

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. 20 Spring 2006

<revclar -at- yahoo.com.au>

<http://geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo/clar/clarindex.html>

alternative archives

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

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

<http://litek.ws/aaargh/engl/engl.html>

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

"If George Bush were to be judged by the standards of the Nuremberg Tribunals, he'd be hanged. So too, mind you, would every single American President since the end of the second world war, including Jimmy Carter."
Noam Chomsky

SUMMARY

Spanish Revisionist Publisher Re-Arrested!

Two charged for Holocaust denial

Germany offers to help open records of Holocaust

Israeli civil libertarian's introduction to German edition of *Beyond Chutzpah* by Felicia Langer

Foreword to the second paperback edition Norman G. Finkelstein

Palestine Solidarity Hate-Fest in Limerick This Weekend

Christian Morality and Holocaust Revisionism By Paul Grubach

Horst Mahler has his Passport confiscated

The Genie is Out of the Bottle by Horst Mahler

Repentance does not work By Israel Shamir

Germany's Terror Apologist By John Rosenthal

Revisionists only deny one aspect of Holocaust story: Butz

ZIONIST INCITEMENTS TO GENOCIDE:

Bremer says he urged more postwar troops in Iraq

A Lecture on the Hollowcause in Amman

THE AMAZING, RAPIDLY SHRINKING "HOLOCAUST" by David McCalden

Watching the Dissolution of Palestine By Jennifer Loewenstein

Arab professor: Holocaust is a 'myth'

Holocaust Fundamentalism: You WILL Believe!

Re: Let Ernst Zundel and David Irving Go Home

A NICE FAIRY TALE

NU professor backs denial of Holocaust by Iran chief By Jodi S. Cohen

Iran has the U.S.'s number, By Arthur R. Butz

When reason gives way to hysteria by Henry M. Bowles III

Prison Sentence for Irving is Outrageous By Mark Weber

'Freedom for the thought we hate' By Jeff Jacoby

SOME WAYS YOU ARE LIED TO -- LESSON ONE

How Many Jews Does It Take...? By D D Guttenplan

Martyring Voltaire By James Hall

Protecting The Rights Of A Holocaust Denier By Michael Shermer

A JEWISH STATE IN CENTRAL POLAND? by Jędrzej Giertych

Big Pharmaceuticals Pushes "Miracle Cure" For Holocaust Denial Syndrome By Michael James

Letter to the editor of the *Tehran Times* Brian F. Maiorana

Talabani: Autonomy for Turkmens in Kurdistan By Turhan Tisinli

TIDBITS

Zundel tapes, Butz, Ken McVay, Red Cross, Amman

RECIDIVIST

Spanish Revisionist Publisher Re-Arrested!

Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain. On Tuesday, April 11, 2006, the revisionist publisher Pedro Varela was arrested at his Libreria Europa bookstore in the Catalan capital for "defending and justifying genocide" by publishing books such as Joaquin Bochaca's *Mito[Myth] de los 6 millones* and, strangely, "putting in danger the security of foreign states." [!?] (Bochaca is an author frequently published by *The Barnes Review*.)

Five hundred books were seized in the raid. Varela was under arrest from 11 a.m. Tuesday to 2 a.m. Wednesday, when he posted bail. Varela is subject to 5 years in prison if convicted.

Ironically, one book he is accused of publishing is a standard, classic 1971 work on the subject of race and IQ by the great scientist Hans Eysenck, *Race, Intelligence and Education*, published in the U.S. as *The IQ Argument*. Eysenck, a German who left the Third Reich in the 1930s out of opposition to its policies, authored 50 books and 900 academic articles, and was one of the most highly regarded scientific psychologists in the world. His book *Race, Intelligence and Education* was even carried until eight or nine years ago by the biggest supermarket chain in Spain, El Cortes Ingles, owned by the Jewish Koplovitz family.

The federal prosecutor for Barcelona who caused his arrest is a Mr. Mena, a former Maoist who is now a "democrat."

Varela has had previous contacts with the "justice system" of his country, as well as that of Austria, thus he is a "recidivist," which may affect the outcome of his current indictment. He was arrested first in December 1996 on similar charges of defending genocide. Twenty thousand books plus other items were seized and later ordered burned.

On November 16, 1998 a Spanish court sentenced Varela to five years imprisonment for "incitement to racial hatred" and for "denying or justifying genocide." The sentence was Spain's first conviction for "Holocaust denial." It is based on the country's 1995 anti-genocide and anti-discrimination law.

Until 1995 Spain had been both an oasis of freedom of speech and a land of political asylum for nationalist patriots on the run such as the Belgian Leon Degrelle, the German WWII officers Otto Remer and Otto Skorzeny, and the Austrian revisionist publishers Walter Ochensberger and Gerd Honsik. It was the shining exception on a darkened European continent where so-called "hate speech" and so-called "Holocaust denial" everywhere else had been made illegal.

Spain until then had seemed a lasting haven of peace and freedom for patriots worldwide. There were the long-standing right-wing and politically incorrect traditions of both Catholic Spain, a nation that famously expelled its Jewish population in 1492, and more recently of the Franco dictatorship (1936-1977), which was allied with National Socialist Germany and after the war, remained fiercely anti-communist and pro-Catholic.

However, on May 11, 1995 the Spanish parliament revised the country's criminal code by creating the crimes of "justifying genocide" and "promoting racial hatred." Signed into law by Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and King Juan Carlos, the preamble of the 1995 legislation claimed that revisionist books lead to violence:

"The proliferation in several European countries of incidents of racist and anti-Semitic violence, carried out under the flags and symbols of Nazi ideology, obliges the democratic states to take decisive action to fight against this."

Thus it was to fight violence that black-garbed police ninjas seized the historian and publisher Pedro Varela and hauled him off to jail.

Sources:

- 1) Telephone conversation of Sunday, April 16, 2006 between John de Nugent and revisionist author Joaquin Bochaca of Barcelona, a friend of Varela.
- 2) <http://www.davidduke.com>
- 3) Wikipedia on "Hans Eysenck":
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hans_Eysenck

The Barnes Review Newsletter, 16 April 2006

Two charged for Holocaust denial

Berlin - German prosecutors say they have charged a German far-right activist, extradited from the United States, and a Belgian man, handed over by the Netherlands, with incitement for allegedly denying the Holocaust.

On Tuesday, prosecutors in the western city of Mannheim said Germar Rudolf and Siegfried Verbeke were accused of "systematically" denying or playing down the Nazi genocide of Europe's Jews in documents and on the internet, and of stirring anti-Semitic hatred. Denying the Holocaust is a crime in Germany. It carries a maximum sentence of five years imprisonment.

Rudolf, 41, published a study claiming to prove that the Nazis did not gas Jews at the Auschwitz concentration camp. He was deported to Germany from the US in November, to serve a 14-month prison sentence for a 1995 conviction on similar charges.

Verbeke, 64, was arrested in the Netherlands and also extradited to Germany in November. Prosecutors in Mannheim are leading a similar, but unrelated case, against Ernst Zundel, a German deported from Canada last year.

18 April 2006

http://www.news24.com/News24/World/News/0,,2-10-1462_1918387,00.html

See also http://www.news24.com/News24/World/News/0,,2-10-1462_1918387,00.html

Germany offers to help open records of Holocaust

Washington. Germany said yesterday that it will help clear the way for opening records on 17 million victims of the Nazis, a major step toward ending a long battle over access to a vast and detailed archive from that era. German Justice Minister Brigitte Zypries said her country would work with the United States to ensure the opening of the archives, which are held in the German town of Bad Arolsen, and allow historians and survivors access to 30 million to 50 million documents. Until now, Germany had resisted providing access to the archives, pointing to privacy concerns.

The announcement, made at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, came after a decades-long effort by Holocaust survivor groups and several countries to gain wider access to the archives. In a meeting yesterday, Zypries said Germany had changed its position and would immediately seek revision of an 11-nation accord governing the archives. The 10 other countries must also formally agree if the records are to be opened, a process she said would take no more than six months.

Edward B. O'Donnell Jr., the State Department's special envoy for Holocaust issues, said he was encouraged, but he added, "We still have negotiations to do." The next step is a meeting in Luxembourg on May 15, when all 11 countries would have to reach a consensus. In some instances, parliaments would have to approve the archives' opening as well. Opening the archives would enable many survivors and families of victims of the Nazis to find out with more certainty what happened to their relatives.

"We are losing the survivors, and anti-Semitism is on the rise, so this move could not be more timely," said Sarah Bloomfield, director of the U.S. Holocaust Museum. For 60 years, the International Red Cross has used the archived documents to trace missing and dead Jews and forced laborers, who were systematically persecuted by Nazi Germany and its confederates across central and eastern

Europe before and during World War II. But the archives have remained off-limits to historians and the public.

Speaking in German, Zypries said, "We now agree to open the data in Bad Arolsen in Germany. We now assume the data will be safeguarded by those countries that copy the material and use it, and now that we have made this decision we want to move forward." Her remarks were translated into English for reporters.

Germany's privacy law is one of the most restrictive among the 11 countries, Shapiro said. Remaining safeguards, he said, might limit duplicating a document or prevent using the name of someone mentioned without the person's permission, he said.

Dissemination through the Internet also might be tightly restrained. However, privacy laws of the other countries will now prevail, he said. Most are less restrictive than Germany's. Bloomfield called the decision "a great step, a really important step." She said, "I will be completely thrilled when I get the material in the archives."

"Overall, it makes it possible to learn a lot more about the fate of individuals and to learn a lot more about the Holocaust itself - concentration camps, deportations, slave-enforced labor and displaced persons," Paul Shapiro, director of the museum's center for advanced holocaust studies, said.

International Red Cross Committee spokesman Antonella Notari said that body is not on the 11-member decision-making panel and is not against opening the archives, but it believes personal information needs to be treated carefully. The international body opened its own archives a decade ago, she said. "It should definitely be open for historical research, and there are ways to do that with respect for personal data," said Notari, who is chief spokeswoman of the ICRC in Geneva. Besides Germany and the United States, the other countries involved are Belgium, Britain, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Poland.

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/nationworld/bal-te.holocaust19apr19,0,5482410.story?coll=bal-nationworld-headlines>

PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION OF *Beyond Chutzpah* (N. Finkelstein)

Israeli civil libertarian's introduction to German edition of *Beyond Chutzpah*

by Felicia Langer

It was high time a book on the misuse of anti-Semitism as a political weapon got written. Now it has found its author: Norman Finkelstein. He is no stranger to daring challenges, and as this book clearly shows, Finkelstein has got what it takes. The precision and meticulousness of his research and analyses are admirable.

In the first part of the book, Finkelstein focuses on the misuse of anti-Semitism by the pro-Israel lobby in the United States and Europe, in support of Israeli policies. Any time there is a real risk that the international community will increase pressure on Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories as required by international law, a new anti-Semitism campaign is launched: "yet another meticulously orchestrated media extravaganza alleging that the world is awash in anti-Semitism."

With their allegations of anti-Semitism, American-Jewish elites seek, above all, to convince everybody that critics of Israel are really anti-Semites in disguise. Reports on what it is like for Palestinians to live under occupation, reports on their oppression and their suffering must remain taboo – only Israel is entitled to victim status. Thus reality is being inverted, in order to make sure that Israel enjoys immunity.

The hysteria about a "new anti-Semitism" serves not only to silence legitimate criticism of Israel, but also to deflect attention from violations of international law and elementary human rights. So, for example, the refusal to participate in a war of aggression against Iraq was equated with hatred of Jews. Writer Elie Wiesel, a survivor of Auschwitz and recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, told US-President George W. Bush on 27 February 2003 that Iraq was a terrorist state, and that there was a moral imperative for intervention. Had the West intervened in Europe in 1938, Wiesel observed, World War II and the holocaust could have been prevented. "That was a meaningful moment for me," Bush said later, "because it was a confirming moment."

The president of the Central Council of Jews in Germany Paul Spiegel vehemently denounced the German opposition to the war on Iraq, making arguments similar to Elie Wiesel's. Alas, his words had a very bad ring to them in the light of the millions who marched to protest the war, in Germany and all over the world, among them many Jews.

It is appalling to see what kind of allies this lobby has attracted on the right end of the political spectrum: Silvio Berlusconi and Gianfranco Fini from the neo-Fascist National Alliance in Italy, Jean-Marie Le Pen in France... As for the Christian fundamentalists in the United States, the lobbyists argue that the fundamentalists' proverbial intolerance is not too harmful nowadays, and that what really counts is their favorable attitude toward Israel.

I want to share with the reader my experience of living in Germany, both as an Israeli Jew and as a holocaust survivor. My husband, Mieciu, went through five Nazi concentration camps. He is the only one from his family to have survived the holocaust, and was himself on the brink of death. My mother and I survived, in the USSR, but all the rest of my family were murdered. My husband and I have been living in Germany for fifteen years now, and it has become our beloved home. In all those years, we, personally, have not experienced any anti-Semitism. This merits emphasis because my husband has been talking about his Nazi era suffering for years, and those who have heard him speak at German schools now number in the thousands. I do not, however, want to deny that anti-Semitism and xenophobia exist in Germany. Our first experience in this regard was the following:

One day in 1990, I noticed a black swastika on the wall of a mall in Tübingen. All the beauty of the enchanting summery scenery surrounding it could not cover up this blemish. My husband and I decided to go and remove the swastika, and we went there that same night. However, we discovered that someone had already painted it over, apparently just a couple of minutes before we arrived – someone who, just like us, had been disgusted by the Nazi symbol. This was my first encounter with an anonymous protester in Germany.[1]

These protesters are our allies in Germany: in our fight against xenophobia and the real anti-Semitism, as well as in our fight against war and the devastating Israeli policies vis-à-vis the Palestinian people – the policies which are the subject of this book. Norman Finkelstein deplores the misuse of the holocaust by those who use anti-Semitism as a political weapon. His concern is to restore the victims' dignity and to do what their real legacy requires us to do. My husband, Mieciu, and I share Norman Finkelstein's concern, and I would like to repeat here what I've written elsewhere about this legacy:

Over the years, Mieciu and I have internalized the legacy of those who were murdered, and this legacy, as we see it, is this: never to be silent in the face of any crime or injustice, but to fight relentlessly against each and every form of racism and anti-Semitism, and to defend the dignity and rights of all human beings, whoever they may be. This will be the obligation of the German people for all times, but it is not an exclusively German obligation. In honor of the memory of all those victims and in the spirit of their final legacy, which is humanity, I denounce the decades-long oppression of the Palestinians by Israel, and the wrong that was done to them and that still persists to this day.[2]

Norman Finkelstein says, rightly, that those Jews who want to fight the real anti-Semitism must first of all expose the alleged "anti-Semitism" as the sham it is:

Tell the truth, fight for justice: this is the time-tested strategy for fighting anti-Semitism, as well as other forms of bigotry. ... A full Israeli withdrawal from the territories conquered in 1967 would ... deprive those real anti-Semites exploiting Israel's repression as a pretext to demonize Jews – and who can doubt they exist? – of a dangerous weapon, as well as expose their real agenda. And the more vocally Jews dissent from Israel's occupation, the fewer will be those non-Jews who mistake Israel's criminal policies and the uncritical support (indeed encouragement) of mainline Jewish organizations for the popular Jewish mood.[3]

A clear and unambiguous statement.

In the second part of this book, we read about the human rights situation in Israel/Palestine. Israel's human rights record is "generally superb," Harvard Law School professor and lawyer Alan Dershowitz claims in his book, *The Case for Israel*. "The purpose of this book," he writes, "is to help clear the air by providing direct and truthful defenses to false accusations." Dershowitz's book became a best seller in the United States. American-Jewish organizations widely distributed it on college campuses; and the Israeli Foreign Ministry bought thousands of copies, in order to distribute them.

Having devoted 23 years (1967-1990) to defending the Palestinians in the occupied territories and having been the first Jewish lawyer to do so, I have many things to say about the human rights of Palestinians in the occupied territories and Israel's flagrant violations of these rights. I want to thank Norman Finkelstein for exposing Alan Dershowitz's lies in this book and for making available to the reader important information from the various Israeli, Palestinian, and international human rights organizations, who have – ignored by Dershowitz – unanimously and vehemently deplored Israel's human rights violations, many of which amount to war crimes. I, too, deplore them, and I do so both as a witness to an era and as an eyewitness. I denounce the various Israeli governments.

Those pages of this book dealing with Israel's crimes during the Al Aqsa intifada – crimes which, according to Dershowitz, did not happen – are deeply distressing. Reading these pages, the German media's reluctance to cover Israeli crimes, and their concealment of the actual scale of the Israeli repression in the Palestinian territories, becomes glaringly obvious.

One chapter is devoted to the so called liquidations (a Nazi terminus, incidentally), i.e., Israel's assassinations of Palestinian "suspects," which Dershowitz justifies. Already during the first intifada (1987-1993), the undercover units made frequent use of their license to kill. In the course of the second intifada, these assassinations have become official Israeli policy. Extrajudicial executions are not only acts of state terrorism but quite simply, according to the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention, war crimes.

During a 21 August 2002 talk I gave in Vienna, I spoke, inter alia, about Israel's criminal invasion of the occupied territories, which Norman Finkelstein, too, discusses in his book, and which was euphemistically referred to as Operation Defensive Shield. I spoke about the executions, and the crimes in Jenin refugee camp, but also about a peaceful resolution of the conflict. Vienna's Jewish Community had sent their members to disrupt the talk, to defame me both as an anti-Semite and a traitor, to stage tumultuous protests, to shout "Nazis out!" etc. Things very nearly got physical, and the event had to be broken off. The Austrian branch of the Jewish lobby could not bear to hear the truth and used the allegation of anti-Semitism as a weapon.

The chapter entitled "Israel's Abu Ghraib," on torture, is of particular significance for me. When I saw the pictures from Abu Ghraib prison, in Iraq, on the TV screens, I thought of my tortured Palestinian clients, and publicly declared: "These are the Israeli methods to break the detainees. It's just that there are no photographs and, regrettably, our torturers enjoy immunity." I thought about Sami Esmail – Norman Finkelstein reports his case – and about Dershowitz who already in 1978 had been willing to lie in order to whitewash Israel's methods of ill-treatment and torture. I saw my clients' wounds, resulting from torture, with my own eyes. I petitioned the Israel Supreme Court. To no avail. In some cases, the torture led to permanent psychological disorder; some of my clients – for example, Auad Hamdan from the West Bank who died in July 1987, and Mahmud El Masri who died in the General Security Service's wing of Gaza prison in March 1989 – even lost their lives.[4] I would suggest to read this especially important chapter very carefully, for Israel has resumed its routine torture of Palestinian detainees, and inside the prisons the horrors depicted in this book are very real.

In addition, Norman Finkelstein writes about house demolitions as collective punishment. During the second intifada, Israel began using this cruel measure on a massive scale. Thousands of Palestinians have been rendered homeless, many of whom not for the first time in their lives. This policy is in contravention of international law and has been condemned by the international community. Yet Dershowitz justifies it. Basing himself on human rights reports, Finkelstein documents that Palestinians have been buried alive in the rubble of their homes. I cannot stress too much that, in all those years, my attempts to get the Israel Supreme Court to abolish or at least halt this collective punishment, illegal under international law, were futile. Finkelstein also writes about the destruction of "illegally" built homes. I hereby declare that I tried for many years, mostly without success, to obtain building permits for Palestinians. Israel pursues a clear policy of strangulation, and Norman Finkelstein has reached the same conclusion as I have: the aim of this policy has been to maximize the land available for Jewish settlement and to make it impossible for Palestinian towns and villages to expand.

"[Israel's] Supreme Court is among the best in the world, and it has repeatedly overruled the army and the government and made them operate under the rule of law," Dershowitz avers. Basing himself on human rights reports and Israeli expertise, Norman Finkelstein proves this absurd thesis to be wrong.

I agree with Finkelstein that, instead of seeking justice, the Israel Supreme Court has all too often legitimized injustice, and that singing paeans to it is absolutely unwarranted. I testify to this as the first "pioneer lawyer" who has had 23 years of experience with petitioning the Israel Supreme Court on behalf of Palestinians, against the occupying forces. Many Israeli colleagues of mine can testify to this too. No matter what the issue – house demolitions; settlements and land grab; deportations; torture; denial of family unification; administrative detention – the Supreme Court routinely rejected my petitions, and it did so mostly in violation of wholly unambiguous maxims of

international law. It was to protest these many years of the Supreme Court's pursuit of injustice as well as the brutal military justice system of the occupation that, after 23 years, I shut down my lawyer's office in Jerusalem. This does not mean, however, that I admit defeat. Rather the contrary. I continue to take every opportunity to bring the truth to light.

Norman Finkelstein seeks to disentangle, historically and politically, the artificial web of complexity woven around the Israel-Palestine conflict, and demonstrates how the conflict may be solved in accordance with international law. He describes the "two-state settlement." The Palestinians have declared long ago that they would be willing to make do with roughly twenty percent of historic Palestine, while it remains to be seen how the refugee problem will be solved in accordance with international law. Israel, on the other side, continues to illegally settle the occupied territories, builds an apartheid wall encroaching deeply into the West Bank, and refuses to accept any responsibility for having caused the tragedy of the Palestinian refugees.

Norman Finkelstein calls upon his readers to get politically involved and to commit themselves to the truth, "so that, together, we can achieve a just and lasting peace in Israel and Palestine." By deploring the wrong done to the Palestinians, he reaches out to the dispossessed, thus building a bridge of peace between Israel and Palestine. Finkelstein's is an important voice, a conscientious and human voice – a *different* Jewish voice, a blessing both for the Palestinians and the Jews.

10 May 1976 was a memorable day for me. I gave a talk at Harvard University's Science Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Due to massive threats, the event and I were under police protection. The disruptions, shouts, and boos were immense. The rowdies, Jewish-Zionist students, yelled, "She won't speak here!" Afterwards, a woman came up to me and handed me a portrait she had made of me. The drawing was entitled:

"Blessed are the peacemakers"

For me, this gift proved that the rowdies had not gained the upper hand. I would like to say to the author of this book:

"Blessed are the peacemakers!"

Tübingen, Germany, October 2005
(Translation: Maren Hackmann)

1. Felicia Langer, *Mieczys später Bericht: Eine Jugend zwischen Getto und Theresienstadt*, Lamuv Verlag, Göttingen 1999, pp. 136-7.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 127-8.
3. Norman G. Finkelstein, *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History*, University of California Press, Berkeley 2005, p. 85.
4. See Felicia Langer, *Zorn und Hoffnung* (autobiography), Lamuv Verlag, Göttingen 1991, pp. 388-98.

<http://www.normanfinkelstein.com/article.php?pg=11&ar=172>

Video: Finkelstein at Yale, 10.20.2005

<http://www.normanfinkelstein.com/article.php?pg=11&ar=99>

THE HOLOCAUST INDUSTRY

Foreword to the second paperback edition

Norman G. Finkelstein

This will almost certainly be my last word on the Holocaust industry. In prior editions of this book I said pretty much everything I wanted for many years to say: it was finally – pardon the cliché – off my chest. On the other hand, I requested of my publishers, and they generously consented, to put out a second paperback edition focusing on the Swiss banks case. My main concern is to provide readers and, especially, future researchers with a clear picture of what happened and a guide to what to look for amid the heaps of disinformation. Regrettably, the trial record cannot be fully trusted. The presiding judge in the case elected – for reasons not divulged but fairly simple to deduce – not to docket crucial documents. In addition, the Claims Resolution Tribunal (CRT), which could have produced an objective assessment of the charges against the

Swiss banks, also can't any longer be trusted. Midway in its work and heading towards vindicating the Swiss banks, the CRT was radically revamped by key figures in the Holocaust industry. Its only function now is to protect the blackmailers' reputation. These developments are copiously documented in the new postscript for this edition. Using as my foil an authoritative account of the Holocaust compensation campaign, I present in the new appendix a comprehensive overview of this "double shakedown" of European countries and survivors of the Nazi holocaust. Although I would be most curious to read a refutation by someone from the Holocaust industry of my findings, I suspect – again, for reasons not difficult to discern – that none will be forthcoming. Yet silence, as my late mother used to say, is also an answer.

Apart from an abundance of *ad hominem* slurs, criticism of my book has fallen largely into two categories. Mainstream critics allege that I conjured a "conspiracy theory," while those on the Left ridicule the book as a defense of "the banks." None, so far as I can tell, question my actual findings. Although the explanatory value of conspiracy theories is marginal, this does not mean that, in the real world, individuals and institutions don't strategize and scheme. To believe otherwise is no less naive than to believe that a vast conspiracy manipulates worldly affairs. In *The Wealth of Nations*, Adam Smith observes that capitalists "seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices." (¹) Does this make Smith's classic a "conspiracy theory"? Indeed, "conspiracy theory" has become scarcely more than a term of abuse to discredit a politically incorrect sequencing of facts: to maintain that powerful American Jewish organizations, institutions and individuals, in league with the Clinton administration, coordinated their assault on the Swiss banks is thus alleged to be *prima facie* a conspiracy theory (not to mention anti-Semitic); but to maintain that Swiss banks coordinated an assault on Jewish victims of the Nazi holocaust and their heirs can't be called a conspiracy theory.

It is often wondered why I – a person firmly of the Left – would defend Swiss bankers. In fact I subscribe to Bertolt Brecht's credo: "What's robbing a bank compared to owning one?" Yet my concern in this book is not at all Swiss bankers or, for that matter, German industrialists. Rather, it is restoring the integrity of the historical record and the sanctity of the Jewish people's martyrdom. I deplore the Holocaust industry's corruption of history and memory in the service of an extortion racket. Leftist critics claim that I have made common cause with the Right. They seem not to have noticed the company they're keeping – a repellent gang of plutocrats, hoodlums and hucksters as well as egregious apologists for American and Israeli power. It is a sad (but telling) commentary how little respect for the dead counts in the moral calculus of my critics on the Left, with their mind-numbing incantations about "the banks." To a correspondent's insinuation that she had neglected her father's gravesite, Eleanor Marx – a remarkable militant in her own right – indignantly replied that "the roses she had put in six or seven years ago were to be replaced but this was not the season for it; that naturally she did not wish to disturb the ivy Engels had planted and... she and her sister were quite able to care for their parents' grave." (²)

Apart from those already acknowledged in prior editions of this book, I would like to thank Michael Alvarez, Camille Goodison, Maren Hackmann and Jason Coronel for their assistance.

Norman G. Finkelstein
April 2003 -- Chicago

ZIONISTS ATTACK

Palestine Solidarity Hate-Fest in Limerick This Weekend

This weekend takes place in Limerick University a very special type of conference. The aim of this particular conference is to stir up hatred against Israel and also to give support to the Jew-hating and anti-semitic Palestinian Arab movement, NOW LED BY ISLAMOFASCIST HAMAS.

Limerick Hate Israel Conference

A Special Hate Conference This weekend takes place in Limerick University a very special type of conference. The aim of this particular conference is to stir up hatred against Israel and also to give support to the Jew-hating and anti-semitic Palestinian Arab movement, NOW LED BY ISLAMOFASCIST HAMAS.

The Conference is organized by the Irish Palestine Solidarity Group.

¹ Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations* (New York: 2000), intro. by Robert Reich, p. 148.

² Yvonne Kapp, *Eleanor Marx* (New York: 1976), vol. 2, p. 632.

What is the Palestine Solidarity Group? This is an organization which in Ireland links up with neoleft movements such as the Irish equivalent of the Socialist Workers Party of Britain, to which well-known broadcaster Eamon McCann from Derry is connected.

But it also links up with the Irish Republican movement in all its forms and so gives great momentum to **the spread of anti-Semitism** in Ireland. It is of great importance for Jews to see that the most leading member of Sinn Fein and the IRA, apart from Adams, a man by the name of Martin McGuinness is present on the platform of this anti-Jewish Hate Fest in Limerick City.

Many leading Irish Politicians

It also enrolls in its support many Irish leading politicians. In the past a lady called Mary O'Rourke, a very prominent politician, has attacked Israel in the Irish Parliamentary system.

And this organisation finally has many links with the prominent website from the Belfast region called The Blanket (The name obviously comes from the Republican Hunger Strike protest). The main person there is Anthony McIntyre **who has repeatedly called Israel a Nazi state** in the pages of his web journal. (<http://lark.phoblacht.net/>)

Time and time again it has been shown that there is great hatred for Israel in Ireland. Let us immediately call this by its correct name which is anti-Semitism.

(We will also see that in this Conference the Palestine Solidarity Group calls on the services of one Michael D. Higgins. More on him later)

On this issue of what is anti-Zionism, anti-Israelism, and anti-Semitism I will call on no less than Dr Martin Luther King who when speaking at Harvard University in 1968 had this to say:

"When people criticize Zionists they mean Jews, you are talking anti-Semitism." http://www.jewish-history.com/mlk_zionism.html

I think that this quotation by Dr King which has been carefully hidden by these Israel-haters should be firmly kept in mind in discussing this Israel hate-fest Conference in Limerick.

Israel and Ireland Should be Standing Alongside Each Other Israel SHOULD have a good name in Ireland. It is a tiny, tiny country and is outnumbered by Arabs by something like 500 to 1. It also faces the hatred of 1,400 millions of Muslims in the Islamic world. [**For a lot of good reasons**] It is not much bigger than Munster.

That geographical fact alone should make Irish people think and ask what precisely those Irish politicians in Limerick this weekend are up to!

Israel is tiny [**but still it has been stolen from its legitimate owners !**]. Much of its land as it stretches along the sea is not much more than 15 miles wide. That would be something like from Drogheda to Dundalk, or from Lisburn to Dromore.

Israel is surrounded on ALL sides by hostile Arab states pushed up against the sea and is historically shown to be hugely vulnerable.

Israel faces the hostility of all the countries and major powers on the earth. I can think of no exceptions. And there is NO other country which is like that. And that IS anti-Semitism in action!

There are though some special enemies.

First of all I have to place the Europeans.

