For the Record:
How to traumatise a nation’s settlers – before, during and after the Holocaust-Shoah...

Dozens of Ashkenazi Babies Mysteriously Disappeared During Israel’s Early Years

As we say here often on this website, the key to understanding Jewish history resides in understanding Jewish behavior, and the key to understanding Jewish behavior lies in understanding the abusive, corrosive, and highly dysfunctional spiritual/psychological energy that animates and electrifies Jewish thinking which can basically be summed up in just a few items – unbridled narcissism rooted in a ‘chosen’ status above other peoples coupled with an A-to-Z proforma of trauma-based mind control methods.

If everything in this piece is factually accurate, and it is safe to assume it is, what it underscores is the process by which the leaders within the Judaic community engage in a process of constant mental conditioning of those under their sway as a means of fashioning them into Zion’s foot soldiers for the benefit of those at the top. Stealing their children from them and then selling them either to adoption agencies, medical experiments, for use as sex slaves or for the purposes of organ harvesting is not something that the crime bosses relegate only to Gentile children.

As Jesus made clear in his condemnation of the Pharisees, it is the ruling class within the Judaic community that bears the blame for the thousands of years of reflexive conflict between the Judaic and non-Judaic worlds, for, as Jesus Himself said in his condemnations of that same Jewish leadership - “You travel over land and see to win a single convert and then once you have him within your clutches, you turn him twice as much into a son of perdition as you are.”


Exclusive:
Dozens of Ashkenazi Babies Mysteriously Disappeared During Israel's Early Years

A Haaretz investigation based on the testimony of Holocaust survivors and their families reveals that Ashkenazi children disappeared in a similar manner to the abducted Yemenite children.

The immigration card issued for Ganit Efrat's parents. Tomer Appelbaum

Ganit Efrat, a lawyer from Petah Tikvah and a former Mossad agent, has been feeling that her heart is “bleeding,” as she says, in the past months. The media coverage of the stories of the Yemenite children who disappeared during Israel's first years has resurfaced the pain, sadness and frustration over the disappearance of her big brother Zelig, who she didn't get to know. Like many of the Yemenite children who disappeared, Zelig was also hospitalized as a baby after falling ill, never to return to his parents. They were also told that he died, but weren’t presented with a death certificate or a grave. They were also bluntly silenced, and they too were left with a big question mark looming over their son’s fate.

Zelig, however, wasn't born to a family that made aliyah from Yemen or disappeared from a transit camp in Rosh Hayain. His parents were Eastern European Jews who lost all of their family in the Holocaust and were deported by the British to a detention camp in Cyprus, where they were also forced to bid farewell to their baby son, under circumstances that to this day remain unclear. Their family tragedy later disappeared on the margins of the Yemenite children affair.

Now that the affair has again resurfaced, it is important for Efrat that the public know that not only children from Yemen disappeared in the past. "This method started even before the establishment of the state, outside of Israel, with Holocaust survivors,” she says.
Recently, Haaretz has received information about dozens of new immigrants from Eastern Europe, many of whom were Holocaust survivors, who were separated from their infant children and do not know what happened to them. It happened both in hospitals in Israel and at the British detention camps in Cyprus before the founding of Israel. The background of the families involved “shows it was not racism of Ashkenazim against Sephardim, but patronizing and arrogance by veterans against new [immigrants],” says a woman who is still searching for her sister who disappeared just a few days after she was born. 

Zelig’s father, Moshe Eff, came from the city of Turobin in Poland. His mother, Miriam, was born in Cernowitz, now in Ukraine. The two escaped the Nazis and after the war met at a displaced persons camp in Austria, where they fell in love and married. In 1947 they sailed to Mandatory Palestine aboard the “Hatikvah” boat, but like tens of thousands of other Jews were deported by the British to a detention camp in Cyprus. A few months later, in June 1947, their eldest son Zelig was born in the camp. His mother was 20 years old and his father 25. “My parents said he was a healthy and good-looking child who was born weighing four kilos. Everything was fine,” Efrat said this week. From here on the story is very similar to those of the immigrants who arrived from Yemen. When Zelig was four months old he fell ill. “He just had a light cold, so my mother took him to the clinic at the camp,” Efrat says. The clinic, similar to the other institutions at the Cyprus camp, was run by the Jewish Joint organization together with Jewish Agency emissaries who came from pre-state Israel. The medical team instructed that she leave her baby overnight for observation, and refused to allow her to stay with him, as she asked. The following morning, when she came with her husband to the clinic, they were told that the son died overnight. When they asked to see his body, they were driven away in disgrace. According to Efrat, her mother told her that “the medical team told them ‘go away, you’re still young, you’ll have more children.’ That’s how the story ended, but really, this is only where it begins.”

In February 1948, her parents were released from the camp and made their way to the port to board the ship that would bring them to Israel. Oddly, “the representatives from Israel, who came to Cyprus, asked them to declare that they are making aliyah with their son – the same baby that only months ago they were told died,” Efrat says. “My parents told them: ‘But he’s dead! We don’t want to lie’, but they were convinced that they’ll get better terms and a better apartment if they declared that they were arriving with their son.”

She keeps at home the Oleh card that the Jewish Agency issued for her parents. Alongside the names of Moshe and Miriam appears the name of their son Zelig, as though he arrived in Israel with them. In Israel, the couple settled down in Jaffa, in a house that belonged to Arabs that escaped it during the War of Independence. In the following years they had three more children. The vanished baby wasn’t spoken of at home. “We didn’t know anything,” says Efrat. “In a ‘Holocaust’ family you don’t speak of such things.”

Twenty years ago, she says, the silence was suddenly broken. “My father told me the story. It turns out that the issue was a burning concern for him for years but that it was suppressed.” In the same conversation he told her that for years he searched for the doctor and the nurse who took care of his baby son, and finally found the nurse at a retirement home in central Israel. “He said the nurse confessed to him, that their son was sold for 5,000 dollars to a childless couple, and said that it wasn’t the only case,” says Efrat. Her mother died nine years ago. Only in retrospect did Efrat understand an incident that occurred some decades ago when she herself lost a baby right after the birth. “My mother started screaming like a wounded animal. Back then I still didn’t know of this whole story, and I said to her ‘Mother, I’m the one who lost a daughter, not you! You need to support me, not me [support] you.’ Only years later did I understand that her tears were for herself and not only for me,” she says.

Her father, 95, is still alive. “That’s the main thing he’s still living for. He’s waiting for news. He thinks there might still be a miracle,” says Etti Ron, Efrat’s sister. The sister adds: “He told me that if anyone could find the abducted child – it’s only me. I’m convinced from the bottom of my heart that he was sold. I have no doubt about it. My intuition tells me he’s still alive, but we have no lead.”

Efrat sometimes wonders, “Maybe he’s looking for us? Maybe he doesn’t even know that he’s adopted? It’s an enigma, we have no idea. He would be 70 today. Maybe he’s no longer alive? And maybe he lives in this building? There are a lot of residents here and I don’t know everyone. I’m not going to use anyone, but I want to know what happened there, who did it and why,” she concludes.

In the state’s commission of inquiry report into the abduction of Yemenite children, published in 2001, cases like the one of the Efrat family appear under a short clause under the title “The disappearance of babies from other communities.” According to the report, about a third of the babies that disappeared and whose cases were brought before the commission weren’t Yemenite. The majority of them, however, were of Mizrahi origin. In a table attached to the report, the inquiry commission wrote that 30 cases of children of “European” or “American” origin were among those who disappeared.

“The circumstances of the disappearance of the babies of other communities are very similar to the circumstances of the disappearance of the Yemenite immigrants’ babies,” the report said.

“In general, this is about the disappearance of babies of families that made aliyah in the first years following the state’s establishment, and in their cases too, the babies generally disappeared from their parents following hospitalization or soon after birth at maternity homes,” the report added.

The report’s authors were aware of the sensitivities regarding mentioning children of other origins together with the children born to Yemenite families who then disappeared. “Even though, babies from other communities also disappeared under similar circumstances, the phenomenon of disappearance was etched into the consciousness of the Yemenite community as a phenomenon unique to the Yemenite community,” the report said. “The disappearance of babies of other communities under similar circumstances naturally tears away at this singularity,” it said.

In other words, the state commission of inquiry was concerned that families of Yemenite origin won’t view favorably the mention of those abducted from other communities, as that might have weakened their main
claim that the establishment – which was mostly Ashkenazi at the time – was responsible for the abduction of Yemenites, among other things for racist motivations, and as part of a discriminatory and humiliating treatment of Mizrahi immigrants.

There’s no clear evidence of the number of Ashkenazi babies who disappeared at the time, but testimonies of families from across the country that reached Haaretz as part of an investigation carried out in recent weeks indicate that the figures reach dozens of cases and maybe even more. Some of them were published in the media in the past as individual stories of mysterious disappearances that weren’t categorized as part of a wider phenomenon. Others were never reported, and only now, when the issue has returned to the public agenda, the families chose to speak out.

“My heart goes out to all the families of the kidnapped children, including the Yemenites, but for us the tragedy is double,” says Rachel Potter from Ramat Gan, who lost a brother under similar circumstances. Her parents were Holocaust survivors. Her mother, Chaya-Sarah Sonya Persky came from Volozhin, which today is part of Belarus. Her father, Simcha Potter, was born in Warsaw, Poland. Both her parents lost their families in the Holocaust and met in Poland after World War Two. Her parents were also deported by the British to a detention camp in Cyprus after trying to reach Israel. They married in Cyprus. In 1948 they arrived in Israel and were sent to a camp for new immigrants in Hadera. In March 1949, their first child, a son named Aharon, was born in Brandeis Hospital in Hadera.

"My mother told me that she breastfed him and he was a good looking and healthy child,” says Potter. After giving birth, Chaya-Sarah became ill and remained in the hospital. Later she told her daughter that because she could not get up, her husband went to visit their son in the children’s home.

One day, as the mother tells it, she asked her husband to bring their baby son for a test at Hadassah Hospital in Tel Aviv and leave him there. “They took advantage of my mother being bed-ridden to kidnap her son,” she says. After three days Simcha was told that their son had died, but he never saw the body or a grave. "He came and told me that they told him the child died, and that's it. We didn’t talk about the child ever again. It was over,” her mother said much later.

Potter remembers how her mother would tell her: "They stole my [son].” Her mother would cry a lot, she says. "Her eyes were always red, she told me her tears were not water, but blood,” said Potter this week — and broke out crying herself. Attempts to locate her lost brother have become the mission of her life, and she has paid a high emotional price because of it.

Along her long journey, she has managed to find various documents; and found a great number of question marks in them: “The birth and death dates and various dates of hospitalization... so many contradictions,” she says – presenting proof of her claims from the documents she found.

“I am angry with the Ashkenazi establishment just like the Yemenites. The anger is directed at those same Ashkenazim who did it to us too,” says Rachel. "My father took it to heart and died at a young age from grief,” she says crying. "I was daddy’s girl. When I was born, he was so afraid that it would happen again that he never left me for a second. I was stuck to his leg all the time. When he died, 33 years ago, I went crazy,” she says. Her mother is still alive, but “she never recovered and all her life she suffered and was depressed and deteriorated.”

Far to the south of Ramat Gan, 150 kilometers away in Dimona, lives Rachel Ben Shimol. She keeps a a picture of a sleepy baby in her house, her younger brother Zvi. He was born in 1948 in the transit camp in Marseilles, France to his parents Shmuel and Liza Rettig, Polish Jews who managed to escape the Nazis, and then they moved to Israel.

In 1950, Zvi fell ill and was hospitalized in Jaffa. His parents never saw him again. They too were told he had died, and they too never received a death certificate or were shown a grave. “The years passed. My parents never spoke about it and did not mention it,” says Ben Shimol. “Every Friday I saw my mother wipe the dust off Zvi’s picture, but she never said anything.”

Later, when the stories of the missing Yemenite children began to come out, the suspicion began to take hold in her too, and she asked her mother: “Maybe my brother was kidnapped too?” but never received an answer.

When she began to look into the matter herself, she realized that more was hidden than known. At the Interim Ministry she found out that — similar to many of the missing Yemenite children — her brother was listed as having left Israel. “Ceased being a resident,” is what the ministry says officially. “It still makes me shudder when I think about it, because after all they told us he had died,” she says.

At the burial society her brother is listed as having died and buried in the children’s section in the Kiryat Shaul Cemetery in Tel Aviv. “Something here is strange,” says Ben Shimol. Over the past few years she has been conducting a legal battle against the government in order to receive a permit to open the grave and conduct a DNA test on the bones inside, in order to know once and for all whether her brother is buried there. “I want for him to have a gravestone and for the affair to be closed,” she says.

As a result of similar questions, 15 years ago well-known director David Fisher began a historic and family journey, which he has documented in his film “Love Inventory.” The case was of his twin brother and sister who were born in 1952. His parents were both Holocaust survivors, who married after they reached Israel. The twins were born in Assaf Harofeh Hospital in Tzrifin. The girl was born first. Fisher’s mother was exhausted and fell asleep after the birth. When she woke up, she was told her daughter was sick, and later she was given the news that she had died. They didn’t even have time enough to give her a name. After seven months the boy, Sami, was infected with polio and hospitalized in Pardes Katz Hospital.

“They didn’t let my parents enter [the hospital],” Fisher said this week. “My mother said she peeked in through the window in order to see him. They had the feeling the boy was getting better in the hospital, until they realized they were wrong. When he died — assuming he died — no one bothered to inform them.”

The parents never saw the graves of their children. “My parents were used to death from their surroundings when they were young. Now, when the twins died, they chose to continue on and not get stuck. They lost their entire families in the Holocaust. They lost another two now, but they chose to continue, to make more,” says Fisher.
Decades passed. Before her death, Fisher's mother asked him to solve the riddle. “I didn't succeed,” he admits. He was unable to find traces of his lost sister, even though he is convinced she is alive. At the height of his detective campaign, which included intensive searches in archives all over the country, Fisher turned to a retired senior police officer, Dr. Avital Ginaton, who was the head of the police's psychology unit. He asked him to prepare a composite portrait of how his lost sister might look today, after so many years.

The picture was published in the weekend edition of Yedioth Aharonoth 15 years ago, but did not lead to a breakthrough. Ginaton explained at the time in an interview with Yedioth that “the purpose of the composite drawing was to create visual documentation of an eyewitness and not to recreate a week-old person, who no one alive today can remember. There is no real basis for it, except that it is the nature of siblings to look similar to each other because they are the children of the same parents. But there are siblings who are not alike and we cannot trust the assumption that the lines of similarity that characterize the siblings in a family apply to her too,” he said.

Fisher found the grave of his brother Sami in the Kiryat Shaul Cemetery in Tel Aviv, but he and his four siblings, one of them attorney Ronel Fisher, chose not to open the grave and check if their brother really was buried there. Not everyone who grew up in a family in which one of the children disappeared is willing, or interested, in exposing themselves to the public. A few of the families, whose details are being kept confidential by Haaretz, prefer to let the matter rest. “I am against forcing people out of the closet,” says Efrat. “Not everyone can withstand the psychological and emotional burden involved.”

This is exactly the case of Ella (a pseudonym, whose real name is being kept confidential by Haaretz). She lives in the center of the country and this week she told Haaretz about two twin girls who disappeared in her family right after they were born. “It was an Ashkenazi family, which spoke Yiddish at home. The mother came from Romania, the father from Belgium. They took both of their babies,” says Ella.

It happened in 1954 in the Dajani Hospital in Haifa. “Their mother saw them and heard them crying. They told her they were healthy and everything was fine, and that’s it. She never saw them again,” said Ella this week. “After a day or two, a doctor came and said they had died. How did they die? What were they sick with? All these questions weren’t answered. They died, go home. You will have other children, ‘they were told.’ So the mother left the hospital without birth certificates and without death certificates.

The mother of the twins, who is now 90-years-old, is still alive. “She is sure they died, or she has convinced herself they died. I am afraid that if we reveal the names and pictures she will understand they kidnapped her twins and it will kill her,” said Ella.

“Throughout all the years she said they died, that is what everyone thought. And then, a year ago, when the entire matter of the Yemenite children arose again, I had the thought that the story was very similar to the other stories I heard, so I started to ask a few questions,” says Ella.

“She said they died, that she did not see their grave, but the hospital took care of it. She still believes it, even though she never saw any documents—not a birth certificate and not a death certificate. She remembers they were born healthy and strong, but says then they still didn’t know how to take care of babies,” she says. “It is clear to me, completely clear, they were kidnapped. I have no doubt whatsoever,” concludes Ella.

Orna Klein from Kfar Sava, who was also a Mossad agent in her past, is now collecting information on the missing children from Ashkenazi families.

“When I tell my story to families of Yemenite immigrants, they tell me, ‘What, you too, the Ashkenazim, they took babies? No way,’” says Klein.

Even as a girl, so she says, Klein knew that her family’s story was “like the story of the Yemenite children.” Her parents, Riva and Baruch Sendler, both descendants of Ashkenazi families, were born in South Africa and in 1949 made aliyah to Israel. In 1951 their daughter Ilana was born in the Brandeis Hospital in Hadera. Two days later they were told the baby had died. “My parents, who good little children and disciplined children of 23, thought the establishment was God. When they were told the baby die — then there was no other option,” says Klein.

They too never saw their daughter’s body or grave. For years her parents were convinced their daughter really had died. Later the doubts began to creep in, which grew as they burrowed into the documents in the archives more and more.

“In my mother’s medical file we found that all the information on the period of her pregnancy and giving birth were torn out, while what came before and what came after — [were still there],” she says. “When we asked to look at the files for the maternity hospital, they told us the archive had burned down.”

The Ashkenazi background of her parents makes it difficult for Klein to attribute the attitude of the authorities to her parents as motivated by racist-ethnic reasons. In her opinion, “it is not racism of Ashkenazim against Sephardim, but patronizing and arrogance of veterans against the new [immigrants].” The attitude in Israel was as if they were Diaspora, ghetto Jews. They were humiliates because they dressed differently and did not know the language, says Klein. “My parents hated Mapai exactly the way the Yemenites hated it.”

