

THE REVISIONIST CLARION 2008

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

YEARLY NEWSLETTER ABOUT HISTORICAL REVISIONISM
AND THE CRISIS OF IMPERIAL POWERS

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

TOWARDS THE DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL
AND THE ROLLING BACK OF USA

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

Issue Nr. 24

Summer - Winter 2007

revclar@yahoo.com.au

< <http://revurevi.net> >

alternative archives

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

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

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

CONTENTS

Afghanistan mission close to failing

Declan Walsh and Richard Norton Taylor

The good killer

Man accused of accosting Nobel winner Wiesel apologizes in court

Jaxon Van Derbeken

WIESENTHAL CENTER WELCOMES CRUCIAL
HISTORICAL CHANGES TO STATE DEPARTMENT WEBSITE

Palestine

MICHAEL ST. JOHN'S CONFIDENTIAL FILE

David Abravanel Stein

**Iran's Propaganda, Holocaust Revisionism
and Western Civilization**

Marek Jan Chodakiewicz

Finkelstein on Hilberg on "deniers"

Torture in Israeli Prisons

Rev. Ted Pike

Holocaust and the myth of Sisyphus

Prasenjit Chowdhury Kolkata

Grubach's open letter to David Irving on his change of mind on
Holocaust

Harvard law school expels star student for "holocaust denial"

Holocaust denial

Gregory Stanton

Anti-Semitism Right Here at Home

By: Lily Galili

Military Resistance Forced Shift on Iran Strike

by Gareth Porter

"Revision" Michel Bounan

Genocide Inflation is the Real Human Rights Threat:

Yugoslavia and Rwanda

by Edward S. Herman

**Spanish FM: Constitutional Court decision "must be
overturned"**

Vincent Reynouard was convicted for writing a 16-page pamphlet

Neo-Nazi Gary Lauck of Nebraska hosts about

80 foreign Web sites.

By Russell Working

Holocaust denial squashed by Aspen TV

The European Court Awards Compensation to a Journalist who

Fights Antisemitism

Islamophobia and Holocaust Denial

By Norman G. Finkelstein

New Zealand Holocaust denier appointed dean

European Jewish group calls for stiffer penalties

for hate crimes in Greece

The *Shoah* must go on

Anne Frank Fund tries to stop musical based on her life

By Graham Keeley

Revisionism for Our Time

By Murray N. Rothbard

A Disgusting Display of Hypocrisy

By Lawrence Uniglicht

PALESTINIANS GET A HOLOCAUST DENIER

AS FIRST PRIME MINISTER

By Rafael Medoff

Atrocity Gods

About the proposed EU Holocaust Denial Law

Ashley Howes

BOOKS

Idith Zertal, Ilan Pappé, Ariel Toaff, Gian Marco Lucchese, Pietro Gianetti

Arnold J. Toynbee had dealt directly with the [Palestine Mandate](#) in the British Foreign Office; he wrote **in 1968**: "All through those 30 years, Britain (admitted) into Palestine, year by year, a quota of Jewish immigrants that varied according to the strength of the respective pressures of the Arabs and Jews at the time. These immigrants could not have come in if they had not been shielded by a British *chevaux-de-frise*. If Palestine had remained under Ottoman Turkish rule, or if it had become an independent Arab state in 1918, Jewish immigrants would never have been admitted into Palestine in large enough numbers to enable them to overwhelm the Palestinian Arabs in this Arab people's own country. The reason why the State of Israel exists today and why today 1,500,000 Palestinian Arabs are refugees is that, for 30 years, Jewish immigration was imposed on the Palestinian Arabs by British military power until the immigrants were sufficiently numerous and sufficiently well-armed to be able to fend for themselves with tanks and planes of their own. The tragedy in Palestine is not just a local one; it is a tragedy for the world, because it is an injustice that is a menace to the world's peace."^[2]

^ Robert John and Sami Hadawi, *The Palestine Diary*, vol. I (1914-1945), (New World Press, New York, 1970), pp. xiv-xv.

"With Holocaust denial so rampant on the Internet these days, *Nuremberg* has never been more necessary. This film, and this film alone, **can stop the deniers dead in their tracks.**"

Professor John Michalczyk, Boston College; author, *The Resisters, the Rescuers, and the Refugees*;

<http://www.nistarim.com/nuremberg.htm>

If the "myth" of the Holocaust "falls," the West is gone. Marek Jan Chodakiewicz.

"Even if he [David Irving] wasn't a denier, he gave the deniers leverage," Lipstadt said of the England native. "He was the most dangerous of all deniers because he had an outside reputation other than being known as a Holocaust denier." Poor Old Debbie, Kent University, 14 Nov. 2007.

IT'S OVER

Afghanistan mission close to failing

Injection of troops and aid has not brought stability says intelligence chief
Declan Walsh in Islamabad and **Richard Norton Taylor**

After six years of US-led military support and billions of pounds in aid, security in Afghanistan is "deteriorating" and President Hamid Karzai's government controls less than a third of the country, America's top intelligence official has admitted.

Mike McConnell testified in Washington that Karzai controls about 30% of Afghanistan

and the Taliban 10%, and the remainder is under tribal control.

The Afghan government angrily denied the US director of national intelligence's assessment yesterday, insisting it controlled "over 360" of the country's 365 districts. "This is far from the facts and we completely deny it," said the defence ministry.

But the gloomy comments echoed even more strongly worded recent reports by thinktanks, including one headed by the former Nato commander General James Jones, which concluded that "urgent changes" were required now to "prevent Afghanistan becoming a failed state".

Although Nato forces have killed thousands of insurgents, including several commanders, an unrelenting drip of violence has eroded Karzai's grip in the provinces, providing fuel to critics who deride him as "the mayor of Kabul".

A suicide bomb at a dog fight near Kandahar last week killed more than 80 people. Yesterday fighting erupted in neighbouring Helmand when the Taliban ambushed a police patrol. The interior ministry said 25 militants were killed; a Taliban spokesman said they lost one.

A day earlier, the Asian Rural Life Development Foundation aid agency said it feared that Cyd Mizell, an American employee kidnapped in Kandahar last month, had been killed in captivity.

A big injection of foreign troops has failed to bring stability. The US has almost 50,000 soldiers in Afghanistan and - twice as many as in 2004 - while the UK has 7,700, mostly in Helmand. Another 2,200 US marines are due to arrive next month to combat an expected Taliban surge.

Nato commanders paint the suicide bombs and ambushes as signs of a disheartened enemy. Yesterday, Brigadier Andrew Mackay, commander of the British contingent in southern Afghanistan, said the Taliban were "worn down", running low on fighters, and being ostracised by local communities. "Logistically they are also challenged. The cumulative effect of all of this is that they are having to change their modus operandi, and that is why we are seeing more asymmetric attacks and suicide bombings in places such as Kandahar," he said.

But analysts believe the Taliban is successfully adapting the brutal guerrilla tactics that have served Iraqi insurgents so well. The six British soldiers killed in Helmand over the past three months were victims of roadside bombs. The drugs trade is swelling the Taliban coffers - according to the highest estimates, 40% of profits, or tens of millions of pounds, go to the insurgency. Attacks have made the main road from Kandahar to Kabul too dangerous for foreigners. Afghan truck drivers travel with armed escort.

The insecurity has penetrated the capital. Since an assault on Kabul's Serena Hotel last January, westerners have disappeared from the streets of Kabul. This week Taliban commanders threatened to step up the campaign with more bombs.

The key to the Taliban's success, McConnell said, "is the opportunity for safe haven in Pakistan". Meanwhile the surge in violence has placed a big strain on Nato. The French president, Nicolas Sarkozy, has agreed to deploy a battalion outside Kabul after America has criticised European states for refusing to join the fight in the south and Canada threatened to withdraw its troops from Kandahar next year if reinforcements do not arrive.

An Oxfam report yesterday said international and national security forces, as well as warlords, criminals and the Taliban, were perceived by ordinary Afghans as posing security threats.

The Guardian 29 Feb; 2008

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/feb/29/afghanistan.terrorism>

JEWISH HUMANISM

The good killer

Yitzhak Arad, a noted historian and partisan fighter who served 21 years as the chairman of Israel's national Holocaust museum, is suspected by Lithuanian prosecutors of being involved in the wartime killing of Lithuanian civilians. The issue came to light when Lithuanian authorities sought to question Arad, a request Israel has refused.

On Wednesday, the current chairman of Yad Vashem, Avner Shalev, delivered a written protest of the matter to visiting Lithuanian Foreign Minister Petras Vaitiekunas. Shalev urged the minister to bring the matter to a speedy resolution.

"It is clear that initiating criminal proceedings into Dr. Arad's involvement in [Communist] partisan activity during World War II is tantamount to a call for an investigation into all partisan

activity," Shalev wrote. "Any attempt to equate those actions with illegal activities, thereby defining them as criminal, is a dangerous perversion of the events that occurred in Lithuania during the war."

<http://www.jta.org/cgi-bin/iowa/news/article/20080227AradLithuania02272008.html>

COMEDY

Man accused of accosting Nobel winner Wiesel apologizes in court

Jaxon Van Derbeken

The man accused of accosting Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel in a San Francisco hotel apologized to the Nobel Peace Prize winner in court Monday as Wiesel recounted what he described as his most harrowing ordeal since World War II. "I'm terribly sorry about what happened," Eric Hunt, 23, blurted out as the 78-year-old Wiesel was on the witness stand in San Francisco Superior Court at the defendant's preliminary hearing.

Superior Court Judge Harold Kahn will hear arguments next week and decide on whether to order Hunt to stand trial and on what charges. He ordered an independent mental evaluation of Hunt over prosecutors' objections Monday. Hunt told Wiesel in court that he was sorry both that he had scared him and that Wiesel had suffered during the Holocaust. Hunt also told Wiesel that his grandfather had fought the Nazis.

Hunt's attorney, John Runfola, tugged on his client's shoulder in an attempt to keep him from talking. Runfola later said Hunt has cared for his grandfather, a paratrooper during the war who now suffers from Alzheimer's.

Wiesel said outside court that he was skeptical of the apology. "I expected it," he said. "I'm a novelist. I imagine situations - this is something a character would do. It's clever, very clever." Asked if he thought Hunt's apology was sincere, Wiesel said, "No, I didn't," but later added, "I don't know."

Hunt is accused of six felonies, including attempted kidnapping, battery and stalking, in connection with the Feb. 1 incident at the Argent Hotel. The Sussex County, N.J., resident is accused of traveling 3,000 miles to confront Wiesel at a conference that was being held at the hotel.

Wiesel testified that Hunt had grabbed him by the arm in a hotel elevator and told him, "You must come with me." When Wiesel replied that they should go to the lobby, he testified, Hunt said, "You must come to my room."

"I felt threatened; I felt frightened," Wiesel said. "I felt he could kill me and I began to shout, 'Help! Help! Help!' " As Wiesel struggled to free himself, he said, Hunt told him, 'You are afraid of the truth.' " Wiesel managed to get away and rode down to the lobby. The experience left him feeling "violated" and more frightened than he had been since the war, he testified.

"The shock to me was so great that I lost a sense of time and space," Wiesel said.

Hunt was arrested three weeks later, after someone identifying himself as Hunt posted an account of the incident on an anti-Semitic Web site. In an interview with New York police, Hunt admitted that he had written the post in a library in Chicago as he headed home, New York police Sgt. Al Fiore testified Monday.

Hunt told Fiore that he had been trying to get Wiesel to confess that the Holocaust never happened, the sergeant testified. Hunt was voluntarily committed soon after returning to New Jersey and was ultimately arrested at a mental clinic.

He has pleaded not guilty. His attorney has said Hunt suffered from a manic phase of bipolar disorder and said he had sent a psychiatric evaluation to prosecutors and to Wiesel. Wiesel testified that the fear he felt that evening has yet to dissipate.

"If a young man could devote his life now to the cause of Holocaust denying, what kind of world do we live in?" Wiesel said. "The anguish I felt multiplied."

Runfola suggested that Wiesel had suffered no harm and that there was no evidence Hunt had wanted to do anything other than talk to the author. But Wiesel said that when he was pulled out of the elevator, "I was convinced that if he managed to get me to his room, something terrible was going to happen. That's how I felt."

Wiesel was sent by the Nazis in 1944 to Auschwitz, where his mother and three sisters were killed. His father died on a forced march to Buchenwald, another concentration camp, three months before the camp was liberated in 1945.

Wiesel has written more than 40 books based on his Holocaust experiences. He won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1986. He testified that Holocaust denial goes hand in hand with anti-Semitism, as it

suggests that the Nazis' murder of 6 million people was fabricated by Jews. **Hunt was going to "force me to say that my testimony was false," Wiesel said, "that the whole story, the whole event, the whole tragedy was nothing but lies." That was what frightened him : recognize that he is a liar, a complete liar...**

After he left the stand, Wiesel was approached by the defendant's mother, Naomi McCloskey, who was in tears. "I want to ask you for your forgiveness," she told him in the hallway of the courthouse. "He is a kind boy, a sensitive boy. He took care of my father. I want him to do good in this world. I believe he can." Wiesel listened, despite efforts by prosecutors to stop the conversation, but left without giving Hunt's mother a reply.

San Francisco Chronicle, August 14, 2007

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/08/14/BAJFRHP2U.DTL>

Obviously, for Wiesel, an arch-liar, the greatest risk is to meet someone who calls him a liar, right in his face...

HOW TO FALSIFY HISTORY

WIESENTHAL CENTER WELCOMES CRUCIAL HISTORICAL CHANGES TO STATE DEPARTMENT WEBSITE

Center says, "In a world where terrorists and Holocaust deniers even lead nations, Hitler's Final Solution, must never be underplayed or forgotten."

The Simon Wiesenthal Center praised the U.S. State Department for immediately acting to make changes to its *Background Note* on Germany to clearly stress the implementation the Holocaust. The previous entry – a key component of the State Department's website – contained only a general reference to the crime of genocide and the establishment of concentration camps, but omitted the mention of the principal victims of the Holocaust and that the real purpose of the camps was to eliminate Europe's Jews.

"I am pleased that the State Department recognized the deficiencies of its previous background note on Germany and consulted with us to post a new note that accurately reflects the enormity of the crimes committed against the Jewish people during the Holocaust," said Rabbi Marvin Hier, founder and dean of the Wiesenthal Center. "In a world where terrorists and Holocaust deniers even lead nations, Hitler's "Final Solution" must never be underplayed or forgotten," he added.

August 10, 2007

http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/nl/content.asp?c=fwLYKnN8LzH&b=312458&content_id={6B05AA0F-80BD-4530-B4E9-B7426ADCEF54}¬oc=1

CHALLENGE

Palestine

Tuesday, December 12th, 2006

President Ahmadinejad's conference whose "brief" is to examine whether the Jewish holocaust occurred opened in Tehran yesterday.

Toynbee was one of the first to have written about the holocaust of the Armenians. Here is a link to his work on this. The first time the phrase "crimes against humanity" was used was in a statement by the Allied Powers in relation to the Armenian genocide.

(Genocide-denial by the successor of the state which sponsored it *is* a reason to delay Turkey's entry into the European Union. So are economic incompatibilities. Religious differences are *not* a reason.)

In the first volume of the *Study*, Toynbee recognises the genocide of indigenous peoples that occurred in north America at the hands of white Protestant immigrants. I'll quote passages later. He does not use that term there, because the word genocide did not exist in 1934.

I don't think that north Americans even now often speak of an American genocide. They've come to terms with the record on slavery, and its aftermath (1865-1965), but I am not sure whether they have with the other issue.

Toynbee often contrasts the behaviour of Catholics worldwide with that of Protestants: the Protestants come off much worse. We've had a little from him on Mexico already (a country of whose race relations he has a rather rosy view) and on the treatment of black people by Protestants in Africa and America.

But on Israel, his view was blunt. The crime committed against the Jews in Europe did not justify the crime committed against the Palestinians in Asia. He identified Zionism with an instinctive imperialism and colonialism. In fact, a possible Zion discussed between 1903 and 1905 was in Africa, in "Uganda", land which is now actually in Kenya. He believed that it was easy to create a Jewish state at a distance, where mere Arabs were involved, not so easy to think of one closer to home. The perpetrators of the genocide of the Jews in central Europe should have given up some of their own land for this state.

Whether this could have been discussed practically in 1945 seems rather doubtful. The main decision as to the location of the Jewish state had been taken a generation earlier. Immigration into Palestine by Jews had started a generation before that. But Toynbee was accusing the West of two crimes: against the Jews and against the Palestinians, by sponsoring the creation of a Jewish state on Palestinian land. He was not necessarily speaking in practical political terms.

This view is not popular and can seem heartless. There is even a school (Melanie Phillips) which equates criticism of the Jewish state with a more general Western defeatism, of the sort of which Toynbee was often accused. But such was his view.

What should be done now? I suppose Toynbee's least demanding answer would have been: withdrawal now to secure pre-1967 borders; after a certain point you cannot visit on the sons the sins of the fathers. His more challenging answer would have been: all peoples of all religions and races must live together in the single space of Palestine-Israel in a secular state.

Depressingly, I fear that Toynbee may be quoted in Ahmadinejad's disgraceful conference.

<http://davidderrick.wordpress.com/tag/palestineisrael>

On and around Toynbee, see the interesting website published by David Derrick called

The Toynbee convector

<http://davidderrick.wordpress.com/>

ZIONIST INFILTRATORS

MICHAEL ST. JOHN'S CONFIDENTIAL FILE

HELLO AMERICA! The Tehran Holocaust denial conference was denounced by the United Nations, the U.S. Congress, the British and French Parliaments, and the Israeli Knesset. But even as outrage over the conference spread, the world could only guess at what was transpiring behind the closed doors of the clandestine meeting rooms where the deniers plotted their strategy.

Now the world will have to guess no longer, because one man -- Holocaust historian and documentary filmmaker **David Stein** -- **was able to infiltrate the conference and secretly record the proceedings**. Stein, currently at work on the documentary film *Nuremberg*, starring Whoopi Goldberg, put all of his projects on hold when he learned about the Tehran conference. "I felt that someone had to document what was going on," Stein told me during a recent interview. "Someone had to record the deniers' plans, and someone had to tell the world. This was the first time that a government had sponsored a Holocaust denial conference. Deniers have had conferences before, but always in private or secret. Now, they

were the honored guests at a state-sponsored event. That's a very ominous sign."

As a well-known documentary filmmaker, **and a Jew**, Stein couldn't infiltrate the conference himself, so he worked in tandem with an associate who was able to slip in and out of the conference unnoticed. "At the close of the conference," Stein adds grimly, "President Ahmadinejad pledged twenty-five million dollars to the cause of Holocaust denial, and the attendees toasted to the destruction of Israel. And we have it all on tape."

Stein is editing the footage from the Iran conference into a documentary film, which will explore the rise in anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial worldwide. Apart from the footage in Iran, Stein was able to score another exclusive -- an interview with **Mel Gibson's** Holocaust father. "Mel's dad had never before granted an on-camera interview," explains Stein. "I sat him down to ask him the questions that are on everyone's mind, questions like how deeply does anti-Semitism factor into Gibson family life, and what does Mel think about his dad's outspoken Holocaust denial. The answers I got were sometimes very shocking."

David, whose production company is **Nistarim International Media** (www.nistarim.com), hopes to have his film ready by the end of the year ('07). [*By March 08, no news of the movie on the website*]

Canyon News 23 Aug. 2007

http://www.canyon-news.com/artman2/publish/Entertainment_1150/michael2000.php

Nistarim International Media was created with one goal in mind: To produce and distribute entertainment programs that have a positive impact on society.

Media that entertains. Media that educates. Media that enlightens. This is our objective, and our purpose. We provide a safe haven for artists who have something to say... artists who have a vision... artists who seek to create new and challenging works of expression.

Nistarim International Media takes its name from Jewish folklore. The "Nistarim," or "concealed ones," are the "hidden saints" who exist in every generation. The Nistarim are seemingly ordinary people, but deep inside they possess a hidden greatness that allows them to rise to the challenges of their day and do something meaningful for mankind.

The aim of Nistarim International Media is to help artists unearth, and *unleash*, the "hidden greatness" that lies within. Artists from diverse backgrounds, artists with diverse views, artists who have something meaningful to say – these are the people who make up the Nistarim family.

Media that makes a difference. That's what Nistarim International Media is all about.

David Abravanel Stein President, Nistarim International Media (310) 226-8047
Info@Nistarim.com

The Ninth Circle

It was an event that made headlines around the world... an international gathering of Holocaust deniers, neo-Nazis, anti-Semites, and Muslim extremists in Tehran, hosted by the Iranian Foreign Ministry, and convened by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad – a man who called the Holocaust a "myth," and who has repeatedly pledged to "wipe Israel off the face of the earth." [*A bloody lie, as we know*]

For five days in December 2006, the world press was fixated on the Tehran "Holocaust denial" conference. Front page stories in *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The London Times*, and every other major newspaper in the world; live coverage on CNN, Fox, and every major network. But as widespread as the media coverage was, the press was not in a position to tell the full story of what was going on at the conference, because only the invited participants were allowed behind the closed doors of the meeting rooms where the international collection of hate-mongers discussed the true purpose and goals of the gathering...

And although the press was able to name some of the more well-known, "publicity-hungry" attendees like former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan David Duke, the media had

no knowledge of the participants who preferred to remain in the shadows, including several European politicians and military leaders, and at least one internationally-wanted terrorist. [????] Nor were any outsiders allowed to witness the conference's closed-door planning sessions, one of which was entitled "Cleansing Europe of Jews." [*A pure invention of this nuts Stein...*]

The Ninth Circle is the result of an unprecedented effort by a group of documentary filmmakers and Holocaust educators to infiltrate and expose the proceedings of the the Iran Holocaust denial conference. Beginning nearly a year earlier (in January 2006, when President Ahmadinejad announced his intention to hold the conference), a "mole" – an undercover investigator – began gaining the confidence of the Iranian government officials who were in charge of arranging the conference... winning their trust, and ultimately being rewarded with a personal invitation once the conference became a reality.

The result: the makers of *The Ninth Circle* were able to tape every moment of the conference... sometimes the "mole" was able to videotape openly, and sometimes, during the top-secret meetings, a hidden camera was used – a great risk, because, if caught, the undercover agent would have been at the mercy of Ahmadinejad's secret police. The resulting footage will lead any viewer to a sobering conclusion: the Iran conference was about much more than "Holocaust denial"... it was about uniting hate-mongers of the world for an all-out assault against Jews. [*Of course, nothing of the sort ever came to the minds of the assistance. But, certainly some spies were infiltrated, under embassy cover, into the crowd. There was no filtering. One movie camera, belonging to a participant, was stolen...*]

In *The Ninth Circle*, the footage of the Iran conference is used to anchor a wide-ranging look at what many see as a global resurgence of anti-Semitism.

Included in the footage already shot: An in-depth interview with Mel Gibson's father Hutton Gibson (the only on-camera interview he's ever agreed to do) in which he addresses the questions that have been on everyone's mind since Mel's infamous Malibu traffic stop – questions regarding the role of anti-Semitism in Mel's upbringing, its role in Mel's adult life, and Mel's views about Jews and Holocaust denial. To this day, Mel has refused to distance himself (or even discuss) his father's obsession with Holocaust denial and Jewish conspiracy theories...so the makers of *The Ninth Circle* simply asked Hutton Gibson point blank – what does Mel really think about your views?

When Mel apologized for the anti-Semitic rant that followed his drunk driving arrest, he wondered aloud where his "vitriolic and harmful" words came from. After viewing the footage of Mel's father, the answer to that question is strikingly clear. [*Gibson father and son were not invited to Tehran nor did they show up.*]

Also included in *The Ninth Circle*: Footage of armed, paramilitary neo-Nazi units in Eastern Europe...many with ties to North American extremist groups; [*Rehashed provocations always paid for by the avid networks. No relation with Tehran.*]

A shocking admission by an editor at one of the biggest newspapers in the U.S. that one of his star reporters helped popularize the anti-Semitic myth that Jewish employees who worked in the World Trade Center knew about 9/11 in advance and stayed home that day; [*No relation with Tehran*]

Interviews with human rights activists in Latin America who are attempting to counter growing anti-Semitism in South and Central America; [*Zionist propaganda*]

A devastating exposé of the acceptance of Holocaust denial and Jewish conspiracy theories among some of America's leading academics; [*The entire academic establishment in the US is, genuinely or not - pro-Israel. If not they losse their job.*]

Interviews with journalists regarding the French government's attempt to cover up the details of a crime ring in Paris that kidnapped, tortured, and killed Jews throughout 2006. Amazingly, some of these journalists willingly went along with the cover-up. [*This "cover-up" is a Zionist hoax.*]

This footage is just the tip of the iceberg in *The Ninth Circle*, a documentary that presents an unflinching look at a relevant, controversial, and very frightening topic. [*Thus, sofar, no footage from Tehran...*]

<http://www.nistarim.com/ninthcircle.htm>

WARMLY CHEERED

Iran's Propaganda, Holocaust Revisionism and Western Civilization

Marek Jan Chodakiewicz

When President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of Iran described the Holocaust as a "myth" and hosted a Holocaust revisionist conference in Tehran in December 2006, he was warmly cheered in the Third World and severely castigated in the United States and Europe. Yet most Western pundits largely failed to grasp the significance of the assault. They limited themselves to outrage and righteous indignation. Ahmadinejad's fulminations were, on the one hand, jeered as "paranoid" and, on the other, described as on par with his other threats to destroy Israel -- pardon, "the Zionist entity." In other words, Western commentators dismissed the Iranian President as a vile, if dangerous troglodyte.

But Iran's leader is much more sophisticated than that. Ahmadinejad apparently applied Western logic to score a major propaganda victory. First, he argued that the failure to hold the Holocaust to legitimate "scholarly" scrutiny is an intellectual and moral flaw. Next, the Iranian President depicted himself as a defender of the freedom of inquiry. He trumpeted that only the irrational and the corrupt would refuse to allow academic freedom. Therefore, last but not least, he roundly condemned anyone who took offense at Holocaust revisionism as a lackey of "the Jews." After all the Shoah is just a "Jewish myth." And Western opponents of Holocaust revisionism are simply mercenary hypocrites, according to him.

Ahmadinejad selected the Holocaust not so much because of its special significance to the Jewish people, but because it appears to be the only unassailable truth in Western intellectual discourse. His is a dangerous assault on the West itself.

In the United States and among our allies, Holocaust revisionism is practically the only revisionism beyond the pale of academic inquiry. Whereas Western universities are full of Communist apologists, there are scarcely any Nazi sympathizers. American and European fans of Adolf Hitler rear their ugly heads mostly on the Internet. The mainstream public hears about them only occasionally.

The Revisionists

The average news consumer could probably name but one Holocaust revisionist: David Irving. The British researcher is arguably the most notorious because he is also the most sophisticated of the revisionists. In essence, Irving denies that there was a phenomenon of planned mass murder at all that could be conceptualized as the Holocaust. Instead, borrowing a cue straight from Sovietological revisionism, he argues that the local Nazis overzealously interpreted their orders to transfer the Jewish population "to the East." There was some killing. But Hitler did not know any of this, of course. True, he argues, there were also disassociated massacres of Jews, mostly not as Jews but as Communist sympathizers, by Stalin's erstwhile Eastern European victims. Irving also questions whether gas chambers existed at all. Most Jews died of hunger and diseases, he claims. There was never any systematic murder campaign against them and certainly no general order from Der Führer, according to Irving.

Other revisionists argue along similar lines, as "Hitler's Apologists: The Anti-Semitic Propaganda of Holocaust Revisionism" (New York: ADL, 1993) shows. Many are associated with the Institute for Historical Review, and its flagship quarterly Journal of Historical Review (JHR). Frenchman Robert Faurisson, for example, specializes in exposing the "fraud" of the gas chamber and so does American Fred A. Leuchter, Jr. JHR's long time editor, Canadian [*in fact US citizen*] Mark

Weber, even claims that "the Holocaust hoax is a religion. Its underpinnings in the realm of historical fact are non-existent -- no Hitler order, no plan, no budget, no gas chambers, no autopsies of gassed victims, no bones, no ashes, no skulls, no nothing."

A separate school of revisionism treats the Holocaust as a non-event. For instance, the editor in chief of the periodical *Siegrunnen*, Richard Landwehr and his associates, whose mission is to glorify the SS, resort to mendacious euphemisms as when referring to the Nazi extermination units as having had "destroyed numerous communist terror bands" in the East (Richard Landwehr, "V. SS Mountain Corps and 32nd SS Panzer Grenadier Division '30 Januar' on the Oder Front," 1945 (Brookings, OR: Siegrunnen, 1991), p. 61).

Mainstream Academia

Holocaust revisionists have long looked with hope to mainstream academia. They have applauded particularly the tendency to shift the blame for the extermination of the Jews from German Nazis to their non-German helpers, real and alleged. Accordingly, Richard Widmann of the Adelaide Institute Newsletter and "Samuel Crowell" of the JHR embraced warmly the claims of Princeton's Jan Tomasz Gross, whose recent deeply flawed case study blames Polish Christians rather than German Nazis for massacring Jews. A similarly unsound case study, likewise blaming Polish Christians for Nazi German crimes, by Brooklyn College's Yaffa Eliach, caused an outraged scholar to brand it as outright "Holocaust denial" in the *Journal of Genocide Research*.

