

<http://www.codoh.com/viewpoints/vppgothier.html>

THE BEST INTRODUCTION

***Lectures on the Holocaust by G. Rudolf (August, 2005)***

**Review by Patrick McNally**

available:

<http://vho.org/GB/Books/HHS.html>

<http://www.vho.org/GB/Books/loth/>

These *Lectures* could be called introductory [as could Hegel's "Lectures.."], but this tome's 566 pages take the reader very far into the various scientific, forensic, and historiographic issues in contemporary holocaustology. This book is a very important, up-to-date, and thoroughly researched one-volume expose of the Hoaxoco\$t as a shameless and obstinate lie of the Jewish misleaders. The 527 pages of text are a multi-faceted and fascinating presentation of the widest possible range of material relating to the actual hoaxoco\$t, its antecedents, and its subsequent misuses.

The book has at least four different aspects:

- 1.) An informal series of lectures in which the listeners were permitted frequent interjections, questions, objections, etc. Both holocaust faithful and sceptics were given the opportunity to participate.
- 2.) The 27 tables and 156 illustrations make this book a valuable reference work to be consulted in any discussion about holocaust fact and fiction.
- 3.) An extensively annotated bibliography on virtually all the well-known and not so well known books dealing with holocaustory has been integrated into the text.
- 4.) A cogent and incisive analyses of complicated political, constitutional, and philosophical issues.

Most of the book is quite easy to read because of the informal and conversational tone of the lectures, but the wealth of detailed and invaluable information in the tables and illustrations make it advisable for the serious student-holocaustorian to have his own copy on hand for ready reference purposes.

For example, Table 1 compares Hilberg and Davidowicz on the number of supposed victims at different alleged murder sites and on the total number. This one table exposes the totally unscientific nature of the main works of these two leading holocaustomaniacs and is a good introduction into the problem of "hoaxoco\$t arithmetic," i.e. whatever components are used the magic total of 6M always pops out.

Tables 5 and 12 show the incredibly shrinking number of victims claimed by hoaxoco\$tomaniacs for Auschwitz and Treblinka respectively. Over time the total alleged for Auschwitz has shrunk down from 9,000,000 to 510,000 and Treblinka's from 3,000,000 to 200,000. There are similar tables for other camps.

The illustrations are equally valuable and perhaps even more essential to understand the author's arguments and to prove one's points [One picture is worth a 1,000 words.]. For example, Illustrations 84-86 respectively show:

- 1.) "what the airtight doors of [the Nazi] homicidal 'gas chambers' looked like,

2.) the door to a single-person execution gas chamber in the USA, and  
3.) the door to a delousing chamber at Dachau. Just these three photos are rather convincing evidence that the fable of Auschwitz's mass-homicidal gas chambers is a shabby lie believable only by well brainwashed children and village idiots. Illustrations 104, 105, 112, 113a-c, 114, 115, 116, 117f, 119, 120, 121 deal with photo fakery, forgery, and mislabeling. These photo-illustrations are an essential part of the author's argument and, therefore, absolutely indispensable for the reader and anyone with whom the reader would like to discuss these issues [One fake photo is worth a 1,000 lies.]

One very detailed annotated bibliography [pp. 132-184] shows the gingerly way in which historians writing in German have written about the holocaust. This 52-page section is very useful in giving the non-specialist an overview of the gradually strengthening of revisionism in Germany.

Because Rudolf is a PhD-level chemist, it is not surprising that he discusses in great detail issues of forensic evidence, chemistry, and on-site investigations of the alleged gas chambers. [Notate bene: Holocaustomaniacs deprived Rudolf of the opportunity to receive his PhD, so the phrase "PhD-level" is used.] A liberally educated chemist writing for non-scientists should make the important issues clear. Rudolf certainly does. For example, the backcover has four photos: 2 from Auschwitz, 1 from Majdanek, and 1 from Stutthof. Three of the photos show the widespread blue staining characteristic of the extensive use of Zylon B. Only one photo shows no blue staining whatsoever. It is the photo that should actually show the most staining, i.e. the alleged genocidal gas chambers at Aw-shucks. Jurists and Latinists use the phrase, *res ipsa loquitur*, to describe this type of situation and the unavoidable conclusion. Please check out the author's photos and arguments for yourself!

In connection with the "Germans murdered 6M Jews" filthy blood libel, Rudolf raises two issues that are very important for modern nations:

1. Are human bodies self-cremating, i.e. can they be used as fuel ?
2. Is it possible to eliminate 6M bodies with no trace ?

Question #1 is very important for India, Japan, etc. and any country that cremates bodies rather than burying them. The Japanese annually spend billions of increasingly valuable Yen on imported fuel for cremations. Moreover, there are over 25,000 Japanese over the age of 100 who will soon need to be cremated. Let us find out from holocaust survivors how bodies were used as fuel in order to save a lot of money in the near future!

Question #2 raises important environmental issues. It would be possible to free up immeasurable amounts of land if bodies could be made to disappear without a trace.

