

Chapter Eight: Holocaust Revisionism And The Skeptics' Movement

Although it enjoys a worldwide following, the modern Skeptics' Movement is based primarily in the United States, in particular in and around certain institutions of higher learning and research. There have been skeptics and debunkers since ancient times, of course, but the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims Of the Paranormal was founded only in 1976; it arose out of a two day conference held on April 30 and May 1 of that year at the newly opened Amherst campus of the State University of New York at Buffalo; like most organisations with cumbersome names, it is generally referred to by an acronym: CSICOP. CSICOP's Chairman from its inception to the time of writing is Paul Kurtz. In 1976 he was a professor of philosophy at State University; at the time of writing he is Professor Emeritus. (1) Kurtz is the author of many books, and, at the end of the Second World War, he entered Dachau concentration camp with the American Seventh Army. CSICOP publishes an excellent theoretical journal, the internationally acclaimed *Skeptical Inquirer*; its original quarterly circulation of 1,000 has now grown to 50,000 bi-monthly. (2) There are other skeptics' magazines too: in Britain there is the *Skeptic*, (3) while in the United States there is Michael Shermer's *Skeptic*.

For the most part, skeptics have ignored Holocaust Revisionists, and when they have commented on them and their activities, have compared them with the likes of Flat Earthers. An excellent (or appalling) example of this is the uncritical review of Deborah Lipstadt's *Denying The Holocaust*, which was published in the Spring 1994 issue of the *Skeptical Inquirer*. The reviewer, a professor of psychology, makes only one tiny criticism of Lipstadt: "Readers will disagree about whether [refusing to debate Revisionists or their ideas] is a proper strategy", but otherwise he praises Lipstadt's polemic to high heaven: "This is an important book that should be widely read." (4)

My own correspondence on this subject with Paul Kurtz (which I will not discuss here) leads me to believe that pursuing the subject with either the *Skeptical Inquirer* or CSICOP, would be a waste of time and money. Like many

or most skeptics, Kurtz is a secular humanist, which far from being an antidote to religion is an equally unpleasant alternative to it. (5)

There are signs though that the Skeptics' Movement may yet take an intelligent interest in the subject of Holocaust Revisionism, although to date only one well-known skeptic has condescended (or dared) to take on the Revisionists, American college professor Michael Shermer, editor of the aforementioned *Skeptic*.

In a 1993 issue of the *Skeptic*, Shermer dared to pose the question does Holocaust Revisionism warrant serious skepticism? and concluded that it does. In his lengthy closing paragraph, he asked his readers: "If some or all revisionists are anti-Semitic, neo-Nazis, or both, is it a proper refutation of their position to simply dismiss them as such? Not if you are a scientist or rational skeptic, any more than it would be to dismiss a creationist as a 'Bible thumper'. If claims are made that can be tested against the evidence, then only the evidence should matter...What do you think?" (6) This is an admirable attitude, (Deborah Lipstadt take note). In the next issue, Shermer reported that the feedback to this invitation had been entirely positive, and in a two page article he made his own position clear.

"Deniers claim that Jewish historians are, at the very least, biased to distort the picture in their favor...Since I am not Jewish and the Skeptics Society is not affiliated with any Jewish organization there is no way we can be accused of being biased in either direction." (7) These claims are *non sequiturs* but otherwise Shermer's logic is difficult to fault, and it is refreshing to find a mainstream academic with the courage to at least examine the Revisionist position:

"...when a body of knowledge is accepted by most experts in the field, the burden of proof is on the challengers to present a theory superior to the one in existence, It is not enough to just tear down the old theory. You must also replace it with a superior one that better explains the data." (8)

This is actually the way science works: the theory which best explains all or most of the phenomena concerned is the most accurate, and should be retained until somebody comes along with a better one. It is not sufficient for the critic simply to nit-pick. This is also the way criminal investigations work, or are supposed to work. The mere fact that a murder suspect has an alibi will not get him off the hook if forensic evidence and half a dozen reliable witnesses put

him at the scene of the crime, although it may well put his alibi witness in the dock with him.

What Shermer doesn't appear to realise is that Revisionists, or most of them, do actually postulate an alternative (and superior) hypothesis. Professor Butz in particular claims that Western governments knew all along that the atrocity propaganda that was being churned out in World War Two by Zionist, Jewish, free Polish and Communist sources was blatantly false, and that it was given credence only reluctantly. (9) He suggests also that the origins of the gassing claims arose out of the Nazis' euthanasia programme (a programme of mass murder which no Revisionist disputes), and even gives a precise citation, a December 1941 BBC broadcast by the anti-Nazi propagandist Thomas Mann. (10) Mann was a German-born novelist and essayist who later became a U.S citizen. (11)

The following year, Shermer devoted an entire issue (or almost an entire issue) of the *Skeptic* to Holocaust Revisionism. In spite of his and its obvious bias, this is a step in the right direction.

A lengthy article by Shermer himself makes the ambitious (but flawed) claim of being "The Restoration of History". (12) A look at the credits at the foot of page 32 is enough to dismiss this claim in its entirety. (13)

In a review of Lipstadt's polemic, contributor Brian Siano concludes that "The revisionists are supple dancers around the truth. But they will have to work hard to get around Lipstadt's indictment", which he calls "a valuable contribution". (14)

He does though report that Lipstadt's book is flawed, and makes "demonstrably false claims against [Noam] Chomsky". (15) A third article with the unfortunate title of *Giving The Devil His Due*, although strongly hostile to both Holocaust Revisionism and Holocaust Revisionists comes down strongly on the side of free inquiry and free speech. (16)

One group of people who were very happy with this forum were the controllers of the IHR. On July 22, 1995, Shermer took the Holocaust debate one stage further. On his return from a tour of the camps (Auschwitz, Majdanek, Mauthausen and Dachau), Shermer entered into a two hour debate with *Journal of Historical Review* editor Mark Weber. Later, the IHR produced a video of this meeting of minds, something they would hardly have done if Shermer had got the better of the argument. (17) The following year, the *Journal of Historical Review* contained a lengthy report on this debate. (18)

We end this chapter with a brief mention of another skeptic, Joe Nickell. Nickell is one of the more active members of CSICOP; in 1994 he published an excellent book called *Camera Clues* in which he discusses, among other things, fake photographs. Although he is concerned here primarily with fakes made for commercial purposes and with fake photographs of flying saucers, ghosts, etc, Nickell closes his book "on a lighter note", a parody on Holocaust Revisionism. (19)

This "parody" (or satire) - the claim that the State of Idaho is a myth - has also been posted to the Internet. (20) It includes the following passage:

"It is important to note that a photograph without a caption is often meaningless. A picture of people in boats surrounded by mountains could have been taken in Colorado or Nevada, but when the holy caption says that this is a picture of the 'Salmon River' in 'Idaho,' gullible readers tend to swallow this information whole *without any further examination*.

We have examined literally hundreds of these 'photographs,' and the ones that are not outright fakes are all clearly taken in other parts of the nation." (21)

This passage is truly ironic because, as we have seen, many such Holocaust photographs were indeed taken "in other parts of the nation", indeed, many of them were taken in another nation entirely. Photographs of mass graves at Belsen in Germany, victims of starvation at the end of the war, and of typhus and other diseases, do not prove that Jews were gassed at Auschwitz in Poland.

For the record, the State of Idaho satire is not even original. In 1819, Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, published a similar satirical essay (on David Hume's *Of Miracles*) called *HISTORIC DOUBTS RELATIVE TO NAPOLEON BUONAPARTE*, in which he questioned the existence of the famous French General!

Chapter Nine: Nizkor And The On-Line Holocaust "Educators"

The 1990s have seen the rise of the Internet. Rise? Explosion would be a better word. In spite of the hype, the Internet, World Wide Web and associated manifestations of computer technology are here to stay. Literally every interest group can now be found on the Internet, from book reviewers to multi-level marketers, from music fan clubs to flying saucer enthusiasts, from porn peddlers to religious fundamentalists, from Jews to Nazis, and from Holocaust Revisionists to organised Exterminationists. There is one Internet newsgroup dedicated exclusively, or almost exclusively, to Holocaust Revisionism: alt.revisionism.

