

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067

Australia

Mob: 61+401692057

Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org

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

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



March 2012 No 610

Here is stuff from Germany – no time for translation. The essence is that the Holocaust denial law has been gutted – it conflicts with free expression – judgment made on 9 November 2011 but only now publicised!

Peter Wakefield Sault - peter.sault@odeion.org - says: 'It is of course a coded message from the German government, which is fully aware that 9/11 was an USA/Israel operation, hence the date of the judgment, 9/11 in the Euro date format.'

52. 22.12, Seite 1

Karlsruhe und der Holocaust

Das höchste Gericht will einen glühenden Neonazi nicht strafen

Ein Neonazi geht in die Kneipe. Dort läuft der Fernseher, eine Dokumentation über den Zweiten Weltkrieg. Der Neonazi ereifert sich; er agitiert gegen die Juden. Er empört sich über angebliche Geschichtslügen. Zwei Tage später kommt er wieder und übergibt dem Wirt einen Päckchen brauner Schriften. Eine davon behauptet, es sei wissenschaftlich erwiesen, dass es im Dritten Reich keine Gaskammern zur Tötung von Menschen gegeben habe. In einer anderen Schrift wird der Holocaust als „Zwecklüge“ bezeichnet. In drei Instanzen wurde der Neonazi dann wegen Volksverhetzung verurteilt. Das Bundesverfassungsgericht hat diese Verurteilung nun aufgehoben. Der Neonazi dürfe sich, erklären die Richter, auf das Grundrecht der Meinungsfreiheit berufen (1 BvR 461/08).

Die Entscheidung verwundert und befremdet. Hat sich die Rechtslage geändert? Nein. Im Strafgesetzbuch steht nach wie vor der vor ein paar Jahren verschärfte Paragraph 130 zur Volksverhetzung. Diese Verschärfung wurde im Jahr 2009 vom Verfassungsgericht in der „Wunsiedel-Entscheidung“ ausdrücklich bestätigt. Billigung, Leugnung, Verharmlosung oder Rechtfertigung der NS-Verbrechen war, ist und bleibt also unter Strafe gestellt. Das bestreitet der neue Karlsruher Beschluss auch nicht.

Die höchsten Richter sägen aber für den „glühenden Neonazi“ (so das Landgericht) einen Notausgang, durch den sie ihn entkommen lassen: Zwar sei die Holocaust-Lüge an sich schon strafbar – nicht aber im konkreten Fall. Der Neonazi habe den Holocaust ja nicht einfach so, sondern etwas raffinierter geleugnet. Er habe diese Lüge „lediglich als Teil eines einleitenden Begründungsversuchs“ benutzt, um die fehlende Kriegsschuld Deutschlands darzulegen. Im Übrigen habe der Neonazi auch gar nichts im Rechtssinn „weitergegeben“, weil er nicht habe wissen können, ob der Wirt das braune Zeug nicht vielleicht wegwirft.

Auf diese Weise wird die gesetzliche Strafnorm, wie das Juristen formulieren, „entleert“: Sie steht zwar noch im Gesetz, ist aber nichts mehr wert. Solche Art der Rechtsinterpretation hat vor mehr als 80 Jahren Gustav Radbruch auf den Plan gerufen: „Manchmal will es scheinen“, so schrieb der Rechtsphilosoph der Weimarer Republik, „als gebiete die Methode der juristischen Rechtsauslegung, sich als reiner Tor zu gebärden oder, vulgär gesprochen, sich dumm zu stellen.“ Damals war es das Schimpfwort „Judenrepublik“, das die Richter milde in den Händen drehten. Heute ist es die Leugnung der Judenvernichtung.

Es gibt in der Tat Kritiker, welche die Meinungsfreiheit massiv gefährdet sehen durch die Bestrafung der Holocaust-Leugnung. Der Gesetzgeber hat sich aber bewusst dafür entschieden – nicht nur, um das Gedenken an die NS-Opfer zu bewahren, sondern auch, um neue Opfer zu schützen. Ausgerechnet in der Zeit nach der Aufdeckung der Neonazi-Morde schließt sich nun das Gericht diesen Kritikern an und macht der Strafbarkeit still und leise den Garaus. Die Entscheidung datiert vom 9. November 2011, erst jetzt wurde sie publik. Entschieden hat eine dreiköpfige Kammer des Ersten Senats. Berichterstatter war Johannes Matting. Er war schon 2010 verantwortlich für einen Beschluss, der die Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung rügte. Sie hatte eine von ihr gedruckte Broschüre mit einem geschichtsfälschenden Text wieder eingestampft. Dagegen geklagt hatte der Autor des Textes – wegen Verletzung seiner Persönlichkeit. Karlsruhe gab ihm recht. Heribert Prantl

<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/justiz-in-deutschland-wann-holocaustleugnung-legal-ist-1.1290218>

Justiz in Deutschland

- Wann Holocaustleugnung legal ist

Heribert Prantl – politik-online@sueddeutsche.de
22.02.2012

Ein Neonazi leugnet den Holocaust und wird in drei Instanzen wegen Volksverhetzung verurteilt. Das Bundesverfassungsgericht hebt diese Verurteilung wieder auf. Der Mann dürfe sich auf das Grundrecht der Meinungsfreiheit berufen, erklären die Richter. Eine Entscheidung, die verwundert und befremdet.

Ein Neonazi geht in die Kneipe. Dort läuft der Fernseher; eine Dokumentation über den Zweiten Weltkrieg. Der Neonazi ereifert sich; er agitiert gegen die Juden. Er empört sich über angebliche Geschichtslügen. Zwei Tage später kommt er wieder und übergibt dem Wirt einen Päckchen brauner Schriften. Eine davon behauptet, es sei wissenschaftlich erwiesen, daß es im Dritten Reich keine Gaskammern zur Tötung von Menschen gegeben habe. In einer anderen Schrift wird der Holocaust als "Zwecklüge" bezeichnet. In drei Instanzen wurde der Neonazi dann wegen Volksverhetzung verurteilt.

Das Bundesverfassungsgericht hat diese Verurteilung nun aufgehoben. Der Neonazi dürfe sich, erklären die Richter, auf das Grundrecht der Meinungsfreiheit

berufen (**Az: 1 BvR 461/08**, Urteil im Wortlaut siehe unten)

Die Entscheidung verwundert und befremdet. Hat sich die Rechtslage geändert? Nein. Im Strafgesetzbuch steht nach wie vor der vor ein paar Jahren verschärfte Paragraph 130 zur Volksverhetzung. Diese Verschärfung wurde im Jahr 2009 vom Verfassungsgericht in der "Wunsiedel-Entscheidung" ausdrücklich bestätigt. Billigung, Leugnung, Verharmlosung oder Rechtfertigung der NS-Verbrechen war, ist und bleibt also unter Strafe gestellt. Das bestreitet der neue Karlsruher Beschluß auch nicht.

Die höchsten Richter sägen aber für den "glühenden Neonazi" (so das Landgericht) einen Notausgang, durch den sie ihn entkommen lassen: Zwar sei die Holocaust-Lüge an sich schon strafbar - nicht aber im konkreten Fall. Der Neonazi habe den Holocaust ja nicht einfach so, sondern etwas raffinierter geleugnet. Er habe diese Lüge "lediglich als Teil eines einleitenden Begründungsversuchs" benutzt, um die fehlende Kriegsschuld Deutschlands darzulegen. Im Übrigen habe der Neonazi auch gar nichts im Rechtssinn "weitergegeben", weil er nicht habe wissen können, ob der Wirt das braune Zeug nicht vielleicht wegwirft.

Auf diese Weise wird die gesetzliche Strafnorm, wie das Juristen formulieren, "entleert": Sie steht zwar noch im Gesetz, ist aber nichts mehr wert. Solche Art der Rechtsinterpretation hat vor mehr als 80 Jahren Gustav

Radbruch auf den Plan gerufen: "Manchmal will es scheinen", so schrieb der Rechtsphilosoph der Weimarer Republik, "als gebiete die Methode der juristischen Rechtsauslegung, sich als reiner Tor zu gebärden oder, vulgär gesprochen, sich dumm zu stellen." Damals war es das Schimpfwort "Judenrepublik", das die Richter milde in den Händen drehten. Heute ist es die Leugnung der Judenvernichtung.

Es gibt in der Tat Kritiker, welche die Meinungsfreiheit massiv gefährdet sehen durch die Bestrafung der Holocaust-Leugnung. Der Gesetzgeber hat sich aber bewußt dafür entschieden - nicht nur, um das Gedenken an die NS-Opfer zu bewahren, sondern auch, um neue Opfer zu schützen. Ausgerechnet in der Zeit nach der Aufdeckung der Neonazi-Morde schließt sich nun das Gericht diesen Kritikern an und macht der Strafbarkeit still und leise den Garaus. Die Entscheidung datiert vom 9. November 2011, erst jetzt wurde sie publik. Entschieden hat eine dreiköpfige Kammer des Ersten Senats. Berichterstatter war Johannes Masing. Er war schon 2010 verantwortlich für einen Beschluß, der die Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung rügte. Sie hatte eine von ihr gedruckte Broschüre mit einem geschichtsfälschenden Text wieder eingestampft. Dagegen geklagt hatte der Autor des Textes - wegen Verletzung seiner Persönlichkeit. Karlsruhe gab ihm recht.

Bishop Williamson's legal persecution has been stayed. If the public prosecutor wishes to continue to pursue Williamson, then he now needs to start again!

*



<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/bayern/verfahren-gegen-williamson-eingestellt-holocaust-leugner-bleibtstraffrei-1.1290981>

*

"Erst die Veröffentlichung in Deutschland, also nicht schon das Geben des Interviews unter Ausschluss der Öffentlichkeit, kann die Strafbarkeit begründen", heißt es in der OLG-Entscheidung."

"It was not until the publication in Germany, not even giving interviews to the exclusion of the public, may constitute a criminal offense," says the Court of Appeal decision."

<http://www.abendblatt.de/politik/article2194458/Prozess-von-Holocaust-Leugner-muss-neu-aufgerollt-werden.html>

Holocaust-Leugnung Prozeß gegen Bischof Williamson wegen Verfahrensfehler gestoppt 22.02.2012

Das Oberlandesgericht Nürnberg hat das Verfahren gegen den Holocaust-Leugner Richard Williamson vorläufig eingestellt - wegen eines Fehlers im Strafbefehl. Die Staatsanwaltschaft kann nun erneut Anklage erheben.

Das Oberlandesgericht Nürnberg hat das Verfahren gegen den als Holocaust-Leugner bekanntgewordenen Bischof der katholischen Piusbruderschaft, Richard Williamson, vorläufig eingestellt. Der Bischof war zunächst vom Amtsgericht Regensburg und später vom Landgericht Regensburg wegen Volksverhetzung zu einer Geldstrafe verurteilt worden. Das OLG Nürnberg hatte sich als Revisionsgericht mit den vorausgegangenen Entscheidungen zu befassen. Wie das Gericht am Mittwoch mitteilte, schildere der Strafbefehl das Amtsgerichts Regensburg vom 22. Oktober 2009 "keinen hinreichend deutlichen Anklagesachverhalt". In dem Strafbefehl werde lediglich eine Vorbereitungshandlung und demnach ein (noch) nicht strafbares Verhalten des Bischofs angeführt. Konkret ging es in diesem Justizstreit darum, daß Bischof Williamson im Priesterseminar der Piusbrüder in Zaitzkofen (Oberpfalz) gegenüber einem schwedischen Fernsehsender ein Interview mit der Holocaust-Äußerung gab. Im Strafbefehl fehle aber der Hinweis, wie und wo das Interview in Deutschland bekannt wurde. Dies ist nach Auffassung des Nürnberger Gerichts aber von "zentraler Bedeutung", weil entsprechende Äußerungen der Volksverhetzung so nur in Deutschland strafbar sind. Die Staatsanwaltschaft hat nun erneut die Möglichkeit, Anklage zu erheben.

Verfahrensfehler Prozeß gegen Holocaust-Leugner Williamson wird neu aufgerollt, 22.02.2012

Der Fall stürzte die katholische Kirche in eine tiefe Krise - und wird nun erneut die Gerichte beschäftigen: Wegen eines Verfahrensfehlers erfährt der Prozeß gegen Holocaust-Leugner Bischof Richard Williamson eine Neuauflage.