The most interesting parts of the book for the general reader might well be the many cogent and brief analyses of issues surrounding the holyhoax. I list only a few:

1. the holocaust as a sociological taboo much stronger than any other taboo in pseudo-enlightened societies that pride themselves on not having any taboos [pp. 9-14]
2. the case of Dr. Carol Loftus [pp.348-351], the racist American Jew, who would not testify at the Demjanjuk Trial in Jerusalem. Her racism is more disgusting than that of the locust plague of professional holyhoax witness-liars. After all, these professional liars make a living off their deceit. For Loftus human rights are a "Is it good for Jews?" issue.
3. the modern holocaust show trials and medieval witch trials [413-416]: Rudolf lists c. 23

similarities and shows that the Stalin-type hoaxoco\$t trials were and still are a throwback to pre-modern judicial proceedings and were essentially the same as the Moscow show trials of the 1930s.

4. the Demjanjuk Case and the vicious lies told and forgeries committed to give Israel another Eichmann-style shoah-business circus [pp.103-110]. And the ensuing petty revenge of American Jewry's elite in getting the victim re-deported back to the Ukraine.

5. The utterly phoney basis of democracy and human rights in the Federal Republic of Germany [pp.397-412]. In the early 1950s, West Germany got a so-called Basic Law but no constitution. The Basic Law required Germany to accept all the verdicts of the Allies' holocaust show trials so that the "hoax of the century" became the very foundation of today's Germany. Consequently, freedom of speech in Germany has a very Stalinesque twist, i.e. you can say anything you like as long as the government does not dislike it. So Germany is a HOG [Hoaxoco\$t Obsessed Government].

6. The extent to which racist Jewish holocaustomaniacs have willy-nilly become revisionists and then the shameless way in which they shift the blame for their own original lies onto Gentiles and finally claim for themselves the merit of having exposed the lie. Examples are the:

- a. human-fat-into-soap lie,
- b. human-skin-into-lampshades lie,
- c. Wannsee-Conference-to-murder-Jews lie,
- d. fable about the homicidal gas chambers.

Will the same psychotic Jewish elite eventually come forward to claim that the Germans made up the whole holyhoax story of 6M murdered Jews "to create a time bomb against the Jews"? [p. 177] They probably will!

At any rate, the Jewish misleaders' trick of falsely accusing others of making false accusations has been very shrewd and effective. I never understood this until Israel Shamir wrote about it in reference to the false charge attributed to Christians that Jews are responsible for the death of Christ. It has never been the teaching of mainline Christianity that Jews in general are responsible for Christ's death or for anything whatsoever. Each individual [Self-Chosen or Unchosen] is responsible only for his own actions according to Plato, Aristotle, and Christian teaching. Shamir points out that the Talmud teaches that Jews should be proud of having killed Christ who is supposed now boiling away in hell in excrement. The Jewish elite trick works like this: Make false accusations! Get caught? Falsely accuse others of having made the false accusations!

## Conclusion

Dr. Joachim Hoffman wrote a 4-page "Expert Report" on Rudolf's *Dissecting the Holocaust*. I am only a beginner in holocaustiana -not anywhere being an expert- and my most basic qualification for writing this review is that I attended eight years at a good grade school in the 1950s. In those years we intensely practiced all four basic arithmetic operations so we could not be fooled by anything as shallow and stupid as "holocaust arithmetic." If the components of a sum total go down, the sum total must go down. We were also taught, "Fool me once, shame on you! Fool me twice, shame on me!" and the right to self-defense against physical violence and outrageous lies. Have smaltzy professional hate-mongering hoaxoco\$t liars fooled you? Do you need to defend yourself? Read Rudolf's *Lectures on the Holocaust* to answer those two important questions for yourself! This book is also a great detective story that makes Sherlock Holmes and Agatha Christie mysteries look positively boring.

<http://forum.codoh.com/viewtopic.php?t=2851&highlight=mcnally>

## CRUSHING DEMOCRACY

### Italian government to propose bill criminalizing Holocaust denial

ROME: The Italian government will propose legislation next week making it a crime to deny the Holocaust, the justice minister said Friday. Clemente Mastella made the announcement as Germany pushes to criminalize incitement of hatred and acts of racist violence, including denying the genocide of Jews during World War II, throughout the 27-nation EU.

Germany holds the EU's rotating presidency.

"We must keep our guard high against any resurgence of anti-Semitism," Mastella said. Mastella discussed the plan with Prime Minister Romano Prodi on Friday, and the two agreed to present a bill at next week's Cabinet meeting, the Justice Ministry said. Any proposal by the government would then require parliament's approval.

The Italian government's proposal would come shortly before Jan. 27, the day Auschwitz was liberated in 1945. The date was set aside for international Holocaust remembrance.

Mastella met Thursday afternoon with representatives of the Jewish communities in Italy, including Rome's chief rabbi Riccardo di Segni, to discuss the proposal, the ministry said. Many EU nations already ban denials of the Holocaust, including Germany, France, Spain, Austria and Belgium. Austria last year jailed British historian David Irving for questioning the Holocaust in a book published in the country.

