

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia

Online
ISSN 1440-9828

Mob: 61+401692057

Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org

Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>



December 2009 No 473

Holocaust denier says he's 'unbroken' after prison JTA, November 19, 2009

SYDNEY, Australia -- A Holocaust denier released from an Australian jail after publishing material offensive to Jews says he is "unbroken" and "unrepentant."

Dr. Fredrick Töben, the founder of the Adelaide Institute, emerged from three months in a South Australia prison on Nov. 12.

The Federal Court had found him in breach of a 2002 court order to remove all offensive material from his institute's Web site.

Töben's site this week carried a message saying that he is "unbroken and unrepentant," and appears "refreshed and relaxed" after his "little holiday."

The site features three links to video clips on YouTube during which Töben, 65, vows to continue his work

"demolishing the Holocaust." It also carries a banner saying that "The days are numbered for the greatest lie in the history of mankind."

Töben also spent two months in Wandsworth Prison last year as German authorities tried unsuccessfully to extradite him on a European Arrest Warrant for publishing Holocaust denial material -- a crime in Germany. Töben was arrested at Heathrow Airport on his way to Dubai from America.

He had spent several months in prison in Germany in 1999 for denying the Holocaust.

<http://jta.org/news/article/2009/11/19/1009296/holocaust-denier-says-unbroken-after-prison>

From: ReportersNotebook@yahoogroups.com On Behalf Of ReporterNotebook

Sent: Wednesday, 18 November 2009 6:27 PM

Subject: Demything Zion - Professor Arthur Butz

Demything Zion - Professor Arthur Butz

Arthur Butz MSc (MIT), PhD (Minnesota), professor of electrical engineering and computer science at Northwestern University in Illinois, wrote a groundbreaking technical and historical analysis and refutation in his 1977 book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*.

He gives a wonderful example of the seemingly endless contradictions and ironies evident throughout the entire 'official' historiography of the Holocaust.

He quotes Martin Gilbert's 'long and copiously annotated study' *Auschwitz and the Allies*:

Between May 1942 and June 1944, almost none of the messages reaching the west had referred to Auschwitz as the destination of Jewish deportees, or as a killing centre. Nor had the name of Auschwitz made any impression on those who were building up what they believed to be an increasingly comprehensive picture of the fate of the Jews.' (p 340).

He compares this with the contention of Walter Lacquer in his 1980 'shorter but also copiously annotated study' called *The Terrible Secret*.

Lacquer explains that mass exterminations at Auschwitz could not have been concealed, noting that Auschwitz was a 'veritable archipelago', that 'Auschwitz inmates.. were, in fact, dispersed all over Silesia, and.. met with

thousands of people', that 'hundreds of civilian employees .. worked at Auschwitz', and that 'journalists travelled in the General Government [German-controlled Poland] and were bound to hear', etc. (Lacquer p22-25).

Butz says, 'I have no quarrel with such observations, as I have made them myself, and on the basis of essentially the same considerations [Butz (1977) pp87f, 92ff].. ..

Now the reader of Gilbert, Lacquer and Butz can make a very simple determination.

He is being told that:

(a) in the period May 1942 to June 1944, those interested in such matters had no information of mass gassings at Auschwitz and

(b) mass exterminations at Auschwitz could not have been concealed from the world for any significant length of time.

The reader.. should assume both claims to be true: There was no information of mass gassings at Auschwitz during the relevant period, and mass gassings could not have been kept secret.

Therefore, there were no mass exterminations at Auschwitz.'

Butz, *Context and Perspective in the 'Holocaust' Controversy*, in the *Journal of Historical Review* Winter 1982 pp385-386.

The Complete Guide to Killing Non-Jews

Roi Sharon, *Ma'ariv* 09.11.09

When is it permissible to kill non-Jews? The book *Torat ha-Melekh* [The King's Teaching—INT], which was just published, was written by Rabbi Yitzhak Shapira, the dean of the Od Yosef Hai yeshiva in the community of Yitzhar near Nablus, together with another rabbi from the yeshiva, Yossi Elitzur. The book contains no fewer than 230 pages on the laws concerning the killing of non-Jews, a kind of guide for anyone who ponders the question of if and when it is permissible to take the life of a non-Jew.