She recently published a novel privately titled “June 27, 1951” — the date her lost sister was born. Klein, like the others, is convinced her sister is still alive. Her parents are 89 and live not far from her. “I want to hug the baby,” her father tells her once in a while. “Dad, she’s not a baby. She is 65-years-old,” she answers.

http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.736574

From Your Quora Digest - Visiting and Travel

**What should I definitely not do in Germany?**

---

**Oliver Hager**, Born and grown up in Germany... Lives in Brazil permanently since 2008

NEVER EVER lift your right hand and yell “Heil, Hitler”. This is one of the most offensive things you can do and you can even be smacked up for it (at least I would!). Do not think that Germans make jokes about their history.
Everything related with this dark epoch is a very sensitive topic and mostly a taboo. Trying to start opinionated discussions about the Nazis is not recommended - most probably you wouldn't have enough knowledge about this topic to start a serious discussion. So avoid everything pointing to Nazism --- just to have an idea: Numbers like 88 (HH), 18 (AH) are considered (not by all, but by many) as "hidden" Nazi symbols.

Beside this, you should know that German folk is most times serious and very organized. Here is a list of things my people in general don't like (in biased order of importance)

- Lateness (meeting at 9 a.m. starts five minutes earlier)
- Noise
- Breaking Rules (e.g. passing the street while traffic lights are red)
- Unforeseen and unorganized things
- Untruth (even saying yes, if you don't mean it)
- Being informal (always use Mrs, Mr or Ms Müller -Don't use "Du", but "Sie", unless the other person agreed on "Du")

Comment: Fredrick Toben

- What isn't mentioned here is that legal force has castrated many Germans into pitiful submission for the sake of self-preservation. Section 130 of the Criminal Code prevents anyone from "defaming the memory of the dead", which is used to stifle any open debate on matters Holocaust-Shoah. This

Ursula Haverbeck
Published on May 14, 2015

In 2015, Ursula Haverbeck made history in a defiant interview in which she threw down the gauntlet to the biggest taboo of our times. Revisionism . . . on German TV! A seismic event.

***

PANORAMA: You once created a sensation with the statement: "The Holocaust is the biggest and most persistent lie in history." What do you mean by that?

Ursula Haverbeck: Well, naturally I said that somewhat in the style of Faurisson, of Robert Faurisson, who was one of the first to look for these alleged gas chambers — in the concentration camps — and found none.

And I mean it in this sense today: there is, I believe, no lie that has operated more persistently and transformatively and indeed not only in Germany but practically worldwide as this Holocaust. I would have to search a long time to find something equivalent.

P: Because it didn't happen, you believe?

UH: Yes, well. If it couldn't have worked with Zyklon B the way it is described, if there were no gas chambers as watered-down defamation law requires no proof of anything and truth is no defence.

The fact that anyone brought into court under S130 is assumed to be guilty of whatever charge is made out or not. In matters history, then, Germans are facing the legal witch-trial era where the taboo must be protected at all costs. Australia, Canada, and various other European countries have similar laws enacted that protect the official Holocaust-Shoah narrative from scrutiny.

In Germany lawyers, who defend their clients too vigorously, are fined, e.g. Ludwig Bock in the Deckert case during the 1990s. Usually witnesses can relieve an accused of a charge but in these cases the "Holocaust denial" term now protects outright lying in court.

In the 1985 Ernst Zundel Toronto case historian Raul Hilberg was the last witness to give evidence, e.g. that there were not two Hitler orders that started the Holocaust-Shoah. Hillberg had to revise his book on account of that admission. And also from then on never was an alleged Holocaust survivor ever rigorously cross-examined about what they had to say.

The recent German trials of geriatric soldiers was farcical as far as rigorous legal procedures is concerned. But there is change in attitude coming from overseas Germans - have a view:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WPa_qeV9KDM
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E1pmXaO6V0k
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WMxVGeTiK0

---

11.11.2015.

Where, then, were the six million killed?

Must be answered: Numbers like 88 (HH), 18 (AH, AH, or AH) are considered (not by all, but by many) as "hidden" Nazi symbols. And you once more explain in a few sentences, as it were, why the Holocaust, for you, is a biggest taboo in our times. Revisionism . . . on German TV! A seismic event.

Many people meanwhile have said, then the question must be answered:

Where, then, were the six million killed?

For five years I have asked this question systematically, with friends, and received no answer, not one. Then I wrote to the Justice Minister: "This is the situation. Could we now please have a public debate between both sides, pro and con?" No answer.

So then I wrote to him: "Since you have no answer to that for me all that remains is to draw the natural inference and admit the conclusion: There was no Holocaust." And in that case it really is the biggest lie ever.

I mean, there are legal experts who say that the whole post-war political system will fall apart if THAT is questioned. That's why it's so vehemently defended, quite logically.

P: All that is, naturally, for . . . for —

UH: " . . . the normal citizen today a slap in the face."

P: a slap in the face, exactly.

UH: — Yes.

P: - everyone has learned it that way: the Holocaust happened, it happened with six million deaths . . . could you once more explain in a few sentences, as it were, why the Holocaust, for you, is a — is the biggest lie in history?

UH: Because it's the most persistent, because it has had the most impact. And when one can't get a straight answer, not even from the Central Council of Jews in Germany — and I've written to them at least four times on this account — as to where the Jews were killed, then is that an answer right there [to your question]. And the second answer is that when one needs a law that sets the Holocaust in stone and threatens
punishment, if anyone investigates it openly, well, there you have the next problem, no?
P: -- and the question --

**UH:** For the truth needs no laws. In other words, that — it's clear from that that something's not right. And when one considers all that has been built upon it, and when the legal experts say that the whole post-war political system would fall apart, if it were to be questioned, then really it is rather clear that it is the biggest — the biggest lie — since one gets no answers. And "Auschwitz" cannot stand.

**P:** Seventy years after — after the Holocaust — naturally you might now just say you want to live your last years in peace. What keeps you going?

**UH:** Well, just these same contradictions that weigh down people's lives. And — I must add this as well — it is the members of my generation who suffered so terribly. Everything is said about atrocities is only ever said with respect to others.

What is never mentioned, however — there are no big memorials — is that fifteen million Germans from the lost eastern provinces, myself among them, were driven from their homes. That's equivalent to the entire population of Scandinavia. Try to imagine, that was it — a notice would appear on the door: "You must vacate the house by tomorrow at such-and-such o'clock, keys are to be left in the door, you may take with you no more than 20 kg each."

And then they came. And as a result two-and-a-half to three million people truly brutally murdered: raped to death, crushed beneath tanks, and so on.

And even Konrad Adenauer said in his first Bernauer speech in 1949, shortly after the founding of the Federal Republic: "We have many problems, but the biggest problem is the —" he says fourteen million, he claims to know that from the Americans — "the fourteen million German expellees, of whom six million have never arrived. They are dead and gone."

Remarkably, he says six million. Today actually we know that it is probably three-and-a-half or two-and-a-half — it's never been possible to determine exactly how many didn't arrive, but perhaps Adenauer was right after all and we simply don't know. It's all a muddle.

**P:** -- But one cannot . . .

**UH:** But in any case, the number of victims at Dresden was not 25,000, as is claimed today. That would mean that Dresden was practically empty, right? Now there you have a lie so big it can't be topped either. The authorities in Dresden itself told me, after reunification — I had asked what was said in Dresden about the number of the dead — "About 235,000 — as far as it can determine. But there could be many more still lying under the rubble."

And then fifteen years later, when I heard that a new group of historians was working on the problem I asked again at the very same institute and they told me, "Well, right now we have 35,000 but it will probably come to 25,000." So you see, there are all sorts of lies from all sorts of sides, only the other side's are weightier. And then the whole lot got such a working over that on the second or third reading — I can't exactly recall now, there's something you can research — they passed the paragraph by a majority. And this paragraph, which in its language is already an absurdity — it says, namely, that "a punishment of up to five years in prison or a fine will be assessed on anyone" — and then comes a reference to international law — "who approves of, denies or minimizes the crimes committed by National Socialism in a manner that is liable to disturb the public peace."

So first of all it says crimes committed by National Socialism. It can't just be said, or believed or claimed, it has to be an established fact. But in the meantime this "fact" is much disputed, and so already that can be eliminated.

Next comes "approve of." The greatest crime ever committed by humanity — which is what the Holocaust would be — could hardly be "approved of" by anyone if it were unequivocal. It's the same, for that matter, even if it's just a single serious traffic accident or a single murder: the majority of people will cry "severest penalty!" Right?

People are always calling for the severest penalty, they don't approve of these things. So that's all very unclear. And then, I was once in the Federal Administrative Court in Leipzig on account of the Collegium institute, and the discussion turned to the word "deny." And the judge admitted, the presiding judge — there were five gentlemen — "Indeed, we must in fact prove that you're convinced the Holocaust happened. For 'to deny' something means — "(I had said this myself earlier) "to claim something against one's better knowledge. The word 'deny' depends on the word 'lie.'"

So if you accuse me of having denied something then you must prove against me — the judge was quite right — that I actually believe it. And yet they do the exact opposite in their indictments. And so that falls apart.

And as for "minimize," he said, "It's really not entirely clear that that should be punishable." Good. Moreover, it's not the case that any denial or any minimization entails a punishment, but rather only — (aside, unclear) if it is apt to — if it's done in a manner that is apt to disturb the public peace.

And here the Federal Constitutional Court says, quite correctly — in 2009, in the famous Wunsiedel Decision — That is an assumption. Who's to say if it is "apt" or not? How do they know that some statement somewhere is "apt" to do so? The "public peace." What after all is the public peace? That is all mere assumption. If that is the sole point on the basis of which a statement is liable to punishment, and it is only an assumption, then, says the Federal Constitutional Court, the whole thing is legally untenable. Indeed, jurist Heribert Prantl has gone so far as to write in the Süddeutschen Zeitung that the
Holocaust, this Paragraph 130, thus becomes no more than an empty shell that is no longer legally applicable. And yet it still has not been struck down in the Bundesverfassungsgericht. But that just won't do. An absurdity this law is: one sees clearly how the Deputies disagreed and were at odds with themselves, and thus wound up making this monstrous verbal formulation in which everything's back to front and nothing makes sense.

And afterwards they could take, for example, someone like Germar Rudolf, a chemist, who made a study of a chemical substance and whose results didn't sit well with the political world, and put him in jail for three and a half years. And Horst Mahler for twelve. Right? On the basis of such a law. And that must inwardly outrage any decent person and awake real doubt in a so-called nation of laws that allows such a thing.

That really is something that, naturally, spurred me to action for I want a nation of laws, I don't want a nation of un-laws, I don't want a nation that constantly talks of law and justice and so on — of "freedom of expression" as in France again right now — and does the opposite.

That is the situation that really upsets me the most, that it was my own generation that suffered so terribly and no one talks about that. Everyone only talks about the six million Jews. No school child knows how many of the German expellees died, they don't even know that Breslau was a German city. That is unbearable.

P: So you go about openly claiming that Holocaust didn't happen in such a way — so nicht stattgefunden?

UH: Yes, naturally, just so. And I also say — and I put this on the Internet as well — that that doesn't mean, however, that a single revisionist has ever claimed that there were no concentration camps. Of course there were concentration camps, and bad things happened in them. And there even were four concentration camp commandants who were prosecuted by an SS court-martial because they, in violation of the regulations in the Commandants' Orders, did not deal with prisoners appropriately but rather struck them or even shot some, and so on. And that was strictly forbidden and two of them were executed.

But here's the kicker: I don't know that from the Jews who are always accusing us, I know that from the revisionists — they're the ones who discovered that such cases occurred and that the SS in fact took the strictest measures against them. So none of us would ever say that nothing happened there. Of course things happened. In times of war, the negative qualities in people are always aroused and encouraged and to that extent . . . But that has nothing to do with the notion that a unique, unparalleled, enormous crime was committed by the Germans. One must see this in context.

P: So, if I understand you correctly, the concentration camps did exist but a program of mass extermination, in the sense we understand it today, did not. Well then, what happened in the camps?

UH: Auschwitz was quite simply a huge industrial complex and they performed very valuable work there for the armaments industry.

P: So that means the prisoners who were there were rightly there?

UH: That's another thing Prof. Nolte has established. If one goes by the Hague Conventions on Land War then every state, in the event of war, has the right to intern enemy nationals residing in its territory because the danger exists that they may commit espionage. Everyone did it. For example, one of my uncles was in India at the time but the English were there and so he was interned there. My mother's brother was in America and he was interned there. Everyone did it. And um, the Russians did too, of course. One mustn't forget that.

P: Against that background, then what you're saying is that what happened in Auschwitz was right-correct-acceptable?

UH: Well, "right-correct-acceptable" is rather . . . It was legally unassailable, let's put it that way. As to whether I find it "right-correct-acceptable" that people were . . . But then, my own high school class was also mobilized for the armaments industry and we too had to work on armaments. For example, I painted munitions crates and the like. So it wasn't just them — we were all mobilized, especially during the last year. Nor was that a special case. We all had very little to eat and hardly anything to wear, and above all no shoes. Or none that fit: young people's feet are always growing and we'd have to cut the fronts off.

P: I'd like to turn now to the Garrison and Commandant Orders. Now . . .

UH: Yes, these are truly paradigm-changing, even for me when I first read them. For these details — for example these dealing with nutrition.

They're not in here, they're in the Special Orders. They actually recommended what we had to painstakingly learn in our senior Home Economics cooking class: not to overcook vegetables but rather to cook half until they are just soft and to just steam the other half as quickly as possible because then the vitamins are preserved better. And then they told them they must go out and gather wild herbs and the like and put them raw on top, in place of parsley as it were. And that they were to make a hearty, thick soup — not a thin broth, but a thick soup. And if the cook didn't, then he was to be removed and another cook put in his place. That was the sort of thing they were concerned with — in the middle of the war! It's really most remarkable.

P: What conclusion do you draw from these Garrison and Commandant Orders?

UH: I draw the conclusion, that here we have the ultimate, perhaps most outstanding proof that Auschwitz was not an extermination camp but rather a work camp in which all of the workers interned there were indispensable for the armaments industry. That's what is said quite clearly, isn't it.

P: So there was no mass extermination at Auschwitz?

UH: No, one cannot want to have armaments workers and exterminate them at the same time that makes no sense, it's a self-contradiction. And it makes even less sense when one asks them later, "Would you like to stay and be liberated or would you like to come with us to the Reich?" and they say, "No, we'd rather go with our murderers." It's schizophrenic.

P: What did you think when you read that for the first time?

UH: Frankly I was rather amazed that it was all so clearly laid out here. — Until then I had . . .

P: — What is so clearly laid out?

UH: That it was a work camp, which is just what the veterans had always said. And everyone jumped all over them. And yet they were right, that's the really painful part.

P: Is there anything about the gas chambers?

UH: No, nothing at all. And they can't be inferred from Reich orders either.
P: How do you explain the fact that the gas chambers are not mentioned?
UH: Because there weren't any, naturally. One cannot mention something that doesn't exist. Why do you want to cling to the gas chambers when you can read what is written here? Above all, I find it presumptuous of people living today who think they know better than those who actually lived then. And the people who were there, all the old defendants said: "We never saw anything like that." But we know better what it was like there! We know better what it was like in the Third Reich than those who lived through it. That's the great failing, the lack of self-critique in those talking today. That's what is so astounding here and what . . .
P: In other words, you conclude from the fact that no gas chambers are mentioned that at the camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau there weren't any?
UH: No, you just have to remember what I said earlier. That goes along with the fact that one simply couldn't have done it with Zyklon B. It wouldn't work. I mean, we live in a scientific age! We have to listen to the experts. And when the chemist Germar Rudolf says it wouldn't work and every chemical dictionary says so too, and when Fred Leuchter, the sole living expert in gas chambers — for there still are states in America that use them to execute people — takes a look at what is claimed and says, "That's completely absurd. One can execute a single individual in an hermetically sealed, highly complex technical structure, in such-and-such amount of time . . .", then the whole thing falls apart. And I am not ready to just take the lawyers at their word that they know better. And I don't just take others at their word either. But then that's why they didn't promote this book. They didn't promote it!
P: What are the points that most persuaded you?
UH: All right, 7 February 1944: "Prisoner Transports."
P: — yes, OK.
UH: I find this quite astonishing, shall I read it out here?
I can just sum it up.
P: Yes.
UH: It is ordered that the camp doctor must first examine all prisoners before they go into the transport. Then how the transport wagons are to be procured. If it's cold, each car must be thickly strewn with straw and there must be a stove inside, and above all else — our people would have loved to have had that — there must be boiled water or tea available inside. And also stated explicitly: to take along sufficient food — the transports could be delayed by bombing attacks — in order that no one should starve. Our people went for seven days without getting anything to eat. So yes, that's quite striking. And it's also quite striking here . . . where it is again related how the sick are to be handled.
Indeed there was . . . The Red Cross — I believe it was the Red Cross — also inspected Auschwitz and they found a very modern clinic there. And the sick were looked after very carefully in order that they become healthy again as quickly as possible. And also about the special diet — there was a special diet though naturally they had to provide it only within this infirmary.
And that the condition of clothing must be continuously monitored, especially shoes. That makes sense. And then, hard-working prisoners could even earn special privileges — they even received bonuses for extra piecework or their industriousness could be so rewarded that they be given early release. There's that too. It's all in here.
P: Do you believe it also happened?
UH: I would assume so. Whether it still happened in the last . . . What year is it here? 1944 . . . in February. Whether that was still possible at the end of 1944, I doubt, but . . .
P: In the footnotes there's a comment on this point that "No prisoner ever obtained freedom on account of industriousness. Despite repeated directives from the SS Economic and Administrative Office, the goal of internment and punishing concentration camp prisoners retained priority over the efficiency of labor deployment." — Does that not contradict . . .
UH: — Yes, but where . . . Where did the commentator in question get that from? It reminds one of the Foreword, which also completely dodges the issue. So I would immediately ask, where do you know that from then? If the order says one thing, how can you, a person living today, simply claim the opposite? You'll have to prove that to me, please.
We are too trusting. We'll believe anything people say today. If someone says, "I experienced such and such", then I can't simply claim the opposite, I have to prove it. Anyway, you know the lot — Otto Uthgennant and Enrico Marco, and whatever they're called, all the people who have lied about us. Initially they got — they had to observe a two-hour midday break and have an evening break at four or five o'clock.
And during the break, the deployment leader had to make sure that they did not receive any additional assignments. Because, first of all, one gets more out of one's food when one rests afterwards and secondly, because only then is one capable of working. This sleep-break directive really surprised me, I must confess.
P: What do you conclude from it?
UH: That they wanted to have good workers.
Curiously, it even says somewhere that there were very good watchmakers among the Jews who were then to be sent on to special locations. I never knew that the Jews were especially good watchmakers. So one's always finding something here that's odd — or astounding. "Foot-inspection for prisoners in every subcamp." Hmm! "Foot-inspection to be held 3 times [weekly] among the prisoners to check on foot injuries and cleanliness of prisoners." You see they placed — on account of this terrible typhus epidemic — they placed, they had to place, enormous value on hygiene. And as a result this had to be respected. And hair had to be shorn not only among the prisoners but among the SS men as well. Because that's where the lice usually would get established. And they still weren't at all past this typhus epidemic.
And I have also — Was it in here? Somewhere, anyway, I've read that the lice were brought into the camp from outside: the prisoners themselves had no lice. Naturally I can't verify that, I can only take it as is. So, in addition to everything up to this point, it really is quite remarkable what it says here under the title "Mistreatment of Prisoners": "On this occasion, I once more expressly draw attention to the standing order that no SS man may lay a hand on a prisoner. In this fifth year of the war every emphasis must be placed on maintaining the working strength of the prisoners. Should a prisoner violate regulations then a report should be made."
So they weren't allowed to do it themselves. And that's why I said earlier and I point out again that strict punishment cases were carried out for any SS men who didn't follow such orders. One can thus . . .

