

CENTRAL ASIA'S OILFIELDS

Putin's hands on the oil pumps

By John Helmer

Moscow - For a decade Washington has backed the Turkish and Azerbaijan governments to steer the export of Caspian region crude oil away from Russia. Russia's newest riposte has been to ally the Russian and Iranian oil industries, and open up the shortest, cheapest and most lucrative oil route of all, southwards out of the Caspian to Iran.

The economics of the southward route are the latest blow for the Bush administration as it tries to redraw the geography of the Caucasus on an anti-Russian map. But for oil exporters and shippers in the Caspian, President George W Bush's jawboning looks to be as futile as King Canute telling the sea to roll backwards.

Early oil from Azerbaijan's newest offshore oilfields has been piped northwestwards through the Russian pipeline system to Novorossiysk port, on the Black Sea, along with crude from the Caspian shoreline of Kazakhstan. But there have been frequent arguments with the Azeris over volumes and transit fees, and these have led to frequent oil stoppages. Azeri oil for transit across Georgia to Supsa port is a costly trickle, by comparison.

Bosphorus chokepoint, Bosphorus bypass

In parallel, Turkey has been steadily tightening restrictions on tanker movements out of the Black Sea, through the Bosphorus Straits. The latest rules ban lengthy and large-capacity tankers - those which are most cost-effective for charterers and cargo-owners - from moving through the straits at night. The delay adds to the transport charges, creating an expensive chokepoint that has multiplied the costs of routing oil through the Black Sea for US allies, and Russia, alike.

As new Caspian oilfields come onstream, and the volumes of crude lifted grow beyond the capacities of the Russian pipeline system to absorb, the American strategy has been to press hard to redirect these exports across land towards Turkey. The pipeline route chosen is known by its origin and destination as Baku-Ceyhan (Azerbaijan-Turkey). It passes through Tbilisi in Georgia and is known as the BTC project.

The Russian government has always understood that the this pipeline was part of the broader US strategy to cut all links with Moscow of the former Soviet states in the Caucasus, building a new economic infrastructure that would dissuade the Caucasus group from ever renewing these ties. These efforts have proved to be a costly boomerang.

To thwart those in Turkey who view the Bosphorus logjam as leverage to promote the Ceyhan route, Russia's state-controlled pipeline agency Transneft has found a Turkish partner, and proposes building a relatively low-cost, short-distance pipeline to avoid the straits - and avoid the Ceyhan pipeline too.

Transneft disclosed its Bosphorus bypass plan in February, when chief executive officer Semyon Vainshtok said his company was interested in constructing a 193 kilometer pipeline on the territory of Turkey, with the local contractor Anadolu. Last year, he noted, Russian companies shipped 62 million tonnes of oil through the straits, or over 30% of all Russian export volumes. Compared with the Ceyhan's project cost of more than \$5 billion, the bypass reportedly would cost about \$900 million, with capacity estimated in the range of 50-60 million tonnes per year.

This is roughly equal to Russian shipments by tanker through the straits. Vainshtok also claimed that two major Russian oil producers, Tatneft and Tyumen Oil Company - now controlled by British Petroleum - have offered their guarantees to supply the bypass with crude. This was another slap at the Ceyhan project, whose backers admit it lacks guarantees of enough crude to justify its cost. According to the latest news reported in Moscow, the potential starting point for the Bosphorus bypass route could be Kiyikei on the Black Sea, and the end-point at an offloading terminal at Ibrikhaba on the Aegean Sea.

In June, while North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) heads of state were holding their annual meeting on the shores of the Bosphorus at Istanbul, the Russian government despatched a warning that the security measures Turkey had implemented in the straits violated 68-year-old treaty provisions that still bind both the NATO states and the Russians. In an unusual statement, the federal Ministry of Transport in Moscow issued a warning to the Turkish government, accusing its ban on tanker traffic through the Bosphorus of being a violation of the Montreux Treaty.

According to the ministry, "unilateral actions undertaken by Turkey contradict Article 2 of the treaty of Montreux of 1936". The statement, drafted by the foreign relations department at the Transport Ministry, referred to the ban, in effect from June 27 to 29, on vessels carrying hazardous cargoes, notably oil and gas. The Montreux Treaty was the most recent in a series of last-century international pacts declaring the straits to be international waters, and prohibiting Turkey from taking unilateral action to interfere with innocent passage of vessels.

Ukrainian reversal, Croatian opening

The American effort at the north end of the Black Sea, on the Ukrainian shore, has had even less success.

A Ukrainian pipeline, designed to attract Caspian oil into Odessa port, on the Black Sea, and then pump it northwards to Brody, and thence into Poland and other central European destinations, has lain empty for almost a year. Despite US government prodding, even the major US oil companies in the Caspian cannot quite absorb the commercial disadvantages of the route. Nor can US allies in the Polish government overrule their colleagues with demands to buy this anti-Russian, but higher-priced oil.

The Russian government, together with Russian oil exporters, has countered with a proposal for the Ukrainian government to reverse the oil flow in the pipeline, and pipe Russian crude southwards to Odessa, for tankering out of the Black Sea. At first, the Ukrainians rejected the offer. But as port shipments of oil from Odessa dwindled, and the economics of the Brody direction began to talk louder than politics, a deal was done to accept the Russian oil, and reverse the pipeline direction.

The conflict in Kiev over the strategic pros and cons of these alternative oil routes has damaged another US ally in the region. Late last year, the Ukrainian parliament voted to block the Adria pipeline reversal project. This is aimed at delivering Russian crude to the deep-water port of Omishalj in Croatia, on the Adriatic Sea. The Ukrainian veto was retaliation by the anti-Russian oil lobby in Kiev for the failure of its Odessa-Brody project.

The irony of this outcome is that the Omishalj project was first proposed in 2002, and agreed upon by Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Slovakia, Hungary and Croatia as a way of despatching Russian crude in large tankers to Bush constituents who own the refineries on the Texas coast of the United States.

Initial capacity, according to the Omishalj plan, was 5 million tonnes per year, rising eventually to 15 million tonnes. The Ukrainian deputies justified their no-vote because, they said, it would be the final blow to the proposed Odessa-Brody pipeline, should the Druzhba line be filled up west of Ukraine. "This is true," says Adam Landes, an oil analyst in Moscow. "But Odessa-Brody is doomed regardless. It offers no competitive advantage to potential Caspian shippers, or buyers of crude, and this is why it has been idle for two years now, since it was essentially completed. The longer Ukraine takes to face up to these rather obvious facts, the longer that this ill-fated pipeline will lie dormant." The Croatians, too, have now bowed to the realities of the oil marketplace, and Omishalj will soon start regular dispatches of Russian oil cargoes.

Embargo for Latvia

Another US ally to be caught in the cross-fire has been Latvia. As the anti-Russian pressure has mounted against Russian oil shipments in the south, Moscow accelerated the completion of a new oil outlet on the Gulf of Finland and Baltic Sea. This is Primorsk, which opened two years ago, and is being expanded by Transneft to become Russia's largest oil port.

Controlled by Transneft, Primorsk receives its crude from the Baltic Pipeline System - a network of pipelines linking Russia's new Arctic oilwells and expanding northwest Siberian fields

to the sea lanes to Western Europe's markets. Once the Primorsk outlet was established, the Russian government ordered Transneft to turn off the supply of oil to Ventspils in Latvia. At one time the Soviet Union's northern gateway for oil exports, in 1990 Ventspils almost matched Novorossiysk in capacity and throughput. But no longer. The Latvians have appealed to Washington for help, but Moscow will not listen. The opening of Primorsk was the deathknell for Ventspils.

Checkmate for the Yukos-Houston alliance

The Americans responded in 2003 by pressing the Russian government to end Transneft's monopoly over pipelines, and allow the Russian oil majors to build a pipeline of their own to Murmansk. That, Washington energy officials claimed, would open a new, commercially effective route for crude deliveries to US East Coast refineries. Transneft has responded by accelerating the expansion of the Baltic Pipeline System, while the Kremlin has started prosecutions of Yukos, the oil company which was closest to Washington. The speed of this pipeline expansion effort will overtake the growth of Russian export volumes by 2005, Transneft officials have said. The Murmansk project will wither, they believe, for lack of oil to ship.

Beginning in May 2002, Russian and US energy officials appeared to endorse public announcements from the two leading Russian producers and exporters, Yukos and LUKoil, that they were prepared to start strategic shipment of oil to the US. Russian tanker operators were skeptical from the start. Yukos led with a shipment of about 250,000 tonnes of oil which was despatched to Houston in June of 2002 on three 80,000-tonne tankers, which transferred the cargo to a VLCC (Very large crude carrier) in the Mediterranean.

LUKoil followed with an announcement it was preparing a shipment at Malta. Dmitri Skarga, chief executive of Sovcomflot, Russia's leading tanker company, told Asia Times Online at the time that he thought the Yukos project "may be effective, but that depends on the level of prices and the tariff rates". He said that adjusting deliveries to refinery needs was a time-consuming and costly business. Yukos chief executive Mikhail Khodorkovsky then announced that the trade would not be profitable unless oil were above \$25 per barrel.

Mikhail Perfilov, a leading Moscow analyst, noted skeptically, "LUKoil has been speaking of plans to start supplies to the US for years now, and I won't be surprised if they still continue this talk a few years from now."

By August, Russian oil industry sources were conceding that two years of publicity and political talks by the two governments had failed to produce a viable Russian supply line for crude deliveries to the US.

Sergei Grigoriev, vice president of Transneft and the company spokesman, told Asia Times Online that the Murmansk project - also known by the Russians as the North Project - is still under study, and no decisions have been made. "The pipeline direction starts from Surgut and goes towards the Barents Sea, but we don't know where it will finish. We have two variants - a port in the Indigo area, in the Nenets region, or at an undeveloped site called Svyatoy Nos [Saint Nose], also in the Nenets region." In the ongoing feasibility studies, Grigoriev said the throughput target is "approximately 50-60 million tonnes".

But is this route a realistic option for Russia to supply the US? "I wouldn't talk about US shipments now," Grigoriev replies, "because currently there is no direct shipment of oil from Russia to the US. The numbers are insignificantly small - something less than 300,000 tonnes a year in 2002, and I don't know the later numbers. Maybe the US buys some Russian oil in Rotterdam. The only direct shipment project I know was the Yukos experiment, but it failed."

Two years ago, LUKoil, Russia's largest oil producer and second exporter after Yukos, waxed enthusiastic on the Murmansk project, but no longer. Spokesman Mikhail Mikhailov says now "it's too early to speak about the project. While it's at the feasibility study stage we aren't ready to announce how we will use it because a lot of necessary information is unknown." He claimed that LUKoil had earlier announced that it would contribute 20 million tonnes to the line, "but now the situation has changed, and the terms and extraction volumes are different".

Does LUKoil have a view of the projected capacity of Russia to supply the US with crude oil? "We are speaking about non-existent facts. Maybe some oil was shipped through Rotterdam, but its volume was very small." The commercial viability of Russian oil shipments to the US, LUKoil now concedes, depends not on the US, but on the Russian government. "[This]

depends on the terms of the project, terms which Transneft will create." TNK-BP - the new British-controlled form of Tyumen Oil - is also no longer the talkative US booster it once was. A spokesman, claiming anonymity, would say only that the Murmansk project was "currently at such a preliminary stage we are not ready to discuss its details or its opportunities".

The data on Russian crude exports to the US confirm that the Yukos experiment has failed. Petroleum Argus reports that in the first half of this year, direct Russian exports to the US were "close to zero". Indirect shipments, through Rotterdam and other markets, were "approximately 250 to 270,000 tonnes per month". A Russian Energy Ministry official told Asia Times Online he lacked a precise number for total Russian exports to the US, but he acknowledged that there is no direct shipment, and the aggregate is "too small to report".

Yukos sources now say they believe Yukos, now close to insolvency after being held liable for billions of dollars in unpaid taxes from 2000, and former chief executive officer Mikhail Khodorkovsky - now on trial in Moscow on multiple charges relating to his share dealings - never intended that Russia should assist the US as a strategic oil supply partner. Rather, the sources believe that Khodorkovsky and his shareholding allies in the company believed the oil shipments to Houston could generate favorable publicity as they sought to sell their shares on the New York Stock Exchange, or find a major US oil producer to buy up to 40% of the stock. "It was a case of what the US could do for the Yukos shareholders," one source said, "not what Russian oil could do for the US." The arrest of Khodorkovsky in October 2003 exposed how far apart these two ambitious plans were.

Putin's hand on the oil pump - the eastern option

Until Vladimir Putin became president in 2000, Russian oil policy was dictated by a corrupt alliance of Russian oil producers and the US government. Putin's campaign against Yukos has put a stop to that. Even during the Boris Yeltsin period, however, Russian public policy was not to attack the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline on strategic grounds. Rather, Russian tactics were to play for time, and wait for the economics of oil transportation to tell against the US plan. So long as crude oil prices remained low, time encouraged delay in starting Baku-Ceyhan. The US war against Iraq threatened the pipeline plan too, by raising the prospect of a gusher of Iraqi crude on the market, cutting prices.

But now that Bush is proving that he cannot lift Iraqi oil, and oil has begun to substitute for the US dollar in international financial speculation, further counters to Baku-Ceyhan are being created by Moscow to retain the upper hand.

One new export route for Russian oil goes southwards by tanker through the Caspian to Iran. Russian oil producers and shippers say they are expecting the volume of crude oil and petroleum products shipped from the Russian Caspian port of Astrakhan to Iran to more than double this year. A spokesman for Volgotanker, the leading tanker operator in the Caspian, said it is expecting growth of its oil volume to jump 150% over the 2003 level of 800,000 tonnes.

Russian industry sources claim the expansion of the Iranian port of Neka, and the construction of a 120,000-barrels/day pipeline from Neka to Rey, is one of the new options for oil movement southwards. The Russian shipments of Caspian oil are paid for by swap arrangements with Iranian oil shipped out of Persian Gulf ports. Enzeli, the only Iranian Caspian port able to receive deep-draught vessels, is also being considered for receiving oil aboard railcars shipped by ferry from Astrakhan. LUKoil's new oil terminal at Ilyinka, on the Astrakhan shore, will reach transshipment capacity of 3 million tonnes annual capacity (60,000 barrels per day) next year; this year capacity is 1 million tonnes (20,000 bd).

Russian use of its oil exports in strategic policy has been frustrating to China, an erstwhile ally in the Far East. So far, despite years of negotiations, the government in Beijing has failed in its bid to get access to the pipeline flow of Russian oil exports. A non-binding agreement signed last year between the Chinese and Russian governments envisages that China will receive 700 million tonnes of Russian crude through the pipeline over 25 years at a current cost of about \$150 billion. The price formula Russia and China would use for the oil has not been disclosed, and is apparently not settled. The strategic objective for Beijing is obvious: it wants to reduce its growing dependence on oil shipped from the Middle East, Africa and Southeast Asia, and lower both oil and delivery premiums Beijing is currently obliged to pay.

The target for this Chinese strategy has been the construction of a pipeline from the

southeastern Russian refinery town of Angarsk to the northwestern Chinese terminal center of Daqing. The Chinese section of the pipeline is already under way. The Russian section is stalled on the drawing-board. An increase in rail deliveries across the border makes up only a fraction of the planned pipeline deliveries.

Statements to Asia Times Online by Transneft executives have backed the Russian and Chinese government decision of last year to build the Angarsk-Daqing line at a cost of less than \$3 billion, in preference to the \$7 billion line to Nakhodka. But Putin's campaign since last July against shareholders of Yukos has complicated the China project; that is because Yukos had been the intended oil supplier to China.

Japanese offers to finance the heavy cost of the Nakhodka line have been treated skeptically by the Kremlin, which wants to avoid single-market oil commitments - to repay Japanese loans, as much as to commit to Chinese supply terms. A Nakhodka oil shipping hub is, however, viewed in Moscow as potentially more open to spot-market pricing of oil than Daqing would be.