Although the book is not being distributed by the leading book companies, it has already received warm recommendations from right-wing elements, including recommendations from important rabbis such as Yitzhak Ginsburg, Dov Lior and Yaakov Yosef, that were printed at the beginning of the book. The book is being distributed via the Internet and through the yeshiva, and at this stage the introductory price is NIS 30 per copy. At the memorial ceremony that was held over the weekend in Jerusalem for Rabbi Meir Kahane, who was killed nineteen years ago, copies of the book were sold.

Throughout the book, the authors deal with in-depth theoretical questions in Jewish religious law regarding the killing of non-Jews. The words "Arabs" and "Palestinians" are not mentioned even indirectly, and the authors are careful to avoid making explicit statements in favor of an individual taking the law into his own hands. The book includes hundreds of sources from the Bible and religious law. The book includes quotes from Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, one of the fathers of religious Zionism, and from Rabbi Shaul Yisraeli, one of the deans of the Mercaz Harav Yeshiva, the stronghold of national-religious Zionism that is located in Jerusalem.

The book opens with a prohibition against killing non-Jews and justifies it, among other things, on the grounds of preventing hostility and any desecration of God's name. But very quickly, the authors move from prohibition to permission, to the various dispensations for harming non-Jews, with the central reason being their obligation to uphold the seven Noahide laws, which every human being on earth must follow. Among these commandments are prohibitions on theft, bloodshed and idolatry. [The seven Noahide laws prohibit idolatry, murder, theft, illicit sexual relations, blasphemy and eating the flesh of a live animal, and require societies to institute just laws and law courts—INT]

"When we approach a non-Jew who has violated the seven Noahide laws and kill him out of concern for upholding these seven laws, no prohibition has been violated," states the book, which emphasizes that killing is forbidden unless it is done in obedience to a court ruling. But later on, the authors limit the prohibition, noting that it applies only to a "proper system that deals with non-Jews who violate the seven Noahide commandments."

The book includes another conclusion that explains when a non-Jew may be killed even if he is not an enemy of the Jews. "In any situation in which a non-Jew's presence endangers Jewish lives, the non-Jew may be killed even if he is a righteous Gentile and not at all guilty for the situation that has been created," the authors state. "When a non-Jew assists a murderer of Jews and causes the death of one, he may be killed, and in any case where a non-Jew's presence causes danger to Jews, the non-Jew may be killed."

One of the dispensations for killing non-Jews, according to religious law, applies in a case of *din rodef* [the law of the "pursuer," according to which one who is pursuing another with murderous intent may be killed extrajudicially] even when the pursuer is a civilian. "The dispensation applies even when the pursuer is not threatening to kill directly, but only indirectly," the book states. "Even a civilian who assists combat fighters is considered a pursuer and may be killed. Anyone who assists the army of the wicked in any way is strengthening murderers and is considered a pursuer. A civilian who encourages the war gives the king and his soldiers the strength to continue. Therefore, any citizen of the state that opposes us who encourages the combat soldiers or expresses satisfaction over their actions is considered a pursuer and may be killed. Also, anyone who weakens our own state by word or similar action is considered a pursuer."

Rabbis Shapira and Elitzur determine that children may also be harmed because they are "hindrances." The rabbis write as follows: "Hindrances—babies are found many times in this situation. They block the way to rescue by their presence and do so completely by force. Nevertheless, they may be killed because their presence aids murder. There is justification for killing babies if it is clear that they will grow up to harm us, and in such a situation they may be harmed deliberately, and not only during combat with adults."

In addition, the children of the leader may be harmed in order to apply pressure to him. If attacking the children of a wicked ruler will influence him not to behave wickedly, they may be harmed. "It is better to kill the pursuers than to kill others," the authors state.

In a chapter entitled "Deliberate harm to innocents," the book explains that war is directly mainly against the pursuers, but those who belong to the enemy nation are also considered the enemy because they are assisting murderers.

Retaliation also has a place and purpose in this book by Rabbis Shapira and Elitzur. "In order to defeat the enemy, we must behave toward them in a spirit of retaliation and measure for measure," they state. "Retaliation is absolutely necessary in order to render such wickedness not worthwhile. Therefore, sometimes we do cruel deeds in order to create the proper balance of terror."

In one of the footnotes, the two rabbis write in such a way that appears to permit individuals to act on their own, outside of any decision by the government or the army.

"A decision by the nation is not necessary to permit shedding the blood of the evil kingdom," the rabbis write. "Even individuals from the nation being attacked may harm them."

