

POWER



WITH YOUR
HELP
WE CAN WIN!

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

Issue Nr. 338

Personal Opinions of the Author

May 1, 2007

Page 1

**What do we know of "asymmetric warfare"?
Zundel challenges judges in bid for re-hearing!
David Irving is back - in his old, incomparably feisty style -
German Police cadets disdain Holocaust indoctrination -
Congressman Dana Rohrabacher on CIA's extrajudicial renditions -
US Attorney General Gonzales on the hot seat!**

Please be partner in our information offensive – call or fax Ingrid's Senator and Congressman!

To our friends around the world –

So far, the verdict has not yet been finalized, even though it's been two months. Technically, Ernst is still in "investigative custody." It means that the mail restrictions still apply, even though at least one supporter told me that his letter plus newspaper clippings have made it through the censorship bottle neck. However, the latest wrinkle in our political struggle this past month has been the confiscation, if not theft, of my weekly letters to Ernst.

It seems that right after his verdict, none of my letters reached him for some six weeks, and of course he was frantic, thinking that something had happened to me. Several times I sent replacement copies – he did not get them either. He complained to the prison administration and to Dr. Meinerzhagen, both of whom claimed they had not received any letters. I tried to track them through my post office – no doing! Finally, I sent six weeks' worth of past letters in one huge envelope, certified and registered – and, bingo! It worked like a charm, since someone had to sign for having received and accepted them! Similarly, an important letter sent Global Priority to one of my contacts in Germany arrived only after several weeks. Global Priority, which costs \$9.50 per letter, is supposed to have delivery guaranteed in three or four days. It is clear that somebody somewhere has sticky fingers!

I am describing this in such an elaborate detail because both Ernst and I believe that what we are experiencing is what is called "asymmetric warfare" – a political attempt to deliberately cause severe mental stress to family units, particularly partners, to distract them from the battle at hand. I hate to put it that way, but to withhold mail is a rather mild form of this tactic, as these "distractions" go. I'll give you an example of something much more serious – I'll leave it up to you to decide if this could be coincidence or not!

As you may remember, during a crucial time in Ernst's Canadian legal battle, Doug Christie had to withdraw because his wife, Keltie, developed breast cancer. This may well have derailed some very important strategies at that time in Canada, besides costing us a huge pile of money, because we had to switch legal teams. Barely was Ernst in Germany, when the wives of both defense attorneys, Mrs. Rieger and Mrs. Bock, were reported to suffer from breast cancer also. I understand that both of them have died. This, too, in the middle of important moves in the Mannheim Zundel trial. Ernst himself has asked: Can this be coincidence that the partners of three defense attorneys should be afflicted with the same disease in the same time span of a crucially important political trial? We are asking.

Similarly, last summer I was battling a very distressing medical emergency in my family in that I had to move my handicapped son from California to Tennessee because he was reeling from one diabetic coma to another. (He has survived ten life-threatening comas, so far, in a little over a year..) As I understand it, hypoglycemic comas happen through insulin overdosing – too much of a rapidly-acting hormone and not enough food in the body – and since we managed to get control of his shots through a more carefully controlled dosage protocol, he has recovered to a remarkable degree. And of course with Ernst battling high blood pressure, for him to imagine all kinds of disasters pertaining to me must have been distressing. But if our enemies think they can throw a monkey wrench into our very close relationship, they are mistaken. Ernst and I are comrades, not just marital partners. Ernst himself put it well when he commented along those lines:

They will put me through the wringer and [take advantage of] my being in their clutches for every minute, day, and year. Their aim is to illustrate their total control and power – and our powerlessness. They are making very good use of me, from their vantage point. Not only do they snoop on every letter and conversation, which certainly is a dream come true that they have [tried to achieve] for 30-40 years – they also [cause stress] by their decrees, court orders and prison and court censorship rules as well as their presence at visits and during telephone calls, which are intercepted, you can be sure. (...)

You really were never interested in statecraft or military/political history. Ingrid, that's not being critical. I did not work with you, or get married to you, because you were a Rosa Luxemburg. We had other topics and things that united us and made our meeting [each other] fruitful and productive – and immensely important and useful.

Ingrid, the enemies knew that, QUICKLY, and earlier than you and I realized. That's why their massive effort from Day ONE [was] to sabotage the work, the mechanism, then the relationship. (...) Everything from the beginning was designed to cut, to prevent or outright destroy this combination of talents, skills, knowledge and personalities. That's [what] kept puzzling these people! That's why I was asked as late as last Christmas if ours was a real marriage. (...)

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

These people have a radar far, far superior to ours. We are superficial in our [understanding of] forces and talents, skills like intuition, clairvoyance and esoteric dimensions that they have educated out of us. (...) While they consciously cut us off from our multidimensional capabilities, they infected and blinded us with their "induced thinking" (...) in short, they messed with our software, what our hardware can accept and what software will play on that marvelous machine which is the human body and mind.