*International Herald Tribune* 19 Jan. 2007

<http://www.ihf.com/articles/ap/2007/01/19/europe/EU-GEN-Italy-Holocaust-Denial.php>

## FOLLOW UP

Hours before the UN resolution was passed, the Italian government published a draft law which proposes penalties of up to three years in jail for inciting racial hatred, but stops short of making Holocaust denial a crime. Some 200 historians had voiced their objection, arguing that it would infringe on free speech, and Justice Minister Clemente Mastella failed to win support for a more explicit bill.

The Italian cabinet has approved a draft law imposing jail terms for racist or ethnically motivated crimes, **but stopped short of making Holocaust denial illegal** following opposition from some Jewish leaders and others. [...] But Prime Minister Romano Prodi's government, which passed the measure late on Thursday night (25 January), backed off from Mastella's initial plan to make denying the Nazi attempt to exterminate the Jews a crime. **Several top university professors wrote an open letter** saying Holocaust denial was effectively a cultural problem that could not be solved with jail sentences.

*Legislationline* 15 Feb. 2007

[http://209.85.129.104/search?q=cache:SZKAixQI3ewl:www.legislationline.org/news.php%3Ftid%3D218%26jid%3D1+Mastella+Holocaust+%22denial%22&hl=it&ct=clnk&cd=4&gl=it&lr=lang\\_en](http://209.85.129.104/search?q=cache:SZKAixQI3ewl:www.legislationline.org/news.php%3Ftid%3D218%26jid%3D1+Mastella+Holocaust+%22denial%22&hl=it&ct=clnk&cd=4&gl=it&lr=lang_en)

## TYPICAL JEWISH FALSE NEWS

### Italy approves law making Holocaust denial a crime

By DPA

Italy's government Thursday approved a bill that makes denying the Holocaust a crime and stiffens prison sentences for those found guilty of inciting racial hatred. The decree, submitted by Justice Minister Clemente Mastella, received unanimous approval by the Romano Prodi cabinet. Italy will celebrate Holocaust Memorial Day on Saturday.

Ha'aretz Last update - 21:35 25/01/2007

<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/817994.html>

ROME (EJP)--- After lengthy negotiations, Italy's center-left coalition government has approved Thursday a bill making racial hatred a crime and stiffening prison sentences for those found guilty of inciting racial hatred. **But it makes no reference to Holocaust denial.** The decree, submitted by Justice Minister Clemente Mastella, received unanimous approval by the



Romano Prodi's government. The decree, which was originally meant to bring Italy in line with European countries such as Austria, Germany, Spain, Belgium or France, makes no reference in its final draft to denial of the extermination of six million Jews during World War II. **Justice minister Clemente Mastella had initially proposed a law specifically targeting Holocaust denial but top coalition partners including education minister Fabio Mussi and culture minister Francesco Rutelli rejected the plan, saying education in schools was the solution rather than turning denial of the Shoah into a crime.**

<http://www.ejpress.org/article/13348>

DO WE NEED FUEL ?

## **Auschwitz work could fuel denials warns camp expert**

A BRITISH expert on Auschwitz has warned that plans to preserve the former death camp could give Holocaust deniers more ammunition for their claims that the Nazis' mass murder of millions was fabricated.

Jonathan Webber, a professor of Jewish studies at the University of Birmingham and a member of the International Auschwitz Council, a board that advises administrators at the camp in Poland, says he is particularly concerned about a move to build retaining walls around the gas chambers to prevent them sinking.

"Anyone tampering with gas chambers is tampering with the heart and soul of what Auschwitz represents," said Webber, who has urged the council to seek the advice of the best engineering experts in the world before starting any work. His call comes as Holocaust survivors gather at Auschwitz today on the 62nd anniversary of its liberation by Soviet troops.

Time and tourism is taking its toll and the camp's new director, historian Piotr Cywinski, 34, is searching for ways to preserve vital evidence and update exhibits without diluting evidence of atrocities inflicted on Jews, gypsies, political prisoners, homosexuals and others

Evening News Edinburgh Sat 27 Jan 2007

<http://edinburghnews.scotsman.com/international.cfm?id=142852007&format=print>

OF COURSE, THEY HAVE NOT READ THE BOOK

## **Professor's Claim Of Truth To 'Blood Libel' Plays Into Hands Of Anti-Semites**

New York, NY, February 8, 2007... The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) today called a charge by an Israeli historian that there was some truth to the medieval "blood libel" accusation "baseless and playing into the hands of anti-Semites everywhere." The charge that Jews used Christian blood for ritual purposes appears in the book, *Bloody Passovers: The Jews of Europe and Ritual Murders* by Professor Ariel Toaff of Bar Ilan University.

**Abraham H. Foxman**, ADL National Director, issued the following statement:

It is incredible that anyone, much less an Israeli historian, would give legitimacy to the baseless blood libel accusation that has been the source of much suffering and attacks against Jews historically.

