

**AAARGH REPRINTS**

aaarghinternational@hotmail.com

## **THE TEHRAN PAPERS 11 - 12 DECEMBER 2006**

### The geopolitical environment of the holocaust myth

**Abu Nicola al Yunani**

As you all know, attempts to organize a conference like this one have been made in the past. Those attempts however, did not come to fruition, due to interference by the governments of the countries concerned. And this was in spite of the fact that some of the countries in question were outside the direct sphere of influence of the United States, and its local policeman, the Zionist state. In contrast here, not only have we not had negative interference by the government, but in the contrary the authorities of the Islamic Republic of Iran have organized and facilitated this conference. For this reason, I feel I must begin by thanking and commending the Iranian authorities for allowing and helping this conference to take place.

Other members of this conference, and many revisionist historians who are not present here, some of them languishing in jails all over the "free world", have undertaken the tremendous task of knocking down the holocaust myth. They have managed, using hard science, to demonstrate that it is nothing more than that : a myth. They have proved that the famous gas chambers, used to exterminate Jews by the millions, have never existed, and could not have existed. I will not attempt to present, or even summarise their work. Other participants of this conference can do this much better than me.

My focus will be to examine the geopolitical environment in which the holocaust myth was created and took roots. To explain, in other words, how what is arguably the biggest lie of modern history, could be so successful. And I will also try to briefly outline the geopolitical environment of the struggle against the holocaust myth. To

examine, that is, what the specific political meaning of the struggle for the truth is, and how this struggle can be more effective.

### **The prehistory of the holocaust myth: the Zionist project**

Zionism is often erroneously regarded – and wants to present itself – as the expression of national aspirations of Jews, mainly European ones. But this fails to take into account historical reality. And the historical truth is that the Zionist project was born decades before the birth of the modern Zionist movement – and by actors who couldn't care less about the sentiments and interests of Jews.

In the 19th century, Africa and Asia were regarded by the great European colonial powers as their playfields. Large parts of these continents were under direct colonial occupation. Others were targeted for such occupation. The so-called Near East was under ottoman rule. But the Ottoman Empire was collapsing, and European colonial powers wanted to inherit its lands. The Ottoman Empire was thus their enemy, but so were the indigenous liberation movements. Faced with those two enemies, they followed a policy which would today be called "dual containment". When the Balkan peoples revolted in what is generally known as the Greek Revolution of 1821, the powers waited for the Ottomans (with the help of the Egyptian Army) to crush the revolution. Then, and only then, they intervened in its help. Later on, when Muhammad Ali of Egypt sought to unite the African and Asian wings of the Arab world, they intervened against him and restored Syria to Ottoman rule. They understood well that if the Arab world was liberated from Ottoman rule and united, it would become a formidable power in itself.

It was at this period that Viscount Palmerston (at the time serving as British foreign secretary), proposed the transfer of Jews to Palestine, in order to create there "an alien demographic barrier" which would prevent the unification of the Arab world. Palestine is the place where the Asian and African wings of the Arab world meet. By establishing there an alien population, Palmerston sought to preclude the possibility for unification. In a letter to the British Ambassador to Istanbul, he wrote: "The return of the Jewish people to Palestine, represents a bulwark against any evil designs prepared by Muhammad Ali or whoever succeeds him".

These lines were written around 50 years before the first Zionist congress. Even before that, Napoleon, when embarking on the Egypt expedition, had called on the Jews to meet him in Palestine. And long after that, in WW I, when the British state was duplicitously calling on the Arab people to help it in its war effort against the central powers, and promised in exchange to help them achieve their freedom – while at the same time signing agreements with the French distributing with them the Arab world – a new promise was made to the Jews (the Balfour declaration), with the same as always intention. The creation of an alien demographic barrier which would prevent the realization of the national aspirations of the Arab nation, and would assure that it would remain forever divided and weak, controlled by the western colonial powers. This was then, and remains to this day, the *raison d'être* of the Zionist state.

### **The Zionist movement**

The Zionist project, therefore, far from being a product of Jewish nationalism, was conceived by western colonialism as a means for enabling and perpetuating colonial control of the so-called "Near East". But what about the Zionist movement? Was it aligned with the colonial project of the western powers, or did it have a different content altogether?