So, for the snoops who will comb this letter for clues of cracks in our relationship – to you I say: You can go fly a kite! Or as Ernst puts it: "They are barking up the wrong tree!"

Back to more mundane developments:

After our second appeal at the Cincinnati Sixth Circuit was turned down by a very hostile judges' trio, my very shocked Immigration Attorney, Bruce Leichty, immediately launched a blistering counter-offensive:

ZUNDEL CHALLENGES JUDGES IN BID FOR REHEARING

Cincinnati, Ohio—Two of three judges who denied his federal court appeal should voluntarily disqualify themselves because of improper associations with his federal government adversary, maverick publisher Ernst Zundel says in a petition filed April 12 with the U.S. Court of Appeals in Cincinnati seeking a rehearing on his United States habeas corpus case. The court denied his bid for a habeas corpus fact-finding hearing in February 2007.

Zundel, a German national married to a United States citizen but currently jailed in Germany, is asking for either a rehearing by a new three-judge panel because of bias, or a rehearing *en banc* by a larger group of judges because of the critical constitutional issues his case raises, says his California attorney, Bruce Leichty.

In his request for rehearing Zundel asserts that the three-judge panel which denied his appeal failed to address his argument that his habeas rights had been unconstitutionally suspended, and failed to address the implications of "converting" his appeal into a petition for review under the REAL ID Act of 2006.

Under the REAL ID Act, immigrants hit with a deportation order are allowed only "one bite at the apple" consisting of a request to a federal appeals court for review of legal issues, notes Leichty. "The impatience of Congress with seemingly interminable federal court review of deportation orders was understandable at the time the REAL ID Act was passed in 2006," notes Leichty, "but the REAL ID Act also assumed that immigrants hit with deportation orders already had had administrative hearings and due process in front of an immigration judge. That never happened in Ernst Zundel's case."

Leichty says among its errors, the Cincinnati appeals court assigned an illegal immigrant status to Zundel that he did not

have, overlooked the expiration in May 2000 of a congressional program which prevented German visitors from asserting their rights, and also failed to address the fact that Zundel in October 2000 had been given work authorization and the right to travel and return to the United States, after his wife, Ingrid Rimland Zundel, petitioned for his permanent residence as her spouse. The court further ignored the fact that INS had a policy of not deporting immigrants awaiting permanent residence through a U.S. citizen spouse petition, according to Leichty.

The Zundels were living in Tennessee and awaiting an immigration interview in 2003 when federal agents arrested him without a warrant, just a few months after the FBI had found that Zundel's conduct was protected under U.S. law and that he would likely obtain permanent residence. Upon his arrest Ernst Zundel promptly filed a petition for habeas corpus, but a federal judge in Knoxville twice disavowed any jurisdiction, and Zundel was whisked across the Canadian border while his appeal was still pending; the appeals court has now refused to require a hearing despite precedents requiring such hearings for deported immigrants when they are barred from reentering the United States, says Leichty.

Zundel discovered after his arrest that two letters sent by his Tennessee attorney to INS about rescheduling his permanent residence interview were missing from the INS file. The arresting authorities used the pretext of a "missed hearing" when they arrested Zundel, says Leichty.

"Here is a man who never had his day in any sort of court before being carted out of this country to face indefinite imprisonment in Canada and Germany under laws that Americans have historically rejected," says Leichty.

Zundel spent two years in solitary confinement in Canada while the Canadian Interior Ministry attempted to prove, through use of secret evidence, that he was a national security risk to that country, and he was then convicted in Germany in February 2007 of a speech crime after Canada deported him. He is currently sentenced to serve a five-year prison term in Germany, but plans to appeal that sentence.

Leichty states that because of the label of "Holocaust denier" attached to Zundel and the stigma associated with it, it has been difficult or impossible for Zundel to get a fair trial in any of the countries where he has been imprisoned. In Germany Zundel was not allowed to present evidence to rebut the government's contention regarding "the Holocaust," although the exact meaning of that term and the limits of acceptable discourse regarding the events of World War II remained ambiguous, says Leichty.

The judge presiding at Zundel's "security certificate" trial in Canada was a former advisor to the Canadian national intelligence service, which provided the secret evidence used to convict Zundel there—although the Canadian Supreme Court has since found that the use of secret evidence in such proceedings is unconstitutional.

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.

The judge presiding at Zundel's trial in Knoxville found that he had written "anti-semitic" materials, a finding repeated by the Cincinnati appeals court in the first sentence of its February 2007 opinion, despite the fact that Zundel has always disclaimed anti-semitic views and despite the fact that Zundel's political opinions should have been irrelevant for the purposes of immigration issues, says Leichty.