I signed up for the Internet in December 1994, but due to technical problems it took a little while for me to get on-line, and to join in the main Revisionist forum. By this time, alt.revisionism had been around for quite a while. In spite of its name, this newsgroup is a forum mostly for anti-Revisionist polemics; the main organised Exterminationist group on the Internet is Nizkor, or, to give it its full (and misleading) title: The Nizkor Project: An Electronic Holocaust Resource. (1) The Nizkor crowd are extremely active in alt.revisionism.

In a sense, the Nizkor Project was started about 1991 when Canadian resident Ken McVay put his E-mail file server on-line. But the Nizkor Project really only got underway about 1994: "The publicity that Ken attracted that got him the funding necessary to put the web site on line was *not* his own doing; someone else liked what Ken was doing and talked him up entirely on his own. (That person wishes to remain anonymous.) Until that time Ken was financing the whole thing [himself]." (2)

Nizkor is run by a number of volunteers, in particular McVay himself, Jamie McCarthy, Dan Keren Phd, and others. McVay and McCarthy are Gentiles; Keren is a Jewish academic, and a particularly stropy one at that. McVay is the ultimate arbiter of what goes into the archive. (3)

According to a July 1996 posting by Nizkor Canada (presumably Ken McVay), there are now well over 2,500 Holocaust bibliographic reference files

freely available from Nizkor. And they "will prove invaluable for anyone interested in learning more about the collective events referred to as the Holocaust."

There are other Holocaust "Educators" on the Internet; the current writer once received an E-mail from a lady who claimed to have been one of the "original" on-line Holocaust Educators. (4) Nizkor's idea of education though is not one we need waste too much space on. The current writer has many times crossed swords with both Ken McVay and Jamie McCarthy, who are affable enough if more than a little pedantic, and with Dan Keren, who abuses Revisionists as "revisionazis", calls us crazy, and hurls all manner of insults at us, then has the temerity to brand us anti-Semitic when we reply in the same coin.

The basic premise of Nizkor is that all testimonies of survivors and perpetrators are to be taken at face value, and if there are errors, or lies, then so what? The evidence is so overwhelming that only an anti-Semite *ad nauseum*, would be so presumptuous as to challenge it, or any part of it. Unlike mainstream Exterminationist academia, the Nizkor crowd claim to be prepared not only to debate the Revisionists but to have refuted them. They even accuse Revisionists of being afraid to debate. Like all Exterminationists they promise far more than they deliver.

Keren in particular is fond of posting eyewitness testimony from legal proceedings and other sources as though any of this proved anything. One such testimony that has been posted to alt.revisionism is the so-called Blaha testimony. We will discuss the Blaha testimony and its refutation in some depth because it gives an insight not only into the Nizkorite mentality, but also into the facts surrounding it. Furthermore, examining the way these facts were *developed*, has a didactic value which anyone researching in this field will find invaluable.

Dr Blaha gave evidence at the International Military Tribunal; he was a witness to the operation of the non-existent Dachau gas chamber. According to the good doctor on January 11, 1946: "Until the year 1943 [Dachau] was really an extermination camp. After 1943 a good many factories and munitions plants were established...and...it did become a work camp." (5) The current wisdom of course is that the concentration camp system was first used *inter alia* for forced labour and only later for *extermination*.

Blaha reported too that skin, especially tattooed skin, was removed from prisoners, but not from Germans, and that some were made into saddles,

handbags, etc. It is not clear if he claims to have seen this personally, but as he was working in the autopsy room what else is one to believe? (6) Needless to say, none of these saddles, handbags or other artifacts were ever found. And if they were found they were never subjected to a proper forensic analysis. (7)

According to Dr Blaha: "It was common practice to remove skin from dead prisoners. I was ordered to do this on many occasions. Dr. Rascher and Dr. Wolter in particular asked for this human skin from human backs and chests. It was chemically treated and placed in the sun to dry. After that it was cut into various sizes for use as saddles, riding breeches, gloves, house slippers and ladies' handbags. Tattooed skin was especially valued by SS men." (8) Again, this is pure fantasy, but the Nizkor crowd insist that only Nazis and "anti-Semites" would have the temerity to reject this garbage. So what is the truth about the Blaha testimony?

Briefly, there were indeed some tattoos and other specimens taken in one of the camps, (9) but if this had any sinister connotations, it was the result of plain, old-fashioned corruption (and depravity) rather than the result of unique Nazi wickedness. Karl Koch, the Commandant of Buchenwald, was at the centre of a ring of corruption that had spread through the concentration camp system, "and had involved the murder of some prisoners who knew too much". (10) According to former Buchenwald inmate Christopher Burney, Koch was (or became) a homosexual, and Frau Koch was a "harlot". (11) While Koch was (presumably) chasing blond-haired, blue-eyed *Aryan* boys in black uniforms, Frau Koch was having it off with selected prisoners, who were then murdered.

Frau Koch seems to have had a preference for prisoners with tattooed skin, and, according to Professor Butz, these "facts" were subsequently "developed" into an official deposition. (12) Frau Koch was convicted of such crimes at her trial but in 1948, General Clay, the US Military Governor of Occupied Germany, reviewed the evidence and found it wanting. In Clay's own words, four prosecution witnesses against Ilsa Koch were found "unworthy of belief". Curiously, their names were not definitely known. (13) Her case was reviewed by a total of nine lawyers, and Clay concluded that though she left Buchenwald in August 1943, "No real examination has been made of her activities after that date." (14)

A brief summary of the Kochs' activities is given by the *Encyclopedia Of The Holocaust*. Karl Otto Koch joined the Nazi Party in 1930, married in May 1937,

and became the first Commandant of Buchenwald in August that same year. In September 1941 he was transferred to Maidanek as commandant, then to a Soviet prisoner-of-war camp run by the Waffen-SS, where there was an enormous rise in the number of prisoners killed, and in July 1942 there was a mass breakout from the camp. Koch was suspended, tried and acquitted. In August 1943, he was rearrested on fraud, embezzlement and "other charges" (a reference, apparently, to murders). He was executed by the SS in April 1945! His wife was acquitted. (15)

Shortly after the liberation of Buchenwald, a British Parliamentary delegation visited the camp and on its return a White Paper was published. The delegation reported on the typhus experiments carried out at the camp and stated that "We were told that Frau Koch, the wife of the German Commandant, collected articles made of human skin. We obtained pieces of hide which have since been identified by Sir Bernard Spilsbury (16) as being human skin. One of these pieces clearly formed part of a lampshade." (17)

There are several possibilities here: Sir Bernard Spilsbury could have been "got at", or he could have been presented with specially manufactured artifacts, and so on. However, it is quite likely that the specimen(s) he was presented with were the genuine article. (18) However, as stated, Frau Koch was not the Commandant's wife at the liberation - Koch had been succeeded by Pister - so her connection with such bizarre artifacts is tenuous, to say the least. (19) It is most likely that they were bona fide medical specimens, albeit with a bit of gilding the lily by those in charge of investigating alleged war crimes.

By the time Dr Blaha came to give his testimony, he had obviously read about or heard of the Buchenwald *revelations* and other atrocity stories. All manner of nonsense was being peddled in occupied Germany at the time. (20) All manner of nonsense is still being peddled to this day, but for Dan Keren PhD and his cronies at Nizkor, the fact that such words were uttered under oath and that they show the Nazis in a bad light, means they must be gospel.

I could recount countless anecdotes about my encounters with these bods in alt.revisionism, but one more will suffice. Harry Mazal (or Harry Mazal OBE as he styles himself) is a Jew who posts from Texas. Not long after I joined alt.revisionism I had an exchange of correspondence with him. He sent me the text of an advertisement from a newspaper which purports to prove that the Jewish Holocaust Revisionist David Cole is a damned liar. (21) This advertisement was placed by Mazal at his own expense in response to an earlier

advertisement by Cole for his Auschwitz video. Although it does make serious criticisms of Cole's methodology, (22) Mazal adopts the typical disingenuous discourse of all his ilk when he claims that "...Mr. David Cole, would have readers believe that a conspiracy of colossal, indeed epic proportions has been foisted upon the world by thousands of eye-witnesses, dozens of confessed perpetrators, hundreds of American soldiers...and the entire judicial process that took place at Nuremberg after World War II..." (23)

Again, that wonderful word conspiracy: use it in the same sentence as the word Jew and it kills the debate dead. (24) Having read this far the reader will realise that this is not what Cole or any Revisionist worthy of the name does believe, nor does Cole nor any other Revisionist seek to foist such beliefs onto the public. They seek simply to peddle their wares in the free market of ideas, unlike most of their opponents, who seek to make any questioning of their own already officially sanctioned lies a criminal offence.

