AHRIMAN Publishing House
www.ahriman.com/en

September 8, 2026

AHRIMAN *versus* “perspektive”: **Appeal hearing before the Higher Regional Court of Karlsruhe – an interim report**

On September 8, 2026, the appeal hearing finally took place before the Higher Regional Court of Karlsruhe, after the Freiburg District Court had dismissed AHRIMAN Publishing House’s lawsuit against “perspektive” a year earlier, thereby granting those despicable slanderers a carte blanche to spread their outrageous lie that AHRIMAN, the publishing house with the highest proportion of Jewish authors, “regularly publishes anti-Semitic books.”

The hearing was scheduled for 2:00 p.m., and already an hour beforehand, a large crowd had gathered in front of the courthouse; as could be inferred from their conversations, those attending the trial had travelled from all over Germany to show their support for AHRIMAN Publishing House. A handful of recognizable “perspektive” supporters, looking remarkably shabby, were also hanging around, but showed no interest in entering the courtroom – obviously, that was all they could mobilize, and what a bunch of characters! There was no sign of their “information booth” – which had been announced beforehand on the “perspektive” website (and was certainly not authorized – we had informed the court of this the day before and expressed our interest in ensuring the proceedings went smoothly. Police patrols were therefore present as needed, and heightened security checks had already been announced in advance. Every visitor was thoroughly searched at the entrance, and their bags were thoroughly checked, which took a long time due to the large number of visitors, so that the start of the trial was delayed by about half an hour; despite additional seating – there were about 50 trial observers in the courtroom in total – quite a few interested people had to stay outside.

The presiding judge then presented the facts of the case clearly and accurately – a marked contrast to the previous proceedings at the District Court, which, in its disgraceful ruling, had ultimately claimed that the “perspektive” lies were simply a matter of “freedom of expression” and did not even require any “factual basis” – an outrage that also completely contradicts established legal practice. In contrast, the Higher Regional Court judge now aptly explained that, first, the publisher’s corporate right of personality is severely violated by the accusation of “antisemitism,” particularly against the backdrop of German history; for example, authors – especially Jewish ones – would then no longer publish with the publisher, and second, that such an assertion must, of course, be based on factual grounds. And the court was unable to find such facts. For the one-time use of the word “Judas” – notably as an unambiguous metaphor for “traitor” – in a footnote of a book several hundred pages long, and the mention of the name Soros in another, do not imply “antisemitism” and certainly do not justify the claim that the publishing house, which features a very high proportion of Jewish authors in particular and, by its own definition, is committed to the Enlightenment, publishes “regularly anti-Semitic books” – according to the judge, the defendant had either “conducted poor research” or simply made an unfounded claim.

For his part, our attorney once again pointed out the complete untenability of the defamatory statements, and our publishing house representative emphasized that the criticism of George Soros in the AHRIMAN writings naturally has nothing to do with his coincidentally Jewish religion, summing it up with the pithy phrase: “Anti-imperialism is not antisemitism!” The opposing attorney and his client Opitz, who had appeared this time, were visibly surprised that they were not facing a court that was biased in their favour. Their initial, constant smirk gradually froze into a stiff expression. What they then went on to say – dragging out the proceedings and speaking at great length – came across as rather helpless and often confused. According to their argument, the “Ketzerbriefe” (Heretics’ Letters, a magazine) were supposed to be books, and Soros was, after all, mentioned there quite often (which is true, but even there exclusively in an anti-imperialist context – a fact any reader would immediately confirm). In this context, opposing attorney Forst had the cheek – obviously relying on intimidation – to draw the court’s attention to the current spy agency brochure on “anti-Semitic codes” (we have already commented extensively on this piece of trash – press release from June 2026).

At some point, the presiding judge and the associate judges appeared (with restraint) annoyed by these insubstantial arguments, which were intended to ramble on about a “right” to incitement and defamation. And before a recess, our representative then took the floor once more, briefly and to the point: “In the past two years of this proceeding, the defendant has failed to find a single antisemitic statement among the more than 20,000 printed pages of the publisher’s programme (not counting the 258 issues of the magazine “Ketzerbriefe” [Heretics’ Letters]), for the simple reason that there aren’t any!” And what constitutes antisemitism cannot by any means – as claimed by the defendant – be said to be hard to define or somehow very difficult to distinguish, or even simply “difficult”; rather, it is clearly defined as an irrational prejudice against Jews by birth. For example, the Higher Regional Court of Karlsruhe (June 23, 2021, Case No. 6 U 190/20) states that an anti-Semite is someone who “has something against Jews simply because they are Jews,” or, in other words, “harbours a negative attitude toward Jews solely on the basis of their Jewish faith.” “The claim made by “perspektive” is therefore nothing more than defamation.”

In response to a settlement proposal from the court – which it is always required to make – defense attorney Forst, after a pause, managed to cobble together a completely convoluted and confusing cease-and-desist clause, to which our attorney concluded by stating, in a dismissive tone, that it was entirely incomprehensible (no one in the courtroom had understood it) and therefore, of course, did nothing to address the danger of a repeat offence. The court should therefore render its verdict. The verdict is now scheduled to be announced on September 21, 2026. We will see whether the verdict reflects the course of the proceedings and whether the defamer is convicted in accordance with our complaint.