The EU is the historical and bitter enemy of Israel, just as **the major part of Europe was involved in the Holocaust**, either directly as in the case of the German Nazis, or indirectly by allowing it to happen, as is the case with Britain (led by Churchill no less) and the others such as France and Ireland.

But the greatest enemy of all of Israel and the one which puts the lives of Jews in MOST danger, all the time, is the one which is thought of as a friend. That is the United States and here I am careful to note that I am talking specifically about the United States Government. not the American people! Different thing! [**The guy must be crazy**]

In 2002 George Bush Jnr did what no other President did before, even the most Israeli hating ones like Clinton and Carter, he called for the establishment of a Palestinian (Fascist and terrorist) state on the historic land of Judea and Samaria. [**It had been signed already by Begin and Sadate**]. Moreover Bush in that same speech called for Israel to withdraw to the 1948 borders, the borders against which the Nazi Hajj Amin el Husseini led his genocidal Arab armies in 1948, to wipe Israel off the map and to finish the evil work of the Holocaust.

Now when you think about it that IS a very anti-semitic political strategy. It means that Bush is asking the Jews of Israel to forget about what happened in 1948.

How can Bush do that and get away with it?

Ah that is a mystery! But it is a mystery only until you begin to analyse the nature of a goodly part of the American Jewish leadership. The role of many leading American Jews is to support the American Government no matter what.

This is why sooner or later we have to turn the spotlight onto the so-called Jewish leaders in America.

Francisco Gil-White has begun to do this on <www.hirhome.com>
<http://www.hirhome.com/israel/leaders2.htm>

So, the question which is emerging and it is in no way academic! Friends of Israel. Friends of Jews. Are there any? This is now a burning question as the election of genocidal Hamas demonstrates.

Not unfortunately many in Ireland. The atmosphere has been poisoned. But yes there are friends of Israel and of Jewish people and they are to be found in the masses of the ordinary American people.

Note that I draw a sharp distinguishing line here between rulers or Government and people. I do this for all countries actually, but it is most obvious in America.

The American people are the great and perhaps only hope that Jews will continue to exist and that an Islamofascist genocide against Israel may be stopped.

The political situation facing Israel is indeed critical:

There is the election of the Islamofascist and genocidal Hamas by the majority of Palestinians.

There is the hatred spewing out of Arab and Islamist countries

There is the hatred of the EU towards Israel

There is as we have seen the anti-Semitic politics of George Bush jnr and his Government, especially in the State Department

And there is the wish of Iran to wipe Israel off the map even as it gathers its forces to create a nuclear weapon

And it is in this critical situation that the Israel hating Conference is being called in Limerick University, promoted by a PLO terror supporting group which is lodged in the University of Cork. So I have taken time here to place down on record how I see the political context in which the Palestine Solidarity anti-Semites are now working in Ireland.

The political situation facing Israel is indeed critical!

As I noted in the last article Israel is very isolated in the world situation such is the hatred which has been generated over decades by Palestinian lies allied to a Western need for Arab oil.

The Election of Hamas is Central at Limerick University This Weekend

A very central issue has been the election by a majority of Palestinian Arabs of Hamas.

This is an openly Islamofascist organization whose main aim is to create an Islamist Palestinian state.

In the past the Palestinians have been supported by the neoleft. But what is now posed is the fact that with Hamas in power the Left is supporting Islamofascism with all that that means.

And it is in this critical situation that the Israel hating Conference is being called in Limerick University, promoted by a PLO terror supporting group which is lodged in the University of Cork.

Jews obsessed with their hatred of Israel are Present in Limerick One of the worst aspects of this Conference is that it has brought across into Ireland some of the most Israel hating people on this earth. These people who are obsessed with their hatred for this tiny country, Israel, also happen to call themselves Jews.

There is also speaking at this conference a man who has been the PLO best friend for many years, a man called Michael D. Higgins.

This man, Higgins, has been President of the Irish Labour Party. This is indeed an issue for all Irish people with a decent spark of Irish national pride, because that was the party which was founded in Ireland by the great Irish Labour leaders and internationalists, James Connolly and Jim Larkin.

The Irish should not allow Higgins drag THEIR names into the mud with him. A little more on Higgins later!

Penny Rosenwasser

One of the guest speakers at this conference in Limerick is an American Jewish woman. Her name is Penny Rosenwasser.

This woman is obviously obsessed with hatred of Israel. I consider this person to be a number one enemy of Israel in Ireland this weekend. She is joined on the platform by another man called Pappé, also billed as a Jew, well known also as a hater of Israel.

The full list of speakers as appears on the Palestine Solidarity poster advertising the conference is as follows:

"Speakers include: Mustafa Barghouti, Daniel Machover, Dawood Hammoudeh, John Gormley, Conor Lenihan, Martin McGuinness, Penny Rossenwasser, Lidon Soriano, Josh Ruebner, Elizabeth Corrie, Carmela Armanious Omary, Ilan Pappé and Michael D Higgins ". In researching Rosenwasser for this article I have seen her linked to Women in Black, which American readers may have heard of.

Rosenwasser and the Jenin Big Lie

I will focus on her activity as part of the organisation Jewish Voice for Peace as they staged a takeover of an Israeli embassy at the time when the Israeli Army was conducting its famous and

valiant [**genocidal**] operation against the nest of terrorist suicide bombers who infested the Palestinian camp in the City of Jenin.

The months and years before this necessary operation by the young Israeli soldiers on this Islamofascist scum who belted on explosives, WANTING TO DIE AND MEET THEIR 72 VIRGINS, so long as ordinary Jews could be murdered.

That is what the operation on Jenin in April 2002 by the Israeli Army was all about.

And that is also how you can figure out the anti-Semites who populate the Irish and other landscapes. In the eyes of the anti-Semites it was acceptable for the Islamofascist scum to carry out their suicide murders but NOT all right for the Jews to do anything about it. [**They should beat it and leave.**]

I know for a fact that at that very weekend Mr Anthony McIntyre and his Belfast PLO supporters were marching up and down the Belfast Falls and Springfield Road junction. They were certainly not attacking the suicide murderers, but the young Jewish boys in the Israeli army in the Jenin operation against the Islamofascist terrorists and Jew haters.

That was exactly the same weekend that Rosenwasser and her American Jewish friends in the Jewish Peace Group were occupying the Jewish Embassy. She described what this Jewish Jew-hating group as

"working together cooperatively, powerfully, emphatically, as both outraged and heartsick, of taking action very visibly as Jews against the brutal policies of the Israeli government and army." The other context of the above thoughts of Rosenwasser were this:

As she paraded with her reactionary Jewish friends outside that embassy Jewish soldiers were fighting house to house because a decision was taken that bombing from the air was not possible because of the danger to Palestinian Civilians. As she pranced around shouting anti-Israel hatred 13 young Jewish lads of the IDF were blown up and murdered by the Islamofascists. [**If no virgins in the netherlands, maybe Yahwe could provide a little gesheft...**] The area was booby trapped at every turn.

And why should Rosenwasser make Jewish people really angry. Because not once does she mention the preceding suicide bombers and their murders of Jewish people.

I think there is only one name for this and I think the name is Anti-Semitic.

There is no other word which can describe this pattern. To have a lapse of memory on the Islamofascist suicide murderers, [**but, poor you, these islamosomething are Semites also, in their own right. Are YOU antisemitic, or something ?**] then to mobilise on the American streets to oppose the operation to root out of Jenin those very suicide bombers. No. I am sorry to say it but I think anti-semitic is a fair description.

That is who the Irish Palestine Group have roped in as a special guest speaker at the meeting in Limerick University, along with the noted Irish political figure, Michael D. Higgins.

Michael D. Higgins and the Irish Labour Party

Micheal D. Higgins is a very big name in Ireland and is closely associated with the Irish labour Party which has been in Government. Higgins has therefore been in positions of high power in Ireland.

He is also closely connected with the world of the arts, the Media and coming from the West of Ireland with the Irish language movement.

What on earth is this man doing mixing it with the Irish Palestinian Group in Limerick this weekend! It would appear that Higgins hates Israel and that is his motivation.

But then Higgins is also a great "promoter" of womens rights, and gay rights. What then is his present position on the Palestinians who have just elected into power Islamofascist Hamas.

Surely Higgins is not going to blame the Jews of Israel for THAT!

All in all it is going to be a very sordid affair. Protests should be sent to the University of Limerick and also of University of Cork for associating with this and for allowing their premises to be used for an Israeli hate-fest.

All Irish people, nationalist and Unionist, Catholic and Protestant, must raise their voices against this abomination taking place in Limerick this weekend.

Posted by Felix Quigley

<http://www.israpundit.com/2006/?p=664#more-664>

<http://www.israpundit.com/2006/?p=689>

CHRISTIAN TRUTH

Christian Morality and Holocaust Revisionism

By Paul Grubach

Recently, the Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Murphy-O'Connor, declared that Holocaust denial is tantamount to "sacrilege" after he issued a message of solidarity to Britain's Jewish community ahead of Holocaust Memorial Day. (1) According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "sacrilege" is defined as "the violation or injurious treatment of a sacred object." So, Cardinal Murphy-O'Connor is saying that anyone who is a **Holocaust revisionist** and rejects the traditional view of the Holocaust is **guilty of violating a sacred object**. But is this really so?

Consider the following facts that the Institute for Historical Review pointed out about the so-called "sacred doctrine" of the Holocaust: "At the postwar Nuremberg Tribunal, the Allies charged that the Germans exterminated four million people at Auschwitz. Until 1990, a memorial plaque at Auschwitz read: «Four Million People Suffered and Died Here at the Hands of the Nazi Murderers Between the Years 1940 and 1945.» During a 1979 visit to the camp, Pope John Paul II stood before this memorial and blessed the four million victims.

Is it 'Holocaust denial' to dispute these four million deaths? Not today. In July 1990, the Polish government's Auschwitz State Museum, along with Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust center, conceded that the four million figure was a gross exaggeration, and references to it were accordingly removed from the Auschwitz monument. Israeli and Polish officials announced a tentative revised toll of 1.1 million Auschwitz dead. In 1993, French Holocaust researcher Jean-Claude Pressac, in a much-discussed book about Auschwitz, estimated that altogether about 775,000 died there during the war years." (2)

So let us get this perfectly straight. Pope John Paul II invoked the concept of God to give credence to the falsehood that four million people were murdered at Auschwitz. In essence, he treated a sacred object – the concept of God – in an injurious manner, as he used it to lend credence to a propaganda lie. I could cogently argue that it is Pope John Paul II who is guilty of sacrilege, and not those who debunk the traditional view of the Holocaust. If Pope John Paul II had real moral integrity on this issue, he would have publicly apologized for invoking the name of God to bless a falsehood, and he would have tried to make amends for misleading his flock. He could have at least shown the moral integrity to publicly admit that the Auschwitz death toll of four million is an exaggeration by at least two million and nine hundred thousand souls!

But he never did this. Nor has any official of the Catholic Church ever publicly apologized for committing the sacrilege of invoking the name of God to lend credence to the propaganda lie that four million people were murdered at Auschwitz. One of the most important commandments of the Christian religion is "Thou Shalt not lie." In other words, a Christian is commanded by God to tell the truth. This command applies to the Holocaust ideology just as it applies to any other historical issue.

A Christian does not find the truth about the alleged Holocaust by blindly accepting what the Zionist Establishment media tells him. For if he did, he could end up like the late Pope John Paul II, who accepted and promoted the propaganda lie that four million people were murdered at Auschwitz. The point I am trying to make here is this. Cardinal Murphy-O'Connor, who claims that questioning and rejecting the Holocaust ideology is tantamount to a sacrilege, is just as befuddled and wrong as the late Pope John Paul II was when he solemnly invoked the name of God to bless the propaganda falsehood that four million people were murdered at Auschwitz. O'Connor is not obeying the Commandments of the Christian religion – for political reasons he is prostrating himself before the power of Zion. The real Christian strives for the truth. He gives the Holocaust revisionist and traditional view of the Holocaust a fair hearing, and then attempts to determine where the truth really is.

1. http://www.totalcatholic.com/universe/index.php?news_id=652&start=0&categ

2. <http://www.ihr.org/leaflets/denial.shtml>

GERMAN POLICE IS RIDICULOUS

Horst Mahler has his Passport confiscated

- to prevent his attending the Iranian Revisionist Conference

Translated by [James Damon](#)

Horst Mahler
29 January 2006
To: The Honorable Mr. Dehne
City of Kleinmachnow - Bureau of Internal Security

Dear Mr. Dehne:

I hereby request that you immediately rescind your "passport limiting measure" of 26 January 2006 and return my passport to me without delay. It is obvious from the press reports you are acting on instructions from your superiors rather than your own initiative -- others want to receive from the Central Jewish Council of Germany the laurels that you gained for restricting my freedom of movement by confiscating my passport. And yet, obedience to your superiors can neither justify nor excuse you. In carrying out your assignment, you have committed several serious errors. You simply took the "Factual basis" for the "passport limiting measures" from press reports. You did not consider it necessary to hold a legal hearing. Since that was still not enough, you simply invented the facts that you considered necessary.

In your notification you write: "In particular, it would be incompatible with Germany's responsibility toward the nation of Israel resulting from Germany's history, for you as a German citizen abroad to deny the Holocaust and again commit a felony for which you have already been convicted." Apparently you are not aware that questioning the Holocaust in Iran is not a punishable offense. Dear Mr. Dehne, the criminal law of the OMF/BRD (Organizational Form of A Modality of Foreign Rule, the Federal Republic of Germany) applies to acts committed inside Germany (§ 3 StGB).

Furthermore I have never been convicted of "denying the Holocaust." I disputed the matter before the so called Constitutional Court during a trial to suppress the National Democratic Party, in explaining why the Jews have been hated at all times by all the nations that have hosted them, and why they continue to be hated today. For this the 22nd Circuit Court of Berlin convicted me of "Incitement of the Masses" and sentenced me to nine months in prison. I appealed that verdict to the Supreme Court, which has not yet decided the matter. If it should become clear that you released your statement of 26 January 2006 to third parties such as the press, you would be liable to charges of malicious slander. However, that is a minor issue.

With your "passport limiting" measure, you are deliberately obstructing clarification of the question whether the "Holocaust" took place as claimed by world Jewry. Perhaps it still has not gotten through to you that the leaders of world Jewry -- especially the brothers Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson, the "King of Diaspora Jews;" Nahum Goldmann, the "Emperor of America;" Sam Rosenman, the "Right Hand of President Roosevelt;" Felix Frankfurter and Rabbi Wise did in fact meet together and conspire in order to lend credence to the historical lies of the "International Military Tribunal" for the so called "Nuremberg Trials" conducted against the leaders of the Reich, which the Jewish leaders planned in detail.

The Holocaust laws of the OMF/ Federal Republic of Germany are continuing the judicial tradition of Stalinist show trials introduced into Germany by the victorious Allies with the International Military Tribunal. Far from being guided by a quest for reality and justice, they are a "continuation of the war effort of the allied nations" in the words of US Chief Prosecutor Robert Jackson.[1] The OMF/ Federal Republic courts which impose the Holocaust laws are nothing but a cover for despotic rule by the enemies of the Reich. Following unconditional capitulation by the Wehrmacht at the end of World War II, the victorious Allies had the power to write the history of the period as they saw fit. Not surprisingly, they labeled the Germans as "criminal," just as they had attempted to do during the First World War. They then established their postwar order of global Mammonism, based on the historical lies they fabricated. There is no possibility that our enemies could ever be inclined to give up the fruits of their victory over the Reich. They have always been determined and are still determined to hold onto them and protect the

source of their wealth.

He who builds his house on lies fears nothing more than the truth, which can tear it down at any time. This is the reason why, where historiography is concerned, the courts of the OMF/ Federal Republic are bound to uphold the lies of the victorious powers in complete disregard for German public opinion. These courts are forced to uphold the Allies' lies against the Reich leadership exactly as they were proclaimed in the Nuremberg show trials.

With its transparent intent of again deceiving the German nation concerning its impotence, the government of the OMF/ Federal Republic has placed the following manipulation in motion. In the "Two Plus Four" treaty signed on 12 September 1990, the supremacy of the OMF/ Federal Republic was announced as follows:

ARTICLE 7

(1) The French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America hereby terminate their rights and responsibilities relating to Berlin and to Germany as a whole. As a result, the corresponding, related quadripartite agreements, decisions and practices are terminated and all related Four Power institutions are dissolved.

(2) The United Germany shall have accordingly full sovereignty over its internal and external affairs.

Fifteen days later, over 27 and 28 September, the sovereignty clause of the agreement was "rephrased" in a separate "agreement." The newer agreement states the following:

Agreement of 27/28 September 1990

1. (*Suspension of the so called "Treaty with Germany As a Whole"*)
2. (*Partial Suspension of the so called Transition agreement*)
3. *The following provisions of the Transition Agreement however remain in force.*

Part One: (individual paragraphs from Articles 1 through 5)

Article 7 Paragraph 1.

Source: *Bundesgesetzblatt* Teil II (Federal Law Gazette II) Page 1386 Article 7 Paragraph 1 of the "Treaty for the Regulation of Questions of War Arising from War and Occupation" dated 26 May 1952 (the so called "Transition Treaty") reads as follows:

- (1) *All verdicts and decisions in criminal matters that have been pronounced in Germany by any court or judicial department of the Three Powers, or by any one of them individually up to the present or later (!!) shall continue to be legal and effective in every regard under German law, and they shall be administered accordingly by the German courts (!!) and administrative entities.*

See also: *Bundesgesetzblatt* Teil II, Internationale Verträge (Federal Law Gazette Part II, International Treaties) 1955, Number 8, Bonn, 31 March 1955, "Treaty for the Regulation of Questions Arising from War and Occupation," Part One, and also Article 7 (page 413.)

The historian General Gerd Schultze-Rhonhof elucidates this provision as follows: [2]

The verdicts of the victorious powers delivered in the so called Nuremberg Trials by the International Military Tribunal are verdicts and decisions in the sense of the abovementioned Article 7 (1). German culture ministries and subordinate positions are agencies in the sense of the above mentioned Article 7 (1). They issue guidelines for instruction at universities and schools and approve teaching materials, including history books used in the public schools.

According to Article 19 of its statute dated 8 August 1945, the International Military Tribunal was **not bound by rules of evidence**. According to the Article 20 of the same statute, the court could admit or reject evidence as it desired. Thus, rebuttal evidence that the defense could have used to counter the prosecutors' charges was frequently not taken into consideration.

The basis of verdicts formulated by the Nuremberg court contain recitals of facts

relating to the causes of the Second World War and the actions of German armed forces. According to Article 7 (1), they may not be questioned by German courts and authorities, even in the light of new historical evidence. Regarding content of school books, the ministries for education and the arts are also bound by these recitals of fact.

Mr. Dehne, you know very well what is expected of you. By enforcing the Holocaust lies against historical truth you are acting as a direct agent of the destructive will of our enemies. Enforcement of the "laws" of the OMF/ Federal Republic assures that no actions can ever impair the interests of the Jews.

Where Holocaust law is concerned, it is stated very openly.[3] This situation necessitates a brief discussion of the Nuremberg Tribunal, which is a disgrace to Western civilization.

The credit for inventing the Tribunal goes to two Lithuanian Jews, the brothers **Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson**, while credit for actual implementation belongs to the Jewish World Congress. World Congress President Nahum Goldmann, the "King of the Diaspora Jews", praised its creation as "one of the greatest acts in the history of international justice and morals." [4] Nahum Goldmann also gives us an idea of how Jewish circles were employed to introduce this idea to the US government.

He writes:

"Under the leadership of the two brothers Robinson, the Jewish World Congress devoted a great deal of energy to the mental and moral preparation of these trials. To the great credit of the Roosevelt Administration, it unerringly adopted their principles and was able to put them through against the doubts of many among the Allies, especially in England." [5]

Goldmann's account informs us just how this came about: [6]

"In the war years 1941 and 1942 we received information from Geneva concerning the destruction of Jews in the Nazi camps. This prompted Wise to decide that we had to visit the President and insist that the Allies warn the Germans about the consequences of their brutal policy and their certain punishment after the War... We arranged a weekend meeting with Rosenman [7] in his summer villa near Roosevelt's "Hide Park" in order to discuss what he should recommend to the President in Washington on Monday.

It was a hot morning and we were sitting on Rosenman's veranda without jackets and ties when we suddenly heard the signal that the President's car always gave. We suddenly realized that Roosevelt was coming to see Rosenman. We began putting on our coats and ties, but Rosenman said this was not necessary since Roosevelt attached no importance to formalities. Very soon the President's car stopped in front of the veranda, and before we could greet him, Roosevelt humorously remarked: "Well now, this is interesting -- Sam Rosenman, Stephen Wise and Nahum Goldmann sitting here discussing what orders they want to give the President of the United States! Just imagine what the Nazis would give for a picture of this little scene." We began stuttering that we were discussing an urgent message from Europe that Rosenman wanted to show him on Monday. But Roosevelt just winked and said: "That's fine. Sam can come to see me on Monday and tell me what I'm supposed to do." Then he drove off.

In another place Goldmann expresses the pleasures of exercising power even more intimately: "Seduction can turn into passion... The sensation of seducing a woman might be more intense momentarily, but winning a statesman is something very similar." [8] "During the time I lived in America nearly all presidents -- Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon -- had their 'Court Jews,' wealthy people who helped finance their election campaigns and influential leaders of the Jewish community." [9] Another prominent "Court Jew" was Felix Frankfurter, to whom Roosevelt was always "very personally attached." For many years Frankfurter was "one of the most influential personalities in Washington," which made him a competitor for the sobriquet "Emperor of America" among some Jews. Many of Frankfurter's students were appointed to high positions in the Roosevelt administration. Goldmann remarked that "Frankfurter had no desire to perform on stage, but he derived all the more pleasure from pulling strings behind the scenes." [10]

While the British government argued in favor of summarily executing captured

German leaders -- at least 50,000 of them -- Stalin favored the show trials that were dear to his heart. The US were also interested in such trials. Under international law, however, it was not possible to punish military personnel for carrying out orders. When Jacob Robinson suggested placing captured Germans before a tribunal anyway, American judges on the Supreme Court said he was crazy. "What was unusual about the wartime actions of the Nazi officers?" they asked. It might have been possible to place Hitler and even Göring before a court, but certainly not ordinary military men who conducted themselves as loyal soldiers and carried out orders. Finally Robinson succeeded in persuading Supreme Court Judge Robert Jackson to accept his point of view.

Robert H. Jackson (1892-1954), a close friend and trusted adviser of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had served as Assistant Attorney General from 1936 to 1939 and as Attorney General in 1940 and 1941. He was of the opinion that an Allied military tribunal would be "a continuation of the war efforts of the allied nations." [11] At war's end Jackson was sent to Europe with instructions to juridically brand Germany for all time as the aggressor nation solely responsible for World War II.

On Roosevelt's orders, Judge Samuel Rosenman had gone to London at the beginning of April 1945 in order to develop plans for a collective trial of "German War Criminals." On 5 April Lord Chancellor Sir John Simon, head of the British juridical system, had argued for summary execution of Hitler and his cohorts without any kind of trial. British Attorney General Sir David Maxwell Fyfe informed Rosenman that he also was "personally in favor of the method of summary execution." [12] On the next day, however, Simon announced that Washington needed "judicial proceedings before executions." [13] Obviously, those who thought up the tribunal idea had persuaded the "head of the British legal system" of the advantage of having a high ranking international "Judiciary" create the "manifest obviousness" necessary to support the historical lies about German criminality and war guilt. But would any judge accept the idea that the victorious Allies' shooting of 50,000 captured National Socialists proved the 50,000 victims had committed the cruel deeds of which they were accused by their enemies? That was most unlikely. Any "judge" who accepted the notion that being a victim of murder proves that the victim of murder had committed a capital offense and therefore makes his guilt obvious, would presumably land in an insane asylum.

After Roosevelt's death, and with the acquiescence of the President Truman, Rosenman officially offered Jackson the post of chief prosecutor at the victors' tribunal. The offer came with this stipulation: The captured Nazis should first receive a "fair trial" -- and then be hanged! "Extraordinarily happy about the offer," Jackson accepted immediately. [14] He had long defended the thesis that in the 20th Century, 19th Century concepts about war no longer applied. He also believed that the USA, on account of its "leadership role in the world," was entitled to intervene in any military conflict and act as it saw fit. Jackson announced that in order to "secure the moral leadership of the USA" he was authorized to "prove," with the help of a military tribunal, that "these damned Germans were solely responsible for the war... We need a scapegoat on which to foist the world's evils for a long time to come." [15]

In consultations preparatory to the tribunal, Jackson ignored the objections advanced by the European allies that the accused could prove, based on documents seized in France, that the Reich was not responsible for the outbreak of World War II; rather, the War had been forced on Germany. They pointed out that the documents would prove that England, France, and the USA had all backed Poland in its stubborn and aggressive attitude toward Germany. After all, Poland had mobilized twice before Germany mobilized. In July 1939, Polish Marshall Rydz-Smigly publicly stated before officers in Thorn that "Poland wants war and Germany will not be able to prevent it, even if it wants to." Furthermore, Roosevelt had for all practical purposes declared war against Germany in 1941. The German Declaration of War was completely legitimate, given the provocative American aggressions against German ships and its violation of neutrality by delivering weapons to the British. [16]

None of that could be mentioned during the trial, of course. Germany must be branded and condemned as the sole guilty party, and the European war had to be presented as German aggression from the very beginning. Brigadier General Telford Taylor, later the chief American advisor for the prosecution, objected that it would not be possible in a fair trial "to push through the absurd notion of Germany's sole guilt -- rather, the opposite will come out." Finally the USA had driven Hitler into a Polish trap from which he was unable to extricate himself: Churchill and Roosevelt had agreed on the complete annihilation of the German Reich from the very beginning.

To this Jackson retorted: "Who's talking about a fair trial? Of course the Germans

will try to accuse the Allies of pursuing a policy that forced them into war. I expect that, since I know about the documents seized from the German Foreign Office. They all come to the same conclusion: 'We have no way out. We must fight; we are encircled; we are being strangled'; Well, it would be a catastrophe if this trial got into a discussion about the political and economic causes of the war. That could cause an unending disaster in America and Europe both. Out of that would come an unending disaster in Europe as well as in America." Taylor concluded, "That means the question of who is guilty of starting the war must be avoided at all costs... it must not be allowed to come up." That however would be possible only if Jackson could succeed as lawmaker, in setting up the rules of the game for a perfect trial by simply forbidding all discussion of the causes of the war before the tribunal. [17] Jackson took Taylor's remarks as his guidelines and remarked: "If all documents and statements to this effect are rejected by the court as irrelevant or unimportant, the war policies of the Western Powers, Poland and the USSR cannot be discussed."

Taylor expressed the idea in a metaphor, saying "The shark pool of European politics between the wars must appear as a carp pond with one single evil pike swimming around." Jackson added "And this pike, Hitler naturally, must by the end of the trial have mutated into a monstrous killer shark, threatening to devour all the little fish and striving for world domination." On 6 June 1945 Jackson reassured Truman with a report setting out the new "legal concepts" along with his plans for the course of the trial, which included a London conference with jurists from all the other allies. [18] This conference took place in London between June 26 and August 8. The French Professor of international law, Dr. Gros, began by pointing out that "wars of aggression" did not represent a criminal violation of international law... If the war were thought of as a "criminal act of individuals," however, the law could be bent. The latest book by Trainin [the Soviet expert on international law who took part in the conference] states that "A war of aggression is to be regarded as an international crime in the sense of the discussions held at the League of Nations." Compensation can be demanded, but criminal penalties do not ensue. For this reason, he said, one may not invent a punishment. Trainin would have liked to come to a different conclusion; but, as he stated, a "war of aggression" entails no criminal liability. Furthermore the Joint Declaration made at the Yalta Conference in February, 1945 made no mention of the crime of aggressive war.[19]

Jackson reacted to these objections with indignation. He said that the US had conducted total war and paid no attention to international law, unless it had reason to fear retaliation by the enemy. Furthermore, since the US was the most powerful victor, no one was in a position to hinder it from introducing new guidelines in the interest of the Allies. With this in mind he had worked out his own proposal for the prosecution. It contained the following main points: "Offensive war, invasion, attack in violation of international laws and treaties, along with war as an instrument of national policy." He stated that he considered charges of war atrocities as being of "secondary importance." In the course of further discussions he explained: "As far as specific charges are concerned, the United States are particularly interested in developing the (new) criminal charge of waging aggressive war, in order to depict Germany's entire conduct of the war as illegal. This is because during the War I suggested certain measures to President Roosevelt that under international law could be justified only with the theory that Germany's conduct was illegal. In order to justify these measures, the United States have a particular interest in judicially establishing the illegality of the German war." [20]

The French appeals court judge Robert Falco gave Jackson something to consider by pointing out that: "If we go through with this, the court will be punishing the Germans for crimes with which the Allies can also be charged." Thus the problem was, how could the victors conduct in international court, an international trial for violation of international law, in which Germany's violations of international law would be pilloried and punished, but theirs would not? It had to be anticipated that the world would hurl the response "But you did the same thing!" back in the victors' faces, and the judges from neutral countries would throw out the whole trial. "At the end, the whole thing would turn into an international tribunal," Falco lamented. At this point Jackson dropped his mask. His response was, "You must understand that it is not going to be just an international tribunal, but an *international military tribunal!* And nobody will have a say about its composition except we and we alone. All the judges will be picked from countries that took part in the War. We will be the ones who frame the court charter, determine the composition of the court, and write the legal code for the court. We will be the court prosecutors and the court judges. In this trial neither the accused nor the witnesses will have a right to testify freely, except perhaps Hermann Göring."

Here Prof. Gros interjected that "If lawmakers, prosecutors and judges are all the same persons, this fact alone will constitute a decisive objection. In every legal system with which I am familiar, such a composition would be illegal and impossible." Again he raised the question: "Besides, how can men who have committed no criminal acts still be accused and sentenced? We French may think that such a thing would be politically desirable, but it is not possible under international law." [21] Jackson had no response to that except a cynical rejection of legal procedure by stating: "I must admit that international law is weak and unclear in support of our position... We simply have to explain that the Germans are personally responsible." Prof. Gros still could not follow his thought. He objected: "The acts of which the German leaders can be accused is an old familiar story, but the fact remains that no one has ever declared such deeds to be criminal violations of international law. If we do this now, it will be a case of *ex post facto* lawmaking."