P: What conclusion you draw from that, against the background [of claims] that at Auschwitz-Birkenau people were mistreated and ultimately killed?

UH: Presumably it's the same as what the English and Americans did as they entered Germany and distributed propaganda leaflets to "inform" their soldiers of the terrible atrocities that the Germans supposedly committed because the soldiers were so appalled by the destruction of German cities. And to make it comprehensible to them that this was justified they distributed these leaflets claiming the most awful atrocities which they hadn't, however, "discovered" among the Germans — they made them up. Sefton Delmer himself said that, right? And here it's just the same: everything has been twisted and turned into its opposite. And sadly one must also say that a great deal.

P: Anyway, for example, of what German POWs went through on the Rheinwiesen or in the Gulags in Russia, they accused us of. And the women — and the Russians themselves said so. It was them that Bolshevism-infected army that actually encouraged its soldiers to rape women. On our side that stood under penalty of death. We had two very good friends, one my husband's and one my father's, who discovered that a man in their unit had raped a Pole or a Russian. And they had to hand them over to a military court martial even though they needed every man they had for the war, knowing full well that they would be executed. And that weighed upon them for their whole lives. But that's just how strict it was.

P: Why do these Garrison Orders, in your eyes, have supreme, independent credibility?

UH: Because they are originals. And because they're also consistent with the Reich Orders decoded by Enigma. It's no anomaly. Each side complements the other. And they are complementary as well with the stories of those who lived through it all. And to that extent they are the final confirmation that was missing.

P: If they are such paradigm-changing documents, why haven't they been talked about?

UH: You can answer that for yourself. Because it wasn't desirable.

P: To whom?

UH: Them. The people who brought the whole business about.

P: Why publish it then?

UH: Because one feels — That's just it, I said this earlier. Wherever you go, you find this sort and that sort. And that goes as well for these institutes. Martin Broszat, for example, when he said that there were no gassings in imperial Germany itself — authentic, from the Institute for Contemporary History — after they'd been saying for more than a decade that there were gassings everywhere. And that's just how it is: one tries to pass off the negative things one has done to the other, defeated side, and history is always written by the victors. And so they had this material, and they thought, "We must publish this, as the Institute for Contemporary History we cannot just lock it away." But it simply wasn't discussed. And so for ten years it remained in obscurity.

P: Could it be that the responsible officials who wrote these orders conscientiously left out the aspect of the extermination of prisoners, or internees, in order to leave no evidence for the future, as it were?

UH: That would be completely unrealistic, in the middle of war. The question is completely unrealistic. In the middle of a war in which one is fighting for one's very survival, and one's trying to reach the labor quotas that are being demanded of one, they wouldn't have had five minutes for such a thing. It's simply unimaginable. Everyone still believed in victory. It was only very late in the war that people started to doubt.

P: The book has been published for some time now . . .

UH: It was published in 2000, but only came to the attention of a few historians in 2013. Before that, it was dead.

P: Why?

UH: Because people had decided . . .

P: So really Norbert Frei, as editor, should have said that history has to be rewritten here or at least, the history of the Holocaust.

UH: So you say: he should have said that. But you know that Germans are all afraid. Back then, there still weren't — To be fair to him, I would even say there hadn't yet been all those trials, there weren't yet so many facts that had come to light, so many contradictions, in 2000 as today. To that extent, fear of the consequences for one's career and one's fate really was much more pressing than it is today. Today one can say more, because meanwhile more contradictions have become evident. That still wasn't possible then. So I would grant Frei that much, that he — that they all, all five of them here — might have said, "But we'll keep quiet about that. We won't discuss it. We have to do it because we're historians and the Institute for Contemporary History has such things as its mission, but . . . we won't try to publicize it." And none of them spoke about it.

P: Have you ever spoken with Professor Frei, as editor?

UH: No, I don't know him. I've mostly dealt with Nolte...

P: — Not about the Garrison and Commandant Orders?

UH: — No.

P: Why not?

UH: It never really occurred to me to.

P: — Yeah but . . .

UH: — I simply don't know the man. I've spoken with Walter Post and Stefan Scheil and Ernst Nolte.

P: But if you take this as evidence, as the last piece of the puzzle, for the non-existence of the Holocaust might you not have asked why . . .

UH: Why did he do it?

P: Maybe you should ask him. . . . why he published it, and whether his interpretation is the same as yours?

UH: If he has courage then it will be. If he doesn't have courage he'll try to avoid it, like in the Introduction. That's quite clear.

P: What does the Introduction say?

UH: In the Introduction they attempt, desperately — but it really is quite desperate and quite obvious that it's false — to find something somewhere showing that someone was gassed — I'm not sure they say "gassed," but murdered, anyway. Some big number. But it doesn't hold water, what they say in the Introduction. One can refute it quite quickly.

P: What do you think: would he acknowledge that, on the basis of the Garrison and Commandant Orders, one can call into question the Holocaust in the form it's known in today?

UH: I couldn't say, I don't know him. I don't know how courageous the man is. I couldn't say.
P: But might he not say that the orders have to be seen in context, they relate to individual areas in the concentration camp, there were parts of the camp that were fairly described by precisely those aspects which you have just mentioned, but . . . ?

UH: Yes, but the whole place was a giant armaments complex, there were all sorts of armaments firms there. There was a film once on television about a woman who worked there as a secretary. And naturally she too said, "I never saw anything of the sort. I had to manage the list for the bordello and things like that." Those who were there always said something quite different and now we're trying to reconcile that with what we've been taught for 50 years in school. That is our problem, and naturally it is very hard. Above all, one must then say, "My teachers and parents lied to me." That is bitter. That is bitter.

P: What does that mean then for history? The extermination of the Jews was essentially, as we learned in school, a part of the ideology of National Socialism? What does that mean for history if the concentration camps, and the extermination of the Jews didn't happen?

UH: Well, I think there have now been quite enough investigations of that. It was not a matter of extermination, it was a matter of removal from Germany. And that indeed on the basis of the experience of two world wars. Hitler knew quite well that already in the nineteenth century it had been decided to destroy Germany. And we knew about the declarations of Morgenthau and Nizer and whatever they were all called. So that meant, ultimately, that Hitler wanted Germany freed from this Jewish influence. But they also said, "I'll decide who's a Jew." So if a Jew had converted to Christianity, or if they . . . for example, the many popular and respected pediatricians, and even in the military — Erhard Milch was a half-Jew. Right? And yet he remained in the military. So "extermination" is not true, "resettlement" is correct. But the Zionists themselves wanted that. And to that extent they even collaborated on it. The Zionists wanted to have a state... In 1897 was the big Jewish Congress where Herzl presented the plan and on that account they collaborated on it. They had the same goal: one side wanted their own state — and above all they wanted the German Jews since they were the cleverest, the bankers . . . though Herzl said they didn't want the really rich bankers . . . but the real technicians, engineers and so on — "We'll take those!" And Hitler wanted to be rid of them, so it all went together quite well. But that doesn't mean exterminating them.

P: If, as you say, the mass extermination did not happen as claimed, then did these crimes not happen as well?

UH: Yes, crimes ...didn't I say that four camp commandants had to appear before an SS court? Inevitably there were some crimes, but that wasn't the goal.

P: But then that means Hitler was not the greatest criminal in history?

UH: Of course not. That will in time be evident that that's not right.

P: Hitler wasn't a criminal?

UH: Now it's Putin who is the greatest criminal.

P: But back then Hitler was not a criminal?

UH: When it comes to pinning such a label on anyone, I would be very cautious.

P: All right, but if you say the mass extermination —?

UH: There is no order for extermination! But of course Hitler isn't accused of just that. He's supposed to have done many other things, and certainly did do many other things as to calling a person a criminal, that goes against my nature because I know that in every person there is a spark of the divine and it needs to be addressed as well. And if I pin a label on someone and say, "You are a criminal!" then the divine in him can only be smothered, so I would never do that. I wouldn't say it of any person.

P: But must the figure of Hitler be seen in a new light as a result?

UH: Well, more than anything, I can say something to that. The view of Hitler that we currently have is already in complete contradiction with the view that historians like Joachim Fest or Werner Maser and so on presented in their big biographies back in the seventies or sixties — sixties. Fest says, "Hitler was, for ten years, the center of movement for the world." That's not exactly negative. And if you read Lloyd George and the English writers who came to Germany, in some cases in secret, in order to determine what was really happening here in the 1930s . . . they spoke in astonishingly positive terms about Hitler. And they published it too: Hans Grimm, for example. And just as he is presented today, the further one gets away from that time the more negative everything becomes for the Germans.

And do you know why? Because they're afraid that a change may come again and that the lies will be exposed. That's the only reason. Why are they now using Burger like another Frankfurt Trial pulled from the drawer, even though that's now all been proven in all possible trials to be a fake?

P: So you say Hitler was not a criminal?

UH: I just told you, I would not say of anyone, "He is a criminal." A man has the most various possibilities to develop personally. And when I read the statements from that time then it's clear he was of great significance for world history.

And that brings me to the fourth level of historical understanding: Why do such men appear in history? Hitler always spoke of Vorsehung-Providence to which he felt responsible, as it were. And he felt himself to be called to his task. And one could never call that criminal. Didn't you learn anything else in school about bad things Hitler did — just the Jews?

P: Well, yeah, that he killed a lot of other people.

UH: One hears, one learns.

P: And that he was more or less responsible for the greatest world war in history —

UH: That he started the war.

P: Yes,

UH: Yes they teach that to children too.

P: But that isn't so?

UH: No, of course not. But really that is rather obvious. We won't have to wait so long as we did for Clark and his Sleepwalkers. Just as the Germans have nothing to answer for in the First World War one will soon discover that they have nothing to answer for in the Second. That won't take nearly so long. Many people already — Even, what's his name? Haffner. The Second World War, he said, began at Versailles. Versailles is the cause of WW II then, not Hitler. In every person there are changes. Hitler did many positive things, which many significant people recognized — read the biographies by Fest and Maser — and a great many things are foisted on him that he did not do. — But he was a man . . .
P: For example the mass extermination of the Jews.

UH: Yes. A man with his highs and lows and so on. And my husband always said — he'd met Hitler in person, and he was always bewildered, "Write a book about Hitler!" — and he always said, "That's such a complex personality and there's so much — "the most in all literature, the person about whom there are the most biographies, etc. — "I must first read all that . . . I leave that to future generations in a hundred years. For now, we will always only be able to say something false." And I would say the same.

P: When you call the Holocaust into question seventy years afterwards, is that not a slap in the face for the relatives of victims, and above all to survivors?

UH: I find the real slap in people's faces are those individuals who have written books — which are flogged in our schools — and told about their sufferings in a concentration camp without ever having been in one. And it seems that even goes for Elie Wiesel, who's still working on touching up his autobiography.

P: But were you ever in a concentration camp?

UH: I'm sorry?

P: Were you ever in a concentration camp?

UH: Of course not. No. I was still too young. I was seventeen.

P: But then you say, of course . . .

UH: No, look for a moment. . . .

P: . . . the concentration camps, in the generally recognized form, did not exist.

UH: I say that the concentration camps existed and that terrible things happened. In any case, it's always something about Auschwitz, it is the symbol.

P: But it was a work camp . . .

UH: It was a work camp and the Commandant Orders confirm that. And there weren't six million people killed; the reduction on the memorial tablets at Auschwitz confirms that. And above all that is confirmed by my own unsuccessful efforts to get to the bottom of it. Really, I asked everyone. Not a single one of them could tell me where the six million were killed. And in that case, one must show a little courage and say that it's a lie. Or one must indeed say there and there. One or the other. But that is a task for others, not me; I can only point out what the questions are.

P: At the same time, it just so happens it will soon be 70th anniversary of the war ....

UH: It's going to be talked about everywhere. . . .

P: and naturally it's a big topic, and there are many survivors who have made it their task to remember the Holocaust, to say, as it were, "Don't forget the evil that happened here." But when you say that the Holocaust, in its recognized form, did not exist, is that not a slap in the face-Ohrfeige for these people?

P: No. The slap in the face is this: it is seventy years not only since the end of the war, not only since the liberation of Auschwitz, but also since the expulsion of 15 million Germans from their ancestral homeland with the murder — proven murder — of 2.5 million of them, and probably many more. That is never mentioned, not a word. That is something I might actually call a slap in the face. I might ask the question, Why not this? Why only that?

P: These pictures of piles of bodies in Auschwitz and in Bergen-Belsen . . .

UH: In Auschwitz there couldn't have been any since the prisoners were evacuated, the majority, and the rest they left behind to be liberated. And when you see pictures of them they look quite normal.

P: But then where do they come from, these pictures?

UH: Don't you know about the piles of bodies in our ruined cities? From Hamburg, from Pforzheim from Hildesheim, from Dresden . . .

P: And they were brought into the camps?

UH: No need to bring them in. One makes the piles of bodies, takes some pictures, and . . . They can piece it together with pictures, there's no great art to it. One young man managed to be everywhere. In Dresden, and there and there. It was always the same young man. We know all that, you just have to read! The piles of bodies at Bergen-Belsen certainly were real, but why did they occur? They have nothing to do with the camp system, or rather they do, but only in the sense that all access routes had been destroyed by bombing and that they thus could no longer get any food or medicine. The director of the camp went in desperation to the local farmers but they all had hardly anything to eat themselves. After all, this was 1945, in May. And then the English came and made huge quantities of sardines available to them. I know that because a good friend of ours had a brother-in-law who was there and told us. And the starving prisoners couldn't tolerate such food, and they all got dysentery and so on. And when someone lay down to die, there they lay, since no one was left to bury them.

P: But you can't call that something of the Germans' doing. That has nothing to do with it. You know, this kind of mendacity, we never could have imagined it, me included. It is enormously difficult for me to imagine that anyone could ever lie the way they've lied to us. But they have lied to us like that. And when one thinks today —

P: You mean that the completely emaciated people, the pictures of emaciated people . . .

UH: There are other reasons!

P: . . . the piles of bodies in Dachau, in Buchenwald, in Theresienstadt, in Auschwitz, where did they come from?

UH: I just told you where they come from. Besides, at the end of the war we were all starving; my mother weighed only ninety pounds! We were all emaciated.

P: You mean to say the . . .

UH: And the bombs! . . .

P: the terrible condition of these poor people was not the result, as it were, of what the Germans had established in the camps?

UH: They were not the result, or at any rate not the goal. But they were the result of the war. Think about it: when you no longer have the least scrap of transport infrastructure, when everything is broken . . . the bridges were broken, you couldn't drive at all, you could still get about by bicycle, but otherwise . . . then the prisoners could no longer be supplied. Of course not.

P: But all the same, you must admit that is still the result of how the Germans acted toward them in the camps.

UH: No. It is a result of how the enemies of Germany acted by completely bombing Germany to pieces. People today cannot imagine it.

P: Do you believe that you could convince the majority of Germans that the Holocaust, in its recognized form, did not occur, that it never happened?

UH: Even now, I already have the impression that the majority of thinking Germans have experienced so many contradictions that they, at the very least, doubt it strongly. And perhaps even more so, a great many trades people and the like, precisely because they're
people with their feet on the ground, also say, "That simply can't be right." I take their word.

P: What can't be right?

P: Why, in your opinion, is it important to pass down to the next generation doubt about the historicity of the Holocaust?

UH: Because otherwise they'll suffer under it uselessly for all eternity. And they do, they're told they have to. This guilt complex is so deeply rooted — and above all then there are the demands too: give more submarines, give more this, do more that, and so on. All of that is founded upon "we and our past . . ." They heard that in school too. And above all the worst of it is, the Jews themselves don't want it. They make it a reproach to us now that we do as much. Read the open letter by . . .

What was his name now? — Meir Margalit, written after the visit to Israel by Chancellor Merkel and her speech to the Knesset, which he himself heard. At that rate we have to despair of ourselves all the more. They make it a reproach to us now that we do that. We must, and — No, I can't imagine that thinking people will go along with that for much longer.

P: What events do you organize in order to spread this idea . . .

UH: I don't organize anything.

P: . . . where do you appear, how do try to pass this on to young people?

UH: I don't do anything at all from my side. I get asked questions, on every possible subject, not just that.

P: And who comes then, what sort of people are they?

UH: All sorts of people, old and young mixed, but lots of young people. The young, however, mostly want to hear about what you asked about earlier, the Third Reich. That interests them the most.

P: Are they for the most part National Party members then, or . . .

UH: I don't think so. No, no, I wouldn't say that. The NPD is not highly regarded by the young. Or I have that impression, anyway. Though perhaps the fault for that lies . . . well, I can't generalize. But in any case, with regard to the young people who invite me to speak I would say, no. They're mainly not NPD. They're quite critical of it. But they do want to be German! That's what it is. And even just to be German today is "fascist." That is the problem. It probably has to be — thought I haven't yet finished sorting out what I think about this . . . Why did these events — why did this conflict, Jews and Germans, become so stark, and why this hate of the Jews, why did it have to happen? It's still completely unclear to me. But perhaps I'll manage someday.