However, for the most part, the Holocaust has been spared the revisionist treatment applied to all other topics. Only a few mainstream academics indulge in egregious interpretation of the Shoah. For example, feminist scholar Joan Rigelheim "exposes" the victimization of Jewish women and children by the alleged patriarchalist nexus between "Nazi sexism" and "Jewish sexism." Sociologist R. Ruth Linden bewails the environmental destruction of "the lakes and rivers" by dumping human ashes around Auschwitz. Linden also calls on scholars to "decenter" themselves from the "anthropocentric" approach to the Holocaust. Writing in *The Wall Street Journal*, Gabriel Schonefeld has acerbically referred to this sort of "scholarship" as "The 'cutting edge' of Holocaust Studies." One wonders whether all this is just trivializing of the Shoah or full-fledged revisionism. Perhaps it should be dubbed as "revisionism by default."

Despite that, as mentioned, the Holocaust remains relatively immune from the politically correct commissars of deconstruction and post-modernism. The truth about the extermination of the European Jewry has its fierce defenders and serves as the litmus test for all that is decent in the contemporary West. Everything else has been pretty much fair game: faith, family, property, philosophy, and history. "Cutting edge" intellectual antics routinely target the very core of our civilization, reflecting a profound crisis of the West.

The West in Crisis

Post-modernism and other sexy trends in Western academia have undermined the traditional Aristotelian "logocentric" approach and discarded the need for empirical research. After the cultural revolution of the 1960s, a slew of politically correct doctrines accomplished "the closing of the American mind," according to Alan Bloom. In particular, the ideology of moral relativism triumphs. Its main purveyors are Michel Foucault, Richard Rorty, and others. Threats emanating from their teachings are not immediately apparent to most, including those who are otherwise quite vigilant as far as Holocaust denial.

Yet, the nexus between deconstruction and Holocaust revisionism should be obvious. According to Christina Hoff Sommers, the deconstructionists deny the existence of the "objective truth." As a result, at Williams College for example, since "all knowledge is a social construct," a student wondered whether the Holocaust had taken place at all. "Perhaps it was a perfectly rational conceptual hallucination."

Admittedly, for now, the post-modernists still dare not attack the Shoah openly. Full-fledged Holocaust denial is not welcome in Western academia. **However, it has insinuated itself into the temple of knowledge indirectly through the back door of deconstruction.** One cannot deny with impunity the existence of truth in the abstract and expect historical facts to remain unchallenged.

Enter Ahmadinejad

It is precisely into this intellectual morass that Iran's President sallied confidently. According to Victor Davis Hanson, "he knows how Western relativism works. Who is to say what are facts or what is true, given the tendency of the powerful to 'construct' their own narratives and call the result 'history'?" ("Nuclear Iran?" *Imprimis: The National Speech Digest of Hillsdale College*, vol. 36, no. 4 (April 2007)). Hanson posits that this is a dialectical propaganda bid to prepare the world for Iran's

nuclear weapons: "Their uncanny diagnosis of Western malaise has now convinced them that they can carefully fabricate a Holocaust-free reality in which Muslims are the victims and Jews the aggressors," and, hence, the former need the A-bomb to defend themselves from the latter.

From the short-term political perspective, Hanson is right. But he fails to draw cultural conclusions about Ahmadinejad's effusions. Holocaust denial Tehran-style is not just a propaganda rouse to justify Iran's quest for nuclear arms. Its aim is much more insidious.

The terrible, if unstated, implications of the anti-Jewish logic of the Islamists are clear. For them, **the Holocaust is the secular religion of the West**. The United States is the dominant Western power. It is controlled by "the Jews" who purvey the "myth" of the Holocaust. If Ahmadinejad and his cronies destroy the "myth," they will destroy the West.

After all, they see that the Holocaust is virtually the only topic apparently treated with reverence. The Shoah is the only historical phenomenon in the West that is, at least to a large extent, outside of the post-modernist, deconstructionist "school" of thought. Everything that used to be sacred for the West has been challenged and discredited by the dominant liberal elite. That includes all religions (in particular Christianity), America's Founding, and Western Civilization.

The Holocaust is perhaps the last vestige of the Truth that Westerners generally agree on among themselves. It is the only general exception in the sea of the West's nihilism and moral relativism. **If the "myth" of the Holocaust "falls," the West is gone**. As Hansen put it "there are millions of highly educated but cynical Westerners who see nothing exceptional about their own culture." And our culture is based upon the millennia old premise that the truth exists and is demonstrable. Deny that and Western civilization crumbles. Thus, the true objective of the Holocaust revisionist policies of the Islamic radicals is to destroy the last vestige of truth as encapsulated in the historical fact of the Jewish extermination by the Third Reich. Once that is gone, the center will no longer hold.

Marek Jan Chodakiewicz is academic dean and professor of history at the Institute of World Politics in Washington, D.C. He was formerly assistant professor of history of the Kosciuszko Chair in Polish Studies at the Miller Center of Public Affairs, University of Virginia. He has authored numerous works in both Polish and English.

World Politics Review 6 Sept. 2007

<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/article.aspx?id=1099>

SMUG

Finkelstein on Hilberg on "deniers"

His confident knowledge of the field no doubt accounted for Hilberg's **easygoing tolerance** of Holocaust deniers. Those who want to suppress them do so not only in disgust at what they might say but also in dread of the inability to answer them. (The hysterical allegation of Holocaust deniers lurking in every corner is apparently also contrived to justify the endless proliferation of Holo-trash.) Hilberg recently made the provocative statement that whereas the Nazi holocaust is an irrefutable fact this was "more easily said than demonstrated."

It is indeed easy for the non-expert to be tripped up on the details especially when on crucial matters like the gas chambers (a favorite target of the deniers), there exist, as historian Arno Mayer noted, "many contradictions, ambiguities, and errors in the existing sources," none of which however "put in question the use of gas chambers in the mass murder." On a personal note I myself vividly recall reading Arthur Butz's *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* and not being able at the time to answer many of his simplest challenges. (If the figure for Jews killed was put at six million right after the war, and the total number of Jews killed at Auschwitz was then estimated at three million, how --he asked-- can the figure still stand at six million if the estimate of the number killed at Auschwitz has now been scaled down by scholars to one million?) Her lawyers imposed a gag rule on Deborah Lipstadt during her trial with David Irving --she was banned not only from testifying in court but also from speaking to the press-- because they knew full well that a single word from this know-nothing's mouth would sink the ship. In her account of the trial Lipstadt can barely conceal **the lawyers' contempt for her**, yet she is too thick-headed to notice the absurdity of her smug two thumbs-up after the jury

announced its verdict. She had as much to do with the victory as I did with last night's performance of the Bolshoi.

Mention of Irving's name didn't evoke howls of indignation or torrents of abuse from Hilberg. Instead he recognized Irving's impressive apprehension of some of the subject matter, although qualifying it --with a touch of snobbery-- as "self-taught," and speculated that his preposterous statements sprung less from anti-Semitism than love of the spotlight. Of Holocaust denial in the Arab world Hilberg observed that "they are as confused about the West as we are about them," while he casually dismissed the Holocaust denial conference in Teheran as "needless difficulty and trouble," and said he was "not terribly worried about it."

Echoing John Stuart Mill's [On Liberty](#), Hilberg even declared that Holocaust deniers served the useful purpose of posing questions that everyone else assumed were already answered. [...]

There Went a Man : [Remembering Raul Hilberg](#), By NORMAN FINKELSTEIN
Counterpunch, 22 Aug. 2007

<http://www.counterpunch.org/finkelstein08222007.html>

A. Butz *The Hoax of the XXth Century* is available for free download at:

<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres3/HoaxV2.pdf>

THE ADORABLE JEWISH HUMANISM, AGAIN

Torture in Israeli Prisons

Written by Rev. Ted Pike

Today, more than 8,000 Palestinians are locked in Israel's prisons, most without due process. For the majority, their crime is resisting a nation that violently stole 90 percent of their parents' and grandparents' land and possessions and expelled them to wretched detention camps in Gaza, the West Bank, and Lebanon.

(See, <http://www.truthtellers.org/alerts/mideaststrifeexplanation.html>)

These sons and grandsons were imprisoned for crimes ranging from stone-throwing at Israeli tanks to violent terrorist activity. As prisoners, they have virtually no rights. Many are held without charge or trial. They can be legally tortured without restraint.

Since at least 1967, the government of Israel has vehemently denied that it uses torture, and Israel signed the 1987 Landau Agreement banning most forms of torture. (1) But in 1995 a secret government report (not released until 2000) admitted Israel does torture. (2) In 1999 Israel's Supreme Court ruled that torture can be employed as a "necessity" in exceptional cases when officers have reason to believe they can prevent a crime. This has created a loophole, exempting interrogators/torturers from punishment as long as they claim they tortured in the national interest. (3)

Since every Palestinian prisoner may be viewed as possessing information valuable to preventing terrorist attacks, virtually all have been tortured. *The Palestine Monitor*

<http://www.palestinemonitor.org> reports that since 1987 the Israeli Security Agency has tortured at least 850 Palestinians a year during interrogations. Since the Supreme Court ruling in 1999, according to the Israeli human rights organization B'Tselem, **85 percent of Palestinian prisoners** are still subjected to torture. The *Monitor* asserts that during the first Intifada (1987-1993), Israeli security "interrogated approximately 23,000 Palestinians." The Public Committee Against Torture (PCAT) estimates that almost all suffered some torture during interrogation. (4)

The Palestine Monitor says that methods of interrogation and torture frequently used by Israeli security service include:

Tying up detainees in painful positions for hours or days.

Containment in tiny cramped spaces (for days, prisoners have been stuffed in boxes about 2 feet square and 5 feet high, often with spiked floors).

Prolonged beatings.

Enclosing the detainee's head in a sack (often soaked with urine and feces).
Violent "shaking" (Physicians for Human Rights says this has caused brain damage, even death). (5)
Bending body in extremely painful positions.
Prolonged exposure to extreme cold or heat.
Sexual, verbal, and psychological abuse.
Threats against the individual's life or family members' lives.
Playing extremely loud music.
Choking and pulling out hair (prisoners have been forced to swallow hair).
Intentional tightening of handcuffs (According to Amnesty International, the handcuffs used by the Israeli Security forces are in themselves a form of torture, "...the plastic handcuffs tighten on the detainee's wrist, causing intense pain; former detainees describe their wrists becoming blue as a result of their tightening and adult men screaming with pain as they begged to be taken off."
Putting head of prisoner in toilet bowl. (6)

Some prisoners are guilty of terrorist acts, including attempted suicide bombings. As victims of injustice, they have also committed injustice. Yet international law forbids torturing prisoners, military or civilian, even to obtain vital information. The Old Testament, ostensibly respected by Israel's government, also gives no sanction to torture, even of Israel's bitterest enemies. The implicit message of the Old Testament is that torture is barbaric, unthinkable among God's chosen people. (7)

Israelis Criticize Torture

For five months in 1977, the *London Sunday Times* investigative team worked inside the West Bank, Gaza, and surrounding areas to investigate evidence of torture. The team recorded 110,000 words of testimony and found proof of torture "... through the ten years of Israeli occupation since 1967." (8)

The *Times* presented the cases of 44 tortured Palestinians. Some of these cases are included in three chapters of the *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem*, p. 593-672. (9) They confirm that the following forms of torture have existed in Israel's prison system since 1967.

Prisoners were:

hung by their wrists for long periods.
beaten extensively, over periods of days and months.
struck in the genitals, and testicles twisted, squeezed, and crushed; testicles compressed around an iron ball placed between them.
sexually abused - sometimes through "anal assaults," including homosexual rape and pushing of bottles up rectums.
attacked by dogs.
beaten on soles of feet.
hosed with icy water, forced to sit in blazing sun for hours.
penetrated in the penis with a ballpoint pen; metal rods up urethra, rupturing it.
exposed, blindfolded, to the wrath of a raging public, pelted with rocks and bottles at Israeli football games.
forced to drink urine and allow soldiers to urinate in their mouth.
forced to grasp barbed wire and endure electric shock, having electrodes attached to various parts of the body and enduring shocks so powerful they lift the victim off the ground; forced to stand in electrically charged water.
hung in crucified position for up to four days in the scorching sun.
hung by feet and used as punching bags for boxers.
forced to sit for up to a week with hands over head.
forced to "run the gauntlet" of beatings by 8 to 10 soldiers.
laid on the floor and jumped on by guards.
dragged by rope around neck.
beaten and tortured in front of family members, commanded to rape their daughters.
crushed under bulldozers.
blindfolded and hung from helicopter.

In addition, they had:

their teeth torn out with pliers; false teeth were smashed.
shards of glass pushed deeply into nostrils.
a tube pushed up nose with salt water forced into stomach; batons were jammed in mouth, rupturing throat.
ribs, bones, and teeth deliberately broken.

Red Cross Describes Torture

In *Prisoners of Israel*, Israeli civil libertarians Ralph Schoenman and Mya Shone confirm:

... the pattern of torture repeated by the *Sunday Times* is similar to that found in the hundreds of testimonies published by Israeli lawyers, Felicia Langer and Lea Tsemel, by Palestinian lawyer Walid Fahoum, as the accounts we have heard from former prisoners.

... this pattern is documented in the West Bank as early as 1968, one year after the occupation began. Although the International Red Cross does not make public declarations, it had prepared in 1968 a finding of torture. Its "Report on the Nablus Prison" concludes:

"A number of detainees have undergone torture during interrogation by the military police. According to the evidence, the torture took the following forms:

1. Suspension of the detainees by the hands and the simultaneous traction of his other members for hours at a time until he loses consciousness.
2. Burns with cigarette stubs.
3. Blows with rods on the genitals.
4. Tying up and blindfolding for days.
5. Bites by dogs.
6. Electric shocks at the temples, the mouth, the chest and testicles." (10)

A report by Amnesty International of August 9, 1982 estimated the number of detainees in the large prison camp of Ansar at 10,000. According to the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights, the total number of prisoners amounted to approximately 15,000, including children and elderly persons..."

As a result, the *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem* tells us "there are many thousands of Palestinians and Lebanese who are disabled as a result of long years of imprisonment and torture." (p. 599)

Women Don't Escape Torture

After 1967, the number of women incarcerated and tortured grew dramatically.

One such prisoner, Rasmiya Odeh, says: "The first time they stripped me and threw me on the floor, the room was full of men -- civilians and soldiers. They laughed at my nakedness and kicked me, beat me with sticks, punched me all over, especially on the breasts; my body was covered with bruises. Then they got a wooden stick, not a smooth one, and pushed it into me to break the hymen. They brought my father and fiancé to see me. I lost consciousness..."

One time, an interrogator, Abu-Hani, sat me on a chair and sat himself opposite. He put his legs on the chair on either side of me and boxed me on the ears until I couldn't hear anymore and brought in my father and told him to strip and make love to me. "She isn't your daughter, she's your wife, go on, sleep with her." My father screamed and they beat him till he lost consciousness. Blood was pouring from my mouth and nose and I couldn't hear anymore. They dragged him unconscious from the room. Another time, they stripped me and took me to a room where men were suspended from the ceiling. They handcuffed me to the hooks in the ceiling -- it was a pulley system which could be raised and lowered- and then chained my feet to the ground, wide apart, and raised me so only the tips of my toes touched the ground. They said they had been going to rape me, but I was too dirty for them and they would instead get some prisoners who hadn't seen a woman for a long time." (11)

The *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem* says, "The tortures recounted in this chapter [such as the above] have been duplicated en masse on thousands of Palestinian women detainees of all ages." (p. 671)

Isn't it significant that a number of Israeli torture experts instructed US interrogators at the US military base of Abu Ghraib in Iraq several years ago? They taught American soldiers the same torture techniques used in Israeli prisons. (12) It is also chilling that the Bush administration, allowing "coercion" torture of Muslim prisoners at Guantanamo, uses virtually the same evasive language as Israel. Bill Quigley, professor of law at Loyola University in New Orleans, says 44 detainees in Iraq and Afghanistan have died in U.S. captivity, having been hooded, strangled, gagged, or beaten with blunt objects. (13)

All civil liberties/humanitarian groups that monitor Israeli torture indicate that the Israeli government at every level, from the premier and Shin Bet (equivalent to our FBI) down to the military police, colludes with torture. As a result, Ha'aretz says, "It is no surprise that no Shin Bet interrogators have been found guilty of torturing a suspect..." (14)

Why Should We Care?

In Nazi Germany, Hitler's SS tortured people "inferior" to the "master race." Similarly, Israel's torture of Palestinians is fueled by Talmudic teachings which assert that Gentiles are inferior to the "chosen race" ... Jews.

See, <http://www.truthtellers.org/alerts/talmudscalpel.html>

Should torture in Israeli prisons concern us as Americans? What about the millions of evangelical Christians who staunchly support Israel ?

The Bible says someday Christians will also be incarcerated in Israeli prisons. Describing the events of the last days before His second coming, Christ said, "They will lay their hands on you and will persecute you, delivering you to the synagogues and prisons..." (Luke 21:12) During this future worldwide Jewish persecution of Christians, the same penal hellholes that now muffle the screams of thousands of tortured Palestinians will also cage Christians.

Why would Israel imprison Christians?

For anti-Christian Jewish activists, there is no greater criminal in history than Jesus Christ. Such Jews believe that, by vilifying the Pharisees (modern Judaism's greatest guiding lights), Jesus began an evil trend of suspicion toward Judaism, a movement that New Testament writers and later church fathers magnified through "anti-Semitic" depiction of Jews as "Christ killers." Many Jews believe that anti-Semitism comes from Christianity; they believe the New Testament "blood charge" that Jews had Christ crucified spawned nearly 2000 years of living hell for the Jewish people, culminating in the Holocaust.

See, <http://www.truthtellers.org/alerts/ntantisemitic.html>

When Sarah Silverman in her film *Jesus is Magic* said, "I hope the Jews did kill Christ. I'd f---ing do it again in a second," she expressed a historic Jewish point of view: If Jesus had been smothered in His cradle, a world of Jewish suffering would have been avoided. Activist Jews of ADL/B'nai B'rith consider the accusation that the Jews had Christ murdered so evil they have included it as one of the 14 criteria of anti-Semitism published by their Office of Global Anti-Semitism in the US State Department. (See, <http://www.truthtellers.org/alerts/gestapobeingcreated.html>>Global Hate Crimes Gestapo Being Created: <http://www.truthtellers.org/alerts/gestapobeingcreated.html>) Such "anti-Semitism" is now a hate crime punishable by the B'nai B'rith hate laws in Canada with huge fines and even prison. 15

Already, Jewish activists in high places can deport and imprison those who offend them. At the insistence of B'nai B'rith International, Holocaust reductionists Ernst Zundel and Germar Rudolph were extradited from Canada and America and imprisoned in Germany for violating Germany's B'nai B'rith-inspired "anti-hate" laws.

Knesset can now demand from any nation extradition of those who publicly question the accuracy of the six-million figure of the Holocaust. 16 If nations accept this request and deport citizens to Israel, such victims may be tried there for "crimes against the Jewish people" and sent to Israeli prisons where they may be tortured alongside Palestinians.

Knesset is also deliberating legislation that would make it a federal crime for visiting evangelicals, and even resident Jewish Christians, to witness publicly for Christ in Israel. 17 Penalty: a year in an Israeli prison, again possibly facing the same tortures meted to Palestinians. In the book of Acts, Christians who publicly witnessed for Christ in the streets of Jerusalem faced imprisonment and possible flogging (torture). The same is becoming true today.

Ultimately, Christians may be "delivered" from the nations to Israel for the "crime" of supporting those who caused the Holocaust -- Jesus and the New Testament writers.

Time for Christians to Suffer

Today, few evangelical Christians have sympathy for Arab suffering. "Israel first" evangelicals view Palestinians as Satanically driven opponents to God's chosen people, Israel. They consider Israel the apple of His eye, blessed and intimately guided from above, especially in military victories. One pastor frankly told me God is really interested only in the Jews. "He's pretty much written off the whole Arab world." Reflecting this mentality, most evangelicals pledge themselves to unconditionally support Israel.

Yet when Christ's words are fulfilled and the church suffers imprisonment and torture at the hands of Jewish leaders, a few believers will suffer with a clear conscience. They did not assist, but resisted, the rise of the anti-Christ system that now oppresses them. They had compassion on its first victims, the Palestinians, as would the gentle Jesus.

Most imprisoned evangelicals will not have this consolation. They will remember how they and their fathers blindly encouraged the ascent of the Great Harlot, Israel, and stopped their ears from hearing the cries of her victims.

The Palestinians have suffered without mercy or justice from most evangelicals for at least 60 years. Someday it will be the turn of evangelicals to scream from undreamed of tortures in Israeli prisons and also be unheard by a hostile and indifferent world.

Endnotes:

1. In his 50-page report, the UN special investigator on torture, Nigel Rodley said Israel told him, "...that its law forbade all forms of torture or maltreatment and it was in full conformity with the 1987 Convention Against Torture which it has ratified." Yet, he goes on to relate how his investigations confirmed that practices amounting to torture, such as sleep deprivation, hooding, and violent shaking, were going on at the same time. Reuters, March 23, 1997, "UN Investigator Says Israel Tortures Palestinians."
2. "Israel Admits Torture," <http://www.news.bbc.co.uk> Feb. 9, 2000.
3. Human Rights Watch, <http://www.hrw.org/> Memorandum: Israel 's Second Periodic Report to the Committee Against Torture," May 1998.
4. <http://www.palestinemonitor.org/> , Fact Sheet of Torture of Palestinians, Aug. 17, 2007. The *Monitor* says, "According to Amnesty International, since 2001, Israeli authorities '...have actually continued and intensified implementation of a policy of torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, and collective punishment against Palestinians..."
5. " Israel and the Occupied Territories: Shaking as a Form of Torture. Death in Custody of Abdal Al-Samad Harizat. A Medicological Report by Physicians for Human Rights, October 1995," <http://physiciansforhumanrights.org/library/documents/reports/israel-and-the-occupied.pdf>
6. <http://www.palestinemonitor.org> Fact Sheet of Torture of Palestinians, Aug. 17, 2007.
7. The altruism of the Old Testament toward one's vanquished enemies is revealed in II Kings 6:22: "Would you kill those you have taken captive? Set bread and water before them that they may eat and drink and return." As a result of Israel's kindness to a captured invading foe, "marauding bands of Arameans did not come again into the land of Israel."
8. Schoenman and Shone, *Prisoners of Israel*, Santa Barbara, CA, Veritas Press, 1984, p.13.

9. *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem*, Intercontinental Books, Nov. 1991. Edited by Christian Palestinian lawyer and diplomat Dr. Issa Nakhleh, this 2-volume work is available at most university libraries. Online on the AAARGH site : <http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres5/palproblem.pdf>
10. *Prisoners of Israel*, p. 594.
11. *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem*, p. 646. (See footnote 9)
12. Columnist Wayne Madsen writes, "According to a political appointee within the Bush administration and U.S. intelligence sources, the interrogators at Abu Ghraib included a number of Arabic-speaking Israelis... who also helped U.S. interrogators develop the 'R21' (resistance to interrogation) techniques. Many of the torture methods were developed by the Israelis over many years of interrogating Arab prisoners in the occupied West Bank and in Israel itself." <<http://www.counterpunch.org/> "The Israeli Torture Template: Rape, Feces and Urine," August 17, 2007.
13. "Priests Expose Secret Cycle of U.S. Torture," Brenda Norrell, <http://www.counterpunch.org> , Aug. 13, 2007.
14. <http://www.haaretz.com> , "Torture in Israel Has Again Become Routine," Aug. 18, 2003. The Palestine Committee against Torture concludes, "...not a single GSS interrogator has been brought to trial since 1994," PCAP, Sept. 2004, cited by the *Palestinian Monitor*.
15. I asked a friend in Toronto what would happen if he publicly stated that the Jews had Christ killed. "Ted," he replied, "I'd be playing with fire. The police might come and arrest me."
16. On June 20, 2004 the *Jerusalem Post* reported that Israel's **Knesset empowered the State of Israel to criminalize anyone in the world who publicly reduces the six-million figure**. The government is now authorized to request extradition to Israel of such alleged "hate criminals" from any nation. Israel can also seize, prosecute, and imprison them should they set foot in Israel. [*They have not yet dared to do so, so far.*]
17. Since 1977, Israel's anti-missionary law has decreed 5 years in prison for any non-Jew who attempts to convert a Jew from his religion, making use of a material enticement (tract, cup of coffee, etc.). This law has not been strictly enforced out of fear of losing evangelical favor and tourist dollars. Israeli law also requires a 6-month prison term for anyone, Gentile or Jew, encouraging conversion of a Jewish minor. This spring, the Shas party (equal in votes to Likud) proposed that attempts to convert a Jew of any age in Israel should be punished by 1 year in prison. "Shas Seeks Harsher Penalties for Missionaries," Mar. 14, 2007, <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3376215,00.html>

Source: <http://www.truthtellers.org/alerts/tortureinisraeliprison.htm>
02 September 2007
http://www.ziopedia.org/en/articles/israel%10palestine/torture_in_israeli_prison/

SEEN FROM INDIA

Holocaust and the myth of Sisyphus

Led by hardliner Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the Holocaust-deniers are pushing a new culture of barbarism

Prasenjit Chowdhury Kolkata

Did the Holocaust happen? Is the killing of six million Jews during the World War II and the systematic pogrom and gassing that led to the biggest hecatomb of what we know as the 'Final Solution' in history a mere figment of imagination? Unbelievable it may sound, but there seems to exist a motley crowd of Holocaust-deniers who believe that the most graphically documented blot of 'man's inhumanity to man' (via the concentration camps and mass deportations) is a diabolic hoax. A 'myth'.

If that sounds like an atrociously preposterous piece of historical negation and revisionism perpetrated by a motivated bunch of history-sheeters, witness the deliberations of an international 'educational' conference on December 11-12, 2006. Titled 'Review of the Holocaust: Global Vision', held in Tehran, it was hosted by a crank, dispeller of this 'myth', hardliner Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who went on record some time back as seeking to wipe Israel off the map. The extraordinary conference was held by the Iranian Foreign Ministry's Foreign Policy Centre, attended by 67 scholars from 30 countries, including Europe and the US. Interestingly, a number of Jewish rabbis and orthodox Jews came around to reject the existence of Israel, wearing badges, "A Jew, not a Zionist". Some came with the Israeli flag crossed out. The conference has been widely discredited by the European Union, United Nations Vatican, and condemned by many countries, including the US,

the UK, France, Germany, Russia and Austria.

Although there was a veneer of scholastic objectivity about the conference, the international cast of established Holocaust-deniers and implacable foes of Israel included David Duke, a former imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan; Robert Faurisson, a French lecturer stripped of his academic tenure for his anti-Holocaust opinions; and Michele Renouf, a London-based associate of the British author David Irving (Irving is currently serving a jail sentence in Austria for Holocaust-denial.). Also, there was a group of radical anti-Zionist rabbis like Rabbi Ahron Cohen representing 'Jews United Against Israel', who oppose a Jewish state on religious grounds.

The basic contention was simple—that the Holocaust perpetrated by the Third Reich was a colossal "propaganda myth" employed by the Zionists to dislodge the Palestinians from their homeland. That it was contrived to gain moral advantage by Germany's politico-military adversaries, in combination with an amorphous 'International Jewish Conspiracy', during and after World War II. And that across the Middle East, contempt for Jews and Zionism is mainstream, as many believe that the Holocaust has been wildly exaggerated to justify the creation of the Jewish state in 1948 at the expense of the Palestinians, a move viewed as yet another example of Western imperialism.

This is dangerous propaganda, akin to claiming that the 'Rape of Nanking' never happened or defending Creationism. But when the historicity of the Holocaust is questioned, the problem is compounded because the Nazis were meticulous record-keepers. They listed the names of people sent to Auschwitz, Dachau and other death camps. The name of Anne Frank, whose diary described living in hiding from the Gestapo, appears on the list of a concentration camp, where she later died.

As for more evidence, Germany, in April 2006, decided to open up its hitherto-closed Holocaust archives, which contain 30 million to 50 million documents. Those records alone provide evidence of how the Nazis tortured and killed 17 million people, including six million of Europe's 8.8 million Jews. Documents like these and the memories of the few who survived will ensure that history's darkest hour is never forgotten.

The rub is that the rationale behind such a 'historic' conference, many suspect, is not in the spirit of academic probity, but is a sinister attempt to heighten frenzied anti-Semitism that runs deep in the collective psyche of the Arab people. Other historians, such as Arthur Butz, Ernst Zündel and Robert Faurisson, have worked hard to discredit the prevailing theory that the German regime under Hitler systematically killed millions of innocent civilians.

The first purveyor of this tripe of Holocaust-denial was Paul Rassinier, an ex-French Communist Party member turned virulent anti-communist cum Nazi apologist, [*that is a bloody lie.*] who published his seminal work, *Le Passage de la Ligne* (Crossing the Line), in 1948, the contention of which was this: much of that the Nazis are accused of accrued from "the natural tendency of its victims to exaggerate". [*Can't be more wrong*]

In the US, the anonymous release of *The Myth of the Six Million* (a book actually written by a Harvard-trained history professor named David Leslie Hoggan, published by Willis Carto), in 1969, and a booklet *Did Six Million Really Die?* by Richard Verrall (aka Richard Harwood, 1974), leader of the British National Front, tried to question the veracity of the number of Jewish people killed during the Holocaust.

In late 2005, Ahmadinejad said that if the Europeans insisted the Holocaust did happen, then it was they who were responsible and hence they should pay the price. "If you committed this big crime, then why should the oppressed Palestinian nation pay the price?... This is our proposal: if you committed the crime, then give a part of your own land in Europe, the United States, Canada or Alaska to them (Jews) so that the Jews can establish their country," he said.