Even a cursory examination of the founding documents of the Zionist movement shows that it was 100% aligned with the colonial project. Zionists planned to invade Palestine backed by the military strength of a great power, stay there as policemen of that power, assuring the continued slavery of Arabs, and reap the benefits. And they didn't have many qualms about the power which they would be representing. Legatees of a culture of usury, they would be content to go with the highest bidder. In the Vienna congress of 1896, Theodor Herzl proposed acting in the name of "his majesty the Sultan". In the 1905 seventh Zionist congress, Max Nordau made the same proposal, even more concretely :

"The movement which has taken hold of a great part of the Arab people may easily take a direction which may cause harm in Palestine. ...The Turkish government may feel itself compelled to defend its reign in Palestine and Syria with armed force. ...In these circumstances, Turkey can be convinced that it will be important for her to have in Palestine and Syria a strong and well-organized group which ... will resist any attack on the authority of the Sultan and defend his authority with all its might."

Chaim Weizmann made virtually the same proposal to the British crown (in 1914): "We can reasonably say that should Palestine fall within the British sphere of influence, and should Britain encourage Jewish settlement there, as a British dependency, we could have in twenty to thirty years a million Jews out there, perhaps more; they would develop the country, bring back civilization to it and form a very effective guard for the Suez Canal."

Theodor Herzl also approached the Russian count von Plehve, and had a very good understanding with him. Among other things, he promised to safeguard the Czar's interests in Palestine, and to rid Eastern Europe and Russia of the "noxious and subversive Anarcho-Bolshevik Jews".

Later on, during WWII, Zionists again tried to strike alliances with both sides in the conflict. Menachem Begin started his political career as leader of the fascist Zionist youth of Italy. He was an ardent admirer of Hitler. The Zionist Federation of Germany worked closely with the Nazis. The Haganah extended an invitation to Adolf Eichman to visit Palestine. At the same time, David Ben Gurion was working with the allies. Both flavors of Zionists, shared the same aim : Colonising Palestine with the military aid of a western power, in order to secure its interests there, and reap some profits for themselves.

It is therefore clear that there was no discrepancy between the Zionist project as conceived by European colonialists, and the Zionist movement which sought to bring to fruition this project and reap the benefits from it. And it should be noted that both Soviet Russia and the Communist International, which regarded support for the right to self-determination as one of the pillars of their policies, were in their early years strenuously opposing Zionism on exactly those grounds. For them, the solution to the "jewish question" was to be found in the assimilation of Jews in the countries where they lived. The Zionist project, in their eyes, was a colonialist project and should be combated as such.

## **The creation of the Zionist state**

In the years leading up to WWII, both camps – the Anglo-French and the Axis – were actively promoting Zionism. This may seem absurd, but it is not. In fact, both the Anglo-French camp AND the Axis, sought the same aims: colonial domination over Africa and Asia. Their only difference was over who was to dominate them. But as the aim of domination itself was not questioned, so wasn't support for Zionism.

During the war, a new factor entered the scene: the United States. The U.S. had originally abstained from the war – but only in order to see which side the balance of forces was leaning toward. Eventually it intervened on the side of the allies, not in order to “liberate” Europe, as is claimed, but in order to subjugate it, just as Europe had before subjugated the rest of the world. It is not by coincidence that their first operation in Europe was called “Operation Overlord”.

When the war ended, the victorious European powers - primarily the U.K. - were too weak to implement their plans for the creation of a Jewish state in the heart of the Arab world. The U.K. found that the only thing which was still within its power, was to attempt to keep its influence in the region through the Arab client regimes it had created and nurtured. The U.S. hijacked the Zionist project, and used it to wrest control of the Arab world from the European powers. The U.K. attempted to block the implementation of the plan which it had originally conceived, and which was now being used against it – but it only did so half heartedly.

