

# POWER



WITH YOUR  
HELP  
WE CAN WIN!

The Zundelsite:  
www.zundelsite.org  
E-mail: irimland@zundelsite.org

Issue Nr. 340

Personal Opinions of the Author

July 1, 2007

Page 1

**The Zundel appeal has been filed! Now we wait for a response!**

**Mail sabotage in Mannheim –**

**Mapping out a new direction for our struggle -**

**Francis Parker Yockey's take on "The Man of Politics"**

**Paul Findley: "The High Cost of Subservience to Israel"**

**Deciphering Ahmadinejad's Holocaust Revisionism -**

**To our friends around the world –**

It is my understanding that Ernst's major appeal of the Mannheim verdict has now been timely filed. Dr. Schaller, our brilliant Austrian-based defense attorney has put together a stunning document that puts Ernst's struggle front and center with regard to the Zionist co-opted judiciary in Europe, particularly Germany. In a letter dated June 4, 2007, Ernst wrote:

Dr. Schaller came to see me this morning and brought along the work he did for the appeal. Ingrid, he was in constant pain, could hardly walk. It's the best, tightly argued, actually brilliant presentation of the fix the Germans maneuvered themselves into because of their opportunistic attitudes. I am grateful to the old man whose body may be worn out – but, Ingrid, his mind and expertise on this difficult topic have been invaluable in this case. The others have not yet sent me their submissions.

What could be done, was done! It was worth the effort. The job had to be done. It was needed – and for me an ethical imperative. Dr. Schaller's submissions are a tightly argued, Barbara Kulaszka-like, well-structured, exhaustively reasoned document of which we can be proud before history. Now we wait – and struggle on.

History will be the judge. It is a worthy conclusion to this phase of my life. By the time this case is completed, those whose job it is to see that justice is done will have had every opportunity given by fate and history to grapple with all the myriads of facets that enter into this case. I cannot do more for Germany and its intellectually strangely un-curious people, to put it mildly.

Further down in this letter Ernst talks about his disappointment of wasted opportunities laid on the table for the asking - all the way to the politically coerced ending of his trial, and how it is now incumbent upon all of us to chart a new direction. This topic of finding alternative ways of spreading the word is nothing new for me, for Ernst and I have had three years of thoughtful solitude in which we honed our plans and actually managed to lay a modest but solid foundation here in the Smoky Mountains. It is a direction we both feel passionate about, and I will comment briefly and give you a bit of an outline of projects I am working on, but first let me touch on a recurring crisis in Mannheim: the withholding of my mail, apparently in an attempt to drive a wedge between us!

This mail sabotage started right after the verdict, and as it now turns out, I may have been at fault. I was very angry about the unfair and utterly uncalled-for politically motivated sentence of a

demonstrably innocent man, and I gave vent to my anger by addressing a couple of letters to Ernst as "Political Prisoner Ernst Zundel." Furthermore, across the envelope I wrote in bold red ink: "Shame on Germany!" That's how I feel, and that's what I said – and will say in the future at every opportunity!

I live in a relatively small community. We have a cozy post office, right next to the police department, and Ernst is a big hit with the staff in both places, believe me! They all know him, like him, are incensed by what has happened to him, and suffer along with me – so whenever I take a letter to be mailed, especially when there is a long queue, policemen and all, I make sure a conversation about the shameful, undemocratic German censorship ensues. After all, it is my duty, as I see it, to spread truth! I tell them, loud and clear, sometimes flanked by the Pigeon Forge police, that unlike here, in Germany there is no such thing as Freedom of Speech, that in the past year alone, according to a post on David Irving's website, some 15,000 unfortunates have had to face a cowed, politicized judiciary and have been punished for exercising their god-given rights! I always have a most attentive, sympathetic audience!

Well, it seems that Judge Meinerzhagen took offense at what I had written and sent through the U.S. mail conduits for all and sundry to ponder - and to teach me a lesson, I guess, all throughout May, he withheld my weekly letters from Ernst. He did not tell him why, and Ernst, of course, was worried. Somebody was stealing his mail! Weeks went by in this limbo. In Mannheim there was denial all around, with staff insisting that no letters were received.

I started sending letters per "return receipt requested" and could soon see that the letter thieves were, in fact, nesting in Mannheim, not here. I also did a couple of special, certificated airlifts, sending replacement copies. As far as I can tell, Ernst has received the first, not yet the second. The latest is that I started faxing my letters to Dr. Meinerzhagen's office direct so we would have some documented evidence per telephone bill. Yesterday, Ernst's sister called, and there is temporary respite: two more of my letters were reluctantly handed to Ernst.

**Please help us free Ernst Zündel! With legal struggles in three countries on two continents, we need your support more than ever!**

The point, as I see it, is that whether or not the powers that be like it or not, I will do whatever I can – which is plenty! – to inform my surroundings and beyond by any means I can think of that officials in Germany are acting in the most disgracefully unlawful way by keeping an innocent man in a cage – and denying him what little comfort he is still entitled to receive, by law! And that includes his mail! There will be free speech demonstrations before the German Embassy in England and in Hungary in the near future, and I am working on two other European countries. And large German-American businesses in various countries will be next.

Ernst also tells me that he is now handed letters that were mailed as early as two years ago! As he points out, in that same time, a space shuttle could probably make it to Mars – and return!