Toaff's citing the 'testimony' of Jews allegedly admitting to the use of Christian blood for Jewish ritual purposes is absurd on its face since these Jews were tortured and anything they said was under duress and not to be taken seriously. It is like trying to establish the charge of witchcraft based on the testimony at the Salem witch trials.

There is absolutely nothing in Jewish religion law that remotely suggests or allows such activity. The accusation, like many other conspiracy theories about Jews, was made out of whole cloth and reflected the tendency in Medieval Europe, based on Christian anti-Jewish doctrine, to demonize Jews and blame them for problems in society.

This is a time when conspiracy theories about Jews are flourishing. Extremist, anti-Semitic, and Islamic extremist groups will undoubtedly use this charge to further their hostile aims to the Jewish people.

ADL

[http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ASInt\\_13/4976\\_13.htm](http://www.adl.org/PresRele/ASInt_13/4976_13.htm)

**THE ITALIAN BOOK, *PASQUE DI SANGUE*, IS AVAILABLE ONLINE ON THE AAARGH WEBSITE**

<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres7/PasquediSangue.pdf>

## Historian gives credence to blood libel

By Lisa Palmieri-Billig

ROME. An Israeli historian of Italian origin has revived "blood libel" in an historical study set to hit Italian bookstores on Thursday. Ariel Toaff, son of Rabbi Elio Toaff, claims that there is some historic truth in the accusation that for centuries provided incentives for pogroms against Jews throughout Europe.

Toaff's tome, *Bloody Passovers: The Jews of Europe and Ritual Murders*, received high praise from another Italian Jewish historian, Sergio Luzzatto, in an article in the *Corriere della Sera* daily entitled "Those Bloody Passovers."

Luzzatto describes Toaff's work as a "magnificent book of history...Toaff holds that from 1100 to about 1500...several crucifixions of Christian children really happened, bringing about retaliations against entire Jewish communities - punitive massacres of men, women, children. Neither in Trent in 1475 nor in other areas of Europe in the late Middle Ages were Jews always innocent victims."

"A minority of fundamentalist Ashkenazis...carried out human sacrifices," Luzzatto continued.

Toaff offers as an example the case of Saint Simonino of Trent. In March 1475, shortly after a child's body was found in a canal near the Jewish area of Trent, the city's Jews were accused of murdering Simonino and using his blood to make *matzot*.

After a medieval trial in which confessions were extracted by torture, 16 members of Trent's Jewish community were hanged.

Toaff reveals that the accusations against the Jews of Trent "might have been true."

Toaff refers to kabbalistic descriptions of the therapeutic uses of blood and asserts that "a black market flourished on both sides of the Alps, with Jewish merchants selling human blood, complete with rabbinic certification of the product - kosher blood."

Dr. Amos Luzzatto, former president of the Union of Italian Jewish Communities said, "I would expect a more serious statement than 'it might have been true.'" He also expressed dismay at the sensationalism with which *Corriere della Sera*, Italy's leading daily, treated the issue.

"It is totally inappropriate to utilize declarations extorted under torture centuries ago to reconstruct bizarre and devious historical theses," declared 12 of Italy's chief rabbis in a press release refuting Toaff's claims.

"The only blood spilled in these stories was that of so many innocent Jews, massacred on account of unjust and infamous accusations," the statement continued.

The town of Trent, near the Austrian border, commemorated Simonino's "martyrdom" for five centuries, until, in 1965, the Vatican published the *Nostra Aetate*, which aimed at extirpating anti-Semitism from Catholic doctrine. The Bishop of Trent signed a decree proclaiming that the blood libel against the city's Jews of that city was unfounded.

Alessandro Martinelli, the Catholic Church's delegate for Interreligious Dialogue in the Diocese of Trent, recalls a well-documented DVD and historical monograph by historian Diego Quaglioni disproving Jewish responsibility for Simonino's death. A plaque the community had erected to mark the tragedy of the Jews who were martyred called for atonement and reconciliation between Catholics and Jews based on adherence to historical truth.

To all this, Dr. Amos Luzzatto comments, "Even if the author should manage to prove that a deviant sect existed for centuries...clearly it could never be identified as a Jewish group, or as part of a Jewish community. This would be comparable to saying that the rabbis who were present at [Iranian

President Mahmoud] Ahmadinejad's Holocaust Denial Conference in Teheran represent mainstream Judaism."

*Jerusalem Post* 8 Feb. 2007

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?c=JPArticle&cid=1170359806416&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

JEWISH WAR PROPAGANDA

## OFFICIAL ANTISEMITISM IN VENEZUELA

Karl Pfeifer

Added by David Hirsh on February 22, 2007 11:10:01 AM.

Armed police raided the Jewish elementary and high school at the Jewish Cultural Centre in Caracas on 29 November 2004 implementing a court order that alleged that materials of a criminal nature, such as electronic equipment, arms and explosive devices were concealed in the building. The swoop started at 6.30 am, when school buses and parents had already started to bringing children to the school, but, after rooting through the building for three hours, the police left having found zilch. The court order, it has since been revealed, had been issued three days earlier but the police waited until Venezuelan president, Hugo Chavez, arrived in Teheran for a state visit to Iran. That was two years ago, but things have only got worse in the intervening period. Indeed, since election of the left-wing populist Chavez in 1998, Venezuela has witnessed a proliferation of virulently anti-Israel and anti-Zionist propaganda, frequently entwined with nakedly anti-Jewish slogans.