That tickles the raw bone of Zionism. Modern Zionism emerged in the late 19th century in response to the violent persecution of Jews in Eastern Europe and anti-Semitism in Western Europe. Its founder, the Viennese Jewish journalist, Theodor Herzl, argued in his 1896 book *Der Judenstaat* (The Jewish State) that the best way of avoiding anti-Semitism in Europe was to create an independent Jewish state in Palestine. Zionism was named after Mount Zion in Jerusalem, a symbol of the Jewish homeland in Palestine since the Babylonian captivity in the sixth century BC. The yearning to return to Zion, the biblical term for the Land of Israel and Jerusalem, has been the cornerstone of Jewish religious life since the Jewish exile from the land 2,000 years ago, and is embedded in Jewish prayer, rituals, literature and culture.

Zionism, the religio-political movement advocating the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine (Zion meaning the city of Jerusalem), had been around for half century before the Holocaust, but it had always been a minority movement among the Jews of Europe. The Holocaust changed that radically, creating a new sense of dire expediency in which a Jewish state had to fight its way into being. In the war that accompanied Israel's emergence, the Palestinian Arabs, who had been two-thirds of the population of Palestine, found themselves confined to 22 per cent of their territory (West Bank and Gaza), prevented by new Israeli laws from reclaiming the homes and land from which

hundreds of thousands had fled.

As for moral high ground, Nachem Goldman, one of the founders of the Jewish state and the Zionist movement, has said that it is "sacrilege" (he used the Hebrew word) to use the Holocaust as a justification for oppressing others. He was surely speaking of Israeli atrocities on the Palestinians and the violent spiral of reprisal and counter-reprisals.

That is, to question the intent of manipulating the Holocaust is one thing, but to deny altogether that the Holocaust happened or that it is "a myth" is a dangerous travesty of history. To deny that Jewish deaths during the war were not caused by genocide is actually an attempt to turn our back on history. History is replete with instances of mass-killings on a genocidal scale: Soviet 'collectivisation' of the 1930s, the Armenian massacres of 1915, the extermination of indigenous people in the US, the Khmer Rouge carnage in Cambodia and many more (including in India: 1984, Bombay pogrom 1992-93, the Gujarat genocide).

Unfortunately, many of these acts of barbarism do not enjoy the pious degree of bad faith compared to the uniqueness of the Holocaust. History is not a subject of dogma. When that happens, history degenerates into propaganda or counter-propaganda of a very venal kind.

Hardnews (New Dehli)

<http://www.hardnewsmedia.com/portal/2007/09/1193>

This guy mentions books he has not read. They can be found at :

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/livres.html>

LETTER

October 06, 2007 3:01 AM

Grubach's open letter to David Irving on his change of mind on Holocaust

Dear David,

I am making a thorough study of the document that you claim changed your mind about the Holocaust. I have a college level German instructor who would be willing to make the appropriate translations of the relevant documents if need be, as long as his/her identity is kept anonymous.

When I asked you where is the document that changed your mind on the Holocaust, here is how you responded: "It is the Hoefle document

http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/docs/decode150143_Hofle.html "

Concerning this document, you were quoted as saying: "If the document is genuine, it refutes the view of the revisionists that nothing happened." The *Guardian* made this statement about your change of mind: "[Irving] says that a document, which he is 80% sure is genuine, suggests that 2.4 million Jews were killed in Poland..."

Presumably, here is the English translation of said document on your web site. (Please correct me if I am wrong) It is at

<http://www.fpp.co.uk/History/General/Korherr/Heim311242.html>

I examined the English translation of the document. It seems to refer to large scale deportations. As of yet, I see nothing at all that says the people being transported were being murdered. It seems to say that there were only a large number of people being transported to certain camps.

This is all very consistent with the Holocaust revisionist thesis as presented by historians Carlo Mattogno and Jurgen Graf in their *Treblinka: Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?* and in Mattogno's *Belzec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research, and History*.

My questions to you are these. Let us assume that the document is 100% genuine and authentic. How does the document refute the Holocaust revisionist viewpoint that the mass murder of Jews did not take place in Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor? How does it prove that the mass murder of Jews took place in those camps?

I believe that you owe all of your supporters an answer.

Paul Grubach

LAND OF FREEDOM

Harvard law school expels star student for "holocaust denial"

CAMBRIDGE, Mass (AP) What began as a minor citation in a scholarly work ended up causing Noor Alhiem to be expelled from Harvard Law School. Alhiem, a third-year student majoring in criminal law, submitted a paper that examined Nazi travesties of criminal law, and received an 'A' grade. She was set to graduate Summa Cum Laude at the end of this semester, but the university law school was forced to reconsider her status when criminal law professor Alan Dershowitz criticized Alhiem's scholarship.

"She could have used any number of sources for her paper," Dershowitz explained, "but for some reason, one of her citations mentioned the book *Did Six Million Really Die?* by imprisoned Holocaust denier Ernst Zundel."

"I admit there were misunderstandings," Alhiem says. "But I did not actually quote the book. I quoted a German legal reference that happened to be cited in the book. Also, the citation was only one of three hundred miscellaneous citations in my paper, and I was commended for the thoroughness of my research. Furthermore the author of *Did Six Million Really Die?* was not Ernst Zundel, but Richard Verrall, whose pen name was Richard Harwood."

Saul Rubin, Dean of Harvard Law School, submitted the matter to an academic review board. "The German legal reference was obscure, and Ms. Alhiem could have cited it directly, or through some other work," Rubin says. "That fact that her paper's bibliography mentioned Zundel's *Did Six Million Really Die?* is indicative of carelessness or maliciousness. Either way, we were forced to take Ms. Alhiem's status under advisement."

A series of further misunderstandings ensued, at the end of which the review board ruled against Alhiem. Harvard Law School was forced to revoke her academic status, which had the effect of expelling her. "The book has been outlawed in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, and most of mainland Europe," Dershowitz explains. [*One of his many lies*] "To use such a hate-filled reference in a scholarly work strikes me as more than a coincidence."

Alhiem, who is a Muslim, asked the law school if it would expel a student for citing Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*, which has been outlawed in most Muslim nations.

"They told me no they would not, because Rushdie's book does not deny the Holocaust. They also objected to my use of a book that has been banned in several countries. My position is that many banned books turn out later to be literary classics. The Soviet Union banned Orwell's novel *1984*. England banned Orwell's *Animal Farm*, plus Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*. America banned Harriet Beecher Stowe's anti-slavery book *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Iran banned Vladimir Nabokov's novel *Lolita*. Is America the same as the Islamofascists?"

"That's a clever argument," Dershowitz says, "but none of those books killed six million people. Moreover, a book like Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* merely questions theology and belief, while Zundel's book is a hate-filled assault on well-documented truth."

Alhiem submitted a formal apology, and offered to rewrite the paper without the citation, but dean Saul Rubin said the review board's decision was final, and was out of his hands. "I can see the board's point," Rubin explains. "When a person commits a robbery, do we excuse her merely because she says he's sorry? As an aspiring criminal attorney, Ms. Alhiem surely realizes that all of us must take personal responsibility for our actions."

After her expulsion, Alhiem applied to other law schools in the hope of finishing her education, but she says they all rejected her because of the incident at Harvard. "Now I have no way to pay back my school loans. Harvard wants to make an example of me. They also want to separate Muslims from the rest of American society by creating the

illusion that only Muslims deserve to be attacked. In reality, many people are attacked; not just Muslims."

"That's a typical blame-the-victim response," Dershowitz says. "Whenever hate is exposed, its perpetrators claim that their people are singled out as a group for unfair treatment. This is only my opinion, but it seems to me that all Muslims over-generalize, especially about Jews. Also, it is absurd for Ms. Alhiem to claim that only Muslims are held accountable. Is Zundel, the book's author, a Muslim? We see this kind of illogic and selective quoting all the time. Frankly, I find it hypocritical."

Aljiem plans to sue the university law school to reinstate her academic status. Representing the law school will be a team led Alan Dershowitz, who was not part of the review board.

October 03, 2007

<http://www.wakeupfromyourslumber.com/node/3925>

Dershowitz is what the American university produces as most despicable, a racist, who favors torture and genocide for the defence of Israel, an illegal colonial and murderous group. Moreover, the booklet WAS NOT written by Zundel. Fullstop. Consider the evidence on our bookshelves online : <http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/livres.html>

See below:

SELF WHITEWASHING

Holocaust denial

Gregory Stanton

Did Six Million Really Die? by Richard Harwood (a.k.a. Richard Verrall). The Supreme Court of Canada found in 1992 that the book "misrepresented the work of historians, misquoted witnesses, fabricated evidence, and cited non-existent authorities."

This article is about the history, development, and methods of Holocaust denial.

Holocaust revisionism as it is referred to by its supporters or Holocaust denial as referred by its opposers, is the belief that the Holocaust did not occur as it is described by mainstream historiography.

Key elements of this belief are the explicit or implicit rejection that, in the Holocaust: The Nazi government had a policy of deliberately targeting the Jews and the Gypsies for extermination as a people; Over five million Jews were systematically killed by the Nazis and their allies. Tools of efficient mass extermination, such as gas chambers, were used in extermination camps to kill Jews.

In addition, most Holocaust denial implies, or openly states, that the current mainstream understanding of the Holocaust is the result of a deliberate Jewish conspiracy created to advance the interest of Jews at the expense of other nations. For this reason, Holocaust denial is generally considered an antisemitic conspiracy theory. Because of this, Holocaust denial is also illegal in a number of European countries, as their governments hold that it is motivated by an antisemitic and anti-democratic agenda.

Most historians and scholars reject Holocaust denial as "grounded in hatred, rather than any accepted standards of assertion, evidence, and truth" and a "pseudoscience" that "rejects the entire foundation of historical evidence," instead motivated by an anti-semitic ideology.

While a few Holocaust deniers have training as historians, some of their most prominent representatives have been shown in court to have a pattern of falsifying historical documents (e.g. David Irving) or deliberately misrepresenting historical data (e.g. Ernst Zündel). This history of Holocaust deniers distorting, ignoring, or misusing historical records has led to almost universal condemnation of the techniques and conclusions of Holocaust denial, with organizations such as the American Historical Association, the largest society of historians in the United States, stating that Holocaust denial is "at best, a form of academic fraud."

Similarly, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, summarizing the work on the subject done by a range of historians including Jaroff, Lipstadt, Riech, Ryback, Shapiro, Vidal-Naquet, Weimann, and Winn concludes: "No reputable historian questions the reality of the Holocaust, and those promoting Holocaust denial are overwhelmingly anti-Semites and/or neo-Nazis." (Vol. 59, p. 270)

Many Holocaust deniers insist that they do not deny the Holocaust, preferring to be called "**Holocaust revisionists**". They are nevertheless commonly labeled as "**Holocaust deniers**" to differentiate them from historical revisionists and because their goal is to deny the existence of the Holocaust, as it is commonly understood, rather than honestly using historical evidence and methodology to examine the event.

Terminology: Holocaust denial or Holocaust revisionism?

The term "denier" is objected to by the people to whom it is applied, who prefer "revisionist". Most contend that the latter term is deliberately misleading. While historical revisionism is the re-examination of accepted history, with an eye towards updating it with newly discovered, more accurate, and less-biased information, "deniers" have been criticised for seeking evidence to support a preconceived theory, omitting substantial facts.

Broadly, historical revisionism is the approach that history as it has been traditionally told, may not be entirely accurate and should hence be revised accordingly. Historical revisionism in this sense is a well-accepted and mainstream part of history studies, and it is applied to the study of the Holocaust as new facts emerge and change our understanding of it.

Holocaust "deniers" maintain that they apply proper revisionist principles to Holocaust history, and therefore the term Holocaust revisionism is appropriate for their point of view. Their critics, however, disagree and prefer the term Holocaust denial. As the historian Gordon McFee wrote in his essay *Why Revisionism isn't*:

"Revisionists" depart from the conclusion that the Holocaust did not occur and work backwards through the facts to adapt them to that preordained conclusion. Put another way, they reverse the proper methodology [...], thus turning the proper historical method of investigation and analysis on its head."

In general, the term Holocaust denial fits the description at the beginning of this article, while Holocaust revisionism ranges from Holocaust denial through the belief that only minor corrections are required to Holocaust history. However, because the latter term has become associated with Holocaust deniers, mainstream historians today generally avoid using it to describe themselves.

Beliefs of Holocaust Deniers

Holocaust deniers make the following claims, though not all Holocaust deniers make all of the claims listed:

- Nazis did not use gas chambers to mass murder Jews. Small chambers did exist for delousing and Zyklon-B was used in this process.
- Nazis did not use cremation ovens to dispose of extermination victims. The amount of energy required to fire the ovens far exceeded what the energy-strapped nation could spare in wartime.
- The cremation ovens that existed would have been too small for this purpose and the reason there were cremation ovens at all was they were put in to provide cremation services for the deaths from natural causes and disease epidemics that could reasonably be expected in a high-density work camp.
- The figure of 5-6 million Jewish deaths is an irresponsible exaggeration, and many Jews who actually emigrated to Russia, Britain, Palestine and the United States are included in the number.
- Many photos and much of the film footage shown after World War II was specially manufactured as propaganda against the Nazis by the Allied forces. For example, one film, shown to Germans after the war, of supposed Holocaust victims were in fact German civilians being treated after Allied bombing of Dresden. Pictures we commonly see show victims of starvation or typhus, not of gassing.
- Claims of what the Nazis supposedly did to the Jews were all intended to facilitate the Allies in their intention to enable the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, and are currently used to garner support for the policies of the state of Israel, especially in its dealings with the Palestinians.
- Historical proof for the Holocaust is falsified or deliberately misinterpreted.
- There is an American, British or Jewish conspiracy to make Jews look like victims and to demonize Germans. Also, it was in the Soviet interest to propagate wild stories about Germany in order to frighten related nations into accepting Soviet rule (Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc.). The amount of money pumped into Israel and reparations from Germany alone give Israel a strong incentive to maintain this conspiracy.
- The overwhelming number of biased academics and historians are too afraid to actually admit that the Holocaust was a fiction; they know they will lose their jobs if they speak up.
- In any event, the Holocaust pales in comparison to the number of dissidents and Christians killed in Soviet gulags, which Holocaust deniers usually attribute to Jews.

Additionally, two other common claims of Holocaust deniers are easily confused with the legitimate debate of functionalism versus intentionalism:

- Although crimes were committed, they were not centrally orchestrated and thus the Nazi leadership bore no responsibility for the implementation of such a policy.

Documents such as the Wannsee Conference protocols, the Einsatzgruppen reports, and many other original materials have overwhelmingly demonstrated the centralized planning and knowledge of the Holocaust by most upper echelons of the Nazi leadership.

Historians continue to debate how widespread the knowledge of the Holocaust was in German society and government, and how the decisions to implement the Final Solution evolved, but the centrally-planned nature of the Holocaust, and the role of the Nazi leadership in its planning and execution, has not been subject to any doubt by scholars or historians.

- There was no specific order by Adolf Hitler or other top Nazi officials to exterminate the Jews.

While **to date no such specific "Führerbefehl" has been found**, there is no necessity for it to exist in order to establish that Hitler was aware of the Holocaust. In addition, particularly in the context of the Wannsee Conference, it has been proven that the upper echelons of the Nazi regime did indeed give orders that resulted in the Holocaust. [*This is certainly NOT in the Wannsee Protocol*]

Holocaust denial examined

Holocaust denial ignores or minimizes the tens of thousands of pages of documentation and photographs prepared by the Nazis themselves that survived the war.

Pictured is a map titled "Jewish Executions Carried Out by Einsatzgruppe A" from the December 1941 report by the commander of a Nazi death squad. Marked "Secret Reich Matter," the map shows the number of Jews shot in the Baltic region, and reads at the bottom: "the estimated number of Jews still on hand is 128,000." The many Eisa(n)tzgruppen reports detail over 1.5 million people killed in open air executions alone.

Public denial of the Holocaust is a criminal offence in Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Switzerland, and is punishable by fines and jail sentences.

Much of the controversy surrounding the claims of Holocaust deniers centers upon the methods used to present arguments that the Holocaust allegedly never happened. Numerous accounts have been given (including evidence presented in court cases) of claimed "facts" and "evidence"; however, independent research has shown these claims to be based upon flawed research, biased statements, and even deliberately falsified evidence. Opponents of Holocaust denial have compiled detailed accounts of numerous instances where this evidence has been altered or manufactured (see Nizkor Project and David Irving). Evidence presented by Holocaust deniers has also failed to stand up to scrutiny in courts of law (see Fred A. Leuchter), further questioning its veracity.

As Holocaust denial is not considered to be historical research by almost all scholars, there has been a substantial debate on the right way to respond to deniers. Since the contentions of Holocaust denial -- that the Holocaust did not happen -- are contradicted by a deep historical record, many scholars worry that to debate Holocaust denial is to make it appear a legitimate field of inquiry.

A second group of scholars, typified by **Lipstadt**, have tried to raise awareness of the methods and motivations of Holocaust denial, while trying not to legitimize the deniers themselves. Lipstadt explained her goals:

We need not waste time or effort answering the deniers' contentions. It would be never-ending to respond to arguments posed by those who freely falsify findings, quote out of context and simply dismiss reams of testimony. Unlike true scholars, they have little, if any, respect for data or evidence. Their commitment is to an ideology and their 'findings' are shaped to support it.

[See D. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*,
<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres2/LIPS.pdf>]

A third group, typified by the **Nizkor Project**, responds by confronting Holocaust denial head-on, debunking the arguments and false claims of Holocaust denial groups.

History of Holocaust denial

Research into Holocaust Denial has revealed that anti-Semitism has been an important part of the revisionist philosophy since the very beginnings of the movement. With few exceptions, charges of anti-Jewish bias have been leveled against many deniers over the years – charges that they have rarely rejected.

Early examples

Scholars credit the very first Holocaust deniers as the Nazis themselves. Historians have documented evidence that Heinrich Himmler instructed his camp commandants to destroy records, crematoria and other signs of mass extermination of human beings, as Germany's defeat became imminent and the Nazi leaders realized they would most likely be captured and brought to trial. [*This is a myth. We have enormous archival material.*] Following the end of World War II, many of the former leaders of the SS left Germany and began using their propaganda skills to defend their actions (or, their critics contended, to rewrite history). Shortly after the war, denial materials began to appear. One of the first published revisionist works (though the word "revisionist" was not used to describe it) was Friedrich Meinecke's *The German Catastrophe* (1950), in which he offered a brief defense for the German people by blaming industrialists, bureaucrats and the Pan-German League for the outbreak of World War I and Hitler's rise to power. Meinecke was openly anti-Semitic; nonetheless, he was a respected historian. Another early proponent of Holocaust denial was Francis Parker Yockey, an American admirer of Hitler whose book *Imperium*, a purported "philosophy of history and politics" filled with anti-Semitic analysis, was published in 1962.

[Meinecke is unknown amongst revisionists for the simple reason he was not and has never been a revisionist himself. He is widely perceived as a liberal. Moreover his book was published in 1946. Stanton is misled by his desire to find German origins to the case under study.]

The case of Harry Elmer Barnes

Also eventually taking a Holocaust denial stance in the later years of his life was **Harry Elmer Barnes**. Barnes is an unusual case because he was at one time a mainstream historian with liberal credentials. Between World War I and World War II, Barnes became well known as an anti-war writer and a leader in the historical revisionism movement. Following World War II, however, Barnes became convinced that allegations made against Germany and Japan to justify U.S. involvement in WWII were merely wartime propaganda that needed to be debunked. He later began including the Holocaust in this category in his later writings. Barnes' anti-war and mainstream historical revisionist writings are still held in high regard by some libertarians. Following the example of Barnes, a few other early libertarian writers also concerned with anti-war historical revisionism began to take a Holocaust denial stance, including James J. Martin. Most libertarians, even those who otherwise hold Barnes' writings in high regard, reject his Holocaust denial. Barnes' name has since been appropriated by some modern Holocaust deniers in an attempt to lend credibility to their cause, most notably **Willis Carto**. [See <http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/livres.html> for books by Barnes]

The beginnings of the modern movement

The KKK: Nazi salute and Holocaust denial

The beginnings of modern-day Holocaust denial are somewhat obscure.

Public challenges to the historical accounts of the holocaust first began to appear in the 1960s, with French historian **Paul Rassinier** publishing *The Drama of the European Jews* in 1964. Rassinier was himself a Holocaust survivor (he was imprisoned in Buchenwald for his socialist beliefs) [*No, for counterfeiting ID paper for fleeing Jews*], and modern-day revisionists continue to cite his works as scholarly research that questions the accepted facts of the Holocaust. Critics and opponents of revisionism, however, note that Rassinier's own anti-Semitic views influenced his viewpoint; [*He did not care about Jews but found them gullible, swallowing Soviet propaganda*] more importantly, he was arrested in Germany in 1943, and had long since been transferred to Poland by the time the extermination was fully in progress. [*One wonders from what garbage dump Stanton is retrieving his information : Rassinier was arrested at home, in France, near the Swiss border, tortured by the Gestapo (and made invalid) then deported to concentration camps in Germany (Buchenwald, Dora). He has never been in Poland. Remember Stanton is no historian, although he gives lessons. He studied Law. He is one of the many profiteers from the genocide business.*]

The Holocaust denial movement grew into full strength in the 1970s with the publication of Arthur Butz' *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century: The case against the presumed extermination of European Jewry* in 1976 and David Irving's *Hitler's War* in 1977.

These books, seen as the basis of much of the deniers' arguments, brought other similarly inclined individuals into the fold. [*Sorry, but Irving has never been part of the movement, in the mind of those who participated.*]

Ultra-Left Negationism

There was a political current including such people as Pierre Guillaume (who was involved in the bookshop La Vieille Taupe during the 1960s); *La Guerre Sociale*, Jeune Taupe and Révolution

Sociale were all Ultra-left negationists. Some people claim that *Auschwitz ou le grande alibi*, written by Amadeo Bordiga in 1960, is the source of ultra-left negationism. [*It is a widespread mistake. We now know it was penned by a certain Axelrod.*] They claim that this booklet was available at La Vieille Taupe in the sixties, and that by the eighties La Vieille Taupe had become a major source of Holocaust denial material. Defenders of Bordiga say that he should not be judged by the idiosyncratic career of Pierre Guillaume, and a few other associates who deny the existence of the gas chambers at Auschwitz. They argue with Bordiga that the culpability for the Holocaust is the capitalist system, rather than Nazism and situate the six million Jewish dead within the context of 50 million human beings during the Second World War. Vigorous critics of Stalinism, they argue that American, British and USSR forces all committed atrocities during and after the Second World War.

Institute for Historical Review

In 1979 the Institute for Historical Review (IHR) was founded by the neo-Nazi Willis Carto as an organization dedicated to publicly challenging the "myth" of the Holocaust. The IHR sought from the beginning to attempt to establish itself within the broad tradition of historical revisionism, by soliciting token supporters who were not from a neo-Nazi background such as James J. Martin and Samuel Edward Konkin III, and by promoting the writings of French socialist Paul Rassinier and American anti-war historian Harry Elmer Barnes to attempt to show that Holocaust denial had a broader base of support besides just neo-Nazis. The IHR brought most of Barnes' writings, which had been out of print since his death, back into print. However, most of IHR's supporters were neo-Nazis and anti-Semites, and while IHR included token articles on other topics and sold some token books by mainstream historians in its book catalog, the vast majority of material published and distributed by IHR was devoted to questioning the facts surrounding the Holocaust.

The IHR became one of the most important organizations devoted to Holocaust denial. In recent years the IHR underwent an internal power struggle which ousted Willis Carto. Under the subsequent leadership of Mark Weber, the IHR has taken on an even more explicit neo-Nazi orientation than it had under Carto. [*Quite the opposite in fact.*] Carto went on to found the *Barnes Review* magazine after his ousting from IHR, a magazine which is also devoted to Holocaust denial.

In recent published articles, volunteer organizations monitoring hate groups have stated that Holocaust denial groups, such as the IHR, have been having difficulty finding supporters (and especially financial sponsors) in the United States. As a result, spokespersons for the IHR and other denial groups have been travelling to the Middle East in an attempt to forge closer ties with extremist groups there. IHR spokespersons have been reported to have met with Arabs suspected of involvement with terrorist groups. [*Typical calumny, that can lead you to Guantanamo in a jiffy. Stanton, how do you dare ?*]

In an "**About the IHR**" statement on their website, the IHR makes the claim that "The Institute does not 'deny the Holocaust'," though they explicitly deny many of the elements of the mainstream view of the Holocaust, calling them a "hoax," as stated in the IHR journal:

There is no dispute over the fact that large numbers of Jews were deported to concentration camps and ghettos, or that many Jews died or were killed during World War II. Revisionist scholars have presented evidence, which "exterminationists" have not been able to refute, showing that there was no German program to exterminate Europe's Jews, and that the estimate of six million Jewish wartime dead is an irresponsible exaggeration. The Holocaust -- the alleged extermination of some six million Jews (most of them by gassing) -- is a hoax and should be recognized as such by Christians and all informed, honest and truthful men everywhere. (*Journal for Historical Review*, 1993, 13, 5, p. 32)

Commentators have noted the misleading nature of statements by the IHR that they are not Holocaust deniers. For example, in *The San Francisco Express*, Paul Raber described a revisionist "word game":

The question [of whether the IHR denies the Holocaust] appears to turn on IHR's Humpty-Dumpty word game with the word Holocaust. ... According to Mark Weber [the Director of IHR], ... "If by the 'Holocaust' you mean the political persecution of Jews, some scattered killings, if you mean a cruel thing that happened, no one denies that." ... That is, IHR doesn't deny that the Holocaust happened; they just deny that the word "Holocaust" means what people customarily use it for.

Bradley Smith and CODOH

Bradley Smith is the founder of a group called the "Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust". CODOH was founded in 1987. In the United States, CODOH has repeatedly tried to place

newspaper ads questioning whether the Holocaust happened, especially in college campus newspapers. These ads typically cause a stir on each campus, whether or not they are actually run in the campus newspaper. Some newspapers have accepted the ads, some have rejected them. No matter which decision the editors make most papers run an editorial defending their decision either on free speech grounds or on the grounds that Smith's views are repugnant and rightfully kept out of the newspaper. During the early 1990s, CODOH's ad campaign attracted national controversy after many campus newspapers accepted the ads, and was the subject of editorials in major newspapers such as *The New York Times*. CODOH's newspaper ad campaign has fallen into inactivity since 2000, because most campus papers now reject the ads as a matter of course and the attempts to place the ads no longer generate the controversy they once did. Bradley Smith has more recently sought other avenues to promote Holocaust denial, with little success.

R. v. Keegstra

In 1984, James Keegstra, a Canadian high-school teacher was charged with denying the Holocaust and making anti-semitic claims in his classroom as part of the course material. Keegstra and his lawyer, Doug Christie, argued that the section of the Criminal Code (now section 319(2)), is an infringement of the Charter of Rights (section 9(b)). The case was appealed to the Supreme court of Canada, where it was decided that the law he was convicted under did infringe on his freedom of expression, but it was a justified infringement. Keegstra was convicted, and fired from his job.

The Zündel trials

Former Canadian resident Ernst Zündel operated a small-press publishing house called Samisdat Publishing, which published and distributed Holocaust-denial material such as *Did Six Million Really Die?* by Richard Harwood (a/k/a Richard Verrall - a British neo-Nazi leader). In 1985, he was tried and convicted under a "false news" law and sentenced to 15 months imprisonment by an Ontario court for "disseminating and publishing material denying the Holocaust." Zündel gained considerable notoriety after this conviction, and a number of free-speech activists stepped forward to defend his right to publish his opinion. His conviction was overturned in 1992 when the Supreme Court of Canada declared the "false news" law unconstitutional.

Zündel established his own Web site to publicize his viewpoints. [*This is false*] In January 2002, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal [*No tribunal really. A blackmail device.*] delivered a ruling in a complaint involving his website, found contravening the Canadian Human Rights Act. The court ordered Zündel to cease communicating hate messages. In February 2003, the INS arrested him in Tennessee on an immigration violations matter [*contrived*], and few days later, Zündel was sent back to Canada, where he tried to gain refugee status. Zündel remained in prison until March 1, 2005, when he was deported to Germany; under whose laws he could be prosecuted for disseminating hate propaganda. [*He was condemned to five years in gaol.*]

Ken McVay and alt.revisionism

In the mid-1990s, the popularity of the Internet brought new international exposure to many organizations, including Holocaust deniers and other groups. A number of authority figures stated publicly that the Internet allowed hate groups to introduce their messages to a widespread audience, and it was feared that Holocaust denial would gain in popularity as a result. But this was not the case, largely due to the efforts of Ken McVay and the participants in the Usenet newsgroup alt.revisionism.

McVay, a Canadian resident, was disturbed by the efforts of organizations like the Simon Wiesenthal Center to suppress the speech of the Holocaust deniers. On alt.revisionism he began a campaign of "truth, fact, and evidence," working with other participants on the newsgroup to uncover factual information about the Holocaust and counter the arguments of the deniers by proving them to be based upon misleading evidence, false statements, and outright lies. He founded the Nizkor Project to expose the activities of the Holocaust deniers, who responded to McVay with personal attacks and slander. McVay received a number of death threats, and the Nizkor Project soon became the number-one online foe of many Holocaust deniers, some of whom were neo-Nazis and white supremacists. [The Nizkor website is in a deep slumber, since many years...]

The Lipstadt affair

In 1998, the best-selling British historian David Irving filed suit against American author Deborah Lipstadt and her publisher Penguin Books, claiming that Lipstadt had libeled him in her book *Denying the Holocaust*.

The statements made by Lipstadt included the accusation that Irving deliberately twisted and misrepresented evidence to conform to his ideological viewpoint. Under English libel law, which seeks primarily to protect the reputation of an individual, Lipstadt and her publisher bore the full burden of

demonstrating not only that they had not shown "reckless disregard" for the truth (as would be the case in America), but also that the statements made were true (that Irving had denied the Holocaust, and that the Holocaust had, in fact, happened).