P: The hate of the Jews for the Germans?

UH: Yes. I have never read, from any other people, such hate-filled expressions about another people as from the Jews. Why?

P: More than the hate of the Germans toward Jews?

UH: That's much later, the hate of the Germans. The Jews were much earlier. And it's . . . all you have to do is read the Talmud. I have all twelve volumes there in the authorized, most recent translation and edition, 2002. I bought them with Horst Mahler because we wanted to verify the commonly circulated statements from the Talmud, whether they were authentic, and especially from an authorized edition. And I couldn't read more than three pages - it made me feel ill. That's how revolting it is, all the stuff in it about sexuality and so on, about how you can do it with a three-year-old child, and and . . . You know, it's all just so alien to us. I don't even want to think about it.

P: As a last question I'd like to ask you, since you just mentioned Horst Mahler . . . The things that you say and that you believe — namely, that the Holocaust in particular did not happen, as you say — saying this, naturally, could land you in prison.

UH: Well then, that's just a risk I have to take, if people want to do that. Better to stick to your beliefs. That's, that's . . . look, I'm old. I've had a long life, a good life, as I've told you. That's just the price that one must pay. I always think of Schiller, Wallenstein's Camp: "Rise up, my comrades, to horse! to horse!" And it ends, "And if you will not stake your lives, You'll never win life as your prize." Very simple. That's what your motto must be. And you must also be prepared — And Nehru, by the way, said that to the Kurds too: if one is ready to pay the price for freedom, then you cannot make them unfree. It just depends on the price one is ready to pay.

English Subtitles by Kladderadatsch – https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WPa_QeV9KDM

AUSWIRKUNGEN

Rechtsextremen fühlen sich durch das Urteil aus Naumburg bestärkt. Schon seit Jahren gehen sie offensiv in die Öffentlichkeit, suchen den Tabubruch. Vor zwei Jahren ließ Haverbeck, die wohl umtriebigste Aktivistin dieser Szene, ein Video ins Internet stellen. »Der Holocaust ist die größte und nachhaltigste Lüge der Geschichte«, behauptete die 87-Jährige. Dass sie bis heute dafür nicht belohnt worden ist, sieht sie als Bestätigung dafür, dass die »Sechs-Millionen-Lüge« zusammenbreche.

NACHFRAGEN

Dass der Naumburger Freispruch für Hans Püschel, auch wenn er von einem OLG kommt, Auswirkungen auf Verfahren gegen Holocaust-Leugner außerhalb Sachsen-Anhalts haben könnte, etwa auf die Prozesse gegen Ursula Haverbeck, gilt als unwahrscheinlich.

VEREHRUNG


In Berlin bekamen Polizei und Verfassungsschutz Anfang des Jahres nicht einmal mit, dass sich 80 Rechtsextremen, darunter NPD-Funktionäre, zu einer öffentlichen Veranstaltung mit Haverbeck versammelten. Auch hier konnte die alte Dame der Geschichtsfälschung wieder ihre Lügen verbreiten: »Den Holocaust hat es nicht gegeben!«

http://www.juedischeallgemeine.de/article/view/id/26273

Darf die Schoa als ›Marx‹ und ›Mythos‹ bezeichnen: NPD-Politiker Hans Püschel aus Sachsen-Anhalt

Putin to Western Elites: Playtime is Over
An excellent blogger about Russia distills Putin's Sochi speech into 10 simple points

Dmitry Orlov, Thu, Mar 17, 2016 | 37,082 72

Kinder sollen spielen, Erwachsene – handeln
A longer version of this article originally appeared at the ClubOrlov blog.

Most people in the English-speaking parts of the world missed Putin’s speech at the Valdai conference in Sochi a few days ago, and, chances are, those who have heard of the speech didn’t get a chance to read it, and missed its importance. Western media did their best to ignore it or to twist its meaning. Regardless of what you think or don’t think of Putin (like the sun and the moon, he does not exist for you to cultivate an opinion) this is probably the most important political speech since Churchill’s “Iron Curtain” speech of March 5, 1946.

In this speech, Putin abruptly changed the rules of the game. Previously, the game of international politics was played as follows: politicians made public pronouncements, for the sake of maintaining a pleasant fiction of national sovereignty, but they were strictly for show and had nothing to do with the substance of international politics; in the meantime, they engaged in
secret back-room negotiations, in which the actual deals were hammered out. Previously, Putin tried to play this game, expecting only that Russia be treated as an equal. But these hopes have been dashed, and at this conference he declared the game to be over, explicitly violating Western taboo by speaking directly to the people over the heads of elite clans and political leaders.

1. Russia will no longer play games and engage in back-room negotiations over trifles. But Russia is prepared for serious conversations and agreements, if these are conducive to collective security, are based on fairness and take into account the interests of each side.

2. All systems of global collective security now lie in ruins. There are no longer any international security guarantees at all. And the entity that destroyed them has a name: The United States of America.

3. The builders of the New World Order have failed, having built a sand castle. Whether or not a new world order of any sort is to be built is not just Russia's decision, but it is a decision that will not be made without Russia.

4. Russia favors a conservative approach to introducing innovations into the social order, but is not opposed to investigating and discussing such innovations, to see if introducing any of them might be justified.

5. Russia has no intention of going fishing in the murky waters created by America's ever-expanding "empire of chaos," and has no interest in building a new empire of her own (this is unnecessary; Russia's challenges lie in developing her already vast territory). Neither is Russia willing to act as a savior of the world, as she had in the past.

6. Russia will not attempt to reformat the world in her own image, but neither will she allow anyone to reformat her in their image. Russia will not close herself off from the world, but anyone who tries to close her off from the world will be sure to reap a whirlwind.

7. Russia does not wish for the chaos to spread, does not want war, and has no intention of starting one. However, today Russia sees the outbreak of global war as almost inevitable, is prepared for it, and is continuing to prepare for it. Russia does not war—nor does she fear it.

8. Russia does not intend to take an active role in thwarting those who are still attempting to construct their New World Order—until their efforts start to impinge on Russia's key interests. Russia would prefer to stand by and watch them give themselves as many lumps as their poor heads can take. But those who manage to drag Russia into this process, through disregard for her interests, will be taught the true meaning of pain.

9. In her external, and, even more so, internal politics, Russia's power will rely not on the elites and their back-room dealing, but on the will of the people. To these nine points I would like to add a tenth:

10. There is still a chance to construct a new world order that will avoid a world war. This new world order must of necessity include the United States—but can only do so on the same terms as everyone else: subject to international law and international agreements; refraining from all unilateral action; in full respect of the sovereignty of other nations. To sum it all up: play-time is over. Children, put away your toys. Now is the time for the adults to make decisions. Russia is ready for this; is the world?

EXCLUSIVE:
‘Draw Mohammed’ Winner Creates New Image Showing Geert Wilders Locking Up Muslim ‘Prophet’

By BREITBART LONDON 13 Aug 2016
Bosch Fawstin, winner of the Mohammed Cartoon Contest in Garland, Texas, has made a new Mohammed cartoon showing Dutch politician Geert Wilders putting the Islamic prophet Mohammed behind bars.
Mr Fawstin came first in last April’s contest, which was attacked by Islamic State sympathisers.

Speaking on the new cartoon, Geert Wilders said: “Bosch Fawstin was raised as a Muslim and personally experienced the atrocities of Islam up close. “He is one of the biggest heroes of our time because he had the courage to leave Islam. I am proud that he made another Mohammed cartoon. It shows Mohammed behind bars and myself being satisfied about locking up the danger. For me it symbolizes that we urgently have to act against the terrorist Islamic ideology and terrorist attacks by isolating the violent Islamic ideology and de-
Bendigo Advertiser

'I have already been cleared': Assange

It was fears he could be extradited from Sweden to the United States on charges relating to espionage and terrorism that led Mr Assange to seek asylum, rather than face questioning in Stockholm.

And despite his impending arrest by British authorities, Mr Assange said he favoured his chances of not being extradited to the US by the UK government as slightly better than with Sweden.

"The Swedes have extradited every single person that the US has asked for since at least the year 2000, they have a 100 per cent extradition rate to the United States," he said.

"The UK has a 90 per cent extradition rate."

Mr Assange was also critical of the US government in pursuing charges against him, despite not being a US citizen, nor having been alleged to have committed a crime on US soil.

"We have the United States asserting jurisdiction over an Australian not in the Unite States, asserting jurisdiction over web servers and publishing operations in Europe and Australia," he said.

Despite the controversy surrounding the allegations against Mr Assange, the packed Ulumbarra Theatre crowd was largely sympathetic, delivering rousing applause at various points in the discussion.

Castlemaine’s Justin Eales said he had come away with a more favourable view of the Wikileaks founder.

"I was a bit in doubt about him to an extent, and hearing him talk so passionately and eloquently about his cause certainly swayed me somewhat,” he said. "At the start of the talk when he was talking about his motivations, it’s pretty hard to disagree with all of that stuff.”

Mr Eales said he was not in a position to judge the veracity of the sexual assault allegations against Mr Assange, but was open to the possibility they were politically motivated.

"You can't totally know the situation so I’m not 100 per cent convinced one way or the other, but his willingness to talk about it certainly puts it in the US government's favour,” he said. "It’s quite clear that something like that could be politically motivated."

Overall, Mr Eales said he thought the decision to include Mr Assange was a good move by festival organisers.

"For me the festival has mainly been about ideas, they say it’s writers but it’s mainly about ideas and how people get those across,” he said. “He’s obviously a man with lots of important ideas, he wants to change the world and he’s had a pretty bloody good crack at it so far.”

Bendigo woman Kate Fraser chose not to attend the session, but also backed the decision to include Mr Assange in the festival line up.

"I think it’s appropriate, I wouldn’t be at all surprised that some of that controversy has been whipped up in order to silence him because I think that's actually how some of the major political systems do work,” she said.

"I really agree with the sort of work that Julian Assange has done but I actually find him a pain in the neck.”

http://www.bendigoadvertiser.com.au/story/4094231/i-have-already-been-cleared-assange/

Julian Assange speaks with Robert Manne at the Ulumbarra Theatre as part of the 2016 Bendigo Writers Festival. Picture: JASON WALLS

Full coverage: Bendigo Writers Festival 2016

Julian Assange has used his appearance at the Bendigo Writers Festival to address the controversy surrounding allegations of sexual assault made against him in Sweden.

Mr Assange made a point of speaking about the issue, despite interviewer Robert Manne’s initial reluctance, in a live cross from the Ecuadorian embassy in London.

"The situation is this, there is one allegation, there are no charges, there have never been charges," he said.

"In relation to this precise allegation, I have already been cleared by the chief prosecutor of Stockholm, back in 2010, who found that no crime had been committed whatsoever."

Mr Assange said the remaining allegation was only in the preliminary stages of investigation, and pointed out the United Nations had since declared his effective detention by the United Kingdom government in the Ecuadorian embassy to be unlawful.

"After the [original] preliminary investigation was closed and I was formally found to be innocent, it was reopened after the intervention of a politician,” he said.

"It’s been at the stage of preliminary investigation ever since."

But even in the event he is ultimately cleared by Swedish authorities, Mr Assange said he would remain unable to leave the embassy where he has been living since being granted asylum by Ecuador in 2012.

Asked by Professor Manne how confident he was he would be allowed to go free if the Swedish charges were dropped, Mr Assange was unequivocal.

"I’m 100 per cent confident that I would not be a free person because the British government has said, regardless of whether the Swedes drop the case or not, they’re going to arrest me,” he said.

“The UK government also refuses to confirm or deny whether there is already a US extradition request.”

Julian Assange speaks with Robert Manne at the Ulumbarra Theatre as part of the 2016 Bendigo Writers Festival. Picture: JASON WALLS

Jason Walls@jas_walls
13 Aug 2016, 10:30 p.m.
Senator David Leyonhjelm’s 18C case on ‘white’ abuse

The Australian, 12:01PM August 15, 2016

18C of the Racial Discrimination Act has broad appeal across the community — from human rights lawyer Julian Burnside to former prime minister Tony Abbott.

Senator Dean Smith spoke yesterday after delegates at the West Australian Liberal Party state conference voted in favour of removing the words from the act.

At the conference on Saturday, federal Liberal frontbencher Ken Wyatt argued strongly against the original motion to repeal section 18C altogether.

MORE: Left’s new war on free speech

***

Australian politician to test race hate laws after being called ‘angry white male’

LATIKA BOURKE, AUGUST 15 2016 - 3:08AM

Can a white man be racially discriminated against?

This is the question Australian Liberal Democrat David Leyonhjelm will be asking of the Human Rights Commission after Fairfax political commentator Mark Kenny wrote a piece labelling Leyonhjelm "a boorish, supercilious know-all with the empathy of a besser block." Kenny went on to say of Leyonhjelm and Malcolm Roberts, the One Nation Senator also pushing for changes to the Racial Discrimination Act, that "this gormless duo has declared, with all their angry-white-male certitude, that a verbal abuser cannot cause offence or humiliation."

You would think a free speech advocate wouldn’t get upset. Leyonhjelm says he’s not. But he wants to test the case before the Human Rights Commission to see if it’s fair that someone’s skin colour can be used in the debate if it happens to be white.

"The comments are reasonably likely in all the circumstances to offend or insult some white males. My colour was one of the reasons the comments were made," he is quoted as saying. [Simon Benson/Daily Telegraph]

Watch this debate very carefully as there is a lot more to come on it in this parliament. While the term “18C” might pass over the heads of most people trying to live life, this is a hugely internally political and significant story that I’ve been following for years. It’s a free-speech totemic issue for the right-wing of the Liberal Party. BTW, did you notice how on the weekend, Tony Abbott, back in campaign mode (gee, what could he be possibly be campaigning for…?!?) latched straight back onto the issue. [James Massola/Fairfax]

18C could become a proxy for leadership, if it isn’t already. Leyonhjelm’s move is not only some political trolling, but designed to highlight this already troublesome issue for the Liberals.


Montessori schools distance themselves from One Nation’s Malcolm Roberts

Kelsey Munro, AUGUST 14 2016 - 12:23AM

Montessori schools have moved to distance themselves from controversial political party One Nation after it emerged that the party’s Queensland senator, Malcolm Roberts, was involved at a senior level for many years with the private school group in Queensland and internationally.

The newly elected senator, a climate change denier who argues global warming is a socialist conspiracy of the United Nations and a cabal of international bankers, was the chairman of the Brisbane Montessori School in Fig Tree from 1999-2003.

Liberal Party state conference voted in favour of removing the words from the act. BTW, did you notice how on the weekend, Tony Abbott, back in campaign mode (gee, what could he be possibly be campaigning for…?!?) latched straight back onto the issue. [James Massola/Fairfax]

18C could become a proxy for leadership, if it isn't already. Leyonhjelm’s move is not only some political trolling, but designed to highlight this already troublesome issue for the Liberals.
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18C could become a proxy for leadership, if it isn't already. Leyonhjelm’s move is not only some political trolling, but designed to highlight this already troublesome issue for the Liberals.

Montessori schools have moved to distance themselves from controversial political party One Nation after it emerged that the party's Queensland senator, Malcolm Roberts, was involved at a senior level for many years with the private school group in Queensland and internationally.

The newly elected senator, a climate change denier who argues global warming is a socialist conspiracy of the United Nations and a cabal of international bankers, was the chairman of the Brisbane Montessori School in Fig Tree from 1999-2003.

On his professional CV he also touts a personal invitation from Timothy Seldin, chairman of the Montessori Foundation, to join the International Montessori Council’s global advisory board, on which he served for eight years from 2000.

The senator, a former coalmine manager, is advocating for a royal commission into climate science as well as a review of the Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO’s climate change "positions", and wants compensation for residents suffering from what he calls Wind Turbine Syndrome.

He sent a bizarre affidavit to then prime minister Julia Gillard in 2011 demanding to be exempt from the carbon tax and using language consistent with the "sovereign citizen" movement, although he has subsequently denied being a member.

One Nation’s party plat form calls for a ban on Muslim immigration to Australia, including Muslim refugees; "an inquiry or Royal Commission to determine if Islam is a religion or political ideology", and a ban on the burqa.

Senator Roberts joined Derryn Hinch and David Leyonhjelm during the week to again push for the abolition of Section 18c of the Racial Discrimination Act, which makes it unlawful to "insult" or "offend" others based on race.

The Montessori Australia Foundation says its child-focused approach to education fosters "inclusivity and positive social development". The educational philosophy outlined by Italian educator Maria Montessori has grown in popularity in Australia – in 2007, there were just 150 Montessori schools. Today there are more than 250.

One Nation senator Malcolm Roberts. Photo: Robert Shakespeare

Malcolm Roberts & the climate science/UN/banking/Al Gore conspiracy theory
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IxFItkCZzyA

Climate Excerpt - David Leyonhjelm and Malcolm Roberts join Insiders
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2nJdvKco5tA

Sky News’s broken coverage of Malcolm Roberts conference
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rm479gJGyC

Mr Seldin confirmed that Senator Roberts served voluntarily on the advisory board "as a parent representative member".

"The issues that ... he is advocating are not representative of Dr Montessori’s global vision, and do not reflect the views of the Montessori Foundation or the International Montessori Council," said the US-based Mr Seldin, who was one of the first 1000 presenters trained by Al Gore in his climate change advocacy program, now known as the Climate Reality Project.

Malcolm Roberts with One Nation leader Pauline Hanson.

The principal of the Brisbane Montessori School, May Selkirk, said that from 1999-2003 Senator Roberts "would have been a voluntary member of the board because he was a parent of the school. Mr Roberts has not been involved in the school since that time."

Senator Roberts responded that he shared a passion for Montessori’s philosophy of education with Mr Seldin but did not see any contradiction with his party’s climate policies.

“I valued our working relationship and admire his devotion to supporting our planet’s children for which I work every day through One Nation policies and my work on restoring scientific integrity to climate issues.”

RELATED CONTENT
Free-speech fundamentalists break free of good conscience
One Nation senator’s bizarre letter to Julia Gillard

...more on s18C – the Toben Amendment to the Racial Discrimination Act...