The Zionist gangs, strengthened with shiploads of Jews newly freed from concentration camps, and with others who sought to flee a Europe destroyed by the war, under the tutelage of the United States, armed to the teeth by the allied forces, with a savagery that equaled and surpassed that of their mentors – the Nazis, the Americans, the British – fell upon a population which had been kept unarmed by the British occupiers of Palestine, and which had only minimal help from the Arab states – weak and subjugated themselves. The outcome was predictable: a large part of Palestine was occupied by the Zionists, and a state was proclaimed there – to be recognized immediately by the victors of WWII.

## **The birth of the Holocaust myth**

It was in that historic period, the war and immediate post-war period, that the holocaust myth was created. As in all wars, the enemy had to be demonized, in order to better mobilize the friendly forces against him, to justify the crimes that would be committed during the war by friendly forces, and to chill any opposition to the war. The crimes which were committed in this war were arguably greater than those of any previous war, and the demonisation needed to be accordingly greater. This is especially true of the crimes committed by British and American imperialism at the end of the war: The bombings of Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Dresden. The Holocaust myth was designed to misrepresent the war – which was in actual fact a criminal endeavor of gigantic scale from both sides – as a battle between the forces of civilization on one side, and those of darkness on the other. For this representation to

become plausible, the very real crimes of the Nazis and their allies were not sufficient. They had to be elevated above their historic context, inflated out of any proportion with reality, and represented as something completely unprecedented in the history of humanity. This was the *raison d'être* of the “six million Jews killed in the gas chambers”.

In order for the myth to be believable, it needed to be firmly rooted on reality, to tie in with what people knew to be true. And indeed, the foundations of the myth were rooted in historical truth. The Nazis did build concentration camps, people did die there in large numbers, and many of them were indeed Jewish. Aside from that, the people of Europe at least, did know from their first-hand experience that the Nazis would commit atrocities without blinking an eye. Needless to say, this is a common trait of occupying powers. Current-day Palestinians and Iraqis, Algerians and Vietnamese of the previous generation, can attest to this from personal experience.

But the Holocaust myth was designed to serve more than one purpose. Aside from absolving the Allies of any responsibility for their war-time crimes, it was to serve as a justification for the post-war crime. The entire planet was to be treated as war spoils, and shared between the victorious powers in a card game in Yalta. Nations newly liberated from the yoke of the Axis powers, were to be subjugated again to a new yoke, which in many cases was just as cruel, or worse. And in this framework, of course, the case of Palestine stands out. Under the lame excuse that the persecution of Jews by the nazi regime proved once and for all that Jews needed a national home where they would be forever safe, an entirely innocent people – the Palestinians – was to be expropriated of its ancestral lands. Worse still, the entire Arab nation would be prevented from achieving its self-determination. Lame as it was, the only excuse for this was the myth of the Holocaust.

### **The corollary to the Holocaust myth: the myth of western anti-fascism**

It wouldn't be out of place here to note that the holocaust myth has a “collateral myth”, so to speak: The myth of western anti-fascism. According to this myth, fascism was an abomination specific to the Axis powers, especially Germany. The great western democracies (meaning, by definition, the United States, the United Kingdom and France), so goes the myth, are intrinsically inimical to fascism. Unlike fascism, whose main attribute is barbarity, the western democracies are intrinsically civilized and moral. When they do commit crimes, these crimes are aberrations, not the rule.

The truth is very different, of course.

First of all, it is a known fact that Hitler had prominent admirers both in the British and U.S. ruling elites. As for France, it was in the verge of civil war before the nazi invasion, and it is exactly for this reason that the ruling elite opted to capitulate without firing a single shot, seeing in Hitler the guarantor of stability.

Second, it is well known – at least outside the United States – that the U.S. and its allies have supported all sorts of dictatorships all over the world. It is well known that the most barbaric regimes enjoyed and enjoy the support of the U.S. and its allies. And that every single one of the worst crimes in the last 60 years, was committed either by the U.S., or with its active support.

Third, in their lack of imagination, the U.S. ruling elites, especially their more senile factions, like the currently ruling clique, are copying not only the strategic plans and the modus operandi of old-time fascism, but even their formulations: the “new world order”, the “desert fox” etc.