Transneft sources, along with oil industry executives in Moscow, agree on one thing about the eastern option for shipping Russian oil. The principal market for this crude will be Asia, and not the US West Coast. But think for a moment what might have happened if the Yukos owners had managed to sell control of their company last July to Chevron-Texaco or Mobil, as Khodorkovsky intended - Russia as an independent oil exporter would have been on its way to a level of independence that is less than Aramco, the Saudi oil company. It is unsurprising that the US media have failed to report the Yukos affair in this light, let alone to have noticed that the US, the world's largest oil consumer, has tried, but so far failed, to compel Russia, the world's second or first-largest oil exporter, to ship and market oil in the way Washington, or Houston, wants.

Asia Times

http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Central_Asia/FH26Ag01.html >

IF HE BECAME PRESIDENT

Romania yields to the blackmail of Jewish organisations

By **Robert Faurisson**

The press of the whole world has rung with the news: Romania, after persistently saying that it had incurred no personal responsibility in what is conventionally called "the extermination of the Jews" (or "the Holocaust" or "the Shoah"), has at last seen the error of its ways and is set to do penance. In France, *Le Monde* recently headlined "Romania formally acknowledges its participation in the extermination of the Jews" (article by Mirel Bran, 17 November 2004, p. 7).

Yet, if there is one country that protected its Jews during the Second World War, that country is Romania. This truth could still be articulated twenty or so years ago. Today, we are bidden to conceal it, and so to lie.

On the reality of the Romanian Jews' fate during the war, let us first quote, by way of a foreword, a testimony published by *L'Express* in 1979 under the title "Les Roumains et les Juifs" ("The Romanians and the Jews"), then, for a more in-depth consideration, look closely at a 1982 report in *Le Monde juif*, the review of the *Centre de documentation juive contemporaine* (CDJC) in Paris, under the remarkable heading "La Roumanie sauvée de l'Holocauste" ("Romania saved from the Holocaust").

"The Romanians and the Jews"

Here is the letter signed by one Constantin Mares that appeared in *L'Express* (week of 10 to 16 March 1979):

I am a Romanian living in the Federal Republic of Germany. I am 51 years old. When Hitler died I was 17.

— I read with bewilderment in *L'Express* n°1440 that in Romania, during the Second World War (source cited and taken up without objection), 425,000 Jews are alleged to have died or disappeared, in other words 50% of a Jewish population of 850,000 (in 1939).

— This is a grave error, a veritable slander directed at a people who have suffered far too much, who have never practised hatred, political or racial mass killing or invasion of territories belonging to other peoples. It is also the occasion to remind your readers that, during the Second World War, Romania was not led by a Fascist party but by a marshal who committed some errors, but who waged a struggle of invaded territories.

— It is my duty to specify that, during the Second World War, my Romanian compatriots of Jewish origin were not made to wear the star of David, that they had schools, that, in the capital of the country there operated a [Jewish] secondary school (the "Culture") and a [Jewish] theatre (the *Baracheum*), the latter being attended by all inhabitants of Bucharest, Jewish or non-Jewish. In those years, on the stage of the Romanian national theatre, the play "Star without a Name", written by the great Romanian playwright of Jewish origin Mihail Sebastian, brought full houses. In all Romania there existed no concentration camps for the Jews, with Marshal Antonescu having personally opposed Hitler's request [to establish them], and, consequently, none of my compatriots were handed over to the Nazis.

Let us chiefly note three strong points of this brief testimony: the Romanian Jews, unlike, for example, certain French Jews, did not have to wear a star of David in public, were not put in concentration camps and were not handed over to the Germans for deportation to Germany or Poland.

"Romania saved from the Holocaust"

(presentation of the Popescu report by *Le Monde juif*)

Bearing the signature of Josif Toma Popescu, the report entitled "La Roumanie sauvée de l'Holocauste" (*Le Monde juif*, January-March 1982, p. 1-2 and 3-11) is all the more important as it received the approval of the CDJC, whose director was Georges Wellers, sworn enemy of the revisionists. The presentation by *Le Monde juif* (p. 1-2) of the report (p. 3-11) is laudatory and rather honest. It is careful to recall that the Romanian government did not incur responsibility in the fate that may have been experienced by the Jews of certain territories that had been stripped from the country between 28 June and 30 August 1940 in application of the German-Soviet pact and of the treaty of Vienna imposed by Hitler and Mussolini. In the space of two months, northern Transylvania was annexed by Hungary, Bessarabia and northern Bucovina were annexed by the Soviet Union and southern Dobruja was annexed by Bulgaria. Consequently, to impute to Romania responsibility for the fate of the Jews in all of those regions amounts to a swindle. What is true is that in 1941 the Romanian government, allied with Germany, was to recover Bucovina and Bessarabia and then transplant many Jews of those provinces in Transnistria (the western part of the Soviet Ukraine) with the intention of sending them to the Urals should circumstances allow. The project of a transfer and settling of those Jews was to meet with disaster and, one year on, those of them who had avoided death from typhus, hunger and the cold — the main killers in the tragedy — were taken back to Romania.

The team of *Le Monde juif* specify: "The responsibility of the Romanian government in these hardships is a heavy one, although it is not easy to distinguish it from that of the German officials [Romania's allies in the crusade against the Soviet Union]. *Le Monde juif* condemns the existence of ghettos (!) in the rest of the country and the anti-Jewish laws whilst adding that, on the other hand, there were no deportations to the camps in Poland or Germany. It goes so far as to acknowledge that general Antonescu (who became Marshal in August 1941), deputy prime minister Mihai Antonescu (an Anglophile), the Queen Mother and some high authorities of the orthodox church responded favourably to the numerous interventions by the chief rabbi of Romania, Dr Alexandre Safran. As for Iuliu Maniu, former prime minister and president of the National Peasants' Party, he played, in his relations with Marshal Antonescu, a decisive role in favour of his Jewish compatriots.

“Romania saved from the Holocaust”
(the Popescu report itself)

At the time, J. T. Popescu was a practising barrister in Bucharest. His report is rich in precisions confirming that, thanks in particular to Marshal Antonescu's government, the Romanian Jews saw themselves spared all sorts of hardships inflicted on the Jews of various other European countries. A certain number of these Romanian Jews showed their sympathy for the cause of the Soviet Union, which was fighting Romania. At the beginning of the war, in the town of Iasi, a Romanian military formation, marching to the front and passing through a narrow street, had been attacked by some Jewish communists: there ensued an engagement that cost lives on either side as well as amongst the population; only the Jewish losses, considerably inflated by legend, have been recorded in history. J. T. Popescu does not bring up this affair but he does call to mind an illustration of it: the Romanian Jews were not mobilised in the Romanian army and thus did not take part in the Russian campaign, which was to cause Romania terrible losses. As compensation for this privilege, Marshal Antonescu had foreseen “a special contribution imposed solely on the Jews, considering that they were not participating in the military campaign” (p.7). Nonetheless, upon one of the many interventions of I. Maniu, the projected measure was abandoned. The Popescu report also mentions an astonishing Jewish privilege: the granting, with retroactive effect, of an old-age pension to foreign Jews who, having worked in Romania, had neglected to satisfy the formalities of naturalisation within the stipulated time. With illegal Jewish immigrants flocking to the country from Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland, the government in Bucharest looked to take measures for the internment and forcible repatriation of such persons but ended up, once again, abandoning the idea. On 23 August 1944, when the fortunes of war had turned, Marshal Antonescu was arrested by order of King Michael I and handed over to the Soviets, who executed him in 1946.

The figure of Marshal Antonescu

For their part, the Romanian people after the war were to experience the rigours of communism (1947-1989). Then, after the fall of communism, they set about erecting statues here and there of their former “Conducator”. Far from appearing as a “fascist”, Antonescu at the time assumed the traits of a nationalist who, in 1941, had, at the extreme right, violently put an end to the Iron Guard movement and, at the extreme left, taken up arms against communism. With respect to his German allies he had proved to be fiercely independent both in his refusal to hand over the Jewish communists in his country for internment in camps in Germany or Poland and also in the facilities that he accorded to the Jews, at the height of the war, in order to let them reach Turkey.

Today the Romanian Jewish community and its friends in the international community protest against the homage paid to the memory of the Marshal who was shot by the communists. In December 2000, a right-wing leader, Corneliu Vadim Tudor, who received 28% of the votes cast in the presidential election of that year won by Ion Iliescu, stated: “I do not dispute the Holocaust, but I don't think that grief should be exploited as a business. [...] In [the case of] Romania, figures are exaggerated so as to claim a maximum of financial compensation [...]. The Jews are asking us to demolish the statues of Antonescu as the Talibans have done with the Buddha's” (Mirel Bran, “L'autre mémoire roumaine”, *Le Monde*, 8 March 2002, p. 8).

Romania is a candidate for membership in both the European Union and NATO. But the first condition imposed on candidate countries is, as we know, the payment of an entrance fee to benefit the international Jewish organisations. The amount of the fee is not negotiable: it is directly proportional to these organisations' tally of Jews who, they allege, perished during the war in the country in question. This kosher tax will have to be paid, cash on the nail, as the Swiss have paid theirs, even though they were not asking anything of anyone, and certainly not membership in the European Union or NATO.

Kneeling and penitence

The Romanian government has bowed low, got down on its knees and made its act of contrition. “Under the pressure of the Jewish community of the United States, Romania, a candidate for NATO, has ended up reconsidering its past. In March [2002], a new law notably

prohibited [...] statues of Marshal Antonescu. Three of these have already been dismantled”, announced Mirel Bran with satisfaction (*Le Monde*, 17 July 2002, p. 5). The said law, in its anti-revisionist provision, punishes “any public denial of the Holocaust” with five years’ imprisonment (in France the tariff is one year). In an open letter signed by Hillary Clinton, senatrix from New York, Romania has been summoned to remove the Marshal’s portrait from the gallery of portraits of all Romanian prime ministers. Octogenarians of Romanian origin, having become United States citizens since the war, have been declared former war criminals by American courts, stripped of their American nationality and handed over to Romania for trial and conviction there. Elie Wiesel has personally inaugurated a monument to the “Holocaust” in Romania and warned president Iliescu and social democratic prime minister Adrian Nastase: “Do not turn your back on the past. [...] Integrate it into your life and you will flourish. Forget it and you are doomed” (*New York Times*, 31 July 2002). Slightly less than a year afterwards, on 12 June 2003, the Romanian government, in an ephemeral movement of rebellion, declared: “This Government encourages research concerning the Holocaust in Europe — including documents referring to it and found in Romanian archives — but strongly emphasizes that between 1940 and 1945 no Holocaust took place within Romania’s boundaries”, which was accurate. Five days later, “yielding to international pressure”, to the wrath of the State of Israel and to the indignation of the Yad Vashem Institute in Jerusalem, Bucharest rectified its position and, on 17 June, issued a statement confessing that the Antonescu government “was guilty of grave war crimes, pogroms, and mass deportations of Romanian Jews to territories occupied or controlled by the Romanian army”, adding that the wartime regime had employed “methods of discrimination and extermination that are part of the Holocaust”
<http://www.rferl.org/newsline/2003/06/4-SEE/see-180603.asp>.

On 14 February 2004, the press announced the repentance of the “far-right” politician C. V. Tudor: “I am asking for forgiveness from all Jews. I’ve changed”. He stated his intention to “lead a group of [Greater Romania] party members to the site of the Auschwitz camp in southern Poland this year. He also promised that if he became president, he would introduce the study of the Holocaust in schools”
<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/JPArticle/ShowFull&cid=1076744701710&p=1008596981749>.

Thus, as we have seen, *Le Monde* of 17 November 2004 was able to trumpet in a three-sentence headline: “Romania formally acknowledges having participated in the extermination of the Jews. President Ion Iliescu assumes ‘the full responsibility of the State’ for the Shoah during the Second World War. About 400,000 Jews and 11,000 Gypsies were killed.” The latter figures obviously do not correspond to any historical truth; they constitute a mere indication of amount of the bill that will be presented to the Romanian taxpayer. The article recalled that, in the recent past, Ion Iliescu had tried to “minimise the tragedy of the Jews in Europe and especially in Romania” to such a degree that “the *Jerusalem Post* had called for the isolation of the Romanian head of State on the international scene, likening him to the Austrian extremist leader Jörg Haider”. The Israeli interior minister, Avraham Poraz, himself born in Romania, had declared the Romanian president “persona non grata”. The *Le Monde* piece ended with the confirmation of three news items: a memorial to the Shoah is to be built by the Romanian government, then a museum of the “Holocaust” and, finally, “this dark episode of Romanian history will be incorporated in the school textbooks”.

If Georges Wellers were to return to this world and reiterate in Bucharest the remarks made in *Le Monde juif* of March 1982, he would incur on the spot a five-year prison sentence: the fact stands as a firm indication that that, year after year and from one country to another, the conquering character of Shoah Business and the “Holocaust” industry is growing ever more forceful. Over this subject there reigns an entente, and a cordial one, of master blackmailers between the State of Israel, the Jewish diaspora and the American superpower.

Note: Today Romania is accused of having *killed* 400,000 Jews and, if one is to believe the press, she is also accusing herself. Yet, according to the most highly regarded Jewish historians, the number of *dead* (and not only of the killed) was quite smaller. Gerald Reitlinger proposes a total of from 210,000 to 220,000 dead, whilst specifying that “owing to the lack of

reliable information at the time of writing, these figures must be regarded as conjectural" (*The Final Solution*, Jacob Aronson, North Vale, New Jersey, 1987 [1956], p. 497, 501). Lucy Dawidowicz puts forth the figure of 300,000 (*The War against the Jews, 1933-1945*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975, p. 403) and Raul Hilberg that of 270,000 (*The Destruction of the European Jews*, New York, Holmes and Meier, 1985, p. 1220). Leni Yahil, for her part, refrains from giving any figure; her conclusion on the fate of the Romanian Jews is, in certain places, qualified to the point it amounts, if one may say so, to a defence of Romania (*The Holocaust, the Fate of European Jewry, 1932-1945*, translated from the Hebrew, New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990 [1987], p. 344-348). For an interesting debate between two revisionists (Serban C. Andronescu and Mark Weber) on the subject of the Romanian Jews during the Second World War and for some quite different mortality figures, one may consult *The Journal of Historical Review* (Summer 1982, p. 211-223; Fall 1982, p. 233-238; Winter 1982, p. 357-358, 479).

23 November 2004

TV BANNED

"Jewish organizations behind Al Manar ban in France: Faurisson"

Tehran (MNA) -- The Mehr News Agency recently conducted an interview with Professor Robert Faurisson, a former lecturer of Lyon University, about France's decision to ban the Al Manar satellite television network.

Following is the text of the interview:

MNA: France's highest administrative court, the Council of State, last week moved decisively to ban Al Manar television, alleging that the network had repeatedly violated the country's anti-hate laws and ignored its own pledge to avoid making anti-Semitic statements. What is your view of the decision?

Faurisson: Unfortunately, it is totally normal. In France, Jewish organizations get whatever they demand. And especially the Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France (CRIF), headed by former banker Roger Cukierman, who was very instrumental in the campaign against Al Manar.

MNA: Do you think the Zionist lobby in the U.S. influenced France's decision to ban Al Manar?

Faurisson: In France Jewish power is even stronger than in the USA. In France it is our lobby number 1. Nobody dares to speak out against those people because of their alleged "Holocaust".

MNA: France claims it is a pioneer in freedom of expression, so how do you evaluate this claim? Isn't the recent decision against freedom of expression and human dignity?

Faurisson: Please, don't be naive! In 1789, France said: "Liberté, égalité, fraternité." Three years afterwards, France began massive killings of French citizens in the name of "Liberté, égalité, fraternité". It is an old tradition to say something and to do the contrary. In the Book of Laws, we have one sentence to say that freedom of opinion, of press, of research is a principle and then we have pages and pages for explaining that that freedom is so important that it needs to be protected by dozens of prohibitions, exceptions, bans, etc.