Tony Abbott reopens racial discrimination debate and laments 'hyper-partisan' politics

James Massola, AUGUST 12 2016 - 8:00PM

Tony Abbott says his government should have pursued less ambitious reform of section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, in comments that will re-open debate in the conservative wing of the Liberal Party about changing the Act and potentially create a new headache for Malcolm Turnbull.

In a speech to the Samuel Griffith Society in Adelaide on Friday, Mr Abbott also lamented Australia’s "hyper-partisan" politics and surprisingly suggested that while opposition leader in 2011, he should have allowed Julia Gillard’s government to implement its so-called Malaysian solution and send up to 800 asylum seekers to that country, to deter the flow of asylum seeker boats.

18c back on the agenda

The former prime minister is also strongly critical of Liberal state premiers, including NSW leader Mike Baird and former Victorian Liberal leader Denis Napthine, who opposed the harsh cuts to schools and hospitals in the 2014 federal budget.

Crossbench senators David Leyonhjelm and Bob Day have both flagged they will introduce legislation to, respectively, abolish section 18C of the RDA, which makes it illegal to "offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" a person, or in Senator Day’s case to remove the words "offend" and "insult" from the controversial clause.

‘We’re not responsible for the feelings of others,’
Former prime minister Tony Abbott wanted to water down section 18c but later abandoned the plans. Photo: Andrew Meares

There was now, he said, "no real prospect of change" to the law and as a consequence "our Parliament prefers to tolerate over-the-top prosecutions than to upset thin-skinned activists". Mr Abbott said that he had been reflecting on his time as opposition leader and that he still believed it was right to oppose the carbon tax, the mining tax and the Rudd government's Pink Batts and School halls stimulus programs. However, "I wonder, though, about the former government's people-swap with Malaysia...I doubt it would have worked". "Letting it stand would have been an acknowledgment of the government-of-the-day's mandate to do the best it could, by its own lights, to meet our nation's challenges. It would have been a step back from the hyper-partisanship that now poisons our public life."

Tony Abbott speech

On the 2014 budget, which he linked to his plan to reform the federation, Mr Abbott said his government had sought to reduce the unsustainable funding promises made by the former Gillard government. "Our idea was the constitutionally correct one: to have the states and territories running public schools and public hospitals take more responsibility for funding them," he said. "Again led by Liberal premiers, the response was a fusillade of criticism along the lines of cruel cuts and broken promises. "The states would rather blame federal funding than address the shortcomings in their schools and hospitals; while the Commonwealth won't risk a scare campaign by considering real change." [http://www.smh.com.au/federalpolitics/politicalnews/tony-abbott-reopens-racialdiscrimination-debate-and-laments-hyperpartisan-politics-20160812-qar91f.html](http://www.smh.com.au/federalpolitics/politicalnews/tony-abbott-reopens-racialdiscrimination-debate-and-laments-hyperpartisan-politics-20160812-qar91f.html)

Free-speech crusaders 'close' to eroding Racial Discrimination Act, says Liberal Senator

JARED OWENS, Reporter, Canberra, @jaredowens

Free-speech crusaders are "closer than ever" to eroding the controversial Racial Discrimination Act, Liberal senator James Paterson said last night, saying Malcolm Turnbull should be "taking up the mantle and leading" on the hot-button issue. Tony Abbott angered his supporters in 2014 by abandoning an election promise to repeal the law, amid fears that loosening restrictions on speech could stymie efforts to silence radical preachers. However Coalition MPs, buoyed by the recent election of like-minded senators including Pauline Hanson and Derryn Hinch, are ramping up pressure on senior ministers, including the Prime Minister, to revisit the issue. The issue has gained additional prominence this week with libertarian senator David Leyonhjelm complaining about a newspaper column that described him as an "angry white male". Senator Paterson said the parliament was "closer than we ever have been to passing 18C reform through the parliament". "My assessment is we are only one or two votes away from where we need to be in the Senate and the right bill, well-crafted, with the right approach, has a very good prospect of passing this parliament," the Victorian senator told Sky News. "The Prime Minister has spoken about his support for freedom of speech in the past. He has said that he would be quite comfortable with a bill... which does take out insult and offend from the act, so I think it's a question of him taking up the mantle and leading on this." Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act prohibits speech that is "reasonably likely, in all the circumstances, to offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" on the basis of "race, colour or national or ethnic origin". The law does not apply to comments made "reasonably and in good faith" in pursuit of art, science, the public interest or academia. Fair comment that is a genuine belief held by the author is also protected.

Liberal senator Scott Ryan, also a Victorian senator, said the continuation of section 18C "still troubles a lot of people on my side of politics" after it was used successfully against newspaper columnist Andrew Bolt. "It's not in my portfolio. It is a matter for the Attorney-General, and as I understand he has indicated that the position, as announced a couple of years ago, stands. It is not a priority for the Government moving forward," Senator Ryan said, describing himself as a "First Amendment person" who was "out on the edge of freedom of speech".

Mark Dreyfus, the opposition legal affairs spokesman, yesterday called on Mr Turnbull to "step up and categorically rule out any changes to section 18C". "Mr Turnbull's refusal so far to condemn this attack on Australia's protections against racist hate speech is a reflection of the spinelessness of the Turnbull government and on Mr Turnbull's utter lack of leadership within the Liberal Party," he said.
A focused government can fix both the budget and free speech. With the Turnbull government floating around with no economic or cultural ballast, reforming section 18c might repair some of the brand damage done to the Liberal Party in the last three years. If not now, when?

Speaking in Adelaide at the annual Sir Samuel Griffith Society conference last Friday, Tony Abbott admitted he was wrong to walk away from a pre-election promise to reform section 18c, which prohibits words that are “reasonably likely … to offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate another person or a group of people” because of their “race, colour or national or ethnic origin”. Here are five reasons why Turnbull should do what Abbott refused to do as PM. First, the country is crying out for sensible cultural leadership. As Turnbull told The Bolt Report last year, it is entirely sensible to excuse “offend” and “insult” from section 18c. Second, Senator David Leyonhjelm has lodged a complaint against Fairfax journalist Mark Kenny for writing a column that likely breaches section 18c. Kenny described Leyonhjelm as an “angry white male”, a “boorish, supercilious know-it-all”. Why shouldn’t Leyonhjelm claim Kenny’s words are reasonably likely to offend? Or is the law seriously saying white people don’t have feelings?

And that raises the third reason why Turnbull should act. The Federal Circuit Court will soon decide whether a section 18c case against three young students from Queensland University of Technology will go to trial. Three years ago, a few students were evicted from an indigenous computer lab by an indigenous woman. The student wrote on Facebook: “Just got kicked out of unsigned indigenous computer room. QUT stopping segregation with segregation.” Prior lodged an 18c complaint against the boys because she says her feelings were hurt. Some might find Kenny’s criticisms of Leyonhjelm far more cogent reason for reforming 18c. Whether it goes to trial or not, everyone is a loser in this case. First and foremost, the students for posting innocuous comments. These young men simply want to study and work and forge a career without being branded bigots. They don’t want to be cultural warriors fighting to defend their right to free speech. But that’s what they have been forced to do, engaging lawyers, spending time and energy on a case that makes no sense.

The second loser is Prior. A law that encourages a person to become a hapless victim by claiming her feelings have been hurt by a few words on Facebook is a law that infantilises that person. It encourages Prior to see herself as weak and vulnerable, incapable of dealing with the most trifling of words. And the third loser is us. Laws that infantilise Prior also infantilise us by allowing feelings to trump reason. Laws that sluice bigot label on students for a few words posted on Facebook are laws that stand ready to label any of us bigots if we say the wrong thing. It’s not just a few; it’s anyone.

The brouhaha over a cartoon in The Australian by Bill Leak provides the fourth reason why 18c must be reformed. Leak’s cartoon about family dysfunction in indigenous communities should have raised intelligent questions about family dysfunction in indigenous communities. Instead of confronting the real issue, ABC radio’s Jon Faine immediately encouraged offended people to lodge a complaint under section 18c to establish that Leak’s cartoon is prohibited by law. Curious about Faine’s attempt to stifle free speech, I contacted the Australian Human Rights Commission that same day for comment. What did the new Human Rights Commissioner, Edward Santow, have to say about this uproar that was now raising questions about free speech?

The commission’s media adviser advised me this was a race issue and accordingly the Race Commissioner would comment.
Sure enough Race Commissioner Tim Soutphommasane said that “Aboriginal Australians who have been racially offended, insulted, humiliated or intimidated … can lodge a complaint under the Racial Discrimination Act”.

With calls even from the Race Commissioner for people to complain under section 18c, I suggested to the commission’s media adviser that it was also a free speech matter. I repeated my request for a comment from the Human Rights Commissioner, who is charged with responsibility for the human right to free speech. There was only silence on that front. The Commission decided it was a race issue. End of story.

When claiming money for hurt feelings under section 18c takes precedence at the Australian Human Rights Commission over defending the human right to free speech, it’s clear our culture is being corrupted by the very institution charged with protecting human rights.

The foyers of the commission’s offices in Sydney openly exhibits that corruption. A floor-to-ceiling glass wall adjacent to where visitors sit says: “Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and wellbeing of themselves and their families.” Do I really have a human right to demand a certain standard of living from the government? Who determines what that standard of living is? Me? You? Some make-work bureaucract at the commission trying to justify a sky-high salary? What about my responsibility to create a standard of living for myself?

Speaking at the Sydney Opera House last week, PJ O’Rourke identified the core of this rights corruption. He pointed to the trumped-up rights over get-outta-here rights. Gimme-rights are when you claim you have a human right to get something — like more than $240,000 for having your feelings hurt. The get-outta-here rights mean you have a right to get government out of your life — say a student who expects to be able to freely post a few pointed comments about QT’s boneheaded segregation without being hauled before a court. Too many politicians are also consumed with gimme-rights rather than defending get-outta-here rights. Promising people things under the banner of gimme-rights rather than defending get-outta-here rights gives politicians things to do. When was the last time a politician with real power promised to get out of our lives and deliver on that front?

The new Senate offers Turnbull additional heft to defend free speech. Re-elected senators Bob Day and Leyonhjelm are on board. So are new senators Derryn Hinch, Pauline Hanson and her three One Nation senators. Maybe a decent debate can entice Nick Xenophon and his senators to defend principles rather than pursue populism. Turnbull should make the case for what he called sensible reform of section 18c, not as a sop to conservatives, but because it is the right thing to do in a Western liberal democracy committed to free speech.

So let’s ask again, if not now, when?

janeta@bigpond.net.au

MORE: Frontbencher backs 18C change
MORE: ‘Come clean on 18C deals’

COMMENTs

Paul8 HOURS AGO

The new crossbench senators aren’t there to give Malcolm Turnbull additional heft to achieve things he wants to achieve. When he tries, Janet Albrechtsen, you’ll see what I mean.

Fredrick8 HOURS AGO

As I stated in my response to yesterday’s thoughtful piece by Gerard Owens “Free-speech crusaders ‘close’ to eroding Racial Discrimination Act, says Liberal Senator”, S18C has to be scapped or needs to be tested in the High Court. It surprised me that Andrew Bolt didn’t do it, while Mrs Olga Scully and I simply didn’t have the resources nor the legal support, to do just that — which lead to both of us being bankrupted on account of the horrendous legal costs to run the case being awarded against us by the Federal Court, and me having to do some time for contempt of court!

This 1990s legal tendency to protect hurt feelings, of course, was specifically designed to gag open debate on contentious issues — as similar laws were enacted also during this time in Germany and Canada where basic legal procedure didn’t achieve the goal of silencing individuals who wished to contest specific historical narratives.

S18C is a watered-down version of defamation law, except that in defamation cases the truth concept still operates while in S18C cases it claims to protect hurt feelings. However, the hypocrisy is glaringly obvious to those who have been subjected to it. It is not really to protect anyone’s hurt feelings but rather to extend legal protection to certain narratives of the Holocaust-Shoa, and although it is possible to discuss anything at all in our vital Australian democracy, the Holocaust-Shoa narrative, remains legally protected. Cui Bono – in whose interest is that?

Liberty7 HOURS AGO

@Fredrick Antisemitism is vile. Don’t you agree Tobin? Go Israel. Go the Jews. Our greatest ally in the middle east.

Fredrick3 HOURS AGO

@Liberty @Fredrick Please, the mindset embodied in sloganeering does not address the truth-content issue, which is at stake here. And should we not get back to the basics of what the Enlightenment/ Reformation was all about - .the exercising of our reason and understanding and the asking of questions without someone claiming that such act is "antisemitic", "racist", et al?

Remember how on 8 January 1696 Thomas Aikenhead, an Englishman who cast doubt on the authenticity of the Bible, was publicly hanged and his property confiscated. What was his crime? He had stated publicly that the Bible is full of madness and nonsense and it amazes him how stupid the world is to let itself be conned by its content. Remember also what rests on Salman Rushdie’s head - but in his case the Iranians claim Rushdie was telling lies and he should return to Iran to be questioned. Would you advise him to return to Iran?

S18C is a legal instrument that silences dissenting views and protects contentious views. As stated elsewhere, this claim to need to protect "hurt feelings" when it is an obvious con-job to silence critical voices and possibly lose business opportunities, is nothing new.

While the Catholics reigned supreme, the Bible remained a Latin text and was thus not accessible to the general public. Martin Luther changed that by translating it into German making ordinary people a chance to read what’s inside - and critically to evaluate it for truth-content. And the rest is current history. It amazes me how supposed mature individuals get so upset - let their feelings be hurt - when, for example, they hear that Climate Change may be not settled, and former PM Julia Gillard let their feelings be hurt when, for example, they hear that Climate Change may be not settled, and former PM Julia Gillard made the unscientific pronouncement that Climate Change “is settled”. Any scientist knows that scientific research results are never absolute and that we live within a process where our knowledge of things forever grows. It is only when the shonks come out and try the con-job of deriving some material benefits that insults and outright verbal abuse arise.

But then it should not be S18B that comes into force in order to protect someone’s hurt feeling but rather a legal instrument where truth is a defence, and that is a defamation action. Also, while I’m at it - Mrs Scully defended her actions by claiming she was acting in "good faith" - s18D - and that as a Russian-born Australian she should have a right to look at Russian history, especially the Soviet Union-Bolshevik Holocaust.

But like Richard below, that is not permitted because her views are “Nazi” - and again “Nazi-Nazi”, if not "RACIST". We are moving towards a new Dark Ages where Enlightenment-
Reformation impulses are sorely needed, and scrapping s18C would be a splendid beginning for a new dawn, a new awakening of national spirit! How's that?

Richard6 HOURS AGO
@Fredrick I live in Tasmanlia and saw the material that Scully pushed through peoples’ letterboxes in Launceston. I remember what that case was actually about and it was a bit more than someone having hurt feelings from a bit of non-PC wording - it was about the distribution of viciously antisemitic material of the nastiest, lowest kind. The usual "Holocaust was invented by Jews", all the egregious latter day Tobin-Nazi nut job crap. It was absolutely disgusting and went well beyond exercising a right to free speech. Don't come on here looking for sympathy and especially, don't try to suggest that the Scully case somehow justifies amending S18C etc because the facts of your case simply provides ammunition to the other side. If anyone wants some background on this, try googling Olga Scully, Launceston, jews. ....

Lee11 HOURS AGO
If 18D is such an effective restraint of insubstantial claims how on earth did the absurd claim in Tasmania against the Catholic church - the staggering nonsense of the Qland Uni claim and even the Andrew Bolt case 'in the public interest ......anf if the comment is the genuine belief of the person.' The reality seems to be that 18c holds far more sway in social and legal contexts due to activism and the timidity of those in power.

Fredrick8 HOURS AGO
@Lee And don't forget the Olga Scully case of the 1990s that had Tasmania abuzz because she claimed s18D protection, which was rejected. If you dabble in matters Holocaust, as she was doing, then the defence of "in good faith", becomes ineffective. How can you have good faith when your work is hurting vested interests?

Liberty7 HOURS AGO
@Fredrick @Lee But do you agree that those who deny the holocaust are complete crackpots? Go Israel. Go the Jews.

Fredrick3 HOURS AGO
@Liberty @Fredrick @Lee You are using a typical shut-up word "crackpot", and so individuals are afraid to even approach the topic, let alone study the subject in any depth. When you are certain you are right, then one thing is certain you could be wrong. http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/ja net-albrechtsen/turnbull-must-reform-18c-now-as-free-speechisnogimme/newsstory/e5fca688a0672e5ce1e722539e3dfe96

*******
'Supportive' Malcolm Turnbull in deal with Bob Day to defer 18C push

SARAH MARTIN, Political reporter, Canberra, The Australian, 12:00AM August 19, 2016 - @msmarto

Family First senator Bob Day and Malcolm Turnbull ‘agreed the time (for a vote) was not right for either of us at that time’. Picture: Ray Strange

Malcolm Turnbull expressed his "general support" for senator Bob Day’s push to amend section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, and pledged to look at the matter early this year after asking him to delay a vote on the change.

As some Coalition senators rally support for a renewed push to amend section 18C of the law, Senator Day revealed to The Australian that the Prime Minister had phoned him last year during debate on the bill and the two "agreed the time (for a vote) was not right for either of us at that time."

Senator Day said Mr Turnbull indicated his “general support” for the push to amend the contentious section, which restricts speech that is "reasonably likely, in all the circumstances, to offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" on the basis of "race, colour or national or ethnic origin".

"Shortly after he became Prime Minister, (Mr Turnbull) rang and we discussed my 18C bill, which I had in the Senate at that time,” Senator Day told The Australian. "We landed at the position where I would not put it to a vote, but would bring it back in the new year and we agreed with that timetable.”

When asked why the bill did not return for a vote in the new year, Senator Day said circumstances, including the election and the debate over Senate voting reform, did not allow it.

Liberal Democrat senator David Leyonhjelm, who was a co-sponsor of Senator Day’s bill, said a vote last October would have “killed the bill”, but he had not welcomed Mr Turnbull’s intervention.

“Bob told me that the Prime Minister had called him and asked him not to bring it on,” he said. "My answer was to tell the Prime Minister to get stuffed, to bring it on anyway, but Bob is an obliging sort of a bloke and supportive of the Libs and he had made up his mind he would hold back.”

