The Sailors And The Holocaust

The affair of the 15 British sailors and Marines illegally captured and mistreated by Iran and then released has been a humiliation for Britain and the West, and a triumph for the Iranian regime and every other enemy of the West.

Clearly the British government is not claiming the moral high ground to which it is entitled. It is not demanding the trial and punishment of the perpetrators of the blatant war crime, nor reparations for the victims and for Britain itself. It is not behaving in any way like the wronged party. This stance implicitly, but unmistakably, legitimises Iran's actions and creates a new, more dangerous status quo.

We don't know what additional price was secretly paid, if any. But it seems plausible that, in some way or other, Britain conveyed to the Iranian regime that it will never use force against Iran under any circumstances. If so, this reverses Prime Minister Blair's official policy of not ruling out force. It is **rumoured** that only last year this policy was important enough to Mr Blair to cause him to sack the then Foreign Minister, Jack Straw.

What does all this have to do with the Holocaust? Only this: A reversal of that policy would translate into a British endorsement of the Iranian nuclear weapons programme. Hence it would be tantamount to condoning, and enabling, the Iranian regime's planned destruction of Israel and Second Holocaust.

Wed, 04/11/2007 - 16:41 | **digg** | **del.icio.us** | **permalink**

The Holocaust

Iran's regime likes to deny the Holocaust for political reasons. Their ploy with the British sailors played true to form: tell the world about the generous and beneficent Iranian government, how well it treats those it captures although their country has been so unfairly vilified by "The West". The lesson is that Iran's government cares nothing for the reality of the situation, only for the propaganda opportunities of parading trite images before the world media.

Hitler's Germany understood this practice well. Neville Chamberlain and his ilk were easily deceived because they wanted the

propaganda to be true. There is a lesson of history to be learned.

Propagandists require willing participants, willing shills and foils for their trite images to succeed.

The war journalist Martha Gellhorn wrote of her experiences upon entering Dachau shortly after Germany's surrender. Her experiences of the aftermath of Hitler's Germany as exemplified by the piles of dead and the ghosts of the living were real beyond anyone's imagination. Her cynical optimism for the future of the human species was forever quenched. She wrote a novel shortly thereafter, Point of No Return. The chief protagonist, a U.S. Army enlisted man, at the end of the story, the war over, intentionally drives his jeep into a small group of innocent German citizens, killing three. There is no moral of the story other than no German in peace is worth living after what they each had allowed their country in war to become.

It is only a novel. But her frame of mind was clear.

She never forgave the Germans, despite several visits well after the war had ended. She never saw hope for their recovery from the twin sins of obedience to authority or the cruel authority of rule. She forever after believed that the Germans by nationality, all of them, were beyond redemption. They were forever damned.

Is today's Iran the same as Nazi Germany, history again preparing to repeat itself? Is every Iranian as guilty by name and deed as their worst propagandist? Is every Iranian an obedient son or daughter or a cruel practitioner of the lie and the equivalent of a hobnailed boot? Is there any hope for the citizens of a country that would allow their leader to deny the Holocaust? At what point, if ever, is the Point of No Return?

And for England, too: where is the Point of No Return?

by a reader on Fri, 04/13/2007 - 03:04 | **reply**

twisted, dangerous, ugly thinking

"...by nationality, all of them, were beyond redemption. They were forever damned."

by a reader on Sat, 04/14/2007 - 16:58 | **reply**

liberationist interventionism

good stuff. so what criteria do you use when deciding which places to invade, and how many innocent people are allowed to be killed before it stops? should "we" go into North Korea? Venezuela? Russia? England? America?

one problem with waging war is that it invariably increases the power of the state. does war ever serve any other function (aside from untold misery)?

what should policy towards Iran consist of? maybe leaving them

well alone, for a start. the insane evil foreigner label is usually mistaken, but still, the possibility exists that a particular state will kill millions of people. forgive me if the previous century doesnt contain enough examples of this. all we can do is give any enemy as little reason to be evil as possible. i dont see that pretending to own the world is the best strategy for peace.

thanks.

how many

giving Iran "as little reason to be evil as possible" won't help us. they already have no reason to be evil; no one has such a reason. being evil is wrong.

some people want bad things. it is unacceptable to let them be and hope they choose not to hurt us, when we could defend ourselves. even if a war increases state power it is better than the giant risk of a tyrant using the weapons he goes to great lengths to build.