The mail situation is getting ever more grotesque. I am now getting letters from July 2005. One letter was just now confiscated from someone I don't even know who must have written some nasty, to-the-point things about which they are allergic here. So, whoever it was, he now faces an investigative action. He had sent his letter on 7 January 2006 – almost 1 1/2 years ago! Only now do they get around to process it! That tells you what is going on with the mail.

So if you have written to Ernst in the past, don't expect to receive a timely reply – chances are he never got to see your letter in the first place.

As I am leafing through his letters, which keep arriving more or less intact, I am skipping through some rather bitter passages where Ernst reflects on a badly derailed trial for reasons not to be put in this letter, and expresses the need for a different strategic direction:

Opportunity after opportunity came and was not exploited – opportunities created by our sacrifices and perseverance. The public debate never had a chance to develop because nothing was thought of, much less attempted, that might have finally forced society, especially German society and the ruling circles to deal with this important topic. Sadly.

Ingrid, it is the [lack of imagination], the [poverty of spirit], the missing dimension [of what democracy should mean] that is responsible for the political-cultural wasteland Germany and Europe have become, for the mental and spiritual malaise and paralysis is Western-culture-wide! We Westerners have more or less stagnated in the areas where renaissance was needed – and, let me say, was possible. What was lacking, and still is, is the creative spark that is usually inherent in creative people. Cultural and not just economic creativity is called for! Culture is not just the filth of rap music or the degeneracy of sexual immorality – or what passes for “art” and “sculpture” in this age and time.

Ingrid, it is the inflexible [inertia], the mere repetition of old slogans, that clearly no longer resonate with the public as we find it – not as we wishfully thought it was. My conclusion is that it's time to re-examine, to reflect, to re-think, just as we thought we could do with our move to Tennessee. Now I have to do it in my prison cell, while

you run yourself ragged out there just to keep the wolves at bay. We were right in our feeling that [we are facing] a deep cultural malaise that needed different solutions – we were right, and, Ingrid, the sacrifices notwithstanding, [a remedy] still needs to be undertaken!

Western civilization's survival is a cultural-political problem, maybe even a religious one. [...] It is not surprising, for it is the spirit of the age, the *Zeitgeist*, that Francis Parker Yockey pointed that out in his guiding writings in the 1940s and '50s before materialism took hold in the West as the dominant driving force. Europe had just come out of half a century of sacrifice and idealism – by Communists, Nationalists, Fascists, and the German National Socialist ideology. One could say that Western civilization saw a fading away of those “isms” and its ideas.

Yockey stated repeatedly that the age of materialism and mercantilism was going to be superseded by the age of total politics. The way I interpreted his writings, politics was “wholistic” – religion, ideology, and politics were a blend, an overarching, all-encompassing whole, in which economic activity and finance were not the dominant driving force, the role it plays today.

Yockey made the statement that I always found very significant: “The man of politics will always be superior to the man of the military or of finance and commerce.” Yockey thus saw clearly that the overemphasis on money was a transitory phenomenon, culminating in what he called “Imperium”. Yockey married the ideas of Jefferson as encoded in the US Founding Fathers' ideas of individual freedoms and personal responsibility, bracketed by freedom of religious expression and freedom of speech and assembly. All are needed for a system not to calcify – because the freedoms and privileges in the Bill of Rights of the U.S. are needed for permanent renewal *from within*. That's why the system of constitutional amendments was adopted as part of the U.S. Founding Fathers' vision of what a modern state needed to be founded on.

It has been and will be for some time to come an uphill battle against great odds, for you are tangling with Evil Incarnate. Not some goofy bureaucrats! My arrest and rendition to Canada and my treatment there were not some INS slip-ups. You and I were, and still are, targeted for special treatment – hence, the stealing of our mail. They have succeeded in having me yanked from your side – Ingrid, I hope you do understand the reasons. At least one of the reasons was the combination of the U.S. Bill of Rights/Freedoms/Constitutional protections coupled to the meshing and the matching of knowledge, talents, and skills in a couple complementing each other in many areas. That's the combination that frightened them! Protected freedom, coupled with inalienable rights, exercised with skill and, above all, goal-oriented endurance by sober, decent people – that's one powerful combination! That's what made America a beacon of light for over two centuries. The old America. The one that was still true to its founding principles. That's why “they” had to capture America.

Today, America has become the plaything and instrument of powerful lobbies against which even Eisenhower warned in his farewell speech in 1960, before he turned the reins over to Kennedy. That was the first alarm bell I remember clearly understanding, for my English had improved enough to know the significance of what he was saying.

Please remember that if you send cash, Canadian bills and Euros are fine. Also, I can deposit a Canadian check but not a Euro check. We don't have a German bank account.

So, believe me – you, I, the rest of the world are suffering this fate because Americans as a people did not heed that warning in sufficient numbers – then or now! They ignored Eisenhower. They ignored Lindbergh. They ignored George Washington's dire warnings not to get involved in foreign wars and alliances, not to take sides in quarrels of foreign interest. They ignored Jefferson's wise counsel on the dangers of too much central authority, about the peril poised by a politicized judiciary, repeated by Madison and all kinds of lesser American thinkers over the last two centuries. To be ignorant of history means to repeat its errors. Ignorance when it comes to politics is not bliss. It's dangerous.

Yockey realized this after he had a chance as part of his U.S. War Crimes Investigative Unit to interrogate Europe's "other" elite after the Allied victory. And from there came the cross-fertilization of American ideas of individualism with the European concept of collective responsibility, and an individual's part of a community-wide embeddedness of all who live normal lives.