Fourth, it is also a well-known fact that the U.S. and their allies, after reconquering Europe, became the new employers of the worst Nazi criminals. They hired them to learn from their expertise, used them to organize their clandestine networks, even to run the states they “liberated” from German occupation. In occupied Palestine, at least two former nazi admirers and collaborators (Begin and Shamir) became prime ministers. My own country, Greece was for decades ruled by the forces that had collaborated with Germans, and those who had fought against them were persecuted, exiled, tortured, exterminated.

### **The Soviet paradox...**

Monstrous as it is, then, the creation of the Holocaust myth had natural and obvious advantages for the western colonial powers. Less obvious is why the Soviet Union would support such a charade. And it is crucial to understand how such a thing could have happened, because the Holocaust myth couldn't have survived for a day without the endorsement of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union came out of the war with enormous advantages. It won control over a large part of Europe. But, just as importantly, it won an enormous moral capital – a capital which, unfortunately, it spent in a rather unwise way. Had it contested the Holocaust myth, it would have easily reduced it to a joke.

The Soviet Union presented itself as the protector of the oppressed worldwide. It was, after the war, the deadly enemy of the United States. Yet it supported a myth that was conceived in order to continue the oppression of peoples under colonial and semi-colonial rule, to justify the occupation of the defeated Axis states, to ensure imperialist domination over the strategically important Arab World, thus strengthening the anti-Soviet block. Isn't this absurd?

In a way it is. But this absurdity was inherent in the politics of the Soviet Union after its early years – and it is this absurdity that eventually led to its demise.

### **...and its explanation**

The Soviet Union, and with it the Comintern, was built on the premises of revolutionary communism – which is generally, and correctly, identified with the legacy of Marx and Lenin. While Marxism and Leninism remained the official ideology of the Soviet Union to the end, the underlying content gradually changed.

After the initial difficulties faced by the young revolutionary state – the civil war, foreign intervention, famine – the revolutionary camp in Russia had lost its strength. As was the case in the French revolution, one and a half century earlier, the defeat didn't come from outside, in the form of a restoration, but from inside, in a “thermidorean” reversal. The state apparatus rose above those who would have destroyed it, and the entire old guard of the revolution was exterminated, politically, morally and physically. In France, the Directoire and then Napoleon marched under

the banners of the revolution – but in the opposite direction. The same, more or less, happened with Soviet Russia. This development brought a sharp turn in the policies, both internal and foreign, of the Soviet government. The program of world revolution was abandoned in favor of an alliance with one or another of the imperialist camps – and in fact, Soviet Russia vacillated for a long time between the two camps, changing direction more than one time. Eventually it was Hitler who decided its course, when he broke the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact and attacked the Soviet Union. From that time on, both the Soviet Union and the communist parties it controlled, entered the struggle against the Axis, and in many cases rose to its leadership. In Europe, this was the case, most notably, in Yugoslavia and Greece – the two countries, beside the Soviet Union, where there was a serious resistance to nazi occupation. In the so-called Third world, the cases of China and Vietnam could be noted.

Having decided to cooperate with imperialist powers, the Soviet Government gradually toned down its criticism of, and opposition to, Zionism. In doing so, it was sending a clear signal to imperialist powers, especially England, that they didn't have to treat the Soviet Union as an enemy – they could very well work with it.

Immediately after the war, the Soviet leadership built a belt of satellite "buffer" states in Eastern Europe as an insurance against the possibility of an attack against it. At the same time, it initially strove to achieve "peaceful coexistence" with its imperialist "allies". In this period, the economy of the buffer states was left alone. In China, Mao and Chiang were negotiating with the aim of arriving at a formula for sharing of power. In Vietnam, Ho had arrived at a short-lived agreement with France. In Greece, the communist party attempted to participate in a "national unity" government. And in Palestine, the Soviet Union and the communist parties supported the partition plan. But around 1947, the Soviet leadership began to see that peaceful coexistence was not possible. To borrow a phrase from current-day zionists, they saw that they had no partners for peace. Churchill, among others, clearly saw that a strong Soviet Union, regardless of Stalin's good intentions, posed a potentially great risk to the future of imperialism. He was thus campaigning for a cold war (while a "hot" one was preferred by the cowboy Truman).