Unlike books of religious law that are published by yeshivas, this time the rabbis added a chapter containing the book's conclusions. Each of the six chapters is summarized into main points of several lines, which state, among other things: "In religious law, we have found that non-Jews are generally suspected of shedding Jewish blood, and in war, this suspicion becomes a great deal stronger. One must consider killing even babies, who have not violated the seven Noahide laws, because of the future danger that will be caused if they are allowed to grow up to be as wicked as their parents."

Even though the authors are careful, as stated, to use the term "non-Jews," there are certainly those who could interpret the nationality of the "non-Jews" who are liable to endanger the Jewish people. This is strengthened by the leaflet "The Jewish Voice," which is published on the

Internet from Yitzhar, which comments on the book: "It is superfluous to note that nowhere in the book is it written that the statements are directly only to the ancient non-Jews." The leaflet's editors did not omit a stinging remark directed at the GSS, who will certainly take the trouble to get themselves a copy. "The editors suggest to the GSS that they award the prize for Israel's security to the authors," the leaflet states, "who gave the detectives the option of reading the summarized conclusions without any need for in-depth study of the entire book."

One student of the Od Yosef Hai yeshiva in Yitzhar explained, from his point of view, where Rabbis Shapira and Elitzur got the courage to speak so freely on a subject such as the killing of non-Jews. "The rabbis aren't afraid of prosecution because in that case, Maimonides [Rabbi Moses ben Maimon, 1135-1204] and Nahmanides [Rabbi Moses ben Nahman, 1194-1270] would have to stand trial too, and anyway, this is research on religious law," the yeshiva student said. "In a Jewish state, nobody sits in jail for studying Torah."

<http://didiremez.wordpress.com/2009/11/09/settler-rabbi-publishes-the-complete-guide-to-killing-non-jews/>

In Italy, sparked by the case of a dissident university professor, an attempt to outlaw defending freedom of speech and unorthodox investigations of WWII history is led by neo-Fascists and Zionists

FASCIST-ZIONIST COALITION IN ITALY

by Miguel Martinez, Palestine Think Tank

Pacifici and Alemanno – the Zionist and the Neo-Fascist decide who must be silenced in Italy.

Antonio Caracciolo is a scholar of philosophy of law who is a member of the Faculty of Political Sciences of Rome University in Italy. Politically, he is a liberal in the Italian sense of the word: a believer in the separation of Church and state, constitutional democracy, the rule of law and a free market; however he keeps his opinions strictly out of his work, reserving them for his blog Civium Libertas. Recently, his blog has dedicated much attention to the politics of Israel and the methods used by Zionist organizations in Italy to silence criticism of Israel in the Italian media and political sphere.

The Zionist discourse, in recent years, has focused increasingly on the extermination of the European Jews during the Second World War, and this has led Antonio Caracciolo to touch another topic. As a liberal and legal scholar, he considers the attempt to introduce prison sentences against "Holocaust deniers" or "revisionists" incompatible with Articles 21 and 33 of the Italian constitution, which protect freedom of expression and of inquiry. In this context, however, Antonio Caracciolo has refused to get involved in historical discussions, or to support any "revisionist" thesis.

His blog – one of hundreds of thousands on the net in Italy – passed unnoticed for over two years, until a few days ago Italy's leading daily, La Repubblica, decided to make its existence front page news, under the more-than-misleading title: **'The extermination of the Jews is a**

legend,' Holocaust denier professor, Rome University under shock.'

Gianni Alemanno, mayor of Rome, immediately demanded that the President of Rome's University, Luigi Frati, take steps against Antonio Caracciolo. It is ironic to recall that Alemanno is not only the first neo-Fascist to become mayor of the Italian capital, he has also been the historic leader of the mystic current in the Alleanza Nazionale (former MSI) party, and is the son-in-law of Pino Rauti, who introduced the occult ideas of Julius Evola into the neo-Fascist movement. [1] In Europe, even in the Middle Ages, mayors had no right to tell universities whom to hire or fire. Yet, the President of the University, Luigi Frati, thanked Gianni Alemanno for his prompt action and promised to "look into taking disciplinary steps against Caracciolo," which could include his being fired from his job.

The right-wing president of the Rome town Council, Marco Pomarici, declared that "one cannot tolerate certain statements circulating freely around Europe's largest university, especially in a course on Philosophy of Law. Such theories can generate a return of anti-Semitism and it is quite clear that Caracciolo is not suited to teach and must be dismissed." Irony again, since Councilor Pomarici, a short time ago, declared publicly that "there were also many positive elements in Fascism."