Prof. Gros's objection did not impress Jackson in the least: "You may be right," he replied. "Precisely for that reason, explanations and discussions of the principles of international law must be restricted to the minimum in the courtroom." At this point British Attorney General Maxwell-Fyfe interjected: "What we want to avoid in this trial is a discussion about whether or not the proceedings are violations of international law. We shall simply state what international law is and then not allow any discussion of whether it is international law or not." Jackson reiterated the quintessence of the discussion in these words: "You are entirely right. After all, the Allies are still technically at war with Germany, even though its military and political institutions have collapsed. Our military court represents a continuation of the war effort of the Allied nations... As the victors, we see it as our undisputed right to keep secret from the court every document and every witness that could prove damaging to us." Prof. Gros again objected, "But that is turning the entire European legal tradition upside down. So we are not interested in establishing the truth here, we are just interested in winning a judicial victory?" Jackson: "That's right. And since all the advantages are on our side, our victory before the court is assured."

Thus the Nuremberg Tribunal was and remains to this day a triumph of power over the law, committed by criminals who wrapped themselves in judges' robes.

On 8 August 1945 the London conference ended with the "Agreement on the Prosecution and Punishment of the Principal War Criminals of the European Axis Powers" including the court statute for this court that was appended to the agreement. The protocols of the London sessions were illegally published four years later as the "Report of Robert H. Jackson." If they had been made public in 1945, in any trial conducted according to English Common Law, they would have caused a mistrial. As soon as they knew of these discussions, the judges would have had no choice except to discontinue the trial or begin anew. Those present at the London conference understood this perfectly well: any verdict that was reached before the trial would have to be overruled. The judges who participated in the London discussions were clearly compromised. They were obligated to recuse themselves, but they failed to do this. [22] The precise index of sources for this matter may be found in Hans Meiser's book *Das Tribunal*, a computerized copy of which is appended hereto.

When one realizes that the International Military Tribunal was nothing except a victors' consortium for murder, it becomes clear that the Agreement of 27/28 September 1945, along with Article 7 (1), *Überleitungsvertrag* (transmission treaty), is a pinnacle of infamy directed against the German people. With their death sentences, the so-called "judges" at Nuremberg accomplished nothing more than rationalizing the murder of the Reich leadership. The agreements signed on 27 and 28 September 1945, however, have mercilessly delivered the entire German nation for all time to the "Auschwitz Cudgel," with which our enemy is annihilating the soul of the German nation.

The "manifest obviousness of the Holocaust" alleged by the courts of OMF/BRD, (our Organizational Form of a Modality of Foreign Rule, the Federal Republic of Germany) is but an empty phrase. There is no evidence for the event conjured by this battle cry, as is clearly demonstrated in the appended book by Gernar Rudolf: *Vorlesungen über den Holocausts -- Strittige Fragen im Kreuzverhör (Lectures on the Holocaust)*, Castle Hill Publishers, PO Box 118, Hastings, TN34 3ZQ, UK, April 2005,

Mr. Dehne, perhaps you now understand the panic with which world Jewry is reacting to President Ahmadineshad's announcement that Iran will sponsor a scientific commission and conference to investigate the authenticity of the Holocaust. If, as you state, my participation in the conference planned by the Iranian government would threaten "serious consequences" for the *Bundesrepublik*, then you have said everything about the Federal Republic that needs to be said. The *Bundesrepublik*, along with the Basic

Law, is doomed to vanish on the day when "a constitution goes into effect that has been created by the German nation in a free election." (Article 146 of the Basic Law.) This will be the day when the German nation through its *Reichsordnende Versammlung* (Constitutional Convention) officially reject the historical falsifications sponsored by the enemies of the Reich and reclaim its sovereignty. That day is coming sooner than you think. The Teheran conference will greatly facilitate the dissolution of the Federal Republic, since it is constructed on a great lie that will be demolished in Teheran: the Holocaust Lie.

In conclusion, I would like to remind you that the German Reich continues to exist. Its laws are still in effect. They can not at present be carried out, for the reason that foreign domination, in clear violation of international law, is hindering the Reich by force from doing so. When the Reich's ability to function is again secured, actions such as yours will be punishable as treason.

Very truly yours,
Horst Mahler

- [1] Protokolle des Nürnberger Prozesses Bd. XIX S. 440)
- [2] Gerd Schultze-Rhonhof, DER KRIEG, DER VIELE VÄTER HATTE Der lange Anlauf zum Zweiten Weltkrieg, OLZOG-Verlag, München 2003 (Seiten 12f)
- [3] Stefan Huster in der Neuen Juristischen Wochenschrift (Heft 8/1996 S. 487 ff.) und Winfried Brugger im Archiv des öffentlichen Rechts, Band 128 (2003) S. 372 [403].
- [4] Nahum Goldmann, Staatsmann ohne Staat, Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln 1970, S. 271 und 273
- [5] Nahum Goldmann a.a.O. S. 273
- [6] Nahum Goldmann, Mein Leben USA-Europa-Israel, Verlag Langen Müller, München 1981, ISBN 3-7844-1920-8, S. 116
- [7] der Jude Sam Rosenman war der von dem Jüdischen Prof. Felix Frankfurter (genannt "Kaiser von Amerika") dem US-Präsidenten ins Nest gesetzte Chefberater
- [8] Nahum Goldmann, Das Jüdische Paradox, Köln 1978, S. 151
- [9] Nahum Goldmann, Mein Leben - USA, Europa, Israel", Langen Müller Verlag, München 1981, S. 93
- [10] a.a.O. S. 95
- [11] Protokolle des Nürnberger Prozesses, Band XIX, S. 440.
- [12] Memorandum über ein britisch-amerikanisches Treffen am 5. April 1945 (PROfile LCO.2/2980).
- [13] Simon an Rosenman, 6. 4. 1945 (PRO file LCO. 2/2981).
- [14] Jacksons Tagebuch vom 27. 4. 1945 (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, R. H. Jackson papers, box 95).
- [15] Meiser, Hans, Das Tribunal, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 2005, ISBN 3-87847-218-8 S. 18
- [16] Meiser S. 19
- [17] Meiser S. 21
- [18] Meiser S. 21
- [19] Meiser S. 31
- [20] Meiser S. 35 f.
- [21] Meiser S. 36
- [22] Meiser 35 ff.S.

http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/Dissenters1/Mahler/2006_passport1.htm

THE ZÜNDEL TRIAL - ROUND TWO

The Genie is Out of the Bottle by [Horst Mahler](#)

Translated from the German by [James Damon](#) and [Patrick McNally](#)

Zündel's defense attorney Sylvia Stolz, responding to the statement by the Mannheim Holocaust Judiciary:

"The Holocaust Laws of the OMF-Bundesrepublik (Organizational Form of a Modality of Foreign Rule of the Federal Republic of Germany) are pure treason!"

On the first business day of the recently resumed show trial against Ernst Zündel for

"Denying the Holocaust," Dr. Meinerzhagen (pottering about as head judge) proved to be extremely irritable. After numerous but fruitless attacks against Sylvia Stolz (chief defense lawyer for Ernst Zündel), he finally lost his composure and muzzled the defense. Unprecedented events have indeed taken place. After the rather timid reading of the charges against Zündel by two prosecutors, the assistant defense lawyer, Attorney Schaller of Vienna, had responded with an eloquent appeal for observance of the rules that characterize court procedure in a state of laws, which the Mannheim justices are obligated to observe.

Following Schaller, Sylvia Stolz addressed the court as follows:

"The defense rejects the accusations against Ernst Zündel, a citizen of the German Reich. This is not a legal prosecution under the laws of the Reich or any other legal system. It is an exercise of power that is illegal under international law, by a puppet government called "Federal Republic of Germany." [1] To use the expression coined by the professor of international law, Dr. Carlo Schmid, the Federal Republic of Germany is an "Organizational Form of a Modality of Foreign Rule." Henceforth we shall refer to this foreign occupation government as "OMF-FRG."

I described the legal structure of OMF-FRG in the court document dated 18 October 2005, complete with lengthy quotations from the founding speech of the OMF-FRG Parliamentary Council presented by Prof. Dr. Carlo Schmid. I also quoted pertinent remarks by the professors of International Law Prof. Friedrich Berger and Prof. Otto Kimminich and elucidated the conclusions to be drawn as they relate to the case of Ernst Zündel. In its meeting outside the main trial, that is, in the absence of the presiding judges, the "Sixth Superior Criminal Court of Mannheim District has given notice that it intends to simply ignore the duly submitted argument made by the defense. The decision of the Criminal Court states that "The legal profferings that the defendant submitted in his petition cannot be accepted by this Chamber. They and the conclusions at which they arrive, appear to be ultimately devoid of judicial relevance."

The defense refuses to accept this peremptory dismissal. Every layman with at least a primary school education should be able to understand the arguments developed therein, as well as the significance of their conclusions for the Zündel trial. As counterproposal, the defense will read its submission dated 18 October 2005 in the main trial, including basis for its arguments, so that the hesitant attitude of the 'professional judges' will be recognizable and the court of appeals will be able to correct their capricious refusal to accept our submissions.

The signers of the ruling of 7 November 2005, Dr. Meinerzhagen, Dr. Hamm, and Mrs. Krebs-Dörr are conducting themselves in the tradition of the International Military Tribunal of the victors over the German Reich, who agreed to disregard all discussion about whether their actions were violations of international law. Those so-called 'judges' and 'prosecutors' resolved that 'we will simply declare what international law is so that there can be no discussion of whether it is international law or not.' [2] The persons responsible for that atrocity propaganda show had expressly abandoned any quest for truth and concept of justice in order to make their lynchings of leading Reich personalities appear to be legal. I shall return to this later in my presentations.

In my motion of 18 October 2005 (page 26) I gave notice that the defense would attack the dogma of 'Offenkundigkeit' (Manifest Obviousness) of the 'Holocaust' with all the resources at its disposal. I said the defense would show that in the continuing war against Germany by the enemies of the Reich, 'manifest obviousness' has been feigned and assumed from the very beginning.

The above mentioned jurists have taken this statement as occasion to, express their intent for mendacious procedure in the main trial as follows:

'As far as manifest obviousness of the Holocaust is concerned, the motion recapitulates familiar pseudo arguments that have been proffered and continue to be proffered by so-called revisionists (see BGHSt 47,278) without raising bona fide doubt about the historically proven and therefore manifestly obvious genocide, particularly of the Jews, by the National Socialist Dictatorship (stdg. Rspr. des Bundesverfassungsgerichts und des Bundesgerichtshofs vgl. BVerfGE 90, 241, 249; BGHSt 40,97, 99,; 46, 36, 46 f.; 47, 278.) This genocide is factually assumed in Paragraph 130 III of the Penal Code (See Bundesgerichtshof Strafsachen, Reports of the High Court in Criminal Matters, 47, 278). Thus any evidentiary exhibit that would deny this is forbidden in Reports of the High Court in Criminal Matters and other publications.

With this reasoning, Dr. Meinerzhagen and his colleagues have obviously abandoned the dogma of Manifest Obviousness. That is the good news. The bad news is the withdrawal of permission to submit evidence, which took place despite the abandonment of

'manifest obviousness.' What is going on inside the heads of these judges? What is the definition of Scheinargumente (show arguments)? In imitation of the Nuremberg Tribunals, these jurists use the term 'show arguments' to designate arguments that are likely to prove, in support of the will of the foreign occupation government, any previously established 'verdict' as illegal and unjust. Such arguments have to be repressed. And what are 'familiar show arguments?' 'Familiar show arguments' are apparently arguments on which OMF/FRG judicial arbitrariness has been successfully tested.

And what in Heaven's name are 'factual presuppositions? The term 'factual presupposition' or 'presumed factuality' refers to the court's complete disregard of the criminal law. In criminal law, punishment is court ordered compensation for a debt. Debt is a deficit appearing in a transaction that should not be there. But if there is no transaction, there can be no debt. In order to distinguish terror from punishment, the penal code typifies certain transactions as punishable by designating them "Tatbestandsmerkmale" (factual characteristics), thereby separating them from permissible activity. The facts of the case extend to the transaction in the narrower sense of an act or failure to act, as well as to accompanying circumstances that are significant for determination of the demerit. In a narrower sense, the action classified in Paragraph 3 of the Penal Code is an expression of opinion. The circumstance accompanying the misdeed is a certain contemporary historical fact (called 'Holocaust.')

It is the task of the judge to determine the given life circumstances involved in the case.) In the present instance this consists of a certain expression of opinion, along with accompanying circumstances. The judge must determine what is to be considered as "given" and whether the facts of the case correspond to an action that can be classified as punishable. The citizen under the law can adapt his intent to avoidance of the classified action.

The statement of facts of a punishment norm also guarantees the freedom from punishment of all actions that do not meet the criteria of punishable (nulla poena sine lege – "no punishment without law.") Within the realm of actions classified as nonpunishable, one can live free from fear of being punished. This is what distinguishes a nation of laws from tyranny. However, the statute of the victors' tribunal at Nuremberg violated this basic principle (that is unanimous opinion.) Egged on by the High Court of the OMF/FRG, Dr. Meinerzhagen and his colleagues are likewise engaged in tearing down the boundary between justice and tyranny. Where "Holocaust" is concerned, they intend to set aside the burden of proof that is obligatory on the judge. They intend to do this with allegation of a fiction that does not even appear as such in "the law" (Paragraph 130 III of Penal Code.)

What is the source of this legalistic and dogmatic mistake of Dr. Meinerzhagen and the High Court of OMF/FRG? In their "argumentation," they dogmatically assume that the so called Holocaust is a given fact in time and space. They postulate that any and all doubts concerning "Holocaust" are unthinkable. They have defected from the ranks of the truth-seekers and joined the ranks of the religion-founders. Religion requires that we rule out doubt and substitute belief in its stead. The true believer vehemently crushes every attempt to introduce reason into his consideration, since reason is the harbinger of doubt. Believing demands unquestioning trust in the priestly caste, which functions simultaneously as the faith police.

Within the hazy realm of Holocaust religion, the legal apparatus of the OMF/FRG has degenerated into an inquisition. There is a cynical calculation of power in this. Following World War II, world Jewry recognized the possibility of using the Holocaust lie to found Israel and create a world empire to support and secure it against all opposition. World Jewry knows from experience that almost everyone can be made to believe almost anything if it can be suggested to them that most people believe it. Through the power of suggestion combined with Jewish control of world media the "Holocaust" has indeed become the suggested belief of almost everyone.

When he was still Cardinal Ratzinger, Pope Benedict XVI said the following on the subject of this power of world Jewry:

'The feeling that democracy is not yet the proper form of freedom is rather common, and is continuing to spread... Is there not an oligarchy consisting of those who determine what is "modern" and "progressive," and what the enlightened person should think? The cruelty of this oligarchy, and its power to make the public do its will, is all too familiar. Whoever blocks its path is an "enemy of freedom" for the reason that he is allegedly hindering free expression of opinion... Who can have doubts about the power of these interests, whose dirty hands become more visible all the time? And besides: is the system of majority vs. minority a system of true freedom?'[3]

If it is to be suggested that the Holocaust lie is to be "believed by nearly everyone,"

then the real truth must be sunk in a bottomless spiral of silence. And this can succeed only if the contradiction of the "Holocaust" lie is forcibly suppressed -- obviously through a modern inquisition. Criminal law serves the cause of justice through atonement for crime by punishment, while inquisition serves the enforcement of a particular belief through destruction of heretics. However, it is the general will of Western civilization that involuntary belief of all kinds should be abolished. That is precisely what comprises the substance of freedom of belief, the nucleus of recognizing the individual as a person. This general will constitutes the difference between modern and medieval times.

Inquisition is the purest atrocity, since it destroys freedom of belief. Inquisition has nothing to do with the application or reestablishment of justice through punishment. The enforcement of "Holocaust" law is inquisition, hence unmitigated crime. As Plato pointed out, inquisitory law is in fact the worst kind of injustice because it pretends to be justice.

Exclaiming " Enough of that!" Dr. Meinerzhagen then interrupted Attorney Stolz, taking away her right to speak and terminating the session. He fled into the conference room with his colleagues and returned after a quarter hour. Dr. Meinerzhagen then proclaimed the directive of the court that in future, Attorney Stolz would have to submit all her motions in writing, and would not be allowed to read them aloud before the court. With this ruling, the show trial has become another "Ghost Trial" (Rainer Hamm, Counsel for Defense, 94, 457.) The public will no longer be allowed to hear the arguments of the defense. The Holocaust judges are attempting to introduce the "silence of the grave" in the courtroom (see Scheffler, Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 94, 2194.) However, their attempt to disguise their illegal action as legal procedure is still doomed to failure. They are chanting the allegation that the Holocaust has been "proven many times" into empty space. The undeniable fact that the opposite has long been proven, is enough to completely disqualify it.

The court appointed expert witness Prof. Dr. Gerhard Jagschitz of the University of Vienna Institute for Contemporary History (A 1090 Wien, Rotenhausgasse 6) demonstrated that the opposite is true in his written report submitted to the Landesgericht für Strafsachen (District Criminal Court), Vienna, on 10 January 1991. See Az. (Archiv für Zivile Praxis): 26 b Vr (Verwaltungsrundschau)14 184/86.)

Prof. Jagschitz presented his findings as follows: "...in the course of research into the literature on the subject, it developed that a relative scarcity of scientific and objective literature is offset by an abundance of eyewitness accounts and subjective summarizations. I found numerous contradictions, retractions, omissions and inadequate references to sources. Furthermore, substantial doubts about basic questions have been reinforced by a number of court exonerations in relevant trials. These exonerations resulted from expert reports presented to both national and international courts. Thus the mere extrapolation of court verdicts and evocation of judicial notoriety of the familiar stories of gassings of Jews at Auschwitz no longer suffice as a basis for reaching verdicts -- at least not in the context of any democratic concept of justice. Thus in this expert report, it was proven necessary to undertake the necessary corrections of relevant literature as well ... In the course of this research it became clear that resources from certain archives were inadequately utilized in previous research. Thanks to political events of the last few years, resources that were heretofore unavailable to us in the West have now been made available. I am referring in particular to documents of the Reichssicherheitshauptamtes (Central Reich Security Office) in Potsdam, a huge resource of Auschwitz documents (several tons) that are stored in various archives in Moscow..."

The historian Prof. Dr. Ernst Nolte also refers to the baselessness of using this inquisitorial device of assumed manifest obviousness in order to protect the Holocaust lie against consideration by the court:

"Not until the rules of examination of witnesses have been generally applied and testimony is no longer evaluated according to political criteria, will secure ground be won for any attempt at scientific objectivity regarding the 'final solution'.[4] The widely disseminated notion that all doubt concerning the prevailing concept of a 'Holocaust' with six million victims is to be automatically treated as though it were maliciousness and inhumanity, and therefore repressed by all means, can under no circumstances be accepted by objective science. This is because of the fundamental significance of the maxim 'de omnibus dubitandum est' (everything is to be doubted) for objective science... This attitude must be rejected as an attack on the principle of freedom of research. [5]

Although I consider myself more challenged by 'Revisionism' than most contemporary German historians, I soon arrived at the conviction that the Revisionist school has been treated in a subjective and unscientific manner. In established literature

it has met rejection, suspicions about the motivation of its authors and above all, dead silence.[6]

Radical revisionism is much more prevalent in France and the USA than in Germany. There can be no doubt that its forerunners are well informed and have carried out extensive investigations in the field.

As far as mastery of source material is concerned, and especially criticism of source material, these investigations probably surpass those of established historians in Germany.[7] At any rate we must give the radical Revisionists and their provocative theories credit for having forced established historiography to reassess its positions and find firmer basis for their assumptions and conclusions, as Raul Hilberg has done.[8] "...The questions about the reliability of eyewitness testimony, the significance of documents, technical impossibility of certain procedures, credibility of numbers quoted, the and persuasiveness of the circumstances are permissible and legitimate. Not only are they permissible, but they are procedurally indispensable, and every attempt to dispense with Revisionist arguments and evidence by imposing total science or banishing them from the world, has got to be illegitimate.[9]

If radical revisionism were correct in its assertion that there was no 'Holocaust' in the sense of a comprehensive and systematic program of annihilation ordered by the highest levels of government, I would have to arrive at the conclusion that National Socialism was not a 'bizarre copy of Bolshevism,' but rather that it was simply leading the struggle for survival of a Germany that had been forced into the defensive worldwide. No author wants to admit that nothing of his work has survived except rubble and so I too have a vital interest in proving that Revisionism is incorrect, at least in its most radical manifestation.[10]

The above formulation provides the key to understanding our present world. It is not just the scientific work of Ernst Nolte that would be lying in ruins. The very foundations of the Jewish American world empire would be shaken. The German Empire would again be perceived as the power that had defended the Christian West "to the last drop of its blood" against talmudic mammonism (Satan.) Adolf Hitler would no longer be the devil, he would be the savior. The world would recognize the profound truth concerning the Nuremberg Tribunal as proclaimed by the Portuguese expert on international law, Dr. Joao das Regas:

"In actuality, two mutually incomprehensible worlds faced each other at Nuremberg. The materialistic world of Mammonism and hypocritical democracy opposed to the idealistic and heroic conception of a nation that was defending its right to exist... How could the sated and materialistic world understand the unflinching and heroic will to survive of a nation that, despite its exasperation over diminished territory, had presented our culture with immortal works for centuries, and before the Second World War had stood at the forefront of critical scientific progress in our century?

It was characteristic of the depraved mentality of the international press to continue their attacks against the leaders of the German nation despite the noble manner in which they conducted themselves throughout their disgraceful treatment and unjust death sentences. As precursors of social justice built on a national basis, the condemned German leaders went to their deaths at Nuremberg with a glowing confession of love for their nation and their ideals. Theirs was a truly heroic deportment, worthy of our highest admiration." [11]

The Evil Empire that, true to its nature, is forever demonizing others (the goys) has mobilized all the material and intellectual resources at its disposal in the effort to hinder dissemination of the truth. The truth can no longer be held back, however. For the first time, the leader of a large and wealthy nation is directing his country's national policy toward exposing the Holocaust lie. His intention, born of self defense, is to remove the Zionist settler state of Israel from the map, thereby making it possible for Jews and Arabs to once again coexist in peace. It marks the beginning of the end for the Great Lie that has long held our nation in bondage. The reaction of world Jewry to Achmadinedschad's announcement of the convocation of an international commission to investigate the "Holocaust" shows that the conspiracy of silence surrounding Revisionism has finally been broken. The Jews are no longer able to suggest that "nearly everybody believes in the Holocaust." We are witnessing the end of the greatest lie in the history of mankind. He who still continues to defend the lie and thereby soils his hands will be left behind. In the words of Michael Gorbachev, "Life punishes those who get left behind."

Some other remarks by Prof. Dr. Ernst Nolte on the subject of Revisionism are noteworthy:

"I do indeed feel challenged by Revisionism, but I am unable to join those who demand that the state and the police intervene to repress Revisionism. For this very reason I find myself compelled to ask the question of whether Revisionism has/represents real arguments, or really does consist of mere deceptive agitation. The general all around quality of the individual historian comes into play here. The real historian knows that revision is the daily bread of scientific history.

Real historians also know that in the final analysis, some Revisionist theories are going to be acknowledged by established historians, or at least taken into the discussion... For example, during a recent congress of historians it was not specifically mentioned that during the War and immediately afterwards there were many allegations that the Germans had carried out mass executions by the use of hot steam in sealed chambers, electric shocks on giant electrical plates, and quicklime. By its complete silence, the congress declared these allegations to be as irrelevant as the rumor of soap made from Jewish corpses. (Incidentally, a well known film director has recently resurrected those rumors in German newspaper announcements.)[12]

Even the testimony of the SS leader and Bekennende (Confessing) church member Kurt Gerstein, probably the most widely circulated "Holocaust" account of the 1950s, is no longer accepted in documentary collections, even by the most orthodox scholars. And it is well known that Jean-Claude Pressac, who despite his peculiar precedents is still acknowledged to be a serious researcher, recently reduced the number of Auschwitz gas chamber victims from four million down to around half a million. Their abandoned allegations do not differ fundamentally from individual corrections of the kind that, to my knowledge, have been brought forward only by 'Revisionists:' The corrections that the first confessions of the Auschwitz commandant Höß were extracted under torture; that giant flames leaping from crematory chimneys, reported by numerous eyewitnesses, are best explained by mistakes of visual perception; that the technical prerequisites for cremating up to 24,000 corpses per day were simply not available; and that the cellar morgues in crematories of camps that had to accommodate around 300 "natural" deaths per day were indispensable during the typhus epidemics of those days and could not have been utilized for mass murders, at least not during epidemics.

Such ideas can hardly surprise a historian. He knows from his own day to day experience that, since Herodotus' time, it has been necessary to treat large figures with suspicion, insofar as they do not originate with official statistical bureaus. The historian understands no less well that large groups of people exposed to stressful circumstances and confusing events that are now and have always been rumor incubators...[13]

The testimony of Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höß was obtained under torture. Without doubt, his confessions contributed greatly to the collapse of the defense in the Nuremberg trials. His testimony would not have been admissible in any court of law that complied with Western legal and judicial standards. The so-called Gerstein documents contain so many contradictions and objective impossibilities that they must be discarded as worthless, while the few actual eyewitness accounts consist of hearsay and mere assumptions. Thanks to the Soviet and Polish communists, a thorough investigation of Auschwitz by an international commission of experts did not take place after the end of the War. This stands in contrast to the case of the mass graves at Katyn Forest discovered by the Wehrmacht in 1943. The publication of photographs of crematoria and some cans with the label "Zyklon B Poison Gas" has no value as proof of murder since crematoria had to be constructed near large camps and Zyklon B was the best known disinfectant of the time. Zyklon B was indispensable wherever masses of people were forced to live under crowded conditions.

The integrity of the scientific discipline of historiography demands that it be allowed to question the established and "politically correct" version of history – namely that mass murder in gas chambers has been proven by numerous eyewitness accounts and incontrovertible facts, and therefore is not open to doubt. If historiography is not allowed to do this, then science as such is inadmissible.[14]

The basic issue is the assertion that on the basis of scientific findings or technical facts, either there were no mass gassings or else they could not have taken place, certainly not in the scope and number heretofore assumed. Here I am referring to the chemical investigations or expert reports on the residues of cyanide in the disinfection chambers on the one hand and the cellar morgues of the crematoria on the other. I have in mind the reports of Leuchter, Rudolf, and Luftl as well as the unusually detailed studies of Carlo Mattogno on extremely detailed questions such as the length of time to burn corpses, the coke required, et al.

No fundamental objection can be made against the Revisionist argument that the

scientifically or technically impossible cannot have occurred, even though hundreds of witness reports and testimonies might have stated the opposite. The conclusion is unavoidable that humanities people and ideological critics have absolutely nothing to say in this matter." [15]

The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* expressed a similar opinion in the following: [16] "Raul Hilberg and Ernst Nolte agree that one must read the eye witness reports of the celebrated Elie Wiesel with extremely critical attention. Hilberg's most recent book and grandiose work of his elder years, 'Sources of the Holocaust, has silently taken leave of many of the most familiar but obviously unreliable witnesses, such as Kurt Gersten and Jan Karsky... liars and propagandists must be seen as complementary to our age." What effect does the following confession of Raul Hilberg, the Pope of the Holocaust Church, have on the minds of holocaust believers?

"But what began in 1941 was not a previously planned annihilation (of the Jews), organized centrally by a single office, there were no plans and no budget for these annihilation measures. These measures developed step by step, one after the other; and not through the execution of a plan, but rather by an extraordinary meeting of minds, a coincidence of views within a comprehensive bureaucracy." [Quoted in Rudolf, *Vorlesungen*, Page 187.]

Did not all the world believe that the annihilation of the Jews was centrally planned and decided in the "Wannsee Villa" on January 20, 1942? [18] How are we to reconcile all this? The Jewish historian Yehuda Bauer, director of the International Institute for Holocaust Research in Jerusalem, ridicules the fact that "...Just as before, the public keeps repeating the foolish story that the annihilation of the Jews was agreed upon at Wannsee." [19] Professor Dr. Eberhard Jackel, co-editor of the official Encyclopedia of the Holocaust, addressed the issue in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine* on 22 June 1992:

"Historian Jacke: Purpose of the Wannsee Conference Disputed: The decision to murder the European Jews was made earlier... Jackel said that the protocol for the Conference does not contain a single word about a decision to murder Jews. Furthermore the participants at Wannsee lacked authority to do make such a decision... He pointed out that the actual purpose of the Wannsee Conference is disputed. He stated that an English colleague had remarked forty years before that the Conference was simply 'a sociable lunch, and that the list of participants proves the conference played no role whatsoever in the deportations, since there were no representatives of the Wehrmacht or the Reich Ministry for Transportation present. Jaeckel is of the opinion that a corresponding order of Hitler's to annihilate the Jews followed the meeting that took place between Hitler, Himmler, and Heydrich on September 24, 1941, i.e. three months before the Wannsee Conference. Conjectures, absurdities, forgeries, and lies - thus the foundations of the "Manifestly Obvious Holocaust" were created, and now we are supposed to swallow this swindle as "factually presumed." Just how stupid do you think that we Germans really are, Dr. Meinerzhagen? Can't you see what you are representing to the entire world, and for the history books yet to be written? Does the High Court still want to hold fast to the assertion that the Holocaust has been completely and undeniably proven? How are the "Redrobes" [High Court judges] setting themselves up to be characterized in future? Dear Dr. Meinerzhagen, "the emperor has no clothes." Or do you really see clothes where there are none? How do you propose to cover your own nakedness? You should take to heart the knowledge that there are insurmountable limit for every lawmaker: he can not decree facts. This is what distinguishes politicians from magicians and Almighty God.