Lipstadt and Penguin hired British lawyer Anthony Julius and Cambridge historian Richard J. Evans to present her case. Evans spent two years examining Irving's work, and presented evidence of Irving's misrepresentations, including that Irving had knowingly used forged documents as a source. One of the few witnesses called on Irving's behalf was American evolutionary psychology professor Kevin B. MacDonald. The presiding judge, Charles Gray, was persuaded by the evidence presented by Evans and others and wrote a long and decisive verdict in favor of Lipstadt, calling Irving a "right-wing pro-Nazi polemicist," and confirming the accusations of Lipstadt and Evans.

Some journalists called the verdict a blow to free speech, although others pointed out that it was Irving who had initiated legal action for damages from the publication of Lipstadt's work, and hence no one's speech was restricted.

Ahmadinejad remarks

In a December 2005 speech, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said that the Holocaust was "a myth" that had been promoted to defend Israel, ramping up his rhetoric and triggering a fresh wave of international condemnation. "They have fabricated a legend under the name 'Massacre of the Jews', and they hold it higher than God himself, religion itself and the prophets themselves," he said. He also called for Israel to be relocated to Germany, or Austria, arguing it was these nations that persecuted the Jews, so they should carry the responsibility, not Palestinians forsaking their land to form a state of Israel. He also suggested the USA. [???] The remarks instantly provoked a firestorm of international controversy as well as swift condemnation from government officials in Israel, Europe, and the United States. All six political parties in the German parliament signed a joint resolution condemning this Holocaust denial. Hamas political leader Khaled Mashaal called Ahmadinejad's remarks "courageous" and declared that "...Muslim people will defend Iran because it voices what they have in their hearts, in particular the Palestinian people." In the United States, the Muslim Public Affairs Council condemned Ahmadinejad's remarks.

Public reactions to Holocaust denial

Holocaust denial is illegal in France (Loi Gayssot), Belgium (Belgian Negationism Law), Switzerland (article 261bis of the Penal Code) and several other West European countries. The Council of Europe's 2003 Additional Protocol to the Convention on cybercrime, concerning the criminalisation of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems includes an article 6 titled Denial, gross minimisation, approval or justification of genocide or crimes against humanity. [*Does this mean the dictatorship of the Lobby is not real ?*]

Many Holocaust deniers claim their work falls under a "universal right to free speech", and see these laws as a confirmation of their own beliefs, arguing that the truth does not need to be legally enforced. Some people who do not deny that the Holocaust occurred nevertheless oppose such restrictions of free speech, including **Noam Chomsky**. An uproar resulted when **Serge Thion** used one of Chomsky's essays without explicit permission as a foreword to a book of Holocaust denial essays. [*Thion had of course an explicit permission, carte blanche.*]

At times, Holocaust deniers seek to rely on Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, which guarantees freedom of expression, when faced with criminal sanctions against their statements or publications. The European Court of Human Rights however consistently declares their complaints inadmissible. According to Article 17 of the Convention, nothing in the Convention may be construed so as to justify acts that are aimed at destroying any of the very rights and freedoms contained therein. Invoking free speech to propagate denial of crimes against humanity is, according to the Court's case-law, contrary to the spirit in which the Convention was adopted in the first place. Reliance on free speech in such cases would thus constitute an abuse of a fundamental right.

In the Middle East, individuals from the Syrian and Iranian government, as well as Palestinian political groups (Hamas) have published and promoted Holocaust denial statements. Denials of the Holocaust have been regularly promoted by various Arab leaders and in various media throughout the Middle East. In August 2002 the Zayed Center for Coordination and Follow-up, an Arab League think-tank whose Chairman, Sultan Bin Zayed Al Nahayan, served as Deputy Prime Minister of the United Arab Emirates, promoted a Holocaust denial symposium in Abu Dhabi. [*It was later closed after open Jewish pressures were applied.*]

Hamas leaders have also promoted Holocaust denial; Abdel Aziz al-Rantissi held that the Holocaust never occurred, that Zionists were behind the action of Nazis, and that Zionists funded Nazism. [*Just before his assassination by nice, humanistic Jews.*]

A press release by Hamas in April 2000 decried "*the so-called Holocaust, which is an alleged*

and invented story with no basis" Holocaust-denial literature is also sold at white-supremacist bookstores run by immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Israel.

Many Neo-Nazi groups and people associated with them believe that the Holocaust never occurred.

Many Jews protest that Holocaust denial trivializes the suffering caused to victims of the Holocaust when it juxtaposes it with accounts of the Germans (most estimates are 500,000 to 2 million, but some Holocaust deniers put the figure as high as 10 million) who died of starvation and from Russian violence immediately after WWII. They argue that this is an attempt to make the Germans feel they do not deserve full blame for the war crimes of the Nazis, on the basis that the Soviets, British, and Americans committed similar war crimes without repercussions. This position is based on the work of James Bacque, Ernst Mayo, and others. [*This "Ernst Mayo" is totally unknown. Stanton seems to imagine characters...*]

Recently the terms *Holocaust industry* and *Shoah business*, have come into vogue among those who believe Jewish leaders use the Holocaust for financial and political gain. The term Holocaust industry comes from the title of a book by Norman Finkelstein, a Jew and the son of Holocaust survivors. He fully accepts the fact that the Holocaust occurred, but believes that its memory is being dishonestly exploited. However, his term has also been picked up by Holocaust deniers who believe the Holocaust was faked for the purpose of financial and political gain, although that usage is much less frequent. Finkelstein's work is rejected by much of the mainstream Jewish community as well as many scholars.

Spokespersons for Holocaust deniers have claimed that the deniers are often "persecuted" for their beliefs. This stems from the widespread negative reaction to Holocaust denial in the general public [*No, not the "general public": be precise. The organized groups from the Jewish communities.*]. Holocaust deniers have stated that they have received personal threats and even been assaulted, as happened in an incident known as the **Faurisson affair**.

Recently, a number of public figures and scholars have increasingly spoken out against Holocaust denial. The Holocaust Research Center director Dr. William Shulman described the denial "...as if these people were killed twice."

In 2006, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said: "*Remembering is a necessary rebuke to those who say the Holocaust never happened or has been exaggerated. Holocaust denial is the work of bigots, we must reject their false claims whenever, wherever and by whomever they are made.*"

Other genocide denials

Other acts of genocide and atrocity have met similar attempts to deny and minimize. The list of these acts is extensive and proof is often difficult to obtain, either because governments are involved in the denial or because there is debate on whether the occurred atrocities are genocide or not.

For example, **Ward Churchill**, a controversial scholar and activist in the area of Native American studies, asserts that the concept of holocaust denial applies to minimization of the significance of attempted extermination of other victims of the Nazi holocaust such as Gypsies and to marginalization of other "holocausts" such as the near elimination of Native Americans.

Some other examples are:

The toll of the Great Chinese Famine caused by the government of Mao was higher than the toll of the Second World War in China but could only be proved some decades later with demographic evidence.

the **Nanjing Massacre** (1937) by the Japanese army, which many Japanese politicians, such as **Ishihara Shintaro**, have denied happened;

Japanese concentration camps for Dutch and other Western citizens during the 1940s were well exposed in the West but are almost completely unknown within Japan;

The **Armenian Genocide** by Turkey is denied by the Turkish government. Although some Turkish writers are being persecuted for going against the state's official standpoint concerning the massacre, the situation might change complexion in the coming years, mainly as a result of Turkey's attempt to join the European Union;

The **Ustasha genocide** by Croats, who killed hundreds of thousands of Serbs in WWII in Jasenovac and other places, was denied by Croatian president **Franjo Tudman**, a revisionist historian, and by a many people in present day Croatia.

The mass-killings organized by the **Khmer Rouge** in **Democratic Kampuchea** (today Cambodia), now almost universally regarded as genocide, were sometimes denied or minimized by contemporary commentators, primarily on the political left.

Critics of **Noam Chomsky** accuse him of doing so. Chomsky's position was based largely on his prior objections to the Khmer Rouge's opponents, whom he considered imperialists (see *argumentum*

ad hominem). Chomsky now refers to what happened in Cambodia as a genocide. .

Australian historian **Keith Windschuttle** has challenged the evidence and scholarship that suggested there was systematic genocide of Tasmania's indigenous population.

The **Bosnian Genocide** by Bosnian Serbs is still denied by most Serbs and others although it has gained acceptance at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) through the court case entitled Prosecutor vs Krstic.

Gregory H. Stanton, formerly of the US State Department and the founder of **Genocide Watch** lists denial as the final stage of a genocide development: "Denial is the eighth stage that always follows a genocide. It is among the surest indicators of further genocidal massacres. The perpetrators of genocide dig up the mass graves, burn the bodies, try to cover up the evidence and intimidate the witnesses. They deny that they committed any crimes, and often blame what happened on the victims."

One thing remains to be explained : Why did Stanton invite Serge Thion, a well-known "denier", to deliver a Rafael Lemkin lecture at the Law School of Yale University in February 1992, under a significant title : Genocide as a political commodity ?

http://www.martinfrost.ws/htmlfiles/holocaust_denial.html

INSIDE ISRAEL

Anti-Semitism Right Here at Home

By: Lily Galili

To the list of oddities by which the world is now defined, a few local paradoxes can be added. It appears that the number of Russian Jews who will emigrate to Germany this year will be larger than the number who come to Israel; the law under which Jews from the former Soviet Union can immigrate to Germany is close to the restricted definition of "Jewish under Jewish law." The Israeli Law of Return, however, **is in fact based on the Nuremberg Laws**, in which the Germans expanded the definition of who is Jewish in accordance with their own needs.

Anti-Semitism has been swelling recently in Europe, and **also in the Jewish state**. Not long ago, the first Israeli neo-Nazi Internet site was launched. More precisely, it is an Israeli site in the Russian language. *Who says there are no original productions here?*

The site is well organized. It has text and pictures showing the activists of the organization, "The White Israeli Union," some of them in Israel Defense Forces uniforms on the background of army camps and saluting with a raised arm. The expanded text is divided into sub-sections. There is one on "Who we are," where the managers of the site introduce themselves as "Ilya from Haifa and Andrei from Arad," and it is related there that the members of the organization are "people who have pride in themselves and are sick of living among the dirty bastards." There is a section on "Who our enemies are," where all the "enemies" are extensively documented: the Jews, the Arabs, the immigrants from all Moslem republics of the former Soviet Union, the Moroccans, the foreign workers - in short, the "black-asses." In the material about the Arabs there is even a practical suggestion to enlist in the IDF in a combat unit, in order to get weapons and begin to shoot at them in every possible circumstance.

In the guest forum on the site, other opinions can also be found - for example, that the hatred of Jews should lead to an alliance with the Arabs. There is also a "codex" section of rules of behavior for members of the organization, among them respect for parents, but also "not to be miserly, because a miser is a Zhid," a derogatory Russian word for Jew, approximately equivalent to "Kike." And notably there is a rich section of jokes, the greater part of which is devoted to all kinds of funny incidents in concentration camps that end badly for the Jews.

Those who follow phenomena of this sort say that in its structure and content, the site resembles neo-Nazi sites in Russia, and strong connections exist between the activists here and the activists there. In the forum on the local site, there is an ambivalent attitude toward the fact that these proud white people are living in Israel. There are those who attack them for this and there are those who say that it is in fact important that some of "our people" be in the "Jews' state," too. The members who live in Israel explain that they want to defend the true Russian person on Israeli soil. They have a mission.

Avigdor Yardeni is one of the many people in the community of immigrants from the Confederation of Independent States who are concerned about the spread of this phenomenon. Yardeni (whose name was originally Mashogiyani), the son of a Jewish mother and an Armenian father, immigrated to Israel 12 years ago. Here, he has fathered two "sabara" daughters and has tried a number of occupations: He worked as an engineer, as a salesman, as youth emissary for the Jewish Agency in Russia and as a businessman who went back and forth between Israel and his old homeland. Now he is mainly a concerned citizen who is anxiously keeping track of the spread of anti-Semitic phenomena in the Russian-speaking community, most notably the new neo-Nazi Internet site.

According to him, from a close reading of the contents of the site, there is no doubt that these are young people of army age and a bit older. The low literary level of Russian, which is full of mistakes, shows that these are people with little education, in whose poor language Yardeni identifies a marked Hebrew influence. That is, these are young people who came to Israel with their families under the Law of Return and have grown up here.

This story gives him no rest. In contrast to many others who just click their tongues, Yardeni has decided to do something about it. In coordination with about 10 immigrant friends and with the "Russian Israeli" newspaper in the Russian language, they are planning a convention from which a call will be issued to change the Law of Return in a way that will prevent such elements from arriving in Israel.

"My motivation is my daughters," says Yardeni. "They are going to live in this country. Ostensibly, we have other options. I have a mother and a sister in the United States, and we could have joined them, but there's something enjoyable about life here, which I don't intend to relinquish. But if Israel becomes an arena for swastika graffiti, of cries of Zhid and neo-Nazi sites, then why come here of all places? Absurdly, these phenomena are fading in the large Russian cities. In all of Moscow, with its 12 million inhabitants, there are about 5,000 organized neo-Nazis; if in Israel there are a few 100, or even a few dozen, that's a lot."

The White Israeli Union site is a new peak among a number of anti-Semitic phenomena in the Russian-speaking community in Israel. For about three years now, the Information Center for Victims of Anti-Semitism in Israel has been active. Its members track manifestations of anti-Semitism in this country through "open" sources, such as the press, and individual complaints that are made to them. The center is headed by Zalman Gilichinsky, 39, a painter by profession, a newly observant Jew who immigrated to Israel from Kishinev.

Over time he has accumulated hundreds of incidents that elsewhere in the world would be defined as "manifestations of anti-Semitism," but in Israel, the political system and the law-enforcement authorities relate to them with studied indifference. The range of incidents is wide: non-Jewish immigrants calling Jewish immigrants Zhid, an elderly Jewish immigrant woman in Jerusalem being beaten by a non-Jewish caregiver who calls her "Zhidovka," comments like "Hitler didn't finish the job," swastika graffiti found all the time in predominantly Russian-speaking neighborhoods, vandalism in synagogues and cemeteries.

In November, 2002, an immigrant social worker was called urgently to a school in Kiryat Menachem in Jerusalem to help children and families who were hurt in a terror attack on a bus in the neighborhood. Distressed and anxious, she made her way to the neighborhood by bus. Before she got off the bus, one of the passengers, a Russian-speaking woman, said: "This isn't enough; we have to finish you off."

Recently, skinheads have been seen in Hatzor and Kiryat Shmona. **In Russian bookstores in Israel, books that promote Holocaust-denial are sold openly (which is against the law)**, as are cassettes of neo-Nazi songs like "The Nazis are Coming."

Gilichinsky's attempts to enlist the help of the Anti-Defamation League, the president of Israel and the official site maintained by the State of Israel and the Jewish Agency have all been answered in the same spirit: "It's not our mandate. Our mandate is anti-Semitism around the world, not in Israel." However, newspapers in Europe, including the Russian Pravda, have been glad to publish comprehensive reports on the new phenomenon of anti-Semitism in Israel.

"I didn't think that after I'd left Russia I would ever go back to Pravda because of this issue," says Gilichinsky sarcastically, but the policy of silencing things in Israel reminds one of the policy that prevailed in the Soviet Union - a policy of silencing anything that is not in agreement with the official doctrine."

Even if there is not really a doctrine as such, clearly these phenomena are being ignored in a surprising way. Perhaps this derives from shock at the rise in anti-Semitism in the only place in the world that is supposed to be exempt at least from this phenomenon. But deep down, and especially in light of the thundering silence of Knesset members who are supposed to be representing the immigrant public, it is possible that there are other weighty reasons for this silence.

At the immediate political level, in taking a stance there is a certain amount of electoral risk. Judging by many forums and chat groups on the Internet, the voting patterns of this population that is hostile to Israel and the Jewish people that dwells here are scattered all over the political spectrum from right to left. Among them there are supporters of Shinui and Meretz, who see these parties as a liberal opening for realizing their aspirations. There are supporters of the National Union, who are attracted to the bullying nature of the movement and the hatred of Arabs. But more than this, it appears that the entire political spectrum and the organizations associated with it have chosen not to relate to the issue because it touches the most sensitive nerves in the national ethos: the Law of Return and the definition of the state on the "Jewish-democratic" axis.

"There is a metaphysical dimension in the Law of Return that comes in to compensate for every drop of Jewish blood for which the Nazis wanted to slaughter the Jewish people," says writer and essayist Maya Kaganskaya, who has also made a study of fascism in Russia. "Metaphysically, I also agree with it. But in the real sense, the Jewish people is in danger because of it. There is a problem here that is difficult to solve. It's easy to deal with the neo-Nazi movement - they should simply be thrown out of here. I am familiar with this phenomenon from Russia, where it's fairly popular. Nazis and Hitler become surrounded by a halo of romanticism in the struggle against the new world. But the real problem is the Law of Return. A Jewish state according to Jewish religious law and a state built on the Law of Return as it stands both lead to the end of the state. It is necessary to bring together intellectuals, demographers and legal experts who will reexamine to what extent and according to what test it is possible to accept immigrants here."

MK Yuri Stern of the National Union says that for a long time now his movement has considered it necessary to examine whether in existing legislation there are enough sanctions against anti-Semitism in Israel, but it has yet to do so.

"The time has come," he says. "There are enough people here with an anti-Semitic background, and when life is difficult and tense, these things burst out. Even if this is a phenomenon of limited social and political importance, it is cruel and unacceptable."

But this whole issue requires delicate handling and a clear and sharp distinction between non-Jews who have come here under the Law of Return and have linked their fate to the country's fate, and those elements that are clearly hostile; between phenomena of mere hooliganism or youthful naughtiness, however perverse, and real danger. It is also important to distinguish between an organization that aims to undermine the foundations of the state and legitimate cultural demands of the non-Jews who have come here under the expanded Law of Return.

It must be understood that there are cases in which a verbal anti-Semitic reaction is a response to racism encountered here by non-Jewish immigrants, especially the young people whose lives the Israeli establishment embitters, pushing them to alienation from the state. In this tangle of nuances, on Israeli soil that is in any case racist, all these distinctions are critical in order to isolate from them the truly dangerous phenomena.

But above all, dealing with the phenomenon must begin with the demographic madness, whereby everyone is welcome to come here as long as he is not an Arab. Even if he hates the state, even if he hates Jews, he is considered a positive contribution to the needs of the demographic head-count. About a year ago, Lutfi Mashour, the editor of the Arabic newspaper Al-Sinara, told Haaretz that while the Jews are obsessing about the Arab demographic threat, a demographic problem is burgeoning for them in quite a different place.

Yardeni, who defines himself as a "liberal rightist," agrees with Mashour: "The cure is far worse than the illness," he says. "I am thoroughly ashamed of having participated at the time in this system of bringing over everyone possible. I am against this demographic madness that you describe, in the framework of which we bring in the sickest elements."

And Gilichinsky says bitterly that he was promised one thing by the Jewish Agency emissaries in Russia with absolute certainty: that only in Israel would he not encounter anti-Semitism. But this promise, too, was not kept and instead he has found the classical Israeli policy of not really dealing with any complex issue. Everything will be fine, they tell him.

Haaretz, May 23, 2003.

2003, and this is not finished !!

THEY DARE NOT...

Military Resistance Forced Shift on Iran Strike

by Gareth Porter

October 19, 2007

The George W. Bush administration's shift from the military option of a massive strategic attack against Iran to a surgical strike against selected targets associated with the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), reported by Seymour Hersh in the *New Yorker* earlier this month, appears to have been prompted not by new alarm at Iran's role in Iraq but by the explicit opposition of the nation's top military leaders to an unprovoked attack on Iran's nuclear facilities.

The reorientation of the military threat was first signaled by passages on Iran in Bush's Jan. 10 speech and followed by only a few weeks a decisive rejection by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of a strategic attack on Iran's nuclear facilities.

Although scarcely mentioned in press reports of the speech, which was devoted almost entirely to announcing the troop "surge" in Iraq, Bush accused both Iran and Syria of "allowing terrorists and insurgents to use their territory to move in and out of Iraq." Bush also alleged that Iran was "providing material support for attacks on American troops."

Those passages were intended in part to put pressure on Iran, and were accompanied by an intensification of a campaign begun the previous month to seize Iranian officials inside Iraq. But according to Hillary Mann, who was director for Persian Gulf and Afghanistan Affairs on the National Security Council staff in 2003, they also provided a legal basis for a possible attack on Iran.

"I believe the president chose his words very carefully," says Mann, "and laid down a legal predicate that could be used to justify later military action against Iran."

Mann says her interpretation of the language is based on the claim by the White House of a right to attack another country in "anticipatory self-defense" based on Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. That had been the legal basis cited by then National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice had in September 2002 in making the case for the invasion of Iraq.

The introduction of a new reason for striking Iran, which also implied a much more limited set of targets related to Iraq, followed a meeting between Bush and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on Dec. 13, 2006 in which the uniformed military leaders rejected a strike against Iran's nuclear program. Time magazine political columnist Joe Klein, reported last May that military and intelligence sources told him that Bush had asked the Joint Chiefs at the meeting about a possible strike against the Iranian nuclear program, and that they had unanimously opposed such an attack.

Mann says that she was also told by her own contacts in the Pentagon that the Joint Chiefs had expressed opposition to a strike against Iran.

The Joint Chiefs were soon joined in opposition to a strike on Iran by Admiral William Fallon, who was nominated to become CENTCOM commander in January. Mann says Pentagon contacts have also told her that Fallon made his opposition to war against Iran clear to the White House.

IPS reported last May that Fallon had indicated privately that he was determined to prevent an attack on Iran and even prepared to resign to do so. A source who met with Fallon at the time of his confirmation hearing quoted him as vowing that there would be "no war with Iran" while he was CENTCOM commander and as hinting very strongly that he would quit rather than go along with an attack.

Although he did not specifically refer to the Joint Chiefs, Fallon also suggested that other military leaders were opposing a strike against Iran, saying, "There are several of us who are trying to put the crazies back in the box," according to the same source.

Fallon's opposition to a strike against Iranian nuclear, military and economic targets would make it very difficult, if not impossible for the White House to carry out such an operation, according to military experts. As CENTCOM commander, Fallon has complete control over all military access to the region, says retired Air Force Col. Sam Gardiner, an expert on military strategy who has taught at the National War College.

Douglas McGregor, a retired Army Lt. Col. who was a tank commander in the 1991 Gulf War and has taught at the National Defense University, agrees. "I find it hard to imagine that anything can happen in the area without the involvement of the Central Command," says McGregor.

The possibility that Fallon might object to an unprovoked attack on Iran or even resign over the issue represents a significant deterrent to such an attack.

Former NSC adviser Mann believes the Iraq-focused strategy is now aimed at averting any resignation threat by Fallon or other military leaders by carrying out a very limited strike that would be presented as a response to a specific incident in Iraq in which the deaths of US soldiers could be attributed to Iranian policy. She says she doubts Fallon and other military leaders would "fall on their swords" over such a strike.

Gardiner agrees that Fallon is unlikely to refuse to carry out such a limited strike under those circumstances.

Mann believes the Bush-Cheney purpose in advancing the strategy is to provoke Iranian retaliation. "The concern I have is that it would be just enough so Iranians would retaliate against US allies," she says.

But the issue of what evidence of Iranian complicity would be adequate to justify such a strike evidently remains a matter of debate within the administration. A story published by McClatchy newspapers Aug. 9 reported that Vice President Dick Cheney had argued some weeks earlier for a strike against camps in Iran allegedly used to train Iraqi Shiite militiamen fighting US troops if "hard new evidence" could be obtained of Iran's complicity in supporting anti-US forces in Iraq.

But Cheney and his allies have been frustrated in the search for such evidence. Mann notes that British forces in southern Iraq patrolled the border very aggressively for six months last year to find evidence of Iranian involvement in supplying weapons to Iraqi guerrillas but found nothing.

After several months of trying to establish specific links between Iraqis suspected of trafficking in weapons to a specific Iranian Islamic Revolutionary Guard contact, the US command has not claimed a single case of such a link. Maj. Gen. Rick Lynch, the US commander for southern Iraq, where most of the Shiite militias operate, admitted in a Jul. 6 briefing that his troops had not captured "anybody that we can tie to Iran."

Sen. Joe Lieberman, who is known to be closely allied with Cheney on Iran policy, has betrayed impatience with a policy that depends on obtaining proof of Iranian complicity in attacks. On Jun. 11 he called for "strike over the border into Iran, where we have good evidence that they have a base at which they are training these people coming back into Iraq to kill our soldiers."

Lieberman repeated that position on Jul. 2, but thus far it has not prevailed.

Inter Press Service

<http://www.antiwar.com/porter/>

ARCHEO

"Revision"

Michel Bounan

Over the course of the 1950s and '60s, several groups of individuals issued from Marxist, anarchist and surrealist currents attempted to reconstitute a modern social critique upon the debris of its recent failure, upon the comprehension of the forces that had vanquished it, and upon the organization of the world that had been produced. Many people -- more particularly, young people, less dazzled than their elders by the refrigerators, TV sets, so-called popular theater or the Great Russian Revolution -- very keenly felt the repercussions of modern social organization, individual isolation, general passivity and the poverty of the lived. And this suffering rendered them particularly sensitive to the likely reasons for their strange life and attentive to any enterprise that aimed at diverting its course. Collective unease more and more sympathetically encountered the new social critique that itself was nourished by such dissatisfaction, and, in France, this convergence culminated in an explosive fashion in 1968.

The role played by the Situationist International (1958-1972) seemed, after the fact, to have been considerable. It had nevertheless been ridiculously exaggerated -- and also minimized -- by the same procedure of advertising lighting. Those who first participated in its activities had been the dissatisfied children of their time and the spokespeople for the collective dissatisfaction. They were also the *inheritors* of the revolutionary movement as well as the critical instruments that it had forged 150 years previously. It was in the "melee" of their epoch and the historical movement that they named, denounced and confronted the conditions of life that were shared by all. Social critique thus reemerged, through them, in history as the *subject* of the world and in the affirmation of its exclusive legitimacy. Social critique made itself recognized as the forgotten maternal tongue of the newly colonized people of the modern world. In the revolt of 1968, social critique had been the contrary of an

admirable *object* and became known to people who had previously not known of its existence and its language.

One knows that, for some police officers, journalists and several others, the situationists were the principal artisans of the revolt. It was not comprehensible from their special[ized] point of view because they did not know the origins of the situationists themselves nor those of their critique. Curious individuals thus began to be drawn to what they elaborated, and proclaimed themselves to be "revolutionaries," "libertarians" and "radicals," according to the procedure enunciated a century before by Maurice Joly[1]: "speak their language . . . penetrate into their ranks . . . give them directions," etc.

In 1965, a headquarters opened in Paris under the sign The Old Mole [*La Vieille Taupe*], in which a team of booksellers sold old works from the workers' movement, reprinted texts by **Amedeo Bordiga** (for whom the genocide of the Jews perpetrated by the Nazis only resulted from the collapse of the petite bourgeoisie in the course of the accelerated concentration of capital),[2] as well as copies of the journal *Internationale Situationniste*. This went on for several months before it appeared to the situationists that the revolutionary pretensions of these booksellers and their [actual] associations were so incompatible that they smelled something burnt.[3]

The Old Mole, whose members had already done their schooling in diverse groups of advanced social critique in the 1950s and '60s,[4] thenceforth presented itself as an autonomous, revolutionary, radical and situationistic group, and invented for itself the confusionist label "ultra-Leftist," which [in France] had never been anything but the label of this small group.

Beyond their activity as booksellers, the members produced commentaries on critiques, showed up during May-June 1968 in diverse committees, commissions and liaison groups, and were in contact with similar groups, principally in Italy and Spain. They proclaimed themselves in perfect agreement with the revolutionary project, but without ever giving the reasons that led them to it, nor producing an original critique -- even of a miniscule aspect -- of what they claimed to denounce "radically." They simply set themselves there, in the revolutionary current of the era, precisely to say nothing except that they were there.

In the counter-revolutionary reflux of the 1970s, the bookstore closed its doors (in 1972) and the sign The Old Mole left the public sphere.[5] It would return with a bang several years later, adorning itself with a quite different program, one that was completely exclusive.

Since the end of the [Second World] war and the enormous lie of the victors that attributed to Germany alone the responsibility for the genocide of the Jews,[6] old Nazis and others who compromised themselves with them (German nationalists and the sons of anti-Semitic shopkeepers), thereafter exposed themselves for banishment from humanity, for committing unprecedented crimes of which they had only been, at worst, the instruments. Their political position prohibited them from accusing their judges of crimes that they were forced to carry out, and they strove, instead, miserably, to reduce or even to deny the existence of the Jewish genocide that condemned them, and them alone, to hell. These micro-sects, which claimed to correct history to their least disadvantage, called themselves "revisionists" and their sympathies were allied with the outlandish neo-Nazis groups.