MNA: Actually, France doesn't respect the rights of its citizens, as it has banned the *hijab* (Islamic headscarf) in public schools. How do you assess that?

Faurisson: Because Jews, in a certain way, are used to treating the French as they treat Palestinians. The difference is that Palestinians refuse to obey the Jews, whereas the French obey the Jews, once more because of the Big Lie of the alleged "Holocaust", in which unfortunately they seem to believe. The alleged "Holocaust" of the Jews is the sword and the shield of the Jewish tyranny all over the world. Destroy it!

Tehran Times, December 19, 2004

ANNUAL VOMIT

Holocaust Denial: A Global Survey - 2004

by Alex Grobman & Rafael Medoff

Executive Summary: Holocaust Denial - A Global Survey: 2004

Holocaust-deniers in the United States continued their efforts to gain a measure of respectability in 2004, and benefitted from the willingness of several individuals of prominence to associate with them. Peter Gemma, a former senior staff member of the Pat Buchanan 2000 presidential campaign, spoke at a Holocaust-deniers' meeting; a newsletter edited by pundit Alexander Cockburn defended imprisoned Holocaust-denier Ernst Zundel; and Hutton Gibson again publicly denied the Holocaust, while his son, actor Mel Gibson, declined to clearly dissociate himself from his father's views.

Some Arab governments continued to actively promote Holocaust-denial in 2004, and a Holocaust-denier emerged as the leading candidate for chairmanship of the Palestinian Authority.

At the same time, a number of Western governments and other institutions took important steps against Holocaust-deniers. The Canadian government sought to deport Ernst Zundel; the government of New Zealand denied entry to David Irving; the French government brought charges against Bruno Gollnisch; Harvard University returned a gift from an Arab leader who promoted Holocaust-denial, and *The Nation* magazine said it would no longer accept advertisements from Holocaust-deniers. Most notably, U.S. intervention brought about the **first-ever public disavowal** of Holocaust-denial by an Egyptian government official.

North America

Canada

William Baker, former chairman of the extremist Populist Party, which was established by Holocaust-denier Willis Carto, spoke at a conference on "Reviving the Islamic Spirit," in Toronto on January 3, 2004. Baker is currently head of a California-based organization called "Christians and Muslims for Peace."

Mobina Jaffer, a state senator from British Columbia who is a Muslim, announced on January 8, 2004, that she is resigning as a columnist for the weekly Muslim newspaper *The Miracle*, because it published an article accusing Jews of fabricating the Holocaust and causing both world wars, among other things. [footnote 1: Jewish Telegraphic Agency, January 9, 2004]

Holocaust-denier Ernst Zundel, who has been in prison in Canada for more than a year, continued his legal battle to prevent his deportation to Germany after Canada declared him to be a danger to Canadian society. Zundel was arrested in February 2003 near Knoxville, Tennessee, for having failed to show up at an immigration hearing, and he was deported to Canada. Zundel, 63, a German citizen, was convicted by a Canadian human rights tribunal in January 2001 of promoting hatred against Jews through his web site, but he left the country prior to the verdict. There is an outstanding warrant for his arrest in Germany, where he was convicted in absentia of Holocaust denial. [footnote 2: Jewish Telegraphic Agency, January 9, 2004.]

An editorial in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on March 6, 2004 criticized the Canadian government for invoking undefined "national security" concerns to imprison Zundel without revealing all the evidence against him. "These are extreme measures in a democratic society, and Ottawa should use them only if it believes a suspect is likely to do physical harm to people or property," it contended. "Odious as he is, Mr. Zündel poses no such risk. He has never been charged with a violent crime and does not urge others to commit violence. He is a crank, not a terrorist ... The real danger to Canadians comes not from obnoxious nuts like Ernst Zündel, but

from a government that casually discards their most precious rights.”

A Canadian court on June 25, 2004, rejected Zundel's attempts to subpoena officials of the Canadian Jewish Congress and B'nai Brith Canada, whom he accused of improperly lobbying the Canadian government to deport him.

In August, however, the Sixth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, in Cincinnati, granted Zundel's request for a hearing to challenge the government's deportation of him to Canada. [footnote 3: Associated Press, August 11, 2004]

In September, the Canadian Supreme Court declined to grant a hearing for Zundel to advance his claim that he is being treated unfairly because a portion of the evidence against him as been kept secret on national security grounds. On October 22, the Supreme Court rejected an appeal by Zundel a challenging the constitutionality of the security review process that is the basis for the charges against him. [footnote 4: *Jerusalem Post*, October 24, 2004.]

United States

Holocaust-denier Ernst Zundel (see Canada, above) was the subject of a sympathetic article in the February 1-15, 2004 edition of the political newsletter *CounterPunch*, edited by pundits Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair. The article, by Alan Cabal, praised Zundel as a “painter and pacifist” who is being “persecuted” by the U.S. and Canadian governments. Cabal described Zundel as “the most widely recognized figure in the growing number of historians, both amateur and academic, questioning the veracity of orthodox accounts of the events which took place in the Nazi concentration camps during World War II ... The ‘Holocaust Industry’, as Norman Finkelstein dubbed it, behaves in every way like a fanatical cult. The persecution of Ernst Zundel has been and continues to be both relentless and utterly ruthless.” Cabal characterized the deportation proceedings against Zundel as “an affront to justice and public decency that goes far beyond anything that Mr. Zundel has to say.”

In an interview on New York City radio station WSNR on February 16, 2004, Hutton Gibson, father of actor and film director Mel Gibson, reiterated his previous statements denying the Holocaust. “It's all --maybe not all-- fiction, but most of it is,” Gibson said of the Nazi genocide. “Do you know what it takes to get rid of a dead body? To cremate it? It takes a liter of petrol and twenty minutes. Now, six million of them? They did not have the gas to do it. That's why they lost the war.” Gibson said Jews “claimed that there were 6.2 million [Jews] in Poland before the war, and they claimed that after the war there were 200,000 -- therefore he [Hitler] must have killed six million of them.” Gibson claimed that what actually happened to the Jews of Poland is that they “simply got up and left. They were all over the Bronx and Brooklyn and Sydney, Australia, and Los Angeles.”

When asked by ABC-Television reporter Diane Sawyer about his father's statements denying the Holocaust, Mel Gibson replied: “He's my father. Gotta leave it alone, Diane. Gotta leave it alone.” [footnote 5: *Jerusalem Post*, February 20, 2004.] In the March 2004 edition of *Reader's Digest*, interviewer Peggy Noonan asked Mel Gibson about his father's religious beliefs and view of the Holocaust. He replied: “My dad taught me my faith, and I believe what he taught me. The man never lied to me in his life.” Noonan asked: “You're going to have to go on record. The Holocaust happened, right?” Gibson responded: “Yes, of course. Atrocities happened. War is horrible. The second World War killed tens of millions of people. Some of them were Jews in concentration camps. Many people lost their lives. In the Ukraine, several million starved to death between 1932 and 1933.”

The State Department on February 25, 2004 released its annual “Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2003.” In its list of human rights violations by the government of the United Arab Emirates, the report included the government's shutdown of a center which promoted antisemitism and Holocaust-denial:

“In August, the Government closed the Zayed Centre for Coordination and Follow-up, a think tank that published and distributed literature, sponsored lectures, and operated a website. The center published some books with anti-Jewish themes such as “The Zionist Movement and its Animosity to Jews” and “Al Buraq Wall, Not Wailing Wall.” It also allowed some anti-Semitic language on its website, and hosted some speakers who promoted anti-Semitic views.” (Also see United Arab Emirates, below.)

On February 19, Mark Weber, director of the Institute for Historical Review, the most

prominent Holocaust denial organization in the United States, addressed a meeting at a restaurant in Arlington, Virginia. He claimed forty people attended, and, according to the IHR website, he “was introduced by Peter Gemma, an editor and former editorial writer for *USA Today*.” [footnote 6: <http://www.ihr.org/>] Gemma served on the staff of the Pat Buchanan presidential campaign in 2000. [footnote 7 : <http://www.splcenter.org/intelreport/article.jsp?pid=97>]

On March 26, IHR Director Mark Weber made his sixth appearance on the Jeff Rense radio show. Weber later reported that “throughout the interview, the host was cordial and supportive.” On the show, Weber spoke at length about Canada’s efforts to deport Holocaust-denier Ernst Zundel, and claimed that “three US Congressmen are now helpfully ‘working on’ the Zundel case, said Weber, citing confidential information provided by Zundel’s wife, Ingrid Rimland.” Weber did not give their names or any other evidence to support this claim.

William Baker, former chairman of the extremist Populist Party, which was established by Holocaust-denier Willis Carto, was invited by the Muslim Student Organization at Florida Atlantic University to speak on campus in March 2004. However, after protests by local Jewish organizations, the event was postponed indefinitely. [footnote 8: *Boca Raton News*, April 2, 2004]

The Institute for Historical Review had planned to hold its April 2004 conference at the Turn Verein, a German-American cultural institution in Sacramento, California. After an article in the *Sacramento Bee* on April 15, 2004, the owners of the Turn Verein canceled the conference, stating that the IHR had not informed them of the true nature of the planned gathering. The IHR then held the conference at an undisclosed location elsewhere in Sacramento. It claimed that the one-day event was attended by “about 130 persons of all ages from across the country and many foreign lands [among them] a university professor, a motion picture producer, and several scholars and authors (including Hans Schmidt, publisher of the *Ganpac Brief*). The speakers included IHR director Mark Weber, Paul Fromm of the “Canadian Association for Free Expression,” Chuck Carlson, of “We Hold These Truths,” British author Lady Michele Renouf, veteran Holocaust-denier Bradley Smith, and Idaho attorney Edgar Steele. [footnote 9: <http://www.ihr.org>]

Holocaust-denier Bradley Smith spoke on the campus of San Jose State University on April 6, 2004, the first day of Passover. It was the third time since 1998 that Smith spoke on the campus. Nineteen people attended his talk, according to press reports. The next day, April 7, 2004, Smith spoke on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley. The UC-Berkeley newspaper, *The Daily Californian*, and the San Jose student newspaper, *The Daily Spartan*, both published advertisements about Smith’s appearances. *Spartan* advertising manager Victoria Monroe said she did so because “the community had a right to know Smith would be speaking.” [footnote 10: *Jewish Community News of San Jose*, May 2004; *J. (Jewish Newsweekly of Northern California)*, April 16, 2004.]

White supremacist and Holocaust-denier David Duke was released from prison in April 2004 after serving a year in prison for fraud. He was assigned to a halfway house in Louisiana and received approval to do his required community service with the European-American Unity and Rights Organization,” a hate group of which Duke is founder and director. [footnote 11: *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, May 11, 2004; www.whitecivilrights.com]

Former world chess champion Bobby Fischer was arrested in Japan on July 13, 2004, and may be deported to the United States, where an arrest warrant was issued because he violated U.S. sanctions imposed on Yugoslavia by playing a chess match there in 1992. According to media reports, Fischer may seek to stave off deportation to the U.S. by claiming German citizenship, because his father is German, but traveling to Germany could result in him being prosecuted for Holocaust-denial. Fischer’s personal web site declares: “The so-called ‘Holocaust’ of the Jews during World War II is a complete hoax! It never happened. The Jews are liars ... Japan beware you’re backing a loser. Don’t go down the drain with the filthy Jew-controlled U.S.” [footnote 12: *Jerusalem Post*, August 5, 2004.]

Twenty members of two neo-Nazi groups, the National Socialist Movement and the National Alliance, held a rally in front of the Nebraska state capitol building in Lincoln, NE on July 17, 2004. Among the speakers was Ray Larsen, identified as Imperial Wizard of the Ku

Klux Klan, who spoke about “the myth of the Holocaust” and claimed the diary of Anne Frank is a forgery. [footnote 13: Jewish Press (Omaha, NE), July 23, 2004.]

British Holocaust-denier David Irving spoke to audiences in a number of cities around the United States during 2004. In June, Irving addressed a meeting in New York City organized by Michael Santomauro, head of the internet service “Roommate Finders.” Santomauro contends that about two million, not six million, Jews were murdered by the Nazis, and has caused controversy by sending unsolicited e-mails about the Holocaust and other subjects to his Roommate Finders clients. [footnote 14: The Forward, October 22, 2004]

Irving addressed small private meetings in Baltimore and Washington D.C. in late June, then visited the National Archives on June 24. He reported that veteran archivist John Taylor was “delighted to see me there,” agreed to pose for photographs with Irving, and even “asked for a print.” The photo of Taylor now appears prominently on Irving’s web site. [footnote 15] On July 6, Irving spoke at a meeting in West Palm Beach, Florida, and on September 10, he spoke at Colorado University at Boulder. According to press reports, the talk, which was sponsored by a student organization, was “well-attended.” [footnote 16: Intermountain Jewish News, September 17, 2004.]

On October 2, Irving and IHR director Mark Weber addressed a meeting at a hotel in Costa Mesa, California, on October 2, 2004. According to the IHR, seventy people attended, “sales of books and tapes at the meeting were brisk, and several attendees made generous donations to the IHR.” Irving said in his remarks that the 9/11 attacks were an expression of rage against “U.S. support for Israel’s brutal oppression of Palestinians,” and “the third airliner ... which came down in Pennsylvania, may have been shot from the sky on orders of Vice President Cheney...” [footnote 17: <http://www.ihr.org/>]

In response to a complaint by The David S. Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies, *The Nation* -- one of America’s leading weekly political journals -- adopted a new policy of refusing to accept paid advertisements from Holocaust-deniers. The controversy began when an advertisement from the Institute for Historical Review appeared in the May 3, 2004 issue of *The Nation* (which was on newsstands in mid-April). The ad promoted a book which, it said, “dissects ... the most sacred of Jewish-Zionist icons, the Holocaust story.” The Wyman Institute sent a letter to *The Nation* on April 21, 2004 protesting the publication of the IHR ad as well as the “sponsored link” by *The Nation* which appeared on the IHR web site. The letter stated: “Holocaust-deniers are **not offering a legitimate alternative viewpoint**. They are in the business of hate-mongering. They should not be in *The Nation*, and *The Nation* should not be on their web site.” The letter also pointed out that *The Nation*’s link to the IHR “is especially troubling in view of *The Nation*’s proud history as one of the few prominent American publications to speak out, during the Holocaust, for the rescue of Jews from Hitler... A business relationship with Holocaust-deniers today sullies that proud record.” The letter concluded: “We therefore urge you to sever *The Nation*’s relationship with the Institute for Historical Review and to publicly affirm the principle of refusing to accept advertisements from the IHR and similar groups in the future.” The Wyman Institute then received a letter from *The Nation*’s advertising spokesman, Leigh Novog, dated April 21, 2004, stating that the Wyman Institute’s protest “prompted a meeting of *The Nation*’s Advertising Acceptability Committee.” The conclusion of the meeting, Novog wrote, was that “[T]here is a strong presumption against censoring any advertisement, especially if we disagree with its politics. This case, however, is different. Their arguments are ‘patently fraudulent.’ The magazine has requested the advertiser, The Institute for Historical Review not run advertising in future issues.” [footnote 18 : Wyman Institute Press Release, April 22, 2004.]

[See these guys are proud on their act of censorship.]

Conflicts continued between the IHR and its arch-rival, 77 year-old Willis Carto, founder of the Liberty Lobby. The IHR claimed in a July 9, 2004 news release that its efforts had resulted in the issuing of an arrest warrant for Carto and his associate Henry Fischer in Switzerland on charges of “abuse of trust, disloyal management and money laundering” in connection with Carto’s alleged embezzlement of funds from the IHR. [footnote 19: <http://www.ihr.org/>]

Europe

Denmark

British Holocaust-denier David Irving spoke in Copenhagen on February 22, 2004. He was interviewed by Danish Television and the national newspaper *Berlingske Tidningen*, and addressed meetings of supporters at the Falconer Hotel and the Angleterre Hotel.

