

Translation of:

<http://www.lrytas.lt/print.asp?k=news&id=13281025111327484305>

<http://www.lrytas.lt/-13281025111327484305-apie-an%C4%8Diuk%C4%85-donald%C4%85-su-svastika-ir-hitleri%C5%A1k%C4%85-katin%C4%85-skaitant%C4%AF-miau-kampf.htm>

---

# On Donald Duck with a Swastika and a Hitler-like Cat Reading "Meow Kampf"

Tomas Kavaliauskas (Kultūros barai No. 1)

Feb 5 2012 10:39 PM

Stankeras's new "diamond" is called "Fear the Man of One Book." This "gem" deco(sec)rated Kulturos barai No. 12. I call this issue the Christmas issue since it appeared on the newspaper and magazine stands just before Christmas Eve.

Feeling the spirit of the holiday, I opened my favorite magazine and my eyes fell out when I saw this historian's text, "Fear the Man of One Book."

The text trivializes the racist ideology of Hitler's "Mein Kampf" and even tries to skirt that entirely, while the author attempts to emphasize the book's connection with German philosophers, including Friedrich Nietzsche, who sang the praises of war as the highest expression of the human soul.

Stankeras, understandably, does not neglect to provide cover for himself: he quotes some old matter from 1972, author Cesar C. Aronsfeld of the Institute for Jewish Affairs' academic periodical, who says that Hitler's book is an introduction to his spiritual world, and thus one must be acquainted with it.

Well yeah, one must be acquainted with everything, and some people help that to happen. Or take this attempt at self-cover: Stankeras decides to call the book by this Nazi monster the creation of an uneducated person [crank]. There is even a subtitle: "Mein Kampf - A Textbook of Incorrect Views and Unlearnedness That Became a Bestseller." So what are these "incorrect" views? Is perhaps racist ideology faulty? And if it is faulty, can it be fixed? The word "incorrect" [in Lithuanian, klaidinga] is so strange and causes such misunderstanding. Is hatred of Jews and the desire to exterminate them for the sake of the purity of the Aryan race just an "incorrect view?"

Let's take a look at what Hitler himself wrote: "The basis of the destructive force of Jewish activity in the bodies of other peoples is to be ascribed to eternal attempts to overthrow the personality of homemakers and the change it into the masses. So the principle of Aryan humanity maintaining order is exchanged for the destructive principle of the Jew. He becomes the agent of decay infecting people and races, and in the wider sense becomes the destroyer of the culture of humanity." [translated from Lithuanian without reference to the original source –trans]

Why shouldn't a respectable historian comment upon such "faulty" and allegedly unlearned views? It seems that things are rather learnedly and philosophically laid out by Hitler; he understands perfectly well what he seeks and what his fascist followers should seek.

French social anthropologist Louis Dumont speaks of the anti-Semitism of Hitler's "Mein Kampf" without magical/Stankerasite double meanings: "There is clearly a transit from religious anti-Semitism to racist anti-Semitism, and Hitler himself says so.

"In that regard in the dialogue written by Eckart and published in 1923, Hitler makes the statement that the burning of Jewish schools and synagogues achieves nothing so long as Jews physically survive in rebuttal to Luther's text. In the book Mein Kampf, Hitler stresses that purely

religious anti-Semitism is insufficient: this is allegedly empty talk.”  
[translated from Lithuanian without regard to original source –trans]

If it is clear to us that "Mein Kampf" is not just an anti-Semitic book but calls for the extermination of Jews in creating a new biological purity for the Aryan race and order, then what was the thought that led the historian to decide to "decorate" the text with caricatures: Donald Duck wearing a swastika armband, and a cat with Hitler's face with the book "Meow Kampf" under his arm? What's funny here? What manner of taste [sensitivity] is this? I don't know where the illustrations came from because there are no sources indicated. [Walt Disney produced cartoons under contract to the US government during WWII including the Nazi Donald Duck; "Meow Kampf" kitty appears fairly regularly on <http://boards.4chan.org/b/> and was presumably created by users there -trans].

Only one thing is clear: they are disgusting. Speaking the language of the streets, one might query: who is being dumbed-down here [or "what is this stupidity?"?]? Is [Stankeras] trying to say with this article that this global but supposedly poorly written racist work is not harmful? Does hatred of Jews with a Nazi philosophical basis mean nothing? Is Donald Duck enjoying this Nazi bible sending the signal that it is also appropriate for children? How should we interpret the appearance of the cartoon hero beloved by children in this fascist context?..

Stankeras writes the Vatican has not added Hitler's "Mein Kampf" to its list of banned books, and that he himself even approached the European Union Information Center on the public distribution and publication of this book. It's not clear why the historian continues by saying that he got a very vague answer; the way he retells it, the answer sounds very specific: "racism and xenophobia, as well as symbols associated with such, including books, oppose the principles upon which the EU was founded and which are shared by all member-states. The publication and distribution of Mein Kampf can be interpreted as incitement to racism and brutality." What exactly is "unclear" here?

Anyway, why does one need to go to "Brussels" with this topic? Do the bureaucrats of Brussels have something to tell us on how to behave regarding fascist, racist propaganda? Does our own conscience fail to answer that question? Is the history of genocide of Jews, Roma and the disabled not sufficient so that we don't have to ask anymore? If Brussels, let's say,

answered unclearly, and the Vatican didn't include Hitler's book on the list of banned books, then perhaps this "bestseller" can be distributed and even morally rehabilitated? Is this how far [down the rabbit hole] the historian wishes to go?