Nürnberg/Regensburg - Ein Formfehler macht eine Neuauflage des Prozesses gegen den Holocaust-Leugner Bischof Richard Williamson nötig. Das hat das Oberlandesgericht Nürnberg (OLG) entschieden. Es begründete dies am Mittwoch damit, daß das Amtsgericht Regensburg bereits in seinem Strafbefehl nicht erläutert habe, in welcher Weise und wo genau in Deutschland ein umstrittenes Interview des Bischofs veröffentlicht worden sei. Dies sei aber Voraussetzung für eine strafrechtliche Verfolgung einer möglichen Volksverhetzung.

Die Staatsanwaltschaft habe die Möglichkeit, den gleichen Sachverhalt erneut zur Anklage zu bringen, erklärte das Gericht. Es gehe nicht darum, daß die Bischof Williamson zur Last gelegte Äußerung nicht strafbar sei. Die Richter hätten aber festgestellt, daß

ein nachträglich nicht korrigierbares strafprozessuales Hindernis in dem Verfahren vorliege.

Der 71-jährige Bischof der erzkatholischen Piusbruderschaft hatte im Oktober 2008 im Priesterseminar der Vereinigung bei Regensburg einem schwedischen Fernseherteam ein Interview gegeben. Darin bestritt er die Existenz von Gaskammern und die millionenfache Tötung von Juden durch die Nazis. Das in Schweden ausgestrahlte Interview war auch im Internet veröffentlicht worden.

Auf Betreiben der Staatsanwaltschaft hatte das Amtsgericht in Regensburg Williamson wegen seiner Äußerungen 2009 zunächst per Strafbefehl zur Zahlung von 10.000 Euro Strafe aufgefordert. Als der Bischof dies ablehnte, kam es zum ersten Prozeß. Darin bestätigte das Amtsgericht 2010 die Geldstrafe, 2011 wurde diese in zweiter Instanz vom Landgericht auf 6500 Euro gesenkt. Dagegen legte Williamson erneut Revision ein, so daß sich nun das OLG Nürnberg in dritter Instanz mit dem Fall befassen mußte.

Strafbefehl nicht detailliert genug

Dem OLG zufolge war in der ersten Instanz im Strafbefehl nicht erläutert worden, in welcher Weise und wo genau in Deutschland das Interview des Bischofs veröffentlicht worden war. Da der Straftatbestand der Volksverhetzung aber von der öffentlichen Verbreitung der Passagen abhängt, sei dies entscheidend.

Die Staatsanwaltschaft kündigte an, sie werde unter Beachtung der OLG-Hinweise sehr schnell einen neuen Strafbefehl beziehungsweise eine Anklage erstellen. Es gehe der Staatsanwaltschaft um eine Bestrafung Williamsons, betonte der Regensburger Oberstaatsanwalt Wolfhard Meindl. Die neue Anklageschrift werde voraussichtlich in etwa fünf Wochen fertig sein.

Der Fall hatte die katholische Kirche in eine schwere Krise gestürzt. Denn genau zu der Zeit, als das Interview öffentlich wurde, hatte der Vatikan die Aufhebung der Exkommunikation Williamsons und dreier weiterer Bischöfe der Piusbruderschaft bekanntgegeben. Papst Benedikt XVI. erklärte, er habe von dem Interview nichts gewußt.

http://www.spiegel.de/panorama/justiz/0,1518,816972_00.html

Az: 1 St OLG Ss240/11

ulz/dpa/AFP

+++++



Das Bundesverfassungsgericht

Urteil BVerfG **Az: 1 BvR 461/08**

Quelle: <http://www.wer-weiss-was.de/theme64/article6782995.html>

Ur-Quelle:

<http://www.juris.de/jportal/portal/t/81/page/homerl.psml?doc.hl=1&doc.id=KVRE397651201%3Ajuris-r00&documentnumber=1&numberofresults=1&showdoccase=1&userHasToLogin=true&cmsuri=/juris/de/startseite/hinweissei>

[te.jsp&target=jurisw.psml&changePage=group/HomepageUser/html/homerl.psml](http://www.juris.de/jportal/portal/t/81/page/homerl.psml?doc.hl=1&doc.id=KVRE397651201%3Ajuris-r00&documentnumber=1&numberofresults=1&showdoccase=1&userHasToLogin=true&cmsuri=/juris/de/startseite/hinweissei)

Das Urteil des Landgerichts Mühlhausen vom 10. April 2007 - 101 Js 50935/06 - 5 Ns - und der Beschluß des Thüringer Oberlandesgerichts vom 14. Januar 2008 - 1 Ss 249/07 (243) - verletzen den Beschwerdeführer in seinem Grundrecht aus Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 des Grundgesetzes.

Die Entscheidungen werden aufgehoben. Die Sache wird zur erneuten Entscheidung an das Landgericht Mühlhausen zurückverwiesen.

Damit wird der Beschluß des Thüringer Oberlandesgerichts vom 11. Februar 2008 - 1 Ss 249/07 (243) - gegenstandslos.

Im Übrigen wird die Verfassungsbeschwerde nicht zur Entscheidung angenommen.

Begründung:

Der im Jahre 1924 geborene Beschwerdeführer wendet sich gegen eine strafgerichtliche Verurteilung wegen Volksverhetzung nach § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a, Abs. 3, Abs. 5 StGB durch das Verbreiten von Schriften.

I.

2 1. Am 15. April 2005 besuchte der Beschwerdeführer die Gaststätte "B." in der Gemeinde O. Während des Besuchs wurde in der Gaststätte auf dem Nachrichtenkanal ntv eine Dokumentation über den zweiten Weltkrieg gezeigt. Der Beschwerdeführer ereiferte sich laut über den Krieg, dessen Folgen und die Umstände der Verursachung.

3 Am 17. April 2005 suchte der Beschwerdeführer die Gaststätte erneut auf. Allein der Gastwirt war zu dem Zeitpunkt in der Gaststube anwesend. Der Beschwerdeführer verwickelte ihn in ein Gespräch über die Geschehnisse in Deutschland während des "Dritten Reichs". Dabei übergab der Beschwerdeführer dem Gastwirt in einer Mappe Informationsmaterial in Form von zwei Redemanuskripten ("Trauermarsch anlässlich des 60. Jahrestages der Bombardierung Magdeburgs" und "Trauermarsch anlässlich des 60. Jahrestages der Zerstörung Würzburgs"), die der Beschwerdeführer in der Vergangenheit öffentlich gehalten hatte, sowie jeweils eine Kopie mehrerer Aufsätze des "Kampfbundes gegen Unterdrückung der Wahrheit in Deutschland", darunter "Die Geschichtslüge des angeblichen Überfalls auf Polen im Jahre 1939" und "Über die verantwortlichen Staatsmänner, die den Zweiten Weltkrieg verursachten und die ihn zu verhindern suchten". Im erstgenannten Aufsatz wird unter anderem im Zusammenhang mit dem Holocaust behauptet, es sei wissenschaftlich erwiesen, daß es keine Gaskammern für Menschen gegeben habe. Im zweitgenannten Aufsatz wird der Holocaust an den Juden als "Zwecklüge" bezeichnet.

4 2. Mit Urteil vom 28. Juni 2006 verurteilte das Amtsgericht Sondershausen, Zweigstelle Artern, den Beschwerdeführer aufgrund der Geschehnisse vom 15. und vom 17. April 2005 wegen Volksverhetzung in zwei Fällen zu einer Gesamtgeldstrafe von 100 Tagessätzen zu je 40,00 EUR.

5 3. Auf Berufung des Beschwerdeführers änderte das Landgericht mit angegriffenem Urteil vom 10. April 2007 das Urteil des Amtsgerichts dahingehend ab, daß es den Beschwerdeführer gemäß § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a, Abs. 3, Abs. 5 StGB wegen Volksverhetzung in nur mehr einem Fall (Geschehen vom 17. April 2011) zu einer Geldstrafe in Höhe von 60 Tagessätzen zu je 35,00 EUR verurteilte und ihn im Übrigen (Geschehen vom 15. April 2011) aus tatsächlichen Gründen freisprach.

6 Grundlage der Verurteilung wegen des Geschehens vom 17. April 2005 bildeten - wie auch bereits bei der Verurteilung

durch das Amtsgericht - die Aussagen, es sei wissenschaftlich erwiesen, daß es keine Gaskammern für Menschen gegeben habe, und der Holocaust an den Juden sei eine Zwecklüge.

7 In der Würdigung der Beweisaufnahme führte das Landgericht insbesondere Folgendes aus:

8 In der mündlichen Verhandlung habe er sich noch daran erinnert, daß der Gastwirt nicht nur sprachlich sehr unbeholfen gewesen sei, sondern auch über keinerlei geschichtliches Wissen, insbesondere über die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus sowie über den Zweiten Weltkrieg und seine Ursachen, verfügt habe; deswegen habe er ihm Informationsmaterial ausgehändigt. Der Gastwirt habe als Zeuge ausgesagt, daß er den Beschwerdeführer an beiden Tagen habe reden lassen und ihm nicht entgegengetreten sei. Der Beschwerdeführer habe ihm die Unterlagen bei einem der beiden Besuche ausgehändigt, damit er sich über die - angeblich - tatsächlich ereigneten historischen Geschehnisse informiere. Er habe die Unterlagen entgegengenommen und sie später auf Anraten seines Bruders der Polizei übergeben und den Vorgang zur Anzeige gebracht, um sich nicht selbst der strafrechtlichen Verfolgung auszusetzen. Daß (darüber hinaus) der Beschwerdeführer tatsächlich die Schriftstücke nicht nur dem Gastwirt habe übergeben wollen, um diesen über die angeblich wahren Geschehnisse in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus und im Zweiten Weltkrieg aufzuklären, sondern daß er es auch für ernstlich möglich hielt, daß diese Schriftstücke einem Personenkreis weitergegeben würden, folge aus dem konkreten Umstand, daß er sie einem Gastwirt übergeben habe, der Zugang zu einem größeren Publikum, nämlich seinen Gästen, habe. Auch wenn die Gaststätte in den Mittagstunden wenig frequentiert gewesen sei, so sei doch allgemein bekannt, daß Lokale wie die "B." keine reinen Speisewirtschaften seien, sondern auch Bierkneipenfunktion hätten, und daher insbesondere in den Abendstunden von Leuten frequentiert würden, die sich nur unterhalten und etwas trinken wollten. Die Kammer sei daher davon überzeugt, daß der Beschwerdeführer, der auch heute noch ersichtlich ein glühender Verfechter der nationalsozialistischen Ideologie und Geschichtsfälschung sei, mit der Hingabe der Schriftstücke an den Gastwirt habe erreichen wollen, daß dieser sie zum Beispiel durch Auslegen im Gastraum weiteren Personen zugänglich mache und ihnen bei Interesse auch übergebe. Daß der Beschwerdeführer den Gastwirt habe überzeugen wollen, folge daraus, daß er in der Gaststätte sowohl am 15. April 2005 als auch am 17. April 2005 ungefragt seine Meinung zu den Geschehnissen kundgetan habe. Da der Gastwirt den Ausführungen nicht Einhalt geboten habe, sei der Beschwerdeführer ersichtlich davon ausgegangen, daß seine Ausführungen auf fruchtbaren Boden gefallen seien, weshalb er sodann das Informationsmaterial bei seinem nächsten Besuch am 17. April 2005 mitgebracht und dem Gastwirt ausgehändigt habe in der Erwartung, wenn er diesen einmal überzeugt habe, würde er schon für die weitere Verteilung der Unterlagen sorgen.