"And now Zundel has been victimized yet again by federal appeals court judges who should have disqualified themselves from hearing his case because of partisanship," claims Leichty. One of the judges, Clinton appointee Martha Daughtrey, has a daughter working as an Assistant United States Attorney in Tennessee under Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, the respondent named in Zundel's case and also the officer heading the department litigating Zundel's habeas corpus claim.

The presiding judge in Zundel's U.S. appeal, a 2003 Bush appointee named Deborah Cook, was forced to issue a public apology in January 2007 for having tried to make a prohibited campaign contribution to the then-senior Republican Senator from Ohio, Michael DeWine, who was engaged in 2006 in a fierce reelection battle with his Democratic challenger. Investigative journalists at www.Muckraker.org first uncovered the prohibited contribution and said that Cook initially tried to blame it on her lawyer husband before finally conceding that she didn't know such contributions were prohibited, because she missed "judge's school." President George Bush twice flew to Cincinnati to appear at fund-raisers for DeWine, one of which was held at the home of the brother of another Ohio federal judge.

Documentation of all those facts has been presented to the Court of Appeals in Cincinnati as part of Zundel's petition for rehearing, says Leichty, who notes that he didn't discover the judges' associations until after both judges showed their predisposition at oral argument in January 2007.

"Clearly when Judge Cook made that campaign contribution to a Bush crony she showed a total lack of understanding of the fact that she was obliged to leave partisan politics behind her when she was appointed to the federal bench," adds Leichty. "How then can a controversial political dissident deported by the Bush administration have any confidence in that judge?"

Leichty notes that in early April he visited with Zundel at the prison in Mannheim, Germany where he is confined. Despite appeals to international law, German judicial authorities refused to allow the two to talk confidentially, placing an "interpreter" in the room despite the fact that English has always been the language that Leichty and Zundel communicate in.

"Ernst's spirit is unbroken and he believes he will be vindicated by history in all three of the countries where he has been persecuted," says Leichty. "My immediate hope is that he will also be vindicated by the judicial system in at least the one country which still claims to protect free speech and habeas corpus and due process."

Just last night I learned that one of our nemeses, a very slick and unpleasant government attorney, has been kicked off the case and

replaced. We don't yet know what it means, but our challenge is moving like the proverbial heat-seeking missile, and we are certainly not giving up.

David Irving is back - in his old, incomparably feisty style:

April 7, 2007 (Saturday) London (England)

I AM TOLD that in today's Times (April 7) the poo-obsessed Times columnist Giles Coren has revealed that his doctor has told him that he produces an excess of bile. His writings about me of late suggest that he had no real need to seek medical expertise to learn this.

MORE seriously, the German Government has quietly admitted that over the last twelve months it prosecuted over 18,000 Germans for offences of "right-wing extremism," of which only a few hundred involved actual violence: i.e. they prosecuted over seventeen thousand thought-crimes — people unwitting displaying the old swastika emblem, or even worse, National Socialist ideas, and perhaps even "denying the H."

As the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung recently pointed out in a courageous editorial, most of these new criminal records have been sprung on ordinary citizens blissfully unaware of the criminality of their actions and thoughts, because the tame German media are too cowardly to report any of these cases — even the major trials like those involving the revisionists Ernst Zündel and Germar Rudolf.

These absurd laws themselves are protected by fresh layers of other, even more absurd, laws making it impossible even for court-appointed attorneys to provide an adequate and conscientious defence to those accused under the thought-crime laws. Any German or Austrian lawyer who does, can be — and frequently is — himself ordered arrested by the judge, for having associated himself with these criminal thoughts and deeds. Zündel's court-appointed defence attorney Sylvia Stolz made herself unpopular with the prosecutor for "hampering the prosecution," and is now to be prosecuted for so hampering. Go figure, as the Americans say.

More than once my chosen Austrian lawyer, Dr Herbert Schaller, arrived in the Vienna prison with fresh horror tales from Zündel's Mannheim courtroom — the judge Meinerzhagen had warned him that if he asked certain questions of the court, or made certain defence motions, he too would be arrested.

I remember that in January 1993, when I was tried in Munich under Germany's laws for the suppression of free speech, one of my three lawyers turned up apologetically on the morning of the hearing apologizing that he could not continue to act for me, as the Munich Bar Association had threatened him with dismissal — i.e. the end of his career — if he did. He showed me their actual letter. I was fined thirty thousand deutschmarks, around twenty thousand dollars, for uttering a single sentence which the Polish authorities now belatedly admit was true.

I NOTICED when I was in Viennese prison that the jailhouse, built to hold eight hundred malefactors, currently held 1,400 inmates, a quarter of them Blacks. It was a tight fit but it was possible, provided we did not all breathe at the same time.