Riccardo Pacifici, the very Zionist president of the Judaic community elected by a first-time right wing majority (on

a ticket explicitly called "For Israel"), and well known in Italy for an "aid to Gaza" hoax, calls directly for imprisoning Antonio Caracciolo: "Such "gentlemen" in some European countries – alas, not in Italy yet – are punished by the law for the ideas they uphold".

The next day, Riccardo Pacifici launched an appeal (directly from Israel) to the academic world, announcing that he would take legal action against Caracciolo's blog, and calling on university professors to take steps to "prevent allowing certain people having contact with students" (La Repubblica, October 23, 2009). Specifically, he calls upon the professors to "help us so that Italy makes laws declaring holocaust denial a crime".

Pacifici claimed the existence of a "true Holocaust denial network" on the Internet, hardly surprising if we consider that the Internet is a network. Pacifici also told the press that he had presented a black list of websites to the police.

"The problem of the net, emphasizes Pacifici, is that it is uncontrolled. The risk is that one can write anything by simply opening a website in Moscow. We also need to intervene in terms of legislation about this."

Statements of indignation about Caracciolo's blog "are not enough," Pacifici goes on. "Unanimous condemnation is not enough. We need to act in terms of criminal law."

The Caracciolo case opens a new frontier. Not only would unpopular opinions be banned, but also the right to criticize this censorship. Pacifici's proposal, if applied in Germany, would put Henryk Broder, candidate-president of the German Judaic Community, in jail, since Broder has promised to fight for the repeal of "Holocaust denial" legislation.

The following day, October 24, Repubblica itself published an article by Christopher Hitchens which called for a military attack on Iran, no less, but this seems not to have sent any shock waves through the media.

Far more than Holocaust revisionism/denial is at stake. Pacifici is calling for legislation that would outlaw a blog like that of Antonio Caracciolo, which criticizes a government of the Middle East, analyzes the action of public figures and organizations in Italy, and defends freedom of speech.

Such legislation would be possible only if laws were passed forbidding opposition to government policies, declaring certain foreign states to be above criticism, and forbidding support for free speech.

This of course is the basic issue behind "Holocaust denial legislation," which is actually only part of the general attempt by governments to control the Internet and to make opposition – outside of very limited channels – a crime: one need only think of the Czech Republic, where legislators slipped a few extra words into the "Holocaust denial" legislation.

In Prague today, one can go to prison for up to eight years for "supporting class hatred" in "print, film, radio, television." "Hatred" of course is a purely emotional term, and any judge will be free to decide whether the person organizing a strike had such wicked feelings or not.

Note:

[1] The Italian neo-Fascist party, MSI (later Alleanza Nazionale, now dissolved into the governing centre-right party) was a complex coalition, with three main strands: very conservative, largely Catholic anti-Communists; the "left-wing" which saw Mussolini as the "true" Socialist in the progressive and secular nationalist tradition of the 19th century; and a mystic, largely pagan wing with close cultural ties to certain currents of German thought.

<http://revisionistreview.blogspot.com/2009/10/fascists-and-zionists-in-italy-ban.html>

Amelia Aremia says: Time To Fight Back!

Re: The Executive Committee of Australia Jews asks Attorney General to streamline racial vilification

Back in August 18, 2009, Steven Lewis and Peter Wertheim wrote Freedom of Speech should not be freedom to vilify. Although it has its certain merits; however, when it comes to those who question or deny the Holocaust, the word is grossly overused...denying freedom to those who question. Instead of debating the issue, these people are vilified and their good character is assassinated by instilling and reading into what the Jews twist to believe the questioners had written. To the average reader the questions do not sound offensive, racial hatred, racist or anti-Semitic but are logical questions when one considers that a Holocaust did not occur as such, for the killings not only included Jews. Pulling a "Holocaust" out of World War II, is, in itself, a racist act, ignoring millions of other minority or ethnic groups who met the same death. To question the Holocaust did not occur, or that there were no gas

chambers at Auschwitz, that Jewish people who believed in the Holocaust have exaggerated the number of Jews killed during World War II to profit from what he described as "a Holocaust myth," are reasonable, not racist, anti-Semitic, or hatred. Many facts and stories were later proven wrong, or actually did not happen—even the 6 million supposedly killed had been reduced to a little over one million.