Since I started work on this book I have had the privilege of viewing the David Cole Auschwitz video; in it, Cole is shown around the camp (Auschwitz I) by a Museum guide, who tells him that the gas chamber as seen is in its original state. Later on the tape, when Cole interviews Franciszek Piper, the latter admits that it is a reconstruction. In his letter of October 21, 1993, (which was published in the Mazal advertisement), Piper provides documentation from the 1957 book by Jan Sehn which states clearly that the gas chamber is indeed a reconstruction, (25) but his claim that Cole used a "Neonazi style monologue" is an outright lie, and, needless to say, he makes no mention of the fact that tourists are routinely misled (as the guide attempted to do to Cole).

In his letter, Piper states too that "In his advertisement [Cole] introduces me as a 'Head of Auschwitz Archives at the Auschwitz State Museum'. This is untruth. I am not now and I have been neither a head of Auschwitz Archives nor a director of Auschwitz Museum [sic], as Cole maintains in other propaganda leaflets. The purpose of such manipulation with the facts is clear..."

Either Piper is being disingenuous here or he is nit-picking; according to the book *Anatomy Of The Auschwitz Death Camp*, which was published in 1994, Piper is Head of the Department of Historical Research at the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum. (26) And according to a letter of Dr. Cynthia Haft, Coordinator, Yad Vashem, addressed to the members of ESTABLISHING THE LEGACY (dated July 21, 1990), Dr. Frantisek [sic] Piper was then "Director

of the Historical Department of the Auschwitz Museum". (The current writer found a copy of this letter in the Library of the Imperial War Museum).

In response to Mazal's mailing I sent him documentation on the lies of South African Zionists Suzman and Diamond, (see Chapter Five). My letter was dated June 13, 1995, and minutely referenced. Mazal's response was to claim (or infer) that I had sent him forged documents. (27) In this case, Mazal's *ad hominem* was so blatant that Mike Stein (an honest Jewish Exterminationist) took my side. Eventually, when Mazal realised he'd lost the argument, and that his venal co-racialists had indeed lied through their teeth, he changed the subject entirely and denounced me as an anti-Semite for some other reason.

David Cole has summed up this tactic poetically; the following lengthy quote is from a 1995 alt.revisionism posting by (to his credit) Jamie McCarthy of Nizkor. (28)

"You see, AT FIRST the line was Cole's lying about Krema 1 being remodeled after the war. But now that this has been officially admitted the line has changed to sure it's been remodeled, but so what? This is a standard anti-revisionist tactic. When a revisionist points ANYTHING out, the first response is simply to DENY what he's saying. He's lying. It doesn't matter if it's REALLY known whether he's lying or not. It's just STRATEGICALLY the best way to deal with revisionists. Just accuse them of lying. THEN, if the thing that the revisionist was pointing out becomes adopted as part of the standard Holocaust line, the tactic CHANGES (out of necessity) to sure the revisionist is right about this ONE LITTLE TINY POINT - but it makes no difference - he's still wrong about everything else!

"This was the tactic with the Auschwitz swimming pool. The first responses were there is no pool. Then, when it became clear that there WAS one, it became sure there is, but so what? It's an irrelevant point. The same pattern occurred with the delousing chambers. First it was denied that Zyklon was actually used for delousing in the camps. Revisionists were actually RIDICULED for saying so. Then, after Pressac, it became okay, sure, there were delousing chambers - but so what? We see the same pattern with the human soap, the Dachau gas chamber, the reduction of the Auschwitz death toll (something that revisionists were talking about while Yehuda Bauer was still going through puberty), and many other things. The rule of thumb for those who battle revisionists: DENY first. Throw around the word liar like a football. Then sit back and hope that

everyone believes you and the revisionist goes away or is put in jail or beaten up. But if the worst happens, and the revisionist is proven right, just pretend that you ALWAYS knew the truth of what he's been saying, and make sure that everyone understands that the revisionist is STILL a liar about everything else!"

Away with all pests, let us now make a short analysis of recent survivor literature.

Chapter Ten: An Overview Of Recent "Survivor" Literature

In Chapter Five we discussed the pamphlet *Did Six Million Really Die?* and alluded to the favourable review of this slim, poorly funded publication by the impressionable Colin Wilson in the November 1974 issue of *Books & Bookmen*. The publication of this pamphlet and its reception, was a watershed; it also triggered off a prolonged bout of whining and wailing in the controlled media which has if anything grown more pronounced over the years. It is probably not much of an exaggeration to say that every book, pamphlet or other publication (1) on the Holocaust since *Did Six Million Really Die?* has been directly affected by it in at least some small measure. A host of Revisionist publications have drawn their inspiration from it - including those of the current writer - and a deluge of anti-Revisionist publications have been slanted towards refuting the claims therein, even those which do not discuss Holocaust Revisionism.

If this demonstrates the power of Organised Jewry and the fear and loathing this entity instills in the *goyim*, it demonstrates even more clearly the triumph of ideology over the quest for truth. This taint, for that is what it is, is something even leading Revisionists have not been free of. The most outrageous example of this is surely the *Lachout (or Müller) Document*, a forgery which was introduced in evidence at the second Zundel trial at Toronto, Canada, in 1988. I have discussed (and unconditionally condemned) this forgery elsewhere, (2) so will not discuss it here. On the other side, probably the most venal anti-Revisionist publications are Suzman and Diamond's *Six Million Did Die* and Gill Seidel's *The Holocaust Denial*.

I leave it to the reader to assess where on a scale of one to ten Deborah Lipstadt's polemic stands as far as venality and hysteria are concerned, or of any of the other anti-Revisionist tracts discussed here. We will though discuss some modern examples of eyewitness testimony to the alleged greatest crime in history. The purpose of this exercise is to demonstrate not just how unreliable is such testimony as proof or even evidence of genocide, but how the

publishing profession and even academia have been prostituted in the aforementioned struggle of ideology against truth.

A Note On Irresponsible Publishing

In October 1933, an article in the *Daily Express* sounded the death knell for spiritualism. Harry Price (3) claimed "We have nearly knocked the bottom out of it". (4) Spiritualism actually started life as a con; both its origins and refutation are well documented. (5) One might ask sincerely what there was to refute, what Harry Price and his fellow travellers had to knock the bottom out of. In retrospect, his statement was not merely premature but rash in the extreme. Six decades and more on, spiritualism is alive and well, on this plane of existence at least. No amount of scholarly debunking and *exposés* has diminished its appeal one iota, indeed, *New Age* nonsense abounds nowadays; we are inundated not only with spiritualism but with astrology, Scientology, and God knows what else. The latest craze (at the time of writing) is Feng Shui, an ancient Chinese art form (or whatever you want to call it) which teaches that rearranging one's furniture in a certain way can have beneficial psychic effects. Did anyone ever hear of such lunacy?

The mass media and, most notably, book publishing, have been the prime movers, if not the actual instigators, of this return to the age of unreason. The slightest critical faculty shown by a publisher or editor would scotch most books on the supernatural at the synopsis stage. Let me give one brief example. The late Doris Stokes, for many years Britain's leading medium, claimed in her book *Voices In My Ear* to have obtained valuable information through psychic channels which all but enabled her to solve the case of the murders of three babies at Blackpool's Victoria Hospital, and in a separate case, the murder of a 17 year old girl at Kirkham, Lancashire. In the latter case, she passed on this channelled information to a friend, who passed it on to the police, and "They were impressed enough to send Detective Sergeant [Brian] Woods round for a sitting." These claims were complete bunk, as was most or all of the flim-flam this evil old woman foisted onto a credulous public for many years, but nobody at Aidan Ellis (6) had enough initiative to write to the police,

which would have led, if her publisher had had any integrity at all, (7) to her contract being cancelled.