This morning I have received a letter from Frau K., an elderly Viennese lady in her nineties. Exercising what is the constitutional right of every citizen in most other countries, on September 27 of last year she had written a personal letter to the President of Austria, one Herbert Fischer — a small, straw-haired gentleman of even smaller character and endowed with all the intellect and bearing of Lady Chatterley's gardener — to protest against my arrest, trial, and imprisonment. "What D. I. said was right," she wrote in one passage of this incriminating letter.

She received no presidential reply? Right. — She heard no more? Wrong.

On March 8 the Austrian criminal authorities sent her a letter fining her the sum of 200 euros under penalty of jail for having written these seditious words to their august president. No trial, no hearing, no defence — no lawyer would have dared to defend her anyway.

This is the new Europe, coming soon to a jailhouse near us. I for one shall do my damndest to prevent it.

So the dissident glove is still very much in the ring, and I don't want to hear any yammering that we are "losing this battle"! Far from it! Every day, the enemy reveals himself disastrously — in front of the entire world. Especially young people are fed up to the hilt with this unrelenting diet of Holocaust fare. Here is one fine example:

Police cadets disdain Holocaust indoctrination

Source: **The Times**, March 23, 2007 Roger Boyes in Berlin

Fears that the German police force contains neo-Nazi sympathisers have been sparked after disdainful cadets delivered an extraordinary rebuff to a Holocaust survivor.

Students at the Berlin police academy refused to listen to the harrowing testimony of Isaak Behar, 83, who had been invited to lecture them on his experiences as a Jew in the Third Reich. Mr Behar lost his parents and his two sisters in the Auschwitz concentration camp.

The cadets shouted that they did not want to hear about the Holocaust any more, and said that the Jewish community was emotionally blackmailing Germany, according to German press reports. Dieter Glietsch, Berlin's police commissioner, has opened an investigation. (...).

[Behar] has demanded a parliamentary inquiry from the state of Hesse, which is responsible for protecting him. According to the mass circulation newspaper Bild, one of the investigated bodyguards threatened "to spill the beans about far-right activity at Frankfurt police headquarters" if charges were pressed against him.

The bodyguards have been suspended from duty. The German press and Police Workers' Association have called for their dismissal from the force.

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

"These incidents show that far-right thinking is now anchored in the mainstream of German society," said Mr Friedman, "and it is increasingly obvious in the police force".

That sentiment was echoed by Andreas Nachama, a leading rabbi. "This antisemitism is appearing everywhere and it is as threatening as it is reprehensible."

Insiders say that police antisemitism is usually more discreet, confined to comments at the police station after a stint of duty.

The guarding of Jewish sites, from synagogues to the Jewish Museum in Berlin, is particularly unpopular among the police rank-and-file. Their task is to head off neo-Nazi attacks or report antisemitic symbols daubed on buildings overnight.

In the April Power letter I mentioned the extrajudicial rendition scandal that has started a real flame war in the German media. When Bruce and I were in Washington, D.C. a few weeks ago, in vein trying to talk to my Tennessee senator and congressman about political kidnappings, there was scant interest. The impression left with me was that it was either too hot a potato to discuss, or there was lack of information. Now it turns out that already in January there was a European Union delegation trying to pinpoint the tail on the CIA donkey. Here is what Bruce sent me last night — and it is a shocking piece of evidence of how deeply the US is involved:

Congressman Dana Rohrabacher Personifies Why Many Dislike America and Its Policies / By Ann Wright / † t r u t h o u t | Guest Contributor / 23 April 2007

"I hope its your family members that [sic] die," said US Rep. Dana Rohrabacher to American citizens who questioned the Bush administration's unlawful extraordinary rendition policies.

Congressional hearings provide a deep insight into the inner spirit of our elected representatives - and sometimes the insight is not pretty.

On April 17, we witnessed Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-California) unleashing his anger onto members of the European Parliament's House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights. The members were invited guests and witnesses at the hearing. The subcommittee had issued a report in January, 2007 that was sharply critical of the Bush administration's extraordinary rendition program in which persons from all over the world were detained by either the CIA or local police, then flown by CIA jet (torture taxi) to other countries where they were imprisoned (Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Libya, Djibouti, Morocco, Yemen. The report was equally critical of European governments for allowing the unlawful flights to take place.

From 2001 through 2005, the governments of fourteen countries in Europe allowed at least 1,245 CIA flights with illegally abducted terrorist suspects to be flown through their airspace or to land on their territory. Germany, Britain, Ireland and Portugal allowed the highest numbers of covert flights. As well as at least the 1,245 flights operated by the CIA, there were an unspecified number of US military flights for the same purpose.

The European Parliament report differentiated between lawful extradition of criminal suspects for trial in another country and unlawful abduction - sending to a third country usually noted for torture of prisoners and imprisoning for years without trial persons suspected of criminal terrorist acts.