9 Rechtlich ging die Kammer davon aus, daß eine Schrift verbreite, wer sie einem größeren Personenkreis zugänglich mache. Entscheidend sei hingegen nicht, aus wie vielen Personen der Kreis bestehe, dem die Schrift tatsächlich übergeben werde, sondern daß der Täter diesen Personenkreis in Bezug auf eine Weitergabe der Schrift nicht kontrollieren könne. Dies sei - vgl. Thüringer Oberlandesgericht, Beschluß vom 23. Juni 2003 - 1 Ws 190/03 -, NSTz 2004, S. 628 ff. - dann der Fall, wenn mit einer Weitergabe einzelner Exemplare an andere Personen zu rechnen sei. Dieser Fall liege hier vor. Daß zu dem Zeitpunkt der Übergabe außer dem Gastwirt keine

weiteren Personen in der Gaststube gewesen seien, sei unerheblich. Entscheidend sei nur, daß der Beschwerdeführer dem Gastwirt die Schriften übergeben habe und er es nicht mehr unter Kontrolle gehabt habe, ob und gegebenenfalls an wen der Gastwirt sodann diese Schriften weiterleite. Es komme nicht darauf an, ob die Weitergabe in der Öffentlichkeit oder in einer Versammlung geschehen sei. Der Beschwerdeführer habe eine Verbreitung der übergebenen Schriften mithin zumindest billigend in Kauf genommen. In den verbreiteten Schriften werde auch der Holocaust geleugnet. Dieses Leugnen des Holocaust sei geeignet gewesen, insbesondere ein aufnahmeberechtigtes Publikum aufzuhetzen und damit friedensstörend zu wirken, was der Beschwerdeführer in Kenntnis des Inhalts seiner Schriften ebenfalls zumindest billigend in Kauf genommen habe.

10 4. Die Revision des Beschwerdeführers verwarf das Oberlandesgericht mit angegriffenem Beschluß vom 14. Januar 2008 als unbegründet.

11 Das Landgericht habe rechtsfehlerfrei festgestellt, daß der Sachverhalt das Tatbestandsmerkmal des Verbreitens gemäß § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a StGB erfülle.

12 5. Mit weiterem, ebenfalls angegriffenem Beschluß vom 11. Februar 2008 verwarf das Oberlandesgericht auch die daraufhin erhobene Anhörungs- und Gegenvorstellung des Beschwerdeführers.

13 6. Mit seiner Verfassungsbeschwerde rügt der Beschwerdeführer - unter anderem - eine Verletzung seiner Meinungsfreiheit aus Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG.

14 7. Es wurde dem Justizministerium des Freistaates Thüringen und dem Thüringer Landtag Gelegenheit zur Stellungnahme gegeben. Der Thüringer Landtag verzichtete auf eine Stellungnahme. Das Justizministerium des Freistaates Thüringen nahm insoweit Stellung, als es die Verfassungsbeschwerde, soweit sie sich mittelbar auch gegen § 130 Abs. 3 StGB wendet, für unsubstantiiert erachtet. Ferner wurde der Bundesgerichtshof gebeten, zum Tatbestandsmerkmal des "Verbreitens" aus seiner Sicht Stellung zu nehmen. Er hat von einer über die bekannte Rechtsprechung hinausgehenden Stellungnahme abgesehen.

II.

15 1. Soweit der Beschwerdeführer rügt, durch das angegriffene Urteil des Landgerichts und den angegriffenen Beschluß des Oberlandesgerichts vom 14. Januar 2008 in seinen Rechten aus Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG verletzt zu sein, nimmt die Kammer die Verfassungsbeschwerde zur Entscheidung an, weil dies zur Durchsetzung der in § 90 Abs. 1 BVerfGG genannten Rechte des Beschwerdeführers angezeigt ist (§ 93a Abs. 2 Buchstabe b BVerfGG). Die Voraussetzungen für eine stattgebende Kammerentscheidung liegen vor (§ 93c BVerfGG). Die für die Entscheidung maßgeblichen verfassungsrechtlichen Fragen der Reichweite von Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG bei der strafrechtlichen Beurteilung von Meinungsäußerungen hat das Bundesverfassungsgericht bereits entschieden (vgl. BVerfGE 7, 198 <207 ff.>; 61, 1 <7 ff.>; 90, 1 <14 ff.>; 90, 241 <246 ff.>; 93, 266 <289 ff.>; 124, 300 <320 ff.>).

16 a) Das Urteil des Landgerichts und der Beschluß des Oberlandesgerichts vom 14. Januar 2008 verletzen den Beschwerdeführer danach in seiner durch Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG gewährleisteten Meinungsfreiheit.

17 aa) Gegenstand des Schutzbereiches des Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG sind Meinungen, das heißt durch das Element der Stellungnahme und des Dafürhaltens geprägte Äußerungen (vgl. BVerfGE 7, 198 <210>; 61, 1 <8>; 90, 241 <247>). Sie fallen stets in den Schutzbereich von Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG,

ohne daß es dabei darauf ankäme, ob sie sich als wahr oder unwahr erweisen, ob sie begründet oder grundlos, emotional oder rational sind, als wertvoll oder wertlos, gefährlich oder harmlos eingeschätzt werden (vgl. BVerfGE 90, 241 <247>; 124, 300 <320>). Dementsprechend fällt selbst die Verbreitung nationalsozialistischen Gedankenguts als radikale Infragestellung der geltenden Ordnung nicht von vornherein aus dem Schutzbereich des Art. 5 Abs. 1 GG heraus (vgl. BVerfGE 124, 300 <320 f.>).

18 Neben Meinungen sind vom Schutz des Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG aber auch Tatsachenmitteilungen umfaßt, da und soweit sie Voraussetzung für die Bildung von Meinungen sind beziehungsweise sein können (vgl. BVerfGE 61, 1 <8>; 90, 241 <247>). Nicht mehr in den Schutzbereich des Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG fallen hingegen bewußt oder erwiesen unwahre Tatsachenbehauptungen, da sie zu der verfassungsrechtlich gewährleisteten Meinungsbildung nichts beitragen können (vgl. BVerfGE 61, 1 <8>; 90, 241 <247>). Allerdings dürfen die Anforderungen an die Wahrheitspflicht nicht so bemessen werden, daß darunter die Funktion der Meinungsfreiheit leidet. Im Einzelfall ist eine Trennung der tatsächlichen und der wertenden Bestandteile nur zulässig, wenn dadurch der Sinn der Äußerung nicht verfälscht wird. Wo dies nicht möglich ist, muß die Äußerung im Interesse eines wirksamen Grundrechtsschutzes insgesamt als Meinungsäußerung angesehen werden, weil andernfalls eine wesentliche Verkürzung des Grundrechtsschutzes drohte (vgl. BVerfGE 61, 1 <9>; 90, 241 <248>).

19 Das Grundrecht der Meinungsfreiheit ist allerdings nicht vorbehaltlos gewährleistet. Nach Art. 5 Abs. 2 GG unterliegt es insbesondere den Schranken, die sich aus den allgemeinen Gesetzen ergeben. Darunter sind alle Gesetze zu verstehen, die nicht eine Meinung als solche verbieten, sich nicht gegen die Äußerung der Meinung als solche richten, sondern dem Schutz eines schlechthin, ohne Rücksicht auf eine bestimmte Meinung, zu schützenden Rechtsguts dienen (vgl. BVerfGE 7, 198 <209>; 93, 266 <291>). Darüber hinaus hat das Bundesverfassungsgericht eine Ausnahme vom Erfordernis der Allgemeinheit meinungsbeschränkender Gesetze für Vorschriften (im konkreten Fall: § 130 Abs. 4 StGB) anerkannt, die auf die Verhinderung einer propagandistischen Affirmation der nationalsozialistischen Gewalt- und Willkürherrschaft zwischen den Jahren 1933 und 1945 zielen (vgl. BVerfGE 124, 300 <328 ff.>).

20 Bei Auslegung und Anwendung der die Meinungsfreiheit einschränkenden Vorschriften haben die Gerichte jedoch im Einzelfall ihrerseits wiederum dem eingeschränkten Grundrecht Rechnung zu tragen, damit dessen wertsetzende Bedeutung, die in der freiheitlichen Demokratie zu einer grundsätzlichen Vermutung für die Freiheit der Rede in allen Bereichen führen muß, auch auf der Rechtsanwendungsebene gewahrt bleibt. Zwischen Grundrechtsschutz und Grundrechtsschranken findet eine Wechselwirkung in dem Sinne statt, daß die Schranken zwar dem Wortlaut nach dem Grundrecht Grenzen setzen, ihrerseits aber aus der Erkenntnis der grundlegenden Bedeutung dieses Grundrechts im freiheitlich demokratischen Staat ausgelegt und so in ihrer das Grundrecht begrenzender Wirkung selbst wieder eingeschränkt werden müssen (vgl. BVerfGE 7, 198 <208 f.>; BVerfGE 124, 300 <332 u. 342>). Allein die Wertlosigkeit oder auch Gefährlichkeit von Meinungen als solche ist kein Grund, diese zu beschränken. Demgegenüber ist es legitim, Rechtsgutsverletzungen zu unterbinden (vgl. BVerfGE 124, 300 <332 f.>). Verboten werden darf mithin nicht der Inhalt einer Meinung als solcher, sondern nur die Art und Weise der

Kommunikation, die bereits den Übergang zur Rechtsgutsverletzung greifbar in sich trägt und damit die Schwelle zu einer sich abzeichnenden Rechtsgutsverletzung überschreitet (vgl. BVerfGE 124, 300 <342>). In diesem Verständnis sind dementsprechend im Lichte des Art. 5 Abs. 1 GG sowohl die Tatbestandsmerkmale einer Strafnorm auszuliegen als auch der Lebenssachverhalt unter die Strafnorm zu subsumieren (vgl. zu den Tatbestandsmerkmalen des § 130 Abs. 4 StGB ausdrücklich: BVerfGE 124, 300 <343>).

21 bb) Diesen Maßstäben halten die angegriffenen Entscheidungen nicht stand.

22 (1) Die Äußerungen, die der Verurteilung zugrunde gelegt wurden, unterfallen noch dem Schutzbereich der Meinungsfreiheit. Zwar leugnen sie - wie von den angegriffenen gerichtlichen Entscheidungen zutreffend erkannt - das historische Gesamtgeschehen des Holocaust. Dieses insbesondere gegen die jüdische Bevölkerung gerichtete Massenvernichtungsunrecht ist aber eine geschichtlich erwiesene Tatsache, deren Leugnen folglich als erwiesen unwahr allein für sich betrachtet nicht dem Schutzbereich der Meinungsfreiheit unterfällt (vgl. BVerfGE 90, 241 <249>). Im Gesamtkontext der jeweiligen Aufsätze betrachtet sind die den Holocaust leugnenden Äußerungen vorliegend jedoch untrennbar mit Meinungsäußerungen verbunden. Der Aufsatz "Die Geschichtslüge des angeblichen Überfalls auf Polen im Jahre 1939" bestreitet primär die Schuld Deutschlands am Ausbruch des Zweiten Weltkriegs und stellt insofern die Behauptung auf, daß dies eine Lüge der Nachkriegsgeneration, insbesondere der "BRD-Politiker" sei. Die erste, den Holocaust leugnende Äußerung benutzt der Beschwerdeführer aber lediglich als Teil eines einleitenden Begründungsversuchs, warum die Nachkriegsgeneration Deutschland die alleinige Kriegsschuld zusprach. Auch die zweite, den Holocaust leugnende Äußerung der Aufsätze, steht zu den Grundthesen der fehlenden Kriegsschuld Deutschlands und der diesbezüglichen "Lügen der Nachkriegsgeneration" in unmittelbarem Kontext. Diese Thesen sind ihrerseits aber als wertende Äußerungen vom Schutzbereich der Meinungsfreiheit umfaßt (vgl. BVerfGE 90, 1 <15 f.>; 241 <249>).

23 (2) Damit wäre aber bei Auslegung und Anwendung des vorliegend von den Strafgerichten für einschlägig erachteten § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a, Abs. 3, Abs. 5 StGB auch der wertsetzenden Bedeutung des Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG ausreichend Rechnung zu tragen gewesen.