Do you think this limitation does not apply to judges as well? The legislator -- not the judge -- can under certain circumstances manipulate facts. Legislative fictions can never be used to establish guilt, however, since only real guilt -- not pretended guilt -- can be punished. Or do you want this principle to no longer apply? Who are you to arrogate such power to yourself? Should German law and justice be sacrificed to the delusions of a few jurists of that government of foreign occupation, the Federal Republic of Germany?

10 February 2006

[1] zu diesem Begriff vgl. Berber, *Friedrich, Lehrbuch des Völkerrechts*, Band II Kriegsrecht, 2. Aufl., C.H. Beck Verlag München 1969, S. 132 f.

[2] Heydecker, Leeb, *Der Nürnberger Prozeß – Bilanz der Tausend Jahre*, 6. Aufl., Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln 1962, S. 94

[3] Kardinal Ratzinger "Freiheit und Wahrheit" in Jürgen Schwab, Otto Scrinzi, *Über die Revolution von 1848* Aula-Verlag, Graz 1998

[4] Ernst Nolte, *Das Vergehen der Vergangenheit*, Ullstein, Frankfurt/Main 1987 S. 594 (Rudolf *Vorlesungen* S. 136)

[5] Ernst Nolte, *Streitpunkte*, Ullstein, Frankfurt am Main / Berlin 1993 S. 308 (Vorlesungen S. 137)

[6] Ernst Nolte a.a.O. S. 9 (Rudolf *Vorlesungen* S. 137)

- [7] Ernst Nolte a.a.O. S. 304
[8] Ernst Nolte a.a.O. S. 31; (Rudolf Vorlesungen S.138)
[9] Ernst Nolte a.a.O. S. 309
[10] Ernst Nolte, François Furet, *Feindliche Nähe*, Herbig, München 1998 S. 222-224
[11] João das Regras, *Um novo Direito Internacional, Nuremberg*, 1947 zitiert bei Maurice Bardèche, "Nürnberg oder die Falschmünzer", Verlag Karl Heinz Priester, Wiesbaden 1957 S. 62
[12] "Atze" Brauner, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 6.5.1995.
[13] Ernst Nolte, *Feindliche Nähe*, S. 74-79 (Rudolf Vorlesungen S. 138 f.)
[14] Ernst Nolte, *Der kausale Nexus*, Herbig. München 2002, . 96 f. (Rudolf Vorlesungen S. 140 f.)
[15] Ernst Nolte a.a.O. S. 122 (Rudolf Vorlesungen S. 141)
[16] *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7.10.2003, S. L 37.
[17] R. Hilberg, *Die Quellen des Holocaust. Entschlüsseln und Interpretieren*, S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2002; vgl. Jürgen Graf's Rezension, "Der unheilbare Autismus des Raul Hilberg", *VffG* 7(1) (2003), S. 107-114.
[18] vgl. die offizielle *Enzyklopädie des Holocaust*, Argon Verlag, Bd. III, S. 1516ff.
[19] Nachweis bei Rudolf, *Vorlesungen* S. 126

<http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/Iran/mahler.htm>

TURNCOAT

Repentance does not work

By Israel Shamir

Ludwig Watzal, a good German activist and a friend of Palestine, once wrote a touching review of the *Galilee Flowers*. Now he recanted and <http://www.freitag.de/2006/06/06061502.php> renounced me. This act of once-brave man reminded me the true words Ernst Zundel wrote to his wife from his German concentration camp:

"Whatever else you do, do not come to Germany, not under any illusion of safe conduct! This entity, and its population, has had 60 years to free itself from its mental shackles. [The Germans] are not in this situation for lack of knowing what the facts are - they are, to one degree or another, wilfully blind out of cowardice, not out of ignorance of the facts! More truth will not make them more free - it will only make them more afraid, increasing their cowardice exponentially! Fear and cowardice have their own rules. Fearful people are in a labyrinth of terror, usually of their own making! The Americans have a very deep, meaningful saying: «The coward dies a thousand deaths - the brave man only once.»! I have often wondered about my own people, out of whose [midst] I was born. Why this fear? How can one explain the heroism of these people in war - and their abject and continued cowardice when confronting the facts of their own history?"

Indeed, the German courage was broken so completely by the bombing raids of 1944-45 that one hardly can expect them to show any spirit at all.

But cowardice does not pay. Watzal repented. Alas, the Enemy does not forgive the repentant as easily as the Church did in case of Galileo, as he could learn from the bitter fate of David Irving. He repented, and humiliated himself, and was punished anyway.

He was attacked in German

<http://www.hagalil.com/archiv/2006/02/watzal.htm#Watzal>

and <http://www.tcsdaily.com/article.aspx?id=022306F> in English ; probably will be attacked again and again.

Do not be faint of heart, friends, for it is not worth it. Once you showed your -not animosity, just lack of love to the Judeocrats, they won't forgive you ever.

Here is the beastly article attacking Watzal. I am really sorry for the man, but in a way, he brought the calamity on himself when he showed weakness of knees and repudiated his own words and me.

28 Feb. 2006.

NUMEROUS ANTI-SEMITIC STEREOTYPES

Germany's Terror Apologist

By John Rosenthal

The European militant group Campo Antiimperialista first came to the broad attention of the American public in June of last year when <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/news/articles/050623/23eurolft.htm> *US News and World Report* reported that it was collecting money for the terrorist "insurgency" in Iraq. This was not in fact news. The group's Europe-wide "10 Euro for the Iraqi Resistance" campaign had already been under way for over a year and half and had been the subject of scattered reports in the European media in winter 2003. Following the *US News* story, it was further revealed that Campo Antiimperialista and its website antiimperialista.org had -- unsurprisingly in light of their public fund-raising campaign -- been under investigation by the US Department of Homeland Security.

The German version of the multi-lingual Antiimperialista site -- seemingly launched in January 2001, when the first entry in the site archive, under the bland heading "No to Globalization!" was published -- is the most elaborate of the seven different versions. (Antiimperialista.org lists an Austrian cell phone number as its contact number.) It includes an electronic periodical called *Intifada*. A typical contribution, from *Intifada* no. 11 in January 2003, begins as follows:

The attacks on New York City and Washington on September 11, 2001 have fundamentally changed the agenda in international relations. Since then, the combating of "international terrorism" in all its varieties is the top priority in international politics. In light of the crime, however, should not the causes of terrorism be eliminated? Aspects of social justice, freedom from oppression and exploitation, as well as the right to self-determination, have not only fallen into disrepute, but are labeled as terrorism, as one can see in the Middle East and Chechnya. The fight against terrorism threatens to end up in a series of military actions unilaterally dictated by Washington. The so-called anti-terror alliance is thereby transformed into a mere fig-leaf: it becomes an instrument of the American striving for hegemony.

And so on and so forth. In itself, there is nothing particularly remarkable about the passage. In the meanwhile, both the apologia for terrorism it contains and the associated "analysis" of American motives have become numbingly familiar. The only notable details are the date -- this represents a relatively early specimen of the genre -- and the fact that the author, one Ludwig Watzal, is an important official of Germany's Federal Bureau for Political Education (BpB).

An agency of the German Ministry of the Interior, the BpB was founded in then West Germany after World War II. Its stated purpose is to "strengthen the democratic consciousness" of the citizenry through a wide variety of pedagogical activities. Among these, it publishes a thematic newsletter, *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* [Politics and Contemporary History], that appears as a supplement to the weekly publication of the German Bundestag, *Das Parlament*. Ludwig Watzal is one of the four co-editors of *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*.

Watzal's article goes on to assert that Israel since 9/11 is "behaving like a colonial power gone wild" and darkly to envision a new "expulsion" of Palestinian Arabs from the West Bank and Gaza in the event of an American-led intervention in Iraq. "A regional superpower is conducting a war against a third-world people that is fighting for self-determination and freedom," Watzal writes. "Israel has succeeded in making the international community believe that this is 'terrorism' and that the Palestinian resistance belongs among the enemies of the West."

The placement of the term *terrorism* within scare-quotes is a regular feature of Watzal's prose. "There is a right to resistance [against occupation]," Watzal writes further on, "and that is what 'Palestinian terrorism' is about" -- before adding "though not against innocent persons". It is not only the ungrammatical "tacked-on" quality of the latter phrase that reveals its function as an alibi. Since Watzal qualifies the violence of the Intifada as such as legitimate "resistance" and since the violence of the Intifada has been *principally* directed against Israeli civilians, one is left wondering just whom exactly Watzal considers innocent. Moreover, when he does not seem outright to negate Palestinian terrorism, he relativizes it by accusing Israel of likewise targeting "innocent Palestinians". Thus, for example, he writes in comparing Israel -- unfavorably! -- with South Africa under Apartheid: "The white racist regime would have never dared to use F-16s, Apache helicopters, tanks and other heavy

weaponry 'Made in USA' and 'Payed by the US' [*sic* -- *in English in the original*] against supposed terrorists and civilians."

Watzal is represented by no less than *seven* contributions on antiimperialista.org. Taken together, they provide a veritable phantasmagoria of the *idées fixes* of the contemporary anti-American, anti-Zionist -- supposedly "anti-Globalization" -- "Left". They include, for instance, a glowing review of a volume on the Bush administration by the French 9-11 conspiracy theorist Eric Laurent, who not only asserts that the US government had prior knowledge of the 9/11 attacks, but persistently insinuates a Mossad-connection to boot. "What's striking about the Bush administration," Watzal writes in one of his more delirious passages,

is that it is intellectually borne by a coalition of Christian Fundamentalists and Jewish interest groups, even though the majority of the Christian fundamentalists express anti-Semitic and anti-Jewish resentments. "These Christians support the Jews, in order to eliminate them."

The presence of Watzal's articles on antiimperialista.org has recently been the subject of controversy in German-language media, with critics questioning the appropriateness of a BpB official collaborating with an organization that openly supports terrorism. Watzal has responded by brandishing the threat of legal action against his critics and underscoring that his contributions on antiimperialista.org had also been published in other venues. Nonetheless, prior to the controversy, he had listed antiimperialista.org on his own homepage as the place of publication for five of them.

Moreover, however Watzal's articles found their way onto antiimperialista.org, the fact is that his writings -- both on anti-imperialista.org and elsewhere -- are entirely of a piece with the orientation and purposes of the "Antiimperialistas". Thus, comparing the American presence in Iraq to the Israeli presence in the West Bank and Gaza in <http://www.freitag.de/2003/36/03360102.php> an August 2003 article for the German weekly *Freitag*, Watzal writes:

In both places, the struggle against international terrorism, claimed as a moral right, ends up in a colonial policy. For the 21st Century, this is such an anachronism that it is hardly surprising that in Iraq, as in the Palestinian territories, a resistance movement is actively fighting against the continuing destruction of the basis for the existence of its peoples [*sic*]. In this connection, it is evident that in Iraq it is a matter neither of the democratization of the country, much less of the region, but rather of geo-strategic interests: apart from the control of oil resources, the domestication of Iran and Syria.

What reason would the author of such a passage have to object to the use of his articles in a journal called *Intifada* and by an organization that raises money for the Iraqi "resistance"?

The scrutiny lately devoted to Watzal's writings has also led to renewed charges of anti-Semitism against him. Such charges first arose in 2004, following a radio appearance in which Watzal, bizarrely invoking Norman Finkelstein's book *The Holocaust Industry*, seemed to accuse the Israeli-American entrepreneur Haim Saban of exploiting the memory of the Holocaust in order to gain control of the German television network ProSiebenSat.1. The title of a recent article on the Austrian website "die Jüdische" described Watzal as an "Anti-Zionist Anti-Semite". Following threats of legal sanctions against both author and publisher, the article was removed from the site.

Then, however, the Hamburg-based political scientist Matthias Küntzel threw down the gauntlet, publishing an article titled <http://www.matthiaskuentzel.de/contents/tag-watzal-darf-ich-sie-antisemit-nennen>

"Hi Watzal! May I Call You an Anti-Semite?" [link in German]. In it, Küntzel alluded to what he called "numerous anti-Semitic stereotypes" in Watzal's writings and pointed, in particular, to the similarity between Watzal's thesis of an "Israelification of US [Foreign] Policy" and the classical anti-Semitic motif, dating back to the Nazi period, of America's "Jewification". "Why this coinage?" Küntzel asked:

The noun "Israelification", like the verb "israelify" that Watzal also uses, does not stand for a particular activity or a precisely delimited content. Rather it mobilizes a diffuse, but clearly anti-Jewish, resentment.

Watzal again responded with legal threats. He demanded, among other things, that Küntzel and the websites that had carried his article cease to include the above passage -- *unless* it was supplemented by a roughly 350-word citation of Watzal's choosing and that Watzal and his attorney

evidently took to exonerate him of the charge of anti-Semitism. When Küntzel refused, Watzal's attorney replied that the matter was "not worth legal proceedings."

Indeed. On further inspection of Watzal's "Israelification" thesis, it turns out that the anti-Jewish resentment is not even always so diffuse. Consider this passage from a <http://www.watzal.com/schweizermonatshefte044.pdf> 2004 Watzal article on the subject in the *Schweizer Monatshefte* [pdf-file]:

Ideologically, the American government has taken over Israel's claustrophobic worldview, which is full of hatred and in which terrorists are everywhere... Both states cultivate the image of victimhood and of absolute vulnerability: Israel by way of the Holocaust, the USA by way of September 11. There is only good and evil. Both peoples consider themselves to be "chosen by God".

Leaving aside the reference to Israel cultivating an image of victimhood "by way of the Holocaust" ^ a formula that, minimally, coquets with Holocaust negationism – who exactly are the "chosen people" to whom Watzal makes allusion? Would that not be... *the Jews*?

In the meanwhile, Watzal seems to have adopted a radically different tactic to deflect the charge of anti-Semitism: namely, to demonstrate his innocence **by denouncing others** on the same charge. Thus, just last week, he published <http://www.freitag.de/2006/06/06061502.php> a column in *Freitag* "outing" the writer on Middle East politics who goes by the name of "Israel Shamir" as an anti-Semitic conspiracy theorist. The problem is that Watzal got there a bit late. Despite his, apparently assumed, name, hardly anyone who has sampled Shamir's feverish prose -- complete with its dark ruminations on "ZOG": the "Zionist Occupation Government" that is supposed to control American politics -- could have doubted that he is an anti-Semite. See, for example, <http://www.trans-int.com/blog/archives/146-israel-shamir-and-the-austrian-left.html> Karl Pfeifer's discussion from last May of Shamir's recent volume *Flowers of Galilee*. But in June, Watzal also published <http://www.freitag.de/2005/22/05221501.php> a review of *Flowers of Galilee* and, at the time, he wrote glowingly of Shamir's "moral-ethical" [*sic*] motives and his "candid" and "biting" depiction of Israeli politics. "At first glance" -- as Watzal sheepishly puts it in his latest contribution -- Shamir's anti-Semitism seems somehow to have escaped his notice.

23 Feb. 2006. *John Rosenthal's writings on international politics have appeared in Policy Review, the Opinion Journal, Les Temps Modernes and Merkur. He is the editor of the Transatlantic Intelligencer* <http://www.trans-int.com>

<http://www.tcsdaily.com/Authors.aspx?id=968>BIO>

NOT A DENIER BUT A REVISIONIST

Revisionists only deny one aspect of Holocaust story: Butz

TEHRAN, Feb. 1 (MNA) -- In the wake of the international uproar that arose in response to Iranian President Mahmud Ahmadinejad's contention that the Holocaust is a myth, the Mehr News Agency spoke with Arthur R. Butz, an associate professor of electrical engineering and computer science at Northwestern University, about his views on the issue.

Following is the text of an interview of Butz conducted on December 26:

In 1976 I published a book entitled [The Hoax of the Twentieth Century](#), in which I argued:

1. The alleged slaughter of millions of Jews by the Germans, during World War II, did not happen.
2. The extermination allegation is properly termed a hoax, that is to say, a deliberately contrived falsehood. It was not at its source an honest misunderstanding or accidental falsehood.
3. The hoax had a Zionist provenance and motivation. That is, while some of the original obscure stories did not come from Zionist sources, the elevation to allegations repeated by the American and other governments, and major institutions, was due to Zionist circles within those countries, who acted with Zionist motivations.

I continue to maintain those three theses, which have become core features of what is called

"Holocaust" revisionism. Apart from some nuances of wording, the three theses were repeated by President Ahmadinejad. Therefore, there can be no question that I endorse his remarks in those respects.

In the years since the publication of my book in 1976 there were two developments that I did not expect:

4. Western countries undertook a massive repression of revisionism. In some cases, particularly in Europe, legally formulated persecution has sent revisionists to prison, in blatant contradiction of the sermons we have given the rest of the world on "human rights" and "freedom". In other cases, revisionists have been ruined professionally with the cooperation of government bodies.

5. The cognizance of the "Holocaust" in the West was transformed into a loud, never-ending series of ceremonies that can only be interpreted as religious in nature.

President Ahmadinejad's remarks also included the last two observations, so of course I also endorse the remarks in those respects. I congratulate him on becoming the first head of state to speak out clearly on these issues, and regret only that it was not a Western head of state.

His political remarks receive no comment on my side. By "political remarks" I mean those that deal with questions of what ought to happen now.

Explanation:

Butz says he is not a Holocaust denier but a Holocaust revisionist. However, he says: I have no objection to being called a "Holocaust denier" provided the meanings of terms are clear. The following has been on my website (<http://pubweb.northwestern.edu/~abutz/abhdhr.html>) since 1997:

Arthur Butz. Holocaust Denial or Holocaust Revisionism?

A minor question that sometimes arises is the relative merits of the terms "Holocaust denial" and "Holocaust revisionism" to describe the views on the Jewish "extermination" claim that I and others have expressed. Generally, my side says "Holocaust revisionism" and our enemies say "Holocaust denial". I did not originate either term.

I am willing to accept both terms under appropriate circumstances, but I usually say "Holocaust revisionism".

The problem with the term "Holocaust denial" is that it conveys, to most people, a false idea of what we say. For the typical person the term "Holocaust" refers to a complex of events. He thinks of Nazi persecution of Jews, concentration camps, crematoria, dead bodies strewn about camps (especially Belsen) at the end of the war and, of course, "extermination" of millions of Jews in gas chambers located in some camps. Thus he tends to take the meaning of "Holocaust denial" as denial of all of these things, whereas we deny only the last among them. The effect is to make us seem, to passing observers, detached from reality.

In general I prefer the term "Holocaust revisionism" because it does not imply a complete rejection of all that is popularly understood by "Holocaust", and invites the observer to consider carefully what is being accepted and what is being rejected.

On the other hand I, and Holocaust revisionists generally, emphatically reject the "extermination" claim and, by implication, any figure of Jewish dead (due to Nazi policies) in the millions. Provided this is what is clearly meant by "Holocaust", I have no objection to calling my thesis "denial". Such a context of comprehension is sometimes difficult to achieve. An exception is when our enemies speak of us. They understand quite well what we do and do not claim, and they also understand that most in their audiences do not. Thus they use "denial" as a rhetorical device conveying an implicit false representation.

*Dr. Arthur R. Butz was born and raised in New York City. He received his bachelor of science and master of science degrees in electrical engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1965 he received his doctorate in control sciences from the University of Minnesota. In 1966 he joined the faculty of Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois). Dr. Butz is the author of numerous technical papers and the book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century: The case against the presumed extermination of European Jewry*. The book is available from the Institute for Historical Review. Since 1980 he has been a member of the Editorial Advisory Committee of *The Journal of Historical Review*, published by the Institute for Historical Review.*

<http://www.mehrnews.ir/en/NewsDetail.aspx?NewsID=285640>

THE BLUFF OF GENOCIDE

ZIONIST INCITEMENTS TO GENOCIDE:

"There is a huge gap between us (Jews) and our enemies not just in ability but in morality, culture, sanctity of life, and conscience. They are our neighbors here, but it seems as if at a distance of a few hundred meters away, there are people who do not belong to our continent, to our world, but actually belong to a different galaxy." -- Israeli president **Moshe Katsav**. *The Jerusalem Post*, May 10, 2001

"The Palestinians are like crocodiles, the more you give them meat, they want more". -- **Ehud Barak**, Prime Minister of Israel at the time - August 28, 2000. Reported in *The Jerusalem Post* August 30, 2000

The Palestinians are] beasts walking on two legs." --**Menahim Begin**, speech to the Knesset, quoted in **Amnon Kapeliouk**, "Begin and the Beasts". *New Statesman*, 25 June 1982.

"The Palestinians' would be crushed like grasshoppers ... heads smashed against the boulders and walls." --Israeli Prime Minister (at the time) in a speech to Jewish settlers *New York Times* April 1, 1988

"When we have settled the land, all the Arabs will be able to do about it will be to scurry around like drugged cockroaches in a bottle." --**Raphael Eitan**, Chief of Staff of the Israeli Defence Forces, *New York Times*, 14 April 1983.

"How can we return the occupied territories? There is nobody to return them to." -- **Golda Meir**, March 8, 1969.

"There was no such thing as Palestinians, they never existed." --**Golda Meir**, Israeli Prime Minister, June 15, 1969

"The thesis that the danger of genocide was hanging over us in June 1967 and that Israel was fighting for its physical existence is only bluff, which was born and developed after the war." --Israeli General **Matityahu Peled**, *Ha'aretz*, 19 March 1972.

"If I were an Arab leader, I would never sign an agreement with Israel. It is normal; we have taken their country. It is true God promised it to us, but how could that interest them? Our God is not theirs. There has been Anti - Semitism, the Nazis, Hitler, Auschwitz, but was that their fault? They see but one thing: we have come and we have stolen their country. Why would they accept that?" -- **David Ben Gurion** (the first Israeli Prime Minister), quoted by **Nahum Goldmann** in *Le Paradoxe Juif* (The Jewish Paradox), pp121.

"We must do everything to insure they (the Palestinians) never do return" . . . "The old will die and the young will forget." --**Ben Gurion** in 1948 assuring his fellow Zionists that Palestinians will never come back to their homes. :

"We have to kill all the Palestinians unless they are resigned to live here as slaves." --**Chairman Heilbrun** of the Committee for the Re-election of General **Shlomo Lahat**, Mayor of Tel Aviv, October 1983.

"Every time we do something you tell me America will do this and will do that . . . I want to tell you something very clear: Don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We, the Jewish people, control America, and the Americans know it." --Israeli Prime Minister **Ariel Sharon**, October 3, 2001.

http://www.jrbooksonline.com/Martin_Webster_01.htm

MEMORIES OF A DUMMY

Bremer says he urged more postwar troops in Iraq

WASHINGTON, Jan 8 (Reuters) - L. Paul Bremer, who led the U.S. civilian occupation authority in Iraq after the 2003 invasion, urged U.S. President George W. Bush and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to increase U.S. postwar troop strength in the country, but his pleas were ignored, the former diplomat said.

In an interview on NBC Television broadcast Sunday night, Bremer said he sent a memo to Rumsfeld suggesting that half a million soldiers would be needed, three times the number deployed by the Bush administration.

"I never had any reaction from him," Bremer told NBC's Brian Williams on "Dateline."

Although he never heard back from his direct boss, Bremer said he did discuss his concerns with Bush.

Quoting Bremer, the network said Bush replied that he would try to get more troops from other countries "but made no mention of increasing the number of American forces."

Bremer thought the Pentagon painted a false picture of the capability of the Iraqi force, who would take over when the Americans departed.

"I raised my concerns about the numbers and quality of these (Iraqi) forces -- really right from the beginning," he said.

Asked why he did not go public with his concerns, Bremer defended what he considered his obligation to "tell the president what you think ... in private, through the appropriate channels, as I tried to do."

Many critics fault the administration for not posting sufficient American troops in Iraq, including in Baghdad, to contain postwar violence and ensure that essential services such as power and water were quickly restored.

Bush's public opinion ratings have declined considerably as the insurgency in Iraq has claimed more American and Iraqi lives. The comments by Bremer, who during his tenure as Iraq's ruling administrator defended U.S. policy, could fan a new wave of criticism.

Bremer, on a media blitz in connection with release of his book on Iraq, acknowledged that in November 2003 he told Vice President Dick Cheney he was worried that there was no military strategy for Iraq and that the policy was driven more by the Pentagon's plan to bring troops home by the spring of 2004.

The book, "My Year in Iraq: The Struggle to Build a Future of Hope," is due to be released on Monday.

"The vice president said to me, 'Well, I have similar concerns,'" Bremer said in the interview.

"He thought there was something to be said for the argument that we didn't have a strategy for victory at that time," the diplomat added.

Publicly, Cheney, a major cheerleader of the administration and its war efforts, has not hinted at such misgivings.

There was no immediate comment from Cheney, Rumsfeld or the White House on the latest Bremer revelations.

Bremer recounted the decision to disband the Iraqi army quickly after arriving in Baghdad, a move many experts consider a major miscalculation.

He said it was not fair to fault him for the decision because "it wasn't me" who made it and because the Iraqi army had largely disintegrated on its own in the face of the U.S. invasion.

"The decision was discussed by my advisors with the seniors civilians in the Pentagon for weeks before I made my recommendation, which was approved in Washington," he said.

Despite his criticisms, Bremer said he still supported the war in Iraq. "We've got young Americans dying over there still today. That is a painful price of war. That doesn't make it wrong. It just makes it difficult," he said."

Reuters Foundation 9 Jan. 2006

<http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/N06261100.htm>

POLITICAL USES OF THE MYTH

A Lecture on the Hollowcause in Amman

On the evening of Saturday, March 4, 2006, a lecture on the myths of the Hollowcause and their political uses was delivered in the Association against Zionism and Racism in Amman, Jordan by the Arab revisionist Ibrahim Alloush.

The announcement for the lecture carried the title: Is the Hollowcause Scientifically

Feasible? And Why Does it Concern us Politically as Arabs?

The main topics tackled in the lecture included:

- 1) the three components of the Hollowcause myth,
- 2) the political uses of the myth, and why one can't reject those uses while accepting the myth,
- 3) Arab attitudes towards the Hollowcause and why one can't accept the myth without diminishing the cause of Palestine,
- 4) a summary of the works of revisionist historians debunking the myth scientifically, especially the alleged 'gas chamber', and how that chamber is the centerpiece of the myth, not the exaggerated numbers as some think,
- 5) the persecution of revisionist historians and the Hollowcause as one of the most important files of the Arab-Zionist conflict, and why we should step all over the myth without flinching.

In the question and answer period that followed, the audience which filled the hall to the hilt interacted quite positively with the propositions being advanced. Several demanded that the conclusions of the lecture be propagated as widely as possible. There was definitely mass interest and sympathy there with the revisionist cause and with revisionist historians.

The morale of the story is: taking this position doesn't isolate us but brings us closer to the pulse of the street. For the ones who are isolated are the ones who find themselves more and more often sitting with imperialists and Zionists criticizing the 'barbarism' of the people!

8 March 2006

<http://www.freearabvoice.org/newsbytes/MakhrakaLecture.htm>

WRITTEN IN 1988

THE AMAZING, RAPIDLY SHRINKING "HOLOCAUST"

by David McCalden

Is the Holocaust Industry singing its swan-song? The spring of 1988 will see a flurry of international conferences, where participants will desperately be seeking ways to halt the onslaught of Holocaust Revisionism -- the school of thought which regards the "Holocaust" as a gross and vulgar exaggeration.

In April 1988 -- coinciding with Hitler's birthday -- a conference at Hofstra University on Long Island, NY will *discuss possible ways to introduce "race relations" laws into the United States*. **The focus of the meeting will be to figure out ways to circumvent (or overturn?) the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees free speech.**

Then in July 1988, focusing on the 50th anniversary of *Kristallnacht*, Oxford University in England will host a major conference dealing with the "impact of the Holocaust." The conference is sponsored by the wealthy British-Jewish publisher, **Robert Maxwell**.

Hollywood is also getting in on the act. ABC-TV plans to delight us with the eagerly awaited sequel to *Winds of War*, entitled *War & Remembrance*. Although the sequel is already in the can, after the most expensive location-shooting in television history, its broadcast has been mysteriously postponed until next season -- perhaps to make a few corrections, in response to Revisionist criticism?

Likewise, NBC-TV will be bringing us *The Mel Mermelstein Story* -- an all-Jewish production starring **Leonard Nimoy** in the title role, about a professional "survivor" who launched a personal crusade against Revisionism in California.

In January, Canadian publisher **Ernst Zündel** [206 Carlton Street, Toronto, ONT M5A 2L1, Canada; Phone: 416-922-9850] was back to court for his retrial for the "crime" of "publishing false news" in that he re-published a British Revisionist pamphlet entitled *Did Six Million Really Die?* Although Zündel was originally convicted on this charge, both the Ontario Appeals Court and the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that there were so many defects in the original trial that he must have a new trial, or have the charges dropped. Throughout the original litigation, it was obvious that the prosecution was retreating further and further in its Holocaust claims. The Crown's barrister tried to

steer his "survivor" witnesses away from making their most outlandish claims; at the appeal, the Crown preferred to rely on "experts" rather than "eye-witnesses," and in recent months, the original complainant, **Mrs. Sabina Citron**, has been thoroughly rejected, discredited, rebuked -- and even fined -- by the Canadian authorities.

In the United States, a traveling exhibit from the Auschwitz Museum in Poland has been subject to intense criticism within and without the Jewish community. Before the display was unveiled (at the United Nations building in New York) Jewish groups insisted that the (Communist-Polish) exhibitors should include more emphasis on specifically *Jewish* suffering, before the exhibit could go ahead. Even with the Jewish emendations, the traveling exhibit has received a remarkably lukewarm reception from Jewish groups around the country. In fact, after its appearance at the Los Angeles City Hall rotunda, councillors voted unanimously that private groups should no longer be allowed to exhibit there.

In the scholarly publishing world, historians are furiously attacking one another for exhibiting symptoms of "proto-Revisionism" (known in the trade as "Functionalism") while at the same time they try to disassociate themselves from the more absurd claims of Exterminationism. (For a particularly amusing example of this cat-fight, please refer to the *Journal of American History* issues dated December 1986 and September 1987.)

