

Chapter Five: Holocaust Revisionism's Enemies: Academia - 1

"The first law for the historian is that he shall never dare utter an untruth. The second is that he suppress nothing that is true." - Cicero (1)

Just as there is no homogeneous entity known as Organised Jewry or the organised left/"anti-fascist" movement, so too is there no such animal as anti-Revisionist academe. There are many agendas at work in academia in exactly the same way there are in other fields; one thing that may be safely said of all mainstream academic historians is that they have been and remain unconditionally hostile towards Holocaust Revisionism, or indeed towards any Revisionism, and that this hostility is rooted in cowardice, spinelessness, and a host of other unpleasant characteristics which have no place in any institution of higher learning or research. Another thing that may be safely said of all of them is that, at least as far as the Holocaust, and more generally the Jewish Question, are concerned, Cicero's dictum - above - has been honoured more in the breach than in the observance. Almost without exception, those academics who have studied this supposedly so difficult subject have subjugated open inquiry and the quest for truth to dogma, in many cases, to ideology, and in a few, to outright tyranny. This latter is particularly true - for obvious reasons - of Jewish academics and institutions, and this is where we will start.

The Board Of Deputies And The South African Board Of Deputies: Documentation On Lies And Deception About Dachau

The Board of Deputies is constantly working behind the scenes to make any questioning of its officially sanctioned lies about the Holocaust a criminal offence. Although this perfidious organisation has been largely responsible for Britain's already Draconian "race relations" laws, (2) it has so far not managed to institute a full scale intellectual tyranny in Britain on the subject of rewriting history. But its South African equivalent has. We will shortly document the lies and academic sophistry that led to Organised Jewry's successfully enacting a ban on Holocaust Revisionism in South Africa, and on the lies perpetuated by this filthy cabal in Britain, but first we must give the reader a little history lesson.

Dachau Concentration Camp: Truth Versus Media Myth

Dachau was the first of the Nazi concentration camps; its completion was announced on March 21, 1933 and the camp was opened the following day; it was to house 5,000 inmates. (3) Although concentration camps rapidly acquired a bad name - which they have retained to this day - they were represented in the Nazi propaganda of the time as being a more humane alternative to prison. One can argue that many of the people interned by the Nazis should not have been so interned but one can hardly argue that it is more humane to lock prisoners in cells for 23 hours a day - as has frequently been reported in many of Britain's overcrowded prisons and remand centres - than it is to allow them freedom of movement behind the wire.

After 1942, the crowding in Dachau became intense and there were never less than 12,000 inmates in the camp. (4) The Dachau régime was harsh, although, surprisingly, prisoners were permitted to vote in the 1933 election, (5) and as late as the summer of 1943, Himmler is said to have set up brothels in the camps' *Sonderbau* (ie special building) "to solve the sexual problem, combat homosexual practices, and increase the workers' output." These were staffed by women from Ravensbrueck; thirteen of these women were to "serve" in Dachau. (6)

One thoroughly documented feature of the Dachau camp is its use by Nazi doctors for medical experiments, many of them inhuman and some of them fatal. (7) Although there was some resistance from the medical profession to the Nazis' racial policies, it is again thoroughly and shamefully documented that doctors, scientists and many other academics were among the Nazis' earliest and staunchest supporters. (8) Indeed, there are striking parallels between this enthusiastic endorsement and the diametrically opposite policies of "anti-racism" which have subverted academia since the fall of Nazism.

Murderous science aside, one thing that never happened in Dachau was the extermination or execution of prisoners in gas chambers. According to the "official history" of the camp, which was published in 1975, a gas chamber was commissioned in March 1942, and final approval was given in July of the same year. It was codenamed *Baracke X*, but it was never used. (9) Likewise, the *Encyclopedia Of The Holocaust*, which was researched under the auspices of Yad Vashem - the world's leading Exterminationist authority - reports that "In 1942 a gas chamber was built in Dachau, but it was not put into use." (10) The same encyclopaedia also tells us that a total of 206,206 prisoners were registered at Dachau during its existence and that there were 31,591 registered deaths, "most of them during the war". (11)

That is clear is it not? Both the official history of the camp - which was written by a Belgian General - and the world's leading Holocaust archive confirm that there were no gassings in Dachau. Unfortunately, when one studies the contemporary archives, one finds photographs of what were claimed to have been gas chambers. For example, to this day there are such photographs in the archive of the Imperial War Museum. In the Department of Photographs, photograph KY 65496 is captioned "Gassed prisoners, awaiting burning, are piled nearly to the roof of the crematory." These photos are "CERTIFIED AS PASSED BY THE SHAEF CENSOR". The researcher is informed that: "When

Americans entered the camp...[t]hey discovered gas extermination chambers, incinerators full of naked bodies, bodies marked for dissection and the bodies of several small children." (12)

In September 1945, the London *Daily Mail* compiled a gory photographic souvenir called *LEST WE FORGET*. The book, which had an introduction by one George Murray, is subtitled *THE HORRORS OF NAZI CONCENTRATION CAMPS REVEALED FOR ALL TIME IN THE MOST TERRIBLE PHOTOGRAPHS EVER PUBLISHED*. On page 5 it is stated quite candidly that the book "may well play a useful part in the re-education of the Germans", while on page 50 a photograph of the alleged gas chamber is captioned *GAS CHAMBER EXTERIOR...DACHAU*. On page 51 is another photograph, of a pile of corpses captioned *SOME OF THE GASED...DACHAU*. These photographs have since been exhibited all over the world, but they were *not* of either gas chambers or the victims of gas chambers. So what were they? The former were delousing chambers; the latter were the victims of typhus, other diseases and starvation; and here we will have to take another diversion, to discuss typhus, and the methods the Nazis used to combat it.

Typhus And Delousing (13)

It is far too easy for those of us, like the current writer, sitting behind an IBM compatible computer in a centrally heated apartment in a suburb of one of the world's great cities, to compare life today with those of other great civilisations of the past. This is a mistake too many people make - especially the greens - with their "small is beautiful" philosophy and their carping back to a mythical golden age. At the turn of the century and indeed until well into this century, diseases such as tuberculosis were widespread, even in "rich" countries. The majority of the population didn't have hot running water in their homes, much less colour televisions. Indeed, one can still see such scenes today when the global media broadcasts live pictures of war zones. Whenever there is an earthquake or some other large scale natural disaster, one of the very first fears of the authorities and humanitarian organisations is the

outbreak of infectious diseases due to the breakdown of water supplies and other utilities.

To put this in perspective we can do no better than compare the infant death rates of three countries for the past hundred years. The following table is extracted from B.R. Mitchell's *International Historical Statistics*. (14)

Table 2: Deaths per thousand live births (under one year old)

	United Kingdom (15)	Germany	Russia (16)
1880	153	240	286
1899	163	216	240
1928	65	89	155
1933	63	77	
1988	9	8 (17)	25

Even in 1928, a Russian child had, on average, nearly a one in six chance of dying before his or her first birthday. This may seem like a truly horrifying statistic - and it is today - but at the time the premature deaths of infants was accepted as a fact of life. Even today one constantly hears stories about young children dying in their droves in Third World countries.

Returning to typhus, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says of this disease that: "Epidemic typhus has been one of the great disease scourges in human history. It is classically associated with people crowded together in filth, cold, poverty, and hunger; with wars and famine; with refugees; prisons and jails; concentration camps; and ships." Also known as spotted fever, it is now regarded as a series of diseases, and is spread by rats and other rodents, the rat flea and lice. Typhus has been described reliably from the Middle Ages; it was a major problem during the Napoleonic Wars and the Irish potato famine of 1846-9. (18) *Britannica* reports that "At the close of World War I the disease caused several million deaths in Russia, Poland and Romania..." A world authority on the disease goes further: between 1917 and 1923, 30,000,000 cases of typhus resulted in 3 million deaths in European Russia alone. (19)

Essential to curbing the spread of typhus was delousing; the substance used for this in the concentration camps was Zyklon B, a commercial preparation

of hydrogen cyanide. Zyklon B had been used by the German military since 1924, (20) and was used to disinfect (delouse) both barracks and clothes. (21)

From Delousing To "Gassing"

Zyklon B is actually a crystalline substance which is used to bind the gas. Hydrogen cyanide is an extremely dangerous gas whose properties have long been recognised by chemists and people who work with it. A standard work on toxins written before Hitler came to power reported that "The indiscriminate use of this very dangerous gas by persons quite unfamiliar with it led to the accidental death in Cleveland of four persons who inhaled hydrocyanic acid gas with which a restaurant under their apartment was being fumigated." (22) The same author reports the death of ten men from HCN poisoning in a workman's barracks in Essen, Germany. (23) The suggestion that the Nazis or anyone would use such a gas to "exterminate" people en masse beggars belief. (24)

Descriptions of the operation of delousing equipment can be found in the Holocaust literature, although they are few and far between. The 1947 book *Smoke Over Birkenau*, by the Gentile Auschwitz survivor Seweryna Szmaglewska, contains some fascinating passages relating to this; these have been overlooked - or most likely wilfully ignored - by the intellectual prostitutes who have the temerity to call themselves historians, probably for fear of being branded "anti-Semitic" by the slime of Organised Jewry. A couple of quotes from the above book will illustrate the point.

"It had been announced that while the women took their bath their clothes would be disinfected in the gas chamber and in a steam kettle. But actually it turned out that the men working in the gas chambers could not catch up with their work. So we wait naked, in the big, cold hall.

After an hour the first batch of gassed clothes is brought." (25)

Later, the author refers to the staff of the *Effektenkammer* (gassing, sorting and putting away of clothes), gives a detailed description of the gassing of

clothes and says that girls were in charge of the gas chamber. She even states that "Two rooms adjoin the gas chamber - one for the storage of coal and coke, the other for the disinfected clothes." (26) And later, after a fire had destroyed the gas chamber, "the Efinger girls, suspected of sabotage, were sent to work in the fields." (27) Which begs the question: why weren't they exterminated?

Although references to the use of disinfecting gas chambers in the Holocaust literature are rare, one finds constant reference to typhus. Szmaglewska tells us that on the barracks doors is an inscription: *Eine Laus - dein Tod*, (ie "One louse - your death.") (28) and that the women's camp took two weeks to delouse, while everything women in the hospital own is stripped from them and sent to the gas chamber. (29)

It should be noted that Zyklon B was not the only substance used to combat the spread of typhus, and here we may draw on the recollections of another Auschwitz survivor, this time a Jewess. In her fantasy prone book *I am alive*, Kitty Hart reports a disinfection in which she and others were smeared all over with green fluid and showered, then had to stand for a naked roll call. (30) To the current writer it sounds like they were bathed in Swarfega. (31) Szmaglewska reports that she and others were made to take a long, hot steam bath then a cold shower after which they were sprayed with "some evil-smelling liquid, with which they disinfect your head". (32)

It is not inconceivable that some inmates who were deloused genuinely believed they were about to be gassed, or even that they had been gassed. In her 1987 book *I Light a Candle*, another female survivor, Gena Turgel who, like Kitty Hart, was sent to Auschwitz as a young girl, publishes a lengthy description in which she claims - possibly sincerely - to have been in a gas chamber. The following account is from pages 106-8 of the 1988 edition of Mrs Turgel's book.

"As soon as we arrived (33) we were segregated. The guards there told us that we were going to the shower room and that our clothes would be disinfected. We undressed and left our clothes in a heap on a bench outside. They shouted at us: 'Go in! Quick! And they locked the doors behind us...When the doors opened again and we got out, several other women embraced us. Some were civilians, DPs (displaced persons) like ourselves, whom the Nazis had recruited to work there. They said to us: 'Do you realize you've escaped the furnace?' I opened my eyes very wide and said: 'Furnace? What furnace?' 'The

gas chamber,' they said...We all wept tears of joy. I shall never know how we came out alive. The gas chamber was operated from another part of the camp. Had the gas supply suddenly failed? Why did the guards, usually so super-efficient, fail to discover this and not send us back inside again? Was the woman I knew an angel from heaven or some higher power, who had appeared through those heavy iron doors to save us from death?"

As stated, it is possible that even this account is sincere, I am not accusing Gena Turgel of lying outright here, even though the book contains many outright lies by both Mrs Turgel and her husband, and there are many problems with her book, not the least of which is the fact that it was ghost-written more than forty years after the events it purports to describe. [The reader is referred to Chapter Ten for a critique of the Turgel and Hart books]. All of the above has taken us a long way from the lies of Organised Jewry's academic arm about the non-existent Dachau gas chamber, so let us now return to this.

Dachau Revelations And Misrepresentations - 1: In Britain

In 1960, Dr Martin Broszat of the Institute for Contemporary History at Munich wrote a letter to the magazine *Die Zeit* in which he explained the official version of the Dachau gas chamber. This letter, which appeared in the August 19, 1960 under the heading *Keine Vergasung in Dachau* is reprinted below: (34)

"Neither in Dachau nor in Buchenwald were Jews or other prisoners gassed. The gaschamber in Dachau was not quite finished or set into operation. Hundreds of thousands of prisoners, who were sent to Dachau or other concentration camps in the territory of the old Reich, were in the main victims of catastrophic hygiene and supply problems: in the twelve months from July 1942 to June 1943, according to official SS statistics, in all the concentration camps of the Reich, 110812 persons from illness and hunger. The mass destruction of Jews by gassing started 1941/42, and many incorrigible self-teachers, who certainly possess the correct grand total, base themselves on arguments

which are individually correct, but which by means of polemics have been torn from their contexts, in the consideration of which they hurry past, basing themselves on false or deficient information."