How often have Ernst and I discussed these ideas during the first three years of our marriage! While he was helping me to understand the ideological underpinnings, I distilled out for myself how I could be most effective, in a practical way, in bringing about this new direction he envisioned. I had been working in various public relations functions for years, and I was always thinking of a concrete translation of these incisive, all-embracing concepts. I always like to say that I can't sing, and I can't swim, and I don't even like to cook – but I can write in ways that touch the hearts and minds of manu. I've done it many times. I make no claim to being a meticulous Revisionist scholar, which would be utterly boring to me, but I know how to translate creatively for others what our struggle is really all about – and, hopefully, get them to join in an exciting undertaking that will leave a mark in this world.

I am keenly aware that what I have given you above is merely an outline of what I have in mind. In this letter, I want to sketch in a very preliminary way what both Ernst and I have often discussed should be an *expanded* outreach of what we loosely call "Revisionism." While Ernst was still with me, we talked about it endlessly – that the essential work of digging for evidence and assembling facts to challenge the orthodox version is finished, and that we need to think of *application* of those findings to the frayed social fabric of our world.

The traditional version of what is called "the Holocaust" is a destructive tactic that hurts not only us but many nationalist-oriented societies who equally labor under what our impeccable Revisionist scholars have shown up to be a politically useful and financially lucrative hoax. That's fine and good, in fact, essential – but ours should not be a sterile exercise, forever arguing with every Holocaust Believer who is stuck on the Six Million hoax and shrieks at us: "Prove it to me that what you say is true!" Why should we? We have. It's all there, for the asking, right on the Internet.

Where do we go from here? I say we need to find those audiences with whom we share a common cause. We need to make them our allies – all those who have had their voices muzzled, who have been lied to, who have been betrayed by their own governments,

who are aching to have their voices heard above the shibboleths. There are plenty such groups – the many patriotic Southern organizations, the victims of the Oklahoma bombing, of 9/11, the USS Liberty folks – to mention just a few. We all have suffered from the brazen lies surrounding manufactured terror events leading to government censorship. And we know very little of each other – in fact, we often shun each other and even fight each other. We need to step out of our self-imposed ghetto. The time has come for finding common ground.

Secondly, I know we need to work on weakening a psychological weapon of war our common enemy has managed to unleash on us, still very largely unchallenged – and that is the weapon of demonization. There is no point in telling each other that we are good and decent folks – by our actions we need to demonstrate that to those audiences who have been brainwashed to shun us. I know that if they really knew who we are and what we say and stand for, they would have no objection to our form of outreach.

How can we do that – convincing our potential allies that we should all in a pro-active way reach out to each other and circle our wagon against a common foe? By conducting ourselves as intelligent, responsible patriots. The formula is very simple. Our image is a political asset that we should guard and cherish – and apply!

Let me tell you by an example, without getting into specifics, for I have no interest in harming either individuals or groups with whom we might have many things in common. Recently, the matter of sleazy music came up that many young people in our ranks are using to drug their angry emotions. Now let me say up front that I am not exactly blessed with a musical ear – it's mostly noise to me, and certainly so-called "modern" noise is what a friend of mine described as "the sound a cement truck might make." It's unpleasant stuff. It's unworthy of us. And add to that the lyrics, straight from the Marxist sewer – and I am up in arms! I recoil from such stuff – always have!

My counterpart insisted that one can't make young, angry people enjoy and appreciate classical music, and that we need "to reach them where they are." I don't agree. If their cultural taste buds are right in the sewer, why lower ourselves into the sewer with them? It doesn't have to be classical music – but it ought to be clean music, uplifting music, music that reaches the heart! There must be this kind of musical talent out there!

And something else as well that I feel passionate about – and that is our duty to first cull out of the degenerate Marxist mess our best and finest young people – before we attempt to rescue the rest. Recently, I was on a long car trip with intelligent friends whose company I treasured. They made the well-known mushy argument that every one of our youth is worthy of salvation – and if, say, fifty are immersed in sewer filth and we can merely rescue two – well, our efforts have paid off!

**Together we will win! Every contribution counts!**



Well, not so fast! Against that argument, I say the following: Let's say you are a farmer with only a handful of grain. Your enemies have managed to contaminate acres and acres with weeds. Would you look for the thickest patch of weeds imaginable to sow your precious kernels? Of course not. You would look for a patch where your kernels still have a fair chance to grow. That's only common horse sense.

In our outreach, we need to be selective and prudent. Before we do anything else, we need to find and cultivate intelligent, responsible, productive young people. We don't need to fritter away our limited money and even more limited political and ideological muscle on punks.

This is the barest outline of the direction that I plan to take while I am waiting for Ernst Zundel to once again put his own shoulder to the wheel. I want to start producing products that reach the best of our kin, that will enhance our image, and I am looking for people who can and are willing to share our struggle in an expanded outreach that will net us dignity and pride.

I know it can be done. A few weeks ago I took a little excursion outside our own revisionist sandbox and attended a convention of USS Liberty survivors and their own relatives and friends. I did so in the company of a film producer and his wife who are working on a screen play of the USS Liberty story. I met him a few months ago, and we have talked projects and products. He is committed to working with me to get Ernst's story out in innovative ways to larger, mainstream audiences.