The report acknowledged that terrorism is a threat to European countries as well as to the United States, but the European Parliament committee said that terrorist acts must be handled lawfully by both European countries and by the United States. The report said: "After 11 September 2001, the so-called 'war on terror' - in its excesses - has produced a serious and dangerous erosion of human rights and fundamental freedoms." The extraordinary rendition program undercuts the exact liberties we are defending, the rule of law, the right for a fair and speedy trial and the right to know the evidence on which one is held and prosecuted.

Some who were kidnapped ended up in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Others were flown to prisons in other countries for interrogation and torture. Many of those who were subjected to extraordinary rendition are still in Guantanamo. Many have been there for over five years. Over 400 of the 770 persons who have been imprisoned in Guantanamo over the five years since it was opened have been released. Only 380 are left imprisoned in Guantanamo. Only three have been charged by the Military Commission, and only one was tried in Guantanamo. After five years of being held prisoner, Australian citizen David Hicks was convicted in March 2007 of material support to terrorism and sentenced to only seven months further imprisonment, which he is serving in Australia. The Bush administration has said it will try only 50-70 of the 380 remaining in Guantanamo. That means that of 770 who have been in Guantanamo, only 50-70 will be tried. The others eventually will be freed due to lack of evidence of a crime. Many will have spent five years or more in prison.

Virtually every prisoner who has been released reported being tortured while imprisoned in countries such as Syria, Uzbekistan, Egypt, Pakistan and Afghanistan. Some prisoners say they were tortured by police or interrogators. Some say they heard American voices in the background while they were tortured. None were charged with any crimes. None went to trial. They were abducted by CIA or local authorities at the request of the United States. The United States did not present evidence of criminal actions, nor request extradition from the country where the person was detained. Nor did a central approving authority look at the rationale for spiriting a person to the control of a third country for interrogation. Persons were "rendered" many times on the say-so of junior CIA officials.

Back to the Congressional hearing. With eyes narrowed and mouth in a contorted grimace, Congressman Rohrabacher attacked the two British and one Italian members of the European Parliament who testified before the committee. Reminding one of Joe McCarthy in tone and substance, Rohrabacher demeaned and degraded the report and chastised, belittled and berated the Parliamentarians.

Remarkably, Rohrabacher said most of the CIA private flights that landed in Europe were to transport CIA agents all over the world, not to move prisoners. Yet the logs of the 1,245 flights have been tied by date and location to the movement of specific individual prisoners from one location to another.

Rohrabacher railed against anyone who questioned the right of the Bush administration to do whatever it wanted - legal or illegal - to prevent terrorist acts, and said that [European countries] not supporting the Bush policies were consigning their countrymen to terrorists. In particular, he said that any Americans who questioned the extraordinary rendition were un-American.

Citing historic examples of other countries kidnapping persons, Rohrabacher said Israel had every right to kidnap Nazi official Adolph Eichmann from Argentina, bring him to Israel and execute him. Rohrabacher conveniently forgot to mention that the Israeli government did put Eichmann on trial - a trial which none of those who have been extraordinarily rendered have had. Rohrabacher then attacked and belittled the European Community for outlawing the death penalty, saying, "You in the European Community won't stand up to evil people, you won't execute them. Eichmann deserved to be executed, just like these terrorists must be executed."

Rohrabacher never once mentioned due process, the rule of law, right to a trial for anyone picked up in the extraordinary rendition program. Merely because persons were "rendered" and imprisoned by the US meant to Rohrabacher they were guilty.

Rohrabacher said if European countries did not cooperate with the United States and go along with whatever the Bush administration wanted, they were condemning their countrymen to terrorists by not using extralegal methods to imprison terrorist suspects. When citizens attending the hearing, including members of Codepink Women for Peace and Veterans for Peace, heard Rohrabacher's statement, they collectively groaned. Then, much to the shock and disbelief of everyone in the hearing room, Rohrabacher said to those who had expressed displeasure at his statements: "I hope it's your family members that die when terrorists strike."

At that point, I had had enough of Rohrabacher. I stood up and said, "I did not serve 29 years in the US military and 16 years in the US diplomatic corps to see demise of the rule of law and violation of our own laws. Rohrabacher's statements are outrageous. No wonder the world hates us!"

Chairman Delahunt gavelled for me to stop speaking, and I was escorted by the police out of the committee room. I was not arrested.

Remarkably, I do agree with one thing Rohrabacher said. "They hate us."

Rohrabacher finished his sentence with, "They hate us because they hate our way of life." Unfortunately, many people do hate us, but it's not for our way of life.

Its for exactly the talk and actions that Rohrabacher and the Bush administration represent: illegal and unlawful actions, an arrogant attitude that America is always right and everyone else is wrong, that the world's resources are for the exclusive use of the United States and we have the right to invade and occupy any country.

Until we change the manner in which presidential administrations and the Congress operate and the way we approach our membership in the community of nations, the world will continue to question what America stands for.

