BEHIND ENEMY LINES IN BRUSSELS: A Victory for Revisionist Norms

by Michèle, Lady Renouf
www.birobidjan.co.uk

During the afternoon of 6th October 2009 a conference on DENIAL AND DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE was held in the European Parliament, Brussels. It was sponsored by the Centre Communautaire Laic Juif (a Jewish body), the European Armenian Federation and IBUKA-France (an African body) under the patronage of the European Member of Parliament Mr Elmar Brok. I attended as a delegate - a delegate behind enemy lines, as it were, for I firmly denounce the conflating of oxymoronic ideas as bogus advertising for which in my view the European Union law-makers are retail experts.

caption: The location of that 'tower of babel', the European Parliament complex, Brussels in Belgium.

caption: This is the 'aquarium' conference scene, a corner of the interior of the European Parliament in Brussels.

caption: Here I swim alone in dangerous waters as the three groups gathered: the duped dolphins, the dolphins as mimetic sharks, and their school of learned sharks.

Nine speakers in all present their specialist arguments for entertainng the oxymoronic notion of denial and democracy and of these the three keynoters are:

1. Mr Elmar Brok, the German MEP who represented the European Parliament during the sovereignty-denying Lisbon Treaty negotiations. Mr Brok was the one who inadvertently (though tellingly) helped equate the recent Irish turncoat "Yes" vote on the (tyrannical tooled) Lisbon Treaty with how: "This proves from my point of view that the advantages of the Treaty have become even more obvious in view of the current economic crisis."*

2. Mr Jean-Marie Cavada who at once declared himself "1/3 jewish"; quoted Elie Wiesel in recommending we rely (on this inveterate wartime liar) for one "can't trust people who don't look at their past"!; and praised Willy Brandt for kneeling (as per a righteous "footstool" - Psalm 110: " I make thine enemies thy footstool."). Mr Cavada made no estimation of the culpable harm of Chaim Weizmann. As head of the Jewish Federation in the 1930s, Weizmann defined his Jewish people in Germany as a subversive "invisible army" acting as "a nation within nations" for "we are the Trojans within the enemy's fortress" - though in Weizmann's horse, entering to undermine remembrance of Europe's Classical Virtues (which are ethically incompatible with anti-gentile Torah teachings).

3. Dr H.C. Ralph Giordano (*left*) who straightway pronounced himself "a survivor of Auschwitz": a double-speak survivalist who still attributed the discredited "quotation" to Adolf Hitler (who did not say): "I have assembled my SS to send to the death, men, women and children in Poland because who talks today about the destruction of Armenians", to bring a third of the delegates to their feet (perhaps more specifically, to heel).

Then the six speakers:

1. Dr. Yves Ternon, historian, and the first on this occasion, to twice demonise the French revisionist Prof Robert Faurisson - (quite oxymoronically for, after all, revisionism is a normal forensic method) - by declaring Faurisson the "Father Number 2 of Revisionism"; and that "in the 1970s and 1980s the difference between revisionism and science spread with Nazism rather than Communism". Dr. Ternon stated that "it made my heart leap higher" that "German co-responsibility" had been raised "67 years later for its failure to object to this [Armenian] slaughter" and as "reported to the German Embassy in 1916 about these deportations".

Dr. Ternon expounded on what he saw as "four denial methods/mechanisms":
"1. Rationalism": by which he surmised the revisionist forensic investigative method as "in the name of freedom of speech making up false claims to find some wrong detail ... to dismantle all the evidence which at the same time changes the meaning ... claiming evidence was collected in the wrong way." The professor saw this "mechanism" as "difficult to debate with". It sounded rather more like an outright reverse projection of the precise revisionists' claims, in the case of Faurisson since 1976! Alas Dr. Ternon offered no precise forensic proofs to illustrate his case which remained vague and sweeping.
"2. Reductionism": for which likewise this historian offered no specific samples.
"3. Accusing the victims": But again the historian did not touch on anything specific, say, on the collusion between ruthless Zionists and expedient National Socialists who had opened the mutually inglorious Kibbutz training centres like those in Berlin for youthful Jewry to prepare themselves for Palestine, a programme which persisted as did their migrations there during the 1940s. Nor was there any mention of the fact that Zionists made sure that not even the Allied countries would allow jews in so they would have to go to Palestine.
"4. Anamorphosis": A type of transformation "mechanism" - [meaning a distorted image or drawing that appears normal when viewed with or reflected by means of a mirror or other devices] was attributed as "invented by Faurisson" and summarised as "the denier builds his own contradictions", for instance "this never happened"; "we are the victims". He concluded that "deniers' accusations are actions to destroy memory and hurt communities ... and have no place in universities where it only offends and hides facts ... it's a crime disseminating on the internet ... and the harm it makes".