The truth is though that most publishers who churn out this sort of rubbish don't give a damn that the public is being conned, as long as they sell books and rake in the bucks. If there is little incentive for publishers and their employees to fact check the ravings of the late Mrs Stokes (8) and her fellow travellers, there is a positive disincentive for them to exert the least critical faculty when publishing the memoirs of Holocaust survivors. Is there any mainstream publisher who wants to run the risk of being smeared as anti-Semitic, for this reason at least? (9) Let us then look at some of the latest offerings; we begin with the works of Kitty Hart.

Hartfelt Fantasies

Former Auschwitz inmate Kitty Hart (nee Felix) actually published her first book more than three decades ago. *I am alive* was published by Abelard-Schuman in 1961; (10) a Corgi edition appeared in 1962; and a revised edition in 1974. In 1979, Mrs Hart appeared in a TV pseudo-documentary called *Return to Auschwitz*, which was described by Dr Anthony Kushner as "important and harrowing". (11) A book of the same name appeared in 1981. (12) This book was ghost-written or written in collaboration with, a professional writer named John Burke. There are many identical or near identical passages in the two books - ie *I am alive* and *Return to Auschwitz* - which begs the question: was the first book Mrs Hart's unaided effort? The current writer thinks not.

In *I am alive*, Mrs Hart tells her readers that "The other prisoners informed us that there was a Concentration Camp in Auschwitz, known as the 'Extermination Centre No 1'." (13) This was while she was en route to Auschwitz. Of course, nobody told her any such thing; Auschwitz I was known as the *Stam-merlager*, not as the Extermination Centre!

In *Return to Auschwitz*, she tells the reader that 18,000 bodies were disposed of in every 24 hour period at Birkenau, 8,000 of them in the pits! (14) This figure is ludicrous, as even arch-anti-Revisionist Jean-Claude Pressac admits. (15) On page 112 she gives the following description: "I went on staring at the

building. Smoke was beginning to billow out of the tall chimneys. Soon a spurt of flame shot up into the sky. The black smoke became thicker and darker and choking, bringing with it the smell of burning fat and bone and hair." Again, this is nonsense; anyone who has seen these chimneys, or visited a crematorium, will realise that such descriptions are at best allegorical, at worst, outright lies.

One more excerpt from Mrs Hart's fantasies will suffice. On page 91, she describes witnessing an actual gassing. Allegedly. "They hurried up the slope above the underground gas chamber, or climbed a ladder to the roof if working on one of the smaller ones, and lifted flaps above the vent. In dropped the Zyklon B crystals, and they beat a hasty retreat. Twenty minutes to half an hour later, ventilators were switched on to disperse the gas."

It takes only a little common sense to realise that this testimony was manufactured for the sake of beefing up an otherwise boring book. We will not cover here the nonsense of SS man Wagner throwing the baby into the oven - after it had survived a gassing! - this is a hearsay account at best (and at worst yet another outright lie). Nor need we concern ourselves with her claim that "it was the sight of the little babies thrown into the bonfires without the detour of the gas chamber that always made me feel sick." (16) Mrs Hart's books have something in common with all other survivor testimony: when the testimony relates to the alleged gassings and exterminations it has no value whatsoever; when it has some value, it does not relate to gassings, and indeed the plausible testimony is often irreconcilable with the gassing claims.

The reader who reads survivor testimony with his critical faculties intact, who does not allow himself to be deceived (or more often intimidated) by primitive (or sophisticated) appeals to emotion, will find something of value in even the most bizarre accounts. These people did suffer, no question about that, they had a hard time, though nowhere near as hard as some of them would have us believe, and of course it wasn't simply Jews, and other inmates of the Nazi camps who suffered during the Second World War.

Mrs Hart is not a Holocaust name in the same class as Elie Wiesel, but she is a professional survivor, and has done her bit to perpetuate the myth of *Aryan* evil. In October 1993, she appeared in a another TV pseudo-documentary, one which was designed, supposedly, to show *racists* the evil of their ways. She and her companions (fellow survivors) were taken to Auschwitz with a group of young far rightists. Although they were hand picked for latent aggression

rather than for brains, and although they were clearly deceived as to the nature of the trip (and just as clearly angry at being deceived), the *racists* acquitted themselves reasonably well. Mrs Hart was no more impressive on this programme than in print, and obviously relished playing to the camera.

Gisella Perl: Doctor In Auschwitz

A number of doctors have written lurid accounts of their lives in the camps. Normally, one expects doctors to be among the more credible of witnesses; sadly this is not the case as far as the Holocaust is concerned. Gisella Perl published her book *I Was A Doctor In Auschwitz* in 1948. (17) It was reprinted in 1992. (18) As such it does not fall into the same category as the more recent testimony of Kitty Hart, but as somebody thought it worth reissuing forty-four years on, it is worth taking a brief look at.

According to her account, in or shortly after mid-March 1944, gynaecologist Dr Perl was ordered by the Gestapo to establish a hospital and a maternity ward in her home town in Transylvania. The Nazis, it seems from this, were uncharacteristically concerned for the welfare of the next generation, and indeed, after her first delivery, the head of the Gestapo arrived with a few diapers "a present for the newborn child". He congratulated the good doctor on her skill, but subsequently deported the mother and child to Auschwitz.

Dr Perl was the camp gynaecologist in Auschwitz, where she claims that victims were sent to the gas chambers (disguised as showers) in small wooden houses. "The children...did not go with their mothers into the gas-chambers." Instead they were burnt alive! Hundreds of thousands of them. (19)

On page 33 there is a far from charming passage: "There was, of course, no toilet paper in the latrine and we had no way of obtaining paper except when somebody stole some from the store-rooms around the crematories. We got into the habit of tearing tiny squares of material off our shirts, drying our eyes with them at first, then using them to clean our rectum [sic]. However careful we were, the shirts got shorter and shorter until there was nothing left but the shoulder straps and a narrow strip around our chests."

On pages 33-4, the reader is told that this resulted in a shirt inspection; naked whippings and selection "to die in the flames" was the punishment for damaging camp property. Those who fainted at roll call were also punished by being "thrown into the flames, alive." Again, there is no meaningful evidence of this; one can dismiss such fantasies as the inventions of disturbed minds.

The current writer has read the entire transcript of the Belsen Trial - at which Dr Perl did not give evidence, even though she was transferred to Belsen, and surely would have had the opportunity to bear witness against her torturers. Even though the transcript of the Belsen Trial contains some lurid and totally unbelievable testimony, it contains no mention of prisoners at Auschwitz or anywhere else being thrown into the fire for fainting at roll call.

The Turgel's Accounts: A Foi A Deux

We mentioned earlier the case of Gena Turgel, (see Chapter Five). She claims to have been the Bride of Belsen; whilst Gena Goldfinger did indeed marry Sergeant Norman Turgel at Lübeck Synagogue in 1945 (20) as she claims in her book, she was by no means *the* Bride of Belsen. The camp actually remained open until 1950 (21) but there were many marriages at Belsen, even in 1945. Her husband also contributes to the book and makes a number of palpably false claims, including that he personally arrested Commandant Kramer. In fact, according to Mr Turgel's account it sounds like he arrested half the camp. (22)

The arrest of Commandant Kramer is well documented and need not be related in any depth here; the first British officer to arrive at Belsen was Lieutenant Derrick A. Sington; he gave evidence on the third day of the Belsen Trial, September 19, 1945. (23) Mr Turgel did not give evidence at this trial, and he surely would have if he had arrested the Commandant or had played an important role in the liberation. (24)

Mrs Turgel claims to have shared a barrack with Anne Frank - which is possible - but her other claim does not have the ring of truth. Anne Frank "lay a few bunks away from me, dying from typhus. I can remember so clearly my mother telling me about this Dutch girl in the barrack who had apparently

written a diary. Other people were talking about it, too, and whispering and *shushing* because they knew she was dying. She had had to leave the diary behind in Holland." (25)

Although, undoubtedly, Anne Frank had aspirations for her "diary" (26) neither she, nor any of her fellow inmates, could have foreseen what the future would hold for it. Even if she did tell anyone else about it - which is doubtful - it would hardly have aroused the slightest interest in the camp, especially under such circumstances.

