

## **Democratic Tyranny: The Example of Switzerland**

**Participation of Jürgen Graf at the organized convention of the Committee of Solidarity for Political Prisoners on the topic *Palace Justice and Totalitarian Democracy* , Milan, 24 June 2000**

**A Russ Granata translation of the original Italian  
["La tirannia democratica: L'esempio della Svizzera"](#) by Jürgen Graf**

According to the generally recognized definition, democracy is a system in which the majority of the people, through election of the government, determines the politics of a state.

But more and more, every electoral referendum clearly demonstrates that the distance between theory and practice is almost overwhelming.

The most spectacular electoral tendency in all democratic systems is characterized by increasing non-participation and returning a blank voting slip. A more and ever larger part of the citizens do not have any confidence in a system in which the parties have become practically indistinguishable and in which electoral propaganda is devoid of values and which does not supply an answer to the urgent necessity of the people.

Defenders who are upset with parliamentary democracy also have more and more difficulty denying the evident weaknesses of this system. Forced to accept the validity of certain arguments of critics, they will oppose them with the famous phrase of Winston Churchill, according to which democracy is the worst political arrangement except all the others, and will insist on the fact that contrary to authoritarian or totalitarian regimes, democracy concurs with everyone to say what they want, to read and to write what they want, and to freely express their dissent.

Regarding some countries, this argument remains valid. For illustrative purposes we recall that the United States does not recognize opinion crimes. In spite of the superpower of the "one-worlders," there are not yet resolutions to abolish the most important *First amendment* that protector of freedom of opinion. Naturally, he who dissents substantially runs certain risks, even in America. One can lose his job, or be defamed in the media without having the possibility to answer attacks of slander from adversaries. But one will not end up in jail because of his convictions. Actually, the same goes for Russia; during my recent visit to Moscow, I have been able to state that all the political and ideological tendencies of whatever color can be supported without any restrictions. If someone had said to me twenty years ago that in the year 2000 Russia would be more free than Switzerland, I would certainly have declared him crazy.

Being Swiss, and having tried on the benefits of the democracy in my country, I shall speak about the more recent developments in Switzerland in order to illustrate the phenomenon of the political repression in Western Europe.

In April of the past year, a referendum took place in Switzerland on the new constitution processed from the federal council. The majority of those who went to vote approved of the plan. The new constitution, which went into effect some months after the plebiscite, is much more democratic than the previous one because it explicitly guarantees certain fundamental rights not mentioned in the old constitution.

Article 15 guarantees religious freedom, specifying that every citizen has the right to freely choose his religion and his

*Weltanschauung*. Article 16 guarantees freedom of opinion and assures the right to receive and to disseminate information. Article 17 promises freedom of the press, and article 20, freedom of inquiry.

Being condemned in 1998 to a penalty of 15 months in prison without conditional sentence for the crime of revisionism, I would have had the benefit of prompt amnesty after the new constitution went into effect. Because article 14 of the new constitution guarantees religious freedom, I am not obliged to join the religion of the holocaust. Because freedom of opinion is guaranteed by article 16, I have now the right not to believe in the gas chambers and the six million number of Jews killed by the Germans during the Second World War. Because the same article guarantees the right to disseminate information, I can now sell my writings in advance and post them on the Internet without being annoyed by the courts and without having to endure house searches. Because that article 20 assures the freedom of inquiry, I can now dedicate myself to historical research and publish my conclusions without fear of disagreeable consequences. If my conclusions are wrong, they will be refuted in free debate between free historians. Viva the new constitution!

But unfortunately, that has not happened. I have not benefited of any amnesty. Swiss justice has not stopped persecuting persons who place in doubt the Jewish version of the Second World War. During the first of April of this year a Stalinist type trial has been carried out in Lausanne, which in its infamy, has eclipsed all the previous trials based on the ill-famed law "against racial discrimination" - a trial about which I shall subsequently return.

Naturally, if I have the right of inquiry, how can this blind

intolerance be reconciled with a constitution that promises to the citizen all the freedoms? In fact, the federal council has raised this problem and supplied the following answer:

Article 7 of the new constitution says as follows: "*human dignity must be respected and be protected.*" In the case of a collision with one of the rights formally guaranteed, human dignity shall have precedence.