The bill did not have the numbers to pass the Senate, so Senator Day’s assessment was to keep it alive in the hope he could secure the numbers to pass the legislation this year. Senator Leyonhjelm said Mr Turnbull should have sought to advance the issue to try to garner support for the bill, which was also sponsored by Liberal senators Cory Bernardi and Dean Smith.

“I do think the government is going to find it hard to say no to this continuously, this is a small-l liberal issue, and if they don’t take up the cause of free speech then others will,” he said.

Two more Liberal senators called yesterday for the government to revisit its position, which is being defended by members of the executive. When asked his position on changing section 18C, Scott Morrison said he was focused on budget repair.

"It doesn't help me to reverse the deficit, it doesn't help me pay back the debt, it doesn't help me get one more extra person in a job and it doesn't lead to one extra company investing more in Australia, so you can appreciate that it is not at the top of my list," the Treasurer said.

Tasmanian senator Eric Abetz, who will also lend his name as a sponsor to the bill, said cabinet should reconsider its position.

"There is strong support right around the country for this change and I hope that the government might find time to allow
it to be debated, especially given that support seems to be gathering among the Senate crossbench," he said. Senator James Paterson told Sky News he hoped "to persuade them that it is necessary to make changes". "I hope, with the right process and the right approach, that this is an issue that during this term we can address."

While agreeing budget repair was a priority, Victorian backbench MP Michael Sukkar also urged the government to revisit the issue. "Promoting freedom of speech is core business of the Liberal Party, but to implement an appropriate change to section 18C, we should be progressing it through our internal process - processes."

Arguing that the change was "modest", Senator Bernardi said an "overwhelming majority" of the Coalition partyroom supported amending the bill.

"I do not understand why the government is not prepared to support it," he said.

**COMMENTS**

**Charmaine2 HOURS AGO**

Bob Day was led up the garden path by Turnbull when he implied action would be considered later if he delayed presenting his free speech amendment bill in the run up to the election. Anyone who has had dealings with narcissists will have recognised one of the many techniques used to manipulate others in order to always get his way. MT did not want free speech to become an election issue, nor get caught up in any public promises as clearly, he does not really believe in this core Liberal principle.

We know Turnbull has gagged his front bench from publicly supporting the amendment of the RDA (he is supposed to be the first minister among equals. He does not rule by divine right). He claims this issue is not a priority for "his" govt, and yet Senator Bernardi has been quoted as saying the "overwhelming majority" of the Coalition caucus supports it. We can be forgiven from concluding then, that this shows clearly that this is Turnbull's own personal opinion blocking action on this amendment.

We would expect this attitude from a Leftist leader, not a Liberal one. Turnbull does not believe in nor support freedom of speech, something central to Liberal principles.

**Victoria4 HOURS AGO**

Proponents of the amendment need to give examples of how it is used against individuals. Eg keep telling the public about the QUT situation, and how damaging it is to be forced to fight a spurious legal case - time, stress, and legal costs. A lot of us were students once - imagine having this to deal with as well as studies and precarious finances.

Opponents of change play 18c down as small deal - it's not a criminal conviction, and after all, "why do you want to say offensive things anyway"? - In the QUT case the students politely queried what the fuss was about. One academic in the gun merely remarked "that it seemed a bit silly" to stop students using a vacant computer room. Anything is accepted as "offensive" if someone says it is in support of a claim.

Punitive consequences are quasi-criminal - what are the chances of getting an academic post or other public service job with an 18c finding on the record?

**Brasso2 HOURS AGO**

@Christine In fairness to him, he really does have his work cut out with budget repair. Anything else is a distraction for him and also diminishes the media and public focus on what needs to be done (fiscally). The ramifications of the budget not being repaired, and soon, is frightening.

**Lloyd4 HOURS AGO**

The wording of 18C needs to be modified as it is too open to "selective interpretation" by activist Judges like Mordecai Bromberg and the HRC to pursue partisan agendas. The ruling against Bolt and the current QUT issue are both testament to that.

**Victoria4 HOURS AGO**

@Lloyd and the "defence" in s18D that apologists like to point to did not help Andrew Bolt, even though prima facie he was protected by it.

**Fredrick1 HOUR AGO**

@Lloyd And read Justice Bromberg's judgment and find out on which precedent case in particular he rests his decision. 

**Stuart6 HOURS AGO**

@Bill @John @Mark @Stewart @Stuart There has to be a sensible middle ground without limiting free speech too much. You just shouldnt be able to call Aboriginal people all the filth that people called them in the past. That's what I see those who want 18c removed or modified want.

**Lloyd4 HOURS AGO**

@Stuart @Bill @John @Mark @Stewart Garbage! If that's all you can see Stuart, take your blinkers off. The issue has far wider implications than that.

**Kym6 HOURS AGO**

@Mark @Stewart @Stuart I find your remarks constantly offensive to our Australian liberal way of life. Your constant support for other than traditional Ozzie culture is offensive with claims of racial discrimination of reference to current Australians responsible for past discrimination in a different time in history. I find your need to claim victim for anyone not white Australian as a racist view and I question your value and loyalty to Australia. I want to say I question all this because you are from a different background and you are resentful because of this. Have I offended you?

**Fredrick30 MINUTES AGO**

@Kym @Mark @Stewart @Stuart Anyone who uses shut-up words, such as "racist", "hater", "Holocaust denier", "antisemite", "xenophobe" lacks the moral and intellectual integrity to face up to and use the truth concept in order to clarify problems that generally transcend our daily lives. As we are seeing with the Trump case in the USA the overarching conflict-world view is between nationalism and
internationalism - and this has been a timeless cultural HUMAN conflict. Social engineering specialists know all about it and classical world literature shows us where we are at in this timeless process. It seems to me that at the moment we are facing another Reformation, if not a future Revolution, against the current PC mindset because the PC shroud is stifling our humanity and directing the up-coming generation into self-destructive hedonistic inversion.

But there is always hope because the universe is good to humanity and those that predict gloom and doom and extinction, a la Al Gore and his climate change nonsense, will also fret and strut their hour upon the stage of life, and then will be heard no more.

http://www.theaustralian.com.au/nationalaffairs/supportivemalcolmturnbullindealwithbobdaytodefer18cpush/newsstory/3e0e3afc1a48abfb1373b5bab9189d78

Australian politician files human rights complaint after newspaper calls him ‘angry white man’

Australia's racial discrimination act makes it clear that insulting someone because of the colour of their skin is against Australian law. David Leyonhjelm, a libertarian senator, has recently campaigned to repeal that clause, claiming that such a law damages the Australian tradition of freedom of speech. That is, until journalist Mark Kenny penned a newspaper article calling Leyonhjelm's view on the law indicative of the senator's "angry-white-male certitude". The commentary, published in the Sydney Morning Herald on August 8, prompted Leyonhjelm to use the very law he's trying to repeal in order to file a human rights complaint against Kenny.

In an interview with the Daily Telegraph, Leyonhjelm said "the comments are reasonably likely in all the circumstances to offend or insult some white males". "My colour was one of the reasons the comments were made," he added.

Apparently, he believes that his complaint is completely absurd – and that's all the more reason for going through with it. "If I'm going to succeed in having it repealed, I need to change minds," he said. "If I'm going to change minds, I have to show [the] absurdity of the law."

One of Leyonhjelm's biggest complaints about the law's current language is that it applies to any comments that "offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" on the basis of race. According to him, offence is always taken, not given, and therefore cannot be blamed on the person responsible for making potentially offensive comments.

Prime Minister Tony Abbott had previously made moves to repeal the law, but backed down when he faced opposition from lawmakers. He most recently suggested that perhaps just the words "offend" and "insult" should be repealed. This article appeared in the South China Morning Post print edition as: MP files complaint over 'racist' article


Think on these things:

*The Holocaust-Shoah as a new Religion*

Ernst Notle’s Contentious thought:
Ich stelle mich kritisch zu derjenigen These von der Einzigartigkeit, die als Fahne vor Heerhaufen getragen wird. Diese Art, wir sind im Besitz der Einzigartigkeit des Holocausts und damit brauchen wir über nichts mehr nachzudenken, brauchen keine Beziehungen herzustellen, sondern halten diese Fahne hoch - das ist der Übergang in eine neue Religion, wenn auch in eine Pseudoreligion.

I critically view the uniqueness thesis, which is like an army’s battle banner. This claim, we are in possession of the uniqueness of the Holocaust, does not require us to think about anything else, does not need us to nurture relationships but merely to keep this flag flying high - this is the transition stage to a new religion, albeit a pseudo-religion.

It can be compared with Martin Heidegger’s thought:
The Jews, with their marked gift for calculating, live, already for the longest time, according to the principle of race, which is why they are resisting its consistent application with utmost violence.

Such basic truths, such truth-telling liberates our minds from an intellectual dictatorship that today is called Political Correctness.
Anfangs galt er als Linker. Das änderte sich radikal, als Ernst Nolte erklärte, der Holocaust sei eine Reaktion auf die Verbrechen der Sowjet-Kommunisten gewesen; Mit dieser These entfachte er den Historikerstreit. Ein Nachruf auf den umstrittenen Historiker.

Seine wissenschaftliche Reputation war zu Beginn seiner Karriere über jeden Zweifel erhoben. Der Oberstudienrat Ernst Nolte hatte 1963 mit seinem Buch "Der Faschismus in seiner Epoche" den Ausdruck "Faschismus" für den Nationalsozialismus in die Geschichtsschreibung eingebracht. Die intellektuelle Linke applaudierte ihm, die Universität Marburg berief ihn kurz darauf zum ordentlichen Professor. 30 Jahre später formulierte Nolte die Gräueltaten der Nazis als Reaktion auf die Untaten der russischen Bolschewiki. Der Historikerstreit brach los. Gab es zwei Noltes? Hatte er sich verändert?

"Ich habe mich geändert, sondern die öffentliche Meinung"


Der Gulag mit seinen Millionen Toten, so Nolte damals, und auch die fürchterlichen Hungernöte in der Ukraine 1932 bis 1934 seien Vorbild gewesen für die Verbrechen der Nazis. Diese Verbrechen seien nicht allein Folge der deutschen Geschichte, sondern des Ideologiestreits zwischen Faschismus und Kommunismus.


30 Jahre später formulierte Nolte die Gräueltaten der Nazis als Reaktion auf die Untaten der russischen Bolschewiki. Der Historikerstreit brach los. Gab es zwei Noltes? Hatte er sich verändert?

"Ich habe mich geändert, sondern die öffentliche Meinung"


Der Gulag mit seinen Millionen Toten, so Nolte damals, und auch die fürchterlichen Hungernöte in der Ukraine 1932 bis 1934 seien Vorbild gewesen für die Verbrechen der Nazis. Diese Verbrechen seien nicht allein Folge der deutschen Geschichte, sondern des Ideologiestreits zwischen Faschismus und Kommunismus.

"Kausaler Nexus" - Auslöser des Historikerstreits


"Ich habe mich zurückhaltend ausgedrückt, wie es einem Historiker und Wissenschaftler ja zukommt. Kausaler Nexus bedeutet ja nicht etwa eine vollständige Verursachung, sondern es gibt Hunderte von kausalen Nexus, aber es ist ein wesentlicher kausaler Nexus."


"Vergleichende Verharmlosung"

Literaturkritiker und Holocaust-Überlebender Marcel Reich-Ranicki nannte ihn daraufhin eine "trübe, verächtliche Figur der Zeitgeschichte". Und der Kulturwissenschaftler Peter Gay schrieb: "Ich beschuldige Nolte nicht, dass er wissentlich falsches Material zusammengetragen hat, das nun andere ausbeuten, deren Hände weniger sauber sind als seine. Aber wissentlich oder nicht: Sein Deutschland und der Kalte Krieg läuft auf eine umfangreiche und kunstvolle Ehrenrettung des modernen Deutschland hinaus. Ich nenne diese Methode 'Vergleichende Verharmlosung'. Denn ihr liegt der Kunstgriff zugrunde, die Gräueltaten der Nazis zwar einzugestehen, doch sie sozusagen zu humanisieren, das heißt zu entschuldigen."

Bekannte Kollegen wie Heinrich August Winkler wandten sich von Nolte ab. Der Historiker Eberhard Jäckel sprach für viele: "Vergleichen kann man alles miteinander. Und aus dem Vergleich ergibt sich, dass der nationalsozialistische Mord an den Juden im Zweiten Weltkrieg einzartig war, weil noch nie zuvor mit staatlichen Mitteln eine bestimmte Menschengruppe, einschließlich der Alten, der Frauen, der Kinder und der Säuglinge, unterschiedslos getötet worden war. Und in den Thesen von Ernst Nolte, dass dieser Mord auf eine gewisse Weise provoziert worden war, sei ich nicht nur eine wissenschaftlich verfehlte Antwort auf die vergleichende Frage, sondern auch eine bedenkliche Äußerung der Relativierung."

Auch Nobelpreisträger Elie Wiesel nahm Stellung zur Verrechnung der Verbrechen: "Nur wenn wir an die Einzigartigkeit dieses Vorgangs glauben, können wir irgendwie in seinem Schatten leben und in seinem Schatten überleben. Wenn wir ihn zur Banalität reduzieren, dann sind wir verloren. Es wird uns dann nicht einmal als Warnung dienen können."

Nolte isoliert

Nolte geriet zunehmend in Isolation. Einer der brillantesten Historiker, dessen Schriften zur Industrialisierung Maßstäbe historischer Genauigkeit waren, wurde in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten hauptsächlich von Burschenschaftlern und rechtskonservativen Vereinen eingeladen. Dennoch hielt er an seiner These fest. Im Film von Andreas Christoph Schmidt bestätigte er, der Holocaust sei nicht einzigartig: "Ich stelle mich kritisch zu derjenigen These von der Einzigartigkeit, die als Fahne vor Heerhaufen getragen wird. Diese Art, wir sind im Besitz der Einzigartigkeit des Holocausts und damit brauchen wir über nichts mehr nachzudenken, brauchen keine Beziehungen herzustellen, sondern halten diese Fahne hoch - das ist der Übergang in eine neue Religion, wenn auch in eine Pseudoreligion."

Kommentare

Am 18. August 2016 um 18:40 von karlheinzfaltermeier

"Die Ansichten..." und Thesen Ernst Noltes werden immer zu verschiedenen Wertungen führen. Vor allem, weil sie letztlich nicht "wissenschaftlich" bewiesen werden können, wie ein physikalische oder mathematische Erkenntnis. Der Grund dafür liegt sicherlich entscheidend darin, daß Noltes Thesen zu keinem Zeitpunkt emotionsfrei waren - die seiner Kritiker aber auch nicht! Seltsamerweise kann man nämlich Noltes Kritiker die gleichen emotionalen Argumente vorhalten, die sie selbst benutzen!

Nolte hat nach meiner Ansicht den Fehler begangen, aus psychisch-liberalen Verhalten Staats und der gesamten KpDsu einen emotionalen Bogen zur Bevölkerung im deutschen Reich zu schlagen und deren Empfänglichkeit für Menetekel jed. Natürlich wurde das von entsprechender Seite mit Freude als "Entschuldigung" angesehen, ohne zu erkennen, daß es keine Entschuldigung sein konnte! Die Abqualifizierung durch Reich-Ranicki zu einer "trüben, verächtlichen Figur der Zeitgeschichte" war überflüssig, aber vielsagend!

Am 18. August 2016 um 18:44 von yolo

Er hat sich getraut...

Nolte kann man sicher vieles nachsagen, aber vielleicht sogar verübeln. Aber eines kann man nicht Behaupten, dass er keinen Mut gehabt hätte, sich auch gegen einen gültigen Mainstream seiner Tage zu stellen. Man kann auch nach seinem Tod noch über seine Arbeiten streiten...mit Verlaub...das ist es sicher auch, was er...
provozieren wollte. Die Auseinandersetzung mit der eigenen Geschichte in Zusammenhang mit der Historie noch weit vergangenerer Tage.


Am 18. August 2016 um 19:10 von Demokratie-Jetzt
Das Prädikat „umstritten“ gilt im deutschen Mainstream ja leider als Schimpfwort.


Am 18. August 2016 um 19:29 von kinsky
Der wissenschaftliche Diskurs ist eben nicht frei, objektiv und immun gegen den gesellschaftlichen und politischen "Mainstream". Aber gerade dieser sachliche Streit um wertfreie Denkmodelle geht mir zunehmend ab. So ist möglicherweise auch der "Kommissarbefehl" der Wehrmacht ein kausaler Nexus.


Der Gulag mit seinen Millionen Toten, so Nolte damals, und auch die fürchterlichen Hungermünder in der Ukraine 1932 bis 1934. Vor der Zwickel der gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse war in Westeuropa riesengroß und ist bestens so empfunden. Die Angst des Bürgerums vor den russischen Verhältnissen war in Westeuropa riesengroß und ist bestens dokumentiert.

Umdrehung der Tatsachen


Jetzt dieser Noltschen Theorie folgen zu wollen, dass die "Reaktion auf die "existenzielle Bedrohung" Deutschlands durch die russische Revolution" die Vernichtung hervorbrachte ist m.E. haarestreubend! Das Kaiserreich war es doch, dass diese deutsche kommunistische Ideologie in den Osten trug um dort das Zarenreich zu schwächen und die Ostfront zu befrieden. Was ja auch gelang! Wenn die Argumentationskette gestellt werden soll, dann sollte das Pferd doch bitte von vorne aufgezäumt werden.

Am 18. August 2016 um 21:15 von 9mm parabellum

Ernst Nolte hat ein überfälliges Tabu gebrochen und das war sehr wichtig. Er hat es gewagt, die Gemeinsamkeiten von Nazionalsozialismus und Stalinismus aufzuzeigen.

Am 18. August 2016 um 22:08 von frandk als Historiker versagt


Nein, ihm ging es nicht um den Vergleich, sondern um eine kausale Ableitung des dt. Faschismus aus dem Sozialismus der SU. Er versuchte somit den dt. Faschismus zu entschuldigen.


Die "Reaktion auf die "existenzielle Bedrohung" Deutschlands durch die russische Revolution" kann ich im Ts-Artikel nicht erkennen. Aber den von Nolte behandelten nicht vorhandenen Zusammenhang haben Sie sehr gut dargestellt.