All across the board the Holocaust theologians -- the Exterminationists -- are in full flight, before the irrefutable onslaught of Revisionist logic. They are continuing to revise and retract their own more outrageous claims, and replace their original *scientific claims* with *symbolic, theological beliefs*. Their original scientific claims were tested, and found lacking. Theological, religious belief is not based on empirical evidence, but on blind faith, and thus cannot be subjected to scientific examination.

"The eye-witness"

Some "eye-witnesses" are complete charlatans. The French "survivor" of Treblinka, **Martin Gray**, has been widely condemned as a fake, especially by the leading Exterminationist **Gitta Sereny** (*New Statesman*, 2 November 1979, p.672) who says that Gray asked her to fabricate a powerful chapter of his "memoire" *For Those I Loved*. After she refused, he instead engaged the ghostwriting services of one **Max Gallo**, who went on to become a minister in the French government.

Ms. Sereny also has some scathing comments on **Jean François Steiner's** similar book, *Treblinka*, as does former OSI head **Allan A. Ryan Jr.** (*Quiet Neighbors*, Harcourt, 1984, p.367). Both condemn the book as a hodge-podge of fiction and hearsay.

Anyone who has attempted to correspond with the German-Jewish "survivor" **Filip Müller** would acknowledge that his literary skills do not quite match up to his supposed memoir: *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers* (Stein & Day, 1979). In fact, this salacious work was the product of a German ghostwriter, **Helmut Freitag**, who was so lazy that he plagiarized entire sections from an earlier pot-boiler, *Doctor at Auschwitz* (Crest, 1961), allegedly written by one **Dr. Miklos Nyiszli** -- who may or may not have really existed.

Page 161 of Müller's book has a young rabbi preaching a stirring sermon in the "gas chamber." Page 144 of Nyiszli reports a young rabbi giving a stirring sermon in the "gas chamber" -- again reported verbatim. A similar story of naked, female gasees singing patriotic songs has also gone the rounds. Müller has them singing the "Hatikvah" on page 111; another "survivor," **Rudolf Vrba**, has them singing first the Czech national anthem, and then the Hatikvah (*Escape From Auschwitz: I Cannot Forgive*, Grove, 1986 [originally published 1964] p.248); the story pops up at various other, more obscure places, such as the *Hefte von Auschwitz* [Auschwitz Notebooks] (Auschwitz Museum, 1972, Vol.1, p.121), where this time they sing -- simultaneously -- the Polish and Hebrew national anthems.

When Vrba was presented as a prosecution eye-witness at the Great Holocaust Trial of Ernst Zündel, Vrba was forced to admit -- under withering cross-examination -- that his book was not in fact a scholarly history, but was "an artistic depiction" ...and that he had "used poetic license to re-create the situation." Despite Vrba's propensity for "poetic license" his description of Auschwitz became a cornerstone of wartime Allied propaganda: the War Refugee Board's *German Extermination Camps: Auschwitz & Birkenau*, published in November 1944. Strangely, the WRB attributed their "facts" to several Jewish escapees from Auschwitz, whom they declined to name. It was only at the Eichmann trial in 1961 that it was claimed that Vrba was one of the escapee sources for the report; since that time, Vrba has popped up as a witness at various trials, but has by and large kept his head down.

Likewise with professional survivor **Mel Mermelstein**. His book *By Bread Alone* (self-published, Los Angeles, 1979) admits right away that many of the names therein "had to be changed to protect their privacy." That's not all he has changed. The cover of the book shows the inmates of Buchenwald being liberated on 16 April 1945. However, another reproduction of this same photo on

page 208 indicates that Mermelstein has painted out one figure, for reasons unknown. Similarly, on pages 120-121 the author shows a picture of the alleged "gas chamber" at Auschwitz-1, and his caption claims that it is "Auschwitz-Birkenau" -- 5km away! He also asks the reader to "note the pipes and shower heads above" -- a task which is difficult since the ceiling does not have any "pipes and shower heads" either in the photo or in real life! In his suit against me, and in his book (p.114), Mermelstein claims that he saw his mother and sisters heading down a tunnel into "gas chamber #5" at Birkenau. However, the [ruined] "gas chamber #5" at Birkenau does not have, and never had, a basement; it was entirely above-ground. This is even confirmed by the CIA report *The Holocaust Revisited* (CIA, February 1979; ST-79-10001, p.12). Although he agrees that he didn't actually witness "gassings" (he was told of his family's fate later), Mermelstein insists that he was an eye-witness to genocide by immolation. On page 115 of his book he describes "three huge pits ...[with] humans in the fire, writhing and moaning ...[and] around the naming pits naked men were running in an endless circle [being beaten by] SS guards with leather whips." At several points in his book, Mermelstein remarks that he was unable to distinguish between reality and nightmares. No doubt this explains why he has been seeing a psychiatrist for many years, often on a weekly basis. He admits that he has made two dozen trips to Auschwitz -- the site of Jewish "destruction" and only one or two to Israel -- the site of Jewish "salvation."

Mermelstein's account of Jewish immolation may be lifted from the book of Jewish fairy tales known as *The Holy Bible*, where in *Jeremiah* 7:31 we read that the Jewish exiles in Babylon eagerly worshipped the Babylonians' fire god, Moloch, by sacrificing their babies in a "gas oven." Likewise, the tale of Shadrak, Meshak, and Abednego walking around inside a "gas oven" with the Messiah himself, shows us that Holocaust lore has been around for longer than one would think.

Furthermore, Mermelstein may have been influenced by the Holocaust guru **Eli Wiesel**, who was allegedly shipped from Auschwitz to Buchenwald with him. (Although Mermelstein is prone to emphasize his bunkhouse comradeship with Wiesel, for reasons best known to himself he denies that "Elijah ...from Sighet [p.195] is actually Eli Wiesel from Sighet, a town in Romania.)

Wiesel, too, has a "thing" about immolation. Throughout his autobiographical literature there is no mention whatsoever of "gas chambers." Instead, Wiesel speaks of fiery pits (*Night*, Avon, 1969, p.44; also *Report to the President*, President's Commission on the Holocaust, 1980) and of "geysers of blood" squirting out of the ground for "months" after the alleged Babi Yar massacre (*The Jews of Silence*, New American Library, 1966, p.48).

Significantly, Eli Wiesel recently resigned as Chairman of the President's Council on the Holocaust, allegedly because it was becoming a boondoggle for Jewish property developers. However, informed sources indicate that his resignation had more to do with his fear of the Revisionists, than his lack of confidence in his kinfolk. Naturally, Wiesel's departure received very little play in the secular press.

Other Auschwitz alumni pop up from time to time. **Jack Glocer**, now of Normal, [sic] Illinois, claims in lectures that the Auschwitz Nazis burned and buried Jewish babies alive (University of Tulsa *Collegian*, 11 February 1982). This one sounds awfully like various biblical atrocity yarns, such as the one where God ordered 70 Jewish babies to be decapitated, and their heads loaded into baskets at every city gate (*II Kings* 9:8 and 10:1-11); and the thousands of first-born [Gentile] babies slain by God in Egypt because their parents were not smart enough to paint their doorposts with blood (*Exodus* 12:29).

Kitty Felix-Hart, now of Birmingham, England, has not only written a book, *Return to Auschwitz* (Athenaeum, 1983), she was also featured in a 1979 Yorkshire Television production "Kitty - Return to Auschwitz" which is still available on videotape. Her book deals with "gassing" in just one paragraph on page 112. Her film deals with the scenario more extensively. In the movie version she claims that she was sunbathing opposite Auschwitz-Birkenau crematorium #4 when she witnessed an SS man climbing up a ladder and tipping in Zyklon-B, and human ashes coming out **10 minutes** later. Since modern cremation techniques take at least two hours, we are quite sure that mortuaries around the world will be clamoring for this amazing, miraculous formula.

The recently-deceased **Fania Fenelon** (who, like Kitty Hart, was only half-Jewish) had her memoirs of Auschwitz openly ghostwritten by one **Marcelle Routier** (*Playing for Time* [Berkeley/Athenaeum, 1979]). Although she dedicates the book to "the survivors of [Auschwitz-] Birkenau extermination camp," the reader is hardpressed to find any first-hand references to "gas chambers" within the text. On page 134 she tells of sooty air; likewise on p.145, and p.181. We never get a first-hand account of "gassings" -- all we read are hearsay stories and allegations, such as on p.172, p.173, p.175, p.186, p.197, and p.203. Ms. Fenelon even lurches into the absurd, when she accuses Auschwitz-Birkenau commandant Josef Kramer of having made his wife a handbag out of "tattooed, human skin" (p.197) -- an allegation which has long since been abandoned by scholarly exterminationists.

However, the "handbag of human skin" is not the most ludicrous of Ms. Fenelon's allegations. On p.173 of her narrative she claims that she had "heard" that the Nazis segregated the women prisoners according to breast-droop. The officer would lift the women's breasts with the tip of his whip (naturally); "those whose breasts sagged went to the left, those whose breasts remained firm went to the right." This sounds on a par with the aforementioned Filip Müller's *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, where SS doctors would slice off bits of the [dead] gasees' flesh, which promptly jumped around in buckets (p.47); a striptease in the "gas chamber" (p.87); chief gasser Moll, and his dog, getting sexually excited by a gassing (p.141); and babies being flung into pits of sizzling human fat (p.142).

On a similar level is **Jack Eisner's** *The Survivor* (Bantam, 1982), written with the "editorial assistance" of one **Irving A. Leitner**. While still a teenager, the remarkable Eisner managed to smuggle food and arms into the Warsaw Ghetto, to take part in the ghetto uprising, to escape from several death camps, to escape execution by seconds -- and even after all this trauma he is still able to recount specific conversations verbatim, and specific sexual encounters blow-by-blow. It is understandable that such a miraculous adventure -- recorded by such an accurate mind -- should now become a book, a stage play, and a film.

Sometimes Gentiles get a look in. The Ukrainian survivor of Auschwitz, **Petro Mirchuk** has given us his memoirs, *In the German Mill of Death 1941-1945* (Vantage Press, 1976), where on page 127 he tells the story of a young "Greek-Jewish dancer" who stabbed an SS guard to death, before being herself machine-gunned. In *The Naked Puppets* by "**Christian Bernadac**" (Forni Publishing, Geneva, 1978) the valiant, naked partisan has become a "classical American dancer" (p.227). Whether or not she was the same gasee who distracted her gassers with a striptease in order to attack them with her stiletto-heel (Müller, p.87), or the beautiful, naked Polish gasee who gave a fiery speech in the gas-chambers (*Hefte von Auschwitz*, Vol. 1, p.121) is not known.

Robert Clary, who acts in the television series "Hogan's Heroes," often shows off his Auschwitz tattoo to impressionable high-school audiences, when he represents the Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies. According to the **Serge & Beate Klarsfeld** directory, *Memorial to the Jews deported from France 1942-1944* (Klarsfeld Foundation, New York, 1983), it appears from pages 312-318 that Clary (né: **Widermann**) was "gassed" at Auschwitz. Likewise, with **Mrs. Simone Veil** (né: **Jacob**) who appears among the "authoritative" list of "gasees on page 538. Both Clary/Widermann and Veil/Jacob are extremely active in anti-Revisionist campaigns; for understandable reasons!

Some survivor books have been taken off the shelves rather fast. *The Auschwitz Album* (Random House, 1981) never made it to a second edition -- hardback or paperback -- despite having received a considerable number of favorable reviews. This collection of Auschwitz pictures was "liberated" by one **Lili Jacob Meier**, who -- like Mermelstein, Wiesel, & Co. -- was deported to Auschwitz from the heavily-Jewish Carpathian Mountains in the early summer of 1944. In fact, her book lends more credence to Revisionist theory, not Exterminationism (even though we are condemned editorially on p.xxviii). Photos of the Hungarian Jews arriving at Auschwitz-Birkenau show the crematoria (#2 & #3) quite clearly in the background (p.15, p.59, and especially p.107) and none of them are "belching forth flames and smoke" as the text (p.14) quite bizarrely insists to the contrary. Predictably, the *Auschwitz Album* was brought into publication by the Klarsfeld duo; for some odd reason, their French edition contains some very rare -- and fascinating -- pictures of the Auschwitz-Birkenau crematoria #4 & #5, which do not appear in the U.S. edition.

A similar conundrum surrounds the CIA's 1979 pamphlet *The Holocaust Revisited*. Attempts to ask the two compilers, **Brugioni** and **Poirier**, why there is no "smoke and flame" in their 1944 aerial photographs are met with a wall of silence. This "dog and pony act" (as they are referred to by the Jewish head of the National Archives section, **Robert Wolfe**) performed their "research" in private time, and thus cannot expend CIA time to answer correspondence or phone calls on the matter. No explanation is provided as to how the CIA ever published a "private" pamphlet under its own, government, imprimatur.

Trial Testimony

"War crimes" trials have continued since the end of World War Two, and show no sign of abating. Since the great International Military Tribunal (IMT) and the subsequent twelve (American) Nuremberg Military Tribunals (NMT) standards of jurisprudence have not changed either.

At Nuremberg, the vanquished were judged by the victors; there were no neutral judges; and no Allied war-crimes were judged.

Articles ¶19 and ¶121 suspended normal rules of evidence, and permitted hearsay, affidavits from the dead, and judicial notice of "facts of common knowledge" (i.e. the "Holocaust").

Many witnesses and defendants were tortured or blackmailed into giving perjured testimony.

The most famous of these was **Rudolf Höss**, the one-time Commandant of Auschwitz. At the main Nuremberg trial (IMT) he grunted his agreement to his "confession" which was read aloud to him. But, as he later acknowledged, he had signed this statement [in English!] only after being tortured by British interrogators (see: *Commandant of Auschwitz*, Popular Library, 1961, p.164.). This affidavit claims that "2.5 million" were gassed, plus another "0.5m otherwise executed" at Auschwitz. Although the Polish authorities have generously "rounded-off" Höss's figure to **4m** (Auschwitz-Birkenau monument), modern Exterminationists such as **Dr. Raul Hilberg** put the Auschwitz death-toll at "slightly over one million" (Zündel trial testimony).

In his confessional statement, Höss claimed that the other Nazi death-camps in Poland were "Belzec, Treblinka and Wolzek" (Höss affidavit, 5 April 1946, PS-3868). Yet, Wolzek does not appear on any Polish or German map or gazetteer. (Some language authorities claim that "Wolzek" is the way Poles pronounce "Belzec"; yet Höss already listed that camp.)

Franz Ziereis, the Commandant of Mauthausen, was interrogated on his death-bed, after having been critically wounded "trying to escape." This all-night grilling resulted in his confession that there was a "gas chamber" at Mauthausen (PS-3870, 8 April 1946), yet modern Exterminationists such as **Yehuda Bauer** tell us (*History of the Holocaust*, 1982, p.209) that "no gassing took place at Mauthausen."

Even some of the prominent IMT defendants were tortured. Nazi Labor Minister **Fritz Sauckel** twice asked the court (13 December 1945 and 30 May 1946) to disregard his written confession (PS-3057) since he had only signed it after being threatened with his wife and ten children being turned over to the Soviets.

Nazi propagandist **Julius Streicher** was also tortured before his appearance at Nuremberg. An account appears in **William P. Varga's** biography *The Number One Jew-Baiter* (1981) and also in **Werner Maser's** *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial* (Scribners, 1979). Maser refers to a handwritten account Streicher made of the torture, which was subsequently reproduced in *The Journal of Historical Review* (Spring 1984, p.111). When Streicher's attorney tried to raise the matter at the IMT, the tribunal refused to discuss it, and ordered that the attorney's remarks should be stricken from the record.

The "Nazi confessor" **Kurt Gerstein** was never exhibited in person at the Nuremberg trials because he had conveniently disappeared and was presumed dead. However, thanks to the IMT's [non-]rules of evidence, his "affidavit" was introduced as PS-1553 on 30 January 1946. Even though this "confession" describes impossible visits by Hitler to Lublin, even though he claims that 750 people could be squashed into 25 square meters, and even though he claims to have seen mountains of underwear 40m high -- still his craziness is cited by Holocaust academics. When **Professor Raul Hilberg** was asked on the Toronto witness-stand why he had cited Gerstein as a source at least ten times, he responded that Gerstein was certainly a "mad man" but Hilberg could differentiate between his "mad" and his "sane" fulminations; after all, Hilberg was an Expert®.

Hilberg's 1985 performance did not impress even his own constituency. **Prof. Stanley Barrett** described Hilberg's testimony as "not too effective." (*Is God A Racist?* U. of Toronto Press, 1987, p 162.) He was also ridiculed and berated for his ineptness, when he appeared at a Detroit synagogue a few months later. So it was hardly surprising that Hilberg declined to appear at the second Zündel trial in 1988, bleating that he did not wish the defense attorney (Douglas Christie) to focus on "seeming contradictions" in his various statements. Instead, Hilberg conscripted the *shabbas goy* **Prof. Christopher Browning** of Tacoma, to take the heat for him at the second go-around in Toronto. Four other Holocaust «Experts» never showed up.

The testimony of "survivors" is notoriously unreliable. According to the Director of Archives at Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, **Shmuel Krakowski**, "more than half of the 20,000 testimonials from Holocaust survivors on record at Yad Vashem are 'unreliable' and have never been used as evidence in Nazi war crimes trials" (*Jerusalem Post* article reported in *Wilmington (DE) Evening Journal*, 27 August 1986, p.A10).

According to Exterminationist expert **Gerald Reitlinger**, "a certain degree of reserve is necessary in handling [survivor narratives] ...The witnesses ...are [Eastern Jews] who use numerals as oratorical adjectives and whose very names are creations of fantasy" (*The Final Solution*, Sphere, 1971 p.581).

American writer **Hannah Arendt** covered the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem for the *New York Times* and she later wrote that "If Eichmann's name was mentioned at all, it obviously was hearsay ...the testimony of all witnesses who had 'seen him with their own eyes' collapsed the moment a question was addressed to them" (*Eichmann in Jerusalem; the Banality of Evil*, Penguin, 1978, p.208).

In U.S. deportation/extradition cases, one often finds a traveling-circus of professional Survivors, touring around the country from one trial to the next, often with their spouses joining them

"for medical reasons." In 1978, Florida judge **Norman Roettger** threw out altogether the wild allegations of one such Treblinka troupe, and called their testimony "coached" and "least credible." One "witness" even picked out a spectator in the audience as the defendant! (Although the judge threw out the case, an appeals court overruled him on a technicality; the defendant, **Federenko**, was shipped out to the Soviet Union, where he was put on a show-trial at a union hall, and shot.)

In the 1970s, Chicago factory worker **Frank Walus** was "identified" by a *dozen* "eye-witnesses" as being a Nazi war criminal. "Chicago Seven" Judge **Julius Hoffman** willingly swallowed the accusations, and was so biased in the case that he was condemned by the entire Chicago judicial community. Eventually, documentary evidence was discovered which cleared Walus; however the twelve "eyewitnesses" were never prosecuted for perjury.

Despite having discredited themselves at the Fedorenko trial in Florida, the team of Fabulous Treblinka Testifiers was exhibited again at the **John Demjanjuk** trials in Cleveland (1981) and Jerusalem (1987). Much of their testimony appears to have been lifted from that of the late **Jankiel Wiernik** who claimed that at Treblinka "500 persons were crowded into a 25 square meter gas chamber" and that the Germans would "tear a child in half, by hand" and that "the bodies of women were used as kindling." (This was not the first time Wiernik's 1944 yarn was re-cycled; at war's end, many of his whacky claims found their way into "Kurt Gerstein's" confessions: the outlandish gas-chamber capacities, the Star of David on the gas-chamber roof, and the impossible visits of Himmler and/or Hitler, for example.)

We should probably be grateful that the Treblinka Testifiers have dropped the original claims for that camp of "steam chambers" (complete with "terra-cotta floors") and "electric current" which were included in Nuremberg document PS-3311, submitted on 19 February 1946 by the American prosecutor on behalf of the Polish government. (Other survivors have claimed "vacuum chambers" at Treblinka: **Vassili Grossman**, *The Black Book* New York, 1946.)

Many of the more ludicrous Nuremberg affidavits have been republished in annotated form as *Made in Russia: The Holocaust* (Liberty Bell Publications). Among the bizarre reports reproduced therein are: a *pedal-driven brain-bashing machine* (USSR-52, p.16), human soap (USSR-197, p.597), and a gas-chamber at Dachau (2430-PS, p.332).

Nowadays, all of these devices and techniques have disappeared into a kind of Holocaust Black Hole. Since the early 1960s, no serious Holocaust «Expert» has claimed that there were gassings at Dachau (although there are occasional lapses by the less-sophisticated: e.g., **Robert Abzug's** *Inside the Vicious Heart*, Oxford University Press 1985, p.133) The "human soap" has been discounted long ago (**Deborah Lipstadt**, *Los Angeles Times*, 16 May 1981). And the "steam chambers," "vacuum chambers," and "electrocution chambers" at Treblinka have all now been quietly forgotten, in favor of "fumes from a Soviet tank engine."

We can even detect some moderation in the official claims made about the centerpiece of Holocaust legendry: Auschwitz. Since Auschwitz, Auschwitz-Birkenau, and Majdanek are still intact in many respects, and thus inspectable, Holocaust theologians have had a hard time explaining how come "death camps" had acres upon acres of living accommodations. The first sign of Exterminationist retraction came almost a decade ago, when **Gitta Sereny** wrote: "Auschwitz despite its emblematic name, was not primarily an extermination camp" (*New Statesman*, 2 November 1979, p.671). On the witness-stand in Toronto, **Professor Raul Hilberg** admitted that the "gas chamber" at Auschwitz-1 has been "partially reconstructed after WW2 just for tourists ...and just to show what happened" (Crown vs. Zündel, [Preliminary] 22 June 1984, p.138). In her review of the Auschwitz Museum's traveling exhibit (referred to earlier) **Sylvia Rothschild** does not mention "gas chambers" once; she instead refers to the constellation of Auschwitz facilities as "**labor camps ...a symbol of the horrors, a metaphor for mass murder**" (*Boston Jewish Advocate*, 22 October 1987, p.11).

During the Zündel trial, there were many significant developments. Two prosecution witnesses were wheeled out at the 1984 Preliminary, but were not re-exhibited at the main trial in January-February 1985. **Professor John Fried** -- an "expert witness" was not presented again for "health" reasons; actually because he was such a transparent Marxist. And the original complainant, **Mrs. Sabina Citron**, was also dropped, with no reason given. (In actual fact, her Preliminary testimony had given more credence to the Revisionists, and in any case, she was in trouble with the law herself; eventually being fined C\$5000 for union-busting and sweat-shop activities.)

Even the Survivors who were re-exhibited were an embarrassment to the Crown; in fact, the Prosecution's Appeal Factum makes little reference to the "eye-witnesses" -- only to the "Experts." A close study of the transcript shows that the Crown repeatedly tried to head-off the wild allegations of one **Arnold Friedman**, who several times attempted to discuss his claim that Auschwitz inmates could determine **the nationality of the gasees by the color of the smoke**. (See: Preliminary, p.206; Main Trial, p.326, p.406, p.407.)

By a curious coincidence, Friedman is (or was) one of those Carpathian-Jewish teenagers who

keep popping out of the woodwork, to contradict the photographic, scientific, and forensic evidence. Toronto's Friedman, originally from the Carpathian town of Uzgorod, was in 1944 interned at the brick-factory of nearby Munkacs, before being shipped to Auschwitz-Birkenau, and later to Buchenwald. Carpathian-Jewish teenager **Lili Jacob-Meier** (now of Florida) was likewise shipped from her village of Bilke, to the Munkacs brick-factory, and then on to Auschwitz-Birkenau, and finally to Buchenwald-Dora (where she "liberated" the famous *Auschwitz Album*, which completely contradicts her claims of "flaming chimneys"). California's **Mel Mermelstein** was likewise a Carpathian-Jewish teenager, interned at the Munkacs brick-factory before being shipped to Auschwitz-Birkenau, and then on to Buchenwald. Denver philanthropist **Emil Hecht** was also a Carpathian-Jewish teenager from the village of Svalvava, who was interned at the Munkacs brick-factory, before being transferred to Auschwitz-Birkenau, and then on to Mauthausen (*Denver Post*, 19 May 1987, p.D1). Even Holocaust guru **Eli Wiesel** was a Carpathian-Jewish teenager from Sighet, before being interned at the Munkacs brick-factory, and then trans-shipped to Auschwitz-Birkenau, and on to Buchenwald (along with Mermelstein). Is there something they put in the water up in those Carpathian Mountains, which causes their Jewish teenage inhabitants to have such vivid imaginations?

Of course, the modern "testifiers" have only come to the fore in recent years. During the 1960s and early 1970s we had an earlier batch of "witnesses." Yet, they all contradict one another far more. According to Commandant **Höss**, the gas was squirted out of hollow pillars (*Commandant of Auschwitz*, p.188); Auschwitz doctor **Nyiszli** agrees (*Auschwitz*, p.45); as does Holocaust© Expert® **Reitlinger** (*Final Solution*, p.160) -- while **Müller** implies that Auschwitz did not have perforated pillars, but fake shower-heads (*Eyewitness Auschwitz*, p.38), and he is supported by «Expert» **Hilberg** (*Destruction of the European Jews*, p.627).

It is probably appropriate and timely to draw up a list of various allegations concerning the "Holocaust."

Gassing Apparatus:

hollow pillars p.188 (**Höss**); diesel exhaust PS-1553 (**Gerstein**); hollow pillars p.46 (**Nyiszli**); hollow pillars and fake showers p.60 (**Müller**); fake showers p.627 (**Hilberg**); fake showers (**Reitlinger**). [*In fact, there are no "fake showers" at Auschwitz-1 nor "hollow pillars" at Auschwitz-Birkenau; I have been there to check.*]

Color of victims after gassing:

none p.188 (**Höss**); blue PS-1553 (**Gerstein**); pink with green spots p.627 (**Hilberg**); blue p.199 (**Davidowicz**); blue p.46 (**Nyiszli**).

Victims' hygiene after gassing:

nose bleeds; foam on lips p.627 (**Hilberg**); covered in fæces, blood, sweat and urine p.199 (**Davidowicz**); no evidence of excrement or sweat (**Höss**); "blood spattered" p.160 (**Reitlinger**); blood, sweat and urine PS-1553 (**Gerstein**).

Nazis who confessed under torture:

Franz Ziereis: Commandant of Mauthausen. Confessed to gas chambers at Mauthausen. Shot "trying to escape" 22 May 1945.

Rudolf Höss: Commandant of Auschwitz. Confessed to 2.5m gassed at Auschwitz. Whipped by Jewish (British) interrogators. Executed in Poland, 1947.

Hans Fritzsche: Radio Propaganda Minister. Confessed to "aggressive war." Dental drills applied to teeth. *Life* 20 June 1949 p.92. Sentenced to 10 years. Died in 1953.

Josef Kramer: Various tortures. Confessed to gas chambers at Natzweiler. *Bergen-Belsen*, Frejafon, Paris, 1947. Hanged December 1945.

Fritz Sauckel: Labor Minister. Threatened with his family being turned over to the Soviets. Confessed to "aggressive war." Hanged 16 October 1946.

Julius Streicher: Publisher. Forced to ingest the saliva and urine of Black American G.I.s. Refused to confess. Hanged 16 October 1946.

Hans Frank: Governor of Poland. Beaten, and urinated upon, by Black American G.I.s. Refused to confess. Hanged 16 October 1946.

The preceding article appeared in *Liberty Bell Publications* of January 1988. It may be copied for non-profit purposes only.

<http://www.faem.com/david/shrink2.htm>

FOR THOSE WHO HAVEN'T NOTICED

Watching the Dissolution of Palestine

By Jennifer Loewenstein

For those who haven't noticed, Israel opposes a two-state solution. It has been doing everything in its power to prevent a Palestinian state from emerging and will continue to do so as long as it can count on the complicity of its powerful friends and on abundant popular indifference. Under such circumstances, it is incumbent upon ourselves to ask why Hamas has therefore been ordered - by Israel and its same powerful friends --to accept "the two-state solution" especially when, unlike Israel, it has stated clearly and repeatedly that it would accept a Palestinian state on the lands occupied by Israel in the 1967 war, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem. Indeed, all of its key spokespeople have said this: Zahar, Haniye, Meshal, and Yassin and Rantisi before they were murdered.

Judea and Samaria which are, or were, the northern and southern West Bank, have been subdivided and parceled out over decades to hundreds of thousands of Jewish settlers for their houses and orchards and gardens. They have been crisscrossed and circled with Jewish-only roads that bind the land, the houses and orchards and gardens, to Israel. They have been manned with guards and gunmen and tanks and blue and white Israeli flags that defend, protect and assure the settlers, their houses and orchards and gardens, that they are in fact Israelis belonging to a single Jewish state.

The settled lands with their settler families, their houses and gardens, shops and schools, clubs and cafes and pools, have been mapped and assigned, seized and secured from the Arabs in the shabby clothes in the rundown villages who live outside of, or have been forced to leave, the protected colonial zones. The projected frontiers, the future borders, depend on the disappearance of these Arabs, which is anxiously anticipated and actively encouraged. Most of the eastern perimeter of the current state is a concrete wall erasing from view that Other Side, which is unmentionable in polite company. The eastern perimeter wall will soon be the western perimeter wall because the acting Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, has just announced that the rest of the unincorporated West Bank land will soon be annexed to Israel: The Jordan Valley, the West Bank's border with the state of Jordan, now to be Israel's eastern border with the state of Jordan, will also be secured by the wall and off-limits to "non-Israelis," meaning Palestinians, who will then be fully encircled in their stagnant reservations unable to access the outside world.

In the same breath as he announces this latest unilateral declaration of confiscated land for a Jewish State, Olmert announces a sanctions regime against the Palestinians of the occupied territories for refusing to believe that this land transformation in which one society is strengthened and expanded and the other is dissolved into a thousand pieces is actually the two-state solution.