24 Der Gesetzgeber hat - ungeachtet der Frage, inwieweit § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a, Abs. 3, Abs. 5 StGB aus anderen Gründen den verfassungsrechtlichen Anforderungen, insbesondere etwa im Hinblick auf einen verfassungsrechtlich tragfähigen Rechtsgüterschutz, genügt - dieser wertsetzenden Bedeutung jedenfalls insofern Rechnung getragen, als er in dieser Tatbestandsvariante nicht jede Art der Äußerung unter Strafe gestellt hat, sondern nur das Verbreiten. Hierin sieht er folglich die Grenze zur Rechtsgutsverletzung überschritten. Entscheidendes Kriterium, ob ein Verbreiten vorliegt, ist nach hergebrachtem Verständnis stets, daß eine Schrift einem größeren, nicht mehr kontrollierbaren Personenkreis zugänglich gemacht wird (vgl. nur BGHSt 13, 257 <258>; 19, 63 <70 f.> mit jeweiligen Nachweisen aus den Rechtsprechungen des Reichsgerichts). Daß bei Unterstrafstellung der Verbreitung von den Holocaust leugnenden Schriften durch das Verbreitungsbehebungsengesetz vom 28. Oktober 1994 (BGBl I S. 3186 f.) ein neues, wesentlich anderes Verständnis des Begriffes zugrunde gelegt werden sollte, ist nicht ersichtlich

(vgl. BTD Drucks 12/4825, S. 4 ff.; 12/6853, S. 23 f.; 12/8588, S. 8). Der Gesetzgeber hat folglich das bloße Austauschen solcher Schriften zwischen zwei Personen - und damit das bloße Äußern der konkreten Meinung als solcher - grundsätzlich von der Strafbarkeit nach § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a StGB ausgenommen. Folgerichtig hat der Zweite Senat des Bundesgerichtshofs in Bezug auf das Tatbestandsmerkmal "Verbreiten" bei § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a, Abs. 3, Abs. 4 (jetzt: Abs. 5) StGB konkreter und restriktiver als der vom Landgericht zitierte Beschluß des Thüringer Oberlandesgerichts (a.a.O.), dem derselbe Sachverhalt wie der Entscheidung des Bundesgerichtshofs zugrunde lag, festgestellt, daß zwar schon die Weitergabe eines Exemplars der Schrift ausreiche, wenn dies mit dem Willen geschehe, der Empfänger werde die Schrift durch die körperliche Weitergabe einem größeren Personenkreis zugänglich machen oder wenn der Täter mit der Weitergabe an eine größere, nicht mehr zu kontrollierende Zahl von Personen rechne, daß aber die Weitergabe an einzelne bestimmte Dritte allein das Merkmal des Verbreitens hingegen nicht zu erfüllen vermöge, wenn nicht feststehe, daß der Dritte seinerseits die Schrift an weitere Personen überlassen werde (vgl. BGH, Urteil vom 22. Dezember 2004 - 2 StR 365/04 -, NJW 2005, S. 689 <690>). Auch der dritte Senat des Bundesgerichtshofs hat - wenngleich bezüglich § 184b Abs. 1 Nr. 1 StGB - betont, daß für ein Verbreiten die regelmäßig ohnehin bestehende abstrakte Gefahr der Weitergabe durch einen Dritten nicht genüge (vgl. BGH, Beschluß vom 4. August 2009 - 3 StR 174/09 -, juris, Rn. 27).

25 (3) Indem die angegriffenen Entscheidungen entgegen dieser Wertung das Tatbestandsmerkmal "Verbreiten" überdehnt und letztlich den bloßen Austausch von Schriften zwischen zwei Personen unter den Straftatbestand des § 130 Abs. 2 Nr. 1a, Abs. 3, Abs. 5 StGB subsumiert haben, verkennen sie die Bedeutung der Meinungsfreiheit wesentlich. Sie haben damit in mit Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG nicht vereinbarer Weise nicht erst die Art und Weise der Kommunikation, die bereits den Übergang zur Rechtsgutsverletzung in sich trägt, sondern im Ergebnis schon das schlichte Äußern einer konkreten Meinung unter Strafe gestellt. Insbesondere ist auch die vom Landgericht angenommene friedensstörende Wirkung, wie sie für einen Eingriff in die Meinungsfreiheit erforderlich wäre (vgl. BVerfGE 124, 300 <335>), nicht erkennbar.

26 Denn nach den gerichtlichen Feststellungen haben der Beschwerdeführer und der Gastwirt als Empfänger der Schriften, übereinstimmend ausgesagt, daß der Beschwerdeführer dem Gastwirt die fraglichen Aufsätze

deshalb ausgehändigt habe, damit dieser sich über die sich angeblich tatsächlich ereigneten historischen Geschehnisse informiere. Überreicht worden ist auch jeweils nur ein Exemplar der gegenständlichen Schriften. Sonstige Personen waren beim Austausch der Schriften - soweit festgestellt - nicht anwesend. Der Beschwerdeführer hat den Gastwirt auch nicht aufgefordert, die Schriften in der Gaststätte auszulegen, oder in sonstiger Art und Weise auf die Weiterverbreitung eingewirkt. Für ihn bestanden nach den gerichtlichen Feststellungen keinerlei konkrete Anhaltspunkte, daß der Gastwirt die Schriften den sonstigen Gaststättenbesuchern überlassen würde. Dementsprechend hat dieser die Schriften nicht an Dritte weitergereicht und nach den gerichtlichen Feststellungen dies zu keinem Zeitpunkt beabsichtigt, sondern den Vorfall bei der Polizei zur Anzeige gebracht. Die vom Landgericht gezogene und vom Oberlandesgericht gebilligte Schlußfolgerung, daß der Beschwerdeführer die Weiterverbreitung der Schriften durch den Zeugen zwingend billigend in Kauf genommen habe, da er sie mit dem Zeugen einem Gastwirt übergeben habe und in dessen Gaststätte zwei Tage vorher anlässlich einer TV-Dokumentation über den Zweiten Weltkrieg in der Gaststätte in nicht näher festgestellter Art und Weise die Kriegsschuld Deutschlands geleugnet habe, kann sich damit auf keine unter Beachtung der verfassungsrechtlichen Bedeutung der Meinungsfreiheit hinreichend tragfähigen tatsächlichen Anhaltspunkte stützen.

27 b) Das Urteil des Landgerichts und der Beschluß des Oberlandesgerichts vom 14. Januar 2008 beruhen auch auf der Verkennung der Bedeutung und Tragweite des Grundrechts auf Meinungsfreiheit aus Art. 5 Abs. 1 Satz 1 GG. Es ist nicht auszuschließen, daß Landgericht und Oberlandesgericht bei Berücksichtigung der grundrechtlichen Anforderungen zu einem anderen Ergebnis gekommen wären.

28 2. Das Urteil des Landgerichts und der Beschluß des Oberlandesgerichts vom 14. Januar 2008 sind demnach gemäß § 93c Abs. 2 in Verbindung mit § 95 Abs. 2 BVerfGG aufzuheben. Die Sache ist an das Landgericht zurückzuverweisen. Der ebenfalls angegriffene Beschluß des Oberlandesgerichts vom 11. Februar 2008 wird damit gegenstandslos.

29 3. Im Übrigen wird die Verfassungsbeschwerde nicht zur Entscheidung angenommen (§ 93a BVerfGG).

30 4. Die Entscheidung über die Auslagererstattung folgt aus § 34a Abs. 2 BVerfGG. Die Festsetzung des Gegenstandswerts beruht auf § 37 Abs. 2 Satz 2 in Verbindung mit § 14 Abs. 1 RVG (vgl. BVerfGE 79, 365 <366 ff.>).

Against Hollywoodism, Revisionism

Robert Faurisson, Teheran, 3 February 2012

The term Hollywoodism refers to the transformation, often mendacious, of reality by the spirit and practices of a whole sphere of American cinema. At first, I shall discuss the evil in general done by Hollywoodism. Secondly, I shall describe the wrongs of Hollywoodism in the shaping of the imposture of "the Holocaust", that is in building the myth of genocide, gas chambers and six million Jews killed by the Germans during the Second World War. Finally, in a third and last part I shall speak of Revisionism as the antidote par excellence to Hollywoodism and its incessant, aggressive publicity for the religion of "the Holocaust".

1. Hollywoodism and the evil that it does According to the American Heritage Dictionary, "Hollywood" may signify

"the US film industry" but also "a flashy, vulgar atmosphere or tone, held to be associated with the US film industry". Used as an adjective the word stands for "the US film industry", as in "a Hollywood movie, a Hollywood producer," or means "flashy and vulgar", as in the dictionary's illustrative sentence "Flashy and vulgar, their clothes were pure Hollywood."

A well-known facet of the ideology propagated by this film industry is the basic division of the world between the Good and the Bad. The Good are the United States and the Bad are those whom the United States decrees as such. The Good are fundamentally Good and the Bad are fundamentally Bad. The United States is always in the right and always wins, whilst the "Bad Guys" are always in the wrong and always lose. Thus there cannot, there must not be any pity for the vanquished:

their defeat proves that they were indeed criminals. The winners will independently assume the right to try the vanquished in court or to have them put on trial by others.

Everyone can bring to mind what are known as "the Nazi atrocities", especially the images of walking corpses or corpses proper. For the past 67 years Hollywood has presented them as evidence that the Germans had death factories wherein the SS spent their time killing, especially Jews. In reality, those corpses were proof that because of the systematic destruction of German cities by the Allies, Germany in 1945 was in its death throes: the inhabitants who had survived the deluge of steel and fire were living in rubble or in holes in the ground, exposed to cold and hunger; often there was hardly any food or medicine; the hospitals and schools were destroyed; practically no trains and convoys were running any longer; the refugees from the East terrified by the invading Red Army's murder and rape numbered in the millions. In 1948 the Italian director Roberto Rossellini faithfully described this situation in *Germany, Anno Zero*. Therefore one must not be surprised at the fact that in 1945, in the labour camps or concentration camps, famine and disease (typhus, typhoid fever, dysentery) reigned, whilst medicines and disinfectants such as Zyklon B were sorely lacking.

Hollywood, along with British cinema and Soviet propaganda, had a terrible and direct responsibility both in the lies attending what was called the discovery of the German concentration camps (1945) and in the ignoble "lynching party" (the phrase is that of Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court at the time) that was the Nuremberg trial (1945-1946), where the winners of the war, in coalition, made themselves judges and jury to try the defeated. It is altogether true that in 1945 even a privileged concentration camp like that of Bergen-Belsen offered a nightmarish vision. But the horrors discovered there were not created by the Germans. They were due to the war and, in particular, an air war conducted mercilessly, to the end, by the Allies against... civilians. It took a fine cynicism to show those horrors and point an accusing finger at the defeated when the ones mainly responsible were the US Air Force and the Royal Air Force. In April 1945, no longer able to manage, the commandant of Bergen-Belsen, SS captain Josef Kramer, sent some men to meet the advancing troops of British Marshal Montgomery and warn them that they were approaching a terrible den of infection, and that they should not immediately release the prisoners lest they contaminate the civilian population and the British soldiers. The British agreed to work with the Wehrmacht. Once on the site, they kept the detainees there and tried to treat them but mortality remained appalling high for a long time. The British wanted to know how many inmates were buried in the mass graves. They extracted the corpses and counted them; then, using a bulldozer, a British officer pushed the bodies towards six large ditches where the soldiers forced female SS guards to cast them in with their bare hands. But this reality was very soon transformed by the film propaganda services, which had people believe that the bodies were those of people killed in an alleged extermination programme. A photograph taken from a plane and showing the bulldozer from afar made it possible to convey the impression that the vehicle was driven by a German soldier performing his daily work as an employee of a death factory. In one case, a photo taken from up close showed the bottom of the machine pushing corpses but "beheaded" the driver so that, with him not appearing as a Briton, it was reckoned he was a German. The Americans went on to make more and more falsifications of this kind. The American general

Eisenhower, supreme Allied commander, was the impresario of this intensified Hollywoodism. The famous Hollywood film director George C. Stevens was brought to Germany in the uniform of lieutenant-colonel. His team shot 80,000 feet of film from which 6,000 feet (or 7.5% of the total) were selected for General William Donovan, special assistant to the US chief of counsel at Nuremberg. It was those parts carefully selected by the American prosecution which, on November 29, 1945, practically at the lifting of the curtain of the loathsome "Nuremberg Trial", were projected to a stupefied world; some of the German defendants, most disturbed at what they saw, deduced that Hitler had carried out a gigantic crime behind their backs. In this sense it can be said that the "Nuremberg Trial" marked the triumph of Hollywoodism.