Ann Wright retired as a colonel after serving 13 years on active duty and 16 years in the US Army Reserves. After 16 years in the US diplomatic corps, she resigned in March 2003 in opposition to the war in Iraq. She had been assigned in Nicaragua, Grenada, Somalia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Sierra Leone, Micronesia and Mongolia. She helped reopen the US Embassy in Kabul, Afghanistan in December 2001.

So here, too, are avenues we can investigate and exploit to get to the bottom of Ernst's political kidnapping. And this is only what Ernst calls the "sighting of the periscope" – that small mechanical eye that emerges from the waters and scans the horizon for hostilities – and lets us surmise that there's a submarine deep down we can't yet see or reach.

An unexpected visitor

As I was just about to put the final touches on some ten updates to the Zundelsite, my door bell rang. My unannounced visitor was a man I had never heard of before, who is the right hand of Manfred Roeder, the German nationalist whom many of you know at least by name. These two German travelers wanted to visit a few supporters in the US and had booked a flight without any problems. When their plane landed on American soil, however, three policemen were waiting for them who took Roeder into custody and told him he was not welcome in America.

Here is how Manfred Roeder described his experience in a letter to the United States General Consul in Frankfurt: (translated)

I have just come back from the USA and immediately traveled to the General Consulate in Berlin, as it was urgently suggested to me, to apprise you of my personal experience. However, the doorman refused me entrance and suggested that I write to you. Here is my summary:

I had a valid passport and planned to visit friends and relatives in the USA, but was stopped at the Kennedy Airport. It was explained to me that I was not welcome and would have to fly back. No reason was given. Three times officials of the Customs Border interrogated me and wanted to know about my connections to the Ku-Klux-Klan. The Klan is of no interest to me as a German. Why are they asking me?

What I experienced next, I would never have believed. There was constant surveillance, even at the restroom, as though I was a dangerous criminal. Since there was no flight back available that day, I was locked into a cell that was worse than any prison in Germany. Without any explanation! A cold, tiled cell without any

window, only a toilet in the corner, but not a single piece of furniture. There was no chair, no bed, only a contraption of steel much like an operating table. Where was I to sleep? On the bare floor or on this slab of steel? No blanket, no pillow, despite several requests. A bright bulb was turned on all night long. All my personal items had been removed – belt, wallet, tie, watch, pen, even my comb. Is there now Guantanamo all over America? Arrest without explanation, no recourse to justice, inhuman treatment, senseless torture without any reason or explanation. And this is done to a 78-year old who has had four strokes and is wheelchair bound. Do you know the meaning of all this?

I wanted to apprise you of this situation in person because the guards were keenly aware that this was wrong, that it hurt America's image – but they had no choice. They felt shame. Already there are many countries who call the USA the "Great Satan". Is it any wonder?

As I was waiting for my return flight, another German from Berlin was stopped as well by the Customs Border Police and informed, that he had to take the next flight back, because during a previous visit he had overstayed his visa for a few days because he was helping a cousin, a US citizen who had had just given birth to a baby, to babysit [her other child]. Is this mere stubborn bureaucracy or sick hysteria? It's unworthy of the land of the free and the home of the brave.

I heard from somebody else that a US Professor, a US citizen, who had spoken out against the Bush Administration in an open forum, was not allowed to take even an interstate flight! I plan to fly to California in July to speak at a convention there. Will that be possible? You wonder.

Meanwhile, our nemesis, US Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, who is in litigation with us for violating Ernst's civil right, is occupying a very hot seat in senate investigations for having purged 8 judges who were unwilling to dance to the neo-con tune. A few days ago, he "testified" – if you can call it that!

What Gonzales Really Told Us /

By William Rivers Pitt / t r u t h o u t | Columnist / 20 April 2007

The testimony given Thursday by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales before the Senate Judiciary Committee during a hearing to investigate the firing of eight United States attorneys deserves a place of high honor in the Gibberish Hall of Fame. It was astonishing in its vapidness, almost to a point beyond description. The emptiness of Gonzales's answers, after several hours, became the political version of a Zen koan. They simply stopped my mind.

It was, in the main, an unspeakably gruesome performance. The aspect most commentators immediately seized on was the amazing number of questions Mr. Gonzales answered with either "I don't recall," or some permutation thereof. Estimates put the final count somewhere between 74 and 100 "dunno" replies, an amount truly Reaganesque in stature.

There was no bristling give-and-take during this hearing, no fiery debate, no "Have you no sense of decency" moment when the rogue official is brought snarling to bay. Indeed, the only time tempers flared was when exasperated senators became fed up

with Gonzales's inability to answer virtually any of the questions put to him. The annoyed senators, Republican and Democratic alike, at several points rained condescendingly rhetorical questions upon him in extremis, expecting no answers because they knew none were ever going to come.