It would be necessary to wait until the ferment of the 1970s, resulting from the great fear of 1968, for the newspaper *Le Monde* to launch a curious affair, of which it became the zealous chronicler.[7] A university professor from Lyon maintained that the genocide of the Jews was a simple myth and that "Hitler neither ordered nor allowed anyone to be killed due to his race or his religion." This stupefying proclamation, which no "revisionist" -- neither archeo-Nazi nor neo-Nazi -- had even dared to make, was paradoxically vouchsafed (or so certain journalistic commentaries cautioned) by people who were complete libertarians, anarchists and even "ultra-Leftists,"[8] by an old group of "sixty-eighters" reunited under the re-hung sign of The Old Mole.[9]

The professor from Lyon had a response to everything. The gas chambers? Simple showers. The post-gas aeration system? It would still be necessary to show that it would have been sufficient [to do the job]! Certainly there were the testimonies of the deported people and those of the executioners themselves, but the former had collectively and massively lied to crack themselves up, and the latter confessed everything/anything -- under torture. The millions of deported Jews who disappeared in the night and fog of the Hitlerian camps probably hid themselves in Israel, the United States or the USSR. Himmler's terrifying diary? One must interpret it figuratively, symbolically; it was completely poetic! The incessant convoys toward Auschwitz? It was a great industrial center! Why were there crowds of innumerable children and babies? There was also a vacation resort there. . . . The Holocaust thus never existed and the entire trial of Nazism rested upon a lie![10]

The false "lie of Nuremberg" above all permitted one to dissimulate the true lie, namely the collective responsibility of the German people for a genocide that was now primarily imputable to the international managers of "the cold machine." But the "revisionist" operation then posed the question of finding out who had profited from this invented "Holocaust." The response: the Jews and their usurious demands for excessive indemnities. This operation especially implied that an *occult Jewish*

power had, for a half-century, the political, financial and media power to impose this lie on the entire world. *Jewish domination* was thus highlighted again, thanks to the revelations of The Old Mole. This is why, if the principal activity of the group consisted in the diffusion of the remarks of the counterfeiter from Lyon, some of its members pushed the matter even further: one of them thus worried noisily about seeing "the British army march to the sound of the Shofar" and denounced "The Israeli influence on the West, always pushing for war" (S. Thion), while another -- at the exits of high schools -- distributed tracts in which even his acolytes had to recognize excessive anti-Semitism (Guionnet, called "the Black Eagle" and "Attila the Sorcerer").

The "revisionist" operation thus permitted one to re-start the myth of the *Jewish conspiracy* in the wake of 1968 and despite the Nazi crimes that seemed to prohibit the resurgence of it. This operation affected to take root in a libertarian strategy, like the preceding anti-Semitic operations of Edouard Drumont and Céline.^[11] The Old Mole thus ceaselessly reaffirmed its "ultra-Leftist" label, and it was under this feigned flag that -- at the gatherings of the National Front -- it distributed its own texts, those of old Nazis and neo-Nazis, and texts by the old libertarian Garaudy and the ex-situationist Abbot Pierre^[12] between the sickle, the hammer, the swastika and the holy-water sprinkler.

Historians took the trouble to respond to the counterfeiter from Lyon and his accomplices at The Old Mole. They exposed the trickery of the university professor and his juggling. But none of them revealed the [real] meaning of the maneuver and the public has since then found itself with the alternative of either supporting the official lie of the "German crime" or the dissident lie of the "revisionists."

Nevertheless, after these interventions, the "revisionist" affair subsided within a few years. In 1983, a part of the group declared in its journal *La Banquise*: "Whether the Nazi gas chambers did or did not have a concrete existence matters little to us." No surprise that it didn't matter to them. But this question mattered to those who were accused, not only of having invented this supposed lie, but also of having the power to impose it on the entire world. It also mattered to all those who knew what such a maneuver meant in the real social war.^[13]

At that moment, one of them continued to protest against the censorship of which the counterfeiter from Lyon was allegedly the victim. In 1992, a collective text was addressed to the newspapers, avowing that the entire "revisionist" affair was only a "variety of anti-Semitism."

Finally, in 1996, the most representative of the co-signers of the collective text published via Editions Reflex a kind of *mea culpa* in which they did not content themselves with recognizing the "anti-Semitic drift" of the "revisionist" affair, but also proposed to explain its genesis. And, even more than the recent participation of these repenters from the "revisionist" falsification, it was more obviously their fake confession that showed them to be provocateurs.^[14]

[We have a fairly complete file on this period (in French). See <http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/arvs/bavarde/bavarde.html>]

"It is time," one of them advanced, "that the intellectual balance sheet of this affair is drawn up." "Nothing would have happened," another sighed, "without the new stance of certain revolutionaries facing the world." Their publisher started the machine, worried about the "stance" that claimed to be "revolutionary, Marxist and libertarian," and came to "mount the same battle horse as the neo-Nazis." One of these oddballs delivered the expected conclusion: "It was the same operational scheme that led to the revolutionary 'stance' and to neo-Nazism": such was the explanation of the "revisionist turn that would affect a good part of the ultra-Left," that is to say, The Old Mole group (revolutionaries, obviously, have always mocked the enterprises of the "revisionists," whether the latter are orthodox or dissident, repented or unrepented).

In reality, as one of the repenters made clear, it was the "phantasm of the Machiavellian maneuvers of the State" that ended up in the baleful theory of Jewish conspiracy (this was actually a diversion that our century knows well, yet it has needed the "Machiavellian maneuvers" of the Okhrana, the Black Hundred and other specialized police forces, as well as the money of Krupp, I.G. Farben, Henry Ford and other purveyors of funds).^[15]

Whatever this indecent truth was, it was now necessary (it was decided) to finish off with the "*illuminist cult* of the truth" and instead promote an opportune tolerance towards provocateurs, liars and falsifiers. Revolutionaries have thus been quite guilty, this tolerant repenter continued, because "in place of a universal to share as a communal practice, they make the *truth* a secret to be revealed." What secret could indeed hide behind the fabrication of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, the nazification of Germany and the work of The Old Mole?

The universal consensus elaborated by the mediatic experts thus had to take the place of the truth, because "the mistrust of official experts" -- the religious fanaticism of mistrust! -- and especially the arrogant pretense to contradict them publicly, the "propensity to always want to be scandalous and detested," led to Nazism.

"The position of revolutionaries and partisans of the human community," they finally decreed --

addressing those who obviously regurgitated all of the "positions" that one wanted to accord them -- "is with the clandestine people and those without [proper] papers," certainly not to demand the suppression of papers, passports, nationalities and other humiliating ignominies, but so that each person has the right to a nationality and a job; not to collectively invent new human relations, but so that each where has the right to her [identity] card and her work. Any other project will thus be likened to the Nazis' crimes; and here the expected conclusion finally arrives: it is necessary to be done with the "residual delirium of May '68" since -- the operation of The Old Mole has proved it -- these dangerous follies "are inextricably mixed with neo-fascist phantasmagoria."

This unsurprising conclusion thus completes the so-called "revisionist" operation, the unfolding of which reproduced very exactly that of the great anti-Semitic maneuvers deployed, for a century, during the course of the principal social crises.

[1] Maurice Joly (1829-1878) was a French satirist and the author of *Dialogue in Hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu* (1864), which was used as source material for *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. (Note that when Bounan refers to "curious people," it appears that he means provocateurs, police agents or other enemies of social critique.)

[2] In 1960, *Programme Communiste* -- the organ of a Marxist sect founded by Amadeo Bordiga -- published an anonymous text entitled "Auschwitz, or the Great Alibi." In 1970, this text was reprinted by The Old Mole.

[3] See "On the Poverty of the Bookstore," *Internationale Situationniste* #11 (October 1967). Though he appears to have frequented the bookstore in 1965, the situationist Guy Debord (briefly a member of Socialisme ou Barbarie in 1960) had not been on speaking terms with the bookstore's founder, Pierre Guillaume (1940-present), since 1962: see his letter to André Girard dated [15 May 1962](#) and his letter to Marie-Christine Guillaume dated [22 March 1965](#). As for Guillaume, in a ridiculous text called [Debord](#) (1995), he alleged that Debord himself had sympathies with the "revisionist" movement. (The author's reference to "something burnt" alludes to an arson attack against the bookstore in early 1966, after which it sold the partially burnt books at a discount.)

[4] Pierre Guillaume had been a rank-and-file member of Socialisme ou Barbarie (S. ou B.) and then Pouvoir Ouvrier in the early 1960s. (In "[Addendum, Or the Cornelius Castoriadis/Agora International Website Receives a Threat](#)," David Ames Curtis notes that: "Some unscrupulous souls have used especially the S. ou B. connection with Pierre Guillaume (not to be confused with long-time S. ou B. member and author Philippe Guillaume, Pierre Guillaume having never penned a S. ou B. text) to attack C[ornelius] C[astoriadis] and S. ou B.; see Nadine Fresco, 'Parcours du ressentiment,' *Lignes*, 2 (février 1988), to which Castoriadis replied in 'Au sujet de 'Parcours du ressentiment' de Nadine Fresco,' *Lignes*, 4 (octobre 1988). CC found Pierre Guillaume's supposedly leftist version of negationism a tawdry and appalling spectacle, 'stupidity' and 'maliciousness' combined, he wrote.")

[5] In "A Paper Eichmann" (*Assassins of Memory* [1992], p.11), Pierre Vidal-Naquet -- quoting Pierre Guillaume -- reports that, as early as 1970, The Old Mole "shared in essence the theses of Paul Rassinier." Like Robert Faurisson (see footnote 7), Rassinier was a denier of the Holocaust's existence. The Old Mole would go on to reprint two of his books.

[6] Presumably that responsibility was shared by Nazi Germany's allies (Italy and Japan), the countries that were happy to assist in the deportation of Jews (France, Belgium, Hungary and Poland), the countries that financed and profited from Germany's war machine (the USA, among them), the countries that refused to increase its immigration quotas to accommodate Jewish refugees (the USA, among them), et al.

[7] On 29 December 1978, *Le Monde* published an article by Robert Faurisson, a professor of literature at the University of Lyon, entitled "'The problem of the gas chambers,' or 'The rumor of Auschwitz'." A storm of controversy broke out; Faurisson responded to it on 16 January 1979. Thereafter, *Le Monde* refused to print any more of his texts.

[8] Including Pierre Guillaume, Serge Quadruppani, Gilles Dauvé (aka Jean Barrot) and Jean-Gabriel Cohn-Bendit (Daniel Cohn-Bendit's brother).

[9] *Author's note*: According to their own declarations, the animators of The Old Mole were inspired by the writings of the anti-Semitic "revisionist" Rassinier, whose theses had been noticed in the course of the 1950s and 1960s: the maneuvers of the "Jewish lobby" were responsible for the Second World War; there had never been a Nazi will to exterminate the Jewish populations of Europe; the mortality in the Hitlerian camps principally fell upon the Socialist-Communist prisoners. Rassinier was obviously a "man of the Left" since he had previously and for many years shuffled through diverse "Left" or "extreme Left" groups," and had been deported to Germany. He, too, thus claimed to speak as a libertarian; and Céline had admired, as a connoisseur, his delicate work ("a splendid work and worthy of the best society").

[10] *Author's note*: This professor of literature -- whom P. Vidal-Naquet recalls having known in the classes that prepared them for taking the entrance examination for the Ecole Normale Supérieure, "was devoured by a delirious anti-Semitic passion" -- was put in his place due to his "inconceivable negligence" in his thesis on Arthur Rimbaud by the erudite scholar Eugene Canseliet (E. Canseliet, *Alchimie, Pauvert*, 1964). At the moment of his campaign of "revisionist" mystification, his partisans proclaimed him to be "apolitical," "rather Leftist," and "not at all an anti-Semite." It was thus only in the framework of his literary specialty that he rendered an ardent homage to Céline in *La Revue célinienne*.

[11] Edouard Drumont (1844-1917), though Jewish, was one of the 19th century's most virulent anti-Semites. He was one of Alfred Dreyfus' most vocal accusers. Louis-Ferdinand Destouches, aka Céline (1894-1961), was a French author who supported the Nazis before and during WWII. [*Both characterisations are untrue. Drumont was a moderate, albeit clearly antisemite. He was no Jew. Céline, the author of three notorious antisemitic*

pamphlets, was not involved in the "collaboration" with the Nazis, he somehow despised. The main works of both Drummond and Céline have been made available on the Net by AAARGH. The pamphlets of Céline have not been reprinted since the '40s. See

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/livres.html> and <http://uuurgh.net>]

[12] Roger Garaudy (1913-present) is a former Communist who converted to Islam in 1982 and became a virulent anti-Semite and Holocaust-denier. The reference to him being "libertarian" is sarcastic. Henri Grouès (aka Priest Pierre) was the founder of a Catholic association that cared for the poor. In 1996, he defended Garaudy.

[13] *La Guerre Sociale* was the name of a journal run by Pierre Guillaume; [*this is not true*] in 1979, it published a "revisionist" text by Gilles Dauvé entitled "From exploitation in the camps to the exploitation of the camps."

[14] In Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* (translated by Richard Crawley and revised by Donald Lateiner), we read:

In the state of irritation thus produced, many persons of consideration had been already thrown into prison, and far from showing any signs of abating, public feeling grew daily more savage, and more arrests were made; until at last one of those in custody, thought to be the most guilty of all, was induced by a fellow-prisoner to make a revelation, whether true or not is a matter on which there are two opinions, no one having been able, either then or since, to say for certain who did the deed. However this may be, the other found arguments to persuade him, that even if he had not done it, he ought to save himself by gaining a promise of impunity, and free the state of its present suspicions; as he would be surer of safety if he confessed after promise of impunity than if he denied and was brought to trial. He accordingly made a revelation, affecting himself and others in the affair (...); and the Athenian people, glad at last, as they supposed, to get at the truth, and furious until then at not being able to discover those who had conspired against the commons, at once let go the informer and all the rest whom he had not denounced, and bringing the accused to trial executed as many as were apprehended, and condemned to death such as had fled and set a price upon their heads. In this it was, after all, not clear whether the sufferers had been punished unjustly, while in any case the rest of the city received immediate and manifest relief.

For a more contemporary discussion, see Guy Debord's discussion of the *pentiti* in Italy in the 1970s in his [Comments on the Society of the Spectacle](#).

[15] The Okhrana were the Czarist secret police; among other "operations," they constructed and distributed *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. "The Black Hundred" was an anti-Semitic movement involving many groups in Russia in the wake of the 1905 revolution. Krupp and I.G. Farben were German companies convicted of war crimes during WWII. Henry Ford was an American industrialist who thought *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* was an authentic document and paid to have it distributed in the USA during the 1920s.

(Written by Michel Bounan and published as Chapter VII of *The Art of Celine and His Times* [Editions Allia, 1997; new edition published in 2004]. Translated from the French by NOT BORED! 20 October 2007. All footnotes by the translator, except where noted. Thanks to Jean-Pierre Baudet, Fabrice de San Mateo, and David Ames Curtis for their help.)

To Contact NOT BORED!: Info@notbored.org ISSN 1084-7340.

Snail mail: POB 1115, Stuyvesant Station, New York City 10009-9998

<http://www.notbored.org/revision.html>

repris dans :

<http://www.infoshop.org/inews/article.php?story=20071020111053520>

We may avail ourselves of this opportunity to announce the publication online of an English translation of Pierre Guillaume's book *Law and History*, 132 p. published in 1986 by La Vieille Taupe, with footnotes added.

<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres7/PGLawhistory.pdf>

VERY BAD

Genocide Inflation is the Real Human Rights Threat: Yugoslavia and Rwanda

by Edward S. Herman

We have all heard about "genocide denial" and "holocaust denial" as very bad happenings that have focused attention, indignation, and concern to the point of laws passed to criminalize such behavior in Austria, Belgium, France, and elsewhere. But very little attention has been paid to genocide *inflation*, where killings are wildly exaggerated and claims of genocide are made based on hearsay, rumor, knowing lies, and otherwise problematic "information." No indignation has been expressed even over its more egregious illustrations, and no laws have been proposed or passed to

punish its practitioners. This is because the focus on denial has been useful to powerful groups and countries in the West, whereas the critics and victims of genocide inflation have been weak and with no political or media leverage. It will be shown below, however, that this pattern not only fails to protect anybody's human rights, but instead allows the powerful to kill and violate human rights more easily.

Genocide Denial

Genocide denial has received its greatest attention in relation to the occasional questioning of the Nazi destruction of the Jews during World War II. Those denying this horrendous set of real events have almost always been powerless eccentrics who posed no threat to existing Jewish populations, and in fact the outcries against them have gotten louder as real antisemitism has declined (although hostility to Israeli policy has increased). This was surely true in the famous case of **Robert Faurisson** in France, where his denial in the late 1970s, which aroused great indignation, led to legal action, and elicited great publicity, occurred in a country where antisemitism had demonstrably fallen sharply. [1] A powerless individual, he and his crank opinions posed no threat whatsoever to French Jews. It was pointed out at the time that similar crank views by the U.S. academic **Arthur Butz** had simply been ignored, and in consequence he was unknown here and completely lacking in influence. Why did the French (mainly Jewish) activists give Faurisson such free publicity? They talked about "insults" and "honor," but one thing they omitted: that Israel was being increasingly criticized for its intensifying **ethnic cleansing** programs involving Palestinians, and bringing attention once again to the Nazi Holocaust would deflect attention from the ugly present in which Jews were victimizers to the time when they were massive victims.

In recent years as well, Israel has been subject to increasing criticism for its harsh and illegal treatment of its own *untermenschen*, and the response of many individual and organized Jewish groups in the United States and Europe has been once again to cry about genocide denial and an alleged increase in antisemitism (more and more identified with hostility to Israeli policies). This has been happening in a period where real antisemitism (as opposed to hostility to Israeli ethnic cleansing) and holocaust denial are at a low level, but where the power of Western Jewish elites and lobbying operations are unprecedentedly high. [2] This has allowed them to get substantial but completely unwarranted publicity for their current victimization claims, including even the passage of laws outlawing Holocaust denial and legislative as well as private efforts to rein in critics of Israeli policy. [3]

The human rights impact of this set of campaigns, including those featuring and trying to constrain Holocaust denial, has been negative. As Jews are not under threat in the West, the campaign does not help their human rights. On the other hand, by featuring Jewish victimization these campaigns build support for Israel and hence contribute to the astonishing willingness of the West not only to allow massive human rights violations of Palestinians and Lebanese by the Israeli Defense Forces and Israeli settlers but to actively support these by punishing the victims. [4]

It has of course been argued that Iran President Mahmoud Ahmanidejad has posed an existential threat to Israel with his reservations about the Holocaust and alleged desire to "wipe Israel off the map." [5] But his Holocaust doubts prove nothing about prospective Iran policy, and his "wiping out" threat has been shown to have been a mistranslation of an expressed position favoring regime change from racist to non-racist state. The most clear and direct threats involving Iran are those by the United States and Israel in favor of regime change in Iran itself, and with the use of force – even nuclear weapons – very much "on the table." It can never be expressed in the Free Press, but not only does Iran lack a single nuclear weapon, even if it had a few using them would be an act of national suicide. On the other hand, that would not be true if the United States or Israel used such weapons, and both are openly threatening a military attack on Iran. [6]

It should also be noted that there is a systematic "genocide [or holocaust] denial" when it comes to treating Western-based genocidal operations, but this is invisible because the West does it. The most prominent illustration at present is the U.S. and "coalition of the willing" mass killing in Iraq. The million Iraqi deaths from the "sanctions of mass destruction" of the 1990s is unmentioned in Samantha Power's ludicrous treatise on genocide (*"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide*), just as she fails to deal seriously with the Indonesian massacres in East Timor. [7] The U.S.-coalition invasion-occupation of Iraq from 2003 has added another million to the Iraqi toll, but the idea that this is "genocide" is inexpressible in the U.S. mainstream media, which is focused on the more politically convenient killings in Darfur – attributable to a Western target, the Arab government of the Sudan, hence subject to the invidious word genocidal. This is implicit but real denial, which follows from the political basis of naming and concern.

Genocide Inflation

Yugoslavia. All through the Yugoslavia wars of the 1990s there were cries of genocide – first in Bosnia, then in Kosovo, with the Serbs as villains and the Bosnian Muslims and then Kosovo Albanians as the victims. The numbers of Bosnian Muslim civilians allegedly killed by the Bosnian Serbs reached 250,000 or 300,000 by 1993, the source of this information being Bosnian Muslim officials who were both notorious liars and working as hard as they could to make a case for NATO armed intervention on their behalf. Throughout the period 1992-1995 propaganda claims of Serb massacres, death camps, and rape camps were profuse, pushed not only by Muslim and NATO officials but by an enthusiastically gullible Western media. [8] By 1995, war campaigner David Rieff was asserting that the “genocide” of Bosnian Muslims “is all but complete.” [9]

But awkwardly for Rieff and his fellow war campaigners and propagandists, in 2005 and 2007 two studies made their appearance, one by Ewa Tabeau and Jacob Bijak published in 2005 under the auspices of the Western-organized Yugoslavia Tribunal, the other in 2007 by the Bosnian Muslim lawyer Mirsad Tokaca and funded by the Norwegian government, both claiming that the total Bosnian war deaths on all sides, military and civilian, was in the order of 100,000, of which some 40-55,000 were civilians (including thousands of Serbs). These new values penetrated into mainstream reporting slowly and grudgingly, because the inflated numbers had fitted so well the needs of U.S. and NATO policy and the closely related biases of the Western media. [10]

While the Bosnian “genocide” has taken a beating, the Srebrenica massacre of July 1995 has survived as a now institutionalized “genocide.” But it has done so in the face of intractable problems: the NATO-organized and compliant Yugoslav Tribunal identified it as such by finding that there could be genocide in one small town, where the genocidists had bussed to safety all the women and children of their target population, and where the claims of 8,000 executed have never been verified by forensic or credible witness evidence of anything like this scale of killing. [11] It lives on by virtue of its political utility and aggressive challenges to its truthfulness as “revisionism” and “denial.”

This same inflation process occurred before and during NATO’s 78-day bombing war on Yugoslavia and takeover of Kosovo. The pre-bombing propaganda barrage claiming Serb misbehavior was massive, and then during the war itself there was a stream of hysterical claims of indiscriminate killing, official U.S. claims of Bosnian Muslim deaths reaching 500,000, with a very profuse use of the word “genocide.” After the war, the claimed deaths quickly fell to 11,000, and one of the greatest forensic body searches in history produced only 4,000 bodies (with some 2,000 still reportedly missing). [12]

Needless to say, there has been no apology, or any call for reprimand let alone punishment, for participation in these processes of genocide inflation. But in contrast with the genocide denial cases mentioned earlier, these inflation processes had real and substantial negative human rights consequences. By helping demonize U.S.-NATO targets, they readied Western publics for a refusal to negotiate with the demons, helped bring about an ensuing burst of ethnic cleansing and eventually NATO military intervention, and they helped cover over the NATO commission of war crimes. Michael Mandel made an excellent case that the main point of the Yugoslavia Tribunal’s operations from its inception in 1993 was to demonize the NATO target (Serbia) and to allow the demand for “justice” to trump peace settlements, which the United States and its allies did trump from 1992 till the Dayton Accord in late 1995 [13] The genocide inflation helped to this end. The same was true in the Kosovo case, where the inflated claims of Serb violence against the Kosovo Albanians both before and during the bombing war – including the fabricated threat of a Serb mass ethnic cleansing under Operation Horseshoe – helped make publicly acceptable the carefully engineered avoidance of negotiations and plunge into a bombing war.

Rwanda. A less well-known and less well-understood case of genocide inflation – and possibly even more important, misapprehension of the true source and major direction of the killings – is that of Rwanda. In the establishment narrative, genocide irrupted suddenly following the April 6, 1994 shooting down of a plane at the Kigali airport that killed the Hutu presidents of both Rwanda (Juvenal Habyarimana) and Burundi (Cyprien Ntaryamira). According to the narrative, the Hutu *génocidaires* and the *Interahamwe* militias unleashed a huge pre-planned killing spree against the minority Tutsi population that wiped out some 800,000 to 1.2 million people, mainly Tutsis. In the myth structure, Bill Clinton made a regrettable error in pressing for the withdrawal of UN forces that might have protected civilians, for which he apologized. In a major article of September 2001 in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Samantha Power and others dubbed the United States “bystanders to genocide,” which is also a myth. [14]

Contrary to the establishment narrative:

(1) The plane was shot down by Paul Kagame and his Tutsi associates, [15] with active or tacit

help from the Belgians, UN representative Romeo Dallaire, [16] and possibly the CIA. This act was part of the Kagame-Tutsi final assault to seize power after a four-year war, with the assistance of the U.S.-sponsored Ugandan military. When the chief investigator for the Rwanda Tribunal, Australian Michael Hourigan, reported solid evidence on this locus of responsibility for the April 6th assassination to Chief Prosecutor Louise Arbour in 1997, **she immediately closed down the investigation and ordered him to destroy his files.** This finding, which does not comport with the idea of a pre-planned Hutu murder program, has been suppressed in the Free Press. [17]

(2) The two leaders whose plane was shot down on April 6, 1994, were Hutus. A third Hutu leader, Melchior Ndadaye, an earlier president of Burundi, was assassinated by his Tutsi military in October 1993, which was followed by an anti-Hutu pogrom that killed tens of thousands and drove hundreds of thousands of Burundian-Hutu refugees into Rwanda.

(3) Clinton and his Western allies (UK, Belgium) sponsored the U.S.-trained Kagame, supported his invasions of Rwanda from Uganda and massive ethnic cleansing prior to April 1994, and via their control of the Security Council refused to allow additional UN troops into Rwanda in April 1994, in fact forcing a reduction of the UNIMIR contingent in Rwanda from 2,500 to 270, not because of caution but because Kagame didn't want them there to interfere with his conquest of Rwanda, which Clinton and his allies supported.

(4) The Hutu authorities urged more UN troops – and in light of the Kagame/U.S. (etc.) opposition to such civilian-protective assistance, this once again calls into question who it was that did the main killing in Rwanda.

(5) A suppressed 1994 UNCHR (Gersony) Report documented massacres of civilians in Kagame-controlled areas of Rwanda, which was confirmed by contemporaneous Amnesty and HRW reports.

(6) A University of Maryland research team led by Christian Davenport and Allan Stam, sponsored by the Western-organized Rwanda Tribunal, initially found that only about 250,000 civilians had been killed in Rwanda and that two out of three victims were Hutus. This caused a great deal of dismay and the authors have been under attack and in retreat ever since. The 800,000 (and higher) figures have no basis in any other scientific studies but are essentially the Kagame regime's numbers.

To an amazing degree, the Western media and NGOs swallowed the propaganda line and lies on Rwanda that turned things upside down. They made the prime aggressors and genocidists, who were responsible for the dual assassination of April 6, 1994 that precipitated the mass killing, into heroic defenders against the *de facto* victims. The dictator **Paul Kagame, one of the great mass murderers of our time**, was made into an honored savior deserving and receiving strong Western support. Philip Gourevitch and the *New Yorker* whipped up sympathy in the West by labeling the Tutsis the "Jews of Africa;" the label stuck, and it garnered even greater support for Western anti-"genocide" intervention. [18] These big lies are now institutionalized and are part of the common (mis)understanding in the West.

Because the Western propaganda machine succeeded so well in making the Hutus the villains and killers, and Paul Kagame the defender/savior of Rwanda, this cleared the ground for Kagame and Yoweri Museveni – Kagame's ally and fellow U.S. client and dictator (of Uganda) – to periodically invade and occupy the Eastern Congo (then Zaire) and beyond without "international community" opposition as they were allegedly cleaning out the *génocidaires*. The Pentagon very actively supported this on the ground, even more than it supported the Kagame machine's drive in Kigali. This led to the killing of hundreds of thousands of civilian Hutu refugees in a series of mass slaughters, and also provided cover for a wider Kagame-Museveni assault in the Congo that has led to the deaths of literally millions. [19] This was again compatible with Western interests and policy, as it all contributed to the replacement of Mobutu with the more amenable Kabila and the opening up of the Congo to a new surge of ruthless exploitation of its mineral resources by Western companies – a fine illustration of "shock therapy" with murderous human consequences but large gains to a small business and military elite. [20]

In sum, Rwanda offers an outstanding illustration of how genocide inflation and lies can have immense, even catastrophic, human consequences. Thus, not only did the West fail to intervene to prevent "genocide," it intervened both before April 6th and after to ensure that the right killers took over and in *support* of genocide. This also ensured preferential treatment in both Rwanda and the Congo for the killers' sponsors in the West. This history also shows how magnificently the Western media and NGOs can adapt even in the grossest cases to serve Western political-economic interests. With media and NGO help genocide claims now function as a tool of U.S. expansionism, appropriately labeled "genocidalism," [21] regularly applied to virtually any target and helping clear the ground for bombing attacks, invasions, occupations and regime change by the United States itself or one of its proxies or clients.