The Jewish population in Venezuela numbers only around 25,000 out of a total population of close to twenty-seven million. So, why does the official media of a government that claims to be socialist, devote its energy to poisonous attacks on a very small Jewish community?

One possible explanation given is the fact, that one of Chavez's important early advisers and political mentors was a - now deceased - **Argentine Holocaust denier called Norberto Ceresole, a friend of the French fascist Robert Faurisson and the French ex-Communist Roger Garaudy** who converted to Islam and also took up Holocaust denial.

Ceresole strongly believed that Latin America must forge alliances with Arab nations to fight the United States and what he called "the Jewish financial mafia." The tendencies towards distortion of the Holocaust might, further, be explained partly against the background of the increasingly close relationship between oil-rich Venezuela and Iran and other Muslim countries. As such, this kind of nonsense has been incorporated into the Chavez government's anti-imperialist rhetoric with Israel is viewed as a key factor in US politics and, thus, an enemy of the "anti-imperialist revolution."

Antisemitic ranting is not confined to government circles but is spread throughout the mass media. For example, in the *Diario VEA* newspaper, as recently as 20 September, the hardcore antisemite Basem Tajeldine raved: "The Holocaust perpetrated by the Nazis was directed to eliminate the social basis of Judaism that believed in assimilation with the Europeans, the low class majority of Jews. The ideological affinity and the great ties of collaboration that existed between German Zionism and Nazism is undeniable "Sionazis is the most appropriate term to catalogue (sic) the organisation of the political capitalist Jewish elite of Israel that is responsible for the present Holocaust of the Arab people". Similarly in *El Diario de Caracas* earlier this year, Tarek Muci Nasir claims that "The only resource they [the Jews - Editor] have left to stay united, is to cause wars and self-genocide". Nasir goes on to urge that his readers pay attention to the behaviour of the Israelite-Zionist associations, unions and federations that conspire in Venezuela to seize our finances, industries, commerce, construction, even infiltrating public positions and politics and warns that "Possibly it will again be necessary to expel them from the country, like other nations have done before this is the reason why the Jews are always in a continuous stateless exodus and thus in the year 1948 they invaded Palestine."

Commenting on the September visit to Caracas by Iranian's fanatic president Ahmadinejad, Freddy Pressner, head of the Confederation of Jewish Associations of Venezuela, expressed outrage, citing the Iranian leader's open denial of the Holocaust and his statements about erasing Israel from the face of planet.

Chavez's bloc with Iran is making Venezuelan Jews worry about their own security for the first time.

Sammy Eppel, a Caracas-based columnist, addressed the deepening antisemitism in Venezuela in his presentation at a recent conference, in Budapest, of the Tel Aviv University-based Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism and Racism. In his lecture, he revealed that he had found no fewer than 195 examples of antisemitic content in the official and pro-government media in a 65-day period ending on 31 August 2006.

Among slides shown by Eppel was one depicting the front page of a government publication called *Docencia* (Teaching) which denounced the "Jewish killers" perpetrating the war in the Lebanon and which conflates the Star of David with the Nazi swastika, Eppel pointed out that, until a few years ago, "there were hardly any antisemitic articles in the Venezuelan media and that the government has adopted an antisemitic policy. At meetings between Jewish community leaders and top-level government officials, including Chavez himself, the government, according to Pressner, has bleated that its hands are tied, saying, "We'll do what we

can, but we can't deny people freedom of speech." The antisemitism evident even in the political cartoons published in government-owned newspapers is now finding explosive expression at street level. For example, antisemitic slogans, bearing the signature of the Venezuelan Communist Party and its youth organisation, have even been sprayed on the walls of the Jewish Cultural Centre in Caracas in broad daylight. The perpetrators were filmed on CCTV but when a complaint was lodged with the police and interior ministry nothing happened.

It is clear beyond any question that under Chavez's leadership, Venezuela is experiencing a disturbing rise in antisemitism, fostered in large part by Chavez's own rhetoric and that of governmental institutions. The relentless and baseless attacks on the Jewish community are now putting it at great risk.

<http://www.dafka.org/NewsGen.asp?S=4&PageID=1557>

See the Central Jewish monitoring authority on

Venezuela [http://www.emailpresenter.com/Viewer/Viewer4.asp?p=/viewer/presentations/2006112\\_3/634348139/pres.swf&MsgID=1864581&TRK=1&pn=antisemitism%20dossier%20WO%20videos](http://www.emailpresenter.com/Viewer/Viewer4.asp?p=/viewer/presentations/2006112_3/634348139/pres.swf&MsgID=1864581&TRK=1&pn=antisemitism%20dossier%20WO%20videos)

THE DIVA

## DENYING THE DENIERS

Deborah Lipstadt And The Fight To Preserve The Memory Of The Holocaust

by Allison Hoffman

The story of how a feisty college professor named Deborah Lipstadt came to symbolize the fight to preserve the memory of the Holocaust. Lipstadt's forum was a British courtroom, where she successfully rebuffed a libel lawsuit filed against her by David Irving, one of the world's most notorious Holocaust deniers. Although Irving was disgraced, historic revisionism — and other mutations of the Big Lie — continues to thrive, and the truth bravely staggers on.