Evidently nobody has never defined the nebulous concept of "human dignity." A pretext will always be found in order to assert that a certain opinion, a certain book, a certain speech, constitutes a violation of someone's human dignity. In other words: All the freedoms that the constitution guarantees are totally illusory, and the constitution is not even worth the paper on which it is printed.

I readily admit that political repression and processes are phenomena that appear in whichever political system; every regime, as needed, crushes dissent. But the openly authoritarian regimes have at least the advantage of honesty. Neither the Fascists, nor the National Socialists, nor the Communists ever restricted themselves with the license of individual freedom. Instead, parliamentarian democracy expects to base itself on tolerance, and it constantly waves the flag of freedom - but that doesn't impede it in political trials which are the order of the day in France, Austria and Switzerland - not to mention Germany where in 1996 nearly 6000 persons had been put under charges for so-called "extreme right propaganda crimes" [ *Die Welt* , 4-7-1997 ]. It is also considered "extreme right propaganda crime" to make even the mildest criticism of the "politically correct" version of the Second World War, as well as to oppose the invasion. The number of the books prohibited in the Germany of today exceeds by far

those of the free ones which were prohibited in the Germany of Hitler. To this last affirmation it could be objected that no official directory of prohibited books exists in the Federal Republic of Germany. That is quite true. In the Spain of Franco, such a directory, the Index of Prohibited Books, in fact existed and it allowed the citizens to know if the distribution of a certain book was lawful or not. In the Federal Republic of Germany, the citizen is at the mercy of completely arbitrary decisions of local authorities. A friend of mine, a resident of Leipzig, was condemned to six months in jail for buying ten copies of the revisionist book *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* after the release of that book in the autumn of 1994. At that time, that work was not prohibited; it was prohibited several months later in the Spring of 1995. According to the logic of the judge, my friend would have had to know in the autumn of 1994, that the book was to have been forbidden a half a year later, although he did not even know that book's content at the time he ordered it.

But let's return to Switzerland. I have already pointed out the wretched "law against racial discrimination" which serves as the basis for the persecution of revisionists. In 1994, this law was approved by 54% of the participants in the referendum. But the participants in the referendum were 45% of those having the right to express their vote, by which the law was approved; so in reality that results in merely a little more than 23% of the Swiss - and this occurred after a thumping media campaign to make people believe that such a provision was indispensable in order to protect aliens from racist violence.

Here is the text of article 261 of the Swiss Penal Code:

*"Whosoever publicly, has incited hatred or discrimination in the*

*comparisons of a person or a group of persons by reason of their racial heritage, ethnicity, or religion; whosoever publicly has disseminated an ideology finalized to discredit or to denigrate in a systematic way pertaining to the heritage of a race, ethnicity or religion; whosoever in the least way, has organized or encouraged acts of propaganda or has taken part in such; whosoever has publicly by word, by writing, by images, by gestures, by way of fact or in other ways, discredited or discriminated in a way which carries offense to the human dignity of a person or a group of persons by reason of their race, their ethnic heritage or of their religion, or that for the same reasons negates, or minimizes, or attempts to justify a genocide or other crime against humanity; whosoever has refused to a person or a group of persons, by reason of their racial heritage, ethnicity, or religion, a service intended for public use, (...) shall be punished with jail [ up to three years ] or with pecuniary penalties."*

One notices immediately that the text of this law is formulated in a vague way. Being full of concepts not defined, the disposition allows judges to condemn all for everything, according to the political opportunity of the moment. As an example, the adversaries of immigration and of a multicultural society can be convicted for "appealing to discrimination." It is true that no one has yet been convicted for this reason, but due to the more elastic formulation of the law, this could happen at any moment.

Up to now, the majority of the accused in the political processes - they have numbered in the fifties - have been of persons who have provoked the ire of Swiss Jewry. As an example, they have convicted an animal rights activist who had criticized animal slaughtering according to Jewish methods, a doctor who had expressed too much criticism of strict Zionism, and a writer who

had put to the pillory the anti-Swiss banking blackmail of Jewish organizations. But certainly the most spectacular victims of these processes have been scholars of historical revisionism.

