

The Victim Narrative From The Holocaust To The Cosby Scandal

One of the most controversial issues of the past forty years has been the subject of so-called Holocaust denial. The publication in 1974 of the pamphlet *Did Six Million Really Die?* and then two years later of the meticulously researched and irrefutable *The Hoax Of The Twentieth Century* caused a furore in especially Europe. Both were banned even under the Apartheid régime in South Africa.

At times, the mere mention of Holocaust denial, so-called, generates hysteria in the media. Why should this be so? While Holocaust Revisionists are denounced as Nazis, anti-Semites, even lunatics, their supporters fight back with claims that the hate campaign is directed by media Jews or powerful Zionist forces behind the scenes. The usual response to this is that these people are promoting an anti-Semitic conspiracy theory, yet a dispassionate examination of the facts lends support to the Revisionists and their supporters. To take just one example, in December 2008, Joel Stein wrote (1) in the *Los Angeles Times*:

Only 22% of Americans now believe “the movie and television industries are pretty much run by Jews,” down from nearly 50% in 1964. The Anti-Defamation League, which released the poll results last month, sees in these numbers a victory against stereotyping. Actually, it just shows how dumb America has gotten. Jews totally run Hollywood.

Then, putting his money where his mouth is, he goes on to list all the powerful Jews who run the American film industry. While the arrogance is all too common, the candour is not. Jews exercise enormous power and influence in the US media and government, great power in the UK, and indeed many other predominantly white nations, including South Africa. At times the influence is more perfidious than the power, anyone who so much as mentions the hidden hand of Organised Jewry risks social ostracism and even financial ruin. Is this indeed a worldwide conspiracy, or are other forces at work? Tempting though it is to believe the former, I believe there is another explanation, one that at its heart has little or nothing to do with Jews, Zionism, anti-Semitism, or even Jewish power. Please bear with me while I expound this hitherto unexplored thesis.

It is well to remember that power comes in many forms, including the illusory. In his 1987 book *Jews in the German Economy: The German-Jewish Economic Elite 1820-1935*, W.E. Mosse, writes:

in 1908 in Prussia, there were 747 millionaires (with more than 5 million Marks), 162 of them were of Jewish extraction - page 6.

“[A Nazi] document of June 1933 - to be treated with due reserve but seemingly in the main reliable in many of its facts - claims that of 147 members of the stock, produce, and metal exchanges, 116, almost 80 per cent, were of Jewish origin.” There were 25 Jews and 11 Gentiles on the management committee of the stock exchange, 12 Jews and 4 Gentiles on the produce and 10 Jews, 2 Gentiles in the metal exchange. - page 337.

This is economic power, but is it political power? (2) Let us take a more general view. One of the *de rigueur* complaints of social justice warriors is that big business exploits us all, basically that businessmen - almost invariably men - are predators who prey on us ruthlessly. The mere existence of big companies is considered a social evil, even supermarkets are attacked as predatory. The reality is that big companies and especially supermarkets are one of the great

benefactors of the modern age. Were it not for the economies of scale that come with size, the cost of food would be much higher, and consumer goods a lot rarer.

While some companies do bad things - weapons manufacturers, it might be argued - their size does not make them evil, likewise, their power is often illusory. Where retail is concerned, it is the consumer who is powerful, because if shoppers vote with their feet, the company will go out of business, and indeed many huge companies have. To take just one example, HMV was founded in 1921. At the time of writing it owns 125 stores, but in 2007 it owned more than 400 worldwide, and in January 2013 it went into administration. Jewish economic power is no different, it is subservient to the market, and even political power is not all it is made out to be; Jews wielded enormous political power in Weimar Germany, but with the rise of Hitler they were stripped of this power, and their goose was cooked. (3) So how can we explain the taboo and hysteria about the Holocaust, and more generally about Organised Jewry today? The answer is that Organised Jewry are exploiting a victim narrative. This is the real source of power for many pernicious ideologies, organisations and people in the modern world, including feminism and those responsible for the current historical child abuse witch-hunt in the UK.