The floods of publicity for the alleged Jewish holocaust has never ceased, and seem totally out of balance when compared with the immoral silence about the Christian Holocaust in Bolshevik Russia, the Chinese massacre of nearly 80 million.. And now, Israel and the Zionists have made a criminal offense for anyone to inquire or to seek answers to this era of history---their Hate Crime Law, which they have become the biggest offenders of.

Even if the 6 million dead is correct, why is it that millions of words, dozens of books and movies, and oceans of tears have been poured on that one event, while nothing has been done to enshrine and memorialize the horrors of the methodical slaughter of 17 million Christians by Russian Bolshevik leaders, and top secret police officers, many of whom were "Jewish?" Are not 17 million Christians worth the same moralization and sorrow as the alleged 6 million Jews?

There never was a storm of protest when "Hells of States" wined and dined with some of the very men of the Soviet Union who played roles in the Christian Holocaust. Why? Why is Germany made to suffer guilt and continue to pay and pay for a "war crime" after all these years? And finally, why haven't the allies signed a peace treaty with the Germans after more than 64 years, while keeping an army of occupation at great cost, all these years in Germany?

Why isn't there a memorial, also, in Washington, D.C. to the Christian holocaust? Why is there not one in Russia? Why are there no required courses in schools on this tragedy, as one on the Jewish Holocaust is being made mandatory? This is not an attack on the Jewish people; it is seeking to bring before the world's conscience the greater crime of murder of far more Christians than that of any number of Jews who died in the "Jewish Holocaust." Why are these questions not put before the courts and the major news media to answer??

No Christian, or other public affairs groups have ever made criminal charges against the public vilifying of Jesus Christ by Jews from the time they insisted that the Romans crucify him....No non-Jewish groups have ever taken to court Menachem Begin who made a speech to the Knesset (the Israeli Parliament) that was published in The New Statesman in June 25, 1982. when he said: "Our race is the master race. We are divine gods on this earth. We are different from the inferior races as they are from insects---other races compare to us as human excrement."

Neither did any group speak out against Golda Meir, who was Israel's Prime Minister in 1969 when she said: "There is no such thing as a Palestine people. It is not as if we came and threw them out and took their country. They did not exist." For more than 60 years they have been wiping out the Palestinians whom she claimed did not exist. (Is not a denial of an ethnic group an act of racism and hate?)

Like all freedoms, the proper limits of free speech are exceeded when it is about causing physical and mental harm or monetary loss.... But harm has to be proved according to objective criteria. The questions raised by the historian/revisionists were never debated, or proved wrong or harmful ...simply questions of a "genuine academic group seeking clearer facts and scientific debate. The real thrust that such questions are to use the internet to stoke up hatred against Jews as a group, is an unproven statement that has never been clarified or

actually been part of a genuine debate about history, but only distorted politics.

"It is the Jews who originated biblical exegesis (a critical analysis of the Bible), just as they were the first to criticize the forms and doctrines of Christianity...Truly has Darmesteter written: 'The Jew was the apostle of unbelief, and every revolt of mind originated with him.'" (Bernard Lazare, Antisemitism: It's History and Causes, London: Britons Publishing Co., 1967, pp. 149-151).

The Anti-Defamation League, the Jewish Congress, and many other Jewish organizations are "watchdog groups" around the world, seeking to condemn anyone for any statements that can be twisted into a "Hate Crime," turning people into "criminals" and having them imprisoned. History shows that ever since "Jews" were finally dispersed from the promised land of Milk and Honey by their God for not obeying his commandments, they have sought revenge wherever they migrated, and not assimilated. "The Jews claim to be the torchbearers of civilization, but through their parasitic habits have deteriorated or destroyed every nation in which they have existed in large numbers." (Charles A. Weisman, Who is Esau-Edom? -p 28)

"Ever since the Jews invented the libel charge of 'anti-Semitism' in the 1880s. It was first printed in the Jewish Encyclopedia,(1901 Vol. I , p. 641), and has been built up with Jewish money, organizations, propaganda, and lies (such as the Holocaust- Holofoax), so that now the word is like snake venom which paralyzes one's nervous system. Even the mention of the word 'Jew' is shunned unless used in a most favorable and positive context." (Charles A. Weisman, Who is Esau-Edom? - p. 63).