In order to put the leash to the revisionists, the courts resort to paragraph four of the law which forbids negation, minimizing, or justification of a genocide or of another crime against humanity. Obviously, the supporters of the law have only thought of the so-called "holocaust ." Nobody has ever been cited in court to have denied the genocide of the Armenians or of the Cambodians or to have minimized the number of victims of the destruction of Dresden. Beyond the fact just mentioned, this paragraph is incompatible with the constitution which guarantees freedom of opinion. It constitutes a legal monstrosity for three reasons:

1. It is contrary to the principle of the unity of the matter because the negation of a genocide does not have anything to do with racial discrimination. One may very well be a revisionist without being racist or one may be a racist without being a revisionist. The well-known American revisionist Bradley Smith, who went on to a second wedding with a Mexican Indian after being married to a Jewess, would have difficulty in being suspected of racism.

2. It is contrary to the universally recognized principle *null poena sine lege*. Because the concept of "genocide" is nonexistent in Swiss legislation, the courts will have to apply the definition of the UN according to which a genocide is the killing of *a part* of a people. Inasmuch as the National-Socialists have undeniably killed among the Jews, those politics towards the Jews must undoubtedly be characterized as "genocide" according to the aforesaid definition. But no revisionist has ever denied a genocide defined that way. The revisionists deny the existence of gas chambers and

the six million figure. But to be contrary, the judges arbitrarily equate the negation of the gas chambers and the six million with the negation of genocide.

3. The prohibition of "minimizing of a genocide" is foolish because the courts have never established an official figure of the victims of the "holocaust." According to Jewish historian Raul Hilberg, a major extermination specialist, the number of deceased persons at Auschwitz which he piles up comes to 1.3 million, while Jean-Claude Pressac, in the German version of the book *Les crématoires of Auschwitz*, speaks of about 631,000, whereas revisionist historians such as Carl Mattogno affirm approximately 150,000, of which approximately 60% were Jews. So where does "minimizing" begin? And why?

This example is sufficient to demonstrate the absurdity of a law that transforms judges into possessors of historical truth. The foundation or the non-foundation of revisionist theses can only result from free debate and they do not support the verdict of any judge who hardly knows the difference between a gas chamber and a crematory and who confuses Rudolf Höss with Rudolf Hess.

To us it is so obvious that every person of a healthy mind can understand it without difficulty. But strangely, the politicians do not understand it. The journalists do not understand it - or pretend to not understand it.

A trial which was made more ignoble by the introduction of a muzzle order, took place two months ago in Lausanne. The seventy-nine-year-old Gaston-Armand Amaudruz, publisher of *Courrier du Continent*, a newspaper with a circulation of 400 copies, was condemned to one year in jail without conditional

sentence; moreover he must pay nearly 60,000 Swiss francs to three Jewish organizations - one of which is French! - and to a Jewish individual. They had presented themselves as complaining citizens. Representatives of Jewish organizations allowed themselves to rudely insult the accused. I cite Philippe Nordmann, representative of the League against Racism and Anti-Semitism: "*the accused makes me think of an exhibitionist who comes to court without trousers (...) Amaudruz is not a shark that swims in clear water, but rather a fish that lives in foul water and feeds on filth.*" Here is the language of which they speak until nausea about "human dignity" and of "tolerance"!

In his immortal drama *Macbeth*, Shakespeare has his witches say: "*Fair is foul and foul is fair*" - "*Beautiful is ugly, and ugly is beautiful.*" Devoted to this satanic maxim, the holders of the power in the world-wide society have perverted the sense of words. Opponents are imprisoned in the name of "freedom." Books which contain unwanted truths are burnt in the name of "tolerance." The cruel food embargo against Iraq which in ten years has caused the deaths of hundreds of thousands of children, continues in the name of the "rights of man." The criminal aggression of NATO against the Serbs and the rape of Serbian territory has been occurring in the name of "peace." The abominable infanticide of the womb is perpetrated in the name of the "right of the woman to self-determination." Therefore it concerns us and we have made our choice.

We reject this society based on lies, on the systematic counterfeiting of history, and on the perversions of values. And it is useless to complain of the injustice of this enforced system because our complaints will not push the holders of the power to change course. It is necessary to work for the overthrow of a system that

sentences the European culture and the white people to a slow and atrocious death. Historical revisionism is only one aspect of this struggle. The struggle will be long and hard, and the victims in our camp will be many.

As George Orwell wrote, *in a political system in which the lie is the norm in life, to say the truth is a revolutionary act.*

<http://www.russgranata.com/>  
[e-mail: info@russgranata.com](mailto:info@russgranata.com)  
POB 2145 PVP CA 90274 USA