In sum, this historian's arguments amounted to emotive claims not source criticism - and contrary to his case, the latter is indeed where one should expect to find a place: in our culturally Socratic-oriented universities! It seems unjust, not to say, undemocratic that a professor can denounce a fellow former professor of the Sorbonne whilst denying his right to defend his position, as well as denying ours from hearing him first-hand without his case being filtered and thereby effectively rendered by a foe as mere hearsay.

Speaker 2 Prof. Mihran Dabag.

It surprised me how many people drifted out during his speech including the three movie cameramen covering the conference. (It surprised me because later on it was left to his seniority to take on the task of answering my 'mould-breaking' question at the close of the conference. Straight afterwards he appeared to be interviewed about it when his three keynote colleagues tried to prevent my photographing their apparently personal audio recording of his comments.) MEP Elmar Brok had left, presumably on other national sovereignty-denying EU business, soon after Prof. Dabag's speech.

Prof. Dabag stressed it was "important to prosecute those who deny. ... The Framework emphasises the readiness of Europe to prosecute denial ... because of the fact that it is coupled with racist and xenophobic acts .... the German prosecution of the so-called "Auschwitz Lie". .... Democracy has no interest in protecting denial in forming opinions in society ... the victims of denial, the protection of the victims of denial, this is the core of these decisions to prosecute ... a legal means to protect against certain politics ... prosecution is important for moral analysis ... and without clear position it will lead to a denial not just restricted to the Shoah. About Darfur ... we must clearly state who is the victim and who the perpetrator just as in the Armenian case".

However Prof. Dabag made no mention of the victims of the debate-deniers and that for instance veteran Prof. Robert Faurisson the revisionist whom he denounces has been hospitalised on multiple occasions as a result of savage beatings whilst out walking in the park by brutish Zionist young thugs. No-one here is seeking democratic legislation against this actual criminality as opposed to prosecuting debatable opinions.

The so-called Framework Decision of the EU to which Prof. Dabag coat-tails and defers is the continent-wide enforcement of criminal prosecution of "revisionists" - those who dare to oppose the veto on European historical research as prescribed by a pro-Zionist governance. The aim is to "harmonise" with this grotesque separation of scientific attitude and justice in our courtrooms: debate-denial compliance across Europe by 2010.

Speaker 3 Mr. Gilles Karmasyn an expert in Information Systems, he is the first to augment his speech by PowerPoint presentation projected on the two giant screens in the conference hall. I add two extra photographs of this elusive professor since there is no image of him to be found on the internet and conspicuously none in the programme! The programme notes that he is the founder of **www.phdn.org** (Pratique de l'histoire et dévoiements négationistes).

Mr. Karmasyn's case is that "denying reality is a type of line of thought which pretends to be talking like historians ... but is only multiplying footnotes ... claiming to be experts like Faurisson who claims to be a chemist which he is not at all. Denial is anti-historical speech."

In fact, Prof Faurisson has never claimed to be a chemist. He is an expert in textual analysis.

About this presenter I would say, again we hear a projected argument which has been used longer by the professor he denounces but about whom we are only permitted, effectively, hearsay. Why, if Professor Faurisson is made so central to "denial and democracy in Europe" at this conference is he not invited to this debate which can only then fairly feature him and his case? (There was no opportunity to ask this.)

A rather better argument from Mr. Karmasyn commences with " ... democracy is a project not a stable state". However he then immediately conflates the norm of revisionist method

with "they want to rehabilitate race and nation". Yet, whether a revisionist may or may not have an interest in "race and nation" - and not all do - this apparent attempt to demonise "race and nation" is hardly a valid argument in itself against the normal revisionist method being applied to historical source criticism without exception.

This presenter goes on to complain about "the internet as perfect for spreading the ideology of a free market of thought ... a free trade of thought means today that anyone can tell anything ... And another characteristic of this ideology ... intentionally presupposes no government intervention ... anyone can be critical ... there's no stable situation it's a work in progress .... Wikipedia's success is proof of this no middleman anymore ... Today no filter on the internet means loss of references and acknowledged consensus ... one can no longer make a difference between legitimacy ... and this might lead to legitimacy under a libertarian pretext since deniers are champions of debate ... which explains how the internet could serve racist views. ... I am not going to give you a list of denial websites ... [and then his PowerPoint projects up a chronology including that] in 1995-96 the first racist websites were (Stormfront) and revisionist. ... Audiences are vulnerable ... this situation is critical and a real threat to veto intentioned consensual-ism".

Mr. Karmasyn does not find similar concerns with the anti-democratic public information outlets of media monopoly ownership which syndicates pro-Zionist policy in mainstream newspapers nor about who has a veto on the licensing of the TV satellite broadcasting.