Eventually, having exhausted its arsenal of goodwill gestures, the Soviet leadership had to wake up to the fact that, instead of killing revolutionary opportunities in the hope of winning the grace of imperialism, it should take practical measures to shore up its defenses and undermine the positions of the enemy. It is in that period that they began the drive toward "sovietisation" of Eastern Europe. It is also in that period that Mao scuttled all negotiation efforts and began in earnest the struggle to take power. And it is in that period that the Viet Minh began the guerilla war against the French.

Before that, however, the Soviet Union had recognized the Zionist state. Worse still, it had armed (via Czechoslovakia) the Zionist gangs. And of course, the Nuremberg trials had taken place during this period, where the holocaust myth was consolidated and elevated to the level of historical dogma.

Later on, the Soviet position in the Arab-zionist conflict was reversed. From arming Zionists, it switched to supporting the Arab side. But, as was common with Soviet policy, the switch was only half-hearted. They never retracted the recognition of the Zionist state. And they never repudiated the holocaust myth. Doing so would

necessitate a revolutionary regime, and the regime in power in Moscow had long ago ceased to be revolutionary. While building its defenses, the Soviet Union continued to the end to seek peaceful coexistence. And in order to show its sincerity, it continued to support, to some extent, Zionism.

## **A changed geopolitical environment**

As we saw, the holocaust myth was born and grew up in an epoch when the proponents of this myth were all-powerful. For this reason, the myth itself was all-powerful. Up to 20 years ago, few people, in Europe or elsewhere, even knew that there are historians who dispute the official version of the holocaust. And even those who had remotely heard that so-called "holocaust deniers" even existed, were inclined to regard them as "conspiracy theorists of the most bizarre nature" (to quote a friend's expression).

But times are changing. The Soviet Union, one of the main bulwarks of the holocaust myth, collapsed. The authority of the United States, just as it grew by leaps and bounds over Eastern Europe, diminished over a Western Europe which, no longer threatened by a formidable enemy, had less reason to kowtow to every demand from across the Atlantic. The Zionist state itself, having lost steam after several decades of constant war with its neighbors, began to realize that it would have to readjust its vision of militarily conquering the land "from the brook of Egypt to the Euphrates". Instead, they aimed to control it by proxy, via impotent Arab regimes. This was the essence of the so-called "peace process" in Palestine.

And this was the geopolitical environment under which the main body revisionist historians' research took place. To be sure, an environment still very hostile. The enemy was still strong, but not all-powerful. There were leaks here and there. And this gradual weakening of the enemy, made it necessary for him to become more ruthless. It was no longer enough to ignore revisionist historians. The pretensions of "freedom of speech", the façade of a Western Europe which is the legatee of the values of the Enlightenment, were brushed aside and laws were passed in one country after another which reinstated – in some cases for the first time since the Inquisition, the notion of crimes of thought. Several of the more prominent revisionist historians were jailed or sentenced to heavy fines. Their works were relegated to the index of forbidden books. And, of course, alongside the legal witch-hunters acted gangs of Zionist thugs.

Strangely enough - at least for those who look at the world through colonialist eyeglasses - the only places where the freedom of revisionist historians to think, speak and write was respected, was way outside the domain of "European enlightenment values". In the Arab world, the book of Roger Garaudy was not only legally published, but there were newspapers that published it in installments. This is the same book that was forbidden in democratic France, and whose author had to pay an exorbitant fine. A well-known revisionist historian found political asylum in the Islamic Republic of Iran - which, we are told, is governed by intolerant religious fanatics - rather than be imprisoned in his native Switzerland, with its long standing traditions of freedom and neutrality.

This was the general picture up to a couple of years ago. And in this general picture, historical revisionism made what will certainly in the future be regarded as

its first real steps. On a purely scientific level, revisionism is very strong. Yet if we examine the penetration of revisionist research into mass consciousness – at least outside the Islamic world – we must admit that it is still at the beginning.

### **The current period...**

But times keep changing, and this conference is but an indication of these changes.