Am 18. August 2016 um 22:19 von kinsky


http://www.tagesschau.de/inland/ernst-nolte-101.html

Beide Stalinismus und Nazismus waren totalitäre Ideologien. Genau wie in Deutschland war seit Stalin das Regime auf einem Führer zugeschnitten. Desweiteren haben die Nazis ihre Partei nach dem Vorbild der Bolschewisten aufgebaut, und die Tscheke und Polen auch als Vorbild für die Gesellschaft. Der einzige Unterschied bestand in der Zielsetzung, die Sowjetunion habe nie einen Vernichtungskrieg geplant und durchgeführt.

Die mordeten alle ohne Rücksicht auf Herkunft und Religion, die sich ihrem Konzept von der Verwirklichung der kommunistischen Gesellschaft entgegengestellten. Die kommunistische Gesellschaft war auch grundsätzlich allen zugänglich, obwohl der Antisemitismus in der Sowjetunion in allen anderen Ländern Osteuropas sehr stark verbreitet war.

Sein Werk hat er selber zerstört.

Guten Abend,


Am 18. August 2016 um 23:08 von casimir
In einem Punkt hatte er zumindest einen guten Ansatz

Die Ursachen und Anlässe für Holocaust und Vernichtungskriege ausschließlich in Deutschland zu suchen, sondern auch in den Wechselwirkungen in ganz Europa. Wer glaubt, dass die Ereignisse in einzelnen Ländern nicht auch durch die Vorkommnisse in anderen Ländern beeinflusst werden, mach't einen massiven Fehler und wird einer objektiven Analyse niemals nahe kommen. Das gilt heute ebenso wie vor 100 Jahren. Damit relativiert und entschuldigt man nichts, gelangt aber eher an die wahren Motive von Menschenscheu.


Noltes Argumentation ist gefährlich. Ich verstehe nicht, wieso man einem solchen Geschichtsverweis hygienisch entschuldigen. "Der Kommissarbechef wurde VOR dem Überfall auf die Sowjetunion erlassen, also bevor es überhaupt zu Kontakten kam." ja da haben sie vollkommen recht und das wollte ich auch gerade schreiben, und die äußerungen des Verfassers der unverwaltbarkeit sind mehr als grenzwertig.

Am 18. August 2016 um 23:35 von ernst_thälmann @von AK47
"Der Kommissarbefehl wurde vor dem Überfall auf die Sowjetunion erlassen, also bevor es überhaupt zu Kontakten kam." ja da haben sie vollkommen recht und das wollte ich auch gerade schreiben, und die äußerungen des Verfassers der unverwaltbarkeit sind mehr als grenzwertig.

Am 18. August 2016 um 23:36 von Agent Supernull @um 21:51 von FDISK

Am 18. August 2016 um 23:43 von Agent Supernull @um 21:37 von Pilepale
Von den 27 Mio Toten, die Russen würden ich mal die Hälfte Stalinis inkompetenter und unerbetlicher Kriegsführung und der Ineffektivität der roten Arme zurückzählen...Die Horrorverluste `41, weil jeder Rückzug verboten wurde. 1Mio Zivilisten in Leningrad verhungert...in einer Demokratie hätte die Stadt irgendwannmal kapituliert, um weitere sinnlose Opfer zu vermeiden. Die legendarischen russischen Massenangriffe mit Horden von schlechtausgebildeter Infanterie etc. pp. Allerdings hat auch Deutschland große Schuld auf sich geladen und die besetzten Gebiete rücksichtslos ausgelämpert.

Am 18. August 2016 um 23:53 von Stealer @9mm parabellum

Am 19. August 2016 um 00:07 von corigallo
Singularität der Geschichte unvergleichbar


Am 19. August 2016 um 01:06 von wiesengrund Boris,1945, 2018 - Kausaler Nexus


Am 19. August 2016 um 01:23 von tashina @ frosthorn 23.43

Danke für Ihren Beitrag!!

Am 19. August 2016 um 01:27 von deutlich Ich fand schon den Historikerstreit damals schräg

Historiker: Ernst Nolte ist tot
Zum Tod von Ernst Nolte: Selbst gewählt im Abseits
Ein Nachruf von Michael Sontheimer
Donnerstag, 18.08.2016 – 16:44 Uhr

Der Initiator des Historikerstreits Ernst Nolte ist in Berlin gestorben. Der Geschichtsphilosoph hatte sich mit seiner Relativierung des Holocausts immer weiter in die rechte Ecke manövriert und von seinen Kollegen isoliert.


Nolte, gewöhnlich ein sehr distanziert, ruhiger Mann, war äußerer sich. Er warf den streikenden Studenten vor, sie benähmen sich wie Joseph Goebbels und die SA-Männer, die 1930 mithilfe des Freilassens weißer Mäuse die Filmvorführung von "Im Westen nichts Neues" gesprengt hätten.

Nolte hatte eine Neigung zu starken Vergleichen, die zudem mit dem Gefallen daran gepaart war, sich zwischen alle Stühle zu setzen. Dies trug wesentlich dazu bei, dass der im Alter von 93 Jahren in Berlin verstorbene emeritierte Professor für Neuere Geschichte am Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität Berlin.


Kampfansage von Habermas

Nolte verstand sich als Geschichtsphilosoph und dachte entlang der Inhalte seiner Vorlesungen. Er warf den streikenden Studenten vor, sie benähmen sich wie Joseph Goebbels und die SA-Männer, die 1930 mithilfe des Freilassens weißer Mäuse die Filmvorführung von "Im Westen nichts Neues" gesprengt hätten.
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einen Platz haben, selbst wenn sie davon träumen, die alten Verhältnisse wiederherzustellen.

SPIEGEL: Verkörpert die Republikaner, was Ihnen so vorschwebt?


SPIEGEL: Wir haben den Eindruck, daß Sie mit der parlamentarischen Demokratie auf Kriegsfuß stehen. Schon die Errichtung der NS-Diktatur war für Sie nichts anderes als die "Beseitigung der temporären Turbulenz eines unregierbaren Systems" zur "Wiederherstellung eindeutiger Machtverhältnisse". Nazifreundlicher hätten die geistige Sonne mancher Hitleristen auch nicht ausdrücken können.

Nolte: Das ist die Wiedergabe der Auffassungen von bestimmten Autoren - eine altbekannte Geschichte. Es passiert immer wieder, daß, was ich etwa als Meinung Hitlers darstelle, mit meiner Position verwechselt wird.

SPIEGEL: Wir haben nicht Adolf Hitler zitiert, sondern Ihre eigenen Formulierungen. Herr Professor, Sie haben einmal geschrieben, Hitlers Judenausrottung sei der größte und schrecklichste Massenmord der Weltgeschichte, eine Umta


SPIEGEL: Haben Sie Zweifel an der gezielten Massenvernichtung der Juden durch Gas, oder halten Sie, wie Sie jüngst erst geschrieben haben, die Beweislage angesichts der Aussagen von Tätern und Überlebenden für überwältigend? No

Nolte: Es läßt sich gleichwohl nicht bestreiten, daß an manchen Punkten auch politische Interessen hier ins Spiel kommen.

SPIEGEL: Was heißt denn das?

Nolte: Man hat immer wieder gesagt, es dürfte nicht aufgerechnet werden. Das ist nicht falsch, doch es gibt ein "Aber". Ein Opfer hat das Recht, seine Leiden zu unterstreichen. Es läßt sich gleichwohl nicht bestreiten, daß, was ich etwa als Meinung Hitlers darstelle, mit meiner Position verwechselt wird.

SPIEGEL: Man hat immer wieder gesagt, es dürfte nicht aufgerechnet werden. Das ist nicht falsch, doch es gibt ein "Aber". Ein Opfer hat das Recht, seine Leiden zu unterstreichen. Es läßt sich gleichwohl nicht bestreiten, daß, was ich etwa als Meinung Hitlers darstelle, mit meiner Position verwechselt wird.


SPIEGEL: Haben Sie Zweifel an der gezielten Massenvernichtung der Juden durch Gas, oder halten Sie, wie Sie jüngst erst geschrieben haben, die Beweislage angesichts der Aussagen von Tätern und Überlebenden für überwältigend? No


SPIEGEL: Haben Sie Zweifel an der gezielten Massenvernichtung der Juden durch Gas, oder halten Sie, wie Sie jüngst erst geschrieben haben, die Beweislage angesichts der Aussagen von Tätern und Überlebenden für überwältigend? No


SPIEGEL: Haben Sie Zweifel an der gezielten Massenvernichtung der Juden durch Gas, oder halten Sie, wie Sie jüngst erst geschrieben haben, die Beweislage angesichts der Aussagen von Tätern und Überlebenden für überwältigend? No
Nolte: Ich bitte Sie! Es ist natürlich eine Perversion des Begriffs "human". In der Tat war aber zu lesen, der Schriftsteller Joseph Brodsky habe geäußert: Ich jedenfalls hätte es vorgezogen, in den Gaskammern zu sterben, als im Gulag in monatelanger Qual zu verhungern. Ob Brodsky nun recht hat oder nicht - das kann man nicht einfach so wegschieben.

SPIEGEL: Brodsky ist eben nicht verhungert, sondern noch Nobelpreispreisiger geworden. Sie aber ziehen dieses Brodsky-Zitat heran, um die Nazi-These vom humanen, schmerzlosen Tod zu stützen.

Nolte: Dies ist keine Nazi-These, denn von diesem Tod ist nie öffentlich gesprochen worden. Das historisch Präzedenzlose besteht nicht in der Massierung außerordentlichster Grausamkeiten. Sie mögen dagewesen sein, es mag sie geben haben, das wäre nicht historisch Präzedenzlos, denn furchtbare, entsetzte Grausamkeiten hat es in der Weltgeschichte viele gegeben.

SPIEGEL: Was also ist beispielsweise und singulär?

Nolte: Daß Menschen umgebracht werden sollten, weil man in ihnen die Urheber einer verhängnisvollen geschichtlichen Entwicklung sah, und daß man das eben ohne grausame Absicht tat, wie man Ungeziefer, dem man ja auch nicht Schmerzen bereiten will, weghaben möchte.

SPIEGEL: Auch für den Gastod haben Sie inzwischen ein Sowjetmuster gefunden. Sie zitieren den NS-Propagandisten Karl Albrecht, nach Berichten aus dem Gulag sei auch dort durch Gas getötet worden. Sie haben falsch zitiert. In Wahrheit berichtet Albrecht nur, Gulag-Häftlinge seien für Experimente mit Giftgas angezeig worden. Das ist etwas ganz anderes als das, was die Nazis in Auschwitz gemacht haben. Wo ist da der kausale Nexus?


SPIEGEL: Halten Sie es entgegen den Forschungsergebnissen weiterhin auch für eine begründete Behauptung, daß in Auschwitz keineswegs eine Million Juden umgebracht worden seien und auch die Gesamtzahl der NS-Opfer weit unter sechs Millionen gelegen habe?

Nolte: Diese Dinge sind unsicher, und Unsicherheiten sollen - das ist ein wissenschaftliches Prinzip - zum Gegenstand der Forschung gemacht werden, auch die Zahlen. Das ist, glaube ich, ein Postulat, was sich im Grunde von selbst verstehen sollte. Warten Sie die weitere Entwicklung der Wissenschaft ab.

SPIEGEL: Es geht darum, wie das Klima in diesem Land beeinflußt wird durch Behauptungen und Behilfe von Leuten, denen man intellektuelles Format noch nie abgesprochen hat, denen man intellektuelles Format noch nie abgesprochen hat, die man intellektuelles Format noch nie abgesprochen hat.

Nolte: Meine Intention ist doch offenkundig, die Endlösung, wenn Sie so wollen, nicht zu verkleinern, sondern zu vergrößern, sie als den Kern der Ideologie Hitlers nachzuweisen. Die Nationalsozialisten hatten auf ihre Weise rechtmäßige Fotos, wenn man mit Hitler die Angst vor jener Welt- und Geschichtsbewegung teilt, die Heidegger die friedliche Weltzivilisation nennt, am Ende sogar noch mit einer Weltregierung.


Nolte: In Hitlers Überzeugung hatte dieser Modernisierungsprozeß ebenso wie der Bolschewismus menschlich-persönliche Urheber, die Juden. Und im Rahmen dieser Überzeugung hatte er recht. Aber er hatte erstens unrecht, weil diese Entwicklung nicht aufzuhalten ist, und zweitens, weil die Juden zwar damit zusammenhängen, wie letzten Endes alles zusammenhängt, aber unmöglich als Urheber behandelt werden können.

SPIEGEL: Daß Hitler den Antisemitismus, der ja nicht allein in seinem Kopf entsprungen, sondern in der deutschen Gesellschaft weit verbreitet war, demagogisch ausschaltete, um zu manipulieren und zu indoktrinieren, erwähnen Sie nie.


SPIEGEL: Was war denn je neu an Ihrer zentralen These von der Bedeutung des Antikapitalismus und des Antiliberalismus? Dabei nicht die monokausale Einseitigkeit, mit der Sie Stalins Straflager zum historischen Ausgangspunkt für Auschwitz machen und aus einem zeitlichen Nacheinander einen ursächlichen Zusammenhang konstruieren. In "Mein Kampf" hat Hitler offensichtlich die bolschewistische Bedrohung gar nicht so groß gesehen: Es sei die Chance des künftigen Deutschen Reiches, dieses durch Juden, durch Kommunisten geschwächte Rußland zu überfallen und ihm seine wichtigsten westlichen Provizinen zu rauben.


SPIEGEL: Obwohl das objektiv wider die Vernunft, sogar kontraproduktiv war?

Nolte: Er selbst untergrub damit nicht nur faktisch, sondern auch prinzipiell die abendländische Kultur.

SPIEGEL: Sie bewegen sich selbst in den Denkbahnen der Ideologien und versuchen plausibel zu machen, was eben plausibel nicht war. Denn die Juden etwa verkörperten für Hitler im gleichen Maße den raffgierigen kapitalistischen Ausbeuter wie das bolschewistische Schreckgespenst. Und den westlichen Liberalismus bekämpften die Nazis genau so haßerfüllt wie den Kommunismus. Erklärungsbedürftig ist also, wie es Hitler gelang, in der Figur des Juden, den er eben keineswegs nur mit dem Bolschewismus identifizierte, einen Sündenbock für alle Übel dieser Welt zu finden und damit die Massen zu faszinieren.


SPIEGEL: Neuerdings sprechen Sie sogar von der "Größe und Tragik" des Nationalsozialismus, konzedieren ihm ein "historisches Recht", als sei die Entwicklung unvermeidlich gewesen, wohl um dem Sinnlosen im nachhinein noch einen Sinn zu geben. Das ist doch zynische Geschichtsmetaphysik, die vom Leid der Opfer abstrahiert.


SPIEGEL: Sprechen Sie jetzt über den Marxismus oder über den Nationalsozialismus?

Nolte: Über beide Bewegungen. Der Nationalsozialismus war die außerordentliche Antwort auf die außerordentlichen Versuche, und auch ihr muß man diese Art von Größe zuschreiben.

SPIEGEL: Und "historisches Recht".

Nolte: Das heißt einfach: Aus der Situation der Gegenwart heraus gedacht, ist es unsinnig, eine historische Größe zu behaupten.

SPIEGEL: Sie sprechen ja sogar von der "Antizipation positiver Möglichkeiten" im Nationalsozialismus. Kann das vereinte Deutschland demnach vom Dritten Reich lernen?

Nolte: Jedenfalls leugne ich nicht, daß es im Nationalsozialismus positive Elemente und positive Tendenzen gegeben hat. Auch hier liegt, bis zu einem gewissen Grade, eine Phantasieanschauung, halbwegs also in dem Maße, wie es von mindestens verständlicher, nachvollziehbarer Intentionen. Muß ich Ihnen wirklich nachweisen, daß es zahllose SA-Leute gegeben hat, die aus idealistischer Beweggründe dieser Organisation beitraten, weil sie glaubten, sie müßten einen Beitrag zur Verteidigung Deutschlands gegen den Kommunismus liefern und so weiter?

SPIEGEL: Der mißbrauchte Idealismus im Dienste eines mörderischen Regimes ist kein Beleg für angeblich noch heute attraktive Seiten des Nationalsozialismus. Sie trauern dem unwirklichen NS-Projekt nach, dessen Kern für Sie in einem "unschütterlichen und von oben gelenkten Gemeingest" besteht, der ein "hohes Maß an ökonomischer Bewegung und Differenziertheit" ausbalanciert.

Nolte: Von Nach träumern kann keine Rede sein. Aber das Streben nach einer Menschenwelt einer Wirklichkeit, welche die Extreme des amerikanischen Kapitalismus und des rein planwirtschaftlichen Sowjetkommunismus vermeidet, das heißt der Wunsch nach einem dritten Weg, der ist heute so lebendig, wie er es damals war. Man wünscht es sich natürlich anders heute als damals.

SPIEGEL: Und worin liegt die Tragik?

Nolte: Daß die sozialistische Utopie scheiterte, denn die Intention war in vieler Hinsicht gut. Auch die nationalsozialistische Antwort scheiterte und mit ihr das historische Recht, als sei die Entwicklung unvermeidlich gewesen, und da kann man sich drehen und wenden, wie man will - das stärker Begründend gewesen, als der Kapitalismus. Das ist eine gesagte Geschichte, keiner wird das ablehnen.
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die DDR auch vollbracht hat, nämlich die deutsche führende Schicht auszuschalten.

Und ich wende mich deshalb dagegen, weil ich aus der europäischen Geschichte weiß, daß diese Schichten zwar in vieler Hinsicht ihre Schwächen, aber auch große Verdienste haben. Das Bildungsbürgertum, die freien Berufe, die freie Presse, das Unternehmertum - das ist etwas, das sich spezifisch Ockidentales, das es in einem großen Teil der übrigen Welt nicht gibt. Der Versuch, diese Schichten auszuschalten, war entsetzlich und kontraproduktiv.

SPIEGEL: Wer versucht das noch, nach dem Zusammenbruch des Kommunismus?

Nolte: Ich sage nur: Es gibt Überzeugte, es gibt Ideologen, die wollen dies und das durchsetzen.