Judiciary Committee member Tom Coburn, a conservative Republican senator from Oklahoma, dropped one of the more devastating bricks of the day after slogging through Gonzales's feeble display. "It was handled incompetently," said Coburn of the firings that inspired this hearing, if not of the testimony he'd just endured. "The communication was atrocious, it was inconsistent. It's generous to say that there were misstatements; that's a generous statement. And I believe you ought to suffer the consequences that these others have suffered. And I believe the best way to put this behind us is your resignation."

The sentiment was repeated in the waning moments of the hearing by Senator Chuck Schumer of New York, who said: "Mr. Attorney General, at the beginning of the hearing, we laid out the burden of proof for you to meet, to answer questions directly and fully, to show that you were truly in charge of the Justice Department, and most of all, to convincingly explain who, when and why the eight US attorneys were fired. You've answered 'I don't know' or 'I can't recall' to close to a hundred questions."

"You're not familiar with much of the workings of your own department," continued Schumer. "And we still don't have convincing explanations of the who, when and why in regard to the firing of the majority of the eight US attorneys. Thus, you haven't met any of these three tests. I don't see any point in another round of questions. And I urge you to re-examine your performance and, for the good of the department and the good of the country, step down."

Dana Bash of CNN reported comments made by appalled Republicans during breaks in the hearing. "Loyal Republican after loyal Republican in this hearing room," said Bash, "and more specifically in private to CNN today, have made it clear that they are frankly flabbergasted by how poorly they think the attorney general has done in this hearing. During the lunch break, in private, several very loyal Republicans made it clear to CNN that they were really dripping with disappointment."

Another CNN reporter, Suzanne Malveaux, offered other Republican statements of dismay. "Two senior White House aides here," reported Malveaux, "described the situation, Gonzales's testimony, as 'going down in flames.' That he was 'not doing himself any favors.' One prominent Republican described watching his testimony as 'clubbing a baby seal.'"

Ouch.

So what is to be made of this? As attorney general, Gonzales is the top official in the Department of Justice. The list of DOJ-related agencies that Gonzales is expected to oversee is nearly 60 items long. Among these are the FBI, the ATF, the DEA, the Civil Rights division, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the US Marshals Service, the Office of the Solicitor General and, of course, all the US attorneys spread across the 50 states. The DOJ's own web site explains that, "Since the 1870 Act that established the Department of Justice as an executive department of the

government of the United States, the attorney general has guided the world's largest law office and the central agency for enforcement of federal laws."

Is it possible that the man charged with such awesome responsibilities is, in fact, a blithering idiot? Nothing in Thursday's hearing served to disabuse anyone of this notion, and in the final analysis that may be the whole point of the exercise ... and the tip of a very dangerous iceberg.

Allegations have been raised that the Bush administration sought to use the US attorneys' offices within key battleground states, along with political appointees within the DOJ's Civil Rights division, as a hammer to break apart voting protections for minorities. "For six years," reported Greg Gordon in the Baltimore Sun, "the Bush administration, aided by Justice Department political appointees, has pursued an aggressive legal effort to restrict voter turnout in key battleground states in ways that favor Republican political candidates, according to former department lawyers and a review of written records. The administration intensified its efforts last year as President Bush's popularity and Republican support eroded heading into a midterm battle for control of Congress, which the Democrats won."

"Questions about the administration's campaign against alleged voter fraud," continued Gordon, "have helped fuel the political tempest over the firings last year of eight US attorneys, several of whom were ousted in part because they failed to bring voter fraud cases important to Republican politicians.... On virtually every significant decision affecting election balloting since 2001, the division's Voting Rights Section has come down on the side of Republicans, notably in Florida, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Washington, and other states where recent elections have been decided by narrow margins."

Beyond that is the specific case of California US Attorney Carol Lam, who prosecuted and convicted Representative Randy "Duke" Cunningham in a massive Congressional bribery scandal. Lam was later fired from her position, supposedly because she was failing to effectively prosecute immigration cases, or something to that effect. (Mr. Gonzales could not actually recall exactly why Lam was sacked, to nobody's great surprise.)

However, allegations have been raised that she was actually removed because her investigations into Cunningham were leading her closer to the centers of Republican power. Back in March, none other than Republican Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania raised the issue on the Senate floor. Specter openly questioned whether Lam had been removed because she was "about to investigate other people who were politically powerful."

On the surface, yesterday's hearing and the galaxy of unrecollections offered by Gonzales may seem to have been a waste of time. In fact, this was a revelatory moment of grave import. Decisions to disrupt elections and voting rights, decisions to derail investigations into Republicans, are made for political reasons by political people. In this administration, the political people all work in the White House.

There can be little doubt, after yesterday, that Alberto Gonzales was elevated to his position by Bush to affect a political takeover

of the Justice Department. The muscular legal arm of federal power became just another tool to establish Karl Rove's dream of a permanent Republican majority in government by disrupting the vote and by obscuring GOP corruption. Thus, it doesn't matter if the attorney general is a pudding, because there were other chefs in the kitchen at Justice.