It was a small gathering - maybe only 100 or so attendees at this meeting, and I found I was not treated as a leper. People were curious. They knew the Zundel name; they understood the sacrifices Ernst has made to get his struggle known; and they appreciated his principled stand in the Gulag of the Soviet Republic of Germany. Former Congressman, Paul Findley was there. Here is his stand on an issue with which we would not disagree:

#### **The High Cost of Subservience to Israel / June 8, 2007**

In the greatest service of his long public life, former President Jimmy Carter warns of the grave consequences of America's phenomenal subservience to Israel. In his latest book and recent lectures, he focuses on how Israel's cruel occupation, made possible by massive and unconditional U.S. support, has subjected the Palestinian people to terrible suffering for forty long years. Beyond that grave human tragedy, candid observers must cite U.S. complicity in Israeli lawlessness as the major factor that prompted the horror of 9/11 and lured America into launching three costly, wrong-headed, and failing wars - Afghanistan, Iraq and the War on Terror. (...)

Nine-eleven would not have happened if any U.S. president in the last forty years had refused to finance Israel's humiliation and destruction of Palestine. Michael Scheuer, a former CIA analyst, now a consultant to CBS News, recently told a congressional committee that "our unqualified support of Israel" was the main reason for 9/11. Marine General Anthony Zinni, President George W. Bush's first special envoy to the Middle East, has stated that the United States

invaded Iraq for Israel and oil. Osama bin Laden repeatedly said it was payback for U.S. support of Israel's brutal treatment of Palestinians and other Arabs and for U.S. complicity in 1982 when Israeli forces used U.S.-donated munitions to massacre over 18,000 innocent Arabs in Lebanon.

The U.S. acts of war in Afghanistan and the War on Terror were President Bush's retaliation for 9/11. Israel - and only Israel - urged the United States to invade Iraq. Israel's lobby in Washington pushed hard and prevailed. To our foreign critics, these wars focus on killing people outraged by our pro-Israel bias. Our government has done nothing to redress the grievances of Israel's victims.

Despite this grim record, U.S. subservience to the wishes of Israel's leaders does not change. Unconditional aid to Israel keeps flowing, as does Israel's savage treatment of Palestinians and other Arabs. Moreover, the Bush administration is fully and openly pledged to do whatever is necessary - even acts of war - to halt Iran's nuclear program even if its projects are lawfully limited to peaceful purposes. Israel is the only nation urging the United States to attack Iran. The lobby is pushing hard again. If the U.S. assaults Iran it will be on Israel's behalf.

Congress, like the rest of America, is totally devoid of debate on the amazing role of this small nation in critical U.S. policy. Members are fulsome in public praise of the Jewish state, but no politician mentions the illegal behavior of Israel or the staggering burden it imposes on our country.

#### **How did Israel gain this influence?**

It all started 40 years ago. On June 8, 1967, the U.S. commander-in-chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson, turned his back on the crew of a U.S. navy ship, the USS Liberty, despite the fact that the ship was under deadly assault by Israel's air and sea forces. The Israelis were engaged in an ugly scheme to lure America into their war against Arab states. They tried to destroy the Liberty and its entire crew, then pin the blame on the Arabs. This, they reasoned, would outrage the American people and immediately lead the United States to join Israel's battle against Arabs.

The scheme almost worked. It failed because, despite the carefully-planned multi-pronged assault, the Liberty crew managed to broadcast an SOS over a makeshift antenna. When the appeal reached U.S. aircraft carriers nearby, the commanders immediately launched fighter planes to defend the ship. Informed of the launch, President Johnson ordered the rescue planes to turn back immediately.

For the first time in history, forces of the U.S. Navy were denied the right to defend a Navy ship under attack. Johnson said, "I don't care if the ship sinks, I am not going to embarrass an ally." Those were his exact words, heard by Navy personnel listening to radio relays. The ally Johnson refused to embarrass was Israel. To him, saving Israel from embarrassment was more important than saving the lives of the Liberty crew.

The day yielded infamy - deceit, lies and cover-up at the highest level. When the SOS reached the top military commanders in Israel, they immediately canceled the assault, claiming it was a case of mistaken identity. At the White House, Johnson accepted Israel's claim, even though he knew it was a lie. Then Johnson magnified the day's infamy by ordering a cover-up of the truth. Liberty survivors



were sworn to secrecy. Even those in hospital beds and badly wounded were threatened with court martial if they told anyone what actually happened. The cover-up has been continued by every administration since Johnson's.

It proved to be a fateful turning point in Israel's power over U.S. foreign policy. The Liberty experience convinced Israeli officials that they could get away with literally anything – even the murder of U.S. sailors – in their manipulation of the U.S. government. Financial aid to Israel began to pour like a river, all of it with no strings attached. According to The Christian Science Monitor, this outpouring has now cost U.S. taxpayers over \$1.4 trillion. Costs go far beyond money. Thousands of American families are blighted forever, with America's once high moral standing in shambles. Because of its unqualified support of Israel, Washington is hated worldwide as never before.

The principal source of Israel's influence is the fear it seems to instill in every sector of our society. The most effective instrument of intimidation employed by its lobby is the reckless accusation of anti-Semitism, often leveled at anyone criticizing any aspect of Israeli behavior. Several organizations, fundamentalist Christian as well as Jewish, lobby for Israel, but the principal one is the American Israel Public Affairs Committee [AIPAC]. I can personally certify that for many years it has cast a blanket of fear over Capitol Hill and blocked any semblance of unfettered discussion. (...)