2. Hollywoodism's part in creating the myth of "the Holocaust"

"The Holocaust" of the Jews then became a sort of religion whose three main components are the extermination, the gas chambers and the six million martyrs. According to an article of faith of this religion Hitler ordered and planned the methodical slaughter of all European Jews; in so doing he committed a crime without precedent, a specific crime, later called genocide. Then, in order to commit this specific crime, he had a specific weapon developed, a weapon of mass destruction, the gas chamber, operating especially with a powerful insecticide, Zyklon B, whose active ingredient was hydrogen cyanide. Finally, the result of this enormous crime was the death of six million European Jews. The Auschwitz-Birkenau camp was the focal point, the apogee, the Golgotha of that horror. After the war a whole propaganda developed around this holy trinity of "the Holocaust", a whole industry of "the Holocaust", a whole business: the "Shoah Business". In the United States the film industry has fed on this belief and spread it throughout the Western world. It is especially since 1978 that such propaganda has been developed, particularly with the four episodes of the U.S. miniseries *Holocaust* recounting the saga of the Weiss family. It is no exaggeration to say that the showing of that series became, as of 1979, practically mandatory in an entire portion of the world. It triggered a torrent of films including, by Steven Spielberg, *Schindler's List*, by Roberto Benigni, *Life is Beautiful*, by Roman Polanski, *The Pianist*. In France, in 1985, Claude Lanzmann honoured us with a documentary running for over nine hours: *Shoah*. The number of Emmy Awards, Oscars and other prizes given to films like these is staggering. A mogul of the Entertainment Industry, Andrew Wallenstein, once stated in *The Hollywood Reporter*: "Let's just say it: the real reason we see so many of these movies is that they're awards bait." It is such observations that have given rise to the saying "There's No Business Like Shoah Business," inspired by the refrain of the song, sung by Liza Minnelli amongst others, "There's No Business Like Show Business."

3. Revisionism is an antidote to the poison of Hollywoodism

Revisionism is not an ideology but a remedy for the temptation of ideology. It is a method. Whether in matters of literature, science, history, the media or any human activity whatsoever, it prescribes that the reality of a fact be established prior to any considerations on that fact. One must again see, hear, read what is believed to have been seen, heard or read. One must be wary of first impressions, of emotions, rumours, and must not rely on anything or anyone until one's own thorough investigation has been conducted, all the more if one is studying a war rumour for – let us not forget –, in wartime the first casualty is the truth.

In the little time I have left here I cannot, unfortunately, describe how and at what price in fifty years of research I, along with a good number of other revisionists, have come to the conclusion that "the Holocaust" is decidedly but a gigantic imposture, as I was able to convince myself after a few years. Already on December 17, 1980 I had summarised this conclusion in a sentence of sixty French words of which I do not see a single one that needs removing today. Here is the English translation: "The alleged Hitlerite gas chambers and the alleged genocide of the Jews form one and the same historical lie, which has permitted a gigantic political and financial swindle whose main beneficiaries are the State of Israel and international Zionism and whose main victims are the German people – but not their leaders – and the Palestinian people in their entirety."

To get an idea of the spectacular victories won against that imposture thanks to the revisionists' work, one may refer to two studies appearing in my blog: "The Victories of Revisionism" (conference paper for Tehran, December 11, 2006) and "The Victories of Revisionism (continued)" (September 11, 2011). It is no exaggeration to say that currently, in France and elsewhere, the authors who used to defend the "Holocaust" thesis are in complete disarray. The trouble is that censorship and repression still prevent the general public from becoming aware of this good news, but with the Internet, times are changing, and quickly.

Conclusion

The general belief on the part of the Western world in "the Holocaust" has long been the sword and shield of Zionism. But today Revisionism is putting this belief in peril. This conference on Hollywoodism will mark, I think, one more step in our common struggle, a struggle for the rights of all – especially the Palestinians –, a struggle for the whole world to free itself from a tyranny based on the Greatest Lie of modern times.

<http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com.au/2012/02/against-hollywoodism-revisionism.html>



*

For at least the fifth time, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has denounced the taboo of "the Holocaust" or "Shoa"

Robert FAURISSON, 14 February 2012

In December 2006 Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, had invited revisionists as well as anti-revisionists to Tehran to speak freely at an international conference on "the Holocaust", an occasion that was to end with the resounding defeat of the chief representative of the anti-revisionist case, an Iranian academic and "visiting professor" at an American university.

On June 3, 2009, in Rome, the Iranian President stated: "Today in Europe it seems the Holocaust can no longer be talked about freely. I hope that some governments manage to free themselves from the Zionists in order to let **the black box of the Holocaust be opened**".

<http://enqforum.pravda.ru/index.php?topic/179931-ahmadinejad-holocaust-speech-on-3-june-2009-rome>

*

On September 18 of the same year he declared: "If the Holocaust that you talk about was real, why don't you allow the subject to be studied? One can freely research any issue, except for this issue, which is sealed. It is **a black box**, which they do not allow to be opened or re-examined. They do this in order to exploit it. We say to them: This affair, which was so important, which served as a pretext for a certain land to be occupied, for many wars to be waged, for millions to be displaced, for hundreds of thousands to be killed or wounded, for families to be destroyed, for the entire Middle East region to be living under the shadow of threats and insecurity... If this event is so important, why don't you allow it to be deciphered and opened, so that the truth and the facts about it will be revealed to all the peoples?"



<http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2009/11/ahmadinejad-black-box-of-holocaust.html>

*

On February 2, 2012, in tandem with the thirtieth International Fajr Film Festival in Tehran, President Ahmadinejad inaugurated an international conference, again open to revisionists and anti-revisionists alike, on **Hollywoodism**, that is a certain propaganda through films, Americano-Zionist in nature, tending at times to glorify "the Holocaust" or "the Shoa". Amongst the participants at this conference were three anti-Zionist and anti-revisionist rabbis, respectively from Britain, the United States and Canada, along with some other Americans (one of them a Jewish intellectual) and a large French contingent. My own paper bore the explicit title "Against Hollywoodism, Revisionism". As for the revisionist Vincent Reynouard, he is the victim of a travel ban by our government and was thus unable to attend but his collaborator, Marie Bruchet, showed and commented on a remarkable documentary about Hollywoodism. The academic Maria Pournier read a highly inspired text, in a sense comparable to the address delivered before, at the opening of the conference, by Dr Ahmadinejad. A talk by historian Paul-Eric Blanrue, distributed in English and French, dealt with the Zionist entity, its "heart", "lungs" and "brain", a "brain" stricken with Shoatic obsession. Beatrice Pignède presented her film *Main basse sur la Mémoire* ("Making off with Remembrance"), all about the French anti-revisionist Fabius-Gayssot Act of 1990. For technical reasons, two other films could not be screened at the time but will be shown in Tehran at a later date: Paul-Eric Blanrue's *A Man - Robert Faurisson*, and Dieudonné's *L'Antisémitisme*. For his part, Italian Professor Claudio Moffa told again, in French and with no concessions to the adversary, of his risky experience of defending revisionism at the universities of Rome and Teramo. Also attending were delegations from Spain, Greece, Egypt, Azerbaijan, ... Apart from the uncouth behaviour of a member of the American delegation, to whom Marie Bruchet and Dieudonné deftly retorted, the conference took place in a courteous although at times tense atmosphere. It was accompanied and followed by a considerable number of interviews, appearances on radio or television, and academic papers.

On February 11, 2012, nine days after the opening of the conference on Hollywoodism, Dr Ahmadinejad, in a speech celebrating the 33rd anniversary of the 1979 Islamic Revolution, declared: "The West and the colonialists, in order to dominate the world, created **an idol** called the Zionist regime. **The spirit of this idol was a story called the**

Holocaust. The Iranian nation, with courage and wisdom, smashed this idol, to free the people of the West" (a recording of this passage, with simultaneous English translation, is on line at

http://tmtv.shiatv.net/view_video.php?viewkey=5ca737d06df22dd67f77).

*

Le Point of February 2, 2012: the rout of the "Holocaust" or "Shoa" historians

For some years now it has been clear that, on the historical and scientific level, the proponents of "the Holocaust" and "the Shoa" are routed. In this regard I advise laymen to read attentively the French magazine *Le Point* of February 2, 2012 which, on the cover, pompously announced: "Historical revelations [on] the Nazi plot / How Hitler and Himmler prepared the Final Solution / A book that's causing controversy / Testimonies of the last survivors". Pages 62-75, under the cover of the usual rhetoric, reveal how the case for an alleged policy of physical extermination of the Jews has become scientifically untenable even amongst conventional historians or authors who, more than ever, for want of finding any proof, one single proof of such a policy on the part of the Third Reich, are reduced to speculations which they themselves know are essentially speculations. This issue of *Le Point* happens to be dated the very day when, in Tehran, President Ahmadinejad opened the conference on Hollywoodism, an event during which he handed me and a few others a mark of his personal esteem before receiving me for a private discussion.

Ahmadinejad occupies quite a prominent position and his courage is undeniable but, as concerns us, he is a revisionist amongst other revisionists, and it is for this reason that the revisionists of the world can only pay him tribute. Besides, more than courageous, his conduct is heroic. The man and his people, cruelly affected by the West's blockade, aspire only to peace. It is absurd to claim that Iran would take the initiative of launching atomic bombs or any other bombs on the State of Israel, since inevitably those bombs would kill and maim as many Muslims and Christians as Jews.

If there is nonetheless a bomb that Ahmadinejad will not hesitate to use, it is the one I have called "the poor man's atomic bomb", the bomb of revisionism which, killing or maiming no one, will get the better of a huge imposture, – that of "the Holocaust" or "Shoa" – which, for its part, serves to justify ad infinitum new wars and new crusades. Too many minds in the Western world remain conditioned by the "Holocaust Industry" and "Shoa-business" but, thanks to revisionism, recovery is possible and, by the same token, peace could once again have some chance.

Who Will The Israelis – Or Their Proxies - Attack During Purim?

By aletho - <http://alethonews.wordpress.com/author/aletho/>

Based on a fable from the Old Testament Book of Esther, the Jewish holiday of Purim celebrates the slaughter of 750,000 Persians and the hanging of Persian Prime Minister Haman and his ten sons.

Purim is perhaps the only religious holiday that celebrates death, destruction, and pagan decadence. It is more akin to Halloween than Christmas—where rowdy party animals dress like Gene Simmons from Kiss, drink like Charles Bukowski, and wander through town looking for trouble like soccer hooligans whose team just won (or lost) an important match.

This year, Purim will be celebrated from sunset, March 7 until nightfall, March 8.

Over the last twenty years, some of the most egregious war crimes and massacres committed by—or on behalf of—the Israelis have occurred during this holiday. It begs to wonder what they'll be up to this Purim? [...]

Here is a short (but by no means exhaustive) list of some of the more notorious bloody events that transpired while Purim was being celebrated:

Bombing of Libya—March 19, 2011—US and British forces launch "Operation Odyssey Dawn," firing more than 115 Tomahawk cruise missiles on Libyan targets near Benghazi. The seven-month military assault ultimately resulted in the almost complete annihilation of Libya, the brutal assassination

of Muammar Gaddafi, and the deaths of as many as 30,000 people.

Iraq War—March 17, 2003—Then-President George W. Bush issues a 48-hour ultimatum to Saddam Hussein and his sons to either leave Iraq or brace for invasion. An air strike on the Presidential Palace in Baghdad came two days later. The resulting attack led to a bloody eight-year war that “officially” ended last year—but is still going on—with no end in sight!

Cave of the Patriarchs Massacre—February 25, 1994—Israeli settler Baruch Goldstein, a member of the far-right Israeli Kach, opened fire on unarmed Palestinian Muslims praying at the Ibrahim Mosque in Hebron. In addition to the 29 killed and 125 injured at the scene, 19 more Palestinians

were killed by the Israeli Defense Forces following riots and protests that erupted throughout the West Bank.

The Highway of Death—February 28, 1991— Under a white flag of surrender, Iraqi troops were making their way back from Kuwait to Iraq when they came under attack by U.S. military ground and air units. Somewhere between 50,000 to 150,000 were slaughtered on what was later referred to as “The Highway of Death.” According to investigative journalist and author Sherman H. Skolnick, “U.S. Military bulldozers were ordered by Bush to bury these slaughtered surrendering Iraqi troops, some of them still alive, in mass, unmarked graves in the desert.”