Israel allots to itself first use of the natural resources, especially water, from the territory it has appropriated or surrounded. An army of thieves and wreckers has turned the remainder-- the pot-holed roads, the untended groves, the homes, the schools, the mosques and churches, the hospitals, universities, shops and remaining civil institutions -- into a series of impassable mazes, a legal no-man's-land, where travel restrictions, permits, coded IDs, passes, random searches, incursions and arbitrary accusations reduce the inhabitants into suspicious beings without names, faces, addresses or rights; a collective villain to be de-educat! ed and de-nationalized and, one day perhaps, deported for the sake of the Israeli *raison d'être*. It is becoming as difficult for travelers from abroad to visit the occupied territories as it is for the rightful inhabitants to move freely among them. It is therefore more difficult for outsiders to corroborate that the dangers they are warned against come directly from Israel, not the hapless people they have besieged. The daily threat to life and property is growing not abating.

For those who haven't noticed, there is no sign of this process coming to an end. Instead, in addition to the bizarre demand that Hamas accept the two-state solution that Israel has categorically rejected and each day renders even more geographically impossible, another two demands are added to it: Hamas must recognize Israel and it must renounce violence. In other words, it must recognize a state whose policies and whose leaders have worked tirelessly for decades to deny, undo, renounce, prevent and reject the existence both of Palestinians and of Palestine --not only in the present and future but also through erasing the past. Still, our media take it upon themselves to show the world a circus-mirror reality, grotesque in its distortions, in which a democratically elected government-without-a-state and its trampled, largely destitute people are made out to be holding hostage the hoodlums that are busy stomping them to death.

While they are being stomped, shot, beaten, demolished, assassinated, intimidated, robbed,

despoiled, starved, uprooted, dispossessed, harassed, insulted and killed with bullets, missiles, armored bulldozers, tanks, helicopter gun-ships, cluster-bombs, fleshettes, fighter-bombers, semi-automatic submachine guns, sonic booms, tear gas, electrified fences, blockades, closures and walls, they must renounce violence so that the hoodlums won't get hurt. If they defend themselves they lose. If they complain, they are insincere; if they ask for something in return, they are untrustworthy; If they ask for a fair hearing, they are advancing an "agenda;" If they hit back randomly, they are an instrument of terror. So when the furies of the thousands of dead, tens of thousands of wounded and detained, and millions of bound and gagged rise up together in a whirlwind to protest, they will be pointed to as evidence of innate evil that must justifiably be contained, justifiably occupied, with justified indignation and bottomless financial aid.

Hamas' reward for coming to power just in time to provide all the aspiring Sharons the most perfect, served-up-on-a-silver-platter pretext for continuing their well-worn policies with a vengeance, has been for the Kadima party -- the party of the future-- to announce that it will put the Palestinians on a starvation diet for presuming to exercise their rights. Hamas' reward for verifying the smashing success of Israel's goal to destroy Fatah has been Israel's insistence that it abide by all the agreements, treaties and accords that Fatah, essentially the PA, signed but which Israel shredded page by page. With every new brick laid for the settlements, every new road paved to Ariel, Maale Adumim, Illit, Gush Etzion and beyond, with every permit denied for work, education, medical care and travel, every truck left waiting with rotting produce at Sufa and Karni, every tax and customs dollar stolen from a people interned on their own land, Israel parades its contempt for human decency and gets standing ovations in the US Congress and elsewhere.

When Osama Bin Laden opines that it is legitimate for al-Qaida to murder Americans because, as citizens in a democratic country, they are responsible for their government, "civilized" society erupts, appropriately, in indignation. When Dov Weisglass and his smug, sadistic associates advocate appalling varieties of collective punishment against Palestinians for having had the audacity to democratically replace the failed Fatah with Hamas, "civilized" society nods its head in sanctimonious approval.

For those who haven't noticed, Israel opposes a two-state solution. It also opposes a one-state and a bi-national state, a federated secular state, and the zillion interim-state solutions that have been drawn up and debated and argued over the years. It opposes them because it opposes the presence of another people on land it has claimed as the exclusive patrimony of the Jews. This has to be the starting point for effective activism against the racist and hegemonic vision that Israel is implementing and the US guaranteeing, not faraway discussions on the most ideal solution. An effective opposition must not retreat into a slumbering or sidetracked lethal indifference.

Jennifer Loewenstein is a Visiting Research Fellow at Oxford University's Refugee Studies Centre. She has lived and worked in Gaza City, Beirut and Jerusalem and has traveled extensively throughout the Middle East, where she has worked as a free-lance journalist and a human rights activist. She can be reached at: amadea311@earthlink.net
Counterpunch, 24 Feb. 2006.
<http://www.counterpunch.org/loewenstein02242006.html>

TO SQUELCH FREE DISCUSSION

Arab professor: Holocaust is a 'myth'

Agrees with Iranian president, expects America to 'collapse' like Soviet Union

A U.S.-based Saudi professor and former U.N. fellow says he agrees with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad that the Holocaust is a "myth" and says America eventually will collapse like the Soviet Union.

Abdullah Mohammad Sindi, who has taught at four American schools, told Iran's Mehr News Agency Dec. 26, "I agree wholeheartedly with President Ahmadinejad."

"There was no such a thing as the 'Holocaust,'" Sindi said, according to the [Middle East Media Research Institute](#). "The so-called 'Holocaust' is nothing but Jewish-Zionist propaganda. There is no proof whatsoever that any living Jew was ever gassed or burned in Nazi Germany or in any of the territories that Nazi Germany occupied during World War II."

Sindi, who maintains [a website](#), has taught at the University of California at Irvine, California State University at Pomona, Cerritos College and Fullerton College – all in the Los Angeles area. He also taught political science at King Abdulaziz University in Saudi Arabia.

Sindi lives in Placentia, Calif., with his American wife – a middle school teacher – and two children, according to his website.

In the Iranian interview, Sindi said Holocaust "propaganda was started by the Zionist Jews in order to acquire worldwide sympathy for the creation of Israel after World War II," a claim he details in his book "The Arabs and the West: The Contributions and the Inflictions."

Sindi said Ahmadinejad is "100 percent correct and 100 percent logical when he states that if the European countries keep insisting that Nazi Germany gassed and burned 6 million live Jews, then Germany or Austria should be the real location for this rogue state of Israel."

"In fact, this illegal and illegitimate state of Israel is the one that created a real holocaust against the Palestinian people, both Muslim and Christian," he said.

Sindi contended there is a major conspiracy in the West to squelch free discussion of the Holocaust.

"The Western governments and media are hypocritical liars," he said. "They keep talking constantly about their own Western victims or Israeli victims in any situation, real or imagined, including kidnapping. But these so-called freedom-loving Westerners do not care a bit about their own colonial and imperialist wars that cause the death of millions of innocent Muslims and others around the world."

Sindi asserted "Israel controls the West, and not the other way around."

"The Jews and the Zionists rule the world by proxy," he said. "That is exactly what former Malaysian prime minister Mahathir Mohamed said in October 2003 during the 10th Islamic Summit Conference in Malaysia."

WorldNetDaily.com January 6, 2006

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=48246

Dr. Abdallah Mohammad SINDI :

<http://members.aol.com/AMS44AMS/>

MANDATORY BELIEF

Holocaust Fundamentalism: You WILL Believe!

You've seen the films. You've read the books. You've taken the courses. You've heard the news. Soon, your children will be visiting the museums. Everybody knows it's true.

The era of mandatory belief in The Holocaust has arrived. Articles central to The Faith include unwavering commitment to Jewish casualty numbers with a full and complete understanding of the manner in which innocent Jews were gassed, murdered and executed in Nazi Germany. Recalcitrant non-believers are now being rounded up. The typical rhetoric goes: "These bigots deny the facts and lessons garnered from humankind's experience during WWII. Their unique kind of poison will not be tolerated. This is a democracy. You are under arrest."

Only this is not a movie. This is real.

In Europe and North America, Holocaust skeptics are being apprehended, arrested and are now facing lengthy prison terms. Few people have noticed. Nobody's supposed to care. Big media certainly doesn't. Nor the politicians. These Holocaust-denying apostates include British author and historian David Irving, Holocaust revisionist Ernst Zundel, German chemist Germar Rudolf, and others. Their crimes involve disbelief: they dispute the official version of events involving Jews during WWII.

In an era where nearly anything goes, why does the truth need special laws to protect it? Curious, that.

Beginning Jan. 27, 2006, and continuing every year thereafter, the United Nations will inaugurate its first annual Holocaust Remembrance Day. This Israeli-sponsored resolution not only institutionalizes and broadens global sensitivity to The Holocaust, but it will surely aid in prosecuting individuals who reject official Holocaust dogma. **The State Church has arrived. It's creed: Holocaust fundamentalism.**

Question: to what extent do these escalating measures have more than nothing to do with America's "special relationship" with the Jewish State, our war in Iraq, and our saber-rattling towards Syria and Iran? Just curious.

Resistance to the global New Doctrine however is growing. Among the arguments: Laws regulating 'historical interpretation' are themselves a crime. Take your Thought Control laws and shove it.

Primary question: How many Jews died (and how many were deliberately killed) during WWII? How do we know? In how many Western Democracies is doubting the "correct number " of Jewish victims during WWII now against the law? (seven)

It's known that after the second world war, the Red Cross put the number of Jewish deaths at

considerably less than one million. That's still a lot of dead people. Yes, it is theoretically possible that 6,000,000 Jews were killed during the war, but--forgive me--I sense a bold exaggeration.

But aside from that, since when is skepticism a crime? Where are the bodies, for instance? May I have a list of names, please?

Even the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum in Israel, after 60 years, can only muster three million names, and many of those names are of Jews who merely died (or disappeared) during WWII, causes unknown. Many names appear more than once. In a similar vein, while the number of Jews murdered at Auschwitz was officially reduced by millions in recent years, the irreducible number of "six million Jews" remains. Isn't it possible that there's some politically-motivated chicanery here?

It is, after all, indisputable that some earlier "facts" regarding the Holocaust have been streamlined and smoothed out for popular consumption. The lamp shade and human soap stories, for instance, have been quietly retired. The secret dealings between Nazis and Zionists during WWII have been suppressed. Another ignored fact concerns the lethal Typhus epidemics in the death camps. Why have they been airbrushed from popular memory?

One problem is that all the "experts" tend to be Jewish and show bias on the subject. How many Germans died in WWII? Five million? Actually I'm not sure, since their suffering isn't supposed to matter and therefore their casualties aren't noted. What was the total number of dead in WWII?--50 million? How many have died in wars during the 20th Century?--275 million? (that's Zbig. Brezinski's estimate). Considering this, even if six million Jews were deliberately killed during WWII, shouldn't we demand that the Zionized world stop caring so singularly about Jewish suffering? The Jewish obsession with everything Jewish is shamefully narcissistic and burdensome. Their defiant ethnocentrism is an ongoing insult to the rest of the human race.

As for the "un-revisable" six million figure, Jews have superstitious reasons pertaining to the number "six" for claiming that six million died. In fact, similar charges about six million Jews were made, incredibly, in 1919, concerning the fantastic number of Jews facing death during WWI. These nutty allegations were even published in the NY Times. The claimants were Jewish.

But why?

Another reason Jews want to hype the number of victims is that they wanted to have the greatest causality count so they could claim supreme victimhood and reap the political rewards. Holocaust lore is essential to the precarious legitimacy of the Jewish State. Just ask the Palestinians.

But the Holocaust story as now told is a libel on the German people, since it pretends to show that German anti-Semitism sprang from nowhere. But the real story is more complicated.

Rightly or wrongly, the Nazis blamed the Jews for America's entry into WWI as well as the unjust and punitive Treaty of Versailles which followed. It's also undeniable that international Jewry "declared war" (and launched an international boycott) on Hitler's Germany in 1933. Even the outrage known as "Kristallnacht" was provoked in part by a Jewish assassin (Herschel Grynszpan) who, on November 7, 1938, walked into the German embassy in Paris and shot and killed Ernest vom Rath, a German diplomat.

We know, for instance, that soon after the turn of the century, Jews comprised many if not most of the leading political radicals in Europe. They were instrumental in orchestrating and managing the Communist revolution which killed millions of non-Jews well before Hitler's rise. Why aren't the Nazi-hunters interested in finding any of these mass-murderers? Is it justice they're after, or revenge and political advantage? The "innocent little Jewish shopkeeper" archetype as peddled on TV is a self-exculpating myth.

However, that Jews were persecuted and murdered during Hitler's reign is irrefutable. I've never seen or read a Holocaust "denier" who claims otherwise. Not one. The extraordinary claim that "6,000,000 Jews were systematically murdered" is what they contest. This deliberate mischaracterization of Holocaust revisionism has been spread widely and purposefully by keepers of the Holocaust faith. And the disinformation continues to flow.

David Irving, the imprisoned author of dozens of works on WWII, is now alleged to have recently "recanted" some of his "Holocaust denial claims". But his change-of-heart cannot be believed so long as he's being held captive on account of his scholarship.

One reader suggested that we call the search for truth in this matter "Holocaust factualism". Good start. Both teams in this historical divide are clearly inundated with advocates posing as scholars. The entire investigation therefore has been rigged from the start. At the same time, it can't be denied that those championing the Official Version are basically holding all the political cards and resources.

But even if we accept their self-serving stories and invisible body counts, it's still outrageous that the Jews and their lackeys deliberately ignore all the non-Jewish fatalities in Hitler's "death camps". Holocaust survivor, Bruno Bettelheim, writing in his book, "Surviving", notes that according to the Communists in East Germany in 1945, as many as 11 million died in Hitler's gulags, of which 5.5 to six

million were Jewish. This means that, according to Bettelheim, it's possible that as many as half of Hitler's concentration camp victims were gentiles! Where are the monuments to these innocent people? Why is their story being suppressed? Or should we now direct this Kosher Inquisition towards Bruno Bettelheim?

Whatever your view on the casualty count (or the disputed gas chamber stories), the focus must return to the core issue: intellectual freedom.

Historical truth doesn't need to be protected by any special law or speech code. Irving, Zundel, Rudolf and others, need and deserve our unwavering support if we intend to remain even nominally free.

Posted by: Mark Green on Feb 06, 2006 - 03:06 AM [holocaust](#)
Mark Green is a California based producer. His email is markgreen@flashpoint-tv.net

<http://therebel.org/index.php?name=News&file=article&sid=3035>

NOT BLINDLY OBEY

Re: Let Ernst Zundel and David Irving Go Home

You got to wonder how scared the German and Austrian governments have to be of Israel and Jewish lobby groups to pass and enforce laws that rob its citizens (and foreigners) of the right of free speech. In fact, historians specialising on the Nazi era have to exercise self-censure and have their research findings checked for illegal findings prior to publication, if they don't want to risk being arrested and imprisoned in Germany.

We are dealing here with a situation that has a lot of common with the burning of astronomers during Renaissance for claiming that the earth was a ball circling the sun. An increasing number of people are having the sneaking suspicion that those 'heretics' might be right. Why else do the 'defenders' of the Holocaust have to resort to attacking the person of the revisionists instead of arguing their case.

The Jewish Holocaust is probably the most powerful taboo in Western society, stronger even than incest and paedophilia. Most people will react with very strong feelings ranging from anger to fear, shock and disgust, when exposed to any perceived threat to beliefs relating to the Holocaust. Even discussing its taboo nature causes considerable levels of discomfort.

The taboo quality of the Jewish Holocaust in Western society is being enforced **no differently from taboos in Polynesia**: failure to comply results in social and economic ruin, incarceration, physical attack, sometimes even loss of life. Believing that the Jewish Holocaust as we know it – as the systematic, bureaucratic, state-sponsored persecution and murder of approximately six million Jews by the Nazi regime and its collaborators through the use of gas and other methods – actually occurred, determines whether a person is considered a Nazi and Anti-Semite (in other words utterly evil and a danger to mankind) or not.

I can only encourage every reader, to not blindly obey this powerful taboo, but to start thinking about its causes and its consequences. Most people today would be quite happy to accept the idea that not every Renaissance scientist claiming that the earth was a ball surrounding the earth hated God and the Church and was possessed by the Devil. Couldn't it be possible that not every scientist who claims that there were no gas chambers is a Nazi who hates Israel and the Jews?

Andrew Winkler, Editor/Publisher, *TheRebel.Org* 27 Jan. 2006
<http://therebel.org/index.php?name=Comments&tid=15&sid=2974#15>

A NICE FAIRY TALE

[...] Alvin Shipman's time in the war lead him to the Mauthausen concentration camp. As he entered the concentration camp, he saw a man chained to the wall outside by his neck. The man had been there for 36 hours with no food or water, Shirley Shipman said. Pictures of the Shipmans and the camp can be seen on the web site at www.asoldierspromise.com, she said. After Shipman discovered the camp, he brought his unit, the 65th infantry, there and it took command of the camp freeing the prisoners, Shirley Shipman said. The 65th infantry liberated more camps, won more battles and traveled more miles than any other in World War II, Shipman

said. One prisoner, Charles Pilarski, befriended Alvin, Shirley Shipman said. Pilarski translated and wrote the only known deathbed confession of a Nazi camp commander, Franz Ziereiz, Shirley Shipman said. Later a promise made to Pilarski by Alvin Shipman prompted him to smuggle the small tape-bound confession of atrocities overseas in a pillow, Shirley Shipman said. Alvin Shipman cut a pillow open to hide the confession inside and mailed the package to his mother who had no knowledge of the contents, Shirley Shipman said. "My dad was just a plain, ordinary man that did extraordinary things," Shipman told the children. From 1945 until 1973 the pillow remained hidden and untouched at Alvin Shipman's mother's house in Texas, Shirley Shipman said. Then, in 1973 Shirley Shipman and her father retrieved the confession but did nothing with it out of fear of what would come to the Shipman family in the wake of its release, Shirley Shipman said. On his deathbed, Alvin Shipman asked Shirley Shipman to fulfill the promise he made many years ago, to get the confession published, she said. With both her parents in the hospital at the time, Shirley did not think to ask where Alvin Shipman hid the confession, she said. Her father soon died and her mother followed a month later in 1979, she said. Then one day, as Shirley Shipman was moving her father's bed, she noticed some loose floor boards under the bed, she said. Out of curiosity Shirley Shipman said she looked under the boards and found the confession. Shirley Shipman now has her book published, fulfilling her and her father's promise to bring to light the only known death bed confession of a concentration camp commander, she said. HBO soon will make a movie about the story, Shirley Shipman said. After Shipman told her story to the children, they asked questions like "Can I have your autograph," and "When did you make the promise to your father." Then the children recited poems from well known artists to Shipman dealing with the same topics she had covered. After all the children had a chance to get autographs, they had lunch with her. Shipman's earlier efforts helped pass a bill, that was signed by Haley Barbour, requiring all schools in Mississippi teach the holocaust. Her efforts also prompted the building of a holocaust museum in Mississippi. Shipman said she does not know when or where the museum will be built.

Picayune Item, 4 Feb. 2006.

<http://www.picayuneitem.com/articles/2006/02/04/news/03holocaust.txt>

See the most incredible heap of lies falling on Mr Nobody's back, and what his daughter can make out of it. <http://www.asoldierspromise.com/>

Now, if one wants a little fun, just look at an authentic report on Ziereis' death (in French) : <http://www.jewishgen.org/ForgottenCamps/Camps/MauthausenFr.html>

JEWISH LEADERS FEAR

NU professor backs denial of Holocaust by Iran chief

Jewish leaders fear support could add credibility to view

By Jodi S. Cohen

A Northwestern University professor known for denying the Holocaust happened has publicly sided with Iran's hard-line president, who has been on a campaign against Israel.

Engineering professor Arthur Butz said Friday that he agrees with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's remarks calling the Holocaust a "myth." Butz said his comments supporting the president recently were published by the English-language Tehran Times and Iran's semi-official Mehr news agency.

Butz, a tenured professor whose views have been known in the United States for years, is being promoted by Iranian news sources as one of the world scholars who support Ahmadinejad's views on the Holocaust.

"I congratulate him on becoming the first head of state to speak out clearly on these issues and regret only that it was not a Western head of state," Butz said in a Mehr news report. He posted the same comments on his Northwestern-provided Web site.

Jewish leaders expressed fear that support from a United States educator could add credibility to Ahmadinejad's comments about Israel and the Holocaust. "Butz's most recent invective demonstrates the power of hate to rally extremists, anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers

out from under their rocks throughout the world," said Richard Hirschhaut, executive director of the Holocaust Foundation of Illinois.

A report published Wednesday by Mehr said Butz was interviewed Dec. 26 "in the wake of the international uproar that arose" after Ahmadinejad questioned the Nazi killing of 6 million Jews and called for Israel to be "wiped off the map." Iran also recently announced plans for a conference to examine evidence of the Holocaust.

Butz did not comment in the Iranian press or on his Web site about Ahmadinejad's views on the destruction of Israel. Butz told the *Tribune* Friday that his comments supporting Ahmadinejad were first published in December in the Tehran Times after he e-mailed a statement to an Iranian journalist. He said the reporter asked him more questions by e-mail, and his response was published this week by the news agency.

Butz said he spoke to the Iranian press because "sometimes I just talk about the things I'm interested in." Butz said in the Mehr report that the Holocaust didn't happen, that it is a "deliberately contrived falsehood" and that its promulgation was motivated by the desire to create a Jewish state in the Middle East. "I continue to maintain those three theses, which have become core features of what is called 'Holocaust revisionism.' Apart from some nuances of wording, the three theses were repeated by President Ahmadinejad. Therefore, there can be no question that I endorse his remarks in those respects," Butz wrote.

Since 1996, Butz has posted his views about the Holocaust on his Northwestern-affiliated Web site, including information from his 1976 book "The Hoax of the 20th Century: The Case Against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry." Northwestern University spokesman Al Cabbage emphasized that the university does not agree with Butz.

"As certainly has been made clear on many occasions, Northwestern University as an institution obviously does not endorse or agree with the personal opinions of professor Butz," Cabbage said. "At the same time, however, the university does believe that its faculty members are entitled to express their own personal opinions."

Chicago Tribune, 4 feb. 2006.

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-0602040129feb04.1.5661316.story?coll=chi-newsnationworld-hed&ctrack=1&cset=true>

HEINOUS CRIME

Iran has the U.S.'s number

By Arthur R. Butz

I have been asked "why people are so reluctant to consider" the validity of "Holocaust" revisionism. I shall try to answer that, showing the relationship to Iranian President Ahmadinejad.

The principal obstacle to the propagation of revisionism is, simply, fear. At present, the entrenched legend is protected by a system of legal and extra-legal prohibitions ("taboos"). Nobody could dispute the truth of that statement in Europe, where laws in most countries specifically proscribe the expression of revisionist ideas as criminal offenses. For me, the most painful instance of that intellectual terror is the incarceration of my chemist friend Germar Rudolf, presently being held in solitary confinement in a maximum security prison near Stuttgart.

His heinous crime? As a chemistry graduate student he did a forensic analysis of the walls of the alleged gas chambers, didn't find the cyanide residues that ought to have been there and concluded they weren't gas chambers. The lack of such forensic evidence is well known in the field. For example, in the Wall Street Journal of July 7, 2004, Timothy Ryback wrote that "there is little forensic evidence proving homicidal intent" in the ruins of Auschwitz.

For Germar that was a 14 month rap in 1994, and he bolted rather than serve it. Last November he was finally deported back to Germany by the US government, despite his application for political asylum and his marriage to an American woman. For his subsequent writings the Germans are now charging Germar with a new 5-year rap, enacted into law after his original "crime."

This is not a strictly European reign of terror. The U.S. is definitely complicit. How many Americans know that our foremost execution technologist declared the alleged gassings not possible at the alleged sites? That was Fred Leuchter, who actually preceded Germar in the cyanide residue investigations. Leuchter was considered foremost in the execution field until 1990, when his views were widely publicized, and his business ruined by the refusal of authorities to work with him. I doubt he has any work in the field now. Illinois barred the politically unclean Leuchter from servicing the lethal injection machine he had designed and built. During the execution of John Wayne Gacy, there was a hitch attributed to incompetent operation of Leuchter's machine.

The terror exists in the U.S., but it is more subtle than in Europe. That brings us to President Ahmadinejad of Iran. For many years I ignored revisionism coming from Islamic countries, because I found it inept. With Ahmadinejad, I found something else; his statements were formidable in their perspicacity. My original statement on him has to be read to make the specifics clear. He understands the intellectual terror in the West. However, the best surprise came after I wrote my endorsement. British Prime Minister Tony Blair made a routine pompous suggestion to Ahmadinejad: Visit the camps and see for yourself. Ahmadinejad replied: Good idea, I'll bring a scientific team. He knows about the forensic issues too.

The most recent Iranian development has come from Hamshahri, Iran's largest newspaper. They will answer the offensive cartoons of Muhammad, defended in Europe in the name of freedom of expression, with a cartoon contest on the theme of the "Holocaust." Let's hear the Europeans preach "human rights" and "freedom" then! The cartoons will likely be criminal offenses throughout continental Europe and perhaps actionable in Britain as well. The hypocrisy is staggering.

In the present Iran, we have a formidable enemy of some Western trends that ought to be vigorously opposed by all who value "freedom" as more than a mere slogan. That, and not mere "denial," was the basis of my involvement with Ahmadinejad's statements. Beware. Present-day Iran has our number, and is giving it to others.

Arthur R. Butz is an associate professor of electrical engineering. He can be reached at butz@ece.northwestern.edu.
Daily Northwestern – Forum – 14 February 2006
<http://www.dailynorthwestern.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2006/02/14/43f1778c0f7e0>

NORTHWESTERN SPITS BACK

When reason gives way to hysteria

by Henry M. Bowles III

President Bienen's tacky and melodramatic press release on Arthur Butz, the Northwestern engineering professor and Holocaust revisionist, succeeded only in brightening Butz's spotlight. Giving a shout-out to those who would have Butz fired and his ideas shut out of the forum, Bienen labeled the offending views as "contemptible," "odious," and "reprehensible" and cited the university's Holocaust credentials. In the end, of course, Bienen made the perfectly obvious point that a professor cannot be fired merely for voicing unpopular or absurd opinions.

From Bienen's inflated indignation and laughable hyperbole to the embarrassing student movement to have Butz fired or at least, his Web site shut down, the Butz imbroglio is revealing: We are addicted to outrage.

The value of an idea, to botch an old Oscar Wilde, has nothing to do with the integrity of the man who expresses it. Butz may well be an anti-Semite, and anti-Semitism may well lurk behind his take on the Holocaust, but his views on Jews aren't relevant to the merit of his arguments. Butz's ideas, not Butz the man, must be tackled in the public forum. His revisionism must be examined piecemeal. It is doubtful every claim he makes is absurd. It is true that Butz, as a conspiracy theorist, might make claims that are not falsifiable. But this must be explained to the public.

As it turns out, Butz's arguments are articulate, initially persuasive, and mostly debunked by Deborah Lipstadt, a professor at Emory University who studies the Holocaust. Not that you have read that in The Daily. Butz's critics rarely bother to explain what is wrong with his proposed revisions to the

historical record. Hillel has waged a steady campaign to silence him altogether. Is it not obvious that the more outraged and insecure we behave in the face of Butz's claims, the more we try to shut him up as opposed to countering him, the more we fuel questions about whether the Holocaust has been sensationalized?

There are serious objections to the dominant take on the Holocaust, just as there are serious objections to the dominant take on any historical event. The Holocaust should not, merely because of the magnitude of the tragedy, be shielded from rigorous historical review. Some of the lingering Holocaust questions include when extermination was ordered and what Hitler was thinking at the time, and most explosively, the number of Jews who died because of disease versus the number who died as a result of orchestrated murder. Butz's take on the last point has been partly supported by Arno Mayer, a history professor at Princeton.

In their whiny reminders of their mortification of being associated with Butz and their unwillingness to tackle his claims, the faculty response has been particularly embarrassing. You only get to publicly skewer Butz, after publicly addressing his ideas.

Henry M. Bowles III is a Medill senior. He can be reached at h-bowles@northwestern.edu
The Daily Northwestern, 14 Feb. 2006

THE OLD DOUBLE STRANDARD

Prison Sentence for Irving is Outrageous

By Mark Weber

A court in Austria today sentenced British historian David Irving to three years in prison for a 16-year-old violation of that country's "Holocaust denial" law.

This sentence is an outrage. Punishing someone for peacefully expressing an opinion about history is a step backwards to the legal standards of the Middle Ages.

The sentence points up a blatant double standard that prevails in Austria, France, Germany, Switzerland and some other European countries that punish anyone who challenges the prevailing orthodoxy about the Holocaust.

While these countries defend, in the name of free speech, the right of cartoonists and writers to mock and insult the religious sensibilities of Muslims and Christians, they deny that same right to anyone who challenges the official Holocaust historiography.

Irving's three-year sentence is particularly grotesque because it is for a "thought crime" committed 16 years ago. For most crimes committed that long ago, a statute of limitations would have prevented punishment. Irving would not have been punished if, for example, he had stolen a car 16 years ago.

Irving's case is by no means unique. The long list of those who have been fined, imprisoned, or forced into exile for "denying the Holocaust" includes Robert Faurisson and Roger Garaudy in France, Siegfried Verbeke in Belgium, Juergen Graf and Gaston-Armand Amaudruz in Switzerland, and Guenter Deckert, Hans Schmidt and Fredrick Toben in Germany.

In Germany the trial of "Holocaust denier" Ernst Zundel is still continuing. Another German citizen, Gernar Rudolf, similarly faces years of imprisonment there for "denying the Holocaust."

"Holocaust denial" laws violate ancient and universal standards of justice. If the principle of freedom of speech means anything, it means the right to express disagreeable views, particularly about history.

"Holocaust denial" laws are inherently unjust because they are selective and one-sided. They prohibit dissent about only one chapter of history. Similar laws criminalizing dissent about other chapters of history would universally be considered outrageous.

"Holocaust denial" laws inhibit robust and unfettered discussion about an emotion-laden and highly politicized chapter of history. They underscore the quasi-religious status that the Holocaust story has attained in western Europe and the United States.

