

## Holocaust Deniers, as Enemies of Public Fact, are Enemies of Truth

*Is it better to challenge or ignore Holocaust deniers such as Catholic Bishop Richard Williamson and Iranian President Mahmoud Amadenijad? Why?*

1.....An old U.S. Army veteran who was in the unit that freed Dachau in '45 saw the Twin Towers fall in '01. He was there, experiencing both horrors as PUBLIC FACT. Each historical reality - the Holocaust and the Twin Towers collapse - was witnessed by millions; photographically, both have been witnessed by billions. A denier of any such public fact is either demented or politically determined. Politically determined deniers of a public fact have been brain-washed and/or are making political capital of the denial.

2.....The political capital Iran's President is making by his Holocaust denial is the deepening of his people's antisemitism and hatred of Israel. In his mind, the State of Israel must be destroyed, and rhetorical destruction precedes destruction on the ground. His psy-war propaganda proclaims that Jews are liars, enemies of the truth; and supporters of Jews and Israel, especially America, are enemies of truth and of Iran. The West must provide Iran with some nonviolent on-the-ground realities powerful enough to challenge Amadenijad's lie and violent intention against Israel. Failing that, war with Israel seems unavoidable.

3.....What should have been done about Bishop Richard Williamson's lie, for which (among other charges) he was excommunicated, cut off from participating in Roman Catholic sacraments and from all clergy-leadership? Nothing. The excommunication was commendable, an act protecting the faithful from false teaching and defending truth from confusion with error. In traditional Catholic wording, that papal excommunication was a "medicinal penalty," in hope of curing the diseased individual as well as preventing his "spreading division and confusion among the Faithful." The obvious and only cure for the disease is penitent return to the truth and to life under Roman Catholic clerical obedience.

4.....If Bp. Williamson yielded himself to the "medicinal penalty" and Pope Benedict accordingly lifted the excommunication, I would be unsympathetic toward the howling against the pope's decision. But if the lifting was without repentance, as I fear it was, I must join the howlers. For that decision was a multiple *violation* - of truth (and therefore of God), of honor (the human and Christian obligation to act with motives promoting human dignity), of duty (to protect the faithful against false teaching), and of justice (toward Jews, and thus toward all humanity).

5.....Benedict is a good man, a competent scholar, and a faithful celebrant in all the holy orders of the Roman Catholic Church. But, like everybody else, popes sometimes make disastrous decisions with consequences the size of their power, in their case monarchic.

How refreshing it would be were Benedict to repent of this disastrous decision! But that is highly unlikely, for at least three reasons:

5.1.....Benedict sympathizes with the anti-Vatican-II orientation of the four bishops whose excommunication he lifted (one being Bp. Williamson). For one thing, like them he favors returning the Mass from the vernaculars to Latin.

5.2.....Despite his pronounced conservatism, Benedict sees himself as an opponent of schism and a reconciler. The four bishops were in schism.

5.3.....Benedict leans toward the tightening mind of the (counter-Reformation) Council of Trent (closed, 1563). One of that council's decisions was that baptism, confirmation, and holy orders are to be seen as *permanent*, making an indelible mark (in Latin, "character indelibilis"). The notion has stabilizing mystical force even though in specific instances it may prove ludicrous. (For example: Hitler was violently anti-Christian, though his Catholic baptism as an infant officially made him a Christian forever.) / The ordained are permanently "marked" as priests apart from the laity. A very human temptation of popes and bishops is to exercise a preferential option for clergy, a tendency to go easier on their sins. To ecumenical Christian and international scandal, Roman Catholic bishops moved child-molesting priests to other parishes instead of exercising proper discipline; and some such

bishops, instead of being disciplined, were advanced in church-standing. / In my opinion, no status is indelible - but some stains are.

6.....All human organizations - church, state, whatever - must have a double-hung door in the walls of their self-defined community. Jesus scandalized the authorities in his welcome to all, but he balanced this with choosing specific learning-followers ("disciples") and with denunciation of hypocrites and violators of the law of love for God and neighbor. Ironically, Jesus' churches sometimes are excessively generous toward in-house sinners. In Christianity, the burden of proof is on those who are "judgmental." But the New Testament warns against going too easy: "The time has come for judgment to begin, and God's own people are the first to be judged" (First Peter 4:17).

BY WILLIS E. ELLIOTT | FEBRUARY 4, 2009; 12:16 AM ETSAVE & SHARE:



PREVIOUS: [HOLOCAUST DENIERS LIVING IN DENIAL](#) | NEXT: [NOT ALL HOLOCAUST DENIAL IS EQUAL](#)

### Comments

Please report offensive comments below.

Dr. Elliot stated:

>>.....Benedict is a good man  
most likely true

>>a competent scholar  
most would tend to agree

>>and a faithful celebrant in all the holy orders of the Roman Catholic Church. But, like everybody else, popes sometimes make disastrous decisions with consequences the size of their power, in their case monarchic.

This is where the world as a whole misses the whole point. Popes are self-proclaimed representatives (vicars) of Christ on earth. Not so. Their predecessors ravaged the true church of God, beginning not long after our Lord and Savior walked this earth. Their system is a counterfeit system that will continue to make more of a place in the news as the return of Jesus Christ approaches. Rev 12:9, Mr Elliot, explains it all in a nutshell. This great deception that crept into the church has scattered the true church of God, just as scripture tells.

>>How refreshing it would be were Benedict to repent of this disastrous decision!

Benedict, et. al. will definitely need to repent ..just as the rest of need to and will need to as the imminent return of Jesus Christ is at hand

POSTED BY: TOTE | FEBRUARY 9, 2009 12:04 PM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

test

POSTED BY: DAVID\_ALLEN\_WATERS | FEBRUARY 6, 2009 4:23 PM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

TO LANGOHIO

Thanks for the correction on a matter peripheral (as your "I generally agree" grants) to my main point.

Willis, I generally agree, but I don't think it's true that Williamson was excommunicated because he was a Holocaust-denier, unless you have that from another source.

The Vatican may not have known about his views until his interview on Swedish television--a few days before the rehabilitation announcement--was publicized. To me, this looks like a communication screw-up. This doesn't get the Vatican off the hook, but it may be true that the pope wasn't aware of the Swedish television interview when he lifted the excommunication ban on Williamson and the other dissident bishops.

As far as I know, the sole issue when Williamson was excommunicated was his "illicit" ordination as a bishop by the Society of St. Pius X. The "re-incommunication" last week lifted this penalty but, it should be noted, does not mean he is now recognized as a bishop or even a priest by the Vatican.

I'm not aware that anyone in the RC church could be excommunicated because of his or her views on the Holocaust. The church still hasn't been willing to deny communion to Catholic members of Congress who've voted to support abortion laws, despite much pressure from conservatives. Generally, the church does not deny communion to members because of their political views--even views as toxic as Holocaust-denial.

Ordination is a different matter: you don't want to give sacramental authority to someone who holds that the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" are historical documents (as Williamson does) or that "it's a matter of historical record" that "the designing and launching of Communism" was a Jewish plot (as he also does), or that collectively the Jewish people are guilty of the crucifixion of Jesus (ditto). In other words, he's a bigot whose opinions on the Holocaust are consistent with his anti-semitism down the line.

Under the circumstances, he's not qualified to serve as either a bishop or even a priest. So, in my opinion, the real test is not whether he's barred from the communion rail but whether the church would ever permit him to function legally in holy orders--and I think, or at least hope, that this is now highly unlikely.

The comments to this entry are closed.