Feminism is a victim narrative, one of its sub-narratives is that women can do no evil. This was not always the case, but since the 1970s feminists have been pushing the idea that anytime a woman does something bad, even a series of bad acts, it is not her fault, rather it is the fault of the mythical patriarchy, of men, or even of one man. In the UK and Canada especially, there are individuals and organisations who will take up the cudgels for almost any woman accused of murdering a husband or a lover, however overwhelming the evidence against her. A stellar example of this is the American woman Jodi Arias who murdered her lover Travis Alexander.

Arias was obsessive about Alexander, and when her obsessive behaviour went over the top, he parted company with her. Months later, apparently over a period of weeks, she hatched a diabolical plan to kill him. Faking a burglary at her grandmother's home, she stole a gun, hired a car, and drove a thousand miles across the Arizona Desert avoiding gas stations where she might be captured on CCTV. On arriving at his home she bluffed her way in with a promise of sex, lured him into the shower (to destroy DNA evidence), stabbed him to death, put a bullet in his skull, and nearly hacked off his head for good measure.

After her arrest, Arias claimed at first not to have seen her victim for months, then claimed she was present when he was murdered by two mysterious individuals, and finally when that lie could not be sustained either, she claimed to have killed him in self-defence. Who would testify on behalf of such a woman? Alyce LaViolette would, and did. Expert witness so-called LaViolette listened to the lies of Jodi Arias, and stated on oath that the murderess was the real victim. Can anyone credit such nonsense?

This ludicrous victim narrative extends even to serial killers, thus for loony feminist Phyllis Chesler, the person responsible for the crimes of Aileen Wuornos was not the damsel of death herself but her first victim, Richard Mallory, who is said to have raped her. We have only the word of common prostitute Wuornos for this, but according to Chesler, it was this unspeakable act that pushed her over the edge, and led her to murder another six totally innocent men. Incredibly, Chesler was given space in a peer reviewed journal to espouse this nonsense. (4)

Sometimes, indeed often, this special pleading succeeds, thus in the UK, Stacey Hyde was originally convicted of murder and given a 9 year tariff. She attacked her victim, Vincent

Francis, with a knife, stabbing him seventeen times. Hyde had been drinking at the time with Francis and his lover Holly Banwell. She did not live with the couple, but had been invited back to their home for a drinking session. She murdered Francis while Banwell was on the phone to the police, yet she was cleared of murder at a retrial, and walked free. She had been supported by a self-styled women's rights organisation. Would any men's rights organisation do the same for a man?

This particular feminist narrative has been around for forty, perhaps fifty years, yet it is already ingrained in the media, even in the law. The Jewish victim narrative has been around for at least two thousand years - from the time of the Crucifixion - and in a sense goes back three and a half thousand years, to the Exodus. Throughout history, Jews have indeed suffered persecution - as have all peoples - but only they have made a religion of it. For *Torah*-true Jews, persecution and anti-Semitism are divinely inspired, they are a message from the Almighty telling them to stay on the narrow path as God's Chosen People, to lead by example. For Organised Jewry and political Zionism though, the Chosen People concept has an entirely different meaning, namely that they are better than everyone else, and are thereby entitled to ride roughshod over the rest of Mankind. The Jewish victim narrative is part and parcel of that, and includes the Holocaust survivor narrative.

Feminism tells us to believe women uncritically, including and especially victims of domestic violence and rape. After all, who but a *sexist*, a misogynist or a rape apologist would do otherwise, right? For Organised Jewry, uncritical belief in the Holocaust and the testimony of survivors is part and parcel of that narrative. Anyone who does not concur 100% each and every time can only be tainted with anti-Semitism. Now that we have identified this narrative, let us take a long hard look at the reality of the Holocaust.

The first thing one must never challenge is the 6 million figure, and already we run into a problem, because this figure is not simply emblematic, it is pure fiction. Back in the 1990s, someone unearthed a reference from the *American Hebrew* newspaper to a Holocaust of 6 million Jews. This paper was dated October 31, 1919! Since then, Dr Töben and his team have unearthed many more references dating to as early as 1915. It is clear this figure has no basic in fact.