Crystal clear, isn't it: no gassings in Dachau? The reader will recall that it has been reported falsely here and there in the media that people were *gassed* in Belsen and other camps, where it was proved that there were no gas chamber . (35) Although one expects this sort of nonsense from the media, one does not expect it from academia, even from Jewish academic organisations which clearly have axes to grind. Unfortunately however, this is not the case.

In January 1960, a man named John Alldridge published a series of articles in the *Manchester Evening News*. Written as letters to his daughter Jane, they dealt with certain (alleged) aspects of Nazism, including the Dachau gas chamber - the one that didn't exist, remember? These letters are very emotive, they have a poetic quality, but poetry is an entirely different discipline from history. On pages 5-6, Alldridge carps on thus: "...for all to see, was the room where the victims undressed, the gas chamber itself with the peep-hole through which the operator watched for the last death agony so that he could switch on the electric fan to clear the air of its deathly fumes..."

Again, poetry this may be, but history it is not; Alldridge though can be forgiven, but the Board of Deputies of British Jews can't, because in 1963 this august organisation republished the nonsense of John Alldridge as a pamphlet called *Letters To My Daughter*, (36) and the Board of Deputies have research facilities that are second to none.

The same pamphlet reproduces a photograph of a delousing chamber which it palms off on its readers as a gas chamber, (see page 137). This photograph is reprinted by Professor Butz in his book to silence all but conscious liars. The caption on the door is not clear here, but Professor Butz translates it thus: "Caution! Gas! Life danger! Do not open!" (37) The Board of Deputies of British Jews are thus exposed as liars and forgers; and their research department, along with all the other academic historians - Jewish and non-Jewish - who held their peace while this lie was foisted onto a credulous public, are condemned by their silence. In the words of Charles Peguy: "He who does not bellow the truth when he knows the truth makes himself the accomplice of liars and forgers." (38)

Shameful as is this episode in Britain, a far more shameful con trick was performed in South Africa, because in that country the systematic misrepresentation of the non-existent Dachau gas chamber, and other lies about the Holocaust, by two Jewish academics, was used to effect a ban on the Revisionist pamphlet *Did Six Million Really Die?*, and, in effect, to make questioning the Holocaust a *de facto* criminal offence.

Dachau Revelations And Misrepresentations - 2: In South Africa

The 1974 publication in England of *Did Six Million Really Die?* led to an outbreak of whining and wailing in the controlled media. Normally such a pamphlet would have gone unnoticed, but it was reviewed, not unfavourably, by the impressionable author on psychic matters Colin Wilson, in the mainstream montly magazine *Books & Bookmen*.

Attempts to have the author and publishers prosecuted in Britain were unsuccessful, but in South Africa, Organised Jewry's lobbying was rewarded with an order banning the pamphlet. (39) The September-October issue of *Patterns Of Prejudice* reveals that action was taken against the pamphlet at a high level. According to the article in question, the pamphlet was first banned in June 1976 on the grounds that it incited racial hatred [sic] against the minority everybody supposedly has nothing better to do than to hate. "The evidence supporting the ban was collected by the S.A. Jewish Board of Deputies." (40) An appeal against the ban was lodged the following August, but was later withdrawn. According to the South African Jewish lawyer Arthur Suzman: "The evidence was so overwhelming that the appeal could not have stood up to scrutiny for one moment. But we would have welcomed the judgment of the appellànt tribunal which would have expressed the facts." (41) The article adds that this *evidence* was later published as *Six Million Did Die*, (in October 1976). One of the authors of this book was lawyer Suzman; the other was another leading South African Zionist, Denis Diamond. (42)

Although, according to the authors, this book was "widely commended as a significant legal and historical contribution to the study of the Holocaust", (43) it is a tissue of lies, distortions and misrepresentations, none more so than those the authors make about the Dachau gas chamber. On page 122, are two photographs captioned: *Victims of the Dachau gas chamber lie piled to the ceiling in the crematorium.*, and *Bodies piled high in the Dachau crematorium.* (44) As stated, there were no gassings in Dachau, (see pages 59-60). An American soldier is shown standing over bodies piled up in the Dachau crematorium; one it entitled to ask if the bodies of the inmates shown here had really been gassed, why is there no forensic evidence of gassing, an autopsy report or something of the sort? The answer is obvious. Let us now take a more detailed look at the lies and distortions of Arthur Suzman and Denis Diamond.

The Suzman And Diamond Study: More Lies And Deception

As stated, the media is awash with nonsense about the Holocaust as it is about many other subjects, but academics - Jewish or otherwise - have no such excuses; most of them are paid to research and publish their findings in a wide variety of fields. Although the Suzman and Diamond study has the veneer of scholarship it is transparently dishonest to anyone with the slightest knowledge of the Holocaust and the Nazi camps.

On page 5, the authors list the *falsifications and distortions* used by Richard Harwood in *Did Six Million Really Die?*; one of these is the fake photographs. Here is what Messrs Suzman and Diamond have to say about this. "Harwood alleges that the numerous films and photographs depicting Nazi atrocities are faked. He purports to establish this by two photographs...He states that the origin of the first photograph is unknown and alleges that the second is a montage, in which a photograph of a heap of corpses has been superimposed on the foreground of the first photograph.

The first photograph in fact was actually produced in evidence at the major Nuremberg Trial." (45)

The authors seem to think this is some kind of refutation, but they have not answered the question! One version of this photograph is reproduced on page 128 with the caption "*A policy of deliberate and systematic starvation*". As there are (at least?) two versions of this photograph, at least one of them must be a fake, (see page 136). And in any case, such photographs do not prove that the German High Command enforced a policy of deliberate and systematic starvation.

Suzman and Diamond list other footage of films which they claim to be genuine, of which no doubt some, or even the vast majority, are, but what exactly do they prove? On the adjacent page for example the authors reproduce two photographs with the caption "Belsen - From the film exhibited at the Eichmann Trial." (46) Again, Belsen was not an extermination camp, so the inclusion of this film in evidence at the Eichmann trial is an example of the Israeli government gilding the lily as much as these two good ol' boys.

On page 92, are three photographs; the photograph at the top of the page is alleged in the Holocaust literature to have been taken at Auschwitz; (47) this may indeed be the case, but the two photographs below and the photograph on page 94 were staged "for the benefit of the war correspondents". (48)

Returning to the photograph on page 128, we have already alluded to the fraudulent caption "*A policy of deliberate and systematic starvation*." Such mass starvation occurred only at the end of the war, only in selected camps, and did not affect all the inmates in even these. There was certainly food available, but there were often severe logistical problems with regard to its distribution. To take just one example, one of the defendants at the Belsen Trial, Oscar Schmeditz (49) told the court that at least one lorry from the bakery was prohibited from entering the camp because of the typhus epidemic. (50)

In this connection it is worth bearing in mind that even in this day and age in one of the most advanced nations of the world (Britain!) one can find occasional well-documented reports of people suffering from malnutrition and tuberculosis. One should also bear in mind that during the Second World food was rationed, that the Germans suffered far worse than we did, and that prisoners are always at the bottom of the social strata.

Bearing all this in mind, it is worth examining the Calorie counts of the concentration camps. In the mill of death itself - Auschwitz - the official Calorie count was 2,150 per day for those doing hard labour; 1,738 for the rest.

Prisoners actually received a maximum of 1,744, while the worst treated got 1,302 Calories. (51)

Insufficient as this was, it was considerably more than the German people themselves existed on after the war! In his 1950 book *Decision In Germany*, the American general Lucius Clay revealed that in July 1945, rations were set at 950-1150 Calories per day, about half what was needed to support a working population and a third of what Americans were getting! In practice only about 950 Calories per day were distributed. In August 1945, the official ration was fixed at 1,550 Calories for the normal consumer. (52) To add substance to this claim, Clay published a photograph of a German child in a Berlin hospital who was dying of starvation. It looks like a Belsen propaganda photograph! (53)

It should be pointed out that concentration camp inmates were not the only people to starve to death during the Second World War. In 1943, a million and a half people died as the result of a famine in Bengal and the resulting epidemics. Yes, a million and a half! A contemporary report in a British medical journal referred to it as "one of the great catastrophes of the war", (54) yet who today has even heard of the Bengal famine?

We conclude this refutation of the lies of Suzman and Diamond with a brief mention of two articles published in a contemporary medical journal, the *British Medical Journal* for January 5, 1946 and March 23, 1946 respectively.

The former article concerns Belsen camp and states that food was very low by January 1945 although the typhus epidemic didn't start until the following month. Apparently! The official statement was that 10,000 bodies were found at Belsen, and, most enlightening of all: "It is evident that throughout the last weeks of the camp's existence a gruesome form of the law of the survival of the fittest was in operation. The distribution of food was arbitrary, and those that still had some strength left obtained more than their share." (55) In other words, the severe food shortage was exacerbated by the behaviour of the prisoners themselves, or some of them. This view is borne out by numerous survivor testimonies (including at "war crimes" trials). For example, according to Edith Treiger, whose deposition was read on the sixteenth day of the Belsen Trial, the German *Aryan* prisoner Hilda Lohbauer took part in selections and beat prisoners. (56) Lohbauer was found guilty on both counts and sentenced to ten years imprisonment. (57)

The second article reports that in the autumn after the war, Berliners spent the weekends trying to buy food from farmers; that from July to August 1945,

ration cards were often not honoured; and that there were some deaths "from malnutrition alone". (58) From July 12, 1945 to January 12, 1946, a typhoid epidemic in Berlin led to 12,740 reported cases (2,397 in the British sector). (59)

One final, interesting point on the subject of alleged gassings which may give the reader food for thought. The current writer has made a fairly extensive search of the medical literature for 1945 and the immediate post-war period, and has found not a single article relating to gassings. The words Zyklon and hydrogen cyanide are noticeable by their absence from the indexes of the *Lancet*, the *British Medical Journal*, the *Journal Of The American Medical Association* and other medical journals. An interesting article on Dachau was published in the *British Medical Journal* in December 1946, but this contains no mention of alleged gassings; (60) an article in the *Journal Of The American Medical Association* filed from Moscow some eleven weeks after the liberation of Auschwitz refers to the alleged systematic killing of the insane in a hospital near Berlin, (61) but contains no mention of the slaying of what was by then said to be millions of people in the Auschwitz complex and other camps. Such a desideratum is curious to say the least. Or alternatively it could indicate that while the alleged killing of the insane in hospitals was taken seriously by the medical profession, the alleged mass killings of Jews and others in the camps were not.

The Camps In Perspective

While none of the above excuses in the slightest any of the Nazi atrocities or brutalities (of which there were many both inside and outside the camps), it does refute totally the lies and distortions of Suzman and Diamond and their myriad fellow travellers, and also throws an entirely new light on the actual nature of such excesses. Just as it is easy for us today to condemn these atrocities and brutalities - real and imagined - from the comforts of our armchairs - so too is it easy for us to condemn the people who perpetrated them. At the surrender of Belsen, the Commandant, the bull-necked Josef Kramer, unshaven, manacled, brutish, was exhibited to the world as "The Beast

of Belsen". At his trial, Kramer's spirited counsel, Major Winwood, referred to his client as "The Scapegoat of Belsen". (62) Whether or not that was the case, one is entitled to ask how many of Kramer's accusers, indeed, how many of the SS's accusers - Gentile and Jew - would have ended up in the dock if they had found themselves in the same position? Namely, managing a concentration camp system and trying to maintain discipline and order on the receiving end of the bloodiest war in history while fighting food and other shortages, and diseases of epidemic proportions.

Finally, as we pointed out earlier, prisoners are everywhere always at the bottom of the social ladder in every sense, and we should attempt to put the Nazi treatment of prisoners into its proper historical and social perspective. In Britain, whipping was a common punishment for men, women, the young and the old in the early 19th Century. (63) By 1817, women were no longer whipped in public, and by 1820 they were no longer whipped at all. It was only the *Criminal Justice Act* of 1948 which abolished judicial corporal punishment of adults: 3,260 people were whipped in 1900; 60 adults were whipped and 17 adults were flogged in 1938; 43 juveniles were whipped in 1938. (64)

On the twenty-sixth day of the Belsen Trial, the equally spirited defence counsel Major Cranfield, (65) compared Auschwitz and Belsen with the notorious regulation 18b, which he claimed, correctly, was in direct violation of *habeas corpus*, and, referring to hundreds - in reality thousands - of people detained by the British Government, stated that "all efforts to force the Government to give the reasons for their imprisonment failed". (66) He also pointed out that in Egypt, foremen of gangs of labourers carried whips while in India the police carried bamboo poles and added that "A prisoner was whipped to death in a North Carolina Chain Gang in 1925." (67)

However badly the Germans may have treated Jews in the camps (and others who had been designated enemies of the state), the testimonies of British prisoners of war shows them in an entirely different light. Two examples will suffice.

