

## Introduction

In 1993, the Anti Nazi League (henceforth ANAL) published a 16 page pamphlet called *HOLOCAUST DENIAL: THE NEW NAZI LIE*. For the vast majority of people in Britain, as throughout the Western world, the subject referred to by the media pejoratively as Holocaust denial (or often Holocaust lying) is a novelty. Surely everybody *knows* that the Nazis exterminated, in gas chambers and by other means, six million Jews, as do most researchers and specialists in this field, including of course the great majority of academic historians? As one author put it: "Professors of history who have specialized in Germany, if asked, seem to consider the charge as established as the Great Pyramid". (1) Surely if the experts say such things, there can be no room whatsoever for doubt? As well as being denounced as liars, anti-Semites, and, of course, Nazis, Holocaust deniers - or Revisionists, as we shall call them - are often likened, uncharitably, to Flat Earthers. But, unlike Flat Earthers, whose nonsense is too absurd for all but the tiniest minority of the gullible to be taken in by, the lies of the Revisionists are so outrageous (and so dangerous) that they must be denied any platform for their propagation; the charge is often made that, not only do they deny the Holocaust, but that they want to perpetrate another one. In addition to this, as stated, the claim is made that the Revisionists are all Nazis or have Nazi backgrounds.

All this is extremely strong *prima facie* evidence, and must surely weigh against them. Certainly it has with the authorities, because Holocaust Revisionism - in particular denying the Nazi's alleged extermination programme and the existence of homicidal gas chambers - has been made illegal in Germany, and in South Africa, (under the previous Apartheid régime).

Should we then, as ANAL claim, dismiss all the "deniers" as Nazis and fellow travellers and deny them any platform for their *obscene* views? We could do, but before do anything so rash, we should bear in mind the words of the Duke of Bedford to Douglas Hyde, at the time a dedicated communist and an editor of the Communist Party newspaper the *Daily Worker*: "...never...form a final adverse judgment of a man, no matter how black his apparent crimes or how trustworthy his accusers, until you have heard his defence." (2)

## HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?

The Duke of Bedford was a Catholic and a pacifist who had campaigned against the war with Nazi Germany. (3) Hyde was in favour of the war and regarded all who were against it with suspicion. Later, he turned against communism and converted to Catholicism.

The Duke of Bedford's argument is irrefutable. At the time of writing (October 1994), a man from Gloucester is awaiting trial for a staggering twelve murders. Among Frederick West's alleged victims are his first wife and two of his own daughters. The evidence against him appears to be overwhelming, for one thing, most of the victims, who were unquestionably murdered, were found buried under his property, including property he was currently occupying. Yet there has been much disquiet over the way the case has been reported by the press. The tabloids in particular have been warned that if they are not careful they will be found in contempt of court. As with all criminal cases, until (and if) the accused has been convicted, the law forbids the media, or anyone, under threat of fine, imprisonment or both, from saying anything which may prejudice the jury of twelve impartial men and women, the accused's peers, who will be required to sit in judgment on him should he plead not guilty. Even if the accused announces his intention to plead guilty, this remains the law: when reporting alleged crimes before an impending criminal trial, the people who control our media must choose their words with care. Or else!

It would be no use a Grub-Street hack or some other scumbag protesting that Frederick West's alleged crimes are too heinous for him to deserve a fair trial. The court might rightly argue, and would certainly believe that, *it is because the crimes Frederick West stands accused of are so vile, and because the evidence against him is so overwhelming, that he is entitled to the very best defence that can be mustered, and that the law in all its majesty must bend over backwards to be fair to him.* And, when the time comes, Frederick West will have his day in court. He will have the opportunity to step into the witness box and say his piece. No Holocaust Revisionist has committed any crimes of the magnitude of Frederick West's alleged crimes. Should even the most scurrilous writer, the most fanatical anti-Semite, the most twisted, devious, hate-filled of "fascists" or fellow travellers, be denied the chance to state his case when an alleged ghoul and human fiend like Frederick West will not be denied his?