Notes:

1. This was the conclusion of a conference at Brandeis University in 1983 on "The Jews in Modern France", see "Decline Seen in French Anti-Semitism," Reuters, *Boston Globe*, April 20, 1983.
2. See John Mearsheimer and Stanley Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007); James Petras, *The Power of Israel in the United States* (Clarity Press, 2006; also Petras, <http://www.dissidentvoice.org/2007/05/the-pro-israel-lobby-and-us-middle-east-policy/>)
3. For a discussion of the systematic attempts of pro-Israeli-occupation supporters to curb debate on the relevant issues, see, e.g., the audio-links of the presentations at the "In Defense of Academic Freedom" conference held in Chicago, October 12, 2007, <http://www.academicfreedomchicago.org/?q=node/32>.
4. "Ethnic Cleansing and the 'Moral Instinct'," Edward S. Herman, *Z Magazine*, March, 2006, <http://zmagsite.zmag.org/Mar2006/herman0306.html>.
5. Ahmadinejad's remarks on the Holocaust have mainly been complaints that Europe has addressed the problem of the mistreatment of European Jews by imposing Israel on the Palestinians. He doesn't deny that the Jews were targeted for expulsion and death by some of the European states. On his non-existent wipe-out line, see, e.g., Jonathan Steele, "Lost in Translation," *The Guardian*, June 14, 2006, http://commentisfree.guardian.co.uk/jonathan_steele/2006/06/post_155.html; and Arash Norouzi, "'Wiped Off the Map' -- The Rumor of the Century," DemocracyRising. US, January 18, 2007, <http://democracyrising.us/content/view/736/164/>.
6. See, e.g., John M. Donnelly, "Item In War Request Stokes Fears Of Iran Strike," Congressional Quarterly Today, October 23, 2007, <http://public.cq.com/docs/cqt/news110-000002611347.html>; and John H. Richardson, "The Secret History of the Impending War With Iran That the White House Doesn't Want You to Know," *Esquire*, October 18, 2007, http://www.truthout.org/docs_2006/102407B.shtml.
7. Edward S. Herman, "The Cruise Missile Left (part 5): Samantha Power And The Genocide Gambit," ZNet, May 17, 2004, <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=5538>.
8. Peter Brock, *Media Cleansing: Dirty Reporting--Journalism and Tragedy in Yugoslavia* (GM Books, 2005).
9. David Rieff, *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West* (Simon & Schuster, 1996), p. 17.
10. See Herman and Peterson, "The Dismantling of Yugoslavia: A Study in Inhumanitarian Intervention (and a Western Liberal-Left Intellectual and Moral Collapse)," *Monthly Review*, October, 2007, pp. 22-26, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/nfte0907.htm>.
11. See Michael Mandel, *How America Gets Away With Murder* (Pluto Press, 2004), pp. 153-160.
12. Herman and Peterson, "Dismantling Yugoslavia," 27. See also "Kosovo: ICRC publishes new edition of Book of the Missing," International Committee of the Red Cross, August 29, 2007, <http://www.icrc.org/web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/kosovo-news-290807?opendocument>.
13. Mandel, *How America Gets Away With Murder*, pp. 124-129.
14. Samantha Power, "Bystanders to Genocide," *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 2001, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200109/power-genocide>.
15. On November 21, 2006, the French Judge Jean-Louis Bruguière issued a lengthy report on his investigation into the April 6, 1994 shutdown of the aircraft carrying the Rwandan and Burundian presidents back to Kigali from their summit meeting earlier that day in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. More important, Judge Bruguière called for arrest warrants to be issued for Rwanda President Paul Kagame and nine of his associate, on suspicion of masterminding the assassinations. To date, no arrests have been made. See Chris McGreal, "French judge accuses Rwandan president of assassination," *The Guardian*, November 22, 2006; and Fergal Keane, "Will we ever learn the truth about this genocide?" *The Independent*, November 22, 2006.
16. Dallaire, who has attained heroic status for allegedly "resisting" the genocide, and who has been a "fellow" of Harvard's Carr Center for Human Rights, was actually a virtual agent of the invading Kagame forces. He closed one axis of the Kigali airport runway to make the shutdown easier, refused to allow a nearby French investigative team to investigate the crime, failed to warn the Rwanda government of the military buildup of the Kagame forces, and was charged by his direct superior, Dr Jacques Roger Booh-Booh, with working in collaboration with the RPF and also taking orders from the US and Belgian embassies in Kigali. (See his *Le Patron de Dallaire Parle* (Paris: Dubois, 2005) -- in English: "Dallaire's Boss Speaks".)
17. Some accessible basic sources supporting this analysis are Robin Philpot, *Rwanda 1994: Colonialism Dies Hard* (The Taylor Report, 2004), www.taylor-report.com/Rwanda_1994; Barrie Collins, "Rewriting Rwanda," Spiked Online, April 7, 2004, <http://www.spiked-online.co.uk/Articles/0000000CA4BD.htm>; and Keith Harmon Snow, "Hotel Rwanda: Hollywood and the Holocaust in Central Africa," January 10, 2006, <http://www.allthingspass.com/uploads/html-135Hotel%20Rwanda%20Final%2010%20Jan%202006.htm>.
18. On Gourevitch and other Western intellectual apologists for the Kagame assassinations and slaughterhouse, see Philpot, *Rwanda 1994*, Chapters 9-12.
19. See "The Lancet Publishes IRC Mortality Study from DR Congo; 3.9 Million Have Died: 38,000 Die per Month," News Release, International Rescue Committee, January, 2006, <http://www.theirc.org/news/page-27819067.html>; and Simon Robinson and Vivienne Walt, "The Deadliest War in the World," *Time Magazine*, May 28, 2006, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1198921,00.html>.
20. Steven Da Silva, "Revisiting the 'Rwanda Genocide'," Center for Research on Globalization, June 1, 2007, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=5848>; and Michel Chossudovsky, "The Geopolitics

Behind the Rwanda Genocide," Center for Research on Globalization, November 23, 2006, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=20061123&articleId=3958>.
21. Aleksandar Jokic, "Genocidalism," *The Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 8, No. 3, September, 2004, pp. 251 - 297, <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/klu/joet/2004/00000008/00000003/05256293> ; and Aleksandar Jokic and Tiphaine Dickson, "Globalization and Genocidalism: Fictional Discourse Without Borders (for Fun and Profit)," *Sociological Review* (Belgrade), 2006, pp. 323 - 346, [http://www.socioloskipregled.org.yu/Tekstovi/3\(2006\)/1%20Jokic.pdf](http://www.socioloskipregled.org.yu/Tekstovi/3(2006)/1%20Jokic.pdf).

Zmag 26 October 2007

<http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=80&ItemID=14137>

CAMPAIGN AGAINST SPAIN AS AN OUTCAST

Spanish FM: Constitutional Court decision "must be overturned"

MADRID (EJP)---Spanish Foreign Minister Miguel Angel Moratinos said that Spain's Constitutional Court recent decision to eliminate prison sentences for Holocaust denial "must be overturned."

Until the court decision, the Spanish penal code provided for one or two years in jail for anyone who disseminated theories or teachings that denied or justified genocide, such as the Nazi liquidation of Europe's Jews. The new ruling makes only the justification of genocide punishable by prison.

50,000 Jews live in Spain although most of them are not affiliated to a community. Madrid is home of around 20,000 while 14,000 live in Barcelona. The Constitutional Court is the country's highest judicial body with the power to determine the constitutionality of acts and statutes of the Spanish Government. "Even if this means changing the penal code, we must overturn this decision," Moratinos said Wednesday night in a speech at a dinner organized by the Federation of Jewish Communities of Spain (FJCS).

He added very emphatically that neither this government nor any future Spanish government "will ever permit Spain to become a center for neo-Nazi activity." During the dinner, FJCS presented Jordi Pujol, former president of the government of Catalonia, with the Angel Pulido Award for his friendship and support for the Jewish people and Israel. Speaking before Moratinos, Israel Garzon, president of FJCS, deplored the Constitutional Court's decision, declaring: "It distances our country from the ideas that are prevalent in the most important European countries and is in complete contradiction with international human rights agreements that limit freedom of expression to the respect and defense of fundamental rights." He warned that the country will become, with legal protection, the "European centre for Nazi information."

According to well informed sources, neo-Nazis in Spain are planning to start next weekend an anti-Semitic campaign around the theme of globalization and a purported international Jewish conspiracy to control the world economy. They have invited former leader of the racist and anti-Semitic Ku Klux Klan, David Duke, to attend a meeting in Spain.

<http://www.ejpress.org/article/21780#>

FRENCH MAN CONVICTED FOR EXPRESSING OPINION

Vincent Reynouard was convicted for writing a 16-page pamphlet

Paris, 2007-11-15 (mathaba) A pamphlet called *Holocaust? The Hidden Facts* which was written in 2005 and sent to various museums and towns halls across France, pointing out that the number of deaths popularly claimed as being six million Jews during World War II was impossible, has resulted in the conviction of a Frenchman.

Vincent Reynouard was convicted by a criminal court in Saverne, in the east France, in his absence. He is unemployed and lives in Belgium. He was sentenced to one year in prison and fined 10,000 euros and 3,300 euros of damages to be paid to the plaintiffs. There was no demand for his

immediate arrest and his lawyer is appealing the judgement which therefore suspends its execution automatically under French law.

In France there is no right to freedom of opinion on the singular issue of the popular theory of the Jewish Holocaust, such as questioning the number of Jews killed, even though the number has been officially revised downward several times and now is said to have been 1 million. "The countries of the European Union are sinking into the suppression of freedom of opinion. We are not a free country anymore", his lawyer, **Eric Delcroix** commented.

It is not a crime in France to say that no Africans were murdered during the slave trade, nor in the occupation of much of Africa by France, nor is it a crime to say the Pope has given birth to twins, or is a Satanist, nor is it a crime to question any other aspect of scientific exploration or historic revisionism. Commentators and analysts of the phenomenon of European prosecutions for questioning aspects of the Holocaust, even labeling such as Holocaust "Denial", point out that if people state things that are considered absurd or laughable or have no basis in fact, they do not face criminal charges, thus leading to the conclusion that the Holocaust "Six Million" theory is being upheld by force of law.

"It is also not a crime for any politician in any European country to go to elections and lie to the nation about anything, including election promises, even if the politician after election proceeds to do the opposite or is found to have been lying. No citizen can bring a charge against anyone, not even those mandated to serve the public and national good, for lying is not considered a crime under the law" remarked one citizen in response to the news of the charge against Vincent Reynouard.

Another commented "All they have is prison and persecution. They cannot prove the man wrong, so they kill the messenger", while an American said in response to the news: "I guess that's what happens when you elect a known Israeli Mossad agent. Good luck France and welcome to our nightmare."

<http://mathaba.net/news/?x=571009>

FIRST AMENDMENT

Neo-Nazi Gary Lauck of Nebraska hosts about 80 foreign Web sites.

1st Amendment lets fringe groups use U.S. sites to spread their message around the world

By **Russell Working**

It might come as a surprise to the soldiers who defeated fascism in World War II, but the United States has become a refuge for Nazism and other brands of extremism over the last decade. On the Internet, that is.

Hundreds of foreign-language Web sites -- some tied to the Chicago area -- are using U.S. servers to dodge laws abroad that prohibit Holocaust denial or racist and anti-Semitic speech. Run by hosts in the United States, they thrive out of reach of prosecutors in Europe, Canada and elsewhere.

Locally, the connections range from **Radio Islam**, a hate site inspired by a Moroccan exile in Sweden, to a site created by a former Cicero man who was extradited to Germany for Holocaust denial. One Chicago server company is home to as many as 17 hate sites, eight of them European, a watchdog group said.

In the past, Berlin has estimated that computers in the United States host 800 such sites in the German language alone, although its embassy in Washington says no current count is available. The noxious sites, often filled with anti-Semitism or crude ranting about blacks and immigrants, spotlight a trans-Atlantic divide over hate speech. Many European countries have criminalized Holocaust denial or racist speech, while the 1st Amendment grants Nazis and other fringe groups the freedom to spread their message in the U.S.

"Essentially, our view is it's better to be able to confront their ideas and see what they're up to," said Mark Potok of the Southern Poverty Law Center, a civil rights organization. "But most Europeans regard the Americans as insane on this point. They really do." Radio Islam, which lists a Chicago post office box as its contact address, has frustrated the Swedish government for years, prosecutors said in phone interviews. It is hosted on a server in Washington state, and its contents include paranoid writings and the complete text of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in at least 17 languages. Much of the site is

devoted to extolling **Ahmed Rami**, a Moroccan exile in Sweden who claims he fled to Europe after attempting to assassinate his country's king. In his adopted home, he made vitriolic radio broadcasts until Swedish authorities shut down his program and jailed him in the 1990s.

But suddenly the U.S.-based Radio Islam Web site popped up promoting Rami's paranoid views that the United States is occupied by Jewish forces, Hitler was a misunderstood hero, and Judaism is not a religion, but a "dangerous Mafia." In an interview from Stockholm, Rami claimed to have nothing to do with the site. "It's a group of men or teenagers who put it up," Rami said. "Sometimes I write something, and it ends up on their Web site." (The Rami-oriented site has nothing to do with another Chicago-based Radio Islam, which disavows racism and reports it has interviewed Holocaust survivors on the air.)

Chicago-area attack in '99

Little study has been done on the extent to which the Web inspires real-world crime, but Brian Marcus, director of Internet monitoring with the **Anti-Defamation League** in New York, said cyber hate motivated Benjamin Smith, a Wilmette man who shot his way across Illinois and Indiana in 1999. He targeted blacks, Jews and Asians, killing two people and wounding nine before committing suicide.

"[Smith] even said in an interview that it was through the Internet that he discovered the World Church of the Creator," Marcus said, referring to an Illinois group now called the Creativity Movement. "And then in July 1999 he goes on a real-world, multistate killing spree." The violence is not limited to the United States.

British and Polish journalists and human-rights activists have demanded their governments shut down two allied hate sites called *Redwatch*. The sites publish "enemies lists" with home addresses, and they have been blamed for egging on violence by the far right. British journalist Peter Lazenby, a reporter for the *Yorkshire Evening Post*, found his photographs and former address posted on the British version of *Redwatch*, which maintains three Web addresses on U.S. servers. After *Redwatch* posted its blacklist, a thug stabbed a trade union leader in the face outside his home last year, and two schoolteachers' home and car were firebombed in 2003.

"The government says because these sites are based in the United States and [because of] your 1st Amendment, nothing can be done," Lazenby said from Leeds, England. "Well, they certainly manage to shut down pedophile sites and arrest the people behind them."

Redwatch says it doesn't encourage violence and was created in response to leftists' attacks on white nationalists. "We consider Marxists and Capitalists as traitors and they will face the people's courts someday to pay for their crimes," *Redwatch* said in an online statement. In Warsaw, authorities have struggled to shut down the U.S.-hosted, Polish-language *Redwatch*. The site promotes the message of the Creativity Movement, which formed in Illinois and has long included Chicago Polish neo-Nazis.

A multilingual Web site established by a Cicero man continues to sell literature and raise money for the man's defense even though he was deported to Germany in 2005 to serve a prison term for Holocaust denial. In 1995, the man, a German citizen named **Germer Rudolf**, registered a site for the Belgian Foundation Vrij Historisch Onderzoek (Free Historical Research). Pressured by authorities there, he moved his publishing operation to England and then New York. The site is now hosted on a Texas server. A former chemist, Rudolf wrote a 1993 report in Germany that disputed the Nazi gassing of Jews at the Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland. He was convicted of inciting racial hatred and fled, eventually entering the U.S. illegally from Mexico, federal officials said.

'The cost of this freedom'

Karl Zimmerman -- whose Steadfast Networks in Chicago has hosted as many as 17 hate sites, according to the Anti-Defamation League -- said there are only two Web sites he knows of that have drawn several complaints, although some companies that are customers may host other sites. Zimmerman said that as long as the content is legal, Steadfast doesn't enter into a debate about the content.

"Yes, there will be cases where we don't agree with what is said, but that is the cost of this freedom," Zimmerman said Monday in an e-mail. One of the most prolific hosts of foreign racist sites is **Gary Lauck** of Lincoln, Neb., a former Chicago resident who claims to head the American branch of the National Socialist German Workers Party. Lauck, who spent time in a German prison for racial hatred, hosts about 80 German, Swedish and other foreign Web sites. Clients often approach Lauck through anonymous e-mails, so that even he doesn't know their identity.

"We'll say, 'OK, in the future, all you do is send an envelope with some Euro bank notes in it and say this is for Web site XYZ,'" Lauck said. One client is the Danish National Socialist Movement. While the Nazi party is legal there, it asked Lauck to host its backup Web site. "We had an attack by left-

wings a short while ago," said party leader Jonni Hansen, "and our Web hosting by Lauck rescued us, because we were thrown out of the Danish Web server."

Stormfront White Nationalist Community, based in West Palm Beach, Fla., is the giant of international Web hate sites. It hosts discussion groups in 20 languages and boasts more than 111,000 members. Spokesman Jamie Kelso portrays Stormfront as simply a white-interests organization, not unlike those that lobby for blacks or Latinos. But Stormfront members exchange racial slurs and cheer on violent video of Russian skinheads beating up minorities.

Kelso said it's clear why the site draws foreigners. "No other country has a 1st Amendment," he said. "In Canada, where we're very big, you can be jailed for what's called hate speech. You can be jailed and fined and sanctioned. Same thing in Germany." The connections of the Rami-oriented Radio Islam to Chicago are as obscure as the link to Rami, the Swedish-Moroccan founder of the radio program. The site is held by a **Mohamed William**, but a letter to the Chicago post office box went unanswered.

Whether he is behind Radio Islam, Rami is delighted with the site -- and the potential of the Web. "The Internet is more free," he said. "It's difficult to control. The Internet is a fantastic revolution in the modern times."

Tribune staff reporter. 8:13 AM CST, November 13, 2007. Tribune researcher Lelia Arnheim and Polish freelance reporter Magdalena Gorlas contributed to this report. rworking@tribune.com 2007, *Chicago Tribune* <http://www.chicagotribune.com/>
http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chi-naziweb_13nov13,1,3624119.story

FIRST AMENDMENT, BUT NOT FOR EVERY ONE

Holocaust denial squashed by Aspen TV **Board chief says movie 'bigoted' and 'historically inaccurate'**

A public access television station in Aspen, which boasts of being the first such station in the nation, for the first time in remembrance has decided to squash a movie – at least for now – targeting an Australian production that denies the Holocaust happened and affirms the gas chambers saved lives by disinfecting prisoners.

The controversy has stirred up the trendy Aspen, where the local public access television station, after 35 years of service, rarely creates turmoil and more often features the heart-pounding action of the local high school football team, or local school theatrical productions. But in this case, the words have been strong.

The video is "very offensive," **GrassRoots TV** board president Alan Feldman told the local Aspen Daily News. "Especially with my background. I'm Jewish. My family was murdered in the Holocaust."

The production is called "Judea Declares War on Germany: A Critical Look at World War II" and was scheduled to air this week. Officials pulled it because of the objections, and the full board is scheduled to meet later this week to discuss its final outcome.

It was proposed for airing by Steve Campbell, a resident of nearby Glenwood Springs. It was created by Australia's **Adelaide Institute**, which conducts Holocaust denial campaigns, and is hosted by institute founder Fredric Toben, who was featured at a Holocaust denial conference attended by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad last December.

It concludes the Holocaust is a "hoax" and "legend," a stance with which Campbell agreed.

"There's tons of information on this that shows that the story we have been told in the movies just is not true," Campbell told the newspaper. "People just have to do some research. But unfortunately, it's upsetting to a lot of people. Even Mr. Feldman, I'm sure if he really did some research on this he would find some facts that he was unaware of and would change his views."

So much for finding middle ground. Even GrassRoots Executive Director John Masters said the film was "offensive."

"This film is offensive not only to Jews in the world but to any sensible person," Masters said. It plays like "an homage to [Joseph] Goebbels."

A board meeting is scheduled Thursday for the television station to determine how the video will be handled. Master, who has been with the station six years, said he couldn't recall anything else that had been such an issue over program content that the board had been involved.

Campbell, who founded Citizens for 9/11 Truth, said the video simply raises questions about historical "assumptions."

"I think there's a lot of preconceived ideas that have been indoctrinated into people's minds as to what the Holocaust is all about," Campbell told the *Daily News*. He suggested showing the film and allowing people to decide for themselves.

In the film, Toben describes the "alleged" concentration camp gas chambers as a life-saving procedure in which prisoners were disinfected. "You are not supposed to learn these historical facts, which are contained in this video," he said on-screen.

The Daily News reported Campbell has been instrumental in airings of previous controversial films on GrassRoots, including those "debunking" the Sept. 11 attack, but he said he hasn't encountered this reaction before.

"I'd think the board members would look at the GrassRoots policies and say that [the film] doesn't fall into the realm of something [pornography and obscenity] that deserves censorship," Campbell said.

Begun in 1971, GrassRoots airs community programs twice for free and charges for additional screenings or special placement, Masters said.

Feldman said the board is not avoiding the issue, but is giving the issue "tremendous attention."

"Certainly I think this world would be a much better place if we didn't have to address issues of bigotry and anti-Semitism," Feldman said. "But I also welcome the opportunity to address them from an intellectual standpoint."

"The whole idea of Holocaust denial flies in the face of one of the most-documented events in human history," said Bruce DeBoskey. "It fans the fires of anti-Semitism. To suggest that millions weren't murdered in a Nazi regime is just contrary to so much documented history. ... It's insulting."

He's the regional director of the mountain states office of the Anti-Defamation League in Denver.

Feldman said the issue is a "slippery slope," because in Germany it's a crime to advocate the Holocaust was exaggerated or fabricated.

"In my opinion it would be extraordinarily offensive to some people," he said. "That's why I decided to, with the assistance of my board, halt the airing of the film to discuss it. It's an open meeting and we invited anybody who has anything to say to come in and provide their viewpoint."

The station's philosophy is unlimited opportunity of access and it previously has leaned towards free speech and expression.

"There's a point beyond which free speech is not the overriding principle," DeBoskey told the newspaper, "and when you're putting forth a blatant lie about history, then you get to that point where the scales begin to tip in the other direction."

9 October 2007

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=58048

WERGELD

The European Court Awards Compensation to a Journalist who Fights Antisemitism

On 15th November, 2007, the European Court on Human Rights exonerated the Austrian journalist **Karl Feiffer** of the charge of having "caused the suicide" of a **German antisemite**. The decision was handed down regarding a very complicated issue which included freedom of speech, slander and antisemitism. The Court decided in favor of the veteran journalist and determined that the

Austrian courts had not defended Feiffer's good reputation. It decided that the Austrian Government must pay Feiffer 5,000 euros and a further 10,000 euros to cover court costs.

The European Court of Human Rights, which sits in Strasbourg, France, decided that the Austrian court had violated article 8 (the right to a private life) in the European Convention on Human Rights in that it "failed to preserve the balance between freedom of expression and the right of the plaintiff to protect his good reputation".

The course of events:

1995 – Professor **Werner Fiefenberger**, a German lecturer, published an antisemitic article; Feiffer published a reaction and was sued for slander.

1997-1998 – The courts rejected the suit and said that in his reaction to the article Feiffer had expressed a position supported by facts.

2000 – The Austrian General Prosecutor charged Fiefenberg with engaging in Nazi activity. A short time later, Fiefenberg committed suicide.

2000-2002 – An Austrian newspaper accused Feiffer of causing Fiefenberg's suicide. Feiffer sued the newspaper, but the court decided that he was "morally" responsible for the suicide.

2003 – Feiffer appealed to European Court of Human Rights against the Austrian court and the Austrian government.

2007 – The Court of Human Rights exonerates Feiffer and decides that Austria did not protect his good reputation. It determines that Austria pay Feiffer compensation and cover all court costs.

As mentioned above, on 15th November Feiffer won the case and said: "As if it weren't enough to suffer three years of delay of justice in the Austrian courts simply because I didn't believe that the Jews had declared war on Germany, seeing the judge wagging her finger at me and accusing me of being morally responsible for the suicide of was unbearable. The antisemitic journal *Zur Zeit* continues to be subsidized by the Austrian government".

[http://www.antisemitism.org.il/eng/struggle/26279/Austria –
The European Court Awards Compensation to a Journalist who Fights Antisemitism](http://www.antisemitism.org.il/eng/struggle/26279/Austria_-_The_European_Court_Awards_Compensation_to_a_Journalist_who_Fights_Antisemitism)

THE MEANING OF *NEVER AGAIN?*

Islamophobia and Holocaust Denial

Some reflections on Holocaust denial in the Muslim world: Finkelstein speaks at Islamophobia conference in Istanbul

By **Norman G. Finkelstein**

A frequent allegation used to demonize Muslims is that Holocaust denial is widespread in the Muslim world. Recent remarks by President Achmadinejad of Iran seem to have reinforced this prejudice against Muslims. **No rational person** can deny that during World War II the Nazis and their collaborators systematically murdered 5-6 million European Jews.

It is correct that no truth is sacred and that in the course of time even what seem to be the most obvious truths have frequently been shown to be false. It is equally correct that human beings are fallible, none has a monopoly on truth, and an overwhelming majority can be wrong while a minority of one can be right.

However serious persons are also very careful before rejecting an obvious truth that is supported by a vast amount of evidence. It requires more than showing that a fact here or there might be wrong to demolish a scholarly edifice constructed over many years and labored on by many competent minds. [*This is an effort that Good Old Norman never dared to try.*]

In the case of truths that bear on moral concerns such as human suffering compassionate human beings are especially cautious to question established truths because of the needless offense and injury they might cause. Japanese would rightfully be outraged if someone were to say, But isn't it *possible* that the U.S. did not drop an atomic bombing on Hiroshima?, just as Iranians would be rightfully outraged if someone were to say, But isn't it *possible* that the U.S. did not overthrow the Mossadeq regime and the SAVAK did not torture political prisoners. In addition, every culture, every religion honors the memory of the dead and one aspect of honoring that memory is respecting the specific circumstances of their deaths. It should be obvious that it is deeply offensive to rewrite these circumstances for the sake of political convenience or, worse, for amusement.

Yet, there are many understandable reasons why Holocaust denial is to be found in the Muslim world. The assertion that the Nazis exterminated millions of Jews in an assembly-line fashion *does* seem hard to believe. I remember a very decent Palestinian in a refugee camp whispering to me not in malice but in wonderment, Did it *really* happen? In fact **many Jewish leaders in the West did not believe it themselves when witnesses from the death camps managed to escape and inform them.**

Moreover, because Israel has consistently lied about the history of the Israel-Arab conflict, alleging that Palestine was empty before the Jews came and that the Arabs are responsible for all the wars Israel has fought, it is unsurprising that many Arabs would also conclude that Israel is lying about what happened to Jews during World War II. It is also true that the Nazi holocaust has been used as a weapon to legitimize Israel's crimes against the Palestinians as well as against its Arab neighbors. It is often said that because of the unique suffering of Jews during World War II it is understandable that Israel sometimes goes to extremes to defend itself. Because the Nazi holocaust has been used to deny Palestinians their rights, it was perhaps inevitable that some Palestinians would seek to deny the Nazi holocaust in order to "neutralize" this potent weapon.

However, another approach, which also has the virtue of being consistent with truth and morality, is to turn this weapon against Israel's brutal policies. The meaning of the Nazi holocaust should not be Never Again to Jews but Never Again to *Anyone*. The lesson of the Nazi holocaust should not be to rank human suffering in order to diminish the horror of "lesser" forms of human suffering. Instead, as the *epitome* of human suffering the lesson of the Nazi holocaust should be to sensitize us to *all* forms of human suffering. Wherever there is mayhem and murder, wherever there is hunger and homelessness, wherever there is discrimination and degradation – there is the Nazi holocaust. That, at any rate, is the lesson my late parents, who survived the Nazi holocaust, taught me.

It might also be noted that the U.S. and Israel typically invoke the memory of the Nazi holocaust for the purpose not of averting the horrors of war but to justify inflicting them. Whenever the United States and Israel prepare to attack Muslims it is almost always the case that the leaders will be compared to Hitler. In the 1950s-1960s Nasser was compared to Hitler, in the 1990s and again in the 2000s Hussein was compared to Hitler. Now Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran are being compared to Hitler. Those who oppose the illegal war plans of the U.S. and Israel are accused of being like the appeasers of Hitler. It is hard to conceive a more cynical exploitation of the suffering of Jews during World War II than its use to justify murderous wars of aggression.

It should finally be said that before the so-called West deplores Holocaust denial in the Muslim world, it should take a closer look at itself. The U.S.-imposed economic sanctions against Iraq in the 1990s were responsible for the deaths of many hundreds of thousands of Iraqi children. Respected United Nations officials called these sanctions genocidal, yet U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said that the "price is worth it." She did worse than deny genocide; she *justified* it.

In the 1980s during the U.S.-backed wars in Central America, tens of thousands of Guatemalans, Salvadorans and Nicaraguans were killed. The Truth Commission of Guatemala called it a genocide. But in bestselling books nowadays it is said that these murderous wars are a model for how to defeat the insurgents in Iraq. Is this the meaning of *Never Again*?

In the 1960s-1970s during the U.S. aggression against Indochina, 3-4 million Vietnamese, Cambodians and Laotians were killed. But the only question that is asked in the U.S. is, When will the Vietnamese apologize for what they did to *us*?

The Muslim world is demonized for denying the Nazi holocaust. And it is undoubtedly true that, however understandable, such denial is wrong. Indeed, it shames and demeans the deniers not those whose martyrdom is being questioned.

It is true that the U.S. does not deny the many holocausts it has committed. But this is because to deny a fact you first have to acknowledge its existence. The U.S. has not yet even taken this first step of acknowledging the existence of the numberless colossal crimes it has committed.

PROMOTION

New Zealand Holocaust denier appointed dean

A New Zealand historian whose work denied the existence of gas chambers at Auschwitz was appointed dean of a key British defense school. **Joel Hayward** was appointed dean of the Royal Air Force College at Cranwell last year, Britain's *Jewish Chronicle* revealed last Friday. Britain's Prince William currently is training at the college to be a pilot. Hayward, 44, became infamous in New Zealand after his 1993 masters' thesis on the historiography of Holocaust denial prompted furor in the local Jewish community, which demanded unsuccessfully that Canterbury University revoke his degree.

Once described by notorious British Holocaust denier David Irving as "New Zealand's leading Holocaust historian," Hayward's thesis was subject to an inquiry by Canterbury University. Although its report in 2000 found that Hayward's conclusions about the Holocaust were "seriously flawed," it did not cancel his master's degree. Hayward later issued an apology, saying he "regretted working on such a complex topic without sufficient knowledge and preparation." Hayward claims Jewish descent through his grandmother and said he was involved in pro-Israel organizations and campaigns against anti-Semitism, according to the report in the *Jewish Chronicle*.

<http://www.jta.org/cgi-bin/iowa/breaking/106767.html>

We have a replete file on this incredible affair and since the man has survived and found a (good) job, we reinstated his thesis which we had found readable.