There is no concerted effort by any group to fight free speech vilifying non-Jewish races, or ethnic groups by their smears and gross insults. While there is still some freedom of speech, the world needs to counter the Jewish influence that is being inflicted through this "Hate Crime Law" being foisted upon the governments of still independent nations, and superceding the United Nations Resolutions.

Considering that one of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations is that of the dignity and equality inherent in all human beings, and that all Member States have pledged themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization to promote and encourage universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights proclaim the principles of non-discrimination and equality before the law and the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief,

Considering that the disregard and infringement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or

whatever belief, have brought, directly or indirectly, wars and great suffering to mankind, especially where they serve as a means of foreign interference in the internal affairs of other States and amount to kindling hatred between peoples and nations, that it is essential to promote understanding, tolerance and respect in matters relating to freedom of religion and belief and to ensure that the use of religion or belief for ends inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, other relevant instruments of the United Nations and the purposes and principles of the present Declaration is inadmissible,

Convinced that freedom of religion and belief should also contribute to the attainment of the goals of world peace, social justice and friendship among peoples and to the elimination of ideologies or practices of colonialism and racial discrimination as based on This Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief:

Article 1

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have a religion or whatever belief of his choice, and

freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practices and teaching.

2. No one shall be subject to coercion, which would impair his freedom to have a religion or belief of his choice.

Article 3

Discrimination between human being on the grounds of religion or belief constitutes an affront to human dignity and a disavowal of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and shall be condemned as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and enunciated in detail in the International Covenants on Human Rights, and as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations between nations.

This makes no need for the "Hate Crime Law" that has been instigated by the Jewish organizations, and being foisted on individual nations to supercede the UN and their own government laws... such a law will, and can only encourage more hatred.

Amelia Aremia - AAREMIA@nc.rr.com

Der Nachlaßverkäufer

Rainer Höß offers for sale items once belonging to his grandfather Rudolf Höß

- CLAIMS HIS WORLDVIEW IS FAR REMOVED FROM HIS GRANDFATHER'S, AND SINCE HIS PARENTS' DIVORCE HE SEVERED ALL CONTACT WITH THEM.



Rudolf Höß

Jerusalem / Berlin: Im Verlauf der politischen Auseinandersetzung zwischen Links und Rechts fällt nicht selten das häßliche Wort "Nazibrut", um den politischen

Gegner zu diffamieren. Betrachtet man diesen Ausdruck jedoch genauer, so wird man feststellen, daß die eigentliche „Nazibrut“ im Sinne des Wortes für gewöhnlich ganz und gar nicht „rechts“ oder „national“ ist, zumindest was die Nachfahren prominenter Nationalsozialisten betrifft, von wenigen ehrenwerten Ausnahmen mal abgesehen.

So meldete das **ISRAEL-NETZ** gestern, daß **Rainer Höß**, der Enkel des 1947 hingerichteten **Lagerkommandanten von Auschwitz, Rudolf Höß**, dem „Holocaust“-Museum **Yad Vashem** angeboten hat, den Nachlaß seines Großvaters zu verkaufen. In dem Schreiben an das Museum schrieb Rainer Höß, so der Name des Enkels, unter dem Betreff: „Seltene Gegenstände, Auschwitz, Kommandant Höß“ u. a.:

„Es handelt sich um einige Gegenstände aus dem Nachlaß des Lager-Kommandanten Rudolf Ferdinand Höß: Eine massive feuerfeste Kiste mit Auszeichnungen – ein Geschenk von Himmler (der SS-Reichsführer), Gewicht 50 Kilogramm; ein Brieföffner, unveröffentlichte Dias von Auschwitz, Briefe aus der Gefangenschaft in Krakau. Über eine kurze Antwort wäre ich erfreut. Mir herzlichen Grüßen, Rainer Höß.“

In Israel reagierte man auf dieses Angebot jedoch *hochmoralisch*. So berichtet die israelische Zeitung „**Jedioth Aharonot**“, daß Angestellte von Yad Vashem es als widerlich empfänden, wie Verwandte von

Nationalsozialisten versuchten, Profit aus der Erinnerung an den „Holocaust“ zu schlagen und daß man nicht daran denke, Geld für den Nachlaß des Mannes zu bezahlen, der für die strafrechtlich als für jedermann verbindlich geltende Vernichtung von 430.000 ungarischen Juden verantwortlich sei.

Da man jedoch ungeachtet dessen durchaus begierig auf den Nachlaß des Auschwitz-Kommandanten ist, der als Trophäe in **Yad Vashem** sicher gern gesehen ist, schlug man dem Höß-Enkel vor die besagten Gegenstände einfach zu spenden. Geht eben nichts über Moral.