One might query what sort of intention led Stankeras to write the article "Fear the Man of One Book." Does the title invite us to ponder whether we need to fear the racism of the Nazis? Perhaps the title should have been: "Do Not Fear the Man of One Book?" How are we supposed to not be afraid, since Hitler manifested the ideas in the book in the form of concentration camps?! We are not talking about any old theory, but about a racist theory which was put into practice at Auschwitz and the Vilnius ghetto, in the garages [sic] and the Ninth Fort of Kaunas, and so on. Does this really have to be explained to an historian who has worked for the Interior Ministry?

Or is this just another misunderstanding? Did the historian perhaps again express his thought ambiguously and chose the wrong caricatures to illustrate his text? Poor Donald Duck: see, he's not a Nazi, he's just wearing a swastika. And so it is with Hitler's *Mein Kampf*: according to Stankeras, it is unlearned, but that it was the basis for burning people in the concentration camps and turning them into soap, nary a word. Instead, the reader's attention is brought to bear on the fact that "*Mein Kampf*" is a global book translated into different languages, even Arabian (the historian provided an illustration showing how this book appears in Arabian, with a photo of Hitler [on it]).

The author provides [a list of] countries which haven't banned publication of this book and countries which have. Since there isn't international consensus on this issue, one supposes, this somehow confirms the innocence of "*Mein Kampf*" in the historian's eyes.

And this line of thought comes after the scandal raised by an earlier article by the author, "The Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal – The Biggest Legal Farce in History." This article published in *Veidas* magazine cast scorn upon the proceedings themselves of the Nuremberg court and upon the justice it meted out, punishing Nazis for war crimes. Reading the text, one takes away the idea that the Nazis were accused in a failed manner, that it was done bureaucratically, perhaps even needlessly, while to accuse Hitler ... there wasn't sufficient proof, as if the text of "*Mein Kampf*" was insufficient proof! Later Petras Stankeras claimed by way of self-justification on the

website balsas.It that perhaps he had expressed his thought poorly when he wrote about the legend of the 6 million allegedly murdered Jews. It is interesting that the word “perhaps” was used... Why didn’t he say it clearly, without any “perhaps?”

In other parts of the same video interview, Stankeras said he doesn’t deny the Holocaust, he just doubts that 6 million people were killed. This, apparently, is completely normal, since some historians provide one number and others another. It was intriguing that during that same interview, specifically at 20 minutes into the discussion, there was what we call a Freudian slip: “The intention of my research is not just to deny the Holocaust,” Stankeras said. Usually when one makes such a slip, it is quickly corrected. This one wasn’t corrected.

In any event, considering the sincere admission by the historian that he was in shock because of the accusations, it might be better not to pay much heed to psychoanalytical interpretations. Throughout the discussion Stankeras clearly repeated Nazis are war criminals, the Holocaust was carried out, that he himself had written about the mass murder of Jews in Lithuania in his book, and, he emphasized, the number of victims is being manipulated. Rational sentences carry more weight than a Freudian twist of the tongue, that could happen to anyone, especially under pressure.

Readers can watch this video recording on Google and make up their own mind. Just one question: why was this “clarification” [literally “clarity”] (and not without slips of the tongue) only offered after the storm raised by the “legend of 6 million?” If not for the public outcry, we would have just left this little text alone as if it never existed. There is much more said by Stankeras, however, in that scandalous sentence, i.e., that there exists no proof of Hitler’s guilt: “It is also significant that the Nuremberg process lent legal basis to the legend of the allegedly murdered 6 million Jews, although in truth the court had not a single document signed by Hitler on the extermination of Jews (this document, if it ever existed, has still never been found, although a million dollar prize has been offered).” So it follows that Hitler is not responsible for [“guilty of”] the Holocaust, and “Mein Kampf” is, as the historian writes, merely a bestseller by an uneducated fellow, nothing more.

So now I don't even want to ask why it didn't occur to Stankeras that the number of Holocaust victims was higher instead of lower. For example,

Timothy Snyder at the Eurozine Congress in Vilnius on May 9, 2009, said: The Holocaust was much worse and a much more massive phenomenon than we believe. It's worth noting: it was due to the people at Kulturos barai that Snyder even came to Vilnius, the basis of his report was the article "The Holocaust - An Unrecognized Reality" translated into Lithuanian by Almantas Samalavicius, and it was published in the magazine and in the book "Europos istorijos: Rytu ir Vakarų Patirtis [The Histories of Europe: The Experience of East and West]," published by Kulturos barai.

Comparing these two historians we clearly see two different directions taken: Snyder attempts to bring out the maximum scope of genocide committed during World War II, while Stankeras does the opposite, he doubts the figures provided and seeks lesser ones.

As we know, the Vilnius District Court did not perceive Holocaust denial or trivialization of Nazi brutalities in the historian's article "The Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal - The Greatest Legal Farce in History." This story might have ended with that verdict by the Vilnius District Court, except that the acquitted historian decided to speak out again on the topic of Nazism using caricatures of a duck and a cat to express irony on the evil of Nazism.