The Fate of Jews in German Hands

<http://www.aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres8/hay.pdf>

The Hayward file : <http://www.aaargh.com.mx/engl/hay/hayindex.html>

MIND CONTROL

European Jewish group calls for stiffer penalties for hate crimes in Greece

ATHENS (EJP) The president of the European Jewish Congress, Moshe Kantor, has called on Greece to introduce stiffer penalties for hate crimes and voiced concern over the rise of an extreme-right party, during a meeting Monday in Athens with Greek President Karolos Papoulias.

The European Jewish Congress delegation, which was accompanied by the president of the Jewish Community, Moise Constantinis, met also with Greek Prime Minister Costas Karamanlis and Foreign Minister Dora Bakoyannis.

At the meeting, Kantor called for Greece to become more involved in promoting education about the Holocaust and to "stem the growing tide of anti-Semitism and xenophobia". He voiced particular concern over the rise of the far-right Popular Orthodox Rally (L.A.O.S.), a nationalist political party led by controversial journalist Georgios Karatzaferis. The party has entered the Greek Parliament.

During the meeting, the Greek president recalled the fate of the Jewish community in his native city of Ioannina that was almost entirely exterminated in the Nazi concentration camps during WWII, underlining the personal loss that this entailed. "You understand that I spent my childhood years with classmates and friends, girls and boys, from the Jewish community and that cannot be forgotten," Papoulias stressed. Papoulias expressed support for the Mideast peace process and hope that it would "finally reach a happy conclusion." He said that this would require a "certain bravery and a great compromise, a historic compromise." "Both the state of Israel must exist in safe borders and a Palestinian state, which has much to gain from its cooperation with the state of Israel."

Monday night, the Greek Foreign Minister was scheduled to address a Holocaust commemoration event marking the National Day of Remembrance of the Greek Jews who perished during the Holocaust. The event was organized jointly by the Athens prefecture, the Central Jewish Council of Greece and the Jewish communities of Athens and Salonika.

<http://www.ejpress.org/article/23966#>

MONEY MONEY MONEY

The *Shoah* must go on

Anne Frank Fund tries to stop musical based on her life
Legal action is now possible against Spanish producers of show, less than a month ahead of its premiere

By **Graham Keeley**

The Independent, London Sunday, 3 February 2008

BARCELONA — The legal guardians of Anne Frank's memory have stepped in at the 11th hour to try to stop a controversial Spanish musical about the life of one of the Holocaust's best-known victims going ahead.

Rafael Alvero, producer of *The Diary of Anne Frank: A Song to Life*, which is in rehearsal for its opening in Madrid, claims he spent 10 years obtaining approval for the **first song-and-dance version** of the teenage diarist's story. But the Swiss-based Anne Frank Fund, headed by the only living member of the family, Bernard "Buddy" Elias, is demanding a halt to the show. Christopher Knoch, a member of the fund's board, said: "The Anne Frank Fund has granted no rights for the musical by Rafael Alvero. On the contrary, we have requested him to desist from such a production." The fund could take legal action to stop the musical's premiere on 28 February. Mr. Alvero appears to have fallen foul of a long-running battle over Anne Frank's legacy. The fund holds the copyright to Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young Girl*, which has sold more than 30 million copies in 60 languages.

It's about the money

It also controls the rights to film and theatrical productions and guards them jealously: even Steven Spielberg was turned down when he wanted to make a film about the diarist, who hid in an Amsterdam house with her family and four other Jews during the Second World War. In 1944 they were betrayed to the Nazis and sent to the death camps. Only Otto Frank, Anne's father, survived. Otto Frank set up two bodies to perpetuate his daughter's memory. In Amsterdam the family's hiding place was turned into a museum, run by the Anne Frank Foundation, which also undertakes worldwide education projects on the Holocaust. But the money from her book and all adaptations of it goes to the fund in Switzerland, where Otto Frank ended his days. This has caused tension in the past with the Amsterdam-based body, which complained that it was chronically short of funds. A decade ago, the two organizations faced each other in a Swiss court. The fund claimed that the foundation was trespassing on its territory by copyrighting the name of Anne Frank around the world. The museum said this was necessary to stop its educational materials being plagiarized, but the Swiss body said Anne Frank's name could end up on souvenir pencils and T-shirts. The court decided in favor of the foundation, however.

Museum visit inspires musical idea

Mr. Alvero said he first had the idea of presenting Anne Frank's story as a musical when he visited the Anne Frank Museum with his 13-year-old son, David. He spent the next decade convincing the foundation, as well as potential backers, that such a

production would be tasteful. "I took my time to persuade the foundation, which has now seen that it is a responsible work," he said in an interview earlier this year. "We managed to convince Anne's only living relative, her cousin, Buddy Elias." He declined to comment after the broadside from Mr Elias's Anne Frank Fund, referring questions to the Anne Frank Foundation. Jan Erik Dubbelman, of the Anne Frank Foundation in Amsterdam, said: "This production respects the message of tolerance within the tragedy that we want to keep alive." The strong feelings aroused by the teenager's testament were emphasized last month when a chestnut tree she mentions in her diary was saved after a legal wrangle in Amsterdam. The tree, which she could glimpse from her hiding place, was due to be cut down, but will be propped up with steel beams at a cost of £35,000 (\$52,500).

<http://www.independent.co.uk:80/news/europe/anne-frank-fund-tries-to-stop-musical-based-on-her-life-777512.html>

DRUGS

Revisionism for Our Time

By Murray N. Rothbard

This article first appeared in the Rampart Journal of Individualist Thought, Spring 1966.

Revisionism as applied to World War II and its origins (as also for previous wars) has the general function of bringing historical truth to an American and a world public that had been drugged by wartime lies and propaganda. This, in itself, is a virtue. But some truths of history, of course, may be largely of antiquarian interest, with little relevance to present-day concerns. This is not true of World War II revisionism, which has much critical significance for today's world.

The *least* of the lessons that revisionism can teach has already been thoroughly learned: that Germany and Japan are not uniquely "aggressor nations," doomed from birth to menace the peace of the world. The larger lessons have, unfortunately, yet to be learned.

The United States is again being subjected to that "complex of fear and vaunting" (in the brilliant phrase of Garet Garrett's) which drove us, and the Western world, into two other disastrous wars in our century. Once again, the American public is being subjected to a nearly unanimous barrage of war propaganda and war hysteria, so that only the most searching and rational can keep their heads. Once again, we find that there has emerged upon the scene an Enemy, a Bad Guy, with the same old Bad Guy characteristics that we have heard of before; a diabolic, monolithic Enemy, which, generations ago in some "sacred texts," decided (for reasons that remain obscure) that it was "out to conquer the world."

Since then, the Enemy, darkly, secretly, diabolically, has "plotted," conspiratorially, to conquer the world, building up a vast and mighty and overwhelming military machine, and also constructing a mighty international and "subversive" "fifth column," which functions as an army of mere puppets, agents of the Enemy's central headquarters, ready to commit espionage, sabotage, or any other act of "undermining" other states. The Enemy, then, is "monolithic," ruled solely and strictly from the top, by a few master rulers, and is dominated always by the single purpose of world conquest. The model to keep in mind is Dr. Fu Manchu, here trotted forward as an international bogeyman.

The Enemy, then, says the war propaganda, is guided by but one purpose: conquest of the world. He never suffers from such human emotions as fear — fear that *we* might attack *him* — or belief that he is acting in defense, or out of self-respect and the desire to save face before himself as well as before others. Neither does he possess such human qualities as reason.

No, there is only one other emotion that can sway him: superior force will compel him to "back down." This is because, even though a Fu Manchu, he is also like the Bad Guy in the movie Western: he will cower before the Good Guy if the Good Guy is strong, armed to the teeth, resolute of purpose, etc. Hence, the complex of fear and vaunting: fear of the supposedly implacable and permanent plotting of the Enemy; vaunting of the enormous military might of America and its meddling throughout the world, to "contain," "roll back," etc., the Enemy, or to "liberate" the "oppressed nations."

Now revisionism teaches us that this entire myth, so prevalent then and even now about Hitler, and about the Japanese, is a tissue of fallacies from beginning to end. Every plank in this nightmare evidence is either completely untrue or not entirely the truth. If people should learn this intellectual fraud about Hitler's Germany, then they will begin to ask questions, and searching questions, about the current World War III version of the same myth. Nothing would stop the current headlong flight to war faster, or more surely cause people to begin to reason about foreign affairs once again, after a long orgy of emotion and cliché.

For the same myth is now based on the same old fallacies. And this is seen by the increasing use that the Cold Warriors have been making of the "Munich myth": the continually repeated charge that it was the "appeasement" of the "aggressor" at Munich that "fed" his "aggression" (again, the Fu Manchu, or Wild Beast, comparison), and that caused the "aggressor," drunk with his conquests, to launch World War II. This Munich myth has been used as one of the leading arguments against any sort of rational negotiations with the Communist nations, and the stigmatizing of even the most harmless search for agreement as "appeasement." It is for this reason that [A.J.P. Taylor's](#) magnificent *Origins of the Second World War* received probably its most distorted and frenetic review in the pages of *National Review*.

It is about time that Americans learn: that Bad Guys (Nazis or Communists) may not necessarily want or desire war, or be out to "conquer" the world (their hope for "conquest" may be strictly ideological and not military at all); that Bad Guys may also fear the possibility of *our* use of our enormous military might and aggressive posture to *attack* them; that both the Bad Guys and Good Guys may have common interests which make negotiation possible (e.g., that neither wants to be annihilated by nuclear weapons); that *no* organization is a "monolith," and that "agents" are often simply ideological allies who can and do split with their supposed "masters"; and that, finally, we may learn the most profound lesson of all: that the domestic policy of a government is often no index whatever to its foreign policy.

We are still, in the last analysis, suffering from the delusion of Woodrow Wilson: that "democracies" *ipso facto* will never embark on war, and that "dictatorships" are always prone to engage in war. Much as we may and do abhor the domestic programs of most dictators (and certainly of the Nazis and Communists), this has no necessary relation to their foreign policies: indeed, many dictatorships have been passive and static in history, and, contrariwise, many democracies have led in promoting and waging war. Revisionism may, once and for all, be able to destroy this Wilsonian myth.

There is only one real difference between the capacity of a democracy and a dictatorship to wage war: democracies invariably engage much more widely in deceptive war propaganda, to whip up and persuade the public. Democracies that wage war need to produce much more propaganda to whip up their citizens, and at the same time to camouflage their policies much more intensely in hypocritical moral cant to fool the voters. The lack of need for this on the part of dictatorships often makes their policies seem superficially to be more warlike, and this is one of the reasons why they have had a "bad press" in this century.

The task of revisionism has been to penetrate beneath these superficialities and appearances to the stark realities underneath — realities which show, certainly in this century, the United States, Great Britain, and France — the three great "democracies" — to be worse than any other three countries in fomenting and waging aggressive war. Realization of this truth would be of incalculable importance on the current scene.

Conservatives should not need to be reminded of the flimsiness of the "democratic"

myth; we are familiar now with the concept of "totalitarian democracy," of the frequent propensity of the masses to tyrannize over minorities. If conservatives can see this truth in domestic affairs, why not in foreign?

There are many other, more specific but also important, lessons that revisionism can teach us. The Cold War, as well as World Wars I and II, has been launched by the Western democracies so as to meddle in the affairs of Eastern Europe. The great power-fact about Eastern Europe is that the smaller nations there are fated to be under the dominance, friendly or otherwise, of Germany or Russia.

In World War I, the United States and Britain went to war partly to help Russia expand into the part of Eastern Europe then dominated by Austria-Hungary and Germany. This act of meddling on our part, at the cost of untold lives, both West and East, and of an enormous increase in militarism, statism, and socialism at home, led to a situation in Eastern Europe which brought the United States and Britain into World War II, to keep *Germany* from dominating Eastern Europe.

As soon as World War II was over (with its enormous consequent increase in statism, militarism, and socialism in the United States), the US and Britain felt they had to launch a Cold War to oust Russia from the dominance over Eastern Europe which it had obtained as a natural consequence of the joint defeat of Germany. How much longer is the United States to play with the fate of the American people, or even the human race itself, for the sake of imposing a solution of our own liking on Eastern Europe? And if we should wage a holocaust to "destroy communism," and there should (doubtfully) be any Americans remaining, how distinguishable from communism will the American system, in reality, be?

There have been two major facets to the Cold War: trying to establish US and British hegemony over Eastern Europe, and attempting to suppress nationalist revolutions that would take undeveloped countries outside of the Western imperialist orbit. Here again, revisionism of World War II has important lessons to teach us today. For in World War I, England, backed by the United States, went to war against Germany to try to hobble an important commercial competitor which had started late in the imperialist game. Before World Wars I and II, Britain and France tried to preserve their imperialist domination as against the "have-not" nations Germany and Japan that came late in the imperialist race.

And now, after World War II, the United States has assumed the imperialist scepter from the weakened hands of Britain and France. Revisionism thus provides us with the insight that America has now become the world colossus of imperialism, propping up puppet and client states all over the undeveloped areas of the world, and fiercely attempting to suppress nationalist revolutions that would take these countries out of the American imperial orbit.

As Garet Garrett also said: "We have crossed the boundary that lies between republic and empire." Communism having allied itself with the immensely popular movements of national liberation against imperialism, the United States, in the hypocritical name of "freedom," is now engaged in the logical conclusion of its Cold War policy: attempting to exterminate a whole nation in Vietnam to make very sure that *they* are rather dead than Red — and to preserve American imperial rule.

All these lessons revisionism has to teach us. For revisionism, in the final analysis, is based on truth and rationality. Truth and rationality are always the first victims in any war frenzy; and they are, therefore, once again an extremely rare commodity on today's "market." Revisionism brings to the artificial frenzy of daily events and day-to-day propaganda, the cool but in the last analysis glorious light of historical truth. Such truth is almost desperately needed in today's world.

[Murray N. Rothbard](#) (1926–1995) was dean of the Austrian School. See his [archive](#). Comment on the [blog](#). This article first appeared in the *Rampart Journal of Individualist Thought*, Spring 1966. [Posted on 6/29/2007](#)

TALKING WITH A REVISIONIST ?

A Disgusting Display of Hypocrisy

By Lawrence Uniglicht

Wearing a black skullcap, U.S. President George W. Bush walks somberly past photographs of Holocaust victims at Jerusalem's Hall of Remembrance. He rekindles an eternal flame and lays a wreath next to names of death camps etched on a grey marble floor. He respectfully utters, "I would hope if many people in the world would come to this place, it would be a sobering reminder that **evil exists** and a call that when we find evil, we must resist it." Bush later confers with **Mahmoud Abbas**, leader of the Palestinian Fatah party, a man he courts in order to presumably bring peace to the holy land. Yet **Abbas is an unrepentant Holocaust revisionist** who in the early 1980s, as an adult, wrote a doctoral thesis comparing Jews to Nazis, asserting Zionists collaborated with such filth in order to insure the world would feel sorry for Jews and bequeath them a homeland, suggesting gas chambers were not used in the Holocaust, and minimizing the number of Jews that were actually tortured, mutilated, and maimed during this most horrific period of the 20th century. Will the real George W. Bush please stand up! You cannot pay your respects to the victims of the Holocaust then break bread with a Holocaust revisionist who unabashedly disrespects those same victims! Period!

More essentially, why do Israeli Prime Minister Olmert and other high muckamucks, as well as Jewish Israeli citizens collectively, not decry this blatant hypocrisy, albeit perpetrated by the president of Israel's most formidable friend and allied nation? Furthermore, why aren't moral people worldwide, especially Diaspora Jews, appalled at this insensitive indeed cynical act of betrayal to six million Jews? Could it be out of ignorance? Are they not aware of Abbas' abomination? There is no excuse for such ignorance especially among world leaders! Below is an excerpt from *Holocaust Denial: A global Survey-2004* by Alex Grobman and Rafael Medoff from the David S. Wyman Institute For Holocaust Studies.'

"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' 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 28 May 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."

Surely, Abbas' dissertation so distorts the human tragedy of the Holocaust, so castigates Zionist Jews, there is no meaningful difference between the distortion and an outright denial that it ever happened. Indeed, Abbas would have no credibility at all, even among other Jew haters, if he was in total denial of the horrific genocide. There is way too much existing physical evidence. By attempting to twist history however, by lessening the extent and softening the nature of the butchery as well as cast aspersions on its victims, he in fact is more apt to sway minds yearning for excuses to support their anti-Jewish/anti-Israel proclivities. Furthermore, Abbas' assertion to *Ha'aretz* that the

Holocaust was a terrible thing is lip service paid to a Jewish newspaper by an Arab who likely wishes Hitler had succeeded in his quest to annihilate every Jew on earth.

Considering all this, **what demons have invaded the minds of those who accept the Holocaust revisionist** Abbas as an essential negotiator and partner in the peace process between Israelis and so-called Palestinian Arabs, thus disrespecting the spirit of each and every Holocaust victim? How dare a U.S. president be so unaware of the consequences of his behavior! How dare Israeli Prime Minister Olmert, Israeli Jews, Diaspora Jews and all men and women of good conscience worldwide remain silent at this disgusting display of hypocrisy!

Edited by IHC staff, www.infoisrael.net
Israel Hasbara Committee, Published 29 January 2008
<http://www.infoisrael.net/cgi-local/text.pl?source=4/d/i/290120081>

More info :

PALESTINIANS GET A HOLOCAUST DENIER AS FIRST PRIME MINISTER

Palestinians get a Holocaust denier as 1st prime minister

By Rafael Medoff
Jewish Bulletin of North California

While European Union officials praised Yasser Arafat's decision to appoint his first-ever prime minister, historians of the Holocaust winced at the news that a leading candidate for the job is the author of a book denying that the Nazis murdered 6 million Jews.

The candidate is Mahmoud Abbas (also known as Abu Mazen), Arafat's second in command, and his book, published in Arabic in 1983, translates as "*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.

The book repeatedly attempts to cast doubt on the fact that the Nazis slaughtered 6 million Jews, according to a translation provided by the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles. "Following the war," he writes, "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."

Abbas denies that the gas chambers were used to murder Jews, quoting a "scientific study" to that effect by French Holocaust-denier Robert Faurisson. Abbas' book then asserts: "The historian and author **Raoul Hilberg** thinks that the figure does not exceed 890,000."

That is, of course, utterly false. Hilberg, a distinguished historian and author of the classic study "The Destruction of the European Jews," has never said or written any such thing.

Abbas believes the 6 million figure is the product of a Zionist conspiracy: "It seems that the interest of the Zionist movement... is to inflate this figure so that their gains will be greater," he writes. "This led them to emphasize this figure 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."

Another falsehood. In fact, no serious scholar proposes such a figure.

After reducing the magnitude of the Nazi slaughter so that it no longer seems to have been a full-scale Holocaust, Abbas seeks to absolve the Nazis by blaming the Zionist leadership for whatever killings did take place. According to Abbas, "A partnership was established between Hitler's Nazis and the leadership of the Zionist movement... [the Zionists gave] permission to every racist in the world, led by Hitler and the Nazis, to treat Jews as they wish, so long as it guarantees immigration to Palestine."

In addition to encouraging the persecution of Jews so they would immigrate to the Holy Land, the Zionist leaders actually wanted Jews to be murdered, because – in Abbas' words – "having more victims meant greater rights and stronger privilege to join the negotiation table for dividing the spoils of war once it was over. However, since Zionism was not a fighting partner – suffering victims in a battle – it had no escape but to offer up human beings, under any name, to raise the number of victims, which they could then boast of at the moment of accounting."

Perhaps sentiments of this sort were common within Abbas' circle of graduate students in the Soviet Union in the 1970s. But in the free world, such propaganda has never been accepted as serious

scholarship.

In most Western countries, Holocaust-deniers have been treated as **pariahs**. In Canada and many European countries, Holocaust-denial is a criminal offense. In New Zealand, Canterbury University recently issued an apology for having accepting a master's thesis denying the Holocaust, while the French minister of education revoked a doctoral degree that was awarded to a Holocaust-denier by the University of Nantes. A Polish university professor who denied the Holocaust was suspended from his position. The Japanese publisher Bungei Shunju shut down one of its magazines for printing an article denying the Holocaust.

International pressure compelled **Croatian President Franjo Tudjman** to publicly retract statements in his book doubting that the Holocaust had taken place. Austrian Freedom Party leader Jorg Haider was ostracized by the international community for his remarks praising members of the SS, as was French politician Jean Marie Le Pen, for questioning the existence of the gas chambers and belittling the significance of the Holocaust. A recent poll found 64 percent of Americans believe world leaders should likewise refuse to meet with Abbas.

Yet some in the media have treated Abbas with kid gloves, to say the least. The official BBC News Profile of Abbas reports: "A highly intellectual man, Abbas studied law in Egypt before doing a Ph.D. in Moscow. He is the author of several books." *The New York Times* recently characterized Abbas as "a lawyer and historian... He holds a doctorate in history from the Moscow Oriental College; his topic was Zionism." Neither the BBC nor the *Times* offered any further explanation as to the contents of Abbas' writings.

Bestowing the title "historian" upon Mahmoud Abbas awards his writings a stature they do not deserve, and deals a grievous insult to every genuine historian.

If Abbas is elevated to the post of prime minister of the Palestinian Authority, not only the media but the entire international community will be confronted with the question of whether Abbas deserves to be treated any differently from Tudjman, Haider and Le Pen.

<http://www.tomgrossmedia.com/mideastdispatches/archives/000032.html>

It seems that the full translation of Abbas' book, supposedly done by non-Arabist Simon Wiesenthal Center, is not available online. Any information originating with the Wiesenthal Center must be considered as highly doubtful. The Center is part of a large ideological and political Zionist ring serving the interests of Israel's expansionism. The 1983 Arabic edition is no longer in print.

THE SPECIFICS HAVE CHANGED

Atrocity Gods

About the proposed EU Holocaust Denial Law

Ashley Howes

"Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past." George Orwell, "1984"

If the EU is going to craft new 'Holocaust Denial' legislation, surely it must first be defined. Mainly it is used to label those who, in the opinion of the one using the term, minimize the suffering of Jewish Holocaust victims and thereby foster the potential for future state-organised mass murder. The imagery of the über-industrial Holocaust is so gut-wrenchingly horrific that anyone challenging the story is deemed criminally guilty of intent to incite racial hatred or civic disorder.

The subjectivity involved in evaluating intent explains the many glaring examples of double standards surrounding the 'holocaust denial' controversy. For example: the 'establishment' historian **Raul Hilberg** states that the number of those murdered in Auschwitz was not four but one million, whilst the total number of Jews who died in WW II was not six but five million. When he makes such revisions, this is not considered 'denial'. Yet when an 'unapproved' historian such as David Irving cites the same figures or, for example, that the gas chamber at Auschwitz is a post-war Soviet construction, during his trial in Austria he was not allowed to bring in the Auschwitz director to testify because no question regarding the truth or falsehood of any aspect of the

Holocaust was allowed. In most courts where such cases are tried, there is virtually no defence against 'denial' accusations even if the revision in question is generally agreed-upon by 'non-denier' Holocaust historians.

Not only do these surreal double standards make Kafka appear a realist, but also the changing story makes defining the Holocaust, let alone 'denial', almost impossible. Although all mainstream 'approved' historians accept that the systematic mass murder of millions took place more or less as narrated, the specifics have changed considerably in the light of new evidence, usually uncovered by those they label 'deniers'. At first, the method was not gassing but steaming, mass burnings and so forth, with people sentenced to death based on numerous eyewitness testimonies (without cross-examination). Later, gassing was established as the main method with hundreds of further eyewitnesses recalling in graphic - and conflicting - detail as to how this was perpetrated in camps in Germany proper. But years - and more testimonies, convictions and executions - later, all mainstream holocaust historians agreed that there were no gassings within Germany, rather outside, most of them in the Auschwitz complex. But when later forensic analysis, witness cross-examinations and other documentary analysis (train schedules, official German inmate records released from Russian archives, trials etc.) revealed that this too was inaccurate, the numbers in Auschwitz shrank from four to around one million, **though the global total of six million remains.**

Whether or not the total is accurate or even important, always overlooked is this glaring fact: the latest approved version means that previous versions, largely based on eyewitness testimonies in this 'most documented event in world history', were false. In other words, even though we know for certain that many events - such as making soap from Jewish fat - did not occur as related **in sworn testimony** used to execute 'war criminals', pointing this out or challenging any aspect of a decades-old narrative riddled with inconsistencies and thousands of outright lies can be construed as hate speech, whereas the original falsehoods, which themselves are clearly hate speech - indeed blood libels - are neither characterized as such nor are the perpetrators prosecuted.

What matters, it seems, is not the facts but simply who is telling the story. 'Kosher' storytellers can revise the narrative freely whilst their non-kosher opponents are sent into solitary confinement for years, such as **Zündel** and **Rudolf** in Germany. Right now, the kosher historians all 'deny' the following: that gassing happened in German-based camps, that soap was made from Jewish fat, that six millions were killed systematically, that four millions were killed in Auschwitz, and most - but not all - that Hitler gave written orders for mass extermination. They are not guilty of 'denial'. However, if any non-kosher authors state any of the above they can be prosecuted for the crime of hate-speech.

From Denial to Confession

Even assuming such a thought-crime statute were to be passed, it should not exclusively refer to those denying only the Jewish Holocaust during WW II. The point is often made that the Jewish Holocaust receives disproportionate attention because other genocides, such as in Ukraine, Armenia, China or Russia, are generally ignored. Although true, this still misses the key issue, namely the Holocaust's main function as propaganda whose purpose is to preserve our sense of self-worth and honour by demonising the enemy in order to deflect attention away from the atrocities perpetrated by the victors.

For example, it is time the Allies cease 'denying' a literal holocaust (death or sacrifice by fire) that we perpetrated against about 900,000 Germans, mainly civilian women and children in phosphorous-aided firebombing raids. We deliberately burned them to death, thousands of them roasted alive in airtight bomb shelters which remained so hot from the raging flames in the fire-induced tornadoes outside that, when the doors were opened long after the raids were over, the sudden inrush of oxygen caused families of desiccated corpses to spontaneously burst into flames. We literally roasted living people to death. There are many photographs; but few have seen them.

Similarly, it is time the US admitted how many hundreds of thousands (some say well over a million) of German prisoners we starved to death in open fields, with US guards, as ordered by Eisenhower, on pain of execution, not to provide any food or shelter whatsoever. The detainees ate all the grass available, drank rainwater and died in their hundreds of thousands. We did this. Also, the post-war forced winter march of several million ethnic Germans from Eastern Europe during which over two million starved or froze to death - not to mention, no doubt, other atrocities along the way.

One of the first to raise this explicitly was Justice Wennenstrum in the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 23rd 1948, shortly after quitting the Nuremberg Trial proceedings in disgust:

"If I had known seven months ago what I know today, I would never have come here... The initial war crimes trial here was judged and prosecuted by Americans, Russians,

British and French with much of the time, effort and expenses devoted to whitewashing the Allies and placing the sole blame for World War II upon Germany... The prosecution has failed to maintain objectivity aloof from vindictiveness, aloof from personal ambitions for convictions. It has failed to strive to lay down precedents which might help the world to avoid future wars." (*Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 23rd, 1948).

Many say that the main value of remembering the holocaust vividly is so that 'never again' as civilised peoples will we allow such horror to arise in our midst; this is a convincing point, and usually sincerely made. However, by overlooking much of the overall story in favour of allowing one particular slant to dominate the meta-narrative and thus core identity of 'modern' society, we are *already* doing it again. How else to explain how we believe that since 1990 we have starved and slaughtered well over one million Iraqis, mostly women and children, through sanctions, bombing and invasion all in the name of 'justice', 'decency' and 'freedom'? The only way we can buy into such self-serving deception is because of this powerful belief in our own righteousness. This belief allows us to 'deny' that we have perpetrated such war crimes because, thanks to our meta-narrative, we do not perceive ourselves as capable of such crimes even whilst actually committing them, as we are collectively doing even today. Belief trumps facts every time.

More importantly, this collective collusion on our parts drives the process. Even assuming 'ruling elite societies' exist, it is not they who pull strings in a vacuum, rather we who need puppet-masters to assume responsibility for determining our collective imperatives in the right sort of 'feel-good' way. So the murder of a million Iraqis in the past decade, and the displacement of over three million since 2003, is the result of our own mutually engendered 'conspiracy' for which we are all responsible.

The Atrocity God

*'Oh what a tangled web we weave, when first
we practice to deceive!' - Sir Walter Scott*

How can 'good' people like us be the ones perpetrating such crimes even now? Answering this question reveals the ongoing function of the Holocaust narrative in our lives today.

The Holocaust is part of a much larger history involving most of the world during the past century. However, the emotional core of WW II, itself the essential crucible in which today's world order was forged, is experienced viscerally within the Holocaust imagery. This is of far greater emotive import than the outer official 'history'. For us today, the pith of the entire catastrophe known as World War II is captured in the imagined mental image of a few score naked civilians huddled together in a shower room dying an unspeakably horrible death. This vivid imagery provokes immediate, viscerally felt horror. Just as we would deplore anyone who tortures an infant, we feel natural revulsion towards the perpetrators.

To understand this dynamic as it plays out today, we need to examine the nature of the belief system. Since the WW II Holocaust narrative helps shape our belief in who we are as people by defining our role in this seminal period of modern world history, its function is similar to that of a deity - in this case one whose imagery focuses on atrocity, cruelty, injustice, anguish, hatred and so forth. Strangely enough, the past and current examples of our crimes mentioned above are not because of 'holocaust deniers' who in essence question the veracity of this 'Atrocity God', but its adherents who believe that by 'worshipping' images of hatred, injustice and brutality they can in turn dish out atrocity themselves without doing wrong, because 'they' who make us fear atrocity, deserve to suffer it themselves, whilst 'we' who fear and fight against atrocity, are always reasonable people acting in reluctant but heroic self-defence. This sort of view allows Israel, for example, to keep taking more territory in the name of self-defence without seeing the glaring hypocrisies involved. Zbigniew Brzezinski remarked on this during a recent congressional hearing about Iran, namely that after some sort of attack on 'us' - false-flag or otherwise - we could then go after them 'defensively'.