Israel's grip on America seems impervious. Two distinguished political scientists, John Mearsheimer of the University of Chicago and Stephen Walt of Harvard, strode resolutely into the Middle East minefield a year ago by co-authoring a paper on Israel's lobby. More recently, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*, a book written by former President Carter, revered worldwide for his effective work on international conflict resolution, was published.

These brave statements should have produced a groundswell of public protest demanding America's liberation from Israel. Although the professors and Carter have pursued the lecture circuit, no tide of outrage has developed. With few exceptions, America's major editors, producers, commentators, academics and politicians have given these courageous initiatives the silent treatment. Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill simply said, "Carter doesn't not speak for the Democratic Party."

Nationwide, the lobby's influence is pervasive, sustained and deep, a phenomenon unprecedented in U.S. history. Because of that power, the "other" Israel is almost never discussed openly and candidly any place in America, even in private conversation. It is impossible to explain the silence except as a reflection of profound fear.

The situation is highly dangerous. America has already paid a towering price for our subservience to Israel, and great additional burdens seem inevitable. If the United States is involved in acts of war against Iran, anti-American protest will rise to new heights, especially throughout the Islamic world. It will inevitably deepen the widely-held belief among Muslims that America seeks to undermine Islam.

The outlook for reform is grim. Elected officials of both major political parties in Washington seem hopelessly captured by Israel's agents. So does every serious candidate for the presidency in 2008. A senior U.S. Senator told me recently that Israel cannot expect to experience true security until Palestinians are secure in an independent state of

their own, but he spoke off the record and has not made that wise declaration in public.

All U.S. citizens must accept a measure of responsibility for Israel's grip on America. Those of us who knew what was happening did not protest with sufficient force and clarity. Those who did not know should have taken their responsibility as citizens more seriously. They should have informed themselves.

The scene is likely to improve only if U.S. elected officials are criticized so forthrightly from home that they fear a constituent revolt more than they fear Israel's lobby. (...)

mparent7777 Marc Parent CCNWN

I am sure you see the parallels to our kind of struggle. Paul Findley makes the point that Ernst has made decades ago – that America's people were asleep at the switch; now they have to pay the piper; and it's time to call a spade a spade.

I often hear the argument by disillusioned supporters that we are in the doldrums - that censorship is rampant and getting worse; repression is growing; both Ernst and Germar, our stalwarts, are in prison; our politicized judiciary is hopelessly corrupt; and all those years of struggle are for naught. Oh jemine!

Not so! I couldn't disagree more!

Revisionism is ever more recognized for its statecraft potential by country after country – and our detractors are desperately whistling in the dark. Their fear is palpable. As I was putting together this letter, the following came floating on my desk top. Remember this assessment of Revisionism was written by our opposition, paying us a bushel of left-handed compliments by sketching Revisionism's phenomenal growth in the non-Western world, where there is still freedom to say what you think, unlike in our vaunted Western world:

#### **Deciphering Ahmadinejad's Holocaust Revisionism**

by George Michael / Middle East Quarterly / Summer 2007

Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad went beyond previous rhetorical attacks on the United States and Israel when, on December 14, 2005, he suggested that the Holocaust was a myth. Many European officials, among Iran's most lucrative trading partners, were outraged. The German government, for example, condemned his remarks and defended Israel's right to exist. Then, on December 11 and 12, 2006, the Iranian foreign ministry's Institute for Political and International Studies convened a conference promoting Holocaust denial, attended by sixty-seven participants from thirty countries. The fact that a head of state would endorse such a contrarian movement may seem remarkable but, for the Islamic Republic's leadership, it is a deliberate, strategic decision. Not only does the Iranian regime believe that Holocaust denial can propel it into a position of leadership among Islamic countries, but the Iranian regime and Holocaust revisionists have found their relationship to be symbiotic. Each believes a Jewish cabal controls Washington decision-making. Holocaust denial further binds disparate groups who share a critique of Jews and Zionism.

**Please remember our outreach work  
when you make out your will!**

## The Roots of Holocaust Denial

Holocaust denial at its roots is a Western phenomenon. In much of the United States and Europe, the Holocaust is viewed as a singularity without comparison and a story whose lessons are of vital importance to both Jews and gentiles alike. While more people perished in Stalin's gulags or Mao's Great Cultural Revolution, the methodical way in which the Holocaust was prosecuted exemplified what Hanna Arendt referred to as the "banality of evil".

The legacy of the Holocaust stigmatized both anti-Semitism and far right political figures and parties. However, in the 1960s, an intellectual atmosphere emerged in which nearly every truth could be challenged. Holocaust revisionism became the extreme right's answer to deconstructionism. For this fringe, Holocaust denial is a necessary step to bring about the revival of the ideologies that led to the extreme nationalism and xenophobia that enabled the Nazi party to set the Holocaust in motion. These early revisionists sought to exculpate the Germans for World War II. They argued that "World Jewry" had declared war on Germany and that Western powers, fearful of Germany's growing military and industrial power, conspired to support Poland, triggering the war. Subsequent Holocaust revisionists suggested the number of Holocaust victims was exaggerated; several argued many Jews had survived and were living either in Europe, Israel, or the United States.

Eventually three themes developed among many revisionists: First, they argued there were no gas chambers. Second, they denied six million deaths, and third, they said no Nazi master plan existed. Despite their best efforts, neo-Nazis and revisionists hit a brick wall in the West. Few people outside their own circles were willing to discount history, fact, evidence, and logic. While the impact of Holocaust revisionism in the West has been limited, in recent years, it has found fertile ground in the Middle East.