Pat Buchanan: The New Blacklist

My days as a political analyst at MSNBC have come to an end. After 10 enjoyable years, I am departing, after an incessant clamor from the left that to permit me continued access to the microphones of MSNBC would be an outrage against decency, and dangerous. The calls for my firing began almost immediately with the Oct. 18 publication of **“Suicide of a Superpower: Will America Survive to 2025?”**

A group called **Color of Change**, whose mission statement says that it “exists to strengthen Black America’s political voice,” claimed that my book espouses a “white supremacist ideology.” Color of Change took particular umbrage at the title of Chapter 4, “The End of White America.”

Media Matters parroted the party line: He has blasphemed! A Human Rights Campaign that bills itself as America’s leading voice for lesbians, bisexuals, gays and transgendered people said that Buchanan’s “extremist ideas are incredibly harmful to millions of LGBT people around the world.”

Their rage was triggered by a remark to NPR’s Diane Rehm — that I believe homosexual acts to be “unnatural and immoral.” On Nov. 2, Abe Foxman of the Anti-Defamation League, who has sought to have me censored for 22 years, piled on.

“Buchanan has shown himself, time and again, to be a racist and an anti-Semite,” said Foxman. Buchanan “bemoans the destruction of white Christian America” and says America’s shrinking Jewish population is due to the “collective decision of Jews themselves.”

Well, yes, I do bemoan what Newsweek’s 2009 cover called **“The Decline and Fall of Christian America”** and editor Jon Meacham described as “The End of Christian America.” After all, I am a Christian.

And what else explains the shrinkage of the U.S. Jewish population by 6 percent in the 1990s and its projected decline by another 50 percent by 2050, if not the “collective decision of Jews themselves”?

Let error be tolerated, said Thomas Jefferson, “so long as reason is left free to combat it.” What Foxman and ADL are about in demanding that my voice be silenced is, in the Jeffersonian sense, intrinsically un-American.

Consider what it is these people are saying. They are saying that a respected publisher, St. Martin’s, colluded with me to produce a racist, homophobic, anti-Semitic book, and CNN, Fox News, C-SPAN, Fox Business News and the 150 radio shows on which I appeared failed to detect its evil and helped to promote a moral atrocity.

If my book is racist and anti-Semitic, how did Sean Hannity, Erin Burnett, Judge Andrew Napolitano, Megyn Kelly, Lou Dobbs and Ralph Nader miss that? How did Charles Payne, African-American host on Fox radio, who has interviewed me three times, fail to detect its racism?

How did Michael Medved miss its anti-Semitism?

In a 2009 cover story in the Atlantic, **“The End of White America?”** from which my chapter title was taken, professor Hua Hsu revels in the passing of America’s white majority. At Portland State, President Clinton got a huge ovation when he told students that white Americans will be a minority in 2050.

Is this writer alone forbidden to broach the subject? That homosexual acts are unnatural and immoral has been doctrine in the Catholic Church for 2,000 years. Is it now hate speech to restate traditional Catholic beliefs?

Documented in the 488 pages and 1,500 footnotes of **“Suicide of a Superpower”** is my thesis that America is Balkanizing, breaking down along the lines of religion, race, ethnicity, culture and ideology, and that Western peoples are facing demographic death by century’s end.

Are such subjects taboo? Are they unfit for national debate?

So it would seem. MSNBC President Phil Griffin told reporters, “I don’t think the ideas that (Buchanan) put forth (in his book) are appropriate for the national dialogue, much less on MSNBC.”

In the 10 years I have been at MSNBC, the network has taken heat for what I have written, and faithfully honored our contract. Yet my four-months’ absence from MSNBC and now my departure represent an undeniable victory for the blacklists.

The modus operandi of these thought police at Color of Change and ADL is to brand as racists and anti-Semites any writer who dares to venture outside the narrow corral in which they seek to confine debate.

All the while prattling about their love of dissent and devotion to the First Amendment, they seek systematically to silence and censor dissent. Without a hearing, they smear and stigmatize as racist, homophobic or anti-Semitic any who contradict what George Orwell once called their “smelly little orthodoxies.” They then demand that the heretic recant, grovel, apologize, and pledge to go forth and sin no more.

Defy them, and they will go after the network where you work, the newspapers that carry your column, the conventions that invite you to speak. If all else fails, they go after the advertisers.

I know these blacklists. They operate behind closed doors, with phone calls, mailed threats and off-the-record meetings. They work in the dark because, as Al Smith said, nothing un-American can live in the sunlight.

Patrick J. Buchanan is the author of “Suicide of a Superpower: Will America Survive to 2025?” To find out more about Patrick Buchanan and read features by other Creators Syndicate writers and cartoonists, visit the Creators Syndicate Web page at www.creators.com.

In flinching move, Finkelstein slams boycott movement

By Sean O'Neill 16 February 2012

The interview with Norman Finkelstein that circulated all over the web on Wednesday, in which he calls the boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) movement against Israel a "cult" and compares it to Maoism is, I think, a milestone of sorts. Or, more accurately, the symptom of a milestone – a sign that the ground is shifting on Israel/Palestine issues.

Normal Finkelstein has made a career out of being the son of holocaust survivors who doesn't shy away from picking a fight with Israel's backers, and who unabashedly defends the rights of Palestinians. At times his controversial positions have set his career back, as when he was denied tenure at DePaul University. However, on balance he has certainly benefited, as a less combative scholar would today likely be simply one of thousands of obscure political science professors.

Everything about the interview is classic Finkelstein: his demeanor, his tendency to raise his voice, his adversarial, passionate approach, everything, that is, except for the things he's saying. In a bizarre turn of events, he comes off as a Zionist bully, or for that matter, any other angry right wing pundit. He accuses activists for Palestinian civil rights of having a secret agenda, that of destroying Israel. He seems obsessed with some overarching concept of the Law as final arbiter in all matters, as though in this case we weren't talking about a variety of laws, many of which at times contradict each other, and as though there isn't a history of the law being written, enforced, and misinterpreted by political actors at the expense of the weak. His complaint that solidarity movement activists want to cherry pick which laws they respect is reminiscent of the claims made by white religious leaders that Dr. Martin Luther King so famously refuted in his "Letter from a Birmingham Jail."

Moreover, Finkelstein conveniently ignores the fact that international law recognizes refugees as having a right to return to their homeland. When the law is inconvenient, Finkelstein employs another classic conservative tactic, insisting that the public simply won't accept the demands of the activists, that they need to be more pragmatic. Again, see "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" for an eloquent refutation of such logic.

Finkelstein even resorts to the desperate tactic of denial. When the interviewer puts forth his contention that the BDS movement is growing in popularity, Finkelstein rejects the idea out of hand, comparing the movement to some Maoist group he apparently was affiliated with at some point in his more idealistic youth.

I recently witnessed BDS's growing clout at a meeting I attended with a woman working with an Israeli artist helping

set up a series of salons in New York to explore and question the Birthright Israel programs, and the idea of a "birthright" in general. The project sounds very interesting, but the woman was visibly frustrated at their inability to find people willing to work with them in the city. They are partially funded by the Israeli Consulate, and as a result have had the proverbial door shut on them by activists, artists, and professors, Arab and Jew alike. This would have been incomprehensible five years ago, when I first heard of the BDS movement at the annual Bil'in conference and it was, at that point, divisive even among conference attendees.

Here is where things stand now. There is a paradigm shift in the works in how the Israel/Palestine conflict is understood and approached. There is an increasing consensus among Israel's critics to see the issue as one of civil rights, rather than a conflict between two nations. Indeed, some BDS activists harbor a desire to see the end of the Jewish state, and others believe this is the inevitable outcome of a civil rights movement, whether they desire it or not. But many others, I would argue most Palestinians among them, simply don't care about this abstract One State v. Two State argument. They just don't think civil rights - indeed human rights - can be trumped by someone's nationalist claims.

Finkelstein's sudden hostility to the solidarity movement is a symptom of this paradigm shift. It is easy to rail against Israel when the existence of a Jewish nation-state seems guaranteed in perpetuity. But that guarantee seems to have eroded a bit. For some this will be scary. But then change always is. It was scary in South Africa. It was scary in the Jim Crow American South. For others it is liberating, and you can count among these an increasing number of Israelis who see coexistence – real coexistence, not the tenuous kind that reigns in Jaffa, among other places – as a more attractive guarantee to their security than the ethnocratic state. As the ground continues to shift, some of those who are afraid will flinch, and retreat to safer, more moderate arguments. Finkelstein flinched.

<http://www.australiansforpalestine.net/58722#more-58722>

Sean O'Neill worked for Christian Peacemaker Teams from 2006-2009 in the South Hebron Hills supporting Palestinian-led nonviolent resistance to Israeli occupation and continued settlement expansion. He is currently an MA candidate at New York University in Near Eastern Studies and Journalism.

Is Norman Finkelstein a Zionist Stooge?

By Thomas Dalton, MARCH 13, 2010

For most of the past decade, Norm Finkelstein has been held up as a paragon of truth and justice. He is a darling of the anti-war, anti-Zionist set, and friend to Arab and Muslim groups around the world. What could be better?—a Jew critical of the Jewish state, and a champion of the Palestinians. But I think it is high time to expose a few weaknesses in his armor, and to make the case that he is, perhaps unwittingly, an apologist for Israel and for Jewish supremacy. I think one can make a pretty good case that he is, in fact, a Zionist stooge.

First of all, anyone familiar with contemporary Zionism should be able to figure out that Finkelstein could never publish as he

has, or speak as he has, or get the publicity that he has, without the implicit support of the various Jewish lobbies around the world. If he were truly the threat that is portrayed, we can be sure that he would be stopped cold—censored, sanctioned, sued, or imprisoned. Anyone doubting this need only consider the treatment given to Muslim 'extremists' and Holocaust skeptics.

So he must be 'acceptable' in some sense; perhaps even 'useful.' That use is not hard to discern. Every power structure in the world has a need to control and mitigate its opponents. In the good ol' days, a bullet to the head or a trip to the Gulag did the trick. Today one needs to be more

subtle. The modern approach is to stake out the opposition's turf, or to plant a 'soft' opponent. I doubt that Norman is a plant, but he serves the same purpose: a nice, safe, credible 'critic' of Zionism who knows his limits, and doesn't go too far.

What do I mean by this? Two things. First of all, deep down, I have little doubt that Finkelstein is himself a closet Zionist—a *true* Zionist, meaning, a Jewish supremacist. This is the case with the vast majority of American Jews, and virtually all Israeli Jews. They firmly believe that Israel has a right to exist as an exclusively (or at least predominantly) Jewish state. This is a racist notion on any reading, and would be utterly unacceptable for any nation other than Israel. Certainly this is the case in Israel itself; it was recently reported in *Al-Quds Al-Arabi* (Feb. 15) that 75% of Israeli Jews are in favor of some form of ethnic cleansing, to achieve a purified Jewish state. American Jews are similarly inclined. No matter whether right or left, Republican or Democrat, pro-war or anti-war, nearly all Jews support the idea of Jewish-only state; the only disagreement is about the means of achieving it.

Finkelstein never questions this core of Zionism. It's true that he, like any thinking person with a shred of decency, is appalled at what Israel is doing in the occupied territories, but this doesn't make him anti-Zionist (in the deeper sense). He does not question Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. He does not endorse the right of return for all Palestinians, or financial compensation for them. He does not call for full and equal rights of Israeli Arabs. Finkelstein is still, at heart, a Jewish supremacist.

Even worse is his stance on the Holocaust. He made his name in 2000, with his 'radical' book *The Holocaust Industry*. As before, we can be sure that neither his English publisher Verso, nor the printer of his German translation (Piper Verlag), nor any of the other 15 foreign-language publishers would have produced the book if it really got to the heart of the Holocaust story. Finkelstein's main concern is the hype surrounding the event, and the misuse of the money—chiefly, that it's not going to the 'right people.' But he implicitly accepts virtually all of the traditional story.