Next we have what was used for decades as the propaganda proof of the Holocaust, all those terrible photographs from especially Belsen and Dachau camps, but these are not proof at all, because similar photographs can be found of other concentration camps, including from the American Civil War, and even from humanitarian tragedies that have nothing to do with war, famines, for example.

As Professor Butz wrote in his aforementioned classic, quoted here from page 55 of the 2003 edition:

It is, I believe, Belsen, which has always constituted the effective, mass propaganda "proof" of exterminations, and even today you will find such scenes occasionally waved around as "proof." In fact these scenes, repeated in varying degrees at other German camps, e.g. Dachau and Buchenwald, were much less related to "extermination" than the scenes at Dresden after the British-American raids of February 1945, when many, many times as many bodies were found lying around."

This claim is as true today as it was when these words were written, but the reality is there are two Holocausts: the one peddled by the media, and the other which is confined to academic books. In the media, the 6 million figure is sacrosanct, while the atrocity photographs are used

as the mass propaganda proof, after all, who can deny these very emotive and powerful photographs? Yet in their specialist texts, Holocaust academics - Jew and Gentile - concede readily that these photographs are proof of no such thing. Which brings us to the eyewitnesses, the survivors.

If one can cast suspicion on the 6 million and even on the photographs, surely one cannot challenge the veracity of the survivors, the living victims? Yes, we can and should, much of the time. The reality is that many of these survivors - those who have taken to print - are shameless liars. Some are fantasists. A few are not even genuine. (5) And those who were there, either their memories are polluted with horrific but fanciful tales and rumours, or when their recollections are both honest and accurate, they paint an entirely different picture of the camps from Hollywood.

Take for example the case of Gena Turgel, the self-styled Bride of Belsen. Her ghost-written autobiography (6) contains a ludicrous reference to Anne Frank, and the claim that she herself was actually inside a gas chamber at Auschwitz. This was really a shower, but she has repeated this nonsense many times, including at the age of 90.

In December last year, the London *Daily Mail* published an interview with another former concentration camp inmate; Klara Markus is said to have survived Dachau, Ravensbrück and Auschwitz, which begs the question, if the Nazis were so keen to exterminate all Jews, why did she survive even one? But it gets worse, she survived Auschwitz because the Nazis ran out of gas that day. And bullets too, presumably. In 2010, she is said to have told a Romanian newspaper that when she asked about her mother and sisters, the SS replied: "Maybe, you should search for them in the smoke or ashes!"

These claims are not simply ludicrous, they insult our intelligence, but at the time the paper interviewed her, Mrs Markus was a hundred years old, and about to celebrate another birthday. Is anyone going to challenge the testimony of a 101 year old woman, seriously?

Contemporaneous reports by concentration camp inmates are no more reliable; there were two women who claimed to have been sent to the gas chamber and actually gassed: Sophia Litwinska and Regina Bialek. These claims are not well publicised, but documents from the relevant trials are available on-line. (7)

The Litwinska and Bialek testimonies are typical of something I have long maintained, namely that eyewitness and survivor testimonies that support the official version of the Holocaust are not credible, while testimonies that are credible support the Revisionist interpretation. And, incredible though it may seem, we can thank Holocaust true believer Steven Spielberg for reinforcing this indisputable fact. Alarmed that Revisionists were being taken seriously, this powerful Jewish movie mogul decided to set up a foundation to document the testimonies of survivors on film. The young American Revisionist Eric Hunt has carried out a superb deconstruction of Spielberg's foolishness, and has included a number of such testimonies in his documentary *The Last Days Of The Big Lie*.

In spite of this, and in spite of the skepticism shown by regular historians to survivor testimonies (off the record), it is considered anti-Semitic, even obscene, to call them out. Again, this is not because it is indeed anti-Semitic to do so, but because the victim narrative must never be challenged. The parallels with the feminist rape narrative are uncanny. Everyone knows rapes happen, but the reality is that many, perhaps half or more of all allegations are false, and contrary to the claims of the abuse industry, rape is not always a uniquely evil act from which no woman ever fully recovers. Yet anyone who disputes the

spurious rape statistics or the professed effects on victims can only be *sexist*, a misogynist, and very likely a rape apologist.