Historically, anti-Semitism was not as intense in the Middle East as it was in the West. As historian Bernard Lewis observed, Jews under Islam were never free from discrimination but rarely subject to persecution. Their situation was never as bad as in Christendom at its worst and never as good as in Christendom at its best. However, Israel's establishment augmented the vehemence of contemporary Islamic anti-Semitism.

Holocaust denial in the Middle East emerged soon after World War II. In 1955, Lebanese foreign minister Charles Malik dismissed the Jewish Holocaust as Zionist propaganda. Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser once said, "[N]o person, not even the most simple one takes seriously the lie of the six million Jews who were killed." In 1983, Mahmoud Abbas, who would later lead the Palestinian Authority, published a book titled *The Other Side: The Secret Relationship between Nazism and the Zionist Movement*, which claimed that far fewer than six million Jews had died in the Holocaust. More recently, Hamas has dabbled in Holocaust denial. In Saudi Arabia, anti-Semitic themes — including the blood libel accusation, the putative Jewish control of the U.S. media and government, and Holocaust denial — are popular staples in the media and educational system.

However, the Middle East produced no real scholarly exegeses. Revisionist historians associated with extreme right-wing groups in the West developed a far larger corpus of literature. More often than

not, Arabic presses simply translated Western works. Of the various right-wing groups that have reached out to the Arabs, Turks, and Iranians, revisionist historians have been best received.

One of the first efforts was in 1980 when Ernst Zundel, a German expatriate in Canada, wrote a pamphlet titled, "The West, War, and Islam," in which he suggested the existence of a conspiracy between Zionists and international bankers to rule the world. He recommended Muslims could better undercut the Jewish state by funding Holocaust revisionism rather than purchasing weapons. Zundel sent the pamphlet to the heads of state of several Middle Eastern states.

Holocaust revisionism has also become increasingly popular in Arab print media. Writing in the Jordanian newspaper, *Al-Arab al-Yawm*, Mahmoud al-Khatib averred that the "entire Jewish state [was] built on the great Holocaust lie" and that Hitler had killed not six million but only 300,000 Jews because "they betrayed Germany." An editorial in the Egyptian newspaper *Al-Akhbar* said that Jews fabricated the Holocaust in order to "blackmail the Germans for money as well as to achieve world support." More recently, a narrator on Lebanon's popular New TV announced that "never has there been an issue subject to as many contradictions, lies, and exaggerations regarding the number of victims as the issue of the Jewish Holocaust."

As European countries enacted hate laws limiting Holocaust denial, many Holocaust deniers sought safe haven in the Middle East. Few Arab states have hate speech or liable laws, except where they bear on interpretations of the Qur'an. In November 2000, Jürgen Graf, director of the Swiss revisionist organization *Verité et Justice* (Truth and justice), fled to Iran to escape a Swiss hate speech conviction.

The Middle East has become a venue of choice to present revisionist theories. In March 2001, the Newport Beach, California-based Institute for Historical Review and *Verité et Justice* planned a conference in Beirut featuring long-time revisionists Roger Garaudy and Robert Faurisson. Only intense pressure from the U.S. State Department caused the Lebanese government to reconsider its role as host. The organizers simply moved the conference to Amman, Jordan. The Jordanian Writers' Association was happy to sponsor it. While Graf's motives may have been purely anti-Semitic, his Jordanian hosts may have appreciated the geopolitical implications. As Graf explained, "Those countries which are authentically anti-Zionist Ö should make the breakthrough of Holocaust revisionism their foremost priority. A tank costs millions of dollars, yet one soldier can destroy it with a single missile. The revisionists can provide anti-Zionist freedom fighters with a weapon not even a thousand missiles can destroy."

David Duke, the white supremacist from Louisiana, has been at the forefront of right-wing extremist outreach to the Islamic world. In the fall of 2002, he presented two lectures in Bahrain on "The Global Struggle against Zionism" and the "Israeli Involvement in September 11." That same year, he appeared on an Al-Jazeera satellite network talk show and, in November 2005, he held a news conference in Damascus, Syria, pledging to do his best to convey to the world the "real peace-loving Syrian" positions. According to Duke, during his visit to Syria, he met with a high-profile Syrian journalist, Nidal Kaban, who gave a copy of Duke's book, *Jewish Supremacism: My Awakening to the Jewish Question*, to Ahmadinejad, suggesting this may have been the genesis for Ahmadinejad's subsequent Holocaust denial.

## Iran: New Center of Holocaust Denial

Anti-Semitism has long been a problem in Iran. European merchants brought blood libel to Iran in the sixteenth century. During the nineteenth century, the Iranian clergy instigated several pogroms. In the early twentieth century, Reza Shah (r. 1925-41) embraced racist theories. After all, the name Iran literally means "land of the Aryans." His sympathy for Nazi Germany led British and Soviet officials to force his abdication during World War II. Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini who in 1979 would lead the Islamic Revolution, long tinged his writings with anti-Semitism."