Captain Sigismund Payne Best was a British agent who rendezvoused with disaffected German officers at the start of the war. They were said to have wanted to overthrow Hitler and force him to sue for peace. The negotiations were scuppered at an early stage, and Payne Best spent the rest of the war in Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald. First though he was sent to Gestapo Headquarters. Payne Best published his book, *The Venlo Incident*, in 1950, and in

that he paints an entirely different picture from that of the blond-haired, blue-eyed *Aryan* supermen of Hollywood. (68)

He relates for example that at Gestapo headquarters he was told they could do anything they liked to him, "*anything*". Totally unperturbed and putting on a stiff upper lip, he tells his reader: "I was quite calm and answered as politely as I could, that of course I had read a good deal about Gestapo methods but, as in a lifetime experience of Germans I had never found them more inclined to cruelty than ourselves, I had paid no greater attention to such stories than I did to other reports published in the Press."

His interrogator empathised with him and blamed the war on "the Jews and the Plutocrats who batten on the unfortunate people in England as they did in Germany before the Führer rescued us from them." (69)

In Buchenwald, Payne Best met Dr Rascher, an SS officer who had conducted medical experiments at Dachau but who was later arrested. He reports that Rascher told him about gassings, but this is hearsay, and Payne Best says himself that Rascher "gave at least half a dozen different reasons for his imprisonment, and no one ever discovered what he really had done." (70)

Another former British POW, Charles Coward, who gave evidence at the I.G. Farben Trial, was the subject of a highly imaginative book by Ronald Charles Payne and John Williams Garrod. (71) How much of Coward's story is true is difficult to say, certainly large tranches of it cannot be corroborated, but Coward gives the impression that during his sojourns in German custody he didn't fare too badly at all. For example, at Christmas 1942 he and his fellow POWs ate well with Christmas puddings and stuff sent in from home by the Red Cross. They even put on a pantomime in the camp. (72) The following is actually a description not of military combat, but of a snowball fight in the Stalag on Christmas morning.

"In no time the other compounds had entered the fray and hundreds upon hundreds of men pelted each other...Hastily formed platoons carried out sorties into enemy country, while enfilading fire covered their rear. In the excitement the little South African was captured by Coward's side and put to work collecting ammunition..."

The POWs even pelted the Kommandant, and according to Coward and his biographers: "He was quite a decent old stick, it was agreed; almost a pity, really, that he was a German." (73)

After escaping, Coward made his way to Vienna where he allowed himself to be picked up by a revolting whore, who led him straight to the local police station, where "Surprisingly, the police were quite decent to him. He enjoyed a bowl of hot soup and a hunk of dry bread, then, wrapping himself in three blankets, settled down for the night in a fairly warm cell..." (74)

Coward also spent some time at Auschwitz, and although he gives a description of what his biographers would have us believe was a gassing, it is difficult to credit that he actually saw this. (75) Neither Coward's testimony at the Farben Trial nor the highly fictionalised accounts of his other activities at Auschwitz and elsewhere lend much credence to the Extermination thesis, if his story is to be believed. Which is extremely doubtful. (76)

Even though many of them had committed no crimes, concentration camp inmates were still regarded as enemies of the state; it is not true that Revisionists claim that Auschwitz et al were holiday camps, but probably they did not compare too badly with many then contemporary British prisons. Or even with many Third World prisons today, as the accounts of Sigismund Payne Best, Charles Coward, and many others confirm, provided one learns to read between the lines.

The Klarsfelds

Although Serge and Beate Klarsfeld are difficult to categorise, it is fair to say that they are among Holocaust Revisionism's leading, and most vitriolic, enemies. That being said, Revisionists have much to thank them for in the works of Jean-Claude Pressac, (see Chapter Seven). Serge Klarsfeld is a racial Jew of French extraction; his father died in Auschwitz. (77) His wife, the former Beate Kunzel, is both a *goy* - born of Lutheran parentage (78) - and an ethnic German of the most vile sort. (79)

Beate Klarsfeld is a sort of self-styled avenging angel and has, for many years, campaigned for the extradition and prosecution of alleged Nazi war criminals. Without wishing to take any credit away from her husband - who is both her partner and her equal - it is fair to say that she has been the driving

force behind their fanatical campaign of hatred against her own nation, and race.

The Klarsfelds were married on November 7, 1963. He is listed as a lawyer; she as a "Militant anti-Nazi". Unlike her husband, who has an MA in History and two diplomas, Beate Klarsfeld appears to have completed no higher education. (80) As well as a campaigner for "human rights", Mrs Klarsfeld is the recipient of many awards including the 1987 Golda [what Palestinians?] Meir Prize and the Jabotinsky Prize (United States, 1984). Her autobiography, *Partout ou ils seront*, was published in 1972, somewhat prematurely it would appear, because she and her husband have both been extremely busy since then.

In 1978, the Klarsfelds set up the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation. The same year they published *The Holocaust and the Neo-Nazi Mythomania*, which was edited by Serge Klarsfeld. At the back of this book are reprinted extracts from the Foundation's Certificate of Incorporation. Its goals are said to be to publicise the Nazi persecution of the Jews and other minorities and "to do any other act or thing incidental to or connected with the foregoing purposes or in advancement thereof..." (81) The cynical reader will note that this extract does not specify that this "any other act or thing" is to be legal, and shortly he will see why.

Indeed, many years before she and her husband set up this foundation, Beate Klarsfeld had a number of run-ins with the law in several countries. She was imprisoned in Warsaw in 1970 and in Prague in 1971 for demonstrating against "anti-Semitic campaigns and repression". She was arrested in La Paz in 1972 and in Rabat - in October 1974 - for distributing pro-Israel leaflets. (82)

According to one press report, a PLO spokesman commenting on this last incident said the organisation considered her action to be a provocation, and a protest had been lodged with the Moroccan authorities. The leaflets she distributed were said to have "criticized the Palestinians and hailed Israel as a haven for Jews fleeing persecution in other lands." (83) Again, the cynical reader might note that there is a difference - some would say a vast chasm - between educating people about the evils of "anti-Semitism" or campaigning against ethnic persecution on the one hand, and peddling Zionist propaganda (outside an Arab summit) on the other.

In April 1974, Mrs Klarsfeld was arrested at Dachau, on a three year old warrant. According to a press report filed April 18, in 1971 she and her husband had attempted to abduct a former SS officer in Cologne. Kurt

Lischka, one-time head of the Paris Gestapo, was sentenced to life imprisonment in absentia for his involvement in the deportation of Jews, but because there is no extradition treaty with France over such matters he was never sent back. (84)

Klarsfeld's trial began on June 15; (85) she was represented by an Israeli lawyer. (86) Amidst much wailing and gnashing of teeth, she was sentenced to two months' imprisonment; she is said to have claimed the abduction attempt was a publicity stunt! (87) She spent a total of seven weeks in custody. (88) The sentence didn't go down well in France, either, (89) but there can be little doubt who made the most noise.

Returning to their legitimate activities, the Klarsfelds' *magnum opus* was the commissioning and publishing of Jean-Claude Pressac's *AUSCHWITZ: Technique and operation of the gas chambers*, and they have published a number of other Exterminationist studies of the Holocaust, which, in spite of their obvious bias and whining and wailing, are far superior to most of the dross that has been spewed out by the Court Historians since the end of World War II. (90)

Although Beate Klarsfeld in particular is revered almost as a saintly figure by Organised Jewry - failed abductions included - both her aura and her husband's were tarnished a mite in 1985 when they were implicated in a plot to assassinate Klaus Barbie, a leading former Nazi who was then living in exile in South America.

According to a 1985 Reuter dispatch, in 1982, the Klarsfelds hired a Bolivian "socialist" code-named Juan Carlos to assassinate Barbie. This is obviously a serious allegation to make against anyone, so one would expect people as saintly as the Klarsfelds to deny it emphatically or even to institute defamation proceedings. Serge Klarsfeld's reaction ~~appears~~ appears to have been lukewarm, to say the least. He is said to have confirmed that they had been involved in the murder plot but denied that they hired the would-be hitman!

Their story is that they were approached by "Juan-Carlos", a Bolivian socialist exile, who said he was sympathetic to their hunt for Nazi "war criminals" and said that he planned to kill Barbie. Beate Klarsfeld told Reuter that "she approved of the murder plot 'out of despair because we had been waiting for 10 years to have him extradited.'"

These are extraordinarily candid admissions; Serge Klarsfeld is said to have told Reuter that they had not hired the would-be assassin they had "merely

paid his fare back to La Paz". Yes, *merely!* Machiavellian schemers that they are, most Jewish organisations would have run a mile from a character like "Juan-Carlos", but the Klarsfelds paid his air fare!

When he arrived back in La Paz, "Juan-Carlos" telephoned the gruesome twosome and told them he had reconsidered his intentions as there were then "new legal possibilities for getting Barbie out." According to the author of the *Life* article, it was the Klarsfelds who called off the assassination attempt. (91) One is entitled to ask if the tax-exempt status granted the Klarsfelds' foundation was intended to be used for such benign purposes as plotting the murders of old men, even if they were indeed Nazi war criminals. The answer to that question must surely be nay.

In 1996, *The Journal Of Historical Review* published a lengthy article on the activities of "Jewish Militants" in France. The Klarsfelds take up two pages; as might be expected, this well-documented article paints a less than saintly picture of them. (92) One of the citations given for this article is a short but flattering interview given by Mrs Klarsfeld to the *Chicago Tribune* in 1986. Herein she is quoted thus: "Any method that focuses attention on a case is valid, as long as it brings results." (93) Again, *any* method, not any legal method.

To cap all of this, Mrs Klarsfeld became the first German to be nominated by the State of Israel for the Nobel Peace Prize, (94) an award that has been received by such distinguished champions of peace and liberty as mass murderer Menachem Begin (jointly with Anwar Sadat) and Holocaust whiner Elie Wiesel. (95)

Chapter Six: Holocaust Revisionism's Enemies: Academia - 2

Other Lies And Distortions Of Academia

The Suzman and Diamond study discussed in the previous chapter provides clear evidence of the depths to which Jewish academics will sink in order not only to foist their lies onto the public but to give them official sanction backed up by the full coercive power of the state. This and the following chapter will be devoted to analyses of a number of anti-Revisionist tracts; we will also include an overview of most but by no means all of the methods used by the enemies of truth to suppress open debate on this supposedly so difficult subject. By the time he has finished this book the reader will be in a position to meet head-on and refute most of the arguments used by academic Holocaust affirmers, and many of the non-arguments put forward by them and their powerful allies.

We will also take a brief look at the organised persecution of Holocaust Revisionists - in particular the trial of Ernst Zundel and the harassment of Fred Leuchter - and take a look too at some of the (often quite vacuous) attempts to refute the Revisionists' claims rather than simply to pour scorn on them. This will include Gill Seidel's hysterical *The Holocaust Denial*, the extraordinarily candid *Truth Prevails* and the at times embarrassing *AUSCHWITZ: Technique And Operation Of The Gas Chambers*. We will not cover all the trials and tribulations of Holocaust Revisionists - the hysterical campaigns in France against Professor Faurisson and Henri Roques, for example - but we will certainly give the reader an insight into the hysteria surrounding the entire issue.

The strongest polemic against Holocaust Revisionism to date is generally acknowledged to be Deborah Lipstadt's book *Denying The Holocaust*, so let us begin by taking the cow by the horns.

Affirming The Holocaust: A Skeptical Inquiry Into The Cognitive Dissonance Of Deborah E. Lipstadt

Deborah Lipstadt's book was first published in 1993 and was hailed as "an important book that should be widely read" by no less a publication than the *Skeptical Inquirer*. (1) [This prestigious magazine is the theoretical journal of the Committee for the Investigation of Scientific Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP)]. The reviewer was a professor of psychology, in line with the establishment's policy of portraying Holocaust Revisionists as not simply evil and bigoted but mentally ill. CSICOP was founded by Paul Kurtz, an otherwise distinguished philosopher and author of many books. (2) However, as early as 1992, Lipstadt had published a lengthy article in *Patterns Of Prejudice* (based on research for the book); it is called *Holocaust-Denial and the Compelling Force of Reason*. (3)

The polemical nature of Lipstadt's then forthcoming booklength study is evident from the slightest critical examination of her turgid prose. Thus on the very first page we are told that "...the Holocaust was not a tragedy for the Jews but rather a tragedy for the whole of civilization in which the victims were Jews, so too, denial of the Holocaust is not a threat only to Jews and Jewish history, but rather to all those who believe in the ultimate power of truth and reason." (4)

This is an argument Jewish propagandists and apologists never tire of espousing, often just as directly. In other words, anyone who dares to question *us* is not simply an anti-Semite but a threat to *democracy*. Lipstadt is both a Jewish propagandist and a Jewish apologist as well as an academic. (5)

Page 64: "Denial of the Holocaust is certainly a form of antisemitism..." Says who? In fact, as we have stressed already, nobody in his right mind denies the Holocaust, but the term *denier* is an epithet Lipstadt revels in. It is irrational, she says, "and cannot be countered with the normal and natural forces of investigation, argument and debate."