Wie es heißt, kam der Höß-Enkel auf den Gedanken, sich an **Yad Vashem** zu wenden, durch eine Empfehlung des Enkels des früheren HJ-Führers Baldur von Schirach.

Rainer Höß will diesbezüglich auch schon Angebote vom SPIEGEL und vom Axel-Springer-Verlag erhalten haben.

Höß junior gibt nun an, besagte Gegenstände an Yad Vashem kostenlos abgeben zu wollen, will diese Absicht jedoch vom Entscheid des Restes der Familie abhängig machen. Bei **ISRAEL-NETZ** heißt es weiter: „...Er betonte außerdem, daß er „weit von der Weltsicht meines Großvaters entfernt“ sei.

„Seit der Scheidung meiner Eltern habe ich alle Verbindungen zu der Familie meines Vaters, Rudolfs Sohn, gekappt.“

Zum ersten Mal habe Höß im Alter von zwölf Jahren in der Schule von seinem Großvater erfahren. „Ich war vollkommen geschockt.“ Nach der Schule sei er nach Hause gegangen und habe seine Eltern und seine Großmutter gefragt, ob es stimme. Die bejahten es. „Seitdem wollte ich mehr darüber erfahren. Ich hab schon mehrmals versucht, nach Auschwitz zu fahren,

aber sie haben mich wegen meines Nachnamens nicht hineingelassen.“ „

Von diesem Aspekt aus betrachtet, müssen wir den Linken teilweise recht geben, denn diese verächtliche Art von wirklicher „Nazibrut“ lehnen auch wir ab und zwar mit Entschiedenheit.



Hinrichtung von Rudolf Höß am 16. April 1947

http://de.altermedia.info/general/der-nachlasverkaefer-20-11-09_37543.html

Israel's Latest Attempt to Wipe Palestine Off the Map

By Mohammed Omer

Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, Page 11, 21 – Gaza on the Ground



This November 2007 photo shows an Israeli settler riding a horse in the illegal West Bank outpost of Nofei Nehamiya, past road signs on which the Arabic names for Jerusalem and Ariel have been blacked out. (AFP photo/Jack Guez)

The Cairo-based League of Arab States has denounced a July 13 decision by the Israeli Transport Ministry to eliminate Arabic and English names of cities and towns on its road signs and use only Hebrew ones.

In a press release, Mohammed Sobeih, the 22-member organization's deputy secretary general in charge of

Palestinian affairs, described the new Israeli policy as "a grave racist move."

Israeli road signs currently are trilingual, in Hebrew, Arabic and English. Occupied Jerusalem, for example, is identified as "Yerushalaim" in Hebrew, "Jerusalem" in English and "Al Quds" in Arabic. Under the new policy the Holy City will be identified only as "Yerushalaim" in all three scripts.

"This decision is part of a series of measures and Israeli policies aimed at imposing the 'Jewish state' motto," Sobeih stated. He urged "all international organizations...to oppose, as firmly as possible, this racist decision."

Cultural Genocide

Following the 1948 war, Israel systematically replaced with Hebrew names the Arabic names of most Palestinian villages and towns it had conquered or received under the previous year's U.N. Partition Agreement. In 1971, then-Prime Minister Golda Meir made it Israeli state policy that the 1948 Green Line denoting the internationally recognized division between Israel and the newly occupied territories of the West Bank, Golan Heights and Gaza be permanently removed from all Israeli maps.

Indeed, such cartographic wiping off Palestine from the map continues to this day. Many Arab towns in Israel,

such as the city of Tamara, do not even appear on Israeli maps. Others razed in previous wars have been transformed into evergreen forests, claimed by the Jewish National Fund, and banished from maps and history books to prevent the original owners and their descendants from ever returning.

Israeli Transport Minister Yisrael Katz told the mass-selling *Yediot Ahronot* newspaper that the road sign decision was a response to the Palestinian refusal to use Hebrew names for some Israeli towns. "On Palestinian maps, Israeli towns are often still identified with the Arabic names used before the 1948 war," he said.

According to Dr. Atef Adwan, Minister of Refugees in Gaza's *de facto* Palestinian government, the Israeli decision aims to Judaize the land of Palestine and make it yet another fact on the ground.