Holocaust denial was an outgrowth of Iranian anti-Semitism, propelled by the Islamic Republic's antipathy toward Israel. Long before Ahmadinejad shocked the West with his blunt rhetoric, Supreme Leader 'Ali Khamenei suggested the Holocaust to be an exaggeration. 'Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, an Iranian figure often labeled a pragmatist by Western journalists, voiced morale support for Holocaust revisionists in the West, suggesting the West persecuted one prominent denier for "the doubt he cast on Zionist propaganda." However, it was during the presidency of Mohammad Khatami, whose rhetorical calls for a dialogue of civilizations won European and U.N. plaudits, that the Islamic Republic became a sanctuary for revisionists. Tehran granted asylum not only to Graf but also to Wolfgang Fröhlich, an Austrian engineer who argued in court under oath that Zyklon-B could not be used to kill humans. Indeed, it was under Khatami that Iranian policy shifted from anti-Zionism to unabashed anti-Semitism.

In August 2003, the Iranian government invited Frederick Töben, a retired German school teacher living in Australia, to speak before the International Conference on the Palestinian Intifada held in Tehran in which he impugned the Holocaust by contending that Auschwitz concentration camp was physically too small for the mass killing of Jews. Ahmadinejad called the Holocaust a myth in December 2005, a move applauded by Hamas and the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood.

In March 2006, Töben returned to Iran to participate in the "Holocaust: Myth and Reality" conference at Isfahan University where he again argued that Auschwitz was too small to enable mass killings of Jews. According to the official Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting radio, the supreme leader's representatives in Isfahan organized the conference. Alireza Soltanshahi, representing Ahmadinejad, addressed the assembled students and faculty. Ahmadinejad, himself, sponsored and opened an August 2006 exhibition of cartoons denigrating the Holocaust.

Ahmadinejad has become a hero to the extreme right. Kevin Alfred Strom, founder of the white supremacist National Vanguard, expressed solidarity with the Iranian president, especially in his fight against common Jewish and Zionist enemies. He urged Ahmadinejad to use alternative media and advocated for cooperation between the Iranian government and neo-Nazis to reach out to antiwar Americans and break the grip of the "mainstream media monopoly." Right-wing extremists often cast themselves as "alternative media voices." When addressing audiences in Muslim countries, they downplay racist themes and emphasize anti-Americanism and anti-Zionism. This was apparent in interviews the official Mehr News Agency conducted with visiting Holocaust revisionists.

Ahmadinejad appears to have listened. He has made Holocaust denial a central tenet of his administration. Following his September 19, 2006 U.N. General Assembly speech, he granted press availability to

representatives of the alternative media, including Michael Collins Piper, a journalist for the extreme right newspaper American Free Press and author of *Final Judgment*, a book postulating that the Mossad killed President John F. Kennedy. After the conference, a personal friend of Piper, Iranian filmmaker Nader Talebzadeh, introduced him to Ahmadinejad, who actually invited Piper to be his personal guest in Iran. Following his press conference, Ahmadinejad spent half of a 90-minute meeting at the Council on Foreign Relations trying to debunk the Holocaust.

## The Tehran Holocaust Conference

Foreign Ministry sponsorship of the "Review of the Holocaust: Global Vision" conference in Tehran was therefore a culmination of a longer process. Leading officials including Ahmadinejad and Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki attended. The conference provided a venue for the who's who of Holocaust denial and revisionism. Duke gave the keynote address. Other prominent participants included Jan Bernhoff, a computer science professor in Sweden; Mattias Chang, a lawyer and an author of conspiracy books from Malaysia; Robert Faurisson, a former literature professor in France and a long-time Holocaust denier; Wolfgang Fröhlich, a Holocaust denier from Austria; Jürgen Graf, a Holocaust denier from Switzerland; Mohammed Hegazi, a pro-Palestinian activist who resides in Australia; George Kadar, originally from Hungary, who now resides in the United States and writes for the far right newspaper, American Free Press; Richard Krege, a Holocaust denier from Australia; Patrick McNally, a Holocaust denier and conspiracy theorist who currently resides in Japan; Michael Collins Piper, a writer for American Free Press; Michele Renouf, an Australian socialite and supporter of Holocaust revisionism; Bradley Smith, an American Holocaust denier who currently resides in Mexico; Georges Thiel, a Holocaust denier from France; Serge Thion, a French sociologist and critic of the politicization of the Holocaust; and Frederick Töben.\* At the conference, participants agreed to establish a world foundation for Holocaust studies and unanimously appointed Mohammad 'Ali Ramin as its secretary general. An advisor to President Ahmadinejad, Ramin once lived in Germany and is an ardent defender of Holocaust denial. [\*Please note: The author of this article must have worked from an old list in naming these participants; I know for a fact that, for instance, Jürgen Graf did not attend. I am not sure about the others.]

As with the Jordanian conference before, anti-Zionism combined with Holocaust revisionism. Former Iranian interior minister 'Ali Akbar Mohtashamipour conceded that the Nazis "committed horrendous crimes during World War II" but added that "the Zionists' narration of the massacre of the six million Jews at Nazi death camps is far from reality."

Right-wing extremists who participated in the conference expressed satisfaction. By working with Muslims, they hope to dilute the stigma of racism. Rather than characterize themselves as "white supremacist," they now speak of "white separatism," placing themselves within the third-world vocabulary of self-determination and liberation. While associating with a Middle Eastern despot, especially in the aftermath of 9-11, might not seem expedient, neo-Nazi groups may consider that they have little to lose since they are already marginal. That any head of state would embrace them enhances their stature. So, too, did media attention. CNN's Wolf Blitzer granted Duke a platform to discuss his participation in the conference.