During the last half-decade, the so-called peace-process has been abandoned by Zionists, in favor of yet another attempt at a brute-force approach. Yet, instead of crushing the Palestinian resistance, this attempt has brought to power Hamas, the larger organization that continues to reject the Oslo process and the recognition of the Zionist state. Eventually it became once again obvious that the Palestinian resistance cannot be rooted out by brute force, and now attempts are being made to entice the Hamas government into a new version of Oslo. But if the Zionist state cannot survive by war, and it cannot survive by peace either, it seems that the only way ahead for it is not to survive. And it is becoming more obvious by the day that the prediction by Iranian president Ahmadinejad that “this disgraceful stain will be eliminated from the Islamic world” is very accurate.

In Lebanon, Zionists attempted to eliminate the Lebanese resistance as a prelude to attacks against Syria and Iran. Instead of this, they suffered a humiliating defeat, and had to rush their American patrons to the Security Council in order to demand an immediate cease-fire. The myth of the invincibility of the Zionist army, which had already suffered a serious blow when it was first forced to leave Lebanon under the blows of Hizbullah, was shattered forever. And of course, the humiliating defeat of Zionists also humiliated those pro-western Arab heads of state who rushed to condemn the “irresponsible” attack of Hizbullah against their Zionist friends.

And of course, the glorious victory of the Lebanese resistance itself, took place under the shadow of the defeat of the United States by the glorious Iraqi resistance. This defeat is something that even U.S. officials are admitting nowadays. The only reason they are still occupying Iraq is that they can not afford to leave. Just as the defeat of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan opened the way to its collapse, the defeat of the U.S. in Iraq will open the way to its eventual collapse.

It is just a year ago, that the U.S. president, under the pretext of the Iranian nuclear program, was threatening Iran. During the previous summer, there were very persistent rumors about an impending provocation – a “dirty bomb” attack against U.S. soil – which would be the pretext for an attack against Iran, just as the 9/11 provocation was a pretext for the attack against, and the temporary occupation of, Afghanistan and Iraq. At around the same time, another U.S. provocation, the assassination of Lebanese Prime Minister Hariri, was used as a pretext in order to exert enormous pressure on Syria and threaten it with unspecified sanctions. And let’s not forget that a couple of years back, the current U.S. president was threatening with attacks with tactical nuclear weapons against so-called rogue nations.

Under the repeated blows suffered in Afghanistan, Iraq and Lebanon, the current U.S. president lost the majority in both houses of the U.S. congress. This electoral defeat, which took place in the framework of a military defeat, is much more

than a change of persons – regardless of the uncontested fact that the U.S. democratic party is in no way better than the republican, and no less pro-zionist. This defeat is a sign that the current belligerent policy can not be sustained – and it just so happens that there is no other policy to replace it. In a very real sense, we are witnessing the last days of the U.S. empire, and the empire's rulers are as aware of that as anyone else – perhaps even more so.

Here in Iran too, in the last elections the previous president (who has reportedly declared that "the holocaust is a historic fact"), was replaced by a president who helped organize this conference.

So instead of threatening Iran and Syria, nowadays the U.S. policymakers (and their happy lap-dog in the United Kingdom) are floating the idea of inviting them to stabilize Iraq. In other words, they are asking the so-called "axis of evil" to take over control in its former member!

We should also not forget that the U.S. military and political might is to a large extent based on the strength of the U.S. economy. But this strength is now no more than a ghost of the past. The U.S. has been, for several decades, a net importer of goods. In essence, it imports goods in exchange for dollars. As long as the rest of the world keeps taking pieces of paper in exchange for its products, this is not a problem. But during the past year or two, it is becoming more and more apparent that there is increasing reluctance toward the dollar, a reluctance which is mirrored in the falling price of the dollar (or if you wish, the rising price of oil, gold and other commodities).

**... and the future.**

It should be clear that the coming period will be the period of collapse of the last remaining bulwarks of the holocaust myth: the United States and the Zionist state. This will not automatically and miraculously cause holocaust revisionism to triumph, but it will create the necessary conditions for this triumph. As people see their points of reference collapsing around them, they will be forced to reconsider their formerly unshakeable beliefs. The electoral result in the U.S. is just a step in this process. As the United States become weaker and weaker, they will be less and less able to strong-arm their allies into persecuting revisionist historians. The recent electoral results in Latin America are also an indication of where things are heading. As one imperial dogma after another comes into question, the dogma of the holocaust will inevitably also become questioned. And then the scientific groundwork done by revisionist historians, those who are attending this conference as well as those who have been prevented from doing so, will bear fruits.