On page 52 of her book, Mrs Turgel tells her readers that "we knew that Belsen was a *Vernichtungslager* (extermination camp)"; this is not the case; Belsen was, initially, a camp for privileged Jews, in particular for exchange prisoners. (27) In fact, as late as July 10, 1944, 222 Jews were "repatriated" to Palestine. (28) These emigrants were followed by 318 Jews who were sent to Switzerland, and a further 1,365, then another 136 to the same destination. (29) One is entitled to ask why, if the Nazis were at this time hard at work exterminating Jews in Auschwitz and elsewhere, did they bother to "repatriate" any at all? Surely a few thousand more wouldn't have mattered either way. By the same token, why were there extensive hospital facilities in all the camps? Why did the SS go to such lengths to attempt (unsuccessfully) to eradicate typhus in the same camps? (30)

Returning to Gena Turgel, it is difficult to assess the value, if any, of her book. Certainly, as an historical document it is not so much worthless as less than worthless. Incredibly, in the *Epilogue*, Mr Turgel writes "...I believe that there should be much more emphasis on history in Britain's schools, for the benefit of the younger generation." He should start by learning some history himself. Any value it does have must surely be in teaching people to think critically; it remains to be seen how much of this work is due to the shared fantasies of the Turgels and how much is due to commercial pressures, in particular to improvisations by Mrs Turgel's ghost writer, Veronica Grocock.

Voices From The Holocaust: More White Noise

In 1981, Sylvia Rothchild published a collection of interviews with survivors. This book is very typical of survivor testimony, but any small value it may have is greatly diminished by the *Foreword* of professional Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel, who tells us that "Marika Frank Abrams continued to live...in ignorance of the gas chambers even when she was already in Auschwitz!" (31)

The reason for this is obvious, of course. The actual testimony of Marika Frank Abrams is very plausible, but this is because it does not support the Exterminationist position, thus, when Abrams, an Hungarian Jewess, arrived at Birkenau on July 1, 1944, her head was shaved - along with the rest of her intake - and she and they were showered. (32)

According to Abrams, all the women stopped having periods due to their being in such poor condition. There were rumours that this happened because the SS had put something in their food, but, with uncharacteristic common sense, she dismisses this as "absolute nonsense" and blames it instead on shock. (33) Later, she was sent to Belsen by train, and, as Elie Wiesel says, she knew nothing of the "gas chambers" while at Auschwitz, something she makes abundantly clear.

Unfortunately, Abrams' common sense is short-lived because this woman, who passed through the mill of death totally oblivious to the gas chambers now says: "If the German people say they didn't know about the camps, don't believe them. They would have had to have been blind and deaf." (34)

Elie Wiesel is obviously impressed with this sort of *non sequitur* and perverted logic, because he says "This engrossing book must be read; these voices must be heard. You will find in it not only confirmation of things known but also new facts, undisclosed details. We knew, for example, that at Birkenau, before entering the gas chamber, an extremely beautiful woman had rushed at a member of the SS and killed him with his own revolver. But we didn't know that she came from Italy and that she was an actress." (35) This "testimony" is given by Jack Goldman; on page 162 he tells us that "We talked about the actress from Italy. She was also an opera singer. The SS tried to molest her

and she let them make advances until she was undressed and then at the last moment pulled the soldier's pistol from his shoulder holster and shot him. She lost her life but killed him too."

This incident is reported too by former SS man Pery Broad in his book, *KZ AUSCHWITZ: REMINISCENCES OF AN SS-MAN*. (36) Here we are told that on October 23, 1943, a Jewess snatched a revolver from SS-Unterscharführer Schillinger and shot him and Oberscharführer Wilhelm Emmerich. (37) Significantly, Broad's book was published while he was standing trial in the Frankfort Auschwitz Trial of 1964-5. (38) Let the reader recall the words of leading "anti-Revisionist" Jean-Claude Pressac: "Broad's testimony is above all a chronical [sic] of a few striking events at the camp, incapable of providing precise details about the Bunkers and Krematorien. After assessing its reliability, no conscientious historian will be able to use it unless and until the *declaration* has been stripped of the Polish influence, or in other words until the original is published." (39)

Exactly why the original should be any more reliable is not made clear to the reader. Broad's testimony was clearly self-serving. He had been arrested by the British, gave evidence at the Zyklon B Trial of Bruno Tesch and others (which resulted in two convictions and one acquittal - see page 111), and was released in 1947. At the Auschwitz Trial, Broad was described by one witness as "the SS man with the halo" and "the most decent man in the camp administration". (40) Broad's apparent decency notwithstanding, another witness at the same trial saw another side to him, and claimed that Broad had tortured a prisoner the SS doctor considered unfit to interrogate. (41) This, incidentally, is something the current writer finds eminently believable. (42) Broad was sentenced to four years at hard labour. (43)

Returning to Rothchild, we will also mention briefly the testimonies of two other survivors from her book. Elizabeth Mermelstein, a Czech Jewess, was nineteen when Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia. She tells the reader that "I was six months in Auschwitz. I escaped the gas chamber three times." How does she know? On one selection "A group of girls passed us on the way to the kitchen and I just slipped in among them." Just like that! Unfortunately, her sister was sent to the gas chamber, but they had to try three times. Of her sister's callous extermination she says: "They didn't speak of gas chambers...they only said she was not as strong as I was and she was going to another camp." Undoubtedly

her sister was sent to another camp. She may not have survived the war, but this is hardly proof that she was gassed.

Finally, in February 1945, we are told, Robert Spitz narrowly escaped being gassed. In Belsen! "In February of 1945 a German medic came to my compound and announced that anyone who wanted to take a shower could do so. I hadn't had a shower between March of 1944 and February of 1945 - a long time between showers. I went into the shower. The water was ice-cold, there were no towels and no soap, but it was delightful. What I didn't know then was that there were other showers in the same building where gas came out instead of water."

Three Years In The Gas Chambers

Finally, we come to what is perhaps the most venal survivor story ever published. It is venal not because of its author, but because of the circumstances of its publication and the uncritical endorsement it received from major Exterminationist historians, including the Yad Vashem Archive.

Filip (44) Müller's book *Eyewitness Auschwitz* has to be read to be believed. Or rather, to be disbelieved. It was first published in 1979, a considerable time after the events described therein. This is the only excuse the author has. In fact, Müller was not the author of this book, but Helmut Freitag, who is credited as the literary collaborator. (45) Robert Faurisson says of this piece of literary trash: "This sickening bestseller is the result of the work of a German ghost-writer, Helmut Freitag, who did not shrink from engaging in plagiarism." (46)

In the introduction we are told that "At one point Filip Müller decided not to suffer any longer...he tells the story of his attempted suicide, and the cruelty of the SS guard who prevented it." (47) This is a new twist: first the SS are condemned for murdering Jews, then they are condemned for saving them! This incident happens during a make-believe gassing. On page 110, Müller reports that people were forced into the chamber by SS men with dogs. Anybody offering resistance was beaten to a pulp. Then they began singing first the Czech national anthem and then *Hatikvah*, (the *gasees*, not the SS men).

Müller was so overcome with seeing this that he joined his co-racialists in the gas chamber, running to the back and hiding behind one of the concrete

pillars, (page 112). A young boy asked him if he'd seen his parents; Müller replied that they were "milling round in the front part of the room", and the child scampered off. There seems to have been plenty of room in the gas chamber, probably because the door was open!

Next, on page 113, a group of girls, "naked and in the full bloom of youth, came up to me" and implored him to leave. One of them gave appears to have given him a right bollocking.

Page 114: "Before I could make an answer to her spirited speech, the girls took hold of me and dragged me protesting to the door of the gas chamber." His SS boss saw him and knocked him to the ground, "You bloody shit, get it into your stupid head: *we* decide how long you stay alive and when you die, and not you. Now piss off, to the ovens!"

Earlier, on page 12, Müller described his first visit to the crematorium where he was set about stripping the still warm corpse of a woman. On tearing one of the stockings he is told "What the hell d'you think you're doing? Mind out, and get a move on! These things are to be used again!"

On page 13 he is shocked to find that one of the dead women he stripped turned out to be Yolana Weis, who had been at school with him. Another dead woman was a neighbour from his home town. This is a regular theme in the survivor literature. (48)

Page 16: "The powers that be had allocated twenty minutes for the cremation of three corpses. It was Stark's duty to see to it that this time was strictly adhered to."

Page 17: they loaded six ovens with what appears to have been three corpses each; "...it was impossible to cremate more than fifty-four in one hour." three at a time, six ovens.