The Tehran conference may have provided a boost of adrenalin to neo-Nazis. Erich Gliebe, chairman of the National Alliance, the most prominent U.S. neo-Nazi organization, lauded Ahmadinejad and lamented that Western leaders did not have his "guts." Days after the Tehran conference concluded, he announced that his organization would hold a similar conference at its Hillsboro, West Virginia headquarters. Several revisionists who attended the Tehran conference participated.

In an effort to further isolate Iran, nearly forty European and North American research institutes announced that they had suspended contacts with the Iranian Institute for Political and International Studies — a leading Iranian think-tank that helped organize the conference. Francois Heisbourg, head of the Paris-based Foundation for Strategic Research, organized the boycott.

### Strategic Implications of Holocaust Denial

Although other Middle East figures have dismissed the Nazi Holocaust, Ahmadinejad has changed the discourse with his stridency. His gambit may serve him well amid the increasing polarization between Islamic countries and the United States. His confrontation has elevated him to a central player on the international scene. By championing Holocaust revisionism, Ahmadinejad has demonstrated his bona fides to the Islamic world and tapped into the reservoir of resentment against Israel that transcends sectarian differences. By radicalizing the Middle East, Ahmadinejad seeks to prevent a rapprochement between Israel and conservative Arab states that have a security interest in containing an ascendant Iran. In doing so, Ahmadinejad could conceivably draw support from Sunni radicals that have been traditionally hostile to the Shi'a.

Domestically, some Iranians fear that Ahmadinejad's provocative rhetoric is isolating their country. However, Khamenei stands by the Iranian president. On March 22, 2007, for example, the supreme leader railed against the "global Zionist conspiracy," rhetoric borrowed directly from *The National Vanguard*. Some moderates and reformers have urged the Islamic cleric-led regime to rein in the president for fear that his controversial comments may lead to a propaganda campaign against Iran. However, whether for ideological or practical reasons, the Iranian leadership has decided that its natural allies are not liberal Western democracies but rather the right-wing fringe of Western extremism.

[http://www.meforum.org/article/1704#\\_fnref48](http://www.meforum.org/article/1704#_fnref48)

I think my readers will appreciate this summary. Although it's smear, smear, smear – as per usual! – the article makes clear how far and how strongly Revisionism has spread, and that it is perceived as a powerful and, to our enemies, frightening tool of applied state craft. No matter how they shriek and call us names, no matter what they claim - no longer are we "marginal"! And, as you can see, it all started with the 1985 Great Holocaust Trial of Ernst Zundel when he published not only "Did Six Million Die?" but also the little pamphlet, "The West, War, and Islam"!

As some of you know, last summer was a heartbreak time for me. I had to bring my handicapped son home from California because I was sure he was dying. He is a diabetic in advanced stages; he had lost 60 lbs and was so weak that he could barely walk. He was reeling from coma to coma. In addition to the psychological stress, there was the day-and-night worry that he would choke to death

because that's the visible manifestation of insulin shock – I watched it once, and it is terrifying! I didn't see how I could manage to take care of him and still do the work that I needed to keep doing for Ernst.

I am happy to tell you that, at least for now, Erwin has stabilized. He has a small apartment in an Assisted Living complex and seems to do okay. And just to show you what a comfort I derive from Ernst, who understands like no one else on earth what this enormous struggle is costing all those of us in the trenches, here is what he told me in one of his letters:

"I feel for you; I read and sense your heartache about the lost and dashed dreams and hopes due to Erwin's misfortune. Ingrid, of course no one can put himself in your situation, to have an entire life be shadowed by such a tragedy. But, Ingrid, after I came to my senses and saw and experienced your grandeur of soul, and finally understood and saw up close every day your inner values, your core, the essence of your being – Ingrid, I understood that this trauma had forged you into a Special Being, and that it was a privilege to be linked in marriage and in comradeship and to march beside you in this incarnation. It was like a revelation to me.

You so rightly and wisely write that you "Öcan't imagine what it must be like to have served the last four and a half years in these humiliating circumstances and the last 45 years preceding it in that lonely quest for truth and justice for the Germans who now treat you like this – "Im Namen des Volkes" / In the Name of the People – for whom I endured all those half century of nightmare after nightmare, humiliation and often degradation, suffering not only the hurts and bruises, the arson and the bombs, but what weighs more, the psychic or soul pains inflicted by alleged helpers, comrades in the struggle and so-called friends – and, of course, the discarnate evil entities of which we are both aware.

Ingrid, what a life! What karma! Yet, after long reflection and soul searching, and again, after having let my life and career pass in review, having one more time immersed myself in all these materials the Germans have so busily trucked together – Ingrid, my wife, what a rare privilege to have been picked by God only knows what forces of destiny to be the ones to be the instruments to do this job! What an amazing life's path compared to the miserable existence of those miscreant time servers in the anonymous wheels of huge bureaucracies! Can you imagine? To be condemned by fate to such a lifelong punishment, to such a career? That's not a life! That's how serving in Stalin's Gulags must have felt for an idealistic Soviet era Communist.

Compared to them, consider the satisfaction one feels of having kept the circling hyenas at bay, to have bested them for decades, to have hurled into their faces contorted by hatreds of a different, unearthly kind: "To here, and not beyond!" What a privilege!

To that I say, "What a man!" See why I feel we cannot lose? Let no one underestimate the Zundel passion for a calling to better our world - by saying what we say and doing what we do!

Stick to us, and let's soldier on. No surrender!

Ingrid Zundel

