

AHRIMAN PUBLISHING HOUSE

www.ahriman.com

29 September 2025

Court hearing on “anti-Semitism” defamation against Freiburg-based Ahriman Publishing House

The Freiburg District Court apparently intends to endorse this false and highly damaging defamation of the German publishing house, known for its Jewish authors, by an internet platform close to Soros.

On Tuesday, September 23, 2025, the Freiburg District Court heard oral arguments in the injunction suit brought by Ahriman Publishers against the Cologne-based website “perspektive” close to Soros. Of all publishers, it is precisely this publishing house known for decades for its many Jewish authors — including famous Jewish resistance fighters such as Bernard Goldstein and Leopold Trepper — and for its books on the Holocaust and other crimes committed against the Jews, which must defend itself in court against the extremely defamatory lie spread by “perspektive” that Ahriman “regularly publishes anti-Semitic books.”

A bang at the start

Well before the hearing began at 1:30 p.m., a number of interested spectators had gathered in front of the designated courtroom when suddenly, just a few minutes before the start, a court official appeared and informed the bewildered audience that the hearing had been moved to another building. All visitors had to hurry across the street to the new courtroom, where, to their surprise, they found the front row of the audience gallery already occupied by a handful of young “perspektive” supporters, who looked with amusement and even malice at the hastily arriving visitors. Coincidence or collusion?

The course of the trial ...

... quickly gave the impression that the verdict had in fact long since been decided. At the end of the hearing, the chamber announced that the verdict would be handed down on October 10, 2025, but it was the general impression that the verdict was already “in the drawer”. In other words, it seemed clear to almost anybody in the room that the three professional judges had already agreed before the trial to dismiss the lawsuit and to approve the lie that Ahriman “regularly publishes anti-Semitic books” as an alleged “protected expression of opinion”. (According to insiders, it is common practice in German courts, even in non-political cases, to write the verdict in advance of the trial, which in many cases means that the trial is a kind of “judicial theater” that has no influence on the outcome of the case.)

A rigged game?

This oppressive impression arose from the fact that the court carefully avoided to address the only relevant question – are there anti-Semitic statements in Ahriman books or not? – and instead spent the entire hearing engaging in a completely incomprehensible quibbling over abstract legal categories such as “statement of fact,” “expression of opinion,” and “defamatory criticism.” In this way, the whole hour of the hearing passed: The presiding judge, who tried to appear jovial and neutral, conducted the entire hearing alone in the style of this legal sophistry. Her two associate

judges sat silently and impassively beside her. The “perspektive” lawyer visibly enjoyed taking up this abstract legal skirmish with a smug, permanent grin. The Ahriman lawyer was prevented by this ping-pong between the presiding judge and the defendant's lawyer from getting to the heart of the matter. The faces of the audience, who waited in vain for a discussion of the facts instead of sophistry and understood nothing of the confused back-and-forth of legal formulas, grew longer and longer. And the young “perspektive” supporters in the front row (who would have fit in well at any “Antifa” march) watched with glowing faces as the chairwoman persistently sidestepped the heart of the matter—the untruthfulness and threatening nature of the “anti-Semitism” label attached to Ahriman Publishing.

Ahriman clarifies the facts

It was only towards the end of the hearing that this theatrical atmosphere of a strange “non-trial” was broken for a moment when a representative of Ahriman Verlag finally took the floor and, in precise sentences, identified for the first time the core of the entire proceedings:

According to the correct definition of the Higher Regional Court of Karlsruhe, she explained, an anti-Semite is “someone who has something against Jews simply because they are Jews.” But of course, this does not mean that one is not allowed to judge a person's actions negatively because he is Jewish. Rather, it goes without saying that a Jew can be criticized for his actions just like any other person, as the authors of Ahriman have done with Soros, Rockefeller, and Gates in view of their actions as leaders of US megacapital, whom the authors therefore also referred to as the “Soros/Rockefeller/Gates gang”. In addition, Rockefeller and Gates are not even of the Jewish faith. If *that* were to be considered “anti-Semitism,” then criticism of French President Macron would be tantamount to criticism of the French people, and criticism of the German Chancellor Merz would be tantamount to criticism of the German people. Instead of this kind of strange “logic,” the Ahriman representative added, addressing the “perspektive” lawyer, he should have read a bit in the Ahriman publications, in which there is **not a single** anti-Semitic statement, but countless statements to the contrary.

After this unexpected statement, the permanent grin on the face of the Cologne defense attorney faded, and the presiding judge suddenly fell as silent as her two associates. But she quickly recovered and resorted to admonitions such as “Even false opinions may be expressed” (but since when are lies “opinions”?) or “Both parties mistakenly consider this trial to be a landmark case, but it is only about an individual case” — an illogical platitude, since even a death sentence is “only” handed down in an individual case, but can still be a landmark ruling, and in any case, it has as deadly an effect on the life of an individual as the untruthful label of “anti-Semitism” has on the reputation and business activities of a German publishing house today.

Free rein for the slanderers?

Had the court not already decided to dismiss the case before the hearing, it would have confronted the “perspektive” lawyer with at least a few inquiring questions about his ludicrous constructs of “anti-Semitic secret signs” (“codes” whose abstruseness is reminiscent of the witch hunts) copied from the Soros-financed Amadeu Antonio Foundation. Or it had asked him to comment on at least some of the numerous concrete contradictions between his assertions and the arguments put forward by Ahriman. But all this did not happen even once. The presiding judge spared the “perspektive” lawyer any probing into his delusional “anti-Semitism” constructs or his malicious propaganda (such as alleged “connections between Ahriman and right-wing publishers” when the case is about *book content*). But this can hardly mean anything other than that the court wants to base its judgment on these constructs and therefore did not want to see them undermined by factual discussion during the hearing.

It should be added that the court did not schedule this hearing until *fourteen months* after the lawsuit was filed, a delay that is completely unusual in press cases. In keeping with this, at the end of the hearing, the presiding judge announced the date of the verdict: “October 10, 2026” – only to quickly correct her telling slip of the tongue. We will continue to report on the trial.