This deceptive view is far more than simple self-serving opportunism: it is sincerely *believed*, something most critics and victims do not understand. Shortly after he left office, President Clinton said that his biggest mistake early on was to assume that his opponents were aware of their hypocrisies; however, later on he realised that they truly believed they were doing the right thing, which is why they were so powerful.

The 'prayer' invoking such demons into our world is any dynamic which solidifies antagonism between self and other - collectively 'us' and 'them'. This 'satanic' prayer has great 'evil' power, and we see it invoked day after day in so many ways. By praying to such Manichean deities, we engender their type of emotion-based aggression to incarnate in reality. Our world takes on the atmosphere of our perception, as any mystic, lover or good housekeeper well knows, so we should be far more careful about the nature of the gods we worship. Our contemplation essentially

summons them into our mind and body streams, invoking a living presence which then looks out through our eyes, walking amongst us, permeating personal and public life. This power, far greater than any individual's, is all pervasive but invisible and as such is a form of deity, or god.

Our 'belief' in this 'god' allows us to ignore the degree to which its living emotional impact shapes our collective identity by confirming us as those who combat demonic forces and from there being able to deny - sincerely - that we are anything but the good people we 'believe' ourselves to be. We enjoy cheap chocolate and coffee - the products of exploiting child (aka slave) labour, third world farmers, local governments and crooked international funding mechanisms - starve children, bomb civilian populations and so on, secure in the knowledge that we are the good guys who stood up to the totalitarian psychopath Hitler and the mesmerized fanatical German masses who gassed millions of living, innocents, huddled naked and helpless in chambers disguised as public showers.

The story IS the Deity

The meta-narrative is the peg on which we hang the rest of our self-righteous identity. Anyone who criticises 'us' is 'them', whom we are now cognitively 'programmed' to perceive as emotionally identical to those holocaust-perpetrating monsters of yore. Emotion always trumps reason by having a higher volume on the scale of experience, since emotions are felt viscerally in the body-mind, that agent which anchors our experience to specific place and time, aka 'reality'. This is why arguing the facts never challenges a core belief system.

Furthermore, it is not the story that creates the Manichean dynamic, rather that dynamic which creates the story, our desire to have our cake and eat it, to perpetrate injustice and selfishness in the name of justice and altruism. Attacking the story is attacking ourselves and is therefore *verboten*. The debate about whether or not the story is true or its detractors thought criminals is a diversion; rather, we must become more aware of how we use it to avoid responsibility for our own crimes, past and present.

If we in the modern age feel that because of our reliance on science we are less ruled by belief or myth, we are fooling ourselves; there is no power greater in the human realm. Stories mirror how we weave physical, cognitive and emotional faculties into one overall tapestry of experience - aka 'real life'. Without narrative context, we could not progress moment by moment through getting up, bathing, dressing, eating breakfast, going to work and returning back home; we could not grow up, marry, raise children, age and then die in any coherent fashion.

Because all experience is filtered through this narrative cognitive process, 'real life' combines objective and subjective. Each individual at the family dinner table views the same 'facts' differently depending on how they fit into their own particular subjective 'story' or viewpoint. Similarly, we combine fact and fiction to fashion our collective identities from which manifest national institutions, language, dress, highways, schools, technology and so forth. This is called 'culture', something so quintessentially human and real, but which is clearly a blend of reality and artifice. Without such storytelling faculties, we could make no sense of space and time, there would be no society or culture. This faculty binds together our physical, cognitive, emotional and spiritual faculties into that which 'makes sense'.

So the ongoing story of life is a primordial art form; and the art of life is how we fashion the tale to engender mutually enlightening culture, not one that wags us into hell. Hell is where every interaction involves aggression and fear, i.e. intense angst and pain. Intensifying aggression between 'us' and 'them' is that which fuels the furnaces of hell.

Because ultimately we can never separate fact from fiction, in the context of this issue what is most important is to see how we use narrative, including visceral imagery, to empower the Atrocity God to 'bless' our belief that no matter who 'they' are and what we do to 'them', we will always remain on the side of decency, 'freedom', 'democracy' and so forth because 'they' are evil. Through such belief, we are possessed by the demon of self-serving deception - and it is deception, because of course 'they' are of the same nature as ourselves, breathing the same air and sleeping each night under the same celestial canopy of stars.

Propaganda in some form or another is a natural function of all States, for when all is said and done it involves how a collective tells its meta-narratives to itself. In other words, even a totally enlightened society will have its narratives, or 'propaganda'; the issue is whether or not they reflect sanity and wisdom rather than deception and neurosis.

Beyond the Manichean:

Whilst I was slowly writing this article, William Pfaff published one in the [NY Review of Books](#) about America's current myth of, or belief in, cultural exceptionalism. He too seems to be echoing the theme here that a society's 'meta-narrative' determines how we view ourselves, also that the life of a nation resembles the plot-line of any work of fiction, in this case tragedy.

"Schumpeter remarked in 1919 that imperialism necessarily carries the implication of an aggressiveness, the true reasons for which do not lie in the aims which are temporarily being pursued...an aggressiveness for its own sake, as reflected in such terms as "hegemony," "world dominion," and so forth...expansion for the sake of expanding.... This determination cannot be explained by any of the pretexts that bring it into action, by any of the aims for which it seems to be struggling at the time.... Such expansion is in a sense its own "object." [12]

Perhaps this has come to apply in the American case, and we have gone beyond the belief in national exception to make an ideology of progress and universal leadership into our moral justification for a policy of simple power expansion. In that case we have entered into a logic of history that in the past has invariably ended in tragedy."

Being alive at all is a great blessing, and any 'enlightened' society nurtures and celebrates this, whereas unenlightened ones pervert living into some sort of endless nightmare. All over the world billions of parents love their children and vice versa; all over the world, there is sun, wind, rain, trees, flowers, foods to eat. Each blade of grass and dewdrop thereon is saturated with a limitless abundance of basic goodness. However, any or all of us can become 'possessed' by an Atrocity God or any other demonic principle which perverts our basically good nature into an overly selfish, I-versus-other dynamic.

Any aspect of human life that is essentially good, uplifted, decent etc. can be so perverted, be it speech, food, dress, thought, love, marriage, community, solitude, scholarship, monasticism, religion, politics, parenting - and so on ad infinitum. Such deception covers up our naturally good, kind nature, polluting us with the poison of hatred-spawning aggression from which comes all the horror of immorality, societal neurosis and war. Perfectly good people are capable of this, as we proved not only by the literally millions of atrocities we perpetrated during WW II, but also by the ways in which we continue to perpetrate more of the same whilst denying them - and again: sincerely so.

Interestingly, although natural and perverted can be differentiated, 'good' and 'evil' are not simply two sides of the same neutral coin; rather there is fundamental goodness, and then its perversion. The Manichean fallacy is to perceive them as being essentially equal, like two different colours. Although philosophically seminal to the issue under discussion, it is beyond the scope of this short essay, not to mention the wisdom of its author, to expound on further as it deserves.

Even if we are 'good' and happen to be facing those possessed by such demons, the way to 'overcome' them is not by becoming worse demons ourselves, because such aggression only intensifies the demonic 'us-versus-them' dynamic, making the Atrocity God stronger as 'He' seduces more of 'us' into being willing inhabitants in His hell realm. First we should not buy into deceit-derived 'us-them' dynamics; then, starting with our own view, we must find a way to perceive 'them' as 'us' and in turn invite them to feel similarly. In this way, we become of the same kin, which has the same root meaning as 'kind'. True kindness is a virtue, not a vice or weakness - contrary to what so many pseudo 'conservatives' nowadays preach!

If one is not under its spell, this sort of deception is quite easy to spot because it always involves using other to define self, often blaming someone else, or 'them', for one's own condition, a function of solidifying the (illusory) difference between self and other. Those who keep building their narrative edifices using the bricks and mortar of accusing others of being 'liars' or 'mass-murderers', for example, are reflecting their own state of hostility as projected onto others, whilst denying responsibility for their own aggression. So the us-versus-them dynamic is quintessentially aggressive.

This goes back to the deity principle: the deity image (like anything in life) is a symbol of its own nature. The Atrocity God, whilst pretending to champion the opposite, in fact worships atrocity, injustice, cruelty and so forth because that is the aggressive nature of its imagery - its viscerally, and thus literally embodied, state of being. The lie always reveals the nature of the liar just as the object of worship reveals the nature of the worshipper. For example, consider this famous quotation:

"Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate - healthy, virile hate - for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German."

Eli Wiesel, winner of 1986 Nobel Peace Prize

Since he is a leading member of 'the Church of Atrocity', such outrageous statements do not merit hate-crime prosecution. He is a part of 'we', and therefore 'good' (even worthy of a Nobel Peace Prize) so we all basically agree that his hatred is 'healthy', whereas 'theirs', of course, is

beyond the pale. And yet the expression is clearly one of other-demonisation in order to justify hatred.

Criminalizing those who question core aspects of our collective meta-narrative only further empowers this Atrocity God, one of whose favourite deceptions is to prevent us from understanding that pointing out the falsehoods in our other-demonising, self-sanctifying narratives is not necessarily the same as saying that 'they' are all good and we are all 'bad'. In other words, if we strip away the victors' propaganda, we might find that the Germans of WW II were no worse or better than the British, American and Russians, or in other words that we are no better than they who are no worse than ourselves.

But saying this about past or current adversaries is regarded by many as so offensive that any statements intimating that our enemies are anything other than demons or that we are anything other than noble is ipso facto perceived - first emotionally and now legally - as such clear evidence of a 'hate crime' that no defence is even permitted and the perpetrators banished from society.

Threat to our individual or collective identity and thus sense of reality, engenders a viscerally-felt fear response, such inner emotional turmoil instantly projecting out distorted versions of other. Having thus projected onto other our own fear-spawned hatred, using the typical response of aggression which essentially places self above other, we strive to eliminate the threat. Our own fear, born of clinging to the false identities that give existential meaning to our lives, engenders such monsters. Rather than listen to what they have to teach about our own distortions, we destroy them. Because challenging the meta-narrative is threatening, arousing hatred in ourselves, those who claim that denial is a hate crime are sincere, but the question remains: whose hatred is in play: those of the deniers, or those who disagree with them?

Even considering such thought-crime legislation evidences the degree to which the us-versus-them Demon of Aggression, the Atrocity God, holds sway in our culture. And the obvious fact that such laws are now being introduced in Europe sixty years on indicates the narrative's seminal importance in our culture today.

I end this article with the following items for consideration:

If the above hypothesis is true that the 'story-telling' cognitive faculty essentially shapes individual and collective experience and also that the aggressive self-versus-other Manichean view drives the dominant meta-narratives in the West, then, 'scientifically' speaking, we should see certain future outcomes confirming it, such as:

a) Should it be somehow perceived that most of our meta-narratives, including those from WW II, have been largely based on **partisan propaganda**, both Israel's legitimacy as a progressive, western democratic state and the West's general ability to keep portraying ourselves as the 'good guys' - even whilst actually perpetrating ethnic-cleansing or genocide - will be undermined, to the point that Israel will find some way of living at peace with her neighbours, albeit no longer as a racially exceptionalist entity, and America will abandon all of her military bases abroad.

b) The US will not attack Iran in early 2007 as many are predicting because the story doesn't yet fit; or put another way: only when the story fits will they be able to mount and sustain an attack.

c) People go along with more of the deceptive meta-narratives with the result that aggression and conflict intensify, while millions of ordinary people suffer and die needlessly, as happened not so long ago in WW II and has been happening more or less continuously in various regions, often with US and Western participation, ever since. The proof that such WW II based meta-narrative is still in play will be the degree to which current enemies are compared to those of yore.

11. March 2007

Ashley Howes is a Canadian citizen who grew up in the UK. He works in Sydney, Cape Breton, NS, paying modest bills and watching the larger world go by through the lens of the internet. Occasionally, he likes to voice his opinion as an individual citizen of this our world.

<http://one-state.net/howes.html>

BOOKS

@@@@@ Post-zionism

Ship of State: A new book explores Israeli identity and the Holocaust

Ilan Pappé

In August, the Israeli government completed the eviction of eight thousand settlers from the Gaza Strip, which it had occupied since 1967. In a desperate attempt to thwart the government's action, the settlers' crusade adopted an insignia meant to link the pullout with the Holocaust: yellow stars of David and tattooed numbers on the arm. During the actual removal, many of the settlers reenacted scenes they had seen in holocaust films or museums: parents and children raising their hands, crying and shouting on the way to the luxury buses that whisked them off to Israel. Soldiers and police were cursed as Nazis, and senior army officers were likened to Hitler. This was one of the ugliest manipulations of the memory of the Holocaust witnessed in a state that perfected such manipulation as a diplomatic tool in its struggle against the Palestinians and as a forger of a new Jewish identity.

Idith Zertal's excellent book follows **the history of the manipulation of the Holocaust** from the inception of Israel to the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. Zertal's book is part of a **reversionist scholarly literature** in Israel, variously dubbed "post-Zionism," "new history," and "critical sociology," that emerged in the late '80s, all in one way or another part of a critique from within of Zionist conduct in the past and Israeli policies in the present. If some scholars retrenched into patriotism and nationalism after the outbreak of the second intifada in 2000, others, such as Zertal, continued energetically and courageously to challenge the Zionist narrative and to reconstruct Palestine's and Israel's history from a humanist and pluralist point of view.

The preferred objects of these critiques were the 1948 war and the treatment of the Mizrahi [=Egyptian, in fact Oriental Jews] and Palestinian citizens; the Holocaust has been, for the most part, too sacred for many intellectuals to touch, let alone examine (**Tom Segev**, Moshe Zuckerman, Ilan Gur-Ze'ev, and Yosef Grodzinsky were among the few who did). Their works, and this book, have shown how crucial research on the Holocaust memory in Israel (and its political manipulation) is for the understanding of the contemporary scene in the land of Palestine. Their works have exposed the manipulation of the Holocaust memory that pervaded all walks of life in Israel and thus provided us with a more complete picture of the way Zionist identity was constructed and how it has affected its future "benefactors" and, more important, its prospective victims.

Originally published in Hebrew, Zertal's book was brought out by a mainstream publisher in Israel despite its bold engagement with the controversial subject of the Zionist and, later, Israeli uses and abuses of the Holocaust memory. This attests both to the author's former position within the local press – she was previously editor of *Haaretz's* prestigious supplement – and to her determination to stick to her critique even in the "time of the cholera" that engulfed Israel after 2000 (as she has been commended in the editorial description on the Hebrew book's dust jacket).

The book's original title was *The Nation and Death*, and to my mind that should have been retained in the English version. It raises many associations, such as that of Paulina Salas, the heroine of Ariel Dorfman's play *Death and the Maiden*, who survives a totalitarian regime and years later meets the man who tortured her to the music of Franz Schubert's string quartet (which gives the play its title). Schubert's piece was inspired by a popular song, written by Matthias Claudius, in which the heroine has a dialogue with Death, in its purest form. Paulina faces a more concrete death from the past—that of her tormentor. Both the old song and the modern play expound on the human obsession with, and captivation by, Death (as does Roman Polanski's later film adaptation). Dorfman also presented the dilemma of a personal retribution sought by his heroine against an allegedly more commonsensical-and cynical-collective desire of her society for restitutorial justice.

In Zertal's book, ironically, the personal search is for restitution and the national one for

retribution. This is very much an essay on a **necrophilic nation**, obsessed and possessed by death, and particularly the death camps of the Holocaust: unable to comprehend the atrocity and yet quite able to use and abuse its memory for the sake of its political aims.

It is also a fine work of history, retracing the origins of this obsession and its dire consequences. This journey into the past juxtaposes the Jewish state and its political elite against the individuals who survived the inferno and chose to become citizens of Israel (or were forced to do so). Indeed, the institutionalization of the Holocaust memory in Israel and the treatment of the survivors are the two main themes of the book. But a third one emerges halfway through, which in fact deserves a book of its own: **the impact of the manipulation and instrumentalization of the Holocaust memory** on the attitudes toward, and perceptions of, the Palestinians in Israeli society.

The backbone of the institutionalization of the Holocaust memory in the young Jewish state was the construction of a selective narrative that would adapt the history of the Holocaust to the strategic and ideological demands of Israel. Two themes were important in this respect: first, juxtaposing the new "brave" Jews of Israel with those who went "willingly" to the slaughter in the European extermination camps, and second, nationalizing, or Zionizing, the rebellions, particularly the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, as precursors of the resurrection of the Jews as a new nation in their "redeemed" homeland. In the words of **Benedict Anderson**, who inspired much of the theoretical framework of this book, "The ancestor of the Warsaw uprising is the state of Israel." [See his *Imagined communities*.]

When these two themes are taken together, it is clear that the Jews who participated in the uprisings were constructed by the young Jewish state as "proto-Zionists" and not, as Primo Levi and others saw them, as people who wished to choose their own kind of death in the face of massive extermination. In her thick description, Zertal draws many insights from this particular motif in the official instrumentalization of the Holocaust memory. I will mention only two intriguing remarks: one concerning the fusion of Zionist Palestine and the rebellious Jews during the Holocaust, and the other about the Jewish state's struggle against anyone who dared to challenge this retrospective "emplotting."

In the official construction of the collective memory, the uprisings were located in the narrative of Palestine. Everywhere – in Warsaw and in the north of Galilee – brave Jews stood in the face of their enemies. "The flame of rebellion has been ignited in the ghettos in the name of Eretz Israel," declared Zalman (Rubashov) Shazar, who later became Israel's president. The rebels drew courage from the Jews who had withstood Arab attacks in the 1920s, and the brave Zionists drew courage from the rebels in Europe. This reductionist approach, explains Zertal, was not just a cynical construction of a tale; it also served a psychological need to comprehend the Holocaust: "By [the rebels'] acts, the impossible and inconceivable became both possible and conceivable."

Benedict Anderson remarked that it is best to nationalize dead people, since they cannot claim an identity different from the one ascribed. One can imagine how troublesome, then, was **Marek Edelman** – a leader of the Warsaw uprising, a member at the time of the non-Zionist Bund organization, and after the Holocaust a Polish socialist – who was alive and kicking. It was bad enough that Edelman did not fit the image that the official cultural producers of Israel wished the leaders of the rebellion to have; worse, he actively contested it. He wrote a book on this subject in 1945 that appeared in Hebrew only in 2001. He disliked the way he and his friends were portrayed visually and textually – "None of them had ever looked like this... they didn't have rifles, cartridge pouches or maps; besides, they were dark and dirty." Hardly the ideal type of Aryan-like handsome young Jews seen in the Israeli museums of the Holocaust and in the pictures decorating official texts.

Edelman explained that for him the uprising was a humane choice of how to die. But death was not a simple issue for the ruling party in Israel, which was busy shaping the collective will of a society of immigrants and colonizing a population and area that resisted violently against it. The leaders felt a need to hierarchize death: idealize one type and condemn another. Death in rebellion against the Holocaust was commendable, death without resistance was questionable. Death for the sake of the nation was to be the sublime act of humanity. In more ways than one, the Holocaust drove Zionism, as a national movement, into an excessive and at times pathological obsession with death – more uniquely so than in other nationalist movements because death here meant, ironically, the prevention of yet another Holocaust.

Edelman was dwarfed and ignored in the official Israeli texts and representations of the Holocaust. **Hannah Arendt**, who, in the wake of the 1962 Adolf Eichmann trial, challenged head-on the Israeli (mis)representation of the Holocaust and its crude manipulation, was even more fiercely rebuked and to a degree demonized. Arendt not only philosophized about the historical narrative but, far more important, contemplated the moral implications of nationalism, Judaism, and evil. She offered an alternative humanist and universalistic view of the Holocaust and Judaism in the contemporary world. Much in *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood* is devoted to Arendt's critique and to her opponents in Israel. Zertal seeks in hindsight to consolidate her own

deconstruction of the manipulation by relying heavily on the deep epistemological and philosophical layers that Arendt set down almost a half-century ago.

While scholars and historians were recruited to challenge any alternative representation of the Holocaust memory, Holocaust survivors themselves were real victims of this act of official manipulation. This began in earnest in 1947, with the four thousand Jewish immigrants on the ship *Exodus* – whose "heroic" tale, through Leon Uris's book and the subsequent film, became one of the **main media sources to rally the American public** behind the Zionist story. As Zertal has shown previously, the immigrants became pawns in the struggle for the international recognition of a future Jewish state. The wretched survivors demanded, the world was told, to be settled in Palestine, and if not they would rather be sent to the displaced-person camps in Germany. This message was directed specifically at the UN Special Commission on Palestine (UNSCOP), which in early 1947 took over efforts from Britain to find a solution to the Palestine conflict; that summer the British were in Palestine when the ship arrived. The *Exodus* affair was meant to prove to UNSCOP that only the Judaization of Palestine was the apt solution to what to do with the Jewish survivors of the Holocaust. And the gambit was successful. But once the UN decided in favor of the Jewish community and recommended the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine, hardly anyone in the Zionist leadership took interest any longer in the fate of the *Exodus* refugees, who were shipped back to Germany under horrible conditions.

Perhaps this explains Zertal's second theme, that of the survivors' fate in the new homeland. Most of them did not actively challenge the tale told by the state about them and their fate. Their silence was not out of fear; it was a much deeper response to the horrors they had witnessed, as has already been elucidated by Arendt, Levi, and many others. Arendt highlighted **silence as a defense mechanism** against an inconceivable horror that overpowered "reality and [broke] down all standards we know." Levi pointed to the **link between survival and a "privileged" position** in the death camps. This uncomfortable conclusion means, in Levi's words, that "We, the survivors, are not the 'true witnesses' to the Holocaust."

But beyond the impossible and traumatic existence, possibly out of reach of any description or analysis, those of the survivors who made it to Israel could not obstruct but rather had to collaborate with the official memory construction and manipulation. *Ex post facto*, they were Zionists during the Holocaust, whether they liked it or not, and if the survivors did not take an actual role in resistance, they were second-rate Zionists. Worse, unless they belonged to the leadership of the communities (the *Judenräte*), which were incorporated into the ruling elite of Israel, the survivors were at risk of being judged for their activities in the camps. Some were brought to trial for being ex-Capos (which is perhaps understandable) or for collaborating under coercion-in order to survive-in any of the hideous ways made available by the Nazis to the inmates. This insane persecution of survivors was the result of the wish to bring the Holocaust itself to trial-with very limited success. Only in 1960 did the Israelis succeed in capturing an arch-Nazi, Adolf Eichmann, and in staging a show trial, which was more a didactic move than a search for justice. But most of the architects of the Holocaust were dead, gone, or judged at Nuremberg, and in the absence of other arch-Nazis, alleged collaborators were targeted. Such was the case of **Elsa Trank**, a Jewish survivor who for a while was a forced supervisor of a bloc in Auschwitz, and as such indeed contributed to the misery of her fellow prisoners. Zertal's assertion that a trial like that of Trank was part of the struggle of Israel to occupy safely the role of the ultimate and exclusive representative of the Jewish Holocaust needs further elaboration and thought. She is, however, absolutely right to bring in great detail Trank's story as a chapter in the history of the relationship between the state and the survivors.

The Zionization of the struggle left out the daily heroic struggle of those who "just" survived. The main stage for conveying this message was Eichmann's trial. The impact of his trial on the institutionalization of Holocaust memory appears in this book very much as it did in Arendt's seminal work. But here Zertal offers an additional angle. She connects the trial to the third theme, **the equation of Arabs and Palestinians with the Nazis**. Her research exposes how the case against the Palestinians evolved out of that of **Haj Amin El-Husseini**, who as an exiled leader of the Palestinians foolishly flirted with Hitler and Mussolini in the insidious hope of forming an alliance against Britain and its pro-Zionist policy. Palestinians, however, were not the only target of this attempt, which was orchestrated and directed by Israeli prime minister David Ben-Gurion during the Eichmann trial and coincided with crucial elections for his party. Also under fire was Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser. "The danger of the Egyptian tyrant is like that which afflicted the European Jews," Ben-Gurion said in the Knesset to help prepare the ground for an aggressive war against Egypt in 1956.

The manipulation of the Holocaust memory in this respect served two purposes: The obvious one was the Nazification of the Palestinians, with the ultimate example being Menachem Begin's comparison of Arafat in Beirut to Hitler. One of the many illuminating examples of this Nazification

praxis, already provided by historian Peter Novick, is El-Husseini's entry in the pro-Israeli Encyclopedia of the Holocaust – an entry longer than any other personality apart from Hitler! (Himmler and Goering apparently paled in comparison to the crucial role played in the destruction of the European Jews by a pathetic Palestinian leader who served as a broadcaster to the Arab world from Berlin during the war.)

A less obvious objective was the discourse used by the political elite in order to move the public to support any crucial decisions taken in the struggle against the Arab world. From vindicating the brutal killing of Palestinians in 1948 and later in the war against Palestinian infiltrations; through the instigation of public panic on the eve of the 1967 war; to the justification of official intransigent positions on peace after the war; to the present oppressive policies against the Palestinians in the occupied territories, Holocaust memory was the most useful and accessible means of silencing criticism and pursuing a policy of belligerence. The price, as Zertal shows toward the end of her book, has been high—the fanatical settler movement in the territories Israel occupied beginning in 1967 exploited the Holocaust memory to justify an expansionist, theocratic, and racist version of Zionism that eventually turned against the state itself.

The book is a bit anticlimactic, to my mind, when it links Rabin's assassination and the trajectory described hitherto in its concluding pages. The murder indeed grew out of the fanatic fringes that expanded through Israel's oppressive policies, which were no doubt justified by the Holocaust memory, but the killing of Rabin was the least of their explicit, and the state's implicit, crimes. What they and the army have done to the local population – in the name of the Holocaust memory – is for me the crescendo of Death and the Nation.

In August of this year, those who were evicted from the Gaza Strip and moved into four-star hotels in the Negev complained that the proximity of railway lines to the hotels reminded them of Auschwitz. So now we are in the grotesque stage that probably no longer appeals to most Israelis as sincere or authentic. But we are still left with the chilling remark of Aryeh Caspi – a *Haaretz* journalist who died recently and prematurely – that, unfortunately for the Palestinians, so long as the state's policy toward them is less than genocidal, anything else is morally justifiable.

The repertoire, short of Nazi extermination, has since then become quite clear, but it is this excellent book that underlines why we should be fearful of worse to come, in the name of the Holocaust, inside Israel and Palestine.

Israel's holocaust and the politics of nationhood by Idith Zertal. New York: Cambridge University Press. 236 pages.

Bookforum, October / November 2005
http://www.bookforum.com/archive/fall_05/pappe.html

@@@@@ Chickening out

BLOOD PASSOVER

By Ariel Toaff

Complete English Text (of the first edition)

The following translation was performed free of charge to protest an injustice: the destruction by the ADL of Ariel Toaff's BLOOD PASSOVER on Jewish ritual murder. The author is the son of the Chief Rabbi of Rome, and a professor of Jewish Renaissance and Medieval History at Bar-Ilan University in Israel, just outside Tel Aviv.

Dr. Toaff is uniquely qualified to write this book, being thoroughly familiar with the derivative literature in English, French, German and Italian, as well as the original documentary sources in Latin, Medieval Italian, Hebrew and Yiddish. This is not something he worked on in secret. On the contrary, he worked on it openly with his university students and colleagues in Israel for several years; one of his students was even going to publish a paper on the subject. The author is extremely careful about what he says, and his conclusions must be taken seriously. It reads like a detective story.

If it had been published in Israel, in Hebrew, no one would have cared. There are large bodies of literature in Hebrew that Jews do not wish Gentiles to know about. But Dr. Toaff's announcement of its publication in Italy, in Italian, raised a worldwide firestorm of fury. Under unbearable pressure, the book was withdrawn from publication [one week after its publication], and is not to be re-issued.

[*WRONG : a second edition just appeared in the Italian bookshops, one year later, with some changes and a thinck postface.*]

You can strike a blow against censorship by circulating this text by e-mail or posting in on the Internet. No one can sue hundreds of people. It has been posted on <http://www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres7/pasque.pdf> for months, as well as at <http://www.laboratorio99.com/upload/Pasque%20di%20Sangue.pdf> As far as we know nothing happened legally (the latter version is much preferable as it retains the original footnote numeration).

If the text is all over the Internet, and everybody has it and everybody knows what is in it, the cat will be out of the bag, and it will have to be published sooner or later.

Come in out of the darkness, and strike a blow for the light.

READ AND PASS ON.

Gian Marco Lucchese and Pietro Gianetti, 2007 (the two translators)

We'll see now if they provide an english version of the SECOND Italian edition...

=====
This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, democracy, scientific, and social justice issues, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to:

<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml> . If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.

Our address : [revclar -at- yahoo.com.au](mailto:revclar@yahoo.com.au)

The AAARGH website : <http://aaargh.com.mx>

or <http://vho.org/aaargh>

If you wish your email address be deleted from our lists, drop a note at revclar@yahoo.com.au

OTHER AAARGH YEARLY PUBLICATIONS

< <http://revurevi.net> >

El Paso del Ebro

Das kausale Nexusblatt

Il Resto del Siclo

Conseils de Révision

La Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues (multilingual)

O revisionismo em lingua português

Armenichantage (Armenian blackmail)

Next edition : winter 2009