I have seen Finkelstein speak in person three times. Never once did he indicate any real knowledge about the Holocaust. In fact, at one event he was directly asked about this, and he replied, "I'm not an expert on the Holocaust"—which is a fairly astonishing admission from a man whose claim to fame rests on that event. When a questioner challenged him about the unreliability of the numbers—that the '6 million' has no factual basis, that Hilberg claimed 5.1 million, that Reitlinger claimed 4.2 million, that Yad Vashem has less than 3 million names,

that revisionists argue for 1 million or less—he waived off the whole point: "I just follow the experts."

Finkelstein unquestioningly accepts the 6 million figure, without knowing anything of the massive difficulties behind that symbolic figure. He has no awareness of the physical impossibilities involved with the alleged mass murder and incineration; of the utter lack of forensic evidence, despite knowing where to look; of wartime air photos showing no evidence of mass murder; of 20 years of diary entries by Joseph Goebbels indicating a consistent process of evacuation and deportation rather than mass murder; and so on. At one time he apparently expressed doubt that gas chambers were used for mass murder, but no more; now he toes the line. In this sense, he is a champion of traditionalism, and thus poses no real threat.

In truth the Holocaust story is fraught with difficulties, as I tried to show in my book [Debating the Holocaust](#). Normally one would expect a person like Finkelstein to pick up on this point, since it actually serves his purpose of arguing that emphasis on Jewish suffering was over-blown and exploited for financial gain. But faithful Norman knows that, should he start raising these issues, or take seriously the ideas of Rudolf, Mattogno, Graf, or Faurisson, that he, like they, would be totally shut down. Bad for book sales, eh Norm?

Even the alleged resistance he gets at his various speaking engagements is, at least in part, bogus. On more than one occasion, where his talks were supposedly cancelled by "local Jewish opposition," it was *he himself* who cancelled out. He is in regular contact with Jewish leaders everywhere he goes, and if he gets a whiff that the crowd might be 'uncooperative,' or might raise uncomfortable issues (e.g. Holocaust revisionism), then he cancels. Ask him, for example, what happened to the evening talk to a local Catholic student group in Ghent, Belgium, in 2008.

Readers out there are invited to ask Norman a couple pointed questions at his next local speaking engagement: (1) Do you repudiate the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state? If not, how can you deny being a racist? (2) On what basis do you accept the symbolic '6 million' Jewish Holocaust deaths, without knowledge of the many serious difficulties with that figure? These would make for an interesting response; be prepared for some fancy footwork.

Perhaps I am wrong about Norm Finkelstein; I hope I am. In fact, I would like nothing better than for him to prove me wrong, in public, by clearly exposing Jewish supremacism and racism within Israel itself, and by exposing, or at least acknowledging, the many holes in the Holocaust story. But don't hold your breath.

<http://michaelsantomauro.blogspot.com/2010/03/is-norman-finkelstein-zionist-stooge-by.html>

Eric Campbell - A Bavarian Fairy Tale, 14/02/2012



Bavarians are intensely proud of their traditions.

You can make yourself seasick watching the daily rocking and the reeling in Europe. Will Greece cop another dose of austerity and get another financial lifeline or will they squabble, default on Olympus sized debt and drag the rest of Europe into a mighty financial funk? Are Italy and Spain indebted beyond redemption? Will the European Union hang together? Will the Euro survive? If the rest of the world is absorbed by this slow-motion car wreck unfolding hourly, daily, then why aren't Bavarians also on the edge of their seats? Come to think of it why are they having such a conspicuously good time? Aren't they worried they'll go down with the ship?

'No ship is sinking, there's no earthquake, there's no flood. We're living in paradise.

The beer is tasty and the food as well. (Bavaria is) better than anywhere in the world'. HELMUT ZANKEL Munich resident

Fact is Bavaria is the richest state in Germany and Germany is now the richest country in Europe. And while much of the rest of Europe is mired in the financial quicksand of a sovereign debt crisis, business in Bavaria is booming, exports are rising and unemployment is at a 20-year low.

How come? Well the Germans have got a word for it and only they know what it means. Mittelstand! It's the very German secret to the success of modest family enterprises all the way to the global domination of the local auto-giants like Audi.

Foreign Correspondent's Eric Campbell goes in search of the meaning of Mittelstand and why Germans remain resolutely

allergic to debt, committed to hard work and dedicated to the perpetuation of business beyond one or two generations. If only their profligate neighbours living beyond their means, piling up debt and avoiding tax could take a leaf out of the Mittelstand handbook – if there were such a thing.

Anton Kathrein, Industrialist: *These countries! They have to not spend too much money. They have to earn money!*

Eric Campbell: *They have to be more like Germans? Anton Kathrein: Or Bavarians!'*

No wonder there's growing discontent among Germans about propping up the rest of the Eurozone.

Grab the lederhosen and get out the beer steins - we're heading to Bavaria!

Transcript

CAMPBELL: I've come to the Bavarian capital, deep in the south of Germany, to solve a mystery. Why is Germany's economy going gangbusters while countries like Greece are going down the gurgler?

In Munich, home of Oktoberfest, people like to work hard and play hard, so what better way to start my Bavarian journey than with a beer or two?

The Hofbrauhaus has a proud tradition of selling vast quantities of its specialty brew. Tonight the beer hall is as busy as it's been in two hundred years.

HELMUT ZANKEL: "Drink... drink!"

CAMPBELL: (drinks) "Bavarian beer".

CAMPBELL: Helmut Zankel and his friends have been coming to the same table three times a week for as long as they remember. "This place is busy, Helmut. Where is the economic crisis? Not in Bavaria?"

HELMUT ZANKEL: "In Bavaria? Not at all".

CAMPBELL: "Definitely not?"

HELMUT ZANKEL: "No. No ship is sinking, there's no earthquake. There's no flood – we're living in paradise".

CAMPBELL: "And the beer is tasty".

HELMUT ZANKEL: "The beer is tasty and the food as well".

CAMPBELL: "But everything here is better than in Greece, for example".

HELMUT ZANKEL: Better than anywhere in the world".

CAMPBELL: It's common to hear Bavarians boast that they're the best in the world. This was a separate kingdom until 1871 and outsiders still have to work hard to be accepted. "Helmut, to Bavaria!"

HELMUT ZANKEL: "You have to drink now. He's not drinking. This is not English beer that doesn't get drunk".

CAMPBELL: "It's much better. Best in the world!"

HELMUT ZANKEL: "Oh, now he gets it. It took some time, but he's getting it".

CAMPBELL: But right now, Bavaria does have a lot to boast about. It's the richest state in Germany, which is now the richest big country in Europe. In the midst of the Euro zone crisis, business is booming, exports are rising and unemployment is at a twenty year low. Helmut's retired but his five children have all found jobs in Munich.

HELMUT ZANKEL: "All my kids have work".

CAMPBELL: "No unemployment?"

HELMUT ZANKEL: "No, no, no".

CAMPBELL: Lately, Bavaria's become a magnet for Europe's economic refugees. Juliana Salija escaped war torn Yugoslavia 17 years ago for a better life in Greece. Two months ago she fled Greece where one in five is now jobless.

JULIANA SALIJA: "I love that place but it was impossible... impossible".

CAMPBELL: "So how is Bavaria in comparison to Greece?"

JULIANA SALIJA: "I've got a job, I've got a little apartment and I love here because it is actually international.... easier to live. Not to go to sleep with the thought am I going to have enough to live tomorrow".

CAMPBELL: Not bad for a place best known for questionable fashion, endless 'oom-pa-pa' music and excessive beer consumption.

HELMUT ZANKEL: "Oh, now he's drinking with two hands. I don't think it's going to work".

CAMPBELL: So what um Himmels Willen is their secret? Well we all know Bavaria makes some not bad cars from BMW – Bavarian Motor Works – to Audi. But the secret of their success goes even deeper. Now to find out we need to leave the big city and go out in the countryside in search of a very teutonic concept called – 'Mittelstand'.

The concept of Mittelstand goes back long before there were Audi sports cars or even Porches - back to when people rode horses and what we now call Germany was a loose network of independent kingdoms, principalities and free cities.

Each area tried to stand out from the others by specialising in its own products, from beer to leather shorts to leather shoes. Centuries on, not much has changed.

"So how long have your family been making shoes?"

LUKAS MEINDL: "Over 300 hundred years all in the same place here in Kirschansdoring".

CAMPBELL: "That's extraordinary. Three hundred years in the village?"

LUKAS MEINDL: "Yes, very long but a huge long tradition and I still did learn the profession of shoe-making".

CAMPBELL: Lukas Meindl is the 11th generation shoemaker in the Meindl family. His specialty, trekking boots, now sell to more than forty countries but much of the production and quality control are still based in the family's old village of Kirschansdoring near the Austrian border, population just 1500 people. One hundred and twenty of them, including his relatives, work in this factory.

"This is the one you use in dancing isn't it? You put your knickerbockers on and your lederhosen and away you go?"

LUKAS MEINDL: "It's a nice boot, eh?"

CAMPBELL: "Yeah".

LUKAS MEINDL: "But this is a real tradition".

CAMPBELL: Lukas and his cousin Markus say they'll never leave.

MARKUS MEINDL: "I think it's one of the safest and most

beautiful places all over the world, so why should we go away from here? This is our tradition, this is our heritage here. We can't move. No way".

CAMPBELL: This is what Germany calls a 'mittelstand'. There's no work like it in English because it refers to a deep-seated German tradition – family-owned businesses, usually in the provinces, that make niche products for the world market. Forget the big car companies, these speciality firms account for more than half of Germany's exports and they've hardly been dented by the Euro zone crisis.

LUKAS MEINDL: "At the moment you know Germany has a very good situation. Even when there's talk about the crisis Germany is very very prepared because we still produce. We built up something in Germany and we have something different than the other countries are doing in the world. This makes us different to the others. And this is the reason why we have still jobs, we have still a situation where people like to live. This makes a difference".

CAMPBELL: Cousin Markus runs the clothing side of the business.

MARKUS MEINDL: (looking at photos on wall) "Down there that's me, that's Lukas my cousin and that's my other cousin Berndt, you know".

CAMPBELL: He specialises in that great Bavarian tradition, leather pants.

MARKUS MEINDL: "You know this is one my grandpa did, it's about 80 years old. This is a hand stitched one. We do the same today, you know?"

CAMPBELL: "People still wear lederhosen?"

MARKUS MEINDL: "Yeah a lot of them".

CAMPBELL: "Truly?"

MARKUS MEINDL: "Yeah, yeah".

CAMPBELL: "Some people do suggest they're a fashion crime".

MARKUS MEINDL: "No, lederhosen is a culture you know and this is something you can be proud of it you have a right one you know?"

CAMPBELL: This is not just a provincial clothing store. Typically for a mittelstand, it punches far above its weight, attracting international customers like the Terminator himself, Arnold Schwarzenegger.

MARKUS MEINDL: "These are our friends in the end, not really customers you know?"

CAMPBELL: "Does Arnold Schwarzenegger wear lederhosen?"

MARKUS MEINDL: "Yeah, a lot of them".

CAMPBELL: "In public?"

MARKUS MEINDL: "A lot of them – jackets, leather trousers, yeah, yeah coats – a lot of things from us he has yeah".

CAMPBELL: More on the Terminator later. The biggest concentration of Mittelstand businesses is here in Bavaria, a region with few natural resources but a long history of craftsmanship. Unlike many multi-national corporations, they don't chase short-term profits or dabble in high-risk investments.

MARKUS MEINDL: "You know, we don't have to think about investing money in finance and make dirty money. We invest our money in our products and we invest in our workers. That's the reason why for us the future is still always one step after the other one and we are safe because we don't invest too much money, what we can't afford. So that's the thinking of our grandfather, of our father and you can only buy what you can afford – nothing more".

CAMPBELL: And that conservative philosophy is working remarkably well. While businesses elsewhere in Europe are drowning in debt, most Mittelstand businesses are boringly

solvent and stable. They don't pay millions to CEOs to strip staff, smash unions and boost quarterly shareholder returns. Instead, they foster staff loyalty by keeping them on in good times and bad. Some workers have been at Meindl for more than forty years. The planning focus for the family is the next generation.

LUKAS MEINDL: "I have 2 boys. One boy is 8 years and one is 5 years".

CAMPBELL: "A future shoemaker there, you think?"