France

On January 14, 2004, a French court reinstated master's degrees which Jean Plantin had been awarded by the University of Lyon II in 1990 for a thesis supporting Holocaust denier Paul Rassinier, and from the University of Lyon III in 1991 for his research on typhus epidemics in Nazi concentration camps. (Holocaust deniers often claim that Jews who perished in Nazi camps were not murdered, but died of diseases.) The university withdrew the degrees after Plantin was convicted in 1999 for denying crimes against humanity, but the court ruled that any challenge to the degrees had to be made within four months of when they were awarded. [footnote 20: Jewish Telegraphic Agency, January 14, 2004; Agence France Presse, July 7, 2003; *Times Higher Education Supplement*, July 4, 2003.]

The Commission on Racism and Negationism at Jean Moulin University Lyon III, which was established by the French government two years ago to investigate evidence of racism and Holocaust-denial at that university, released its report on October 9, 2004. The committee, which was chaired by historian Henry Rousso, concluded that the university has "an extreme-right wing kernel" but is "not a fascist campus." [footnote 21: Jewish Telegraphic Agency, October 11, 2004.] The report was strongly criticized by Bruno Gollnisch, a professor of languages and Japanese culture at Lyon III who is also a member of the European Parliament and deputy leader of Jean-Marie Le Pen's extremist National Front party. He commented: "There is not a serious historian who adheres completely to the conclusions of the Nuremberg trials. I do not call into question the existence of the concentration camps, but as to the number of dead, historians could still have something to argue about. As to the existence of the gas chambers, that is up to the historians to determine." In response, Lyon III president Guy Lavorel urged French Minister of Education Francois Fillon to fire Gollnisch, but Fillon declined to act, saying he "does not have the right to intervene." The Justice Ministry, however, announced on November 28 that it will prosecute Gollnisch for his statements about the Holocaust. [footnote 22: Chronicle of Higher Education, October 29, 2004; Jewish Telegraphic Agency, November 29, 2004.]

Germany

During a court appearance on February 6, 2004, Horst Mahler, a former leader of the extremist National Democratic Party, declared: "It is a lie that we systematically murdered six million Jews." Mahler, 68, and two colleagues were being prosecuted for circulating antisemitic pamphlets on the internet. [footnote 23: Associated Press, February 6, 2004.]

Holocaust-denier Mohammed Salmawy appeared at this year's Frankfurt Book Fair, which ended on October 10, 2004. Salmawy, editor of the French Arabic-language newspaper *Al-Ahram Hebdo*, delivered a message of greeting from author Nagib Mahfus, who was unable to attend. Salmawy has written: "There are no findings to indicate the existence of mass graves, because the size of the ovens makes it impossible for many Jews to have been killed there. According to the lists presented by the Soviets to the Germans, no more than 70,000 Jews were registered as having been at Auschwitz." [footnote 24: http://medienkritik.typepad.com/blog/2004/10/frankfurt_book_.html; www.bbcnews.co.uk, August 10, 2003]

A Turkish-language newspaper in Germany, "*Vakit*," published an article on December 1 by Hasan Karakaya, which stated: "The truth is: There was no Holocaust. And the so-called gas chambers also are a lie." Claud Guggenberger, spokesman for the German government's Department for Constitutional Protection, said "*Vakit*" would face criminal charges as a result. [footnote 25: Jewish Telegraphic Agency, December 6, 2004.]

Great Britain

A Holocaust-denier was suspended from his teaching position at a Catholic school in April, after declaring himself a candidate in the European Parliament elections for the extremist British National Party. Math teacher Simon Smith was suspended from his position at the St. Peter's Roman Catholic secondary school in Solihull by the Birmingham Diocesan Schools Commission. Smith's web site, which was shut down last year because its name was too close to that of Yahoo, included this statement: "The 'six million' and 'gas chambers' story is a lie -- this sounds delusional when you first hear it -- but investigate the matter for yourself." [footnote 26: *The Guardian*, April 29, 2004.]

Lithuania

Lithuania prosecutors announced in June 2004 that they would not bring charges against two suspected war criminals, on the grounds that there is no evidence that the massacre in which they are believed to have participated actually took place. In July 1941, members of a Lithuanian basketball team took part in a contest with German soldiers, and as their "prize" were permitted to murder about thirty local Jews. The two suspects were members of the team. The Lithuanian ambassador to Israel, Alfonsas Eidintas, conceded that the massacre did take place, but defended the prosecutors' decision. [footnote 27: *Jerusalem Post*, June 10, 2004.]

Romania

On February 14, 2004, extremist politician Vadim Tudor publicly asked for forgiveness from the Jewish people for making antisemitic remarks, and pledged to visit Auschwitz with a delegation from his Greater Romania Party. Dr. Efraim Zuroff of the Simon Wiesenthal Center questioned the sincerity of Tudor's apology, noting that in January 2004, after Tudor had retracted his earlier denial that Romanian Jews were murdered in the Holocaust, Tudor's newspaper, *Romania Mare*, published an article saying that Jewish victims of Romanian pogromists in 1941 were actually Romanian nationalists murdered by Jews. [footnote 28: *Associated Press*, February 14, 2004; *Jerusalem Post*, February 17, 2004.]

Russia

Russian publisher Viktor Korchagin, whose books include the Holocaust-denial writings of Swiss author Jurgen Graf, was convicted by a Russian court on November 24 on the charge of publishing hate materials, and given a one-year suspended sentence. However, the conviction was immediately annulled because of the statute of limitations. [footnote 29: *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, December 2, 2004.]

Middle East

Bahrain

William Baker, former chairman of the extremist Populist Party, which was established by Holocaust-denier Willis Carto, was hosted by senior officials of the Bahrain government during a visit to that country in March 2004. Baker, who is currently head of a California-based organization called "Christians and Muslims for Peace," addressed the Bahrain Chamber of Commerce and Industry and was the guest of honor at a luncheon attended by the Deputy Prime Minister, Information Minister, Agriculture Minister, and other leading political figures.

Egypt

On May 9, 2004, the Egyptian weekly newspaper *Al-Arabi* published an interview with movie producer Yousef Shaheen, in which he dismissed the Holocaust as "the tale of the Holocaust." [footnote 30: *New York Sun*, August 11, 2004.]

On June 24 and July 1, 2004, *Al-Liwaa Al-Islami*, the official newspaper of Egypt's ruling National Democratic Party, published a two-part article by Dr. Rif'at Sayyed Ahmad, titled "The Lie About The Burning of the Jews."

He wrote: "[T]his lie [about] the burning of the Jews in the Nazi crematoria has been disseminated throughout the world until our time in order to extort the West and make it easier for the Jews of Europe to hunt [sic] Palestine and establish a state on it, in disregard of the most basic principles of international law and the right of peoples to independent life without

occupation. [This lie] was raised [also] so that [the Jews] would receive financial, technological, and economic aid from the West.”

After the article was translated by the Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI) and quoted by WorldNetDaily.com, *Al-Liwaa al-Islami* editor Muhammad al-Zarqani issued a statement that the articles expressed only “the opinion of the writer, which is subject to discussion, agreement or rejection.” Dr. Ahmad, however, refused to retract his article, saying: “The issue should be the holocaust that the Palestinians are going through, not the Jews. The West has a serious problem of double standards.” [footnote 31: www.WorldNetDaily.com, August 5, 2004]

According to reports in the Arabic press in London, officials of the U.S. embassy in Cairo met with Egyptian government officials and officials of the National Democratic Party to protest the article. The newspaper then published a statement by Egyptian Information Minister Mamdouh El-Beltagui, on its front page, in which he stated that the National Democratic Party “does not believe that human tragedies and suffering that befell a nation or a people could be a lie.” Al-Zarqani then he either resigned or was forced out of his position.

On August 5, 2004, *Al-Liwaa Al-Islami* published a statement on the bottom of its front page, which read: “*Al-Liwaa Al-Islami* has received a number of letters and phone calls regarding the two articles written by Dr. Rif’at Sayyed Ahmad on the Holocaust. Some of the reactions sided with the article and others opposed it, and the question was raised whether it represents the opinion of the National Democratic Party, of Mayo publications, of the journal or of the editor. The answer is: the opinions expressed were those of the author, and they are open to debate, and [furthermore] this is in no way an Islamic question.”

On August 25, 2004, the newspaper published a statement on its front page by Egyptian Information Minister Mamduh Al-Beltagi published an article on the front page of the weekly which read: “The National Democratic Party, which is the party of the majority in Egyptian society, does not believe that suffering and human tragedies of a nation or of another people can be lies. It is impossible to downplay the Nazi atrocities and the tragedies of the Second World War that hurt the Jews and other peoples. The things that Dr. Rif’at Sayyed Ahmad wrote in the *Al-Liwaa Al-Islami* have nothing to do with the worldview of the [average] Egyptian nor with the ideology and policy of the National Democratic Party.”

Dr. Ahmad responded with a statement addressed to Egypt’s National Council for Human Rights, in which he reaffirmed his denial of the Holocaust and accused U.S. Jewish organizations, the U.S. Congress, and the U.S. Embassy in Cairo of waging a “Zionist-American campaign of blackmail” to bring about the firing of al-Zarqani. He also accused the Egyptian government of preventing the publication of his weekly newspaper column.

A statement issued by the Egyptian Journalists Association defended Ahmad, declaring: “[Ahmad’s] articles are historical research. The author is not opposed to Judaism or to the Jews, but rather to Zionism and Nazism, the result of both of which is the occupation of the land of another people, who [then] pay the price for Western racism and its crimes. The Journalists Association denounces the all-out campaign on the part of the Jewish organizations and the criminals, and demands to respond to it and to the blackmailing of the Muslim world in the name of the Holocaust.” [footnote 32: MEMRI Special Dispatch, September 10, 2004.]

A program on Egypt’s Al-Mihwar Television on August 28, 2004, featured a panel discussion about the controversy, with former *Al-Liwaa Al-Islami* editor Muhammad Al-Zurqani, columnist Abd Al-Qader Yassin, Dr. Ahmad. During the discussion, Ahmad said that the Holocaust “was, at the very least, falsified or exaggerated,” and program host Sayyd Ali agreed that “its truth is in doubt.” Al-Zurqani, joining the discussion by telephone, said “I agree with what Dr. Rif’at Sayyed Ahmad wrote... We were educated from childhood that the Holocaust is a big lie.”

Yassin, identified as a “Palestinian politician,” said that “there is doubt as to the truth of this story [of the Holocaust],” and referred to the Ph.D. dissertation--later published as a book--by former Palestinian Authority prime minister Mahmoud Abbas, denying the Holocaust. [footnote 33: MEMRI Special Dispatch, September 10, 2004.]

In an interview on Egyptian Television on September 8, 2004, Gamal Abd Al-Gawwad, a researcher at the Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, argued that Holocaust-denial is unwise for tactical reasons. He remarked: “I can understand the Western frenzy over

the Holocaust. This crime is described -- whether it is true or not -- as a real event, in which several millions were killed in the face of complete silence, and that caused pressure on the Western conscience. There is such a thing as the Western conscience. You cannot deny that there's such a thing as a Western conscience; there is a Western conscience and there is an interest in human rights. We must play with this conscience and its contradictions, and not the other way around: We must not tell [the West] it is hypocritical and that the Holocaust never occurred, and that the whole issue of human rights is nothing but words. This isn't the way to deal with it. It will lead us nowhere. We must play by the existing rules, which we cannot change right now." [footnote 34: www.memritv.org]

Iran

In April 2004, Iranian Television broadcast a series on Jews in the movie industry. The narrator described films about the Holocaust as an attempt to perpetuate "the false myth about the murder of six million Jews at the hands of the Nazis" in order to arouse international sympathy. [footnote 35: www.memri.org]

In December 2004, Iranian Television began broadcasting a 29-part Syrian-produced series called "Al-Shatat" (Diaspora), a survey of Jewish history and the rise of the Zionist movement. When the series was aired on Lebanese Television in 2003, the Syrian government denied reports that it was involved in producing the series, but the credits at the end of each episode give special thanks to "The Defense Ministry, the Culture Ministry, the Damascus Police commanders, the Archeology and Museums Administration, Damascus District, Aleppo District, Tartus District, [and] the Tartus Port Administration" for their assistance in the production. It was produced by the Syrian company "Linn" at a reported cost of \$5.1-million.

The series alleges that Jews have been attempting to control the world for many centuries and have engaged in a variety of conspiracies to further that aim. Regarding the Holocaust, the series claims that the Nazis murdered one million, not six million Jews, and that Jewish leaders actively collaborated in those murders. In Episode 22, members of the "global Jewish government" are shown celebrating the deaths of one million European Jews, and their leader explains: "The higher the number of Jews killed in this war, the more we will be able to convince the world that the 'Protocols of the Elders of Zion' is nothing more than a lie invented by the Christian world to increase people's hatred for the Jews. After public opinion is persuaded that this book is nothing more than a lie, we will launch a secret and quiet offensive to prove the truth of this book, until the world again fears us deep inside, and will be defeated by us without a war. Now, a toast in honor of this great war." [footnote 36: *Palestinian Media Watch*, December 14, 2004; MEMRI Special Dispatch, December 12, 2003.]

Israel

In July 2004, Israeli Knesset Member Aryeh Eldad (National Union party) introduced legislation that would make Holocaust denial committed overseas an offense under Israel's legal jurisdiction and could serve as grounds for extradition to Israel from another country. Eldad said his part of his intention was to "send a signal to a Holocaust denier like Abu Mazen [Mahmoud Abbas, now chairman of the PLO]" that if he enters Israel he would be regarded as a criminal. Eldad also said that enactment of his legislation would make it possible for the Israeli government to file a counter-suit if an Israeli citizen were to be sued for libel for characterizing someone as a Holocaust-denier. Eldad's bill was endorsed by Yad Vashem chairman Avner Shalev, who said "It sends the message that Israel is against Holocaust-denial everywhere and anyone who engages in it is not welcome in Israel." The *Jerusalem Post's* report on the Eldad bill expressed doubt as to the practical impact of the legislation, arguing that "countries that do not have laws against Holocaust-denial are unlikely to extradite citizens to be tried in Israel for the crime.." [footnote 37: *Jerusalem Post*, July 20, 2004.]

Palestinian Authority

In February 2004, the Bush administration included in the U.S. foreign aid budget for 2004 a provision that no U.S. funds will be used "to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services or any other form of assistance to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation." The action followed protests by Members of Congress over PBC programs

promoting violence, antisemitism, and Holocaust-denial. [footnote 38: Jewish Telegraphic Agency, February 4, 2004.]

On March 25, 2004, to mark Holocaust Remembrance Day, Palestinian Authority Television showed a children's play in which the actors portrayed dead Arab children and the narrator said: "They [Israel] are the ones who did the Holocaust, their knife cuts to the length and the width of our flesh ... They opened the ovens for us to bake human beings. They destroyed the villages and burnt the cities. And when an oven stops burning, they light a hundred [more] ovens. Their hands are covered with the blood of our children." [footnote 39: *Palestinian Media Watch*, April 19, 2004.]

In a sermon on April 16, 2004, aired live on Palestinian Authority Television, Sheikh Ibrahim Mudeiris praised French Holocaust-denier Roger Garaudy as "the French intellectual who exposed world Zionism ... He converted to Islam and wrote of World Zionism's covetous aspirations, based on *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Whoever thinks America controls Israel and its decisions is wrong." [footnote 40: www.memri.org]

On May 20, 2004, Palestinian Authority Television aired a discussion with Jareer Al-Qidwa and Issam Sisalem, identified as "Palestinian historians." Regarding the Holocaust, Sisalem said: "This is a great lie. Were Goebbels and his ilk to be resurrected, he would reveal that they are greater liars than he is, I mean those who have whined in the past that they have been oppressed or killed... and a holocaust... and massacres in Russia... and Chmielnicki pogroms... Now they attack a people on its land... a people with 7,000 years of history." [footnote 41: www.memri.org]

On November 15, 2004, Mahmoud Abbas became chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, succeeding the late Yasir Arafat. On November 26, 2004, Abbas was nominated by the Fatah movement as its candidate for the chairmanship of the Palestinian Authority.