With each passing year, "Holocaust denial" laws will be regarded as ever more bizarre and embarrassing. It is difficult to imagine that they will still be in place anywhere ten years from now.

Axis of Logic, 22 Feb. 2006
http://www.axisoflogic.com/artman/publish/article_21200.shtml

FUNNY AUSTRIA

'Freedom for the thought we hate'

By Jeff Jacoby

Funny people, the Austrians. If you're Kurt Waldheim — a former Nazi military officer linked to a genocidal massacre during World War II — they elect you president. But if you're David Irving — a British author who claimed that there never was a Nazi genocide during World War II — they throw you in the slammer.

On second thought, not funny at all. Austria disgraced itself when it elected Waldheim president in 1986, apparently unconcerned by the revelation that he had served in a German military unit responsible for mass murder in the Balkans and been listed after the war as a wanted criminal by the UN War Crimes Commission. In a very different way it disgraced itself again last week, when a Vienna court sentenced Irving, a racist and an anti-Semite, to three years in prison for denying that the Nazis annihilated 6 million European Jews.

Irving is a man of great intellectual gifts who devoted his life to a grotesque and evil project: rehabilitating the reputation of Hitler and the Third Reich. Necessarily, that meant denying the Holocaust and ridiculing those who suffered in it, and Irving has long done so with relish. "I don't see any reason to be tasteful about Auschwitz. It's baloney, it's a legend," he told a Canadian audience in 1991. "There are so many Auschwitz survivors going around — in fact the number increases as the years go past, which is biologically very odd to say the least — I'm going to form an association of Auschwitz Survivors, Survivors of the Holocaust, and Other Liars, or A-S-S-H-O-L-S."

Presumably Irving had in mind people like my father, whose arm bears to this day the number A-10502, tattooed there in blue ink on May 28, 1944, the day he and his family were transported to Auschwitz. My father's parents, David and Leah Jakobovic, and his youngest brother and sister, Alice, 8, and Yrvin, 10, were not tattooed; Jews deemed too old or too young to work were sent immediately to the gas chambers. His teenage siblings, Zoltan and Franceska, were tattooed and, like him, put to work as slave laborers. Zoltan was killed within days; Franceska lasted a few months. Of the seven members of the Jakobovic family sent to Auschwitz in the spring of 1944, only my father was alive in the spring of 1945.

So on a personal level, the prospect of David Irving spending his next three years in a prison cell is something over which I will lose no sleep. He is a repugnant, hate-filled liar, who even as a child (so his twin brother told the Telegraph, a British daily) was enamored of the Nazis and had a pronounced cruel streak.

But as a matter of law and public policy, Irving's sentence is deplorable. The opinions he expressed are vile, and his arguments about the Holocaust — perhaps the most comprehensively researched and documented crime in history — are ludicrous. But governments have no business criminalizing opinions and arguments, not even those that are vile or ludicrous. To be sure, freedom of speech is not absolute; laws against libel, death threats, and falsely shouting fire in a crowded theater are both reasonable and necessary. But free societies do not throw people in prison for giving offensive speeches or spouting historical lies.

Austria, the nation that produced Hitler and cheered the Anschluss, may well believe that its poisoned history requires a strong antidote. Punishing anyone who "denies, grossly trivializes, approves, or seeks to justify" the Holocaust or other Nazi crimes may seem a small price to pay to keep would-be totalitarians and hatemongers at bay. But a government that can make the expression of Holocaust denial a crime today can make the expression of other offensive opinions a crime tomorrow.

Americans, for whom the First Amendment is a birthright, should understand this instinctively. "If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought," wrote Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. in 1929. "Not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we hate."

It is popular in some circles to argue that the United States should do certain things — adopt single-payer health insurance, abolish capital punishment, etc. — to conform to the practice in other democracies. Those who find that a persuasive argument might consider that Irving is behind bars today because Austria doesn't have a First Amendment. Neither do Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, or Switzerland — all of which have made Holocaust denial a crime.

"Freedom for the thought we hate" is never an easy sell, but without it there can be no true liberty. David Irving is a scurrilous creep, but he doesn't belong in prison. Austria should find a way to set him free — not for his sake, but for Austria's.

Jeff Jacoby is a Boston Globe columnist. Comment by clicking [here](#).

[Jewish World Review](#) March 2, 2006

<http://www.jewishworldreview.com/jeff/jacoby030206.php3>

DID SIX MILLION REALLY DIE?

SOME WAYS YOU ARE LIED TO -- LESSON ONE

In order to perpetuate the holocaust legend, Jews must constantly hide the truth from the general public.

The ways of doing this are many and varied.

In lesson one we will investigate the following idea:

Set up a false opposition front, in this case, an "anti-Jewish" web-site that provides free books concerning the holocaust legend (and Jews generally) for the public to read.

Rewrite the books, with the obvious proviso that the changes are not so obvious that you blow your cover. This involves:

- removing all the passages that you do not like, or find dangerous, and substituting passages that you do like,
- "accidentally" changing references, or leaving out page numbers, or parts of a name, in order to make further investigation of sources that you do not approve of, difficult,
- adding extra references, or information concerning sources that you do approve of,
- correcting mistakes in the original that are neutral or advance your cause, and calling the original "an earlier edition",
- removing complementary references to your opposition, etc, etc.

In our example we will examine the web-site at <http://www.ety.com/HRP/>

To see how well our Jewish friends at <http://www.ety.com/HRP/> have preformed their given task, we downloaded the web-pages for the book "*Did Six Million Really Die?*" by Richard Harwood, from

<http://www.ety.com/HRP/booksonline/d6mrd/>

We then compared these pages to the original from the Institute for Historical Review

<http://ihr.org/books/harwood/>

The results may interest you and are presented at :

<http://www.vancouver.indymedia.org/news/2004/03/122056.php>

MAVERICKS

How Many Jews Does It Take...?

Should freedom of speech stop at Holocaust denial?

By D D Guttenplan

The notorious revisionist historian David Irving has been jailed for three years by an Austrian court for denying the Holocaust. DD Guttenplan, author of *The Holocaust on Trial: History, Justice and the David Irving Libel Case*, argues that allowing mavericks the right to deny historical truths is a risk worth taking to preserve the right to free speech.

The ironies of history are seldom subtle. Thus Charles Clarke's announcement, on the eve of Holocaust Memorial Day 2005, that the government will seek to end the centuries-long right of habeas corpus and that henceforth mere suspicion of certain terrorist activities may result in detention.

Listening to the Prime Minister's plea that we retain a sense of proportion, and that the new measures will only affect "a handful of people" (though the newspaper accounts suggested that coverage would extend to animal rights activists and Northern Irish militants as well as suspected

al-Qaeda cells) one could hardly help recalling Martin Niemöller's auto-indictment: 'First, they came for the Communists...".

So I may perhaps be excused for pointing out that the conflict at the centre of proposals to outlaw Holocaust Denial in Britain — between freedom of speech and freedom from a form of racist harassment — has its own history. In 1949 the United States Supreme Court had to decide whether the city of Chicago acted rightly in fining Arthur Terminiello, a Roman Catholic priest, \$100 for breaching the peace by making a speech attacking "atheistic, communistic Jewish or Zionist Jews".

The record doesn't show whether Terminiello's career as a Jew-baiter extended to Holocaust denial, but his case is relevant to the current debate even without such obvious cues. Robert Jackson, one of the judges who heard Terminiello's appeal, had been chief US prosecutor at Nuremberg. Weimar Germany's failure to defend its constitutional order was still fresh in his mind when Jackson warned his colleagues "if the court does not temper its doctrinaire logic with a little practical wisdom, it will convert the Constitutional Bill of Rights into a suicide pact".

Not everyone who favours making Holocaust Denial a crime in Britain advances a rational argument for doing so. When Tony Blair said in 1997 that there was "a very strong case" for a law against Holocaust denial he never went into specifics — an omission which looks prudent now that his government has apparently lost its enthusiasm. Still, while it is unfashionable to say so, I believe there are at least two strong arguments in favor of such a law, and that both arguments deserve to be taken seriously.

The first argument is that Holocaust denial is a form of racial abuse directed not just at Jews but at a particularly vulnerable subset of Jews. As someone who spent more time than I liked reading the works of Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz and David Irving I can attest that this is the case.

For all their pseudo-scholarly decoration, the deniers' devotion to historical argument is on a par with Terminiello's contribution to theological disputation. To fail to acknowledge the pain felt by Holocaust survivors at the negation of their own experience — or to treat such pain as a particularly Jewish problem which need not trouble anyone else — is to deny our common humanity.

Which in many cases is precisely the abuser's aim—not to lure the rest of us into joining in, but simply to further isolate the victims by our indifference.

And as a general proposition Jackson was right. Free societies do have not only a right but an obligation to defend themselves. As individuals we are free to emulate Voltaire's willingness "to give my life to make it possible" for someone whose views we detest to continue to express them. But we do not have the right to impose such self-abnegation on our fellow citizens.

Jackson's fellow justices needed no reminder of where Jew-baiting could lead. Yet by a 5-4 majority the court overturned Terminiello's conviction, and though I think they were right to do so, the thinness of the margin also seems appropriate. This is not a question where certainty is warranted on either side.

In Britain and the United States we regard Free Speech as sacred. Americans venerate the First Amendment, while Britons cite Milton, who in *Areopagitica* said true Liberty only exists "when free born men / Having to advise the public may speak free". Holocaust denial is currently a crime in Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Switzerland.

Do the citizens of those countries value freedom less than we do? Or might other factors be involved?

Robert Kahn, author of *Holocaust Denial and the Law*, points to a "fault time" separating the "common law countries" of the US, Britain, and former British colonies from the "civil law countries of continental Europe". In civil law countries the law is generally more prescriptive. Also under the civil law regime the judge acts more as an inquisitor, gathering and presenting evidence as well as interpreting it.

Unlike the Anglo-American adversarial system, where fairness is the primary attribute of justice, and the judge functions as a referee, trials under the continental system aim at arriving at the truth.

This divergence has a number of consequences.

One of them was on view when Irving sued Deborah Lipsadt, an American academic. Irving claimed that since the Holocaust never happened, it was libellous to call him a Holocaust denier. As the claimant under British law Irving was able to force Lipsadt to prove him wrong by in effect proving the historical actuality of the Holocaust. This put an enormous additional burden on Mr Justice Charles Gray, who in presiding over the trial had to constantly attend to the claims of truth as well as justice.

Continental judges also have much greater latitude in taking "judicial notice" — ie in declaring that certain facts are well-established and need not be proven anew. The result is a system where, by habit if not by aptitude, the courts are more comfortable in simply pronouncing

on questions of historical fact.

Ultimately, though, it is the difference in historical experience that ought to constrain our attitude to other countries. In Germany and Austria Holocaust denial is not "mere" Jew-baiting but also a channel for Nazi resurgence much like the Hitler salute and the display of the swastika, which are also banned.

The case for a ban in Israel should also be obvious, if not beyond argument. Similarly, countries where the experience of occupation and the shame of collaboration still rankle ought to be able to make their own decisions. Blasphemy is still illegal in this country, and though Americans are theoretically free to do all sorts of things no American these days can afford to be smug about anyone else's liberty. Nor, after Bosnia and Rwanda, can we pretend that free speech is an absolute value. Sticks and stones may break bones, but name-calling can clear a path for genocide.

Where should we set the balance in Britain? My own view is that the existing laws against incitement to racial hatred are sufficient. Making a special case for Holocaust denial might be justified if British Jews were in jeopardy, or if there were a fascist movement in this country, fueled by Holocaust denial, which posed a genuine threat to democracy. Happily we are far from such dangers, and if we take the Prime Minister at his word and retain our sense of proportion we ought to recognise that we have far more to lose from even such a tiny erosion of our liberties.

In 1949 the radical journalist I F Stone described himself as "exactly what Terminiello in his harangues meant by an 'atheistic, communistic, zionistic Jew'. I would not demean myself or my people by denying him the right to say it." Stone's denunciation of judges "who would have permitted some measure of suppression in my protection" as "not men whose championship I would care to have" could have been written of any number of recent Home Secretaries.

In rejecting Justice Jackson's analogy between Weimar Germany and post-war America Stone proved a better historian as well as a more robust libertarian. As an American Jew resident in twenty-first century Britain it seems to me that free speech is still worth the risk.

Issue 2/05 of *Index on Censorship: Forgive or Forget*. 20 Feb. 2006

<http://www.indexonline.org/en/news/articles/2005/1/britain-holocaust-rememberance.shtml>

THEY CALL IT A "LAW" !

Martyring Voltaire

By James Hall

David Irving's persecution has been compared to the prosecution of Galileo. The Rev. Ted Pike offers up a list of other less celebrated fatalities of thought crimes. Pike's prediction is frightening: "The conviction of David Irving is a chilling wake-up call that hate crimes laws and international enforcement of them are not going to go away. They are vital to the ADL/B'nai B'rith master plan for eventual triumph over Christian civilization."

Austria may be getting the recent headlines but Germany has the final solution. It is called by law - Paragraph 130!

Section 130a Instructions for Crimes

(1) Whoever disseminates, publicly displays, posts, presents, or otherwise makes accessible a writing (Section 11 subsection (3)) which is capable of serving as instructions for an unlawful act named in Section 126 subsection (1), and is intended by its content to encourage or awaken the readiness of others to commit such an act, shall be punished with imprisonment for not more than three years or a fine.

(2) Whoever:

1. disseminates, publicly displays, posts, presents, or otherwise makes accessible a writing (Section 11 subsection (3)) which is capable of serving as instructions for an unlawful act named in Section 126 subsection (1); or

2. gives instructions for an unlawful act named in Section 126 subsection (1), publicly or in a meeting, in order to encourage or awaken the readiness of others to commit such an act,

shall be similarly punished.

(3) Section 86 subsection (3), shall apply correspondingly.

Ernst Zündel is the next victim in the dock for sins against holocaust orthodoxy. Christopher Bollyn in the *American Free Press* quotes French academic Dr. Robert Faurisson:

"The Jews do not tolerate any questioning of the 'Holocaust,'" Faurisson told the Mehr News Agency of Iran. "Against the revisionists they use physical violence and judicial repression because, on the level of historical and scientific argumentation, they have been defeated hands down by the revisionists. We have been able to expose their lies, one by one. Therefore Jews and Zionists seek refuge in violence and intimidation. They treat revisionists like Palestinians."

Bollyn compares Zündel to Luther. But in a direct report from the Zündel trial, you get the cruel harsh reality of this kosher inquisition. "Vastly simplified, the Zundel Heresy Trial has now become the vehicle to try to shake off Israeli (and Allied) control of Germany, and hopefully of Europe. Ernst has become the symbol and political icon of that struggle because he is the best-known Prisoner of Conscience in the Western world and his name carries weight and prestige with important dissidents who have put the mosaic together and refuse to live by the Lie." As reported in the "Poodle Media", the significance of such a show trial is ignored with its ensuing cover-up in order to perpetuate the only account of WWII allowed. Since history is written by the victor - surely there can be no doubt who actually won that war!

Perverted hate legislation is coming to Amerika and will be written by the same Pharisee tribe as in Europe. How quickly the lessons in IMPERIUM by Francis Parker Yockey are shredded from consciousness of rational inquiry out of fear from the gulag despots.

The cultural divide is no myth. It is essentially a spiritual war. The opponents of individual liberty must eliminate Christian heritage and destroy believers in order to achieve their Talmud heretical rule. If you believe in the Father and in His Son, there can be no rapprochement with the defilers of His word.

Intimidation and threats will not destroy the truth. Only apathy and cowardice will guarantee defeat. The basic purpose of your being is at stake as well as the future of our country. Allowing the law to be subverted to punish truth seekers, where ever the evidence leads is wickedness incarnate. Patrick Henry understood the real meaning of the American experience. "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death" applies directly to the treachery of faceless thugs who manipulate the law to silence the cries of real social justice. Promoting false guilt under the guise of a phony tolerance is obscene.

Facts of history do not discriminate among sufferers to make any group special. Was the dread of the Bataan march or the POW that built the Thai-Burma railway any less important or dear? What about the killing fields of the Khmer Rouge or the Siberian internment hell holes? Was the suffering under the hands of Pol Pot or Joseph Stalin any less tragic? The myth that a Jewish Holocaust (whatever the actual death count) is the single most evil event in all of history is objectively offensive.

Recent threats upon Rense.com contributors illustrates that the grand inquisitors of intimidation seek to export their persecution campaign to America. The case of Google Video removing two of revisionist Michael A. Hoffman II's three videos from its free video online website. Hoffman received the following e-mail from Google: *Google has been notified that your videos violate our Program Policies. The titles of the videos are listed at the end of this message. According to our policy, we are removing the following videos: World War Two Revisionist Charles Provan [and] Deborah Lipstadt, "Amalek" and David Irving.* "Google is supposed to be dedicated to providing access to the whole spectrum of human knowledge and inquiry. But with their self-censorship of the Lipstadt and Provan videos, they demonstrate to the world that Google is not an information provider but an information gatekeeper, similar to the tired, discredited model perpetuated by the old media," Hoffman concluded.

Both of these instances illustrate that much more than censorship is the core issue. The pattern of structured and methodical targeting of voices that dare challenge the superior status of those who rely upon a hoax of uniqueness is clearly evident. The legal and natural right of Free Speech is not only threatened with incarceration, but physical harm is indeed implied. At what point will their *strappado* rack be used to bring a version of the infamous paragraph 130 to the United States?

In order to understand and internalize the depth of the spiritual foe, that politically incorrect academic Jimmy Cantrell in his essay - The Most Significant Part of the Talmud - removes the veil from the temple. Roy Schoeman wrote - Salvation is From the Jews: The Role of Judaism in Salvation History From Abraham to the Second Coming. "Schoeman is an ethnic Jew who passed from Talmudic study to academia to having religious visions that led him to say to God that he did not care who God is or what religion he would need to join as long as God is not Christ because he did not want to be a Christian. Jones labels that the Jewish "animus against Christ" that is "ancestral, visceral and palpable..." Though Schoeman had prayed that God be anything but Christ, he eventually decided that Jesus is both the Messiah and God, and Schoeman became Catholic."

Cantrell citing from a review by E. Michael Jones in the February 2004 issue of *Culture Wars*, makes this observation: *Jones's review is primarily a study of what Schoeman does not say directly in his book: "... what the Jews had become in the centuries since their leaders rejected Christ, not the religion of Moses but an anti-Christ ideology."*

Before condemning such an insight as anti-Semitic, consider Revelation 3:9 (New American Standard Bible) "Behold, I will cause those of (A)the synagogue of Satan, who say that they are Jews and are not, but lie--I will make them (B)come and bow down at your feet, and make them know that (C)I have loved you." (additional verses from letter reference)

The malice within the imposition of hate laws is apparent. The objective is to silence and punish any questioning of contrived and erroneous political agendas that are designed to subjugate Western Civilization under the yoke of Talmud sacrilege. Yet, this circumstance is not solely a Jewish plot. Not all Jews worship at the *synagogue* of Satan. Likewise not all Catholics were ready to burn Luther or cast Galileo into a dungeon. Christendom isn't monolithic any more than Jewry.

Light from the Torah contrasts with Judaism's wickedness of the politically motivated Talmudical objectives. This distinction is crucial to understand the underlying reasons why Irving and Zündel are subjected to a Zionist *paragraph 130* kangaroo court. In all likelihood Faurisson may follow under other trumpeted up charges.

When François-Marie Arouet uttered his famous quote, the Jesuit educated polemicist could not imagine that in his revolutionary Europe he could be sharing a cell with Irving some two centuries later. Only in a world devised under the most perverse intentions and tortured legality could such intellectual inquiry be so criminalized.

When Tony 'poodle boy' Blair challenged Iran's Ahmadinejad: "should come and see the evidence of the Holocaust himself in the countries of Europe", we see the hypocrisy of the enablers of Talmud tyranny. With blistering speed Ahmadinejad, a populist conservative took up the challenge and was soundly denied access to inspect the physical evidence that venerates the "Holocaust Industry". Top this off with Blair's own duplicity: "The Labour leader said he saw a "very strong case" for making it illegal to say that Hitler's extermination of six million Jews did not take place. Opening an exhibition dedicated to Anne Frank, Mr Blair pledged that a Labour government would give "active consideration" towards legislation."

This is the Europe that deserved to be rescued so that Zionists could rule over the vanquished? That's not the Western Civilization that merits respect and preservation. Voltaire may not agree with what Irving, Zündel or Faurisson has to say, but he affirmed that he would defend to the death their right to say it. His Age of Enlightenment has been crucified just like Jesus. Those same hands can't wash away the blood of their deeds without divine redemption.

Before Section 130a Instructions for Crimes becomes the law for our land, faithful Americans need to take back our country from dual loyalists and traitors that dread the awakening of the heartland of God fearing citizenry. The America-First tradition is the solution. The lines are clearly drawn, the foes are unequivocally known. The saints need to act. Martyrdom need not happen.

James Hall, SARTRE.

<http://batr.org/gulag/022706.html>

BATR websites attacked by Cliff Jones, Bureau Editor

<http://batr.net/columnistguildnewsbureau/2006/02/batr-websites-attacked-by-cliff-jones.html>

Al-Jazeera, February 27, 2006

<http://www.aljazeera.info/Opinion%20editorials/2006%20Opinion%20Editorials/February/27o/Martyring%20Voltaire%20By%20James%20Hall.htm>

Original publication: <http://www.batr.org/gulag/022706.html>

WHORISH

Protecting The Rights Of A Holocaust Denier Ultimately Protects Us All Free speech, even if it hurts

By Michael Shermer

'More women died in the back seat of Edward Kennedy's car at Chappaquiddick than ever died in a gas chamber at Auschwitz.'

Is this line more offensive to Jews than an editorial cartoon depicting the prophet Muhammad with a turban bomb is to Muslims?

Apparently it is, because the editorial cartoonists are still free, whereas the man who made this statement - British author David Irving - was sentenced this week to three years in an Austrian jail for violating a law that says it is a crime if a person "denies, grossly trivializes, approves or seeks to justify the National Socialist genocide or other National Socialist crimes against humanity."

That Irving has been, and probably still is, a Holocaust denier is indisputable. In 1994, I interviewed him for a book on Holocaust denial, and he told me that no more than half a million Jews died during World War II, and most of those because of disease and starvation. In 2000,

Irving lost his libel suit in Britain against an author, and the judge in the case called him "an active Holocaust denier anti-Semitic and racist." And in April 2005, I attended a lecture he gave in Costa Mesa at an event sponsored by the Institute for Historical Review, the leading voice of Holocaust denial in the U.S. There he joked about the Chappaquiddick line and, holding his right arm up, boasted: "This hand has shaken more hands that shook Hitler's hand than anyone else in the world."

The important question here is not whether Irving is a Holocaust denier (he is), or whether he offends people with what he says (he does), but why anyone, anywhere should be imprisoned for expressing dissenting views or saying offensive things. Today, you may be imprisoned or fined for dissenting from the accepted Holocaust history in the following countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Lithuania, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Switzerland.

Given their disastrous history of being too lenient with fringe political ideologues, it is perhaps understandable that countries such as Germany and Austria have sought to crack down on rabble-rousers whose "hate speech" can and has led to violence and pogroms. In some cases, the slippery slope has only a few paces between calling the Holocaust a "Zionist lie" and the neo-Nazi desecration of Jewish property.

And as we have witnessed repeatedly, Europeans have a different history and culture of free speech than we do in this country. In Germany, for example, the "Auschwitz lie" law makes it a crime to "defame the memory of the dead." In Britain, libel law requires the defendant to prove that he or she did not libel the plaintiff - unlike U.S. law, which puts the onus on the plaintiff - and the British recently debated the merits of banning religious hate speech. In France, it is illegal to challenge the existence of the "crimes against humanity" as they were defined by the military tribunal at Nuremberg; another law, on the books until just a few weeks ago, required that France's colonial history (which was not always "humane") had to be taught in a "positive" light.

In traditionally liberal Canada, there are "anti-hate" laws against spreading "false news." In late 1992, Irving went to Canada to receive the George Orwell Award from a conservative free-speech organization, whereupon he was arrested and deported on the grounds that his German court conviction for denying the Holocaust made him a likely candidate for future hate-speech violations.

Even in the land of Thomas Jefferson and the 1st Amendment, freedom of speech does not always ring. On Feb. 3, 1995, Irving was invited by the Berkeley Coalition for Free Speech to lecture at UC Berkeley. More than 300 protesters prevented Irving and the 113 ticket holders from entering. (That, however, is quite different from passing a law that bars him from speaking.)

Austria's treatment of Irving as a political dissident should offend both the people who defend the rights of political cartoonists to express their opinion of Islamic terrorists and the civil libertarians who leaped to the defense of University of Colorado professor Ward Churchill when he exercised his right to call the victims of 9/11 "little Eichmanns." Why doesn't it? Why aren't freedom lovers everywhere offended by Irving's court conviction?

Freedom is a principle that must be applied indiscriminately. We have to defend Irving in order to defend ourselves. Once the laws are in place to jail dissidents of Holocaust history, what's to stop such laws from being applied to dissenters of religious or political histories, or to skepticism of any sort that deviates from the accepted canon?

No one should be required to facilitate the expression of Holocaust denial, but neither should there be what Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis called the "silence coerced by law - the argument of force in its worst form."

The point was poignantly made in Robert Bolt's play, *A Man for All Seasons*, in which William Roper and Sir Thomas More debate the relative balance between evil and freedom:

Roper: So now you'd give the devil benefit of law.

More: Yes. What would you do? Cut a great road through the law to get after the devil?

Roper: I'd cut down every law in England to do that.

More: Oh? And when the law was down - and the devil turned round on you - where would you hide? Yes, I'd give the devil benefit of law, for my own safety's sake.

Call David Irving the devil if you like; the principle of free speech gives you the right to do so. But we must give the devil his due. Let Irving go, for our own safety's sake.

24 Feb. 2006. Dr. Michael Shermer is the publisher of *Skeptic magazine*, a monthly columnist for *Scientific American* and the author of [a very poor book] *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?*

POLISH HISTORY

A JEWISH STATE IN CENTRAL POLAND ?English Summary by **Jedrzej Giertych**

In this largely unknown work the author formulates the hypothesis that there was a dualistic plan in some Zionist circles during the Second World War to achieve not only the political aim of a Jewish state in Palestine, but also another political aim: the establishment of a similar state in Poland (in the province of Lublin); and that in this endeavour the Jewish politicians initially had some support on the part of Hitler, or at least of some German government circles at the time of Hitler's rule. The matter requires more thorough examination in archives and the author is not presently in a position to undertake such an examination. But the general lines of the problem present themselves sufficiently clearly in the light of scattered information, accessible in works which have been already published.

The author gathered together in this work information in the form of excerpts; from printed works (many of them in the English or German language, all quoted in the original, but always with an added Polish translation). All the texts quoted have been carefully examined, translated and interpreted by the author.

It is an indisputable fact that in 1939 and in 1940, the German occupation authorities in Poland were organizing a "Jewish Reserve" in the province of Lublin in Poland. According to some German pronouncements, this "Reserve" was to contain the whole Jewish population of Poland and probably also the Jewish population transferred from other countries, such as Germany, Czechoslovakia and Austria. As, according to an official estimate, there were 3,351,000 Jews in Poland on 32nd August 1939 (3,136,000 according to the official census of 1931), the transfer of the total Jewish population of Poland into the Lublin province would have created, even without the transfer of Jews from abroad, an accumulation of Jewish population twice as large as the present total population of the Republic of Israel and roughly equal to the total population of such independent states as Denmark, Norway, Finland, Eire or Syria. The German transfer of groups of Jewish population from other Polish provinces and from abroad into the Lublin province, and expulsions of the Polish population from this province, actually took place but they were on a small scale. This however is easy to explain because of the difficulties of war time. There is however another sign which supports the opinion that the German government seriously considered the plan of a "Jewish Reserve."

The total Jewish population in Poland was transferred by the German authorities into "ghettos" in the larger Polish cities and towns and in these "ghettos", enclosed by walls, ordered to perform industrial work for the German Army. Undoubtedly suffering great economic and physical persecution, the Jews were allowed one very important concession: some elements of political self-government (a Jewish administration, police, tax system, school system, prisons, courts, public welfare etc.) which was preparing them for future statehood.

In the administration of the "ghettos", the German authorities found a large class of enthusiastic supporters among the Jews themselves. It is impossible to dismiss this fact by the statement that they were quislings and traitors. It is obvious, that they were Jewish patriots, that they believed in the usefulness and importance of their work for the Jewish cause and that they seemed to work according to a common political plan, undisclosed, but clearly perceptible in their attitude. They were not perturbed by the oppressive character of German rule and calmly conducted their work until a very late date. When they discovered that the Germans were aiming at the massacre of the Jewish population - and for a long time they did not want to believe this - they almost all died a patriotic death, either by suicide or by volunteering for the "gas chambers", or German execution by firing squad.

The Jewish "ghettos" became another step along the way, leading to German massacre, but they could easily have also become a step towards a Jewish state on Polish soil. The transfer of the Jews into the "ghettos" destroyed the former basis of Jewish economic existence in Poland as a scattered population of traders, merchants, artisans, workers and professional men.

The years of life in isolated, purely Jewish communities under a harsh German rule, in poverty, in hard work and in a system of Jewish self-government, had also transformed them psychologically and made of them a human material far better suited to the future role of Zionist settlers. After the war, the "ghettos" would have been opened. The transfer of their population into a newly created, purely Jewish province with an agricultural basis, would have been an almost obvious solution. Contrary to opinions expressed by some at the quoted sources, the Lublin province was one of the richest and most fertile provinces of Poland. The city of Lublin contained centuries old historical

traditions in its local Jewish community and was, during the epoch of Jewish dispersion, one of the main historical centres of Jewish life, similar to Toledo, Amsterdam and Wilno.