Nolte: Es ist selbstverständlich keine reguläre Kriegserklärung, aber auch keine Quantité negligeable. Nicht ohne Grund wird Stalin habe Finnland auszuschalten, war entsetzlich und e doch acht lassen. Richtig ist, daß nicht alle meine Auffassungen

Nolte: Trotzdem kann man den Zweiten Weltkrieg virtuell als einen Einigungskrieg Europas betrachten. Die bloße Tatsache der Gewaltanwendung liegt so sehr in der bisherigen Geschichte, daß man daraus allein dieses absolute Verdammungsurteil nicht herleiten kann.

SPIEGEL: Hitlers europäische Einigungsmasche kommt doch erst, als der Krieg so gut wie verloren ist - weil die SS neues Personal braucht. Was wäre denn "die angemessene Position" für Deutschland in Ihren Augen gewesen? Und was sollte sie heute sein?

Nolte: Auch damals wäre sie dasjenige gewesen, was das im 20. Jahrhundert zweimal besiegte Deutschland allem Anschein nach auf andere Weise jetzt erringt, nämlich zusammen mit Frankreich die Führungsmacht eines geeinten Europas zu sein. Dieses Europa würde eine der Weltmächte sein, das versteht sich.

SPIEGEL: Herr Professor Nolte, wir danken Ihnen für dieses Gespräch.


http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-13683263.html
From: Gerd Ittner gerd.ittner@gmx.de
Sent: Saturday, 20 August 2016 5:42 AM

Hausdurchsuchung bei Alfred Schaefer


Erstaunlicherweise kamen zu dieser Hausdurchsuchung zur "zivilen Zeit" um 7:30Uhr lediglich zwei höflich auftretende Personen in Zivil, ein Mann und eine Frau. Diese hatten auch keinen für Hausdurchsuchungen obligatorischen Zeugen dabei, sondern sie sagten zu Alfred, er könne sich einen Zeugen dazuholen. Alfred holte seinen Nachbarn, den ebenfalls am Starnberger See wohnenden Grafen von Luxemburg, der, als Rechtsanwalt, den Hausdurchsuchern auf den Zahn fühlte. Aufgrund dessen wurde eine telefonische Rückfrage derselben bei ihrer "Behörde" nötig. Alfred hörte, daß man von einer Akte Kaufman/Orlikowsky sprach, offensichtlich die Anzeigeerstatter. Wer heißt denn so?

Und Alfred sagte am Telefon zu mir: "Wir drücken den Brocken jetzt über die Klippe. Er wir fallen im freien Fall, wie die Türme bei 9/11. Die halten jetzt nichts mehr auf!"

Nur zwei Zivil"beamte" bei einer Hausdurchsuchung wegen "Holocaustleugnung"... Was soll man davon halten? Sollte die Polizei bereits keine rechte Lust mehr dazu haben, beim Verbrechen der Meinungsverfolgung mitzumachen? Bisher gingen Hausdurchsuchung bei "unsereins" nicht ohne eine Truppe martialisch auftretender "Robocops" in Kampanzügen vor sich - pünktlich um 6Uhr morgens. Der Zeuge wurde dabei von der Polizei gleich mitgebracht.

Durchsucht wurde bei Alfred laut Beschluß wegen des Videos mit seiner Schwester, Monika Schaefer, "Sorry Mom, I was wrong about the Holocaust" - "Entschuldigung, Mama, ich hatte Unrecht, was den Holocaust betrifft".

https://www.sonnenrad.tv/video/Entschuldigung-MamaichhatteUnrechtwasdenHolocaustbetrifft/d040051747f80b6632e6d99cfe059efff

Selbstverständlich wird sich Alfred und werden wir uns von dieser Hausdurchsuchung weder einschüchtern noch aufhalten lassen.


Um mit einer Zeile aus meinem Gedicht "Feuer des Reichs" zu sprechen:

"Wir halten stand, wir zwingen das Glück, in uns ist das Feuer entbrannt!"

Schluß mit der feigen Angst, ihr Deutschen - und im Kampf für die Wahrheit mutig voran!

Die Freiheit und das Himmelreich gewinnen keine Halben!

Mit reichsdeutschem Heilsgruß aus Nürnberg

Gerd Ittner

-----------------------------------------------

Persecution of German Videographers whose sister questions the official and legally-sanctioned/protected Holocaust-Shoah narrative – under Germany’s Criminal Code, Section 130:
FROM MONIKA
monika_schaefer@hotmail.com
August 19, 2016 at 10:26 AM

Hello everyone, just a quick note to let you know, yes it is true, Alfred's home was raided. Computers and papers taken. Paul I found out first from your mailing! I just talked with Alfred and he is exceedingly happy. Says the timing could not have been better. Had just completed uploading the expanded all-German version of the Gerd Ittner video. It is up. There is also the English voice-over.

It is like a gift he says. Since he had just finished that project, he didn't have another project lined up. Now he does. This all becomes part of the story. The JWO folks are wetting themselves.

I highly recommend viewing the Ittner video soon in whichever language you prefer, perhaps downloading it to your hard drive too. Ittner had already sent it to ALL the judges in Germany before this raid took place. Alfred’s channel is still up and running, and as we see from Arthur's radical press site, it is not so easy for them to take things down. They know it will just highlight the tyrannical behaviour the cabal.

Anyway, Alfred and Elfriede had just finished cleaning up their place the night before, studio away, etc. But had not yet put away papers on the desk including the written text of his psychological warfare talk that he gave in London in July.

Alfred emphasized to the police how important that talk was, and he was very happy that they took it. He thinks that maybe they will get an education from it, and pass it on to all their colleagues, and they can all get an education from it! Here is an email that Alfred wrote about the specific timing of the raid. It is very funny. My Toronto session next week just gets more interest.

So, now I will have to change my computer gone. I told them I have many other videos that they may also be interested in. I have never in my life seen a better opportunity to embarrass these thought police that this now offers us. The fact that the witness name on the "search" papers was GRAF VON Luxburg will make the accuser uncomfortable. Plus, they took so much stuff from me that they will learn a lot when they go through it. I told them that it is all OK, they are only following orders and I am very happy that they will not shoot me as would have been the case in the Soviet Union under the same tyranny, so I am, indeed, very lucky.

I told them I have many other videos that they may also want to check out. I may be handicapped as I can only write emails from my wife's Ipad, but that is a thing I can live with for now. So, now I will have to change my daily routine a little and see how this develops.

As an afterthought, when asked on the phone just now if Alfred was actually charged, he says, oh.... yeah,... denying the holocaust... They told him the computers were from the criminal police. My wife, Elfriede, opened the door and had to let in a man who were from the criminal police.

After coming out of the bathroom completely naked I greeted the Gentleman and asked him what it is he desires in our house. He told me that he has an order to take things down. They know it will just highlight the tyrannical behaviour the cabal.

Anyway, Alfred and Elfriede had just finished cleaning up their place the night before, studio away, etc. But had not yet put away papers on the desk including the written text of his psychological warfare talk that he gave in London in July.

Alfred emphasized to the police how important that talk was, and he was very happy that they took it. He thinks that maybe they will get an education from it, and pass it on to all their colleagues, and they can all get an education from it! Here is an email that Alfred wrote about the specific timing of the raid. It is very funny. My Toronto session next week just gets more interest.

So, now I will have to change my computer gone. I told them I have many other videos that they may also be interested in. I have never in my life seen a better opportunity to embarrass these thought police that this now offers us. The fact that the witness name on the "search" papers was GRAF VON Luxburg will make the accuser uncomfortable. Plus, they took so much stuff from me that they will learn a lot when they go through it. I told them that it is all OK, they are only following orders and I am very happy that they will not shoot me as would have been the case in the Soviet Union under the same tyranny, so I am, indeed, very lucky.

I told them I have many other videos that they may also want to check out. I may be handicapped as I can only write emails from my wife's Ipad, but that is a thing I can live with for now. So, now I will have to change my daily routine a little and see how this develops. The timing was absolutely perfect, just got the dissipent video up in English and German, just cleaned away the studio, and ding dong, they were there.

A week earlier would have been bad, and now we just may be able to really embarrass them. Monika, for the call on Sunday with Sinead, ask her for a phone number that I can call into as my Skype will not work with my computer gone. Alfred.

From: videos@sansconcessiontv.org
Sent: Saturday, 20 August 2016 5:57 PM
Subject: Des scoops pour la rentrée

Bonjour à Toutes et à Tous,
Depuis un mois je n’ai pas donné signe de vie sur Youtube. Je n’étais pas en vacances, au contraire : j’ai travaillé en moyenne onze heures par jour dans des archives digitalisées... Cela m’a permis de préparer une série de vidéos que je diffuserai à partir de la rentrée. Je vous y promets des révélations et des analyses.

Vincent Reynouard: A Profile
http://www.revisionists.com/revisionists/reynouard.html
**Czech bus owner to remove Auschwitz design**

**Tour operator stunned by outcry over vehicle adorned with Star of David, death camp imagery, and slogans promising an emotional ride**

**By JTA August 18, 2016, 7:17 pm**

A bus in the Czech Republic advertising the Nazi death camp Auschwitz as fun holiday destination that was originally made as a film prop seen on the website of the Auto Xaver bus company on August 16, 2016. autoboxaver.com

PRAGUE — The owner of a Czech tour bus that advertised the Auschwitz extermination camp as an emotion-packed holiday destination will remove the vehicle’s controversial design showing oversized pictures of inmates from the Nazi extermination camp and a massive yellow Star of David. The action comes following an outcry from Czech Holocaust survivors and Jewish leaders.

“I’m taking it off today and tomorrow, and it will be gone,” the owner of the tour company that operates the bus, Svatopluk Strava, told JTA on Thursday. “Most of it has been removed already.”

The design completely covered the vehicle. Along with the inmates’ photos and the Star of David, it featured a picture of the notorious Arbeit Macht Frei (Work Sets You Free) inscription as well as the slogans “Let’s Go to Auschwitz,” “A Journey through Emotions” and “Our Guides Speak Czech.”

The design was applied in June when the vehicle, owned by Balkanbus, a small tour agency based in Blüčina, some 135 miles southeast of Prague, was used as a prop in a “stylized news feature” depicting the life of a Czech neo-Nazi and his family. The film, titled “The World According to Little Dalibor,” includes a scene of the main characters visiting the Auschwitz memorial, according to the film’s director, Vít Klusák.

“While working on the scene, we came across the strange world of the adventure tourism industry in the former death camps,”

For a month I have not been on YouTube. I was not on vacation, on the contrary, I worked an average of eleven hours a day in digitized archives. It allowed me to prepare a series of videos that I will spread from September. I promise you there will be revelations and new analysis because I have unearthed many unpublished document.

In these videos, I revisit the history of Jewish-German relations between 1933 and 1945. Period by period, I will outline the evolution of German policy toward the Jews and the anti-German incitement campaign by Jewish organizations. This will allow me to explain precisely how the rumor of “gas chambers” spread and developed. You can follow this progression from March 1933 to its triumph in 1945. The fact of Aa German denial in early April 1945 broadcast by Radio-Berlin, comes from a person who has never spoke about it before, not even to the Revisionists, and so on this point I unveil an unpublished document.

Then using specific examples, I explain how the strategy of defense in the post-war trials contributed to this triumph. In the analysis of the main arguments I will respond to statements usually employed by those who oppose the Revisionists: the six million, testimonies and confessions, Hitler’s speech of 30 January 1939, Himmler’s speech of October 4, 1943, photos of the Polish resistance.

Finally, I argue that the last three "material evidence" of the gas chambers at Auschwitz, recently restored and now exposed, are worthless.

This presentation will give rise to a series of videos because we cannot counter 70 years of propaganda in twenty minutes; that would be illusory.

There are many arguments that require a response. I shall then publish a book wherein the key documents re reproduced.

In response, please write to: vincentreynouard@hotmail.fr

With much love,

Vincent

---

Hello everyone,

Vincent

Voici quelques nouvelles. Car je reviens avec une moisson de documents dont beaucoup sont inédits.

Dans ces vidéos, je réécrirai l’histoire des relations judéo-allemandes entre 1933 et 1945. Période par période, j’exposerai l’évolution de la politique allemande envers les Juifs et la campagne d’excitation antiallemande menée par les organisations juives. Cela me permettra d’expliquer avec précision comment est née puis s’est propagée la rumeur des «chambres à gaz». Vous pourrez suivre son évolution de mars 1933 jusqu’à son triomphe en 1945, malgré un démenti allemand début avril 1945 diffusé par Radio-Berlin, un démenti dont personne n’a jamais parlé, y compris chez les révisionnistes (sur ce point, je dévoilerai un document inédit).

Puis j’expliquerai, sur des exemples précis, comment la stratégie de la Défense dans les procès d’après guerre contribua à ce triomphe. Au cours de cet analyse, je répondrai aux principaux arguments habituellement opposés aux révisionnistes: les six millions, les témoignages et les aveux, le discours d’Hitler du 30 janvier 1939, le discours d’Himmler du 4 octobre 1943, les photos de la Résistance polonaise... Enfin, je démontrerai que les trois dernières «preuves matérielles» des chambres à gaz d’Auschwitz, récemment reconstituées et actuellement exposées, sont sans valeur. Cet exposé donnera lieu à une série de vidéos. Car on ne peut contrecarre 70 ans de propagande en vingt minutes; ce serait illusoire. Il y a tant d’arguments à répondre. Puis un livre paraîtra, qui coucherà pas écrit ce que j’aurai expliqué à l’écran, avec une reproduction des principaux documents.

Pour toute réponse, veuillez écrire à : vincentreynouard@hotmail.fr

Avec toute mon amitié,

Vincent

***

Quick Google translate

Hello everyone,
ADL Calls Trump Plan to Ban Anti-Semites 'Anti-Semitic'

By Thomas Rose, 17 Aug 2016, Indianapolis

The total transformation of the once hallowed Anti-Defamation League may now be complete. Established more than 100 years ago to fight Jew hatred at home and abroad, has the ADL now done a 180? Has its core mission changed from fighting anti-Semitism to defending it? That’s the question clearly raised by the ADL’s instant condemnation of Donald Trump’s calls Monday to ban anti-Semites from entering the United States.

Not surprisingly, the ADL was not unhappy. Another legendary Jewish group, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, almost just as quickly did precisely the same thing. Ironic isn’t it? Groups that routinely accuse the GOP Presidential nominee of fostering anti-Semitism are the very first to condemn him for trying to keep Jews from entering the United States, either as refugees or immigrants.

Liberal Jewish Congressman Ted Deutsch (D-FL) responded to the proposal by claiming Jews were ‘repelled’ by Trump’s suggestion and accusing him of inflaming anti-Semitism.

Making matters worse; today’s Jew hatred is deadlier than ever. Both the pervasiveness and shocking virulence of anti-Semitism in the Muslim and Arab world is so pronounced that the drafters of the Pew 2011 Global Attitudes Survey tried to bury their own findings; at least 96% of respondents in every Muslim majority nation surveyed expressed either “unfavorable” or “very unfavorable” attitudes toward Jews.

Is this our generation’s way of proving ourselves more virtuous than the one we were raised to condemn for abetting the Holocaust? Championing the ingathering of peoples from lands redolent with open support for the destruction of the State of Israel and the annihilation of every Jew in it? That’s our answer.

The best way to reduce anti-Semitism in the United States is to import, as Hillary Clinton proposes, more than half a million almost certain anti-Semites to live in the United States?

Today's Jew haters know from experience that the road to legitimizing their anti-Semitism lies not in taming their Jew hatred, but in increasing it. The more blatantly anti-Semitic bile these groups spew, especially about Israel, the more ‘outrage’ the debilitated mainstream Jewish world will seek to conduct. To them, it is only the overt criticism of left wing and Muslim Jew hatred that can be openly condemned.

Left wing anti-Israel Jewish groups like J-Street and the New Israel Fund oppose sanctions against terror states like Iran but support them against Israel. They oppose boycotts against all countries except Israel, while supporting all the anti-Israel resolutions at the UN. They accuse pro-Israel politicians like Ted Cruz and Mike Pence of being anti-Semites because they support and defend a strong Israel and Jewish religious liberty rights at home.

Sadly, for most American Jews, liberalism is much more than an element of Judaism, it is their Judaism, and hence their religion. “Jews,” quipped Norman Podhoretz, founder of Commentary Magazine and author of the 2009 Book Why are Jews Liberals, “Insofar as they know anything about the Hebrew prophets, think they are high dollar fundraisers for the Democratic party.”

Despite it all, most American Jews still believe the absurd proposition that liberalism and the Democrat party are the very extensions of Judaism itself. If that was true, Orthodox Jews, being the most knowledgeable about Judaism, would be the most liberal, which of course, they are not. They are the most conservative.

Time and again on issue after issue, whenever the values of Judaism conflict with the more important values of liberalism, it’s always the Jewish values that need to make way. In this case, the Jewish value of fighting anti-Semitism must give way to the value of labelling as ‘anti-Semitic’ everything Donald Trump proposes.

To too many liberal Jews, the very purpose of Judaism is now wholly subordinate to the cause of liberalism. Judaism’s purpose is no longer to stand alone, but rather to provide support to what ever the liberal ethos of the day happens to be — even if it means bringing more anti-Semites to our shores.

Anymore it seems, the only way to be a good liberal Jew requires sacrificing clearly identifiable Jewish self interest — all to prove continued support for the gauzy cause of an ever changing “greater good”.

As American Jews move farther to the left, they grow not only less attached to Israel but increasingly hostile to it. Things have become so Orwellian inside the mainstream liberal Jewish world that the way only way to prove you are pro-Israel is to become anti-Israel. The debilitating impact this is having inside the older, more established institutions of the American Jewish community is profound. As the well-funded, anti-Israel Jewish left grows in size and scope, the older establishment institutions are either marginalized or simply taken over altogether.

By far the largest and most important of all communal Jewish organizations, the United Jewish Appeal, recently elected to lead its New York affiliate Aliza Doctoroff, an open supporter of the notorious New Israel Fund, which is a major sponsor of the anti-Semitic BDS (Boycott, Divest and Sanctions) movement that seeks the destruction of the Jewish state through demonization, delegitimization and economic strangulation.

That the ADL and other Jewish groups should accuse Donald Trump of anti-Semitism for suggesting we try and prevent more anti-Semites from coming to this country must have George Orwell spinning in his grave at record speed.