Abbas is the author of a 1983 book denying the Holocaust. The book was titled *The Other Side: The Secret Relations Between Nazism and the Leadership of the Zionist Movement*. It was originally his doctoral dissertation, completed at Moscow Oriental College, in the Soviet Union. According to a translation of the text provided by the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Abbas's book repeatedly attempted to cast doubt on the fact that the Nazis slaughtered six million Jews. He wrote: "Following the war, word was spread that six million Jews were amongst the victims and that a war of extermination was aimed primarily at the Jews ... The truth is that no one can either confirm or deny this figure. In other words, it is possible that the number of Jewish victims reached six million, but at the same time it is possible that the figure is much smaller--below one million ... It seems that the interest of the Zionist movement, however, is to inflate this figure so that their gains will be greater. This led them to emphasize this figure [six million] in order to gain the solidarity of international public opinion with Zionism. Many scholars have debated the figure of six million and reached stunning conclusions--fixing the number of Jewish victims at only a few hundred thousand." Abbas denied that the gas chambers were used to murder Jews, quoting a "scientific study" to that effect by French Holocaust-denier Robert Faurisson. In an interview with the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* on May 28, 2003, Abbas asserted that in his book, he "did not address the question of the number of victims but cited historians who said the victims ranged in number from one million to 12 million ... The Holocaust was a terrible thing, and nobody can claim I denied it."

United Arab Emirates

On July 26, 2004, Harvard University's Divinity School announced that it was returning a \$2.5-million gift from the president of the United Arab Emirates, Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan al-Nahyan, because of his connection to the Zayed Center for Coordination and Follow-up, which promoted antisemitism and Holocaust-denial. The center was shut down in August 2003. [footnote 42: *Jerusalem Post*, July 29, 2004.]

On September 20, 2004, the London-based newspaper *Al-Hayat* reported that "Egyptian academicians urged the United Arab Emirates to 'take a second look at their decision to close the Zayed Center.' The academicians, who all belong to a group they call 'The Centre for Arab Research after September 11th,' announced in the office of Hosni Mubarak that it is most necessary to reopen the centre." [footnote 43: *New York Sun*, September 29, 2004.]

On September 22, 2004, the Office of Information Affairs for the deputy prime minister of

the United Arab Emirates criticized the State Department for mentioning the shutdown of the Zayed Center in its annual report on human rights around the world. (See United States, above.) The office denied that the Center “promoted anti-Semitic views of any kind.”[footnote 44: *New York Sun*, September 29, 2004.]

Elsewhere

New Zealand

On September 16, 2004, Holocaust-denier David Irving was prevented from boarding a flight in Los Angeles bound for New Zealand, after the government of New Zealand announced it would not grant him entry, citing the fact that he was previously denied permission to reside in Canada because he was deemed a threat to national security.[footnote 45: *New Zealand Jewish Chronicle*, August 2004; *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, July 21, 2004 and September 19, 2004]

South Africa

Controversy continued over a program broadcast in May 1998 on a Muslim radio station, Radio 786, in Cape Town, South Africa. On the program, Yacoub Zaki of the London-based Muslim Institute said that one million, not six million Jews, had died in Europe during World War II, and they were not murdered but had died of diseases. The South African Jewish Board of Deputies had complained to the Broadcasting Monitoring Complaints Committee about the incident, but the committee ruled in November 2002 that there was no basis to the complaint and no need for a hearing on the matter. On March 24, 2004, Johannesburg’s High Court overruled the committee and ordered that a hearing be held. The radio station appealed the decision, but on September 6, 2004, the Supreme Court of Appeal agreed that a hearing should be held.[footnote 46: *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, March 25, 2004; September 7, 2004]

The David S. Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies
www.WymanInstitute.org

<<http://wymaninstitute.org/articles/2004-denialreport.php>>

Notice that almost all sources are Jewish. Where is the bias ?

PUBLISHERS AND CENSORS

Russian [in fact : Jewish] activists outraged after hate publisher walks free

By Lev Krichevsky

Moscow, Dec. 2 (JTA) — Jewish leaders and human rights activists in Russia are outraged by a sentence handed down in the case of a publisher known for printing anti-Semitic articles.

Alexander Brod, the director of the Moscow Bureau for Human Rights, said activists would seek new opportunities to bring Viktor Korchagin to justice for activities that include the publication of a Russian edition of Hitler’s “Mein Kampf.”

On Nov. 24, a Moscow court found Korchagin guilty of publishing hate materials and gave him a one-year suspended sentence, which was immediately annulled because of the statute of limitations.

Boris Stambler, who has **for several years** tried to have charges brought against Korchagin, called the sentence “a mockery of common sense, facts and law.” “Under the pretext of statute of limitations, the court has de facto acquitted Korchagin,” said Stambler, a Jewish veteran of World War II.

The verdict, which was welcomed by ultranationalist leaders, was the result of four years

of court battles waged by Stambler and other Jewish activists. "I feel a serious concern that the culprit was not punished," one of Russia's **chief rabbis**, Berel Lazar, said in a statement. "**The freedom of speech should have its limits**. One cannot cover up one's actions by freedom of speech in order to abuse, and call for pogroms and deportations."

Korchagin, appearing unrepentant, called the ruling a victory.

Two years ago, a Moscow court shut down one of Korchagin's newspapers for publishing hate materials and **calling for the deportation** of Jews and other minorities. The decision on *Russkie Vedomosti*, or Russian Gazette, marked the first time that a media outlet was closed down in Russia under a media law that includes a ban on distribution of anti-Semitic and hate propaganda.

Despite the 2002 court ruling, Korchagin continued to call for a solution of the "Jewish question" through the deportation of Russia's Jews in his other publications.

He is the founder of a small publishing house called Vityaz, or Knight, that made a name for itself in conservative circles by publishing the "Library of a Russian Patriot."

The collection of 25 paperback books includes such titles as the 19th-century anti-Semitic forgery, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, a Russian translation of Henry Ford's *International Jewry* and **the writings of Jurgen Graf, a leading Holocaust denier**. The entire collection is sold through mail order for the equivalent of \$10.

Korchagin also published at least two editions of Hitler's "Mein Kampf" that can be found at some book stands in Moscow and elsewhere in Russia for about \$10 per copy. Hate speech is a criminally punishable offense in Russia, although Russian courts have been reluctant to enforce the law. Since the end of communism, only one individual has served a prison sentence for publishing hate materials, even though dozens of anti-Semitic and xenophobic books and magazines are being published in Russia, according to human rights watchers.

Jewish Telegraphic Agency

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?intarticleid=14805&intcategoryid=2

THE RACE FOR JEWISH

Israeli bank at centre of probe into Holocaust victims' millions

By **Rajeev Syal**

The London subsidiary of Israel's second-biggest bank is being investigated over millions of pounds belonging to Holocaust victims. Documents at Bank Leumi's London office listing accounts held between 1933 and 1941 have been examined by auditors working for the Knesset, Israel's parliament.

It is understood that papers will be submitted to the Knesset next month suggesting that Holocaust victims' money was retained in London. The bank denies the claim and co-operated voluntarily with the inquiry. Yehudah Barlev, the senior investigating auditor, said last month that he had identified more than 180 accounts and suspected that another 100, now dormant but worth tens of millions of pounds, were also held in Bank Leumi. [*Leumi means "national" in hebrew*]

He told a Knesset committee: "It [the evidence] suggests that the funds were known to the bank but had not been made available to the victims' families." The London investigation centred on accounts opened with the Anglo-Palestine Bank, the former name of Bank Leumi, before the Second World War. The bank was set up in 1902 by Jewish financiers to help settlers in Palestine and by the 1930s had attracted thousands of investors.

As countries such as Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Italy came under the Nazis' sway, Jews in those countries were classified by the British as "enemies" and their assets were seized. The bank, under the jurisdiction of Britain, was ordered by the Government

to hand over the accounts of those Jews to an appointed custodian.

The Knesset's auditors claim that this did not always happen; instead, the Anglo-Palestine Bank secretly transferred "enemy accounts" to the office in London to hide the money.

Documents uncovered by the *Telegraph* show that British civil servants in Palestine suspected that something was amiss.

In *The Custodian of Enemy Property Report*, compiled for the British government in December 1941, one senior official wrote: "During the course of these investigations it was ascertained that the [Anglo-Palestine] bank intended to transfer the accounts of their foreign correspondents in 'enemy territory' to their London office. The custodian has called for and obtained returns of these correspondents' accounts. These returns, however, are not accurate."

Gil Raveh, a solicitor in Israel whose great-grandfather's family was all but wiped out in the Holocaust, has demanded action from the Israeli government. He said it was cynical of ministers to criticise only Swiss banks for failing to return Holocaust money. "It is a moral outrage that Jewish organisations have campaigned against European institutions while this has been going on," he said.

Yona Fogel, the executive vice-president of Bank Leumi Group, said that there were no dormant accounts in London that belonged to Holocaust victims. "Investigators came to our offices in London in February," he said. "The bank transferred all known accounts to the custodian between the period of 1933 and 1940. Since then, we have aided schemes to allocate Holocaust victims' money."

He said that from 1933 to 1944, the bank transferred the names and accounts to the British authorities. Any residual accounts were then transferred in 1948. "There were fewer than 10,000 dormant accounts from the period of 1902 to 1955 and 99 per cent of these held less than £1."

He said that the allegations were particularly hurtful because many bank staff were also descendants of Holocaust victims. "This is insulting and untrue," he said. "The bank will be cleared by the Knesset, I am sure."

Additional reporting by Jamil Ahmad, 25/07/2004

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2004/07/25/nhol25.xml&sSheet=/news/2004/07/25/ixhome.html>

1941

When Iraqi Jews got butchered as Hitler fought to meet his oil needs

By Edwin Black

Editor's Note: The following article is adapted from "Banking on Baghdad," a new book by Edwin Black about the history of Iraq.

Washington, Oct. 4 (JTA) — At about 3 p.m., June 1, 1941, everything changed for Iraq's Jews.

No American Holocaust museum pays homage to their tragedy. Holocaust studies have virtually overlooked the incident and its profound consequences. But the Jews of Baghdad found themselves caught between Hitler's master plan to dominate Europe and the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine.

At stake was the oil Hitler needed to succeed.

As the world finds Iraq once again at the center of competing international interests, a look back at this bloody chapter in Iraqi history illuminates how this region's inherent geography and geology have given rise to a crossroads for conflict, conquest and commerce that has endured through the years.

That day in 1941, on the Jewish festival of Shavuot, the sight of Jews returning from the Baghdad airport to greet the returning Regent Abdul al-Ilah, ruler of Iraq, was all the excuse an

Iraqi mob needed to unleash its vengeance.

The attack began at 3 p.m., as the Jewish delegation crossed Baghdad's Al Khurr Bridge. Violence quickly spread to the Al Rusafa and Abu Sifyan districts. The frenzied mob murdered Jews openly on the streets. Women were raped and infants were killed as their horrified families looked on. Torture and mutilation followed.

Jewish shops were looted and torched. A synagogue was invaded, burned, and its Torahs destroyed in classic Nazi fashion. The shooting, burning and mayhem continued throughout the evening. Jews were dragged from their automobiles. Homes were invaded, looted and burned. On June 2, the fury continued with policemen and slum dwellers joining in.

At the Muallem-Cohen house, young Nezima was terrified. Her father had just returned from the synagogue, relating terrible stories about daughters being raped and homes burned, when suddenly shouting, armed men crashed through his own front gates. Quick, Mr. Muallem-Cohen rushed his family to the stairs to escape to the roof. Up they scampered, first young Nezima, then her mother, and then her father. A shot — Mr. Muallem-Cohen was dead.

Mrs. Muallem-Cohen looked back in horror. Just then a policeman appeared. "They killed my husband," she shrieked. "How do you want to die?" the policeman snapped back, and then cracked her skull with his gun.

Finally, in the afternoon, British forces punched into the city. They opened fire on the rampagers. A 5 p.m. curfew was broadcast. Scores of violators were shot on sight. The disturbances were finally quelled.

The carnage of those 48 hours would be forever seared upon the collective Iraqi Jewish consciousness as "the Farhud," best translated as "violent dispossession."

It was the beginning of the end. From that moment, Iraq's approximately 125,000 Jews would be systematically targeted for violence, persecution, commercial boycott, confiscation and eventually, in 1951, near complete expulsion. ***[This is a brazen lie and a complete distortion by a Zionist author. We urged the reders to look at a testimony, Naeim GILADI, Ben-Gurion' Scandals -- How the Hagannah and The Mossad Eliminated Jews at***

<<http://aaarghinternational.org/fran/livres4/giladi.pdf>>

Giladi says the riots were organized by the British. Nothing of the sorts has happened before. >

For 2,600 years, the Jews of Iraq had dwelled successfully in the land of Babylon, achieving as much acceptance and financial success as any non-Muslim group could in an Islamic society that despised infidels.

In 1941, Iraqi Jews were well entrenched at all levels of farming, banking, commerce and the government bureaucracy.

What happened in 1941 and why?

After the Allies defeated the Turks in the First World War, the British in 1920 engineered a League of Nations mandate over Turkish Iraq to obtain its fabulous but still undeveloped oil. Faisal, who fought alongside Lawrence of Arabia, was rewarded with the monarchy, and designated "King of Iraq."

In 1941, the succeeding heir was Faisal's 4-year-old grandson. So London installed as Iraq's governing regent Abdul al-Ilah, another Hashemite prince from Saudi Arabia.

This appointment stirred deep resentment among Iraq's Muslim masses that viewed the British "infidels" as occupiers, and those who cooperated with them as lackeys. As resentment turned to armed resistance and terror, militants targeted the British, as well as anyone deemed collaborators — including many Jews who held the top posts in all strata of commerce and civil service.

Seizing on the growing discontent, the pro-Nazi cleric Haj Muhammed Amin al-Husseini, mufti of Jerusalem, the leader of the Arabs of Palestine, continuously railed against the Jews, accusing them of being part of a Zionist plot to dominate the Middle East.

The mufti — who was being sought by the British in Palestine on charges of terrorism — had slipped into Iraq on Oct. 13, 1939, six weeks after the outbreak of World War II.

In Iraq, the mufti set up a new and powerful base. He conspired with a group of pro-Nazi Iraqi officers, known as the "Golden Square," to overthrow the regent.

The mufti also entered into a secret pact with Germany, offering Iraq's precious oil in exchange for the destruction of the Jews of Palestine and the Reich's support of Arab national aspirations across the Middle East.

Hitler himself was anxious to thwart Britain's domination of the oil-rich Middle East and secure the oil needed to fuel his planned invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941. So he went along with the idea, even though the Nazis reviled "the Arab race."

On April 1, 1941, the Golden Square staged a coup, forcing the regent to flee Iraq. British warplanes stationed in Iraq responded with a series of persistent bombardments against Golden Square forces.

The German high command reacted as well, dispatching 16 Heinkels and 10 Messerschmitt heavy fighters to aid in an all-out attack on British forces at the giant British air base at Habbaniya, located midway between Fallujah and Ramadi. Meanwhile, two dozen German mechanics and airmen filtered into the country, along with Reich secret agents known to Arab elements.

Luftwaffe planes began running strafing and bombing missions against Habbaniya, as well as British commando formations crossing the desert to aid the besieged camp. The British airbase at Habbaniya, at the time, was only defended by students and instructors. Undaunted, the Brits climbed into their rickety trainers and took to the skies, heroically flying day and night against the Germans and the small Reich-supported Iraqi air force. Most enemy craft were destroyed on the ground, sometimes a dozen at a time.