Again, this argument is so overwhelming, and should be so obvious, that it can and should be applied to any political, religious or other beliefs and philosophy. The idea that any creed is so subtly and overwhelmingly dangerous

that it will poison the minds of all those who are naïve enough to give it a fair hearing is too absurd for words. On the other hand, people can clearly have their minds poisoned by being subjected to a continuous barrage of one-sided propaganda from whatever source, because eventually they begin to believe that there is no other viewpoint. This is why in dictatorships the media is invariably subject to heavy censorship and at times outright state control. In a dictatorship, the media directs rather than reflects the beliefs of the people by suppressing all dissident views, including democracy.

An important point here is that there is always an opposing or dissenting view, and it is not necessary to be any manner of conspiracy theorist to realise this. History and science are constantly being rewritten as fresh facts and new evidence come to light. It is not necessary for opposing or minority views to be correct or even substantially correct, indeed, they are more often than not wrong, fallacious or grossly mistaken. But if any viewpoint, however ludicrous, is suppressed, any grain of truth it may contain will be suppressed with it, and the prevailing wisdom will become a rigid, immovable dogma.

Then there is the question of faith in your own beliefs. The current writer is an atheist, but his *faith* in atheism is strong enough for him to debate with any Catholic or any advocate of any religion. If you believe you are in the right, you should never be afraid to debate with anyone. Could this be the reason ANAL, academics, the Jewish establishment, and even the government, are afraid to debate with Holocaust Revisionists? That they fear the Revisionists may be right? Are the Revisionists right?

I do not propose even to attempt to answer that last question in this study, but what I do propose to do is present a vigorous defence of the Revisionists, these apparently so evil and untrustworthy men, against their apparently so idealistic and trustworthy accusers. This study is divided into two unequal parts: a philosophical discussion of the validity of Holocaust Revisionism, or any historical revisionism; and a reply to ANAL's pamphlet, which includes a documented exposé of some of the countless slanders and libels against the Revisionists and the German people. The second part includes also an exploration of some of the numerous ways in which the Holocaust is exploited.

Having researched this subject intermittently and with my limited resources for the past fourteen years, I feel that a purely philosophical defence of Holocaust Revisionism is long overdue. This book is both a philosophical defence and a Libertarian defence. Although I am a committed Libertarian I

am certainly no philosopher, at least no more so than the proverbial man in the street. My only qualifications for writing this book are my aforementioned ongoing research, an appreciation of the scientific method, a certain commitment to historical truth, and a reluctance to apply double standards to Revisionists and Exterminationists, (4) Nazis and anti-Nazis, Gentiles and Jews.

For many years this subject was totally taboo in academia; in a very real sense it was - and still is - less of a taboo to be a convicted child molester than to be a Holocaust Revisionist. In short, the Holocaust - the orthodox version of it - has become in a very real sense a religion, an article of faith. As an atheist and a rationalist, I have little or no respect for faith, and even less for religion. And as a confirmed skeptic, I find nothing sacred. Except the right to question.

One final note, as with most of my non-fiction publications, I have worked overwhelmingly with documentation which is in the public domain. This means that the skeptical reader can order the relevant press cuttings and books for himself to satisfy himself (or herself) of my veracity, and that any errors I make are likely to be errors of interpretation rather than of fact.

Alexander Baron,  
Sydenham,  
London,  
England.

November 8, 1994

## Notes And References

(1) *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, by A.R. Butz, published by Historical Review Press, Brighton, Sussex, Second Edition, (1977), page 6.

(2) *I Believed*, by Douglas Hyde, published by William Heinemann, London, (1950), page 180.

## HOLOCAUST DENIAL: NEW NAZI LIE or NEW INQUISITION?

(3) **William Sackville Russell Hastings, 1888-1953, the 12th Duke of Bedford, formerly the Marquis of Tavistock. He was also an ardent financial reformer.**

(4) **Just as I shall refer throughout this book to the deniers of the Holocaust as Revisionists rather than by the epithet Deniers, I shall refer to its proponents as Exterminationists rather than by the equally derogatory "Court Historians", a term which appears to have been coined by the early American Revisionist Historian Harry Elmer Barnes.**