LUKAS MEINDL: "I don't know now, but we'll see if they like it. I think it's important that people see, as the boys at least now see, what we do. When they like it, we help them - and we hope they like it".

CAMPBELL: "The Mittelstand's embodies the kind of Victorian values of prudence and thrift and saving that Margaret Thatcher tried to instil in Britain. But the problem of Thatcherite deregulation was that it also led to greedy banks offering easy loans that put the whole country in debt. Now here Bavarians have gone down a very different path. Instead of borrowing money to buy stuff, they saved money while they made stuff and they made it so well, the rest of the world wanted to buy it. Weird, huh?"

And the rules apply to Bavaria's biggest corporations as much as to shoemakers. Dr Anton Kathrein runs one of the world's largest electronic components companies. He's proud to call it a Mittelstand.

DR ANTON KATHREIN: "We are mittelstand. Mittelstand is not depending on the size - how many people you have in the company... employees... how many turn over. It's a mentality... it's a philosophy. And I am still responsible for the company. It means if the company goes bankrupt I am personally bankrupt. It is a high motivation. The other motivation is, on the product is my name, the family name 'Kathrein'. It's also high motivation for the quality and to be reliable for the customers. Customers can trust my name. So for me the name is important. In Germany we say 'der Ehrbarer Kaufmann' – that means we are trusting each other. If you give a handshake it's a handshake, it's a contract. Not lawyers with hundreds of papers".

CAMPBELL: His father founded the company in 1919, as a one man business in a cellar, making lightning conductors.

DR ANTON KATHREIN: "So it was a very tough situation after World War First, he had no money but he had an idea, a vision, and the vision was a product".

CAMPBELL: "Wow and you've gone from a one man operation to one of the world's biggest antenna companies?"

DR ANTON KATHREIN: "We are the oldest and biggest antenna company worldwide. We have now 6,700 people. The turnover this year is over 1.4 billion Euros and we are still a private company and third generation is waiting. My son is just finishing his studies in Karlsruhe – the best university in Germany - and he will then, mid of this year be back here, and will help me".

CAMPBELL: It makes decidedly unsexy products, from antennas, to widgets and thingamies, to things that go into other things. But Dr Kathrein is passionate about every part of his business and he owns every centimetre of it.

DR ANTON KATHREIN: "There is no money from the banks. It's paid already. I'm happy about this. So there is no crisis. Also banks ask me, don't you want to go to the stock exchange? Don't you want to be a blue chip? And I said yes it's interesting but yeah you can earn a lot of money then and what shall I do with the money? You have to reinvest it and where? Yeah in telecommunications. I am in telecommuni-

cations. I don't need this! So I'm still here and I'm independent and I have no problems with the banks".

CAMPBELL: He doesn't have a problem with trade unions either.

DR ANTON KATHREIN: "For sure we have the union here because we're the largest metallic and electronic company in this field. So we have a union but we never have problems with the union. We're working together as partnership. For sure sometimes they have different ideas, but it's normal, that is normal. But at the end of the day we are working together to be successful for the company and to keep the people here, to keep employees here or to increase the number of employees. And this I think is the right situation - not to fight".

CAMPBELL: Like most mittelstand businesses, it's still based in the provincial town where it all began. Here, the problem isn't regional unemployment, it's finding enough people to do the work. Not so long ago the money men of Wall Street and London thought Germany was a bit of a joke. Still manufacturing things in villages when the real money was in just shuffling money around, making collateralised debt obligations or structured asset backed security tranches or other things too complex to understand for which they paid themselves billions of dollars while destroying the global economy. Well no one's laughing at Germany now. Tempting as it might be.

Bavaria in particular is a place where men aren't afraid to wear funny hats. They're intensely proud of their traditions and right now they're feeling rather virtuous. Unlike their European neighbours such as Greece, they haven't ruined their economy by living beyond their means. And they're in no rush to bail out their neighbours.

LUKAS MEINDL: "We're very annoyed about this for sure, because it's very easy to understand that we have to pay now the bills for the others and this is very difficult to do, no? Personally I see it as, only to give money to someone and they're not changing it's the wrong way. Who is paying the bills has to make the decision. I think this is a clear rule and when countries are not following these rules then we cannot help. This must be the rules because we cannot work in this way - build up something and then the money is taken away from our country to other countries that's not changing anything".

CAMPBELL: Like most of their German brethren, Bavarians are insisting the rest of Europe has to change its ways. If countries like Greece want Germany's help, they have to agree to live within their means. They want governments to collect proper taxes and like German shoppers, to balance their budgets.

DR ANTON KATHREIN: "For sure these countries they have to not spend too much money, they have to earn money".

CAMPBELL: "They have to be more like Germans?"

DR ANTON KATHREIN: "Or Bavarians!" (laughter)

CAMPBELL: A lot of Greeks are already like Bavarians. Munich has one of Europe's biggest Greek communities thanks to guest workers who came to Germany in the 1960s. George Gergianakis is the son of a guest worker and has lived in both Germany and Greece but he moved back to Bavaria with his Greek American wife Georgia to raise their children.

GEORGE GERGIANAKIS: "I speak Greek to them, my wife speaks English to them because she's from Boston and they learn German in school - and we combine the three cultures".

CAMPBELL: This Sunday is a special day for the family, eight year old Emmanuela is performing for the Greek congregation. (child playing violin) George and his wife both worked in

Athens in the boom times, helping to plan the 2004 Olympics, but even then they could tell the good times were built on the sands of debt. The news they're now getting from Greece has confirmed they were right to have their children here.

GEORGE GERGIANAKIS: Doctors Without Borders here they asked for support for Greece now, for medicine and support for the poor and the needy for food. So the problem seems to be, ah becoming more dramatic right now and we expect a very, very difficult year in 2012 and everybody's very anxious right now. We are receiving weekly I think, questions from friends and from family members to come here to work. So we are very.... we are very anxious and very curious to see what's going to happen in the next, in the short term, yeah?"

CAMPBELL: The difference they find in Bavaria is that the system works. Unlike in Greece, you don't have to know someone or bribe someone to get things done.

GEORGE GERGIANAKIS: Bavaria as a state is very reliable. You can rely on everything, whereas Greece the role that the state plays is very different. I mean you cannot rely on the healthcare system, you cannot rely on public services because in order to get the service that you want you have to have relations in place or a network in place, and that makes the things difficult".

GEORGIA GERGIANAKIS: "But that doesn't mean we don't love Greece, we really do love Greece and the culture and the sunshine - can't take that away from Greece".

CAMPBELL: Like most people in Munich the family is renting while it saves to buy. Germany frowns on consumer debt. In contrast, George's 70 year old father in Greece was until recently plagued by banks trying to lend him money.

GEORGE GERGIANAKIS: "If you wanted to apply for a mortgage loan, in Germany you have to go through many checks and it was very difficult traditionally, whereas in other countries and Greece is just one example, this has changed rapidly after the membership of the European Union and the Euro so that everybody was offered loans and they accepted naively and at the end everybody is in debt now in Greece and getting out of this requires a stable work environment and a stable income which is not the case anymore - which brings everything to a collapse I think right now".

GEORGIA GERGIANAKIS: "I do hope that one day our children can experience living in Greece through their work because it's a really nice experience to have. But if the economy continues the way it's going then there won't be jobs for them in Greece".

CAMPBELL: But as much as George and Georgia despair for Greece, even they don't believe Germany should bail out Greek debt.

GEORGE GERGIANAKIS: "If you give money it's like pouring water into sand".

CAMPBELL: Even so Germany can't stay aloof from the problems of its neighbours. The Alps won't protect it from the debt contagion and Europe is still its main export market.

Across the border in the Austrian town of Kitzbuhel, the Audi car company is spending big. It's sponsoring a downhill ski race to promote the snow-handling qualities of its new models. For big companies like Audi, the Euro has been a boon, allowing them to trade in one currency across most of Europe. Marketing Manager, Peter Schwarzenbauer hopes Germany will do whatever it can to preserve it.

PETER SCHWARZENBAUER: "I think everybody, at least all the responsible politicians know that this is the only way we can go and I'm totally convinced that if we meet here again in ten years we still we talk about the Euro and we'll still talk about that the Euro was the right decision".

CAMPBELL: "But will all the countries still be in it like Greece?"

PETER SCHWARZENBAUER: "I think that still all countries will be in, I would guess that probably even more than today".

CAMPBELL: "Really? What would be the effect if Germany lost the euro, had to go back to the Deutschmark and deal with the lira and the schilling and the frank?"

PETER SCHWARZENBAUER: "This is a scenario I don't even want to think about. It will not happen".

CAMPBELL: Despite the crisis, Audi is actually expecting to increase sales this year and it's not afraid of spending money to make money. It's brought in a bevy of celebrities to glamour up the brand. There are celebrity athletes, celebrity actors and celebrity celebrities.

"What do you think of the global economic crisis?"

WOMAN: "Oh it's terrible of course".

CAMPBELL: "You're against it?"

WOMAN: "I'm against it?"

CAMPBELL: "Yeah".

WOMAN: "Oh yeah I'm against it of course".

CAMPBELL: Peter Schwarzenbauer has even hooked a celebrity lederhosen wearer, Arnold Schwarzenegger! (shouting) "Mr Schwarzenegger, Mr Schwarzenegger what do you think about mittelstand values?" (Arnie keeps walking) Unfortunately, we didn't get to find out.

Back in Audi's Bavarian headquarters, we did learn more about mittelstand values. While it's now one of the biggest car

corporations, it's origins lie in four small carmakers who merged in the Great Depression. Peter Schwarzenbauer credits the company's endurance to its mittelstand origins.

PETER SCHWARZENBAUER: "One of the secrets of success is that it still feels like a mittelstand company. I mean we have 60,000 people on board but it's still very familiar, you know? You know people, we have short decision cycles so we are working like a mittelstand company, even being a big international corporation".

CAMPBELL: Even with its automated robots, the company employs more than 30,000 people in its production plant in Ingolstadt and even more abroad.

"And you're not sacking your staff every time things get a bit tight?"

PETER SCHWARZENBAUER: "No. Exactly. I mean the last crisis in 2008/2009 now we stick to our people here in the factory, we kept everybody on board and this was I think one of the main reasons why we came out much faster, much stronger in the crisis than anybody else".

CAMPBELL: The challenge for Germany, with its disciplined, well-ordered tax paying society is how to operate in a continent of vastly differing values. It's unclear how the single currency can survive in a continent where some work to live, while others live to work. But for now, Germany's success, nowhere greater than in Bavaria, is something to celebrate.

<http://www.abc.net.au/foreign/content/2012/s3430858.htm>

Naomi Zeveloff: Anti-Israel attitudes spreading at U.S. universities, report says

The David Report says that while anti-Semitism is less of an issue for U.S. Jewish college students, negativity about Israel threatens to erode bipartisan support - 22.02.12

A report released February 8 by The David Project, one of a handful of Jewish groups devoted to campus activism on Israel, paints a nuanced picture of the challenges Israel faces on U.S. university campuses. Called "A Burning Campus? Rethinking Israel Advocacy at America's Universities and Colleges," the paper claims that universities are host to the worst anti-Israel behavior in America, even as the American public, more broadly, is supportive of the Jewish state. But veering from the Israel advocacy world's frequent position, the report makes a strong distinction between "anti-Israelism" and anti-Semitism on campus. Conflating the two does not "jive" with the experience of Jewish students who feel largely comfortable in American universities, the report warns. The problem, it stresses, is not anti-Semitism; it's a "drip-drip negativity" about Israel that, according to the David Project's Executive Director David Bernstein, threatens to erode support over the long term.

"The chief concern, therefore, is not the welfare of Jewish students," the report states, "but that a pervasively negative atmosphere will affect the long-term thinking of current college students, negatively affecting strong bipartisan support for Israel."

The way the new David Project sees it, a subtle problem deserves a subtle response. Its new agenda focuses on selling Israel rather than on reaming out its critics. Rather than counter anti-Israel speech on campus with flashy events featuring big-name speakers, the group proposes a kind of pro-Israel diplomacy in which students "map" their campuses to find and influence thought leaders — namely, other students and faculty members.

<http://www.haaretz.com/jewish-world/anti-israel-attitudes-spreading-at-u-s-universities-report-says-1.414124>