A few months ago, shortly after an Austrian court sentenced Holocaust denier David Irving to three years in prison for attempting to manipulate history, Holocaust historian and author Deborah Lipstadt took to her computer blog and issued her own scathing verdict. "Once again," Lipstadt wrote, mincing no words for her longtime nemesis, "Irving seemed to behave in a way that said, 'I can do whatever I want, say whatever I want, and get away with it.' The problem is, he can't."

One reason Irving can't is that his celebrated attempt to legitimize his own peculiar view of history by targeting Lipstadt had boomeranged horribly only a few years earlier.

A self-taught historian of the Third Reich, Irving filed suit in London in 1995, claiming that Lipstadt had libeled him by describing him as a Holocaust denier because of his publicly stated view that there had been no gas chambers at Auschwitz, and no officially sanctioned attempt by Hitler to annihilate European Jewry.

Not only a putative scholar, Irving was also widely known in his native Britain as a shameless self-promoter who pulled stunts that included offering to pay a thousand pounds to anyone who could produce a signed piece of paper proving that Hitler authorized the mass killing of Jews.

Lipstadt, by contrast, was a conventional, albeit fiercely outspoken, inhabitant of academia—a professor of Modern Jewish and Holocaust Studies at Emory University in Atlanta, who was recognized and respected in Jewish circles, but not well-known much beyond.

A native New Yorker, Lipstadt is, at 59, herself too young to be a survivor, and though her German father's immediate family did survive the war, he had left Europe in the early days of the Third Reich.

As an undergraduate, Lipstadt studied American politics, but after graduation, she made what she has described as an "impetuous decision" to spend two years studying at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In Israel, she says, she fully understood the influence of Israel and the Holocaust on the modern Jewish psyche for the first time, and decided to spend her career studying it.

Her first book, *Beyond Belief* (1986), examined how American newspapers of the 1930s and '40s played down or entirely ignored the persecution of Jews in Eastern Europe as well as the subsequent Holocaust itself.

Her second book, the one that eventually made her famous, was *Denying the Holocaust* (1993), which exposed a cadre of "historians" - including Irving - and so-called "lay experts" from California to Europe who made it their business to deny evidence of the Shoah. In her book, Lipstadt accused Irving of being "one of the most dangerous spokespersons for Holocaust denial."

If Irving ever thought he had found an easy mark in Lipstadt, he was mistaken. "You could not call her an introvert," noted Jehuda Reinharz, now the president of Brandeis University, who met Lipstadt when they were both graduate students there in the 1970s. "She has always been quite clear as to where she stands, and the role she played in the trial and after, not by choice but because of circumstances, did not cow her." Another longtime friend, the Jerusalem-based playwright Joyce

Klein, drew a parallel between Lipstadt and Queen Esther, the fabled heroine of the Purim story. "She [Lipstadt] took very seriously this idea that she was put in this place for a reason, that she was fulfilling a role no one else could fulfill," Klein told me. "There was a definite sense of mission, a sense of doing something for a cause."

Lipstadt demurs. "All I did was defend myself," she says of her decision to contest Irving's libel suit. But of course, she wasn't just defending herself. She was also defending the collective memory of the Holocaust, which is losing the reinforcement of living testimony as the remaining survivors of that epochal genocidal campaign die off.

"Survivors or children of survivors will thank me for what I did, which is mind-boggling to me," she told me recently from Rome, where she spent the spring semester teaching. "It's not that I'm such a humble person-I put a lot of effort into the fight, and who doesn't like to be thanked for something they've done? But compared to what they went through, I didn't do very much."

Even more importantly, though, Lipstadt was defending the sanctity of history itself, which is her primary academic focus. "There is a certain compact between author and reader," she told me. "The author promises not to twist the facts, and to report disagreements, to say that unlike Mr. X who believes that one plus one is two, I believe the answer is 12. But with Irving, you look at the citations and the sources and there is no proof; he takes things which are not there and says that they are there." In particular, Lipstadt recalled, Irving went to great lengths to distort evidence regarding Hitler's role in the events of Kristallnacht, as well as his orders regarding the deportation and extermination of Jews in the eastern labor and death camps.

As the philosopher Hannah Arendt, who covered the 1961 trial in Jerusalem of Adolf Eichmann, wrote in an essay for *The New Yorker* nearly 40 years ago, "Even if we admit that every generation has the right to write its own history, we admit no more than that it has a right to rearrange the facts in accordance with its own perspective; we don't admit the right to touch the factual matter itself."