This is a candid admission indeed; obviously she didn't intend it to sound so, but what she is saying is that Exterminationists cannot counter the arguments put forward by Revisionists. (6)

She continues: "Half-truths - portions of stories which conveniently delete critical information - leave the reader with a distorted impression of what really happened." In a footnote she cites *The Diary Of Anne Frank*. Like the whiner and hypocrite she is, Lipstadt rails at the alleged half-truths and distortions of the Revisionists while carefully omitting all mention of the most gross half-truths, distortions and outright lies perpetuated by the Exterminationist lobby, including Organised Jewry, the organised left and her fellow academics. In particular, that Holocaust Revisionism was not, in the first instance, the work of Nazis, anti-Semites and sundry cranks; the two men who pioneered it were both anti-Nazis, and one of them was a Jew.

The French academic and socialist Paul Rassinier (1906-67) was interned by the Nazis at Buchenwald camp. (7) After the end of the war he was amazed to hear stories of gas chambers operating in Buchenwald, among other things. As a result of his investigations he authored a series of books. (8) Rassinier's work led to a violent press campaign against him and legal actions in which he, his preface author and publisher were acquitted, convicted, then finally acquitted again. (9)

Lipstadt does mention Rassinier in her book, and does make some meaningful criticisms. For example, she points out that Rassinier invented a fellow inmate in his book *Crossing the Line* - apparently as a didactic device. (10) He appears to have gone over the top with his attacks on the Holocaust scholar Raul Hilberg. (11) It is possible - indeed it is likely - that Rassinier, who was writing in French, had made some honest mistranslations. (12) However, Lipstadt's criticisms of Rassinier are, for the most part, ludicrous, although they will not necessarily be so recognised by the lay reader who (unlike the current writer), has neither the time, the resources, the opportunity nor the inclination to poke around in archives and research libraries. Thus, Lipstadt informs us that Rassinier tried to vindicate the Nazis by proving that atrocity allegations against them were "inflated and unfair". (13)

The reality is that many atrocity allegations were indeed inflated, as Exterminationists themselves now concede, albeit with the greatest reluctance. To take just one example: the death toll at Auschwitz was inflated wilfully by the

communists, who claimed that up to four million people had been done to death there.

The earliest reference the current writer has found to this figure is a story that appeared on the front page of the *Yorkshire Post* on May 8, 1945: *4,000,000 Dead in One Camp*, (see page 101). This report was filed from Moscow. On May 9, 1945, Dr Ada Bimko swore a deposition at Belsen in which she reported that "I have examined the records of the numbers cremated and I say that the record show [sic] that about 4,000,000 persons were cremated at the camp. I say that from my own observation I have no doubt that at least this number were exterminated." (14)

In his book on the Holocaust, which was first published as long ago as 1953, the Jewish scholar Gerald Reitlinger writes that "the figure of four million has become ridiculous. Unfortunately, Russian arithmetic has blurred the stark and inescapable fact that 800,000 to 900,000 human beings perished in Auschwitz, its gas chambers and its camps. There are probably too many incalculable factors to make a closer estimate of the number of Auschwitz victims possible..." (15)

The claim that the legitimate downward revision of atrocity statistics vindicates the Nazis is thus exposed as semantic nonsense, unless she is claiming that the downward revision of such statistics is legitimate when they are so revised by Jews and/or Court Historians, but not by Revisionists. (16)

Lipstadt claims that Rassinier set out to prove that survivors' claims were not to be trusted, and that inmates rather than SS men were responsible for running the camps and committing atrocities. (17) Both these claims are true, indeed, immediately after writing this, Lipstadt herself concedes that some former inmates did, and still do, embellish their experiences. (18) This sort of thing happens all the time in all fields of human activity, so one should make allowance for this when reading survivor testimony, especially when it is given many years after the war; there is though a stark difference between embellishment and outright lying. As to atrocities being committed by inmates rather than by SS men, we can do no better than adduce the following quote: "The German capos were a thousand times worse than the SS men, because among the SS men there were some human beings." [This is from the July 1964 testimony of former inmate Franz Ruprecht at the 20 month long Auschwitz trial in the 1960s]. (19) The reader is also referred to the Belsen Trial and the allegations against Hilda Lohbauer, for example, (see page 64).

One can even find references in survivor and other Holocaust literature to murders committed by inmates and attempts to justify them. In her book *Five Chimneys*, former Birkenau inmate Olga Lengyel claims that she and other inmates murdered babies in the camp hospital, and offers the following justification: women who gave birth in the infirmary were sent to the gas chamber along with their babies, unless the baby was stillborn or when it was unlikely to survive, in which case the mother was spared. (20) As a result of this, Lengyel and her collaborators decided to save pregnant mothers by murdering their newborn babies and passing them off as stillborn! "And so, the Germans succeeded in making murderers of even us." (21) Exactly why the SS would send mothers with their babies to the *gas chambers* but not the mothers of stillborn babies is not made clear.

The book *Fighting Auschwitz* - a scholarly work by Józef Garlinski - claims that "The Hospital also afforded many opportunities to save prisoners from the trusties and sometimes even from the S.S." (22) Which begs the question why should prisoners need to be saved from the trustees? A bit later the author reports that towards the end of the war babies were saved, but before that, in Auschwitz, women criminal prisoners drowned them in buckets of water! (23) Garlinski goes on to describe the murder of an alleged Gestapo informer in a particularly gruesome manner. (24) The victim had been sentenced to death by the underground. He describes other murders too, including, most incredibly, by specially bred typhus lice. This novel method of assassination is said to have disposed of a number of SS men, ie "caused serious losses". (25) If this story is true then it may well have caused or helped cause the deaths of dozens, hundreds or even thousands of prisoners, and this at a time when the Nazis were doing their best to eradicate typhus in the camps! (26)

Returning to Lipstadt's polemic against Rassinier, she says that "He dismissed as gossip the testimony of survivors who claimed they had witnessed atrocities..." (27) We have already covered this sort of claim, along with Lipstadt's admission that survivors do embellish their tales. To this one should add that, if the above extraordinarily candid revelations are in any measure true (murdering newborn babies, wilfully spreading typhus, etc), some survivors have good reason both to embellish and to demonise the Nazis. But for the grace of God, they, like former Auschwitz and Belsen inmate Hilda Lohbauer, could well have ended up in the dock at the subsequent war crimes trials.

On page 52, (28) the author claims that at the time the Nazis had justified rather than denied atrocities. Denial is again seen as the road to respectability; if they can convince the world that the victims rather than the Nazis themselves were guilty, then the white man will flock to the swastika in his millions. This may be true of Nazis, but it isn't necessarily true of Revisionists. And it most certainly is not true either of Lipstadt's co-racialists in Occupied Palestine or of the Islamic fanatics who oppose them. The Zionists are quite blatant in their mass murder of innocent men, women and children; the use of torture against alleged terrorist suspects is even enshrined in Israeli law! (29) On the other side, "Islamic" fanatics have no respect either for Zionist Jews' lives or for their own, hence the spate of suicide bombings and other dastardly acts with which Islam has become associated.

On page 54, (30) Lipstadt gives the impression that she believes Nazi methods were unique. The unspoken corollary is of course that Jewish suffering is unique, and that Jews need, indeed deserve, special protection and special privileges (31) under the law of the land. It is a *de facto* reality that Organised Jewry has long since been recognised as a *special* entity, although there are signs that this is changing as the truth about both the Middle East and Zionist power and mendacity seep out.

Next, Lipstadt argues that by the 1960s, Rassinier argued that the gas chambers themselves were a myth. (32) This could have been the result of increasing paranoia, or it could have been that by this time he had done further research.

Nowhere in her book does she mention the courageous Jew J.G. Burg. (33) Burg published three Revisionist books in the 1960s; unfortunately, none have (yet) been translated into English. They are *Schuld und Schicksal*, 1962; *Suendenboecke*, 1967; and *NS-Verbrechen*, 1968. Burg's courage was not appreciated in all quarters, and in 1956 he was beaten up by Zionist thugs while visiting his wife's grave in Munich. Burg's beating and courage were noted by Professor Butz in his iconoclastic book; (34) ten years earlier, Burg received a mention in *Patterns Of Prejudice*; in the September/October 1967, C.C. Aronsfeld referred to Burg's work as "the self-denunciation of a Jew". (35) The same article slagged off two leading anti-Zionist *Torah* Jews: Rabbi Moshe Menuhin (father of the famous violinist) and Rabbi Elmer Berger. Berger was said to be an unsophisticated rabbi. (36) This is absolute nonsense; thirteen years later Berger published a very sophisticated analysis of Zionism; (37) likewise,

Menuhin is the author of an excellent book exposing Zionism from the *Torah Jew's* viewpoint. (38)

Burg also gave evidence at the 1988 Zundel Trial - of which more anon. This is another desideratum in Lipstadt's book; she and her kind can and do exhibit all the mock outrage in the world at the supposed "Half-truths - portions of stories which conveniently delete critical information" and all the other alleged distortions and dirty tricks of the Revisionists, but like all hypocrites, her own distortions, half-truths and outright lies never enter the equation.

It is worth mentioning here three other authors who, although they didn't investigate the alleged extermination programme, made comments that deserve to be noted, and did so well before Holocaust Revisionism was a household name.

In 1946, a short article appeared in *The Social Crediter* which questioned the six million; the full text of this article appears below:

Stop Press. "B."B.C. reduces Jews murdered to three million. What's a few millions, anyway? The "B."B.C. continues to "plug" the figure of six million Jews murdered in concentration camps and elsewhere (e.g., 8 a.m. April 29th). Taking the duration of the active war to be five years, this is one million, two hundred thousand per annum, or three thousand, two hundred and fifty per day, seven days a week, or about *seven per minute* for five years if the murderers worked an eight hour day. Does anyone in their senses accept that statement? Or that 40 *per cent.* of the total number of Jews in the world, as given by the Jews themselves, were killed, leaving immense numbers of Jews still alive in Germany? Has anyone heard that a Rothschild, a Bleichroder, or a Mendelssohn was amongst them?

We take this propaganda very seriously. It is clearly intended to bolster some proposal the effect of which is still further to exacerbate the European problem, for the final subjugation of the Continent to the Communists.

Would the "B."B.C. now like to throw a little more mud at Mr. Chamberlain? (39)

Although this article is uncredited it was almost certainly written by Major Douglas himself. For the uninitiated, Major Clifford Hugh Douglas (1879-1952), (40) was the founding father of Social Credit. An engineer by profession, Douglas applied engineering principles to the financial system and clearly identified its major fault - and the cause of most social and political unrest - as the deficiency of purchasing power caused by the creation of credit as an

interest-bearing debt. It must be stressed that Social Credit is a scientific analysis of economics, and not a revealed truth - unlike the Holocaust; like its founder it has been consigned to the memory hole because of its opposition to the powerful vested interests of usury capitalism.

The above analysis is also based on science - a precise mathematical calculation - as the reader will see if he performs these calculations himself. The actual duration of the alleged extermination programme was somewhat less than five years, so even allowing for the deaths of Jews on the Eastern front and from other reasons (bombardment, old age, infant mortality, etc), we are still being asked to accept an enormous figure.

Another person who questioned the six million figure was the distinguished journalist Douglas Reed whom we have already met, (see page 21). In the same book that Reed attacked the Anti-Defamation League he poured scorn on the six million figure, (41) commenting that "In my judgment the figure of six millions was a grotesque exaggeration which an unintimidated press would never have published, save to expose." (42)

Yet another person who questioned the six million was John Beaty. In his 1951 book *Iron Curtain Over America*, Beaty ridiculed the six million figure by comparing various official statistics and concluded that the world Jewish population actually showed a small increase in the war decade. Beaty was suspicious of reparations that were due to be paid to Israel, and commented that "the known facts on Jewish migration and Jewish power in Eastern Europe tend, like the World Almanac figures accepted by the Senate Judiciary Committee, to raise a question as to where Hitler got the 6,000,000 Jews he is said to have killed. This question should be settled once and for all before the United States backs any 'Israeli' claims against Germany." (43)

It goes without saying that Beaty's book has been smeared as "anti-Semitic" by Organised Jewry for the above (and other) reasons. Robert Singerman's *ANTISEMITIC PROPAGANDA*, a standard reference work, reports that "One source views this book as 'the most extensive piece of anti-Semitic literature in the history of America's racist movement.'" Singerman himself says the book "Contentends that America is being communized by Khazar Jews following directions from their Kremlin headquarters. The Democratic Party has already been captured by the Khazars who guide Truman and Roosevelt before him." (44) These are blatant, bare-faced lies, but those of us who have crossed swords with Organised Jewry expect little else.

John Beaty was a senior officer in G-2 and one of the two editors of the daily secret *G-2 Report* which was issued to the White House - and other high places. (45) From 1943, he was also Chief of the Interview Section of the General Staff Corps and interviewed over two thousand people over a three year period, "most of whom were returning from some high mission, some delicate assignment, or some deed of valor". Beaty comments that the picture such people painted of the world scene was "terrifyingly different from the picture presented by our government to the American people!" (46) For the above reasons, Beaty's views command respect, far more so than the views of many Holocaust survivors.