At the time of writing we are seeing a witch-hunt in the UK; celebrities have had their names dragged through the mud, and at least three, probably four, have been convicted of imaginary crimes and given long prison sentences. Some of these imaginary crimes date back forty or more years; the victims were said to have been too traumatised at the time and for decades later to report them, but once one comes forward, the floodgates open, the proof of these crimes is the fact that so many allegations have been made. Major or even impossible discrepancies in the accounts of the *victims* are considered to be the result of that trauma, thus Rolf Harris was convicted of indecently assaulting one woman even though there was absolutely no evidence that he had ever visited the community centre where this very public assault was supposed to have taken place. Query this though, and you are mocking the victim.

We see victim narratives of this sort everywhere, they are used to excuse bad, criminal or even murderous behaviour, as in the case of Stacey Hyde. The victim narrative empowers the *faux* victim, and the alleged perpetrator is himself victimised by society, including to the full extent of the law. It is this, I believe, that is the true secret - if secret it be - of Jewish power, especially with regard to the Holocaust.

The latest manifestation of this nonsense is something that is called intersectionality, in which various minority groups including women (who are far from a minority) compete for victim status. At the top of the chain of oppression are white, Anglo-Saxon, heterosexual males, who cannot be oppressed, although some allowance may be made for the white working class male. White women are of course not quite as oppressive as men, then comes black men, then black women. What happens though when oppressions collide? An amusing example of this is the Bill Cosby rape scandal.

In 2005, Cosby was accused of drugging and raping a white woman, thirteen other victims came forward, but the scandal went to sleep for a decade after he settled with his first accuser. Last October it returned with a vengeance, and initially the media was somewhat skeptical. Talking heads were also in an uncomfortable position: did they side with the women and risk being branded *racist*, or did they side with Cosby and become rape apologists? Eventually, this bandwagon became too seductive for a number of black women, and after they jumped on it too, the issue was no longer *racism v rapism* but a wealthy and powerful man using his power to violate vulnerable women. The most fascinating thing about the Cosby scandal is that the majority of his accusers have little if any credibility, yet the media never mentions this. The numbers are certainly impressive, but so are those for sightings of the Loch Ness Monster.

Returning to the Jewish Question, I will add that the reason we are supposedly seeing a resurgence of anti-Semitism in Europe is because the Jewish victim narrative in the Middle East has lost out to the Palestinian victim narrative. After decades of censorship, double standards and at times naked tyranny, the sheeple have woken up to the reality of Zionism and its atrocities. Indeed, there are now so many Jews opposed to the barbarism of the Israeli Government that it is hopeless even for the Zionists to try to defend it anymore, so instead they have created a new victim narrative, now anti-Semites are out to get the Jews everywhere else.

Another victim narrative deserving of mention is that of the homosexual lobby. It is difficult to credit that when I was a boy, homosexual acts between consenting adults were criminal here in the UK until the so-called Wolfenden reforms, and even in the US. In practice,

homosexuals were tolerated as long as they did not attempt to corrupt the young, and otherwise kept themselves to themselves. In October 1953, the famous Shakespearean actor Sir John Gielgud was fined after being arrested for *cruising* in a public toilet. It did not do his career the slightest harm.

Today, the organised homosexual movement is not satisfied with mere legality, they and their supporters demanded - and got - the right for men to marry other men, and now they demand not only that society recognise their perversion, but the social ostracism and even criminal prosecution of those who are unwilling to accept their *gay* lifestyle. There have been several cases recently on both sides of the Atlantic which have seen the full force of the law used against dissenters, yet still homosexuals portray themselves as victims.