It is the author's opinion, that in 1939 and in 1940 the creation of a Jewish state or "reserve" in the Lublin province was a serious German aim. In summer of 1940 the Germans began to have doubts, and in 1941 dropped the plan altogether. The plan of a massacre of the Jews was not an original German aim, but was conceived only in or after 1941, in connection with some general change in German political plans. The abandonment of the German plan of a Jewish Reserve in Lublin may perhaps be connected in some way with the breakdown of German-Soviet political co-operation in the years 1939-1941.

The reason why the German Nazi government, known for its anti-Semitism, may have wanted to create a Jewish territory, which sooner or later would have to become a Jewish state, can be explained by the fact that they were prepared to use any means which would help to destroy Poland.

A question, which is impossible to answer without an examination of archives, is the problem of whether there were in 1939 or at any other time - formal agreements, concerning the Lublin Reserve, between the German government and any responsible Jewish political circles. It seems to the author, that there must have been some such agreement or at least discussion. The author quotes long excerpts from a remarkable book by one of the most prominent Jewish politicians, the leader of the influential party of the Zionists-Revisionists, the late Vladimir Jabotinsky, in which the idea incessantly recurs, that it was the aim of the Jewish nation to establish **more than one** Jewish state after the end of the Second World War.

It needs not be said, that a plan, involving the expulsion of a several million of Polish population from the Lublin province and the establishment of a Jewish state there, would have been a terrible shock for Poland. Such a state would have immediately been taken under the protection of Soviet Russia and it would have also enjoyed sympathies in the Anglo-Saxon world. In the centre of Poland a strong, alien body would have been established and this could have been for Poland almost a death blow. There is no justification whatsoever for accession of Polish territory for Zionist ends. Poland is not the homeland of the Jews and Poland was never consulted on the question.

The nation of Poland has accorded hospitality to the Jews for many centuries, and besides Spain, she was the main country outside Palestine in which they found a temporary home. But it would have been ingratitude on the part of the Jews to repay Poland for her hospitality by territorial aggression.

It is the widespread opinion in England and America, that during the between-the-wars period of 1918-1939, the prevailing attitude of the Polish nation towards the Jews was a manifestation of 'anti-Semitism'. It will not be out of place here to say a few words about this for the benefit of the English or American reader. This opinion is completely unjustified, because the Polish-Jewish conflict of that time was of a purely political character and did not differ from any other political conflict between nations, such, as the Polish-German, or English-Irish, or Italian-Yugoslav, or Greek-Turkish. The nature of so called Polish anti-Semitism, is best shown by the fate of Jan Mosdorf, one of most prominent of its leaders, whose name resounded in the thirties throughout the world for this reason. During the Second World War, the Germans placed him in a concentration camp, where he joined an underground group, which for motives of Christian charity, was organizing help for the Jews, who were the most persecuted among the inmates of the camp. His activities were discovered by the Germans and he was executed for this. I would say, this is not the most typical attitude or behaviour for an anti-Semite: to give his life for persecuted Jews.

This so-called mislabeled Polish 'anti-Semitism' was not directed against the Jews as a race, but against the Jews as a political entity, whose aims were opposed to Polish national aspirations. Polish and Jewish interests diverged. What was considered good for the Jews from their perspective was not in the best interests of the Polish nation or the Polish people. There exists palpable similarities between the Jewish-Arabic political opposition in Palestine between the wars and the Jewish-Polish conflict of interests in Poland of the same time. The Arabs also were not anti-Semites; it would be ridiculous to refer to them by this name if only for the very simple reason that they are Semites themselves. The simple fact is, that they were opposed to the Zionists not because they did not like Semites, but because they saw in them and in their political program a danger to the Arab national cause and to their country.

The Jews were, in Poland, a force which was not negligible numerically. Discussions in which it was broached that a Jewish state could be created on Polish territory did not start only in 1939: such talk was widespread already many years earlier, not, it is true, in connection with the province of Lublin, but with the province of Polesie which, since the Russo-German agreements of 1939, had been in the Russian zone of Poland. (This province, which included the towns of Pinsk and Brest, was an immediate neighbour of the province of Lublin). The number of Jews in Poland was sufficiently large to form a viable independent state.

The Jews in Poland were ardent Nationalists and it was they who were to create the Zionist Republic in Palestine. (With the exception of Herzl, all the most important leaders of Zionism were Jews from the territory of ancient Poland and the bulk of Zionist settlers and stragglers came from Polish territory, also.) They were a tremendous economic and financial power in Poland and this power was increased by their ties with Jewish communities abroad. Their political attitude was to a great extent hostile to Poland. A very substantial part of the Jewish proletariat and intelligentsia in Poland sympathized with Soviet Russia and helped the Russian side in the Polish-Russian war of 1919/20. The Communist Party in Poland was to an overwhelming extent composed of Jews and even today people of Jewish origin form a very numerous and influential part of the Communist administration in Poland. The religious, liberal and wealthy sections of Jews in Poland before, during and after the First World War, sympathized with Prussia, with Imperial Germany, with the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and with the German Weimar Republic. Those Jews who took part in Polish political life often undisguisedly showed their hostility to Poland; e.g. Mr. Isaac Grunbaum, the leader of the Jewish representation in the Polish Parliament (which was quite numerous thanks to the Polish proportional electoral system), conducted a policy of permanent alliance with the Nazi representation of the German minority in Poland and with Ukrainian separatists, with the aim of transforming Poland into a Polish-Jewish-German-Ukrainian federation, in which the predominantly Polish character of Poland would disappear. In notorious utterances in the Polish Parliament in 1919, Grunbaum made threats that Poland would lose Gdansk, Wilno, Lwow and Silesia if she would not comply with Jewish demands. (He later became one of the most prominent leaders of Zionism and a member of the Government of the Republic of Israel.)

The facts quoted above should be sufficient to prove that Polish-Jewish antagonism was primarily a political one. This antagonism was increased by the fact that many persons of Jewish origin became nominal Christians in Poland, and were superficially assimilated into the Polish nation, but were in fact atheists and cosmopolitans and exercised a disruptive influence in the life of Polish society, whose cultural and religious basis is essentially Roman Catholic.

One must also remark, that in past centuries the Jews enjoyed in Poland an exceptional amount of liberty, never enjoyed to such extent in other European countries. It was a part of Poland's political philosophy that nobody should be persecuted for his faith and that unbelievers should not be compelled to become Christians if they did not wish to. (The most coherent exposition of this philosophy was made by the Polish thinker of the XVth century, Paulus Vladimir. This philosophy permeated practically the whole of Polish history from the XIIIth century till modern times.) Poland has never known religious intolerance and has never known religious persecution. (The sufferings of Jews in Polish Ukraine in the XVIIth century were not the fault of Poles but of the Cossack rebels, who mutinied against Poland.) At the time when the Jews suffered persecutions and massacres in Germany and many other countries, and were completely expelled from such countries as Spain and England, unlimited teeming masses of Jews from all European countries sought refuge in Poland and found it there. Polish tolerance and hospitality became the cause of a mass immigration of Jews into Poland and the birth of extraordinarily ubiquitous Jewish communities, forming a unique Jewish nationality and sub-culture within the Polish nation, a sub-culture whose interests were at variance with the interests of the Polish nation and Polish ethnic/religious community.

In the period of Poland's partitions (1772-1918) the predominant section of Jews found it expedient to make arrangements with Poland's oppressors (Prussia, Russia and Austria), and to dissociate itself from the Polish cause. Jews helped to spread the German and Russian languages in Poland. In many Polish cities they started to speak Russian and to support the Russian theatre, the Russian press, the Russian schools, etc., - in such cities as Wilno, Pinsk, Bialystok and to some extent even Warsaw. In the same way they started to speak German in Poznan, and to some extent in Cracow and Lwow. Jews supported the Prussian and Austrian governments in Western and Southern Poland and the Russian revolutionary parties in Eastern and Central Poland. Having the support of Poland's oppressors who, according to the principle *divide et impera*, tried to transform the Jews into a factor counter-balancing the native Polish population.

Jews became during the XIXth century a tremendous economic and political-power in Poland and came to consider themselves co-owners of Polish territory and Polish industry. This was the source of their program to organize within the body politic of Poland a purely Jewish province into which the bulk of Jewry in Poland could be transferred. A good example of the increase of Jewish influence in Poland is the fact that in Poland's capital city, Warsaw, they formed 4.5% of the population in 1781, in the time of Poland's independence, and 33.9% in 1857 under Russian rule. In the second largest Polish city, Lodz, 5.7% in 1793, 31.8% in 1897 and 40.7% in 1910.

* * *

It seems that there was also a plan to organize a third Jewish territory in the Crimean Peninsula of Southern Russia and in adjoining districts. A large scale agricultural Jewish colonization was conducted there at the beginning of Soviet rule and several "autonomous Jewish districts" were created.

It is the opinion of the author that the real program of at least some of the Zionist circles before and during the Second World War was to create not only one Jewish state (in Palestine), but two or perhaps even three. The simultaneous existence of two or three Jewish states, in the Middle East, in Central Europe and perhaps also in Southern Russia, would have given the Jewish nation much greater leverage in world politics than at present. These plans came to ruin in consequence of the sudden change of German policy which prompted the terrible massacre of the Jews, executed by Hitler in the last years of the Second World War. Only a relatively small fraction of Jews living in Poland was saved (partly thanks to the heroic help of the Poles), and was able to contribute its substantial effort to the building of the Republic of Israel in Palestine.

(Written in 1956) Acc "Komunikaty", Tom II cz.I 1979/1980, Arc. KSC2005/02
February 7, 2005

<http://www.papurec.org/>

APRIL 1 ST ?

Big Pharmaceuticals Pushes "Miracle Cure" For Holocaust Denial Syndrome

New drug closes down brain's intellectual center, blocks politically incorrect neurotransmitters involved in critical thought processes

By Michael James in Frankfurt, Germany February 20, 2006

Governments, police services and prison authorities around the world are reportedly "overjoyed" by the launch of a new prescription drug that cures people who are suffering doubts about the veracity of the so-called Jewish Holocaust. Shares in Israel-based Goy & Goy Pharmaceuticals Incorporated rocketed to 89 US dollars following the long-awaited announcement of a miracle cure for Holocaust Denial Syndrome (HDS).. Soon to be marketed and sold under the name Holozac, the drug works by rapidly closing down the brain's centre of intellectual inquiry. It also blocks the re-uptake of politically incorrect neurotransmitters involved in critical thought processes, making it more difficult to distinguish between truth and lies..

"We're simply overwhelmed by the response of the governments we control in the Zionist West," says Ari Scheister, Marketing Director for Goy & Goy's regional office in Germany. "Particularly so in the European Union where prisons are bursting at the seams with professors, journalists and academics who are all suffering the symptoms of advanced and potentially fatal HDS and other diseases associated with human awareness and a passion for the truth.". Europe's most prominent sufferers, Ernst Zundel, Germar Rudolf and David Irving are said to be in a stable condition following incarceration in high-security prison facilities for People Who Read Books (PWRBs).. "Next to People Who Have the Audacity to Actually Write Books (PWHATAWBs), the PWRBs are our most urgent concern," says Guenther Gutmensch, Parliamentary Chairman of the Federal Commission for Confiscating and Burning Books That Make People Think Something Ain't Right (FCFCABBTMPTSAR). "They ask lots of questions and they have an unnatural and very unhealthy obsession with finding out the truth. They simply do not believe a word we say."

Goy & Goy Pharmaceuticals were given the green light by EU health regulators yesterday following extensive double-blind tests involving twenty HDS sufferers. Over a seven-day period, the patients were allowed unrestricted access to a library of detailed and scientifically authenticated studies of the so-called Jewish Holocaust. Ten of the patients were given a placebo, whereas each of the other ten was administered 500 mg of Holozac twelve times a day.. "The results were astonishing," says Dr Ron Haggler, who supervised the trial. "On the first day, both groups quickly

found all three volumes of the 1948 'Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross', and 'The Hoax of the Twentieth Century' by Arthur Butz. On the second day, patients were still reading and discussing Gernar Rudolf's 'Lectures on the Holocaust' and Juergen Graf's seminal 'The Giant with Feet of Clay'. "However," continues Haggler, "by Wednesday morning the group treated with Holozac had actually pushed aside Carlo Mattogno's 'Auschwitz: Rumor and Reality' and Norman Finkelstein's 'The Holocaust Industry' in favour of the semi-mythical 'Schindler's List'. At the end of the experiment they were actually fighting over the only available copy of Germany's favourite self-loathing, government-controlled newspaper 'Bild Zeitung'."

There are however side effects associated with Holozac. It's active ingredient Zionine has been shown to cause a pathological hatred of Palestinians and Muslims in general.. "It's not for cartoonists or editor's of Mossad-controlled newspapers," Haggler explained. "We are also cautioning doctors not to prescribe to patients who have a habit of harming either themselves or complete strangers and who then blame that harm on imaginary Arab terrorists.". Haggler's colleagues also stress that giving the drug to Christians who have been artfully persuaded to believe a false, unscriptural, satanic doctrine known as the Zionist Dispensation would be sheer overkill.. "Cyrus Scofield and the Rapture crowd did to American Christians what this drug can do to the Holy Remnant," says an Israeli team coordinator, smiling. "Pastors and Ministers in the United States, who have deliberately confused the pristine Kingdom of God with a stretch of worthless real estate on a spinning ball of dirt, have all but made medical treatment with Holozac unnecessary. A Scofield Reference Bible believer on just one milligram of Zionine would make the Irgun death squad look like the Cub Scouts on a paper chase. Buying stock in Caterpillar Bulldozers would be a smart move. Here's my broker's phone number." . Despite such reservations about possible side effects, the European Union has already invested 15 billion euros in what it describes as the most ambitious mental health campaign in modern times. "We're talking about targeted pre-emptive measures," says an EU spokesman for Mental Hygiene and Correct Thinking. "Holocaust Denial Syndrome begins at home and in the classroom. Does your child ask questions? Does he or she read books? Does he or she get bored with television news programmes and surf the Internet for uncensored history sites and the truth about September 11? If the answer is 'yes' to any one of these painfully necessary questions, then your child should be treated with Holozac immediately before his or her brain has a chance to fully develop its dangerous critical faculties."

Much to the delight of Goy & Goy shareholders, that recommendation was heartily echoed by bought-and-paid-for psychiatric professionals throughout the European Union yesterday.. "We often find ourselves being called out at short notice to help the police deal with highly intelligent people who question the official version of history and who therefore require urgent medication," says first-responder Heidi Stomp. "At the end of the day, all we want is a society of normal, well-adjusted people who watch television, trust the government, don't ask questions, pay their taxes and love Israel.". "Governments are limited in terms of what they can do to keep young men dying in wars for Israel premised upon our cleverly scripted history and other scams," reiterates Ari Scheister. "They can burn books and lie and deceive over and over again, but there's always a hard core of dangerously self-educated and wilfully informed people who persist in asking troublesome questions about our precious and wonderfully unique Holocaust, despite the threat of imprisonment or worse. The only way to deal with this terrible disease and stop the truth from infecting other people is by treating sufferers with our new miracle Holozac.". "To paraphrase one of our cleverest non-attributable disinformation slogans of all time," concludes Scheister, "it may not be the only solution, but it's sure as hell the final solution. Pass the Sushi, will ya?" .

<http://www.haltturnershow.com/NewDrugCuresHolocaustDenial.html>

A MORON

Letter to the editor of the *Tehran Times*

Brian F. Maiorana

Dear sirs,

I am an average American citizen, a nobody really, cast in a sea of 299 million morons that believe everything the United States government tells them. They believe everything the Zionist-controlled media tells them as well.

I don't know exactly how, but from an early age I seemed to notice something about the

American press. No matter what newspaper you read here or what news show you watched on television, they all sounded alike. They continually repeated the same nonsense over and over. Yes there are some very small publications that do reveal some of the truth as to what's going on here. But they are printed on a weekly or even monthly basis and have a very small circulation. That all changed when the internet came along. That is why they are desperately trying to censor it here and place all sorts of controls over it. Because here an average person such as myself should never be allowed to know the truth. To know who is responsible for all the ills of my country. To know that the blame lies squarely with those filthy Zionist bastards that have infiltrated every aspect of my country's culture. They have taken over every part of our government, to the highest levels. The most powerful are not even elected, but appointed by a grinning babbling idiot we have for a president.....!!!!!!

I applaud your country, and your countrymen. You're not afraid to stand up against this tyranny called the new world order, which you and I both know means, "Do as we say or we will annihilate your country."

I am personally asking your people and your government to use tact and intelligence in dealing with this scum. They are beating the war drums here again for a military strike against your country. I do not want to see a repeat of Iraq. That's exactly what it will become, if they go ahead and try to use military force against you.

We both know that the development of weapons isn't the issue. All of us now know that Saddam Hussein never had any stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. What he did have was oil... and what he said he was going to start doing. Two months before the bombs started falling over Iraq, he announced he was no longer going to accept petrodollars for Iraqi oil. Instead he would only accept euros.

Most people here have no idea that your country is going to open a mercantile exchange, an oil bourse I believe it's called, except maybe some investors. I fully understand the reasons why you are going to open this exchange and why you want to use only euros. The American dollar is pretty much worthless because my country has put itself in a state of debt that it can never pay back. The debt here is so high that all of the property owned by individuals, homes, cars, businesses, savings, does not even come close to what my county owes in debt. We have spent ourselves right down the toilet. Just the way the old Soviet Union did. This is the reason why China and now Japan are both dumping the dollar on to the market, hoping someone will buy them. Anyone with any brains out there would laugh.

I truly wish your country success and prosperity with your endeavors. In closing, I want to say to the Iranian people, that not all of us Americans are completely brainwashed by a Zionist-controlled media. That some of us have nothing but contempt and a burning hatred for that \$%&*# little illegitimate state of Israel. That I am personally gleeful at the site of seeing Ariel Sharon die a slow painful death -- a just ending for a butcher who slaughtered innocent women and children.

Sincerely,

Teheran Times, 16 feb. 2006-02-23

<http://www.tehrantimes.com/Description.asp?Da=2/16/2006&Cat=2&Num=11>

RACIST KURDS

Talabani: Autonomy for Turkmens in Kurdistan

By Turhan Tisinli

Turkmens cannot be quieted by vague promises, and definitely cannot willingly be a part of a country that calls itself by an ethnic name like that of "Kurdistan"; and be partners with a people who have been planning to change their ethnic identity, as recent history tells us about Erbil. People who would like to be partners with Turkmens must first of all stop all the rhetoric about Kurdishness of Turkmen Land in general, Kerkuk in particular. Kerkuk being "Jerusalem of Kurds" (as if Turkmens are the occupying Jews), and similar absurd and unfounded claims by Kurdish parties must stop immediately, all the "peshmerge" forces must be withdrawn from Turkmen Land (Turkmen Eli). Turkmens must be recognized as an equal partner whether in Iraq or whatever unit the Turkmens are going to end up in. My heart is still bleeding for what happened in Telafer to hundreds of innocent people. Ironically, we Turkmens instead of being unified against the unrelenting, and ever increasing

threats to our very existence, we are still squabbling about who should have been the "emperor" of the Muslim Nation some 1400 years ago. Unaware of the (successful) attempts to wipe us out of existence, we are still flogging ourselves for our masters' losing the chance to come to power then, all the while we are subjected to life-and-death issues facing us in the present, this minute to be precise.

All the non-Turkmen who were resettled in the Turkmen cities and towns were resettled there for one and only one reason: robbing the Turkmen of their claim to their cities and towns and natural resources, alienate them, and eventually dissolve their presence. Since the construction of Iraq (some 80 years ago), Racist regimes of Baghdad as well as racist Kurdish parties raced with each other to Arabize, Kurdify, or simply "de-Turkmenize" Turkmen cities and towns. Even the defunct IPC resettled the Assyrians and the Armenians near the oil fields and installations and employed them with generous salaries all the while the rightful inhabitants of Kerkuk suffered from poverty and neglect. As the site of one of the few giant oil producing fields of the world, Kerkuk is still a slum-looking town, which lacks the infrastructure it deserves for being the sole life line of Iraq for many decades. Even a simple university was seen too much for Kerkuk. Talking to a Turkmen friend about the issue in the 1970's he said it is good that they didn't, because it would be a good pretext to bring more Arabs to the city, as was the case with Sulaymaniyya University, that was used to introduce Arabs to that Kurdish city.

Kerkuk was home for one of the biggest military bases in the country (the Second Brigade, that helped the Kurds in the famous 1959 massacre of Turkmen in Kerkuk) that brought thousands of Arabs and Kurds to the city who eventually chose it as their permanent address. Kerkuk in particular, and Turkmen Eli in general, unwillingly and due to political naivety of Turkmen (who were not allowed to have leaders from themselves), absorbed thousands upon thousands of non-Turkmen that were brought there by British oil industry (Iraqi Petroleum Company), army bases, and other governmental establishments, not because the city lacked local workers, but due to conscious and covert plans to dilute the Turkmen concentration and gradually get rid of them. I appeal to humanity to stop rewarding the Kurds (who undoubtedly suffered a lot in the hands of past Iraqi regimes) at the expense of Turkmen, who suffered many extermination attempts by the same regimes, and ironically at the hands of Kurdish "peshmerge" themselves too.

posted by Turkmeneli News Agency-kerkuk

<http://turkmenelina.blogspot.com/>

TURKMEN OF IRAQ
KERKUK IS CAPITAL CITY OF TURKMENELI
<http://www.kirkuk.us/>

TIDBITS

§§§§§§§§ **Turn over**

CBC ordered to turn over Zundel tapes Richard Blackwell

An Ontario judge has ruled that the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. must turn over videotapes of a demonstration outside a jail where Holocaust denier Ernst Zundel was behind bars.

The broadcaster had fought against release of the material, which includes out-takes from a television program called *The Nerve*. The CBC crew filmed 90 minutes of the demonstration on Sept. 12, 2004, outside the Metro West Detention Centre in Toronto, where Zundel supporters clashed with an anti-racist group. There was little violence, but three pro-Zundel demonstrators were charged with weapons offences.

The police subpoenaed the CBC tapes, including more than 80 minutes that never aired publicly. Both the Crown and lawyers for the three defendants wanted the tapes turned over to the court so they could see them.

The CBC had argued that handing over the tapes would have a "chilling" effect on the

Amazon

http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0967985692/qid=1136745236/sr=2-1/ref=pd_bbs_b_2_1/103-3989330-3074221?s=books&v=glance&n=283155

§§§§§§§§§§ LEARN ABOUT IRAQ (AND SEE MUSTAFA BARZANI (sr) DON AN ISRAELI MILITARY UNIFORM...)

Look for this book, translated from Hebrew to Arabic:
Shlomo Nekdimon, *The Mosad in Iraq and surrounding countries*,
translated by Bader Oqaily, 1997, Dar El Jaleel, Palestinian studies, Amman, Jordan, PO box 8972 tel (amman) 667627.

§§§§§§§§§§ IS HE A PEDOPHILE OR WHAT ?

An Interview With Ken McVay

Jonathan Wallace

Ken McVay is a lone warrior on the Internet who has made it his work to combat the Holocaust revisionists. I interviewed him by email over a several week period.

Ken's materials can be found on the Internet at:

The Nizkor Project: An Electronic Holocaust Resource. Ken himself can be reached at kmcvay@oneb.almanac.bc.ca.

*Q: What makes the "revisionists" tick? I've used the link from your pages to visit the IHR pages, and noticed that, instead of the ravings you'd expect, the whole thing is pitched so low key that it would persuade a certain number of people who know nothing about the Holocaust. **What is their agenda?***

A: Surely you understand that I can't begin to speak for them - all I can do is speculate. For many of them, in my view, the agenda is simply to indulge in Hitler-cleansing, in order to make fascism respectable. However, so long as the Holocaust remains as unquestioned historical reality, nothing these people either do or say will convince anyone that Adolf Hitler was really a rather nice chap, albeit misunderstood.

I think this is about power - nothing more, nothing less.

Q: What got you interested in going after the revisionists?

A: They offended my humanity. It's that simple.

Q: I hope I didn't upset you with the phrasing of my last question, but what I was trying to get at was your motivation in coming to this work, or at least a mini-history of how it happened.

A: I wasn't upset, it's just a natural reaction to a question I am asked dozens of times every month. The answer, of course, can only be sheer speculation.

Motivation? That's the #1 question asked by media folks... the answer is always the same: Holocaust deniers and neo-Nazi activists **offend** me. They offend my sense of humanity - what is right, and what is wrong. They make me angry, and prone to violent thoughts, and I dislike them for that - making me look at the violence within me. These people deliberately offend. They deliberately hurt. They stand for decay - death and destruction. How could one not be offended? [***This loony forgets to speak about the fat pay he receives from hidden sponsors for his good job...***]

Q: Thanks. I was glad to hear from you. In preparing for the June issue of the Ethical Spectacle (when I will also run this interview) I read extensively in both primary and secondary sources on Auschwitz and the Holocaust. When comparing the reaction of survivors on the meaning of the experience, I found a wide range of opinions, from the cynical and desperate (Tadeusz Borowski, who killed himself in 1951), to the angry and unreconciled (Elie Wiesel in Night), to the optimistic and platitudinous (Primo Levi, whose insights into the experience are much better than his overview and recommendations for the future). Other writers, who did not themselves experience it, portray the Holocaust as a black hole, which can never be plumbed or understood, as the end of theology, etc. When Primo Levi asked a German soldier in Auschwitz "Why", the soldier replied, "there is no why

here." Or, as one doctor commented to me, "When I read too much about the Holocaust, I become clinically depressed."

Do you think human beings are far more capable of perpetrating evil than of remembering, understanding, or avoiding it? The thesis that we all bounce off the Holocaust might explain everything from Greg Raven to the phony hopefulness of [Schindler's List](#).

Hope that was a better question, one you don't get many times a month! If not, well, there's little originality under the sun. By the way, if there is anything else you want to say, or question you'd like to supply, please go ahead.

A: As to the first question, it seems clear enough... Man has a horrid capacity to do evil, almost as if he cannot avoid it - a genetic marker gone bad, perhaps. As events in x-Yugoslavia and elsewhere show, we don't seem to learn a thing from the past, either.

Instead, we prattle about genocide, and discuss it in the abstract while we watch it on the tube every night. [**Where ? Where? He does not dare to mention Palestine...**] ...and become hardened to it, as it is repeated in 2-minute segments, week after week.

The bottom line seems to be that, in spite of our words, we really don't give a damn.

It's difficult for me to know what to say.. I've become somewhat jaded about the press, after all the interviews I've put behind me... all of the magazine and newspaper articles seem the same to me after awhile.

Perhaps one thing that I should note, because authors often sensationalize the hatemongering on the Net, is that, for all their vitriol, these people are only a tiny handful of the 30-40 million users on the Internet. I am weary of seeing their activities blown out of proportion, as **I am weary of seeing the issue of "child porn" blown out of proportion (I've been on and around the Net since 1988, and have yet to come across anything I'd consider "child porn." I've seen photos of naked children, but then I've got some of those in my family photo album, and fail to see the harm, or any great moral danger to our society).**

We are dealing with a few dozen cynical activists, trolling the net for money and cannon fodder. Even if **all** of the estimated 20,000 or so facists on the continent became active on the Net, they **still** would represent no more than a small ripple in the internet pond. In spite of that, the press continues to sensationalize their presence, using it as an excuse for black headlines, and the Canadian and American governments dutifully blather about "controlling the Internet," presumably for "our own good."

Speaking for myself, I wish to make it crystal clear that I don't **want** to be "protected" by government thought police. Everywhere we turn, governments are pushing and prodding our lives, and I'm far more concerned about **them** attacking the Net, and thus our freedom, than I am about watching the Nazis do it.

(No date given)

<http://www.spectacle.org/695/mcvay.html>

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ A FACTUAL APPRAISAL OF THE "HOLOCAUST" BY THE RED CROSS.

by NoEvidenceOfGenocide

<http://thunderbay.indymedia.org/news/?author=NoEvidenceOfGenocide&comments=yes> Friday
January 28, 2005

No Evidence Of Genocide
The Jews And The Concentration Camps:
A Factual Appraisal By The Red Cross.

There is one survey of the Jewish question in Europe during World War Two and the conditions of Germany's concentration camps which is almost unique in its honesty and objectivity, the three-volume Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross on its Activities during the Second World War, Geneva, 1948.

<http://thunderbay.indymedia.org/print.php?id=18220>

§§§§§§§§§§ **Arabic Lecture (only Oner night)**

A Lecture on the Hollowcause in Amman

On the evening of Saturday, March 4, 2006, a lecture on the myths of the Hollowcause and their political uses was delivered in the Association against Zionism and Racism in Amman, Jordan by the Arab revisionist Ibrahim Alloush.

The announcement for the lecture carried the title: Is the Hollowcause Scientifically Feasible? And Why Does it Concern us Politically as Arabs?

The main topics tackled in the lecture included: 1) the three components of the Hollowcause myth, 2) the political uses of the myth, and why one can't reject those uses while accepting the myth, 3) Arab attitudes towards the Hollowcause and why one can't accept the myth without diminishing the cause of Palestine, 4) a summary of the works of revisionist historians debunking the myth scientifically, especially the alleged 'gas chamber', and how that chamber is the centerpiece of the myth, not the exaggerated numbers as some think, 5) the persecution of revisionist historians and the Hollowcause as one of the most important files of the Arab-Zionist conflict, and why we should step all over the myth without flinching.

In the question and answer period that followed, the audience which filled the hall to the hilt interacted quite positively with the propositions being advanced. Several demanded that the conclusions of the lecture be propagated as widely as possible. There was definitely mass interest and sympathy there with the revisionist cause and with revisionist historians.

The morale of the story is: taking this position doesn't isolate us but brings us closer to the pulse of the street. For the ones who are isolated are the ones who find themselves more and more often sitting with imperialists and Zionists criticizing the 'barbarism' of the people!

=====
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-at-yahoo.com.au)

OTHER AAARGH MONTHLY PUBLICATIONS

<http://www.geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo>

El Paso del Ebro

Das kausale Nexusblatt

Il Resto del Siclo

Conseils de Révision

La Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues (multilingual) <http://ggb.0catch.com>

O revisionismo em lingua português

Armenichantage (Armenian blackmail)