Returning to Lipstadt's *Patterns Of Prejudice* polemic, the author announces on pages 66-7 that "Given the preponderance of evidence from victims, bystanders and perpetrators, why waste time worrying about them?" - the Revisionists, that is. The same argument can be used for flying saucers, miracles, and indeed every other strange phenomenon. This is what is known as the faggot fallacy: masses of weak evidence - and lies - do not a strong case make; the only thing they do make is weak evidence and lies.

On page 68 she tells an outright lie: "...the revisionists draw a great deal of inspiration from *The Protocols*, a work which has enjoyed a sustained and vibrant life despite its having long ago been proved a forgery."

The simple fact is that no Revisionist worthy of the name has ever given any credence whatsoever to the *Protocols Of Zion*. I might add that many non-Revisionists have believed in the *Protocols* and continue to believe in them. To take just one - extremely bizarre - example, William Cooper, a former American Naval Intelligence officer, who later went off his head, (47) is a firm believer in the *Protocols*. Cooper though does not believe they were written by "the Jews" but by the Illuminati. He also believes that the Illuminati is working hand-in-hand with aliens (at least one race of which is chlorophyll-based!), and that during the Second World War the Nazis bought the Zyklon they used to gas [sic] the Jews from the future Pope, who was then a salesman for I.G. Farben! (48)

Back to Lipstadt: her book also has several mentions of the *Protocols*. For example, on page 37 (49) she drags them in again. It must be stressed though that the learned professor is not concerned simply with showing Jewry in the best possible light; although she rails at the Nazi menace, she makes no

mention whatever of Roosevelt's U-turn on foreign policy and his famous quarantine speech. (50)

The author's closing her mind and refusing to debate is fine with me, and with every other Revisionist, but what she and her equally venal co-racialists have no right to do is to shut the Revisionists up, or prevent other people from debating with them.

Let us now hop back to her *Patterns Of Prejudice* article. On page 68, here as always is the assumption that not only were Jews exterminated by the Nazis but that they were exterminated in the precise manner in which the Exterminationist lobby claim they were and in such numbers. On page 69 she is obviously unhappy with the opinion of the distinguished scholar Noam Chomsky that "...scholars' ideas, however distasteful, cannot be censored." One might ask: why only scholars?

She rambles on: "Even the supposed protectors of the western liberal ideal of reasoned dialogue can fall prey to the convoluted notion that all arguments are equally entitled to a hearing. Those who argue that the deniers must be given a fair hearing fail to recognize that the deniers are not searching for truth."

In view of her own desiderata and wilful blindness this is arrogance indeed; Lipstadt has clearly tailored her "facts" to support her foregone conclusions. Why no mention of Burg? Why no mention of Beaty? Why the damned lie about Revisionists drawing inspiration from the *Protocols*? Because you, dear Deborah, are not interested in truth any more than are the publishers of your quite venal article and even more venal book.

Page 71: "Those who are committed to the liberal ideal of dialogue may fail to recognize that certain views cannot be discussed rationally..." This is as good as an admission that she - and her kind - cannot debate the Revisionists rationally.

On the same page she claims that "We are not, of course, suggesting that the deniers should be muzzled". If by *we* she means *Patterns Of Prejudice* then she is either mistaken, or more likely lying again, for as long ago as 1982, the Institute of Jewish Affairs published a pamphlet called *Making the Denial of the Holocaust a Crime in Law*. (51) Don't tell us that you have never heard of it, Deborah. The *chutzpah* of Lipstadt and her kind knows no bounds. We have now completed the overview of her *Patterns* article, but we have by no means finished with her book.

On page vii she compares Revisionists with Flat Earthers; this analogy has been made many times before and is flawed for a number of reasons, not the least being that it was what we might call the "Round Earthers" - Copernicus, Galileo, and company - who challenged orthodoxy, who were persecuted in various ways and to various degrees, and who were eventually successful in turning back the tide of superstition, ignorance and proof by assertion of the establishment. On the same page and the next page she reiterates that this is a debate that is no debate and an argument that is no argument. She and her kind keep insisting that this is so, yet in practice they have long conceded that there is both an argument and a debate.

In 1979, in what was surely one of the most venal pronouncements ever made by any group of academics at any time, the leading historians in France issued the following pronouncement:

The Hitler Policy of Extermination: A Declaration by the Historians

"Since the end of the Second World War, it has happened on several occasions that publicists, sometimes taking the title of historians, have cast doubt on the veracity of the evidence on the Hitler policy of extermination. This evidence had, in 1945, a glaring obviousness. The great majority of the deportees today are dead...To contend that Zyklon B merely exterminated lice, it is really necessary to admit in one's conscience that the Jews, the Gypsies or if need be the Slavs, or men worn out by labor, were really only lice...It is not necessary to ask oneself how, technically, such a mass murder was possible. It was possible technically because it took place...there is not, there cannot be, any debate on the existence of the gas chambers." (52)

However, a mere six years later, the Exterminationist lobby admitted that some of the confessions of the alleged mass murderers could not be taken literally. Thus, of Josef Kramer, commandant of both Birkenau and Belsen: "The executor of this task was the camp commandant, SS Captain Josef Kramer. The way in which he gassed a number of people, as confessed by him on the 26 July 1945 to Major Jadin cannot be considered credible. He would have ended up gassing himself." And that "Because of the absurdity of this modus operandi and his ignorance about the substances involved, some quite legitimate historical suspicion has weighed on the procedure and on the very

existence of the gas chamber at Struthof." (53) The laws of physics are universal, regardless of the confessions or other claims of Josef Kramer.

The Exterminationists' hatred of Robert Faurisson has always been far more pronounced than their hatred of the publicity-seeking Zundel, solely because Faurisson is an accredited academic. On page 9, Lipstadt says that Faurisson asserts that the German army was given "Draconian orders" not to kill civilians, including Jews. Let us turn to the *Jewish Chronicle* for confirmation of this: on page 10 of the June 7, 1940 issue it is claimed that the official Nazi wireless station in Brussels had announced that fourteen Belgian Nazis and four German soldiers were to be executed as a means of stopping uncontrolled anti-Jewish excesses. The paper's comment was: "The Nazis are nothing if not methodical." Methodical or not, most people would agree that such sanctions were indeed Draconian. One can hardly imagine the Israeli authorities taking such action as a means of stopping uncontrolled anti-Palestinian excesses!

On pages 11-2, Lipstadt boasts of the official persecution of so-called neo-Nazi publishers but makes no mention throughout her book of the physical attacks on Revisionists. Page 16 quotes a *New York Times* report that one of the reasons Faurisson does not believe in the gas chambers is because "no death-camp victim has given eyewitness testimony of actual gassings." This is said to ignore "the extensive testimony of the Sonderkommandos who dragged the bodies from the gas chambers." There is indeed extensive testimony, but testimony must not simply be extensive, it must also be credible. In fact, it is most unlikely that Robert Faurisson has ever made any such claim; this attribution to Faurisson is probably an example of sloppy journalism (or wishful thinking) by the *New York Times*. Faurisson is certainly aware of the testimony of the former Sonderkommando Filip Müller, for he wrote of Müller's absurd book that: "This sickening bestseller is the result of the work of a German ghostwriter, Helmut Freitag, who did not shrink from engaging in plagiarism." (54) We will return to Filip Müller's testimony in Chapter Ten when we discuss selected extracts from survivor literature.

On page 16, the author cites the distinguished American-Jewish academic Noam Chomsky whose defence of Faurisson's right to free inquiry and free expression has not gone down well at all with her and her kind. Chomsky is said to have asked the obviously rhetorical questions: "Is it antisemitic to speak of Zionist lies? Is Zionism the first nationalist movement in history not to have concocted lies in its own interest?"

She accuses Chomsky of double standards because on one occasion he argued that "scholars' ideas cannot be censored irrespective of how distasteful they may be" (see also page 81), while on another he attacked proponents of American involvement in Vietnam. This seems to be something of a non-sequitur, but as Lipstadt herself has claimed - remember? - that "We are not, of course, suggesting that the deniers should be muzzled", (55) she can hardly condemn Chomsky for his opposition to censorship!

Although Faurisson is beyond the pale, Chomsky is in a different category. As well as being of Jewish origin he is a confirmed leftist with the most impeccable credentials. It is difficult not to read some sort of vague appeal for racial solidarity into Lipstadt's carping on at him, or failing that, academic solidarity. "Be reasonable, Noam, you can't say anything that would embarrass us. We must present a common front to the wicked Nazi conspiracy, and truth be damned!"

On page 24, the reader is told that the aim of the Revisionists is to promote seeds of doubt "that will bear fruit in coming years, when there are no more survivors or eyewitnesses alive to attest to the truth." As usual, the inference is not just that the Revisionists are damned liars but that they are nit-picking and that although survivors (and others) may get the details wrong, and from time to time one of them may actually exaggerate (perish the thought!), the holy writ of the Holocaust is not to be challenged. This is the most sacred of sacred cows, and for that reason no one must ever be permitted to challenge any part of the dogma in any meaningful sense.

This is complete nonsense, of course, and the reader is referred to Chapter Ten for an insight into the truth of the Holocaust as attested by survivors and eyewitnesses. [For a more detailed discussion, the reader is referred to the current writer's book *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?*, (already cited)].

On page 32, the author alludes to the founding father of Revisionist History, Harry Elmer Barnes, who, she says, was famous for his *ad hominem* attacks on those he disagreed with. Hmm, sounds a bit like you, Deborah. On page 33 comes an admission, albeit about the First World War: Britain falsely accused Germany of perpetrating horrible atrocities. On page 34 she recites some of this atrocity propaganda: homicidal gas attacks on civilians, babies used for target practice, etc. She appears not to even consider the possibility that the British resorted to such techniques in World War Two. Obviously she hasn't read the autobiography of one of Britain's leading "Black Men" (in his own parlance).

Berlin-born Denis Sefton Delmer (1904-79), was a pre-war correspondent for the *Daily Express*. During the war he worked for the Psychological Warfare Department, and in his 1962 book *Black Boomerang* (56) he made more than a few candid admissions including the following: "When we learned that families bombed out during the 'Terror Raids' on Hamburg were being evacuated to Eastern areas such as Poland, Slovakia and Ruthenia, we reported the epidemics of typhoid and cholera allegedly raging in those areas." (57) Obviously one must always assess such claims very carefully, but while showbiz autobiographies are noted for their hyperbolae (and outright lying) it is almost certainly the case that Delmer suppressed rather than fabricated many of the details of his war-time career. (58) As to his claim that his department invented epidemics of typhoid and cholera, it goes without saying that they may well have invented gas chambers too, or at the very least leant a hand in disseminating the propaganda.

Back to Lipstadt: on the same page she carps on that American intervention in World War One was thought by the early Revisionists to be an unmitigated disaster for the United States. As indeed it was. Let us quote the American conspiracy theorist and Conservative, Gary Allen: "World War I...was a catastrophe of such magnitude for the United States that few even today grasp its importance. The war reversed our traditional policy of non-involvement and we have been enmeshed almost constantly ever since in perpetual wars for perpetual peace." He added that Winston Churchill once observed that all nations would have been better off had the U.S. minded its own business. (59) Allen was writing in 1972, (60) but his claim has been prophetic. Since 1972, as since World War I, the United States has been involved in one fiasco after

another, and often with the best of intentions. The United States' involvement in Somalia was a purely humanitarian one, and look what happened.

Back to Deborah, on page 36 she points out that Jews were accused of trying to precipitate a war. This is a typical dirty trick of the likes of Lipstadt, (61) she uses the word "Jews" to imply that anyone who attacks the machinations of Organised Jewry or political Zionism is attacking *all* Jews and is therefore a raving anti-Semite. She neglects totally to mention the boycott of Nazi Germany which did so much to antagonise the Nazis. (62) She does not though neglect the famous September 1941 Des Moines speech of the aviator Charles Lindbergh. (63) She interprets this as a claim that the British, the Jews (ie all the Jews) and the Roosevelt Administration were agitating for war. As a Briton I might take offence to that, except that *as a Briton* I also know what perfidy my government is capable of and to what depths politicians of all races will sink.

Lindbergh's speech was roundly condemned as - bore, bore - anti-Semitic, but what exactly did he say? Here is the all important quote: "The three most important groups who have been pressing this country toward war are the British, the Jewish, and the Roosevelt Administration. Behind these groups, but of lesser importance, are a number of capitalists, anglophiles, and intellectuals...[and] the Communistic groups, who were opposed to intervention until a few weeks ago..." (64)

That is a very fair and accurate assessment of what actually happened. In other words, Lindbergh was making an attack on warmongering in general, not on the United States Government, not on the British people, and not on "the Jews". For the record, after the United States entered the war, Lindbergh trained pilots and took part in fifty combat missions, shooting down at least one Japanese plane. (65)

The author also mentions the movie industry and says that an investigation into movie industry propaganda took on an anti-Semitic tone "because virtually all those named by the investigation were Jewish". Again we meet this persistent association of any criticism of Organised Jewry or of questionable Jewish activity with rabid anti-Semitism. What are the facts?