This nonsense has obviously been written with the intention of maximising the camp's death toll; the tendency now is to claim that the Communists have exaggerated it for their own purposes.

Page 38: "Cozened and deceived, hundreds of men, women and children had walked, innocently and without a struggle, into the large windowless chamber of the crematorium. When the last one had crossed the threshold, two SS men slammed shut the heavy iron-studded door which was fitted with a rubber seal, and bolted it."

The reader should compare this passage with the scenes Müller describes on pages 112-3.

Pages 46-7: "From time to time SS doctors visited the crematorium...Like cattle dealers they felt the thighs and calves of men and women who were still alive and selected what they called the best pieces before the victims were executed. After their execution the chosen bodies were laid on a table. The doctors proceeded to cut pieces of still warm flesh from thighs and calves and threw them into waiting receptacles. The muscles of those who had been shot were still working and contracting, making the bucket jump about."

This is a favourite of the Revisionists; Bradley Smith is alleged once to have said that the bucket did the lambada across the crematorium floor. (49)

On page 87, the story about the woman performing a strip tease for the SS is related. Müller gives the impression that he was present when it happened.

Jean-Claude Pressac says of Müller's book: "I offer this account by F. Müller for what it is worth. Much too late, thirty-six years after the event, it is at the limit of credibility. Filip Müller is an important witness, but in choosing to describe material and precise facts in a book and in 1979 (1st German edition) he has accumulated errors, thus making his account historically dubious. The best approach is to read it as a novel based on true history." (50)

Pressac is far too charitable; according to page xii of the *Foreword*, a summary of Müller's testimony was published in Czechoslovakia in 1946 and in English in 1966 as *The Death Factory*, by O. Kraus and E. Kulka. This *Foreword* was written by Professor Yehuda Bauer, who is now regarded as the Dean of Exterminationist Holocaust scholars. Professor Bauer tells us too that Müller "saw a civilization being destroyed by devils in ordinary, human form" and that "We must contend with Filip Müller's testimony, if we want our civilization to survive." The current writer endorses this statement, for until we can contend with the testimony of the likes of Filip Müller, and recognise it for what it is, our civilisation is most certainly doomed.

Chapter Eleven: Conclusion: Holocaust Affirmers - Their Raison D'être, And Why It Is Important That These Lies Are Refuted

"Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past..." (1)

I ended the last chapter with the words "until we can contend with the testimony of the likes of Filip Müller, and recognise it for what it is, our civilisation is most certainly doomed." This is no exaggeration, for throughout the West the whole of our social policy on that supposedly most difficult and controversial of subjects, race relations, is based on a monstrous lie which may be summarised concisely by the phrase "*racism equals gas chambers*".

The original definition of *racism* was "The theory that distinctive human characteristics and abilities are determined by race.", (2) which is surely neither controversial nor hateful. Nowadays, the word itself is never defined, except in the most nebulous of terms. It would be true to say that the word *racism* can be used, and is used, to describe any manifestation of race consciousness, overt or covert, in the white majority. In other words, in the *Aryan goyim*.

The struggle against *racism* has become a holy crusade, particularly with the organised left. *Racism*, along with capitalism, Imperialism and the profit motive, has been branded the root of all evil, indeed more so than capitalism and Imperialism, because it is possible, still, to defend capitalism without being subjected to total social ostracism, but heaven help the white man or woman who is foolhardy enough to utter in public any statement that might be even vaguely construed as *racist*.

The Holocaust has been the greatest weapon in the arsenal of the "anti-racist" lobby for at least three decades and has been used quite shamelessly, as a moral battering ram, to subjugate the wicked *Aryan goyim* and to stifle all dissent to

the genocidal policies of both the internationalist left and the emerging New World Order of finance capitalism.

It is no exaggeration to say that it has been used literally to brainwash white - and other - schoolchildren equally shamelessly. A particularly vile example of such brainwashing is the book *The Nazi Holocaust*, by Jewish author Ronnie Landau. In this work, published in 1992, Landau reports that the operation of Apartheid in South Africa is "not in itself a genocidal situation but perhaps potentially so". (3) The hidden agenda of the book, and of its author, shines through on page 11 when he carps on that "The teachers interviewed were virtually unanimous in their belief that the Jewish experience in general and the Holocaust in particular must be taught in order to combat racial prejudice and the abuse of power." On the same page he mentions the Revisionists, and, naturally, has nothing favourable to say about them.

A book on a similar theme and with an identical *raison d'être* is *From Prejudice To Genocide*, by one Carrie Supple, (4) who is yet another Jew. (5) Supple is also a director of the misnamed Searchlight Educational Trust, which is yet another arm of the Gable octopus known as the Searchlight Organisation. (6)

The message of such books, and of organised "anti-racism", is clear: the white race is wicked, it must be stamped out, or rather bred out. Which is rather ironic in view of the noise the same people make about the alleged genocide of the Jews.

By the most perverted twists of logic we are led to believe that because the Nazis lost the Second World War, race does not exist. Not that the races do not differ in physical and/or psychological ways, nor that one race is not superior to any other, nor even that race doesn't matter, but that it doesn't exist, period. Scientists who point out the obvious, that race does exist and that different races have different levels of achievement, are denounced as "scientific racists" and are hounded throughout academia, and often outside academia. (7)

So, *racism* = gas chambers; campaigning against non-white immigration = gas chambers; campaigning against illegal immigration = gas chambers; campaigning against miscegenation = gas chambers; campaigning for White Survival and against racial death = gas chambers. For the *Aryan goyim*, that is. Jewish *racism* never seems to count. To take just one example, David Cesarani, one of the academic "anti-racists" whose mischief-making has been analysed in this book, told the *Jewish Chronicle* in September 1996 that: "It

seems to me that the real danger that Jews face today lies in assimilation, in a gradual erosion of traditions, a flattening out of what it means to be Jewish, a merging and disappearance." (8) In other words, we (Jews) must preserve our heritage and our traditions, we must perpetuate the concept of Jewishness for our children, our children's children, and our children's children's children to the Nth generation. While white Gentiles who seek to do the exactly same, to preserve their heritage to the Nth generation, are smeared as Nazis, fellow travellers and "anti-Semitic".

What are the facts about the Holocaust and *racism*? Leaving aside for the moment the question of were there any homicidal gassings at all, (9) or was there in any meaningful sense a plan to exterminate the Jews, it is clear from the most superficial examination of the known facts of history that the Holocaust had absolutely nothing to do with *racism*, and it is, or should be, even clearer that the very last remedies for state sponsored genocide are the repressive laws which the "anti-racist" lobby campaigns for incessantly.

In the first place, Nazi *racism* is largely a myth. There is no meaningful evidence that Adolf Hitler was any more anti-black or anti any minority (bar Jews) than any other white statesman of his day, and as far as racial hatred existed in Nazi Germany, it was directed almost exclusively towards the Jews. (10) Indeed, throughout history *racism* has been the norm, be it white *racism* or any other kind. It is well documented that Abraham Lincoln - the Great Emancipator - was every bit as *racist* as his pro-slavery contemporaries. Lincoln was not only a strong opponent of racial amalgamation but was also an unashamed White Supremacist, something which has been conveniently forgotten since the Holocaust. (11)

It has likewise been conveniently forgotten since the Holocaust that the United States enforced a strict policy of racial segregation - in its Southern States at least - until well after the Second World War. Indeed, even though segregation was struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court decades ago, a *de facto* segregation remains in force in many areas and many fields to this day, not only in the United States but everywhere else. (12)

This is a segregation which is practiced by peoples of all races, not because they are bigots and haters, but for the simple reason that people prefer to associate primarily with their own kind; it is human nature. In major cities across the Western world are enclaves of ethnic Chinese, many of whom have never visited China. Every such "Chinatown" is the product of *racism*; Ortho-

dox Jews live in similar enclaves, not because they are compelled to, but because they choose to. (13)

One historian has written "[In Japanese society] all non-Japanese, lacking divine ancestry, are basically inferior beings, existing only one cut above the level of animals and, accordingly, having no basis on which to claim any consideration, loyalty, or consistency of treatment at the hands of Japanese." (14) Many if not all other races have similar traditions, folklore and customs, not because people are wicked, but because this is human nature.