"Occupation aims to erase Palestinian history and culture, as well as commitment to the Palestinian land, from the minds of the Palestinian people," he said.

Among the Palestinian cities, towns and villages whose names will be Judaized is the hometown of Jesus, known to Christians worldwide as Nazareth and to Palestinians as Al Nasrah. Henceforth it will be identified on Israeli road signs by its Hebrew name, Natsrat. The ancient Roman port of Caesaria will become Kesariya, and Tiberias, on the Sea of Galilee, Tveria—on the Yam Kineret.

Katz's decision sparked scorn among Arab-Israeli lawmakers, including Ahmad Tibi, of the United Arab List-Ta'al party, which holds four seats in Israel's 120-seat Knesset, or parliament.

"Al Quds remains Al Quds," Dr. Al Tibi, insisted. "Minister Katz is mistaken if he thinks that changing a few words can erase the existence of the Arab people or their belonging to the land.

"Yisrael Katz will come and go—Netanyahu will come and go—but Al Nazirath and Jerusalem will remain forever," Tibi added.

Israeli historian Ilan Pappé, author of the 2006 book *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (available from the AET Book Club), said of the Israeli move: "It is part of an overall strategy to rob the Palestinians in Israel of their basic human and civil rights....There is little difference between [the Israeli political] 'Left' and 'Right' on this. The 'Right' cares less about public opinion abroad and is more open about its intention to dispossess the Palestinians in Israel. It even believes that more explicit language helps to accelerate the process of dispossession."

Israeli Anti-Semitism

Ironically, the Jewish state will be discriminating not only against its minority Christian and Muslim citizens, but against Jewish Israelis as well—those from Arab countries who often find themselves treated as second-class citizens, relegated to separate schools and at times housing and jobs as well. To be Semitic, after all, is to be of Arabic ancestry and speak one of the five ancient Semitic languages. By eliminating Arabic-language names and replacing them with modern Hebrew, the state of Israel is in essence cleansing the land of its Semitism as well.

Determined to carry out his plan, however, Minister Katz may have inadvertently revealed an ulterior motive: Israel's desire to annex all of Jerusalem as Jewish only, in defiance of international law. "This government, and certainly this minister," he vowed, "will not allow anyone to turn Jewish Jerusalem into Palestinian Al Quds."

Award-winning journalist Mohammed Omer reports on the Gaza Strip, where he maintains the Web site <www.rafahtoday.org. He can be reached at gazanews@yahoo.com

[WRMEA Archives 2006-2010 - 2009 September-October](#).

Australia OKs extradition of accused Nazi criminal

AP, November 12 2009

ADELAIDE, Australia — The Australian government on Thursday approved the extradition of an alleged Nazi war criminal accused by Hungary of a World War II killing. Home Affairs Minister Brendan O'Connor said Australia takes war crimes seriously and will not be a haven for alleged criminals.

Australian citizen Charles Zentai, 88, is accused by the Hungarian government of being one of three men who tortured and killed a Jewish teenager in Budapest in 1944 for failing to wear a star identifying him as a Jew. Zentai, who emigrated to Australia in 1950, says he is innocent and was not even in Budapest at the time.

He turned himself in to Australian police in the western city of Perth last month after exhausting his legal appeals.

"My decision is not one of determining Mr. Zentai's guilt or innocence," O'Connor said. "It was about deciding whether or not Mr. Zentai should be surrendered to Hungary in accordance with Australia's extradition legislation and its international obligations."

Hungary has two months to carry out the extradition. Zentai's son, Ernie Steiner, said he was shocked by the government's decision and had spoken with his father's

lawyers about taking legal action in an attempt to overturn the decision.

"We will exhaust all avenues," Steiner told reporters. "There's issues about whether Hungary can provide a fair trial for my father in the absence of any living witnesses."

Steiner said he had not spoken to his father since the government's announcement.

A warrant was first issued for Zentai's arrest in 2005. An Australian court ruled last year that Zentai was eligible for extradition, but his poor health has kept him out of custody. He appealed the court's decision in March and again in October and lost both times.

Zentai is listed by the U.S.-based Simon Wiesenthal Center, a Jewish rights group, among its 10 most wanted suspected former Nazi war criminals for having "participated in manhunts, persecution, and murder of Jews in Budapest in 1944."

Copyright © 2009 The Associated Press. All rights reserved.

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALegM5jc6KrE6GOV829R2MrxeusMgn88PwD9BU02801>