In 1987, an American Jewish author wrote that "Until television undercut the industry's power, Jews guided the destiny of America's largest propaganda machine [and] put their stamp on the American mind..." (66) Whilst the nature of what we might call Jewish influence in the Western media is often misunder-

stood, (67) misinterpreted and not least greatly exaggerated (68) by anti-Semites and their fellow travellers, it was and remains very real. After his supposedly so controversial outburst on the American *Larry King Show* in April 1996, the actor Marlon Brando was assailed by Organised Jewry to such an extent that one Jewish pundit wrote in the *Daily Telegraph* that "I found it vastly amusing: here were Jewish community leaders and groups taking great offence at the notion that they form an effective pressure group which can force their views on an industry. As evidence of this frightful lie, they turn around and proclaim that they will make Brando's life in Hollywood a living hell." (69)

In fact, "Jewish Hollywood" probably no longer exists in any meaningful sense. A good analogy is with Marks & Spencer, a company founded by the Jewish peddler Michael Marks and his Gentile partner Tom Spencer. For many years this was a Jewish family firm but now it is the same as any other enormous company, a corporate body run by a board of directors who are, for the most part, far more interested in the pursuit of profit than in furthering Jewish aims.

That being said, the Jewish control of Hollywood is an historical reality, so if there was subversion of the movie industry by anti-Nazi propagandists who were trying to drag America into the Second World War, it is hardly surprising that there would have been some comment directed at the suspects' ethnic origins.

The subversion of the film industry - particularly by leftist "intellectuals" - was no flight of fancy, and, ironically, one of those blacklisted for her outspoken anti-Communism was the Russian-born Jewess Ayn Rand, who wrote in a pamphlet *Screen Guide for Americans*, that "The purpose of the Communists in Hollywood is *not* the production of political movies openly advocating Communism. Their purpose is to corrupt our moral premises by corrupting non-political movies..." (70)

In October 1947, Rand appeared in front of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a friendly witness, and she wasn't the only one. At that time, Hollywood was infested with card carrying communists. (71) Nuff said.

After this lengthy diversion we return to Lipstadt's text; as stated there is no mention in her book of Roosevelt's U-turn on foreign policy nor of his notorious "Quarantine" speech of October 5, 1937, (see page 81).

On page 40 she reports that to Hitler the Poles were *Untermenschen*, and that he wanted only to decimate Poland. Again, this is more *Master Race*

propaganda. In total contradiction to this, the non-Revisionist author Jozéf Garlinski reveals that "Thousands of prisoners could have got out of the camp (72) if they had been willing to sign the *Volkstliste* and enlist in the *Wehrmacht*...Signing the *Volkstliste* meant that the person involved accepted that he ceased to be a Pole and became a German." Garlinski cites the case of one man who did just that. Presumably there were others too. (73) So much for Hitler's "Master Race" theories!

On page 42 in particular and more generally throughout the book, the author seems to go out of her way to perpetuate the theory of *Aryan* evil, and Jewish suffering, of course. On page 45 she says there was no starvation program in post-war Germany. If by this she means that there was no deliberate policy to starve the German civilian population, then yes, she is correct. By the same token there was no deliberate policy to starve inmates of the concentration camps. However, let us not stop here. [If the content of the following two paragraphs sounds familiar that is because it is! See also pages 63-4].

In 1950, Lucius Clay (74) revealed that in July 1945, rations were set at 950-1150 calories per day, about half what was needed to support a working population and a third of what Americans were getting! In practice only about 950 calories per day were distributed. In August 1945, the official ration was fixed at 1,550 Calories for the normal consumer. (75) To add substance to this claim, Clay published in his book a photograph of a German child in a Berlin hospital which was dying of starvation. (76) It took until July 1948 to raise the daily ration to 1,990 calories, an acceptable minimum. (77)

How does this compare with Auschwitz? Well, according to Garlinski, the official Calorie count is said to have been 2,150 per day for those doing hard labour; 1,738 for the rest. Garlinski reports that 4,800 and 3,600 are the norm. And that prisoners actually received a maximum of 1,744; the worst treated received 1,302 Calories. (78) I have no reason to dispute Garlinski's claims re the actual rations distributed, but his "normal" Calorie counts are way off beam. (79) With regard to post-war Germany, the reader is referred to the March 23, 1946 *British Medical Journal* article of Horsburgh and Raeburn already cited, (see page 8).

On page 47 and generally, the author cites extremists and nutters in an attempt to bolster her case but fails to see such hatred of members of her own race. And the arrogance. The simple fact is that one can find extremists at both

ends of the political spectrum and in many non-political fields; it is not only "Nazis" who believe that the end justifies the means.

On pages 61-2, Hitler's ravings against "international finance Jewry" are interpreted as threats of genocide. It is difficult to take such rhetoric seriously, whether or not it loses anything in translation. Like many other anti-Nazi propagandists, Lipstadt cannot resist Hitler's famous Reichstag quote of January 1939: "Today I want to be a prophet once more: If international finance Jewry inside and outside of Europe should succeed once more in plunging nations into another world war, the consequence will not be the Bolshevization of the earth and thereby the victory of Jewry, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe." (80)

Judge Staeglich says of this sort of sophistry that: "angry words were part of the vocabulary of the times...When quoted in context - as they seldom are - these remarks show that Hitler was not really suggesting the physical annihilation of the Jews." (81) Then he goes on to put this speech into its proper context; interested readers are referred to his book, in particular to page 60. (82)

On page 63, (83) Lipstadt says that Zionists were said to have used their remarkable powers to prevent the truth from emerging. There is just a hint of sarcasm here, but the author surely cannot be unaware of the reality of Jewish, and in particular of Zionist, power. The persistent misrepresentation of the situation in the Middle East is surely proof enough of that. Up until the atrocities of Sabra and Shatila, the Zionists could get away with virtually anything in the Middle East; for the most part, Zionist propaganda went unchallenged except by the anti-Zionist extreme left (84) and other - more mainstream - elements (85) who were often smeared as anti-Semitic for their troubles. Since Sabra and Shatila, and later, the *Intifada*, the pendulum has swung the other way, and even many Jews have seen through the simulated idealism of this dreadful inhuman philosophy. For some time it has been possible to voice vocal criticism of Zionist policies without being smeared as anti-Semitic. The day has yet to come when this privilege is extended to questioning the perceived wisdom of the Holocaust.

On page 95, Austin J. App is said to have claimed that Jews wanted to use the six million "vindictively as an eternal club for pressuring indemnities out of West Germany and for wringing financial contributions out of American Jews." These may be harsh words, but for Organised Jewry they are true in both

substance and fact. Though Professor App should have added that the Holocaust - whatever it was - has been exploited even more shamelessly by the "anti-racist" lobby.

Page 96: "If Jews controlled the media why did it treat Nazi Germany's persecution of the Jews in such a lackadaisical fashion during the 1930s and 1940s." She appends no question mark to this statement, but this is certainly a good question. The answer is that this is not a simple question; there is undoubtedly a heavy Jewish presence in the media, and has been in both Britain and the United States since the 19th Century. Indeed, there have been and remain many distinguished Jewish journalists: in Britain one thinks immediately of Bernard Levin, hardly the most politically correct of people, (see also note 67). In Britain, control of the press has long since fallen into the hands of multi-nationals, but at the time Lipstadt is referring to it was largely controlled by wealthy upper class families, the Harmsworth family (the Rothermeres) for example.

The *Daily Telegraph* was founded by a Jew, as indeed was the massive Reuters newsagency; in 1991 the latter employed over 10,000 people, but it would be facile to claim that this proved that "the Jews" controlled the British press. Neither can be said to be Jewish-owned in any meaningful sense. (86)

In the United States, there is, and has been for many years, considerable Jewish ownership of the press and other media. For example, the two most influential daily newspapers in the United States: the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, can both be said, to some extent, to be under Jewish control. The *Washington Post* was founded for many years by Eugene Meyer (1875-1959); he was succeeded by his daughter, Katherine Graham. The *Washington Post* is now owned by the Washington Post Company. (87) According to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Volume 11, page 1463), the Washington Post Company was (is?) headed by Katherine Graham. The *New York Times* was founded in 1851 and was taken over by Adolph Ochs (1858-1935) in 1896. (88) From there it passed into the hands of Arthur Hays Sulzberger (1891-1968).

As with Britain though, this is far from the whole story. Anyone who makes an objective study of the British press for the immediate pre-war years will rapidly conclude that at times the press was fair, some might justly say too fair, to Hitler and the Nazis. To take just one example, as long ago as October 1933, a correspondent for the *Daily Express* wrote the following of the Führer: "Politically, Hitler's life is black with crime. But the private life of Hitler is

without reproach. Alone among his fellow leaders his shield is pure." (89) These are hardly the words of someone who is in the pockets of Organised Jewry. There is though another dimension to "Jewish press control".

Recall the words of Douglas Reed: "In my judgment the figure of six millions was a grotesque exaggeration which an unintimidated press would never have published, save to expose." (90) Like politicians, the media is subjected to a host of pressures from different lobbies and interest groups. There is nothing at all sinister or immoral about this, indeed, every group, be it an ethnic, religious, business or any other, has the right to lobby on behalf of its members, supporters or others. (91) But there is a vast chasm between legitimate lobbying and intimidation, which in the case the Jewish lobby means smearing all and sundry as anti-Semitic.

Since the end of World War Two, the Jewish lobby has intimidated Western politicians, policy makers, indeed whole governments, by its unremitting campaign of wailing and whining. As to Lipstadt's claim that the media treated the Nazi persecution of the Jews in a lackadaisical fashion during the 30s and 40s, this is a distortion. Certainly after the start of the war (1939 in Britain) and prior to America's entry into the war (ie after Pearl Harbor), anti-Jewish atrocities - real and imagined - were a staple of anti-Nazi propaganda. Furthermore, Lipstadt totally omits any mention of the International Jewish Boycott of Germany and German goods that was instituted progressively from 1933, and which received varying degrees of support from non-Jewish institutions, (see also pages 19-20).

On pages 100-1, Lipstadt gives as an example of faulty reasoning the following: the Yad Vashem archive had gathered two and a half million pages of testimony (ie victims). The archive itself has admitted that more than half its testimonies are *unreliable*. (Her word). These testimonies were not used in trials. "For deniers this was further evidence of a *hoax*." She asks "Why did it not simply replace these testimonies with *correct* ones? Why did it not have its researchers further *falsify* the data?"

This is a valid point, if one subscribes to the view that the Holocaust and all the resulting propaganda is the work of Jews and Jews alone. The current writer knows of no mainstream Revisionist who subscribes to such a belief. It must be said though that for such a high percentage of testimonies to be admitted by the leading Exterminationist research institution to be *unreliable* is hardly a vote of confidence in the perceived wisdom of the Holocaust.

Page 102 reports "blanket denial of the validity of any...eyewitnesses"; all testimony of Jews to mass murder are said to be perjured. Again, this is simply not true. Here is what Professor Butz has to say about the role of the *Einsatzgruppen*.

"...I do not want to create an impression that I am denying that the *Einsatzgruppen* executed apparent civilians, including women and children, in connection with their activities in Russia. All experience with anti-partisan warfare...suggests...that such things happened." (92)

Page 109 reports the Nazis exporting of "penniless and desperate Jews". No doubt some Jews were "exported" penniless and desperate. However, some of them most definitely were not, and neither Lipstadt nor Jewish propagandists can have it both ways.

Writing in 1939, one author pointed out that "It is claimed that the Jewish refugees who have arrived in this country have not displaced British work-people, but by setting up new industries here have actually given jobs to 15,000 British workers. If this is so, then those who have arrived here could not have been as poor as refugees are usually described." (93) Citing Sir Samuel Hoare he added that two hundred factories had been opened by refugees "in the special and other industrial areas." (Up until January). (94)

On page 113, Lipstadt says that Margarete Buber's book contains "a variety of historical flaws." This is in response to the claim by Richard Harwood that Buber's survivor memoirs "present a totally different picture of the conditions prevailing in [Nazi concentration camps]." (95) Buber, who was not Jewish - as Harwood claimed - was interned by both the Soviets and the Nazis (by the latter at Ravensbrück). In her book she reports that "My first German camp meal consisted of a sort of sweet porridge with stewed dried fruit. But in addition each of us received a large piece of white bread, a piece of sausage, a portion of margarine and a portion of lard." This prompted her to ask a fellow prisoner: "Is there an inspection or something, or is this some sort of special occasion?" Then "Do you always get as much to eat as this, then?" She comments "Anyone who has been in a Russian concentration camp has quite different views about what constitutes quality and quantity in foodstuffs." (96) Obviously, however bad the Nazis were, the Communists were far worse, as indeed they always have been and still are. However, a reading of Buber's book adduces no meaningful evidence of atrocities, but clearly Ravensbrück was no

holiday camp, for she reports that on one occasion a woman received 25 lashes for stealing a turnip! (97)

On balance, Margarete Buber's book is an honest memoir of a woman who suffered under both Stalin and Hitler, and, its obvious shortcomings and factual errors accepted, is one of the very few concentration camp memoirs which is worth anything as an historical document.