Churchill had already sent a foreboding cable to President Franklin Roosevelt, stating that if the Mideast fell to the Germans, victory against the Nazis would be a "hard, long and bleak proposition." All understood that if Germany secured Iraq's oil, the Reich would proceed all the way to the East.

By May 15, 1941, urgent messages burned the telegraph wires as British commanders in the area informed London that land operations to destroy the oil infrastructure were now out of the question. One typical note declared: "In view changed situation Iraq, consider it will be impossible to destroy Kirkuk wells at short notice."

Besieged and out of options, the British called in the Irgun, an extremist Jewish defense organization in Palestine. Irgun commander David Raziel, at that moment, was in a British prison in Palestine. Raziel was approached by British intelligence and asked if he would undertake a dangerous mission to destroy the oil refineries in Iraq, thereby denying fuel to the Germans.

The answer was yes, on one condition: Raziel wanted to kidnap the mufti of Jerusalem and bring him back.

Agreed.

The next morning, May 17, 1941, Raziel and three comrades, along with a British officer, quietly climbed into an RAF plane parked at Tel Nof airbase, and flew to Habbaniya. While in flight, however, London decided that the destruction of Iraq's refineries should be delayed to the last minute. Rebuilding the pipelines would take years and place an enormous strain on British fuel needs for the rest of the war.

Raziel was given new orders: Undertake an intelligence mission preparatory to a British sweep into Fallujah as part of the final drive to retake Baghdad from the Golden Square.

On May 17, Raziel and his three comrades, along with a British officer, set out by car from the Habbaniya base toward Fallujah. At the first river, they found a boat, only big enough for two. Raziel ordered his comrades to proceed, while he went back to the car with his fellow Irgunist and the British officer.

Just then, from nowhere, a plane — no one knows if it was British or German — dived from on high, dropping a bomb. The car was destroyed and Raziel with it.

On May 25, Hitler issued Order 30, redoubling support for Iraq. "The Arabian Freedom Movement in the Middle East," he wrote, "is our natural ally against England. In this connection special importance is attached to the liberation of Iraq...I have therefore decided to move forward in the Middle East by support of Iraq."

The Admiralty in London now gave the final order to destroy the refineries and pumping stations in Iraq at will.

"If Germans occupy Iraq and Syria," the message read, "they cannot profit by the oil resources there for at least some time." But suddenly, the forces at Habbaniya were gaining the upper hand. Persistent bombing, Arabs abandoning their positions and equipment en masse to disappear into the populace, plus the sheer exhaustion of Arab supplies delivered victory to British forces.

On May 30, the British-organized Arab Legion, led by legendary Major John Glubb of Britain, pushed past fatigued ground resistance and a steady barrage of German air attacks. Major Glubb reached Baghdad at about 4 a.m. By now, the Golden Square, and their Reich cohorts, had fled to Iran.

The mayor of Baghdad was the only one left to sign the cease-fire document.

On May 31, Regent al-Ilah was preparing to fly into Baghdad to reclaim his leadership. To avoid the appearance of a London-sponsored counter coup, British troops were instructed by their commanders to remain on the outskirts of Baghdad, allowing the regent to enter unescorted.

But for days before, the mufti had been broadcasting by radio, inciting the people of Iraq against the Jews, accusing them of having intercepted telephone and telegraph transmissions and passing the information to the British Embassy — thus causing the defeat of the Golden Square. All Jews, the mufti declared, were spies.

For a few hours on June 1, a power vacuum existed in Baghdad. The Golden Square had fled. The regent was en route. The British were at the city's edge. For just a few hours, Baghdad was unsupervised. But a few hours was all it took for angry masses to suddenly erupt in a maniacal pogrom against their Jewish neighbors.

At 3 p.m. the sight of Jews returning from the Baghdad airport to greet the regent was all the excuse an Iraqi mob needed to unleash its vengeance.

The Farhud and its consequences are absent from the Holocaust museums and study courses. But it will live forever in the hearts of generations descended from the Farhud's victims and the more than 100,000 Iraqi Jews who 10 years later, after a campaign of systematic persecution, were expelled to Israel.

Jewish Telegraphic Agency

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?strwebhead=The+forgotten+pogrom+of+Baghdad&intcategoryid=5

A VERY GREAT BOOK

The Controversy of Zion by Douglas Reed A summary

by Knud Eriksen, 1998

In the foreword to the 1985-edition of Douglas Reeds book, the author Ivor Benson describes, how the intervening years from 1956, when the book was completed, until 1985, have confirmed Douglas Reeds interpretation of the past 2.000 years of history in every way. He covers the continued role of the Middle East as the tinderbox, that can become the cause of the next world war, and the continued suppression and misrepresentation, in the media, of all news and discussion.

It was only the few who knew the background of talmudic Zionism and Communism, who had a chance to understand such decisive events as the so-called "Six-days-war" and the later massive invasion of Lebanon i 1982. The invasion was supposed to do away with the PLO, it was said, but in reality it was simply a part of the old Great-Israel-plan (*Eretz-Israel*). Just as is todays invasion of Iraq.

The worlds pro-israeli massmedia picture of Israel as a small, innocent democracy, which was constantly in need of help, became more and more untrustworthy, so not many were surprised, when the English *Institute of Strategic Studies* could report, that Israel had become

the worlds *fourth greatest* military power after The United States, Soviet and China, but way ahead of nations like England and France. After the fall of the Soviet Union, this country, with a population about the same size as the tiny danish one, may even have risen further on this top-4-list!

The change in the reactions of the Jews themselves at this time - 1982 - was significant: After the massacre of 1.500 men, women and children in two palestinian refugee-camps in Beirut, the Western media timidly withheld comments, while 350.000 inhabitants of Tel Aviv protested against their own government.

Douglas Reed seems to have foreseen this development also, for among the last words in his book – from 1956 – are the following: “I think, that the Jews of the world are beginning to realize the wrong of revolutionary Zionism, the twin of the other destructive movement, Communism, and that towards the end of this 20th Century they will finally have decided to join in the ranks of mankind.”

The book starts out with a 1789-quotation from the philosopher Edmund Burke who, in *Reflections on the Revolution*, directed a literary attack on the French Revolution:

“Something has happened which it is hard to speak about and impossible to keep silent about.”

World Revolution, Zionism and World Government

The World Revolution, which in this century (20th) has destroyed human civilization to an unheard of degree - so far - was only one of the two revolutionary movements, which spread like an epidemic pest over the world from the same week in October 1917. Both sprang from talmudic-lead Eastern Jews. The World Revolution has been the climax, so far, of judaic world conquest. The defeat of the Revolution is only apparent. Its destructive effect continues a bit more covertly without Soviet, but still with China as an example of this type of terror-lead slavesociety, and with judaic agents solidly placed on the most important posts in the world. All the “spiritual values” continue, as f.ex. also in the EU.

And its twin, Revolutionary Zionism, grows ever stronger towards the envisioned *Eretz-Israel* - Great Israel, which is to stretch from the Nile to the Euphrat in the whole “original area”, with all the “Jews” of the world brought together there, and with Jerusalem as the world capital and centre of the “World Peace of the World Government”.

Everything is supported by the Pentateuch of the Old Testament, supplemented by the Talmud, concerning the predestination of the “Chosen People” to exterminate or subjugate all other nations. Among the Zionist leaders this is taken one hundred percent seriously. Like a military operation the two groups work together with incredible synchronisation towards the all-domineering World Government. It will not be long before it becomes a reality. We see it happening every day: UN, NATO, EU, WTO, International Treaties and Conventions, International Courts with transnational jurisdiction and the hundreds- even thousands - of international mergers and take-overs in business.

Also the idea of world government has its background in The Old Testament and the Talmud. It is “The Chosen People”, which arranges matters according to the text, with the rest of the world as slaves. The greatest achievements of both movements took place in the periods of confusion close to the end of-, and right after the two worlds wars, which were started by the leaders of these two movements. Only the Revolution and Zionism came out as winners after the two global wars, with their inconcievable suffering.

Victors in the first global war

After the First World War the Revolution was fixed in Russia with terror and extermination of all “classes” down to - and including - the culac, a farmer with 3 cows. It was an almost exclusively Jewish government, which wielded this terror. It was to last for 70 years, with roughly 100 million murders on its conscience.

Although western media, especially from 1952 on, carried on about “anti-semitism” in the Soviet, this was never anything but bluff, because these Soviet Jewish leaders simply got cold feet as the reign of terror came to be known as the Empire of Evil. In reality it was only different fractions fighting each other. The most obvious “Jewish” representatives were withdrawn, but the power structure, especially in the secret police, that had the decisive power, remained

“Jewish”. “Anti-semitism” was severely punished (right up until the fall of the Soviet Union, and possibly still is) and was therefore quite unthinkable.

Right after the Revolution there was a death penalty for being in possession of “The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion”, which was apparently one of the “Jews” plans for world conquest through revolution, and for breaking down Christian countries.

At the same time Zionism, with the Balfour-Declaration of October 1917, had obtained a promise from Great Britain, in return for bringing The United States into the World War, to give to the Jews “a national home” in Palestine.

Slowly the pressure on the politicians of the West was increased, in order to make this a reality. Especially on the American ones, who were surrounded by Jewish “advisers”, and the immigration to the area increased enormously by the miraculous remedy of “Anti-semitism”, combined with the support of Jewish tycoons and western pro-Zionist leaders in the inter-war period.

And the League of Nations became the first core of the World Government, also with Zionists on high posts, pulling strings.

And in the next global war...

In the same way it was only these three movements – Communism, Zionism, and World Government, that profited from the suffering and destruction of the Second World War. The Western Powers helped the World Revolution to entrench itself deep in Europe.

General Eisenhower ordered the Western generals to stop at a line Vienna-Berlin. All of the Eastern European countries, the “liberation” of which had supposedly been what the whole war was all about, were sacrificed to the revolutionary terror at the Yalta-conference.

At first Zionism supported Hitler financially and with a hesitant or even obliging press. Then, in 1933, it declared Holy War on him.

Zionists obtained so much compassion for Jews after the persecution and the much-advertised extermination, that the world powers and the populations of the West accepted a division of Palestine and the “re-settling” of Jews in the area. The Arabs were deliberately sacrificed, and this started one of our times’ most dangerous anti-Western hate-waves – strongly maintained ever since.

Reed gives many examples of the “special sufferings” of the Jews during the war being only media-fabricated lies. In ratio to their numbers they didn’t suffer any more or any less than other people, but this was an example of the phenomenon, that everything must focus on Jews. Other peoples have suffered far more, numerically. At the end of the war, and shortly thereafter, Zionists received enormous loads of weapons from the Soviet Union. And several hundred thousands of Jews emigrated from a country, which no-one else could get out of, so that soon they became a well-armed majority, being able to drive the original population away by Old Testament terror. The result was 600.000 miserable refugees.

The United Nations, which was originally planned and organized by Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, both later exposed as Jewish communist spies, was to become a temporary climax of a Judaic-dominated World Government. Its many ramifications all had as their most important purpose to reduce the sovereign nations to municipalities, and to give unlimited power to the organisation itself. Naturally in order to “secure peace”, just like the League of Nations. For many years the organisation was communist-dominated, and its many condemnations of Israeli terror were never followed up by action.

The unconditional support from Western leaders for an ever-growing Great-Israel leads towards a World Government with-, or without a Third World War. Israel’s open nationalism and racism gets no serious criticism from a Zionist-dominated “public opinion”. The West is closing down its own states as “antiquated”, and they are more and more under the control of the swelling international organisations, dominated by “Jewish” agents. The pattern of setting Western powers up against each other and letting them bleed to death, is now worked in thoroughly, and has become almost an exact science.

The “Jewish Agents” of the West, who are working for either Zionist or Communist success, are now behaving in an unrestrained, treasonable manner and quite in accordance with “The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion” for destruction of “Christian Nations”. A Third World War could be the third act, which these forces consider necessary to gain complete

control in the ensuing need and confusion.

Sacrificing many of their “own people” has been acceptable, even necessary, before, in order to maintain a government based on fear, and also for populating Israel through manufactured “anti-semitism”.

And then we get the war ... *unless* enough people, the world over, wake up and pull the war-mongers away from the “handle for the big bang.”

The history of the previous 2.000 years

The author supports his arguments by quoting statements, writings and actions made by “Jews”. The description of the development of Zionism, in the last Century, for instance, focuses on Chaim Weizmann, who was a key figure in the political Zionist intrigues, and who became the first president of Israel. A special source is Weizmanns auto-biography from 1949, *Trial and Error*.

The Jewish background of Communism and World Revolution is a fact, and enormous amounts of money have been spent exactly to try to hide this. Probably no other secret has cost as much to maintain. But Jewish sources exist, that admit it. Both Jewish historians, communist leaders, newspaper articles and reports from the time of The Revolution are used as source material.

As to the longer historical perspective, Reed particularly supports his arguments by reference to the stongly Zionist historian, Dr. Josef Kastein, whose book, *History and Destiny of the Jews*, appeared in 1933. However, he also uses many other sources, all mentioned in the *bibliography* in the book. Kasteins book covers the same time-span as “*The Controversy*”, and much information in Dr. Kasteins book can be taken as direct evidence of Douglas Reeds conclusions.

The Master Race

The misery began in the year 458 b.C., when a small tribe in the old Judea accepted a creed based on race. The tribe had previously been expelled by the Israelites for such racism. This seemingly unimportant event has probably caused more destruction for Mankind than both the existence of explosives and epidemics. The tribe adapted the creed of the Master Race as nothing less than “The Law”.

The Judeans were a small tribe under the Persian king. The creed of Judaism was not the beginning of monotheism, as has been propagated. Monotheism dates all the way back to The Egyptian Book of the Dead, 2.600 years b.C. and maybe even further. Judaism, on the contrary, was the exact anti-thesis, namely the worship of a racist tribal god.

“The Law” or “The Pact” was – and is – unique in being based on a statement from a tribal god, to the effect that his “chosen people”: “the Israelites” (in reality, the Judeans) would be set above all other peoples and settled in a “promised land”, if only they would stick to all of his rules and judgements. If Jehova, then, was to be worshipped in a certain place, it followed, that when the worshippers were not actually in that place, they were being “persecuted”, in “captivity” and had to “destroy” the “strangers” that “kept them in captivity”. Only in this way was Jehova to be a god for all other peoples – as the punishing god, who punished his own people first – by a “captivity” among the heathens for their “transgressions against the law” and then, as by an exact script, punished the strangers by a predestined *extermination*, when “the chosen people” had followed all the rules to the letter.

It was probably not even a pact with the Judaeans, for according to “The Holy Scripture”, the pact was made with the *Israelites*, who had long since mingled with the rest of Mankind, and who have never known this racist creed as far as we know. *The Jewish Encyclopaedia* says, that the Judeans “probably were a non-Israeli tribe”. The Israelites turned away from the racism of the Judeans. The creed has gone down in history as having been created by the *Levites from Judea*.

What happened before 458 b.C. is mainly mythology, unlike the later, most important events. The written record predates 458 b.C. by a couple of centuries, when the Israelites rejected the Judeans. The history of Moses was taken by the Israelites from the widespread mythology, which goes all the way back to the history of the Babylonean king, Sargon the Elder, 2.000 years earlier. The ten commandments are much like similar commandments from the

Egyptians, the Babyloneans and the Assyrians. These common ideas about one god for all mankind, the Levites, the rulers of Judea, then put in reverse, when they wrote down their laws. They founded the permanent counter-movement against all universal religions and identified the names Judea and Jews, with the doctrine of self-made separation from Mankind, racial hatred, murder in the name of religion, and revenge. Also the personification of treason, a Judas, was included right from the beginning of Judea.

The stories of Moses, leading a mass-exodus from Egypt, can not be true, even according to Dr. Kastein. It was invented, as a necessity, in order to fit into the pattern of "Jehovas revenge", the destructive basic principle of Judaism.

The Israelites had, as the larger part of a segregated group of people, settled in the northern part of Canaan. In the south, surrounded by the original canaanites, the tribe of Judah took shape. Thus the name "Judaism" and "Jew".