It can be easily argued that Gonzales couldn't answer simple questions, not because he is especially dumb, but because he truly didn't know how. He wasn't there to run the place, but to open doors for, and get out of the way of, Bush's political hatchetmen. Any appointees who weren't going along with the program, including those fired US attorneys, were swept aside.

It can just as easily be argued that he was able to answer those questions, but avoided doing so for tactical reasons. The New York Times's editorial on Friday raised this line of thinking by stating: "At the end of the day, we were left wondering why the nation's chief law-enforcement officer would paint himself as a bumbling fool. Perhaps it's because the alternative is that he is not telling the truth. There is strong evidence that this purge was directed from the White House, and that Karl Rove, Mr. Bush's top political adviser, and Harriet Miers, the former White House counsel, were deeply involved."

Either way, subpoenas need to be delivered to the hatchetman-in-chief, Karl Rove, as well as to members of his crew, to gather their sworn public testimony on the matter. It was made clear Thursday that Gonzales wasn't in charge at Justice, and Rove appears likely to have been the man who stood in his stead. Why? That's why we ask questions.

For the record, decisions to disrupt elections and voting rights, and decisions to derail investigations into Republicans, are flatly illegal. The first is fraud, the second is obstruction of justice, and both are felony crimes. The exposure of Gonzales on Thursday represents a long step towards pinning legal accountability to the door of a certain Pennsylvania Avenue house, and to the lapels of those persons within who are, at last, running out of excuses.

William Rivers Pitt is a New York Times and internationally best-selling author of two books: "War on Iraq: What Team Bush Doesn't Want You to Know" and "The Greatest Sedition Is Silence." His newest book, "House of Ill Repute: Reflections on War, Lies, and America's Ravaged Reputation," is now available from PoliPointPress.

Where are we in this battle? We're in the trenches – true! I still say we are truly fortunate to have a ringside seat in these momentous times! While we are waiting for the written verdict in Ernst's case – it's been two months, and still no word! – before we can launch a two-front legal-plus-media offensive – already very much in the making...! – I have two jobs for you. Please do your part – it is important to show unity of purpose!

There will be a photo-op demonstration in front of the Washington, DC based German Embassy on May 7, and I would like you to alert my Congressman and Senator to the demonstration and ask them to arrange for a one-to-one meeting with me on May 8 that was refused to me last time.

Just tell them why you think that they should meet with me. Once more, the contact information is as follows:

- **The Honorable Bob Corker, U.S. Senator**
10 W Martin Luther King Street, 6th Floor
Chattanooga, TN 37402

Phone Number: (Washington) 202-224-3344 and Tennessee 423-756-2757 / Fax: 423-756-5313

- **The Honorable David Davis, U.S. Congressman**
PO Box 769 Kingsport, TN 37662

Phone Number: (Washington) 202-225-6356, and Tennessee 423-247-8161 / Fax 202-225-5714

Faxing or calling would be best! Keep your message short, polite, non-threatening – but forceful!

Secondly, I'd like you to scan your address book or memory and see if you might have a German-speaking friend. If you know of a German club in the area, that would be even better. I'd like for as many German-speaking people as possible to have a copy of Ernst's paperback, **Setting the Record Straight**, now titled in translation, **Briefe aus Gefängniszelle 7**. It really is a little masterpiece. It reads even better in German than in the original English version.

There are two ways you can help distributing this book – you could simply order a copy to give to your friend with a few helpful words – or, if there's real courage in your heart and a few extra dollars in your pocket for a good cause, you could make a present to 20 members of your local German Club. You can have 20 copies at cost! Included is an order blank for your consideration.

Dear Friends and Comrades in this struggle: The Information War is sizzling! A lot is happening. In a few weeks, I will be doing presentations in West Virginia and California. There will be a follow-up meeting with British-based Lady Renouf - to take up where the Iranians left off. In my vicinity, I have already had several meetings with a reputable feature film maker who is on our wave length and fascinated by the Zundel story - he will be visiting Ernst in Germany this month. There will be magnificent footage from the Washington, DC demo itself, filmed by a Canadian documentary producer. There are splendid new update DVDs that are in the hopper but need to be finalized and distributed. There's more I will tell you next time.

Thank you for not letting us down! I feared a lessening of interest and support after the brutal verdict – so far, it hasn't happened! Let's not let it happen tomorrow! Our information front stands firm. There's work to do with callused hands, powered by sturdy hearts with confidence. The Ghetto will not win!

Ingrid Zundel

Breaking News: Sylvia Stolz just e-mailed me that she has been ordered by a judge to undergo a psychiatric evaluation for her heretical opinions!

Just like in the Soviet Union !