Returning to Lipstadt, on page 124 she condemns Professor Butz for the publication of his book by the (openly Nazi) Historical Review Press in the UK and by the Noontide Press in the United States. No doubt Professor Butz would have like to have seen his book published by Oxford University Press or some other prestigious academic publisher; I don't know if he approached any mainstream publisher at the outset - I strongly suspect not - but the fact that his book has not been taken up by such mainstream publishers twenty years down the line speaks for itself. Be that as it may, when an academic - or anyone else - has a message for the world, and they feel strongly about it, they will use whatever channels are open to them. Curiously, Lipstadt also condemns Professor Butz for claiming that the Nazis did indeed murder Jews, perhaps as many as a million!

Page 132: Butz is taken to task for claiming that the media of the Western democracies constitute "a lie machine of vaster extent than any of the more independent minded have perceived." This again is extraordinary, for surely *everybody* knows that the media is a lie machine. There can hardly be a celebrity on the face of this planet who has not read some totally fictitious story about his or her exploits at some time, manufactured by some tabloid journalist for the basest of reasons. Leaving aside the tabloids, in the West the media is part of the political establishment. It is well recognised that certain newspapers exert an enormous influence over the formulation of government, and more generally, social, policy. The fact that the media can and has brought down individual politicians (98) and can even sway a general election should not blind anyone to this.

On page 144, Lipstadt refers to Robert Welch as "a known anti-Semite"; this is garbage. Welch was the founder of the John Birch Society and a leading American ultra-Conservative. He was also an ardent conspiracy theorist. It is an unfortunate fact that many conspiratorially minded organisations do attract anti-Semites - and mystics - but Welch never encouraged these. Welch was one of those who espoused what may be called the grand conspiracy theory,

to wit he believed that virtually every revolutionary movement of the modern era was manufactured or controlled by the Hidden Hand. In Welch's case, this Hidden Hand was not Jewish but was that of the Communists, who in turn were controlled by the *Insiders*, exceedingly wealthy mega-capitalists who used the communist movement and the communist "revolutionaries" as pawns in their game.

Welch believed that the *Protocols Of The Learned Elders Of Zion* had been written not by "the Jews" but by Lenin, who used it as the Communist Party's blueprint for world domination, and that the purpose of using the *Protocols* thus was the time honoured one of scapegoating the minority that everybody loves to hate. (99)

On page 148, Lipstadt quotes Francis Parker Yockey who said "Gas-chambers' that did not exist were photographed and a 'gasmobile' was invented to titillate the mechanically minded." We have already dealt at length with a gas chamber that was photographed by the Americans at Dachau, even though it didn't exist. And of the subsequent lies and distortions that Organised Jewry have spun about it, in particular those Machiavellian schemers Arthur Suzman and Denis Diamond, who used such lies to effect a ban on the Harwood pamphlet in South Africa, (see Chapter Five). As for the gas vans, no one has ever produced so much as a photograph of one of these vans. Not one.

On page 158, Lipstadt refers to a book by Ernst Zundel: *UFOs: Nazi Secret Weapons?* and to Adolf Hitler's "white supremacist ideology". There is hardly any mention of the first trial of Zundel's Canadian "thought crime" trials and no mention at all of one of the star prosecution witnesses, Rudolf Vrba, and for good reason. The current writer is not so shy, however, so I will now explain very briefly what lay behind the Zundel trials.

In 1985, the German-born Canadian commercial artist Ernst Zundel was dragged into court for publishing and distributing two pamphlets: *Did Six Million Really Die?* and *The West, War and Islam*. The second of these is said to be a four page pamphlet written by Zundel himself. (100) This prosecution originated in a complaint laid against Zundel on November 18, 1983, by Sabina Citron, a Canadian Jewess and activist with the Canadian Holocaust Remembrance Association. Zundel's "crime" was the archaic one of distributing "false news". (101)

Although the first trial resulted in Zundel's conviction on one of the charges, (102) it soon became clear that it was the Holocaust rather than Zundel that

was on trial. Zundel's team had forgotten to read the script, and many of the major tenets of Holocaust theology were successfully challenged. The second trial was ordered because of errors of law in the first trial; the Ontario Court of Appeal ruled in favour of Zundel on January 23, 1987; the new trial was ordered June 4, 1987, following a failed appeal by the Canadian Attorney General. (103)

Zundel's second trial had much the same outcome: he was convicted but once again it was the Holocaust rather than Zundel that was really on trial. Worse was to come for the enemies of truth though, because Zundel took his case to the Appeal Court of Canada, and in 1992 his conviction was overturned. (104)

Whatever Ernst Zundel's ideology, he is unquestionably both a showman and a self-publicist. And a damned good one! It is common knowledge amongst Zundel supporters that some of the weird and wonderful books and pamphlets he has churned out over the years have been published for the express purpose of capturing an audience. Zundel's showmanship extended to his trials, and to his legal team.

Zundel's supporters portrayed both trials as "Zionists versus Zundelists"; as stated, at the first trial, Zundel was actually tried in connection with *Did Six Million Really Die?* and another pamphlet, *The West, War And Islam*, the latter of which was "highly critical of Freemasons". (105) One of the prosecution witnesses was a police officer, Sergeant Roy Bassett, a Freemason. Cross-examined by Zundel's lawyer Doug Christie, Bassett claimed that Freemasonry was a philanthropic institution and denied that it was in any sense conspiratorial. But he refused to answer questions about Masonic oaths! (106)

Lipstadt herself acknowledges Zundel's showmanship; on page 159 she refers to his "publicity stunts", such as turning up at court in a bullet-proof vest and a hard hat. What she doesn't acknowledge though is that the hard hat if not the bullet-proof vest, was no publicity stunt, as anyone who has seen footage of Zundel being besieged by those poor, persecuted, powerless people on the steps of the courthouse will soon realise. Zundel also received death threats, and at one point a home-made bomb was exploded outside his garage. (107)

As to Lipstadt's reference to Hitler's (supposed) "white supremacist ideology", this is more bunk. The simple fact is that Adolf Hitler was no more *racist* and probably a lot less *racist* than any contemporary white European. In fact,

notwithstanding its policy of *Lebensraum*, Nazi ideology was somewhat anti-Imperialist. In the wake of Kristallnacht, the Nazis responded to allegations of anti-Jewish brutalities as "The alleged measures of violence in Germany, in which not a hair of a single Jewish head was touched, lasted a few hours." Then they went on to accuse the British of oppressing colonial peoples, especially in Palestine. (108) If the claim about "alleged measures of violence" was not sincere, the sympathy for colonial peoples may well have been. Seven months later the *Jewish Chronicle* reported that the Moslem University of Aligarh was displaying "pro-Nazi propaganda" and that a university professor had published a pamphlet extolling Hitler as a great friend of Islam. (109)

Returning to the first Zundel trial and the testimony of star witness Rudolf Vrba, Lipstadt makes no mention of this character because he was totally humiliated by Zundel's lawyer. Vrba is an important eye witness, one of the most important eye witnesses, of the Holocaust. Along with another Jew, Alfred Wetzler, he escaped from Birkenau in April 1944. (110)

Vrba was the principal author of the *War Refugee Board Report*, which was issued in November 1944. (111) On page 7 of the *War Refugee Board Report*, the following claim is made: "The following report does not contain everything these two men (112) experienced during their captivity, but only what one or both together underwent, heard, or experienced at first hand. No individual impressions or judgments are recorded and nothing passed on from hearsay."

Wilhelm Staeglich examines the *War Refugee Board Report* in his book *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks At The Evidence*, and concludes that it is so full of inaccuracies that "one may rightly doubt whether the authors ever were in Auschwitz or Birkenau." (113)

Of Vrba's 1964 book, (114) Staeglich says that it contradicts many of the claims made by Vrba and Wetzler twenty years earlier, (115) as indeed it does. Furthermore, at the first Zundel trial, Vrba admitted that his book was "an artistic picture" and that he had never personally witnessed a gassing, (116) contrary to his 1964 text, (117) nor even seen the inside of the Auschwitz crematoria. So much for "nothing passed on from hearsay."

Another Revisionist whose name is omitted from Professor Lipstadt's index is Udo Walendy, probably because his study of doctored, retouched and fake photographs of the Final Solution is too much for her to stomach.

On page 161, Lipstadt says that David Irving had once started his own political party (citing the *Jewish Chronicle*, May 27, 1983). According to the

same source, allegedly, he saw himself as a future leader of Britain. The current writer consulted this issue of the *Jewish Chronicle*, and, in spite of an extensive search I could find no mention of Irving's non-existent political party or of his Churchillian ambitions. This issue did contain a reference to Irving as a "document-grubbing workaholic", but this was in the context of his having inspired a recently published book by the Jewish historian Gerald Fleming. (118) Whether Lipstadt lied or simply got her wires crossed, the truth is that Irving has never started his own political party; in the early eighties he published a short lived and not particularly pleasant ultra-conservative magazine called *Focal Point*. Associated with this was the Focus Policy Group; (119) which was probably a one-man band. Irving is not a particularly likeable or charismatic person; his scholarship may be respected in far right circles, but the man himself is far from revered. (120)

On page 162, Lipstadt says that Zundel paid Leuchter \$35,000. Fair enough, Deborah, but who pays you? Who paid Raul Hilberg? And it goes without saying that not a few *survivors* have made more than a few shekels out of the lecture circuit, books, etc. Pages 161-2 refer to Leuchter's team "surreptitiously and illegally collecting bricks and cement fragments..." from the alleged gas chambers, referred to deprecatingly as "forensic samples".

This is more innuendo, ie that Leuchter and his team planted their samples. The admissibility of evidence gathered improperly by police officers is a regular subject of debate in criminal trials. Leaving aside the fact that this was not a police operation, what were Leuchter and company to do? It is most unlikely that the Communist authorities would have given permission for such samples to have been taken, certainly for such a purpose. Furthermore, there is an interesting twist here: throughout the Cold War we in the West were led to believe that the governments of the Eastern Bloc were not to be trusted on any sensitive matter; the Communists were liars, period. There have been a number of campaigns in the West on behalf of Soviet Jewry, and at times the Soviet Bloc has been accused of churning out anti-Semitic propaganda. For example, in 1968, the Institute of Jewish Affairs published a pamphlet which claimed that the "Zionist conspiracy" was peddled behind the Iron Curtain. (121) Yet when it comes to the Holocaust, we are expected to accept at face value all the *evidence* churned out by the rotten commies, we are not even to be permitted to take our own forensic samples!

Back to Lipstadt, on page 172 (2nd Edition) she pours further scorn on Fred Leuchter, claiming that his credentials as an execution expert are totally bogus: "Missouri was the only state Leuchter actually advised on gas execution chambers. The closest his company had apparently come to building one was a proposed blueprint it prepared for refurbishing the state penitentiary. He submitted a plan that was never used because the state switched to lethal injection for executions." She cites in support of this claim a book edited by her co-racialist and fellow whiner Shelly Shapiro. (122) What she doesn't tell her reader though is that it was Leuchter who sold Missouri this lethal injection machine! For \$30,000. (123) Leuchter has also sold a lethal injection machine *and* a gallows to the State of Delaware, and is the author of the State of Delaware's hanging manual! (124)

On page 173 (1st Edition), she mentions the researches of Jean-Claude Pressac. Sauce for the goose, Deborah, who paid him? For the reader's information, the sponsors of Jean-Claude Pressac's massive study *AUSCHWITZ: Technique and operation of the gas chambers* include members of the Socialist Group of the European Parliament. (125) Another Exterminationist study informs us that since 1982, Pressac has been "promoted and supported on a documentary, editorial, and financial level by the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation..." (126) Again, sauce for the goose.

On page 175, she criticises Professor Faurisson. It is a sad fact that some Revisionists can be every bit as dogmatic as Exterminationists so this criticism may have some validity. In Faurisson's defence I will say that as he has been hounded both by red mobs and by those poor, persecuted, powerless people, including out of his university and into court, the poor man does have some grounds for his supposed paranoia. (127)

On page 176, Lipstadt takes Faurisson to task for asserting that if a survivor lied on one point he (or she) may have lied on other points. Again, this is a valid criticism, but there is also the question of the frailty of human testimony. Lipstadt appears to be suggesting that survivors, Jews, and especially Jewish survivors, should be exempt from the normal rules of evidence just because they have suffered, or claim to have suffered.

On page 178, she reports on an ABC TV programme which gave Leuchter an airing in his capacity as an execution expert. Or other. Rather than interpret this as proof - or at least evidence - that the Jews don't control TV, she castigates the show's executive producer. In reality, this simply proves that the media

really doesn't give a monkey's, within limits. By the same token they will keep reeling in long discredited quacks and cranks, everyone from astrologers to the Aetherius Society.

Page 181: David Irving is said to be one of the most dangerous spokesmen for the Revisionist movement. In fact, Irving's contribution to hard core Revisionism is nil. On page 182, she concludes the chapter with the phrase "truth is far more fragile than fiction...reason alone cannot protect it." Presumably legislation is needed. We can't trust the Revisionists, but we can trust the state!