The activists of the "anti-racist" industry are, in effect, campaigning against human nature; by their incessant whining and wailing and their successful enforcement of no-platforms for *racists* and fascists, they and their political allies have successfully suppressed all opposition to their tyranny, and have continued to stir up racial antagonism, in particular hatred against the white race, which leads, inevitably, to a white backlash, and is used in turn as further justification for even more repressive "race relations" laws, even more Draconian restrictions on freedom, and the extension of their tyranny, fanaticism and unconditional hatred into every facet of our lives.

The fact that "anti-racism" is a political tool, or perhaps more accurately, a weapon, rather than a genuine humanitarian movement, can be gleaned from occasional press reports which show it in an entirely different light, in particular the selective indignation of its most dedicated practitioners.

On August 24, 1996, the London *Times* ran a story *Israel prepares to deport 100,000 foreign workers*, in which it revealed that Israel was drawing up plans to expel more than 100,000 illegal foreign workers "fearing they represent a social time bomb which could challenge the very identity of the Jewish state." The "anti-racist" lobby in Britain never batted an eyelid. (15) Nor were there any protests in October 1994 when it was reported that the government of "anti-racist" Nelson Mandela was rounding up immigrants from Mozambique and sending them "back to their own country" (my quotes). Contemporary reports - including at least one by BBC Television - revealed that South Africans of *all races* were blaming "illegal immigrants" for rising crime, depressing wages and dealing in drugs. Sound familiar? The current writer could cite many similar examples of non-white *racism* which go almost largely unreported, and totally uncondemned.

Racism is neither a white disease nor unnatural, and, as stated, "anti-racism" is purely a political device and a convenient club used by the enemies of Western civilisation with which to batter the white man over the head.

It is though a mistake, as many of the more conspiratorially minded believe, to postulate that the hysteria over the Holocaust generated by the race industry is the result of a conspiracy, except in the broadest sense of the word. (16) There are many agendas at work here, and indeed the hysteria over *racism* has lately been extended by the "anti-racist" bureaucracy to cover discrimination against whites and, more generally, into the wider field of political correctness. This is being done not out of sincerity or out of a desire to create a society based on equality of opportunity, but out of fanaticism, and a desire to empire build and thus to extend their own power deeper and deeper into the lives of ordinary people, and business, purely for the sake of it. A few examples culled at random from the pages of the *Times* will suffice:

"Six white women were each awarded £1,000 damages after they were barred from a race relations meeting at Newham Council, east London." (17)

A dismissed secretary took her former boss to an industrial tribunal for sex discrimination because he fired her for wearing high heels. He claimed they made a hole in the carpet. Fortunately she lost her case. (18)

Helen Bamber, a 32 year old bond dealer, was earning a cool £43,000 working for a Japanese-owned bank. She claimed she was discriminated against sexually. (Wanna change places?) She won her case. (19)

"Women are to be included in Alabama's previously men-only prison chain gangs after two convicts threatened to sue the state for sex discrimination." (20)

And, the most absurd, and outrageous report of the lot. The Equal Opportunities Commission complained to Britannia Rescue after the company issued a leaflet advertising a service that put vulnerable women at the top of the queue for assistance. Eg lone or pregnant women on the motorway. The leaflet may have been illegal under anti-discrimination legislation. "Motoring organisations were astonished at the ruling". The RAC was said too to have been

cautioned for running women only maintenance classes. (21) [In 1988, Marie Wilks, who was seven months pregnant, was brutally murdered while stranded on the M50 in Hereford and Worcester; her throat was cut. A man was later convicted of her murder and gaoled for life but was cleared on appeal].

From the most absurd to the most obscene: "A HOMOSEXUAL man has won the right to adopt a child. The ruling by appeal judges in Scotland is the first known case of an adoption by a homosexual male being approved in the United Kingdom."

The victim is a five year old disabled boy. The surrogate "parent" is said to have lived in "a 'close and loving relationship' with another man for ten years." (22)

And a report that Rotherham Social Services placed an advertisement in a newspaper to recruit "gay couples" [sic] these so "under-represented" people as carers, along with "single people, those with disabilities and those from the ethnic minorities". (23)

I do not propose to attempt to apportion on a percentage basis exactly how much one of the above nonsense can be laid at the door of the political exploitation of the Holocaust and the associated hysteria over *racism*, but without doubt the Holocaust has been and remains a keystone of the anti-discrimination industry as much as of political Zionism, and indeed in recent years it has been hijacked increasingly by the Organised Homosexual Movement, of all entities.

In Chapter Six we alluded to the World Congress of Gay and Lesbian Jewish Organisations [sic!] which held a two day conference in London, where it was resolved that "the homosexual community should become involved in Holocaust education". Present at this conference was, of all people, David Cesarani, (24) who at the time of writing combines a professorship at Southampton University with the Directorship of the Wiener Library.

Cesarani is a man who makes much about "anti-Semitism" and who whines just as loudly if not more so than any other member of the Anglo-Jewish Establishment about the Holocaust. His participation in this conference was a disgrace and nothing less than an insult to the dead. To devout *Torah*-true Jews, homosexuality is an abomination, and to them this kind of exploitation and trivialising of the Holocaust is both sacrilegious and deeply offensive.

The goal of Holocaust Affirmers such as Cesarani is to shut down the Holocaust Revisionist movement by *whatever means necessary*, which in many

cases, including his one suspects, does not involve the rejection of illegal means. (25) This is the goal too of all but a tiny minority of die-hard Holocaust Affirmers. (26) It is important that we - and by we I don't mean simply Holocaust Revisionists but everyone who cherishes freedom - it is important that we recognise these people for who they are, and for what they are. For far too long Jewish, crypto-Jewish, "anti-fascist" and "anti-racist" organisations have been permitted to hide behind a veneer of respectability. When they express mock concern over "bigotry", "intolerance", "xenophobia" or any of the "isms" they profess to combat we are supposed to take them always at face value and to queue up to throw away our hard earned freedoms and civil liberties. Freedoms our ancestors paid for with their precious blood. When they shout jump, the government, the police, and institutions of law enforcement and social control are supposed to respond: How high? And for what? Because some Jew somewhere or some "anti-fascist" has been *offended* by the *outrageous* claims of "Nazis", and their fellow travellers. But taking a wider view, there is a far more sinister threat posed by the Affirmers' and their left wing allies' incessant assaults on freedom of speech, freedom of inquiry and free debate.

In politics, money talks, and so does persistence. Civilisation as we know it exists because of law. We need laws. Society cannot function without them. Every advance in technology requires legislation; legislation is also required to tackle social evils such as poverty and deprivation, and for countless other purposes. But every year, numerous laws are passed in this country and elsewhere which serve no meaningful social purpose, rather they are passed at the whim of some minority or vested interest in order to increase their own influence or power or to shield them from legitimate criticism. (27)

Since the 1930s, Organised Jewry have been lobbying to make "fascism" illegal. Except their own particular brand of fascism, of course. They have also been lobbying to make "anti-Semitism" illegal. The 1930s saw the rise of Nazism, and Jewish concerns were more than justified, although the policy of confrontation enacted by Organised Jewry and their powerful friends and supporters did far more harm than good and led, ultimately, to the outbreak of the Second World War, the annihilation of more than fifty million people, the devastation of Europe, and the post-war enslavement and suffering of countless millions of others under Communism. (28)

We are not living in the 1930s now though, or any era comparable with it. There was, it is true, a post-war revival of fascism in this country, of sorts, and

indeed there are both fascists and Jew-haters everywhere; there are even anti-Semites in Japan (29) which has no Jewish population of any significance. (30) With the defeat of Nazism one would have expected Jewish organisations to call off the witch hunt against "anti-Semites" and to concentrate on documenting the proven atrocities against their race. They have done the latter extremely poorly and have done the former not at all, indeed, the meaning of "anti-Semitism" has been progressively redefined by Jewish lobbying organisations, as has *racism* by the race industry and the organised left.

Now, "anti-Semitism" is not limited simply to overt hatred of Jews, but to such nonsense as projecting "negative stereotypes", to asking legitimate questions about the extent of Jewish power and influence, and, of course, having the temerity to challenge Organised Jewry's officially sanctioned lies, or indeed questioning any aspect of the Holocaust.