Speakers 4 and 5 and 6 address tragic remembrance issues.

Speaker 7 Dr Laurent Leylekian claims that "denial is aimed at erasing responsibility." He explains that "for example in England they are not always willing to penalise denial of the Shoah."

Quite so, we in England are not willing to call freedom of opinion a crime! And indeed I was instrumental in assembling an expert extradition team - headed by Kevin Lowry-Mullins - to defeat a legal precedent being expedited which would have meant the UK "harmonising" with Germany's Israeli-drafted laws. For European courts imprison citizens under the European Arrest Warrant for their historical source criticism, plus their lawyers for defending them "too well". Thus England was spared the back door entry of the denial law and colluding with the expected easy extradition of academics like Dr. Fredrick Töben who support the right of scientists, for instance the chemist Germar Rudolf, who are jailed for years for simply publishing their forensic findings.

Dr. Leylekian alluded to the Gayssot Law and article 607 of the Spanish penal code. He spoke of the Framework decisions which "also want to include the Stalin genocide ... and that Armenia's is not recognised by the international court. ... I would like to have a real instrument to penalise deniers ... I notice that the MEPs have now left the room ... so when will there be a public hearing on this?"

Speaker 8 Mr Manuel Abramowicz defines two types of denial:
1. "The Nazis of 1944 ... denied genocide by just following orders ... their reason was to save their own lives".
2. "The second type of denier ... those in the services denied because they had to bear their burdens and so denied them." (I was not certain that he meant services like the Red Cross, or the military Services.)

This speaker also denounced Faurisson (unsatisfactorily in that professor's excluded absence) for his radio shows in 1979 and 1981 when "Faurisson claimed genocide was used as a pretence to gain Palestine. This argument is also used by the Iranian president today. ... Denial is used for racist objectives." Mr Abramowicz does not explain the "racist objectives" of the Iranian president who provides a representative for jews in his parliament and is not on record for having said or committed any anti-jewish acts.

"Denial is used for racist objectives" ...But Mr Abramowicz did not mention, much less denounce, the genocidal 1896 manifesto of the Jewish State by its founding father Theodor Herzl which became the Israeli State's euphemistically stated policy to "disappear the entire population of Palestine" and certainly the country of Palestine off the world map as we can bear witness to Israel's chronic culling programme in our present day. This "Denial and Democracy in Europe" conference, though the "settlers" of Israel are from Europe, never mentions that by 1946 there was no political impediment for these European Jewish refugees to enter their ever peaceful First Jewish Homeland in the Autonomous Jewish Region (the size of Switzerland) known by them as Birobidjan ... but 'overlooked' by Zionist leaders and the public information media as the commonsense option for settling European Jewry in their own independent Jewish Republic.

The conference over-ran by half an hour and so the Armenian chairwoman then declared there was no time for questions because the room had to be vacated and the interpreters dismissed. Nevertheless I held up my hand and seeing it was solo she kindly allowed my question.

My exposition and question was precisely this:
"Thank you Madam Chairman,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
This conference is entitled "Denial and Democracy in Europe".
There is surely only one way to combat "denial" in a "democratic" context -- by not instituting debate-denial across Europe -- but instead by providing documentary evidence to disprove the deniers' case. Two weeks ago Benjamin Netanyahu based his address to the United Nations on evidence -- so-called industrial WMD construction blueprints - evidence, which had been rejected as spurious by Jewish experts such as Prof. Van Pelt, who went so far as to say "the deniers are having great fun because it shows how people are gullible". Such documents, held up as proofs by Netanyahu were in fact first discovered in 1976 by the veteran revisionist Professor Robert Faurisson! -- as proof of the normality of gas chambers thus clearly labelled for disinfecting clothing during epidemics. Faurisson first published his discovery in 1979.
Can this expert conference succeed where Netanyahu failed? Can this conference send us away with one - just one - clear item of documentary proof which confounds source-critical "Holocaust" revisionists? Or must we merely silence such sceptical voices with threats, fines and prison sentences and teach our school children debate-denial of normal historical source criticism? Have you seen the "Guidelines for Teaching about the Holocaust"? Here is that Handbook. If I may, I'll quote from it: "Care must be taken not to give a platform for deniers .... or seek to disprove the deniers' position through normal historical debate and rational argument."
As a former lecturer at a university I ask please can the EU do what the UN did not and give us today one document upon which school children and their teachers can rely? For even the denial law which uniquely privileges one version of history does not define this unique industrial mass murder weapon. This weapon - which must not be questioned or investigated. Those who do so or deny its feasibility are condemned and denied democractic rights and sit for years in European prisons."