**Where do we go from here?**

For this to happen, the forces of change all over the world must forge alliances, draw from each other's strength, in order to hasten the defeat of the enemy. We must learn from the recent victory of the Lebanese resistance. The victory would of course have been impossible without the heroism of the thousands of fighters of the resistance. It would be impossible had it not been for the systematic organizational work done by Hizbullah over the last 25 years. But for all the heroism of the fighters, and for all the brilliant organizational work of their leadership, it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to defeat the Zionist army if the Lebanese resistance

had been left to its own means - as the Palestinian resistance is left, to a large extent. Fortunately, over a course of many years, Iran and Syria, instead of normalizing relations with Zionists, as most Arab states are doing, followed a different course. They sided with their brothers in Lebanon, and offered their support – political, moral, spiritual and material – to the Lebanese resistance movement.

This alliance made the victory possible. And this alliance, with its fortunate result, must serve as a lighthouse, it must be "*al manar*" showing the path: Every single state and movement opposing the empire must be supported. From North Korea to Latin America, and of course in the Arab and Islamic world, the forces fighting against the common enemy must coordinate and draw from each other's strengths. The Hamas government, strangled as it is from western powers, must be supported in every way possible. It must be armed, funded, recognized. Those who put pressure on it to recognize the Zionist state and renounce the struggle for liberation, should be vehemently denounced and ostracized.

The heroic Iraqi resistance against the occupation, this force that has brought the American empire to its knees, must be wholeheartedly supported. The so-called Iraqi government, which was brought to power by the novelty of "free" elections held under foreign occupation, must be denounced as a puppet of the occupation forces, in no way representative of the Iraqi people and its aspirations.

The work of revisionist historians must be supported in every way possible. In every international forum, representatives of states like the Islamic Republic of Iran should grab every available chance to denounce the hypocrisy of the west which at the same time that it is shedding crocodile tears about the lack of freedom and democracy in the parts of the world it doesn't control, at the same time persecutes and imprisons historians because of their researches. Revisionist works must be published and distributed as widely as possible, in as many languages as possible. Leaders of other states who are in the same camp – for example Venezuela, should be pressured to take a public stand on this issue.

Revisionist Historians, and their supporters, should also study the work of another group of "revisionists", who are also slandered and ridiculed like them: those who have researched and challenged the official version of the September 11 events. Those "revisionists" in turn – people like Thierry Meyssan, for example, should be approached and pressured to take a very serious look at the work of "holocaust" revisionists. Many of those people have an important audience, one which is ready to examine critically the official version of major historic events.

And the states that oppose the empire should also attack the empire where it hurts most: in its currency. Several years ago, Mahathir Muhammad, then prime minister of Malaysia, proposed an "Islamic dinar" system, which would eventually lead to a common currency among Islamic states. A currency which would be based on gold reserves, instead of reserves in U.S. dollars, as is the norm nowadays. Beside being a very sound course from an economic point of view, such a move would hit the empire in its soft underbelly: its ailing economy. This proposal must be resurrected and pushed forward. Aside from that, every single state that fights against U.S. imperialism should stop subsidizing it, and switch its foreign reserves away from the dollar – a first step, if you wish, toward a future monetary unification.

The Islamic Republic of Iran had declared in the past that it would open a new oil exchange, where oil would be traded in Euros, instead of dollars. Little is known, at least outside Iran, about the progress of this plan. Whatever the case, it must be accelerated because to a large extent, the dollar is based on its oil convertibility.

\*\*\*\*

I sincerely hope that, by the next time we meet, many of the things I have talked about will have been accomplished. The course of history is moving in that direction, and it cannot be stopped. Insa' allah, revisionist historians will benefit from these historic changes, in order to give a fatal blow to the monstrous lie that their research seeks to expose.

Thank you.  
Abu Nicola al Yunani

Permission is hereby granted for anyone to publish, copy and otherwise distribute the above text IN ITS ENTIRETY in any form and way possible. The publication of isolated parts thereof, however, is expressly prohibited.