One final lesson should be learned from all this, the usual explanation for the rise of Nazism and the purge of Jews by the Government of Adolf Hitler is anti-Semitism or more generally *racism*. The reality is that black Americans were second class citizens in the Deep South at the same time and for a long time before, but apart from the occasional lynching, since the abolition of slavery blacks were never in danger of being purged from the American economy, and were certainly never rounded up and thrown into concentration camps. The Nazis were able to treat the Jews like this because they created their own victim narrative - the anti-feminist blogger Alison Tieman calls this a threat narrative, but it amounts to the same thing. A substantial tranche of the German establishment was able to convince the bulk of the population - or at least a significant number of those who mattered - that the German people were victims of Jews (by their apparent domination of the economy, etc). In continuing to plug their own victim narrative, Organised Jewry are playing a dangerous game, as is evinced by the about face of Western establishments over the past forty years on homosexuality: yesterday's oppressor is tomorrow's victim, and vice versa.

I could write a lot more about victim narratives, but I will end by saying that they are so pernicious I truly believe that along with usury they account for most of the evils that currently plague Mankind. Victim narratives are largely unknown, and when they are detected are just as widely misunderstood. The far right blame them on "the Jews", Zionism, cultural Marxism; the conspiratorial left like some elements of the far right on the Illuminati. The big mistake they all make is that they are looking for a conspiratorial hub that doesn't exist; it is not the people behind them that are evil necessarily, but the victim narratives themselves, although many of those pushing them are indeed evil, some beyond belief.

We must expose and destroy victim narratives wherever they rear their ugly heads. This does not mean that we should not have compassion for genuine victims; in one sense we are all victims, because we are all born to die. If we die young, then we are victims on that account; if we live to any reasonable age, we will all have our share of physical and spiritual pain, some more than others. Some of us will face disfigurement, lose limbs, we will all lose friends - and a man who has no friends to lose is doubly a victim - we may suffer financial loss, humiliation, loss of honour (rightly or wrongly), and so on. But the fact that we are all victims and that some suffer more than others should not be used to exploit others or demand special privileges by manipulating the hierarchy of oppression.

Notes And References

(1) *Who runs Hollywood? C'mon*, from the on-line edition, December 19, 2008. This article has of course been widely cited by the usual suspects.

- (2) In 1933, the London *Jewish Chronicle* published a supplement with its February 24 issue which included an extensive analysis of German Jewry. The make up of the professions was given as follows: actors - 31, authors - 374, dentists - 713, doctors - 3,670, editors - 41, lawyers - 2,208, singers - 103. If these figures are correct, they are surprising; Jewish influence in the media was minimal, yet out of a population of around 600,000, 1% were either doctors or lawyers.
- (3) To give just one example from this period, in 1936 it was reported that 7,000 Jewish egg dealers had been eliminated from German commerce and that the egg industry was not 96% "Jew-free", *Jewish Chronicle*, April 17, 1936, page 12.
- (4) Both these cases are sufficiently notorious as to require no citation. For a discussion of both and other cases, see my article *In Denial Of Female Evil*. Chesler's sickening apologia for Aileen Wuornos, *A Woman's Right to Self-Defense: The Case of Aileen Carol Wuornos*, was published in the Fall-Winter 1993 issue of *St John's Law Review*.
- (5) Only very occasionally will this be admitted in a regular public forum. See for example *The men who whitewash Hitler* by Gita Sereny, published in the *New Statesman*, November 2, 1979.
- (6) *I Light A Candle* by Gena Turgel with Veronica Grocock, published by Grafton, London, (1987).
- (7) Litwinska's deposition can be found at Kew in file WO235/21. Bialek's testimony even found its way into print in *TRIAL OF JOSEF KRAMER AND FORTY-FOUR OTHERS (The Belsen Trial)*, Edited by Raymond Phillips, *Foreword* by the Right. Hon. Lord Jowitt, published by William Hodge, London, (1949), page 657.

The Author

Alexander Baron is an independent researcher and archivist. The author of several books including two on the Holocaust from the Revisionist perspective, the advantage he has over most others in this field is that he did not attend university and was therefore not taught how not to think. Having though spent half his life researching in some of the most prestigious archives in the world, he does not feel his education has been in any way compromised.