The first to respond was Dr Laurent Leylekian who in a disdainful tone attempted to challenge only my credibility with: "what subject did you lecture in and where?" My reply: "I lectured in Fine Arts and pioneered Media Studies at the Queensland University of Technology because I took a professional interest in source scepticism versus mirage advertising. I am now an independent documentary film-maker from London."

Prof. Miharan Dabag takes the challenge (for he was awarded by Germany for his work in "collective violence and genocide, the process of a national formation, colonisation, and the theory and policy of memory", as described in the programme notes.)

Prof. Dabag offered that: "Genocide need not be proved; the result itself is proof ... Genocide research, this can only take place once the result itself has been qualified and then we can look at the details; of genocide we don't need evidence."

Frankly I could not make out his rather "Catch 22" argument, for the professor said "the result of genocide itself is proof". His seems to be offering the same bottomline as Norman Finkelstein's: first we accept an unproven premise that despite the absence of bodily remains (since no geological excavation or autopsy reports are sought) or scientific evidence for the mass murder weapon (and its technical properties), we are to presume as the 'German' law calls it the "manifest obviousness". About no other era of history is such a bottomline considered scientific. But I'd had my answer. There was no document even as we are told there are countless documents attesting to an indisputable proof.

Pity was that the elusive Mr Karmasyn left after his own speech. Otherwise this fanatical anti-revisionist may have come up with something more by way of an answer ... or he may have called for my arrest. The UN Resolution of 2005 (this Israeli-drafted directive which was passed without a vote) demonises any normal querying of "The Holocaust in whole or part" as blasphemous.

So luckily for me afterwards (though no luck for science from this afternoon's assembly), only two delegates approached me. The first asked me did I know of the man who first defined genocide? I replied I do know there are now many definitions. Would it be defined as genocide if one forceably expelled what their own subversive leader defined them, as "an invisible army" for "we are the Trojans in the enemy's fortress"?

The second Armenian delegate said his wife was an Australian Republican who fought for Armenian interests more ardently than himself. I replied perhaps it proves that race and nation matter since she has so keenly adopted his, and thus these metaphysical/metapolitical identities do not deserve today's automatic conflation with evil?

Outside the EU building as I hurried to catch my Eurostar train home to Mother England, I chanced to notice a demo being staged directly opposite the Parliament complex. The fools were chanting something that was commensurate with "the invisible army" of anonymous Twitterers who tried to bring down President Ahmadinejad by appealing to the complacent line of craven least resistance. Westernised Iranians do not appreciate they have in this statesman something singular to celebrate. For he states the facts which other governments are too in debt and thus enslaved to dare challenge. Few will face much less resist the invisible thrall to greed and vanity we have come to owe so much to in its seemingly invincible International Monetary System of grotesque compound usury.

Yet it's a case of 'you can take a horse to water but you cannot make it drink' or as Dorothy Parker put it "you can take a whore to culture but you cannot make her think". Likewise, it is one thing for a prophet to free his people - but another to make them long for the dignity to drink it in.

Glad to get out of the rain and away from the chanting, I asked the nearby taxi driver (from Morocco) what he thought of this demo in Belgium against President Ahmadinejad. He said Iran does not want peace. As we travelled along, I replied but there is no foundation to persistent media claims, plus those today from the US Israeli Ambassador, of "Ahmadinejad's genocidal rhetoric and the iniquity of the Goldstone Report "***

Ahmadinejad has never come on record with any anti-Jewish 'hate- filled' "genocidal rhetoric". As my favourite self-called "ex-jew" Gilad Atzmon has declared, Ahmadinejad "is indeed extremely critical of the Jewish state and its *raison d'etre*. He is also highly critical of the crude and manipulative mobilisation of
the holocaust at the expense of the Palestinian people."****

With a sudden thought for poor Vanunu's plight in a taxi, and that this strange driver might be an agent, I did not go on to quote Faurisson's notorious 60 words nor hand him my card which bears the url and oneliner explaining my website campaign for the all-round commonsense option of the First Jewish Homeland in the Jewish Autonomous Region (the size of Switzerland) on Russia's south-east border called Birobidjan at www.birobidjan.co.uk

For in Belgium as in ten European countries (including Israel) it is a crime to quote Professor Faurisson, and I sensed there was little point in engaging in further conversation on the UN meeting last month after the Iranian president denounced Israel's "genocide, barbarism and racism" ***** .... until I was somewhat safely back in Blighty.

****

Footnotes:

1.*
http://www.examiner.ie/breakingnews/world/tory-leader-cameron-urged-to-stopplotting-on-lisbon-428759.html
2.**
http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1035958
3.***
http://www.tnr.com/article/world/deep-denial
4.****
Who is a Jew?
by Gilad Atzmon
5. *****
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/6256173/Mahmoud-Ahmadinejad-revealed-to-have-Jewish-past.html