This tribe was isolated from-, and did not get along well with, the neighbours, right from the start. There is much mystery concerning it, including its beginnings. It seems more to have been expelled than chosen. And in the following editions of "The Holy Scriptures", written by their scribes, who wrote whatever suited them arose, in the course of the centuries, and in more and more places, the commands "destroy completely", "tear down", "exterminate" etc.

The Israelites had withdrawn, then, from the Judeans' racist beliefs and had mingled with the rest of Mankind. They "disappeared" in this way as a separate people, while the Judeans kept to themselves by strict racial laws.

In the course of time these were further sharpened and expanded to regulate even the most trivial daily details. The punishments for breaking the laws were severe, and common "Jews" came completely under the control of the scribes. It was this spiritual ghetto, which became the forerunner for the physical ghetto and for the antagonism and exclusion by others, of the Jews, as a retribution.

Talmud and Treason

In the Babylonean "captivity" the scribes added four "Mose"-books to the 5th, which had been the first. They expanded, in this way, further the intolerant racial religion, which would keep the Jews separated from the rest of mankind forever, if it could be enforced. And in Babylon they found the means. The religious leaders actually succeeded in keeping their congregation completely separated from the surroundings. They obtained authority with those, who kept them "in captivity" for use against "their own", and finally, in the year 536 b.C., to show their gratitude, they destroyed the entire host-country through treason, through the help of the army of a new ruler, king Cyprus of Persia, who, in turn, they then destroyed etc the well-known pattern, which was later perfected and used, among many other occasions, in the two world wars in The 20th Century. "The Jews", by the way, at least the leaders, had a fine time in Babylon, according to Dr. Kastein. They were completely free. The narrative of the destruction of Babylon created an image of an irresistible destructive power. This was another pattern, which was further expanded by the scribes.

Treason was always the return for hospitality. According to Dr. Kastein, the Jews were instrumental in the destruction of the Babyloneans, the Persians, the Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans. Each time by "stretching out open arms" to a conqueror.

This situation has continued up through the centuries. Simultaneously, the chains of the common Jews were tightened more and more, and from the time of Jesus the Talmud had been developed, as a collection of scriptures, which contain rules of conduct for everything, particularly directed against Christianity. The new religion of tolerance, which was the direct opposite of the Levitical racial hatred, constituted the worst danger for the scribes - that of losing their grip on the congregation. If the many Jewish rules of conduct were broken, this was punished severely, even by death. The Jewish authorities held the common Jews in a grip of terror by means of an authority, given them by the "Christian" rulers. After Rome had lost its patience with the Jews, Jerusalem was destroyed in the year 70 and the Jews were scattered in the surrounding countries.

Sanhedrin

The world leadership in Judaism, which in Jerusalem was called the Sanhedrin, "the wise

men of Zion", moved around during the next centuries, as a mobile government with incredible power over the scattered congregations. After the destruction of Jerusalem the headquarters were moved to Jamnia, where it remained for about 100 years. Thereafter it was Usha in Galilea, then, as always because of "persecution", it moved back to Sura in Babylon. For 600 years the world leadership remained in Jamnia, Usha and Galilea, in the oriental climate, where it belonged. When the world center was then moved to Spain, as a result of the moslem conquests (!) a long painful coexistence with the Christian countries began, in which the "oriental" mentality was not understood and appreciated. These sufferings are about to destroy the West in our time.

Treason in "Spanish"

In the Christian Spain treason was repeated. As in Babylon and Egypt the Jews turned against the people among whom they lived. They opened the gates of the city for the conquerors and was thereafter given custody of the raped city by the moslems ... against whom they also turned in the end. Once more they were thrown out for bad behaviour, in 1492. They obviously were identified with the moslem conquerors and thrown out together with them. Among the worst "persecutions" they had had to endure, was being forbidden to keep slaves! (prof. Graetz): "hereafter the Jews could neither buy Christians as slaves nor receive them as presents."

They had, by this time, been in Spain for 800 years. Most of them went back to Northern Africa, from where they had come, or they went to Egypt, Palestine, Italy, The greek Islands and Turkey. Other colonies had arisen in France, Germany, Holland and England, and these also received some of the expelled. Wherever they settled down, the religious leaders always had the local prince help them retain power over their congregation. *Total power*. Some of these Jews became very wealthy and they particularly developed loan capitalism as their power base. They lent large sums to extravagant princes, and in return for these received many privileges as court Jews. The best known representative for this money-power was the Rotschild family, which in the 19th century had become the real rulers of Europe.

Then the world leadership of Judaism was then moved to Poland.

The Chazars

This is one of the central mysteries. *Why* Poland? There was no information about any considerable part of the Spanish Jews having moved to Poland, or information that any earlier mass-immigration of Jews into Poland had taken place. In the 15-hundreds a (Jewish) population, counting millions, suddenly arose (Dr. Kastein). But populations of millions do not suddenly arise, and Dr. Kastein evades the question. Behind this suppressed knowledge lies the key to understanding the following history of Zionism. The Jewish headquarter was established amidst these so-called *Eastern Jews*, of whom even the Western Jews had, until then, only heard rumors, and of which the rest of the world knew nothing. From then on they took over the leadership of World Judaism. They were descendants of the Chazars, a people of Turkish-mongoloid origin, who had converted to Judaism around the 7th Century a.C. From here an even harsher segregation was ordered by "the wise ones". Meanwhile, the western Jews were slowly becoming "assimilated" in the Western European population, especially after the legislation that followed the French Revolution, which gradually gave them full civil rights. This eastern group gradually took over the leadership of "Judaism" to such a degree, that the Jewish "statistics" – which by the way have always been quite untrustworthy – practically let them disappear. Today eastern Jews constitute at least 90 % of all Jews, according to these statistics, both in Israel and in the rest of the world.

The western Jews who, by using fantasy and a maximum of twisting of truth, claimed to have once lived in Palestine, were slowly becoming assimilated, after having been thrown out of Spain, and almost "disappeared" as an entity. In their stead appeared the Eastern Jews, an Asian people, which had never had the slightest connection with Palestine.

And, suddenly, also the the world headquarters of the Jews disappeared. According to Dr. Kastein it "ceased to exist".

World Government without Address

There was, however, not much indication that this was so. But it became secret after 1772, when Poland was divided, and the larger part of the Jews came under Russian rule. Such a world headquarter had existed for over 2.500 years, and now it was supposed to have suddenly disappeared. It could, nevertheless, be assembled, when Napoleon called in "The great Sanhedrin" in 1807, in order to get clarity concerning the loyalty of French Jews or lack of same. Dr. Kastein, himself, reveals joyfully, that "in the 19th Century a Jewish International took shape".

The 19th Century belonged to the revolutionary conspiracies of both Zionism and Communism, which unfolded in the 20th Century. It was also in that Century, that the physical ghetto was replaced by a mental one: the fear of "Antisemitism". In Jewish families, the question was whether to further Revolutionary Communism or Revolutionary Zionism (Weizmann). It ended up being both. Communism should tear down all nations. Zionism should establish one. A World Government without an address was becoming a fashion, which has been followed undeviatingly all through the 20th Century.

World Revolution and Master Race

The British statesman, Benjamin Disraeli (a baptised Jew) said, that Jews were behind all the revolutions in the middle of the Century (from 1848), and there was significant *participation* by Jews also in the French Revolution. However, according to Reed, no Jewish leadership of the initial intrigues has been traced. It was secret societies, especially the Jacobins, who played the leading part, and these could be traced back to the German professor Adam Weishaupt, who in 1776 founded the *Illuminati*, a secret society, directed against all Christian authorities. Soon it had infiltrated all of the European freemasonry and it then went on to America. The conspiracy of the *Illuminati*, which was accidentally revealed by the Bavarian government in 1787, contained almost, word by word, the same text in their program as the later "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" (Nesta Webster) and it was clearly recognizable in the theories of the Russian Revolution. The "Russian" Revolution was the first, which was Jewish without any doubt (around 90% of the leaders were Jews) and this revolution, along with the First World War was the first clear evidence, that "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" were being followed literally in the major events of the world.

Reed gives several other examples of this script being an exact prophecy for the nearest future or a frightening plan for world conquest. (See Chapter "The Protocols", in Reeds book). It may never be proven, whether they are "Jewish" or not. More importantly, Reed frequently points out, that it has been mostly Jewish dissidents, who have warned against them. He mentions several. But the details of the World Government are being put in place day after day.

Knud Bjeld Eriksen, 6. February 1998

<<http://knud.eriksen.adr.dk/summary.htm>>

See the book by Douglas reed:

<<http://aaarghinternational.org/fran/livres/reedcontrov.pdf>>

ZIONIST SWINDLERS

Faurisson Affair

In 1979, Robert Faurisson, a French professor, wrote a book claiming that the Naziss did not have gas chambers, did not attempt a genocide of Jews (or any other groups), and that the "myth" of the gas chambers had been put forth by Zionist swindlers for the benefit of the state of Israel and to the detriment of Germanss and Palestinians. (Hitchens, 1985) *The Chorus and the Cassandra*.

Serge Thion, a libertarian socialist scholar with a record of opposition to all forms of

totalitarianism, asked Noam Chomsky to sign a petition calling on authorities to insure Robert Faurisson's "safety and the free exercise of his legal rights". (Faurisson had been beaten up by students, then suspended from teaching by his university on the grounds that the university could not guarantee his safety. Later he was charged in court with "falsification of history".) A furore soon arose over the wording of the petition, which referred to Faurisson's "extensive historical research" and mentioned his conclusions as "findings". Chomsky's critics saw this as a defence of Faurisson's opinions and not merely of his right to state them. In reply, Chomsky wrote an essay entitled *Some Elementary Comments on The Rights of Freedom of Expression*, which dealt mainly with the freedom to conduct and publish unpopular research. It also stated that he had not found evidence of anti-Semitism in the parts of Faurisson's work that he had reviewed. Chomsky writes:

"Faurisson's conclusions are diametrically opposed to views I hold and have frequently expressed in print (for example, in my book *Peace in the Middle East?*, where I describe the Holocaust as "the most fantastic outburst of collective insanity in human history"). But it is elementary that freedom of expression (including academic freedom) is not to be restricted to views of which one approves, and that it is precisely in the case of views that are almost universally despised and condemned that this right must be most vigorously defended. It is easy enough to defend those who need no defense or to join in unanimous (and often justified) condemnation of a violation of civil rights by some official enemy.

[<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8010-free-expression.html>]

Chomsky granted permission for this essay to be used for any purpose. Faurisson then used it as a preface for a book, without Chomsky's knowledge. Later Chomsky requested that Faurisson cease using it, but that request was declined.

Chomsky also commented on the difference between the acceptance of historical facts (in this case, the existence of gas chambers, denied by Faurisson) and the attitude towards certain people (hatred of the Jews, anti-Semitism, probably *also* held by Faurisson):

"I see no anti-Semitic implications in denial of the existence of gas chambers or even denial of the Holocaust. Nor would there be anti-Semitic implications, per se, in the claim that the Holocaust (whether one believes it took place or not) is being exploited, viciously so, by apologists for Israeli repression and violence. I see no hint of anti-Semitic implications in Faurisson's work." (quoted in *Noam Chomsky's Search for the Truth*)

Chomsky's writings sparked a great furor. Many people held that Faurisson's statements were the archetype of anti-Semitism, and that the logical conclusion of Chomsky's statement would be that Nazism was not anti-Semitic. The main argument for this is that Holocaust deniers are not interested in truth, but "motivated by racism, extremism, and virulent anti-Semitism" ([http://www.adl.org/braun/dim_14_1_deniers.asp] Deborah Lipstadt, in *Dimensions*, the journal of the ADL, 1991).

In *His Right to Say It*, published in *The Nation*, Chomsky states: "It seems to me something of a scandal that it is even *necessary* to debate these issues two centuries after Voltaire defended the right of free expression for views he detested. It is a poor service to the memory of the victims of the Holocaust to adopt a central doctrine of their murderers."

[<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8102-right-to-say.html>] His argument stressed the conceptual distinction between *endorsing someone's view* and *defending his right to say it*. Insofar as the latter does not imply the former, condemning censorship should not be read as espousing the censored view.

<<http://faurisson-affair.wikiverse.org/>>

BRAINWASHING

Catholic Teachers Learn Shoah Lesson

by Sharon Schatz Rosenthal, Education Writer

Early in her teaching career, Marilyn Lubarsky introduced her ninth-grade history

students to the Holocaust by showing "Nuit et Brouillard" ("Night and Fog"), a 1955 film containing vivid images of the horrors endured by Jews in concentration camps.

"I thought, 'I'm going to make my students feel my pain,'" Lubarsky, an Upland High School social studies teacher and Mandel Fellowship graduate of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) in Washington, D.C., told a classroom of Catholic educators at Mount St. Mary's College Chalon Campus in July. "But I'll never forget when my most gifted student put her head down on her desk [during the movie]."

Lubarsky's anecdote about a misguided attempt to teach students about the Shoah was met with sympathetic nods and collective sighs from the Southern California-based participants in the Anti-Defamation League's Bearing Witness Institute, held July 26-30. The four-day workshop focused on the history of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust and addressed the issues of diversity, prejudice and bigotry and how to teach these topics in a Catholic school setting.

As global anti-Semitism continues to rise and the number of anti-Semitic incidents in the United States remains constant, Holocaust education for non-Jews is more crucial than ever.

"In some ways, it's more important for non-Jews than Jews to study the Holocaust, just like the issue of racism," said Deborah Lipstadt, the director of the Institute for Jewish Studies at Emory University and a council member of the USHMM. "It's more important for the perpetrators to study it than for the victims to study it."

With Pope John XXIII's admittance of the church's anti-Semitism and failing to help the Jews during the Holocaust, as well as Pope John Paul II's recognition of the State of Israel, **the Vatican has legitimized Catholics' responsibility to learn about the Shoah** and the religious group's moral failure during that time period.

Lipstadt feels that when Catholics study the Shoah, it is not necessarily a lesson in Jewish history for them.

"Catholics learning about the Holocaust are learning about what Christian Europe allowed to happen in that period. They're not learning about Jews," said the historian. "It's important to Catholics and Christians as Catholics and Christians."

Many of the teachers at the Bearing Witness Institute felt that this newfound knowledge made them accountable.

"It's our responsibility to make sure our students are aware of the past and make sure the future isn't repeated in this manner," said Bryant Jozef Begany, a religion teacher at St. Pius X School in Santa Fe Springs.

"Teaching [Catholic students] about the Holocaust is important because they must understand our common heritage with the Jews," said Marisa Meyka, a sixth-grade language arts teacher at St. Mary of the Assumption in Whittier. "Finally we have this opportunity to undo the mistakes from our past."

While finding a connection to the Shoah is clearly a crucial component within Jewish identity, is there such a thing as "too much" when it comes to Holocaust education?

"No," said Rabbi Abraham Cooper, associate dean of the Simon Wiesenthal Center. "In Judaism the view is that every life is precious." [**Except the lives of the Palestinians, of course...**]

Rather than worrying about an over-abundance of information on the Holocaust, Cooper is more concerned about the victims' memories being manipulated to decouple the continuity of Jewish history.

"There are universal lessons to be learned by the Shoah, but we have to be on our guard to be sure the non-Jewish world does not see a connection with [the idea that] we don't need a Jewish homeland," Cooper said. "For someone to say they relate to the victims of the Shoah, but they're not sure that Israel has a moral right to exist, that person hasn't really learned a thing."

The existence of Israel was not a key topic during Bearing Witness, but the connection between anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment came up during some of the discussions. While the workshop focus was Holocaust education, the idea of eliminating prejudice and bigotry serve as a backdrop for the experience.

Back in the classroom, Lubarsky discussed the idea of translating statistics into people, avoiding the comparison of pain endured during the Shoah versus other suffering in history and

other sensitive and thorough methods of relaying the information.