On page 184, she refers to the Committee on Open Debate on the Holocaust; it's actually the Committee *for* Open Debate on the Holocaust, (emphasis added). On page 186, she refers to the National Alliance as a pro-white organisation. Good grief, how did she miss this? The National Alliance is about the most rabidly anti-Semitic "intellectual" think tank in existence; its head honcho William Pierce is well known for his belief that there were too many Holocaust survivors and that the world would have been better off if the Nazis really had exterminated the Jews.

In 1982, the British nationalist magazine *Spearhead* reprinted an article from Pierce's *National Vanguard* in which he asserted that "The 'revisionist,' the conservative, the right winger, the anti-Semite [must] face the Holocaust squarely and judge it on the basis of a higher morality..." Accompanying this article is a photograph of a group of concentration camp inmates said to have been taken at Buchenwald, May 1945; it is captioned "...Many American 'liberators' of Germany's concentration camps eventually reached the conclusion that the world would have been better off...if there had been no survivors." (128)

In this article, Pierce is scornful of many Revisionists: "There are reckless 'revisionists' who assert that no Jews were killed, solely for being Jews, by the German government. That is almost certainly not true.

I have spoken with SS men who told me that they shot Jews, and I believe them." (129)

Pierce's thesis is that the media's incessant whining and wailing about the Holocaust is not primarily the result of Jewish control but is mere fashionable-ness. He likens it to US Presidents who shake hands with a Mao or a Tito - mass murderers who have ordered the extermination of countless numbers of

their own people - then order a boycott of [then] Rhodesia. (130) From a philosophical point of view, his argument is not entirely without merit.

Pierce is also the author of two appallingly badly written genocidal novels: *The Turner Diaries* and *Hunter* which glorify the murders of Jews and non-whites. (131) Incredibly, Lipstadt mentions none of this.

On page 186, she does mention Mark Weber's concern for the future of the white race. So he shouldn't be concerned? She does not though mention that Bradley Smith is married to a Mexican or that Dietlieb Felderer is both a Jehovah's Witness and married to a Philippina.

On page 187, Lipstadt mentions a certain Leonard Zeskind whom she describes as "a respected specialist in extremism in America". Zeskind is actually a former organiser of the Marxist-Leninist Sojourner Truth Organization; (133) he is director of something called the Center for Democratic Renewal, which until 1986 was known as the National Anti-Klan Network. The NAKN itself evolved out of a Marxist-Leninist organisation. (134) Zeskind is also the US correspondent for the British-based Searchlight Organisation, (135) which hardly enhances either his respectability or his credibility.

On page 188, a small footnote says that the memorial stone at Auschwitz lists the number of victims of the camp at 4 million, a figure that has now been drastically reduced to between 1.5 and 2 million (victims of the gas chambers), 85-90% of whom were Jews. Lipstadt harps on that "It is correct that in recent years newly revealed documentation has allowed scholars to assess more precisely the number of Jews thought to have been murdered at Auschwitz. It is also accurate that scholars have long written that despite wartime rumors to the contrary, the Nazis apparently did not use Jewish cadavers for soap."

Let us deal with the four million first. Hardened Exterminationists now admit that this figure is an "exaggeration" dreamed up by the Communists. (The current writer has seen and indeed participated in much discussion about this subject on the Internet). The four million figure has no basis at all in fact, and this was acknowledged as long ago as 1953 by Gerald Reitlinger in his book *The Final Solution*, (see also page 75). According to Reitlinger, "using rectified coefficients for the part-time employment of the crematorium ovens and for the periods when they stood empty, the technical expert commission has ascertained that during the time that the Auschwitz camp existed, the German butchers [sic] exterminated in this camp not less than four million citizens of the U.S.S.R., Poland, France, Jugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary,

Holland, Belgium, and other countries." He continues: "The world has grown mistrustful of 'rectified coefficients' and the figure of four million has become ridiculous. Unfortunately, Russian arithmetic has blurred the stark and inescapable fact that 800,000 to 900,000 human beings perished in Auschwitz, its gas chambers and its camps. There are probably too many incalculable factors to make a closer estimate of the number of Auschwitz victims possible..." (136)

Whatever Reitlinger's views on "rectified coefficients", the fact remains that the figure of four million dead in Auschwitz appeared in print as early as May 1945. The following report is typical: (137)

*4,000,000 Dead in
One Camp*

MOSCOW, Monday

The number of human beings who were put to death in Auschwitz (Osweicm) was over 4,000,000, and industrial concerns made fortunes from their bodies, the Russian State Atrocity Commission said in a report to-day.

This was Germany's largest murder plant, personally directed by Himmler, according to the report.

Roughly one million victims were "processed" each year in the huge area, in which were some 620 barracks.

In addition to being a factory for wholesale extermination, Auschwitz was a great industrial centre for the manufacture of superphosphates and fertilisers - from human bodies. -
British United Press.

The anti-capitalist nature of the propaganda is clearly visible in the above: ie Jews and others were murdered for profit. Notwithstanding the analysis of Gerald Reitlinger (and those of other scholars) the fact remains that the Communists did not revise the Auschwitz death toll from four million down to approximately one million until 1990. (138)

The other claim on page 188, that the Nazis did not use Jewish cadavers for soap [apparently] (139) and that academics have long recognised this, is yet more sophistry, for if this libel on the German people has long been recognised and acknowledged - albeit grudgingly - in the West, then it hasn't been so in Eastern Europe. In January, 1995 - well after the publication of Lipstadt's book - an article appeared in the London *Times* which reported that: "Jewish fat" was scraped from the chimneys of the Auschwitz crematoria. On the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, *Times* readers were told that "Yesterday, Andrzej Paluch, a sociology professor, explained why: the fat was made into blocks of soap and sold to Poles in the neighbouring town of Oswiecim." Professor Paluch is quoted thus: "It was known as RJF - Reines Jüdisches Fett - pure Jewish fat". (140) The professor said this was called *ryfka* by the Poles, and apparently the Poles used it because "It was the only soap we could get on our ration cards. There was no choice." [This was said to have been a typical response]. (141)

One might also ask why such nonsense was reported totally uncritically in the London *Times*. The obvious answer is that anti-German libels don't count. One can imagine the hysteria that would have ensued if the Jews rather than the Germans had been accused of turning their victims into soap.

On page 189, Lipstadt denies or suggests that it is not true that the Court Historians are revising their ideas in response to the Revisionists. The truth is that if it were not for the Revisionists we'd still be reading about the Dachau gas chambers, the six million Gentile victims of the *Holocaust* and the electrocution of prisoners as well. Jean-Claude Pressac's massive study - which we will discuss in Chapter Seven - was written (ostensibly) as an antidote to Revisionism, yet as one leading Revisionist points out: "[The] book provided enough arguments for historical Revisionism to be considered *crypto-revisionist*, evidently even by its own publisher, because it has been practically impossible to obtain." (142)

On page 191, Lipstadt says that in the censorship debate there are "always other publications". She doesn't say those published by the American Nazi Party and the Ku Klux Klan, but it is difficult to see what others she could mean. On page 194, she complains that some papers refuse to print racist [sic] or sexist [sic] advertisements, and even cigarette ads: So why should they accept Bradley Smith's adverts? More to the point, why should they refuse the others? The arrogance of this supposedly so learned professor knows no bounds.

Of course, if Revisionists' advertisements were to appear only in far right publications that would be further *proof* of their wicked, lying agendas. This though is not the case, as stated, it is probable that Professor Butz would have liked to see his book published by a mainstream academic publisher; certainly all Revisionists would like to see their message brought to a wider public, but in the real world, Revisionists - like everyone else with a message - must use whatever medium they can, however unpalatable. Either that or not be heard. (143).

On page 203, Lipstadt refers to a CODOH member who claims to be a Jew, presumably David Cole, while on page 206 she claims that "hundreds of antisemites believed the *Protocols* genuine". In reality, hundreds of thousands and perhaps countless millions of people once believed this document to be genuine. That doesn't mean they were anti-Semites. In 1920, an edition of the *Protocols* was edited by an American intelligence officer! (144)

Page 215 contains the usual pithy arguments about the uniqueness of Jewish suffering and the wickedness of the *Aryan goyim*. "Why, then, do we 'only' hear about the Holocaust? For the deniers and many others who are 'not yet' deniers, the answer to this final question is obvious: because of the power of the Jews."

Well, it must be said that this is part of the reason; as usual though, life is not that simple. While the Holocaust - whatever it was - has most certainly been exploited by Organised Jewry to extract special privileges for their race and to put Jews as a group above all criticism, it has been used far more effectively by the "anti-racist" lobby to suppress "nationalism", to carve out comfortable if facile careers in the race industry and to promote all manner of political gerrymandering. There are signs though that this has now gone too far. In September 1995 an organisation called - get this - the World Congress of Gay and Lesbian Jewish Organisations, arranged a two day conference where it was

resolved that "the homosexual community should become involved in Holocaust education". The International Association of Lesbian and Gay Children of Holocaust Survivors was said to have 65 members. (145) This sort of poison is anathema to devout Jews, and it can only be a matter of time before such insults to the dead are perceived for what they are.

On page 214 of Lipstadt's book, *Shoah* gets a brief mention; this piece of blatant anti-German hate propaganda has been dealt with more than adequately by the *Journal of Historical Review*. (146)

Page 216: "If Holocaust denial has demonstrated anything, it is the fragility of memory, truth, reason, and history." It is difficult for the current writer to disagree with this statement, though I doubt very much Lipstadt will share my Revisionist interpretation.

On page 225, Lipstadt wilfully confuses the role of Zyklon-B claiming that the Revisionists refer to it as a disinfectant when in fact it is a fumigant, and on page 228 she repeats the claim that so-called deniers "[cling] to their *morgue* theory...[and that] the morgues were disinfected with Zyklon-B."

So what? Gerald Reitlinger also refers to Zyklon-B as a disinfectant. (147) All Lipstadt is doing here is playing at semantics; this is akin to calling a finch a sparrow when one is really referring to a small bird.

Be that as it may, this "morgue" may well have been used for other purposes besides storing corpses, such as fumigating blankets. On the fifth day of the Belsen Trial, Dr Ada Bimko, a Polish Jewess who had been employed at Birkenau as a camp doctor, told the military court that she had been sent to this "gas chamber" to collect some blankets. The following is extracted verbatim from the official shorthand transcript of the trial. (148)

COL. BACKHOUSE (149): Have you ever been into one of the gas chambers? A. Yes.

Q When was that? A. In August 1944. I was working in a portion of the camp which was called...(150) as a doctor, and again a new crowd of those selected for the gas chamber had arrived, and as they were sick they came covered with a blanket. After two days we were told to fetch all those blankets from the gas chamber. I took the opportunity, as I always wanted to see with my own eyes this ill-famed gas chamber, and I went. I did go into this crematorium.

It is clear from above passage that what Bimko refers to as a "gas chamber" was in reality no such thing. The current writer has no reason to question the veracity of the above paragraph, but elsewhere she is clearly repeating hearsay. Incidentally, on the following page of the official transcript, Dr Bimko gives another explanation for the alleged four million death toll in Birkenau. Asked by Backhouse if any of the prisoners kept records in respect of the operation of the alleged gas chambers, (151) she replied: "Yes...One of those who took part...a man called Grzecks, told me that others of those kommandos before having been gassed had complete records of all those transports which did arrive and then eventually were destroyed. This man Grzeck [sic] told me that others who took part in these kommandos, and in fact he himself, kept records and that the number of those Jews who were destroyed in this gas chamber would be about four million." (152)

This is one "gas chamber" by August 1944! What are we to make of this claim? In the first place it is hearsay; in the second place, it is most likely that this interchange did not take place and that Bimko was simply parroting Soviet propaganda.

This concludes our exhaustive analysis of Deborah Lipstadt's technique. By now the reader should have a firm grasp of all the methods employed by anti-Revisionist academics: the wilful desiderata, the whining and wailing, the intellectual dishonesty. We end this chapter with a brief mention of a (much shorter!) review of *Denying The Holocaust*.

In 1995, a Nigerian academic (another Nazi?!) dissected this piece of Semitic sophistry for the *Journal Of Historical Review*. (153) He says that "From the start it is clear that serious problems lurk behind the noble motives she proclaims" and makes the point that "We are expected simply to trust Lipstadt to tell us the truth. She will 'respond' to deniers, but won't permit them the same right."

Her book is, he says, an "intellectual kangaroo court". He is unimpressed by her feigned opposition to censorship of Revisionist ideas and points out that she has "no more respect for law than for truth. She clearly approves of legal muzzles of revisionists, lamenting only that such measures often don't go far enough (!)" For him, Lipstadt shows "exactly what an academic should *not* be: a blindly believing bigot."

As well as pointing out that Lipstadt employs epithets and sweeping generalisations, Dr Oluwatoyin makes a very salient point that while Lipstadt contends that Revisionists see the Jewish conspiracy everywhere she has no qualms at all about portraying Holocaust Revisionism as an all-encompassing international conspiracy. He concludes with the bald statement that "Whatever her motives, Lipstadt is not animated by concern for humanity or a passionate search for truth." The same can of course be said of all her kind, Jew and Gentile.