

Choosing Lawyers

June 25, 2011

These “Comments” do not usually tell of things personal, but on the eve of their writer’s Appeal being heard in Germany (July 4), an UNTRUTH is circulating which needs to be set straight, amongst other things to allay unwarranted anxieties. The untruth is that I wish my defence against the German State’s accusation of “racial incitement” to be based on the truth or falsehood of what actually happened in the most controversial episode of recent German history.

In fact from the moment I knew that I might be accused in Germany of “racial incitement” for remarks made in English to Swedish journalists in November of 2008, I also knew that if I repeated the remarks in front of a German law-court, I risked being immediately thrown into jail. Such is the present state of German law. However, I would rather not be decorated with chains, if I can help it.

So from the beginning I heeded the advice to defend myself on the basis that my remarks were self-evidently in no way intended for a German audience, and thus the German law did not apply to my situation. This much is clear from the last minute of the famous video-clip available on *YouTube*, which is the last several minutes of the one-hour interview with the Swedes. Moreover, immediately after those remarks, but off camera, I went up to the Swedes and earnestly asked them to be “discrete” in the use they would make of the last part of the interview. This much they would have to admit if they were to testify, but they cannot be forced to come to Germany, so they decline to do so.

As for my changing lawyers four times, the Society’s Superior General originally entrusted my defence to the Society’s lawyer, Maximilian Krah, who chose to engage Matthias Lossmann, a member of the, alas, anti-Catholic Green Party. He

was conscientious but perhaps not too enthusiastic about the case. Through friends, I discovered a lawyer enthusiastic and highly successful in defending such delicate cases, Wolfram Nahrath, but Lossmann was unwilling to work with him. Seeking only the best legal counsel available to me in my quandary, I switched from Lossmann to Nahrath.

However, when the Superior General was informed by aides of Nahrath's political position, he ordered me to find someone else again, believing in good faith no doubt that any public association between the SSPX and "an extreme rightist" would be detrimental. He approved of the elderly and honourable Dr. Norbert Wingerter, a conservative Novus Ordo Catholic, but it appears that it could be Wingerter who is unwittingly the source of the untruth now in circulation. I do not know why, but he seems to be under the mistaken impression that I wanted to go, in front of the court, into the truth or untruth of that episode in German history. Fortunately the Superior General had already approved of yet another lawyer, who now understands correctly how I wish to be defended.

Dear readers, if you think that the interests of God are in any way at stake (not everybody thinks so), do say a prayer between now and July 4 for my latest lawyer who has been for several months working hard on the case, but who is liable to come under fierce pressure from anti-Catholic interests and their powerful servants.

Kyrie eleison.