"I don't give a test on [the Holocaust] unit and I urge you not to," Lubarsky said. "I don't want a child who has decided to eliminate a particular vulgar word from his vocabulary to then get a C on a Holocaust test."

For more information on the program, visit
<www.adl.org/bearing_witness> .

<<http://www.jewishjournal.com/home/preview.php?id=12769>>

ATROCITY PROPAGANDA AND POLITICAL JUSTICE

Allied Propaganda during World War II

Udo Walendy

Sefton Delmer, born in Berlin in 1904, with Lord Beaverbrook's support, *Daily Express* correspondent of long standing, promoted in 1940 to be the leading correspondent for the British Information Secretary of State, Duff Cooper, and finally directed the German-language broadcasts of the BBC and the propaganda linked with it. About his first BBC radio broadcast Sefton Delmer wrote as follows:

«For Hitler had chosen my first Friday - Friday July the 19th, 1940 - to make his triumphal Reichstag oration in celebration of his victory over France. More important still, he had chosen it as the occasion for his "final peace appeal" to Britain.

"It almost causes me pain," I heard him piously intone as I listened in on the radio in the BBC studio, "to think that I should have been selected by Providence to deal the final blow to the edifice which these men have already set tottering... Mr. Churchill ought for once to believe me, when I prophesy that a great empire will be destroyed which it was never my intention to destroy or even to harm... In this hour I feel it my duty before my conscience to appeal once more to reason and common sense in Britain... I CAN SEE NO REASON WHY THIS WAR MUST GO ON!"

...Within an hour of Hitler having spoken I was on the air with my reply. And without a moment's hesitation I turned his peace offer down. My colleagues at the BBC had approved of what I meant to say. That was enough authority for me.

"Herr Hitler," I said in my smoothest and most deferential German, "you have on occasion in the past consulted me as to the mood of the British public. So permit me to render your excellency this little service once again tonight. Let me tell you what we here in Britain think of this appeal of yours to what you are pleased to call our reason and common sense. Herr Führer and Reichskanzler, we hurl it right back at you, right in your evil smelling teeth..."

...Duff Cooper rallied to my support with all his suave authority. He assured the House that my talk had the Cabinet's full approval. And when the Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax replied to Hitler a couple of days after me the sense of what he said was the same, although he used rather more restrained language. (*Black Boomerang*, pp. 16-18)»

Sefton Delmer finally was entrusted with the command of a "Research Unit," which, however, did not have anything to do with research - but was simply the cover-name - for special radio stations giving the impression, "as if they were working at some place inside the Europe occupied by Hitler." His initial chief was Leonard Ingrams, a key employee in "the Cloak-and-Dagger Organisation S.O.2 later renamed S.O.E. (Special Operations Executive) which was responsible for the organisation of resistance, sabotage, assassination and kindred enterprises" (pp. 36-37). Delmer's remit: "There are no limits. No holds are barred" (p. 38).

Delmer's instructions included the following:

"Accuracy first," I used to tell the writers. "We must never lie by accident, or through

slovenliness, only deliberately!"

And as we put out news bulletin after news bulletin and service programme after service programme an entire system of subversive campaigns developed. (p. 92)

* * *

We are waging against Hitler a kind of total war of wits. Anything goes, so long as it serves to bring nearer the end of the war and Hitler's defeat. If you [Otto John] are at all squeamish about what you may be called upon to do against your own countrymen you must say so now. I shall understand it. In that case, however, you will be no good to us and no doubt some other job will be found for you. But if you feel like joining me, I must warn you that in my unit we are up to all the dirty tricks we can devise. No holes are barred. The dirtier the better. Lies treachery, everything. (p. 181)

* * *

The monitored conversations between the generals, the interrogations, the maps all travelled down to MB [Milton Bryan, near Woburn]. And there they were built up into news stories about the hitherto top secret private life of Hitler and his suite that tortured the ailing Führer with the suspicion that the British had their spies right inside his HQ. Clifton Child was a genius at freshening up a piece of intelligence with a new development that made it sound like something that had happened the night before...

Hitler's suspicions reached their climax when the Soldatensender, using the same technique of intelligent deduction and anticipation which had served us so well in the past, reported an order issued by the Führer at a conference in his headquarters, and did so within twenty-four hours of his having given it and before it had been carried out. (pp. 207-208)

* * *

We never attempted to concentrate on individual coups. Our task as I saw it was to corrode and erode with a steady drip of subversive news and 'evidence' the iron system of control in which Hitler's Police State had locked the body and soul of the German people. (p. 213)

Examples of such measures:

The first consisted of posting letters to the relatives of German soldiers who had recently died in German military hospitals in Italy. Fortunately for us the German hospital directors made a practice of sending radio telegrams *en clair* to the local party authorities in Germany asking them to break the news to the relatives. These telegrams were intercepted and passed on to me. And they gave us all the information we needed - the soldier's name, the address of his relatives and the name of the hospital.

We now concocted a moving letter, written out in German longhand script on notepaper bearing the letter heading of the German hospital. Ostensibly the letter came either from a nurse or from a comrade of the dead man who had entrusted it for posting to someone going to Germany on leave. Whoever was the writer, he or she had been with the dead man during his last hours, and was now writing to comfort his relatives...

On other occasions we used the same technique to tell the relatives that their soldier had not died of wounds, but had been given a lethal injection. The Nazi doctor at the hospital, we explained through our nurse, had considered the man had no chance of becoming fighting fit again before the war was finished. The doctor had required the man's bed for soldiers with a better chance of rapid recovery. (p. 133-134)

Next I decided to fake a letter allegedly written by Mölders expatiating on the doubts he and his comrades felt about fighting for the atheist Hitler... For it was in keeping with the character of young Mölders to have written such a letter. He alone could have denounced it convincingly, and he was dead - murdered, so everyone believed, by the Nazis themselves. (pp. 139-140)

To lighten my conscience a little - and help on our desertion campaign at the same time - I also arranged for food parcels to be sent to those relatives of dead soldiers whom we had hoaxed so cruelly with our 'Red Circle' letters. To reinforce their belief that the dead man was not dead at all but a deserter earning good money in a safe refuge abroad we gave the alleged sender of the food parcel the dead man's Christian name. (p. 142)

* * *

When the bombers of the RAF and USAF flew into Germany and some of the German transmitters went off the air so as not to serve as beacons for the raiders, a number of German regional radios closed down with them and their frequencies were left vacant - a practice which we had already been exploiting in our war with the jammers.

Our plan therefore was for 'Aspidistra' [the transmitter] to lie in ambush on the frequency of a German station we expected to go off the air and take over the moment it did. Harold Robin had perfected an electronic device specially designed for the purpose.

It enabled 'Aspidistra' to take over the German target frequency within one two-hundredth of a second of the German station closing down. On it we then planned to broadcast the identical programme the Germans had been broadcasting when they closed down. For the German listeners therefore there would be no break in continuity. They would be completely unaware that the big bad British wolf had put on Grandma Goebbels's nightcap and spectacles and crept into bed in her place.

How did we mean to accomplish this? I had found that when Leipzig or Frankfort, or whichever it was, closed down there were always several other stations left on the air broadcasting the programme which the dear departed had been carrying. All we had to do therefore was to take over this programme from, let us say, Hamburg or Berlin on our antennae and relay it on to the frequency of our German target station through 'Aspidistra'. In much the same way we occasionally relayed the radio speeches of Hitler and Goebbels onto the Calais programme. We only needed to carry on with the relay for a fraction of a minute. Then having established the continuity we would interrupt the programme with one of those special announcements which the German authorities, now that other means of communication had broken down, were increasingly fond of making over the radio. The announcement finished, we would carry on with the Goebbels programme for a minute or so. Then, we, too, would fade out as 'enemy Terror Raiders approached...' (pp. 196-197)

We did not have long to wait for an opportunity to try out Big Bertha. Winston Churchill saw to that.

As the British and American armies began their advance into Germany, the BBC, the Voice of America, and the 12th Army group broadcasters of Radio Luxemburg had all been telling the German civilian population - "Stay where you are. Don't move." They had done so under a carefully considered directive from SHAEF. But when Winston learned of this advice - quite fortuitously - he blew up in hot outrage. (p. 200)

On the Soldatensender, and in *Nachrichten*, we plugged a story of seven bomb-free zones in Central and South Germany where refugees would be safe from further enemy air attacks. Neutral Red Cross representatives in Berlin, we reported, had informed the Reich authorities that Eisenhower was going to declare these seven zones as bomb-free safety areas. Banks were already moving their securities into them.

These 'safety zones' were all the more effective as almost at the same time as we were announcing them Eisenhower began to proclaim as 'targets for tonight' the total destruction of such city areas as Cologne, Dusseldorf, Frankfort and Mannheim. Ike, too, was following the Churchill directive.

Were Big Bertha's instructions obeyed? Did the population leave the towns and villages, and crowd the roads, as Churchill had wanted? The confidential 'weekly report' of the Gauamtsleiter of Lemgo, which I reproduce in the Appendix, suggests that they did. But I never checked any further.

When I got to Germany at the end of March, the roads were indeed crowded with refugees - miserable ragged families, trudging wearily along the Autobahn and through debris-cluttered streets of bomb ruins. Behind them they dragged carts, buses that had no fuel for their

engines, and even hearses. All were loaded with bedding and babies. It was the epitome of everything I had seen in Spain, Poland and France.

I did not stop to question any of them whether it was a message on Radio Cologne or Radio Frankfurt that had first started them on their trek. I did not want to know. I feared the answer might be 'yes'.

What I do know is that by our intrusion with counterfeit instructions we finally deprived the German authorities of the use of the radio for issuing orders to the German population. For when Hitler's men woke up to what was happening they howled in loud and indignant protest.

"The enemy is broadcasting counterfeit instructions on our frequencies," the Nazi announcers cried. "Don't be misled by them. Here is an official announcement of the Reich authority for..." That was just what we wanted.

"The enemy," said our announcer in Big Bertha's next intrusion, "is broadcasting counterfeit instructions on our frequencies. Don't be misled by them. Here is an official announcement of the Reich authority for..." It was such a pushover for us that Goebbels abandoned the battle. He gave up just as he had given up once before when we counterfeited Mussolini's Fascist Republican Radio from Munich. No more orders and announcements went out over the ether. Instead, the Reich government confined itself from now on to giving out its announcements and instructions over the *Drahtfunk*, a wired diffusion network on which we could not intrude but which was greatly restricted in its scope. And of course we did not limit our Big Bertha counterfeit to messages designed to get the German population moving out on the roads. I also did my best to further our oldest psychological warfare aim of setting German against German. (pp. 204-205)

It is a matter of course that a tremendous amount of documents were forged in the course of this work.

The war was in its last stages, when Walter Adams the new Deputy Director General, came down to MB and asked me to stay on with the department, in order to take on an important new job in connection with the occupation of Germany.

The department was being reorganised, he said. The old regional directorates were being abolished and in their place three 'Divisions' were being organised to take care of the new tasks which the Cabinet had allotted to us. One division would look after the London end of our political warfare in the Far East. David Bowes-Lyon was taking charge of that one. A second division was to take on the screening and re-education of prisoners of war. A third was to see to it that the Germans and Austrians under British administration got the right kind of newspapers, radio, periodicals, books, theatres and so forth...

"Both [Anthony] Eden and Brendan Bracken say that you are the man for the job." (p. 228)

And after the war in 1945, to the staff at Milton Bryan:

"You have not talked about our work with outsiders and nothing much is known about us or our technique. People may have their suspicions, but they don't know. I want you to keep it that way. Don't be misled into boasting about the jobs we have done, the tricks we have played on the enemy..."

"If we start boasting of the clever things we did, who knows what the result of that will be. So mum's the word. Propaganda is something one keeps quiet about..."

What I had not expected was that PWD SHAEF would include our 'black operations' in its Official History and that as a result our work would be dragged into controversy between the two American 'Sykewar' agencies. (pp. 218-220)

Sefton Delmer was among the men "who were given the opportunity in 1945 of making changes in Germany" (p. 228). What these intended changes looked like, the German constitutional lawyer Prof. Friedrich Grimm depicts in his book 'Political Justice' (pp. 146-148):

In May 1945, a few days after the collapse, I had a notable talk with an important representative of the opposite side. He introduced himself as a university professor of his country, who wanted to converse with me on the historical basis of the war. It was a conversation of high standing we conducted. Suddenly he dropped the subject, pointed to the leaflets lying on the table in front of me, we were flooded with during the first days after

surrender, mainly circling around the concentration camp-horrors. "What do you say about it?" so he asked me.

I replied:

"Oradour and Buchenwald? With me you force an open door. I am a lawyer and condemn the wrong wherever I meet with it, more than all, when it happens on our side. I know, however, to make a distinction between the facts and the political use one makes of it. I know the meaning of atrocity propaganda. After World War I, I have read all publications by your experts on this subject, the writings of the Northcliff Bureau, the book of the French minister of the finances Klotz 'From War to Peace' (Paris, 1923), depicting how the story of the chopped-off children's hands was cooked up and what profit one got out of it, the enlightenment writings of the journal *Crapouillot* comparing the atrocity propaganda of 1870 with that of 1914-1918, and finally the classic by Ponsonby: 'The Lie in War' [*Falsehood in Wartime*], revealing that one had in the preceding war already magazines showing artificial corpse mountains by photomontage composed of dummies. These pictures were distributed, with a space left for caption. It was given out by telephone later on according to the needs from the propaganda centre."

Thereby I pulled out one of the leaflets exhibiting allegedly mountains of dead bodies out of the concentration camps, and showed it to my visitor, who looked at me taken aback.

I continued:

"I can not imagine that in this war with all weapons perfected to such an extent, this mentally toxic weapon should have been neglected that decided the outcome of World War I. More so, I know it for sure! The last months before the collapse I read daily the foreign press. There was reported on German atrocities from a central office, operating in a certain turn. There was one occupied territory after the other called to mind, today France, tomorrow Norway, then Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Greece, Jugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia.

"First were reported hundreds of corpses in the concentration camps, then six weeks later when it was the turn of this same country again, thousands, then ten thousands, then hundred thousands. Here I thought to myself: this number inflation can not possibly skyrocket into the million!"

Now I reached for another leaflet: "Here you have the million!" There my visitor blurted out: "I see, I have run into an expert. Now I also want to tell you, who I am. I am not a university professor. I am of the central office you talked about: Atrocity propaganda - and with it we won the total victory."

I replied: "I know, and now you must stop it!" He retorted: "No, now we shall start all the more! We shall continue this atrocity propaganda, we shall intensify it, until nobody shall accept a good word from the Germans anymore, until all the sympathy you had in other countries shall be destroyed, and until the Germans themselves shall be so confused that they do not know anymore what they are doing!" I terminated the conversation: "Then you shall burden yourself with a great responsibility!"

What this man had threatened us with, came true. The worst, however, was the confusion caused among the Germans themselves.

Prof. Dr. Friedrich Grimm did not know the true identity of his interlocutor: It was Sefton Delmer!

† Walendy calls the German edition 'The Germans and I' and translates Delmer's response to Hitler's peace offer as "Mr. Führer and Chancellor of the Reich, we throw this incredible imposition back at you in the midst of your maladorous Führer snout" (p. 421). The original broadcast was in German. Delmer's autobiography was published in Britain in two volumes, *Trail Sinister* (1961) and *Black Boomerang* (1962). Additional reference: Hans Frederik, 'The Candidates' p. 180.

From Udo Walendy, *The Methods of Reeducation*, Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho/Weser, 1979

The Heretical Press
PO Box 1004, Hull, Yorkshire HU3 2YT, England
<http://www.heretical.com/walendy/sdelmer.html>

+++++

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.

OTHER AAARGH MONTHLY PUBLICATIONS

El Paso del Ebro

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

Das kausale Nexusblatt

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

Il Resto del Siculo

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

La Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues (multilingual)

<<http://ggb.0catch.com>>

Conseils de Révision

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