Facing a man who, like other Holocaust deniers fit the description of a "paper Eichmann" (in the phrase coined by the French Jewish scholar Pierre Vidal-Friquet), Lipstadt chose to take the fight directly to Irving by resolving to prove the veracity of what she had written-that is, to demonstrate that Irving and his cohorts had manipulated historical facts when they disputed whether key aspects of the Holocaust had ever taken place.

Complicating Lipstadt's task was the fact that British libel law is notoriously sympathetic to the plaintiff. In British courts, the burden of proof rests with the defendant-just the opposite of the American system. Several friends advised Lipstadt to settle with Irving, not only to avoid the possibility of losing the case, but also to deprive him of a public forum that might legitimate his views.

As Lipstadt recounts in her memoir of the court fight, *History on Trial*, her defense was orchestrated by Anthony Julius, a London lawyer who is also acclaimed for his writing on modern antisemitism. It was Julius who assembled a small army of historians and other experts who set out to demonstrate that Irving had distorted evidence and otherwise shredded his own credibility as a historian.

The one thing Lipstadt refused to do, however, was to call Holocaust survivors as witnesses-partly to spare them the ordeal of being cross-examined by Irving, who acted as his own counsel in the trial. In declining to pursue that option, Lipstadt also hoped to prepare for the day in the not-distant future when the existence of the Holocaust would have to be defended without survivors remaining to bear their own witness.

"We conducted the trial as though there were no survivors, because we don't need the survivors any longer to establish what happened," Robert Jan van Pelt, the Dutch academic who provided expert defense testimony on Auschwitz during the trial, said in a telephone interview. "There is more documentation about the Holocaust than about any other event in history, and the evidence is all there. In no other historical event do we ask the survivors to go in and establish what actually happened."

Lipstadt elaborated: "One of the things my trial demonstrated is that the historians can defend the truth based on the available evidence and testimony. There is an impact when those who can speak in the first-person singular are no longer available, and something valuable will be lost, but the documents triangulated with the oral histories and testimony by perpetrators are in fact a better form of evidence."

In April 2000, after a grueling, four-month-long trial that cost the defense **more than \$3 million**, Lipstadt finally prevailed. The trial judge found that her criticisms of Irving were well-founded, and that no "objective, fair-minded historian" could possibly doubt that Jews were murdered in gas chambers at Auschwitz.

The 355-page ruling was undoubtedly a vindication for Lipstadt and her supporters, but there was something undeniably "asymmetrical" about the whole episode, Julius said by telephone. "Losing the case would have been much more seriously adverse than winning was beneficial."

Jehuda Reinharz, whose academic specialty is modern Jewish history, agreed, arguing that "if she had lost, it would have been an enormous weapon against Jewish history, against the state of Israel, against the credibility of every historian who has ever written about the Holocaust. This idea that Jews have created a myth about the Holocaust-it's like a new blood libel, and Deborah was able to puncture that."

In many ways, the verdict was the death knell of traditional, right-wing Holocaust denial that aped the methods of professional historians to produce what Lipstadt and others have called "pseudo-history," complete with its own research institutes, published journals, and annual conferences.

"Irving was the most polished, most intelligent of these guys," explained Michael Shermer, publisher of *Skeptic*, a magazine devoted to examining and disproving pseudo-scientific claims. "The past few times I've seen him speak, he just acted as if there were no trial, as if all the things that came out after the trial never happened, but now these guys are starting to run low on funds. The worst thing that could happen to them has happened-they're being ignored."

But instead of vanishing, the phenomenon Reinharz called "the new blood libel" hasn't gone away; it's just been taken up in different quarters. Earlier this year, at about the same time Irving was being sentenced in Austria, a leading Iranian newspaper sponsored a competition for cartoons denying the Holocaust, in retaliation for the Danish publication of cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed as a terrorist.

Meanwhile, the president of Iran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has given a series of press conferences in which he called for proof of the Holocaust, though he has allowed that it might indeed have taken place. In that case, Ahmadinejad asked that Israel be relocated to Europe so that Palestinians would no longer be made to pay for the crimes of the Nazis. That position echoes an idea propounded by many pro-Palestinian activists, who appear to be animated in part by maverick author Norman Finkelstein, the ardently anti-Zionistic son of Holocaust survivors. Finkelstein argues that Jewish efforts to preserve the memory of the Shoah have created a "Holocaust industry" that exploits guilt over Nazi atrocities in service of Zionist interests.

"There is now a kind of Islamic antisemitism which is distinct from classic far-right antisemitism, but which incorporates into it the conception of the Jews running riot over Islamic interests," Julius said. "It's a genuinely new mutation of antisemitism which has been grafted onto the 19th-century claims."

On another front, Lipstadt is fighting the creeping effects of post-modernism and other forms of relativistic thinking that create **a hospitable climate for the propagation of fallacies like Holocaust denial**. "In part it's the sense that anything goes, when in fact everything does not go," Lipstadt said emphatically. "But it's a failure to think clearly to say that all points of view are equivalent and all views are equal."