As stated, it is not simply Organised Jewry who are engaged in this activity, not any more and not for a long time. Now, every "oppressed" minority under the sun is lobbying Parliament, the media and all and sundry, screaming for their "rights" and demanding that government money - your money - be spent on quangoes, commissions and campaigns to promote their particular vested interest (or perversion) and to pass laws making any criticism of them or any imagined slight against them a criminal offence. All such laws, be they against "anti-Semitism", *racism*, or - God forbid - *homophobia*, are counterproductive in that they generate far more hostility towards the lobbying group than they eradicate. I will give one, and only one, example of this here, and allow the reader to extrapolate.

In the Spring of 1991, the prominent Jewish Labour MP Gerald Kaufman received through the post a sticker on which was drawn a cartoon that depicted Uncle Sam as Uncle Sol. It was captioned thus:

Middle-East War
I WANT YOU
TO FIGHT FOR
ISRAEL

This cartoon was issued by Colin Jordan, who has been Britain's leading Nazi and Hitler apologist since 1956. (31) It was issued as a protest against Britain's involvement in the Gulf War (which Jordan blamed on the Jews). As

a result of issuing this one poxy sticker, Mr Jordan's home was raided by no less than seven police officers, who, in his words, "ransacked it, conducting a search and seizure far beyond the terms of the warrant which itself was outdated and thus invalid." Altogether they took away sixty of his research files, the work of a lifetime. It took him eighteen months and a great deal of hard work to have his property returned. (32)

Colin Jordan - an arthritic pensioner - is proud to call himself "anti-Jewish". He is too old and set in his ways to realise his folly, but leaving that aside, will this sort of state repression at the behest of a powerful, forever wailing and gnashing of teeth minority, make Colin Jordan or anyone else for that matter hate Jews any less? Indeed, any Jew who supports this sort of tyranny deserves to be hated. That dictum applies to the overwhelming majority of the Jewish political establishment, not just in Britain but everywhere else throughout the Western world where these Kosher fascists have not merely endorsed such tyranny but have been instrumental in imposing it.

Holocaust Affirmers want anyone who has the temerity to question any aspect of the Holocaust to be treated in the same fashion as Colin Jordan. The "anti-racist" industry want the same treatment to be meted out to *racists*. The Organised Homosexual Movement want *homophobes* to be dealt with in similar fashion likewise. And, in spite of the recent minor revolt against "political correctness" we are seeing more of this sort of nonsense all the time.

In his 1983 book *UFOs The Public Deceived*, Philip Klass, the world's leading skeptic and debunker of flying saucers, discusses at length the role of irresponsible media in promoting the UFO phenomenon and the nonsense that surrounds it. Chapter 28 of this book is called *The Public Brainwashed*. Herein, Klass reports that a recent Gallup Poll had indicated that 57% of the American population believed in UFOs. True believers were delighted with the result of this poll, but not Klass, who argues forcibly that "I am very much concerned, because the future of this republic depends upon a well-informed citizenry, which in turn depends on a well-informed and responsible news media." (33)

It is not infrequent for British judges to comment on prejudicial press coverage in sensational court cases. Anyone who has ever participated in such legal proceedings will be all too aware that very often what is reported in the press - and not always the tabloid press - bears little relation to the facts which are proved in court. (34) Be that as it may, it is one thing for the media to

misrepresent totally legal proceedings, but it is quite another for such wilful misrepresentations to be written into the fabric of the law.

In the *Appendix* to her misnamed book *Denying The Holocaust*, Deborah Lipstadt informs her readers that although she will not debate with Revisionists, she will, with great reluctance "devote this section to three of the charges most frequently made by Holocaust deniers, citing a variety of documentary and technical proofs that demolish any semblance of credibility they may be accorded." (35) The current writer has given many more than the three paltry examples cited by this polemicist and propagandist, and, having read this far, the reader should have a fair insight into both the sundry dirty tricks of, and the cabalistic mentality of, Comrade Lipstadt and her ilk, and of the stranglehold this filthy cabal has effected over the Western mind in little more than a generation.

In Chapter Five, we discussed in some depth the mischief-making of Arthur Suzman and Denis Diamond, and proved that these two lying, scheming Zionist Jews had, by sheer duplicity, brought about a total ban on the distribution of the pamphlet *Did Six Million Really Die?* in South Africa. In particular we proved that their own study, *Six Million Did Die*, is a tissue of distortions, half-truths and outright lies, and that, among other things, they wilfully misrepresented photographs of piles of corpses taken at the Dachau concentration camp at the time of the liberation as the bodies of gassed Jews. This means that Holocaust Revisionism, whatever its merits, has been outlawed in South Africa (36) on the basis of Zionist-inspired lies.

Like Philip Klass, we should be very much concerned at such mendacity, because it is not simply the future of the American republic, or of the South African republic, that depends upon a well-informed citizenry, and on a well-informed and responsible news media. Rather it is the survival of freedom, of Western Man, and of civilisation itself, which depends on a well-informed and responsible system of government. Government is, by definition, force, a force which is given legitimacy by law. As stated, most of our social policy on race relations is based on a monstrous lie: "racism equals gas chambers". As long as the lies of Arthur Suzman and Denis Diamond and their kind, and the hysteria such lies and distortions generate, provide the basis for the legitimisation of the force on which government is based, then civilisation, Western Man, and, most of all, freedom, are doomed irrevocably.

Ironically, that wonder of the Twentieth Century, the silicon chip, which has given us the Internet, instant worldwide communication at the press of a button for the price of a local rate phone call, which has increased productive capacity thousands or even millionsfold, and which has done so much to transform all our lives in such a short time, that wonder of modern technology the silicon chip, also has the ability to enslave mankind with a tyranny more total and more brutal than even the most vociferous opponents of Nazism could have ever imagined.

The eventual computerisation of the world will result, almost inevitably, in an emerging central database. It is not only cranks and conspiracy theorists who postulate that the whole of mankind may one day be controlled totally: "a microchipped population connected to a global computer"; (37) this call has also come in deadly earnest from supposedly responsible journalists. (38) Doubtless, there are agencies of the United States Government, and other governments, that are working on such schemes at this very moment.

The pressure for such total control and centralisation of power comes not only, and perhaps not even primarily, from government, but from powerful highly organised, and totally duplicitous minorities such as Organised Jewry, and similar cabals who are forever bombarding the media, the state and other institutions with demands that further legislation be passed to outlaw "anti-Semitism", "hate", *racism*, "xenophobia" or whatever "ism" is flavour of the month. These people have absolutely no respect whatsoever for the truth, and they will lie about and smear anyone and everyone in order to further their fascist ideologies.

The greatest irony here, as far as Organised Jewry are concerned, is that not only do their activities bring more hatred on their race than the Anti-Semitic International has ever done, but under the coming repression they will almost certainly be the first, or one of the first, to be purged from the system, and to be thoroughly tyrannised. Indeed, this has been a recurrent theme throughout Jewish history.

In his 1993 book *The Fatal Embrace*, American Jewish scholar Benjamin Ginsberg points out that "Their relation to the state has often made it possible for Jews to attain great wealth and power", (39) and that, for example, "The Hungarian Communist government established by Bela Kun in 1919 was dominated by Jews. Twenty of the regime's twenty-six ministers and vice-ministers were of Jewish origin" while three of the six members of Lenin's first

Politburo were Jews. (40) Jews were also prominent in Stalin's reign of terror; the secret police of the Stalinist purges were often led by Jews, who were killed in turn. (41) The Doctor's Plot of 1953 led to the dismissal of hundreds of other Jewish doctors, and only Stalin's death saved the accused from execution, while in the 50s, prominent Jewish communists in the satellite countries were purged and replaced. In Hungary in 1953, many were killed. (42)

The suppression of Holocaust Revisionism like the suppression of anything else, can and will lead, ultimately, to tyranny. And once such a tyranny has been established, anyone and everyone will be subjected to the whims of the ruling bureaucracy, (the reader is referred to the *Times* articles already cited). (43) The current writer takes no pleasure in the fact that his arch-enemies may well end up in front of the firing squad before he does. The struggle against the tyranny of the Holocaust Affirmers and their politically correct fellow travelers must go on, and must be won, if the greater struggle, against the total state of the emerging New World Order is not to end, as George Orwell predicted, with a boot stamping on a human face forever.