-- Elliot Temple
curi@curi.us
Dialogs

but Elliot...

"even if a war increases state power it is better than the giant risk of a tyrant using the weapons he goes to great lengths to build." are you sure? what if others disagree? im not sure that a libertarian position is to force the state on people and then increase it size. im sure this has happened before...

how sure are you of this giant risk? who is being targeted anyway? assuming the threat is "real," is it entirely unrelated to the fact that America and co commit crimes of such great magnitude? and so, as a method of preventing an attack on America, should American violence in the Middle East stop, or increase?

everyone legitimises aggression as defence. why is it any different when the "defenders" are American? to ignore the consequences of America and co believing themselves to be the legitimate world police seems to me to be grossly mistaken. libertarians do not usually accept the lies told by their government.

so, why not nuke the whole of Iraq to make sure that nothing bad ever happens again? and Iran. and North Korea. and so on. this is the logical consequence of your position, is it not? "libertarians for war"?

perhaps you can give a few examples of previous interventions (mass state killings and the increase of state power) that have been

both morally justified and successful. (e.g. WW2 being *all* Hitler's

fault, etc)

difference

what's the difference if it's American or Iran doing the attacking and calling it defense?

only one of these countries has elected officials that declare, in public, their genocidal intentions and desires.

who is targetted?

top targets are israel and USA. see for example the pictures here:

http://atlasshrugs2000.typepad.com/atlas_shrugs/2005/10/the_world_witho.html

-- Elliot Temple
curi@curi.us
Dialogs

Answers

These words by Elliot are worth repeating:

> giving Iran "as little reason to be evil as possible" won't help us. they already have no reason to be evil; no one has such a reason. being evil is wrong.

In response to some of *a reader*'s questions:

Question 1)

> assuming the threat is "real," is it entirely unrelated to the fact that America and co commit crimes of such great magnitude? and so, as a method of preventing an attack on America, should American violence in the Middle East stop, or increase?

What "crimes" and of what "magnitude" are you referring to? The daily tens of people killed in Iraq are not killed by Americans, nor are they Americans. They are ordinary Iraqis killed by criminal terrorists and co. Even the invasion of Iraq had a very temporary "increase" of American violence, and that only against Saddam's regime. The "American violence" today is directed against those who are disrupting the creation and the progress of a free and stable Iraq within some margin of error. The people of Iraq were and are not the target.

Question 2)

> everyone legitimises aggression as defence. why is it any different when the "defenders" are American? to ignore
>
> the consequences of America and co believing

themselves to be the legitimate world police seems to me to be grossly mistaken. libertarians do not usually accept the lies told by their government.

This has nothing to do with "Americans." It has to do with defending people's lives and freedoms. The police in a small city might also raid the criminals' command center. That the world does not (and with current conditions cannot) have a functioning and legally binding police force does not relieve the burden from the shoulders of the free nations of the world to act as one when and where they can and are morally bound to. Especially when and where the responsible "international" bodies fail to do so. Look at Darfur now. How long should we wait? Till the problem erases itself out?

Question 3)

so, why not nuke the whole of Iraq to make sure that nothing bad ever happens again? and Iran. and North Korea. and so on. this is the logical consequence of your position, is it not?

No it is not. The logic here is to protect people's lives and freedoms from those criminals who deny them these inalienable rights. Evidence: the basis and the practice of the political system, following discussions, stated goals and objectives, and the enacted policies of the major player in all this, i.e. the US. The logical consequence cannot be killing those same people -- that is the illogical consequence. You assume that the logic at work is instead an evil one that seeks to enslave other peoples for their resources etc. You are mistaken. I challenge you to present a coherent theory in support of this that would stand up to rational criticism.

-- Cyrus Ferdowsi, **http://libiran.blogspot.com**

by **Liberal Iranian** on Mon, 04/30/2007 - 09:23 | **reply**