To illustrate the perils of relativistic thinking, consider the cases of memoirists James Frey, the author of *A Million Little Pieces*, and J.T. LeRoy, author of *The Heart is Deceitful Above All Things*, who were recently exposed as fabricators. (Leroy, purportedly a man who was abused as a child, turned out to be the invention of a Brooklyn writer named Laura Albert.)

All too often, both transgressions were viewed through the distorted lens of "truthiness," a bogus concept popularized late last year by the television comedian-pundit Stephen Colbert, to describe a philosophy that gives credence to "what you want to be true, as opposed to what the facts support." In *The New York Times*, the book critic Michiko Kakutani made the conceptual link between the seemingly meaningless fabulism of Frey and LeRoy and the potentially dangerous denial of scrupulously documented genocide, writing that "when people assert that there is no absolute historical reality, an environment is created in which the testimony of a witness to the Holocaust ... can actually be questioned."

Indeed, Kakutani quoted Lipstadt, who wrote in *Denying the Holocaust* that if no events or facts have fixed meaning, then "any truth can be retold." Lipstadt went on in her book to make the prescient argument that relativism could also be used to defend any speech as valid speech, in the name of free inquiry, which indeed is exactly what Irving's defenders did during her libel trial. They tried that tack again during Irving's trial this year in Austria for breaking that country's hate-speech laws by publicly denying the Holocaust. (It's worth noting that Lipstadt opposes criminalizing Holocaust denial on the grounds that censorship is not an effective deterrent, and can serve to create martyrs.)

"In part it's sloppy thinking, a failure to think clearly. There is the sense that all points of view are equivalent, that anything goes, when in fact, everything does not go," Lipstadt said in an interview, adding later by email: "People have mushy standards."

Of course, Lipstadt continued in the interview, the fibs of writers like Frey pale by comparison to the pernicious falsehoods spread by Irving and other deniers, which are "a different matter," she believes.

"Holocaust denial is lies and distortions," Lipstadt said. "So I wouldn't over-intellectualize the

deniers. I think now people see Irving for the clown that he is."

**B'nai B'rith Magazine**

[http://bnaibrith.org/pubs/bnaibrith/summer2006\\_deniers1.cfm](http://bnaibrith.org/pubs/bnaibrith/summer2006_deniers1.cfm)

Deborah Lipstad consider revisionists like shit

**United Nations Resolution on Holocaust Denial**

The United Nations passed a [resolution](#) condemning Holocaust denial. Only Iran rejected it. The resolution, introduced by the United States and approved by consensus, "condemns without any reservation any denial of the Holocaust." While Iran was not mentioned it was clearly directed at it. The Iranian delegate claimed that it wanted to "study" what happened, as if that is not already going on in spades. While I am certainly satisfied that the resolution passed, there is something in me that remembers what Anthony Julius, my lawyer in London, once said to me when I was ranting about how preparing for the trial was completely messing up my life [this was before the trial]. He said: "Think of fighting David Irving as you would the shit you step in on the street. It has not intrinsic importance unless you fail to clean it off your feet and you track it into the house. Once you have cleaned it off your feet it's gone." So too with this resolution. There is in me something that says Holocaust deniers are not worthy of a resolution passed by the UN [whatever you think of the UN]. **They are like.... you can finish the sentence on your own. Just a thought.**

Posted by Deborah Lipstadt at [1/26/2007 06:19:00 PM](#)

<http://lipstadt.blogspot.com>

BULLSHIT

**Holocaust Controversies**

Some guys have set shop to attack revisionists. Good for them. The trouble is that, in a cursory glance, one can see that they do not read German, nor French. English maybe. How ignoramuses, Zimmerman style, can hope to be taken seriously? They just do take the whole bullshit at face value!

<http://holocaustcontroversies.blogspot.com/>

ON THE OPPOSITE SIDE

# I'm from Missouri

*This site is named for the famous statement of US Congressman Willard Duncan Vandiver from Missouri: "I'm from Missouri -- you'll have to show me." This site is dedicated to skepticism of official dogma in all subjects. Just-so stories are not accepted here. This is a site where controversial subjects such as evolution theory and the Holocaust may be freely debated.*

## About Me

**NAME:** LARRY FAFARMAN **LOCATION:** LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, US

My biggest motivation for creating this blog was to avoid the arbitrary censorship practiced by other blogs and various other Internet forums. Censorship here will be avoided [...]

<http://im-from-missouri.blogspot.com/>

=====

This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, democracy, scientific, and social justice issues, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to:

<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml> . If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.

Our address : [revclar -at- yahoo.com.au](mailto:revclar@yahoo.com.au)

**OTHER AAARGH MONTHLY PUBLICATIONS**

< <http://revurevi.net> >

**El Paso del Ebro**

**Das kausale Nexusblatt**

**Il Resto del Siculo**

**Conseils de Révision**

**La Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues** (multilingual)

**O revisionismo em lingua português**

**Armenichantage** (Armenian blackmail)